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ACADEMY OF POLYGRAPH SCIENCE

SIMPLIFYING POLYGRAPH
For Law Enforcement, Government & Private Examiners

www.apsPolygraphSchool.com

HURRY, SIGN UP NOW!

Upcoming Courses

Basic Forensic Examiner’s Course
January 16 - March 24, 2017
May 1 - July 7, 2017

PCSOT Course
March 27 - March 31, 2017

Advanced Forensic Examiner’s Course
July 10 - July 14, 2017

About APS Polygraph School

Our objective here at APS is to provide our students with the best education and training in the best practices of the polygraph profession. This comprehensive instruction consists of the most scientifically reliable, valid and up-to-date principles and techniques.

Our training will prepare students to perform ethical, valid, and reliable single issue, event-specific issue and multiple-issue exams proficiently. Our courses are designed to provide the highest quality, tailor-made instruction in both the classroom and laboratory settings. Upon graduation, students will be ready to effectively conduct screening and diagnostic polygraph examination techniques.

CALL (630) 860-9700 Ext. 235 for reserved scheduling!

E-mail John@StoeltingCo.com

Academy of Polygraph Science • 8695 College Parkway, Suite 2160 • Fort Myers, Florida 33919
For registration, tuition and general questions, contact John Park:
Phone: (630) 860-9700 Ext. 235 • Email: John@StoeltingCo.com • Website: www.apsPolygraphSchool.com
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APA Elections 2017

Be part of the solution...
Get involved
Announcement Regarding the 2017 APA Election Schedule

APA will hold its annual election for Board offices in June. If you are interested in running for office, please take note of the positions being voted this year:

- President Elect (1 year)
- Director 1 (2 years)
- Director 3 (2 years)
- Director 5 (2 years)
- Director 7 (2 years)

Applicants must specify which of the five offices he or she is a candidate. Candidates may run for only one office per year.

Below are important dates to remember:

- **April 1 – April 30:** Period to submit nominations and self-nominations in writing to the National Office. Nominations must include a cover letter specifying for which office the candidate is vying.
- **May 1 – 7:** Validation of candidates’ eligibility to hold APA office.
- **May 7:** Last day to submit a candidate statement up to 500 words for the APA Magazine and the APA website (editor@polygraph.org)
- **June 7:** Candidacy letters published on the APA website and in the APA Magazine in the order they are received.
- **June 17:** Email notification of elections (Ensure your email address is current on the APA website; www.polygraph.org)
- **June 18 - 24:** Electronic elections.
- **June 26:** Posting of results on the APA website.
- **July 9 - 15:** Runoff elections, if necessary.
- **July 17:** Notification to winners. Posting of final election results.
- **August 31:** Officers sworn in at the APA Annual Banquet.

For additional information, contact Mark Handler at editor@polygraph.org or (859) 539-0705.
IN MEMORIAM
J. KIRK BAREFOOT (1927 - 2017)

The APA is saddened to announce the passing of the first president of the APA, Mr. J. Kirk Barefoot. Three polygraph organizations merged to form the American Polygraph Association, the National Board of Polygraph Examiners, the American Academy of Polygraph Examiners and the Academy for Scientific Interrogation. Mr. Barefoot was president-elect of the Academy for Scientific Interrogations prior to the merger. He then became the first president of the APA. He served as president from 1966 until 1968, and as chairman of the board from 1968 until 1970. He was approved for Life Member status of the APA in August 1977. We are grateful for the influence Mr. Barefoot had in the polygraph profession. May he rest in peace.
Kirk passed away peacefully on Wednesday 3/22 at home surrounded by immediate family. He lived a long and extraordinary life. Born in Brad- dock, PA to Dr. Neal D. Barefoot and Dr. Beula Urey Barefoot, he was a graduate of Washington State University.

He initially enlisted at age 17 in the Army Air Force Cadets, while waiting to be called up at the age of 18. 1945 found young Kirk in the Philippines where he ultimately became a member of an elite intelligence team, under the leadership of the famed Col. Wendel Fertig. Their mission was to determine whether local villagers were sympathetic to the USA or still harboring enemy forces. Kirk was a 2nd Lieutenant when he left the military, but remained active as an army reservist.

He was promoted to 1st Lieutenant as his professional reputation grew and he spoke across the country on the use of the polygraph and other investigative techniques. This early undercover work in the Philippines led to Kirk’s desire to study police science/criminology at WSU, where he graduated in 1951.

Kirk’s professional career blossomed at McKesson Corporation where he was the Director of Security. His use and knowledge of undercover investigation, led to his career as an author. His first book (of 4) Undercover Investigation is currently in its third edition (1995) and remains a classic in college classrooms across the country. Perhaps his greatest professional achievement was that as an early
adaptor/expert witness on the use of the polygraph. He was a founding member and the first president of the American Polygraph Association in the 1960s. He was a life member of the American Society of Industrial Security and served on its board of directors. He was awarded the CPP (Certified Protection Professional). Kirk retired from Cluett, Peabody and Co. (NY, NY) after serving as Director of worldwide security operations. At this point, he moved from Riverside, CT to Skidaway Island, GA, where he and his wife of 67 years, Cathie made many new friends and enjoyed living.

Kirk is survived by his wife, Catherine (Brown) Barefoot, his children Kirk II (Anna), Janice (Nick), Scott (Kathy); his first granddaughter Rebecca (Alan), 6 additional grandchildren: Ellen, Max, Colin, Emma and Claire and three great grandchildren: James, Grace and Elliot. He was predeceased by their son Jeffrey David.
Join ASTM and participate in developing standards for:

- Instrumentation
- Examiner Education and Training
- Psychophysiological Detection of Deception
- Quality Control

The ASTM standards development process is accessible and affordable, with online tools and low annual membership fees. For just $75 (USD), your membership includes:

- Free volume of ASTM standards
- Access to fellow committee members
- Ability to vote on the balloting of standards
- Participation on other technical committees
- And much more

Visit www.astm.org or contact E52 manager Joe Koury at jkoury@astm.org for more information.
American Polygraph Association

52nd Annual Seminar/Workshop
August 27 - September 1
Las Vegas, NV

National Polygraph Academy

Basic Examiner Courses:
April 3 - June 9, 2017 (Richmond, KY)
June 5 - August 11, 2017 (Amarillo, TX)
Sept 11 - November 17, 2017 (TBA)

PCSOT Courses:
June 12-16, 2017 (Richmond, KY)
August 14-18, 2017 (Amarillo, TX)

Advanced Continuing Education (ACE) Courses: March 20-22, 2017 (Lafayette, IN)

PEAK Credibility Assessment Training Center

Basic Examiner's Course
May 8, 2017 - July 14, 2017 (Cape Coral FL)
September 5, 2017 - November 10, 2017 (Cape Coral FL)

Advanced Examiner's Course
July 24 - 28, 2017 (Cape Coral FL)

December 4, 2017- December 8, 2017 (Lafayette IN)

PCSOT Course
July 17 - 21, 2017 (Cape Coral FL)

American International Institute of Polygraph

Basic Classes:
May 15 – July 21, 2017 (Stockbridge, GA)
September 13 – November 17, 2017 (Stockbridge, GA)

Continuing Education
PCSOT July 24-28, 2017 (Stockbridge, GA)

Attention School Directors

If you would like to see your school's course dates listed here, simply send your upcoming course schedule to editor@polygraph.org
Minnesota Sex Offender Program is seeking a Polygraph Specialist

Unique opportunity to provide polygraph services that will include the processing of polygraph referrals, maintaining accurate polygraph data, conducting polygraph exams, reviewing records for quality control, and communicating with clinical staff to assist with enhancing a therapeutic community.

The Polygraph Specialist is required to conduct extensive researching maintaining a best practices for the purpose of providing clinical and investigative polygraph examinations within MSOP.

Location:
Located off highway 169, just south of downtown in the Minnesota River Valley, St. Peter is a welcoming community of 10,000 and offers the best of small town living, with the conveniences of close proximity to Minneapolis/St. Paul. Housing is plentiful and affordable, in addition to a comparatively lower cost of living.

Minimum Qualifications:
• Three years of professional experience conducting polygraphs and/or investigations of civil, criminal and employee misconduct in a forensic, correctional, or law enforcement setting.
• Experience must include:
  o Interviewing and interrogating.
  o Conducting polygraph and Post Conviction Sex Offender Testing (PCSOT) exams.
  o Maintaining and tracking documentation to include, but not limited to, polygraph results and related data.
  o Testifying in court and/or other legal proceedings.
• Valid Driver’s License.
• Obtain and maintain a professional membership with the American Polygraph Association.

Benefits:
In additional to a competitive salary, the State of Minnesota offers excellent employee benefits, including a defined benefit pension (increasingly rare), low-cost health and dental insurance, and affordable dependent coverage.

Apply online by March 9th: www.mn.gov/careers Job ID #11359
Questions: Contact Nicole Elsen at nicole.m.elsen@state.mn.us
52nd Annual Seminar
American Polygraph Association

August 27 - September 1, 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00 - 2:00 PM</td>
<td>Avoiding the Pitfalls: Ethics for Polygraph Examiners</td>
<td>Steve Duncan, APA Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 - 5:00 PM</td>
<td>You Want Me to Ask What? Test Question Construction</td>
<td>Steve Duncan, APA Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCHOOL DIRECTOR'S MEETING**
1:00 - 3:00 PM
(ROOM TO BE ANNOUNCED)

**APA WELCOME RECEPTION**
6:30 - 8:30 PM
MONDAY, AUGUST 28, 2017

CLASSROOM A (disponible en Espanol)

7:30 - 8:00 AM Break Sponsored by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 9:30 AM</td>
<td>OPENING CEREMONIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call to Order</td>
<td>J. Patrick O'Burke, APA President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Las Vegas Metro Police Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledge of</td>
<td>J. Patrick O'Burke, APA President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegiance</td>
<td>Richard Pascuito</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taps</td>
<td>Barry Cushman, APA Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invocation</td>
<td>J. Patrick O'Burke, APA President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome to</td>
<td>Deputy Chief Gary Schofield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>Michael C. Gougler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 - 9:45 AM</td>
<td>Break Sponsored by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:45 - 12:00 NOON</td>
<td>Panel Discussion</td>
<td>Gordon L. Vaughan, Moderator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 - 5:00 PM</td>
<td>Validated Polygraph Principles</td>
<td>Donald J. Krapohl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APA Past-President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12:00 NOON - 1:00 PM Lunch on your own

2:45 - 3:00 PM Break Sponsored by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 - 9:45 AM</td>
<td>Break Sponsored by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:45 - 12:00 NOON</td>
<td>Panel Discussion</td>
<td>Gordon L. Vaughan, Moderator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 - 5:00 PM</td>
<td>Validated Polygraph Principles</td>
<td>Donald J. Krapohl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APA Past-President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CONT'D)

Validated Polygraph Principles
Donald J. Krapohl
APA Past-President
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location A</th>
<th>Location B</th>
<th>Location C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30 - 8:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASSROOM A</td>
<td>CLASSROOM B</td>
<td>CLASSROOM C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(disponible en Español)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 9:45 AM</td>
<td>Interview Route Maps</td>
<td>8:00 - 9:45 AM</td>
<td>8:00 - 9:45 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Stuart M. Senter</td>
<td>UTAH Scoring System</td>
<td>Understanding Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCCA</td>
<td>Dr. David Raskin</td>
<td>Abduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dirk Tarpley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA FBI, BAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PCSOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 - 10:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM - 12:00 NOON</td>
<td>APA ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASSROOM A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 Noon - 1:00 PM</td>
<td>Lunch On Your Own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 - 5:00 PM</td>
<td>Psychological Aspects of Polygraph</td>
<td>1:00 - 5:00 PM</td>
<td>1:00 - 3:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Stuart M. Senter</td>
<td>APA Model Policy for Domestic Violence Testing: History, Program Development, Test Formats, Relevant and Comparison Questions</td>
<td>Boston Marathon Bombing: A Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCCA</td>
<td>Rob Lundell</td>
<td>Title 18 Section 1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Polygraph Associates of Oregon</td>
<td>Mike Delapena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA FBI - Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 - 5:00 PM</td>
<td>Physiology for the Polygraph Examiner: What Do We Really Need To Know?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pam Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APA Past President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don Grubin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APA S&amp;T Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 30, 2017

7:30 - 8:00 AM Break Sponsored By:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSROOM A</th>
<th>CLASSROOM B</th>
<th>CLASSROOM C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8:00 - 12:00 NOON</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Areas of test Data Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James P. Heintzman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, Credibility Instruction Branch, NCCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8:00 - 10:00 AM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Question Formulation;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What We Know, What We</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think We Know, and What We</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretend to Know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Handler, APA Editor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Nelson, APA Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8:00 - 10:00 AM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCSOT Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Baranowski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9:45 - 10:00 AM Break Sponsored By:

| (CONT'D) |
| Gray Areas of test Data Analysis |
| James P. Heintzman |
| Chief, Credibility Instruction Branch, NCCA |
| **10:00 - 12:00 NOON** |
| Understanding Polygraph Test Outcomes; |
| What Does the Test |
| Result Really Mean |
| Mark Handler, APA Editor |
| Raymond Nelson, APA Director |
| **10:00 - 12:00 NOON** |
| Interview and Interrogation |
| "JUST DO IT" |
| Chad Russell |
| APA Treasurer |

12:00 Noon - 1:00 PM Lunch On Your Own

| 1:00 - 5:00 PM |
| Screening Exams: LEPET/DLST |
| Dr. Stuart M. Senter |
| NCCA |
| 1:00 - 3:00 PM |
| What We Might Know Wrong |
| Jamie McCloughan |
| APA President-Elect |
| 1:00 - 5:00 PM |
| RNR: Bringing PCSOT into the 21st Century |
| Don Grubin |
| PCSOT |

2:45 - 3:00 PM Break Sponsored By: **TEXAS ASSOCIATION OF POLYGRAPH EXAMINERS**

| (CONT'D) |
| Screening Exams |
| NCCA |
| TBA |
| 3:00 - 5:00 |
| APA Membership Exam |
| Jamie McCloughan |
| APA President-Elect |
| (CON'T) |
| RNR: Bringing PCSOT into the 21st Century |
| Don Grubin |
| PCSOT |
### THURSDAY, AUGUST 31, 2017

#### 7:30 - 8:00 AM Break

Sponsored By:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSROOM A</th>
<th>CLASSROOM B</th>
<th>CLASSROOM C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (disponible en Espanol) | The Probable Lie Pre-Test Interview  
Miilton O. "Skip" Webb  
APA Past President | 8:00 - 12:00 NOON  
Lessons Learned About Testing Serious Sexual Assaults and Ethics  
Charles Slupski, APA Past President, AIIP School Director  
PCSOT | 8:00 - 3:00 PM  
Developing and Implementing an Internal Quality Control Policy  
J. Patrick O'Burke  
APA President  
TDLR Approved |

#### 9:45 - 10:00 AM Break

Sponsored By:

#### 12:00 Noon - 1:00 PM

Lunch On Your Own

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1:00 - 2:45 PM</th>
<th>1:00 - 5:00 PM</th>
<th>(CON'T)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Legal Issues   | Interview and Interrogation  
Marty Woods  
SA FBI | Developing and Implementing an Internal Quality Control Policy  
J. Patrick O'Burke  
APA President  
TDLR Approved |

#### 2:45 - 3:00 PM Break

Sponsored By:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3:00 - 5:00 PM</th>
<th>(CON'T)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| TBA            | Interview and Interrogation  
Marty Woods  
SA FBI | Testing the Adult and Juvenile Sex Offender and Their Differences  
Sabino Martinez  
APA Director  
PCSOT |

### APA ANNUAL BANQUET AND AWARDS

6:30 - 7:00 PM COCKTAILS

7:00 PM DINNER
### FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7:30 - 8:00 AM Break Sponsored By:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 12:00 NOON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSROOM A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(disponible en Español)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary F. Davis, APA Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSROOM B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 10:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polygraphing Adolescents in a Residential Treatment Setting, Research Supporting Use of the Polygraph in a Clinical Based Model to Advance Treatment and Improve and Heal Relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Brooks, Executive Director Oxbow Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Spalding, Clinical Director Oxbow Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Pickup, Intermountain Polygraph LLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSROOM C</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 10:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress of Research Regarding Polygraph in Colombia: A Look to the Automation and the Acquaintance Test Using Images</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Novoa, Director Latin American Polygraph Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9:45 - 10:00 AM Break Sponsored By:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00 Noon - 1:00 PM Lunch On Your Own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(CONT'D)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest Interview Using Directed Lie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary F. Davis, APA Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM - 12:00 NOON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Controversies in PSCOT with Juveniles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Pickup, Intermountain Polygraph LLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSROOM C</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM - 12:00 NOON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice of Polygraph Use in Court Proceedings in Russia and the Eurasian Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Said Khamzin, APA Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 12:00 Noon - 1:00 PM Lunch On Your Own |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 1:00 - 3:00 PM |
| John Palmatier, PhD |
| Slattery Associates, Inc. |
| **CLASSROOM C** |
| 1:00 - 3:00 PM |
| DLC Single Issue Technique |
| Rodolfo Prado |
| APA Member |

| 3:00 PM |
|****CLOSING REMARKS** |
| James B. McCloughan |
| APA PRESIDENT |
Accredited Basic and Advanced Training
By Internationally Known Polygraph Experts

Nathan J. Gordon and William L. Fleisher

- They Wrote the Books!
- ASIT PolySuite Algorithm Creators
- Software Inventors
- Peer-Reviewed Scientific Research
- Teaching Around The World

Academy for Scientific Investigative Training
Cutting-Edge Forensic Innovators

ADVANCE YOUR AGENCY, & CAREER

- Basic Polygraph
- Advanced Polygraph
- Continuing Education
- Post Conviction Sexual Offender Training
- Proprietary Algorithms for Chart Analysis
- Forensic Assessment Interview Technique
- Integrated Zone Comparison Technique
- Horizontal Scoring System
- Manual Algorithm for Data Analysis
- Integrated Interrogation Technique
- Three DVD’s on Interview & Interrogation
- NEW SCORING SOFTWARE: ASIT Polysuite™
  Now Offered by Lafayette

For registration, more information, training at your location, or to order
- Effective Interviewing and Interrogation Techniques
- The Pre-test Interview; The Foundation of Polygraph
- Just released - The Essentials of Polygraph & Polygraph Testing

CONTACT:

UNITED STATES: Nathan J. Gordon, Director
E-Mail: truthdoctor@polygraph-training.com

MIDDLE EAST: Essam Ali Gamal-El-Din
Voice: 2027607178 Cell: 2010-164-0503
E-Mail: academvtruthseeker@yahoo.com

LATIN & SOUTH AMERICA: Tuvia Shurany
Cell: 972-54-884-4000
E-Mail: tuvia@liecatcher.com

Courses available in Arabic - English – Hebrew - Spanish

2017 A.S.I.T. Courses

Polygraph 101 Basic ($5,750. US/$6,250. Abroad)
(Academics: 10 weeks, Post-Grad: Two Weeks)
March 6 – May 12
September 25 – December 1
Guatemala: Contact Us for Dates

Post Conviction (PCSOT) ($600.)
May 15- 19; December 4 - 8

Advanced Polygraph ($450.00)
July 24 – 25
Advanced PCSOT ($450.)
July 26 - 27
(Attend Both Advanced Seminars $700.00)

Forensic Assessment Interviewing and
Integrated Interrogation Techniques ($600.)
Philly March 13–17; October 2 - 6

Morgan Interview Theme Technique (MITT)
Contact Us for Dates

Academy for Scientific Investigative Training
1704 Locust Street, Second Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103 U.S.A.
www.polygraph-training.com
1-215-732-3349
POLYGRAPH

Best Practices & Legal Issues

WHEN:
May 24 -26th, 2017

**ADDITIONAL 2 DAY TRAINING AVAILABLE ON
MAY 22 & 23, 2017
*NEAPP MEMBER COST $75*

ADVANCED INTERVIEW TECHNIQUES FOR SEX AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CASES

WHERE:
Ramada Saco
352 North St, Saco, ME 04072
Phone: (207) 286-9600
SPECIAL ROOM RATE OF $84.95 PER NIGHT

This is a split 5 day workshop that will provide training on the latest examples of best polygraph practices and polygraph related legal issues.

Additionally there is a separate 2 day course of instruction aimed at the enhancement of interviewing skills and question formulation by improving one's ability to successfully "listen" to those that have been impacted by violence and refine an individual’s skills for working with perpetrators of violence. This material utilizes research from the fields of traumatology, neuro-psychology, linguistics, polygraph, child protection, behavioral profiling and forensic psychology.

Email: mainepolygraphassociation@gmail.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY &amp; TUESDAY, MAY 22-23, 2017</td>
<td>8:00 AM – 9:00 AM</td>
<td>Registration &amp; Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 AM – 4:00 PM</td>
<td>The Use Of Polygraph With Sex Offenders. An In-Depth Study Of The Typologies Of The Sexual Offender And Their Victims For Investigators, Probation And Parole Officers, Child Protective Agencies, Mental Health Clinicians, First-Line Responders And Victim Advocates Cara Kent, M.A.; LCPC, Me Licensed Polygraph Examiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:00 PM – 1:00 PM</td>
<td>Catered Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 2017</td>
<td>8:00 AM – 9:00 AM</td>
<td>Registration &amp; Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 AM – 10:00 AM</td>
<td>Opening Ceremony York County Sheriff Bill King And Honor Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
<td>Ethics Attorney Steve Schwartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:00 Noon – 1:00 PM</td>
<td>Catered Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00 PM – 4:00 PM</td>
<td>Case Preparation For Court/ Lovejoy Case Review F. Lee Bailey, Barry Cushman, Mark Teceno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THURSDAY, MAY 25, 2017</td>
<td>8:00 AM – 9:00 AM</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
<td>Best Practices –Jamie McCloughan, APA President-Elect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIDAY, MAY 26, 2017</td>
<td>8:00 AM – 9:00 AM</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 AM – 10:00 AM</td>
<td>View From The Bench MA Superior Court Judge Kenneth Fishman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
<td>What The PLC Examiner Must Know To Run DLC Exams Dale Austin, US CBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:00 PM – 1:00 PM</td>
<td>Catered Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00 PM – 4:00 PM</td>
<td>Panel Discussion Moderator: Gordon L. Vaughan, Esq. Panel: Jamie McCloughan, F. Lee Bailey, Barry Cushman, Dale Austin, MA. Superior Court Judge Kenneth Fishman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**

“The Presentations Of The Speakers And The Materials At This Seminar Are Designed To Provide General Information On The Seminar Topics Presented In An Effort To Help Polygraph Professionals Maintain Their Professional Competence. The Views Of The Speakers And Contents Of The Materials Presented Have Not Been Approved By The Board Of Directors Of The American Polygraph Association (APA) And, Accordingly, Should Not Be Construed As Representing The Policy Of The American Polygraph Association. The Presentations And Materials Provided At This Seminar Are Provided With The Understanding That The APA Is Not Engaged In Rendering Professional Or Legal Services.”
THE AMERICAN POLYGRAPH ASSOCIATION (APA)
MAINE POLYGRAPH ASSOCIATION (MPA)
NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION OF POLICE POLYGRAPHISTS (NEAPP)
CONTINUING EDUCATION SEMINAR
MAY 22 - 26, 2017
ADVANCED REGISTRATION IS REQUIRED
APA FED ID #52-1035722

LODGING
RAMADA INN
352 NORTH STREET
SACO, MAINE 04072
For Reservations call 1-207-286-9600
ask for the Maine Polygraph Association rate

ROOM RATE: $84.95, Single/Double/Triple/Quad occupancy, plus taxes, all reservations must be guaranteed by a major credit card or advance deposit in the amount of one night's lodging. Reservations not guaranteed will be automatically cancelled at the cut-off date.

CUT-OFF DATE for hotel reservation is 4/15/17 or until MPA's room allotment is fulfilled. Number of rooms is limited. Individual departure dates will be confirmed upon check-in.

REGISTRATION HOURS: Monday and Wednesday, 5/22/17, 5/24/17 at 8:00am

SEMINAR SESSIONS: Monday-Friday, 5/22/17 - 5/26/17

APA CANCELLATIONS and REFUND POLICY: Cancellations received in writing prior to 5/8/17 will receive a full refund.

TAX DEDUCTIONS: All expenses of continuing education (including registration fees, travel, meals and lodging) incurred to maintain and improve professional skills are tax deductible subject to the limitations set forth in the Internal Revenue Code.

REGISTRATION FEE: includes professional instruction, seminar materials, refreshment breaks, daily lunch and Thursday Awards Dinner.

NAME: ______________________ PHONE: ______________________
ADDRESS: ______________________ CITY: ______________________ STATE: ______________ ZIP: ______________
NAME ON BADGE: ______________________ EMAIL: ______________________

PAYMENT RECEIVED BY MAY 1, 2017

$250 - 5 DAY - MEMBER $300 - 5 DAY NON-MEMBER
$200 - 3 DAY - MEMBER $250 - 3 DAY NON-MEMBER
$ 75 - 2 DAY

PAYMENT RECEIVED AFTER MAY 1, 2017

$300 - 5 DAY MEMBER $350 - 5 DAY NON-MEMBER
$250 - 3 DAY MEMBER $300 - 3 DAY NON-MEMBER
$ 75 - 2 DAY

ADDITIONAL $50 FOR THOSE WHO PAY AT THE SEMINAR

Your nametag is your admission to all events and activities. Please wear it at all times during the conference.

PLEASE MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO: APA

REMIT TO: APA, P O BOX 8037, CHATTANOOGA, TN 37414

CREDIT CARD PAYMENTS: Card Number ______________________ (Visa, MasterCard, Discover)
Expiration date: ___________ cvv2: ______________________ Card holder name: ______________________
Card holders address: ________________________________________________________________
City: ______________________ State: ______________ Zipcode: ______________ Signature: ______________________

PLEASE CONTACT THE APA NATIONAL OFFICE IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS
LISA JACOCKS, MANAGER
1-800-272-8037 Fax: 1-423-894-5435
manager@polygraph.org

NAME:___________________________________________ PHONE:_________________________________________
ADDRESS:____________________________CITY:_________________________STATE:______________ZIP:__________
NAME ON BADGE:__________________________________ EMAIL:________________________________________
PAYMENT RECEIVED BY MAY 1, 2017
$250 - 5 DAY - MEMBER $300 - 5 DAY NON-MEMBER
$200 - 3 DAY - MEMBER $250 - 3 DAY NON-MEMBER
$ 75 - 2 DAY
PAYMENT RECEIVED AFTER MAY 1, 2017
$300 - 5 DAY MEMBER $350 - 5 DAY NON-MEMBER
$250 - 3 DAY MEMBER $300 - 3 DAY NON-MEMBER
$ 75 - 2 DAY
ADDITIONAL $50 FOR THOSE WHO PAY AT THE SEMINAR
Your nametag is your admission to all events and activities. Please wear it at all times during the conference.
PLEASE MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO: APA
REMIT TO: APA, P O BOX 8037, CHATTANOOGA, TN 37414
CREDIT CARD PAYMENTS: Card Number ______________________ (Visa, MasterCard, Discover)
Expiration date: ___________ cvv2: ______________________ Card holder name: ______________________
Card holders address: ________________________________________________________________
City: ______________________ State: ______________ Zipcode: ______________ Signature: ______________________
PLEASE CONTACT THE APA NATIONAL OFFICE IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS
LISA JACOCKS, MANAGER
1-800-272-8037 Fax: 1-423-894-5435
manager@polygraph.org
New Jersey Polygraphists, Inc. is the only statewide organization of certified polygraph examiners in New Jersey. We are comprised of polygraph examiners in private practice, police agencies, and various government entities. All of our members use only validated test formats and follow APA published best practices.

New Jersey Polygraphists is a national leader in providing premier polygraph training at our annual seminars, which are offered at minimal cost to all examiners. Past speakers have included the leading names in polygraph research in the world including Dr. John Kircher, Dr. David Raskin, Don Krapohl, Dr. Charles Honts and Raymond Nelson.

New Jersey Polygraphists embraces and supports scientific research to improve and advance polygraph testing.

ADVANCED EXAMINER TRAINING

Gil Witte will be presenting an Advanced Examiner Course designed to further improve the skills and knowledge of experienced polygraph examiners. Topics to be covered will include:

- Updated Polygraph Principles
- Interview Route Maps
- Test Data Analysis
- Interviewing
- Countermeasures
- ESS Scoring

The polygraph profession is a rapidly changing one. Every year our knowledge is advanced by research in methodology, instrumentation and test data analysis. Stay on top of your field by participating in this important training.
**Registration Form**

Cut and Mail this section or send this information to the address below:

Name:  

Email:  

Phone:  

Agency/Company:  

Make checks payable to:  
New Jersey Polygraphists

Mail check and registration info to:  
NJP  
P.O. Box 50  
Pompton Plains, NJ 07444-0050

**Registration Information**

Dates:  
Wednesday May 17, 2017  
8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.  

Thursday May 18, 2017  
8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.  

Friday May 19, 2017  
8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Registration Fee:  
Non-members: $350  
NJP members: $250

Registration includes:  
• 20 hours of APA approved training.  
• Lunch Wednesday and Thursday  
• All training materials  
• Certificate of training upon successful completion  
• Continental breakfast all 3 days  
• Morning and afternoon snacks

NJP has secured a discounted room rate of $71 per night (plus tax). Room is not included in your registration and you must make reservations directly with The Tropicana Hotel. Use this link:  
http://tropac3.net/offercode/HPOLY17

This is a rare opportunity to get the highest quality training at an extremely affordable price.

Questions?  
Mark Smith: 973-931-2028  
Callmps@aol.com

**NEW JERSEY POLYGRAPHISTS:**  
Mark Conroy, President  
Jim Shilling, Vice-President  
Mark Smith, Acting Treasurer  
Jerry Lewis, Board Chair  
Marie Sansone, Secretary  
Kelbin Frias, Secretary
Save the Date!!

20 Hours of Training for Polygraph Examiners

Topics include: Countermeasures, PCSOT, Interviews, & Mind Mapping
Registration: $100 (Before September 1, 2017)
Registration forms available online at www.georgiapolygraph.org
Class times: 8-5 on Tuesday and Wednesday; and 8-12 on Thursday

Hosted by the Georgia Polygraph Association (GPA), North Carolina Polygraph Association (NCPA), and the South Carolina Association of Polygraph Examiners (SCAPE)

POC: Meredith Edwards, GPA President
medwards@wrga.gov
478-302-5386
ANNUAL TWO-DAY CONTINUING EDUCATION TRAINING SEMINAR

MAY 11-12-2017

15 HOURS OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

HOWARD COUNTY POLICE TRAINING CENTER
2200 SCOTT WHEELER DR.
MARRIOTTSVILLE, MD 21104

$125 MPA MEMBERS
$175 NON-MEMBERS

Cost includes Continental Breakfast, Catered Lunch and afternoon snacks

RSVP REQUIRED no later than 5-1-17
Contact: Jeff Johnson 410-854-6949
Email: gjjohns.mpa@gmail.com

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE MPA REQUIRETH THAT ATTENDEES RSVP FOR THE SEINAT AS SPACE IS LIMITED

The following companies have been invited and hope to have representatives at the seminar:

AXCITON
LAFAYETTE
LIMESTONE
STOELTING

Come see the vendors and representatives and make your own side by side comparison and have your question answered.

MPA accepts cash, checks and credit cards and we will have for sale a limited supply of MPA challenge coins.

SEE YOU IN MAY!
Please fill out and return by May 1 via mail to
MPA, P O Box 221, Linthicum, MD 21090 or
Email your information to Jeff Johnson – gjjohns.mpa@gmail.com
You may also call Jeff at 410-854-6949

Your name: ______________________________________________________________

Mailing address: ___________________________________________________________

City, State and Zip: _________________________________________________________

Phone Number: _____________________________________________________________

Email address: _____________________________________________________________

RSVP REQUIRED No later than May 1, 1017

AGENDA
Please visit the MPA webpage mdpolygraph.org under the Events tab for possible further
descriptions of speakers and presentations

May 11
7:30 – 8:00 am: Registration

8:00 am – 12:00 pm: Pharmacology and Chemical Countermeasures
Patty Odum, RN, MSN, FNP-BC

Patty is a board certified Family Nurse Practitioner. She graduated
Summa Cum Laude from Western University of Health Sciences with a
M.S. in Nursing. She graduated Magna Cum Laude from the University of
Colorado with a B.S. in Nursing. Mrs. Odum has 22 years of nursing
experience and provided comprehensive care as a nurse practitioner in
Internal Medicine, Oncology, Geriatric and Hospice. She is currently an
instructor at Marston Polygraph Academy in Pharmacology and Chemical
Countermeasures.

12:00 – 1:00 pm: Crab Cake Lunch

1:00 – 2:00 pm: FBI Polygraph Program Overview; SSA Joe Bradley, Program Manager

2:00 – 3:30 pm: Boston Bombing Case Study; FBI Special Agent
3:30 – 4:30 pm: General membership meeting with election of MPA Officers
Director Bill Cotton will be conducting the election, as his position is the only office that is not up for election.

**May 12**
8:00 – 10:00 am: Ideology of a Media Leaker; Graham Fields, NSA

In 2008, Graham joined NSA Security and Counterintelligence as a Special Agent, and has worked on multiple complex cases involving compromise of classified information due to misconduct of Intelligence Community affiliates. Since June 2013, he has been the lead technical investigator on a major national security investigation. He will be presenting about the culture surrounding and supporting ideological media leakers.

10:00 – 11:30 am: Crimes Against Children; FBI Special Agent

11:30 – 12:30 pm: Catered Lunch

12:30 – 1:30 pm: Doug Williams Case Study; FBI Special Agent

1:30 – 3:30 pm: Interview & Interrogation and Courtroom Testimony; FBI Special Agent

3:30 – 4:30 pm: Next-Gen Insider Risk Management: Proven Strategies for Tomorrow’s Hyper-Connected Workplace; Shawn M. Thompson, Esq.

Shawn is the Founder and Director of the Insider Threat Management Group, LLC which provides strategic insider risk management advisory services to the corporate sector. He also serves as the Chief Operating Officer of Intelligent ID, a data-centric security solution provider. He is a former Insider Threat Program Manager, analyst, Special Agent, Assistant General Counsel, and Assistant United States Attorney with DOJ, FBI, and NSA respectively.
How To Reduce Inconclusive Tests

Presented by:
Ben Blalock
Director of Peak Credibility Assessment Training Center

Seminar held at:
Centerville Ohio Police Department
155 W. Spring Valley Rd.
Centerville, Ohio 45458

Registration

Name: ___________________________________________________________

Address: __________________________________________________________________________

Agency/Company Name:_____________________________________________

Email: ____________________________________________________________

Phone:____________________________________________________________

OAPE MEMBERS FREE

Members of other State Polygraph Association $75
Lodging and Meals Not Included

( ) Purchase Order# ____________________________

( ) Check (make checks payable to OAPE)

( ) Member OAPE

( ) Other Association ___________________________________________
President’s Message

Patrick O’Burke

The Board of Directors finished our mid-year board meeting recently and worked on some important agenda items. No doubt some members have observed that the board has broadened the scope of the Journal Polygraph and modified the name. I had previously discussed this as one of my goals as president and the intent behind this change was to seek broader input and readership for scientific professionals. The editors of our journal have done a good job, scientists and other professionals saw the journal as strictly for polygraph. Attracting college level Master’s and PhD students, as well as scientists who conduct research to submit their work required that we broaden the scope of what the journal accepted. Further, if you are aware of colleges and universities that conduct research in credibility assessment related topics then please have them contact our editor to seek about publication.

Several Board members also attended the American Academy of Forensic Sciences (AAFS) national conference in New Orleans. If you are not aware, forensic sciences for all disciplines are being placed under significant scrutiny to show research and evidence-based standard practices. As an example, fingerprint reporting is moving towards changing the way that an examination report is written, it is becoming unacceptable to say that a person was “matched” to a fingerprint. Science is now reporting that there is not a sound basis for “matching” since fingerprint analysis is a pattern analysis. Fingerprint examiners will be encouraged in the future to report some probabilistic estimate of confidence in their analysis decision. Sound familiar?

Clearly, we need to accept that polygraph is a forensic examination, and that we must function as a scientific discipline. There are several complicated moving parts if we are to be recognized as a science. Polygraph must accredit the training examiners receive, and we must place value on college education for examiners. The day is coming where we must have college degrees, if polygraph is to
be taken seriously. The APA is in the process of aligning our school accreditation program with ASPA, (the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors). This will require some minor changes, but will create recognition for our process. The APA is also working on a Model Policy for Quality Control that we hope to have completed soon, and the board reviewed a draft at the recent meeting. There will also be a need to develop proficiency testing for field examiners, since all forensic disciplines have both quality control policies, and proficiency testing for examiners and polygraph should be no different.

Our members should be familiar with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, as a federal agency housed in the Department of Commerce. NIST has taken on the task of creating equitable standards for all forensic disciplines. NIST's mission is shown on their website as; “to promote U.S. innovation and industrial competitiveness by advancing measurement science, standards, and technology in ways that enhance economic security and improve our quality of life”. NIST has some power and authority, and in the future, will no doubt tie compliance to standards for grant funding for law enforcement agencies.

NIST has the responsibility of creating Organizations of Scientific Area Committees, also called OSACs, to accomplish the enormous tasks it has. Generally speaking, the AAFS works with NIST in helping create the OSAC, and each OSAC also has
a number of individual sub-committees with each of the major committees. I have pasted a graphic below from their website to show what the overall organization of committees look like.

While we were at the conference, your board representatives met with AAFS committee members and have been informed that there is a placeholder in a sub-committee for the discipline of credibility assessment. This sub-committee will house forensic interviewing, testing techniques and other related disciplines. It is important that I recognize the efforts of Dr. Frank Horvath, and board member Barry Cushman for their individual efforts over the past several years for ensuring that we have a place as a forensic science. It is critical for our membership to understand that polygraph makes up a small speck against the larger mosaic of forensic sciences and we are fortunate to be considered as this process begins to shape. As NIST and OSACs set standards, our training, college for examiners, and participa-
tion in these OSAC committees and AAFS will become critical. If we are to remain relevant, then we must understand and meet science standards.

As president, I have invited two board members from AAFS to attend our annual training conference in Las Vegas. It was the board’s intention for our membership to understand our future and recognize where all scientific disciplines are headed - no doubt there will be growing pains and people who will not like change. Ten years ago, hair and fiber examiners, tool marks examiners, and arson investigators were well respected and testified in court on their results. Do your own research, and see how their professions are changing. The good news appears to be that there is some raw material and framework for polygraph to fit in with AAFS and be on an OSAC committee, and this is seriously important for the longevity of our profession. I am however very encouraged for our future. Please take the time to go and look up AAFS, NIST, OSACs and the 2016 PCAST report.

I look forward to seeing each of you in Las Vegas. Please get in touch with me if you have any questions about what we are working on. For your convenience, I have placed links below to the documents referenced in my article

- https://www.nist.gov/forensics/organization-scientific-area-committees-forensic-science
Gary Davis
Director

The Board Meeting in Colorado Springs is now in the record books. From my perspective, the meeting was a success. During the meeting, your Board of Directors voted to rename the Polygraph Journal and address issues facing the APA. Minutes of the meeting are available for members to review.

As Chairman of the Membership Committee I am pleased to report we are receiving new members both domestically and abroad. The change in the bylaws has increased interest in upgrading Associate Member to Full Member. These applications are being processed as rapidly as possible.

The real challenge continues to be examiners who graduated from non-Accredited Polygraph Schools. To facilitate the process President O’Burke developed a form detailing what information is required and what documentation is to be provided. While some of the information may be difficult for “older” examiners, it can be accomplished.

Graduates from a non-Accredited Schools must establish the school substantially met the requirements of the APA Accredited Schools during their training time frame. If you know someone, who graduated from a non-Accredited school, encourage them to join our association to meet the challenges of adopting evidence-based testing practices.

I frequent the Facebook pages of a number of foreign associations. I am thankful for Google Translator. It is interesting to note the challenges for many of these association mirror our own. In countries where polygraph is in its infancy they suffer from the problems we endured in the 1970’s and 1980’s. One of the most common problems is with “chart rollers”. These examiners run as many as 20 tests a day. It will be interesting to see how these problems are resolved by our colleagues abroad. Hopefully they will not have to endure legislation like our EPPA.

On a positive note, many of these foreign associations are seeking training and input from members of the APA. This input comes in the
form of APA seminars in their home countries, APA members as speakers in local seminars and training programs, seminars co-sponsored by local associations and the APA. I believe the more we do to help our colleagues around the world in adopting evidenced-based testing practices and compliance with the APA’s Standards of Practice, Model Policies and Ethics, the better our profession will become.

Remember the seminar in Las Vegas is rapidly approaching. Our block of rooms is quickly filling at the J. W. Marriott. This year’s program covers a wide range of topics and contemporary challenges facing our profession. I hope you are planning to attend. As usual Mike Gougler has achieved the goal for a memorable training experience with quality speakers and valuable resources.

Finally, the time for election of officers is rapidly approaching. I urge all who are interested in serving your Association as an officer file for office. We remain strong because of your involvement.

Steven Duncan
Director

Hello, APA Members. I hope this Board Member Report finds all of you doing well. The board of directors and the National Office are still busy making progress with all the issues facing us as a profession.

The Ethics and Grievance Committee has made progress in completing several cases. The majority of our complaints continue to be unfound. This is a continued indicator that our examiners are following the bylaws and proper procedures. Work is still ongoing with the committee policy.

As a board member, I have continued to assist Members with issues as requested and I am here to help with problems if I can. During the month, I attended the winter Board of Directors meeting. The Meeting was very productive with numerous issues being addressed and successfully handled. I want to commend General Council Gordon Vaughan for arranging the meeting along with Lisa Jacocks and Stephanie Prairie from the National Office. Good facilities along with proper planning made the meeting flow smoothly allowing the board to address all the matters at hand. Discussion of future annual seminars including this year at Las Vegas promise the excellence we have grown accustomed to, both in planned training and accommodations, thanks to Mike Gougler’s hard work.
As always, feel free to call or email me if I can be of assistance to you. I close wishing you all well and looking forward to another great year for the association and for polygraph.

Raymond Nelson
Director

It is now only six months away from the next APA conference in Las Vegas. I hope to see you all there. Rooms are likely to become unavailable soon, so if you are planning to attend then it could be helpful to register early. These recent months have been an interesting and busy time for the board. First, we are proceeding to formulate an improved protocol for quality control. It will be important to correctly appreciate what that can, and cannot, mean for a large national and international professional association that provides leadership and authority primarily through information and association – and less through legal and regulatory mandates. A lot of good work has gone into thinking about this already, and I am sure that when we are done it will be a helpful thing for our profession.

No doubt many have noticed the change to the name of the Polygraph Journal – the premier scientific publication in our area of forensic science. It is no trivial thing to consider a name change for a publication that has existed to help our profession since 1972. President O’Burke initiated this effort, and I must agree that he was correct in his desire to broaden the stated scientific scope of the content beyond the polygraph itself and into the more general area of credibility assessment. I would also like to thank President O’Burke at allowing me to impose my concerned suggestion that we retain a visible use of the term polygraph as this will clearly anchor the ongoing publication to history and tradition and the future goals of the APA and the polygraph profession. After an enjoyable discussion, the board reached a comfortable agreement of the new publication name: Polygraph and Forensic Credibility Assessment: A Journal of Science and Field Practice. The new name reflects the intended editorial purpose – to provide a publication space to disseminate information about both science and field practice in polygraph and credibility assessment. The editor-in-chief, who was unable to attend and participate in the meeting and discussion, was notified of the board’s action and has already implemented change.

In February, Director Cushman, President O’Burke and I attended, the conference for the American Academy of
Forensic Science. That association is primarily composed of scientist and practitioners who have strong academic backgrounds. They are proceeding to transform all areas of forensic science in accordance with a future that will include greater standards and regulations for training, certification, and field practice. AAFS is playing an active role with legislators and other standards agencies to do this, and it is our goal to become more involved with AAFS. I had several very interesting discussions about testing and decision-making with scientists from forensic anthropology, forensic psychiatry and behavioral science. Most interesting though was my discussion with scientists from the Army Forensic Laboratory regarding their development and implementation of algorithmic models for statistical decision making in fingerprint analysis. It seems they are facing many of the same/common challenges that we have faced in the development of classification algorithms for a high-dimensional data space (polygraph data is high-dimensional data – which is why the analysis is complicated). Our progress and their progress show some very interesting parallels.

Perhaps the most common themes that I observed at the AAFS conference was the need to advance the skills of field practitioners’ ability to communicate probabilistic results for their analyses. It seems that all areas of forensic science have been prompted to carefully re-think and correct themselves in this area. Even the sessions on judicial issues and ethics were emphasizing awareness of the legal and ethical vulnerabilities that now surround forensic analysts’ tradition of expressing their un-quantified confidence or their expertise as the basis of validity for their conclusions. It seems that all areas of forensic science have rather fully heard the call from the National Academies and embraced the notion of evidence-based practices.

The good news for us in the polygraph profession is that the activity in broader areas of forensic science is all somewhat familiar. The challenges faced by all forensic analysts – to report quantified and reproducible probabilistic results associated with their analysis and tests methods, to avoid the impulse to communicate or imply certainty where certainty is not possible, to reduce unnecessary areas of subjectivity in analytic conclusions, to clarify standards and education protocols and protocols for professional competency, – is one that we have already begun to tackle.

And finally, the APA election cycle is
upon us. Don’t forget to vote.

See you in Las Vegas.

Darryl Starks
Director

The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines communications as, “The ways of sending information to people by using technology.” Last year I announced that the APA had expanded its use of technology to now include Facebook and Twitter to effectively communicate relevant information concerning the association and the polygraph profession to its membership. I am pleased to announce that the APA currently has 400+ followers on Facebook and 60 followers on Twitter. And the numbers are rising monthly!

At this year’s annual conference & seminar in Las Vegas, NV the Board of Director’s will again utilize the smartphone app and add Facebook and Twitter to communicate “real time” information about conference activities. This will include member photos and “go live” feeds of events such as the opening ceremonies and the banquet dinner.

So please, “like” us on Facebook, “follow” us on Twitter and make sure your user information is up-to-date on the website (member clicks) to get the latest association information available.

See you in Las Vegas!
SECRETARY’S REPORT OF BOARD ACTIONS

Submitted by Lisa Jacocks

This report covers the time period of August 2016 through November 2016

August 26-27, 2016 – BOD Meeting

• Approved the Divisional Affiliate membership for the Polish Society for Polygraph Examinations (PSPE)
• Approved changes to the PCSOT Operational Policy
• Approved recommendation of Life Membership for Walt Goodson
• Approved recommendation of proposed bylaw changes

August 29, 2016 – Special Meeting

• Approved a 100 question exam

September 3, 2016 – BOD Meeting

• Approved Gordon L. Vaughan as General Counsel
• Accepted nominations to fill the unexpired term of James McCloughan
• Approved Barry Cushman to fill the unexpired term of James McCloughan
• Approved joining the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors
• Approved an APA sponsored seminar in Latin America 2018 or 2019, subject to final approval of contract and arrangements by APA Board of Directors
• Approved waiver of the Colombian National Police education and training program
• Approved the waiver request of the Israeli government polygraph education and training program
• Approved a one-time discount for international applicants equal to the fee required by education vetting

• Approved Mark Handler as editor

• Approved Chad Russell as treasurer

• Approved Lisa Jacocks as secretary

• Approved Mike Gougler as Seminar Program Chairman

• Approved continued funding of the treasurer

• Approved salary of the National Office Manager

• Approved the National Office staff to observe the Federal holiday schedule

• Approved hourly wage of the Assistant Office Manager

• Approved funding of the editor

• Approved the funding of the managing editor

• Approved the editor’s budget

• Approved the funding of the General Counsel

• Approved funding for the annual awards

• Approved the funding for the Seminar Program Chair

• Approved funding for up to three (3) people to join AAFS and attend the AAFS seminar

• Made Committee Assignments

• Approved upgrade of Class Marker (testing app)

• Approved the APA online test for upgrade purposes until January 1, 2017

November 10, 2016 – teleconference

• Approved Chicago as the location for the 2021 seminar
• Approved the Divisional Affiliate membership of the Minnesota Polygraph Association

• Approved $1000 donation to the AAFS General Selection Reception
“Price is what you pay. Value is what you get.”

- Warren Buffet
Good question, right? Do you believe in yourself, do you believe in your abilities as a confident, professional, polygraph examiner? Polygraph Instructor? Polygraph School Director? Whether you do or don’t, maybe now is a good time for what some might call a “self-assessment.” As a matter of fact, it’s always a good time to do this. A self-assessment is like an ongoing process that requires being connected to yourself, in fact let’s call it something like connected to your inner self, that little voice inside that my teacher, Sister Mary Sulpicia, used to tell me about all the time when I was in the 8th grade at St. Stanislaus grade school in Michigan City, Indiana. The problem these days however is that many of us appear to be to plugged into today’s devices to see what’s constantly happening in the world through Cellphones, Facebook, I-Phone, the Internet, or whatever, and caught up in only what’s happening in the world today, in what some might call “Trump surprises,” so that there not as connected to themselves as
they were, and experts will tell you that that is no way to help make good or better decisions. Self-assessment means being your own counselor, developing your own views and cultivating the ability to look closely at where you are so you can think through problems. Here’s some thoughts:

Work on developing confidence. Developing confidence to take actions that will advance you in your business or your career as a proficient polygraph examiner, instructor or director. But that idea of building confidence is not as simple as it sounds. The most successful people are those who can manage the contradictions of life, individuals who are aware of boundaries, but not constrained by their limitations.

Let’s face it, insecurity disables us from winning those things that some might call “Inner Demons”, and making something out of our lives. Arrogance or big time pride makes us come off as know-it-alls. I’m sure you’re probably thinking about the same individuals in our profession as I am, when I say that. That superiority personality actually erodes our level of influence, and after a while, people even stop listening to us, no matter how good this information may be. People just stop listening to us. I think confidence is like the balancing act between pride and uncertainty, and I would like to believe it’s always a work in progress situation.

My thoughts today are to surround yourself with trusted friends, and especially individuals like those that I have always regarded as mentors, folks who will be honest with you about your performance and what areas need improvement. Listen to them, then listen to yourself. Regarding my own experiences, there are many such individuals that I have had blessed contact with. Individuals who come quickly to mind would be: “Donald Krapohl”, (He’s the obvious first choice), “Ray Nelson,” (He’s another high on my list) and also these other great influential individuals such as: “Mark Handler, Barry Cushman, Chuck Slupski, Jamie McCloughan,” these are names that come quickly to my mind, “And oh, don’t let me forget the late Ron Decker:”

Now this problem of simultaneously doubting or trusting yourself is the core principle of effective self-assessment. For example, many people find themselves repeatedly crashing into the same brick wall, never changing course. If I find myself blocked at every turn – whether it’s because of people I would have to answer to, or perhaps by some competitive circumstances or situations - I now try to remember to
step back and regroup. And you know what, it works! When we experience failures, even multiple failures, our nature is to blame circumstances, other people, the shape of the universe or... (no, I’m not going to say anything political – even though tempted to do that). But we also have to step back and ask, “Could this be me?” I think this is where the ability to have an intellectual discussion with yourself comes in to play. This is where you can disengage and look at the situation with a longer view. I think this kind of perspective is critical to determining whether your actions are helping or hurting you, your professionalism, your occupation, your work product and perhaps even your belief in the standards and goals of the American Polygraph Association.

I know you have heard this from many sources in your life, that you can carefully plot your own success and evaluate your effectiveness as you go along, but at the end of the day, you know what? You still have to get out there and play in the traffic by yourself, along with everybody else out there. You are never going to be totally trained or prepared. Let me repeat that, “You are never going to be totally trained or prepared,” because things change all the time. New creations, new discoveries, new ideas, new inventions, and there is seldom any schedule of something like required classes to see what’s going to develop next week that you haven’t heard about yet. You have to meet people, develop relationships and swap best practices, and you can make this happen. This APA Journal is jam packed with important necessary information and experiences regarding our practices and profession. You have to meet people, develop relationships and guess what, “Swap best practices.” You have to make things happen. The 2017 American Polygraph Association Conference is where such opportunities occur. Trust your healthy self-confidence, it’s like having an inner gyroscope to keep you on the right course, and above all...You can do it.
The First Year: Tragedy and Triumph

by Jared Rockwood, LCSW

Just over a year ago I completed my basic training with Ben Blalock and Chip Morgan from PEAK Credibility Assessment Center. Being a young idealist I was excited to move from the training center into the real world of practical application. I can attest that the 10 weeks of basic polygraph and an additional 40 hours of PCSOT training are a great foundation for the real-world work we face with in our profession. That stated, there were challenges and even ethical dilemmas - that I had not foreseen during the training stages. One year after leaving the academy I know more acutely than ever that I have much to learn and that the “school of experience” will be the refining fire that sharpens my skills as a polygraph examiner.

I would like to share a few experiences of success and struggle. My hope is that in sharing some of these ethical dilemmas and emotional struggles I remind you of just how challenging this profession can be. My belief is that these are not unique but have been experienced by many of us starting out on this path. I would also assume that even with years of experiences there are times when you are looking at charts debating with yourself what the next best step will be as you prepare to present information to the anxious eager-eyed client sitting just across from you.

I will share two stories of tragedy, and two of triumph. All names have been changed to maintain confidentiality.
My goal in sharing these case studies is to explore some of the more impactful lessons I have learned in my first year. While they may not be illustrative of my daily testing, these are examples that stood out due to their impact and the lessons I learned from them. Stanford Psychologist Alford Bandura said; “Learning would be exceedingly laborious, not to mention hazardous, if people had to rely solely on the effects of their own actions to inform them what to do. The value in sharing the outliers is the gold nuggets of learning that can generalize to less extreme cases.

Before I get into the specifics of the stories I would like to say that having a trusted mentor to talk things over, review charts, and illuminate research has been the key to much of my success. The foundations for good practice were taught and enforced in polygraph school. Once leaving polygraph school, the clash of the real-world versus the “school-world” became evident. I will be eternally grateful for John Pickup and his careful tutelage, mentorship, and patience with my inquisitive and at times petulant nature.

Case Study #1: Stew Umped

We have a variety of clients including; many of the local police agencies’-employment testing and PCSOT testing for adults on probation for sexual offenses. We also work with many organizations that treat adolescents who demonstrate sexual behavioral problems. Stew Umped was one of these adolescent boys we were testing under the umbrella of a PCSOT full disclosure exam.

Stew was the 10th formal test that I had ever completed in real-world practice. I was a bit rough around the edges and took a long time to review the material during our semi-structured pretest interview. This was due in part to lacking competency with the forms we use and I would stumble through the question format, at times getting lost periodically and occupying time in my own disorientation. In addition, the boy was a bit of a talker and keeping him on target was a skill challenge during the interview. Because of the thorough nature of our semi-structured interview, we expect a pretest interview to last between an hour and ninety minutes, before moving into test construction and data acquisition. In this case the interview had lasted almost 3 hours. This was clearly not effective management of the flow of the interview on my part.

After the lengthy interview, I formulated the questions and reviewed them with Stew Umped. I explained the instrumentation and placed it on Stu.
As I began the exam it was immediately evident that something was going on. His physiology was measuring as unstable and distorted during the acquaintance test. The distortion were so bad that it was difficult to imagine what was going on with the charts.

I assumed it was an issue with the instrumentation and my component placement so I first tried a different cardio cuff (kids size vs adult). When that did not help, I put the cuff on his forearm vs bicep. When that didn’t work, I raised the chair arm to be level with his heart. No matter what I did I could not find stable data. In futility, I attempted to run some charts which culminated at one point in the complete disruption of a heartbeat. It trailed off from the traditional diastolic systolic line into an upward squiggle in a single line; like it had been compressed into a death trail. I was so frustrated, and upset, and self-conscious about my incompetence I wanted to crawl under the desk and disappear. In the end, in consultation with my mentor, it was decided to call the test a “no opinion” and he was scheduled to retest the next week. John ran the follow-up exam because I was too insecure about the first round to face the situation and feared it was my fault that readings came out so distorted.

In the end John tested him with more stable physiology. This second time he failed the exam while attempting countermeasures. Months later I was assigned his follow-up test. This time the data were as expected. He added significant disclosures to his original sexual history, and he confessed to trying to alter the outcome of the exam through a combination of movement, flexing, and biting his cheek. One of the lessons, that I learned (and keep in mind), is that bad data is not always about instrumentation, but often is a byproduct of direct manipulation by the client.

Case Study #2: Kasey Fillmore

My professional background is in counseling and therefore the pretest interview has always been the most comfortable phase of a polygraph for me. It models after all the principles of good therapy: building rapport, allowing for open ended questions and discussion, and a supportive non-confrontational approach. On the other hand, the posttest interview is not my most competent area yet. It is more strategic, confrontational, and accusatory. I have used a soft approach in the posttest interview such as saying things like: “this did not go well for you, what do you think happened?” Sometimes I think this soft approach is less about the rapport building therapeutic stuff, and more about some of
my own doubts about the results and if I did it correctly. Especially early on; I was constantly questioning the science and the validity of the test itself (that is part of my petulant nature I referred to earlier).

Kasey was an adult on probation for engaging in sexual abusive behaviors with a child. He had a history with intensive binges of pornography use and he had an interest in child pornography. We completed a semi-structured interview—about his compliance with the terms and conditions of his probation and his engagement and honesty in therapy—and then formulated the test questions. Some of the questions addressed in the exam included if Mr. Fillmore had sexually touched any minors, if he had viewed child pornography, and if he had been alone with any minor (he had several nieces and nephews he had contact with but under supervision as approved by probation).

In the screening exam the charts highlighted a specific area of sensitivity regarding the question about child pornography. I had recently attended the local polygraph association training with Skip Webb who provided a day of training on the posttest interview. He talked about the need to trust implicitly in your results and when you move to enhanced interview that you set aside any excuses or blame in favor of the core issue of “You are lying to me, tell me about it.” I saw the results of the charts and in place of my passive “what do you think happened” default statement; I leaned in and said, “Let’s talk about the child pornography that you have been watching.” Kasey Fillmore put his head down and started to talk about nudist websites he had been viewing for the explicit purpose of finding nude children. He talked about his justifications as to why he thought it was ok and laid the problem on the table.

One thing I had not expected from such an exchange was the surge of adrenaline that coursed through my veins. I was on “cloud nine” completely convinced that the polygraph could never be wrong. Obtaining that first confession based on the accurate results of the polygraph was both empowering and reinforcing. The goal of polygraph is not to get people in trouble, but it is to hold people accountable and to create a safer society. That day was an important day for me as it enhanced faith in the science, in the process, and in the purpose for polygraph.

**Case Study #3: Reggie Ected**

Unlike the first two case scenarios where there were formal systems in-
The next client was a referral from a family therapist that had been working with a couple around trust issues. There had been some infidelity in the marriage both in terms of an affair and Reggie, the husband, had been frequenting ‘massage parlors’ where he paid for sexual favors. His wife stumbled upon some emails where he was setting up one of these ‘massages’ and that created the current crisis that brought them into therapy.

The therapist working with the couple has a unique situation where he works over the internet with couple in therapy, often from out of state. When there were concerns about trust (had been more infidelity than Reggie had disclosed) the therapist suggested they fly out to Utah, have Reggie take a polygraph, and then they could have an in-person, couples session to review the results and to move things to the next level in therapy. Some of the background that I had learned later on was that the wife had made an ultimatum,…“if you don’t pass the polygraph and you have been lying to me, we are done.” So for Reggie, this potentially could signify the end of the relationship.

Reggie is a very intelligent, highly successful, and charming man. He had clearly been working hard on a lifelong struggle with sexual compulsive behaviors as he laid out a very lengthy and complicated sexual development and history in the full disclosure. Often when people are able to talk about, albeit reluctantly, some of the indiscretions and improprieties of their past, it fosters a sense being honest and straightforward. This is someone I expected to do well because he seemed sincere and open in the interview. With some work we were able to define specific time periods, after which, he had stopped specific behaviors. The test had two phases; one addressed infidelity, the other, pornography. The pornography questions were specific to a period of time of sobriety he had identified while attending a 12-step program for support.

During the data acquisition phase, Reggie showed some odd patterns of physiology. At times he was almost panting and his body would subtly shake. This was not consistent throughout the entire test but strategically at moments where directed lie questions were presented. After the initial chart I told him he needed to allow his body to “do its thing”, that he should not control it, and that the first test was likely tainted because of some “odd movements.” In the follow-up charts the odd pattern persisted. The breathing channels had clear changes from relevant questions to comparison questions, and if anything, in the
follow up test were even more aggressive.

In school we had learned a few things about suspected countermeasures. 1) Most people cannot pull them off successfully, 2) If you suspect countermeasures score your charts because they are probably going to fail, and 3) Don’t pass them if it seems they are trying to cheat. In this case our session had run very long. In fact immediately after the polygraph Reggie Ected was scheduled to be at a family therapy session with his wife to review the results. I was already late for that family session but I am staring at these charts wondering if I was paranoid and perhaps misjudging the pattern that I see. The scores were strongly in the truthful direction and the computer scoring validated that. He seemed pretty open in the interview but my gut was telling me something was wrong. I believed that Reggie had intentionally manipulated the data.

I remember talking with some of my mentors about how many anti-polygraph websites will say that you need to ‘help yourself’ to pass a polygraph. That you can’t trust the process and even if you are being honest you need to aid the process along to make sure it comes out in your favor. I, in that moment, feeling like I did not have time to consult with anyone and need-

ing to make a decision told Reggie he passed, AND that I questioned the quality of the data. Then when I called his therapist I simply told the therapist that his scores were passing scores, neglecting to mention the questionable data. I was so afraid of falsely accusing him of cheating that I hid behind the logic that he had passing scores and most cheaters fail anyways.

After he left my office I debated if I should quality control the charts. At the end of the day I think I knew what the results would be and I was hesitant. If I filed this away and did not bring it up, even if I was wrong, no one would likely ever know about it. This was a real struggle, because there is ego involved. To be wrong (which I knew I was) would require reversing a call, looking incompetent, compromising the perception of the infallibility of the polygraph. In the end I had to put my ego to the side and I sent my charts to be reviewed making a note… “these look weird, what do you think?” Inevitably the response that I expected was returned, “There is no question about it, in my opinion, these appear to be classic examples of well-executed countermeasures. Most people can’t pull that off quite as well as he did.”

Then the moral dilemma was around the issue of chalking this up as a learning experience, versus contacting the
therapist and reversing the call and dealing with the ramifications of all of that. Thankfully I was able to sustain my integrity and do the right thing, even if it was late in the game. This required much time, several phone calls, and a family session online with the couple to clean up what I could have done in a few moments right after the test if I had simply done what I knew was right in the first place. That stated, it is not an issue I have let slide again. I learned my lesson. It is more stressful and time consuming to shirk addressing the issue head on, than it is to clean up the mess afterwards.

Case Study #4: Trey Umph

I have saved my favorite story for last. This is the story of an angry cantankerous man that we will call Trey. Prior to even meeting Trey his reputation preceded him. In preparation for all of our PCSOT testing we contact the therapist and probation/parole officer to inquire as to issues that they would like highlighted in the exam and to request background information. Both his therapist and his probation officer warned me that he is argumentative and would likely nitpick everything I did, and they wished me good luck… that had never happened before or since. There was a note from John on the schedule that stated “make sure he pays in advance, if he doesn’t pay in advance do not proceed with the test.”

Mr. Umph was in his mid-sixties and did not seem to be in good physical shape, as the half-flight of stairs to the office winded him considerably. He would not accept my handshake and asked me when was the last time I had washed my hands. He begrudgingly paid his bill prior to the exam, but in line with the predilection for OCD would not touch the pen I offered him in favor of his own pen. When he challenged the upfront payment expectation I told him it insures integrity of the process. He was not paying for the outcome of the exam but for the service. He responded that he would like to go into the polygraph business because he could just fail everyone that came in and make much more money. He ensured me that everyone should fail at least 2-3 times to maximize the best business model.

Nevertheless, I hope you get the picture. Trey Umph was opinionated, strong willed, a bit conspiratorial, and geared up and ready for battle. As it turns out during the full disclosure Trey was convicted of sexually touching his eight year old daughter. There were two stories, the first was the incident that triggered the referral to the police, and the second was something his daughter disclosed when they interviewed her. The initial story was
that while in a store, a citizen reported to the police that he was inappropriately touchy with his daughter. He said he frequently ‘balances’ himself by holding onto his daughter’s shoulder or putting his hand atop her head.

When the police interviewed the little girl she said she could not remember anything odd about the grocery store visit. They asked if he had ever touched her inappropriately and she said that he had. One time they were in a truck that has a single bench seat and Trey had touched her bottom. Trey explained that he pulled her over to drive with the wheel as he worked the peddles (which was something they did from time to time) and that when he put his hand over to pull her close to the wheel his hand “slid into her shorts and I pulled her over to me touching her bare thigh.” Trey indicated that he remembered the incident she was referring to and had confirmed with the police that he in fact touched her skin to skin on the thigh in the vehicle a few weeks earlier when he pulled her close to him.

He was arrested and charged but claimed he had never sexually touched his daughter. When I asked him why he did not fight the charges he said that his lawyer told him his daughter would have to be on the stand and testify and he feared it would be traumatic for her so he took the plea deal. Now he was under supervision and in therapy where everyone was pushing him to take accountability for sexually molesting his daughter; which he was denying ever happened.

In this situation the instant offense was the target of interest. I set it up using a Single-Issue Utah Exam targeting if he had ever sexually touched the private parts of his daughter’s body. It seemed fairly straight forward. Going into the test I, like his therapist, peers in group, and probation officer, believed he was going to fail the exam. I was expectant that this could be a huge growing moment for him where he could be more accountable for his actions and finally take ownership of his sexually abusive behaviors towards his daughter.

The test result was no significant response/no deception indicated, Trey Umph passed the single-issue Utah exam stating he had never sexually touched his daughter. I will admit to being somewhat surprised. As I told him the results, tears flooded from this cantankerous old man. He wept saying, “no one believes me,”no one even ever gave me a chance.” He stood up, firmly shook my hand, and thanked me for not judging him. He even apologized for his earlier bravado.

When someone is falsely accused of
something, how can they ‘prove innocence?’ Often times there is no recourse. They tell their story and people will either believe them, or they will not. That day I learned that polygraph offers a unique sanctuary to the innocent that have nowhere to go for exoneration. Trey Umph could hold his head high and hang onto that moment, when his body spoke the truth. It may not change everyone’s mind, there are likely people that would question the results. But I don’t. I was there as this man melted in gratitude, because someone believed him for the first time. And I did not believe him because I wanted to, or because I was nice, or because I hoped it could be true. I believed him because that is the story that his body told. When polygraph works, it is beautiful.

These are just a few of the many trying and beautiful experiences I have had over the last year as I have waded into the laudable profession of polygraph. After working for 18 years in group homes with troubled youth, I am thankful that this change in my career path continues to have the objective that I have always had as a therapist. I want to help people. I want to help society, and I want to get at the truth. Because in the end it is the truth that sets us free.
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Five-minute Science Lesson: 
Some Rules of Probability

Raymond Nelson¹

¹ Raymond Nelson is a psychotherapist and polygraph examiner who has conducted several thousand polygraph examinations. He has expertise in working with perpetrators and victims of sexual crimes and other abuse and violence. Mr. Nelson has expertise in statistics and data analysis and is one of the developers of the OSS-3 scoring algorithm and the Empirical Scoring System. He is a researcher for Lafayette Instrument Company (LIC), a developer and manufacturer of polygraph and life-science technologies, and is also a past-President of the American Polygraph Association (APA), currently serving as an elected Director. Mr. Nelson teaches and lectures frequently throughout the United States and internationally, and has published numerous studies and papers on all aspects of the polygraph testing, including the psychological and physiological basis, test data analysis, faking/countermeasures, interviewing and question formation and test target selection. Mr. Nelson has been involved in policy development at the local, state, national and international levels in both polygraph and psychology, and has testified as an expert witness in court cases in municipal, district, appellate, superior and supreme courts. Mr. Nelson is also the academic director of the International Polygraph Training Center (IPTC). There are no proprietary or commercial interests and no conflicts of interest associated with the content of this publication. The views and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the author and not necessarily those of the APA, LIC or IPTC. Mr. Nelson can be reached at raymond.nelson@gmail.com.
A probability is the likelihood of an event. Science and scientific testing are inextricably intertwined with probabilities and statistics (Ash, 1970; Jaynes, 2003). This is due to the fact that science and scientific tests are intended to inform our knowledge about phenomena for which it is difficult or impossible to achieve perfect conclusions based on deterministic observation (i.e., information that involves no variation and is immune to the influence of human behavior). Understanding the basic principles of probability will set the foundation for an increasing understanding of statistical principles and how statistical information can help to inform scientific learning and decision processes in contexts that involve some unavoidable margin of uncertainty. The rules of probability are therefore fundamental to science.

**Three Basic Rules Of Probability**

**Subtraction Rule for mutually-exclusive complementary probability events**

*Mutually-exclusive events* cannot occur at the same time. For example: a single coin toss cannot result in both heads and tails at the same time. Another example: The probability that event P(A) will not occur, referred to as the *complement* of event A, is equal to 1 minus P(A). The mathematical complement of event (A) is often noted as (A'). The union of mutually-exclusive complementary probability events, symbolized by U is equal to 1. In other words, P(A) U P(A') = 1, or P(A) + P(A') = 1. Because the events A and A' are mutually-exclusive they cannot both occur. In other words that probability that both A and A' occur is 0. Formally we say this about mutually exclusive events: the *probability of the complement of event A' given event A is zero*. It can be written symbolically like this: P(A' | A) = 0.

Not all mutually exclusive probability events are complementary. For example: consider the mutually-exclusive probability of selecting a King or Queen from a deck of 52 playing cards on a single draw. The probability of a King is 4/52 and the mutually exclusive probability of a Queen is also 4/52. The *union* of the two probabilities is 4/52 + 4/52 = 8/52 = .154, which is not equal to 1.

The subtraction rule can be applied when we have mutually-exclusive and complementary probability events. For example: a concealed information test statistic is the multinomial probability (Handler, Nelson & Kuczek, 2015) that greater changes in physiological activity are loaded at the test key questions due random chance – assuming an uncontaminated question set for which no prior information was
provided or signaled to the test subject. When the random probability is sufficiently low (i.e., below a critical value or alpha level) the data can be interpreted as supportive of categorical conclusion that the test subject possesses some concealed information about the key items, with a margin of error equal to the alpha level for statistical significance. To the extent that a statistically significant probability result can interpreted as an indicator of the probability of an erroneous conclusions the subtraction rule allows us to use the complement of the test statistic to interpret or infer the probability of a correct conclusion.

The subtraction rule cannot be applied when the categorical meaning of test statistic is constrained by the practical meaning of an empirical reference distribution. For example: the OSS-3 (Nelson, Krapohl & Handler, 2008) and ESS (Nelson et al., 2011) analysis models involve empirical reference distributions for criterion truthful and criterion deceptive cases. That is, the reference distributions were obtained from empirical observations of criterion truthful and deceptive cases. Deceptive classifications are made by calculating either the area or density of the test score under the truthful reference distribution, while truthful classifications are made by calculating the area or density of the test data under the deceptive reference distribution. The categorical test result will be taken from the more significant of the two statistics if the statistic satisfies a required level of significance. The practical meaning of the empirical reference distribution is constrained to conclusions about the probability of obtaining test data under the reference distribution – assuming it to be generalizable or representative to the population from which the test subject and data are obtained. But the practical meaning of each reference distribution does not inform us about the probability of obtaining the data under the other reference distribution.

Although a single statistic will become the basis of the OSS-3 or ESS result, there are still two statistical values underlying the result. These two probability values from two different reference distributions are not complementary because they will not sum to 1. Equally important, these two statistics are also non-mutually-exclusive. They are non-mutually exclusive because there always exists a probability score under the deceptive distribution and a probability value under the truthful distribution. In practice, this means that we cannot take the complement of the OSS-3 probability score under the deceptive distribution to infer the probability under the truthful distribution. Neither can we use the OSS-3 probability under the truthful distribution to calculate the complementary probability under the deceptive distribution. Instead, we are required to get the probability scores separately for the truthful and decep-
tive reference distributions. Interpreting the interaction of these probabilities will require that we use a different probability rule.

**Multiplication Rule for Independent Probability Events**

Independent probability events have no shared source of variance. Independent probability events can neither effect nor be effected by other independent probability events. Also, whatever effects the outcome of an independent probability will have no effect on another independent probability event. The combination of two independent probability events is called the intersection. The intersection of two independent probability events, \( P(A) \) and \( P(B) \), is symbolized by \( \cap \), is expressed as \( P(A) \cap P(B) \). The *intersection* is calculated as \( P(A) \times P(B) \). This is the multiplication rule for independent probability events.

The multiplication rule has been described for its application to the Marin (2000) protocol in which the credibility of two opposing witness can be evaluated independently in a *he-said vs she-said* strategy. When the two independent test results indicate that one person has lied and other has told the truth, the probability multiplication rule can be used to combine the two test statistics – but only if the tests were conducted independently such that there is no potential shared source of variance. This means that the tests must be conducted on two different examinees, by two different examiners, and that each examiner must be completely blind and unaware of the outcome of the other examination.

The probability multiplication rule cannot be used when two probability events are not independent (i.e., when they have some shared source of variance). It would be an abuse of the probability multiplication rule and would give an incorrect probability result if one were to attempt to apply the probability multiplication rule to polygraph examination results that are non-independent – such as when a single examinee is tested more than one time, or when a single examiner conducts both exams, or when any information from the other exam is hinted or revealed to one of the examiners.

**Addition Rule for Multiple Probability Events**

The addition rule is used to determine the combined probability of event \( A \) and/or event \( B \). There are two versions of the addition rule, for mutually-exclusive and non-mutually-exclusive probability events.

An example of non-mutually-exclusive probabilities can be the combined probability of error for the result of a multiple issue credibility assessment test where the categorical result is determined using question sub-to-
tal scores instead of the grand-total score. Consider an exam with two investigation target questions, A and B. Because test results are inherently probabilistic, not deterministic, there exists some non-zero probability that either or both question scores could result in an error, making them non-mutually-exclusive. The probability that an error will occur for event A or B is the sum of the probability of each event, minus the probability of the overlap. When two events, A and B, are non-mutually exclusive, there is some overlap between the probabilities associated with the events and this is subtracted from the sum. The probability of the overlap is calculated as the intersection or product of the two probabilities.

The formula for the probability addition rule is as follows: \( P(A \text{ or } B) = P(A) + P(B) - P(A \ast B) \). Using the values \( P(A) = .05 \) and \( P(B) = .05 \) the formula looks like this: \( P(A \text{ or } B) = (.05 + .05) - (.05 \ast .05) \). Reduced further it is this: \( P(A \text{ or } B) = .10 - .0025 = .0975 \). This is mathematically equivalent to the Šidák equation (Abdi, 2007) that is used to calculate some statistical corrections for the effects of multiplicity. The Šidák equation is this: \( \alpha \text{ inflated} = 1-(1-\alpha)^{\text{number-of-decisions}} = 1-(1-.05)^2 = 1-.95^2 = 1-.9025 = .0975 \).

When two probability events are mutually exclusive the product of the overlap between the two events will be 0. This is because \( P(A \mid B) = 0 \) (read as: the probability of event A given event B is equal to zero) for mutually exclusive events. In other words the two events cannot both occur. The result of this is that the value 0 is subtracted from the sum of the two probability values. For practical purposes the probability addition rule can be simplified for mutually-exclusive events: \( P(A \text{ or } B) = P(A) + P(B) \).

**Summary**

Three rules from probability theory have been shown. First, the subtraction rule was demonstrated for its usefulness in understanding mutually-exclusive complementary probabilities. Next, the multiplication rule was illustrated for its application to independent probability events. And finally, the probability addition rule was shown as it applies to both mutually-exclusive and non-mutually-exclusive probability events.

All professionals who work with scientific test results or come into contact with probabilistic information will be wise to become familiar with the basic principles of probability. Those who do not acquaint themselves to the principles of probability theory will be at risk for reckless and erroneous decision making, and for failing to understand the meaning of the probabilistic information with which they work. The result will be a tendency to misinterpret and misrepresent the meaning of the information when faced with
difficult but important questions such as: does the polygraph measure lies? Or: what does the polygraph measure? Or: what does it mean when probability results differ? Or: how can we correctly understand the meaning of several probability results together?

The rules of probability pertain to both frequentist and Bayesian statistical methods. Neglecting to understand and make correct use of the rules of probability theory will lead to conclusions that contribute to increased distrust of science and scientific test results if reality is too often (i.e., more often than predicted) observed to be inconsistent with statistical and probabilistic results. Perhaps the most concerning possibility of all is that professionals who do not acquaint themselves with the principles of probability will be at risk for offering erroneous and unscientific conclusions based on personal bias, convenience, magical expectation, or economic objectives.

All professionals whose work involves the use of information from science and scientific tests to make decisions in a context of uncertainty will be better able to engage in rational discussion and effective decision-making if they are acquainted with the basic rules of probability. This manuscript is intended only as an introduction, and cannot attempt to describe all aspects of something as complex and fascinating as probability theory. This paper does not describe how to combine results of dependent probability events, which requires the use of conditional probability. That will have to be the subject of a different paper.
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I have been intrigued, if not fascinated, with the process of interview and interrogation for all my polygraph career, which now spans more than three decades. For more than twenty-five years, I have also taught interview and interrogation to other investigators who were interested in improving this core competency. I have been blessed to have worked with, or received training from some of the finest professionals that exist in this subject. Having also attended many courses, I have observed instructors teach material that has been passed down for the last fifty years without any substantive change.

When we set up our polygraph and interview training curriculum, we intentionally set out to revamp every single component in such a way that it had to be supported by behavioral psychology and scientific research, or else it was excluded. We incorporated every research finding we could locate to instruct a narrative-style interview. We discovered some portions of older training, along with public misperceptions, taught behavior cues for deception that were not diagnostic. These were eliminated from our curriculum. We also added modules on assessing personality to improve the communication process.
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Currently, there are several good interview training courses that discuss how to properly conduct a narrative interview. These same courses offer training in what behavior cues are actually diagnostic in determining truth and deception. If you do some research you can find what I am discussing and how training is changing. Updating interview training, is critical to avoid perpetuating misconceptions that lack support from behavioral research, and are only supported by anecdotal observations.

Interrogation however, has always held the most mystique, and been the most revered of interviewer skills. Interrogation also carries the greatest consequence and potential for problems. I can vouch that the issue of “false confession” was a concern three decades ago for any professional interviewer. However, the drumbeats regarding this “false confession” seem to be growing louder and louder. I am not taking up this issue one way or the other in this article. Although every professional interviewer must consider that the general public does not understand what interrogators do, and may be very prone to believe interrogation is inherently bad. Equally true however, every professional interrogator should accept that “false confessions” are a reality.

I am reasonably confidant everyone would recognize waterboarding is not acceptable to secure a court admissible statement. However, courts seem increasingly willing to define a confrontational interview as akin to waterboarding. While it is easy to see that emotions can drive some difficult conclusions, we have to recognize that the public, and even the courts, may be unfamiliar with what occurs in the interrogation room. It is also chilling to watch interrogations that have been conducted that resulted in horrible endings for some suspects and consequently the interrogators involved.

I have had numerous professional discussions with highly qualified instructors regarding what problems exist with current interview training. Two core concerns existed in all of these conversations. One, creating an interview plan with specific steps, a one size fits all solution, would have problems. People are unique and applying one solution for everyone is problematic. Take two aspirin and call me in the morning has limitations. Second, the most difficult thing to teach was how to transition from an interview into an interrogation.

Of course, there is the direct-confrontation approach for transition that has been widely taught for many years. Some courts, some legal jurisdictions, and some interview professionals are however making a correlation between direct confrontation and false confessions. I did not say “cause” false confessions, and I am trying to avoid
taking a position here. I have used direct confrontation successfully for years and I have never been accused of obtaining a false confession, but I should not ignore this concern either.

In examining this interview interrogation transition I see that there is an alternative way to cross this bridge. Cognitive-behavioral therapy is a discipline that is supported by science and research. Cognitive-behavioral therapy is a short-term psychotherapy that assumes that faulty thinking patterns cause maladaptive behavior and "negative" emotions. Treatments focus on changing an individual's thoughts (cognitive patterns) to change behavior and emotional state. This method was pioneered by psychologists Aaron Beck and Albert Ellis. Behavioral therapy trains individuals to replace undesirable behaviors with healthier behavioral patterns.

Ellis created a list of thinking errors and believed that maladaptive thinking came before maladaptive behavior. I will not go into the thinking errors here, but suffice it to say it is the kind of thing you see in your interview room every day. Everyone has a personality, and personality disorders exhibit dysfunctional interactions with others. Behavioral therapy then seeks the subject examine their thinking as a path to changing behavior. This type of treatment can also be seen in “transactional analysis” in the book I’m Okay, You’re Okay by Thomas A. Harris, MD.

Clearly, therapists deal with resistant and defiant subjects, because most personality disorders place the blame on others and not the person in need. Despite resistance or denial, therapists tell us people can get help in treatment. Therapists set goals for improvement and the process cannot be never ending. I had a conversation with a therapist who watched an interview of a sex offender in denial. The therapist had concerns about the interview style, but did admit it was effective. I asked if therapists allowed a subject to remain in denial. The therapist replied that offenders were expected to exit denial within three to six months. I responded this offender did it in thirty minutes.

However, I was interested in principles that occur in behavioral therapy can be applied to interrogation plans. As a result of this exploration, the interview methods we teach are incorporating “behavioral intervention” planning as a method for constructing an interrogation to elicit additional information from subjects who have not been forthcoming. We think this is a viable method to obtain information and that will minimize or reduce the potential for false confessions.

I believe additional research is going to be necessary and we invite comments from interested readers.
All polygraph populations of subjects either belong to a truthful population, or a deceptive population.

All polygraph decision methods ever developed will have 3 outcomes (correct, incorrect, or an inconclusive or non call).

This makes up six variables of accuracy for any defined polygraph population. These six variables of accuracy are intrinsically interrelated, so that increasing the accuracy of any one, or combination of them, will tend to diminish the accuracy of the other variables. Such as decreasing the percentage of false hits, will increase percentage of inconclusive results, for example.

Terminology note: The author defines an incorrect di call [#5], as a member of the deceptive population who is incorrectly called truthful (also known as a false-negative result). This is not to be confused with a ‘false di call’ in polygraph lexicon.

Rule 1: Any rational polygraph method must have at least one non-inconclusive variable element from each side of a bi-modal choice. Calling everyone deceptive or everyone truthful is not a rational method.

Rule 2: It is not rational to think that any given polygraph method applies equally to all base rates, and accuracy goal tradeoffs.

Rule 3: Polygraph methods that have fewer accuracy goals to optimize
for, are likely to be more accurate at achieving their goals, than if they include unneeded accuracy goals in their optimization process.

Optimization goal Example 1: An intelligence agency screening of existing, mostly truthful, employees may decide that they want their predictive methodology to optimize for a goal of #2 (minimizing incorrect truthful subjects called di, a.k.a. false-positive results), and #6 (maximizing correct di calls). This is because for a massively truthful base rate population, as would be typical of an intelligence service, if even a small portion of the truthful population is falsely called di (#2) would overwhelm and camouflage the correctly di called members of the deceptive population (#6) (i.e. the traitors, moles, and spies). An intelligence agency may wisely decide that including accuracy #1, #3, #4, and #5 is not worth lessening their bigger goal of keeping accuracy #2 from overwhelming accuracy #6.

Optimization goal Example 2: For a criminal defense lawyer in a pre trial evidentiary hearing, a polygraph examiner would want a polygraph methodology optimization for a goal of #1 (maximizing truthful correctly called), and #5 (minimizing deceptive incorrectly called ndi, a.k.a. false-negative results) in order to convince a judge before a trial that his client is reliably truthful to a tested issue and should not go to trial. For this example excluding #2, #3, #4, #6 from the optimization process would best serve the lawyer, his client, the court, justice, and the taxpayer.

Optimization goal Example 3: In the event that a war torn region needs to have its police, and civil society rebuilt with non hostile sympathizers a polygraph methodology designer may be tasked with optimizing for #1, #3, and #5 for a prescreened population of job candidates.

These are just 3 possible examples optimizing accuracy variables, but there are 26 other rational, non duplicate, accuracy trade off optimization permutations.

With this perspective in mind, for any potential polygraph methodology there is a palate of 26 rational, non duplicate, permutations containing both sides of the non inconclusive elements of a bi-modal population, in their optimization goals that a methodology can select from.

(proof below) [i.e. 4+8+7+6+1]=26

For A SINGLE VARIABLE (non-rational, I.E. call everyone deceptive for variable 6) [0]

1,2,3,4,5,6 (struck through means non-rational)
FOR TWO VARIABLE COMBINATIONS
[4 rational, non duplicate, optimization combinations]

1-6, 1-5, 1-4, 1-3, 1-2
2-6, 2-5, 2-4, 2-3
3-6, 3-5, 3-4
4-6, 4-5
5-6

FOR THREE VARIABLE COMBINATIONS
[8 rational, non duplicate, optimization combinations]

1-2-3, 1-2-4, 1-2-5, 1-2-6
1-3-4, 1-3-5, 1-3-6
1-4-5, 1-4-6
1-5-6
2-3-4, 2-3-5, 2-3-6
3-4-5, 3-4-6, 3-5-6
4-5-6

FOR FOUR VARIABLE COMBINATIONS
[7 rational, non duplicate, optimization combinations]

1-2-3-4, 1-2-3-5, 1-2-3-6
1-2-4-5, 1-2-4-6
1-2-5-6
2-3-4-5, 2-3-4-6
3-4-5-6

FOR FIVE VARIABLE COMBINATIONS
[6 rational, non duplicate, optimization combinations]

1-2-3-4-5, 1-2-3-4-6, 1-2-3-5-6, 1-2-4-5-6, 1-3-4-5-6, 2-3-4-5-6

FOR SIX VARIABLE there is only one combination. [1]

So how accurate is polygraph? Or how accurate is any predictive methodology for any bi-modal population? It depends on first defining which of the 26 discrete possible accuracy tradeoff choices you select, as well as the target population base rate.

It should be noted that this line of reasoning is not limited to polygraph accuracy only, but applies to all bi-modal predictive methodologies in the field of math. Such diverse bi-modal populations as predicting baseball game outcomes (win/lose), cancer diagnosis, predicting 2 party political elections, predicting bi-modal tipping point events such as political revolutions, for example. The only limit is that data must exist with a causal relationship with the bi-modal outcome of interest. Once a causal relationship is known for a predictive methodology, then the above described accuracy goal tradeoffs can be considered.

In summary: As important as white alpha (separate paper) is for measuring accuracy, it is also important for a department, or agency to define their accuracy tradeoff goals, and expected population base rate when developing a polygraph methodology targeted to their needs.
Practical Polygraph: How to Select a Polygraph Test Format

Raymond Nelson\textsuperscript{1,3} and Mark Handler\textsuperscript{2,3}

Diagnostic Test

Is there a known incident or known allegation?

Yes

How many RQs?

2 RQs, 3 RQs

How many RQs?

4 RQs

Test questions will have non-independent criterion variance

More RQs = more data with potentially greater test sensitivity and specificity, and reduced inconclusives

Single target or multiple issues?

Single (single issue screening)

Multiple

How many RQs?

2 RQs, 3 RQs

Questions will be interpreted with an assumption of independent criterion variance

More RQs = potentially increased test sensitivity With more opportunities for decision error and inconclusive results

No

Screening Test
Selection of a polygraph test format should be a rational process based on an evaluation of the case referral information, the needs of the referring professional, and our scientific knowledge about polygraph techniques. In decades past, the traditional way of selecting a polygraph format may have been to use the technique that carried the name of the founder of the polygraph school at which an examiner received one’s training. Use of named polygraph techniques served the profession well for a time – especially inasmuch as it allowed for the recognition and discussion of standardized procedures that that could be studied for the fundamental principles that influence their effectiveness. But field practitioners for a time seemed to harbor an unrealistic, almost mythological, expectation that each different named polygraph technique were sacred, as if they were based on fundamentally different scientific principles, along with an irrational attitudes about the potential value of field practices and scientific knowledge gleaned from professionals trained at other polygraph schools. This amounted to a form of indoctrination or professional imprinting in which the test format was selected as a matter of memorization or habit, with little thought or awareness about the fundamental principles that govern the effectiveness of the test question format.

Although many of the several polygraph techniques in use today have begun to appear more similar than different, some older polygraph techniques that remain in use today still retain aspects and elements of their original design – even though some of the hypothesized design advantages have been inconsistent with scientific evidence. Polygraph examiners who make use of these techniques are required to pay diligent attention to the these original design elements, regardless of their inconsistency with scientific evidence, or risk criticism and the suggestion that they have done something “invalid.”

At the present time, over-reliance on named polygraph technique has begun to contribute more to stasis that to progress and professionalism, as polygraph field practitioners have experienced sometimes great difficulty engaging in rational discussion.

---

1 Raymond Nelson is a psychotherapist and polygraph examiner who works as a polygraph research specialist for Lafayette Instrument Company (LIC). Mr. Nelson is a past-president and currently serves as an elected member of the Board of Directors for the American Polygraph Association (APA). Mr. Nelson is one of the developers of the OSS-3 and ESS models for the analysis of polygraph test data and has published numerous papers on many aspects of the polygraph test.

2 Mark Handler is police polygraph examiner who has published numerous studies on many aspects of the polygraph test. Mr. Handler teaches regularly at several polygraph training programs, and is employed by Converus, Inc., a company that markets credibility assessment technology. Mr. Handler currently serves as the editor-in-chief for the APA.

3 There are no financial or proprietary interests associated with this publication. The views and opinions expressed herein are those of the authors, and not necessarily those of LIC, APA, or Converus Inc.
of polygraph techniques in terms of basic principles of science and scientific testing – not because of the absence of scientific foundations for the polygraph test, but due instead to the continued emphasis on traditional concepts that have outlived their usefulness. In recent years the polygraph profession’s continued over-reliance on named polygraph techniques has served only to increase the difficulty of coherent discussion and shared learning among polygraph professionals and between polygraph professionals and other areas of applied science and forensics.

The antidote to professional stasis is simple: a) avoid reliance on dogmatic notions that are not based on replicable and reproducible scientific evidence, b) make use of all available generalizable scientific information, and c) interact synergistically with other areas of basic and applied science. At a practical level, polygraph professionals will be able to engage in more rational discussion among themselves and with professionals from other areas of science and forensics by moving beyond the dogmatic tradition of named polygraph techniques, and by emphasizing the basic principles of polygraph scientific testing. This can only occur with the recognition that many different named polygraph techniques are in fact constructed of similar scientific principles and are in fact not fundamental different from each other – despite the differences in name. At this time the formal name of the polygraph technique adds only confusion, not clarity, to our thinking and to our discussions about test validity.

Although the topic of scientific validity is a deep and complex discussion, we can simplify it here by emphasizing two important points: 1) construct validity, which refers to the validity of the underlying mechanisms and principles that determine the test effectiveness, and 2) criterion validity, referring to the degree to which whether the test results and conclusions correspond to the external criterion of interest to the test (i.e., the actual deceptive or truthful state of the examinee’s answers). Construct validity is intertwined with the scientific theories that govern whether the test functions as expected, and also help us to understand the potential applications limitations of a test. Criterion validity has obvious practical value. Polygraph field practitioners will be primarily concerned with the validity of the applied or analytic theory of the polygraph test, which is focused on the way in which we expect the reported physiological data to conform to statistical reference models that can enable us to make practical and effective probabilistic classifications of deception and truth-telling. The analytic theory of the polygraph test holds that greater changes in physiological activity are loaded at different types of test stimuli as a function of decep-
tion or truth-telling in response to the investigation target stimuli (American Polygraph Association, 2011; Honts & Peterson, 1997; National Research Council, 2003; Nelson, 2016; Office of Technology Assessment, 1983; Senter et al., 2010).

The tradition of named polygraph techniques may have served the polygraph profession well in its early years. Named polygraph techniques enabled the recognition and discussion of ideas and let to the formulation of standardized practices that could be studied for the validity of their underlying hypotheses. At the time of the Meta-Analytic Survey of Validated Polygraph Techniques (APA, 2011), the authors of that report began to advise that the tradition of named polygraph techniques has outlived its usefulness. In other words, the validity of a polygraph technique is not fundamentally determined by or associated with its name. This became even clearer when members of the APA Research Committee (Nelson, Handler, Oelrich & Cushman, 2014) responded to inquiry about the use of a traditionally multi-issue test format as a single-issue event-specific diagnostic polygraph format without symptomatic questions, and concluded that the present scientific knowledge base and presently available normative reference models would be sufficient to enable us to evaluate the data and interpret the results.

That rational and useful discussion could be engaged without the use of named techniques was further demonstrated by Nelson and Handler (2015), who published statistical reference tables for commonly used polygraph formats and commonly used analysis methods without the use or emphasis on named techniques. Instead, statistical reference tables were described in terms of whether the results would be interpreted with or without an assumption of independent criterion variance, together with information about the number of target questions and the method of analysis.

The premise of this paper is that for both practical and scientific purposes, the selection of a polygraph technique should be based on the known advantages and disadvantages associated with the scientific principles that encompass the structure of a polygraph test format. What then are the fundamental issues that define a polygraph test format?

Polygraph test formats can be easily understood with two questions:

1) Does the case referral information indicate a need for a screening or diagnostic test, and

2) How many relevant questions will be used?

The first question is simply a matter of the presence or absence of a known
incident or allegation. Diagnostic tests, also known as event-specific\(^1\) tests, are done in response to a known incident or allegation. The purpose of a diagnostic test is to provide a basis of information to improve decisions and actions that will be taken in response to a known problem. Screening tests are those tests that are done in the absence of a known incident or allegation.

If there is a known incident or allegation then a diagnostic test is needed. Because our decisions and actions are expected to have some effect on the future of another person, there is an ethical obligation to select a diagnostic polygraph format that will reduce the level of uncertainty and improve our decision making to the greatest extent possible. As shown in a meta-analytic survey of validated polygraph techniques (APA, 2011) polygraph formats that make use of the grand-total score have consistently outperformed test formats that emphasize the use of subtotal scores as the basis for decision making. Polygraph test formats that use the grand-total scores were shown to provide equal or greater test sensitivity and specificity levels, along with lower false-positive and false-negative rates, and fewer inconclusive results. Use of the grand-total score is premised on an assumption that the criterion variance does not vary independently for different questions within a diagnostic test. In other words, all target questions of diagnostic tests will address the examinee’s behavioral involvement in a single known incident or allegation.

Screening tests are those tests that are conducted in the absence of any known incident or allegation\(^2,3,4,5,6,7\),\(^8,9,10\). These tests may involve a single

---

1 These have also been referred to as specific-issue and single-issue tests, though these terms are ambiguous as to whether they refer to a single issue diagnostic test or single issue screening test. Hence the term event-specific is thought to more clearly refer to the diagnostic investigation of a known allegation or known incident.

2 ASTM (2012) E2035 -12, section 3.1. “A PDD examination in which the relevant issues are not related to a known event, and during which more than one issue can be addressed within the same test series... Examples include applicant and counterintelligence screening as well as some forms of PCSOT.”

3 APA (2015) Standards of Practice section 1.1.6. “A polygraph examination conducted in the absence of a reported incident or allegation. Screening exams may be conducted as single issue or multiple issue exams.”

4 APA (2011) Meta Analytic Review, footnote 5, page 205. “Screening tests are any tests conducted in the absence of a known problem, and are intended to search for possible problems. Screening tests, because of the absence of any known problems, and because of interest in several types of possible problems, are often constructed around multiple issues. The terms multi-issue and mixed-issue are used interchangeably. It is not the number of issues that defines the distinction between diagnostic and screening tests, but the presence or absence of a known problem.”
target issue, though they usually involve multiple issues of concern. Multiple issue screening tests are thought to have the advantage of potentially increased test sensitivity to a wider range of topics of concern to the screening context. The trade-off or disadvantage for these exams is that there is some increased risk of testing error and inconclusive results due to the effects of multiplicity when decision making is based on probability scores for multiple target issues.

The number of relevant target issues is important to both diagnostic and screening polygraph testing contexts, though for different reasons. Use of more relevant target questions in the diagnostic context will mean more data upon which to base a single probabilistic test result that can become the basis for the categorical test result. More available data will lead to generally smaller errors of measurement and to generally greater test precision. This can be observed in the

5 Krapohl, Handler & Sturm (2012). Terminology reference 3rd edition, page 77. “A polygraph examination conducted in the absence of a reported issue or allegation to investigate whether an examinee has withheld information regarding engagement in behaviors encompassed by the relevant questions that cover specified periods of time... Screening examinations may be designed to investigate both multiple and single types of behavior.”

6 National Research Council (2003), page 1. For (employee) screening, there is no specific event being investigated and the questions must be generic.

7 Handler, Honts, Krapohl, Nelson & Griffin (2009), page 72. “Unlike diagnostic tests, which are used for criminal investigation polygraphs, screening examinations are conducted in the absence of any known incident or allegation.”

8 Meijer, E., Verschuere, B., Merckelbach, H., & Crombez, G. (2008), page 8. “...specific incident polygraph tests used in a known incident. In screening the examiner does not know whether an incident took place.”

9 Iacono, W. (2007). p. 688. “Screening procedures are typically employed by the government and private agencies to detect security risks. For these procedures, it is not known whether a particular incident has taken place...”

10 Crewson, P. E. (2003). page 60. “Screening applications involve the use of an assessment tool on a general population in which there is no specific evidence of disease. Diagnostic correlates with the polygraph specific-issue test and is reserved for studies where there is prior evidence a condition exists, such as when a test is ordered after a clinical examination of a patient suggests an abnormality.

11 Multiplicity refers to the compounded probability of error when making multiple simultaneous or repeated statistical decisions. These effects can be reduces, though not completely eliminated, by the use of statistical corrections.
published studies on polygraph criterion accuracy (APA, 2011) for which diagnosti
cpolygraph formats with more relevant target issues are observed to have significantly lower inconclusive rates compared to formats with fewer relevant target questions.

In the polygraph screening context, use of more relevant target issues is associated with increased risk for testing error and inconclusive results due to a well-known statistical phenomenon referred to as multiplicity. Increased risk for testing error does not preclude the use of multiple issue tests in screening situations (i.e., where there is no known incident or allegation for which some action is required). Some testing contexts may determine that the increase in test sensitivity from using multiple test target issues will serve their operational objectives and mission priorities. Results of screening tests are commonly evaluated along with other information before proceeding with decisions and actions in the screening context. Circumstances that warrant greater testing precision may benefit from a reduction of the number of target issues in the test question format. It is a matter of both science and ethics that multiple issue tests are not used in diagnostic polygraph contexts. It is difficult to imagine some ethical justification for the selection of a sub-optimal testing format in a diagnostic context – where the purpose of the test is to inform and improve decision making in response to a known allegation or incident.

Summary

Together with the selection of the method for test data analysis, answers to these two questions will predictably influence the effectiveness of a polygraph test format. These questions will also influence the selection of the statistical reference model that will be used to calculate the probability results that can become a basis for a categorical test result.

To summarize:

• Diagnostic tests are those tests that are conducted in response to a known incident or allegation.

• Relevant target questions for diagnostic tests should be non-independent, making sensible use of the grand-total score as a basis for conclusions.

• Use of more relevant questions is associated with potentially increased test sensitivity and specificity and reduced inconclusive results for diagnostic exams.

• Screening tests are those tests that are conducted in the absence of any known incident or allegation.
• Screening tests can address single issue or multiple issues of concern to the screening context.

• Use of subtotal scores as a bases for decision making for multiple issue exams is premised on an assumption of that the criterion variance of the relevant target questions may vary independently\(^{12}\).

• Due to the effects of multiplicity, use of more relevant target questions in multiple issue screening exams is associated with potentially greater opportunity for decision error and inconclusive results.

We recommend that polygraph examiners and polygraph training programs begin to emphasize the notion of polygraph test formats in terms of the basic scientific principles that govern the test effectiveness. We further recommend that the polygraph profession begin to outgrow the tradition of named techniques, as continued reliance on named techniques serves to distract attention away from important scientific principles. Continued use of named techniques will place the polygraph profession at risk for becoming stuck in “traditions” that may represent the state of the science of polygraph at the time of their origin but may be inconsistent with scientific evidence today. Emphasis and attention to basic scientific principles associated with polygraph test formats will help polygraph examiners to avoid becoming limited to the scientific status of polygraph testing at the time of their original training, and will enable them proceed into the future while making use of generalizable scientific knowledge as it applies to the polygraph test as a method for probabilistic quantification and decision making under uncertain conditions involving deception and truth-telling.

12 Recorded physiological responses and test data for multiple issue exams is not independent because these responses have a shared source of variance in the form of the examinee. For this reason, standardized polygraph field practices preclude the occurrence of both positive and negative results within an exam, and instead emphasize a single categorical test result that is the composite of the results of the multiple issue target questions.
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<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Location</th>
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Califorina

Backster School Of Lie Detection
861 Sixth Ave Ste 403
San Diego, CA 92101-6379
Director: Greg Adams – 619/233-6669
E-Mail: gca1265@me.com

Marston Polygraph Academy
390 Orange Show Lane
San Bernardino, CA 92408
Director: Tom Kelly – 909/888-2988
Or 877-627-2223
E-Mail: mail@marstonpolygraphacademy.com

Florida

Academy Of Polygraph Science
8695 College Parkway, Ste 2160
Fort Myers FL 33919
Director: Gary F. Davis – 630/860-9700
E-Mail: apsclassinfo@stoeltingco.com
Website: www.apspolygraphschool.com

Academy Of Polygraph Science Latinamerica (Expired)
12945 Seminole Blvd, Ste 15
Largo, FL 33778
Director: Arno Horvath – 727/531-3782
E-Mail: polygraphacademy@gmail.com
Website: www.abhpolygraphscience.com

International Academy Of Polygraph
1835 S Perimeter Rd Ste 125
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309
Director: Michelle Hoff
E-Mail: dci@deception.com

Peak Credibility Assessment Training Center
1490 NE Pine Island Rd. Unit 7B
Cape Coral, FL 33909
Director: Benjamin Blalock – 239/900-6800
E-Mail: info@peakcatc.com

Georgia

American International Institute Of Polygraph
619 Highway 138 W Suite C
Stockbridge, GA 30281
Director: Charles E. Slupski – 770/960-1377
E-Mail: chuck@Qpolygraph.com

Kentucky

National Polygraph Academy
1890 Star Shoot Parkway, Ste. 170-366
Lexington, KY 40509
Director: Pam Shaw
E-Mail: shaw.national@gmail.com
Website: https://www.nationalpolygraphacademy.com

Maryland

Maryland Institute Of Criminal Justice
8424 Veterans Hwy Ste 3
Millersville MD 21008-0458
Director: Billy H. Thompson – 410/987-6665
E-Mail: mdmicj@aol.com
Website: www.micj.com

New Hampshire

New England Polygraph Institute
15 Glidden Road
Moultonborough, NH 03254
Director: David J. Crawford – 603/253-8002
E-Mail: kacd@worldpath.net

Pennsylvania

Academy For Scientific And Investigative Training
1704 Locust St - 2nd Fl
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Director: Nathan J. Gordon – 215/732-3349
E-Mail: truthdoctor@polygraph-training.com

NCTC Counterdrug Polygraph Institute
c/o Dept. of Military & Veteran’s Affairs
Building 8-64 Fort Indiantown Gap
Annvie PA 17003-5002
Director: Elmer Criswell – 717/861-9306
E-Mail: lietestec@aol.com
Website: www.counterdrug.org

South Carolina

* National Center For Credibility Assessment (NCCA)
7540 Pickens Avenue
Fort Jackson, SC 29207-5000
Director:
E-Mail: susan.gatlin@ncca.mil

Texas

The Polygraph Institute
19179 Blanco Road, Suite 105 #812
San Antonio, TX 78258
Director: J. Patrick O’Burke – 210-377-0200
Website: thepolygraphinstitute.com

* Texas Department Of Public Safety
Law Enforcement Polygraph School
PO Box 4087
Austin TX 78773-0450
Director: Matt Hicks, 512/424-5024
E-Mail: charles.hicks@dps.texas.gov

Veridicus International Polygraph Academy
11230 West Ave Ste 3101
San Antonio, TX 78213
Director: Yasmin Rios
E-Mail: rioscarmona@hotmail.com
Website: VERIDICUSINC.COM

Virginia

Virginia School Of Polygraph
7885 Coppermine Rd
Manassas VA 20109
Director: Darryl L. DeBow – 571/435-1207
E-Mail: polygraph11@verizon.net
FOREIGN SCHOOLS

Behavioral Measures Institute, UK, Polygraph Training Centre  
Office 6  
6-8 Charlotte Square  
Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 4XF  
United Kingdom  
Director: Donnie W. Dutton  
U.S. Inquires 803-238-7999  
U.K. Inquires +440-771-608-1362  
E-Mail: DuttonPoly@aol.com

British Polygraph Academy  
380 Uxbridge Road  
London, England WS 3LH  
United Kingdom  
Director: Nadia Penner  
U.K. Inquires: Don Cargill – 44 7876198762  
E-Mail: don@nationalpolygraphs.co.uk  
Website: britishpolygraphacademy.co.uk

Canadian Police College Polygraph School  
1 Sandridge Dr.  
Ottawa, Ontario K1G 3J2  
Canada  
Director: Andy Ing  
E-Mail: Andy.ING@rcmp-grc.gc.ca

Centro De Investigacion Forense Y Control De Confianza S.C.  
Rodriguez Saro #523, Int. 501-A Col. Del Valle  
Del. Benito Juarez  
Mexico, D.F. C.P. 03100  
Director: Jaime Raul Duran Valle – 011-52-55-2455-4624  
E-Mail: raul.backster@el-poligrafo.com  
Website: el-poligrafo.com

Centro Mexicano De Analisis Poligrafico Y Psicologico, S.C.  
Plateros 110 edificio 76 interior 101  
Col. San Jose Insurgentes  
Del. Benito Juarez  
Ciudad de Mexico  
Director: Fernanda Gadea – 52-55-56608728  
E-Mail: fernanda@cemapp.com.mx

Escuela Nacional De Poligrafia  
Barrio Guadalupe, Edificio Hermitage  
Tegucigalpa, Francisco Morazan 11101  
Honduras  
Director: Raymond I. Nelson  
E-Mail: Raymond.nelson@gmail.com

Escuela Nacional De Poligrafia/ National Polygraph School  
Calle Cuauhtemoc # 168  
Colonia Tisapan de San Angel  
Mexico City, Mexico 01059  
Director: Luz Del Carmen Diaz – 011/52/555/616-6273  
E-Mail: lg151@balnakan.net

Escuela International De Poligrafia Militar  
(Collapsed)  
Calle 11 sur #12-95 Este San Cristobal sur  
Bogota, Colombia  
Director: Robinson Bedoya  
E-Mail: robin0680@yahoo.com.mx

Gaetz International Polygraph School  
29 Hamered Street Industry Building  
Tel Aviv, Israel  
Director: Mordechai Gaetz – 972 3 575 2488  
E-Mail: mordi@gazit-poly.co.il  
Website: www.gazit-poly.co.il

International Polygraph Studies Center  
Colima No. 385-2  
Colonlia Roma Norte  
06700 Mexico D.F.  
Mexico  
Director: Raymond I. Nelson  
E-Mail: international@poligrafia.com.mx

Israeli Government Polygraph School  
(Expired)  
PO Box 17193  
Tel-Aviv, Israel 61171  
Director: Gadi Meshulam  
E-Mail: igpolyschool@gmail.com

Korean Supreme Prosecutor's Office Polygraph Academy  
Forensic Science Division I Forensic Psychology Unit  
157 Banpo-daero, Seocho-gu  
Seoul, Korea 06590  
Director: Sanghyun Lee

Latinamerican Institute For Credibility Assessment  
Calle Los Petirrojos #438  
Urbanizacion Corpac  
Distrito de San Isidro  
Lima, Peru  
Director: Manuel Novoa – 511/226-8450

Latinamerican Polygraph Institute  
Carrera 46 # 93-70  
Bogota, Colombia  
Director: Manuel Novoa – 57-1-2369628  
E-Mail: dirgenneral@latinpolygraph.com  
Website: www.latinamericanpolygraph.com

Mindef Centre For Credibility Assessment  
(Expired)  
Block 13, Mandai Camp 2  
Mandai Road  
Singapore  
Director: V. Cholan  
E-Mail: cholan@starnet.gov.sg

National Academy Of Poligraph Of The National Police Of Colombia  
TC Jorge Zenen Lopez Guerrero  
Transversal 33 No 74a-35  
Sur Barrio Fatima  
Bogota, Colombia  
Director: Andrea del Pilar Carrillo Prieto  
E-Mail: programaacademico@poligrafiaapc@gmail.com

National Academy Of Training And Investigations In Polygraph Analysis  
(Expired)  
Av. Paseo de la Reforma # 364,  
Colonial Juarez, Delegacion Cuauhtemoc  
Mexico D.F. CP 06600  
Director: Julian Flores Anda  
E-Mail: gpecina07@gmail.com

Tudor Academy  
Carrera 66, No. 42-103  
Barrio San Juquin  
Medellin, Colombia  
Director: Charles Speagle  
Website: tudoracademy.com
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- Our Post Conviction Sex Offender Training follows each Basic Course.
- Quality Control support for students following training.
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22610 US Hwy 281 N, Suite 206, San Antonio TX 78258
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