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- Teaching Around The World

Academy for Scientific Investigative Training
Cutting-Edge Forensic Innovators

ADVANCE YOUR AGENCY, YOUR CAREER
- Basic Polygraph
- Advanced Polygraph
- Continuing Education
- Post-Conviction Sexual Offender Training (PCSOT)
- Proprietary Algorithms for Chart Analysis
- Forensic Assessment Interview Technique
- Integrated Zone Comparison Technique
- Horizontal Scoring
- Manual Chart Interpretation Algorithm
- Integrated Interrogation Technique
- Three-Volume Multi-Media VHS Interview and Interrogation Series

2009 A.S.I.T. COURSES
Polygraph 101 Basic
Jan. 5 – Feb., 27; Mar. 9 – May 1; May 11 – Jul. 3; Sept. 21 – Nov. 13
Advanced Polygraph
Mar. 4 – 6
PCSOT - Post-Conviction
May 4 – 8; Nov. 16 – 20
Advanced PCSOT
Sept. 16 – 18
Forensic Assessment Interviewing and Interrogation Techniques (FAINT)

To register, for more information, for training at your location or to order the 2nd Edition of Effective Interviewing & Interrogation Techniques:

United States: Nathan J. Gordon, Director
Voice: 215-732-3349 Fax: 215-545-1773
E-mail: Truthdoctor@Polygraph-Training.com

Middle East: Essam Ali Gamal El-Din
Voice: 2027607178 Cell: 2010-164-0503
Fax: 202-760-7178 E-mail: Info@truth-seeker.net

Singapore: Dr. Anthony Chin
Cell: 65 9069 4769
E-mail: asiatruthseeker@yahoo.com

© Copyright 2006–2008 A.S.I.T. All rights reserved.
Editor’s Corner
Donald J. Krapohl

APA Chairman Donnie Dutton has accepted his nation’s call to work overseas for a few months, and consequently he felt he could not do justice to his duties as the Chair of the APA Fair Election Committee (FEC). Donnie asked me, in my role as a Past President, to act in his stead for the FEC. I enlisted the assistance of Dr. Frank Horvath, another Past President, to conduct the count. Frank was instrumental in establishing Universal Voting for the APA, and has been working quietly behind the scenes ever since to make it work.

The end of the voting period was March 15th, and on March 28th the APA National Office Manager, Robbie Bennett, mailed to me all of the authenticated ballots (i.e., proper signatures on the return envelopes). The ballots will have been counted before the next issue of the APA Magazine, and the results announced in both the Magazine and on the APA website. Below is what we know at the closing of this issue of the Magazine.

There were 837 valid ballots returned. The breakdown by membership category was:

Government: 92
Law Enforcement: 367
Private: 364
Retired: 14

Thanks go out to all of you who took the interest in the future of the APA by submitting a ballot. The number of ballots this year was many hundreds greater than the old system used to select APA leadership, indicating pretty good participation by the membership. To my government colleagues, it seems we still have some work to do.

Now, putting on my Editor’s hat again, I hope you find the new features in the APA publications to your liking, and we are always open to suggestions for improvement. Send comments, suggestions and critiques to: apakrapohl@aol.com.
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In Memoriam

Mark E. Robinson

The APA regrets to announce the passing of member Mark E. Robinson on February, 1, 2009 at the age of 59. Mr. Robinson graduated from the Academy of Polygraph Science in 2005, and was an APA member beginning in 2006. Prior to becoming a polygraph examiner, he was manager of Orbit Productions, Plano, Texas.

Carl W. Kirkpatrick

The APA mourns the passing of member Carl W. Kirkpatrick, (Kirk), 75, on February 28th. Mr. Kirkpatrick was a longtime employee of the Nacogdoches Police Department. He served in the U.S. Air Force from 1951 to 1955, serving in the Korean Conflict and stationed in Alaska before being honorably discharged. Mr. Kirkpatrick attended Texas A & M where he studied to become a polygraph examiner, with 2 years of internship in Houston, after which he became a polygraph examiner. In 1962 he was hired by Nacogdoches Police Department as a police officer. Over the years he advanced from patrolman to lieutenant. He retired from the police force in 1995 but continued doing polygraph examinations for several more years. He is survived by his wife of 53 years, Martha Kirkpatrick of Nacogdoches.
AMERICAN International INSTITUTE OF POLYGRAPH

Accredited by the American Polygraph Association
Recognized by the American Association of Police Polygraphists

WHEN QUALITY COUNTS!

Professional Polygraph Examiner Training. Curriculum and training methods based on Federal training and experience with the US Army Criminal Investigations Command and the Department of Defense Polygraph Institute. Training programs have an overall objective of providing the knowledge, skills and ability to professionally administer polygraph exams.

Schedule 1: TRADITIONAL TEN (10) WEEKS IN RESIDENCE

Schedule 2: EIGHT (8) WEEKS IN RESIDENCE & 2 WEEKS EARNED CREDIT

- We provide polygraph equipment for training. Try it before you buy it.
  - Lafayette  * Axciton  * Limestone  * Stoelting
- Experienced faculty using effective training methods. Less talk, more action.
- Video recorded laboratory exercises. Learn by doing.

2009 Class Start Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan. 5</th>
<th>March 16</th>
<th>April 20</th>
<th>June 1</th>
<th>Sept. 8</th>
<th>Sept. 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lafayette, IN / 8 week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Director & Primary Instructor– Charles (Chuck) E. Slupski

Primary Instructor – Allan E. Stein
Army CID Examiner & Polygraph Instructor at US Army Polygraph School

Primary Instructor – Robbie Frederick
Clayton County Police Department Examiner & Instructor

NEW FACILITY. Great location including large classroom, nine (9) audio-video recorded laboratory rooms, and monitoring room.

Mail to: P.O. Box 686, Morrow, GA 30260-0686
Location: 1115 Mount Zion Road, Suite F, Morrow (Atlanta), Georgia
Email: AIIP@Qpolygraph.com  Phone: (866) 477-5180  Fax: (770) 960-1355
www.polygraphschool.com
Polygraph Examiner
Training Schedule

Academy for Scientific Investigative Training

May 11 - July 3, 2009
September 21 - November 13, 2009

PCSOT
May 4 - 8, 2009
November 16 - 20, 2009

Advanced PCSOT
September 16 - 18, 2009

Forensic Assessment Interviewing & Interrogation Techniques (FAINT)

May 25 - 29, 2009
October 5 - 9, 2009

Defense Academy for Credibility Assessment

April 28 - July 29, 2009
August 18 - November 19, 2009

Horowitz-Ginton Credibility Assessment Academy

April 6, 2009 - December 18, 2009 (part-time)
May 4 - July 3, 2009
November 2 - December 31, 2009

Advanced Training
July 6 - 10, 2009
October 19 - 23, 2009

Marston Polygraph Academy

April 13 - June 13, 2009 (San Bernardino, CA)
July - September, 2009 (Tacoma, WA)

Maryland Institute of Criminal Justice

September 14 - November 6, 2009
January 11 - March 5, 2010

PCSOT
June 1 - 5, 2009
November 9 - 13, 2009

Interview-Interrogation Course
May 5 - 6, 2009
October 6 - 7, 2009

Troy University Polygraph Center

April 6 - May 29, 2009
August 31 - October 23, 2009

Advanced Training
Polygraph Update & Chart Analysis
November 2 - 6, 2009
Advanced Polygraph Techniques
November 16 - 20, 2009
Applicant Testing
November 30 - December 4, 2009
Interview & Interrogation
December 7 - 11, 2009

*based on enrollment

American International Institute of Polygraph

April 20 - June 26, 2009
April 20 - June 12, 2009
June 1 - July 24, 2009 (Lafayette, IN)
September 8 - November 13, 2009
September 8 - October 30, 2009
September 28 - December 4, 2009 (South Africa)

PCSOT
July 27 - 31, 2009 (Lafayette, IN)

Arizona School of Polygraph Science

April 13 - June 19, 2009
September 7 - November 13, 2009

Backster School of Lie Detection

June 8 - July 31, 2009
September 14 - November 6, 2009

PCSOT
November 9 - 13, 2009
Upcoming Seminars

The American Polygraph Association will hold its 44th Annual Seminar/Workshop on August 2-7, 2009 at the Sheraton Music Hotel in Nashville, TN. Details and registration forms are on pages 14-15 of this issue.

The American Polygraph Association and the Virginia Polygraph Association will be holding a Continuing Educational Seminar (CES) on November 5-6, 2009 in Virginia Beach, Virginia. For additional information, please call the APA National Office, 800-272-8037.

The American Association of Police Polygraphists will be holding their 32nd Annual Seminar on May 4-8, 2009 at the Harvey’s Lake Tahoe Hotel and Casino in Lake Tahoe, Nevada. A special room rate is available for attendees who make their reservations by April 1st. Seminar fee is $250 for members and $350 for non-members (paid before April 1st). For further details or to register, contact the AAPP National Office at (888) 743-5479 or visit www.policepolygraph.org.

The South Carolina Association of Polygraph Examiners (S.C.A.P.E.) will be sponsoring an advanced training seminar on May 15, 2009 at the South Carolina Sherrif's Association, 112 West Park Blvd., Columbia, South Carolina. Instructor will be Nate Gordon. This seminar is FREE to SCAPE members who have paid their 2009 dues before April 15th, 2009. Members paying after April 15th, 2009 will be charged a fee of $20 for this training. Fee for non-members is $25.

The registration fee covers a day of instruction, continental breakfast, refreshments, and a buffet style lunch. The last day to register in advance is May 8, 2009. Given the catering and limited seating, it is imperative that you register in advance. Anyone attempting to register late or with questions may contact the President to determine if room is available. Make checks payable to S.C.A.P.E. and send them to SLED Polygraph; Attn: SA Bryan C. Jones; PO Box 21398; Columbia, SC 29221. Membership applications are available for download at www.scpolygraph.com.

The Northwest Polygraph Examiners Association will hold its 2009 Summer Seminar in Newport, Oregon on June 22 – June 26th, 2009 at the Agate Beach Inn. Reservations can be made by calling the Agate Beach Inn at (541) 265-9411. A special rate of $89 for single or double rooms, and $175 for suites has been negotiated. The cost of the seminar is $250 for members and $350 for non-members, and includes thirty four hours of APA approved CE training, daily coffee bar, three hosted meals, admittance to our annual banquet, and admittance to our now infamous hosted hospitality room each night where you can meet and mingle with our members. Come talk polygraph with some of the best examiners in the world! General information about the seminar, including registration information, is available on the NPEA web site at www.nwpea.net. All polygraph examiners are welcome to attend.
GET YOUR GRAND OLE OPRY TICKETS NOW!!

Tickets must be purchased through the APA. Everyone who purchases a ticket will be taken to the Cock of the Walk Restaurant for dinner before the show compliments of the APA.

When: Tuesday, August 4, 2009.
Cost: $36 per ticket.
Deadline to order tickets: June 22, 2009

Be sure to mark the number of tickets you want on the seminar registration form.

MUST BE RETURNED BEFORE THE JUNE 22 DEADLINE!!

---

Academy of Polygraph Science

The Academy of Polygraph Science conducts certification training in basic, PCSOT, and advanced forensic psychophysiology in the detection of deception courses. The home campus is located in Largo, Fl. (Tampa Bay metro area) and satellite classes are continually planned throughout the United States and Latin-America.

Dr. Richard E. Poe, Director has been studying and practicing polygraph for more than 30 years. He graduated from the Univ. of Sarasota, with an Ed. D. Degree and also is a Florida Certified Mental Health Professional.

Dr. Poe is a seasoned Law Enforcement Officer and Polygraphist, who is considered an expert in the 6th Judicial Court System of Pinellas/Pasco Counties, Fl. and Military Court Martial hearings at MacDill A.F.B., Tampa, Fl. Dr. Poe is the past Vice-President-Private, former Treasurer and past member of the Board of Directors of the Florida Polygraph Association and is currently serving as the Director of the School of Continuing Studies.

Dr. Poe holds F.P.A. certificate #127 and AAPP certificate #1745

Class schedules available via e-mail.

Phone/Fax: 352/608-4022
Address: 5441 Emerald Drive, Ridge Manor, FL 33523
E-mail: drpoeandassoc@tampabay.rr.com Website: www.drpoeandassoc.com

---

Announcements

The Israeli Polygraph Examiners Association (IPEA) held election of officers on January 30th. Each officer will serve a two-year term.

President: Shlomo Bruck
Treasurer/Secretary: Meir Modan
Board Member: Beny Ozeri
Vice President Government: Eldad Meiron
Vice President Law Enforcement: Asher Zan-Gar

Congratulations to the new IPEA officers.

If your association has election of officers or other important announcements, please notify the APA Magazine. Send them to: Editor@polygraph.org.
**ADVANCED RESERVATION REQUIRED**

**AMERICAN POLYGRAPH ASSOCIATION**

**SHERATON MUSIC CITY HOTEL**

777 McGavock Pike, Nashville TN 37214

(All room reservations must be made individually through the Hotel’s reservation department by calling 888-627-7060 or 615-885-2200  
(Ask for the APA group rate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APA FED ID # 52-1035722</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan now to attend the APA 44th Annual Seminar/Workshop, AUGUST 2 – 7, 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Room rate: **$119.00 Single/Double occupancy, plus taxes (currently 15.25% tax) <strong>FREE PARKING/SHUTTLE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CUTOFF DATE for hotel reservations is 06/30/09 or until APA’s room allotment is fulfilled. Number of rooms are limited.</strong> Individual departure dates will be reconfirmed upon check-in. (72 HOUR CANCELLATION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Chair: Robbie S. Bennett – 800/272-8037, 423/892-3992  FAX: 423/894-5435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Program Chair: Keith Gaines - 803/751-5885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each registered person will be provided handout material; ID badge and tickets to all APA sponsored events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPORTANT:</strong> The pre-registration discount is good only if payment is received on or before JULY 22, 2009.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Registration Hours**–Sun. 8/2/09, 10:00 am - 5:00 pm  
**On-Site**–Mon. 8/3/09, 8:00 am-12:00 noon  
**Seminar Sessions**–Monday-Friday, August 3 - 7, 2009 |
| Complete the form below, attach check, VISA, MC or AE information payable to the APA and mail to: APA National Office, PO Box 8037, Chattanooga, TN 37414-0037  
Or FAX to 423/894-5435 to arrive **no later than 07/22/09** for applicable discount. Payment information and registration received after 07/22/09 will be charged the on-site fee. |

**APA Cancellations Refund Policy:**

Cancellations received in writing prior to **07/22/09** will receive a full refund. Persons canceling after **07/22/09** will not receive a refund but will be provided with the handout material.

**CONTINUING EDUCATION IS VITAL TO YOUR SUCCESS AND SHOULD BE A LIFELONG PURSUIT**

**Tax Deductions:**

All expenses of continuing education (including registration fees, travel, meals and lodging) taken to maintain and improve professional skills are tax deductible subject to the limitations set forth in the Internal Revenue Code.  
(The registration fee includes professional instruction, seminar materials, AM and PM Refreshment Breaks)

**GRAND OLE OPRY TICKETS**

**TUESDAY, AUGUST 4**

$36 each  
**DEADLINE TO ORDER: JUNE 22**

Number of Tickets:________ 
Amount to be added to registration fee.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRE PAID BY JULY 22, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$350 – Member/Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$475 – Member/App/W/Guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125 – Additional Guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500 – Non-Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$625 – Non-Member/W/Guest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEE RECEIVED AFTER JULY 22, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$400 – Member/Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$525 – Member/App/W/Guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$175 – Additional Guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$550 – Non-Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$675 – Non-Member/W/Guest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*GUEST FEE includes APA SPONSORED EVENTS: Reception, Guest Breakfast, and Banquet.  
*AN APA NAMETAG IS MANDATORY FOR ALL SESSIONS AND ADMISSION TO ALL APA SPONSORED EVENTS

**DATE OF ARRIVAL**_________________________  **DATE OF DEPARTURE**_________________________

VISA ( ) MC ( ) AE ( )_____________________________ (CVV2)________________ EXP:___________  
(CVV2 is a 3 digit number found on the back of your VISA or MC card or a 4 digit number on the front of the AE).  
SIGNATURE_________________________  
2009
Cock of the Walk Restaurant
2624 Music Valley Dr.
Nashville, TN 37214

TUESDAY, AUGUST 4, 2009
ENJOY A MEAL AT COCK OF THE WALK
(PAID FOR BY APA FOR THOSE PURCHASING GRAND OLE OPRY TICKETS)

FOLLOWED BY A TRIP TO THE GRAND OLE OPRY

SHERATON MUSIC CITY HOTEL - NASHVILLE

FREE SHUTTLE SERVICE

The shuttle departs the Sheraton Music City Hotel on the hour and 30 minutes after the hour. It arrives at the airport 15 minutes after the hour and 15 minutes before the hour. This service is a complimentary service between the hours of 5:00 am and 12:00 midnight.

At 1:30 PM, the service changes to “on call”, which means that the shuttle will transport/pick-up guests to/from the airport as soon as notified.

The guest should go to the Baggage Claim Area to retrieve luggage, then proceed to the Phone Bank, depress Button #46 to arrange for shuttle pick-up. The guest should then go down one level to Airport Shuttle pick-up to wait for the shuttle.
The Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) has announced a Department of Energy (DOE) opening for a Federal polygraph examiner position. This position may be filled by an experienced federally certified examiner or by an intern to be trained at DACA and federally certified by DOE. Interested persons should apply via the PNNL jobs website (http://jobs.pnl.gov).

Email submission of resume content may be forwarded to the DOE Program Manager, Shiela Thomas (shiela.thomas@pnl.gov) as a courtesy copy (not required). Applications for the position are ONLY accepted via the website interface. External candidates that experience difficulty locating or submitting to the PD opening on the website are encouraged to contact Robert Dromgoole, NSD HR Recruiter immediately (robert.dromgoole@pnl.gov; 509-375-2441.

**MICJ SCHOOL CALENDAR**

**BASIC POLYGRAPH COURSE**

Session II - April 6 - May 29, 2009
Session III – September 14- November 6, 2009
Session I – January 11 – March 5, 2010

The MICJ polygraph program has been fully accredited by the APA since 1976.

The course focus is on testing techniques most widely used by the US Army CID including numerical chart scoring, MZCT [Zone], Army MGQT, AFMGQT, POT and R/I for Applicant Screening by Instructors with over 150 years of experience

The course meets ASTM Standards and is AAPP and VA Approved.

Call, Fax or email for booklet and enrollment information

SEE MICJ WEB SITE FOR ADDITIONAL DETAILS

**Post Convicted Sex Offender Testing Course - 40-hour Course**

Course Dates: March 9-13, 2009 & November 9-13, 2009

The basic 40-hour course for polygraph examiners.

APA members may take the APA PCSOT Examination to receive APA Certification.

**INTERVIEW - INTERROGATION COURSE – [ I.T.W.O.R.K.S ]**

February 17-18; May 13-14; & October 20-21, 2009

Excellent course feedback for all investigators/detectives/interviewers

Approved for 16- hour CEU credit for polygraph examiners.

**FOR SALE:**

“Polygraph Test Question Source Book” by Billy H. Thompson

$22.00 [includes priority postage & handling]

“Nonverbal Communications…An Investigator’s Guide,” 2d Ed.

by Vickie T. Murphy-Carr, $31.00 [includes postage & handling]

MasterCard/Visa accepted – 1-800 493-8181

MARYLAND INSTITUTE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

P. O. Box 458, Millersville, MD 21108-0458
Tel: [410] 987-6665 • Toll Free: [800] 493-8181 • FAX: [410] 987-4808
Email: mdmicj@aol.com - Web Site: www.micj.com
AMERICAN POLYGRAPH ASSOCIATION

44TH ANNUAL SEMINAR/WORKSHOP

2009 SEMINAR PROGRAM
KEITH H. GAINES, CHAIRMAN

SHERATON MUSIC CITY HOTEL
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“THE WAY FORWARD”
AMERICAN POLYGRAPH ASSOCIATION
44th ANNUAL SEMINAR/WORKSHOP
SHERATON MUSIC CITY HOTEL
777 McGAVOCK PIKE, NASHVILLE TN 37214
AUGUST 2-7, 2009

FRIDAY/SATURDAY, JULY 31 – AUGUST 1, 2009

8:00 AM- 5:00 PM  BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

SUNDAY, AUGUST 2, 2009

9:00 AM - 6:00 PM  REGISTRATION
1:00 PM - 5:00 PM  REGULAR SCHOOL DIRECTORS’ MEETING
6:30 PM - 8:30 PM  ANNUAL RECEPTION

MONDAY, AUGUST 3, 2009

7:30 AM - 5:00 PM  LATE REGISTRATION
10:00 AM - 11:30 AM  SPOUSE/GUEST BRUNCH
12:00 NOON - 1:15 PM  PAST PRESIDENTS’ LUNCHEON
(OLD HICKORY GRILL)

TUESDAY, AUGUST 4, 2009

3:15 PM – 4:15 PM  ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING (CLASSROOM A)
4:15 PM - 9:30 PM  DINNER AT THE COCK OF THE WALK RESTAURANT
FOR THOSE THAT PURCHASED GRAND OLE OPRY TICKETS
(BUS TRANSPORTATION FURNISHED BY AXCITON SYSTEMS, LAFAYETTE INSTRUMENT, STOELTING COMPANY AND COMPLETE EQUITY MARKETS)

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 5, 2009

12:00 NOON - 1:15 PM  INTERNATIONAL LUNCHEON

THURSDAY, AUGUST 6, 2009

6:30 PM  COCKTAILS, ANNUAL BANQUET
GUEST SPEAKER – JUDGE JONATHAN C. THACHER
ENTERTAINMENT – PATRICK DAVIS AND FRIENDS

FRIDAY, AUGUST 7, 2009

3:45 PM  CLOSING REMARKS – APA PRESIDENT SOSNOWSKI
(CLASSROOM A)

SATURDAY, AUGUST 8, 2009

8:00 AM - 3:00 PM  BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
### MONDAY, AUGUST 3, 2009

#### CLASSROOM A
8:00 – 12:00 NOON

**OPENING CEREMONIES**

- Call to Order – Michael C. Gougler, APA President
- Master of Ceremonies – Keith H. Gaines, APA VP Government, 2009 Seminar Program Chair
- Presentation of Colors – Nashville Police Color Guard
- The National Anthem – TBD
- Pledge of Allegiance – Keith H. Gaines, APA VP Government, 2009 Seminar Program Chair
- Bag Pipes and Drums – TBD
- Invocation – TBD
- Welcome to Nashville - TBD

9:15 – 9:30 Break – Sponsored by:

#### INSIDE THE APA

Michael C. Gougler, APA President, Moderator

Panel Members:

- Daniel E. Sosnowski, APA President Elect; Charles E. Slupski, APA VP Private; Keith H. Gaines, APA VP Government; Pamela K. Shaw, APA VP Law Enforcement; Vickie T. Murphy-Carr, Secretary; Chad Russell, Treasurer; Donnie W. Dutton, Board Chairman; Donald A. Weinstein, Director; Barry Cushman, Director; Elmer N. Criswell, Jr., Director; Gordon L. Vaughan, Esq., General Counsel; Donald J. Krapohl, Editor;

10:30 – 10:45 Break – Sponsored by:

12:00 – 1:00 Lunch (On Your Own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSROOM A</th>
<th>CLASSROOM B</th>
<th>CLASSROOM C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 5:00</td>
<td>1:00 – 5:00</td>
<td>1:00 – 5:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Nailing the Pre-Test”</td>
<td>Elicitation Techniques for Blind Interviews</td>
<td>Quality Control Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton O. “Skip” Webb U.S. Army CID</td>
<td>Stanley M. Slowik</td>
<td>Elmer N. Criswell, Jr. APA Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2:30 – 2:45 Break – Sponsored by:

3:30 – 3:45 Break – Sponsored by:

#### APA ISSUES IN THE DIFFERENT FIELDS OF POLYGRAPH
5:15 – 6:15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSROOM A</th>
<th>CLASSROOM B</th>
<th>CLASSROOM C</th>
<th>CLASSROOM D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE</td>
<td>GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL PANEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles E. Slupski</td>
<td>Keith H. Gaines</td>
<td>Pamela K. Shaw</td>
<td>Frank Horvath, PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vickie T. Murphy-Carr</td>
<td>Donald A. Weinstein</td>
<td>Chad Russell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmer N. Criswell Jr.</td>
<td>Donnie W. Dutton</td>
<td>Barry Cushman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Classroom A</td>
<td>Classroom B</td>
<td>Classroom C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 12:00</td>
<td>WORKING WITH INTERPRETERS</td>
<td>THE IMPORTANCE AND CONTRIBUTION OF A CONSISTENCY FACTOR IN NUMERICAL SCORING OF POLYGRAPH EXAMINATIONS/FROM RIGID TO ELASTIC COVER VIA SHORT BLANKET UNDERSTANDING AND COPING WITH THE FALSE OUTCOMES PHENOMENON IN PDD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milton O. “Skip” Webb U.S. Army CID</td>
<td>Avital/Haya Ginton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 12:00</td>
<td>POLYGRAPHY – Scientists’ and Practitioners’ Views on Critical Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Horvath, PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 – 9:30</td>
<td>Break – Sponsored by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 10:45</td>
<td>Break – Sponsored by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 1:00</td>
<td>Lunch (On Your Own)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 3:00</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>CONDUCTING POLYGRAPH EXAMINATIONS IN HIGH PROFILE AND SENSITIVE CASES</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert J. Drdak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 – 3:15</td>
<td>Break – Sponsored by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APA ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING</strong></td>
<td><strong>3:15 – 4:15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSROOM A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DINNER, COCK OF THE WALK / GRAND OLE OPRY</strong></td>
<td><strong>4:15 PM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Wednesday, August 5, 2009

**8:00 – 12:00**  
**Board Room**  
**APA Membership Examination** (Nathan J. Gordon)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom A</th>
<th>Classroom B</th>
<th>Classroom C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 12:00</td>
<td>8:00 – 12:00</td>
<td>8:00 – 12:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| TBA | CLINICAL POLYGRAPH IN THE ASSESSMENT AND TREATMENT OF SEX OFFENDERS  
Maria Mollett, PhD | POLYGRAPH, AN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE: Year IV  
ORGANIZER AND MODERATOR:  
Frank Horvath, Ph. D, APA Past President, Director, APA Research Center  
PANELISTS:  
Rejean Belley, Canada  
Luz Del Carmen Diaz Galindo, Mexico  
Dr. Bibha Rani Ray, India  
Tuvia Shurany, Israel |

9:15 – 9:30 Break – Sponsored by:

10:30 – 10:45 Break – Sponsored by:

12:00 – 1:00 Lunch (On Your Own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom A</th>
<th>Classroom B</th>
<th>Classroom C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 3:00</td>
<td>1:00 – 3:00</td>
<td>1:00 – 3:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| QUALITY CONTROL MANAGEMENT  
Steven K. Pilkington | TEN SIMPLE RULES FOR MINIMIZING ERRORS IN POLYGRAPH EXAMINATIONS  
Robert J. Drdak | PCSOT  
Daniel E. Sosnowski  
APA President Elect |

3:00 – 3:15 Break – Sponsored by:

3:15 – 5:45 POLYGRAPH INSTRUMENTS WORKSHOP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom A</th>
<th>Classroom B</th>
<th>Classroom C</th>
<th>Classroom D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AXCITON SYSTEMS</td>
<td>LAFAYETTE INSTRUMENTS</td>
<td>LIMESTONE TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>STOELEING INSTRUMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THURSDAY, AUGUST 6, 2009

<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</strong></td>
<td><strong>8:00 – 12:00</strong></td>
<td><strong>8:00 - 12:00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT AND TREATMENT OF THE FEMALE SEX OFFENDER</strong></td>
<td><strong>INTERVIEW TRAINING SYSTEM</strong></td>
<td><strong>THE DIRECTED LIE SCREENING TEST (Session 1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Mollett, PhD</td>
<td>Dale E. Olsen, PhD</td>
<td>Benjamin Blalock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9:15 – 9:30</th>
<th>Break – Sponsored by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### ANNUAL STATE LEADERSHIP MEETING
**11:00 AM**
**CHEEKWOOD BOARD ROOM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10:30 – 10:45</th>
<th>Break – Sponsored by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12:00 – 1:00</th>
<th>Lunch (On Your Own)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1:00 – 3:00</th>
<th>1:00 – 4:00</th>
<th>1:00 – 5:00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNTERMEASURES IN 2009, What we know and what we don’t.</strong></td>
<td><strong>IMPROVING THE DECISION ACCURACY FOR CQT POLYGRAPH: To be (a test) or not to be: that is the question</strong></td>
<td><strong>THE DIRECTED LIE SCREENING TEST (Session 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Charles Honts</td>
<td>Dr. Jos Buschman, Senior Diagnosticus, Netherlands</td>
<td>Benjamin Blalock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3:00 – 5:00</th>
<th><strong>The Scientific Communities View of Interrogations, Confessions, False Confessions, and Actual Innocence</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Charles Honts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2:30 – 2:45</th>
<th>Break – Sponsored by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 6:30 BANQUET
**Guest Speaker – Judge Jonathan C. Thacher**

**ENTERTAINMENT**
**Patrick Davis and Friends**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Classroom A</th>
<th>Classroom B</th>
<th>Classroom C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 10:30</td>
<td><strong>IZCT TECHNIQUE</strong></td>
<td><strong>A SCIENTIFIC PERSPECTIVE OF THE COMPARISON QUESTION TEST</strong></td>
<td><strong>PAROLE OFFICER (PCSOT)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nathan J. Gordon</td>
<td>Dr. Charles Honts</td>
<td>Daniel E. Sosnowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academy of Scientific and Investigative Training, Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 – 9:30</td>
<td>Break – Sponsored by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 12:00</td>
<td><strong>TEST QUESTION FORMULATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>A SCIENTIFIC PERSPECTIVE OF THE COMPARISON QUESTION TEST (continued)</strong></td>
<td><strong>PAROLE OFFICER (PCSOT) (continued)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nathan J. Gordon</td>
<td>Dr. Charles Honts</td>
<td>Daniel E. Sosnowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academy of Scientific and Investigative Training, Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 10:45</td>
<td>Break – Sponsored by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 1:00</td>
<td>Lunch (On Your Own)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 3:00</td>
<td><strong>ISSUES IN EPPA</strong></td>
<td><strong>POLYGRAPH TESTING BY THE MEXICAN POLICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gordon L. Vaughan, Esq.</td>
<td>Julian Flores Anda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Counsel</td>
<td>Mexican Federal Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 – 3:45</td>
<td>Break – Sponsored by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45</td>
<td><strong>CLOSING REMARKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Sosnowski, APA President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE TRUTH WILL SET YOU FREE TO EXPLORE CAREER OPPORTUNITIES.

The Troy University Polygraph Center is a program within Troy University established with the purpose of preparing students for careers as polygraph examiners.

The Troy University Polygraph Center is accredited by the American Polygraph Association.

Enroll today!

Samuel L. Braddock
Director
sbraddock@troy.edu

Jessica Bault
Recruiter/Registrar
jbault@troy.edu

TROY UNIVERSITY
A future of opportunities.
troy.edu

Students can earn up to 12 hours of undergraduate credit while completing training.

Troy University Polygraph Center
1117 Perimeter Center West, Suite N101, Atlanta, GA 30338
(770) 730-0033/1-866-426-1068
Atlanta@troy.edu
Greetings:

The Nashville seminar is only a couple of months away. I am looking forward to seeing everyone and enjoying the events and training opportunities.

I have asked program chair, Keith Gaines, to schedule the Monday morning session “Inside the APA.” I hope this training block will allow the membership to understand how the APA and the various committees work. I will host this session and provide all the general committee chairs an opportunity to explain how their committee functions. I believe this will enhance volunteerism on the committees as well as facilitate an understanding of how the members can become involved or seek elected office.

One of the most serious concerns I have is the current election process. We have experienced several problems with the current system. I believe that the concept of universal voting is sound, but our current implementation of the Fair Election Committee and the totality of the process is flawed. I will ask that an alternative to the current process be voted on by the membership at the general membership meeting in Nashville. I have heard from many members who wish to modify the current process. I will have an alternative published 30 days prior to the meeting so that the membership can review it. I will be happy to discuss the election issue with any member.

Your committees continue to complete their assignments and are diligently exploring better ways to serve the membership.

Congratulations to all those newly elected or re-elected to the Board of Directors. I look forward to working with you over the next year. Much progress has been made in the last 9 months, but there is still work to be completed and challenges to be met.

I would ask the Board and committees to press on and complete their assignments prior to the annual seminar. I know that I have tasked all of your with a very aggressive agenda. You continue to answer that challenge and for that “I thank you.”

By the time this issue of the Polygraph Magazine is published and reaches our members, the elections will be over and the new officers announced. I would like to extend my congratulations to each person who was elected or re-elected to the Board of Directors. I look forward to working with each Board member in the upcoming year. I would also like to thank each member who decided to run for office. Our organization needs members to step up and seek elected positions in order to maintain a positive direction and vitality.

As some of you are aware of, this past election experienced some issues that were not foreseen when the Fair Elections Committee was established. Please keep in mind that the Universal Voting system has only been in place for a very short period of time. As an organization, we are taking corrective steps and measures to ensure that anyone who has the desire to seek an elected position within the APA will have a fair and equal opportunity. If the necessary corrective measures and steps that the Board of Directors is considering does not resolve the issues recently experienced, then we as an organization should revert back to our prior system of electing its officers.

Hopefully members are making plans and arrangements to attend the APA Annual Conference in Nashville. We all know that the economy
has taken a hit and there have been cutbacks experienced by all. Many agencies will make the first cutbacks in the area of training but we know that Continuing Education is vital to any organization and individuals. Your training as a professional is essential to maintaining a high level of proficiency.

Keith Gaines has worked very hard to provide training which will be diverse and of interest to all members. Examiners involved with PCSOT testing will be able to receive specialized training from treatment providers as well as probation/parole specialists. This is an excellent opportunity to receive required training at a very reasonable cost.

Those members who attend the Annual Conference will hear a presentation by the entire Board of Directors. Board members will discuss each of the committees that they represent. The goal will be to have members learn more about these committees and how they work and to have a better understanding regarding how the Board works. I have personally stated in the past that I do not have all of the answers but I believe that if we have additional input from members, perhaps we could solve more problems.

As I mentioned in my last article, Keith Gaines has arranged for some exciting entertainment following the banquet dinner. Since this is your conference, please stay and enjoy some music along with some friendship between members.

I have also been informed that the hotel is making arrangements to provide some alternatives to eating at the restaurant. The objective is to have other choices in order for members can purchase lunch at affordable prices as well as in a timely fashion.

I hope to meet as many members who attend the Annual Conference that I can, so please stop me so I can say hello to say thanks for being members of this organization.

As always, I would personally welcome any suggestions or ideas that members have that would benefit this association. Please contact me via my e-mail address at SOS4911@YAHOO.COM.

Keith Gaines
Vice-President Government

To the members of the APA,

This will be my final article as the Vice President (Government). When I asked to serve as an officer of this organization, I planned to only do so for no more than a couple of years. I felt that would be long enough to get an inside look at the machinery that drives this association. It has been quite an education. Let me share what I have learned:

1. The officers of this association are volunteers who give many nights and weekends to this group. They do so because they believe in this sometimes controversial endeavor to pursue the truth. They believe totally in this association and the members they serve. I never attended a meeting of officers, in which every question did not reflect some version of, “how does this serve the polygraph profession?” or “how does this benefit the members of the APA?”

2. The vast majority of the membership is just as dedicated. For the last two years, I have handled countless inquiries regarding the best methods to apply and have had many discussions with members offering suggestions on how to do what we do in a more accurate, reliable, standardized, ethical, and better way. You all are professionals, and it has been my honor to serve you.

While I am on the subject of doing what we do better, I have an exciting announcement to make. On Wednesday morning, August 5th, Mr. Elmer Criswell, a respected senior examiner and school director, is going to be conducting free “one on one” Quality Control (QC) sessions with any members who would like to bring some charts to the conference. If you would like any of your work quality controlled, please bring the electronic file if it is computerized on either a disk or thumb drive. Printouts of charts alone are okay, but Elmer prefers all the data he finds in the electronic file. Files from any of the polygraph vendors are okay. Elmer is sure he can get technical assistance from the manufacturers if necessary.

Most important, you must be willing to accept constructive criticism. Please understand that just because Elmer may not agree with a conclusion you reached or even how you might have got to the conclusion, that does not mean you were “wrong”, only that he possibly disagrees for the specific reason he will provide you. It will never be any form of a personal attack. As a government examiner, every polygraph examination I ever gave was quality controlled and it really helped me become a better examiner. Finally, if you desire your QC to be private, just let Elmer know and he can arrange that. Please take advantage of this free
From the Board

service. If it goes well, maybe we can carry it to future conferences.

What about the rest of the seminar? I am happy to report that the seminar schedule is now full (although as always there may be last minute changes). This year my motto is “The Way Forward,” because we are going to be exposed to some great new ideas and will revisit ways to improve what we already do. The schedule is heavy with the concept of Q.C. and professional review, the latest in PCSOT, a detailed look at the utility of the DLC test, the latest in interviews and interrogations, and a host of other subjects critical to moving this profession forward. The scheduled speakers are first rate and highly respected across several disciplines. They include:

Dr. Charles Honts, Milton “Skip” Webb, Stanley M. Slowick, Elmer Crisswell, Raymond Nelson, Robert J. Drdak, Dr. Avital Ginton, Dr. Frank Horvath, Steve Pilkington, Dr. Maria Mollett, Rejeane Belley, Luz Del Carmen Diaz Galindo, Dr. Bibha Rani Ray, Tuvia Shurany, Dr. Dale Olsen, Benjamin Blalock, Dr. Jos Buschman, Gordon Lr. Vaughan, Esq. Julian Flores.

I am also the Awards Committee Chair again this year and I just wanted to remind you all to submit deserving members for awards. The deadline for awards nominations this year is May 15th. Please get your nominations in before then.

The Awards Committee will be looking for individuals who, though their unselfish and extraordinary efforts, promote and advance the best interests of the polygraph profession. The following awards are being offered by the APA:

William L. Bennett and Robbie S. Bennett Memorial Award: For unrelenting efforts and display of ability in the interest of the APA.

A1 & Dorothea Clinchard Award: For extended, distinguished, devoted and unselfish behalf of the APA membership.

Cleve Backster Award: Honoring an individual or group that advances the polygraph profession though tireless dedication to standardization of polygraph principles and practices.

Leonard Keeler Award: For long and distinguished service to the APA.

David L. Motsinger Horizon Award: In recognition of a new shining star in the profession or association who early in their career demonstrates loyalty, professionalism and dedication to the polygraph profession (less than 10 years).

John E. Reid Award: For achievement in research teaching and writing of the polygraph profession.

Please take a moment and make that recommendation of a person you know deserves an award. They are out there they just need you to recognize them.

Finally, PLEASE stay after the Thursday Night Banquet this year. We have Mr. Patrick Davis, one of Nashville’s brightest young stars coming over to play for us. His acoustic guitar show will include other young singer/songwriters, whose songs many of you have heard on country music radio. It promises to be a wonderful night.

See you all in Nashville!!!

Pam Shaw
Vice President, Law Enforcement

Hello fellow members. The PCSOT Committee continues to work fervently to edit and finalize a proposed Model Policy that will be up for vote by the Board of Directors via teleconference on March 31st. At the time of this publication, a vote will likely have occurred, but at the time of this writing, the Model document is still under construction.

As soon as a PCSOT Model Policy is approved by your Board of Directors, it will be made widely available. Developing a Model Policy has been an arduous journey for the committee as they have attempted to implement thoughts and suggestions from so many sources. I think anyone who has ever served on a committee commissioned with a ground-breaking task can attest to the difficulty and various obstacles that can take you by surprise.

There are many members of this association who have been involved in setting the stage and carrying the banner forward to progress PCSOT in our profession. It has been a pleasure to be a firsthand, eye witness to the inner workings of this committee and the various inputs from so many APA members.

I hope to report again soon with the success of an approved model policy for our association. At that time it will also be essential to ensure widespread distribution and continued feedback from any and all members who would like to comment. All our
model policies are living and breathing documents that can change as our profession dictates the need. Your opinion and your voice are important!

As a reminder, please consider dropping a line or two to Keith Gaines with any suggestions you may have for seminar entertainment, events, topics and/or speakers you would like to see at the upcoming seminar. He is working hard to make it as enjoyable and educational as possible, but it’s a tremendous help for him to receive your suggestions.

If I can be of any assistance to you, your department, or your organization, please feel free to email or call anytime.

Barry Cushman
Director

Well hello again fellow APA members. It won’t be long before we meet for our August seminar in Nashville, and I hope to see many of you there! With the difficult economy, it’s important to plan wisely. Don’t put off making your travel arrangements. Budget now before it gets too late and you regret putting it off.

By the time you are reading this, it is my hope that the BOD will have adopted a new PCSOT model policy. The PCSOT committee has been working overtime trying to produce a final draft for the BOD’s vote. (That vote is now expected to take place on March 31st.) I’ve said it before, but it’s worth saying again: The PCSOT committee was tasked with developing the model policy, and those involved have come up with some very practical solutions to some of the current issues in post-conviction sex offender testing. Once a model is adopted, it will be widely distributed so you all will be up to date. Though model policies aren’t binding on members, they should articulate best practices (based on our current understanding of the science), and an examiner should be prepared to explain why he or she deviated from what is recognized and accepted as best. (Of course, human beings are involved in polygraph testing, which makes it impossible to predict every possible scenario one could encounter in the field. Even though our goal is to have comprehensive model policies, examiners must be proficient enough to know when, why and how to deviate from recognized standards, as well as how to best conduct exams in the absence of any written standards.)

I know Marty Oelrich updates us on the world of ASTM, but as an ASTM sub-committee chairman, I do want to mention an item that is soon to be balloted once again. The former “ethics” standard has been redrafted. There was an objection to calling certain acts or omissions “unethical.” It was determined that a standard should be just that – a standard. It is up to others to decide if an examiner’s deviation from any given standard is unethical. One of the major language changes is a clean-up regarding what is or is not a recognized, legitimate academic degree. (Some of you may recall a similar discussion in a recent edition of POLYGRAPH.) Whether it is passes or not, it is important to mention the issue again. Simply stated, the goal is that an examiner should only boast a bona fide academic degree (or title). For those unfamiliar with the rationale for such a standard, let me explain the need.

There are lots of “school’s” out there that will, for the right amount of money, grant a “degree” for little to no work; others require work (in an attempt to look legitimate), but not at a level equivalent to the work expected at a legitimately accredited college or university. In short, all are simply degree mills. In some states, these “schools” operate legally, and you could therefore argue one of their “degrees” is legal. (They’re just worthless in the academic community.) Don’t get taken by such a school. In the United States it is now almost always true that a legitimate college or university is accredited by an accrediting agency that is itself recognized by the United States Department of Education or the Council on Higher Education Accreditation. If you’re considering a return to school, do your homework first. There are no short cuts – just like there weren’t any in polygraph school.

As always, if there is anything I can do for you, please don’t hesitate to get in touch with me. If you have an issue that you’d like addressed by the BOD, we’d like to hear from you. This is your organization, so let it work for you. As long as you have an issue that falls within the APA’s Constitution and Bylaws, then we can address it. Until next time, God-speed.

Don Weinstein
Director

As most of you know, your Board of Directors met in January in Nashville. The hotel, the Sheraton Music City, is a quite nice hotel, but it is not in the downtown area. Keep in mind before you find fault with this, that when the hotels are closer to metropolitan areas, there is usually a significant price increase. My suggestion, if you are able, and it is within a reasonable distance, is to drive your car, or rent a vehicle if you fly in. There is a small restaurant as part of the hotel, and Robbie
One piece of information to note has to do with the actions of the Fair Elections Committee (FEC). For the record, I voted against accepting the reported recommendations of the FEC, not because I did not find the candidates acceptable, rather that I felt the standard operating procedure (SOP) for the operation of the committee was not as clear as it should have been. Please understand this is not a personal indictment of the members of the FEC (I likely would have been a member of that committee had I already left the BOD). I felt, when I voted that their should have been clearer instructions provided. I wish to make it absolutely clear that this glitch in the SOP isn’t anyone’s “fault.” Remember, our membership wanted to implement a universal voting procedure whereby a member need not be present to cast a ballot, or for that matter be a candidate for office. Reconstructing something that has been in place for years, in this case 43 years, is no simple task. While everyone tried to make sure that every concern was addressed, some things were just missed and the procedure will need some “tweaking” before it satisfies the majority. For the time being, your Board voted in the majority to set aside the previously voted acceptance of the FEC recommendations, and permitted any person who applied for election consideration to appear on the mail-in ballot. This will be a procedure that has some extra costs attached to it, and we must consider the possible delay should one candidate (where there is more than 2) not get 50% of the vote. This delay would be in the form of a second mail out. If you will remember, we used to do this during the business meeting through the process of multiple votes being taken for a given candidate. The universal system requires more time and costs, but it can be done.

While I will be leaving the Board at the conclusion of the seminar in August, I do intend to offer some suggestions about the best way to implement the FEC operating procedure. Some would be very simple, but should we maintain the universal voting system, they must be clearly understood by those seeking office and those performing duties on the FEC.

One suggestion would be to lay out very specifically, a statement of the candidate, not to exceed 500 words to be published. This statement would in effect be a platform for which the candidate wishes the membership to know, it is NOT a platform for personal attacks against another candidate or any other member. If this appears, the candidate would be immediately disqualified. I would suggest that we do away with the 25 signature proposal. If a person wishes to run for office, if is up to him or her to conduct their campaign. Folks, we are closing in on 3000 members. It seems somewhat ludicrous to me for someone to collect 25 signatures and automatically be eligible for consideration in an upcoming election. But, please note, that is my opinion. I would also propose a hard and fast rule. A date will be announced for the submission of intent to seek office. If a commitment is not received by that date, the personal would not be eligible for candidacy consideration. Likewise, there would be a firm date for the submission of the candidate statement. If it is not received (or postmarked) by the proscribed date, the person will not be considered eligible.

What I have proposed is not an absolute fix. I think as times goes by, we will see the need for other “tweaks” until we get a system that is fair and equitable. Take a look at my proposals and perhaps, you may wish to volunteer to the appropriate committee to offer assistance as a member to this important process. After all, it was adopted because the majority of those voting asked for it.

Take care and travel safely.

Vickie T. Murphy-Carr
Secretary

I have completed Minutes of the January BOD Meeting held in Nashville, TN (January 16-17, 2009), and the Teleconference Meeting of February 6, 2009 and copies were forwarded to each Board member.

I coordinated changes to By-laws voted on during the January Board meeting with National Office Manager, Robbie Bennett and the vote will be finalized for those changes during the next Teleconference Meeting of March 31, 2009.
I have reviewed and provided input as directed to President-Elect Sosnowki on the APA Strategic Plan.

I have reviewed and provided input to Pam Shaw on the proposed PCSOT Model Policy.

I researched past Minutes on the history of the “Secretary’s Stipend,” Standing Committees, speaker donations, and waiver of dues as requested.

I have updated the SOP for Secretary, Website Manager, Webmaster, Copyright and Privacy Policies. Changes are still pending for the Legislation and State Advisory Board Committees.

I provided recommendations for seminar speakers and topics to the seminar program committee.

I have responded to all telephonic and electronic inquiries directed to the Secretary.

Public Relations

I have responded to and coordinated telephonic and electronic responses to inquiries received with Public Relations Chair, Don Krapohl.

Legislation

I have notified respective states and provided input on related legislation notifications where requested.

I have coordinated legislation efforts between Attorney Gordon Vaughan, President Gougler, Don Krapohl, Don Weinstein, and Skip Webb.

I have researched and compiled materials relevant to voice stress issues and inquiries to include:

Humble’s Interview on Dateline


APA’s position on Voice Stress, along with links to download the Virginia Report, Truth vs. Myth document, related internet links and CVSA research compiled by Don Krapohl.

APA’s Reading Room postings of:

Voice Stress Analyzer Instrumentation Evaluation
Assessing the Validity of Voice Stress Report No. DODPI198-R-0004 on CVSA May 2001
A Comparative Analysis on Polygraph with Other Screening & Diagnostic Tools
Executive Summary – Voice Stress Complete Study: Univ of FL Assessment of VSA and Layered Voice Analysis
Virginia Report on Voice Stress
Truth vs. Myth
A Guide to Internet Links on Voice Stress Validity

Dr. Kelly Damphousse (405) 325-2529. kdamph@ou.edu. Bio sketch at: http://casweb.ou.edu/home/news/spotlight/spotlight_kdamphousse.htm; (also see http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/journals/259/voice-stress-analysis.htm)


I recommended to President Gougler that the Sub-committee for Alternative Detection of Deception (ADDT) be re-appointed to address voice stress issues, and he has appointed President-Elect, Dan Sosnowski to Chair that Committee.

APA Website

I responded to and/or forwarded requests for information to appropriate committees regarding on-line membership sign-up, passwords, dues payments, seminar registration, seminar information, continuing education programs, state association changes, polygraph techniques, complaints/grievances, publications, requests to purchase publications, examiner referrals, membership verification, standards and ethics, polygraph training, school information changes, school accreditation and their standards, member address & name changes, PCSOT testing, job referrals, employment opportunities, voice stress issues and examiner referrals.

I have updated & posted information to include annual seminar agenda and registration,
state association and continuing education seminars, job opportunities, voice stress issues, and related news articles

I have requested annual payment of renewal fees of host and address spam issues.

I have requested input from Board members and provided Webmasters with direction for Phase IV Web development.

State Advisory Board

Seminar Site Chair, Robbie Bennett has made arrangements for the State Advisory Board Meeting to be held at 11:00am on Thursday, August 6, 2009 in the Cheekwood Boardroom. Space will be limited so representatives from their respective states are requested to RSVP as soon as possible and to provide information on any issues they want addressed.

Summary of Minutes

Vickie T. Murphy-Carr
Secretary

Board of Directors Meeting
Sheraton Music City Hotel
Nashville, Tennessee
January 16-17, 2009

Chairman Dutton called the BOD meeting to order at the Sheraton Music City Hotel, Nashville, TN, on Friday, January 16, 2009 at 8:00am. Members present: President Michael Gougler, Chairman Donnie Dutton, President-elect Dan Sosnowski, Secretary Vickie T Murphy-Carr, Treasurer Chad Russell, VP Private Charles Slupski, VP Government Keith Gaines, VP LE Pam Shaw, Director Barry Cushman, Director Donald Weinstein, General Counsel Gordon Vaughan, and National Office Manager Robbie Bennett. Absent: Director Elmer Criswell.

1. Motion by Shaw/Sosnowski to adopt the Agenda as presented was approved.

2. Motion by Gaines/Slupski to Waive the Reading of the Minutes and approve the Minutes of August 23, 2008 and the Teleconference Meeting of October 7, 2008 were approved.

3. Motion by Slupski/Cushman to accept the FEC recommendations for the ballot was approved. The FEC Committee recommended Nate Gordon and Roy Ortiz for President-Elect; for VP Private, FEC recommended Jim Reistroffer and Raymond Nelson. Due to the remaining positions having two names or less, the FEC recommended that those nominations be placed on the ballot as well.

   (Abstained: Shaw, Murphy, Gougler, Sosnowski); (Nay: Weinstein)

   (Yeah: Cushman, Russell, Gaines, Slupski)

4. President Gougler provided a Directive for the FEC to notify all candidates and to further review FEC guidelines for clarification and recommended changes.

5. Board and Committee Reports were approved for Chairman Dutton, President Gougler, Treasurer Russell, Secretary Murphy-Carr, VP Private Slupski, VP Government Gaines, VP Law Enforcement Shaw, Director Weinstein, Director Cushman, Editor in Chief Krapohl, General Counsel Attorney Vaughan, and National Office Manager Bennett. No report was submitted by Director Criswell.

6. President Gougler directed each Board member to monitor the website and answer questions specific to their committee and to review information and links respective to their committees to make sure information is current and up-to-date.

7. President Gougler Directed Sosnowski to update dates and to remove plans already met for the Strategic Plan (2010-2014) for review at the March 31st Teleconference Meeting.
8. Motion by Slupski/Gougler to accept the rewritten Model Policy for Pre-Employment testing was approved. (Yeah: Gougler, Sosnowski, Cushman, Shaw, Slupski, Gaines, Weinstein & Russell.) (Nay: Murphy-Carr. Murphy-Carr requested that Minutes reflect that her negative vote was due to the board voting on a document that affected a LE/Public Safety Examiners without allowing them to have any advance input.) Directive by Gougler for Shaw to address and publish the Model Policy in the next Magazine and request any input to address and issues and concerns, and to provide that information to Slupski in advance for proposed changes that need to be made for him to present them to the Board for the next meeting.

9. Motion by Slupski/Gougler to accept recommended changes and/or corrections, as appropriate to the APA Constitution and By-Laws was approved.

10. Motion by Shaw/Gougler to discuss the proposed PCSOT Model Policy was Tabled until the March 31st Teleconference. President Gougler provided a Directive to Board members to send their comments, revisions, suggestions, etc., to Shaw in advance for presentation at the March 31st Teleconference meeting.

11. Bennett was directed to send Cushman a copy of the membership examination for review.

12. President Gougler Directed Dutton to draft a letter with his signature, to all individuals who are suspended for non-payment of dues, to go out with the last dues notice on March 31st.

13. President Gougler Directed Krapohl to attend the ASTM meeting on behalf of the APA and that the APA would cover his additional expenses.

14. Motion by Murphy/Weinstein to approve Retired Membership status for Walter H. Green was approved.

15. Motion by Murphy/Gaines was approved for a non-member to pay the full seminar fee and the difference between the member and non-member amount credited towards membership if they fill out an application and pay the remaining amount.

16. Directive by Gougler for Bennett to discontinue the State Advisory Board meeting for 2009, and for Bennett & Murphy to work a meeting for state association presidents into the seminar schedule.

17. Directive by Gougler for Bennett to reserve a room in the dining room and to allow past Presidents to order directly off of the menu for the Past President’s meeting.

18. Motion by Sosnowski/Slupski was approved that effective the swearing in date at the 2009 Banquet (August 6, 2009), there will be no stipend associated with the Secretary/Website Manager position. (Yeah: Gougler, Sosnowski, Cushman, Shaw, Slupski, Gaines, Weinstein, and Russell.) (Abstained: Murphy-Carr).

19. President Gougler Directed Attorney Vaughan to determine if the Website Committee is a Standing or Ad-hoc committee.

20. Motion by Cushman/Gougler to waive primary instruction educational degree requirements and grant a Primary Instructor Certificate for Scott McCloud and Donald Macaulay upon receipt of the required Primary Instructor Fees.

21. Motion by Cushman/Sosnowski to approve the National Academy of Training and Investigations in Polygraph Analysis, Mexico City, for accreditation as a polygraph training facility, retroactive to September 1, 2008 (Director Pam Shaw) was Tabled until notification was given to IAFPI representative, Nate Gordon, and after 30 days advance notice given to be brought up again.

22. President Gougler provided a Directive for Gaines to provide a tentative programs schedule.

23. Slupski Tabled pending Agenda items to include 1) Request for APA to reimburse board members, at their request, for ASTM membership; 2) Discussion of the APA to add “International to the name of the APA; 3) Request for clarification of APA strategic goals; and 4) Submission of the Operational Policy for Standards of Practice Committee.
24. President Gougler Directed Krapohl to draft a letter informing an agency in CA of the possible consequences of adopting the LVA device for criminal investigation and to send it to Dutton for signature.

25. President Gougler Directed reassignment of the APA Specialty Certification Program to be reassigned from Criswell to Slupski.

26. President Gougler Directed Bennett to begin site selections for two years in advance.

27. Motion by Sosnowski/Weinstein was approved to fund the APA National Office as requested for an additional year (February 1, 2009-January 31, 2010).

28. Motion by Murphy-Carr/Gaines was approved to provide the seminar presentations on thumb drives for the 2009 attendees.

29. Motion by Shaw/Gaines was approved for advanced deposit payable to Gray Line Nashville function transportation.

30. Motion by Gaines/Slupski was approved for advanced deposit payment for purchasing 375 tickets to the Grand Ole Opry.

31. Motion by Weinstein/Slupski was approved for funds to rent a storage room for boxes of APA records, merchandise, brochures, past Journals and Magazines as requested.

32. Motion by Slupski/Shaw was approved to purchase 20 additional golf shirts.

33. Motion by Gaines/Slupski was approved to purchase 12 brief bags.

34. Motion by Gaines/Sosnowski was approved to donate $150 per year for the partial support of a new website sponsored by APA member, Dale Austin, polygraphtruth.org. (Abstained: Slupski). President Gougler Directed Gaines to draft a letter and that the sight be reviewed for content prior to any link from the APA site.

35. Motion by Sosnowski/Cushman was approved for the APA to continue to fund a reception at the annual seminar for the research and development writers by invitation only.

36. President Gougler provided a Directive to Bennett and Gaines to look into transportation arrangements for members due to the lack of restaurants and any other facilities inside or outside of the seminar hotel site.

37. President Gougler provided Board members with a Directive to get their committee reports to Sosnowski one week prior to the Teleconference Meeting, for them to notify him of names of persons traditionally invited to the President’s Reception and to let him know of any dates in May that they would not be able to attend a Teleconference Meeting.

38. Motion by Gougler/Gaines was approved for Chairman Dutton to adjourn the Nashville BOD meeting at 2:40 pm on Saturday, January 17, 2009.
Summary of Minutes

Vickie T. Murphy-Carr
Secretary

Teleconference Meeting
February 6, 2009

Chairman Dutton called a Teleconference meeting to order at 6:03pm (EST) on Friday, February 6, 2009 to discuss FEC recommendations for names placed on the 2009 Ballot.

Members present included: Dutton, Gougler, Gaines, Sosnowski, Murphy, Krapohl, Criswell, Vaughan, Shaw and Slupski; Weinstein arrived, 6:06pm; Cushman arrived, 6:08pm; Absent: Russell.

1. Chairman Dutton requested a Teleconference meeting to discuss FEC recommendations and to add additional names on the 2009 election ballot. Attorney Vaughan reported that both the Board and the FEC acted properly and within guidelines regarding selection and placement of names on the 2009 ballot; but that there appeared to be some ambiguity that needed to be addressed.

2. A Motion by Weinstein & Criswell to reconsider the previous January vote that approved the FEC recommendations for names that were placed on the 2009 ballot was approved. (Yeah: Gougler, Sosnowski, Criswell, Shaw, Weinstein, Gaines & and Murphy) (NAY: Cushman, Slupski)

3. A Motion by Sosnowski & Criswell that additional names of individuals be placed on the 2009 APA ballot was approved. Attorney Vaughan noted for the record that while the FEC conduct was appropriate, there appeared to be ambiguity in the By-laws, with room for disagreement on both ends. It was the general consensus of the Board that by adding the additional names to the ballot, it would make sure everyone was treated fairly and the principle of democracy would prevail by letting the membership decide. (Yeah: Gougler, Sosnowski, Criswell, Shaw, Weinstein, Gaines, and Murphy; Nay: Cushman, Slupski).

4. Names to be listed on the 2009 Election ballot include:

   President Elect: FREITAS, Elizabeth, GORDON, Nate, and ORTIZ, Roy;
   VP-Private: NELSON, Raymond, REISTROFFER, James, and TEIGEN, William
   VP-Government: BLACK, Peter T. and PADGETT, Jimmy
   VP-Law Enforcement: SHAW, Pam
   Secretary: HOLDEN, Eric Jay and MURPHY-CARR, Vickie
   Director: MARTINES, Sabino and OELRICH, Marty

5. Chairman Dutton adjourned the Teleconference Meeting at 6:42pm. (Gaines/Cushman).

“All men wish to have truth on their side; but few to be on the side of truth.”

- Richard Whately
You’re Not Just Buying a Polygraph

Cutting edge technology at your finger tips!

**FingerCuff™**
Limestone Technologies’ all inclusive Polygraph Professional Suite™ includes our revolutionary FingerCuff™. Finally an alternative to the Blood Pressure Cuff. Incorporate cutting edge technology with our new FingerCuff™.

**Pulse Oximetry Sensor**
Limestone Technologies has integrated the industries’ best medical pulse oximetry design for our latest Finger PLE sensor. NONIN PureSAT® signal processing technology provides exactly what examiners need! Consistently reliable physiological measurements, even in a challenging monitoring environment.

Untouchable quality with unbeatable pricing!

**Polygraph Professional Suite™**
Silver Solution $5,995USD
- 1 DataPac_USB™ a true 8-channel instrument
- 1 StingRay SE™ piezo electronic film countermeasure cushion
- 2 pneumatic respiration transducers
- 1 complete set of EDA electrodes (traditional metal and silver/silver wet gel electrodes)
- 100 disposable silver/silver wet gel EDA electrodes
- 1 deluxe pneumatic blood pressure cuff with large sphygmomanometer (one size fits all)
- 1 FingerCuff™ pneumatic blood pressure cuff
- 1 deluxe Pelican instrument case with custom padded divider set
- 1 OSS 1 & 2 scoring algorithms, courtesy of Donald Krapohl and Barry McManus
- 1 OSS 3 scoring algorithm, courtesy of Raymond Nelson, Donald Krapohl and Mark Handler
- 1 comprehensive full color printed and bound user’s manual, and integrated video tutorials
- 3 year maintenance agreement (Phone support & software updates)
- 3 year DataPac_USB replacement warranty through overnight courier service

Superior technical support when you need it!

**Customer service 24/7**
Online technical support is available 24/7 through our secure knowledge base. Quarterly program updates are available to customers on our dedicated, secure online server. Software when you want it, at your convenience.

**Replacement Warranty**
Be assured that all instruments include a three year replacement warranty. Our guarantee that any defective equipment will be replaced within 48 hours maximizes your profits and productivity.

See for yourself. Contact us today.

NORTH AMERICA: 866.766.9770 (toll free)
INTERNATIONAL: 011.613.634.2594
E-mail: sales@limestonetech.com
Website: www.limestonetech.com
Winning Strategies
Leonard Bierman

It has long been my desire to advance the image of the polygraph profession both within the legal profession and the community at large. It seems for every forward stride that the polygraph profession makes, another empty-headed television show airs to demean the profession yet again. Throughout the many years I’ve spent as a polygraph examiner, I have frequently thought of methods designed to build respect for myself, the polygraph profession, and quite importantly – from a private examiner’s perspective -- to generate business.

With this in mind, a few years ago I began giving seminars to target audiences – judges, defense attorneys, federal and county public defenders, and more recently prosecutors. Initially I contacted organizations such as the county defense attorney associations to arrange these lectures for their group and they managed to obtain CLE credits for my seminar.

I imposed on an associate and long-time friend, Larry Kohn, to help create a PowerPoint presentation to go along with the script I put together. It worked out well. Prior to the presentation to The Criminal Defense Lawyers Association, they talked up the seminar via e-mail to all their members with the result being a pretty good turnout. I then contacted more associations and some contacted me, and as more seminars were held, excellent strides were made toward attaining my goals – respect, polygraph awareness on a positive basis -- and of great benefit to me, increased scheduling for examinations and expert testimony followed each appearance. Once one seminar was under my belt, it became easier to convince other organizations of the merits to be obtained by putting on similar programs, as now I had a track record and a group I could use as a reference.

When making presentations, it is imperative that you, the examiner, thoroughly know that whereof you speak. You must be able to explain in detail how a test is conducted. And, since the comparison question test is the most commonly used technique, and is also the most confusing for the audience (whether in court or at a seminar) it therefore begs for clarification so you must be able to explain what a comparison question is. In quick summation, it is basically a question that will draw or engage the truthful person’s focus or psychological set, as opposed to the deceptive one.

As I present it, “The manner of introducing and explaining the comparison question is designed to pose a dilemma for the subject. It leads the subject to believe that admissions will cause the examiner to believe that the subject is dishonest and, therefore, guilty. This discourages admissions. All people have arousing experiences from occasional breaches of conduct that are not criminal, but still sources of regret or shame or disgrace. These are readily accessed and reflected upon in comparison questions. The corresponding stress and memory is enhanced.”

Having spoken with Donald Krapohl about my seminar programs, and in discussing the possibility that the format I was utilizing would be helpful to other APA members, Don requested a copy for his perusal. Subsequently, he edited the presentation and together we (Larry Kohn, Donald Krapohl and I) made the entire program, script and PowerPoint available to APA members to help them educate targeted audiences and the general public about polygraph.

In the wake of the success of the seminar programs, one day while having lunch with a friend, he mentioned a newsletter he was circulating to members of a Human Resource Association. Hence, another PR brainstorm was seeded. Why didn’t I publish a newsletter via e-mail to my target audience? In pursuing it I researched how to e-mail a newsletter without it showing hundreds of names in the “to” column. An internet search revealed dozens of companies that could be utilized to send e-mails as if the e-mail were directed to the recipient alone. (It’s very inexpensive – with each company having their own pricing system). Where they
seem to differ greatly is in the information their tracking program provides. The really helpful providers show which individuals opened it and how many times, the day and time it was opened, who opted out of receiving future emails, who visited your website following receipt of the newsletter, and how many e-mails that were sent bounced. This information is helpful in keeping your records as well and eliminating uninterested people from your address lists.

Next I had to decide who to send it to. I contacted the State Bar Association and got a CD with over 800 attorneys in the Criminal Justice System in the three neighboring counties. So far….so good. Next was the hard part – what to send out that would be of interest and keep them reading. I put together some interesting cases of mine, some recent testimony where I or others were heard in court both state and federal, and added some information, which I retrieved from Google’s site about cases involved with polygraph, in particular those involving court decisions. The cases are presented short and to the point with the notation if the reader desires more information they can contact me either by e-mail or phone.

My “Polygraph News” journal has been exceptionally well received with only a total of ten opting out after four issues. The compliments and resultant new clients have far exceeded my expectations. Now that the format is established, my most difficult task is determining future content to keep the newsletters interesting.

One piece of advice….attorneys are busy people, keep it brief.

If there are any questions by members, direct them to lbierman@earthlink.net.

---

**The Arizona School of Polygraph Science**

Approved by:
- American Polygraph Association,
- American Association of Police Polygraphists,
- Various State Licensing Boards and meets ASTM Standards for Polygraph Schools

Licensed and approved by:
- Arizona State Board for Post-secondary Education

Founded 1985 Arizona Incorporated 1986

Laura W. Perry Director
Joe Perry Operations Manager

This polygraph examiner-training course is a comprehensive ten week program in the latest computerized polygraph techniques. Classroom is equipped with state-of-the-art equipment to view live examinations both physically, and electronically, as it is seen and done on the computer screen. Small classes (no more than 10 students) offer one-on-one attention to student needs. It consists of intensive classroom study, hands-on practice and a post-test field project.

Information regarding this course, including, but not limited to pre-requisites, curriculum, tuition, refund policy, academic progress, etc., can be found on our website: [http://www.azpolygraphschool.com/](http://www.azpolygraphschool.com/)

---

**TEN-WEEK POLYGRAPH TRAINING COURSES**

- April 13 to June 19, 2009
- September 7 to November 13, 2009
- January 11 to March 19, 2010

3106 West Thomas Rd. Suite 1114
Phoenix, Arizona 85017
Tel: 602-272-8123
Fax: 602-272-9735
Internet: [http://www.azpolygraphschool.com/](http://www.azpolygraphschool.com/)
E-mail: laurawellsperry@cox.net

---

**FOR SALE:**

I have a brand new Axciton Instrument for sale never been used and placed in a Samsonite carry case.

I bought it for $5,000 and I am willing to talk price to anyone interested in purchasing it from me.

Contact Cliff Lindquist at 760-751-9557 or email: clifylq@aol.com.
“All mammalian bi-peds of the homo sapien order residing in crysto-crystaline edifices should refrain from the propulsion of all inanimate objects.”

Say what? It is written in English. Why can’t I understand it?

How about: “People who live in glass houses should not throw stones.” Better? Oh, now I understand; why didn’t you say so?

Brilliant minds often fail to communicate with lesser mortals. “The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, But in ourselves, that we are underlings.” And so it seems with computer scoring algorithms. Brilliantly constructed by great minds, the end product is often unintelligible to the unwashed masses.

The Objective Scoring System (OSS-3) provides p-value, Bonferonni corrected alpha, Kruskai-Wallis ANOVA, Test of Proportions (Two-Tailed) Standardized Lognormal Ratios, Weighted Mean and Grand Mean. So what?

PolyScore is more miserly with its terminology, but no less confusing. QIG, QIC, Signal Quality Indices and Useable are impressive terms but meaningless to mortal examiners.

Quantitative Evaluation System (QuEST) must be written for the gods for no mortal examiner can understand any part of it. The Scoring Report lists the questions asked and horizontal bar charts showing “Reaction”. There is little to guide practitioners in their quest (pardon the pun) for truth or deception.

Test data analysis has two facets, subjective and objective. Subjective analysis – hand scoring – can be easily utilized and is subject to quality control by experienced examiners. Objective analysis – computer scoring – can be easily utilized but is not subject to quality control (numbers are numbers). If computers are to crunch numbers, their work product must be meaningful to the end user. Such is not the case here on earth.

Perhaps, someday, the gods of computerdom will translate statistics into language for the common man and answer the age old question, “What the hell does that mean and how can I use it?”
Stoelting is the most trusted name in polygraphy, with a tradition of polygraph innovation spanning nearly 80 years. The CPS II is engineered to be the most powerful and easy to use polygraph system on the market.

INNOVATIVE FEATURES OF THE CPS II:

**Eight Signal Channels**
Collect up to 8 channels of data using the most technologically advanced hardware and sensors available.

**Video and Audio Recording**
Record audio and video of an entire exam with a web camera. The CPS II video program is easy to use, providing trouble-free operation and quality video compression.

**New Scoring Windows Screen**
Customize your scoring windows for each channel when numerically scoring your charts. The University of Utah's optimized scoring windows are set as default.

**Exclusive Numerical Scoring Screen**
Numerically score your charts on your computer screen using our display of easy to understand computer measurements which are designed to facilitate the efficiency, reliability, and accuracy of diagnoses of truth and deception.

**Exclusive Voice Response Channel**
Mark the exact time when you ask your questions (onset and offset) and when your subject answers via lapel microphones.

**Scientifically Validated Algorithms**
Evaluate your data using scientifically-validated algorithms created at the University of Utah. All algorithms are included free of charge with the CPS II program.
Legal Speak

Gordon L. Vaughn
General Counsel, APA

New Jersey Considers Whether Suspect Must Have Benefit of Counsel Before Stipulating to Admissibility of Polygraph Examination

New Jersey has long recognized the admissibility of the results of polygraph examinations in which the parties have stipulated to its admissibility. This position was first stated in New Jersey in the case State v. McDavitt, 297 A.2d 849 (1972).1 In McDavitt, the defendant testified during his trial that he had offered to take a polygraph examination to prove his innocence. The prosecutor objected to that testimony and was, under New Jersey law, mistakenly overruled. On cross-examination the prosecutor asked the defendant if he would still be willing to take a polygraph. The defendant stated, in the presence of the jury, that he was. Later, outside of the presence of the jury, the prosecution and the defendant agreed that the defendant would be given a polygraph examination and they stipulated that if defendant was found not to be deceptive to denials of the charged conduct the charges would be dismissed. However, if he was found to be deceptive the polygraph results would be admissible. When the defendant was found deceptive the court admitted the testimony over the defendant’s objection. Admission of the stipulated polygraph testimony was upheld by the New Jersey Supreme Court.

In the years after McDavitt, New Jersey held that an uncharged suspect could enter into a stipulation that would admit the results of a polygraph examination even where the suspect was unrepresented by counsel. See State v. Reyes, 567 A.2d 287 (N.J. App. 1989).

State v. A.O

In the case of State v. A.O, ___ A.2d ___, 2009 WL 529149 (March 4, 2009), the New Jersey Supreme Court explored the question of whether, without the benefit of advice of counsel, an unrepresented suspect may stipulate to the admissibility of a polygraph examination.

Case Facts2

A.O. is a Nigerian immigrant who lived with his girlfriend and her ten year old daughter. On April 27, 2001, A.O.’s girlfriend called him and stated that there was a problem with her daughter and asked him to come to the local office of the prosecuting attorney. When A.O. arrived there were three police officers waiting for him. The officers questioned A.O. for several hours about allegations made by the girl that he had sexually assaulted her. A.O was advised of his Miranda rights on three separate occasions. When it was suggested that A.O. take a polygraph examination, he agreed. An assistant prosecutor provided A.O. with a polygraph stipulation form, which he read aloud to A.O. At the time, defendant was not represented by counsel, was not under arrest, had not been charged with a crime and was not in custody.

The polygraph stipulation signed by A.O. set out that he agreed not only to take the polygraph exam but also agreed to the following: that the results would be admissible at trial; that the polygraph examiner was an expert; that he waived any objection to the admissibility of the expert’s testimony; that he waived the right to call another expert or witness about that evidence; and that no other polygraph would be admissible without a separate stipulation. The polygraph examination was administered by Detective Sergeant John Kaminskas, reported to be a nineteen-year veteran who had administered hundreds of polygraph examinations. According to Sergeant Kaminskas, the polygraph revealed “indications of deception” to each of the four relevant questions addressing the assault. Defendant was, soon thereafter, arrested.
Approximately one week after the arrest of A.O., and just before her medical examination, the girl recanted her allegations against A.O. As a result, no medical examination was performed on the girl. She was, however, removed from the home and placed in a shelter. There, the girl accused a shelter worker of sexual assault and later recanted that allegation upon her interview with prosecutors.

At trial, the girl testified that A.O. had, in fact, sexually assaulted her. There was no physical or medical evidence admitted into evidence to support her allegation. The prosecution introduced the results of the polygraph and Sergeant Kaminskas testified that he had a “100 percent” accuracy rate in the prior 302 tests he had administered - remarking that he “never had a confirmed mistake.” The prosecutor emphasized this testimony in closing argument, stating that Sergeant Kaminskas polygraph was “100 percent accurate.” A.O. was found guilty of first degree aggravated sexual assault and was sentenced to eighteen years in prison and community supervision for life.

A.O. appealed the conviction, arguing in part that the polygraph evidence should not have been admitted as he was not represented by counsel at the time it was signed and violated his Sixth Amendment right that “in all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right . . . to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense.” U.S. Const. amend. VI. Alternatively, A.O argued that New Jersey should reverse State v. McDavitt and State v. Reyes and not permit the introduction of the results of stipulated polygraph examinations or at least those in which the stipulation was entered into without the benefit of counsel.

**Holding**

The New Jersey Supreme Court first considered whether the admission of the stipulated polygraph results violated defendant’s 6th Amendment right to counsel. The Court observed that federal case precedent held that the 6th Amendment right to counsel did not attach until “adversary judicial proceedings have been initiated” against him or her. The New Jersey court held that to trigger the right to counsel there must be both an “accused” and the beginning of an “adversary judicial proceeding.” The New Jersey Court also recognized that: “[o]nce ‘adversary judicial proceedings’ have begun, the right applies not only at trial, but to any ‘critical stage’ of the prosecution, that is, any stage in which the substantial rights of the accused may be affected.” State v. A.O., supra at slip opinion p. __ [citing Estelle v. Smith, 451 U.S. 454, 470-71 (1981)].

Despite rejecting A.O.’s 6th Amendment argument, the Court unanimously reversed State v. Reyes on the basis of their superseding authority to insure fairness and integrity in New Jersey courts and held that a stipulation for the admission of polygraph evidence would not be enforced absent the examinee’s assistance of counsel. While the Court acknowledged that individuals are routinely permitted to waive their rights without advice of counsel, the Court noted that there was a distinction between waiving a right and stipulating to the admission of testimony at trial. As noted by the Court:

>[A] defendant can knowingly consent to a search, but in doing so does not agree to the admissibility of everything found during the search. The State must still establish that the evidence taken is admissible in accordance with substantive and evidentiary rules. . . . The same is true for a polygraph exam. A defendant can voluntarily agree to take the test, but its admissibility is a distinctly separate question. Once properly advised of his rights, defendant could agree to submit to a polygraph. But the ancillary decisions made beyond that choice bear on trial strategy. Defendants typically rely on counsel to object to otherwise inadmissible evidence, attack a witness’s expertise, and decide the most effective way to challenge evidence before a jury.

State v. A.O, supra, Slip Opinion at p.10.

While the Court could have stopped there, it took the opportunity to express grave concerns over whether it would continue to follow McDavitt and permit the use of any stipulated polygraph results, even where the defendant had the advice and consent of counsel. In support, the Court cited the 2002 National Academy of Science Review of Polygraph and the admonitions in United States v. Scheffer, 523 U.S. 303, 312 (1998) that “there is simply no way to know in a particular case whether a polygraph examiner’s conclusion is accurate, because certain doubts and uncertainties plague even the best polygraph exams.”

The Court noted, however, that the record before it was inadequate to address the issue and left the question for another time.
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Discussion

Here, the New Jersey Supreme Court was clearly disturbed by the attempt of the prosecutor to not only secure a stipulation from A.O. to take the polygraph and for it’s admissibility at trial, but also by the prosecutor’s attempt to preclude A.O. from contesting the expertise of the examiner, from being able to present evidence that the exam was unreliable, or from presenting his own polygraph expert. The dilemma faced by the Court, however, was how it could overturn this overreaching stipulation without intruding on long-standing law that recognizes the right of a person to consent to forensic and other examinations and otherwise to make knowing waivers of constitutional and other procedural rights. A.O. sought protection under the 6th Amendment to the United States Constitution to right to counsel. Alternatively, A.O. sought to overturn McDavitt, thus not permitting the introduction of polygraph evidence under any circumstance – even where the defendant had previously stipulated to its use.

The 6th Amendment presented, at first look, an attractive solution. If the 6th Amendment were applied, stipulations such as the one at issue would not be permitted without advice of counsel. Presumably, counsel would not approve such a one-sided stipulation. There was a problem, however, in applying the 6th Amendment to the A.O. stipulation. Historically, it was not until 1963 in Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335 (1963) that the right to counsel was, through the 14th Amendment, incorporated to apply to state criminal defendants. A year later, in Escobedo v. Illinois, 378 U.S. 478 (1964), the United States Supreme Court held that the 6th Amendment provided a criminal suspect a right to counsel during custodial police interrogations. While, in subsequent cases, the United States Supreme Court has held that a criminal defendant has a 6th Amendment right to an attorney during all critical stages of the criminal process, the Court has never extended the 6th Amendment right to counsel to non-custodial interaction between the police and a defendant. As A.O. was not in custody at the time he entered into the stipulation, the Court could not use the 6th Amendment to preclude the stipulation without significantly expanding the right to counsel to pre-custodial stages of a criminal investigation. Additionally, such decision would undermine long-standing law permitting the knowing waiver of counsel by a defendant even during custodial interrogation. The New Jersey Court no doubt recognized that such expansion of the scope of the 6th Amendment would have much broader implications than to just polygraph stipulations. Indeed, had the New Jersey Court so expanded the concept of the 6th Amendment, the case would no doubt have been considered by the United States Supreme Court and almost certainly reversed.

The New Jersey Court, while expressing extreme skepticism of polygraph evidence, was also unprepared, on the record of this case, to abandon McDavitt and the admissibility of stipulated polygraphs.

To resolve its dilemma, the New Jersey Court determined to rely on the rarely used right retained by states’ highest courts. This right, referred to as a “right of supervisory authority” or “control,” permits the Court, in the promotion of justice and the integrity of the justice system, to establish rules which are uniquely applicable to the Courts of the state. The New Jersey Court, then, utilizing this right of supervisory authority, was able to extend a 6th Amendment like right to counsel in the limited circumstance of stipulations to the admissibility of a polygraph examination.

It is important to understand that A.O. does not effect New Jersey law enforcement polygraph examinations that do not seek a stipulation to admissibility. Neither the 6th Amendment nor the order of supervisory control requires advice of counsel before such a polygraph test is administered. (If it is a custodial examination, Miranda rights would, of course, be required.) So too, like other forensic evidence, non-stipulated polygraph evidence is theoretically subject to presentation to the court for consideration of admissibility.

Additionally, A.O. is a state court decision and is not binding on any other state. The decision, however, may have persuasive effect in other jurisdictions. Indeed, given the overreaching nature of the waiver presented to A.O. by the prosecutor, it is difficult to criticize the result reached by the New Jersey Court.

It is this author’s opinion that, absent the overreaching nature of the A.O. stipulation, the New Jersey court would have likely not taken the extraordinary step of using its supervisory authority to reverse Reyes. State v. A.O. is an example of a case where bad facts led to an unfortunate change in what was otherwise favorable law.
Celebrating over 60 years, Lafayette Instrument proudly introduces the new LX5000, the world’s first modular polygraph!

**Hardware Innovations:**
- Simultaneously records an unlimited number of channels*
- Data transfer rate up to 360 samples per second across all channels
- 23-bit analog to digital conversion
- Wired USB connectivity, or cutting edge wireless Bluetooth™ technology
- Small, compact design making transport and storage easy
- The modular design is completely expandable, allowing for easy and inexpensive hardware upgrades
- Extended measurement ranges
- Wireless module includes rechargeable Lithium Ion battery
- GSR and PLE channels on one module
- Choice of electronic or pneumatic Pneumograph module
- Rugged design, yet lightweight
- Operates with same trusted and state-of-the-art LX Software
- 3 year warranty and lifetime technical support

* depending upon your computer's configuration

**New LX Software 10.0 Innovations:**
- LX5000 and LX4000 Support
- Objective Scoring System v. 3 (OSS-3)
- Redesigned E-mail PF Capability
- Translator Mode
- Configurable LXSSoftware File Directories
- Signature Pad Support for Personal History
- Enhanced Technical Support Features
- Prompt for Archiving Audit Trail File
- Preferences Changes No Longer Require a Restart

**Special Offers**
- Trade-in your Axciton, Stoelting or Limestone Computerized Instrument, and receive a $1500.00 discount off the list price of an LX5000 or 4000 System
- UPGRADE to a Lafayette Instrument LX5000 from the LX4000 for ONLY $3750.00
- UPGRADE to a Lafayette Instrument LX4000 from the LX2000 or LX3000 for ONLY $2500.00

**LX4000 - PLATINUM SERIES**
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THE BACKSTER SCHOOL
OF
LIE DETECTION

POLYGRAPH EXAMINER TRAINING COURSES:

320 hour resident basic training phase plus field project
Annual five-day work conference for professional polygraphists to upgrade their skills
Post Conviction Sex Offender Polygraph Examiner Training Course

Accredited by the American Polygraph Association since 1966
Recognized by the American Association of Police Polygraphists

Cleve Backster: Director and Chief Instructor
Charter member: American Polygraph Association
American Association of Police Polygraphists
California Association of Polygraph Examiners
Originator of the Backster Zone Comparison Technique, and the first system
for numerical evaluation of polygraph charts, both now generally adopted as
the standard throughout the polygraph field.

8-WEEK BASIC POLYGRAPH EXAMINER TRAINING COURSES
January 19, 2009-March 13, 2009
June 8, 2009-July 31, 2009
September 14, 2009-November 6, 2009

POST CONVICTION SEX OFFENDER TESTING TRAINING COURSES
March 16, 2009-March 20, 2009
November 9, 2009-November 13, 2009

FIFTY FIRST FIVE DAY POLYGRAPH EXAMINER WORK CONFERENCE
December 8, 2008-December 12, 2008

FIFTY SECOND ANNUAL 5 DAY POLYGRAPH EXAMINER WORK CONFERENCE
December 7-11, 2009

Dani Henson-Phillips: Registrar
The Backster School of Lie Detection
861 Sixth Avenue, Suite 403
San Diego, CA 92101
Tel: (619) 233-6669  Fax: (619) 233-3441

Website: www.backster.net  E-mail: clevebackster@cs.com
1. **Introduction**

1.1 This Model Policy is provided to assist polygraph examiners and local agencies or jurisdictions that are responsible for policy development regarding the activities of polygraph examiners when they engage in pre-employment polygraph testing of law-enforcement and other public-service applicants. Examiners who work in agencies or jurisdictions without local practice regulations may refer to this Model Policy as a guide.

1.2 In the event of conflict between law or local regulations and this Model Policy, law and local regulations should prevail. This model policy should be considered non-binding and not enforceable by the APA or any local jurisdiction.

2. **Evidence-based Approach**

2.1 This Model Policy emphasizes an evidence-based approach, as an alternative to one based solely on a system of values. To the extent possible, it relies on data from existing research pertaining to screening and diagnostic polygraph testing, risk assessment, risk management, and field investigation principles.

2.2 When an evidence-based approach is not possible, this Model Policy should emphasize an approach based on face-valid principles pertaining to polygraph screening and related fields of science. These include psychology, physiology, psycho-physiology, neuro-psychology, forensic threat assessment, decision theory, signal detection theory, and inferential statistics.

2.3 Some elements of this model policy are intended to increase consistency and reliability among field examiners through standardized field practices that are enacted in the absence of data from empirical studies or other face-valid evidence.

2.4 It is assumed that continuing polygraph research will produce findings that are supported by data. Should evidence from future empirical studies reveal the practice recommendations of this Model Policy to be inconsistent with empirically based evidence, the evidence-based practices should prevail.

2.5 This Model Policy should be amended periodically to remain consistent with emerging information from new empirical studies.

3. **Program Goals: Decision-support and Incremental Validity**

3.1 Psychophysiological Detection of Deception (PDD), or polygraph testing, should be regarded as a decision-support tool intended to add incremental validity to risk-assessment and risk-management efforts surrounding the evaluation and selection of law-enforcement and other public-service applicants.

3.2 Polygraph testing, and polygraph test results, should not supplant or replace the need for professional expertise and professional judgment. Polygraph testing cannot replace the need for a thorough background investigation, but should be thought of as part of a comprehensive pre-employment background investigation.
3.3 Polygraph test results should never be used as the sole basis for the selection or rejection of a law-enforcement or public-service applicant.

3.4 Operational objectives of pre-employment testing include:

3.4.1 *Increased disclosure* of addition information that will be of interest to risk adjudicators and hiring professionals in the law enforcement and public service selection process.

3.4.2 *Deterrence of unsuitable applicants* from joining and/or remaining in the applicant pool, by increasing the likelihood that past transgressions and activities will become known to authorities.

3.4.3 *Detection* of applicants who attempt to withhold information that would be of interest to risk adjudicators and hiring authorities in the law enforcement selection process.

4. **Screening Tests**

4.1 Pre-employment tests are screening tests. Screening tests are conducted in the absence of a known incident, known allegation or any particular reason to suspect someone's involvement. This is in contrast to criminal investigative polygraph, or diagnostic examinations that focus on a suspect’s involvement in a single known event or known allegation that is the subject of an investigation.

4.2 Screening exams may at times be narrowed to a single target issue of concern, in the absence of a known incident or known allegation. However, most screening exams include multiple issues of concern (mixed issues), in which it is conceivable that a person could be involved in one or more issues while remaining un-involved in other issues of concern.

5. **Compliance**

5.1 Examiners should adhere to all requirements of the law, to include the Employee Polygraph Protection Act (EPPA), Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and other applicable bodies of law.

5.2 Unless prohibited by law, regulation or government policy, all members of the American Polygraph Association (APA) that conduct pre-employment polygraph testing of law-enforcement and other public-service applicants should comply with the American Polygraph Association Standards of Principles and Practices.

5.3 Except as provided by law, polygraph test information and results should be kept confidential within the screening process; to be used exclusively to assist in applicant selection. Absent a legal obligation and waiver to report polygraph examination information, it should be treated with the utmost respect in regard to confidentiality.

5.4 If local restrictions conflict with this Model Policy, the examiner should comply with local restrictions.

5.5 Where applicable, a polygraph examiner should be licensed or appropriately certified by the regulatory organization for all jurisdictions in which the examiner is testing.

6. **Examiner training**

6.1 Examiners should have completed a basic course of polygraph training at a polygraph school accredited by the APA or training that was substantially equivalent in length and curriculum as required for APA school accreditation. Examiners who qualify for membership in the APA are regarded as satisfying this requirement.

6.2 Examiners should have completed at least a minimal supervised internship following their initial training.
6.3 Examiners should undergo continuing education of at least 30 hours every two calendar years.

6.4 Examiners should be members of a professional polygraph association to facilitate their continuing education and to remain current with developments within the polygraph and applicable professions.

6.5 Polygraph examiners should be trained in conducting structured and semi-structured interviews as they apply to law-enforcement and public-service pre-employment polygraph testing.

7. **Equipment**

7.1 Examiners should use a polygraph that is properly functioning, maintained and calibrated according to the manufacturer’s specifications. In the absence of manufacturer’s recommendations, examiners should semi-annually record a chart demonstrating correct functioning of the instrument and maintain that chart for at least one year, or as determined by law or regulation.

7.2 The instrument should meet the specification guidelines of the American Polygraph Association and local licensing. At a minimum, the instrument should continuously record during testing with the following components:

7.2.1 Two pneumograph components to document thoracic and abdominal movement patterns associated with respiration;

7.2.2 A component to record electrodermal activity reflecting relative changes in the conductance or resistance of current by the epidermal tissue; and,

7.2.3 A cardiograph component to record pulse rate, pulse amplitude and relative blood pressure changes.

7.3 A motion sensor is recommended and will be required effective January 1, 2012.

7.4 Other physiological data may be recorded during testing but may not be used to aid in formulating decisions of truthfulness or deception unless validated in replicated and published research.

8. **Quality Assurance and Recording**

8.1 To assure examiner compliance with the listed recommendations, and to sustain the quality of the testing program, an independent quality assurance review of a portion of each examiners’ work product should take place regularly.

8.2 To facilitate the periodic quality assurance review and safeguard the process against unwarranted allegations of misconduct, all examinations should be recorded in their entirety unless precluded by law or policy. The recording should be continuous in nature, with any stops or pauses explained on the recording.

9. **Test Question Construction**

9.1 Test question language, and the number of test questions, should be consistent with the requirements of the polygraph technique that is used.

9.2 Test question language and construction should be:

9.2.1 Simple, direct, and easily understood by the applicant.

9.2.2 Behaviorally descriptive of the applicant’s involvement in an issue of concern.

9.2.3 Time delimited (time of reference),
9.2.4 Free of assumptions about guilt or deception.
9.2.5 Free of unnecessary legal terms and jargon.
9.2.6 Devoid of mental state or motivational terminology.
9.2.7 Balanced in terms of length and complexity with other relevant questions.

10. Target Selection

10.1 Investigation targets for law-enforcement and public-service pre-employment screening polygraphs should be selected from the agency hiring policies, and should reflect actuarial indicators of training and job performance whenever possible.

10.2 Polygraph investigation targets should be limited to the smallest number possible and restricted to areas that:

10.2.1 Are based on agency hiring policies, or are actuarially relevant to success in law-enforcement or public-service training and job performance;
10.2.2 Describe past behaviors (not thoughts, inclinations, intentions or states of mind);
10.2.3 Are sufficiently recent to assure accurate recollection by the applicant;
10.2.4 Are sufficiently precise in definition as to avoid confusion in the mind of the applicant; and,
10.2.5 Are not adequately, or better addressed, by another investigative method already employed as part of the screening process.

10.3 Suggested investigation targets include:

10.3.1 The applicant’s history of involvement in unknown or unreported criminal activities, including contact, income or involvement with organized crime activities.
10.3.2 The applicant’s history of involvement with illegal drugs, including manufacture, distribution/transport, profit or recent use.
10.3.3 The applicant’s history of involvement in sexual contact with minors, including child-pornography use.
10.3.4 The applicant’s history of involvement in unknown acts of violence, including acts of intolerance towards persons of differing racial or ethnic backgrounds.

11. Environment

11.1 All examinations should be administered in an environment that is free from distractions that would interfere with the applicant’s ability to appropriately focus on the issues being addressed.

11.2 Primary distractions of concern are noise, visual distractions, and other people in the testing room.

12. Pre-Test Interview

12.1 The examination should start with a pre-test interview including at a minimum the following:

12.1.1 Verification of the identity of the examinee.
12.1.2 Written consent to administer the examination as all polygraph examinations are voluntary and may be terminated at any time. The examiner should always obtain documented consent from the applicant prior to testing.

12.1.3 An attempt to ensure the applicant is mentally and physically suitable for testing based on information provided, within legal limitations. If at any time the examiner determines the applicant is not suitable for testing, the process should be stopped until the issue is resolved.

12.1.4 A review of the application for employment and any personal history statement that the applicant completed for the prospective employer.

12.1.5 An explanation of polygraph testing principles, including the accepted cognitive, emotional and behavioral bases for responses to polygraph test questions. Sufficient time must be spent to ensure the examinee understands the process and the expectation for complete cooperation.

12.1.6 A comprehensive discussion of all issues to be tested.

12.1.7 A review of all test questions to ensure the applicant’s satisfactory understanding of each test question.

13. **Pre-Employment Examination Questionnaire**

13.1 A pre-employment examination questionnaire may be provided to the applicant for completion prior to the testing process. The questionnaire should cover the applicant’s entire relevant life activities, including his or her experiences as a law enforcement officer, if applicable.

13.2 The examiner should review the applicant’s questionnaire with the applicant, following the principles of a structured or semi-structured interview.

13.3 Any admissions by the applicant of activity that falls within the purview of legitimate areas of concern for the hiring agency should be noted and reported to the prospective employer for consideration.

14. **Testing Phase**

14.1 The administration of the polygraph test should conform to all professional standards as should all polygraph testing.

14.2 Examiners should use an accepted format for multiple issues testing. A comparison question format is recommended.

14.3 The multiple issue (mixed-issue) examination using a comparison question technique should be limited to not more than four (4) relevant questions. If more issues need to be explored, a second and/or third series should be administered.

14.4 Multiple issue (mixed-issue) examinations using a relevant – irrelevant or non-comparison question technique should be limited to not more than five (5) relevant questions. If more issues need to be explored, a second and/or third series should be administered.

14.5 An acquaintance test should be used as part of the examination process unless validated replicated research shows it would negatively impact on the accuracy of a validated technique.

14.6 Question intervals should allow a reasonable time for recovery. For comparison question techniques, question intervals from stimulus onset to stimulus onset should not be less than 20 seconds.

14.7 To maximize the informational efficiency of multiple issue (mixed-issue) testing and the diagnostic
efficiency of single-issue screening exams, a successive hurdles approach is recommended. This would involve a more narrowly-focused (single-issue) screening examination following a multiple issues exam for which there are significant responses noted to any of the relevant issues. A follow-up screening examination(s) should focus on the issue(s) of concern identified in the screening exam, and may be scheduled for a later date.

15. **Test Evaluation**

15.1 A polygraph examiner should not render an opinion concerning the truthfulness of an examinee until after all data suitable for analysis has been analyzed.

15.2 The examiner should use evaluation methods for which they have been formally trained and that are appropriate for the type of test administered.

15.3 Additional testing may follow any of the following opinions, in accordance with local requirements.

15.3.1 If there are no significant physiological responses noted to relevant questions, the examiner should render an opinion of No Significant Reactions/Responses (NSR) to the test.

15.3.2 If there are significant physiological responses noted to any of the relevant questions, the examiner should render an opinion that there was Significant Reactions/Responses (SR) to the test.

15.3.3 If sufficient criteria to render an opinion do not exist, the examiner should report the exam as No Opinion (NO) or Inconclusive (INC).

15.4 To maximize sensitivity and validity, a single issue examination should be conducted when significant responses appear on a multiple issue (mixed-issue) test. Unless prohibited by law, a professional opinion that an examinee was deceptive, based on physiological data, should only result from a specific issue test.

15.5 Examiners should use all available interpretable information to render an opinion, in accordance with recognized techniques and established procedures.

15.6 Examiners should render a report that the applicant was Purposefully Non-cooperative (PNC) whenever an applicant is determined to be attempting to alter their physiological response data.

16. **Post-Test Review**

16.1 The applicant should be informed of the test results and given an opportunity to provide any additional information or explanation whenever there are Significant Reactions (SR) observed to any of the test questions.

16.2 Any admissions by the applicant of activity that falls within the purview of legitimate areas of concern for the hiring agency should be noted and reported to the prospective employer for consideration.

17. **Records Retention**

17.1 All documentation of the examination should be maintained for a period of at least three years, or as required by law.
Mission and Vision

Mission
The American Polygraph Association (APA) is a professional organization composed of polygraph examiners, researchers, and others who share the goals of the Association. The APA promotes the universal values of justice, community safety, and national security. This is accomplished by encouraging excellence in the field through high quality educational opportunities and professional standards and by improving the understanding of leaders in government, commerce, the judiciary and the general public on polygraph-related issues.

Vision
The American Polygraph Association enables and encourages its members to perform polygraph examinations that are highly useful, valid and reliable in a variety of contexts to serve the cause of truth.

Goal 1. Maintain a high level of competence and ethics of examiners in the conduct and reporting of polygraph examinations.

Strategy 1: Develop best practice guides.

Benchmarks

1. By the 2009 APA Annual Seminar, create and approve or update one model policy that addresses best practices.

2. By the 2010 APA Annual Seminar, create and approve or update one model policy that addresses best practices.

3. By the 2011 APA Annual Seminar, create and approve or update one model policy that addresses best practices.

4. By the 2012 APA Annual Seminar the Board shall oversee the development and dissemination of a list of polygraph testing and analysis methodologies shown in published research to meet minimum validity standards specified in the By-Laws.

5. By the 2012 APA Annual Seminar, create and approve or update one model policy that addresses best practices.

6. By the 2013 APA Annual Seminar, create and approve or update one model policy that addresses best practices.


Benchmarks

1. By the 2010 APA Annual Seminar, the APA Accreditation Inspection Guide will be revised to ensure that existing model policies are incorporated into the instruction curriculum for each school.

2. Beginning with inspections in 2010, APA-accredited schools will be evaluated on their coverage of the APA model policies in lectures, practice and written examinations.

3. Beginning in 2010, create a Sub-Committee that would establish the criteria which would select polygraph techniques that are considered to be “validated”.

4. By the 2011 APA Annual Seminar, approve and adopt the above Sub-Committee’s recommendations in order for polygraph schools to adjust their curriculum.
5. Beginning in 2012 APA-accredited schools will teach testing and analysis techniques that are consistent with published and replicated research.

Strategy 3. Establish minimum CE standards for members.

Benchmark

1. By the 2009 APA Annual Seminar, the APA Board will evaluate and review the effectiveness of continuing education standards for polygraph examiners as a condition of membership.


Benchmarks

1. By the 2009 APA Annual Seminar the Continuing Education Chair shall formally propose a distance learning plan to the APA Board of Directors.

2. By the 2010 APA Annual Seminar the Continuing Education Chair shall have in operation at least two different forms of distance learning available to the membership.

3. By the 2011 APA Annual Seminar, the Continuing Education Chair shall modify the operational policy on APA co-hosting training seminars with State associations.

Strategy 5. Improve instrumentation

Benchmarks

1. By the 2010 APA Annual Seminar the Research and Development Committee Chair shall propose minimum standards for polygraph instrumentation for a Board vote. The proposal shall include recommendations for new sensors and data channels.

2. Effective 2012 all polygraphs used by APA members shall meet the instrument standards approved by the Board.

Strategy 6. Establish quality control resources to assist polygraph examiners.

Benchmarks

1. By the 2010 APA Annual Seminar the Standards of Practice Committee Chair shall propose to the Board a voluntary quality control program for member examiners.

2. By the 2011 APA Annual Seminar, the Standards of Practice Chair will provide a report detailing the utilization of the voluntary quality control program.

Strategy 7. Bring about regulatory legislation that supports the competency and ethical conduct of polygraph examiners

Benchmarks

1. Each year the APA shall support with expertise and funding the legislative initiative of one affiliated state association for state licensure. The level of effort shall be determined by the Board’s assessment of likelihood of success, commitment and support from the APA members in the affected state, and budget limitations.

Strategy 8: Create a competency-based certification process

Benchmarks

1. By 2010, the Board shall create one competency-based certification process (i.e., evidentiary testing, paired-testing, investigative testing, applicant testing, immigration and asylum testing, PCSOT) modeled on those of other professions.
2. By 2011, the Board shall create one competency-based certification process modeled on those of other professions.

Strategy 9. Improve communication to and among polygraph examiners.

Benchmarks

1. By the 2010 Annual APA Seminar members will be offered the option of receiving the APA periodicals electronically.

Goal 2. Improve public understanding about the polygraph profession.

Strategy 1. Create packaged lectures for presentation to influential professionals.

Benchmarks

1. Each year between 2010 and 2012 by the Annual APA Seminar, the Public Relations and Information Committee Chair will have produced a presentation package for dissemination to members who volunteer to speak to one of the following professional groups: judges, lawyers, sex offender treatment providers, or legislators.

2. Each year by the Annual APA Seminar, the Public Relations and Information Committee Chair will update its presentation packages, and solicit from the Board new ideas for presentation packages.

Strategy 2. Create a cadre of trained media representatives.

Benchmarks

1. Each year the APA will prepare 10 APA members to represent the Association to the media.

2. By the 2010 Annual APA Seminar create and implement a formal system to issue press releases to media outlets in the most economical means available.

Strategy 3. Educate scientists who work in related fields.

Benchmark

1. Each year the APA will send representatives to selected major scientific conferences that have potential implications for future regulation, legislation or establishment of governmental research priorities.

Strategy 4. Inform the public about the polygraph.

Benchmark

1. By January 2010, the APA website will make available 50 polygraph-related articles for download by the general public. All articles will be selected by the APA Editor-in-Chief, who shall also be responsible for obtaining necessary permissions and converting the articles into electronic format.

Conclusion

The Association’s Strategic Plan is a roadmap that guides the endeavors of the leadership and members. It represents the values of the organization, its hopes and aspirations, its commitments, and its view of the profession’s role in supporting the truth verification needs of a free and open society. For the Plan to be effective it is the responsibility of the leadership to maintain the document, to refine it as necessary to ensure it continues to represent the goals of the Association, and most importantly, to bring about the progress that the Plan requires. Though the Plan remains dynamic so to respond to the changing needs of the Association, its core vision of professionalism and truth remain.
Polygraph History
by Raymond Nelson

Across

2. 18th century Italian physiologist who did experiments with frogs, magnetism and skin resistance
7. Italian psychologist who studied the role of respiration in deception detection
8. Harvard professor who studied and promoted word-association techniques for detecting deception
9. 19th century researcher who used a plethysmograph, sphygmomanometer, and scientific cradle
12. Lawyer and polygraph researcher, developed comparison question techniques, countermeasure devices, and interrogation methods
13. Harvard professor who studied breathing, and determined blood pressure to be a superior indicator of deception
14. Developed the Zone Comparison Technique, numerical scoring methods, and psychological explanations
15. 18th century writer who described the effect of emotions on the pulse rate
16. 18th century English clergy who whose experiments with horses led to the development of the sphygmomanometer
18. 20th century researcher who first used word-association with a GSR device
19. 14th century writer who described a patient whose pulse quickened when a lover entered the room
20. 18th century English novelist who thought that taking the pulse would be the most effective way to catch a criminal

Down

1. Medical director of the Sanatorium of Bellevue, Switzerland, studied the GSR, recommended consideration for external factors in detecting deception
2. 16th century inventory who made the first device to measure pulse rate
3. 19th century criminologist who used a hydrosphygmograph to detect deceit among criminal subjects
4. Father of the modern polygraph – developed the POT and SPOT techniques
5. Fordham University psychology professor who used studied the GSR and first suggested the use of emotional controls
6. 20th century German scientist who first used word-association techniques along with physiological recording devices
8. Harvard psychologist who developed the discontinuous blood pressure test to detect deception – later developed the R/I technique
10. 19th century German researcher who first proposed that GSR could be used to detect deception
11. 19th century researcher who experimented with word association and irrelevant words
15. Berkeley police psychologist who developed the first polygraph instrument to measure and record blood pressure and respiration
17. First used stim marks for the onset and offset of test questions

(see May/June 2009 APA Magazine for answers)
Academy for Scientific Investigative Training
1704 Locust Street, 2nd Floor
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
Director: Nathan J. Gordon
Ph: 215.732.3349
Fax: 215.545.1773
E-mail: truthdoctor@polygraph-training.com
Webpage: www.polygraph-training.com

Academy of Polygraph Science
Nature Coast Office
5441 Emerald Drive
Ridge Manor, FL 33523
Director: Richard E. Poe
Ph: 727.642.6384 or 727.420.0521
E-mail: acdpoly白沙science@tampabay.rr.com
Webpage: www.drpoeandassoc.com

American Institute of Polygraph
908 Barton Street
Otsego, Michigan 49078-1583
Director: Lynn P. Marcy
Ph: 262.692.2413
Fax: 269.694.4666
Webpage: www.polygraphis.com

American International Institute of Polygraph
1115 Mt. Zion Road, Suite F
Morrow, GA 30260-0686
Director: Charles E. Slupski
Ph: 770.960.1377
Fax: 770.960.1355
E-mail: aiip@qpolygraph.com
Webpage: www.polygraphschool.com

Arizona School of Polygraph Science
3106 W Thomas Road, Suite 1114
Phoenix, Arizona 85017
Director: Laura Wells de Perry
Ph: 602.272.8123, 800.464.7831
Fax: 602.272.9735
E-mail: laurawellssperry@cox.net
Webpage: www.azpolygraphschool.com

Backster School of Lie Detection
861 Sixth Avenue, Suite 403
San Diego, California 92101-6379
Director: Cleve Backster
Ph: 619.233.6669
Fax: 619.233.3441
E-mail: clevebackster@cs.com
Webpage: www.backster.net

Defense Academy for Credibility Assessment
7540 Pickens Avenue
Fort Jackson, SC 29207
Director: William F. Norris
Ph: 803.751.9100
Fax: 803.751.9125 or 37
Registrar e-mail: gatlins@daca.mil
Webpage: www.daca.mil
Federal, State, and Local Law Enforcement only

Horowitz-Ginton Credibility Assessment Academy
11 Ben-Gurion, Vita Towers
Bnei-Brak 51260 Israel
Director: Dr. Avital Ginton
Ph: 972.3.616.1111
E-mail: ginton@zahav.net.il

International Academy of Polygraph
1835 South Perimeter Road, Suite 125
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33309-3066
Director: Lou Criscella
Ph: 954.771.6900
Fax: 954.776.7687
E-mail: dcı@deception.com

Israeli Government Polygraph School
P.O. Box 17193
Tel-Aviv 61171 Israel
Director: Eldad Meiron
E-mail: igpolyschool@012.net.il

Kentucky Institute of Polygraph Studies
EKU Funderburk Building
521 Lancaster Avenue
Richmond, KY 40475
Director: Pam Shaw
Ph: 859.622.5944
E-mail: pam.shaw@ky.gov
Latin American Polygraph Institute  
Transversal 17 No. 122-73  
Bogota - Colombia  
Director: Sidney Wise Arias  
Ph: 57.1.4829421  
Fax: 57.1.2148334  
E-mail: swarias@bellsouth.net  

Marston Polygraph Academy  
390 Orange Show Lane  
San Bernardino, CA 92408  
Director: Thomas M. Kelly  
Ph: 877.627.2223 or 909.888.2988  
Fax: 909.383.1025  
tkelly@marstonpolygraphacademy.com  
Webpage: www.marstonpolygraphacademy.com  

Maryland Institute of Criminal Justice  
8424 Veterans Highway, Suite 3  
Millersville, Maryland 21108-0458  
Director: Billy H. Thompson  
Ph: 410.987.6665 or 800.493.8181  
Fax: 410.987.4808  
E-mail: MDMICJ@aol.com  
Webpage: www.micj.com  

Mexico Polygraph Studies Unit  
Calle Cuauhtemoc # 168  
Colonia Tizapan de San Angel  
Mexico D.F. 01059  
Director: Luz Del Carmen Diaz  
Ph: 011.52.55.5616.6273  
E-mail: ldgalindo@entermas.net  

Pennsylvania State Police/HACC  
Polygraph Institute @ Northeast  
Counterdrug Training Center  
1 HACC Drive  
Shumaker Public Services Hall  
Harrisburg, PA 17110-2999  
Director: Elmer Criswell  
Ph: 717.780.2513 or 877.806.6293  
Fax: 717.236.0709  
E-mail: encriswe@hacc.edu  
Webpage: http://www.counterdrug.org  
Municipal and State Agencies only  

Polygraph Science Academy  
L-2-7 (Block L) Plaza Damas  
No. 60 Jalan Sri Hartamas  
50480 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia  
Director: Akhbar Haji Satar  
Ph: 603.62015011, 603.62015012  
E-mail: akhbar@email.com  
Webpage: www.akhbarassociates.com/psa.htm  

Texas Department of Public Safety  
Law Enforcement Polygraph School  
P.O. Box 4087  
Austin, Texas 78773-0001  
Director: Walt Goodson  
Ph: 512.997.4093  
Fax: 512.424.5717  
E-mail: walt.goodson@txdps.state.tx.us  
Local, State, and Federal agencies only  

Troy University Polygraph Center  
1117 Perimeter Center West, Suite N101  
Atlanta, GA 30338  
Director: Samuel L. Braddock  
Ph: 770.730.0033 or 1.866.426.1068  
Fax: 770.730.0596  
E-mail: sbraddock@troy.edu  

Virginia School of Polygraph  
7885 Coppermine Drive  
Manassas, Virginia 20109  
Director: Darryl Debow  
Ph: 703.396.7657  
Fax: 703.396.7660  
E-mail: Polygraph1@verizon.net  
Webpage: www.virginiaschoolofpolygraph.com