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2017 APA Elections

Be part of the solution...
Get involved
2017 APA Elections Schedule

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

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

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

Below are important dates to remember:

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

For additional information, contact Mark Handler at editor@polygraph.org or (859) 539-0705.
Steve Duncan
President-Elect Platform Candidate

My name is Steve Duncan and I am running for the office of President-Elect in the upcoming 2017 election. Many of you know me as the guy who helps with presentations at APA Seminars, presents training at APA annual, regional and state seminars and assists examiners in resolving problems with pre-employment and other testing.

I have been allowed this opportunity to share with you other qualifications which I would like you to consider when you cast your vote. I have served the APA previously and currently as a Board Member and previously as Vice President for Law Enforcement. Having served on the APA board for many years provides me the experience to deal with the needs and functions of the organization. I am a graduate of the Department of Defense Polygraph Institute and have participated in numerous continuing education seminars ranging from Sex Offender Training to Courtroom Testimony to Quality Control. I retired from the
Georgia Department of Public Safety (DPS) in December, 2014 as the Supervisory Polygraph Examiner managing the DPS State Polygraph Unit. I have maintained a private polygraph practice since 1995 conducting examinations for clients in Georgia, Tennessee, Mississippi and Ohio. My instructional experience includes teaching for the National Center for Credibility Assessment as an Adjunct Instructor, functioning as the Deputy Director for the Argenbright International Institute of Polygraph and teaching various polygraph related topics throughout the United States and abroad. These qualifications give me a broad perspective of issues facing Federal, Law Enforcement and Private Examiners, both in the US and Internationally. This perspective combined with my willingness to work for the American Polygraph Association’s members and having the time to invest since retiring from law enforcement has prompted me to run for this esteemed office of President-Elect.

Your support is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Steve Duncan
Join Me In Making the APA Honest, Ethical and Accountable

As current events continue to show, polygraph is notoriously unreliable, plagued with frailties, and easily confounded by following simple instructions freely available on the Internet.

In short, polygraph “testing” is a crapshoot. That's reality.

Effective polygraph has very little to do with science; it relies on examiner expertise. Esoteric lectures on probabilities, biased insider research, and wishful thinking won't change that.

Some history... In 1997, the APA proffered a report – *The Validity and Reliability of Polygraph Testing* – that spawned a lasting perception of near-perfect accuracy. Here's an excerpt:

*The American Polygraph Association has a compendium of research studies available on the validity and reliabili-*
ty of polygraph testing. [...] Researchers conducted 12 studies of the validity of field examinations, following 2,174 field examinations, providing an average accuracy of 98%.

The industry took that 98% figure and ran with it. A legend was born.

But alas, the research, in the words of one APA official, was “overstated.”

Nevertheless, the APA stuck to its 98% accuracy claim until 2011 – ten years after the NAS report condemned polygraph as lacking solid scientific underpinnings – when the APA published another home-grown survey showing about 89% accuracy for incident-specific exams.

But is the APA's more recent claim of 89% accuracy also “overstated”? I dare say that, deep down, most of us suspect it is.

Still, the APA continues to help perpetuate myths. Here’s a quote from the APA web site: “APA examiners are able to attain accuracy rates exceeding 90 percent.” Such a broad-brush characterization of the “test” is hardly befitting of an organization whose motto is “Dedicated to Truth.” Such cavalier treatment of the facts is self-serving and disingenuous. Beyond the APA's questionable claims of high accuracy, the organization must address these other troubling issues: 1) victimization of innocent parties via false results; 2) a lack of research on examiner vulnerability to countermeasures; and, 3) potentially harmful discrimination within the APA.

Consequently, I am running for APA president elect on this remedial platform:

1. A bill of rights – similar to those found in the medical and mental health fields -- for polygraph test subjects, to elevate informed consent and avoid potential harms.

2. Transparent research, including an ongoing countermeasure challenge series, designed to reveal polygraph’s real-world accuracy and expose variations in examiner competence.
3. Equality for all APA members regarding access to political and educational opportunities, thereby reducing the inequities of a de facto caste society.

Recently, the APA actually erased this time-honored goal from its core message: “Serve the cause of truth with integrity, objectivity and fairness to all persons.” Cleve Backster, my teacher and mentor, would be appalled.

Let’s eradicate the APA’s self-made legacy of unrealistic expectations, and compel it to be forthright about the risks, realities and limitations of polygraph “testing.”

As president elect, I will work tirelessly to bring truth, honesty and accountability to the APA. Please join me.

Visit www.polygraphman.com to learn more.
To my fellow members, I write to ask for your support as a candidate for election to the position of President-Elect.

In seeking the office of President-Elect, my desire is to build upon the efforts of President J. Patrick O’Burke, and our current President-elect Jamie McCloughan, to further move our profession toward one that is acceptable to the scientific community, and grounded in well researched theory. To accomplish these goals we do not need to make each member a scientist, but we do need to create an environment in which the practical application of the polygraph process, the assessment of credibility, and science coexist. To accomplish this goal, I would initiate interaction with scientists who have long opposed CQT testing, to encourage collaborative research. I also propose that we attempt to create alliances with the two major Psychophysiology organizations (SPR & IOP) that routinely publish research relevant to credibility assessment.
Although my knowledge of the inner workings of the APA Board has been limited to what has been available in writing and as announced at annual meetings, I am quite aware of how organizations such as the APA function. I served as a board member of the Michigan Association Of Polygraph Examiners (1985-2000) for over 15 years and aggressively participated in all MAPE activities including, of course, strong support for the APA. In addition to my APA membership, I am also an associate member of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, a member of ATSA, and a full member of the American Psychological Association (the other APA), all organizations needing more attention from and collaboration with the APA.

As a member of the APA for 33+ years, I have participated in several APA seminars with the presentation of papers related to our evolving science. My first paper was presented in the 1987 seminar in Fort Worth, Texas with other presentations over the years. My last presentation was in 2015 in Chicago, when after a five-year study, I introduced what I believe is the first scientifically defensible theory for our profession after publishing two papers in the International Journal of Psychophysiology.

I believe my perspective regarding our profession is unique, bringing together 27 years in law enforcement, a 26 year career in the Army, and a PhD level education (Michigan State University, 1996). In 1983, as a Michigan State Police Trooper, I trained at the Canadian Police College as an examiner and served the remaining 16 years of my MSP career in the Forensic Science Division, Polygraph Unit. For 17 years, I have continued administering examinations on a day-to-day basis around the globe, for not only private firms and individuals, but also local, state, and federal entities.

I hope you will agree that my knowledge, experience, and education provide a firm foundation for advancing the interests of the APA and its members, I ask for your support for the office of President-Elect. If you have any questions or would like to know more about what I’ve stated, please contact me: palmatierjohn@yahoo.com.
Pam Shaw
Director 1 Platform Candidate

Dear fellow members and professionals, I am humbly seeking your support for my election to the position of Director 1. I am seeking this position for the simple reason that I would like to serve you, our association, and profession in a more active role.

For those of you who may not know me, I began my polygraph career in 2000 while employed with the Kentucky Law Enforcement Council, a state government agency established to oversee certified police officers and provide pre-employment testing services for over 400 law enforcement entities. During my years with the Council, I served as an examiner, supervisor and polygraph school director for the state. In 2006, I additionally established my own private polygraph company, which expanded my horizons in administering specific issue and post-conviction sex offender tests. During those years, I also began to engage in various educational and consulting endeavors to include quality
control services and curriculum development.

Currently, I am the owner and co-director of the National Polygraph Academy. The school is accredited by the APA and recognized by the American Association of Police Polygraphists. The school provides professional training to law enforcement, government and private sector students in various locations in the U.S. and abroad.

From early on in my career, I have been a strong advocate of education and professional practices in the field of polygraph. I was President of the APA in 2012 and served in other board positions for a handful of years before serving as President. During those years, I was fortunate to serve with some outstanding members of our association and on committees that were responsible for publishing model policies for post-conviction sex offender testing, law enforcement/public service screening as well as the APA’s 2011 Meta-Analytic Survey of Criterion Accuracy of Polygraph Techniques.

As I consider the challenges that we are currently facing as a profession, as well as those anticipated in the coming years, I find an ever-present desire to be a part of the solution and stay more involved. We need strong leadership, a diversity of perspectives and an attitude of teamwork to tackle the challenges before us, while continuing to grow. With my prior board experience, it is my hope that I can bring a blend of historical perspective and renewed energy to the table. With my diversity of experiences in state government/law enforcement, private sector and school directorship, it is my hope that I can adequately speak to the unique considerations centered around the management and practical application of polygraph in various arenas.

If elected to Director 1, I can assure you that I am prepared to roll up my sleeves and get to work for you and our association. I thank you for your consideration and support. If you have any questions or wish to contact me for further information, please email me at shaw.national@gmail.com.
George H. Baranowski

Director 3 Platform Candidate

It has been my honor to have served the American Polygraph Association in the position Director 3 this past term and thank all those who have encouraged me to run for re-election. I am again asking for your vote in the upcoming election to further support essential issues that all polygraph examiners, law enforcement, private or government examiners and their respective supervisors and administrators face. My record will show that I thoroughly support the use of scientifically and legally defensible, evidenced based practices.

Many significant developments have occurred through the efforts of your Board of Directors as they continue to update the Constitution, Bylaws, especially Model Policies and Standards, stepping out of the past and into the technical future. I believe my experience and the knowledge I have gained in this director position have prepared me to assist the decisions and efforts of the Board of Directors to benefit all and every member of the American
Polygraph Association.

I have been a member of the APA the past 32-years, shortly after graduating in 1985 from the Lincoln Zonn Polygraph Institute in Florida. My background is in law-enforcement that includes: retired homicide detective, and after retirement, accepted the position as Chief Investigator for the Prosecuting Attorney’s Office in LaPorte County, Indiana, a position I held for 12-years. My wife Paula and I then opened a private polygraph practice in Northern Indiana, which we have maintained full-time since 1990.

In addition to being a full-member of the APA, I have been a member of, served on the board, and was elected to a 4-year term as President of the National Polygraph Association. I am also a member of the Indiana Polygraph Association and a member of the American Association of Police Polygraphists. I have also been a member of ASTM International Committee E-52 on Forensic Psychophysiology since its birth in 1997, and has served as Chairman of Subcommittee .05 for the past 8-years. I am the author of ASTM Standard E-2080, “Clinical Psychophysiological Detection of Deception (PDD) Examination for Sex Offenders.” I have also assisted in the development of 21 other published standards regarding polygraph.

As a polygraph examiner for over 30-years, I have seen hardships, joys, challenges, victories and changes that have occurred from both law enforcement and private examiner perspectives. I can relate to my fellow examiners because I am not new to this dance. I promise to be a positive advocate for all our members. I will work diligently with President James McCloughan, who I feel is going to be an outstanding president, and the elected board to guard our profession from detractors. Again, I appreciate your support and encouragement, and I can be contacted at mindsightconsultants.com.
2017 APA Elections

Robert Smith
Director 3 Platform Candidate

It is an honor to submit my nomination for the APA Board of Director 3 position. I have been a member of the APA since 2013 and am excited for the opportunity to serve this organization on the national level.

I began my career in public service at the age of nineteen as a United States Marine. In addition to being a veteran of Desert Storm and Desert Shield I went on to serve as a Marine Embassy Security Guard at the American Embassies in New Delhi, India; Bonn, Germany, Moscow, Russia, and Istanbul, Turkey. Upon an Honorable Discharge, I earned a Bachelor’s Degree in Criminal Justice from Virginia Commonwealth University.

My career in public service continued after graduation when I was hired as a correctional officer for the Virginia Department of Corrections where I worked for two years. My criminal justice career continued next as a Deputy Sheriff with the Chesterfield, Virginia Sheriff's Office, then as a Special Agent with the Naval Criminal Investigation Service (also known as NCIS), and fi-
nally as a Probation and Parole Officer with the Virginia Department of Corrections.

As a probation officer assigned to the specialized sex offender unit, I began working with (and truly appreciating) the importance of polygraph examiners with this testing population. In 2012, an APA accredited polygraph school asked me to create the curriculum and test questions for the Virginia Containment Model portion of a PCSOT course. After seven years of working with this diverse group of convicted sex offender and PCSOT certified polygraph examiners, I knew my calling was to become a PCSOT polygraph examiner. In 2013, I resigned my position and enrolled in an APA accredited polygraph school to become a full-time polygraph examiner.

Under my direction, Smith & Associates Pre-Employment and Polygraph Services, LLC currently holds contracts with numerous Virginia and North Carolina state, county and local government, as well as private agencies, to conduct pre-employment public safety and PCSOT examinations. To this end, I owe much of my success to the APA guidelines and numerous members who have spent countless hours guiding me and my company through sound principles, while upholding local, state and federal standards and laws.

I wish to serve as Director 3 to help my fellow APA members fulfill their quest to remain the best educated, informed, diversified, and organized examiners in our profession. I believe my background in criminal justice at the federal, state, and local level can provide a unique perspective to the mission and core values of the APA. My dedication and passion to the polygraph field is genuine and I only hope I can give back to the APA, and to my fellow members, what they have given me. It would be my honor to help play a role in guiding the course of the organization and help accelerate its expansion.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Smith
Erika Thiel
Director 5 Platform Candidate

“Hello! My name is Erika Thiel and I have been a polygraph examiner for five years. I have been running PCSOT exams the entire length of my polygraph career and have extensive knowledge on this type of testing.

I lead a team of six examiners who also focus on PCSOT tests and together we plan on publishing research to better help other examiners who wish to make a successful career out of PCSOT testing. I have a Master’s degree from John Jay College of Criminal Justice in Forensic Mental Health Counseling and will be a fully licensed practicing clinician by the end of 2017.

My hope is to use all my experiences in both polygraph testing and counseling to help others better understand PCSOT theory and add to the growing source of empirical research for PCSOT. Having been a student who traveled for her education, I understand how difficult traveling can be when it comes to trainings and conferences. I
plan to advocate for continuing education that can be done online to help cut down on the cost of overall traveling.

At home, I take care of my three rescued pit bulls and am a full time spinning instructor. I fully believe in living a lifestyle that allows you to take care of yourself and those around you, especially when they cannot take care of themselves.”
Darryl Bullens

Director 7 Platform Candidate

My name is Darryl Bullens, I am running for the Board of Director’s number 7 position and humbly ask for your support and vote. I have been a member of APA since 2001, joining shortly after my graduation from the Backster School of Lie Detection in 2000. I am a former Special Agent in the Bureau of Criminal Investigation for the Virginia State Police as well as a State Trooper for the Tennessee Highway Patrol. I have been active in polygraph throughout my time in polygraph, serving on the California Association of Polygraph Examiner’s board of directors, also as PCSOT Chairman, Vice President, and President. Since my early retirement from the Virginia State Police, I have built my firm from a one man show to nine employees, servicing over 24 government contracts. I am also proud to serve on the Technical Advisory Board for Converus, Inc. alongside Don Kra phol, and Dr. Charles Honts.

I believe in a progressive model for credibility assessment and feel we
owe it to our end consumers to always search for the truth using the tools and testing methodologies that peer-reviewed research supports as being the best. In the private sector, we should never allow the desire for money to outweigh our integrity.

Our profession has seen many changes throughout the years and probably never more so than in the last couple of years. I remember the change from analog to computerized instruments and the consternation many had with that change. Many in our profession have voiced concern as they see the latest round of changes coming, wondering, much like in the past, how they will affect their livelihood, their job security, and the profession they have come to love. I believe the worse thing we can do in a time of change is nothing. If we listen to others and take their opinion as fact, we will remain ignorant to the truth and that does not serve us or our profession well. Do your own research and come to your own conclusions, as change is indeed coming and we need to see it, accept it, address it, and prepare for it. ‘Nature knows no pause in progress’, development, or change, ‘and attaches her curse on all inaction’ and ambivalence ‘from those that choose to ignore it.’ (Johann Wolfgang von Goethe)

To this end, I am offering to serve our wonderful organization and provide my leadership and direction during this time of change and humbly ask for your support and vote.
Gary Davis

Director 7 Platform Candidate

I am seeking Position 7 on the APA Board of Directors. I began my career as a polygraph examiner in 1982 after graduating from the University of Houston Polygraph Program. I have been a Member of the APA since 1982. I served as an examiner with the Kansas Bureau of Investigation until entering Private Practice. During the past 35 years I have conducted over 25,000 examinations for both Law Enforcement Agencies and the legal community. I have had the pleasure of serving as an intern mentor to more than 100 examiners entering your profession. I am qualified as an expert in State and Federal Courts. I the APA effort to have the use of the polygraph recognized as a Forensic Science.

It has been my honor to serve on the APA Board of Directors for the past two years. First as your Vice President-Private and now as Director 7. The past two years have been a learning experience and I hope to continue to serve the membership as a Director in Position 7. I would appreciate your vote in the upcoming election.
Brian Morris

Director 7 Platform Candidate

I am grateful to the American Polygraph Association and all of the opportunities membership in this organization has provided me during my career. From being able to attend an accredited polygraph school, the American International Institute of Polygraph in Morrow, Georgia, to membership in state organizations recognized by the APA: Utah, California, Maryland and Idaho; the American Polygraph Association has always had a hand in every step of my polygraph career. That is why I have taken this opportunity to participate in the upcoming election and ask for your consideration when you decide how you would like to see this great organization move forward.

I began my polygraph career as a private examiner in the PCSOT arena. I worked side by side with Department of Corrections personnel in California, Utah, Idaho, Wyoming, and Washington. Through my Utah state licensing internship, I was afforded the opportu-
nity to work with both state and local law enforcement and became a member of the American Association of Police Polygraphists. After becoming a full member of the APA, I continued my education and became a Certified Primary Instructor and continue to teach today. Following a number of years as a private and law enforcement examiner, I took the opportunity to pursue another life goal, which was attending law school. I graduated from the University of Idaho College of Law in 2012 and have been admitted to practice law in the state of Utah. In 2014, I took advantage of the opportunity to become a federal polygraph examiner and work with another excellent group of polygraph professionals. In the past year, I completed a master’s degree in forensic psychology so that I could better understand what the legal system holds for our profession and how to best advocate for polygraph’s use in the legal arena.

Our organization is at the forefront of many areas of polygraph. Whether it is continuing education, initial training, or research and development of new techniques and standards, we need someone who can speak for all of the different stakeholders our organization represents. I believe that my experience working in all three major areas of polygraph (private, law enforcement, and federal) allows me to help our organization continue to move forward as the preeminent place for the profession of polygraph. I believe that the single most important task of our board members is to find ways to advocate for each of our different profession groups. We need our association to be strong through our united efforts and inclusiveness. I look forward to this upcoming election and respectfully ask for your support. I hope to have the opportunity to work with incoming President and the other members of the board. I can be reached at pps-utah@hotmail.com if you have any questions. Thank you for your consideration!
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IN MEMORIAM

Investigator Nolan A. Wengert of the Rochester Police Department and formerly of Clayville, passed away suddenly on Sunday, April 9, 2017 in the comfort of his home. At the time of his passing he was in the hearts of those he loved.

Born in New Hartford, NY on June 20, 1984, Nolan was the precious son of Earl G. and Maryrose M. (McTirnan) Wengert. An honors student, he was a graduate of Sauquoit Valley High School/Class of 2002 and was the recipient of a scholarship to Utica College of Syracuse University where he graduated in 2006 summa cum laude with a Bachelor of Science degree in Economic Crime Investigation. It was Nolan's intention to get the criminals off the streets.

He attained his Masters Degree, summa cum laude, via on-line courses through Utica College of Syracuse University while he
concurrently worked in his career in law enforcement.

During his college years, he was an intern for Michael Arcuri in the District Attorney's office and also worked on his campaign bid for District Attorney.

On a beautiful day at Lake Ontario, a romance began between Nolan and Sarah L. Miesner/RN, and it was also the place where he asked her to marry him on Valentine's Day. Sarah said yes, and they set their wedding date for May 5, 2018. She loved him and he was everything a woman could want. He was loving, loyal, and gallant; they were perfect partners.

On August 21, 2006 Nolan joined the Rochester Police Department. As a patrol officer, he spent almost his entire career working in the southwest area of the city, assigned to the West Division's 3rd Platoon. He also served as a Field Training Officer, General Topics Instructor at the academy, and a member of the Firearms Training Unit.

He was promoted to Sergeant in 2012 and proudly accepted the title of Investigator in 2013 assigned to the Lake section. Investigative work was his passion and the west side was under his purview and protection. His humble nature allowed him to recognize that a good arrest was a result of team work. He appreciated the teachings of his mentors, trainers, and fellow officers.

He believed in his calling to serve mankind, to safeguard lives and prop-
erty; and to respect the Constitutional rights of all persons to liberty, equality, and justice. He was available 24/7 to assist and give directions for every call.

Nolan was blessed with a keen eye for critical details and he worked with many branches of law enforcement including the FBI, ATF (Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms) Parole Board, Probation Department, Marshall's Office, and all of these agencies had his personal cell phone number.

In recognition of his hard work and dedication, Nolan earned a myriad of accolades, multiple times, including The Chief’s Letter of Recognition (21 times), The Excellent Police Service Award (10 times), The Distinguished Service Award, Officer of the Month/May 2008, Officer of the Month/October 2009, Officer of the Year 2012, Investigator of the Year 2015, and his current nomination for Investigator of the Year 2017, an award of the culmination of recognition of over 700 fellow officers.

For several years he operated Wengert Polygraph Services for central and western New York. Nolan loved his motorcycles, a red Hyabusa Honda and a Yamaha Raider. He rode Lake Road and the Letchworth State Park, memories that were special to Sarah and Nolan. He was an avid, responsible, gun enthusiast and often gave advice to novice gun owners on rules and regulations, shooting techniques, laws, and safety.

Nolan is survived by his amazing parents, Earl and Maryrose; his beloved fiancee, Sarah; his aunts and uncles, Elaine and Dave Szalkowski, Marilyn McTiernan, Joanne McTiernan, Gerald Wengert, Bruce and Betsy Wengert, Judy Springer, Kathy, Fred, and Dave and Reiza Zimmerman; extended family, Charly and Gracie Isgro, Dick and Chris Roberts, Marsha Shaoud and the late Ray Shaoud, Patty and Leo Boulerice, Frank and Debby Rocco, and Walt and Tina Bayley; cousins, Joe and Missy Vatalaro, Florida Canine Officer Gerry Wengert, Jr., Jennifer Wengert, and Kristin Neves; his future mother-in-law Mary Miesner, his future in-laws, Lee and Bonnie Miesner, and Sarah's niece Kaelynn, and nephew Nathaniel, all of whom spent enjoyable times together with Nolan.

So many are at a loss over Nolan's passing, but he truly shared his heart and life with these precious friends, Aaron and Kimberly Eyrich, Adam Alliet and Erin Alliet, Jason Prinzi, Daryl
Hogg, James LaRuez, Jason Hess, Russ Tinker, Justin Assisi, Caleb Sirco, Chris Kimball, and John Williams; and a host of men and women of the Rochester Police Department; they were all truly his brothers and sisters. He was predeceased by his paternal grandparents, Earl and Alma R. Wengert; maternal grandparents, Edwin T. and Marian (Nolan) McTiernan; his aunt Erla Zimmerman; and uncle Edwin McTiernan. The family is grateful to the Emergency Department staff and the Pediatric Emergency staff at Rochester General Hospital who are Sarah’s co-workers. Family members were comforted by their love and concern; and the Rochester Police Department for their brotherhood and compassion.

_Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God._

Rest in Peace
Insurance is about Peace of Mind

Complete Equity Markets, Inc. has been insuring polygraph examiners for over 25 years. We are backed by an insurance company that’s been in business for over 300 years and has defended a suit against a polygraph examiner all the way to the State Supreme Court.

Limits up to 1M/3M

- Duty to Defend
- Polygraphists Misconduct Endorsement available (includes coverage for Sexual Abuse and Molestation)
- Disciplinary Proceedings Coverage included
- Personal Injury included
- Discovery Demand Defense Coverage included
- Up to 30% in discounts (video, good client, certification)
- Private Investigation Coverage included (except surveillance) if less than 50% of your time and gross receipts from Private Investigation work under $50,000.
- No deductible
- Recently lowered rates in CA, NY, NJ, HI, FL, TX & AK
- Covers polygraph exams done as a police officer
- Optional Data Security Breach Governmental Proceedings Coverage Available
- Coverage for ODT Exams Available
- Optional Contingent Bodily Injury Sublimit
- General Liability also Available

Complete Equity Markets, Inc. in CA dba
Complete Equity Markets Insurance Agency, Inc. CASL 0D44077
www.cemins.com  (800) 323-6234
Committee E52 on Forensic Psychophysiology

Join ASTM and participate in developing standards for:

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

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

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

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

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

National Polygraph Academy

Basic Examiner Courses:
June 5 - August 11, 2017 (Amarillo, TX)
Sept 11 - November 17, 2017 (TBA)

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

PEAK Credibility Assessment Training Center

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

Advanced Examiner's Course
July 24 - 28, 2017 (Cape Coral FL)
December 4, 2017 - December 8, 2017 (Lafayette IN)

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

American International Institute of Polygraph

Basic Classes:
September 13 – November 17, 2017
(Stockbridge, GA)

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

Attention School Directors

If you would like to see your school's course dates listed here, simply send your upcoming course schedule to editor@polygraph.org
Save the Date!!

2017 Tri-State Polygraph Conference

October 3-5, 2017
Hotel Tybee, Tybee Island, GA

20 Hours of Training for Polygraph Examiners

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

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

POC: Meredith Edwards, GPA President
medwards@wrga.gov
478-302-5386
52nd Annual Seminar
American Polygraph Association

August 27 - September 1, 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSROOM A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1:00 - 2:00 PM | Avoiding the Pitfalls: Ethics for Polygraph Examiners  
Steve Duncan, APA Director |
| 2:00 - 5:00 PM | You Want Me to Ask What? Test Question Construction  
Steve Duncan, APA Director |
| **SCHOOL DIRECTOR’S MEETING** |                                            |
| 1:00 - 3:00 PM | (Room to be announced)                      |
| **APA WELCOME RECEPTION** |                                            |
| 6:30 - 8:30 PM |                                            |
### MONDAY, AUGUST 28, 2017

**CLASSROOM A (disponible en Espanol)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30 - 8:00 AM</td>
<td>Break Sponsored by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 9:30 AM</td>
<td>OPENING CEREMONIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Call to Order - J. Patrick O'Burke, APA President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of Colors - Las Vegas Metro Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The National Anthem - Ms. Kaylee M. Hank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pledge of Allegiance - J. Patrick O'Burke, APA President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taps - Richard Pascuito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invocation - Barry Cushman, APA Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome to Las Vegas - Deputy Chief John McGrath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar Program Chair - Michael C. Gougler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 - 9:45 AM</td>
<td>Break Sponsored by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 - 12:00 NOON</td>
<td>Panel Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gordon L. Vaughan, Moderator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panel: Don Krapohl, Pat O'Burke, Raymond Nelson, Dr. David Raskin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 NOON - 1:00 PM</td>
<td>Lunch on your own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 - 5:00 PM</td>
<td>Validated Polygraph Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donald J. Krapohl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APA Past-President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 - 3:00 PM</td>
<td>Break Sponsored by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(CONT'D)</strong></td>
<td>Validated Polygraph Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donald J. Krapohl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APA Past-President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Classroom A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 9:45 AM</td>
<td>Interview Route Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Stuart M. Senter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 - 5:00 PM</td>
<td>Psychological Aspects of Polygraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Stuart M. Senter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 - 5:00 PM</td>
<td>Taking the Fight or Flight Out of Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Classroom A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 12:00 NOON</td>
<td>Gray Areas of Test Data Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James P. Heintzman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief, Credibility Instruction Branch, NCCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 10:00 AM</td>
<td>9:45 - 10:00 AM Break Sponsored By:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(CONT’D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gray Areas of test Data Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James P. Heintzman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief, Credibility Instruction Branch, NCCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 - 12:00 NOON</td>
<td>12:00 Noon - 1:00 PM Lunch On Your Own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00 - 3:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Stuart M. Senter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00 - 3:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00 - 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:45 - 3:00 PM Break Sponsored By:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(CONT’T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 - 5:00 PM</td>
<td>Screening Exams: LEPET/DLST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Stuart M. Senter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:00 - 5:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THURSDAY, AUGUST 31, 2017

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSROOM A</th>
<th>CLASSROOM B</th>
<th>CLASSROOM C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 12:00 NOON</td>
<td>8:00 - 12:00 NOON</td>
<td>8:00 - 3:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Probable Lie Pre-Test Interview</td>
<td>Lessons Learned About Testing Serious Sexual Assaults and Ethics</td>
<td>Developing and Implementing an Internal Quality Control Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton O. &quot;Skip&quot; Webb</td>
<td>Charles Slupski, APA Past President</td>
<td>J. Patrick O'Burke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA Past President</td>
<td></td>
<td>APA President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

3:00 - 5:00 PM  Testing the Adult and Juvenile Sex Offender and Their Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3:00 - 5:00 PM</th>
<th>(CON'T)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doug Williams: The Fall of a Countermeasure Advocate</td>
<td>Interview and Interrogation</td>
<td>Testing the Adult and Juvenile Sex Offender and Their Differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Pereira</td>
<td>Marty Woods</td>
<td>Sabino Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA FBI</td>
<td>SA FBI</td>
<td>APA Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PCSOT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APA ANNUAL BANQUET AND AWARDS
6:30 - 7:00 PM COCKTAILS
7:00 PM DINNER
### FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 2017

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

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

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

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

| (CONT'D)                     | 10:00 AM - 12:00 NOON Current Controversies in PSCOT with Juveniles         |
|                              | John Pickup, Intermountain Polygraph LLC                                    |
|                              | PCSOT                                                                       |
| Pretest Interview Using      |                                                                            |
| Directed Lie                |                                                                            |
| Gary F. Davis, APA Director  |                                                                            |

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

| 1:00 - 3:00 PM               | 1:00 - 3:00 PM Polygraph 101 - Back to the Basics                          |
| Why It's Not Lie Detection, | Darryl Starks, APA Director                                                |
| But Instead Memory Detection:|                                                                            |
| What Modern Science Says    |                                                                            |
| About Credibility Assessment|                                                                            |
| John Palmatier, PhD         |                                                                            |
| Slattery Associates, Inc.   |                                                                            |
|                              | 1:00 - 3:00 PM DLC Single Issue Technique                                  |
|                              | Rodolfo Prado, APA Member                                                  |

**3:00 PM**

**CLOSING REMARKS**

James B. McCloughan
APA PRESIDENT
2017 School Calendar Class Dates
February 27 - May 5
September 11 – November 17
10 week on campus course

Specializing in:
- Over 95 years in Instructor Experience
- Instruction in all recognized techniques
- Computerized instrumentation
- Court Testimony Training
- Post-graduate Workshops
- Equipment Discounts

1-954-771-6900
President’s Message

Patrick O’Burke

The Las Vegas seminar is rapidly approaching and everyone should be formalizing plans to attend this fantastic event. The J.W. Marriott, our host hotel, is already full and has been for several months. I would encourage you to contact the Red Rock Hotel and Casino, the Suncoast Hotel and Casino, or the Courtyard Summerlin, as nearby hotels to make your room reservations as soon as possible. This conference is shaping up to be the most heavily attended seminar in history and early planning is important. I know that you will enjoy attending this event.

I have written in several previous APA magazine articles that polygraph is a forensic examination, and that the polygraph profession must function as a scientific discipline. There are several components that need to be implemented by the APA as part of this functional necessity for parity with other disciplines. Our members should be familiar with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, as a federal agency that has the responsibility for setting forensic science discipline standards. NIST has created the Organizations of Scientific Area Committees, also called OSACs, to assist in accomplishing the enormous tasks of setting standards for all the various disciplines it will oversee. The American Academy of Forensic Sciences has also worked closely with NIST in this endeavor.

In support of polygraph as a forensic science, the Board of Directors has worked to prepare for aligning the polygraph profession with future forensic discipline requirements. The Board is working on publishing a Model Policy for Quality Assurance, as well as seeking recognition for our school accreditation program effort. I have also confirmed that AAFS has accepted our formal invitation to be present and speak at the Las Vegas seminar. We will be discussing credibility assessment and forensic interviewing for inclusion within one of the OSAC committees.
There will also be the need to demonstrate that the polygraph profession values formal education that is consistent with other forensic discipline requirements. At the Baltimore conference, the APA membership moved to require a college degree to upgrade from Associate to Member status. However, there was a grandfather exception created that required at least sixty hours of college, plus other requirements including a written test, to upgrade in lieu of a degree. This was our first effort at trying to incentivize members to upgrade their membership as it is apparent that a college degree will be a “must” for our future. Since Baltimore, there have been over one hundred (100) members that have taken advantage of this grandfather exception and upgraded from Associate to Member status. We will once again offer the test in Las Vegas to our Associates to help them upgrade to Member status.

The Board of Directors has recently approved a motion that will be presented at the Las Vegas seminar that will remove this grandfather exception in two years. This motion will be presented and must be approved by the Membership at the annual business meeting. This is a necessary step in our evolution as a forensic science discipline to require a college degree as a Member. This motion, if approved, would still allow qualifying examiners without a degree to become an Associate of the APA. The Board was also considerate of our current membership, and a two-year window will facilitate all current Associates can upgrade to Member status. I am optimistic that our Membership will recognize this is a necessary part of evolving to meet standard forensic science discipline requirements for the future. If we are to take ourselves seriously as a profession, I would urge you to attend and vote to approve this measure.
As your President, one of my other priorities was to create a committee of experienced and reasoned professionals to evaluate other forms of technology that could be utilized for credibility assessment and lie detection. This committee has my gratitude and respect for the work that has been done in the last six months. The APA has also worked with the AAPP in this effort. I have also paid attention and observed the committee’s progress and efforts as well. I am confident that the APA Board will be able to evaluate this committee’s work product in the very near term.

I am optimistic that the Board will vote to publish a position statement by the time we are at the seminar in Las Vegas. I am also optimistic that we will do so with the coordination of the AAPP Board of Directors. It is however, premature to discuss any of the committee’s findings, but I think it will be enlightening and worthy of continued discussion regardless of your current position. Collaterally, this committee’s work has underscored my own personal observations that the polygraph industry needs standardization and that there is a need to embrace quality assurance by all examiners. For many, this is going to include the use technology and scoring algorithms. Our panel discussion will no doubt touch on these highly charged issues.
I look forward to seeing each of you in Las Vegas. Please get in touch with me if you have any questions about what we are working on. For your convenience, I have placed links below to the documents referenced in my article:

- https://www.nist.gov/forensics/organization-scientific-area-committees-forensic-science
Are we afraid of Change

I enjoyed a spirited discussion with another APA member. The conversation with complaints about the APA promotion of validated techniques and scoring models. His contentions were the old way worked, why change.

I was reminded; in the “old days” we were taught if we tested like we were taught, we would be protected from mistakes. After all, the instructors had years of experience and were well versed in polygraph.

I was told Polygraph was an Art, not science. Take for example R and I. My friend was trained at the Keeler School and was adamant R and I was the best technique for testing criminal suspects. According to my friend, he could tell when someone was lying before he even ran the test and usually his pre-test opinion was verified by the test and confession.

When I suggested a Comparison Question Technique he responded the problem with the technique was the unreliability of the Comparison Question. After all, we have no way of knowing if the Probable Lie CQ was in fact a lie. The competition between the comparison question and relevant question were dangerous. After all, the comparison may “over power the relevant issue and result in a “bad call”. The research on the use of comparison questions was unreliable since it was conducted by self-serving scientists and examiners.

When I asked about “Directed Lie Comparisons” it appeared I committed blasphemy. I was assured, there was no way just telling someone to lie could possibly compete with a relevant question and result in a reliable opinion.

The end result was, my friend will continue to use R and I and avoid any changes from what he was taught. Some things never change, but our friendship remains. Since we are both in the twilight of our careers, we have agreed to disagree.

As I reflect on this conversation, I wonder how many share this view. I sus-
pect the numbers are small. But, even one is too many. Things change in every discipline. Look at the field of Dentistry. In 1950's, I remember going to the dentist and getting fillings without numbing. The Dentist restrained me and drilled. It hurt! Even today, I fear going to the dentist. Changes in Dentistry make the experience pain free and yet I still fear the appointment.

I wouldn’t want my Doctor to treat me using what was learned in Medical School in the 1960's or even the 1990's. Simply put, things change and we must change too.

I hope we as a profession can embrace research and change. There is no reason to blindly accept change but, when change demonstrate benefits to our profession and the people we serve, we should get the training necessary to adopt changes and improve our techniques and skills.

**Steven Duncan**
**Director**

Hello, APA Members, as we progress into summer, things are still busy within the APA.

Your APA Office Staff and Board of Directors have been working on several projects including arranging for additional Regional Seminars and preparing for the 2017 Annual Seminar in Las Vegas.

The Ethics and Grievance Committee is working on several cases. The majority of our complaints continue to be unfounded. As I’ve stated before, the limited number of complaints we are receiving combined with the number unfounded is a good sign that our Examiners are following the By-laws and proper procedures. Work continues with the Committee Policy.

As a Board Member I have continued to assist Members with issues as requested and I am here to help with problems if I can. I am working on a couple of projects with other Board Members on quality assurance and other issues.

As always, feel free to call or email me if I can be of assistance to you. I close wishing you all well and looking forward to seeing many of you at Seminars this year. Remember, continuing education is a key to maintaining our profession.

**Sabino Martinez**
**Director**

Greetings to members and all oth-
From the Board

ers who read our letters. Our seminar date is fast approaching and I urge all of you to seek qualified award recipients. I would like to thank those of you who have already submitted nominations by using the proper forms and emailing them to the national office.

However, our work is not yet completed. It was brought to my attention that our scholarship was not awarded last year. This is of great concern as it is clear that there are many people who are interested in becoming examiners and are potential candidates for this award. So I hope that all of you who know of someone who is interested in our profession and is committed to becoming a polygraph examiner take the time to encourage them to submit a 1000-word essay along with their resume to our national office manager. Remember that the scholarship awards tuition to the polygraph course of their choice and a polygraph instrument.

On another note, as the chair of continuing education committee, I will remind all of you submitting seminars for approval to please submit the amount of hours that will be presented, subject matter and presenter information. Normally those of you that have submitted seminar information have done so by submitting seminar schedule, subject matter, presentations, handouts, and all instructors CV. This is more than enough information and very much appreciated. Please be professional and avoid submitting an email with no information attached. I encourage all of you to follow the APA Standards of Practice when evaluating the material your speakers are presenting to insure that techniques, procedures or ethical practices are not in question as this may delay your approval for continuing education. I would like to thank all of you for submitting critiques and attendance rosters of those members wishing to receive credit for the hours attended, and remember that the rosters critiques are strictly voluntary.

Thank all of you for taking the time to read the letters and I look forward to seeing all of you in Las Vegas!
By George Baranowski

I have had the honor of conducting US Probation PCSOT examinations in my area of the country, over the past 10-years. There are many hoops to jump through each year to maintain their contract. One of which is a yearly physical inspection of your facility, your locked and protected files, and previous tests which must be kept for 5-years after the examinee finishes their probation, an examination of the actual files themselves of course, and other issues.

In any case, I was contacted by a U.S. Courts Representative on a number
of occasions over a couple of months, by phone and email, and asked questions about issues that she and her colleagues have had regarding Sex Offender polygraph examinations for the Federal Government. In addition, I sent a two-page response to address her issues and also issues that upper management colleagues had apparently inquired. Paula and I were then asked about our availability to present an IN-PERSON program to middle and upper management staff members in Washington, D.C. We agreed and I put together a power point program for the event. Planning and authorization was obtained to deliver a day and a half program at one of the Federal Court buildings in Washington D.C., March 27th and 28th, 2017.

I should mention that just being in Washington D.C.is quite an experience by itself, and even the cab driver who drove us from our hotel to the Federal Court house proved to be an interesting adventure, because he drove us to the wrong Federal Court house. We found out that there are multiple massive Federal Court Houses here, and even the cab driver was confused.

Anyway, we finally made it to the right Federal Court Building, and were escorted to the meeting room where a group of middle and upper management Federal Probation Officials were in attendance. In the program we presented, a number of sex offender test issues were discussed which mostly centered around polygraph terms, issues, procedures and formats. The exchange between the group was consistently positive and friendly throughout the entire day. It was also of significant interest that it was obvious that these staff members all regarded the American Polygraph Association with professional respect and as the authority in sex offender testing supervision. There was an early clarification discussion regarding the training and APA authorization required of PCSOT examiners. I was happy to note that our power point presentation was sufficient and especially contained matters that they described as much-desired clarification of PCSOT terms and issues.

It was also of interest that everyone in this group had our APA Sex Offender Testing Model Policy downloaded to their computers, (both the previous and latest version). A number of issues were focused on the explanation of polygraph terms, applications, test formats and definitions of various subjects.

However, what became very interesting and surprising to me, were the accounts or reports that were received from these staff members and their officers, that had to do with “conflicts of information” received from various polygraph examiners around the country. It was both interesting and I have to admit I was somewhat concerned as to the information that came
forward in this exchange. This part of the dialogue began during the general discussions and explanations of APA Model Policy examination terms and formats. This concern began with a need for clarification regarding Sexual History Examination formats as explained in the APA Model Policy I and II, listed as (SHE-I and SHE-II).

This concern was presented by a staff member who said she was told by one of their polygraph examiners that there are now these two Sexual History examination formats, and that both of these Sexual History tests have to be completed before this examinee can go forward and before any other type of test can be conducted. However, this staff member’s major concern was described as the “cost to the government” having to pay for two sexual history tests, without a sufficient understanding why two Sexual History tests were now, allegedly being required to be run and paid for before moving forward with other formats. I advised this Federal Management person, that this statement made to them by the examiner, that both Sexual History tests (SHE-I and SHE-II) MUST BE conducted BEFORE going forward to any other tests such as Maintenance or Monitoring examinations, WAS INCORRECT. She was advised that there is no requirement that these two sexual history tests must be conducted first, or even that both test designs must ever be conducted. The explanation continued that examiners are not taught in their training that both Sexual History tests had to be conducted before moving on. Where it was discussed that there are issues involved in each of the Sexual History test models, it was important to know that the examiner himself or herself does not call all the shots on sex offender tests, and that input from treatment and probation are invaluable and necessary to PCSOT testing. It is much more likely that directions regarding what kind of tests should be conducted should be coming from treatment and/or probation. I added that I personally have yet to ever conduct a Sexual History II test. Regarding the misinformation initially noted previously about cost to the government without an understanding why two sexual history tests were needed to be run before moving forward, unlike PCSOT tests being paid by the examinee as in State or County jurisdictions, federal examinations are paid by the government, thus their comment about the cost of two sexual history tests. Another situation was then brought up by a staff member, stating that there was an examiner that she believed might have been in Colorado, that had allegedly stated that until the examinee passes their Sexual History test, they cannot move forward to any other testing formats. She added that there was one examinee who had failed three Sexual History tests that ate up about 9-months of this individual’s probation without any new information. Again, it was explained that this not correct either,
and that there is no APA training that directs such a rule.

The group in general appeared quite interested in explanations regarding a number of general terms. For example, an explanation about maintenance and monitoring examinations themselves were discussed. One staff member voiced his belief that he felt all such tests should be termed monitoring tests because they are “monitoring” the individual on probation. A clarification and explanation of these two formats as well as all the other formats appeared to be successful, and he said he concurred with these explanations. Also, an explanation of the values, benefits, and procedure of the pre-test interview, the examination procedure itself, and the post-test activities conducted also appeared to be well-accepted.

Also, a good amount of time was devoted to the explanation, the technique, purpose and importance of comparison questions within the examination process. Explanation distinguishing Probable Lie and Direct Lie Comparison question formats along with the unique difference in their value were explained briefly. The last issue of the day was a discussion regarding medical waivers and separating them from what was felt to be “Legitimate” medical waivers and non-medical waivers. Questions were also raised about individuals reportedly suffering from PTSD.

In a round-table final discussion, there was also a good amount of exchange among the group about some of their personal experiences, and some were quite unusual to me. For example, one spoke about his area within New Mexico where the offenders on probation are often members of Native American Tribes and his officers may have as many as 20 different languages as well as different cultures to contend with that are unique and sometimes unexplainable, not to mention the translation issues. However, what my concern is what some of the staff expressed about the communication problems their field officers report that they have had with polygraph examiners.

In moving into the second day program on March 28th, a slightly larger group attended and it was apparently made up of upper echelon level supervisors, as well as an Attorney for U.S. Probation/Pretrial Services. These in attendance included Program Administrators, Probation and Pre-trial Service Executives, Oversight and Support Division Personnel, Program Services and Program Development Branches and High Risk Violence Administrators.

The program provided the basic information that was provided at the Day-One program and again, this group also appeared quite attentive and appreciative. A number of questions were also presented and dis-
cussed. As observed with the group on the first day, today's information appeared helpful and questions were easily discussed. Also, it was obvious that the regard toward the American Polygraph Association was again quite positive. There were a number of particular comments presented that were complementary to the design of the APA's Model Policy concept itself.

After our basic presentation was completed, there was then a distinct movement toward what was an apparent interest to this group of administrators, which was the monitoring of what was presented as “High Risk for violence Offenders” and “Violent Extremists” committing acts of “Terrorism.” An example given for a high-risk offender was the description of someone who would violently assault someone, causing immense, unnecessary, and pointless physical damage or injury connected in their charged offenses. They spoke about the possibility of having an expert from the APA consult with them regarding such issues and move to eventually the creation of a Model Testing Standard of some fashion, to address this area of concern of High Risk for violence Offenders. There was also a brief mention to the eventual concern toward the testing of “Possible Terrorists.”

As the program concluded, a number of staff officials advised they would keep in touch with me and the APA, and again, in attempting to develop some additional possible programs, and particularly, for violent offenders, as it appeared to be a current central issue with this group.

The program ended just prior to noon, and it was my feeling that the information exchanged was quite beneficial on both sides of the table.

I have made my report to the APA Board of Directors for discussion.
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Electrodermal activity (EDA) is an important source of recorded physiological information during polygraphic credibility assessment testing. Standardized polygraph field practices require the use of the EDA sensor, along with cardiovascular, respiration, and activity sensors. Whereas scientists involved in basic science research in psychophysiology will be interested in both electrodermal level and electrodermal responses, applied psycho-
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physiology in the evaluation of recorded polygraph data involves primarily electrodermal responses. A number of studies have shown that EDA data has a stronger correlation with the external criterion compared to other data recorded during comparison question testing (Capps & Ansley, 1992; Harris & Olsen, 1994; Honts et al., 2015; Kircher & Raskin, 1988; Krapohl & Handler, 2006; Krapohl & McManus, 1999; Nelson, Krapohl & Handler, 2008; Raskin, Kircher, Honts, & Horowitz, 1988; Kircher, Kristjansson, Gardner, & Webb, 2005).

Successful administration of a polygraph test, including recording and analyzing the test data will require that polygraph professionals have some fundamental knowledge about EDA and the technology used to acquire and record the data. To assist field practitioners in being prepared to communicate with and provide correct information to others on the matter of EDA – potentially including examinees, referring investigators, program administrators, other professionals, court officials, legislators and policy makers, media correspondents and members of the scientific community – we have attempted to provide answers to common questions about EDA data and the polygraph test.

**What is EDA?**

EDA is an umbrella term (Johnson & Lubin, 1966) that refers to electrical phenomena associated with the skin. EDA can be recorded through *exosomatic* or *endosomatic* means. Exosomatic refers to the fact that the electrical source originates outside the body, while endosomatic refers to the use of an electric potential within the body (e.g., skin potential). Exosomatic recording has been more commonly used.

EDA has been described as *electrodermal level* (EDL), also known as *skin conductance level* (SCL), which describes tonic EDA, and electrodermal response (EDR) or *skin conductance response* (SCR), which describes phasic responses (Venables & Martin, 1967). EDA is typically measured through the eccrine sweat glands that become filled with sweat as a function of sympathetic nervous system activity associated with cognitive and emotional arousal. Sympathetic arousal is associated with affective and cognitive activity involving attention, memory and learning theory [Refer to Kahn, Nelson and Handler (2009), Handler, Shaw and Gounger (2010), Handler et al., (2013) and Nagai et al., (2004) for more discussion and information.][For an introduction to the published literature on EDA, the reader is directed to textbooks by Andreassi, (2000); Boucsein, 2012; Cacioppo, Tassinary, and Berntson (2007); Edelberg, R. (1971); Prokasy and Raskin (1973), and and Venables and Christie (1980).]
What is the difference between EDA and GSR?

*Galvanic skin reflex* (GSR), also referred to as *galvanic skin response* or *galvanic skin resistance* is an arcane term that is now regarded as unsatisfactory and is no longer used to describe EDA recorded during polygraph testing (Bouscein, 2012; Critchley, 2002). The term GSR implies that the skin functions as a galvanic cell, which involves the production of an electrical current from the interaction of dissimilar metals through a salt bridge. Galvanic processes are unrelated to polygraph testing. Additionally, the term *reflex* does not apply to the polygraph test because reflexes are behaviors intrinsic or neurologically based and are observed to occur without any prior learning experience, whereas EDRs during polygraph testing are based psychologically in emotional and cognitive activity relative to prior behavioral experience described by the test stimuli. Although still visible in older publications, the term GSR has been supplanted in recent years with the more general term EDA.

How is EDA measured?

Exosomatic EDA can be measured using a combination of fundamental and derived measurements1, related to Ohm’s Law (Shedd & Hershey, 1913), and the measurement of electricity2. Ohm’s law states that $V = I \times R$, which means that the amount of voltage in a circuit is equal to the electrical current multiplied by the resistance of the circuit. Ohm’s Law includes three terms: *Volts, Current, and Resistance*. Volts is the unit of electromotive force. Current is the quantity of electrical current, for which the unit of measurement is the *Ampere*. Resistance describes the degree to which substances in the circuit will resist the conduction of an electrical current. It is a simple matter of algebraic rearrangement to isolate any of the three terms alone on one side of the $=$ sign such that $R = V / I$ and $I = V / R$. And of course, when we know any two of the values we can easily compute the third term.

Ohm’s law allows us to measure EDA in terms of either skin resistance or skin conductance. The unit of mea-

---

1 Derived measurements are those for which standardized computational definitions have been established. Derived measurements are computed from base units or fundamental measurements that have been established by the International System of Units (French: *Système international d’unités*, abbreviated as SI). SI base units from which other derived measurements are obtained include the following: the meter as a measurement of length or distance, the kilogram as a unit of mass, the second as a unit of time, the ampere as a unit of electric current, the kelvin as a unit of temperature, the candela as a unit for luminosity, and the mole as a unit for the quantity of a substance. The volt is the SI derived unit for electric potential or the difference in electric potential between two points. The *volt* is also used as the unit of electromotive force.

2 Ohm’s experiments involved a device called a *galvanometer* which measured electrical current in a circuit.
measurement for resistance is the Ohm, for which we can use either R or Ω. The unit of measurement for conductance is the Siemens, for which we use S. Older publications may also refer to the Mho (Ohm spelled backwards) as the unit of measurement for conductance, but this was changed by the General Conference on Weights and Measures in 1971 in order to reduce potential confusion that could result from inattention when reading and typing the same three letters (O, H, M) to refer to the different measurements Ohms and Mhos.

Whereas resistance is a derived measurement that describes how well a material or circuit can resist the conduction of electricity, conductance can be thought of as a derived measurement that describes how well a substance or circuit can conduct electricity. Conductance is the reciprocal or inverse of resistance such that $S = 1/R$. If we know the resistance we also know the conductance. Conversely, if we know the conductance we also know the resistance. The mathematical relation is this: 1 microSiemens of conductance is equal to 1 million Ohms of resistance.

What are constant-current and constant voltage circuits, and why do we care about this?

EDA can be measured and recorded using either a constant-current or constant-voltage circuit design. A constant-current circuit involves the application of a fixed quantity of electrical current to the skin. Changes in EDA will result in measurable and recordable changes in the voltage in the circuit. In contrast, a constant-voltage circuit involves the application of a fixed voltage to the skin, for which changes in EDA will result in measurable and recordable changes in current (measured in microAmperes). Boucsein and Hoffman (1979) reported no difference in EDA measurement sensitivity in a direct comparison of both circuit designs and both measurement units. Kircher, Packard, Bernhardt and Bell (2003) found no difference in detection efficiency coefficients when comparing resistance and conductance units that were collected using a constant-voltage circuit. Later, Honts and Barger (1990) had similar findings regarding EDA sensitivity for constant current and constant voltage systems, but noted that examiners made substantially fewer centering adjustments using a constant-voltage circuit. In practical terms this means that regardless of the type of circuit, EDA can be measured in either resistance or conductance units because there is a mathematical relationship between the two values.

Should EDA be measured as resistance or conductance?

Because resistance and conductance are mathematically inverse it makes no real difference which unit of measure-
ment is used. If resistance is known, then the corresponding conductance can be easily calculated and is therefore also known. Conversely, resistance can be easily calculated if conductance is known. Whereas polygraph systems have traditionally displayed resistance units, psychophysiologists have standardized on the communication of conductance units because these offer a more intuitive monotonic relationship with the number of active sweat glands. Related to discussion about the use of resistance or conductance units, and perhaps more important, is whether the EDA data is within the normal range for skin conductance and skin resistance.

**What is the normal range of skin resistance and skin conductance?**

The normal range for skin resistance is from 50KΩ to 500KΩ. The normal range for tonic EDA conductance has been reported as 2μS to 20μS, which is equivalent to 50KΩ to 500KΩ of resistance (Dawson, Schell, & Filion, 2007). Because they are inverse, and because 1 microSiemens corresponds to 1 M-Ohms, a 500 K-Ohm (1/2 million Ohm) device or circuit will conduct twice as much electrical current as one with 1 M-Ohms. Therefore a 500 K-Ohm upper limit of normal skin resistance is equal to a lower limit of normal skin conductance of 2 microSiemens. The lower limit of the normal range of skin resistance (50 K-Ohms) corresponds to 20 microSiemens, which is the upper limit of the normal range for skin conductance.

Why should field polygraph examiners care about the normal range of skin resistance and skin conductance?

EDA data that are within the normal range can be expected to be easier to work with in terms of management of data quality and test data analysis. EDA data that are within the normal range are presumed to be well-represented by available published studies and normative data. While circuit design and engineering for modern polygraph instruments can easily extend well beyond the normal range for skin resistance and skin conductance, signal processing methods used to acquire, record and display the data are optimized for data within the normal range. EDA data that are not within the normal range may have unexpected response characteristics. In practical terms this means that EDA data may be unproductive or difficult to interpret for persons whose skin con-

---

3 A monotonic relationship is one between two sets (e.g., the number of active sweat glands and EDA measurements) such that as one increases the other always increases – though the relationship may not be specified and the slope angle or degree of change may differ for the two. Monotonic relationships can also be in the reverse (e.g., the number of active sweat glands and skin resistance).
ductance or skin resistance is outside the normal range.

**This tech stuff is nice but what is actually happening to the skin and EDA during polygraph testing?**

Changes in EDA can be thought of as changes in the number of eccrine sweat glands that become hydrated or filled with fluid in preparation for the eventual release of fluid at the surface of the skin (Boucsein, 2012). If we think of the skin and sweat glands as a resistor, then the collection of sweat glands can be thought of as a lot of resistors wired in parallel. Because each of the parallel sweat glands will add to the total current path in the EDA circuit, more active sweat glands will lead to lower total resistance. Because resistance and conductance are mathematically and conceptually inverse, lower resistance is synonymous with increased conductance.

Although sweating is a useful metaphor, sweating is not itself synonymous with EDA, and changes in EDA can be recorded in the absence of observable sweating activity. EDA observed during polygraph testing may be more clearly thought of in terms of changes in hydration of the skin, and may also involve other complex phenomena. [See Handler, Nelson, Krapohl & Honts (2010) for more information about EDA and the polygraph test. More detailed and general information on EDA can be found in Boucsein (2012).]

The simple resistance model for EDA describes the skin as part of a circuit in which resistance and conductance are a function of skin hydration and sweat gland activity. In the resistance model, the sweat glands are like resistors wired in parallel, and changes in EDA are a function of the number of active sweat glands. In a capacitance model for EDA, cell membranes of collections of cells are thought to store electrical potentials like capacitors wired in parallel and release their potential through a process called depolarization that occurs when the cells are stimulated neurologically. Edelberg (1972) suggested that skin capacitance may play an important role phasic EDRs. Both capacitance and resistance models involve the interface between the sweat gland and the sympathetic division of the autonomic nervous system. Resistance models are easier for many people to understand and for this reason have been more commonly described. Also, resistance models are amenable to direct current (DC) circuit designs that are commonly available and easily described, whereas recording and extraction of capacitance information

---

4 For which the total resistance can be calculated as the reciprocal of the sum of the reciprocals of the individual resistors.
requires an alternating current (AC) circuit design.

What is the difference between EDA and skin potential?

Skin potential refers to the measurement of voltage between 2 electrodes when no external current is applied (Burstein, Fenz, Bergeron, & Epstein, 1965). Skin potential is an endosomatic measurement, referring to electrical signals that originate with the physiology. This is unlike EDA – an exosomatic measurement – that is measured by applying an electrical current to the skin from an external source. Skin potential is measured by amplifying the electrical voltage that is obtained from the electrodes attached to the skin. Like EDA, skin potential has been shown to vary with the emotional and cognitive state of the subject. Skin potential has been studied for use in detection of deception (Yamaoka, 1976), and has been described as highly correlated with EDA (Jabbari, Grimnes & Martinsen, 2007).

What do we know about the skin?

The entire body is covered in multiple layers of skin, called keratinocytes, that function as part of a large organ called the integumentary system. The integumentary system, like other organs, can be thought of metaphorically as a large stuff-sack intended to perform certain functions. Skin can be hairy or glabrous (hairless). The functions of the skin include protection from infection, resistance to abrasion, tactile sensation, traction, storage of lipids, synthesis of vitamin D, reduction of dehydration, and thermoregulation through both sweating and blood flow to areas near the skin surface. Thermoregulatory sweating is less likely at the hands and feet, and the skin at these high-contact points is much thicker than in other areas. (Refer to Boucsein, 2012; Fowles, 1986; Handler et al, 2013; and Venables & Christie, 1973 for more information.)

The outermost layer of the skin is the epidermis, consisting of the corneum (outer horny cell layer), which contains multiple layers of dead squamous cells that are linked together to form a continuous layer for protection from the external environment. The epidermis also consists of basal cells and melanocytes that give the skin color. Underneath the outermost layer of skin is the dermis, sometimes referred to as the “true skin” because these cells are supplied with blood and nutrients and contain hair follicles, erector pili muscles attached to each hair, glands for the secretion of oils and other chemicals, and nerve endings that provide sensory information to the brain.

Underneath the dermis layer of skin is the hypodermis, which attaches the skin to other connective tissue over the skeletal muscles. Sweat glands are described as located in this layer, along with blood vessels and neurons.
associated with the other layers of the skin (Boucsein, 2012).

**Everything you ever wanted to know about sweating, but were afraid to ask**

Two kinds of sweat glands have been found in human skin: *apocrine* and *eccrine*. Sweat glands are a type of exocrine gland, which are tiny organs that secrete a substance onto the surface of the skin by way of a duct. In contrast to endocrine glands, which secrete directly into the circulatory system, exocrine glands secrete their products externally. The glands themselves have been described as a kind of valve called a *poral valve* that can open to release fluid when internal pressure increases sufficiently.

Alternatively, apocrine sweat glands are located in axillary and perianal areas in humans (in contrast, they are located over most of the skin surface of most non-primate animals). Apocrine sweat glands discharge into hair follicles, and become active during puberty. These sweat glands can develop a pungent odor from decomposition of the bacteria that enjoy apocrine secretions more than other types of sweat secretions. Polygraph examiners are normally unconcerned about the examinee’s apocrine sweat gland activity.

Eccrine sweat glands are located over most of the surface of the human body and are more densely located in the palmar areas of the hands and feet. People have an average of two to five million eccrine sweat glands (Fowles, 1986). Activity in the eccrine sweat glands is thermoregulatory. Maximum sweat rates for adults can be up to 2–4 liters per hour or 10–14 liters per day, and will vary with climate and physical condition. Sweating helps to keep the skin moist, and may contribute to plasticity. Sweat is mostly water, derived from blood plasma, and contains trace amounts of lactic acid, minerals, and urea. Sweat typically has neutral to moderately acidic pH levels, between 4.5 and 7.0. Other functions of sweating can include gustatory sweating, such as when eating spicy food. It is also suggested that sweating may play a role in sexual selection. Eccrine sweat gland activity is enervated by acetylcholine, and is a useful indicator of changes in activity in the autonomic nervous system.

Hydration of the skin may be affected by ambient temperature. In a cold environment the skin may begin to dehydrate in an attempt to insulate the body from excessive heat loss. This can lead to smaller EDR amplitudes along with greater latencies and longer rise times. Under warm circumstances the sweat glands may fully saturate the skin, allowing sweat moisture to be secreted to the surface where evaporation can assist in cooling. The exact underlying mechanism of sweating and EDA have been studied
for many years, and – like our knowledge of the basic structure and function of cells themselves – although much is known, there remain as many questions as answers. Sweat ducts are involved in both hydration of the skin and sweating at the skin surface, and both have been shown to affect recorded changes in EDA (Edelberg, 1983).

Conductivity of the skin can increase as the skin becomes hydrated, and of course when the skin is wet with sweat. This is because sweat contains sodium and chloride electrolytes (Na+ and Cl-). A simple resistance or conductance model describes changes in electrodermal activity as changes in skin hydration that occur as a function of changes in activity in the autonomic nervous system that occur as a result of a combination of cognitive, affective and learning processes related to the test stimuli (Fowles, 1980; Handler et al., 2013).

Sweating disorders such as hyperhidrosis (i.e., excessive sweat gland activity resulting excessive sweating and abnormally wet skin) are a disorder of the autonomic nervous system. Although not a dangerous problem, persons with these conditions may require medical treatment. Of course, there are additional uncertainties associated with polygraph test results when testing persons known to have functional disorders involving the autonomic nervous system, especially when the effects of these problems can be observed in the polygraph data. Most, if not all, polygraph development and validation studies have not involved persons with autonomic nervous system disorders.

Recent research into sweat-diagnostics and wearable technology has led to increases in our knowledge about sweat, and may lead to more convenient and rapid analytics at the individual and group level. At the present time it is unclear how this new knowledge and technology may apply to polygraph testing.

**How much electricity is involved in the polygraph EDA sensor?**

The recommended maximum current density for psychophysiological recording of EDA with human subjects is 10 micro-amperes (Boucsein, 2012, Edelberg in Brown eds., 1967) per square centimeter (10μA/cm2) of skin. Despite the fact that psychophysicists have published a preference for constant voltage recording, Boucsein (2012) noted that resistance recording systems remain in use for which a constant current source is used, and wherein it is easy to limit the current source to below 10μA while also using an electrode area of at least one square centimeter. Constant voltage circuit designs will select a fixed voltage that will enable the acquisition of data at current densities that vary in a range below the 10μA maximum. To create
a sensation of shock it would be necessary to subject an examinee to voltages and current densities that are not within the capabilities or the design of typical polygraph field instruments. To create a static charge that can dissipate across an air gap (for example: when walking on a carpet floor and then touching a light switch) will require voltage that exceeds that of the EDA circuit by orders of magnitude.

**What if a person has an artificial pacemaker or defibrillator?**

Considering the voltages and current densities involved in a typical polygraph EDA circuit, it is highly unlikely the available current could travel beyond the skin region local to the sensors because the EDA circuit will offer the path of least resistance for the current to return to its source. Of course, it will be wise to consult with a health-care provider for more information before proceeding to conduct a polygraph test on a person who uses one of these devices.

**What is the unit of measurement for EDRs in the displayed or printed polygraph chart data and extracted scores?**

Graphically displayed changes in activity and resulting numerical values for EDRs do not represent the actual level of resistance or conductance. Instead, EDRs are displayed and quantified in dimensionless units that are monotonically related to the level of change in phasic activity.

Dimensionless means that the numerical units are not associated with a physical unit of measurement. This means that they neither represent inches nor millimeters – which can be expected to change with different graphic display or printing sizes. Dimensionless values are commonly used in many areas of science and testing because they allow the comparison and combination of different types of data and data from different sources.

Monotonic means that there is a relationship between the direction and magnitude of observed data and changes in physiology. A monotonic relationship requires no assumption of linearity and no assumption of location for a zero value (e.g., the location for 0 resistance or 0 conductance). This avoids problems associated with assumptions of linearity and the use of either resistance or conductance units. Monotonically, greater changes in the data signify greater changes in physiological activity, regardless of the unit of measurement, regardless of whether it is acquired in resistance or conductance units, and regardless of whether the circuit relies on a constant-current or constant-voltage design. Although EDRs and EDL could be measured in actual conductance or resistance values, field polygraph practitioners have traditionally not attempt-
ed all of the mathematical transformations necessary to make this possible. What is important in the evaluation of polygraph data is the relative magnitude of changes in physiological activity that are evoked by the different test stimuli.

**Should we use metal plates or wet electrodes?**

Many field polygraph systems have traditionally used metal plate electrodes with good results. However, psychophysiologicalists prefer and recommend wet electrodes – with approximately the same concentration of electrolytes as human sweat or interstitial fluid – because these are thought to achieve a more stable connection compared to metal plate electrodes in the event of problematic contact between the skin and electrode, or in the case of incidental physical movement during testing. Electro-conductive gel or paste has also been used successfully with plate and block type electrodes. Regardless of the type of electrode, there are no known differences in the interpretable value or meaning of EDA data that is of normal quality – for which EDRs can be distinguished from EDL, for which the EDRs are timely with the test stimuli, and for which the EDA data is within the normal range.

**Should we clean the skin with soap and water or alcohol?**

It is reasonable to make an unobtrusive visual inspection of the skin surface while attaching the electrodes, looking for obvious indications of potential poor conductivity between the skin and EDA electrode. Although well-intentioned, cleaning the skin with alcohol-based cleaners, is contra-indicated. Cleaning the skin immediately prior to polygraph testing can potentially strip away the normal oils, fluids and electrolytes that support conductivity, thereby interfering with the ability to obtain useable EDA data. Once cleaned it will take time for the skin to re-hydrate and re-establish the normal balance of electrolytes associated with normal skin resistance and skin conductance.

**Can we conduct a polygraph with an examinee with problematic EDA data?**

Field polygraph examiners can expect to observe a lot of variation among different examinees, including some examinees who have difficult EDA data or un-interpretable EDA data. When the EDA data are interpretable such that EDRs can be differentiated from EDL, when the EDA data is within the normal range, and when EDRs are associated temporally with the test stimuli, there are no known problems or concerns associated with the interpretation of recorded polygraph data. When EDRs cannot be differentiated from EDL, when EDRs are not associated temporally with the test stimuli, or when the data are not within the
normal range, then caution is in warranted in the interpretation of recorded EDA data.

Whether it is valid to attempt to interpret recorded polygraph data when the EDA data are not usable or interpretable is partially a practical matter. For example: it is possible to execute the scoring and feature extraction methods and achieve no scored information (i.e., scores of 0 can be thought of as scores that provide no information towards a conclusion of deception or truth-telling, similar to having no data).

Attempts to interpret recorded polygraph data when the EDA data are not usable or interpretable is also partially a matter of test development and validation. Analytic models that make naïve assumptions about the independence and contribution of test data (e.g., naïve Bayes models and 3-position numerical scoring systems) may be completed without the EDA data without violating the assumptions or requirements of the analytic model. However, attempts to analyze polygraph test data without EDA may violate the basic assumptions and requirements of analytic models that rely on normed statistical or structural equations that attempt to make use of the synergistic contribution of the different types of recorded data. Regardless of the analytic methods, our knowledge of polygraph accuracy and validity relies on information that includes the use of EDA data. For this reason, field practitioners may want to use caution whenever attempting to interpret and classify test results with test data for which the EDA is unusable or un-interpretable.

Is it possible to fix or rectify problematic EDA data?

Problems with unstable tonic EDA can be effectively managed with an automatic EDA filter. An effective filter design will not interfere with EDA data in the frequency ranges involved in electrodermal responses of interest to polygraph examiners. This is typically in the range of .03hz to .2hz (Lafayette Instrument Company, 2013). Sudden downward movement of the EDA data may be caused by movement of the palmar or digital extremities to which the EDA sensor is attached, and may also be the result of poor contact when using a damaged EDA sensor. EDA data that is outside the normal range can sometimes be corrected by relocating the EDA sensors or through the use of wet electrode gel to improve the stability of the EDA sensor contact and EDA circuit.

Should we use the automatic or manual EDA mode?

Automatic EDA modes were introduced decades ago in response to observations that tonic EDL is unstable for some persons, making it difficult to use and interpret the EDA data. Pro-
professionals who are interested in both EDRs and EDL will want to use the manual EDA data. Field polygraph professionals who do not interpret EDL data may want to use the Automatic EDA mode that removes low frequency tonic instability, making it easier to manage and extract EDRs from the recorded test data.

**Do medications affect the EDA?**

There is little published research on medication effects and EDA. Some medications may have anti-cholinergic effects that slow the EDA response data. This does not preclude individuals from testing when they take these medications, and field polygraph examiners should be careful to never make recommendations or impose requirements that are contrary to or interfere with medical or psychiatric care. There is no known medication and no published theoretical premise suggesting that any medication will differentially affect responses to different test stimuli. In practical terms this means that although there may be some increased risk for inconclusive results as a result of some medications, there is no known increase in risk for testing error associated with medication use.

Medication effects may vary with the type of medication, dosage, individual physiology, length of time while taking a medication, the combination of different medications and other factors. Persons who function optimally while taking medications may produce polygraph test data of optimal interpretable quality. However, polygraph examiners should remain aware that published studies on polygraph test development and validation, and published statistical reference data and published structural models may not be representative of persons who require the administration of multiple prescription medications to remediate the potentially overwhelming effect of their medical or psychiatric issue on their day to day functioning.

**What can we tell the examinee about the EDA data and EDA sensor?**

Examiners are ethically obligated to explain the testing procedure to the examinee in order to obtain the examinee’s informed consent for testing. In brief, informed consent requires that the examinee is informed about both what will be done during the testing procedure and how the testing procedure and test result may affect them both during testing and after testing. Examinees should be advised of the name of the sensor, where it is located, and its general function in terms of recording changes in activity in the autonomic nervous system that are observed through electrodermal activity.

**Why should field practitioners be concerned with all of these technical details?**
Polygraph examiners are not required to work with technical details in their day-to-day operations, and so some field practitioners may be less interested in these technical details. They may prefer instead to refer important questions to other professionals with more expertise. Those who desire to develop and market themselves as experts in the science of polygraph may have more obligation and opportunity to respond to reasonable questions about the scientific and technical details of the polygraph test and recording instrumentation. It is our hope that this FAQ will be a useful reference that will advance both professional and public awareness of the science and practice of polygraph testing.

Reading list


Neuroscientist, 8, 132-144.


THE HIGHEST QUALITY BASIC AND ADVANCED POLYGRAPH TRAINING

Accredited by the APA and recognized by AAPP, our Basic, Advanced, and PCSOT courses ensure an excellent understanding of not only polygraph systems but also the methodology and science behind their usage.

Visit our website for more information on our many courses.

Ben Blalock, Director
Located in Cape Coral, FL

info@peakcatc.com
www.peakcatc.com
“Price is what you pay. Value is what you get.”

- Warren Buffet
Advertising in the APA Magazine

For pricing and payment information, contact Lisa Jacocks at the APA National Office, P.O. Box 8037, Chattanooga, TN 37414, (800) APA-8037, or email - manager@polygraph.org

Then, all you need to do is send your electronic ad in .jpeg or .pdf file format, to the editor at editor@polygraph.org

Don’t worry, short line items in the Buy and Sell and Upcoming Seminar sections are still free. We also publish (at no charge) in each Magazine a listing of upcoming polygraph training sessions for APA accredited schools.

Submissions and/or technical questions regarding your ad should be sent to editor@polygraph.org. Please note that submission deadlines are posted on page 2 of each issue.

Upgrading Membership Classifications from Associate to Full Member

If you have a college degree and you have completed a minimum of 200 polygraph examinations, request that your membership classification be upgraded from ASSOCIATE to FULL MEMBER.

In order for the Board of Directors to act upon your request, it will be necessary for you to:

Provide a notarized statement from your supervisor or knowledgeable colleague, who must be a full member of the American Polygraph Association, attesting that you have completed a minimum of 200 polygraph examinations.

Please forward the certification directly to:

APA National Office
P.O. Box 8037
Chattanooga, TN 37414

If you have any problems or questions regarding your membership, please call the National Office Manager at 800/272-8037 or 423/892-3992.
(Application for the Certificate of Advanced and Specialized Training will be granted only to those that have completed thirty-six (36) hours of approved advanced and specialized training during the past three (3) years.

NAME: _________________________________________________________________________________________

ADDRESS: _________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________

TELEPHONE #: (       ) _____________________________________________________________________

Membership Status: (   ) Full Member    (   ) Life Member     (   ) Associate Member

Current Dues Paid In Full: (    ) Yes     (    ) No

Approved Advanced & Specialized Training: Attach Certificate(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I,_______________________________________, do hereby make application for the Certificate of Advanced & Specialized Training by the American Polygraph Association. All information contained above is true and correct to the best of my ability. I release the American Polygraph Association to conduct an inquiry or investigation as appropriate to verify said information.

____________________________________
Applicant

Make check payable to AMERICAN POLYGRAPH ASSOCIATION
Original Application $50.00
Renewal $15.00
Mail to: APA National Office, PO Box 8037, Chattanooga TN 37414-0037
APA Accredited
Polygraph Schools

As of May 23, 2017

*SWORN LAW ENFORCEMENT ONLY
*FEDERAL EXAMINERS ONLY

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

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

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

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

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

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

British Polygraph Academy
380 Uxbridge Road
London, England W5 3LH
United Kingdom
Director: Nadia Penner
UK Inquires: Don Cargill – 44 7876198762
E-Mail: don@nationalpolygraphs.co.uk
Website: britishpolygraphacademy.co.uk

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

International Academy of Polygraph
1835 S Perimeter Rd Ste 125 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309
Director: Michelle Hoff
E-Mail: dci@deception.com
International Polygraph Studies Center
Colima No. 385-2 Colonia Roma Norte
Mexico D.F. Mexico CP 06700
Director: Raymond I. Nelson
E-Mail: International@poligrafia.com.mx

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

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

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

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

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

Maryland Institute of Criminal Justice
8424 Veterans Hwy Ste 3
Millersville MD 21108-0458
Director: Jimmy Thompson – 410/987-6665
E-Mail: mdmicj@aol.com
Website: www.micj.com

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

National Academy of Polygraph of the National Police of Colombia
TC Jorge Zenen Lopez Guerrero Transversal 33 No 74a-35 Sur Barrio Fatima
Bogota, Colombia
Director: Andrea del Pilar Carrillo Prieto
E-Mail: programaaacademicopoligrafiaacpc@gmail.com

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Tudor Academy
Carrera 66, No. 42-103 Barrio San Juaquin
Medellin, Colombia
Director: Charles Speagle
Website: tudoracademy.com

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

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

SIMPLIFYING POLYGRAPH
For Law Enforcement, Government & Private Examiners

www.apsPolygraphSchool.com

HURRY, SIGN UP NOW!

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

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

CALL (630) 860-9700 Ext. 235 for reserved scheduling!
E-mail John@StoeltingCo.com

Upcoming Courses

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

PCSOT Course
March 27 - March 31, 2017

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

Admission Applications

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

We are often asked: “Why do we do, what we do?”
The answer is simple, your signals will look better and interpretations of your charts will be easier.

CPSpro Advantages:

• No Re-Centering! No lost data! You will be able to pay more attention to the examinee and allow the state-of-the-art software take control of the channels
• 7-Year warranty
• FREE Software support & upgrades
• Ability to record up to 13 channels
• Skin Conductance or Skin Resistance. Our competitors record one or the other; with us, it’s your choice!
• 24-bit analog-to-digital conversion circuitry
• Medical grade LEMO and Luer inputs and connectors
• Cardiograph supports up to 215 mm Hg
• The only company that offers Skin Potential, Voice Events, Electronic Pneumos, and EDA with Laboratory-Style Finger Contoured Ag-AgCl Electrodes

We can truly stand by the notion that we have the most advanced polygraph system available with an intuitive, user friendly design.

For more information, visit us at www.StoeltingCo.com

Stoelting Co. 620 Wheat Lane, Wood Dale, IL 60191 • 1-800-860-9775 • Info@StoeltingCo.com