



**Testimony of Aliza Kaplan**  
**Professor & Director of the Criminal Justice Reform Clinic**  
**Lewis & Clark Law School**  
[akaplan@lclark.edu](mailto:akaplan@lclark.edu)  
**April 3, 2025**

Chair Prozanski, Vice-Chair Thatcher, and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the -1 amendment to SB 469. My name is Aliza Kaplan and I am a law professor and the director of the Criminal Justice Reform Clinic at Lewis & Clark Law School. The Criminal Justice Reform Clinic (Clinic) offers an opportunity for law students to get hands-on legal experience while working on cases and important issues in Oregon's criminal legal system.

I testified on SB 1027 in 2023, a bill very similar to the -1 amendment.

Every year for at least the last seven years, the Clinic has represented between eight and 10 petitioners (adults in custody petitioning the Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision (the Board) for release) in release hearings. Additionally, the majority of attorneys who take Murder Review and Juvenile parole cases are alumni of the Clinic and/or are attorneys that work directly with the Clinic on their cases. All together, we take on the vast majority of these cases each year.

There is currently a two-part release hearing process for certain Adults in Custody (AICs) who are convicted of aggravated murder or murder, the subject of this bill. First, the petitioner must participate in a Murder Review Hearing, where the Board determines whether or not the petitioner "is capable of rehabilitation within a reasonable amount of time." Then, the Board holds a second hearing, an Exit Interview, where it reviews the AIC's psychiatric evaluation, conduct while confined, and parole plan. The Board must determine whether or not the petitioner has a "present severe emotional disturbance" or whether they have a "present severe emotional disturbance that can be adequately controlled in the community."

This two-part release hearing process is duplicative and lengthy, as well as traumatizing for victims who often participate in these hearings. And like the other release hearings in Oregon and the majority of release hearings in other states, the process can and should be modernized while still maintaining the original intent of the two-part process and consideration for victims and families.

In 2021, the Clinic began working with Dr. Christopher Campbell of Portland State University on a joint study on parole release hearings in Oregon and published the findings in a report the following summer. The report, linked [here](#) and uploaded to OLIS, describes the history of parole in Oregon, as well as the current state of the parole system, and recommended several reforms that would improve the quality of the parole release process. A significant portion of the report was dedicated to interviews of past and present Board members, victims' advocates, adults in custody, and parolees; all who gave helpful insight on areas within the purview of the Board that are ripe for reform.

We believe that the parole hearings process could benefit from numerous changes, but we respectfully request that the committee hold on moving this bill forward, and instead, put together an interim work group to look at the broad spectrum of reforms that can be made to the parole process in Oregon. The Clinic believes strongly that any changes to the current process require a longer, deeper conversation and should be in consultation with stakeholders, including the Board itself.

We can achieve meaningful parole reform in Oregon, but we must be thoughtful in our approach and not rush to quick fixes that cut important stakeholders out of the process.