

A. First Thoughts:

Initially, when I started working on the scenario nominated this week, the first thing that hammered my brain was the high caseload. It jumped to 105 from 85 parolees. It was suspicious, dangerous, and very unrealistic for any offer to treat everyone with ease.

I recalled my previous CYOA assignments immediately, where workloads were even more burdensome, and handling situations was even more impossible. Over and above, every individual has not even received the same amount of attention as per their requirement. Now, this scenario feels relaxing; it is none other than a parallel context.

The first gut feeling directed me to take the "synthetic officer" approach at first (Miller, 2015). This approach of my choice seems most ethical to me, and it permits keeping a check on enforcement with rehabilitation. I have chosen this option of "synthetic officer" as it features the best opportunities to safeguard the public safety and at the same time presents parolees with a smarter choice to prosper in the system where they can give their best and work hard.

B. My Decision Process:

While I was working on the CYOA Assignment this week, I kept three primary frameworks in my mind, which are procedural justice, ethics of care, and act utilitarianism. Procedural justice supported my desire to treat fairly, transparently, and maintain consistency while making each decision. Also, I got inspiration from the ethics of care to be empathetic throughout the simulation, and it also helped me to understand the particular challenges parolees face every day. Their problems are not limited to safety-related issues, financial constraints, or transportation issues; they have to go through something more. The major of all was act utilitarianism, which guided me through the assessment to expand the well-being after each simulation I covered. On

the other hand, rule utilitarianism admires compliance with productive policies that commonly generate better outcomes. While checking the situation where Patricia Chang was under question, I preferred the act utilitarianism, keeping her safety concerns in mind. To me, it was an immediate, exception-based response and justified.

I did my research work on DOC 380.200 and RCW 9.94A.703. Both of these policies have a similar attention to administering fair and consistent decision-making. These two policy guidelines from the "Washington State Department of Corrections" opened a new room of ideas for me. Thereby, I started checking from the end of safety accommodations because virtual check-ins for Patricia Chang were under question and only allowable when credible threats were present.

After reading the synthetic officer framework, I gained confidence to adapt this to be my approach. The best part here was that the framework does not induce people to compromise (Miller, 2015). Further, my thought process took a turn by holding the hand of the Pew Charitable Trusts (2020). It alerted me to the fact that overwhelming conditions, like excessive supervision fees, can submerge the rehabilitation. By taking insight from this, I spent more time and effort to handle the inability to pay by Damon Jackson.

I prioritize the rehabilitation over penalties now. In my earlier CYOA 3, where I played a role as a prosecutor, I learnt the danger of rigid rule enforcement. Again, when I worked as a victim advocate, I saw people needed protection from vulnerability without bias. These lessons encouraged me to be a little flexible while choosing the options, especially where Marcus missed a check-in and Tyler Washington needed the job-related support after losing his job.

C. What Surprised Me?

I was surprised at how fast "special treatment" appeared after granting virtual check-ins to Patricia Chen. I agree, I followed the policies while making the choice, and the policies were ingrained in safety precautions. At times, other parolees treated it as favoritism. A basic point that came to my mind was the understanding that can erode legitimacy, even while taking fairer decisions.

I thought the balanced approach of my choice would be preferable, yet in the end, the lesson that I have been learnt is that the ethical decision must also be justified clearly to those who are impacted. This experience was surprising to me, and it supported community supervision, results that not only rely on what we do, but also on how the reasons have been addressed far from those actions. I knew, once more revised, that clear communication is difficult than the decision itself. I got to know more about cynicism and moral conflict, especially in overwhelming situations. On top of that, one obvious idea popped into my mind.

Ethical challenges do not connect to the decisions only, yet they also depend on high case loads, organizational pressures, and the requirement to balance responsibility while granting a second chance to the parolees.

D. Connecting the Dots:

The scenario made me remember CYOA Assignment 3, where the role I had was that of a prosecutor. I observed that overstressing on metrics leads to a compromise of justice. Community corrections call for both perspectives, while recognizing individual circumstances, endorsing safety and fairness.

The synthetic model had a strong persona with the combination of law enforcement and rehabilitation (Miller, 2015). It also fosters long-term benefits for both the community and the parolees. The lecture this week made me realize the personal investment necessary for therapeutic support like transportation assistance, constant check-ins, and offering parolees with sufficient resources.

Without getting an appropriate amount of care and support, officers, even those who do not have anything unethical in mind, have to fight both consistently and ethically. The concept of ethics in community corrections not only discusses rule compliance, but also talks about decision-making, being cautious, and sustaining efforts.

References

Miller, J. (2015). Contemporary modes of probation officer supervision: The triumph of the “synthetic” officer?. *Justice Quarterly*, 32(2), 314-336.

Pew. (2023). *For people under probation, conditions meant to support behavior change can burden more than benefit*. The Pew Charitable Trusts. Retrieved from:
<https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/issue-briefs/2023/03/for-people-under-probation-conditions-meant-to-support-behavior-change-can-burden-more-than-benefit>
[Retrieved on: August 14, 2025].