

KANSAS LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH DEPARTMENT

68-West-Statehouse, 300 SW 10th Ave.
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1504
(785) 296-3181 ♦ FAX (785) 296-3824

kslegres@klrd.ks.gov

<http://www.kslegislature.org/klrd>

November 8, 2018

To: Joint Committee on Corrections and Juvenile Justice Oversight
From: Robert Gallimore, Principal Research Analyst
Re: Responses to Requests Received at the October 22 and 23 Meeting

Attached to this memorandum are responses received, to date, regarding requests by the Joint Committee or its members at the October 22 and 23, 2018, meeting of the Joint Committee. Where information provided was from a pre-existing publicly available study or publication, the citation for the information or internet address, as of today (instead of a copy of the study or publication), is provided below.

The responses are:

- Cost for the mother visitation program at the Kansas Children's Discovery Center, provided by Kansas Department of Corrections (KDOC);
- Court services officers pay rates, provided by the Judicial Branch;
- Inmate population broken down by gender, criminal history, and severity level, provided by KDOC;
- FY 2018 retirements by location and position type, provided by KDOC;
- Immediate intervention program information, provided by KDOC;
- State of Recidivism, by the Pew Center on the States (available at https://www.pewtrusts.org/~media/legacy/uploadedfiles/pcs_assets/2011/pewstateofrecidivism.pdf) and KDOC Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Risk Level, provided by KDOC;
- KDOC contract bed information, ex-inmate military service information, cost of GED program, and sex offender treatment program completion rates, provided by KDOC; and
- Female incarceration studies, provided by the Kansas Sentencing Commission, including:
 - "The Impact of a Graduated Sanctions Model on Female Probationers; does this program affect women and men the same?" (abstract—attached);

Joint Committee on Corrections and
Juvenile Justice Oversight
Date:
Attachment:

- “Gender Differences in Criminal Sentencing: Do Effects Vary Across Violent, Property, and Drug Offenses?”, *Social Science Quarterly*, Volume 87, Number 2, June 2006;
- “Gender and Sentencing: A Meta-Analysis of Contemporary Research,” 16 *J. Gender Race & Just.* 349 (2013); and
- “Gender and Sentencing in the Federal Courts: Are Women Treated More Leniently?”, *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 2014, Vol. 25(2), 242-269.

RGG/kal

Attachments

Attachment 1

From: Liz Rice [KDOC] <Liz.Rice@ks.gov>
Sent: Thursday, November 1, 2018 11:36 AM
To: Robert Gallimore; Jordan Milholland
Cc: Samir Arif [KDOC]; Cheryl Cadue [KDOC]; Joe Norwood [KDOC]
Subject: response to interim committee question on female inmate program at Discovery Center

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

- Cost factors for mother visitation program?
KDOC Costs associated with the program at the Discovery Center:
One KDOC employee who is the coordinator of the program was there for 8 hours @ \$23.31/hr = **\$186.48/day**.
Transportation – it is an 8.8mil trip (10 minutes) one way from TCF to the Discovery Center.
Staff Cost:
The WALC Coordinator drove 1 van (her cost included above)
A COI drove another van there/back in the morning & there/back in the afternoon.
COI = **\$15.75/hr**. It was probably 40-60 minutes of a COI's time.
Vehicle Cost estimate:
1 van – traveled 17.6 miles
1 van – traveled 35.2 miles
@ \$.54/mile would be **\$28.51**.

United Methodist Women -we had 5-7 volunteers from UMW on-site all day to assist with supervision/monitoring. There is no state cost associated with their attendance.

That makes the total KDOC cost for the event **\$230.74**. Keep in mind the assigned KDOC staff would be on duty anyway so their wages are not an additional expense to the department

Attachment 2

From: Shawn Jurgensen <jurgensens@kscourts.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2018 9:36 AM
To: Robert Gallimore
Cc: Jordan Milholland
Subject: RE: Pay rates for court services officers

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Bob,

Below is the grid showing the four categories of court services officers with the hourly rate for each position based upon which step within our pay plan the CSO is at. The Court Services Administrative Officer is the smallest category (only four employees branch wide). Recall, our pay plan is different from the executive and legislative pay plan. All employees start on step A and no employee may receive any step increase until they have received a performance evaluation rating of at least "successful" at each step level. An employee is eligible to move from Step A to Step B after six months of service and the overall rating of at least "successful" on the six-month performance evaluation. An employee is eligible to move from Step B to Step C after an additional six months of service. From Step C to Step D after serving at least three years on Step C, receiving three annual performance evaluations of at least "successful" and achieving full performance for the employee's classification. From Step D to Step E after at least four years of service on Step D and receiving four annual performance evaluations with an overall rating of at least "successful." Let me know if you have any questions. Never hesitate to contact me if I can help on anything.

Job Title	Pay Grade	A	B	C	D	E
Court Services Officer I	30	\$20.156	\$20.665	\$22.233	\$23.914	\$25.738
Court Services Officer II	33	\$21.703	\$22.226	\$23.898	\$25.728	\$27.700
Court Services Officer III	38	\$24.488	\$25.100	\$27.024	\$29.076	\$31.270
Court Services Administrative Officer	44	\$28.350	\$29.076	\$31.270	\$33.643	\$36.204

KDOC inmates serving a Kansas sentence when most serious current offense is nondrug grid Attachment 3

Severity Level and Criminal History Category by Gender

	A 3+ Person Felonies	B 2 Person Felonies	C 1 Person & 1 NP Felony	D 1 Person Felony	E 3+ Nonperson felonies	F 2 Nonperson Felonies	G 1 Nonperson Felony	H 2+ Misdemeanors	I 1 Misd or No Record
I	3 172	1 110	3 119	5 103	1 63	0 25	4 61	9 96	29 324
II	1 33	1 32	2 27	2 26	3 12	0 5	3 16	5 21	9 57
III	5 338	6 244	4 126	10 113	2 45	1 29	9 46	8 96	18 226
IV	6 103	6 74	1 39	2 28	1 22	3 14	2 32	1 25	6 44
V	18 410	15 243	20 122	2 109	8 48	8 36	13 46	13 62	19 128
VI	8 152	7 67	8 57	3 26	5 21	6 9	8 17	3 8	5 8
VII	15 255	13 168	18 140	3 37	10 56	7 9	3 22	7 22	1 26
VIII	2 53	9 45	3 33	0 9	13 18	4 6	3 6	5 8	1 5
IX	8 94	12 49	8 51	1 17	12 34	5 10	2 3	2 5	2 11
X	0 3	0 2	0 1	0 1	1 3	0 0	0 0	0 1	0 3
	FEMALE		MALE		Presumptive Prison	Presumptive probation	Border Box		

Attachment 5

KDOC FY 18 retirements by facility location and job type. Uniformed positions shaded gray

Facility	Job Title
ECF	Corrections Officer II
ECF	Physical Plant Supervisor Specialist
ECF	Technology Support Supervisor
ECF	Corrections Officer I (B)
ECF	Corrections Officer I (B)
EDCF	Corrections Officer I (B)
EDCF	Administrative Assistant
EDCF	Administrative Specialist
EDCF	Corrections Supervisor II
EDCF	Corrections Supervisor I
EDCF	Corrections Officer I (B)
EDCF	Corrections Officer I (A)
EDCF	Unit Team Supervisor
EDCF	Corrections Supervisor I
EDCF	Business Manager
EDCF	Corrections Supervisor III
EDCF	Corrections Officer I (A)
EDCF	Accounting Specialist
EDCF	Corrections Officer I (B)
HCF	Accountant
HCF	KCI Correctional Industries Manager
HCF	Corrections Officer I (B)
HCF	Corrections Supervisor I
HCF	Corrections Officer I (B)
HCF	Corrections Officer I (B)
HCF	Facility Maintenance Supervisor
KJCC	Juvenile Corrections Officer I (B)
KJCC	Administrative Officer
LCF	Unit Team Supervisor
LCF	Activity Specialist I
LCF	Storekeeper Specialist
LCF	Corrections Supervisor I
LCF	Corrections Officer I (B)
LCF	Corrections Officer I (B)
LCF	Corrections Officer I (B)
LCF	Corrections Supervisor I
LCF	Corrections Officer II
LCF	Corrections Officer II
LCF	Facilities Maintenance Supervisor
LCF	Corrections Officer I (B)
LCF	Corrections Officer I (B)
LCF	Corrections Officer I (B)
LCF	Corrections Officer I (B)

KDOC FY 18 retirements by facility location and job type.

Uniformed positions shaded gray

LCF	Corrections Supervisor II
LCF	Unit Team Manager
LCF	Administrative Specialist
LCF	Administrative Assistant
LCF	Senior Administrative Assistant
LCMHF	Corrections Officer II
LCMHF	Corrections Officer I (B)
LCMHF	Corrections Officer I (B)
LCMHF	Corrections Officer I (B)
NCF	Corrections Supervisor I
NCF	Laundry Manager
NCF	Corrections Officer I (B)
NCF	Corrections Supervisor I
NCF	Corrections Supervisor I
NCF	Corrections Officer I (B)
NCF	Warden
NCF	Corrections Supervisor I
NCF	Corrections Officer II
TCF	EAI Investigator
TCF	Administrative Assistant
TCF	Corrections Officer I (B)
TCF	Unit Team Manager
TCF	Corrections Supervisor I
WCF	Facilities Maintenance Supervisor
WCF	Facilities Maintenance Supervisor
WCF	Corrections Officer I (B)
WCF	Activity Specialist I
WCF	Corrections Officer II
WCF	Corrections Officer I (B)
WCF	Corrections Officer II
WCF	Corrections Supervisor I

Attachment 6

From: Amy Robinson
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Jordan Milholland; Robert Gallimore
Subject: FW: IIP follow up

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: (High Priority)

Senator Baumgardner has viewed this and stated we should send it out with other materials that we send out in a few weeks. Just in case I'm not the one to send it out I am sharing with you both.

From: Randall Bowman [KDOC] <Randall.Bowman@ks.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2018 1:19 PM
To: Amy Robinson <Amy.Robinson@senate.ks.gov>
Subject: IIP follow up

Amy,

As follow up to my testimony on Monday regarding slide #15. The counties from which the local Juvenile Intake And Assessment Service (JIAS) Directors report to KDOC that they have not been able to enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Prosecutor for an IIP are listed below.

Allen, Neosho, Wilson, Woodson of the 31st judicial district.

Leavenworth of the 1st juridical district

Sedgwick county

I hope this is what the committee needed, if more please let me know.

Thanks

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

Attachment 7

KDOC 3 Year Recidivism Rates by Risk Level for calendar years 2008-2014

Risk Level & Calendar year of release	Released	Returned	Overall Recidivism Rate	Conditional Violators NNS Returns	CV Recidivism Rate	New Sentence Returns	NS Recidivism Rate
High CY2014	1385	665	48.01%	390	28.16%	275	19.86%
High CY2013	1662	858	51.62%	449	27.02%	409	24.61%
High CY2012	1577	814	51.62%	467	29.61%	347	22.00%
High CY2011	1525	739	48.46%	413	27.08%	326	21.38%
High CY2010	1451	698	48.10%	454	31.29%	244	16.82%
High CY2009	1452	701	48.28%	384	26.45%	317	21.83%
High CY2008	1331	614	46.13%	414	31.10%	200	15.03%
Moderate CY2014	1714	607	35.41%	357	20.83%	250	14.59%
Moderate CY2013	2027	729	35.96%	389	19.19%	340	16.77%
Moderate CY2012	2030	722	35.57%	430	21.18%	292	14.38%
Moderate CY2011	2005	682	34.01%	365	18.20%	317	15.81%
Moderate CY2010	1977	669	33.84%	436	22.05%	233	11.79%
Moderate CY2009	1995	657	32.93%	412	20.65%	245	12.28%
Moderate CY2008	2071	703	33.94%	481	23.23%	222	10.72%
Low CY2014	1029	128	12.44%	103	10.01%	25	2.43%
Low CY2013	1204	173	14.37%	127	10.55%	46	3.82%
Low CY2012	1009	123	12.19%	89	8.82%	34	3.37%
Low CY2011	934	145	15.52%	103	11.03%	42	4.50%
Low CY2010	919	145	15.78%	118	12.84%	27	2.94%
Low CY2009	1068	134	12.55%	88	8.24%	46	4.31%
Low CY2008	1042	184	17.66%	156	14.97%	28	2.69%

Attachment 8

From: Keith Bradshaw [KDOC] <Keith.Bradshaw@ks.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, November 7, 2018 2:04 PM
To: Robert Gallimore; Jordan Milholland
Cc: Liz Rice [KDOC]; Samir Arif [KDOC]
Subject: CJJ oversight committee responses

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Gentlemen,

Below are the responses to questions pertaining to programs. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Bradshaw

- Where are contract beds for mental health located [believe Liz addressed at the meeting, not sure if anything additional is needed]. The MH inmates are not being housed in contract beds, we have moved other inmates to the following contract beds to make room for the 90 makes from state hospital: Cloud County, Washington County, Jackson County, Cherokee County. Those are our only active contracts at this time.
- Can ex-inmates enter military with the high school diploma they earn in KDOC custody? Some branches will grant a waiver for GED, the offender would also have to have a waiver for the criminal conviction for some offenses
- More info, including \$\$, regarding the GED program. GED Cost – FY 19 \$704,309, all from the Inmate Benefit Fund.
- How many times do inmates go through the sex offender treatment course? Since the inception of the program in the early 1990s:
 - There have been 5,145 successful completions.
 - 389 of those had more than one instance of SOTP, of which 382 had two instances/completions of SOTP and 7 had more than two instances.
 - 4,756 of those who successfully completed went through the program once.

Keith Bradshaw
Executive Director, Contract Programs & Finance
Kansas Department of Corrections

Attachment 9

From: Schultz, Scott [KSSC] <Scott.Schultz@ks.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2018 5:48 PM
To: Molly Baumgardner
Cc: J. Russell Jennings; Jordan Milholland; Browne, Ebo [KSSC]
Subject: Female Incarceration Studies
Attachments: Gender Differences in Sentencing Outcomes.pdf; Gender and Sentencing at the Federal Court.pdf; Gender and Sentencing A Meta-Analysis of Contemporary Research.pdf; ASC Abstract.pdf

Sen. Baumgardner,

Rep. Jennings inquired yesterday regarding any university studies relating to increases in female incarceration. I was able to find a *Newsweek* article and a *Vera* Institute of Justice report covering this topic. A main take-away from the report is that women in jail are the fastest growing correctional population in the country—increasing 14-fold between 1970 and 2014. Comparatively, there has been little research into this topic. I would suspect it was due to small sample sizes since females likely make up single digit percentages in county jails and state prison systems.

I'm also attached a few scholarly articles. The final ASC Abstract is a study my senior research analyst, Ebo Browne, is working on as part of his Ph.D. program at K-State. It should be ready by the end of the year but I thought I would pass along the preliminary abstract.

I hope this information is helpful. Safe travels.

Scott Schultz
Executive Director


700 SW Jackson, Suite 501
Topeka, Kansas 66603
(785) 296-0923
www.sentencing.ks.gov

Attachment 10

The Impact of a Graduated Sanctions Model on Female Probationers; does this program affect women and men the same?

George E. Browne
Lisa A. Melander
Mari-Esther R. Edwards
Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work
Kansas State University

Although originally perceived as an evidence based program, there has been a continual debate on the true effectiveness of the graduated sanctions model for probationers. Nonetheless, what is missing in the literature is an examination of how this program may affect women offenders differently than men. Utilizing data from the Kansas Sentencing Commission (KSSC) and the Kansas Department of Corrections (KDOC), this study examines the impact of Kansas' 2013 House Bill 2170 (HB 2170) on female probationers compared to male probationers. Major findings and policy implications will be discussed.

