

## Administration

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Administration program includes the activities of the Secretary of Corrections and other administrative and support personnel responsible for the operation, management, and oversight of the agency. Failure to fund would result in no leadership, oversight, or HR, fiscal, public information, contract management, and legal support for correctional facilities, parole services, juvenile services, and community corrections.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5201; 75-5204; 75- 5205; 75-5251; 75-5257; 75- 7001; 75-7057	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To provide the leadership, support, and oversight necessary for the correctional system to meets its  
B. To provide the administrative and staff services required for operation of the Department of Corrections

### Program History

The 1973 Penal Reform Act established the Department of Corrections and consolidated all penal institutions under the direction of the Secretary of Corrections. This act also mandated that the purpose of the agency is provide for the proper care and rehabilitation of individuals placed in the custody of the Secretary. Prior to the establishment of the Department of Corrections, management and oversight of the correctional facilities resided with the Board of Administration and later the Board of Penal Institutions from 1861 to 1957. On July 1, 1957, legislation placed this responsibility with the Director of Penal Institutions, where it resided until these duties transitioned to the Department.

### Performance Measures

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
1. Number of Internal Management Policies and Procedures (IMPP) maintained.	A	Not Reported	334	334	334	333	333
2. Number of IMPPs reviewed.	A	Not Reported	11	16	14	89	114
3. Number of IMPPs revised.	A	Not Reported	11	16	14	89	114
4. Number of general orders reviewed.	A	Not Reported	641	619	630	711	706
5. Budget submitted by September 15	B	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
6. Amount of interest paid for late vendor payments.	B	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
State General Fund	\$4,084,225	\$4,556,514	\$4,377,661	\$ 4,877,417	\$ 6,204,242	\$5,762,161
Non-SGF State Funds	1	3,010	512,866	737,056	28,500	28,500
Federal Funds	2,256	1,550	438	554	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$4,086,482	\$4,561,074	\$4,890,965	\$ 5,615,027	\$ 6,232,742	\$5,790,661

## Evasions, Apprehensions, and Investigations

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Enforcements, Apprehensions, & Investigations (EAI) is responsible for conducting investigations, apprehending parole absconders and escapees, and intelligence gathering and analysis. Not funding EAI would place responsibility for apprehending parole absconders and escapees with local law enforcement and eliminate investigative and intelligence capabilities necessary to interdict contraband, monitor gang activity, conduct investigations, among other activities. The director, deputy director, and field agents and their operating expenditures are reported in the Central Office budget, while facility agents are reported in individual facility budgets.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General None	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

A. None  
B.  
C.

### Program History

EAI had previously been incorporated in the Community & Field Services program. This program was separated from Community & Field Services starting in FY 2018 to separate costs associated with EAI activities separate from parole services. EAI was originally established to provide a resource to detain parole absconders for the Department; prior to this KDOC relied on local law enforcement, which would oftentimes result in resource strains being placed on those jurisdictions. Oversight of facility investigators was later moved under the EAI director to provide for more consistency and improve coordination across the KDOC system.

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
1. Outcome Measure #1							
2. Outcome measure #2							
3. Outcome measure comparing outcomes to dollars							
<i>Output Measures</i>							
4. Additional Output							
5. Additional Output							

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
State General Fund	\$ 1,057,515	\$ 1,209,374	\$ 1,024,718	\$ 1,002,666	\$ 910,378	\$ 890,322
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	110,260	-	-
Federal Funds	146,003	155,569	102,080	68,705	129,038	129,003
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,203,518</b>	<b>\$ 1,364,943</b>	<b>\$ 1,126,798</b>	<b>\$ 1,181,631</b>	<b>\$ 1,039,416</b>	<b>\$ 1,019,325</b>

## Information Technology

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Information Technology program is responsible for planning, operation, and support of all information technology functions including telecommunications. Included in this program are IT support staff for central office and parole (facility techs are in the facility budgets), software licensing, maintenance agreements, support for the agency's offender management information systems, Office of Information Technology fees (Desktop as Service, Data Center as a Service, Office 365, etc.), telecommunications costs, and other expense necessary to operate the Department's IT and communications infrastructure.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General None	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

A. None  
B.  
C.

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
1. Amount of time for restoration of services in the event of a failure (hours)		Not Reported	12	12	12	8	6

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
State General Fund	\$ 4,252,571	\$ 4,835,374	\$ 4,751,879	\$ 8,482,829	\$ 10,688,356	\$ 8,583,654
Non-SGF State Funds	559,495	336,642	3,216,283	1,444,325	3,405,000	405,000
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 4,812,066	\$ 5,172,016	\$ 7,968,162	\$ 9,927,154	\$ 14,093,356	\$ 8,988,654

## Community & Field Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Community & Field Services Division is responsible for community-based supervision of offenders who have been released from correctional facilities on parole, post-release supervision or conditional release, but who have not been discharged from their sentence. The Community & Field Services Division also includes the Interstate Compact Unit that is responsible for regulating the transfer and movement between states of adult parole and probation offenders under community supervision. Offenders who transfer to Kansas from other states are also supervised by this program. The purpose of post-incarceration supervision is to contribute to public safety and to assist offenders to successfully reintegrate into the community. If eliminated, approximately 5,300 offenders in the community would no longer be supervised. It is expected that some of these offenders will return to prison as a result of the commission of a new crime.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 75-5204, 75-5214, 75-5216, 75-5217, 76-3001 through 76-3003	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Provide offender supervision commensurate with the assessed risk level.  
 B. Enhance public safety by increasing offender pro-social behavior.  
 C.

### Program History

Parole services was established in the 1973 Penal Reform Act, which established the Department of Corrections. The act requires the Secretary to appoint parole officers in a number sufficient to administer the provisions of the act. Specifically, parole officers are required to monitor the conduct of each person under post-release supervision and work to bring about improving in the conduct of each person under supervision and may propose the revocation for violation(s) of the conditions of release. The State of Kansas became a member of the Interstate Corrections Compact with the pass of the 1972 Interstate Corrections Compact Act. The Interstate Corrections Compact governs the transfer and supervision of incarcerated individuals and persons on post-release supervision between member states.

### Performance Measures

Output Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023
1. Number of offenders under parole supervision in Kansas on June 30th	A, B	5,741	6,318	5,653	5,904	5,790	5,920
2. Number of offenders under parole supervision returned to prison with new sentences for felony offenses	A, B	182	131	134	149	140	145

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
State General Fund	\$ 10,671,660	\$ 12,340,034	\$ 11,917,220	\$ 12,019,496	\$ 12,494,474	\$ 11,911,497
Non-SGF State Funds	1,485,031	894,818	660,702	742,422	799,500	770,000
Federal Funds	-	-	-	229	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 12,156,691	\$ 13,234,852	\$ 12,577,922	\$ 12,762,147	\$ 13,293,974	\$ 12,681,497

## Community Corrections

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The Community Corrections program provides funding for county-operated community corrections programs, to include probation supervision, the operation of adult residential centers in Johnson and Sedgwick Counties, and behavioral health programs. Also included in this program are KDOC staff responsible for providing technical assistance and oversight of the community corrections program. Elimination of community corrections would result in the end of supervision of nearly 9,000 offenders annually. With no other sentencing option, it likely that many of these individuals will be sentenced to prison.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Mandatory	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 75-5290 et seq, 75-52,111, 75- 52,112	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. To increase the successful completion rate by 3% annually until a 75% successful completion rate has been achieved and maintained.
- B. Promote probationer accountability and responsibility to the community and to their victims.

### Program History

The Community Corrections Act of 1979 authorizes the development and implementation of correctional programs, services and sanctions that are administered in the community in lieu of prison. KDOC provides state funds to counties operating a community corrections program. The program's premise is that selected probationers can be effectively supervised in the community. The supervision of probationers is accomplished through assessment, development of individualized case plans, rehabilitation and treatment services, monitoring, and crisis intervention. Community corrections was mandated statewide in 1989. Legislation in 2000 specified the population to be supervised, which was further clarified in 2015 to apply the act to offenders assessed as moderate to very high risk through the use of a standardized risk assessment tool. An alternative drug sentencing was established in 2003. In 2013 the Justice Reinvestment Act extended judges the option of 120-day or 180-day prison sentences in lieu of full revocation and the option for local jail sanctions. In 2019 the Justice Reinvestment Act was amended to remove the 120 and 180 day prison sanctions for offenses committed on or after July 1, 2019. Expenditures for 3rd time DUI treatment services were moved from the Community Corrections program to the Reentry & Offender Programs program in FY 2020.

### Performance Measures

Output Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023
1. To increase the number of probationers who successfully complete their sentence under community corrections supervision and are not revoked to prison.	A	4,230	4,373	N/A*	4,302	N/A	N/A
2. To decrease the number of probationers who are revoked and sent to prison.	A	1,636	1,806	N/A	1,721	N/A	N/A
3. Increase the amount of victim restitution paid by probationers under community corrections supervision on an annual basis. **		\$ 611,688	\$ 506,584	\$ 665,593	\$ 594,622	\$ 678,970	\$ 685,759

\*Calculation is delayed due to staff resources being diverted to Athena Phase 1. Projected cannot be determined until FY 21 is calculated.

\*\*FY 21 Total Restitution paid as of 4/30/21; end of fiscal year totals not available due to change in KDOC case management system.

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
State General Fund	\$ 19,957,260	\$ 19,985,390	\$ 20,016,680	\$ 20,217,835	\$ 20,341,612	\$ 20,666,145
Non-SGF State Funds	3,900,000	3,403,180	1,700,000	1,700,000	2,026,123	1,700,000
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 23,857,260</b>	<b>\$ 23,388,570</b>	<b>\$ 21,716,680</b>	<b>\$ 21,917,835</b>	<b>\$ 22,367,735</b>	<b>\$ 22,366,145</b>

## Reentry & Offender Programs

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

KDOC provides an array of recidivism reducing and reentry programs and services, including but not limited to, education, substance abuse programming, sex offender treatment, transitional housing, mentoring, mental health services, cognitive skills building, workforce development, and discharge planning. At admission, residents are assessed for risk and need levels and area and a plan for case management and programming is developed to work with residents to reduce their risk of returning to prison after release. As release approaches, reentry plans are developed, again focusing on areas of risk and need, and a stable housing plan, to prepare the resident for release. After release, treatment, skills-building work, and other aftercare and relapse prevention continues, to support residents making successful transitions to the community, to become employed, housed, reintegrated to families when appropriate, and to become law-abiding citizens. The ultimate measure of the success of these programs and services is recidivism. Residents released from 1999-2002 had a 55.1% recidivism rate after 36 months. Residents released from 2004-2007 had a recidivism rate of 42.9% after 36 months. Residents released in 2017 had a 32% recidivism rate after 36 months. Thus, through these programs, services, and strategies, KDOC has reduced recidivism rates by 23%. Elimination of these programs would result in higher recidivism rates and an increase in prison admissions.

<u>Statutory Basis</u>	<u>Mandatory vs. Discretionary</u>	<u>MOE/Match Rqt.</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>
General KSA 75-5201, 75-5210, 75-5210a, 75-5211, 8-1567	Discretionary	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Assess residents for risk and need, using validated instruments.
- B. Develop case plans with residents that target risk/need areas.
- C. Enroll residents in evidence-based cognitive-behavioral skills-building classes and programs (e.g., Thinking for a Change, Job Readiness, Improved Family Relations/Parenting, Tenant Responsibility, Substance Abuse Program,
- D. Increase successful program completions through readiness, responsivity, motivational enhancements, and providing programs in a dose that fits risk level (300+ hours for high risk, lower for moderate and low).
- E. Increase pro-social thinking through staff modeling, mentors, visits during incarceration and volunteer-led
- F. Provide quality release planning services that addresses housing, connections to treatment, identification (driver's license), financial obligations, pending detainers (warrants/legal matters), family needs, and employment.
- G. Increase employability and employment opportunities for resident.
- H. Increase access to safe and affordable housing and tenant-ability of residents.
- I. Work closely with treatment providers to coordinate treatment with supervision and help residents remain connected to treatment (mental health, substance abuse).

### Program History

The Penal Reform Act of 1973 charged the Department of Corrections with providing rehabilitative services so residents may return to the community with "improved work habits, education, mental and physical health and attitudes necessary to become and remain useful and self-reliant citizens. Individual programs have been implemented over time as the needs of the population changes and research on effective programming continues to grow. Expenditures for 3rd time DUI treatment services were moved from the Community Corrections program to the Reentry & Offender Programs program in FY 2020.

### Performance Measures

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
1. GED completions	A, B, C, D, G	362	302	275	313	360	396
2. College courses completed	A, B, C, D, G	78	59	118	85	309	371

3. Title I/Special Education Completions	A, B, C, D, G	37	29	42	36	60	66
4. ServeSafe Completions	A, B, C, D, G	92	92	49	78	51	51
5. KS WorkReady Certificate	A, B, C, D, G	421	264	173	286	208	230
6. NCCER Basic completions	A, B, C, D, G	99	98	75	91	100	110
7. Vocational training	A, B, C, D, G	434	467	413	438	409	498
8. Pre-release	A, B, C, D, G	127	154	77	119	108	117
9. LCF BIB Programs	A, B, C, D	55	37	5	32	7	7
10. Work Release	A, B, C, D	283	197	19	166	43	64
11. Substance abuse program	A, B, C, D	1024	969	601	865	765	850
12. Substance abuse assessments/care coordination	A, B, C, D	706	721	360	596	428	523
13. Sex offender treatment completions	A, B, C, D	244	87	147	159	153	153
14. Cognitive skills building program	A, B, C, D	310	311	213	278	255	255
15. Cognitive readiness program	A, B, C, D	80	253	56	130	100	100
16. Moving on program	A, B, C, D	69	91	68	76	72	72
17. Family program	A, B, C, D	357	360	145	287	180	180
18. Job readiness program	A, B, C, D	621	655	369	548	405	405
19. Workforce support and career success program	A, B, C, D, G	104	96	19	73	40	50
20. Batterers intervention program	A, B, C, D	69	25	7	34	16	24
21. Dialectical behavioral therapy program	A, B, C, D	43	33	35	37	42	49
22. Discharge planning services provided	I	1049	446	885	793	885	885
23. Release plan completed	F	4704	4550	4550	4,601	4550	4550

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
State General Fund	\$ 4,672,421	\$ 4,836,028	\$ 5,995,653	\$ 6,109,156	\$ 6,408,834	\$ 6,308,834
Non-SGF State Funds	5,425,916	6,592,060	6,937,335	5,844,036	7,371,321	7,372,469
Federal Funds	122,029	214,023	225,910	380,000	176,228	176,228
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 10,220,366</b>	<b>\$ 11,642,111</b>	<b>\$ 13,158,898</b>	<b>\$ 12,333,192</b>	<b>\$ 13,956,383</b>	<b>\$ 13,857,531</b>

## Inmate Health Care

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The United States Supreme Court, in *Estelle vs. Gamble* (429 US 97), ruled that a prison inmate has the right, under the Eighth Amendment's prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment, to expect that he or she will receive health care of a quality and quantity that is not deliberately indifferent to the inmate's medical needs.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 75-5201, 75-5210, 75-5220, 75-5248; 75-5249, 429 US 97	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

A. Provide for the delivery of appropriate medical care services in accordance with accreditation requirements of NCCHC, ACA, and within the clinical guidelines of AAFP and Medicaid.

B. Provide for the delivery of appropriate dental care services in accordance with accreditation requirements of NCCHC and ACA. Care is also provided within the clinical guidelines of American Dental Association rules and regulations as well as Medicaid rules on dental services.

C. Provide for the delivery of appropriate mental health services in compliance with ACA and within guidelines established by the Behavioral Sciences Regulatory Board.

### Program History

The Penal Reform Act of 1973 specifically established requirement that the Department employ a chief physician at each correctional facility to direct the operation and management of medical services and to supervise and coordinate the care of residents within the correctional facility. Health care services were privatized in 1988 when the Department awarded a contract for comprehensive medical and mental health services to Correctional Medical Systems, Inc. The contract was rebid in 1991 and awarded to Prison Health Solutions (PHS). PHS held the contract until October 2003, when the contract was assigned to Correct Care Solutions (CCS) after it was determined PHS was unable to meet the terms of the contract. CCS was awarded the contract following a rebid in 2005. In 2013, the Juvenile Justice Authority (JJA) was abolished and the functions and duties of JJA were transferred to KDOC. The contract was put back out for competitive bid later that year and health care services at the juvenile correctional facilities were incorporated into the request for proposals. The contract was ultimately awarded to Corizon, who took over health care services at all adult and juvenile facilities on January 1, 2014. The contract was put back out to bid in 2019 and as a result of the competitive bid process, the contract was awarded to Centurion effective July 1, 2020. Starting in 1995, KDOC began contracting for clinical oversight and compliance monitoring. This contract is currently held by the University of Kansas Medical Center.

### Performance Measures

Output Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023
4. Total Vacancies as of June 30	A, B, C	62.7	74.4	87.5	74.9	45.0	45.0
5. Percent of Authorized FTE Vacant as of June 30	A, B, C	15.3%	15.3%	17.3%	16.0%	10.0%	10.0%
6. Number of inmates treated for hepatitis C	A	110	467	137	238	301	301
7. Number of suicides	C	3	4	2	3	1	1

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
State General Fund	\$ 67,471,853	\$ 72,355,932	\$ 75,963,647	\$ 81,841,684	\$ 85,466,587	\$ 87,140,741
Non-SGF State Funds	81,000	259,844	883,156	-	-	-
Federal Funds	326,721	1,122,462	673,634	1,649,724	657,220	657,220
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 67,879,574</b>	<b>\$ 73,738,238</b>	<b>\$ 77,520,437</b>	<b>\$ 83,491,408</b>	<b>\$ 86,123,807</b>	<b>\$ 87,797,961</b>



## Victim Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Statute requires victim notification of offender status, to include release, escape, expiration of sentence, clemency application, and death, among others. Victim services also provides a liaison program, restorative justice programs, and batterer intervention programs. Loss of funding for victim services would prevent the Department from providing required notification services and result in the loss of federal funds for other victim programs.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 22-3727	Mandatory	Yes	1

### Program Goals

- A. Serve as a liaison and service provider for crime victims  
 B. Provide quality, victim-centered batterer intervention program (BIP) services  
 C.

### Program History

The victim notifications requires were established in 1993. Other programs within Victim Services were established as federal and/or state funds became available.

### Performance Measures

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
1. Number of victims who receive services	A	10,826	11,335	10,242	10,801	10,500	11,000
2. Number of victims who registered for services	A	38,065	40,125	40,978	39,723	3,250	3,500
3. Number of victims who were first-time registrants	A	3,563	3,535	3,057	3,385	3,250	3,500
4. Number of victim notification letters sent.	A	15,759	18,955	15,874	16,863	16,000	16,000
5. Number of offenders assessed for BIP.	B	203	185	142	177	175	200
6. Number of participants served	B	406	430	353	396	375	400
7. Number of participants completing group.	B	38	33	34	35	40	50
8. Number of victims served.	B	285	306	322	304	350	375

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
State General Fund	\$ 794,289	\$ 900,113	\$ 878,188	\$ 850,501	\$ 1,092,948	\$ 1,117,332
Non-SGF State Funds	66,862	37,055	98,190	-	-	-
Federal Funds	437,218	601,253	735,801	956,115	1,032,544	970,091
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,298,369</b>	<b>\$ 1,538,421</b>	<b>\$ 1,712,179</b>	<b>\$ 1,806,616</b>	<b>\$ 2,125,492</b>	<b>\$ 2,087,423</b>

## Prisoner Review Board

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Functions outlined in statute currently performed by Prisoner Review Board would no longer be performed. This includes, but is not limited to, decisions pertaining to parole revocations, granting parole for off-grid crimes or revocation of post-release supervision, functional incapacitation releases, and review of clemency applications.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 75-52,153, 22-3701 et seq	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. None  
B.  
C.

### Program History

The 1885 Legislature created the three-member Board of Pardons, whose responsibilities were to review pardon or commutation applications and report their recommendations to the Governor. In 1901 additional early release authority was granted to the Governor with the requirement that releases could only be granted if an adequate amount of time had been served, the inmate could be released without endangering the community, and the inmate could find suitable employment. Conditions of release would be applied, and the release could be revoked if those conditions were not met. In 1903 the Legislature created the Prison Board that consisted of the Board of Pardons and warden of the Kansas State Penitentiary. In 1957 the Prison Board was replaced with Board of Probation and Parole. This five-member panel was appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate. Membership had to include an attorney, a minister, a businessman, and a farmer, and no more than three members could be of the same political party. The board was reduced to three members in 1961. By this time the Board had sole authority to grant or deny parole, while the Governor retained the power to grant pardons and commutations. The Board also had the responsibility of supervising those offenders placed on parole. The supervision requirement changed in 1974 when the Board was replaced with the Kansas Adult Authority and membership increased to five. The board members became full-time state employees in 1979, and in 1983 the board was reduced to three members. In 1986 the name was changed to the Kansas Parole Board. In 2011, Executive Reorganization Order 34 the Board was abolished and the duties and responsibilities of the Kansas Parole Board were transferred to the Prisoner Review Board within the Department of Corrections.

### Performance Measures

Output Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023
1. Number of meetings attended by the PRB		218	250	275	248	275	275

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
State General Fund	\$ 453,760	\$ 471,681	\$ 497,334	\$ 494,068	\$ 497,106	\$ 487,602
Non-SGF State Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 453,760	\$ 471,681	\$ 497,334	\$ 494,068	\$ 497,106	\$ 487,602

## Juvenile Services

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

Expenditures in this program are for Central Office staff who provide technical assistance, training, and oversight of the juvenile justice system in Kansas. Youth sentenced as juvenile offenders and supervised in the community are done so by community supervision officers funded through grants issued by KDOC to counties. Also funded through this grant process are intake and assessment centers, which are utilized by local law enforcement in suspected juvenile offender or child in need of care cases, and grant programs from the Evidence-Based Programs fund. Juvenile Services also contracts with a variety of residential and foster care providers for placement alternatives when staying at home is not in the best interest of youth or the family. Additionally, programs designed to provide youth and their families the resources and skills to address behavior and further escalation into the criminal justice system are provided through the Evidence-Based Programs fund as well other SGF and special revenue funds. Juvenile Services also oversees the Kansas Juvenile Correctional Complex. Elimination of this program eliminates all funding related to the supervision, treatment, and programming of juvenile offenders.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 75-7001 et seq., 76-52,160, 75-52,162, 75-52,163, 75-52,164	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

- A. Effective community-based juvenile justice programs are available to all Kansas youth and their families.
- B.
- C.

### Program History

The Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 1996 consolidated juvenile justice functions that had previously been housed in the Department of Social & Rehabilitative Services, the Judicial Branch, and the Department of Corrections into the Juvenile Justice Authority (JJA). Specific duties and responsibilities of JJA included the operation of the juvenile correctional facilities, evaluation of the effectiveness of juvenile offender rehabilitation efforts, contracting with out-of-home placement providers, providing operating grants, technical assistance, and oversight to community-based juvenile justice agencies, establishing and utilizing a diagnostic evaluation for all juvenile offenders, and monitoring placement trends and minority confinement. In 1998 legislation was passed that provided district court judges more discretion in determining the system under which a dually adjudicated youth would be handled--either as a child in need of care or as a juvenile offender. Legislation passed during the 1999 Session mandated the use of a sentencing placement matrix when a youth is sentenced to a term of incarceration in a juvenile correctional facility. The matrix went into effect on July 1, 1999 and granted authority the courts the authority to determine the length of incarceration in a juvenile correctional facility as well as the term of aftercare or conditional release supervision. Additionally, permanency hearings were implemented for juvenile offenders to reduce the amount of time juveniles spend in foster care by moving them toward a permanent family arrangement. The reforms brought about by the Juvenile Justice Reform Act resulted in a significant decline in the juvenile correctional facility population. This led the closure of facilities in Atchison and Beloit in 2008 and 2009, respectively. Executive Reorganization Order 42 abolished JJA and all duties and responsibilities of the agency were transferred to KDOC effective July 1, 2013. In 2016, the Legislature passed SB 367 which reinvests funds previously allocated for juvenile correctional facility and group home placements into evidence-based programs and practices designed to prevent further offending and youth going deeper into the criminal justice system. Shortly after the passage of SB 367, KDOC closed the Larned Juvenile Correctional Facility.

### Performance Measures

Output Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023
1. Number of technical assistance teleconferences provided for juvenile intake & assessment	A	5	8	9	7	10	12
2. Number of community supervision agency on-site visits	A	58	27	0	28	62	62

3. Number of new staff trained in Effective Practices in Correctional Supervision	A	107	22	23	51	40	40
4. Number of residential provider site visits conducted	A	5	0	4	3	5	5
5. Number of judicial districts participating in JDAI	A	5	5	5	5	5	5
6. Number of judicial districts with evidence-based programs	A	31	31	31	31	31	31

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
Funding Source	\$ 28,389,299	\$ 24,201,575	\$ 29,821,854	\$ 27,199,804	\$ 29,356,981	\$ 39,356,983
Non-SGF State Funds	721,655	1,485,407	1,397,926	1,154,579	13,892,175	3,682,175
Federal Funds	1,372,501	1,938,487	868,867	1,230,178	613,839	623,939
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 30,483,455</b>	<b>\$ 27,625,469</b>	<b>\$ 32,088,647</b>	<b>\$ 29,584,561</b>	<b>\$ 43,862,995</b>	<b>\$ 43,663,097</b>

## Facilities Management

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program provides oversight of the adult correctional facilities, reviews and responds to resident grievances, conducts security audits and training, manages the resident security classification process and determines housing assignments, calculates sentences, manages the five-year capital improvements plan, and responds to constituent inquiries. Also included in this program are lease payments for the Lansing Correctional Facility. Elimination of funding would remove the leadership and centralized functions necessary to operate the Kansas correctional system.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
Specific KSA 75-5201; 75-5204; 75-5205; 75-5218; 75-5219; 75-5220; 75-5221; 75-5223; 75-5224; 75-5226; 75-5229; 75-5233; 75-5246; 75-5247; 75-5247a; 75-5248 75-5250; 75-5251	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Provide the leadership, support, and oversight necessary for safe operation of the correctional facilities.  
 B.  
 C.

### Program History

The functions contained in the Facilities Management program were previously included in the Administration program. These functions were established as a separate program in 2018. Starting in FY 2021, food service contract expenditures were moved out of this program and into the food service program.

### Performance Measures

Output Measures	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023
4. Number of security audits conducted	A	9	9	9	9	9	9
5. Number of fire/safety inspections conducted	A	9	7	15	10	15	15

### Funding

Funding Source	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
State General Fund	\$ 18,257,187	\$ 21,547,697	\$ 25,842,560	\$ 18,854,679	\$ 17,924,264	\$ 18,220,905
Non-SGF State Funds	776,558	1,654,492	2,721,114	1,945,472	5,760	5,760
Federal Funds	165,607	18,888	815,773	20,581	41,076	41,076
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 19,199,352</b>	<b>\$ 23,221,077</b>	<b>\$ 29,379,447</b>	<b>\$ 20,820,732</b>	<b>\$ 17,971,100</b>	<b>\$ 18,267,741</b>

## Food Service

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program was established to track food service contract expenditures separate from the Facilities Management program. Eliminating this program would eliminate funding required to feed the resident population.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General 75-5210	Mandatory	No	1

### Program Goals

A. Provide appetizing meals to the inmate population which meets nutritional and daily caloric intake requirements as well as special diets necessary to meet individual medical and religious needs.

B.

C.

### Program History

None.

### Performance Measures

<i>Output Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
4. Number of kitchen inspections conducted	A	Not tracked	18	19	19	30	30
5. Number of third-party dietician menu reviews conducted	A	Not tracked	8	4	6	8	8
6. Number of food service related grievances filed	A	78	62	55	65	55	55

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
State General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,624,039	\$ 15,376,246	\$ 15,376,246
Funding Source	-	-	-	354,970	943,578	1,593,502
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 14,979,009</b>	<b>\$ 16,319,824</b>	<b>\$ 16,969,748</b>

Note: food service expenditures for FY 2018 through FY 2020 were recorded in the Facilities Management program.

## Debt Service

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

This program was established solely for the purpose of recording interest and principle payments for separate from the operating budget.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs. Discretionary	MOE/Match Rqt.	Priority Level
General		No	2

### Program Goals

A. None; this program is for budgetary and accounting purposes only.  
 B.  
 C.

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>3- yr. Avg.</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
1. Outcome Measure #1							
2. Outcome measure #2							
3. Outcome measure comparing outcomes to dollars							
<i>Output Measures</i>							
4. Additional Output Measure							
5. Additional Output Measure							

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>FY 2018</i>	<i>FY 2019</i>	<i>FY 2020</i>	<i>FY 2021</i>	<i>FY 2022</i>	<i>FY 2023</i>
State General Fund	\$ 516,767	\$ 515,433	\$ 517,328	\$ -	\$ 1,726,148	\$ 3,346,286
Non-SGF State Funds	4,624,235	4,621,602	4,447,276	-	-	-
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 5,141,002	\$ 5,137,035	\$ 4,964,604	\$ -	\$ 1,726,148	\$ 3,346,286

## Capital Improvements

### Consequences of Not Funding this Program

The capital improvement program is used solely for budgeting and recording expenditures related to rehabilitation and repair projects as well as new construction and renovation projects. Funds are transferred to the facility as projects are approved. Larger projects are managed at the KDOC Central Office and expenditures are recorded in this program. Eliminating this program would prohibit the Department from making repairs, upgrades, and improvements to the facilities.

Statutory Basis	Mandatory vs.	MOE/Matc h Rqt.	Priority Level
General KSA 75-5210, 75-52,125	Discretionary	No	2

### Program Goals

A. None; this program is for budgetary and accounting purposes only.  
 B.  
 C.

### Program History

None

### Performance Measures

<i>Outcome Measures</i>	Goal	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	3- yr. Avg.	FY 2022	FY 2023
1. Outcome Measure #1							
2. Outcome measure #2							
3. Outcome measure comparing outcomes to dollars							
<i>Output Measures</i>							
4. Additional Output Measure							
5. Additional Output Measure							

### Funding

<i>Funding Source</i>	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
State General Fund	\$ 48,341	\$ -	\$ 4,275	\$ -	\$ 6,614,588	\$ -
Non-SGF State Funds	860,386	334,350	664,881	50,755	8,973,528	5,664,264
Federal Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 908,727	\$ 334,350	\$ 669,156	\$ 50,755	\$ 15,588,116	\$ 5,664,264