



ex. 5

U.S. Department of Justice

1

National Institute of Corrections

Washington, DC 20534

DISCLAIMER

RE: NIC Technical Assistance No. 14P1033

This technical assistance activity was funded by the Prisons Division of the National Institute of Corrections. The Institute is a Federal agency established to provide assistance to strengthen state and local correctional agencies by creating more effective, humane, safe and just correctional services.

The resource person who provided the on site technical assistance did so through a cooperative agreement, at the request of the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services, and through the coordination of the National Institute of Corrections. The direct onsite assistance and the subsequent report are intended to assist the agency in addressing issues outlined in the original request and in efforts to enhance the effectiveness of the agency.

The contents of this document reflect the views of Glenn Jackson. Points of view or opinions expressed the Technical Assistance report are those of the authors and do not represent the official opinion or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice. Upon Delivery of the final Technical Assistance report to the agency that requested the assistance, the report becomes the property of that agency. The National Institute of Corrections will not distribute the report to non-NIC entities, or consider it an agency record under the Federal FOIA, without the express, written approval of the agency.

Glenn M. Jackson
NIC Technical Assistant Number 14P1033
Nebraska Department of Corrections Record Office
September 8, 2014 – September 10, 2014 on site

Wayne Hill, Program Specialist with the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) contacted me concerning a Technical Assistance assignment in Lincoln, Nebraska. Due to the gravity of the situation, he indicated he needed to know the earliest possible date I could go. He explained the assignment was to examine Nebraska's Department of Corrections (NDOC) record office procedures and operations due to a number of offenders released erroneously. The goal is established what can be done to avert future mistakes. Mr. Hill provided Larry Wayne, Deputy Director as the contact person for this assignment.

Deputy Director Wayne and I spoke briefly after my conversation with Mr. Hill. Our conversation focused on an overview of the situation and why the NDOC requested outside assistance from NIC. The problem as he explained was due to the agency's failure to comply with a Supreme Court Ruling issued in 2013. As a result, over 700 offender's sentences were improperly calculated and not discovered until the World Herald Newspaper released an article concerning the NDOC breakdown to comply with the Supreme Court Ruling. It has also triggered an investigation by the Nebraska State Senate.

Based on our conversation, I requested several documents from Deputy Director Wayne prior to my arrival to acquaint myself with the operations of the office. My request consisted of a number of record office staff, organization charts, policy and procedures, meeting minutes, training schedules, job descriptions, training manuals and a copy of the State v. Castillas Supreme Court Ruling.

Upon my arrival, Director Michael Kenney conducted an overview of the situation in his conference room with Larry Wayne, Deputy Director, Kyle Poppert, Record Administrator, several of the record office personnel, and myself. The Director made it clear to everyone present to assist me with information and materials needed for my assessment. He wants solutions and directions to prevent this or similar situations from ever occurring again.

My assessment focused on management, policies/procedures and training. To achieve this goal, I interviewed twelve Nebraska Department of Corrections (NDOC) record office employees. To get an understanding of NDOC Record Office operations, job duties, and the Central Record Office functions. My assessment also consisted of visiting the Diagnostic and Evaluation Center (DEC), Nebraska Correctional Youth Facility (NCYF), Omaha Correctional Center (OCC) and Central Record Office.

Kyle Poppert was the first person I interviewed due to his connection to the situation and the person in charge of managing the sentence computation unit. I conducted other staff interviews; nonetheless, Mr. Poppert's interview is the only one documented in this report. The other staff interviews are integrated in this report without identifying any one person due to the similarities of their comments.

During my interview with Mr. Poppert, he emphasized his belief to allow staff to develop and perform other assignments to advance their career within the Nebraska Department of Corrections. Since the purpose of my appearance is due to the Castillas Supreme Court Ruling, I started my questions with what were the circumstances that lead to the miscalculations and who is responsible for reviewing mandates from the court. His explanation was there had been previous court decisions that indicated they were correct in their method of performing calculations and the Supreme Court decision was not directing NDOC to change their methodology. He also stated that since legal was aware of the case and had not directed him to amend their methods, the Supreme Court ruling had no impact on NDOC. Based on his response it is my belief that he was unaware of the significance of the ruling; therefore, believed no further inquiry was necessary. An experienced record office person would have questioned the directions and sought clarification.

Another area of my interview with Mr. Poppert targeted training meetings. The emphasis of the questions focused on frequency, who conducts the training and who is involved. He indicated training meetings are conducted, but not as frequent as needed. He also acknowledged he is often not in attendance due to other obligations.

The absence of the person in charge reflects poor leadership, oversight and lack of involvement in an area under his supervision that is crucial to the overall creditability of the agency. This is consistent with the overwhelming comments mentioned by the staff I interviewed of no direction and leadership from the Record Administrator. Directions within the record office has to be consistent to make certain each facility operate under the same standards. The Record Administrator cannot understand the needs or concerns

of his staff if he does not attend the training meetings under his supervision. According to NDOC's records, the record office only had two training meetings with the Record Administrator in attendance (August 11, 2014 and August 19, 2014) over the past three years. Both meetings are in response to the news article concerning the erroneous release of offenders. Other meetings when held were organized by the record managers.

The common concern expressed from staff was the need for training and leadership from the Record Administrator. Most of the staff interviewed indicated they do not consult him for answers because he is not responsive, does not know the answer, nor understand their inquiries. If true, corrective measures should be taken by the administration immediately to take measures to ensure staff questions are answered in a timely manner. The Record Administrator's primary responsibility is to be responsive to the record office personnel he manages.

Efforts to regain public trust will take time. One method of achieving this goal is to work closely with the courts and conduct training exercises. The training exercises should consist of justices explaining court proceedings and how the court would like to be addressed on questionable sentencing orders. Future exercises should be designed based on the needs of the office or issues the court would like to take up.

There are ninety-three counties in Nebraska, each having their own sentencing orders, which has caused confusion with how sentencing orders are submitted to the NDOC. Due to the various sentencing order used by all the counties, it is difficult to interpret the courts intent. With the assistance of the legal department, NDOC should initiate an effort work with a team of justices and create uniform sentencing order. Establishing a uniform sentencing order will create consistency and enhance the agencies

operations by using one uniform order. Not to mention, it will foster goodwill between both organizations.

Eventual collaboration with the County Attorney's, Public Defender's and other law enforcement agencies on subject matters of mutual interest will strengthen the relationships with the stakeholders who are equally concerned about public safety. The goal is strengthen the network between each group to increase productivity, and enhance consistency and accountability.

Although not a major concern, a new offender numbering system will assist by eliminating issuing a new number for an offender each time he returns on a new sentence. By establishing a single number system, it will create uniformity and allow an offender to maintain the same number throughout all his incarcerations. Simplifying the process will improve the overall operation and limit mistakes of not identifying previous numbers.

Would have a new computer system prevented this from happening? In my opinion the answer is no. However, I do believe they are working with many disadvantages due to the numerous manual functions they perform due to their system-limited capabilities. The computer system has virtually no safeguards to alert staff of possible errors. For instance, the system will continue to award three days of good conduct credits per month after an offender has reached their mandatory minimum. Staff must manually count the number days and reduce the credits to ensure the mandatory minimum sentence are met. Computer system safeguards are vital to ensure each release does not compromise public safety.

Another area where the system decreases productivity and reliability is with court and medical writs. The computer system is unable to schedule and track offenders to go out

on writs. Record office staff creates a handwritten or typed list of offenders scheduled to depart for court or medical writs. Programming the existing computer system to perform these functions would increase efficiency and reliability.

Other notable manual functions include Victim Notification requiring type letters to be mailed, fingerprints using ink and finger print cards. The only facility that has a LiveScan system is the DEC.

The computer system allows non-record office personnel to alter sentence computation dates without knowing who made the changes. Again, certain safeguards need to build into the system to prevent offenders released erroneously.

The mainframe system requires constant programming updates to run simple reports. Reports that are unreliable due to the number of overrides staff perform to get the system to work. Funding may be an issue in determining if a new system is feasible. As difficult as it may be to find funding to replace the current obsolete system, it is in their best interest to do so. Patching an old system that is obsolete requires specialized expertise that would be difficult and expensive to acquire.

Another area of concern are the documents inserted in the master file and the Record Administrator has no authority to determine what can and cannot be documents are contained in the master file. Each facility he discretion to determine the content of documents entered in the master file. The lack of consistency creates problems with transferred offenders. It also reflects poor form management and what is considered an authorized document.

Consideration should be given to establishing statewide guidelines by directive of master file content. This will reduce the volume of unrelated information being placed in

offender master files. The current process lacks consistency of what documents are entered into the master file.

Conclusion

The Record Administrator is the Gatekeeper to over five thousand offenders. The person who holds this position should understand the sentence computation process. That is not the case within the NDOC. Record Office personnel have little to no confidence in the record administrator and know he is unable to answer their questions; therefore, they consult with record managers who do know. It is also evident by the Record Administrator own admission, that he does not know how to perform sentence computation and relies on his managers to handle all sentence computation matters. This is perhaps the reason why he failed to grasp the magnitude of the Supreme Court Ruling and waited for an answer instead of aggressively pursuing a response from the legal department. It is my opinion that someone who is in tune to record office procedures would have identified the issue and made every effort to get an immediate resolution.

Throughout my analysis are several suggestions in which I believe will benefit the overall operations of the record office. Some in which I believe warrant clarification, such as Roselle Brown return to the sentence computation unit. Her experience and knowledge of the record office is as good or better than anyone currently working in the department; therefore, it is my belief her experience and knowledge will benefit the office overall operations.

It is also my belief that training and development could have possibly alerted staff to question the decision not to follow the Castillas Supreme Court ruling. At the very least, cause someone to notify the Record Administrator to follow up. A common response I

heard from staff is the dissemination of information is rare. This is disturbing considering communication is one the key elements of preventing erroneous releases from occurring.

I strongly suggest the Record Administrator spend time at each of the facility and learn how of each they function. This will also serve as an opportunity for him to learn how to perform sentence computations and understand his staff encounters daily. Staffs who work in the record offices need to have confidence in the Record Administrator and believe him capable providing directions.

It is my belief the circumstances leading up to the erroneous releases is due to inadequate management, poor communication and improperly trained staff. No effort to seek clarification was made due his lack of understanding.

I discussed with Mr. Poppert the Record Administrator responsibility is to understand mandates, ensure questionable orders are examined by legal and provide staff with directions on how to calculate sentences based on the decision rendered by the court. In this effort, Mr. Poppert failed. He has to be the strongest advocate for all matters relating to sentence computations. Sometimes that requires continuously following up with the legal department on matters relating to the record department. If needed follow the chain of command to alert the Deputy Director and Director of the situation. In this instance, he was not an advocate nor did he fully understand the magnitude of the highest court decision. Even in his current explanation of the ruling, he alludes to previous court rulings having precedence over the current Castillas Supreme Court ruling. His lack of understanding and follow-up is partially the blame for the miscalculated sentences after the Supreme Courts ruling.

Long-term, I suggest centralizing all record office functions. The Bureau of Prisons and a number of states have advanced their ability to perform sentence computations by centralizing their daily duties. The NDOC creation of a Central Record Computation unit will ensure accurate methods of computing release dates, communication and consistency in interpretation of sentencing documentation and the statutes governing them. This would place the authority to formulate policy decisions and the responsibility for their implementation in the same unit. The office would improve the consistency and accuracy of processing sentences as all staff would be located in one central unit, which will allow greater oversight and direction. Central Records Administration can ensure all staff receives uniform training in the area of time computation, thus minimizing the chance of erroneous releases. Additionally, the unit will provide a single point of contact for the Department regarding sentence related issues and have the ability to standardize communication to the courts, outside agencies, staff and public.

The centralized unit will allow throughout the computation process, a new systematic audit procedure, which currently does not exist. For the first time certified computations will be reviewed for accuracy rates and reporting. Current office operation does not allow computations to be measured for accuracy when an offender is released and subsequently returns to custody. By not being able to identify these issues, specific training programs cannot be incorporated to limit errors.

Part of centralization concept should include Court Liaisons. Assigning two people that will conduct training with the court review and contact the court concerning

questionable sentencing orders. The centralized unit as well as the liaisons will provide a single point of contact instead of multiple people inquiring.

It is my opinion that Mr. Poppert is capable of learning the job of a record administrator, but it appears his efforts have been more in line with classification and not sentence computation, which I believe was a tragic mistake. The concept of the Record Administrator position is to have someone who knows and understands the responsibilities of the record office, not classifications. The administration and Record Administrator must see sentence computation personnel as co-equal to officers as far as institutional safety and security. Each job is different, but essential to prevent offenders from escaping or being release improperly.

Attached to this report is a series of the Illinois Department of Corrections cheat sheets, which give record office personnel quick references to state statutes, court decisions and explain why certain guidelines are followed. NDOC creating cheat sheets will increase staff understanding of sentence computations rules and procedures. The cheat will also serve as the foundation to develop a comprehensive training manual. The cheat sheets can also be shared with judges, attorneys and law enforcement agencies during presentations.

Many of the suggestions highlighted in my analysis are practices used in other states and proven to work. I believe they will help develop continuity and increase productivity if enacted. The Record Administrator has to embrace his position, understand the functions of the office, and not rely on his support staff to carry the weight. He needs to conduct routine training meetings, provide directions and develop a plan of action.

Based on my assessment, I have documented several recommendations:

1. Train the Record Administrator how to perform sentence computations.
2. Reassign Mickie Baum to sentence computation unit.
 - a. Need experienced that knows how to perform sentence computations
 - b. Roselle Brown return sentence computation unit. (explanation noted in conclusion)
3. Create an Assistant Record Administrator – succession plan
4. Create comprehensive record office training manual. (Attached in **Section 1** Illinois Department of Corrections Table of Content)
5. Conduct quarterly training meetings and provide training documents to support the meeting.
6. Invite Judges, County Attorney's Office and law enforcement agencies to conduct training relevant to record office operations.
7. Create Record Office Cheat Sheets that explains rules for performing calculations based on Nebraska's State statute and court rulings. (Examples attached in **Section 2** from Illinois Department of Corrections)
8. Create a mandate log sheet to track all mandates issued by the court. (See attached **Section 3** example)
9. The Record Administrator should make routine rounds to the facilities.
10. Develop a sentence computation log to track historical computation rule changes.
 - a. The log should consist of offender number, subject, decision narrative and authorized by. (**Section 4**)
11. Create (Electronic) Release Checklist (**Section 5**)

- a. The checklist ensures required information is examined prior to an offender release.
12. Examine implementing an internal promotion system within record department to maintain experience personnel.
 13. Institute computation certification exam
 14. Develop a Five-Year Plan detailing objectives for record office
 15. Network with the other record administrators and visit other state operations.
(Suggested: Diana Judge, Michigan Department of Corrections, Melissa Adams, Ohio Department of Corrections and Patrick Courtney, Minnesota Department of Corrections)

Staff Interviewed:

Larry Wayne
Kyle Poppert
Mickie Baum
Ginger Shurter
Takak Johnson
Angela Flots-Oberle
Mary Wellman
Anne Thompson
Kevin Wilken
Kendra Fristalyn
Curt Jordan
Val Granholm

Record Office Training Manual

Table of Contents

Introduction

IDOC Mission Statement

Record Office Mission Statement

Record Office Training Manual Project Team

Alphabetical Topics:

Volume I A – Calculations

Bond Lost Time

Concurrent

1. Form & Sample

Consecutive

1. Form & Sample

Determine Custody/Recustody Date

Approval/Denial of Earned Good Conduct Credits

1. Eligibility Review (INQEARN, CHGEARN)

- a. Guidelines to Determine Terms of Incarceration

- b. Excluded Offenses

2. Reports

- a. Automated/Immediate

3. Changes to Awards Resulting from Facility Audits

4. Rescinding EGCC

Electronic Monitoring Credit

Enhanced Sentence/Extended MSR Term (SELMITT)

1. Guidelines

2. OTS Entry

Escape Lost Time

Frequently Asked Questions

GCC Revocation - Paperwork

GCC Restoration

1. Forms

2. GCC Left to Revoke

3. Approvals and Disapprovals

GCC Education Commonly Asked Questions

Johnson Decision

Meritorious/Supplemental Meritorious Good Time

Record Office Training Manual

Table of Contents

1. Calculation
 2. Code 35 Time Adjustments
 3. Comparisons (3)
 4. Docket Card
 5. Eligibility
 - a. MGT
 - b. SMGT
 6. Reports
 - a. Automated/Immediate
 7. Sample Submittals for Violators
 8. Time Adjustment Entry (SELTADJ)
 - a. Approved
 - b. Denied
 9. MGT/SMGT Troubleshooting
- MSR Violation Prep & Calculation
 New Mitts (SELMITT)
 New Mitt Consecutive to MSR Violation
 Truth In Sentencing
 1. References/MSR Violators
 2. MSR Violation Truth in Sentencing
 Violated at the Door Procedure

Volume I B – Calculations

Compensatory Time

Indeterminate Sentences Frequently Asked Questions

1. Appeal Time Lost GCC
 2. Single or Concurrent (SGT)
 3. Single or Concurrent (GCC)
 4. Consecutive
 5. Determination of Calculation Method GCC vs. SGT
 6. Escape Time Lost GCC
 7. MGT Indeterminate GCC/SGT
 8. Parole Violator/SGT/GCC
 9. Probation Credit GCC
 10. Revocation/Restoration GCC/SGT
- Records History

Record Office Training Manual

Table of Contents

Volume II – Intake / Release

Admissions

1. Reception & Classification Centers
2. Return Additional Mitt (RAM) Scenarios

Checklists

1. Intake Checklist (INQREC)
2. Release Checklist (INQREC)
3. Work Release Checklist

LEADS

Master File Organization

Name/Number Changes

Rap Sheet Review & Entry

Sex Offenders

1. Sex Offender Record History
2. Sex Offender Registration Contacts
3. Sexually Dangerous Persons
4. Sexually Violent Persons Review (INQSVP, CHGSVP)
 - a. Tracking SVP Evaluations

Transfers

1. Institutional/Work Release

Writs & Furloughs (SELWBF)

1. Procedures
 - a. Court Writ Procedures – 1 Year or More
 - b. Medical/Critical Illness

Volume III – Warrants / PRB Issues

Interstate Agreement on Detainers

Juvenile Issues

1. Adult Offenders with Active Juvenile Cases (OTS: SELWRNT; JTS: SELRFD)
2. Juvenile Records History

PRB Issues

1. Cook County Removal of Parole Warrants
2. Executive Clemency and Commutations
3. Immediate Releases
4. MSR Docketing Overview
 - a. PRB Liaisons

Record Office Training Manual

Table of Contents

- b. Procedures
- c. Troubleshooting
- 5. Orders/Conditions
 - a. Timely Calculation
 - b. OTS Entry (ADDPB)
 - c. GCC Revocation/MSR Violators
- 6. Morrissey v Brewer Case 408 U.S. 471 (1972)
 - a. Preliminary Hearing Entry
 - b. King Decision
- 7. Parole Hearing Codes
- 8. Sex Offenders Violated at the Door
- 9. Violator Docketing
 - c. PRB Liaisons
 - d. Procedures

Violators

- 1. Non-Warrant New Sentence Violators
- 2. Removal of Parole Warrants After Hearing (Not in IDOC Custody)

Warrants

- 1. Chicago PD
- 2. Cook County/Contacts/Procedures
- 3. Cook County Consent Decree
- 4. Disposition Letter From Transfer Coordinator Office
- 5. Felony or Immigration
- 6. Immigration & Customs Enforcement (ICE) Procedures
- 7. Immediate Releases
- 8. LEADS Checks
- 9. OTS Entry (SELWRNT)
- 10. Quashed
- 11. Service of Warrants
- 12. Withdrawals

Volume IV – OTS Entries

Discipline

- 1. Grade Demotions (CHGGRAD)
 - a. Grade Changes OTS Entry
- 2. Privilege Denials (SELASGN, ADDASGN, CHGASGN)

Record Office Training Manual

Table of Contents

3. Disciplinary Tracking System Reports
4. Disciplinary Adjustments

Movements

1. Bond
2. Court Writ
3. Court Writ Transfer
4. Detainer Agreement
5. Discharge(ADDMVT1, ADMVT2)
 - a. Discharge Types & Procedures
6. Mandatory Supervised Release
7. Medical Furlough
8. OTS Reports Used for Record Office
9. Discharge Addresses
10. Transfer
11. Video Court at Another Facility

Time Adjustments

1. Active Codes (SELTADJ)

Volume V – Legal Issues

Extended MSR Terms for Criminal Sex Assault/Abuse

Frivolous Lawsuits

Mandates

1. Appeal Bonds
2. Interpretation
 - a. Flowchart
 - b. Key Terminology
 - c. Where to find Keys
3. Procedures/Checklist
 - a. Contacts

Master Files of Violators

Pen Pack Requests

Release of Information

1. Copy Fees/Billing
2. Criteria for Releasing Records

Subpoenas

Record Office Training Manual

Table of Contents

Volume VI – Miscellaneous

- Abbreviations Used by the Courts**
- Acronyms & Abbreviations—Cook County**
- Acronyms & Abbreviations—IDOC**
- Contact Information**
- County/State Websites**
- Court Orders**
- Discharged Master File Storage**
- Jail Credit Conversion Chart**
- OTS Fastpaths**
- Record Retention Guidelines**
- Sentence Imprisonment for Felony**
- Victim Services Unit**

Volume VII – Glossary

**75% Time to Serve of Sentence Imposed If Offense is committed on or after 8/13/07
730 ILCS 5/3-6-3(v), Public Act 095-0134**

<u>Years</u>	<u>Breakdown</u>	<u>Years</u>	<u>Breakdown</u>
1	9 mo.	26	19 yrs, 6mo.
2	1 yr, 6 mo.	27	20 yrs, 3 mo.
3	2 yrs, 3 mo.	28	21 yrs.
4	3 yrs.	29	21 yrs, 9 mo.
5	3 yrs, 9 mo.	30	22 yrs, 6 mo.
6	4 yrs, 6 mo.	31	23 yrs, 3 mo.
7	5 yrs, 3 mo.	32	24 yrs.
8	6 yrs.	33	24 yrs, 9 mo.
9	6 yrs, 9mo.	34	25 yrs, 6 mo.
10	7 yrs, 6 mo.	35	26 yrs, 3 mo.
11	8 yrs, 3 mo.	36	27 yrs.
12	9 yrs.	37	27 yrs, 9 mo.
13	9 yrs, 9 mo.	38	28 yrs, 6 mo.
14	10 yrs, 6 mo.	39	29 yrs. 3 mo.
15	11 yrs, 3 mo.	40	30 yrs
16	12 yrs.	41	30 yrs. 9 mo.
17	12 yrs, 9 mo.	42	31 yrs, 6 mo.
18	13 yrs, 6 mo.	43	32 yrs, 3 mo.
19	14 yrs, 3 mo.	44	33 yrs.
20	15 yrs.	45	33 yrs, 9 mo.
21	15 yrs, 9 mo.	46	34 yrs, 6 mo.
22	16 yrs. 6 mo.	47	35 yrs. 3 mo.
23	17 yrs. 3 mo.	48	36 yrs.
24	18 yrs.	49	36 yrs, 9 mo.
25	18 yrs, 9 mo.	50	37 yrs. 6 mo.

1. Gunrunning
2. Narcotics Racketeering
3. Controlled Substance Trafficking
4. Methamphetamine Trafficking
5. Drug Induced Homicide
6. Aggravated Methamphetamine-related Child Endangerment
7. Money Laundering (Pursuant to clause (C) (4) or (5) of Section 29B-1 of the Criminal Code of 1961

Not eligible for MGT/SMGT or GCC for Education, Vocational, Industrial or Substance Abuse Program. Parole violators will be calculated at 75%.

Note: See Class X Felony Convictions on back.

**75% Time to Serve of Sentence Imposed If Offense is committed on or after 8/13/07
730 ILCS 5/3-6-3(v), Public Act 095-0134**

<u>Years</u>	<u>Breakdown</u>	<u>Years</u>	<u>Breakdown</u>
51	38 yrs, 3 mo.	76	57 yrs.
52	39 yrs.	77	57 yrs, 9 mo.
53	39 yrs, 9 mo.	78	58 yrs, 6 mo.
54	40 yrs, 6 mo.	79	59 yrs, 3 mo.
55	41 yrs, 3 mo.	80	60 yrs.
56	42 yrs.	81	60 yrs, 9 mo.
57	42 yrs, 9 mo.	82	61 yrs, 6 mo.
58	43 yrs, 6 mo.	83	62 yrs, 3 mo.
59	44 yrs. 3 mo.	84	63 yrs.
60	45 yrs.	85	63 yrs, 9 mo.
61	45 yrs. 9 mo.	86	64 yrs, 6 mo.
62	46 yrs, 6 mo.	87	65 yrs, 3 mo.
63	47 yrs, 3 mo.	88	66 yrs.
64	48 yrs.	89	66 yrs. 9 mo.
65	48 yrs, 9 mo.	90	67 yrs, 6 mo.
66	49 yrs, 6 mo.	91	68 yrs, 3 mo.
67	50 yrs, 3 mo.	92	69 yrs.
68	51 yrs.	93	69 yrs, 9 mo.
69	51 yrs, 9 mo.	94	70 yrs, 6 mo.
70	52 yrs, 6 mo.	95	71 yrs. 3 mo.
71	53 yrs, 3 mo.	96	72 yrs.
72	54 yrs.	97	72 yrs, 9 mo.
73	54 yrs, 9 mo.	98	73 yrs, 6 mo.
74	55 yrs, 6 mo.	99	74 yrs, 3 mo
75	56 yrs. 3 mo.	100	75 yrs.

Class X felony convictions for the following are 75% Time to Serve if committed on or after 8/13/2007 and the substance containing the controlled substance or methamphetamine is 100 grams or more. Public Act 095-0134 – 730 ILCS 5/3-6-3(v)

1. Delivery of a Controlled Substance
2. Possession of a Controlled Substance with Intent to Manufacture or Deliver
3. Calculated Criminal Drug Conspiracy
4. Criminal Drug Conspiracy
5. Street Gang Criminal Drug Conspiracy
6. Participation in Methamphetamine Manufacturing
7. Aggravated Participation in Methamphetamine Manufacturing
8. Possession With Intent to Deliver Methamphetamine
9. Aggravated Delivery of Methamphetamine
10. Aggravated Possession With Intent to Deliver Methamphetamine
11. Methamphetamine Conspiracy

RECORDS HISTORY – MSR TERMS

JULY 2012

Provided by the Office of Inmate Records

- January 1, 1973 – Public Act 77-2097 – 730ILCS5/3-3-8

Parole terms for felony conviction were established

- February 1, 1978 – 730ILCS5/5-5-3, 3-3-8

Mandatory Supervised Release terms were established for determinate sentences

- January 1, 2000 – Public Act 91-279 Extended MSR period – 730ILCS5/5-8-1(d)5

Offense Dates: On or after 1/1/00

Offenses: Criminal Sexual Assault or Aggravated Criminal Sexual Assault of a victim under 18 years of age for a **second or subsequent Criminal Sexual Assault or Aggravated Criminal Sexual Assault** conviction

MSR term: Five (5) years. At least the first two years of the MSR term shall be in an electronic home detention program (This section amended 12/13/05 and 1/20/12)

Offenses: Criminal Sexual Abuse or Aggravated Criminal Sexual Abuse of a victim under 18 years of age for a **second or subsequent Criminal Sexual Abuse or Aggravated Criminal Sexual Abuse** conviction

MSR term: Four (4) years. At least the first two years of the MSR term shall be in an electronic home detention program

- December 13, 2005 – Public Act 094-715 – 730ILCS5/5-8-1(d)4

Offense Dates: On or after 12/13/05

Offenses: **Predatory Criminal Sexual Assault of a Child, Aggravated Criminal Sexual Assault or Criminal Sexual Assault**

MSR term if Judgment was silent: A minimum of 3 years to a maximum of the natural life of the defendant

MSR term if the Judgment Indicated a determinate MSR term: Follow the MSR term as ordered by the Judge (This section amended 1/20/12)

- January 1, 2009 – Public Act 95-0983 – 730ILCS5/5-8-1(d)4

Offense Dates: After January 1, 2009

Offenses: **Aggravated Child Pornography, Manufacture of Child Pornography, or Dissemination of Child Pornography**

MSR term: A minimum of 3 years to a maximum of the natural life of the defendant

- January 1, 2010 – Public Act 96-0282 – 730ILCS5/5-8-1(d)6

Offense Dates: On or after January 1, 2010

Offenses: Felony Domestic Battery, Aggravated Domestic Battery, Stalking, Aggravated Stalking, and a Felony Violation of an Order of Protection

MSR term: Four (4) years

- Rinehart Decision – Supreme Court Ruling

Date of Sentence: On or after January 20, 2012

Offenses: Predatory Criminal Sexual Assault of a Child, Aggravated Criminal Sexual Assault or Criminal Sexual Assault

MSR term: A minimum of 3 years to a maximum of the natural life of the defendant

On any offenses other than those listed above, the MSR terms are:

Class X or M	3 years
Class 1 or 2	2 years
Class 3 or 4	1 year

If the order indicates convicted of a Class 1 or 2 but sentenced as a Class X, the MSR term is 3 years

RECORDS HISTORY
CHILD SEX OFFENDER, MURDERER & VIOLENCE AGAINST YOUTH
COMMUNITY NOTIFICATION LAW
AUGUST 2011

Provided by the Office of Inmate Records

August 15, 1986 – 730 ILCS 150

Habitual Child Sex Offender: Anyone convicted a second or subsequent time for criminal sexual assault, aggravated criminal sexual assault, felony criminal sexual abuse or aggravated criminal sexual abuse or any other attempts of these offenses shall be certified by the court as a habitual child sex offender.

* A violation of any former law of this state substantially equivalent to any offense listed above is also to be certified as a habitual child sex offender.

January 1, 1993 – 730 ILCS 150

Child Sex Offender: Any individual who is convicted of criminal sexual assault, aggravated criminal sexual assault, felony criminal sexual abuse, aggravated criminal sexual abuse or any attempts of these offenses and the victim is under the age of 18 shall be certified by the court as a child sex offender and will be registered upon release.

January 1, 1996 – 730 ILCS 150

Sex Offender Registration: A sex offender is anyone convicted of the following under 730 Illinois Compiled Statutes 150/2:

- indecent solicitation of a child,
- Sexual exploitation of a child,
- soliciting for a juvenile prostitute,
- keeping a place of juvenile prostitution,
- patronizing a juvenile prostitute,
- Juvenile pimping,
- Exploitation of a child,
- Child pornography,
- Criminal sexual assault,
- aggravated criminal sexual assault,
- Predatory criminal sexual assault of a child,
- Criminal sexual abuse, when a felony,
- aggravated criminal sexual abuse
- ritualized abuse of a child

A felony violation of any of the following Sections of the Criminal Code of 1961, when the victim is a person under 18 years of age, the defendant is not a parent of the victim and the offense was committed on or after

January 1, 1996:

- kidnapping,
- Aggravated kidnapping,
- Unlawful restraint, and
- aggravated unlawful restraint

An adjudication as a **sexually dangerous person** under 725 ILCS 205/1.01 et. seq. "Sexually Dangerous Persons Act."

Other qualifying criteria:

- A felony conviction for attempting any of the above listed offenses;
- A violation of any former law of Illinois substantially equivalent to any offense listed above;
- Persons under the age of 18 convicted of any of the above listed offenses in criminal courts (not adjudicated in juvenile court);
- The offender is found not guilty by reason of insanity;
- The offender is the subject of a finding not resulting in an acquittal at a hearing conducted pursuant to Section 104-25(a) of the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963; or
- A conviction or adjudication for a violation of federal law or the law of another state that is substantially equivalent to any offense listed above.

June 1, 1996 – 730 ILCS 152

Public Act 89-428: Changed the short title of the Child Sex Offender Community Notification Law to the Child Sex Offender and Murderer Community Notification Law and amends the Sex Offender Registration Act to include as a sex offense *first degree murder* committed against a person under 18 years of age, when defendant was at least 17 years old and crime was committed on or after June 1, 1996.

July 24, 1997 – 720 ILCS 5/11:

Misdemeanor violation or any attempt to commit violation of any of the following sections and of the Criminal Code of 1961 and offense was committed on or after June 1, 1997:

- 11-6 Indecent solicitation of a child
- 11-9.1 Sexual exploitation of a child
- 12.15 Criminal sexual abuse

July 24, 1997 – 720 ILCS 5/11-11:

A violation or attempted violation of Section 11-11 Sexual relations within families when the victim was a person under 18 years of age and the offense was committed on or after June 1, 1997.

* An attempt of sexual relations within families is a Class A misdemeanor.

January 1, 1998 – Public Act 90-0124: 720 ILCS 5/10 (1.9) (720 ILCS 5/10-5(b)(10)

Amends the Sex Offender Registration Act to include as sex offense child abduction committed on or after January 1, 1998 intentionally luring or attempting to lure a child less than 16 years of age into a vehicle or dwelling place without parental consent for an unlawful purpose.

July 30, 1998 – Public Act 90-655:

Adds the new offense of Child Sex Offender/School Zone (720 ILCS 5/11-9.3) Class 4

July 1, 1999 – Public Act 91-356: 720 ILCS 5/10-11 (1.10)

Amends the Act to include the following when the offense was committed on or after July 1, 1999:

- 10-4 Forcible Detention (if victim < 18)
- 11-6.5 Indecent Solicitation of an Adult
- 11-15 Soliciting for a Prostitute (if victim < 18)
- 11-16 Pandering (if victim < 18)
- 11-18 Patronizing a Prostitute (if victim < 18)
- 11-19 Pimping (if victim < 18)
- Sexually Violent Persons - or any substantially similar Federal, sister state, or foreign country law.
- Sexual Predators

Sexual Predator as used in this Act means any person who after 7-1-99 is convicted of a violation of any of the following offenses:

- ** 11-17.1 Keeping a place of juvenile prostitution
- ** 11-19.1 Juvenile Pimping
- ** 11-19.2 Exploitation of a Child
- ** 11.20.1 Child Pornography
- ** 12-13 Criminal sexual assault, if the victim is a person under 12 years of age
- ** 12-14 Aggravated Criminal Sexual Assault
- ** 12-14.1 Predatory Criminal Sexual Assault of Child
- ** 12-16 Aggravated Criminal Sexual Abuse
- ** 12-33 Ritualized Abuse of a Child
- ** Convicted of first degree murder when victim was under 18 years of age and defendant was at least 17 years of age at the time of the commission of the offense
- ** Certified as a sexually dangerous person
- ** Found to be a sexually violent person
- ** Convicted of a second or subsequent offense which requires registration under the Act. The conviction for the second or subsequent offense must have occurred after the effective date of this Act.

Amended the term of registration for persons at least 17 years of age at the time of the commission of the offense who is convicted of first degree murder committed on or after 6-1-96 against a person less than 18 years of age to register for Natural Life.

Sexually Violent Persons, Sexual Predators, or Sexually Dangerous Persons shall register for Natural Life if paroled, discharged, or released from any facility.

Added Juvenile Sex Offender - means any person who is adjudicated a juvenile delinquent as the result of the commission or an attempt to commit a violation of any sex offense that is applicable to adults or a violation of any substantially similar Federal, sister state, or foreign country law shall register for 10 years.

Amended the Act to make retroactive the misdemeanor violations of 11-6 Indecent Solicitation of a Child; 11-9.1 Sexual Exploitation of a Child; 12.15 Criminal Sexual Abuse; to be retroactive to 10 years from date of release.

The Director of State Police consistent with administrative rule shall extend for 10 years the registration period of any sex offender who fails to comply with the registration requirements. (Automatic 10 yr. extension)

New statute mandates any failure to comply with the Sex Offender Registration Act is an automatic revocation of Mandatory Supervised Release, Parole, or Conditional Release.

NOTE: Offenses of:

Keeping a Place of Juvenile Prostitution; Juvenile Pimping; Exploitation of a Child; Criminal Sexual Assault Victim < 12; Aggravated Criminal Sexual Assault; Predatory Criminal Sexual Assault of a Child; Aggravated Criminal Sexual Abuse; and Ritualized Abuse of a Child are now lifetime registration unless convicted prior to 7-1-99 then only a 10 year registration.

August 22, 2002 – Public Act 92-828 720 ILCS 5/11 (1.11) & 720 ILCS 150/0.01 (1.12) (11.9)

Adds to Sex Offender Registry, a third or subsequent conviction for public indecency or a conviction for custodial sexual misconduct or permitting sexual abuse of a child; offenses committed on or after the effective date of this Act.

August 20, 2004 – 730 ILCS 150/2 (C-5)

First Degree Murder if victim under 18 years old by a person age 17 years or older shall register for life. This applies to persons who committed the offense before June 1, 1996 if the person is incarcerated in an IDOC facility as of August 20, 2004.

January 1, 2006

A conviction of custodial sexual misconduct shall be registerable regardless of the date of the offense; criminal sexual assault against a victim of any age, shall require the offender to register as a sexual predator for life

June 27, 2006 - Public Act 94-0945

Creation of the Child Murderer and Violent Offender Against Youth Registration Act; individuals who are convicted of an offense under the definition of Violent Offender Against Youth may be eligible for removal from the Illinois Sex Offender Registry and transferred to the Child Murderer and Violent Offender Against Youth Registry.

Definition of a Violent Offender Against Youth

Any person who is convicted or adjudicated of one of the following offenses or an attempt to commit one of the following offenses:

A violation of the following sections of the Criminal Code of 1961, when the victim is a person less than 18 years of age, the defendant is not a parent of the victim, and the offense was committed on or after January 1, 1996:

10-1 kidnapping

10-2 aggravated kidnapping

10-3 unlawful restraint

10-3.1 aggravated unlawful restraint

An attempt to commit any of these offenses.

First degree murder under Section 9-1 of the Criminal Code of 1961, when the offense was committed on or after June 1, 1996, and the victim was a person less than 18 years of age, and the defendant was at least 17 years of age at the time of the commission of the offense. This also applies to a person who committed the offense before June 1, 1996, if that person was incarcerated in an Illinois Department of Corrections facility on August 20, 2004.

Child abduction under paragraph (10) of subsection (b) of Section 10-5 of the Criminal Code of 1961 committed by luring or attempting to lure a child under the age of 17 into a motor vehicle, building, house trailer, or dwelling place without the consent of the parent or lawful custodian of the child for other than a lawful purpose and the offense was committed on or after January 1, 1998.

A violation or attempted violation of forcible detention if the victim is less than 18 years of age and the offense was committed on or after July 1, 1999.

July 24, 2006 - PA 94-1053 (SB 3018)

Amends Sex Offender Registry to include those convicted of sexual misconduct with a person with a disability (11-9.5), when the offense was committed on or after the effective date of this Act.

June 1, 2008 PA 95-0579 (SB0697)

Amends Sex Offender Registry to include those convicted of aggravated child pornography; must register as a predator

June 1, 2008 PA 95-0625 (HB1979)

Amends Sex Offender Registry to include those convicted of a second or subsequent offense of luring a minor under Section 10-5.1 the Criminal Code of 1961 to register as a sexual predator

August 11, 2009 – PA 96-0301 (HB3676)

Amends Sex Offender Registry to include those convicted of grooming and traveling to meet a minor

July 26, 2010 PA 96-1294 (SB 3305)

Amends the Child Murderer and Violent Offender Against Youth Registration Act to include the following offenses committed on or after 01/01/96, against a victim under 18 years of age:

- Domestic battery (12-3.2);
- Aggravated domestic battery (12-3.3);
- Aggravated battery (5/12-4);
- Heinous battery (12-4.1);
- Aggravated battery of a child (12-4.3);
- Aggravated battery of an unborn child (12-4.4); and
- Ritualized abuse of a child (12-33).

The offender must have been convicted on or after July 26, 2010.

The length of registration for these offenses is 10 years.

This Act removes the exception for a defendant who is a parent of the victim in cases of kidnapping, aggravated kidnapping, unlawful restraint and aggravated unlawful restraint who was convicted on or after July 26, 2010.

January 1, 2011 - PA 96-1089 (HB 5043)

Individuals convicted on or after January 1, 2011 of the following offense will be classified as a sexual predator with lifetime registration:

- First degree murder;
- Sexual misconduct with a person with a disability;
- Kidnapping;
- Aggravated kidnapping;
- Unlawful restraint;
- Aggravated unlawful restraint; and
- Child abduction

January 1, 2011 - PA 96-1115 (HB 5762)

Amends the Child Murderer and Violent Offender Against Youth Registration Act to include the following offenses committed on or after 07/01/99:

- Involuntary manslaughter where baby shaking is the proximate cause of death
- Endangering the life or health of a child under Section 12-21.6 of the Criminal Code that results in the death of the child where baby shaking was the proximate cause of the death.

The offender must have been convicted on or after January 1, 2011. Proof of cause of death will be required. The length of registration for these offenses is 10 years.

Records History

June 2013

Provided by the Office of Inmate Records

June 29, 1972

Death Penalty Ruled Unconstitutional: Furman v. Georgia (408 U.S. 238)

Prior to January 1, 1973

No parole term prior to this date. Inmates were released six months prior to their maximum unless paroled earlier by the Parole Board.

January 1, 1973 – 730 ILCS 5/3-3-8

The law was changed and parole terms *were added*. This is also the effective date for the *beginning of Compensatory Good Time* (7 1/2 days per month).

June 1, 1977

The rate Statutory Good Time is awarded was changed. Please note that this rate was only in effect from June 1, 1977, to February 1, 1978, and there are very few inmates currently affected by this law change.

June 21, 1977 – 730 ILCS 5/5-5-3

Public Act 80-26: Reinstated the Death Penalty.

February 1, 1978 – 730 ILCS 5/5-5-3, 3-3-8

Determinate sentencing law, statutory and compensatory credits replaced with day for day Good Conduct Credits, Class X felony, and reduction in length of MSR terms were enacted.

November 21, 1979

Johnson v. Franzen (77 Ill. 2d 513): Illinois Supreme Court ruling which mandated that *indeterminate sentences* be recalculated *inverted to day for day* to determine if day for day was more advantageous.

September 8, 1980

Hampton v. Rowe (88 Ill. App. 3d 352): Third District Appellate Court ruled that compensatory good time be awarded for time spent in county jail.

March, 1981

Weaver v. Graham (450 U.S. 24): This is a Florida case in which the Supreme Court ruled that stricter laws giving inmates less time off for good behavior cannot be applied retroactively to inmates for whom at the time of the commission of the crime there was a more advantageous good time allowance. This decision *changed Administrative Directive 7.452-Conversion of Indeterminate Sentences* Entered on or after February 1, 1978. The ruling in the Weaver case *requires that sentences be calculated awarding good time according to laws in effect at the time of the commission of the offense*, resulting in most inmates sentenced to long indeterminate sentences committed prior to June 1, 1977 and sentenced after June 1, 1977 earning statutory and compensatory good time at the pre June 1, 1977 rate.

March 13, 1981

Jackson v. Fairman (94 Ill. App. 3d 131): 4th District Appellate Court ruling. The result was that *we began using the new sentence date* as opposed to the Prisoner Review Board hearing date to calculate time lost as a violator on new sentence mandatory supervised release and parole violators.

July 13, 1983

Lane v. Sklodowski (97 Ill. 2d 311): Illinois Supreme Court ruled that *only 90 days Meritorious Good Time could be awarded to any one incarceration*. Prior to this date unlimited awards were granted in 90 day increments.

January 1, 1988 – 730 ILCS 5/5-6-4

The law was changed regarding credit for time previously served on probation. Prior to the effective date (January 1, 1988), probation time was creditable unless denied by the sentencing court. After the effective date (Jan. 1, 1988), probation time was not creditable unless awarded by the sentencing court.

January 1, 1989 to January 1, 1990 –

720 ILCS 5/12-4.3

Records History

Aggravated battery of a child for the first offense was a Class 2 and any subsequent was a Class 1.

January 1, 1990 to January 1, 1996

First offense was a Class 1 and any subsequent was a Class X.

January 1, 1996

All offenses are Class X.

October 15, 1990 – 730 ILCS 5/5-8-1-1

Illinois' first Adult Impact Incarceration facility opened at Dixon Springs. Criteria was 30 years of age or under, a sentence of 5 years or less, must be a first time offender and the sentencing order must state recommendation for Impact Incarceration Program participation.

1993 - Criteria was changed to 35 years of age or under, a sentence of 8 years or less, and could be a second time offender.

However, sentencing order still had to indicate recommendation for Impact Incarceration Program.

August 1, 1994 - DuQuoin Impact Incarceration Program opened.

March 16, 1993 - Greene County Impact Incarceration Program opened.

April, 1997 - The first Juvenile Impact Incarceration Program opened.

July 13, 1990 – 730 ILCS 5/3-6-3

Awards of Meritorious Good Time were increased from 90 days to 180 days and classified as Meritorious Good Time of 90 days and Supplemental Meritorious Good Time of 90 days. However, if convicted of first degree murder, reckless homicide while under the influence of alcohol or any other drug, aggravated kidnapping, kidnapping, predatory criminal sexual assault of a child, aggravated criminal sexual assault, criminal sexual assault, deviate sexual assault, aggravated criminal sexual abuse, aggravated indecent liberties with a child, indecent liberties with a child, child pornography, heinous battery, aggravated battery of a spouse, aggravated battery of a spouse with a firearm, stalking, aggravated stalking, aggravated battery of a child, endangering the life or health of a child, cruelty to a child or narcotic racketeering individuals are only eligible to receive the first 90 days Meritorious Good Time.

September 10, 1990 – 730 ILCS 5/3-6-3

Educational Good Conduct Credits: During specific periods of time in which inmates are engaged full time in educational programs provided by the Department and satisfactorily completed academic or vocational training programs they could be awarded .25 days of Educational Good Conduct Credits. No inmate was eligible if convicted of first degree murder, second degree murder or Class X felony or if after an award of Earned Good Conduct Credits was convicted of a felony.

July 27, 1993 – 730-ILCS 5/5-8-7

If sentenced on or after this date and court orders credit for home detention (electronic monitoring), psychiatric, or substance abuse treatment, this time is calculated day for day. Prior to this date credit would be calculated as probation credit.

August 11, 1993 – 730 ILCS 5/3-6-3 Earned Good Conduct Credit: Increased the award to .50 for every day in an educational, vocational, industrial, or substance abuse program. Exemptions: first degree murder (notice drop of second degree murder), a Class X felony, criminal sexual assault, felony criminal sexual abuse, aggravated criminal sexual abuse, aggravated battery with a firearm, or any predecessor or successor offenses or any inchoate offenses.*

* Inchoate offenses are attempt, conspiracy or solicitation.

Also not eligible while assigned to a boot camp, mental health unit, or electronic detention or received credit and been convicted of a felony or has previously served more than one prior sentence or imprisonment for a felony in an adult correctional center.

December 22, 1994 Barger v. Peters (163 Ill. 2d 357): Illinois Supreme Court held that where inmates were convicted at a time when the Educational Good Conduct Credit statute permitted them to earn increased good-time credit, it is an "ex post facto" violation to deprive them of those credits when a subsequent law makes them ineligible for the credit because of the nature of the offenses they had previously committed. When Earned good conduct credit became law on August 11, 1993, the Department of Corrections discontinued awarding credit to inmates who had been previously receiving credit but were now ineligible. As a result of this case, inmates who committed their crimes during the period the old Educational Good Conduct Credit law was in effect (September 10, 1990 to August 11, 1993) continued to remain eligible for EGCC for educational programs at the rate of .25.

Records History

January, 1995 People v. Jameson (162 Ill. 2d 282): Illinois Supreme Court stated that inmates sentenced as Class X offenders due to their criminal history, but convicted of Class 1 or 2 offenses, should still be treated as Class 1 or 2 felons for earned good conduct credit, work release, electronic detention and mandatory supervised release purposes.

June 19, 1998– 730 ILCS 5/3-6-3 (originally enacted 8-20-95)

Truth in Sentencing: Offense occurred after **June 19, 1998**. If convicted of first degree murder, serves 100% of sentence; if convicted of attempt to commit first degree murder, solicitation of murder for hire, intentional homicide of an unborn child, predatory criminal sexual assault of a child, aggravated criminal sexual assault, criminal sexual assault, aggravated kidnapping, aggravated battery with a firearm, heinous battery, aggravated battery of a senior citizen, or aggravated battery of a child shall serve 85% of the sentence. Those who are convicted of home invasion, armed robbery, aggravated vehicular hijacking, aggravated discharge of a firearm if committed prior to 6-23-05, or armed violence with a Category I or II weapon will serve 85% of their sentence if the court enters a finding that great bodily harm occurred.

Effective 1-1-99, Reckless Homicide - 85% - only in cases when the offender was under the influence of alcohol or other drugs

Effective 7-15-1999, Aggravated Battery with a Machine Gun or Firearm - 85% - equipped with any device or attachment designed or used for silencing the report.

Effective 7-15-1999, Aggravated Discharge of a Machine Gun or Firearm equipped with any device or attachment designed or used for silencing the report - 85%

Effective 7-27-2001, Aggravated Arson - 85%

Effective 12-5-2002, Terrorism - 100%

Effective 7-18-2003, Aggravated DUI, Death of Another, Class 2 or higher - 85%

Effective 6-23-2005, Aggravated Discharge of Firearm. (Does not require finding of great bodily harm) - 85%

Effective 8-2-05, Armed Habitual Criminal - 85%

Effective 6-1-08, Child Luring - 720 ILCS 5/10-5.1 - 85% - 2nd or subsequent offense committed on or after effective date

Effective 7-23-10, Aggravated Domestic Battery - 85% - only applies to 720 ILCS 5/12-3.3; does not apply to Domestic Battery 720 ILCS 5/12-3.2

Effective 1-1-11, Aggravated Driving Under the Influence - 85% - if charged as 625 ILCS 5/11-501(a) and sentenced as 625 ILCS 5/11-501(d)(1)(C)

Effective 7-1-11 (PA096-1551), Aggravated Battery with a Firearm (720 ILCS 5/12-4.2 or 12-3.05(e)(1), (e)(2), (e)(3) or (e)(4)),

Heinous Battery (720 ILCS 5/12-4.1 or 12-3.05(a)(2), Aggravated Battery of a Senior Citizen (720 ILCS 5/12-4.6 or 12-3.05(a)(4)) or Aggravated Battery of a Child (720 ILCS 5/12-4.3 or 12-3.05(b)(1))

Effective 1-1-13 (PA097-0990), Attempt to Commit Terrorism

* NOTE: Individuals sentenced to these offenses are also ineligible to receive Meritorious Good Time, Supplemental Meritorious Good Time, Supplemental Sentence Credit, Earned Good Conduct Credit or Program Sentence Credit.

November 19, 1998

People v Latona (184 Ill. 2d 260): Illinois Supreme Court held that individuals sentenced on consecutive sentences should receive one day of "jail credit" for each day actually spent in custody as a result of the offense or offenses for which they are ultimately sentenced. Clarified that inmates are not to receive "aggregated" jail credit for consecutive sentences.

January 22, 1999

People v. Reedy (186 Ill. 2d 1): Truth in Sentencing law in effect since August 20, 1995 held unconstitutional. The Illinois Supreme Court found that the General Assembly violated the "single subject" clause of the Illinois Constitution when it passed original Truth in Sentencing bill. As a result, individuals who committed their crimes between August 20, 1995 and June 18, 1998 were entitled to "day for day" good conduct credits.

March 1, 2001

U.S. v. Johnson (120S.Ct.1114): The U.S. Supreme Court held that the term of a defendant's supervised release commenced upon the actual release from custody, not the date he should have been released.

July 7, 2005 PA 94-0128 (730 ILCS 5/3-6-8 new)

Provides that an additional 60 days of Good Conduct Credit shall be awarded to any adult prisoner who earns a high school diploma or passes the high school level Test of General Educational Development (GED) and receives a GED certificate while the prisoner is incarcerated.

Records History

August 8, 2005 PA94-0491 (730 ILCS 5/3-6-3)

Allows inmates who are assigned to mental health units to participate in educational, vocational industrial or substance abuse programs. Exemptions are: 1st degree murder, a class X felony, criminal sexual assault, felony criminal sexual abuse, aggravated criminal sexual abuse, aggravated battery with a firearm or any predecessor or successor offenses or any inchoate offenses.

Inchoate offenses are attempt, conspiracy or solicitation.

Also, not eligible while assigned to a boot camp, electronic detention or received credit and been convicted of a felony or has previously served more than one prior sentence or imprisonment for a felony in an adult correctional center.

January 1, 2007 – PA 94-0992 (SB02873) Added (e) to 725 ILCS 27/15

The filing of a petition under the sexually violent persons act shall toll the running of the term of parole or mandatory supervised release until:

1. dismissal of the petition
2. a finding by a judge or jury that the respondent is not a sexually violent person; or
3. the sexually violent person is discharged by petition (207/65), unless the person has successfully completed a period of conditional release (207/60)

August 13, 2007 - PA095-0134 Amended 730ILCS 5/3-6-3 (v)

A person serving a sentence for gunrunning, narcotics racketeering, controlled substance trafficking, methamphetamine trafficking, drug induced homicide, aggravated methamphetamine-related child endangerment, money laundering pursuant to clause © (4) or (5) of Section 29B-1 of the Criminal Code of 1961 or a Class X felony conviction when the substance containing the controlled substance or methamphetamine is 100 grams or more for: delivery of a controlled substance, possession of a controlled substance with intent to manufacture or deliver, calculated criminal drug conspiracy, criminal drug conspiracy, street gang criminal drug conspiracy, participation in methamphetamine manufacturing, aggravated participation in methamphetamine manufacturing, delivery of methamphetamine, possession with intent to deliver methamphetamine, aggravated delivery of methamphetamine, aggravated possession with intent to deliver methamphetamine, methamphetamine conspiracy shall receive no more than 7.5 days of good conduct credit for each month of his/her sentence of imprisonment.

Sentences on the above will be calculated at 75% time to serve if the offense (s) committed on or after 8-13-07. Note: Will not be eligible for MGT/SMGT or Earned Good Conduct Credit for Educational, vocational, industrial or substance abuse programs.

January 14, 2010 – Moratorium for all awards of Meritorious & Supplemental Good Time.

June 22, 2012 – PA097-0697 Amended 730ILCS5/3-6-3

Changed all wording from "good conduct" credit to "sentence" credit. Established rules by which sentence credit for good conduct may be awarded (Supplemental Sentence Credit). Eligible inmates for an award of sentence credit may be selected to receive the credit at the Director's or his or her designee's sole discretion. Consideration may be based on, but not limited to, any available risk assessment analysis on the inmate, any history of conviction for violent crimes as defined by the Rights of Crime Victims and Witnesses Act, facts and circumstances of the inmate's holding offense or offenses, and the potential for rehabilitation. Established rules for pre-trial sentence credit for passing the GED exam, education, substance abuse, industries

The rules and regulations also provide for sentence credit for behavior modification programs, life skills courses or re-entry planning (Program Sentence Credit); The rules and regulations shall also provide that sentence credit, subject to the same offense limits and multiplier provided in this paragraph, may be provided to an inmate who was held in pre-trial detention prior to his or her current commitment to the Department of Corrections and successfully completed a full-time, 60-day or longer substance abuse program, educational program, behavior modification program, life skills course, or re-entry planning provided by the county department of corrections or county jail. Calculation of this county program credit shall be done at sentencing as provided in Section 730ILCS/5-4.5-100 and shall be included in the sentencing order (Pre-Trial Program Sentence Credit).

The Department may also award 60 days of sentence credit to any committed person who passed the high school level Test of General Educational Development (GED) while he or she was held in pre-trial detention prior to the current commitment to the Department of Corrections (Pre-Trial GED).

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Release Checklist

Facility _____

Offender's Name: _____ ID#: _____

Complete Part I, as appropriate and complete Part II & III for all releases.

Part I: Felons

Yes	No	A. Prisoner Review Board (PRB) Order/Request or Wrts/Certification	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Is there a PRB Order?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Does the PRB Order contain the signatures of three Board members?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Is there a request from the PRB for victim notification? If yes, enter date PRB was contacted: _____	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Has the offender ever been released on writ? a. If as a result, an additional mittimus was received, has it been calculated accordingly? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No b. If a new mittimus was not received, was the county contacted to ascertain that no other charges or sentences exist? Explain on the reverse side. _____ County Contact Person Date	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	c. Disposition of Writ (if applicable): _____	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Are there any detainers or warrants in the master record file?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6. If there are detainers or warrants, has the filing agency been notified and have arrangements been made for transfer of custody? _____ Agency Contact Person Date	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7. Has a DNA specimen been submitted? Date: _____	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8. Is the offender eligible for an extended MSR term?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9. Has the offender been reviewed as a Sex Offender?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	10. Is the offender eligible for SVP referral? <input type="checkbox"/> Referred <input type="checkbox"/> Not Referred	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	11. Is there an order of protection noted in the file?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	12. If the answer to questions 9, 10, or 11 is "yes", have the proper authorities been notified?	
B. Sentence Structure (Felons)			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Have all mittimi in the master record file been calculated?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Does any mittimus or statement of facts or any other document identify any Case Number for which there is no mittimus in the master record file? If yes, how was it resolved? _____	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Have all mittimi been reviewed for consecutive sentences?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Were the consecutive sentences calculated as such?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Has the calculation been checked for accuracy? a. Custody Date: _____ b. Sentence Computation: GCC/SSC Revoked: _____ GCC/SSC Restored: _____ Escape Lost Time: _____ SSC: _____ Compensatory Time: _____ EGCC/PSC: _____	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	c. Is there any restoration, revocation or award of program or supplemental sentence credit pending? If yes, indicate how it was resolved. _____	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	d. Was the Automated Revocation/Restoration Tracking System (ARTS) checked? Projected Release Date: _____ IIP Release Date: _____	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Has the appropriate parole/MSR term been calculated and the discharge date recorded in pencil in the designated location on the face sheet?	
		Supervisor's Signature _____	Date _____

Part II: Offender 360 Updates

Yes	No	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Has the release date or discharge date or both been verified for accuracy in Offender 360? _____ Terminal Operator's Signature Date Entered

Part III: Disciplinary history ran on _____
Date _____ Signature _____