



**Senate Judiciary Committee
March 11, 2025**

**Senate Bill 288
Testimony of the BIDS Legislative Committee
Presented by Grace Tran
Opponent**

Chairperson Warren and Members of the Committee:

Because we do not believe this bill will decrease recidivism, and because it may even increase recidivism risk, the BIDS Legislative Committee respectfully opposes SB 288.

First, we believe that this legislation will not be effective at decreasing recidivism. While we were not able to identify research specific to school bans, there is ample research that similar location-based restrictions such as residency restrictions are ineffective.

A report from the Department of Justice's Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking (SMART) that evaluated residency restrictions based on distance from schools stated that "there is no empirical support for the effectiveness of residence restrictions."¹ One study cited in the report found that 82.2% of sex offenses occurred in a private setting,² while another found that 85% of recidivist sex offenses occurred in a residential location.³

Not only are these types of restrictions ineffective, they run the risk of actually increasing recidivism by isolating registrants from social support. The SMART report stated that "the research suggests that residence restrictions may actually increase offender risk by undermining offender stability and the ability of the offender to obtain housing, work and family support." The same concerns apply to this proposed legislation.

This legislation would prevent familial support systems, including parents and grandparents, from being on school property to pick up their children from school, attend parent teacher conferences, concerts, sports games, or otherwise being involved in their children or grandchildren's education. This legislation may even prevent students from being on school property. If an 18-year-old who had to register was still in high school, they would be prevented from attending their own school.

¹ <https://smart.ojp.gov/somapi/chapter-8-sex-offender-management-strategies>

² Duwe, Donnay & Tewksbury, 2008

³ Columbino, Mercado & Jeglic, 2009

Not only that, but this bill would hinder the ability of these community members to vote if their polling place is at a school. In Kansas, felons who have completed their sentences may vote. Importantly, offender registration requirements do not restrict voting rights.⁴ Registrants would also be prohibited from attending local churches that hold services on school property. This bill will affect registrants' constitutional rights.

Further, this bill would affect those who have been successfully registering and working to better themselves for years and even decades—people who have never committed another registerable offense. These community members would suddenly be prohibited from: participating in their children or grandchildren's education, attending church services held on school property, and even voting at their designated polling place.

We would also like to note for this Committee that many people required to register had their terms of registration changed from a term of years to a term of life because of the 2011 amendments to our offender registration statutes. This would be yet another significant change without warning, process, or any individualized assessment of risk.

The people affected by this bill have either served their time or were not sentenced to prison at all. They are members of our communities, and it is in all of our interests to support policies that promote rehabilitation. The types of restrictions proposed by SB 288, which isolate people from their support systems and push them to the margins of their communities, only increase the risk of recidivism; they do not deter future offenses.

For these reasons, we respectfully request this Committee not pass SB 288.

Sincerely,

Grace Tran
Assistant Appellate Defender, Appellate Defender Office
Member, BIDS Legislative Committee
gtran@sbids.org

⁴ *State v. Petersen-Beard*, 304 Kan. 192, 377 P.3d 1127 (2016)