

# **Michigan Department of Corrections**

*Expecting Excellence Every Day®*

## **FIELD OPERATION ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS**

### **BIANNUAL REPORT**

**March 2003**

**This report is prepared by the Michigan Department of Corrections / Office of Community Corrections pursuant to the provisions of the Michigan Community Corrections Act [Public Act No. 511 of 1988, Section 12(2)] and the FY 2003 Appropriations Act for Community Programs (Public Act No. 524 of 2002, Section 704).**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>PART 1:</b>	<b>MEASURING THE IMPACT OF PUBLIC ACT 511 . . . . .</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>PART 2:</b>	<b>JAIL UTILIZATION . . . . .</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>PART 3:</b>	<b>PROGRAM UTILIZATION . . . . .</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>PART 4:</b>	<b>FY 2003 AWARD OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS FUNDS . . . . .</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>PART 5:</b>	<b>DATA SYSTEMS STATUS . . . . .</b>	<b>33</b>

## **PART 1**

### **MEASURING THE IMPACT OF PUBLIC ACT 511**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Section 12 of Public Act 511 of 1988 (Community Corrections Act) requires the Office of Community Corrections to submit a biannual report detailing the effectiveness of the programs and plans funded under this act, including an explanation of how the rate of commitment of prisoners to the state prison system has been affected.

Section 8.4 of Public Act 511 states that the purpose of the Act is “to encourage the participation in community corrections programs of offenders who would likely be sentenced to imprisonment in a state correctional facility or jail, would not increase the risk to public safety, have not demonstrated a pattern of violent behavior, and do not have a criminal record that indicates a pattern of violent offenses.”

Analysis of the prison commitment rate data continues to support the selection of the priority target groups for community corrections programs. Research indicates that community sanctions and treatment programs provide alternatives to prison and jail sentences while increasing public safety by decreasing the recidivism rates.

The Community Corrections Advisory Boards (CCABs) are required to focus on prison commitment rates for their county/counties in the annual comprehensive corrections plan and application, establish goals and objectives relative to the commitment rates, and concentrate on reducing or maintaining low prison admissions for priority target populations. The target groups include straddle cell offenders, probation violators, and parole violators. These target groups were selected due to their potential impact on prison commitment rates. Straddle cell offenders can be sentenced to prison, jail, or probation, and the sentencing disposition may be influenced by the availability of sanctions and treatment programs in the community. Probation and parole violators account for approximately two-thirds of the prison intake, and the percentage has steadily increased since 1994. Including these offenders in P.A. 511 programs offer community sanctions and treatment programs as an alternative to a prison or jail sentence.

P.A. 511 funded community corrections programs are not the sole influence on prison commitment rates. The rates may be affected by other programs funded by 15% monies from probation fees, substance abuse programs funded by the Michigan Department of Community Health and federal monies, local and state vocational programs funded by intermediate school districts or Michigan Works, and other county-funded community corrections programs. Other factors that affect the prison commitment rates are the state and local economy, crime rates, and prosecutorial discretion.

CCABs are required to monitor prison commitment rates, adopt local policies to target priority groups of offenders, and track program utilization rates.

## **PRISON COMMITMENT RATES AND PRISON INTAKE**

The prison commitment rates and prison intake data, followed by detailed county tables, provide an overview of prison commitments, utilization of jail resources and programming options among counties, progress toward addressing State and local objectives, and factors which contribute to attainment of objectives.

The original data source is the MDOC Court Disposition database. From this database, an offender database is extracted which reflects only the single most serious disposition for each offender during each report period and does not include delayed/suspended sentences, dispositions where the offender was in prison at the time of the offense, or convictions on escape charges. Offenders are identified by social security number where available, otherwise by state identification number or name where necessary. After excluding offenders in prison, escapees, and offenders on delayed sentence, the most significant record/disposition for each offender is chosen.

Factors utilized to select the most significant record/disposition include:

1. Disposition type (prison, jail, probation, other).
2. Mandatory over non-mandatory sentence.
3. Longest length of maximum term imposed.

### **Prison Commitments**

The enclosed Tables provide data/information relative to prison commitment rates. The data is based on felony disposition data through March 2000 and prison intake data for 2001 (MDOC data for felony disposition rates is not available for 2001).

- C Table 1.1 presents the overall prison commitment rate from felony disposition data for all counties.
  - The rate for the State was 23% in 2000.
  - Twenty-nine counties had a rate of less than 20%, and twelve counties had a rate greater than 30%.
  - The counties vary by size and geographic location.
- C Table 1.2 presents the prison commitment rates for offenders with guidelines in the straddle cells.
  - The prison commitment rate for the State was 43% in 2000.
  - Thirty counties had commitment rates of less than 40%.
  - Fourteen counties had rates greater than 60%.
- C Table 1.3 presents the prison commitment rates for offenders with guidelines in the intermediate sanction cells.
  - The prison commitment rate for the State was 6.1% in 2000.
  - Thirty-one counties had rates of less than 3%.
  - Fifteen counties had prison commitment rates of 10% or greater.
- C Tables 1.4a and 1.4b present prison intake data for 1994-2001. Table 1.4a presents 1994-2001 data relative to new court commitments, probation violations, parole violators-new sentence, and parole violators-technical violations. Table 1.4b presents the 2001 prison intake by county by category (excluding parole violators-technical). The counties are listed from highest to lowest per the intake of probation violators.
- C Table 1.4a demonstrates that new court commitments decreased from 5,680 in 1994 to 4,879 in 2001 (from 53% of the total prison intake and returns in 1994 to 38% in 2001). During this same time period, the prison intake of probation violators increased from 1,932 in 1994 to 3,480 in 2001, and the intake of parole violators-technical increased from 1,964 in 1994 to 3,236 in 2001.

The data per Table 1.4b indicates probation violators accounted for 36% of the total prison intake in 2001.

- The county specific data indicates 36 counties had rates of less than 30%.
- Twenty-one counties- rates were greater than 40%.

The data substantiates the merits of probation violators being a priority population for community corrections policy and programs, and the need for further review/evaluation of the factors which are contributing to high rates of incarceration of violators, particularly in the counties with the highest rates.

C Table 1.5 presents the 2000 prison commitment rates for controlled substance felonies and OUIL felonies.

The rate for the State for controlled substances was 17.7% in 2000.

- The majority of the counties had a rate lower than the State rate.
- Twenty-one counties had a rate higher than the State rate.

The 2000 state prison commitment rate for OUIL felonies was 19.5%.

- Sixteen counties had a rate greater than 30%.

### **Progress Toward Addressing Objectives And Priorities**

Multiple changes have been and continue to be made among counties to improve capabilities to reduce or maintain prison commitments, increase emphases on utilizing jail beds for higher risk cases, and reduce recidivism. These changes include:

- Implementation of processes and instruments to quickly and more objectively identify low to high risk cases at the pretrial stage.
- Implementation of instruments and processes to objectively assess needs of the higher risk defendants/offenders.
- Utilization of the results of screening and assessments to help guide the selection of conditional release options for pretrial defendants and conditions of sentencing for sentenced offenders.
- This also includes the development and implementation of policies within local jurisdictions to emphasize proportionality in the use of sanctions and services, i.e., low levels of supervision and services for low risk defendants/offenders and limiting the use of more intensive programming for the higher risk cases.
- Implementation and expansion of cognitive behavioral-based programming with eligibility criteria restricted to the higher risk of recidivism cases.
- The number of counties with cognitive behavioral-based programs increased during 2002 and the number will be increased further as per the proposals and recommendations which are being presented to the State Community Corrections Board for consideration. It is noteworthy that the program expansion or increases are being achieved among counties primarily via redirection of funds among program categories, e.g., reducing use of community corrections funds for community service to finance cognitive behavioral-based programming.
- Increased focus is being placed on continuity of treatment to ensure offenders are able to continue participation in education, substance abuse, or other programming as they move among supervision options such as the jail, a residential program, and their own place of residence.

The changes which are being made among the counties are in sync with the objectives and priorities adopted by the State Community Corrections Board. They are also supported by research which has demonstrated that use of prison and jail can be reduced and recidivism reduction can be achieved through effective case differentiation based on risk, sanctions and services matching based on objective assessments for risk of recidivism and criminogenic need, proportional allocation of supervision and treatment according to levels of risk and need, and utilization of more intensive (preferably cognitive behavioral-based) programming for higher risk of recidivism offenders.

## Priority Target Groups for P.A. 511 Funding and Programs

The analysis of Calendar Year 2000 court disposition data and prison intake data supports the selection of the priority target groups from the straddle cell offenders and probation/parole violators. In addition, some counties with higher than average prison commitment rates need to examine their prison commitment rates for intermediate sanction offenders. Data for each county is presented on prison dispositions from 1998 - 2000 for both straddle cell and intermediate sanction offenders in the following tables.

The tables show that there is wide variation among counties on these rates. For straddle cell offenders the State average is listed at the top of the column for each year. In 2000, the State prison commitment rate was 43%. The larger counties with above average rates are of concern; annual fluctuations for small counties can distort averages with only a few individuals involved.

Even though intermediate sanction cell offenders are not a target population for community corrections programs, sentencing policies and practices need to be examined in more detail in counties where higher percentages of intermediate sanction offenders are sentenced to prison. Table 1.3 reflects that in 2000, the State average was 6.1%, and the data shows that 15 counties sentenced 10% or more intermediate sanction cell offenders to prison. The counties with high prison commitment rates for straddle cell or intermediate sanction cell offenders are required to address these issues in their annual community corrections comprehensive plan and application for funding.

Preliminary data is presented in Table 1.4b by county for prison intakes during 2001. The various groups of offenders that comprise prison intakes include both new court commitments and probationers sent to prison as a result of technical violations or new offenses. The last column indicates the total percentage involving probationers sent to prison: the State average is 36.3% with a county range from 0% to 80%. Again, the focus is on the larger counties with the higher percentages of probationer intakes. The statistics are an indicator that needs to be used to frame additional questions and analysis for a county.

Overall Felony Disposition Rates By County  
Highest Disposition Rate to Lowest Disposition Rate

		1993	1993	1994	1994	1995	1995	1996	1996	1997	1997	1998	1998	1,999	1,999	2,000	2000
County	Disposition	Total	Rate	Total	Rate												
Gogebic	Prison	3	0.18	2	0.22	2	0.15	2	0.20	0	0.00	4	0.15	3	0.20	3	0.60
Hillsdale	Prison	45	0.32	44	0.32	52	0.33	47	0.40	46	0.36	73	0.49	61	0.48	40	0.45
Lenawee	Prison	76	0.39	101	0.49	100	0.47	112	0.46	96	0.42	148	0.48	113	0.44	92	0.42
Emmet	Prison	21	0.26	10	0.12	24	0.25	17	0.17	18	0.19	33	0.26	21	0.20	38	0.39
Genesee	Prison	591	0.38	603	0.39	638	0.39	593	0.40	561	0.33	662	0.38	608	0.38	630	0.38
Muskegon	Prison	384	0.43	450	0.50	357	0.41	402	0.41	393	0.38	368	0.33	328	0.33	348	0.36
Jackson	Prison	206	0.27	231	0.33	198	0.32	168	0.29	272	0.38	305	0.42	286	0.40	277	0.35
Grand Traverse	Prison	47	0.24	53	0.36	57	0.30	58	0.33	62	0.33	80	0.40	72	0.36	77	0.34
Ogemaw	Prison	16	0.21	13	0.18	12	0.21	8	0.10	19	0.28	13	0.16	17	0.27	19	0.34
Manistee	Prison	14	0.22	19	0.28	25	0.38	31	0.41	27	0.32	26	0.34	29	0.30	21	0.33
Berrien	Prison	218	0.29	181	0.22	178	0.25	242	0.30	293	0.37	224	0.29	267	0.29	295	0.32
Benzie	Prison	4	0.17	5	0.38	3	0.10	11	0.50	10	0.30	8	0.33	14	0.44	7	0.32
Livingston	Prison	96	0.29	79	0.23	74	0.18	136	0.40	114	0.28	100	0.24	120	0.27	148	0.30
Monroe	Prison	135	0.29	132	0.30	150	0.30	186	0.34	165	0.30	158	0.27	151	0.29	163	0.30
Clinton	Prison	36	0.30	35	0.24	24	0.21	43	0.34	52	0.35	42	0.32	36	0.32	42	0.29
Mackinac	Prison	8	0.35	7	0.24	4	0.12	8	0.17	18	0.35	14	0.30	8	0.19	10	0.29
Allegan	Prison	47	0.27	36	0.25	36	0.25	46	0.26	66	0.31	89	0.29	80	0.29	76	0.28
Schoolcraft	Prison	3	0.20	2	0.18	5	0.20	2	0.09	2	0.07	0	0.00	2	0.07	5	0.28
Mecosta	Prison	23	0.23	23	0.18	35	0.24	32	0.21	23	0.19	28	0.22	27	0.23	32	0.28
Crawford	Prison	9	0.26	9	0.20	21	0.33	19	0.26	12	0.18	18	0.22	18	0.32	18	0.27

**Table 1.1**

Overall Felony Disposition Rates By County  
Highest Disposition Rate to Lowest Disposition Rate

County	Disposition	1993	1993	1994	1994	1995	1995	1996	1996	1997	1997	1998	1998	1,999	1,999	2,000	2000
		Total	Rate														
Leelanau	Prison	12	0.30	13	0.30	12	0.29	14	0.33	6	0.19	8	0.20	11	0.22	14	0.27
Shiawassee	Prison	36	0.29	51	0.32	35	0.24	57	0.29	63	0.39	56	0.31	57	0.38	58	0.27
Gratiot	Prison	25	0.30	22	0.22	43	0.33	31	0.27	26	0.27	27	0.29	22	0.27	25	0.26
Charlevoix	Prison	18	0.32	11	0.20	22	0.24	23	0.36	14	0.18	16	0.27	25	0.34	17	0.25
Oscoda	Prison	5	0.22	4	0.31	5	0.36	4	0.44	7	0.39	9	0.45	6	0.30	3	0.25
Barry	Prison	68	0.56	56	0.46	33	0.18	33	0.16	33	0.19	32	0.19	31	0.19	33	0.25
Wayne	Prison	2,632	0.27	2,310	0.24	2186	0.21	2,047	0.22	1,935	0.23	1,549	0.19	2,042	0.24	2,365	0.25
Antrim	Prison	17	0.28	25	0.37	27	0.42	23	0.41	28	0.30	23	0.31	25	0.38	11	0.25
Midland	Prison	54	0.21	56	0.23	61	0.23	70	0.25	73	0.22	82	0.24	60	0.24	81	0.25
Gladwin	Prison	9	0.11	18	0.21	20	0.22	9	0.10	13	0.17	22	0.21	13	0.15	21	0.25
St. Clair	Prison	111	0.21	135	0.22	139	0.22	144	0.22	178	0.23	189	0.25	149	0.20	199	0.25
Huron	Prison	6	0.21	12	0.17	17	0.21	10	0.15	12	0.22	13	0.23	9	0.15	12	0.24
Bay	Prison	121	0.40	92	0.35	109	0.37	68	0.24	83	0.25	113	0.30	94	0.29	79	0.24
Mason	Prison	22	0.22	24	0.27	45	0.38	22	0.23	14	0.16	18	0.16	40	0.34	23	0.24
Iosco	Prison	26	0.31	32	0.40	20	0.22	23	0.28	31	0.32	45	0.38	30	0.41	17	0.24
Cheboygan	Prison	13	0.23	18	0.24	20	0.19	10	0.14	12	0.14	12	0.13	28	0.26	23	0.24
Arenac	Prison	6	0.13	7	0.18	6	0.12	7	0.16	5	0.16	4	0.12	5	0.15	9	0.24
<b>Michigan</b>	<b>Prison</b>	<b>9,398</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>8,794</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>8,558</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>8,813</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>9,120</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>8,945</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>9,002</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>9,179</b>	<b>0.23</b>
Newaygo	Prison	21	0.14	23	0.17	28	0.17	28	0.19	23	0.17	20	0.14	24	0.18	32	0.23
Kalkaska	Prison	17	0.23	14	0.25	19	0.26	8	0.13	24	0.30	31	0.30	18	0.28	16	0.22
Kent	Prison	787	0.29	709	0.27	657	0.25	685	0.23	753	0.24	769	0.26	662	0.24	567	0.22
Van Buren	Prison	52	0.19	55	0.21	57	0.19	65	0.20	49	0.15	42	0.11	78	0.22	65	0.22

**Table 1.1**

Overall Felony Disposition Rates By County  
Highest Disposition Rate to Lowest Disposition Rate

County	Disposition	1993	1993	1994	1994	1995	1995	1996	1996	1997	1997	1998	1998	1,999	1,999	2,000	2000
		Total	Rate	Total	Rate												
Ingham	Prison	298	0.26	290	0.25	259	0.24	268	0.25	296	0.26	264	0.26	180	0.20	185	0.22
Saginaw	Prison	308	0.29	334	0.32	300	0.25	275	0.25	327	0.26	387	0.29	322	0.27	223	0.21
Kalamazoo	Prison	295	0.23	267	0.21	258	0.20	373	0.25	285	0.21	275	0.20	264	0.20	285	0.21
Ontonagon	Prison	3	0.21	7	0.64	3	0.21	0	0.00	2	0.25	3	0.21	0	0.00	3	0.21
Tuscola	Prison	21	0.20	19	0.19	30	0.25	36	0.23	41	0.30	30	0.25	36	0.24	37	0.21
Calhoun	Prison	184	0.29	161	0.25	189	0.27	223	0.26	217	0.22	186	0.19	210	0.21	216	0.21
Otsego	Prison	16	0.21	22	0.29	21	0.26	16	0.27	11	0.16	16	0.20	29	0.29	23	0.21
Missaukee	Prison	11	0.32	3	0.06	8	0.24	11	0.22	14	0.26	12	0.20	10	0.21	12	0.21
Cass	Prison	27	0.18	47	0.27	37	0.25	38	0.22	28	0.19	57	0.25	51	0.21	42	0.20
Marquette	Prison	16	0.14	18	0.13	14	0.10	18	0.15	19	0.16	12	0.11	18	0.17	29	0.20
Branch	Prison	20	0.21	17	0.16	27	0.23	22	0.18	16	0.12	24	0.17	25	0.19	26	0.20
St. Joseph	Prison	48	0.28	28	0.18	45	0.23	50	0.25	35	0.18	50	0.25	48	0.18	43	0.20
Alger	Prison	0	0.00	3	0.21	2	0.10	1	0.04	3	0.11	4	0.15	1	0.05	4	0.20
Delta	Prison	21	0.36	12	0.15	13	0.13	18	0.20	9	0.11	23	0.26	23	0.25	17	0.19
Roscommon	Prison	18	0.16	11	0.11	19	0.16	24	0.19	24	0.18	29	0.22	21	0.21	21	0.19
Houghton	Prison	4	0.07	5	0.09	13	0.23	5	0.11	9	0.21	15	0.23	13	0.31	10	0.19
Luce	Prison	8	0.62	2	0.13	6	0.30	1	0.07	3	0.17	5	0.31	1	0.06	4	0.18
Montmorency	Prison	3	0.10	3	0.07	9	0.27	6	0.22	5	0.18	4	0.14	3	0.07	10	0.18
Iron	Prison	5	0.15	7	0.21	5	0.10	7	0.22	10	0.20	9	0.20	12	0.22	9	0.18
Oakland	Prison	1,010	0.19	828	0.16	742	0.15	806	0.16	907	0.17	983	0.17	908	0.17	912	0.18
Macomb	Prison	375	0.20	377	0.18	330	0.16	319	0.15	429	0.17	437	0.17	475	0.18	493	0.17

**Table 1.1**

Overall Felony Disposition Rates By County  
Highest Disposition Rate to Lowest Disposition Rate

County	Disposition	1993	1993	1994	1994	1995	1995	1996	1996	1997	1997	1998	1998	1,999	1,999	2,000	2000
		Total	Rate	Total	Rate												
Osceola	Prison	11	0.12	6	0.10	20	0.22	23	0.20	29	0.31	19	0.21	17	0.18	17	0.17
Washtenaw	Prison	278	0.35	236	0.30	227	0.26	270	0.31	253	0.26	171	0.18	183	0.22	159	0.17
Lapeer	Prison	46	0.24	38	0.19	38	0.17	42	0.21	43	0.22	45	0.24	55	0.24	34	0.17
Eaton	Prison	58	0.16	55	0.17	42	0.15	67	0.21	56	0.17	55	0.16	64	0.19	65	0.17
Alcona	Prison	5	0.22	3	0.14	2	0.07	7	0.30	7	0.20	10	0.26	3	0.08	6	0.16
Wexford	Prison	16	0.17	21	0.26	21	0.22	23	0.20	27	0.31	32	0.31	18	0.18	17	0.16
Presque Isle	Prison	4	0.11	4	0.10	11	0.22	6	0.13	7	0.16	4	0.10	9	0.21	9	0.16
Sanilac	Prison	21	0.16	20	0.13	20	0.18	21	0.15	25	0.19	24	0.17	24	0.16	21	0.15
Isabella	Prison	26	0.11	20	0.10	19	0.09	33	0.14	34	0.11	23	0.09	44	0.16	43	0.13
Ottawa	Prison	89	0.18	103	0.18	134	0.19	98	0.14	137	0.17	104	0.12	95	0.13	97	0.13
Ionia	Prison	25	0.15	17	0.11	30	0.17	36	0.21	34	0.18	34	0.17	34	0.21	22	0.12
Dickinson	Prison	4	0.05	8	0.12	11	0.14	7	0.09	15	0.17	18	0.18	11	0.12	12	0.12
Clare	Prison	10	0.14	12	0.15	13	0.13	8	0.09	22	0.22	15	0.21	11	0.11	9	0.11
Menominee	Prison	8	0.13	6	0.10	6	0.15	10	0.23	9	0.24	10	0.17	6	0.17	6	0.11
Alpena	Prison	9	0.11	10	0.12	13	0.15	14	0.19	17	0.26	9	0.12	13	0.27	7	0.10
Montcalm	Prison	24	0.13	19	0.10	32	0.15	42	0.18	35	0.20	43	0.20	36	0.17	22	0.10
Baraga	Prison	6	0.67	4	0.31	2	0.18	1	0.14	1	0.13	3	0.17	2	0.15	1	0.09
Chippewa	Prison	12	0.16	13	0.24	12	0.17	11	0.12	10	0.14	10	0.15	6	0.07	6	0.09
Oceana	Prison	10	0.13	5	0.07	4	0.06	14	0.15	22	0.25	12	0.14	22	0.24	8	0.08
Lake	Prison	4	0.10	11	0.24	15	0.32	18	0.24	15	0.23	6	0.12	9	0.19	3	0.05
Keweenaw	Prison	1	1.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.33	1	0.17	0	0.00	0		0	0.00

**Table 1.1**

Note: OCC/MDOC offender database uses the single most serious court disposition received during the reporting period.

**Prison Disposition Rates For all Felony Offenders with SGL Scores Equivalent to Straddle Cell Offenders for 1998 - 2000. County Listing.**

		<b>1998</b>			<b>1999</b>			<b>2000</b>		
<u>SGL MIN/MAX</u>		Total >18			Total >18			Total >18		
<u>SGL MIN/MIN</u>		Total <=12			Total <=12			Total <=12		
		Total	#	%	Total	#	%	Total	#	%
		Disp.	Pris.	Pris.	Disp.	Pris.	Pris.	Disp.	Pris.	Pris.
<b>TOTAL STATE</b>		<b>5,277</b>	<b>2,060</b>	<b>39.0</b>	<b>5,567</b>	<b>2,270</b>	<b>41.0</b>	<b>6,310</b>	<b>2,711</b>	<b>43.0</b>
01	ALCONA	2	1	50.0	8	0	0.0	9	2	22.2
02	ALGER	5	2	40.0	4	0	0.0	2	1	50.0
03	ALLEGAN	31	16	51.6	32	18	56.3	43	25	58.1
04	ALPENA	23	5	21.7	11	1	9.1	16	4	25.0
05	ANTRIM	7	2	28.6	15	7	46.7	6	4	66.7
06	ARENAC	3	1	33.3	2	1	50.0	4	2	50.0
07	BARAGA	1	0	0.0	2	1	50.0	3	0	0.0
08	BARRY	11	4	36.4	24	2	8.3	15	5	33.3
09	BAY	46	26	56.5	50	23	46.0	73	30	41.1
10	BENZIE	0	0	0.0	6	5	83.3	2	1	50.0
11	BERRIEN	104	75	72.1	111	71	64.0	101	67	66.3
12	BRANCH	18	8	44.4	12	7	58.3	27	11	40.7
13	CALHOUN	134	62	46.3	139	69	49.6	151	70	46.4
14	CASS	31	15	48.4	35	17	48.6	45	18	40.0
15	CHARLEVOIX	3	2	66.7	11	8	72.7	15	9	60.0
16	CHEBOYGAN	6	3	50.0	24	13	54.2	26	12	46.2
17	CHIPPEWA	2	0	0.0	8	2	25.0	12	1	8.3
18	CLARE	9	5	55.6	16	3	18.8	15	4	26.7
19	CLINTON	17	12	70.6	11	5	45.5	35	22	62.9
20	CRAWFORD	1	1	100.0	9	3	33.3	10	7	70.0
21	DELTA	13	6	46.2	12	6	50.0	22	10	45.5
22	DICKINSON	12	6	50.0	15	2	13.3	19	5	26.3
23	EATON	25	6	24.0	56	18	32.1	58	10	17.2
24	EMMET	8	5	62.5	14	8	57.1	19	13	68.4
25	GENESEE	192	96	50.0	150	85	56.7	225	122	54.2
26	GLADWIN	13	4	30.8	10	3	30.0	23	11	47.8
27	GOGEBIC	5	2	40.0	5	2	40.0	2	2	100.0
28	GRAND TRAVERSE	29	20	69.0	31	21	67.7	44	38	86.4
29	GRATIOT	9	6	66.7	14	11	78.6	17	11	64.7
30	HILLSDALE	19	18	94.7	17	16	94.1	11	10	90.9
31	HOUGHTON	6	3	50.0	10	5	50.0	5	3	60.0
32	HURON	10	3	30.0	10	1	10.0	11	4	36.4
33	INGHAM	171	71	41.5	187	57	30.5	180	58	32.2
34	IONIA	22	7	31.8	24	9	37.5	30	13	43.3
35	IOSCO	18	14	77.8	13	10	76.9	12	8	66.7
36	IRON	10	2	20.0	5	5	100.0	8	3	37.5
37	ISABELLA	15	1	6.7	27	11	40.7	41	14	34.1
38	JACKSON	106	68	64.2	151	104	68.9	187	118	63.1
39	KALAMAZOO	184	67	36.4	226	82	36.3	288	129	44.8
40	KALKASKA	9	7	77.8	14	6	42.9	13	5	38.5
41	KENT	511	237	46.4	496	199	40.1	492	200	40.7

**Table 1.2**

**Prison Disposition Rates For all Felony Offenders with SGL Scores Equivalent to Straddle Cell Offenders for 1998 - 2000. County Listing.**

		<b>1998</b>			<b>1999</b>			<b>2000</b>		
<b>SGL MIN/MAX</b>		Total >18			Total >18			Total >18		
<b>SGL MIN/MIN</b>		Total <=12			Total <=12			Total <=12		
		Total	#	%	Total	#	%	Total	#	%
		Disp.	Pris.	Pris.	Disp.	Pris.	Pris.	Disp.	Pris.	Pris.
	<b>TOTAL STATE</b>	5,277	2,060	39.0	5,567	2,270	41.0	6,310	2,711	43.0
42	KEWEENAW	1	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0
43	LAKE	1	1	100.0	6	4	66.7	13	1	7.7
44	LAPEER	19	8	42.1	27	19	70.4	31	14	45.2
45	LEELANAU	5	1	20.0	6	5	83.3	10	4	40.0
46	LENAWEE	47	36	76.6	39	31	79.5	27	20	74.1
47	LIVINGSTON	36	12	33.3	43	16	37.2	58	39	67.2
48	LUCE	3	2	66.7	1	0	0.0	6	3	50.0
49	MACKINAC	6	3	50.0	5	1	20.0	8	3	37.5
50	MACOMB	285	96	33.7	277	122	44.0	305	137	44.9
51	MANISTEE	8	5	62.5	13	6	46.2	7	4	57.1
52	MARQUETTE	11	1	9.1	13	2	15.4	30	8	26.7
53	MASON	13	1	7.7	19	8	42.1	14	6	42.9
54	MECOSTA	13	8	61.5	12	6	50.0	26	13	50.0
55	MENOMINEE	3	1	33.3	5	4	80.0	11	4	36.4
56	MIDLAND	36	14	38.9	48	21	43.8	67	32	47.8
57	MISSAUKEE	10	5	50.0	6	3	50.0	7	3	42.9
58	MONROE	67	33	49.3	69	38	55.1	93	51	54.8
59	MONTCALM	18	6	33.3	36	10	27.8	33	7	21.2
60	MONTMORENCY	1	1	100.0	9	0	0.0	9	3	33.3
61	MUSKEGON	154	99	64.3	158	99	62.7	204	130	63.7
62	NEWAYGO	17	7	41.2	23	7	30.4	28	11	39.3
63	OAKLAND	796	253	31.8	887	280	31.6	1014	340	33.5
64	OCEANA	13	4	30.8	19	11	57.9	14	1	7.1
65	OGEMAW	1	0	0.0	8	3	37.5	12	6	50.0
66	ONTONAGON	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	2	1	50.0
67	OSCEOLA	15	6	40.0	10	7	70.0	25	7	28.0
68	OSCODA	1	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	4	2	50.0
69	OTSEGO	7	3	42.9	7	5	71.4	20	12	60.0
70	OTTAWA	54	19	35.2	87	29	33.3	98	34	34.7
71	PRESQUE ISLE	6	2	33.3	7	1	14.3	7	2	28.6
72	ROSCOMMON	11	7	63.6	14	6	42.9	31	13	41.9
73	SAGINAW	123	76	61.8	149	69	46.3	177	58	32.8
74	ST. CLAIR	81	40	49.4	68	29	42.6	128	65	50.8
75	ST. JOSEPH	32	9	28.1	54	8	14.8	35	13	37.1
76	SANILAC	13	8	61.5	15	3	20.0	20	9	45.0
77	SCHOOLCRAFT	5	0	0.0	8	1	12.5	2	1	50.0
78	SHIAWASSEE	22	12	54.5	25	16	64.0	41	23	56.1
79	TUSCOLA	17	8	47.1	25	6	24.0	42	13	31.0
80	VAN BUREN	43	10	23.3	47	16	34.0	45	23	51.1
81	WASHTENAW	150	35	23.3	132	39	29.5	145	35	24.1
82	WAYNE	1280	330	25.8	1,167	418	35.8	1132	473	41.8
83	WEXFORD	12	9	75.0	6	4	66.7	12	5	41.7

Table 1.2

**Prison Disposition Rates For all Felony Offenders with SGL Scores Equivalent to Intermediate Sanction Offenders for 1998 - 2000. County Listing.**

Page 1 of 2

<i><b>SGL MIN/MAX</b></i>	<b>1998</b>			<b>1999</b>			<b>2000</b>		
	Total <=18			Total <=18			Total <=18		
	Total	#	%	Total	#	%	Total	#	%
	Disp.	Pris.	Pris.	Disp.	Pris.	Pris.	Disp.	Pris.	Pris.
<b>TOTAL STATE</b>	17,528	966	5.5	18,520	1,084	5.9	21,052	1,289	6.1
01 ALCONA	16	1	6.3	20	1	5.0	21	0	0.0
02 ALGER	13	0	0.0	15	1	6.7	14	0	0.0
03 ALLEGAN	135	5	3.7	130	2	1.5	146	1	0.7
04 ALPENA	37	1	2.7	21	0	0.0	46	0	0.0
05 ANTRIM	35	2	5.7	25	3	12.0	27	0	0.0
06 ARENAC	11	0	0.0	15	0	0.0	22	5	22.7
07 BARAGA	7	0	0.0	5	0	0.0	4	0	0.0
08 BARRY	75	0	0.0	87	2	2.3	66	3	4.5
09 BAY	167	17	10.2	149	14	9.4	177	13	7.3
10 BENZIE	16	7	43.8	21	5	23.8	18	4	22.2
11 BERRIEN	381	50	13.1	492	85	17.3	496	110	22.2
12 BRANCH	64	1	1.6	87	2	2.3	73	1	1.4
13 CALHOUN	499	18	3.6	499	36	7.2	616	47	7.6
14 CASS	80	0	0.0	118	4	3.4	119	0	0.0
15 CHARLEVOIX	34	2	5.9	35	6	17.1	33	1	3.0
16 CHEBOYGAN	36	0	0.0	45	2	4.4	46	0	0.0
17 CHIPPEWA	42	0	0.0	56	0	0.0	41	0	0.0
18 CLARE	37	1	2.7	51	2	3.9	46	1	2.2
19 CLINTON	70	6	8.6	55	9	16.4	84	5	6.0
20 CRAWFORD	51	3	5.9	25	7	28.0	40	7	17.5
21 DELTA	45	1	2.2	50	1	2.0	56	2	3.6
22 DICKINSON	55	1	1.8	44	2	4.5	57	0	0.0
23 EATON	121	2	1.7	127	2	1.6	177	6	3.4
24 EMMET	68	6	8.8	56	1	1.8	55	8	14.5
25 GENESEE	555	41	7.4	604	52	8.6	800	80	10.0
26 GLADWIN	45	0	0.0	41	0	0.0	33	2	6.1
27 GOGEBIC	18	0	0.0	9	0	0.0	1	0	0.0
28 GRAND TRAVERSE	92	13	14.1	123	22	17.9	141	15	10.6
29 GRATIOT	50	4	8.0	49	4	8.2	60	7	11.7
30 HILLSDALE	84	26	31.0	74	21	28.4	62	19	30.6
31 HOUGHTON	31	2	6.5	17	2	11.8	36	1	2.8
32 HURON	23	2	8.7	27	1	3.7	26	2	7.7
33 INGHAM	440	25	5.7	454	25	5.5	473	24	5.1
34 IONIA	80	5	6.3	84	3	3.6	110	2	1.8
35 IOSCO	78	17	21.8	41	7	17.1	48	2	4.2
36 IRON	22	2	9.1	35	1	2.9	28	1	3.6
37 ISABELLA	67	1	1.5	101	1	1.0	189	3	1.6
38 JACKSON	315	79	25.1	338	63	18.6	429	69	16.1
39 KALAMAZOO	562	16	2.8	594	23	3.9	789	33	4.2
40 KALKASKA	46	1	2.2	27	2	7.4	46	4	8.7
41 KENT	1298	67	5.2	1,329	62	4.7	1515	68	4.5

**Table 1.3**

**Prison Disposition Rates For all Felony Offenders with SGL Scores Equivalent to Intermediate Sanction Offenders for 1998 - 2000. County Listing.**

Page 2 of 2

		<b>1998</b>			<b>1999</b>			<b>2000</b>		
<b><u>SGL MIN/MAX</u></b>		Total <=18			Total <=18			Total <=18		
		Total	#	%	Total	#	%	Total	#	%
		Disp.	Pris.	Pris.	Disp.	Pris.	Pris.	Disp.	Pris.	Pris.
<b>TOTAL STATE</b>		<b>17,528</b>	<b>966</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>18,520</b>	<b>1,084</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>21,052</b>	<b>1,289</b>	<b>6.1</b>
42	KEYMEENAW	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	3	0	0.0
43	LAKE	13	1	7.7	28	1	3.6	38	0	0.0
44	LAPEER	66	6	9.1	106	3	2.8	122	5	4.1
45	LEELANAU	26	3	11.5	33	4	12.1	36	6	16.7
46	LENAWEE	182	59	32.4	151	39	25.8	160	51	31.9
47	LIVINGSTON	230	26	11.3	206	18	8.7	243	18	7.4
48	LUCE	3	0	0.0	8	0	0.0	12	0	0.0
49	MACKINAC	25	0	0.0	28	2	7.1	18	1	5.6
50	MACOMB	1014	34	3.4	1,157	43	3.7	1559	70	4.5
51	MANISTEE	46	11	23.9	51	11	21.6	43	7	16.3
52	MARQUETTE	66	0	0.0	63	1	1.6	82	2	2.4
53	MASON	48	4	8.3	52	7	13.5	51	2	3.9
54	MECOSTA	48	2	4.2	53	5	9.4	52	5	9.6
55	MENOMINEE	40	1	2.5	22	0	0.0	41	0	0.0
56	MIDLAND	121	11	9.1	108	3	2.8	176	10	5.7
57	MISSAUKEE	28	0	0.0	28	0	0.0	43	2	4.7
58	MONROE	232	22	9.5	199	17	8.5	229	8	3.5
59	MONTCALM	90	3	3.3	107	3	2.8	139	2	1.4
60	MONTMORENCY	18	1	5.6	17	0	0.0	28	1	3.6
61	MUSKEGON	490	77	15.7	492	65	13.2	511	85	16.6
62	NEWAYGO	65	3	4.6	59	2	3.4	84	5	6.0
63	OAKLAND	2558	57	2.2	2,559	74	2.9	2638	72	2.7
64	OCEANA	39	2	5.1	46	2	4.3	72	0	0.0
65	OGEMAW	35	3	8.6	26	3	11.5	25	3	12.0
66	ONTONAGON	9	0	0.0	9	0	0.0	10	0	0.0
67	OSCEOLA	54	5	9.3	55	2	3.6	66	5	7.6
68	OSCODA	9	3	33.3	12	3	25.0	6	0	0.0
69	OTSEGO	46	4	8.7	53	6	11.3	61	4	6.6
70	OTTAWA	458	12	2.6	465	8	1.7	472	7	1.5
71	PRESQUE ISLE	18	0	0.0	18	1	5.6	25	2	8.0
72	ROSCOMMON	36	0	0.0	44	0	0.0	59	1	1.7
73	SAGINAW	538	49	9.1	463	32	6.9	521	24	4.6
74	SANILAC	36	1	2.8	52	3	5.8	52	4	7.7
75	SCHOOLCRAFT	14	0	0.0	15	0	0.0	9	0	0.0
76	SHIAWASSEE	79	7	8.9	81	12	14.8	128	6	4.7
77	ST. CLAIR	293	27	9.2	348	26	7.5	357	20	5.6
78	ST. JOSEPH	93	2	2.2	110	3	2.7	123	2	1.6
79	TUSCOLA	38	3	7.9	59	1	1.7	103	5	4.9
80	VAN BUREN	182	4	2.2	183	10	5.5	189	11	5.8
81	WASHTENAW	357	6	1.7	316	11	3.5	437	14	3.2
82	WAYNE	3828	88	2.3	4,391	184	4.2	4693	282	6.0
83	WEXFORD	56	4	7.1	72	3	4.2	70	1	1.4

**Table 1.3**

# PRISON INTAKES AND RETURNS

Fiscal Year/Calendar Year [1]

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000 [2]	2001
<b>New Court Commitments</b>	5,680	5,160	5,090	5,151	4,948	4,414	4,352	4,879
<b>Probation Violators</b>	1,932	2,617	3,046	3,154	3,131	3,136	3,332	3,480
<b>Parole Violators - New Sentence</b>	1,233	890	1,033	1,288	1,345	1,254	1,164	1,195
<b>Parole Violators - Technical Viol.</b>	1,964	1,916	2,577	2,668	3,109	3,186	3,104	3,236
<b>Total B Intake and Returns [3]</b>	10,809	10,583	11,746	12,261	12,533	11,990	11,952	12,790
<b>Total B Intake Only [4]</b>	8,845	8,667	9,169	9,593	9,424	8,804	8,848	9,554
<b>Probation and Parole</b>	5,129	5,423	6,656	7,110	7,585	7,576	7,600	7,911
<b>Percentage: New Commitments</b>	53%	49%	43%	42%	39%	37%	36%	38%

[1] 1994-1999 based on fiscal year data. 2000-2001 based on calendar year data.

[2] Corrections Data Fact Sheet for December 2000.

[3] Prison intake and returns include new court commitments, probation violators (technical and new

[4] Prison intake includes new court commitments, probation violators (technical and new sentence), parole violators with new sentences, and escapees with new sentences.

## Prison Intakes and Returns




Table 1.4a

## Calendar Year 2001 Prison Intakes by Percentage of Probationer Intakes to Prison[1,2]

COUNTY	Escapee	New Court Commitments	Probationer	Parole Violator New Sentence	Total Intakes	% of Probationer Intakes
Montmorency		1	4		5	80.0%
Missaukee		4	6		10	60.0%
VanBuren		15	28	5	48	58.3%
Livingston		53	66	7	126	52.4%
Berrien	2	137	176	22	337	52.2%
Alcona		4	4		8	50.0%
Lake		5	7	2	14	50.0%
Wexford		16	16	1	33	48.5%
Lenawee		59	61	8	128	47.7%
Emmet	1	10	14	6	31	45.2%
Kalkaska		14	12	1	27	44.4%
Presque Isle		5	4		9	44.4%
Monroe	3	64	63	12	142	44.4%
Bay		39	39	10	88	44.3%
Genesee		239	227	55	521	43.6%
Barry		24	21	4	49	42.9%
Iosco		17	15	3	35	42.9%
Clinton		23	20	5	48	41.7%
St. Clair	2	70	65	20	157	41.4%
Oceana		13	9		22	40.9%
Allegan		38	30	6	74	40.5%
Wayne	24	1317	1073	312	2726	39.4%
Charlevoix		13	11	4	28	39.3%
Ingham	2	103	82	22	209	39.2%
Roscommon	1	9	7	1	18	38.9%
Saginaw		119	91	26	236	38.6%
Clare		7	5	1	13	38.5%
Muskegon	1	189	148	49	387	38.2%
Midland		25	19	7	51	37.3%
Shiawassee		32	24	9	65	36.9%
Kalamazoo		134	103	42	279	36.9%
Jackson	2	131	96	34	263	36.5%
Ogemaw		7	4		11	36.4%
<b>State Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>4877</b>	<b>3479</b>	<b>1183</b>	<b>9594</b>	<b>36.3%</b>
Calhoun		97	74	35	206	35.9%
Crawford		7	5	2	14	35.7%
Leelanau		10	6	1	17	35.3%
Dickinson		10	7	3	20	35.0%
Branch		17	10	2	29	34.5%
Alpena		7	4	1	12	33.3%
Antrim		15	8	1	24	33.3%
Cass		20	11	2	33	33.3%
Eaton	1	42	24	5	72	33.3%
Tuscola		23	14	6	43	32.6%
Isabella		15	12	10	37	32.4%
Manistee		10	5	1	16	31.3%
Washtenaw		74	41	19	134	30.6%
Macomb	5	241	129	59	434	29.7%

**Table 1.4b**

## Calendar Year 2001 Prison Intakes by Percentage of Probationer Intakes to Prison[1,2]

COUNTY	Escapee	New Court Commitments	Probationer	Parole Violator New Sentence	Total Intakes	% of Probationer Intakes
Gratiot		15	8	4	27	29.6%
Ionia		20	10	4	34	29.4%
Osceola		22	10	2	34	29.4%
Kent	2	368	188	122	680	27.6%
Hillsdale		43	19	10	72	26.4%
Gladwin	1	10	5	3	19	26.3%
Oakland	5	529	239	150	923	25.9%
Arenac		6	2		8	25.0%
Houghton		6	2		8	25.0%
Luce		2	1	1	4	25.0%
Mason		17	7	4	28	25.0%
Grand Traverse		34	15	12	61	24.6%
St. Joseph		36	13	4	53	24.5%
Lapeer		18	8	7	33	24.2%
Ottawa	1	55	20	10	86	23.3%
Montcalm		32	11	6	49	22.4%
Newaygo		20	7	6	33	21.2%
Iron		6	2	2	10	20.0%
Cheboygan	1	6	2	2	11	18.2%
Delta		10	2	1	13	15.4%
Benzie		5	1	1	7	14.3%
Marquette		11	2	1	14	14.3%
Otsego		12	2	1	15	13.3%
Sanilac		12	2	2	16	12.5%
Mecosta		16	1	4	21	4.8%
Alger		2		1	3	0.0%
Baraga		1			1	0.0%
Chippewa	1	13		1	15	0.0%
Gogebic		3			3	0.0%
Huron		1			1	0.0%
Mackinac		2			2	0.0%
Menominee		9		1	10	0.0%
Ontonagon		2			2	0.0%
Oscoda		6			6	0.0%
Schoolcraft		3			3	0.0%

[1] Prison intake and returns include new court commitments, probation violators (technical and new sentence parole violators with new sentences, and escapees with new sentences, and parole violators that are technical violations.

[2] Prison intake includes new court commitments, probation violators (technical and new sentence), parole violators with new sentences, and escapees with new sentences.

1-28-02 Probationintake2001C.xls

SOURCE: Preliminary 1/10/2002 CMIS dataset

K. Dimoff - H:\ADMITS\2001\REPORTS\20020124.DOC - January 24, 2002

**Table 1.4b**

<b>Table 1.5 Prison Disposition Rates for 2000 - Controlled Substance Felonies</b>		
County	Disposition	
	Prison Count	Prison %
Benzie	2	50.0%
Luce	1	50.0%
Manistee	3	50.0%
Lenawee	13	40.6%
Crawford	4	40.0%
Jackson	60	35.7%
Monroe	41	34.2%
Muskegon	63	34.1%
Genesee	121	33.5%
Charlevoix	2	33.3%
Berrien	44	29.3%
Huron	2	28.6%
Gratiot	3	27.3%
Kalamazoo	82	26.9%
Clare	1	25.0%
St. Clair	37	24.5%
Grand Traverse	6	23.1%
Newaygo	2	22.2%
Iosco	2	22.2%
Branch	5	20.8%
Lake	1	20.0%
<b>Michigan</b>	<b>1538</b>	<b>17.7%</b>
Clinton	3	17.6%
Van Buren	9	17.3%
Wayne	501	17.1%
Presque Isle	1	16.7%
Leelanau	1	16.7%
Mason	2	16.7%
Calhoun	35	16.1%
Ingham	24	16.0%
Kent	93	15.9%
Oakland	159	15.5%
Otsego	2	15.4%
Livingston	11	15.1%
Delta	2	14.3%
Hillsdale	1	14.3%
Lapeer	2	14.3%
Sanilac	2	13.3%
Kalkaska	2	13.3%
Montcalm	2	13.3%
Arenac	1	12.5%
Roscommon	1	12.5%
Isabella	5	11.9%
Saginaw	27	11.3%
Macomb	107	11.3%
Allegan	6	11.1%

<b>Prison Disposition Rates for 2000 - OUIL Felonies</b>		
County	Disposition	
	Prison Count	Prison %
Hillsdale	3	75.0%
Allegan	17	58.6%
Mackinac	1	50.0%
Schoolcraft	2	50.0%
Livingston	40	41.7%
Gladwin	7	41.2%
Muskegon	33	40.2%
Van Buren	12	34.3%
Grand Traverse	18	33.3%
Alger	1	33.3%
Emmet	3	33.3%
Berrien	12	32.4%
Genesee	37	31.9%
Monroe	16	31.4%
Branch	5	31.3%
Gratiot	8	30.8%
Missaukee	3	30.0%
Iron	2	28.6%
Manistee	4	28.6%
Jackson	33	28.2%
Bay	11	28.2%
Cass	10	27.8%
Ogemaw	3	27.3%
Clinton	7	26.9%
Charlevoix	4	26.7%
Kent	47	26.0%
Antrim	1	25.0%
Lenawee	3	25.0%
Wexford	2	25.0%
St. Clair	27	24.3%
Calhoun	13	24.1%
Midland	10	23.8%
Otsego	4	23.5%
Isabella	11	23.4%
Mecosta	3	23.1%
Lapeer	10	21.7%
Barry	5	20.8%
Cheboygan	6	20.0%
Luce	1	20.0%
Kalamazoo	21	19.8%
<b>Michigan</b>	<b>739</b>	<b>19.5%</b>
Sanilac	4	19.0%
Leelanau	3	18.8%
Washtenaw	15	18.3%
Crawford	2	18.2%
Montmorency	2	18.2%

<b>Table 1.5</b>		
<b>Prison Disposition Rates for 2000 - Controlled Substance Felonies</b>		
County	Disposition	
	Prison Count	Prison %
Bay	5	11.1%
Eaton	3	11.1%
Missaukee	1	11.1%
Mecosta	1	11.1%
Shiawassee	2	10.5%
Ionia	2	10.5%
Wexford	1	10.0%
Emmet	1	10.0%
Washtenaw	14	9.6%
Barry	2	9.5%
Midland	2	8.7%
Dickinson	1	7.1%
Oceana	1	6.7%
Tuscola	1	6.7%
Marquette	1	4.8%
St. Joseph	1	4.5%
Ottawa	3	3.3%
Alpena	1	3.2%
Cass	1	3.0%
Antrim	0	0.0%
Alcona	0	0.0%
Alger	0	0.0%
Cheboygan	0	0.0%
Iron	0	0.0%
Baraga	0	0.0%
Montmorency	0	0.0%
Schoolcraft	0	0.0%
Menominee	0	0.0%
Houghton	0	0.0%
Oscoda	0	0.0%
Osceola	0	0.0%
Gladwin	0	0.0%
Mackinac	0	0.0%
Ogemaw	0	0.0%
Ontonagon	0	0.0%
Keweenaw	0	0.0%
Chippewa	0	0.0%

<b>Prison Disposition Rates for 2000 - OUIL Felonies</b>		
County	Disposition	
	Prison Count	Prison %
Osceola	4	18.2%
Delta	5	17.9%
Montcalm	6	15.0%
Newaygo	4	14.8%
Wayne	59	14.3%
Shiawassee	5	14.3%
Alcona	1	14.3%
Macomb	30	13.9%
Oakland	80	12.8%
Kalkaska	1	12.5%
Presque Isle	1	12.5%
Dickinson	3	12.5%
Ingham	13	11.9%
Tuscola	5	11.1%
Ottawa	11	11.0%
Saginaw	9	10.8%
Roscommon	4	10.5%
Clare	2	9.1%
Ionia	5	9.1%
Houghton	1	8.3%
St. Joseph	2	8.3%
Mason	1	7.7%
Eaton	4	7.3%
Marquette	1	6.7%
Chippewa	0	0.0%
Benzie	0	0.0%
Baraga	0	0.0%
Iosco	0	0.0%
Lake	0	0.0%
Alpena	0	0.0%
Huron	0	0.0%
Arenac	0	0.0%
Menominee	0	0.0%
Oceana	0	0.0%
Ontonagon	0	0.0%
Oscoda	0	0.0%
Keweenaw	0	0.0%

## PART 2

### JAIL UTILIZATION

Jails are a key sanction for felony and misdemeanor offenders in each county. Approximately 80% of felony offenders are sentenced to a community sanction - 56% of these offenders are sentenced to a jail term. During the 1990s and through 2000, sentenced felons accounted for an increasing percentage of jails=average daily population. The percentage of felony offenders sentenced to jail increased as prison commitment rates decreased; data presented in Part 1 showed that the use of split sentences has also increased. Progressively, the sentence to jail is a condition of probation and part of a structured sentence plan which includes a relatively short term in jail followed by placement in residential or other community-based programs.

Section 8.4 of P.A. 511 explains that the purpose of the Act includes the participation of offenders who would likely be sentenced to imprisonment in a state correctional facility or jail. Section 2 (c) defines a community corrections program as a program that is an alternative to incarceration in a state correctional facility or jail. Over the years, as prison commitment rates decreased, and as a result of legislative changes, the role of jails in the community corrections system has changed. This section examines the use of jails in Michigan as part of the continuum of sanctions available in sentencing decisions.

The State Community Corrections Board has adopted priorities for jail use for community corrections. Each CCAB is required to examine the jail management practices and policies as part of the annual community corrections comprehensive plan and application for funds. Local policies/practices directly affect the availability of jail beds which can be utilized for sentenced felons. Local jurisdictions have implemented a wide range of policies/practices to influence the number and length of stay of different offender populations. The local policies and practices include conditional release options for pretrial detainees, restrictions on population groups which can be housed in the jail in order to reserve jail beds for offenders who are a higher risk to public safety, earned release credits (i.e., reduction in jail time for participation in-jail programming), and structured sentencing.

During 2000, 44% of the straddle cell offenders were sentenced to jail. Due to the high number of straddle cell offenders sentenced to prison, the State Community Corrections Board targeted this population as a priority population for community corrections.

A jail sentence is also a key sanction used for probation violators. Local probation response guides often include jail time along with additional local sanctions imposed including programs funded by community corrections.

Jail crowding issues can impact the use of jails and availability of beds for alternative sanctions for different felony offender target groups, such as straddle cell offenders, probation violators, and even intermediate sanction offenders. The use of jail beds for serious felony offenders is an issue when jail crowding occurs.

Community corrections programs have been established to impact on the amount of jail time that offenders serve. Program policies have been established so that program participation and successful completion of programs lead to decreased jail lengths of stay.

## JAIL STATISTICS OVERVIEW

During CY 2001 and the first nine months of CY 2002, 69 of Michigan's 81 counties with jails electronically transmitted jail utilization and inmate profile data to the State. Collectively the county data inputs comprise the Jail Population Information System (JPIS).

During the full calendar year of 2001, the reporting counties accounted for an average of 15,854 of the jail beds in the State; about 90% of the total jail beds in Michigan. Since not every county is included in the report and some of the reporting counties did not contribute data every month, the summary data from the report does not completely represent State figures or State totals; however, it does provide a reasonable and useful representation of a mix of counties including rural, urban, and metropolitan counties.



One of the stated purposes of JPIS is to provide information to support coherent policy making. Using this data, the State and CCABs can track jail utilization, study utilization trends, examine characteristics of offenders being sent to jail, and evaluate specific factors affecting jail utilization. Results of such analyses permit formulation of objectives to improve utilization (i.e., reducing jail crowding, changing offender population profiles, and reducing the average length of stay), and to monitor the utilization of the jails after various policies, practices, procedures or programming are implemented.

This part of the biannual report summarizes the data for CY 2001 and the first nine months in CY 2002 based upon primary categories of the JPIS data. The report indicated the average daily populations by type of offenders utilizing the jails, average lengths of stay, and the number of releases upon which lengths of stay are based. This report focuses on felons and misdemeanants that originated in the reporting counties, as opposed to the part of the jail populations made up of offenders boarded for the State, the Federal government and other counties, or offenders held on writs, etc.

The JPIS data for CY 2001 and the first nine months of CY 2002 show the following:

- C Of the offenders released during this period:
  - 138,370 were charged as felons.
  - 289,872 were charged as misdemeanants.
  
- C Of the 138,370 offenders charged as felons:
  - 71% (98,673) were released with unsentenced time in jail.
  - 16% (21,821) were released after sentenced time in jail.
  - 13% (17,876) spent part of their time unsentenced and the remainder sentenced.
  
- C Of the 289,872 offenders charged as misdemeanants:
  - 71% (206,989) were released after unsentenced time in jail.
  - 20% (58,334) were released after sentenced time in jail.
  - 9% (24,549) spent part of their time unsentenced and the remainder sentenced.

These figures are illustrated in percentages in the charts on page 22.




The lengths of stay for these groups involve large differences. Regarding these same offenders graphed above, the data for CY 2001 and the first nine months of CY 2002 show the following:

- C The average lengths of stay for offenders charged as a felon was 36.3 days and offenders charged as a misdemeanant was 9.4 days.
- C Further, for offenders charged as felons:
  - offenders released after unsentenced time in jail had an average length of stay of 20.0 days,
  - offenders released after sentenced time in jail had an average length of stay of 55.4 days, and
  - felons with both unsentenced and sentenced time before release had an average length of stay of 102.9 days.
- C For offenders charged as misdemeanants:
  - offenders released after unsentenced time in jail had an average length of stay of 3.9 days,
  - misdemeanants released after sentenced time in jail had an average length of stay of 16.4 days, and
  - misdemeanants with both unsentenced and sentenced time had an average length of stay of 39.7 days.

These differences in average length of stay statistics are illustrated in the chart below.

### 2001 thru 3rd Qtr 2002 -- Felon & Misdemeanant Average Lengths of Stay by Legal Status



## PART 3

### PROGRAM UTILIZATION

#### FISCAL YEAR 2002

Community corrections programs are expected to contribute to local goals and objectives concerning prison commitments and/or jail utilization of their respective counties. Appropriate program policies and local practices must be in place for the programs to operate as diversions from prison or jail, or as treatment programs that can reduce the recidivism of offenders that successfully complete the program.

To impact prison commitment and jail utilization rates, specific target populations have been identified due to the high number of these offenders being sentenced to prison or jail. It is not possible to individually identify offenders that would have been sentenced to prison or jail if alternative sanctions or treatment programs were not available. But as a group, evidence can be presented to support their designation as a target population.

National research studies have been completed that show that cognitive restructuring and substance abuse programs reduce recidivism. Community corrections funds have been used to fund these types of programs based upon these national studies.

Further, supporting information is available concerning the impact of community corrections sanctions and programs on jail utilization. It is possible to identify local sentencing policies that specify that jail time will be decreased based upon an offender's participation or completion of community corrections programs.

This section presents information relative to offenders screened and determined eligible for participation in P.A. 511 programs and enrollments in community corrections programs during FY 2002. In the following Tables, the number of eligible P.A. 511 offenders represents an unduplicated count of offenders; the number of enrollments is greater than the number determined eligible because an offender can be enrolled in multiple programs.

October 2001 through September 2002 eligible offender data and program enrollment data, submitted by local jurisdictions, indicate the following:

#### **Eligible Offenders**

- \$ Since FY 1997, there has been an increase in the number of felony offenders determined eligible for community corrections programs. In FY 1997, 61% of the eligible offenders were felons and 39% were misdemeanants, while during FY 2002, 63% of the eligible offenders were felons.
- \$ Over 30,300 offenders were determined to be eligible to participate in P.A. 511 programs during FY 2002. For additional information, please refer to the Tables on pages 26-27.

While complete data is not available for analysis for the entire 2002 fiscal year, an analysis of the first six months of FY 2002 yielded the following:

- § Nearly 800 straddle cell offenders were determined eligible for P.A. 511 services in the first half of FY 2002. The actual number of straddle cell offenders was probably higher, but reporting of sentencing guideline data on sentenced felons is incomplete. More than 62% of the offenders have the SGL data recorded as either not applicable or unknown.
- § For the first half of FY 2002, sentenced felons convicted of higher severity felonies were reported for 60% of the eligible offenders. The severity of the felony is a key determinant in the probability of a prison or a jail sentence. The higher the severity of the felony, the higher the probability of a prison or jail sentence. The legislative sentencing guidelines divide crimes into nine levels, from AA@the most serious crimes to AH@the least serious crimes. When the severity group E was included, 60% of the sentenced felons had a felony severity of A through E. Only 5% of the felons were reported with a PACC code that fell into the least severe felony group of H.
- § For sentenced felons, 31% of the offenders were reported with crimes against property, and 28% were reported with crimes involving controlled substances. Crimes against public safety accounted for 21% of the offenders, and crimes against persons accounted for 13% of the offenders.

### **Enrolled Offenders**

- § For October 2001 through September 2002, there were over 54,800 program enrollments, compared to almost 49,500 reported in FY 2001. Nearly 37,400 of the offenders were in programs funded in whole or in part by state community corrections funds.
- § In FY 2002, felony program enrollments in P.A. 511 funded programs accounted for the majority of enrollments in treatment programs: approximately 76% of all substance abuse enrollments, about 84% of all mental health enrollments, approximately 76% of the educational enrollments, and about 71% of the employment enrollments. Misdemeanant offenders were more likely enrolled in community service programs. This is as expected considering community service programs are utilized extensively to reduce the misdemeanor population in the jails in order to increase the availability of jail beds for felons. In addition to the frequent use of substance abuse programs for sentenced felons, alternative funding sources were also utilized to extend these programs to a smaller but sizeable number of misdemeanants.
- § Pretrial service programs have been implemented in several jurisdictions to expand utilization of conditional release options and decrease lengths of stay in jail of pretrial detainees. The enrollment for programs funded by community corrections consists of over 83% felons. This serves as another means to increase the availability of jail beds for sentenced felons.

**Offenders Determined PA-511 Eligible  
Summaries of FY 2001 and FY 2002**

**FY 2001**

	<b>Unsentenced</b>	<b>Sentenced</b>	<b>Totals</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Felony</b>	2,058	16,172	<b>18,230</b>	65%
<b>Misdemeanor</b>	1,563	8,107	<b>9,670</b>	35%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3,621</b>	<b>24,279</b>	<b>27,900</b>	
<b>%</b>	13%	87%		

**FY 2002**

	<b>Unsentenced</b>	<b>Sentenced</b>	<b>Totals</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Felony</b>	3,146	15,949	<b>19,095</b>	63%
<b>Misdemeanor</b>	2,393	8,821	<b>11,214</b>	37%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>5,539</b>	<b>24,770</b>	<b>30,309</b>	
<b>%</b>	18%	82%		

Note: Tables based on CCIS Offender data with available Crime Class and Legal Status.  
Civil infractions included as misdemeanors; federal as felonies.

**State Summary Enrollments by Crime Class & Legal Status  
PA-511 Funded**

FY 2002		Legal Status			
Type of Program	New Enrollments	Unsentenced Crime Class		Sentenced Crime Class	
		Felon	Misdemeanant	Felon	Misdemeanant
Case Management	4,623	321	25	3,560	717
Community Service	7,525	63	98	3,062	4,302
Education	1,307	197	81	799	230
Employment & Training	882	49	42	578	213
Intensive Supervision	4,722	789	362	1,370	2,201
Mental Health	325	55	4	218	48
Pre-Trial Services	9,912	6,026	1,319	2,263	304
Probation/Residential	4,120	77	7	3,903	133
Substance Abuse	3,121	105	47	2,258	711
Other	853	11	4	776	62
<b>Total</b>	<b>37,390</b>	<b>7,693</b>	<b>1,989</b>	<b>18,787</b>	<b>8,921</b>

**State Summary of New Enrollments by Crime Class and Legal Status  
All Funding Sources**

FY 2002		Legal status			
Type of Program	New Enrollments	Unsentenced Crime class		Sentenced Crime class	
		Felon	Misdemeanant	Felon	Misdemeanant
Case Management	5,337	327	354	3,718	938
Community Service	10,037	87	123	4,599	5,228
Education	1,651	261	109	959	322
Employment & Training	1,273	55	46	731	441
Intensive Supervision	5,551	852	656	1,497	2,546
Mental Health	548	95	16	296	141
Pre-Trial Services **	16,360	6,649	6,639	2,354	718
Probation/Residential	4,624	80	12	4,316	216
Substance Abuse	5,673	150	66	3,379	2,078
Other	3,749	28	9	3,586	126
<b>Total</b>	<b>54,803</b>	<b>8,584</b>	<b>8,030</b>	<b>25,435</b>	<b>12,754</b>

Notes: 56,483 total reported enrollments; above tables based upon 54,803 records where program code, crime class & legal status were all available.

Data may include enrollment of an individual in more than one program.

\*\* Some Pre-Trial Services, rendered to offenders eventually sentenced as felons or misdemeanants, appear under the respective "Sentenced" columns.

## PART 4

### FY 2003 AWARD OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS FUNDS

#### COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PLANS AND SERVICES FUNDS

<b>FY 2003 Appropriation</b>	<b>\$13,006,000</b>
<b>FY 2003 Award of Funds</b>	<b>\$13,005,962</b>

FY 2003 Community Corrections Plans and Services funds were awarded to support community-based programs in 72 counties.

On December 5, 2002, Governor John Engler signed Executive Order #2002-22 that reduced the Community Corrections Plans and Services appropriation from \$13,033,000 to \$13,006,000.

The Plans and Services funds are utilized within local jurisdictions to support a wide range of programming options for eligible detainees and offenders. The distribution of funds among program categories is presented below.

#### **Resource Commitment by Program Category:**

Community Service	\$1,067,667
Education	\$1,026,766
Employment & Training	\$462,760
Intensive Supervision	\$1,610,478
Mental Health	\$245,924
Pretrial Services	\$1,801,145
Substance Abuse	\$1,256,996
24 Hour Structured	\$11,000
Case Management	\$1,783,646
CCAB Administration	\$2,882,835
Other	\$856,745
Total	\$13,005,962

In FY 2003, a commitment to increase emphasis on cognitive behavioral-based and other programming for higher risk need cases was continued. This represents a continuation and further implementation of priorities adopted by the State Community Corrections Board and the Department in February 1999 and reaffirmed in February 2000.

#### **Resource Commitment by Local Jurisdiction**

The sanctions and services supported by FY 2003 Comprehensive Plans and Services funds within each local jurisdiction are identified in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1

## MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS - OFFICE OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

## COMPREHENSIVE PLANS AND SERVICES FISCAL YEAR 2003

## BUDGETED AMOUNTS FOR PROGRAM SERVICES

CCAB	COMMUNITY SERVICE	EDUCATION	EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING	INTENSIVE SUPERVISION	MENTAL HEALTH	PRE-TRIAL SERVICES	SUBSTANCE ABUSE	24 HOUR STRUCTURED	CASE MANAGEMENT	OTHER	ADMINISTRATION	TOTAL AWARD	
BARRY/ALLEGAN	-	41,105	-	38,000	-	-	-	-	41,046	-	41,205	161,356	
BAY	20,000	17,560	-	-	-	7,500	57,260	-	-	-	43,500	145,820	
BERRIEN	-	15,000	-	74,000	-	-	20,000	-	46,790	-	33,700	189,490	
CALHOUN	-	-	-	94,700	-	-	20,000	-	-	49,000	55,588	219,288	
CASS	5,400	750	-	9,600	-	-	18,750	-	21,510	600	23,922	80,532	
CENTRAL U.P.	55,472	-	-	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	1,000	23,745	81,217	
CLINTON	25,000	-	7,280	-	-	-	-	-	21,620	-	23,100	77,000	
EASTERN U.P.	52,139	-	-	36,570	-	-	-	-	-	-	38,291	127,000	
EATON	42,898	29,875	-	3,500	-	-	2,500	11,000	17,232	-	44,300	151,305	
GENESEE	5,000	18,000	-	31,200	10,000	56,000	60,000	-	136,760	-	117,040	434,000	
HURON	18,370	1,000	-	-	-	-	28,230	-	-	-	16,750	64,350	
INGHAM/LANSING	53,000	-	64,582	50,000	-	-	47,193	-	-	12,500	62,000	289,275	
ISABELLA	-	45,145	-	10,069	-	-	-	-	11,705	-	26,450	93,369	
JACKSON	49,641	40,200	-	42,840	-	-	-	-	12,250	-	52,800	197,731	
KALAMAZOO	22,500	-	-	71,801	-	127,688	111,500	-	-	-	68,656	402,145	
KENT	58,086	73,200	53,200	102,060	48,060	135,664	125,370	-	22,860	2,000	186,500	807,000	
LIVINGSTON	-	25,000	-	-	-	52,292	6,000	-	49,724	-	31,458	164,474	
MACOMB	31,500	-	-	32,500	-	20,000	175,691	-	230,000	-	112,850	602,541	
MARQUETTE	13,500	22,890	-	10,400	-	5,200	-	-	7,795	5,730	27,385	92,900	
MASON	3,000	-	1,000	-	7,000	-	4,000	-	18,000	11,400	12,000	56,400	
MECOSTA	22,000	-	-	13,000	-	-	1,000	-	-	13,500	15,800	65,300	
MIDLAND	-	-	1,000	-	15,408	-	74,252	-	15,900	3,000	26,324	135,884	
MONROE	-	70,950	12,000	7,150	-	12,000	45,000	-	-	-	35,000	182,100	
MONTCALM/IONIA	47,000	26,800	-	10,000	-	-	22,450	-	-	-	45,000	151,250	
MUSKEGON	30,000	32,500	21,170	-	-	37,500	15,000	-	47,500	-	64,230	247,900	
NORTHERN MICHIGAN	9,000	15,000	-	20,000	10,000	5,000	5,000	-	65,000	-	39,035	168,035	
NORTHWEST MICHIGAN	5,000	88,200	-	37,977	17,780	4,000	51,050	-	149,657	3,000	43,496	400,160	
OAKLAND	-	26,000	203,528	-	-	538,816	40,000	-	275,000	169,750	214,037	1,467,131	
OSCEOLA	31,800	-	-	2,695	-	2,695	500	-	-	-	13,600	51,290	
OTTAWA	70,664	-	-	100,161	-	-	-	-	-	-	42,245	213,070	
SAGINAW	-	50,000	7,000	48,285	-	44,000	30,000	-	-	32,500	77,995	289,780	
ST. CLAIR	-	20,000	-	16,000	28,250	35,450	12,000	-	44,800	-	31,000	187,500	
ST. JOSEPH	-	25,000	-	32,900	20,200	-	-	-	-	-	26,000	104,100	
SANILAC	36,775	-	-	-	-	-	9,050	-	-	-	16,000	61,825	
SHIAWASSEE	-	25,083	-	16,715	-	-	-	-	-	-	17,800	59,598	
THIRTEENTH	-	10,000	-	59,811	10,000	-	-	-	74,040	-	26,859	180,710	
THIRTY FOURTH	17,922	27,608	-	11,187	12,026	-	24,200	-	19,557	-	39,500	152,000	
TWENTY SIXTH	7,500	10,000	-	-	67,200	-	-	-	9,600	-	25,650	119,950	
THUMB REGIONAL	43,000	4,000	-	24,000	-	-	42,000	-	22,800	-	44,000	179,800	
TRI COUNTY	76,000	8,400	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,000	-	36,681	123,081	
VAN BUREN	25,000	25,500	-	8,330	-	-	-	-	12,000	27,765	21,135	119,730	
WASHTENAW/ANN ARBOR	-	60,000	12,000	70,327	-	67,340	64,000	-	38,500	-	61,688	373,855	
WAYNE	-	160,000	80,000	500,000	-	650,000	145,000	-	370,000	525,000	810,000	3,240,000	
WCUP	190,500	12,000	-	23,700	-	-	-	-	-	-	68,520	294,720	
TOTAL AWARD AMOUNTS	1,067,667	1,026,766	462,760	1,610,478	245,924	29	1,801,145	1,256,996	11,000	1,783,646	856,745	2,882,835	13,005,962



## **PROBATION RESIDENTIAL SERVICES**

<b>FY 2003 Appropriation</b>	<b>\$13,685,000</b>
<b>FY 2003 Award of Funds</b>	<b>\$13,685,000</b>

FY 2003 funds were awarded to support residential services pursuant to 31 local comprehensive corrections plans. The FY 2003 awards respond to program utilization patterns between local jurisdictions and create greater capabilities for local jurisdictions to purchase residential services for eligible felony offenders from a wider range of providers.

On December 5, 2002, Governor John Engler signed Executive Order #2002-22 that reduced the Probation Residential Centers appropriation from \$14,997,000 to \$13,685,000. The order decreased the FY 2003 appropriation to support an average daily population from 956 to 872.

During FY 2003, emphases continue to be on: utilizing residential services as part of a continuum of sanctions and services (e.g., short-term residential substance abuse treatment services followed by outpatient treatment as appropriate, residential services followed by day reporting), reducing the length of stay in residence, and increasing the utilization of short-term residential services for probation violators.

It is expected an increase in utilization of Probation Residential Services will be experienced in FY 2003 and that the actual ADP will be greater than 872. The increased utilization is expected due to the following factors:

- \$ Changes being implemented within Wayne County will have an impact on the utilization rates of residential services.
- \$ Utilization patterns among other jurisdictions are expected to continue through FY 2003.
- \$ The statutory guidelines will continue to produce increased demands for residential services. Specifically, offenders with guideline scores in the straddle cells and the higher end of the intermediate sanction cells are increasingly sentenced to a jail term followed by placement in a residential program.
- \$ Attention will continue to be focused on the utilization of residential services in response to probation violations and eligible parole violators in accordance with the Department's policies and procedures.

The attached Table provides information regarding the past three fiscal years= data of the actual average daily population, the FY 2003 awards, and the authorized average daily population of each jurisdiction.

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS PROBATION RESIDENTIAL SERVICES AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION						
CCAB	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	
	ADP	ADP	ADP	ADP	AUTHORIZED ADP	AWARD AMOUNT
Allegan/Barry	4.4	3.2	6.4	5.4	6	100,253
Bay	4.2	5.2	4.1	6.5	5	85,931
Berrien	12.6	18.1	18.1	30.7	27	429,651
Calhoun	10.9	19.4	19.6	24.5	25	401,008
Eaton	2.0	4.3	3.2	4.5	4	57,287
Genesee	68.3	81.9	86.2	81.5	70	1,102,770
Ingham/Lansing	29.0	30.6	34.2	36.0	35	544,225
Isabella				0.8	1	14,322
Jackson	10.7	15.5	13.5	11.5	13	200,505
Kalamazoo	88.7	82.6	84.2	70.9	71	1,117,092
Kent	78.1	91.9	95.8	98.0	88	1,389,204
Livingston				9.4	4	57,287
Macomb	26.1	25.9	25.8	24.6	25	401,008
Marquette	1.2	1.6	2.4	1.9	2	28,644
Midland	3.8	4.1	4.3	5.0	5	71,609
Monroe	4.7	10.4	16.4	18.0	16	257,791
Muskegon	26.8	40.2	30.7	35.8	38	544,225
Northern Michigan	2.4	3.2	3.5	2.6	3	42,966
Northwest Michigan	5.4	8.4	8.9	9.0	8	128,896
Oakland	84.9	91.2	91.0	87.1	86	1,346,477
Ottawa	5.1	3.8	3.0	4.9	3	42,966
Saginaw	47.6	45.9	51.1	54.4	44	687,441
St. Clair	40.0	37.3	42.7	44.1	38	601,511
St. Joseph	42.4	37.7	43.1	47.7	38	601,511
Thirteenth Circuit	7.5	7.5	9.8	8.8	8	128,896
Thirty Fourth Circuit	2.8	2.5	1.8	2.2	3	42,966
Twenty Sixth Circuit	3.3	4.3	4.8	5.6	5	85,931
Van Buren		8.3	4.7	10.4	8	128,896
Washtenaw/Ann Arbor	22.3	39.7	25.5	22.4	21	329,399
Wayne	227.0	216.9	170.2	149.5	168	2,642,723
West Central U.P.	3.4	4.3	4.2	3.1	4	71,609
<b>PRS TOTALS</b>	<b>865.8</b>	<b>945.7</b>	<b>909.2</b>	<b>916.3</b>	<b>872</b>	<b>13,685,000</b>

Table 4.2

**Michigan Department of Corrections - Office of Community Corrections**

**Probation Residential Services**

**Average Daily Population FY 2002**

CCAB	Authorized ADP	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	Total
ALLEGAN/BARRY	6.00	6.23	7.10	7.39	6.74	5.29	5.00	5.23	4.16	2.80	4.00	4.71	6.53	5.43
BAY	7.00	2.71	3.07	4.29	6.52	10.04	8.87	7.57	7.87	8.07	6.84	5.45	7.23	6.54
BERRIEN	30.73	40.45	39.33	33.55	26.97	25.61	23.29	22.50	28.61	27.00	29.32	35.13	36.53	30.69
CALHOUN	28.00	30.03	25.53	27.97	28.77	30.18	28.58	24.30	22.29	27.33	21.32	17.00	10.33	24.47
EATON	5.50	5.32	3.67	3.10	4.42	7.54	7.55	7.73	4.03	2.00	2.48	2.48	3.03	4.45
GENESEE	81.98	72.26	72.97	69.61	78.55	73.50	82.29	87.73	93.32	92.33	82.10	95.13	78.30	81.51
INGHAM/LANSING	38.00	35.77	37.50	41.48	37.10	37.50	35.13	32.23	33.77	35.17	37.55	34.03	34.20	35.95
ISABELLA	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.94	1.00	0.64	1.00	1.00	0.39	0.00	0.00	0.16	1.00	0.81
JACKSON	14.00	11.00	10.83	11.32	10.39	13.21	15.90	15.27	11.61	9.23	8.13	12.35	8.33	11.47
KALAMAZOO	76.34	89.71	85.43	79.29	72.00	70.54	78.90	65.97	64.23	58.90	54.71	60.71	70.47	70.90
KENT	98.49	102.29	100.67	94.81	93.77	88.36	94.03	99.33	101.19	104.53	98.52	100.71	97.33	97.96
LIVINGSTON	8.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.84	6.79	10.03	12.73	11.19	13.77	13.84	9.29	3.37	9.43
MACOMB	28.00	24.84	26.73	27.26	28.61	24.43	28.23	26.07	26.00	23.73	18.55	18.87	22.00	24.61
MARQUETTE	3.00	0.19	2.00	2.65	2.58	1.07	1.29	1.00	0.90	0.00	2.39	3.52	3.00	1.87
MIDLAND	5.00	5.71	4.27	5.48	4.77	4.04	3.16	3.57	3.77	6.47	8.29	6.16	3.93	4.97
MONROE	18.00	15.19	12.60	17.35	17.94	22.46	19.84	17.93	17.84	18.63	15.55	15.55	25.37	18.02
MUSKEGON	38.00	37.03	31.87	34.32	36.26	39.29	35.00	38.03	37.32	36.77	33.00	31.77	38.30	35.75
NORTHERN MICHIGAN	4.00	1.94	1.17	1.39	2.10	2.04	3.00	2.30	3.45	4.57	4.00	2.77	2.30	2.58
NORTHWEST MICHIGAN	9.00	7.29	8.13	10.19	10.35	8.71	8.65	7.73	7.13	6.67	7.06	11.42	14.67	9.00
OAKLAND	92.00	73.00	75.70	80.61	75.77	79.57	95.94	99.40	96.29	85.00	87.35	94.55	103.40	87.22
OTTAWA	5.00	2.58	3.97	2.68	3.29	3.61	5.42	5.63	7.16	7.93	6.00	5.71	4.20	4.85
SAGINAW	55.00	60.29	62.17	60.71	55.97	39.07	42.03	49.47	54.48	50.87	49.58	61.65	66.20	54.37
ST. CLAIR	44.25	43.52	42.27	40.55	43.00	44.82	42.77	44.37	48.39	47.57	42.16	43.55	46.50	44.12
ST JOSEPH	48.00	49.97	51.53	43.58	46.74	49.32	49.39	51.00	48.19	45.90	44.00	47.55	44.67	47.65
THIRTEENTH	9.00	7.16	8.33	9.06	9.29	6.36	9.10	11.50	9.71	11.13	11.23	8.03	4.43	8.78
THIRTY FOURTH	3.00	0.06	1.10	2.00	1.74	1.61	1.87	1.07	2.42	4.13	4.16	3.71	3.00	2.24
TWENTY SIXTH	5.75	4.35	5.67	7.00	4.77	4.50	4.61	4.87	5.19	5.17	7.13	7.58	6.07	5.58
VAN BUREN	10.84	8.90	11.20	9.61	9.06	9.00	7.48	7.03	9.00	13.80	14.29	12.65	12.53	10.38
WASHTENAW/ANN ARBOR	23.00	18.94	16.70	18.74	20.48	29.07	29.00	31.53	25.90	23.03	21.32	18.23	15.23	22.35
WAYNE	154.61	135.65	147.13	147.26	133.29	136.61	143.90	146.93	165.58	163.43	162.77	155.52	155.27	149.45
WEST CENTRAL	5.00	2.48	2.17	3.06	2.77	5.68	5.58	4.10	2.03	2.80	1.71	1.39	0.00	3.07
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>955.53</b>	<b>895.87</b>	<b>901.80</b>	<b>897.26</b>	<b>878.87</b>	<b>880.43</b>	<b>926.84</b>	<b>935.13</b>	<b>953.45</b>	<b>938.73</b>	<b>899.35</b>	<b>927.32</b>	<b>927.73</b>	<b>916.47</b>

**Table 4.3**

## PART 5

### DATA SYSTEMS STATUS

The Office of Community Corrections is responsible for the development of two information systems: the Jail Population Information System (JPIS) and the Community Corrections Information System (CCIS). This report summarizes the status of each system.

#### JAIL POPULATION INFORMATION SYSTEM (JPIS)

##### OVERVIEW

The Michigan Jail Population Information System was developed as a means to gather standardized information on jail utilization and demographics from county jails throughout the state. JPIS is the product of a cooperative effort among the Michigan Department of Corrections, Office of Community Corrections, County Jail Services Unit and the Michigan Sheriff's Association, with assistance from Michigan State University and the National Institute of Corrections. While it was never intended that JPIS would have all the information contained at each individual reporting site, specifications called for capture of data on individual demographics, primary offense, known criminal history and information related to arrest, conviction, sentencing, and release.

##### **Mission and Concept**

The primary purpose of the statewide Jail Population Information System is to provide the ability to monitor and evaluate jail population characteristics for use in policy planning. As a statewide database, it is sufficiently flexible to enable the system to be compatible with existing jail management and MIS systems in each county. Originally developed as a mainframe process, the JPIS system was later rewritten to run on MDOC's PC network, utilizing full-time bulletin board hardware to facilitate gathering monthly files and returning error reports and analytical reports.

JPIS is a means to gather a subset of the information which already resides on individual jail management systems, with each county running a monthly extract process to generate a standard file.

The primary approach taken was to promote the adoption, enhancement and proper use of local data systems. In turn, the local system would provide the foundation to extract the optimum of usable data for the JPIS extract, which should be viewed as a logical by-product.

##### **History and Impact**

The locally-centered approach taken for JPIS development has had a substantial impact on the utilization of local jail management systems throughout the state. When JPIS requirements were first implemented, over half the counties in Michigan did not have functional automated jail management systems, and objective inmate risk classification was in its infancy. Now, all the counties have automated systems, with nearly every county having transmitted electronic data files to the central JPIS system. Similarly, the JPIS requirement for standardized classification of offenders has been a major factor in the adoption of objective offender classification processes and procedures throughout the state.

## **Use of JPIS Data**

Currently, the monthly edit error reports returned to the counties include summaries based upon the incoming file of admissions, releases, and unreleased inmates by reported security class. These reports enhance capabilities to review each monthly submission for accuracy.

Since 1998, detailed reports based upon accumulated JPIS master data have been mailed quarterly to each Sheriff's department and CCAB. The reports cover cumulative data for the current calendar year, as well as full-year data for the preceding year. The associated tables include categories such as jail admissions and releases, length-of-stay for offenders, and average daily population for the jail. In addition, an audit response sheet is included to gather feedback on how well the reports represent the jail population. These reports provide a primary means for on-site review of JPIS statistics with the counties, to isolate and correct data problems not readily identified by routine file editing. As additional data problems are identified and resolved, the quality and confidence of the reports increase.

## **Local Data Systems and JPIS**

Michigan counties employ a wide variety of electronic jail management packages which are based upon their overall size and local requirements to collect jail data. These applications include both custom-written systems and packages sold by outside vendors. On a statewide basis, it is a very dynamic environment, with regular hardware and software upgrades at individual sites - and not infrequently - switches to entirely different jail management packages. This evolving vendor landscape presents some unique data-gathering challenges, as even the most conscientious counties periodically deal with jail management software issues that disrupt both local operations and JPIS data submissions.

## **JPIS Data Reporting**

Even though several counties do not have active Community Corrections Advisory Boards and do not receive community corrections funding, the counties submitting JPIS jail data accounted for nearly 90% of statewide jail beds in FY 2002. OCC has continued to provide technical support to maximize the capability to collect and aggregate local jail data on a statewide basis. By mid-2003, JPIS data reporting should account for approximately 95% of the jail beds statewide.

## **JPIS DATA SYSTEM ENHANCEMENTS**

The Office of Community Corrections continues to review, update and streamline the overall JPIS data reporting requirements to maximize the use of the system. Simplified data specifications were distributed to new vendors, existing vendors, and counties to reduce local demands and streamline processing. The changes to the JPIS data system required several modifications to OCC's editing procedures, master database, and reporting formats. Although the overall number of specified data elements was substantially reduced, some vendor programming was required to achieve the advantage of the new data reporting format.

Coupled with the changes being made to the JPIS data system is the migration to a new software suite in the Department of Corrections. The migration to a new software suite present additional challenges to provide uninterrupted service of incoming jail data, but will provide an opportune time to reassess the methodology and outputs in the current system. Potential changes to processing, reporting, and data transmission methods will now be examined in light of the new set of developmental tools.

The efforts underway to streamline JPIS reporting are expected to contribute toward the goal of providing additional outputs to benefit both the state and local jurisdictions. The focus is upon gathering the most critical data elements from all counties, as monthly reporting is expanded, to make maximum use of the available data for analysis purposes and local feedback.

## **COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS INFORMATION SYSTEM (CCIS)**

### **OVERVIEW**

Local jurisdictions submit monthly offender profile and program utilization data to OCC on all offenders enrolled in community corrections programs funded by P.A. 511 and other funding sources. Two types of data are required: (1) characteristics of offenders who have been determined P.A. 511 eligible for enrollment into programs; and (2) program participation details.

The CCIS data submitted represents an extract of the data available locally for program planning and case management purposes. OCC uses the data to examine the profiles of offenders in programs, monitor utilization, and evaluate the various CCAB goals and objectives specific to program utilization.

Data is submitted via e-mail, however, floppy-disk submissions are permitted if circumstances so require. Data files are edited upon receipt, and error reports are returned if the data does not meet basic format and/or content requirements. When data meets editing requirements, a feedback report is provided to the CCAB to verify the accuracy of the data.

### **CCIS ENHANCEMENTS**

An updated report on CCIS data includes financial data so program utilization can be directly viewed in comparison to program expenses. Available at the CCAB level, the report identifies the budget and year-to-date information on expenses, new enrollments, average lengths of stay of successful and failed completions, and average enrollment levels for each P.A. 511 funded program.

The CCIS edit enhancement detailed above is part of OCC's ongoing commitment to provide feedback to local entities and OCC staff, toward the goal to increase the ability to actively monitor local program activity and examine various elements of services to priority populations.

## Impact of System Enhancements

As changes and improvements to corrections-related data systems continue to be refined, the overall ability to monitor prison commitments, jail utilization and program utilization by priority target groups of offenders continues to improve. Areas in which data system enhancements have impact include:

1. Improvement to the timeliness and availability of felony disposition data.

The use of a data export process developed to provide CCABs with felony disposition data directly generated from the MDOC's master data-gathering system, OMNI, is operational in the Field Operations Administration Region I and Region II offices, and has been initiated in Region III.

The readily accessible and improved timeliness of felony disposition data obtained from OMNI, and enhanced data on sentencing guideline scores, should improve the analytical and reporting capabilities at the local level. As a result, the accuracy of CCIS data should be improved as well.

2. An expanded capability to identify target groups in jails and link to other data sources.

A redesign of the Jail Population Information System is aimed at streamlining the process, while improving the ability to identify target populations among sentenced and unsentenced felons. Over time, the adoption of the JPIS enhancements by software vendors and local jails will provide an expanding capability to link felony disposition data to jail population data.

3. Improved recognition of any data reporting problems.

Expanded editing and feedback routines in the JPIS and CCIS systems should simplify the process to monitor data content and isolate problems in vendor software or local data collection practices which may adversely impact data quality. Expanded feedback on individual file submissions will enable local entities to promptly identify and address potential problems.