

Michigan Department of Corrections

“Committed to Protect, Dedicated to Success”



REENTRY ADMINISTRATION
Office of Community Corrections
Drunk Driver Jail Reduction and Community Treatment Program

BIANNUAL REPORT

March 2019

This report is prepared by the Michigan Department of Corrections / Reentry Administration / Office of Community Corrections pursuant to MCL 791.412 (2) and the FY 2017 Appropriations Act for Community Programs [Public Act No. 84 of 2015 Section 412 and 417 (1)(b)].

INTRODUCTION

Michigan Public Act 511, *also known as the Community Corrections Act*, was established in 1988 in an effort to improve the State's prison commitment rates through the development and utilization of evidence-based, community corrections programming that targets Group 2 straddle cell offenders, probation violators, and parole violators. Counties and regions establishing a Community Corrections Advisory Board (CCAB) appointed member stakeholders as required by PA-511 to identify and target local criminogenic needs that impact prison commitments and recidivism. CCABs are obligated to abide by PA-511 and Michigan Office of Community Corrections requirements when receiving MOCC funding, including but not limited to data tracking and analysis, as well as minimum program eligibility and utilization requirements.

At the onset of PA-511, the State's Prison Commitment Rate (PCR) was 34.7% (FY 1989, as reported by the Michigan Department of Corrections' Statistical Report). It declined to 20.6% in FY 2005, which supported the Department's renewed emphasis on the use of community-based sanctions and services for the target population. For the next ten years, the State PCR fluctuated each year, but demonstrated a slight increase through FY 2015 (21.5%). In FY 2016, the Department again emphasized the use of community-based sanctions and services for the target population. Combined with the increase of local community corrections programming (Example: Drug Courts, Mental Health Courts, Veterans Courts, and Swift & Sure Sanctions Probation Programs) and the utilization of Probation Residential Services (PRS), the State PCR decreased to 20.6% in FY 2016 and to 19.9% in FY 2017.

In 2014, Public Act 466 added revisions to PA-511 that included revisions to membership requirements and modifications to comprehensive corrections plan requirements. Passed in March 2017, additional revisions to PA-511 were approved to include specific recidivism measurements as they apply to probation and parole violators and OCC programming.

Section 12 of PA-511 requires that the Michigan Office of Community Corrections submit a biannual report detailing the effectiveness of the programs and plans funded under this Act, including an explanation of how the rate of prisoner commitments to the State prison system has been affected. For the purpose of this report, the 2017 revisions to PA-511 will not be thoroughly addressed. CCABs need time to collect the data as required by the new revisions; therefore, it is not available at this time. It is expected to take up to 3 years for CCABs to provide accurate and measurable data to address their 3-year recidivism analyses.

Current analysis of Michigan's felony disposition data, as well as prison disposition data, continues to support the State's community corrections target population. Further analysis also indicates that community sanctions and treatment provide effective alternatives to prison and jail sentences while increasing public safety and decreasing recidivism.

PART ONE

STATE COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS ADVISORY BOARD PRIORITIES

The State Community Corrections Advisory Board Objectives and Priorities are a continuation of the priorities which were originally adopted by the Board in February 1999 to strengthen the focus of state and local community corrections policy, practice and programming on treatment effect and recidivism reduction – the priorities were last updated in 2014.

These priorities are a primary focus of the reviews of community corrections comprehensive plans and proposals of local jurisdictions and a key determinant of the awards of P.A. 511 funds.

Prison Admissions - Felony Target Populations

- Reduce or minimize prison admissions for: (a) offenders with sentencing guidelines within the straddle cells, especially those with a PRV \geq 35 excluding G&H; and (b) probation violators.
- Offenders within the presumptive prison group should not be targeted as a group; jurisdictions should examine sentencing options on a case-by-case basis to determine if local programs are appropriate alternatives to a prison commitment.
- Community-based sanctions and services, including the creative use of jail time in conjunction with other community-based supervision, for offenders within straddle cells without compromising public safety.
- Probation violators are a priority population since: 1) technical violations are not addressed in the statutory guidelines; 2) violators account for a large proportion of prison admissions; 3) long jail sentences in response to violations contribute to jail crowding.
- The state and local jurisdictions should utilize comprehensive case planning to determine the most effective sanctions and services available locally. Case planning should begin as early as possible in the process and consider initial disposition, local probation violation response guidelines and available community-based resources. The impact upon public safety, jail crowding, prison commitments and recidivism reduction should be determinant factors.

Recidivism

- Recidivism - defined as “Probation Violations, either technical or new sentence, resulting in prison.” This will be measured by the following:
 - Male Probation Violators with a new felony conviction resulting in a prison sentence
 - Female Probation Violators with a new felony conviction resulting in a prison sentence
 - Male Technical Probation Violators
 - Female Technical Probation Violators

Jail Utilization

Although no longer a Board Priority beyond 2015, public safety should be the primary factor in determining the use of jail resources. Whenever possible, jail resources should be prioritized for use by individuals convicted of crimes against persons and/or offenders who present a higher risk of recidivism.

- The local community corrections comprehensive plan should establish clear guidelines, policies and procedures to ensure appropriate use of all sentencing options for all offender populations.
- For higher risk/need cases, jail should be utilized as a condition of probation and as part of a sentence plan, which includes short term in jail with release to other forms of supervision and/or treatment.

Target Populations for Community Corrections Programs

- Felony offenders with multiple prior convictions and/or multiple probation violations should receive higher priority than first time, civil and ordinance offenders.
- Convicted felony drunk drivers (DDJR eligible) are defined as those with intermediate or straddle cell guidelines with a maximum of 18 months and the prior record variable is less than 35 points; are alcohol dependent or abusing; have not caused serious injury in an alcohol or drug related crash; do not have a violent felony conviction in the past ten years; and do not have more than one violent misdemeanor conviction in the past ten years.
- The targeting of lower level offenders must be accompanied by quantitative measures that show how targeting these populations will significantly affect state and local criminal justice objectives.
- If misdemeanants are included in the local target populations for treatment programs then priority should be given to offenders with multiple prior convictions, including felony convictions, and a current offense for domestic violence, retail fraud, or drunk driving.
- Jurisdictions should annually review and update, as needed, target populations and program specific eligibility criteria for community corrections programs and update the range of sentencing options for all population groups.
- Community-based supervision and treatment services are to be restricted to higher risk/need cases consistent with principles of effective intervention. Priorities are on cognitive-based programming and education/employment services.
- Eligibility for Residential Services is restricted to felons scoring moderate to high in overall risk and/or probable or highly probable in the Substance Abuse needs scale of a State approved actuarial assessment.

Interagency Policy and Program Development

CCABs should actively participate with Community Mental Health, law enforcement, and other agencies in the development of local policy and programming options to reduce admissions to jail and length of stay in jail of mentally ill offenders.

Local policies should be developed and/or updated to increase access to education and employability services for offenders such as those offered through local school districts, Michigan Works!, and other local service agencies.

Sentencing Recommendation and Probation Violation Processing

Each jurisdiction should annually review sentencing recommendation procedures, probation violation guidelines, and update response guides consistent with MDOC policies to reduce prison admission, improve jail utilization, increase program utilization, increase public safety, and decrease recidivism. Probation violation response guides should identify all available resources to address local needs.

Administrative and/or Operational

Local jurisdictions are required to update their local strategic plan and are encouraged to utilize system mapping principles and techniques to: illustrate processes, practices, and decision points within the local system. Further, system mapping should be used to identify and define system issues, examine options to resolve issues, and guide the local comprehensive corrections plan updates and revisions.

Local jurisdictions should describe instruments utilized within the local jurisdiction. Areas to assess should include risk of recidivism and needs for services. A priority should be placed upon criminogenic needs. Individual jurisdictions must describe how the instruments are used and what purpose the instruments serve to guide or support case planning/management and monitoring/evaluation functions.

Public Education

Local jurisdictions are to present specific objectives and strategies to increase awareness of community sentencing options. These efforts should communicate how these options are used to benefit the community and the offender.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Local jurisdictions must implement and maintain current formal policies and practices that support ongoing monitoring of prison commitments, jail utilization and program utilization. These practices should aid in the determination of how local community corrections comprehensive plans effect prison commitments and jail utilization. Policies must be developed that enhance state and local ability to monitor and evaluate program content, quality and effects upon target populations.

PART TWO

MEASURING THE IMPACT OF PUBLIC ACT 511- OUIL 3rd Data

The Offender Management Network Information (OMNI) system is the primary data collection and analysis tool utilized by the Michigan Office of Community Corrections when reviewing felony dispositional data. OMNI provides the capability of analyzing data in a relatively short period and is accessible to all CCABs; therefore, it is most efficient and convenient. OMNI extracts data based on the most serious offense per file number, per date. For example, an offender that is sentenced on more than one charge per file number on the same day will be collected in OMNI by the most serious charge sentenced on that day only. Therefore, OMNI tracks *the number of offenses*, not the number of offenders.

For the purposes of this report, no OMNI data is excluded in the following analysis. Offenders both with and without prisoner status at the time of the offense are included. The Michigan Office of Community Corrections provides the following OUIL 3rd Felony Dispositional Data to measure the impact and effectiveness of DDJR funding on prison admissions. A detailed summary will be presented as well as a comparison to the previous two fiscal years in that category:

OUIL – 3RD DISPOSITIONS

For FY 2018, Michigan had a total of 2,824 felony OUIL-3rd dispositions. This increased from FY 2017 (2,807 dispositions) by 17 dispositions and is 162 more than FY 2016 (2,662 dispositions).

<i>Of all OUIL-3rd dispositions in <u>FY 2018</u>:</i>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>
485 were prison (17.2%)	544 (19.4%)	499 (18.7%)
246 were jail only (8.7%)	245 (8.7%)	262 (9.8%)
1,913 were jail/probation combined (67.7%)	1,881(67.0%)	1,766 (66.3%)
179 were probation only (6.3%)	137 (4.9%)	135 (5.1%)
1 were "Other" (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

<i>Of all OUIL-3rds prison dispositions in <u>FY 2018</u>:</i>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>
51 were Presumptive Cell (10.5%)	55 (10.1%)	48 (9.6%)

312 were Straddle Cell (64.3%)	339 (62.3%)	315 (63.1%)
73 were Intermediate Cell (15.1%)	94 (17.3%)	61 (12.2%)
49 were SGL NA* (10.1%)	56 (10.3%)	75 (15.0%)

*SGL NA - Sentencing Guideline Not Applicable.

Summary:

OUIL-3rd felony dispositions accounted for 6.17% of all Michigan felony dispositions and 5.35% of all prison dispositions in FY 2018. 312 (29.9%) of all Straddle Cell in this category (1,045 total Straddle Cell OUIL-3rd dispositions) were prison dispositions (64.3% of all OUIL-3rd prison dispositions). Meanwhile 51 (77.3%) of all Presumptive Cell in this category (66 total Presumptive Cell OUIL-3rd dispositions) were prison dispositions (10.52% of all OUIL-3rd prison dispositions). It is noted that the number of Intermediate Cell OUIL-3rd prison dispositions in FY 2017 increased by nearly 35 percentage points from FY 2016, with an increase from 61 to 94 prison dispositions. Between FY 2017 and FY 2018 the prison dispositions decreased to 73, indicating that the efforts put forth by Community Corrections programming may have had a positive impact. This information indicates that the consideration of targeting Intermediate Cell OUIL-3rd offenders and the further targeting of Straddle Cell OUIL-3rd offenders for community corrections programming may continue to positively impact prison commitment rates.

PROGRESS TOWARD ADDRESSING OBJECTIVES & PRIORITIES

In the past several years, the State has placed greater emphasis on the expansion of local sanctions in order to allow communities to determine appropriate sentences for low level offenders who would otherwise be sent to prison. The Department has partnered with local governments to revitalize and renew efforts to meet the goals of Public Act 511 to reduce admissions to prison of nonviolent offenders, especially probation violators, and improve the use of local jails. In previous years, the growth in prison intake has been driven by the increase of technical probation violators and offenders sentenced to prison for two years or less -- the exact target population for the Community Corrections Act and the priorities adopted by the State Board.

Local jurisdictions continually review sentence recommendations and update probation violation response guides consistent with Department policies in order to achieve a reduction in prison intake, improve jail utilization, and maintain public safety. Further, local jurisdictions continue to update target populations, program eligibility criteria for community corrections programs, and the range of sentencing options for these population groups (i.e., straddle cell offenders with SGL prior record variables of 35 points or more, probation violators, offenders assessed to have medium to high risk and needs and offenders sentenced to prison for two years or less). These target populations were a primary focus during the review of local community corrections comprehensive plans and a key determinant for the recommendations of funding in the past two fiscal years. As part of the current Comprehensive Community Corrections Plans review process, the Office of Community Corrections has required local jurisdictions to further reduce their overall prison commitment rates by targeting offenders in the Group 2 offense categories with medium to high risk and needs (i.e. Larceny, Fraud, Forgery/Embezzle, Motor Vehicle, Malicious Destruction, Drugs, **OUIL 3rd** and Other Non-Assaultive).

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

- Implementation of processes and instruments to quickly and more objectively identify risk cases at the post-conviction stage.
- Implementation of instruments and processes to objectively assess needs of higher risk offenders.
- Utilization of the results of screening/assessments to assist in the selection of conditional

- release options for convicted defendants and conditions of sentencing.
- Development and implementation of policies within local jurisdictions to emphasize proportionality in the use of sanctions/services, i.e., low levels of supervision and services for low risk offenders and utilizing more intensive programming for the higher risk offenders.
- Implementation and expansion of cognitive behavioral-based programming with eligibility criteria restricted to offenders that are at a higher risk of recidivism.
- Increased focus 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 jail, residential programs, etc.
- Increased focus on the implementation and utilization of evidence-based programming.
- Heightened monitoring and enforcement of performance measures and contractual compliance.
- Emphasis has been placed on offering gender-separate cognitive programming to better address gender-specific needs.
- Increased utilization of Probation Residential Services for substance abusing offenders, probation violators, and eligible pretrial offenders and parolees.

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

PART THREE

PROGRAM UTILIZATION

DDJR funded 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 practices must be implemented for programs to serve as diversions from prison or jail, or as treatment programs that reduce the risk of recidivism.

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 research¹ has shown that appropriately targeted and administered cognitive restructuring and substance abuse programs reduce recidivism. DDJR 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.

¹ Andrews, D. A. & Bonta, James (2003) The Psychology of Criminal Conduct Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing Co.

**State Summary of Program Participants
by Crime Class & Legal Status
With Percents of Successful Outcomes
P.A. 511 Funded
Fiscal Year 2017**

Number of Offenders in Programming			Number of Program Enrollments and Outcomes		
	Number Of Offenders	%	Program Enrollments	Successful Outcomes	% Successful
Felons					
Unsentenced:	3640	26.73%	6170	5839	85.99%
Sentenced:	9980	73.27%	14332	14750	87.14%
Total:	13620	100.00%	20502	20589	86.81%
Misdemeanants					
Unsentenced:	3335	55.80%	4771	4772	93.17%
Sentenced:	2642	44.20%	4450	5201	96.42%
Total:	5977	100.00%	9221	9973	93.39%
Total					
Unsentenced:	6975	35.59%	10941	10611	34.72%
Sentenced:	12622	64.41%	18782	19951	65.28%
Total:	19597	100.00%	29723	30562	88.86%

Table 1

**State Summary of Program Enrollments
by Crime Class & Legal Status
With Percents of Successful Outcomes
P.A. 511 Funded
Fiscal Year 2017**

Type of Program	New Enrollments	Number of Enrollments				Percent Successful				
		Unsentenced		Sentenced		Unsentenced		Sentenced		Overall
		Felony	Misd	Felony	Misd	Felony	Misd	Felony	Misd	
Case Management	1246	61	33	857	295	76.9%	80.4%	70.3%	71.2%	71.3%
Community Service	358	16	6	277	59	88.0%	79.4%	62.2%	76.8%	69.1%
Employment & Training	20	1	0	13	6	100.0%	0.0%	69.2%	70.0%	70.3%
Substance Abuse	470	216	14	224	16	82.0%	88.2%	63.6%	79.3%	74.7%
Other	593	41	24	357	171	71.9%	80.0%	72.5%	83.8%	75.9%
DDJR	247	13	4	230	0	100.0%	100.0%	96.5%	0.0%	96.7%
Group Programming	4054	199	23	3606	226	65.9%	79.3%	67.3%	79.4%	68.3%
Supervision Services	6734	2452	866	1494	1922	72.8%	71.0%	89.4%	96.5%	83.3%
Assessment Services	11116	3184	3833	2144	1955	99.4%	99.9%	99.6%	99.9%	99.7%
Gatekeeper	6304	48	1	6160	95	94.5%	100.0%	99.9%	97.3%	99.8%
Totals:	31142	6231	4804	15362	4745					
Totals w/o Case Mngt:	29896	6170	4771	14505	4450	86.47%	93.39%	89.04%	95.96%	90.30%

Table 2

PART FOUR

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PROGRAMS

The planning process prescribed by the Office of Community Corrections requires the Community Corrections Advisory Boards to identify linkages with other agencies, e.g., Michigan Works!, Substance Abuse, Community Health, local school districts, etc., to facilitate cost-effective services to offenders and minimize duplication of services and administrative costs.

The Office of Community Corrections has administrative responsibilities for the following:

Community Corrections Comprehensive Plans and Services funds, awarded to local units of government, support a wide range of sanctions and services (e.g., case management, cognitive behavioral programming, community service, day reporting, education, electronic monitoring, employment services, mental health treatment, pretrial services, substance abuse treatment, etc.) which vary from county to county depending on local needs and priorities. Per the priorities adopted by the State Community Corrections Board, increased emphases are placed on strengthening treatment effect of programs and services supported by community corrections funds.

Drunk Driver Jail Reduction & Community Treatment Program funds are utilized to increase availability of treatment options to reduce drunk driving and drunk driving-related deaths by addressing the alcohol addiction of felony drunk drivers; to divert from jail sentences or to reduce the length of jail sentences for

felony drunk drivers who otherwise would have been sentenced to jail; and to provide a policy and funding framework to make additional jail space available for housing convicted felons with the aim of enabling counties to receive county jail reimbursement.

Residential Services funds are utilized to purchase residential and support services for eligible felony offenders. The FY 2018 funds support an average daily population of 901. Emphases are on continued development of variable lengths of stay for different population groups – especially probation violators, and improving program quality and offender movement between residential services and other local sanctions and services.

Implementation, Monitoring, and Evaluation - Emphases for FY 2018 include: refinement of local policies; improving the structure, design, and cost efficiencies of local programs; and monitoring/assessment of prison admissions, jail utilization, program utilization and treatment effect. Data from the COMPAS Case Manager Community Corrections and Jail Population Information Systems and the OMNI/Felony Disposition data base are utilized to monitor patterns and trends in prison admissions, jail utilization and program utilization; conduct comparative analyses among programs; and assess programmatic and fiscal impacts of policy options. Local jurisdictions utilize various assessment instruments to determine an offender's risk of recidivism and criminogenic needs, produce data/information to guide case planning and case management, and monitor an offender's progress.

FY 2019 AWARD OF FUNDS

Community Corrections Comprehensive Plans and Applications

In August 2018, the State Community Corrections Board recommended approval for thirty-five (35) proposals which cover forty-four (44) counties for Community Corrections Funds for FY 2019. Director Heidi Washington approved the award of \$1.16 million to support Drunk Driver Jail Reduction & Community Treatment Programs statewide.

- The proposals are pursuant to the county comprehensive corrections' plans which provide a policy framework for community corrections' funded programs.

Twenty-nine (29) counties have elected to participate through formulation of a single county Community Corrections Advisory Board; and, fifteen (15) counties through the formulation of multi-county Community Corrections Advisory Boards. The multi-county boards consist of the following:

- Arenac/Ogemaw
- Northeast - Alcona, Alpena, Cheboygan, Crawford, Otsego
- Thirteenth Judicial Circuit – Antrim, Grand Traverse, Leelanau
- Thumb Region – Lapeer, Tuscola
- Wexford/Missaukee

The comprehensive plans and applications submitted by local jurisdictions addressed the objectives and priorities of P.A. 511 of 1988 and the Appropriations Act, as well as objectives and priorities adopted by the State Community Corrections Board and local jurisdictions.

The following table titled "FY 2019 Contract Award Summary," identifies the plan amount requested for Drunk Driver Jail Reduction & Community Treatment Program funds from each jurisdiction and the awards of funds as recommended by the State Community Corrections Board and approved by the Director of the Department of Corrections.

FY 2019 CONTRACT AWARD SUMMARY - GRANT APPLICATIONS

DDJR/CTP ANNUAL CONTRACTS				
CCAB	FY 2019 Plan Amount	FY 2019 Recommendation	FY 2019 Reserve	FY 2019 Total Recommended
ALLEGAN	-	28,490	-	28,490
ARENAC-OGEMAW	-	-	-	-
BARRY	9,556	18,865	-	18,865
BAY	6,575	6,575	-	6,575
BERRIEN	-	-	-	-
CASS	8,508	2,175	-	2,175
EATON	18,551	18,551	-	18,551
EMMET	-	-	-	-
GENESEE	37,440	37,440	-	37,440
INGHAM	21,169	21,169	-	21,169
IONIA	14,534	14,534	-	14,534
ISABELLA	4,275	4,275	-	4,275
JACKSON	-	7,200	-	7,200
KALAMAZOO	16,200	16,200	-	16,200
KENT	110,620	110,620	-	110,620
LIVINGSTON	-	-	-	-
MACOMB	143,200	143,200	-	143,200
MARQUETTE	1,606	870	-	870
MIDLAND	32,000	32,000	-	32,000
MONROE	-	-	-	-
MONTCALM	3,184	3,184	-	3,184
MUSKEGON	-	6,420	-	6,420
NORTHEAST MI REGIONAL	12,300	5,775	-	5,775
OAKLAND	267,378	289,878	-	289,878
OTTAWA	35,463	35,463	-	35,463
SAGINAW	35,000	35,000	-	35,000
ST. CLAIR	98,800	-	98,800	98,800
ST. JOSEPH	-	-	-	-
THIRTEENTH	22,000	22,000	-	22,000
THUMB	49,828	49,828	-	49,828
VAN BUREN	26,876	26,876	-	26,876
WASHTENAW	-	-	-	-
WAYNE	125,198	125,198	-	125,198
WEXFORD-MISSAUKEE	8,390	8,390	-	8,390
TOTALS	1,108,651	1,070,176	98,800	1,168,976
	RESIDENTIAL SERVICES ALLOTMENT			
APPROPRIATION			APPROPRIATION	\$ 1,168,976

DRUNK DRIVER JAIL REDUCTION & COMMUNITY TREATMENT PROGRAM

FY 2019 Appropriation	\$1,144,100
FY 2019 Award of Funds (CCAB)	\$1,168,976
FY 2019 Award of Funds (PRS)	\$ 271,124

The FY 2019 Drunk Driver Jail Reduction and Community Treatment Program (DDJR&CTP) funds are awarded to support treatment options to reduce drunk driving and drunk driving-related deaths by addressing the alcohol addiction pursuant to local comprehensive corrections' plans developed under P.A. 511.

The Annual Appropriations Act stipulates that the funds are appropriated and shall be expended for transportation, treatment costs, and housing felony drunk drivers during a period of assessment and treatment planning.

PART FIVE

JAIL UTILIZATION

Community Corrections programs must include the participation of offenders who would likely be sentenced to imprisonment in a state correctional facility or jail, with the goal of reducing recidivism. Community programs can be defined as a program that is an alternative to incarceration in a state correctional facility or jail. Through 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.

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/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 in-jail programming), and structured sentencing.

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.

DDJR & CTP programs have been established to impact 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 lengths of stay in jail. 5-Day Housing, a jail reimbursement program, is funded solely through DDJR & CTP funding.

Jail Statistics Overview

The majority of the county jails have been electronically submitting jail utilization and inmate profile data to the State since 1998. Collectively, these county data inputs comprise the Jail Population Information System (JPIS). Jail reporting from year-to-year has been less than uniform in jail representation due to issues such as jails changing jail management systems. In 2011, the Department entered into a contractual agreement with Northpointe, Inc. to implement the COMPAS Case Manager System statewide which includes a centralized data reporting system for the Jail Population Information System. However, it has been determined that only a minimal amount of counties have the ability to report the requested information.

In addition to counties not uploading their data, several system/vendor changes have significantly impacted JPIS reporting. The Department continues to work with the jails to address local JPIS issues.

Jails play a vital role in the sanctioning process, and one of the stated purposes of JPIS is to provide information to support coherent policy making. Using JPIS 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. Such analysis can lead to potential alternatives to incarceration and result in formulation of other objectives to improve utilization (i.e., reduce jail crowding, change offender population profiles, reduce the average length of stay). Further, the data can be used to monitor the utilization of the jails before and after various policies, practices, procedures or programming are implemented.

Recognizing that all counties are not represented in data submissions and periodically some counties' data may not be up-to-date, statewide summary reports do not completely represent State figures or State totals; however, input from rural, urban, and metropolitan counties is included and such reports should present a reasonable and useful representation.

Jail data provided from September of 2018 provides the following observations:

- The State projects approximately 20,224 jail beds available throughout the State.
- Several of the counties have reported local bed closures, with approximately 2,099 beds be closed to date.
- There is no clear correlation between the relative size of the jail and prison commitments; however, data may suggest more aggressive targeting of specific priority populations for diversions. It is evident that prison commitments and jail crowding are directly related to policies and practices which govern how defendants and offenders are supervised and how the jail and other community-based resources are utilized.

PART SIX

Community Corrections Information System (CCIS)

Overview

The Department entered into a contractual agreement with Equivant to implement the COMPAS Case Manager System statewide – this new system merged CCIS data into a statewide centralized website.

Local jurisdictions enter offender profile and program utilization data into the centralized website case manager program for 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 is utilized 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.

CCIS Features

Available at the CCAB level, the report identifies year-to-date information on new enrollments, average lengths of stay of successful and failed completions, and average enrollment levels for each P.A. 511 funded program. Statistics on offender characteristics (i.e., population percentages of felons, probation

violators, straddle cell offenders, etc.) are also provided. Enhancements are part of OCC's ongoing commitment to assist local entities and OCC staff to actively monitor local program activity and the 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 dispositions, jail utilization and program utilization by priority target groups of offenders continues to improve. Areas in which data system enhancements have an impact include:

1. Improvement to the timeliness and availability of felony disposition data. The use of a data export process to import felony disposition data directly generated from the MDOC's master data-gathering system, OMNI, into the centralized website is being created to provide local CCAB timely felony disposition data.

The ready accessibility and improved timeliness of felony disposition data obtained from OMNI and the enhanced data on sentencing guideline scores improves the analytical and reporting capabilities at the local level. As a result, the accuracy of CCIS data is improved as well.

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

The streamlined Jail Population Information System requirements are aimed at improving the ability to identify target populations among sentenced and unsentenced felons. The adoption of the JPIS enhancements by software vendors and local jails provides an expanding capability to link felony disposition data to jail population data.

The centralized statewide case manager system has merged JPIS data into one data system which will increase the Departments and local CCAB accessibility and timeliness of jail data and enhance data reporting capabilities.