

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE
Pursuant to P.A. 200 of 2012
Section 611
Community Reentry Programs

Section 611 of 2012 P.A. 200 requires that the Department of Corrections provide individual reports for the community reentry program, the electronic tether program, and the special alternative to incarceration program, including information on:

- Monthly new participants. Community reentry program participants shall be categorized by reason for placement. For technical rule violators, the report shall sort offenders by length of time since release from prison, by the most recent violation, and by number of violations occurring since release from prison.
- Monthly participant unsuccessful terminations, including cause.
- Number of successful terminations.
- End month population by facility/program.
- Average length of placement.
- Return to prison statistics.
- Description of each program location or locations, capacity, and staffing.
- Sentencing guideline scores and actual sentence statistics for participants, if applicable.
- Comparison with prior year statistics.
- Analysis of the impact on prison admissions and jail utilization and the cost effectiveness of the program.

The Community Reentry Program brings the Residential Reentry Program and the Intensive Detention Reentry Program under the umbrella of Prisoner Reentry, revitalizing the focus on public safety and offender success by assisting offenders in their transition back to their communities. Core reentry principles provide the foundation for how the combined program is operated. Comprehensive and structured programming includes facilitated groups that address issues of Domestic Violence, Substance Abuse, Parenting, Criminal Thinking, Recreation, Employment Preparation, Finance/Budgeting, Life Skills, Family Reunification, 12 Step programs, and other programs identified to meet their needs.

The Residential Reentry Program (RRP) is currently operating at two sites. In 2008, the last Technical Rule Violator (TRV) center, Lake County TRV, changed its focus to reentry by becoming the Lake County Residential Reentry Program (LCRRP). In October 2012, the Ryan Correctional Facility was repurposed and renamed the Detroit Reentry Center (DRC). The Tuscola Residential Reentry Program (TRRP) closed on October 23, 2012 and the program was reestablished inside the Detroit Reentry Center.

Both sites house and work with parolees who need a Reentry refresher course when their behavior exhibits early signs of parole failure. DRC also provides programming to new parolees placed as a condition of their parole. DRC houses male parolees. LCRRP houses both male and female parolees.

In October 2007, the Intensive Detention Reentry Program (IDRP) was brought into the Community Reentry Programs. The IDRP began in July of 2004 as a result of the need to have an alternative for technical parole violators in counties where jail overcrowding had diminished

the Department's ability to detain them. The goal was to provide parole agents the opportunity to detain parolees with compliance problems before they became more serious parole violators.

Currently, the Department contracts with the Ingham County Jail to house parole violators for an average stay of about 30 days. In October 2012 the contract with the Clinton County Jail ended and the Wayne County IDRPs was established within the Detroit Reentry Center. One field agent is assigned to the Ingham County Jail to supervise the IDRPs population. The field agent at the jail assists field agents in the community by developing an updated release plan for the parolee, which includes updated placement information, and outpatient or residential substance abuse recommendations based on assessments to determine level of care needed.

Table 1 shows the number of new Community Reentry Program participants by month and program site.

Table 1 - New Community Reentry Program Participants Monthly By Location

| | IDRP | | | | | | RRP | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|---------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Clinton | | Ingham | | Wayne | | Lake County | | Tuscola | | Detroit | | | |
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Jan | 61 | 62 | 202 | 199 | - | - | 108 | 116 | 60 | 48 | - | - | 431 | 425 |
| Feb | 49 | 47 | 149 | 190 | - | - | 91 | 107 | 60 | 53 | - | - | 349 | 397 |
| Mar | 59 | 62 | 207 | 212 | - | - | 112 | 141 | 65 | 97 | - | - | 443 | 512 |
| Apr | 57 | 60 | 188 | 229 | - | - | 88 | 109 | 106 | 60 | - | - | 439 | 458 |
| May | 56 | 71 | 218 | 233 | - | - | 91 | 138 | 87 | 72 | - | - | 452 | 514 |
| Jun | 64 | 69 | 230 | 253 | - | - | 112 | 126 | 72 | 61 | - | - | 478 | 509 |
| Jul | 58 | 88 | 215 | 259 | - | - | 98 | 120 | 75 | 76 | - | - | 446 | 543 |
| Aug | 69 | 73 | 225 | 271 | - | - | 132 | 138 | 70 | 100 | - | - | 496 | 582 |
| Sep | 49 | 64 | 210 | 217 | - | - | 113 | 100 | 95 | 66 | - | - | 467 | 447 |
| Oct | 58 | 39 | 191 | 262 | - | - | 84 | 132 | 68 | 32 | - | 125* | 401 | 590 |
| Nov | 55 | - | 175 | 182 | - | 226 | 104 | 89 | 77 | - | - | 50 | 411 | 547 |
| Dec | 40 | - | 149 | 152 | - | 228 | 111 | 63 | 79 | - | - | 59 | 379 | 502 |
| Total | 675 | 635 | 2,359 | 2,659 | - | 454 | 1,244 | 1,379 | 914 | 665 | - | 234 | 5,192 | 6,026 |
| Avg | 56.3 | 63.5 | 196.6 | 221.6 | - | 227.0 | 103.7 | 114.9 | 76.2 | 66.5 | - | 78.0 | 432.7 | 502.2 |

* 100 were transfers from Tuscola RRP.

Table 2 looks at only the parole technical violators from the new Community Reentry Program participants for which RRP was an appropriate intervention and breaks down time since parole from prison until admission to the RRP.

Table 2 – Parole Technical Violator Length of Time Since Release from Prison to Admission to RRP

| Length of Time Since Release from Prison | 2011 | | 2012 | |
|--|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 0-6 Months | 292 | 20.4% | 317 | 17.1% |
| 7-12 Months | 279 | 19.5% | 396 | 21.4% |
| 13-18 Months | 248 | 17.3% | 346 | 18.7% |
| 19+ Months | 611 | 42.7% | 793 | 42.8% |
| Total | 1,430 | 100.0% | 1,852 | 100.0% |

Tables 3 through 5 look at only the new RRP participants and present active sentence information for the parolees at the time of their admission to the RRP. In 2012, the 2,178 new RRP participants had 5,066 active sentences, with similar distributions to 2011 participants.

The details presented in Tables 3 and 4 are for individual sentences only, since a composite or cumulative minimum term that accounts for consecutive sentences would obscure offense type information.

Table 3 - Minimum Term Groups for All Active Offenses at the Time of Admission to RRP

| Minimum Term Groups* | 2011 | | 2012 | |
|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 0-12 Months | 1,063 | 22.6% | 1,308 | 25.8% |
| 13-24 Months | 2,297 | 48.9% | 2,327 | 45.9% |
| 25-36 Months | 621 | 13.2% | 723 | 14.3% |
| 37-60 Months | 413 | 8.8% | 418 | 8.3% |
| 61-120 Months | 258 | 5.5% | 223 | 4.4% |
| 121+ Months | 45 | 1.0% | 67 | 1.3% |
| Life | 3 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total Offenses | 4,700 | 100.0% | 5,066 | 100.0% |

* These Minimum Terms represent individual active sentences and disregard consecutives.

Table 4 - Offense Types for All Active Offenses at the Time of Admission to RRP

| Offense Type | 2011 | | | 2012 | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Number | Percent | Average Term* | Number | Percent | Average Term* |
| Nonassaultive | 2,544 | 54.1% | 22.1 | 2,781 | 54.9% | 22.5 |
| Drug | 670 | 14.3% | 22.5 | 731 | 14.4% | 19.9 |
| Assaultive | 1,486 | 31.6% | 40.5 | 1,554 | 30.7% | 38.3 |
| Total Offenses | 4,700 | 100.0% | 27.0 | 5,066 | 100.0% | 26.7 |

* In months, these Average Terms represent individual active sentences and disregard consecutives.

Sentencing Guidelines (SGL) information has been captured in OMNI on a statewide basis since October of 2002, thus 2003 is the first available, full year of the 1999 Legislative Sentencing Guidelines. Unfortunately, roughly 30% of the sentencing dates for the 2011 and 2012 new RRP participants are from before 2003 and additional complications, such as a mix of sentences with and without SGL data, and the change in handling of SGLs with regard to probation violations, make interpreting SGL sentencing characteristics dubious at this time. Regardless, Table 5 shows that most of the actual sentences agree with the SGL ranges, though this comparison is not that useful since it represents less than half of the sentences for new RRP participants.

Table 5 - Comparison of Actual Sentence with SGL Range for New RRP Participants

| Actual Sentence vs. SGL Range | 2011 | | 2012 | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Below Range | 180 | 8.9% | 215 | 8.9% |
| Within Range | 1,720 | 84.9% | 2,028 | 84.4% |
| Above Range | 127 | 6.3% | 160 | 6.7% |
| Total with SGLs | 2,027 | 43.1% | 2,403 | 47.4% |
| Unknown SGLs | 2,673 | 56.9% | 2,663 | 52.6% |
| Total Offenses | 4,700 | 100.0% | 5,066 | 100.0% |

Table 6 reverts back to entire Community Reentry Program data and shows that in 2012, there were 3,554 parolees that successfully completed the IDRP and 2,111 parolees that successfully completed the RRP. The 2012 average successful stay for parolees in the IDRP was 24.3 days (down from 26.8 days in 2011), and for the RRP 65.1 days (down from 66.5 days in 2011).

Table 6 - Monthly Successful Community Reentry Program Terminations by Location

| | IDRP | | | | | | RRP | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|---------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Clinton | | Ingham | | Wayne | | Lake County | | Tuscola | | Detroit | | | |
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Jan | 60 | 49 | 218 | 154 | - | - | 100 | 100 | 44 | 79 | - | - | 422 | 382 |
| Feb | 44 | 61 | 154 | 216 | - | - | 95 | 101 | 43 | 69 | - | - | 336 | 447 |
| Mar | 65 | 49 | 173 | 189 | - | - | 108 | 129 | 77 | 47 | - | - | 423 | 414 |
| Apr | 55 | 62 | 209 | 233 | - | - | 98 | 94 | 78 | 48 | - | - | 440 | 437 |
| May | 55 | 72 | 184 | 243 | - | - | 94 | 129 | 69 | 89 | - | - | 402 | 533 |
| Jun | 63 | 64 | 237 | 234 | - | - | 102 | 118 | 73 | 59 | - | - | 475 | 475 |
| Jul | 61 | 88 | 206 | 273 | - | - | 87 | 139 | 52 | 68 | - | - | 406 | 568 |
| Aug | 68 | 78 | 246 | 261 | - | - | 120 | 132 | 82 | 62 | - | - | 516 | 533 |
| Sep | 53 | 60 | 192 | 220 | - | - | 93 | 113 | 61 | 69 | - | - | 399 | 462 |
| Oct | 53 | 97 | 216 | 261 | - | - | 100 | 135 | 82 | 85 | - | 0 | 451 | 578 |
| Nov | 57 | - | 184 | 220 | - | 1 | 125 | 76 | 67 | - | - | 66 | 433 | 363 |
| Dec | 51 | - | 175 | 160 | - | 209 | 88 | 59 | 68 | - | - | 45 | 382 | 473 |
| Total | 685 | 680 | 2,394 | 2,664 | - | 210 | 1,210 | 1,325 | 796 | 675 | - | 111 | 5,085 | 5,665 |
| Avg | 57.1 | 68.0 | 199.5 | 222.0 | - | 105.0 | 100.8 | 110.4 | 66.3 | 67.5 | - | 37.0 | 423.8 | 472.1 |

Unsuccessful IDRP and RRP terminations occurred in about 1.4% of all terminations for 2012 (down from 1.8% in 2011). Parolees failed the RRP after an average of 35.9 days in 2012, compared to 39.3 days in 2011. Typical reasons for unsuccessful terminations from the RRP include:

- Abscond violation
- Medically / Psychologically unmanageable
- Substance abuse violations
- Rule violation (non substance abuse)
- New felony / misdemeanor
- Threatening / assaultive behavior
- Creating a disturbance
- Failure to follow rules of Reentry Center
- As determined by Central Office or Area Manager/Center Manager

Table 7 - Monthly Unsuccessful Community Reentry Program Terminations by Location

| | IDRP | | | | | | RRP | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|---------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Clinton | | Ingham | | Wayne | | Lake County | | Tuscola | | Detroit | | | |
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Jan | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | - | - | 3 | 5 |
| Feb | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | - | - | 6 | 6 |
| Mar | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | - | - | 9 | 2 |
| Apr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 1 | 3 | 9 | 7 | - | - | 10 | 10 |
| May | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | - | - | 8 | 7 |
| Jun | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | - | 0 | 2 | 11 | 1 | - | - | 12 | 4 |
| Jul | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 6 | 0 | 2 | 5 | - | - | 8 | 5 |
| Aug | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 3 | 9 | 6 | - | - | 9 | 10 |
| Sep | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 4 | 5 | 5 | - | - | 9 | 9 |
| Oct | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | - | 0 | 7 | 6 |
| Nov | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | - | - | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Dec | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 2 | 1 | 5 | 6 | - | - | 5 | 7 | 12 |
| Total | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | - | 2 | 16 | 25 | 69 | 44 | - | 5 | 91 | 79 |
| Avg | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | - | 1.0 | 1.3 | 2.1 | 5.8 | 4.4 | - | 1.7 | 7.6 | 6.6 |

The monthly new Community Reentry Program participants, monthly successful and unsuccessful terminations, and average lengths of stay resulted in the end of month populations shown in Table 8.

Table 8 - End of Month Community Reentry Program Populations by Location

| | IDRP | | | | | | RRP | | | | | | Total | |
|------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Clinton | | Ingham | | Wayne | | Lake County | | Tuscola | | Detroit | | | |
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Jan | 59 | 60 | 154 | 185 | - | - | 238 | 255 | 121 | 119 | - | - | 572 | 619 |
| Feb | 63 | 45 | 149 | 159 | - | - | 232 | 261 | 140 | 93 | - | - | 584 | 558 |
| Mar | 57 | 58 | 176 | 182 | - | - | 234 | 271 | 154 | 147 | - | - | 621 | 658 |
| Apr | 59 | 56 | 155 | 182 | - | - | 223 | 283 | 154 | 152 | - | - | 591 | 673 |
| May | 60 | 55 | 189 | 171 | - | - | 220 | 292 | 149 | 128 | - | - | 618 | 646 |
| Jun | 60 | 60 | 182 | 189 | - | - | 228 | 298 | 139 | 129 | - | - | 609 | 676 |
| Jul | 58 | 60 | 191 | 175 | - | - | 233 | 279 | 155 | 132 | - | - | 637 | 646 |
| Aug | 59 | 54 | 170 | 184 | - | - | 242 | 282 | 159 | 164 | - | - | 630 | 684 |
| Sep | 57 | 58 | 188 | 181 | - | - | 260 | 265 | 161 | 156 | - | - | 666 | 660 |
| Oct | 60 | - | 161 | 182 | - | - | 240 | 259 | 152 | - | - | 125 | 613 | 566 |
| Nov | 58 | - | 152 | 147 | - | 225 | 190 | 269 | 146 | - | - | 109 | 546 | 525 |
| Dec | 47 | - | 126 | 139 | - | 242 | 189 | 269 | 145 | - | - | 118 | 507 | 526 |
| Avg | 58.1 | 56.2 | 166.1 | 173.0 | - | 233.5 | 227.4 | 273.6 | 147.9 | 135.6 | - | 117.3 | 599.5 | 619.8 |

Return to prison statistics measure a parolee's outcome at the conclusion of a standard follow-up period. Table 9 replicates a portion of the **Three-Year Follow-Up Outcomes of Offenders Who Paroled in 1998 to 2008 by Year** reported in the Department's 2011 Statistical Report (the most recent available). The table shows that offenders paroled in 2008 had a Return to Prison Rate of 31.5% (Technical Violators 13.6%, and New Sentence Violators 17.9%) after a full three-year follow up period. New Community Reentry Program participants in 2008 would have had similar recidivism rates.

Table 9 - (portion of) Three-Year Follow-Up Outcomes of Offenders Who Paroled in 1998 to 2008 by Year

| Year Paroled | Total Cases | Success Total | Failure Total | Absconds | Technical Violators | New Sentence | Return to Prison |
|--------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|----------|---------------------|--------------|------------------|
| 2004 | 10,818 | 50.6% | 49.4% | 8.7% | 20.9% | 19.9% | 40.8% |
| 2005 | 9,800 | 49.4% | 50.6% | 10.1% | 19.8% | 20.7% | 40.6% |
| 2006 | 9,694 | 54.2% | 45.8% | 9.4% | 15.6% | 20.8% | 36.5% |
| 2007 | 11,805 | 63.9% | 36.1% | 2.8% | 13.6% | 19.7% | 33.2% |
| 2008 | 11,044 | 66.2% | 33.8% | 2.2% | 13.6% | 17.9% | 31.5% |

See 2011 Statistical Report at
<http://www.michigan.gov/corrections/0,4551,7-119-1441---,00.html>

The Community Reentry Program impacts prison admissions by intervening and diverting eligible parole violators who would otherwise be returned to prison. At the end of 2012, the average time before reparole for a parole technical violator was 12.5 months. The 2012 average successful RRP stay was 65.1 days, or 2.1 months, which saved an average of 10.4 months per parole technical violator RRP participant.

The following IDRPs and RRP Centers were operated during 2011 and 2012:

Clinton County IDRPs *(Closed 10/31/12)* **Capacity: 60 beds**
 1347 East Townsend Road
 St. Johns, MI 48879

| | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| 2011 Staffing | | 2012 Staffing |
| 1.0 | Parole Probation Officer-E | 1.0 |

Ingham County IDRPs **Capacity: 190 beds**
 640 North Cedar
 Mason, MI 48854

| | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| 2011 Staffing | | 2012 Staffing |
| 1.0 | Parole Probation Officer-E | 1.0 |

Detroit Reentry Center **Capacity: 1,044 beds**
 Wayne County IDRPs operate inside of the DRC *(Opened 11/1/12)*
 17600 Ryan Road
 Detroit, MI 48212

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 2011 Staffing | | 2012 Staffing |
| <i>(DRC opened on 10/22/12)</i> | | |
| | Corrections Officers | 138.3 |
| | Departmental Technicians | 2.0 |
| | Senior Executive Warden | 1.0 |
| | Executive Secretary-E | 1.0 |
| | State Administrative Manager-1 | 1.0 |
| | Accounting Technician-E | 1.0 |
| | General Office Assistant-E | 1.0 |
| | Storekeeper-A | 4.0 |
| | Storekeeper Supervisor-2 | 1.0 |
| | Building Trades Crew Leader | 1.0 |
| | Maintenance Mechanic-A | 5.0 |
| | Electrician Master Lic-A FZN | 1.0 |
| | Physical Plant Supervisor-1 | 1.0 |
| | Plumber-A | 1.0 |
| | Library Technician-E | 1.0 |
| | State Deputy Warden-1 | 1.0 |
| | Corrections Resident Rep. | 1.0 |
| | Human Resources Developer-A | 1.0 |
| | Prison Counselor-E | 1.0 |
| | Corrections Shift Supervisor 1 | 10.7 |
| | Corrections Shift Supervisor 2 | 6.0 |
| | Corrections Program Coordinator | 6.0 |
| | Parole Probation Manager 13 | 1.0 |
| | Parole Probation Officers | 7.0 |
| | Secretary 8 | 1.0 |
| | Total Detroit Reentry Center Staff | 196.0 |

Lake County Residential Reentry Program

Capacity: 300 beds

4153 South M-37
 Baldwin, MI 49304

| 2011 Staffing | | 2012 Staffing |
|----------------------|--|----------------------|
| 1.0 | Parole Probation Manager 2 | 1.0 |
| 5.0 | Parole Probation Officer – E | 5.0 |
| 1.0 | Correction Shift Supervisor 1 | 0.0 |
| 10.0 | Corrections Officers | 5.0 |
| 1.0 | Secretary E8 | 1.0 |
| 18.0 | Total Lake County Residential Reentry Staff | 12.0 |

Tuscola Residential Reentry Program *(Closed 10/23/12)*

Capacity: 160 beds

2420 Chambers Road
 Caro, MI 48723

| 2011 Staffing | | 2012 Staffing |
|----------------------|--|----------------------|
| 1.0 | Parole Probation Manager 13 | 1.0 |
| 3.0 | Parole Probation Officers | 3.0 |
| 3.0 | Correction Shift Supervisor 1 | 3.0 |
| 1.0 | Correction Shift Supervisor 2 | 1.0 |
| 2.0 | Corrections Program Coordinator | 2.0 |
| 24.0 | Corrections Officers | 19.0 |
| 3.0 | Food Service Leader Prisoner | 3.0 |
| 1.0 | Maintenance Mechanic – A | 1.0 |
| 1.0 | Secretary 8 | 1.0 |
| 39.0 | Total Tuscola Residential Reentry Staff | 34.0 |