

# **PRISONER RE-ENTRY**

## **SPECIAL ALTERNATIVE INCARCERATION PR In-Reach Facility**

### **ANNUAL REPORT -2012-**

**Pursuant to: PA 200 - Sec. 611 of 2012  
MCL 791.234a (9)**

**Daniel Heyns, Director**

## ***REPORT HIGHLIGHTS***

- 608 SAI male prisoners from 65 counties, and 114 SAI female prisoners from 35 counties, were enrolled in the program. 335 male probationers from 34 counties, and 23 female probationers from 13 counties, were enrolled in the program. See pages 20 through 25.
- 26.7% of the male prisoners, 38.6% of the female prisoners, 17.9% of the male probationers, and 13.0% of the female probationers, 12.6% In Reach male prisoners (IRM) and 6.9% In Reach female prisoners (IRF) enrolled in the program were serving for drug related offenses. See pages 14 - 16 for a list of the offenses of which program participants were convicted.
- 539 SAI male prisoners, 88 SAI female prisoners, 264 male probationers, and 14 female probationers successfully completed the program. The successful completion rates were 94.2% for SAI male prisoners, 94.6% for SAI female prisoners, 88.2% for male probationers, and 93.3% for female probationers. See pages 8 through 11 for complete program results.
- 949 In Reach male prisoners (IRM) from 63 counties and 29 In Reach female prisoners (IRF) from 16 counties were enrolled in the program.
- 750 IRM prisoners and 19 IRF prisoners successfully completed the program. The successful completion rates were 89.4% for IRM prisoners and 95.0% for IRF prisoners. See pages 12 through 13 for complete program results.
- The program is cost effective as compared to prison. See page 7.
- 45.5% of offenders taking the mandatory battery of GED tests earned their GED Certificates while enrolled in the program. See page 7.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
What is Offender Re-Entry	1-3
Special Alternative Incarceration	4-6
Program Cost Effectiveness	7
Evening Educational and Re-Entry Programming	7
Summary of 2012 Male Probationer Program Statistics	8
Summary of 2012 Female Probationer Program Statistics	9
Summary of 2012 SAI Male Prisoner Program Statistics	10
Summary of 2012 SAI Female Prisoner Program Statistics	11
Summary of 2012 In-Reach Male Prisoner (IRM) Statistics	12
Summary of 2012 IN Reach Female Prisoner (IRF) Statistics	13
Probationer Admissions by Offense Type	14
Prisoner Admissions by Offense Type	15
In Reach Prisoner Admission by Offense Type	16
Comparison of Outcomes SAI-Prison vs. Non-SAI	17-19
APPENDICES A-N	20-47
A. 2012 Admissions by County - Probationer	
B. 2012 Admissions by County – SAI Prisoner	
C. 2012 Admission by County – In Reach Prisoners	
D. 2012 Admissions by Month	
E. 2012 Admissions by Gender	
F. 2012 Monthly Population Totals	
G. 2012 Program Outcomes by County - Probationer	
H. 2012 Program Outcomes by County – Prisoner	
I. 2012 Program Outcomes by County-In Reach Prisoner	
J. 2012 Monthly Program Outcomes - Prisoner	
K. 2012 Monthly Program Outcomes – Probationer	
L. 2012 Monthly Program Outcomes – In Reach Prisoners	
M. 2012 Graduates by Gender	
N. Comparative Program Outcomes - 2011 and 2012	

# What is Offender Re-Entry?

Offender re-entry is the process of leaving prison or jail and returning to society. All former offenders experience re-entry into the community whether they are released on parole or without supervision. With successful re-entry, there are great benefits to the community including improved public safety, a tremendous cost savings by reducing the chances for recidivism, and the long-term reintegration of the former offender.

## The Prisoner Re-Entry Vision

The **VISION** of Prisoner Re-Entry (PR) is that every offender released from prison will have the tools needed to succeed in the community.

## The PR Mission

The **MISSION** of PR is to reduce crime by implementing a seamless plan of services and supervision developed with each prisoner—delivered through state and local collaboration—from the time of their entry into prison through their transition, reintegration, and aftercare in the community.

## The Three-Phase, Decision-Point PR Model

The PR Model involves improved decision making at critical decision points in the three phases of the custody, release, and community supervision/discharge process. The Special Alternative Incarceration Program encompasses both the Getting Ready and Going Home phases.

### GETTING READY

The institutional phase describes the details of events and responsibilities that occur during the prisoner's imprisonment from admission until the point of the parole decision and involves two major decision points:

1. Assessment and classification: Measuring the prisoner's risks, needs, and strengths.
2. Prisoner programming: Assignments to reduce risk, address need, and build on strengths.

Participation in each program is the result of assessing each offender's strengths and weaknesses using the Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) and the Transition Accountability Plan (TAP).

The evidence-based programs provided during the offender's SAI experience are:

Cognitive Behavioral Restructuring: Thinking Matters, Journaling (thinking report format), Cage Your Rage, Outpatient Substance Abuse Therapy, A Woman's Way Through The 12 Steps (Female), Seeking Safety (Female), Moving on (Female) and Domestic Violence (Bridges-Male and Meridian-Female)

Family/Community Structure:

Family Focus Education, Family Focus Meeting, Premarital Interpersonal Choices and Knowledge (PICK a Partner), Smart Steps for Step Families, Religious Services, Transition Team Visits and In-Reach Services.

Daily Living Skills:

Work Keys-Vocational Education, GED, Computer Lab, Financial Management, Pre-Release, Public Works and Institutional Work Assignments.

Self Discipline:

Interaction within a highly structured disciplined setting-Offenders rise at 6:00 A.M., attend programs and work assignments throughout the day and participate in physical exercise. (Exercise designed for the offender's physical ability) Bed time is at 10:00 P.M. There are no individual televisions, radios, games or other distractions that prevent the offender from learning and applying the skills they learn while incarcerated in the SAI Program. The offender is challenged mentally, emotionally and physically while at SAI.

## **GOING HOME**

The transition to the community or re-entry phase begins before the prisoner's target release date. In this phase, highly specific re-entry plans are organized that address housing, employment, and services to address addiction and mental illness. Phase Two involves the next two major decision points:

3. Prisoner release preparation: Developing a strong, public-safety-conscious parole plan.
4. Release decision making: Improving parole release guidelines.

The second phase is the "Going home or transitioning from prison to the community" phase. Prior to re-entering the community, a plan utilizing community in-reach resources is developed in collaboration with the offender and those state and local resources.

The community plan is designed to enhance public safety by effective risk management, treatment programs, offender accountability and community and victim participation. These plans are developed prior to the offender leaving SAI with the assistance of Transition Teams.

During the Transition Team or "In-reach" meeting, the offender is introduced to their parole or probation agent. The agent will discuss their home placement and brief initial reporting instructions. Transition Team members from various service providers will be present at the meeting to inquire as to what services the offender will initially require upon release. The offender is allowed the opportunity to discuss or ask questions regarding their release and transition.

## **STAYING HOME**

The community and discharge phase begins when the prisoner is released from prison and continues until discharge from community parole supervision. In this phase, it is the responsibility of the former prisoner, human services providers, and the offender's network of community supports and mentors to assure continued success. Phase Three involves the final three major decision points of the transition process:

5. Supervision and services: Providing flexible and firm supervision and services.
6. Revocation decision making: Using graduated sanctions to respond to behavior.
7. Discharge and aftercare: Determining community responsibility to "take over" the case.

Upon release from Special Alternative Incarceration, prisoners are placed on parole for 18 months, or the expiration of their minimum sentence, whichever is greater. The first 120 days of this parole period is under intense supervision. For the first 120 days of this period, the offender will be on tether. After the intensive supervision period, the offender will transfer to a regular parole caseload.

Probationers upon release are continued on probation. The first 120 days of this probation period is under intense supervision. For the first 120 days of this period, the offender will be on tether. After the intensive supervision period, the offender will transfer to a regular probation caseload.

## Special Alternative Incarceration Program\*

During 2008, the Special Alternative Incarceration Program (SAI) was established as a Prisoner Re-Entry (PR) In-Reach Facility. Early on in this transition it was evident that SAI needed to make and be able to demonstrate significant changes in its structure and operation to meet the standards of Evidence Based Practice established in the PR Model. The SAI program provides for a decrease in the costs of incarceration by reducing the need for premium bed space for more extended periods of time. SAI is unique in the sense that they are a Phase I (Getting Ready) and a Phase II (Going Home) facility requiring the approval of the offender's judge and/or Parole Board to participate in the 90 day program. The program and structural (evidence based) modifications to the SAI program that have been fully implemented are:

### SAI

**In-reach facility:** Focus on individual risks and needs. Embraces attributes of a therapeutic community.

#### **1. Assessment and classification:**

Each offender who enters SAI has a COMPAS profile which is used by the classification director in assigning the offender to programs and work assignments that will increase their knowledge and provide the tools to become successful in the community upon their release. Offenders are now provided specific and appropriate responsive programming based upon their individual strengths and needs as profiled by the COMPAS and entered into the Transition Accountability Plan.

#### **2. Offender programming :**

The programming menus at SAI consist of the following to meet the goals of PR and the programming recommendation made by Lee H. Rome, M.D., Forensic and Correctional Mental Health Consultant. These programs are delivered in a 90 day period.

- Thinking Matters (Cognitive Behavioral Program)
- Cage Your Rage (Cognitive Behavioral Program)
- Journaling -Thinking Reports (Cognitive Behavioral Program)
- Domestic Violence (Bridges)
- Family Focus Education Workshop
- Family Focus Meetings
- Premarital Interpersonal Choices and Knowledge (PICK a Partner)
- Smart Steps for Step Families
- Substance Abuse Outpatient Therapy provided by Apex Behavioral Health Work Keys – Assessment
- Financial Planning
- GED
- Computer Lab
- Pre-Release Vocational Educational Planning
- Seeking Safety (Female only)
- Moving On (Female only)
- Domestic Violence (Meridians)
- A Woman's Way Through The 12 Steps (Female only)

### 3. *Release decision making:*

The COMPAS and Transitional Accountability Plan are used in developing the offender's release plan. All offenders entering SAI are either given automatic paroles or probation depending on the successful 90 day completion. A corrections program coordinator enters the COMPAS profile into the Transition Accountability Plan. This entry is created by COMPAS Assessment, criminal history and the trainee interview. The Transition Accountability Plan (TAP) is used to identify programming and needed intervention to reduce recidivism

The TAP profile is used by the classification director to classify trainees to the programs needed to strengthen weaknesses and to strengthen the existing skills of an offender to become successful in the community. Once the programs are completed, the completion and evaluation for SAI offender is entered into the TAP by the classification director. Completion and offender progress evaluation is provided by a supplemental 363 which was developed for SAI study evaluation purposes. This supplemental form provides both qualitative and quantitative information that allows for better audit information gathering and release decision making.

### 4. *Offender release preparation:*

Three reports currently completed by staff at SAI are:

30 Day Report-reporting court information, after care agent, placement information including employment plans.

Final Report: identifies court information, agent, approved placement and program participation.

Transition Accountability Plan: An Institutional Parole Agent (IPA) interviews the trainees and enters SAI completion data into OCMS that is used in the field to supervise the trainee when released to the community. It is also used by the Transition Teams that meet with the trainee before SAI completion for the purpose of offender release preparation.

Transition Team visits are coordinated by the PR Facility Coordinator. This team works collaboratively to develop a strong public safety conscious release plan with the offender prior to release from SAI. The meetings are either in person, by phone or teleconference.

## **Disciplinary Process**

The disciplinary process focuses on pro-social modeling and intrinsic motivation.

**Immediate Verbal Counseling** - Counsel trainee pointing out infraction of a rule or negative behavior.

**Extra Drill** - Marching and facing movements.

**Extra Duty** - Cleaning trash cans, washing windows etc., up to two hours.

**Journaling** - Writing in a journal about behavior, emotions, and making good decisions based upon what they are being taught in programming, i.e. Cage Your Rage, Thinking Matters, Journaling.

**Detention Class** - Class usually given by the 2nd shift Captain teaches trainees who are not progressing how to properly act and react, and to correct negative behavior and thought patterns.

**Motivation Detail** - An extra work detail usually consisting of cutting wood on the weekends.

**Program Review Board** - A board usually consisting of the Deputy Warden, Treatment Manager, and Shift Commander to review poor or disruptive behavior, major misconduct results, medical issues, lack of progress in the program etc., and determine whether the trainee referred should continue in the program or be terminated.

SAI Health Care also designates certain trainees with medical issues in a "Medically Compromised Platoon". These trainees are not allowed to do any physical training and are not assigned to any work assignments which require intense physical labor without Health Care approval. They are carefully monitored and are allowed to benefit by participating in the Prisoner Re-entry classes.

## **Staff Development**

Modified to the SAI Staff Academy, which incorporates the changes made to become a PR In-Reach Facility. Staff currently attending the Academy will be trained to facilitate current programs, supervise trainees (medical and non-medical), using skills received by attending the "Offenders Under Our Care" module, SAI Staff Academy and the MDOC New Employees' School .

Training in the areas of Evidence Based Programming for each facilitator is also provided.

Current staffing level:

91 custody staff  
15 administrative staff  
03 maintenance staff  
06 food service staff  
08 health care staff

## **Capacity Building**

A medical criterion was issued on January 6, 2009 to change the medical requirements of SAI to allow medically compromised prisoners and probationers to participate in the program (see Attachment 2). Further criterion was developed to screen outpatient mental health prisoners for participation in the SAI Program. These changes, combined with those of the Psychological Service Unit screening criteria, have now increased the number of prisoners available to participate in the SAI program. The current offender capacity is 530 (482 male and 48 Female).

To accommodate the medically compromised offenders, Health Care staff has been increased. SAI currently operates with five R.N.'s, one L.P.N., one RCA, one Health Care supervisor, a part time dentist, and staff from the Outpatient Mental Health Team and Psychological Services Unit. Physical structure now includes a medication room, medical teleconferencing room, and a dental clinic.

In keeping with the components of the Prisoner Re-Entry and expected participation of medically comprised/mentally ill trainees in the SAI program, two modifications have been made to the structure of the program. The changes affect the SAI trainee disciplinary process and physical training regiment. Based on the expected increased risk of heat-related illnesses and number of trainees now on "restricted physical training status" for medical and mental health related illnesses, the operating procedure has been changed, eliminating physical discipline sanctions for medically restricted and non-medically restricted trainees. This change significantly increased the number of offenders who can participate in the SAI program.

\*See 2010 Annual Report for a full before and after comparison of SAI program and structure.

## **PROGRAM COST EFFECTIVENESS**

A process and impact evaluation conducted by the JFA Institute included a cost benefit assessment to estimate net savings that can be attributed to the SAI program. The analysis incorporated up-to-date information regarding SAI population, cumulative SAI program costs (including programs), estimated length of stay in prison for non-SAI cases and per diem costs for Level I and Level II facilities in its calculation. It further controlled for higher parole grant rates that have occurred recently. Finally, recognizing that Length of Stay (LOS) and probability of parole are different, separate estimates were done for each SAI group: Probation, Prison and Intensive Reentry. The figure below is a consolidation of those separate estimates and reflects the mix of trainee types at the time the study was conducted. Net savings figures are subject to change according to SAI population (and resulting per diem costs) and the mix of referral sources.

Based on a mix of Prison SAI, Intensive Reentry (past ERD) and Probation cases, the JFA estimates annual net savings from SAI to be 2,000 prison beds and associated operating costs.

## **EVENING EDUCATIONAL AND SELF-HELP PROGRAMMING**

While enrolled in the program, all 2058 offenders admitted in 2012, participated in programming classes consisting of Thinking Matters, Smart Steps for Step Families, Family Focus Workshop, PICK a Partner, Pre-Release, Substance Abuse Therapy, Financial Planning, Cage Your Rage, Computer Lab, and Journaling. Eight hundred seventy two offenders (42.4% of all admissions), earned their high school diploma, or received their GED prior to their admission into SAI. One thousand one hundred eighty six offenders (57.7% of all admissions) who had not graduated from high school or earned their General Educational Development (GED) Certificate were enrolled in Adult Basic Education (ABE) programming.

As a result of this programming, 355 offenders (45.5% of those completing all mandatory GED test modules) earned their GED Certificates. Those offenders that did not have the academic skills necessary to take the GED test as determined by Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) were enrolled in academic education classes. Program graduates who have completed a portion of the GED test battery are enrolled in adult education programs in the community during the residential aftercare portion of the program.

## **SUMMARY OF 2012 MALE PROBATIONER PROGRAM STATISTICS**

Male probationer program statistics for 2012 are presented in the attached appendices. These key data are summarized as follows:

Of the 335 probationers enrolled in the program:

1. 180 (53.7%) were African-American
2. 151 (45.1%) were Caucasian
3. 3 (0.9%) were Hispanic
4. 1 (0.3%) were of other races

Probationers sentenced in 34 counties enrolled in the program.

Probationer age at sentencing ranged from 17 years to 57 years, with the 17-22 year age group comprising 63.6% of all admissions.

As of December 31, 2012, 79 male probationers were enrolled in the program.

Of the 310 probationers who either completed or were terminated from the program:

(Note: Completed figures include probationers who were already in the program as of January 1, 2012).

1. 264 (85.2%) successfully completed the program
2. 6 (1.9%) voluntarily withdrew
3. 10 (12.9%) were terminated as rule violators

Seventeen probationers were terminated for medical reasons, and eleven probationers were terminated as unqualified.

(Note: Probationers terminated for medical reasons or for being unqualified are reasons out of the probationer's control).

## **SUMMARY OF 2012 FEMALE PROBATIONER PROGRAM STATISTICS**

Female probationer program statistics for 2012 are presented in the attached appendices. These key data are summarized as follows:

Of the 23 probationers enrolled in the program:

1. 8 (34.8%) were African-American
2. 15 (65.2%) were Caucasian
3. 0 (0.0%) were Hispanic
4. 0 (0.0%) were of other races

Probationers sentenced in 13 counties enrolled in the program.

Probationer age at sentencing ranged from 18 years to 37 years, with the 17-22 year age group comprising 47.9% of all admissions.

As of December 31, 2012, 4 female probationers were enrolled in the program.

Of the 15 probationers who either completed or were terminated from the program:

(Note: Completed figures include probationers who were already in the program as of January 1, 2012).

1. 14 (93.3%) successfully completed the program
2. 0 (0.0%) voluntarily withdrew
3. 1 (6.7%) were terminated as rule violators

Five probationers were terminated for medical reasons, and one probationer was terminated as unqualified.

(Note: Probationers terminated for medical reasons or for being unqualified are reasons out of the probationer's control).

## SUMMARY OF 2012 SAI MALE PRISONER PROGRAM STATISTICS

SAI male prisoner program statistics for 2012 are presented in the attached appendices. These key data are summarized as follows:

Of the 608 prisoners enrolled in the program:

1. 216 (35.5%) were African-American
2. 407 (62.0%) were Caucasian
3. 0 (0.0%) were Hispanic
4. 15 (2.5%) were of other races

SAI male prisoners sentenced in 65 counties enrolled in the program.

SAI male prisoner age at sentencing ranged from 18 years to 55 years, with the 17-22 year age group comprising 63.1% of all admissions.

As of December 31, 2012, 132 prisoners were enrolled in the program.

Of the 572 SAI male prisoners who either completed or were terminated from the program:

(Note: Completed figures include prisoners who were already in the program as of January 1, 2012).

1. 539 (94.2%) successfully completed the program
2. 6 (1.0%) voluntarily withdrew
3. 27 (4.8%) were terminated as rule violators

Eleven SAI male prisoners were terminated for medical reasons, and five SAI male prisoners were terminated as unqualified.

(Note: Prisoners terminated for medical reasons or for being unqualified are reasons out of the prisoner's control).

## **SUMMARY OF 2012 SAI FEMALE PRISONER PROGRAM STATISTICS**

SAI female prisoner program statistics for 2012 are presented in the attached appendices. These key data are summarized as follows:

Of the 114 prisoners enrolled in the program:

1. 32 (28.1%) were African-American
2. 78 (68.4 %) were Caucasian
3. 0 (0.0%) were Hispanic
4. 4 (3.5%) were of other races

Prisoners sentenced in 35 counties enrolled in the program.

Prisoner age at sentencing ranged from 18 years to 53 years, with the 17-22 year age group comprising 19.3% of all admissions.

As of December 31, 2012, 27 SAI female prisoners were enrolled in the program.

Of the 93 SAI female prisoners who either completed or were terminated from the program:  
(Note: Completed figures include prisoners who were already in the program as of January 1, 2012).

1. 88 (94.6%) successfully completed the program
2. 0 (0.0%) voluntarily withdrew
3. 5 (5.4%) was terminated as a rule violator

Three SAI female prisoners were terminated for medical reasons, and one SAI female prisoner was terminated as unqualified.

(Note: Prisoners terminated for medical reasons or for being unqualified are reasons out of the prisoner's control).

## **SUMMARY OF 2012 IN-REACH MALE PRISONER (IRM) PROGRAM STATISTICS**

IRM prisoner program statistics for 2012 are presented in the attached appendices. These key data are summarized as follows:

Of the 949 IRM prisoners enrolled in the program:

1. 617 (65.0%) were African-American
2. 321 (33.8%) were Caucasian
3. 0 (0.0%) were Hispanic
4. 11 (1.2%) were of other races

IRM prisoners sentenced in 63 counties enrolled in the program.

IRM Prisoner age at sentencing ranged from 18 years to 52 years, with the 17-22 year age group comprising 31.0% of all admissions.

As of December 31, 2012, 266 IRM prisoners were enrolled in the program.

Of the 839 SAI female prisoners who either completed or were terminated from the program:  
(Note: Completed figures include prisoners who were already in the program as of January 1, 2012).

1. 750 (89.4%) successfully completed the program
2. 13 (1.5%) voluntarily withdrew
3. 76 (9.1%) were terminated as rule violators

Nine IRM prisoners were terminated for medical reasons, and Thirteen IRM prisoners were terminated as unqualified.

(Note: Prisoners terminated for medical reasons or for being unqualified are reasons out of the prisoner's control).

## **SUMMARY OF 2012 IN REACH FEMALE PRISONER (IRF) PROGRAM STATISTICS**

IRF prisoner program statistics for 2012 are presented in the attached appendices. These key data are summarized as follows:

Of the 29 IRF prisoners enrolled in the program:

1. 10 (34.5%) were African-American
2. 17 (58.6%) were Caucasian
3. 0 (0.0%) were Hispanic
4. 0 (0.0%) were of other races

IRF prisoners sentenced in 16 counties enrolled in the program.

IRF prisoner age at sentencing ranged from 18 years to 44 years, with the 17-22 year age group comprising 20.7% of all admissions.

As of December 31, 2012, 4 IRF female prisoners were enrolled in the program.

Of the 20 IRF female prisoners who either completed or were terminated from the program:

1. 19 (95.0%) successfully completed the program
2. 0 (0.0%) voluntarily withdrew
3. 1 (5.0%) were terminated as rule violators

One IRF female prisoner was terminated for medical reasons, and one IRF female prisoners was terminated as unqualified.

(Note: Prisoners terminated for medical reasons or for being unqualified are reasons out of the prisoner's control).

## PROBATIONER ADMISSIONS BY OFFENSE TYPE

The sentence for each of the 335 male and 23 female probationers who entered the program during 2012 was used for the groupings listed below. For probationers serving more than one sentence, the sentence entered into the database first is listed.

Each of the following offense type groupings contains offenses which are similar in nature. For example, the "Fraud" category contains all cases involving financial transactions where trickery or deceit was an element of the crime.

OFFENSE TYPE	PERCENT of TOTAL	
	Males	Females
1. Drug Offenses	17.9%	13.0%
2. Home Invasion	17.9%	26.1%
3. Assault	8.9%	13.0%
4. Unlawful Driving	4.2%	4.3%
5. Robbery	8.9%	4.3%
6. Larceny	14.6%	17.5%
7. Fraud	5.1%	17.5%
8. Weapons	7.5%	4.3%
9. Breaking & Entering	5.4%	0.0%
10. Miscellaneous	9.6%	0.0%

## SAI PRISONER ADMISSIONS BY OFFENSE TYPE

The controlling sentence for each of the 608 SAI male and 114 SAI female prisoners who entered the program during 2012 was used for the groupings listed below. For prisoners serving more than one sentence, the sentence with the longest minimum term is the controlling sentence.

Each of the following offense type groupings contains offenses which are similar in nature. For example, the "Fraud" category contains all cases involving financial transactions where trickery or deceit was an element of the crime.

OFFENSE TYPE	PERCENT of TOTAL	
	Males	Females
1. Drug Offenses	26.7%	38.6%
2. Home Invasion	14.6%	9.6%
3. Assault	8.6%	7.9%
4. Unlawful driving	7.9%	9.6%
5. Robbery	5.9%	10.5%
6. Larceny	7.7%	2.6%
7. Fraud	8.1%	7.9%
8. Weapons	4.8%	1.8%
9. Breaking & Entering	8.1%	1.8%
10. Miscellaneous	7.6%	9.6%

## IN-REACH PRISONER ADMISSIONS BY OFFENSE TYPE

The controlling sentence for each of the 949 In Reach male and 29 In Reach female prisoners who entered the program during 2012 was used for the groupings listed below. For prisoners serving more than one sentence, the sentence with the longest minimum term is the controlling sentence.

Each of the following offense type groupings contains offenses which are similar in nature. For example, the "Fraud" category contains all cases involving financial transactions where trickery or deceit was an element of the crime.

OFFENSE TYPE	PERCENT of TOTAL	
	IRM	IRF
1. Drug Offenses	12.6%	6.9%
2. Home Invasion	18.2%	17.2%
3. Assault	16.2%	6.9%
4. Unlawful driving	5.7%	3.4%
5. Robbery	19.8%	0.0%
6. Larceny	6.3%	13.9%
7. Fraud	2.8%	27.6%
8. Weapons	6.2%	3.4%
9. Breaking & Entering	4.4%	0.0%
10. Miscellaneous	7.8%	20.7%

## **Comparison of Outcomes: SAI-Prison vs. Non-SAI Paroles**

In 2008 the SAI program was substantially modified to bring it in to line with principles of the PR model and standards for Evidence Based Practices (EBP). Specifically, SAI was shifted from a strictly military style Boot Camp approach to an approach focused on individualized assessment of risk and needs and programs targeted to factors associated with each trainee's criminality.

A key element of the restructuring of the SAI program was to contract with Dr. James Austin of the JFA Institute to conduct a scientifically rigorous process and outcomes evaluation of the "new SAI". Previous SAI assessments (e.g., MDOC reports of SAI vs. non-SAI recidivism, Auditor General study of SAI) have generally concluded that SAI outcomes were no worse or even slightly better than non-SAI results. They also agreed that SAI reduces MDOC bed needs due to the shorter length of prison stay for SAI participants. However, none of those studies utilized a rigorously matched Comparison Group, making it impossible to estimate actual net effects of SAI. Further, those studies reported results for the "old SAI," prior to its 2008 modifications.

The JFA evaluation was conducted in two parts. The first phase of the study was a process evaluation designed to assess the extent to which SAI had actually been transformed from a Boot Camp to an Intensive Reentry program. The process assessment included objective data on changes to assessment, programming, community collaboration and program success rates. In addition, the researchers collected qualitative data regarding how both trainees and staff viewed the changes to the program and the extent to which the culture of SAI has been changed to match the structural changes. In other words, the process assessment measured the extent to which actual practice matched theory.

Several key findings emerged from the JFA process evaluation. Among the more important are:

- The process evaluation found that the recommended changes in program screening and intervention/programmatic structure were successfully made in the SAI program. These changes significantly enhanced SAI's potential to reduce recidivism, the MDOC population and agency costs.
- These program modifications positioned the SAI program to continue to produce cost-effective reductions in the Michigan prison population without jeopardizing public safety.
- The modified SAI program is clearly saving significant prison bed space and should be able to demonstrate lower recidivism rates in the future.

Once it was concluded that the SAI program had been successfully transformed, the decision was taken to proceed with the outcome evaluation phase of the study. The outcome evaluation used a comparison group matched on key characteristics, including age, race, gender, current offense and risk. Thus, the comparison group had similar likelihoods of recidivism apart from the effects of SAI and any differences in outcomes found can be reliably attributed to the effects of the SAI program.

Because the changes to the SAI program were so fundamental, results for offenders who went through the program before late 2008 are not informative about the effects of the program as currently constituted. Thus, outcomes reported here are limited to those contained in the Impact Evaluation phase of the JFA evaluation. These results are limited to twelve month follow up, but plans are in place to continue to follow graduates of the modified SAI program to obtain two (and ultimately three) years of outcomes data. Results for the twelve month follow up are summarized in the table following.

Four separate outcomes are reported: Return as Technical Violator, Return with a New Sentence, Conviction for a New Crime and Arrest for a New Felony. Two levels of comparison are of interest in determining the effects of SAI.

1. Comparison of results for the Matched Comparison Group to those for all non-SAI parolees provides a measure of how offenders who look like SAI trainees would be expected to perform on parole relative to the overall parole population. In other words, what would their recidivism rate be without SAI?
2. Comparison of outcomes for SAI graduates to the Comparison Group measures the net effects of SAI on recidivism after other offender characteristics are controlled for. In other words, this comparison captures the **net effects** of the SAI program itself.

**Comparison of Twelve Month Outcomes  
SAI Prison Parolees vs.  
Matched Comparison Group and All non-SAI Parolees  
(Parole Releases January 2008 – May 2009)**

	GROUP					
	SAI Prison		Matched Non-SAI Comparison		All Non-SAI Paroles	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
	1,006	100%	1,006	100%	13,951	100%
Returned to Prison Technical Parole Violator	38	3.8%	43	4.3%	695	5.0%
Returned to Prison Parole Violator New Sentence	53	5.3%	61	6.1%	624	4.5%
New Conviction	130	12.9%	174	17.3%	1,674	12.0%
New Arrest	317	31.5%	371	36.9%	3,787	27.1%

DATA SOURCE: JFA Institute, Special Alternative Incarceration Program: Second Year Process and Impact Evaluation (2010)

Looking at the two types of comparison noted above, some key findings emerge from the table.

- On all measures except Return for Technical Violations, the matched comparison group showed outcomes worse than those for all non-SAI parolees. In other words, offenders who looked like SAI trainees had higher rates of failure than all other parolees if they were not exposed to SAI. This demonstrates that, on the whole, SAI deals with offenders that are more difficult, i.e., riskier than parolees in general.
- On every measure of recidivism, the SAI Prison cases performed better than the matched Comparison Group. They were arrested, convicted and returned to prison at lower rates than comparable cases that did not go through the SAI program. In many cases, rates for the SAI Prison graduates were not much higher than the overall parole population despite their overall riskier profile.

It is worth noting that SAI Prison group includes trainees who graduated in 2008 and who did not go through the “new SAI”. Thus, any effects from the substantial modifications to SAI would not show up for these cases.

The JFA report also notes that the effects of SAI are higher for the 2008-2009 releases than they were for a cohort of 2004 releases compared to a matched comparison group. This suggests that the modifications to the SAI program are producing better outcomes than the old Boot Camp model. Thus, it is reasonable to expect that follow up of more cases that have gone through the modified SAI program will demonstrate better results than what has been captured in this first JFA outcomes analysis.

## 2012 ADMISSIONS BY COUNTY –PROBATIONER

MALES			FEMALES		
Sentencing County	Number of Admissions	% of Total Admissions	Sentencing County	Number of Admissions	% of Total Admissions
Alcona	0	0.0%	Alcona	0	0.0%
Alger	0	0.0%	Alger	0	0.0%
Allegan	1	0.3%	Allegan	0	0.0%
Alpena	3	0.8%	Alpena	0	0.0%
Antrim	0	0.0%	Antrim	0	0.0%
Arenac	0	0.0%	Arenac	0	0.0%
Baraga	0	0.0%	Baraga	0	0.0%
Barry	0	0.0%	Barry	0	0.0%
Bay	5	1.5%	Bay	1	4.3%
Benzie	0	0.0%	Benzie	0	0.0%
Berrien	1	0.3%	Berrien	1	4.3%
Branch	1	0.3%	Branch	0	0.0%
Calhoun	0	0.0%	Calhoun	0	0.0%
Cass	0	0.0%	Cass	0	0.0%
Charlevoix	0	0.0%	Charlevoix	0	0.0%
Cheboygan	0	0.0%	Cheboygan	0	0.0%
Chippewa	0	0.0%	Chippewa	0	0.0%
Clare	0	0.0%	Clare	0	0.0%
Clinton	2	0.6%	Clinton	1	4.3%
Crawford	0	0.0%	Crawford	0	0.0%
Delta	0	0.0%	Delta	0	0.0%
Dickinson	0	0.0%	Dickinson	0	0.0%
Eaton	0	0.0%	Eaton	0	0.0%
Emmet	0	0.0%	Emmet	0	0.0%
Genesee	53	15.8%	Genesee	2	8.8%
Gladwin	0	0.0%	Gladwin	0	0.0%
Gogebic	0	0.0%	Gogebic	0	0.0%
Grand Traverse	1	0.3%	Grand Traverse	1	4.3%
Gratiot	3	0.8%	Gratiot	0	0.0%
Hillsdale	2	0.6%	Hillsdale	1	4.3%
Houghton	0	0.0%	Houghton	0	0.0%
Huron	0	0.0%	Huron	0	0.0%
Ingham	5	1.5%	Ingham	0	0.0%
Ionia	0	0.0%	Ionia	0	0.0%
Iosco	0	0.0%	Iosco	0	0.0%
Iron	0	0.0%	Iron	0	0.0%
Isabella	1	0.3%	Isabella	0	0.0%
Jackson	12	3.6%	Jackson	1	4.3%
Kalamazoo	14	4.2%	Kalamazoo	2	8.8%
Kalkaska	0	0.0%	Kalkaska	0	0.0%
Kent	11	3.3%	Kent	1	4.3%
Keweenaw	0	0.0%	Keweenaw	0	0.0%
Lake	0	0.0%	Lake	0	0.0%
Lapeer	1	0.3%	Lapeer	0	0.0%

**2012 ADMISSIONS BY COUNTY –PROBATIONER – Cont.**

<b>MALES</b>			<b>FEMALES</b>		
<b>Sentencing County</b>	<b>Number of Admissions</b>	<b>% of Total Admissions</b>	<b>Sentencing County</b>	<b>Number of Admissions</b>	<b>% of Total Admissions</b>
Leelanau	0	0.0%	Leelanau	0	0.0%
Lenawee	4	1.2%	Lenawee	1	4.3%
Livingston	4	1.2%	Livingston	0	0.0%
Luce	0	0.0%	Luce	0	0.0%
Mackinac	1	0.3%	Mackinac	0	0.0%
Macomb	40	12.0%	Macomb	1	4.3%
Manistee	0	0.0%	Manistee	0	0.0%
Marquette	0	0.0%	Marquette	0	0.0%
Mason	1	0.3%	Mason	0	0.0%
Mecosta	0	0.0%	Mecosta	0	0.0%
Menominee	0	0.0%	Menominee	0	0.0%
Midland	9	2.7%	Midland	0	0.0%
Missaukee	0	0.0%	Missaukee	0	0.0%
Monroe	7	2.1%	Monroe	2	8.8%
Montcalm	1	0.3%	Montcalm	0	0.0%
Montmorency	0	0.0%	Montmorency	0	0.0%
Muskegon	5	1.5%	Muskegon	0	0.0%
Newaygo	1	0.3%	Newaygo	0	0.0%
Oakland	31	9.3%	Oakland	3	13.0%
Oceana	0	0.0%	Oceana	0	0.0%
Ogemaw	0	0.0%	Ogemaw	0	0.0%
Ontonagon	0	0.0%	Ontonagon	0	0.0%
Osceola	0	0.0%	Osceola	0	0.0%
Oscoda	0	0.0%	Oscoda	0	0.0%
Otsego	0	0.0%	Otsego	0	0.0%
Ottawa	0	0.0%	Ottawa	0	0.0%
Presque Isle	0	0.0%	Presque Isle	0	0.0%
Roscommon	0	0.0%	Roscommon	0	0.0%
Saginaw	16	4.8%	Saginaw	2	8.8%
St. Clair	2	0.6%	St. Clair	0	0.0%
St. Joseph	3	0.8%	St. Joseph	0	0.0%
Sanilac	0	0.0%	Sanilac	0	0.0%
Schoolcraft	0	0.0%	Schoolcraft	0	0.0%
Shiawassee	2	0.6%	Shiawassee	0	0.0%
Tuscola	1	0.3%	Tuscola	0	0.0%
Van Buren	5	1.5%	Van Buren	0	0.0%
Washtenaw	23	6.9%	Washtenaw	2	8.8%
Wayne	63	18.8%	Wayne	1	4.3%
Wexford	0	0.0%	Wexford	0	0.0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>

APPENDIX A

## 2012 ADMISSIONS BY COUNTY – SAI PRISONER

MALES			FEMALES		
Sentencing County	Number of Admissions	% of Total Admissions	Sentencing County	Number of Admissions	% of Total Admissions
Alcona	0	0.0%	Alcona	0	0.0%
Alger	0	0.0%	Alger	0	0.0%
Allegan	3	0.5%	Allegan	0	0.0%
Alpena	4	0.7%	Alpena	0	0.0%
Antrim	5	0.8%	Antrim	0	0.0%
Arenac	0	0.0%	Arenac	0	0.0%
Baraga	0	0.0%	Baraga	0	0.0%
Barry	6	1.0%	Barry	0	0.0%
Bay	11	1.8%	Bay	1	0.9%
Benzie	3	0.5%	Benzie	0	0.0%
Berrien	29	4.8%	Berrien	6	5.3%
Branch	1	0.2%	Branch	0	0.0%
Calhoun	5	0.8%	Calhoun	2	1.8%
Cass	7	1.2%	Cass	2	1.8%
Charlevoix	7	1.2%	Charlevoix	1	0.9%
Cheboygan	1	0.2%	Cheboygan	0	0.0%
Chippewa	2	0.3%	Chippewa	0	0.0%
Clare	6	1.0%	Clare	0	0.0%
Clinton	5	0.8%	Clinton	0	0.0%
Crawford	2	0.3%	Crawford	0	0.0%
Delta	0	0.0%	Delta	0	0.0%
Dickinson	4	0.7%	Dickinson	1	0.9%
Eaton	3	0.5%	Eaton	4	3.6%
Emmet	5	0.8%	Emmet	1	0.9%
Genesee	23	3.8%	Genesee	3	2.6%
Gladwin	2	0.3%	Gladwin	0	0.0%
Gogebic	1	0.2%	Gogebic	0	0.0%
Grand Traverse	5	0.8%	Grand Traverse	0	0.0%
Gratiot	5	0.8%	Gratiot	2	1.8%
Hillsdale	0	0.0%	Hillsdale	2	1.8%
Houghton	2	0.3%	Houghton	0	0.0%
Huron	0	0.0%	Huron	0	0.0%
Ingham	10	1.6%	Ingham	2	1.8%
Ionia	6	1.0%	Ionia	1	0.9%
Iosco	0	0.0%	Iosco	0	0.0%
Iron	1	0.2%	Iron	0	0.0%
Isabella	6	1.0%	Isabella	0	0.0%
Jackson	25	4.2%	Jackson	4	3.6%
Kalamazoo	28	4.6%	Kalamazoo	12	10.5%
Kalkaska	1	0.2%	Kalkaska	0	0.0%
Kent	42	7.0%	Kent	11	8.7%
Keweenaw	0	0.0%	Keweenaw	0	0.0%
Lake	3	0.5%	Lake	0	0.0%
Lapeer	0	0.0%	Lapeer	0	0.0%

## 2012 ADMISSIONS BY COUNTY – SAI PRISONER – Cont.

MALES Sentencing County	Number of Admissions	% of Total Admissions	FEMALES Sentencing County	Number of Admissions	% of Total Admissions
Leelanau	1	0.2%	Leelanau	0	0.0%
Lenawee	8	1.3%	Lenawee	3	2.6%
Livingston	5	0.8%	Livingston	1	0.9%
Luce	0	0.0%	Luce	2	1.8%
Mackinac	1	0.2%	Mackinac	0	0.0%
Macomb	38	6.3%	Macomb	12	10.5%
Manistee	5	0.8%	Manistee	1	0.9%
Marquette	3	0.5%	Marquette	0	0.0%
Mason	2	0.3%	Mason	0	0.0%
Mecosta	5	0.5%	Mecosta	1	0.9%
Menominee	1	0.2%	Menominee	0	0.0%
Midland	2	0.3%	Midland	0	0.0%
Missaukee	5	0.8%	Missaukee	0	0.0%
Monroe	23	4.0%	Monroe	1	0.9%
Montcalm	9	1.5%	Montcalm	1	0.9%
Montmorency	0	0.0%	Montmorency	0	0.0%
Muskegon	12	2.0%	Muskegon	5	4.4%
Newaygo	2	0.3%	Newaygo	0	0.0%
Oakland	23	4.0%	Oakland	4	3.6%
Oceana	0	0.0%	Oceana	0	0.0%
Ogemaw	5	0.8%	Ogemaw	0	0.0%
Ontonagon	0	0.0%	Ontonagon	0	0.0%
Osceola	2	0.3%	Osceola	0	0.0%
Oscoda	0	0.0%	Oscoda	0	0.0%
Otsego	1	0.2%	Otsego	0	0.0%
Ottawa	6	1.0%	Ottawa	1	0.9%
Presque Isle	0	0.0%	Presque Isle	0	0.0%
Roscommon	2	0.3%	Roscommon	0	0.0%
Saginaw	8	1.3%	Saginaw	5	4.4%
St. Clair	8	1.3%	St. Clair	0	0.0%
St. Joseph	23	4.0%	St. Joseph	4	3.6%
Sanilac	2	0.3%	Sanilac	0	0.0%
Schoolcraft	0	0.0%	Schoolcraft	1	0.9%
Shiawassee	2	0.3%	Shiawassee	2	1.8%
Tuscola	4	0.7%	Tuscola	1	0.9%
Van Buren	11	1.8%	Van Buren	1	0.9%
Washtenaw	22	3.6%	Washtenaw	4	3.6%
Wayne	92	15.1%	Wayne	9	7.8%
Wexford	4	0.7%	Wexford	0	0.0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>608</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>114</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

APPENDIX B

## 2012 ADMISSIONS BY COUNTY – IN REACH PRISONER


IRM MALES			IRF FEMALES		
Sentencing County	Number of Admissions	% of Total Admissions	Sentencing County	Number of Admissions	% of Total Admissions
Alcona	0	0.0%	Alcona	0	0.0%
Alger	0	0.0%	Alger	0	0.0%
Allegan	7	0.7%	Allegan	2	7.0%
Alpena	3	0.3%	Alpena	1	3.4%
Antrim	0	0.0%	Antrim	0	0.0%
Arenac	1	0.1%	Arenac	0	0.0%
Baraga	0	0.0%	Baraga	0	0.0%
Barry	0	0.0%	Barry	0	0.0%
Bay	13	1.4%	Bay	1	3.4%
Benzie	0	0.0%	Benzie	0	0.0%
Berrien	43	4.6%	Berrien	0	0.0%
Branch	1	0.1%	Branch	0	0.0%
Calhoun	21	2.2%	Calhoun	0	0.0%
Cass	2	0.2%	Cass	1	3.4%
Charlevoix	1	0.1%	Charlevoix	0	0.0%
Cheboygan	2	0.2%	Cheboygan	0	0.0%
Chippewa	5	0.5%	Chippewa	0	0.0%
Clare	0	0.0%	Clare	0	0.0%
Clinton	2	0.2%	Clinton	0	0.0%
Crawford	4	0.4%	Crawford	0	0.0%
Delta	1	0.1%	Delta	0	0.0%
Dickinson	2	0.2%	Dickinson	0	0.0%
Eaton	4	0.4%	Eaton	1	3.4%
Emmet	2	0.2%	Emmet	0	0.0%
Genesee	42	4.5%	Genesee	1	3.4%
Gladwin	0	0.0%	Gladwin	0	0.0%
Gogebic	0	0.0%	Gogebic	0	0.0%
Grand Traverse	3	0.3%	Grand Traverse	0	0.0%
Gratiot	3	0.3%	Gratiot	0	0.0%
Hillsdale	3	0.3%	Hillsdale	0	0.0%
Houghton	0	0.0%	Houghton	0	0.0%
Huron	0	0.0%	Huron	0	0.0%
Ingham	14	1.5%	Ingham	0	0.0%
Ionia	11	1.2%	Ionia	0	0.0%
Iosco	2	0.2%	Iosco	0	0.0%
Iron	0	0.0%	Iron	0	0.0%
Isabella	3	0.3%	Isabella	0	0.0%
Jackson	21	2.2%	Jackson	0	0.0%
Kalamazoo	34	3.6%	Kalamazoo	2	7.0%
Kalkaska	1	0.1%	Kalkaska	0	0.0%
Kent	74	7.9%	Kent	4	13.9%
Keweenaw	0	0.0%	Keweenaw	0	0.0%
Lake	0	0.0%	Lake	0	0.0%
Lapeer	4	0.4%	Lapeer	0	0.0%

## 2012 ADMISSIONS BY COUNTY – IN REACH PRISONER – Cont.


IRM MALES			IRF FEMALES		
Sentencing County	Number of Admissions	% of Total Admissions	Sentencing County	Number of Admissions	% of Total Admissions
Leelanau	1	0.1%	Leelanau	0	0.0%
Lenawee	7	0.7%	Lenawee	0	0.0%
Livingston	9	0.9%	Livingston	0	0.0%
Luce	1	0.1%	Luce	0	0.0%
Mackinac	1	0.1%	Mackinac	0	0.0%
Macomb	37	3.9%	Macomb	1	3.4%
Manistee	1	0.1%	Manistee	0	0.0%
Marquette	1	0.1%	Marquette	1	3.4%
Mason	1	0.1%	Mason	0	0.0%
Mecosta	2	0.2%	Mecosta	0	0.0%
Menominee	0	0.0%	Menominee	0	0.0%
Midland	5	0.5%	Midland	1	3.4%
Missaukee	1	0.1%	Missaukee	0	0.0%
Monroe	19	2.0%	Monroe	0	0.0%
Montcalm	4	0.4%	Montcalm	1	3.4%
Montmorency	0	0.0%	Montmorency	0	0.0%
Muskegon	35	3.9%	Muskegon	4	13.9%
Newaygo	2	0.2%	Newaygo	0	0.0%
Oakland	91	9.7%	Oakland	2	7.0%
Oceana	0	0.0%	Oceana	0	0.0%
Ogemaw	1	0.1%	Ogemaw	0	0.0%
Ontonagon	0	0.0%	Ontonagon	0	0.0%
Osceola	0	0.0%	Osceola	0	0.0%
Oscoda	0	0.0%	Oscoda	0	0.0%
Otsego	3	0.3%	Otsego	0	0.0%
Ottawa	3	0.3%	Ottawa	0	0.0%
Presque Isle	2	0.2%	Presque Isle	0	0.0%
Roscommon	5	0.5%	Roscommon	0	0.0%
Saginaw	45	4.8%	Saginaw	1	3.4%
St. Clair	8	0.8%	St. Clair	0	0.0%
St. Joseph	5	0.5%	St. Joseph	0	0.0%
Sanilac	1	0.1%	Sanilac	0	0.0%
Schoolcraft	1	0.1%	Schoolcraft	0	0.0%
Shiawassee	1	0.1%	Shiawassee	0	0.0%
Tuscola	6	0.6%	Tuscola	0	0.0%
Van Buren	2	0.2%	Van Buren	0	0.0%
Washtenaw	23	2.4%	Washtenaw	0	0.0%
Wayne	295	31.2%	Wayne	5	17.2%
Wexford	1	0.1%	Wexford	0	0.0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>949</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>29</b>	<b>100%</b>

APPENDIX C


## 2012 ADMISSIONS BY MONTH



### 2012 ADMISSIONS BY GENDER



## 2012 MONTHLY POPULATION TOTALS



## 2012 PROGRAM OUTCOMES BY COUNTY – MALE PROBATIONER

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
Alcona	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alger	0	0	0	0	0	0
Allegan	3	0	0	0	0	3
Alpena	0	0	1	0	0	1
Antrim	0	1	0	0	0	1
Arenac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baraga	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bay	4	2	0	0	0	6
Benzie	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berrien	1	2	0	0	0	3
Branch	2	0	0	0	0	2
Calhoun	1	0	0	0	0	1
Cass	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charlevoix	0	1	0	0	0	1
Cheboygan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chippewa	1	0	0	0	0	1
Clare	3	1	0	0	0	4
Clinton	1	1	0	0	0	2
Crawford	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delta	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dickinson	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eaton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Emmet	0	0	0	0	0	0
Genesee	37	3	0	1	2	43
Gladwin	2	0	0	0	0	2
Gogebic	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Traverse	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gratiot	3	0	0	0	1	4
Hillsdale	2	0	0	0	0	2
Houghton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Huron	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ingham	2	0	0	0	0	2
Ionia	2	0	0	0	0	2
Iosco	0	0	0	0	0	0
Iron	0	0	0	0	0	0
Isabella	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jackson	12	3	0	0	1	16
Kalamazoo	9	2	0	1	1	13
Kalkaska	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	7	2	0	2	0	11
Keweenaw	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lapeer	0	1	0	0	0	1

APPENDIX G

**2012 PROGRAM OUTCOMES BY COUNTY – MALE PROBATIONER –Cont.**

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
Leelanau	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lenawee	3	2	0	0	0	5
Livingston	2	1	0	0	0	3
Luce	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mackinac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Macomb	31	2	0	2	0	35
Manistee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marquette	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mason	2	1	0	0	0	3
Mecosta	2	0	0	0	0	2
Menominee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Midland	4	1	0	1	1	7
Missaukee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monroe	9	0	1	1	0	11
Montcalm	1	0	0	0	0	1
Montmorency	0	0	0	0	0	0
Muskegon	6	1	0	0	0	7
Newaygo	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oakland	23	3	1	2	0	29
Oceana	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ogemaw	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ontonagon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Osceola	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oscoda	0	0	0	0	0	0
Otsego	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ottawa	1	0	0	0	0	1
Presque Isle	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roscommon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Saginaw	6	1	1	1	0	9
St. Clair	0	0	1	0	0	1
St. Joseph	1	1	0	0	0	2
Sanilac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schoolcraft	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shiawassee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tuscola	1	0	0	0	0	1
Van Buren	1	0	0	0	0	1
Washtenaw	21	0	0	4	2	27
Wayne	57	8	0	0	3	68
Wexford	0	0	1	2	0	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>338</b>

## 2012 PROGRAM OUTCOMES BY COUNTY – FEMALE PROBATIONER

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
Alcona	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alger	0	0	0	0	0	0
Allegan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alpena	0	0	0	0	0	0
Antrim	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arenac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baraga	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bay	0	0	0	1	0	1
Benzie	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berrien	1	0	0	0	0	1
Branch	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calhoun	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cass	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charlevoix	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cheboygan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chippewa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clare	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clinton	0	0	0	1	0	1
Crawford	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delta	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dickinson	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eaton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Emmet	0	0	0	0	0	0
Genesee	1	1	0	1	0	3
Gladwin	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gogebic	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Traverse	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gratiot	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hillsdale	0	0	0	0	0	0
Houghton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Huron	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ingham	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ionia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Iosco	0	0	0	0	0	0
Iron	0	0	0	0	0	0
Isabella	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jackson	0	0	0	0	1	1
Kalamazoo	2	0	0	1	0	3
Kalkaska	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	1	0	0	0	0	1
Keweenaw	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lapeer	0	0	0	0	0	0

**2012 PROGRAM OUTCOMES BY COUNTY – FEMALE PROBATIONER –  
Cont.**

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
Leelanau	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lenawee	0	0	0	1	0	1
Livingston	0	0	0	0	0	0
Luce	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mackinac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Macomb	2	0	0	0	0	2
Manistee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marquette	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mason	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mecosta	0	0	0	0	0	0
Menominee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Midland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missaukee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monroe	2	0	0	0	0	2
Montcalm	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montmorency	0	0	0	0	0	0
Muskegon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Newaygo	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oakland	2	0	0	0	0	2
Oceana	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ogemaw	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ontonagon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Osceola	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oscoda	0	0	0	0	0	0
Otsego	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ottawa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Presque Isle	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roscommon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Saginaw	2	0	0	0	0	2
St. Clair	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Joseph	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sanilac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schoolcraft	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shiawassee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tuscola	0	0	0	0	0	0
Van Buren	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washtenaw	1	0	0	0	0	1
Wayne	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wexford	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>21</b>

APPENDIX G

## 2012 PROGRAM OUTCOMES BY COUNTY – SAI MALE PRISONER

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
Alcona	1	0	0	0	0	1
Alger	0	0	0	0	0	0
Allegan	6	0	0	1	0	7
Alpena	3	0	0	0	0	3
Antrim	2	0	0	1	0	3
Arenac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baraga	1	0	0	0	0	1
Barry	7	1	0	0	0	8
Bay	9	0	0	0	0	9
Benzie	2	0	0	0	0	2
Berrien	18	4	0	0	0	22
Branch	1	0	0	0	0	1
Calhoun	8	0	0	0	0	8
Cass	14	0	1	0	0	15
Charlevoix	5	0	0	0	0	5
Cheboygan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chippewa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clare	2	0	0	0	0	2
Clinton	3	0	0	0	0	3
Crawford	1	0	0	0	0	1
Delta	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dickinson	1	0	1	0	0	2
Eaton	6	0	0	1	1	8
Emmet	3	0	0	0	0	3
Genesee	19	2	0	0	0	21
Gladwin	2	0	0	0	0	2
Gogebic	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Traverse	10	0	0	0	0	10
Gratiot	3	0	0	0	0	3
Hillsdale	3	1	0	0	0	4
Houghton	1	0	0	0	0	1
Huron	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ingham	10	0	0	0	0	10
Ionia	3	0	0	0	0	3
Iosco	0	0	0	0	0	0
Iron	1	0	0	0	0	1
Isabella	6	0	1	0	0	7
Jackson	18	0	0	0	0	18
Kalamazoo	24	3	0	1	0	28
Kalkaska	3	0	0	0	0	3
Kent	47	4	0	0	0	51
Keweenaw	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake	0	0	0	1	0	1
Lapeer	0	0	0	0	0	0

APPENDIX H

## 2012 PROGRAM OUTCOMES BY COUNTY – SAI MALE PRISONER – Cont.

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
Leelanau	2	0	0	0	0	2
Lenawee	9	0	0	0	1	10
Livingston	5	0	0	0	0	5
Luce	1	0	0	0	0	1
Mackinac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Macomb	31	1	1	1	0	34
Manistee	4	0	0	0	0	4
Marquette	1	1	0	0	0	2
Mason	1	0	0	0	0	1
Mecosta	3	0	1	0	0	4
Menominee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Midland	1	0	0	0	0	1
Missaukee	2	0	0	0	1	3
Monroe	17	2	0	0	1	20
Montcalm	5	1	0	0	0	6
Montmorency	1	0	0	0	0	1
Muskegon	9	0	0	0	0	9
Newaygo	1	0	0	0	0	1
Oakland	30	0	0	0	0	30
Oceana	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ogemaw	3	0	0	0	0	3
Ontonagon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Osceola	3	0	0	0	0	3
Oscoda	1	0	0	0	0	1
Otsego	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ottawa	6	0	0	0	0	6
Presque Isle	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roscommon	3	0	0	0	0	3
Saginaw	8	3	0	0	0	11
St. Clair	8	1	0	0	0	9
St. Joseph	12	0	0	0	0	12
Sanilac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schoolcraft	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shiawassee	2	0	0	0	0	2
Tuscola	5	0	0	1	0	6
Van Buren	10	0	0	0	0	12
Washtenaw	18	1	0	1	1	21
Wayne	92	2	1	3	0	98
Wexford	2	0	0	0	0	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>539</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>588</b>

APPENDIX H

## 2012 PROGRAM OUTCOMES BY COUNTY – SAI FEMALE PRISONER

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
Alcona	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alger	0	0	0	0	0	0
Allegan	2	0	0	0	0	2
Alpena	0	0	0	0	0	0
Antrim	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arenac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baraga	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barry	1	0	0	0	0	1
Bay	0	0	0	0	0	0
Benzie	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berrien	3	0	0	0	0	3
Branch	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calhoun	3	0	0	0	0	3
Cass	3	0	0	0	0	3
Charlevoix	1	0	0	0	0	1
Cheboygan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chippewa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clare	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clinton	1	0	0	0	0	1
Crawford	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delta	1	0	0	0	0	1
Dickinson	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eaton	1	0	0	1	0	2
Emmet	1	0	0	0	0	1
Genesee	4	0	0	0	0	4
Gladwin	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gogebic	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Traverse	0	0	0	0	0	1
Gratiot	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hillsdale	1	0	0	0	0	1
Houghton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Huron	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ingham	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ionia	1	0	0	0	0	1
Iosco	0	0	0	0	0	0
Iron	0	0	0	0	0	0
Isabella	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jackson	3	0	0	0	0	3
Kalamazoo	3	0	0	1	1	5
Kalkaska	1	0	0	0	0	1
Kent	8	3	0	0	0	11
Keweenaw	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lapeer	0	0	0	0	0	0

**2012 PROGRAM OUTCOMES BY COUNTY – SAI FEMALE PRISONER –  
Cont.**

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
Leelanau	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lenawee	3	0	0	0	0	3
Livingston	1	0	0	0	0	1
Luce	1	0	0	0	0	1
Mackinac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Macomb	10	0	0	0	0	10
Manistee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marquette	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mason	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mecosta	1	0	0	0	0	1
Menominee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Midland	1	0	0	0	0	1
Missaukee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monroe	0	0	0	1	0	1
Montcalm	1	0	0	0	0	1
Montmorency	0	0	0	0	0	0
Muskegon	3	0	0	0	0	3
Newaygo	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oakland	4	1	0	0	0	5
Oceana	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ogemaw	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ontonagon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Osceola	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oscoda	0	0	0	0	0	0
Otsego	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ottawa	2	0	0	0	0	2
Presque Isle	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roscommon	1	0	0	0	0	1
Saginaw	3	1	0	0	0	4
St. Clair	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Joseph	2	0	0	0	0	2
Sanilac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schoolcraft	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shiawassee	1	0	0	0	0	1
Tuscola	1	0	0	0	0	1
Van Buren	2	0	0	0	0	2
Washtenaw	4	0	0	0	0	4
Wayne	9	0	0	0	0	9
Wexford	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>97</b>

## 2012 PROGRAM OUTCOMES BY COUNTY –IN REACH MALE PRISONER

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
Alcona	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alger	0	0	0	0	0	0
Allegan	6	0	0	1	0	7
Alpena	0	0	0	0	0	0
Antrim	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arenac	1	0	0	0	0	1
Baraga	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barry	2	0	0	0	0	2
Bay	8	1	0	0	0	9
Benzie	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berrien	35	2	1	1	0	39
Branch	4	0	0	0	0	4
Calhoun	11	0	0	0	0	11
Cass	1	1	0	0	0	2
Charlevoix	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cheboygan	2	1	0	0	0	3
Chippewa	2	0	0	0	0	2
Clare	1	0	0	0	0	1
Clinton	1	0	0	0	0	1
Crawford	2	1	0	0	0	3
Delta	2	0	0	0	0	2
Dickinson	1	0	0	0	0	1
Eaton	3	0	0	0	0	3
Emmet	1	0	0	0	0	1
Genesee	40	6	1	0	1	48
Gladwin	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gogebic	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Traverse	1	0	0	0	0	1
Gratiot	1	0	0	0	0	1
Hillsdale	4	0	0	0	0	4
Houghton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Huron	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ingham	13	1	0	0	0	14
Ionia	5	1	0	0	0	6
Iosco	1	0	0	0	0	1
Iron	0	0	0	0	0	0
Isabella	4	0	0	0	0	4
Jackson	10	1	0	0	0	11
Kalamazoo	24	1	0	0	0	25
Kalkaska	1	0	0	0	0	1
Kent	51	3	1	2	2	59
Keweenaw	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lapeer	3	0	0	0	0	3

**2012 PROGRAM OUTCOMES BY COUNTY – IN REACH MALE PRISONER  
– Cont.**

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
Leelanau	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lenawee	3	0	0	0	0	3
Livingston	4	1	1	0	0	6
Luce	1	0	0	0	0	1
Mackinac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Macomb	33	6	1	2	0	42
Manistee	1	0	0	0	0	1
Marquette	1	0	0	0	0	1
Mason	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mecosta	3	1	0	0	0	4
Menominee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Midland	4	0	0	0	0	4
Missaukee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monroe	13	0	1	0	0	14
Montcalm	3	0	0	0	0	3
Montmorency	1	0	0	0	0	1
Muskegon	37	3	0	0	0	40
Newaygo	2	0	0	0	0	2
Oakland	60	9	0	2	3	74
Oceana	2	0	0	0	0	2
Ogemaw	4	0	0	0	0	4
Ontonagon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Osceola	1	0	0	0	0	1
Oscoda	0	0	0	0	0	0
Otsego	3	0	0	0	0	3
Ottawa	2	0	0	0	0	2
Presque Isle	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roscommon	3	0	0	0	0	3
Saginaw	38	8	0	0	1	47
St. Clair	3	2	0	0	0	5
St. Joseph	3	1	0	0	0	4
Sanilac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schoolcraft	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shiawassee	5	0	0	0	0	5
Tuscola	5	0	0	0	0	5
Van Buren	1	0	0	0	0	1
Washtenaw	18	2	0	0	0	20
Wayne	253	24	7	1	5	290
Wexford	1	0	0	0	1	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>861</b>

**2012 PROGRAM OUTCOMES BY COUNTY – IN REACH FEMALE PRISONER**

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
Alcona	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alger	0	0	0	0	0	0
Allegan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alpena	0	0	0	0	0	0
Antrim	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arenac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baraga	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bay	1	0	0	0	0	1
Benzie	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berrien	0	0	0	0	0	0
Branch	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calhoun	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cass	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charlevoix	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cheboygan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chippewa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clare	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clinton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crawford	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delta	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dickinson	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eaton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Emmet	0	0	0	0	0	0
Genesee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gladwin	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gogebic	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Traverse	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gratiot	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hillsdale	0	0	0	0	0	0
Houghton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Huron	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ingham	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ionia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Iosco	0	0	0	0	0	0
Iron	0	0	0	0	0	0
Isabella	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jackson	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kalamazoo	2	0	0	0	0	2
Kalkaska	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	4	1	0	0	0	5
Keweenaw	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lapeer	0	0	0	0	0	0

**2012 PROGRAM OUTCOMES BY COUNTY – IN REACH FEMALE  
PRISONER – Cont.**

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
Leelanau	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lenawee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livingston	0	0	0	0	0	0
Luce	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mackinac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Macomb	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manistee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marquette	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mason	1	0	0	0	0	1
Mecosta	0	0	0	0	0	0
Menominee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Midland	1	0	0	0	0	1
Missaukee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monroe	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montcalm	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montmorency	0	0	0	0	0	0
Muskegon	2	0	0	1	0	3
Newaygo	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oakland	3	0	0	0	0	3
Oceana	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ogemaw	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ontonagon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Osceola	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oscoda	0	0	0	0	0	0
Otsego	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ottawa	2	0	0	0	0	2
Presque Isle	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roscommon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Saginaw	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Clair	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Joseph	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sanilac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schoolcraft	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shiawassee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tuscola	0	0	0	0	0	0
Van Buren	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washtenaw	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wayne	3	0	0	0	1	4
Wexford	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>22</b>

APPENDIX I

## 2012 MONTHLY PROGRAM OUTCOMES – SAI PRISONER

### MALE

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
JANUARY	34	1	2	0	0	37
FEBRUARY	31	4	0	3	0	38
MARCH	45	0	0	1	2	48
APRIL	54	6	0	0	1	61
MAY	57	2	1	0	0	60
JUNE	55	1	0	1	1	58
JULY	33	6	0	0	0	39
AUGUST	62	1	0	0	1	64
SEPTEMBER	46	2	1	2	0	51
OCTOBER	19	0	1	1	0	21
NOVEMBER	59	2	1	2	0	64
DECEMBER	44	2	0	1	0	47
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>539</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>588</b>

### FEMALE

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
JANUARY	1	1	0	0	0	2
FEBRUARY	1	0	0	0	0	1
MARCH	4	1	0	1	0	6
APRIL	10	0	0	0	0	10
MAY	10	0	0	0	0	10
JUNE	11	0	0	0	0	11
JULY	7	0	0	1	0	8
AUGUST	13	2	0	0	1	16
SEPTEMBER	10	0	0	0	0	10
OCTOBER	4	0	0	1	0	5
NOVEMBER	15	0	0	0	0	15
DECEMBER	2	1	0	0	0	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>97</b>

## 2012 MONTHLY PROGRAM OUTCOMES – PROBATIONER

### MALE

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
JANUARY	25	4	1	3	2	35
FEBRUARY	22	4	1	2	0	29
MARCH	22	6	0	1	2	31
APRIL	18	3	0	1	1	23
MAY	20	2	0	0	1	23
JUNE	13	4	1	1	1	20
JULY	19	5	2	1	0	27
AUGUST	28	1	0	0	1	30
SEPTEMBER	28	2	1	3	1	35
OCTOBER	28	0	0	1	2	31
NOVEMBER	24	7	0	3	0	34
DECEMBER	17	2	0	1	0	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>338</b>

### FEMALE

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
JANUARY	0	0	0	0	0	0
FEBRUARY	1	0	0	0	0	1
MARCH	1	1	0	1	0	3
APRIL	1	0	0	1	0	2
MAY	0	0	0	1	0	1
JUNE	2	0	0	0	1	3
JULY	2	0	0	1	0	3
AUGUST	2	0	0	0	0	2
SEPTEMBER	0	0	0	0	0	0
OCTOBER	3	0	0	0	0	3
NOVEMBER	0	0	0	1	0	0
DECEMBER	2	0	0	0	0	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>21</b>

## 2012 MONTHLY PROGRAM OUTCOMES – IN REACH PRISONER


### IRM

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
JANUARY	68	3	1	0	1	73
FEBRUARY	42	11	2	0	1	56
MARCH	61	8	1	0	1	71
APRIL	50	3	2	1	0	56
MAY	82	6	0	1	2	91
JUNE	56	5	1	0	3	65
JULY	86	6	1	1	0	94
AUGUST	64	7	1	2	0	74
SEPTEMBER	53	9	2	0	1	65
OCTOBER	74	8	1	1	2	86
NOVEMBER	63	7	0	3	0	73
DECEMBER	51	3	1	0	2	57
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>861</b>

### IRF

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
JANUARY	2	0	0	0	1	3
FEBRUARY	0	0	0	0	0	0
MARCH	1	0	0	0	0	1
APRIL	2	0	0	0	0	2
MAY	1	1	0	0	0	2
JUNE	0	0	0	0	0	0
JULY	1	0	0	1	0	2
AUGUST	1	0	0	0	0	1
SEPTEMBER	5	0	0	0	0	6
OCTOBER	1	0	0	1	0	0
NOVEMBER	3	0	0	0	0	3
DECEMBER	2	0	0	0	0	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>22</b>

## 2012 GRADUATES BY GENDER



APPENDIX M

## COMPARATIVE PROGRAM OUTCOMES – SAI PRISONER MALES 2011 AND 2012

	2011	Prisoners 2012	2011	Probationers 2012
<b><u>Terminations</u></b>				
Successful Completions	565 (92.6 %)	539 (94.2%)	275 (87.3%)	264 (85.2%)
Voluntary Withdrawals	9 (1.5 %)	6 (1.0%)	8 (2.5%)	6 (1.9%)
Rule Violators	36 (5.9 %)	27 (4.8%)	32 (10.2%)	40 (12.9%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>610</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>310</b>
<b><u>Unqualified</u></b>				
Medical Terminations	9	11	16	17
Unqualified by statute	20	5	10	11
<b>Total Program Exits</b>	<b>639</b>	<b>588</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>338</b>

## COMPARATIVE PROGRAM OUTCOMES – SAI PRISONER FEMALES 2011 AND 2012

	2011	Prisoners 2012	2011	Probationers 2012
<b><u>Terminations</u></b>				
Successful Completions	95 (93.1%)	88 (94.6%)	7 (77.7%)	14 (93.3%)
Voluntary Withdrawals	1 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Rule Violators	6 (5.9%)	5 (5.4%)	2 (22.3%)	1 (6.7%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>15</b>
<b><u>Unqualified</u></b>				
Medical Terminations	1	3	1	5
Unqualified by statute	5	1	2	1
<b>Total Program Exits</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>21</b>

APPENDIX N

## COMPARATIVE PROGRAM OUTCOMES – IN REACH PRISONER MALES 2011 AND 2012

	2011	IRM Prisoners 2012	2011	IRF Prisoners 2012
<b><u>Terminations</u></b>				
Successful Completions	714 (92.2%)	750 (89.4%)	13 (76.5%)	19 (95.0%)
Voluntary Withdrawals	8 (1.1%)	13 (1.5%)	1 (5.9%)	0 (0.0%)
Rule Violators	52 (6.7%)	76 (9.1%)	3 (17.6%)	1 (5.0%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>774</b>	<b>839</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>20</b>
<b><u>Unqualified</u></b>				
Medical Terminations	10	9	1	1
Unqualified by statute	18	13	0	1
<b>Total Program Exits</b>	<b>802</b>	<b>861</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>22</b>

APPENDIX N