

# STATE COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS BOARD MEETING APRIL 19, 2012

Lansing Community College ~ West Campus, 5708 Cornerstone Drive, Lansing, Michigan

## Approved

### I. CALL TO ORDER

**PRESENT:** L. Paul Bailey, Jon C. Campbell, Cory Chavis, Thomas P. Clement, William A. DeBoer, Stuart Dunnings III, Matthew R. Heins, Daniel Heyns, Larry Inman, Dennis McMurray, Brigette Officer, and Debra Walling.

**ABSENT:** Alfred Butzbaugh

### II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion made by Larry Inman supported by Thomas Clement to approve the agenda as presented.

VOTE: Motion passed unanimously.

### III. BOARD MEMBER'S APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Inman welcomed new board members William DeBoer representing Community Alternative Programs replacing Louis Dean, Cory J. Chavis representing the General Public replacing Curtis T. McGhee II, Thomas P. Clement representing Defense Attorneys replacing George Zulakis, and Matthew R. Heins representing Chiefs of Police replacing Gary Goss. Mr. Inman extended congratulations for the appointments by Governor Snyder while also thanking the new members for their service.

Mr. Inman continued the meeting by asking all board members to make a brief introduction to those present while also allowing the four (4) newest board members an opportunity to introduce themselves to the board.

Mr. Thomas Clement is a private defense attorney in East Lansing. He has been practicing law for ten years at the capacity of an Assistant County Prosecutor (Eaton) and a private practice attorney specializing in criminal defense.

Mr. Matt Heins from the Jackson Police Department, who has been serving as the police chief for the last five (5) years, with a total of 23 years of service.

Mr. William DeBoer is the Director of KPEP. This diversionary program provides residential and outpatient programs in Kalamazoo, Muskegon, Battle Creek, and Benton Harbor working with state and federal governments.

Mr. Cory Chavis is the Senior Pastor at Victory Church in Detroit. Mr. Chavis is actively involved in numerous boards including Ace Academy Charter School, the Youth Prevention Team and serves as the Chaplin for the City of Detroit.

Director Daniel Heyns bestowed an appreciation of service to all the board members while also welcoming new members to the board.

#### **IV. APPROVAL OF AUGUST 18, 2011 MEETING MINUTES**

Motion to approve the minutes of the August 18, 2011 meeting made by Jon Campbell and supported by Cory Chavis.

VOTE: Motion passes unanimously.

#### **V. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT**

Administrator Brzozowski presented research data reflective to the Department of Corrections , which takes into account prison intake data versus felony disposition data.

In regards to research data for calendar year 2011:

- Felony dispositions have decreased the fourth consecutive year to present a decline in dispositions within the courts. Approximately 10,900 fewer dispositions were reported in comparison to the peak year of 2007, which reflects a 20.6% decrease in the four (4) years recorded.
- In calendar year 2011, 41,833 dispositions reported represent the lowest annual number of felony court dispositions since 2000. This is a decrease of 6.4% from calendar year 2010. The prison commitment rate increased by 0.2% to 23.3%; however, the dispositions to prison decreased by 5.6% (575 dispositions). Dispositions for Probation/Jail split sentences decreased by 9.1%, which are nearly 2,400 fewer dispositions. While dispositions to jail increased by 1.4%, which is an increase by 108 dispositions.
- At the conclusion of 2011, the parole population consisted of 20,129 offenders, which is a 9.3% decrease from the previous year. Over 2,000 fewer offenders were under parole supervision, as this is the second consecutive year to reflect a decline in the parole population.
- The felony probation population ended in 2011 with 52,900 offenders, which is a 9.6% decrease from the previous year. That equates to 5,604 fewer probationers during 2011 in comparison to the previous year.
- As reported in March 2012, the prison population reflects a decline of prisoners, which totaled 43,661 prisoners. This is a decrease of 7,900 prisoners in comparison to the peak in population in March 2007 of 51,554 prisoners. The results show a steady decline in the overall prison population.
- In regards to programming for Residential Services through February 2012, the statewide utilization rate is 86.5% in comparison to a 91% utilization rate recorded at the end of 2011. Comprehensive Plans and Services utilization data for FY 2011 were converted from a stand alone based data system to a web based data system provided by Northpointe. The data system can now generate utilization data for offenders enrolled in community corrections funded programs.
- The Comprehensive Plans and Services data show 54,950 offenders, which accounted for 83,458 program enrollments. Of that number, 72% were felons and 28% were misdemeanants. Supervision Services program data reflect that 86% of offenders successfully completed programming. Group type programs reflect that 83% completed and in the Community Service programs, 81% completed successfully.
- The Governor's Executive Budget recommendation for FY 2013 budget consists of a continuation budget for Comprehensive Plans and Services and the Drunk Driver Jail Reduction & Community Treatment Program. The recommendation for Residential Services reflects a reduction of \$2 million in funding.

- The Community Corrections Comprehensive Plans and Services Application for FY 2013 was distributed to the CCABs earlier this week. During the mid-year reviews of the CCABs, the Manager of Contract and Financial Services will provide an overview of changes that have occurred in the CCABs regarding their administration.

Mr. Dunnings asked for an explanation on the number of fewer felony dispositions, if there were any correlation/s between those felony dispositions and felony crimes reported. The concern stems from there being fewer officers on the streets patrolling. Administrator Brzozowski advised that he is not privy to an analysis of such correlation. Mr. Dunnings continued by inquiring about the reason for fewer paroles. Administrator Brzozowski responded by stating that in the last few years the Parole Board has increased the number of prisoners being interviewed for consideration for parole which in turn created an influx of prisoners being paroled and discharging from parole supervision.

Mr. Dunnings followed up with asking if data was available to disclose how many offenders were involved in the spike years and how many were successfully discharged versus recidivism. Administrator Brzozowski responded that no increase is noted in the return rate in accordance to any available information; nevertheless, the return rate did decrease for PV and PV technicals. As discussed, recidivism is defined as a return to prison not as a new criminal charge. The rates presented are based on actual returns to prison.

Mr. Dunnings continued with asking if there was data available to show a percentage of parolees who have committed other crimes that did not result in a return to prison. Administrator Brzozowski stated that information is collected at a local level through Community Corrections as they are provided the data, which is analyzed on a local basis. Such data would disclose if the felony population were being detained at the local level or sent to prison. They would also know if the person was on parole at the time the offense was committed. The felony disposition data that is provided by OCA to the CCABs and posted on the MDOC website reflects this information.

Mr. Dunnings asked if the local CCABs were in possession of this information and do they report this information to the State Board. Administrator Brzozowski stated that the local level is not required to report this information, but if this is affecting their community justice system then that would be an element of a jail analysis that would disclose an increase in jail occupancy by offenders as reported on a community basis.

Mr. Dunnings stressed his concern about the monthly jail utilization reports that would provide that data, but it was realized that this report is not shared.

Mr. Campbell echoed the statements made by Mr. Dunnings that there is a direct correlation between felony dispositions and 3,500 fewer officers patrolling the streets in the hot spots identified by the Governor. The mutual concern about accuracy of the return reports was also stressed. Administrator Brzozowski reiterated that this same information is reported through the CCABs during the annual applications. There seems to be a direct link between the number of reported dispositions and fewer officers within the communities.

Mr. Inman presented a report to the board from Grand Traverse County provided by the Director of the State Police. The Governor is working on collaboration with the State Police to supplement officers in concentrated areas like Detroit, Flint, and Saginaw area.

This effort will increase the number of State Police patrol cars in tandem with Parole Agents from the Department of Corrections.

Director Heyns commented that some data information provided is rather outdated and information that is more current is forthcoming disclosing the dramatic increase in felony dispositions. Mr. Heyns continued with saying that changes have been implemented in parole supervision. Enhanced parole supervision is credited for the increase in the parole population. The department remains in a state of change, is thoroughly analyzing the data collected, and is reporting accurate numbers. Collectively, this is a part of the Governor's message and justice plan to focus on the high-risk communities experiencing violent crimes. The plan to influence such numbers is to increase enforcement efforts along with a follow up of revamped parole and probation supervision.

Administrator Brzozowski introduced the addition of new staff to OCA. Lisa Schaible is replacing Marta Ford and Field Operations Administration Deputy Director Charles Sinclair was introduced to the forum.

## **VI. MDOC BUDGET**

Director Heyns stated that the budget remains in the debate process. As all involved are deciphering between three (3) proposals (the Governor's Executive recommendation, the House and the Senate), but much discussion and debate lies ahead and any predictions would be premature. Community Corrections is slated for a continuation budget.

Mr. Campbell extended willingness from local organizations to assist with any efforts to continue viable local jail diversions. Director Heyns recognized the important message from the participants as such programs assist in controlling departmental costs.

Mr. Inman added that both he and Mr. Campbell are affiliated with the Michigan Association of Counties. Together they strongly support Community Corrections along with the successful programming and services provided as all are working toward a common goal.

Mr. Barry Wickman confirmed that the budget for FY 2013 did contain some funding reductions for Community Corrections. A consolidation of the appropriations would give Community Corrections more flexibility by reallocating spending from Residential Services to Comprehensive Plans and Services internally through Administrator Brzozowski's division. It is necessary for a separate Appropriation to go through the Legislative approval process with great hopes of consolidating Appropriations to create additional efficiencies with the State. Director Heyns is credited for working with the Legislatures to accommodate viable consolidations of Appropriates. Community Corrections has the opportunity to consolidate allocated resources and efficiencies to divert the reduction of funds from the Legislature transfer process. The decrease in felony court dispositions and additional programming in facilities are further reasons for the funding reductions in Community Corrections and department wide.

Mr. Wickman continued with stating that FY 2012 is facing additional reductions due to negative Appropriations. In previous years, Administrator Brzozowski and staff have limited the reallocation of Community Corrections spending by authorizing only a shift in funding if the county showed further reduction in prison admissions or improved jail utilization. In such an instance, funding can be shifted to support the influx of community diversions.

Mr. Wickman indicated that the May revenue estimating conference will determine the budgeting challenges for the department for FY 2013. The Governor's Executive Budget recommendation called for \$2 million in reductions for Residential Services, although the Legislature could increase that amount based on the preliminary revenue expectations. The house and senate did ask for additional reductions from Corrections; however, negotiations continue.

Mr. Inman offered clarification to the Board by stating that the lapsed money was returned to the general fund in an effort to help the revenue shortfall for the State. This is a common practice until revenues stabilize.

Director Heyns referred to the impending retirement of Mr. Barry Wickman and commended him on his skilled leadership and judgment through years of hardship. Mr. Wickman has been a valuable asset to the Department.

Mr. Wickman followed up by stating that as first and foremost the Department understands the importance of public safety and supports all efforts put forth in Community Corrections to provide appropriate funding for the programs.

Mr. Dunnings asked Mr. Wickman for additional information about the consolidation that would offer more flexibility in spending and asked for an example of such consolidations and flexibility. Mr. Wickman responded with the comprehensive plans of services, felony drunk driver, and the residential services are considered as boarder line items. Currently, the Department needs to seek the cumbersome Legislative processes to reallocate funds that approve the spending balances up to the amount of the appropriations. Such appropriations could be transferred internally if the sum is within the Appropriations amount.

Director Heyns stressed an important point of establishing a track record of financial credibility that starts with coming in under budget and this was an obtainable goal last year and also this year with Mr. Wickman's expertise. By doing so enhances the confidence bestowed to the Director and the Department from the Legislature by handling money and investments wisely. In an effort to achieve this goal, the bundling of multiple line items into one (1) service may enhance the flexibility of the budget.

Mr. Jon Campbell extended congratulations and good wishes to Mr. Wickman on his impending retirement.

## **VII. CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS**

Administrator Brzozowski indicated that after staff reviewed the CCABs mid-year reports it was determined that there were no major issues that needed to be presented to the Board.

Mr. Brzozowski continued with the introduction of Kevin Wiessenborn, Manager of Contract and Financial Services Section. Mr. Wiessenborn noted three (3) CCAB changes within the last year.

- Effective October 1, 2011, Mason County elected to discontinue participation in Community Corrections funding and services. In August 2011, Mason County was awarded approximately \$62,000, which provided community service placement, drug testing, and cognitive change programming. Historically, Mason

- County has experienced a low prison commitment rate, a jail capacity of 50%, and they did not possess the issues that warranted Community Corrections funding.
- Effective April 1, 2012, the Central Upper Peninsula Community Corrections Advisory Board (comprised of Schoolcraft and Alger Counties), in which Schoolcraft County is serving as the fiscal agent, has elected to transfer the fiscal and administrative responsibilities to the Upper Peninsula Commission for Area Progress (UPCAP), who is a 5013C entity, based out of Escanaba, MI. UPCAP was established by the 15 Upper Peninsula counties to facilitate the delivery of a variety of services ranging from economic development planning, housing, and growth development while serving as the fiscal administrative agent for West Central U.P. Community Corrections, which consist of Delta, Dickinson, Gogebic, Iron, Menominee, and Ontonagon. Approximately \$78,000 has been provided to Central Upper Peninsula for community service placement and work group within Schoolcraft and Alger Counties.
  - The Eastern Upper Peninsula Community Corrections advisory board is comprised of Chippewa, Mackinaw, and Luce Counties in tandem with the Eastern Upper Peninsula Employment and Training serving as the fiscal and administrative board. The fiscal and administrative responsibilities will be transferred to Chippewa County effective June 1, 2012. The three (3) counties are collectively provided with approximately \$140,000 for community service placement work and tether programs. The anticipated positive changes would entail a higher percentage of the grant award going toward direct program services rather than administrative costs. In some instances, County's are better situated to assume the administrative and fiscal responsibilities associated with Community Corrections programming and will be able to dedicate a higher portion of funding toward direct program services.

Mr. Wiessenborn recognized the efforts of Ms. Linsey LaMontagne, Grant Coordinator, who has worked diligently in helping to facilitate the changes. In addition, Ms. Rebecca Donaldson, Fiscal Analyst, was recognized for completing a financial review of the Eastern Upper Peninsula and she has worked closely with Ms. LaMontagne to implement the changes. Their efforts were noted and appreciated.

Mr. Dunnings asked if Chippewa County would continue to service the same three (3) counties. Mr. Wiessenborn responded by confirming this information.

### **Mid-year overviews ~ Ionia County CCAB Presentation**

Mr. Abe French, who is the Grants Coordinator for Ionia County CCAB and a Cognitive Behavioral Programs Specialist for OCA, advised the Board that during the past 18 months, the Ionia County CCAB has had file reviews, program reviews, evaluations, and financial reviews and it was determined that the funding for PA 511 activities is in need of improvement. Issues were noted with eligibility assessments and quality program delivery; however, additional training was provided to staff without success. As a result, Ionia County changed providers and staff with improvements noted within 30 days by increasing communication.

Ionia County Sheriff Mr. Dwain Dennis conveyed the importance of the relationship between Ionia County and Community Corrections as a viable piece of programming. Sheriff Dennis also recognized the program discrepancies and took immediate action. Currently, the programming in Ionia County has been rebuilt with the assistance of Mr. French and Mr. Andrew Verheek and it continues to excel on a positive course.

A word of appreciation was extended to Manager Sandi Hoppough and Financial Manager Kevin Weissenborn in assisting Ionia County to improve their OCC office staff. They have met with a variety of stakeholders, including Sheriff Dennis and his staff, the Probation Department, Ionia County Administration, and CBT program providers. As a collective effort, all are moving the programming forward until a new OCC Manager is hired.

Mr. Heins asked a question in regards to issues that resulted in the replacement of personnel in Ionia County, was the community aware of any issues or problems. Mr. French responded by stating the deficiencies and issues were only evident during the delivery of programming and did not transition into the community. As a proactive measure, Sheriff Dennis changed staffing. It is anticipated that the programming will be operational within the next two (2) weeks.

Mr. Cory Chavis asked what plans are being put into place to transition this programming method from a person dependent issue process to more of a process dependent plan. Mr. French stated that the county is entertaining a few options such as revising the position description, ensuring a clear oversight for the position, and potentially contracting the position to offer more flexibility in the hiring process while also revamping the accountability level.

Mr. Dunnings asked Mr. French to identify the specific problem/s in Ionia County. Mr. French explained that during a file review it was discovered that there was a change in the substance abuse program curriculum and a change of program providers. Upon further reviews of the files, in which 17 offenders participated, only 14 files existed. The provider could not locate the outstanding three (3) files. Mr. French noted that 14 participants were enrolled in programming and 11 of those files were lacking an assessment. Essentially, the CCAB Manager failed to inform the service provider that an assessment needs to be completed prior to program enrollment. Therefore, some were ineligible for programming, which resulted in the withholding of funds. Mr. French continued by saying that Andrew Verheek, Community Corrections Planner for Kent County Community Corrections has been instrumental in ensuring that processes are logical and that eligible offenders are receiving the appropriate services.

Mr. Dunnings offered positive comments on the last presentation by Mr. French in which he was very impressed.

### **Residential Services**

Ms. Barb Hankey, Manager of the Oakland County CCAB, opened the discussion about a situation that has occurred in both Oakland and Washtenaw Counties. Ms. Hankey providing some history to the new board members by stating, in 2008 the State Office of Community Corrections assumed all residential service provider contracts. By doing so, this improved efficiencies with county contract providers and allowed for easier movement of monies between programs without the necessity of amending contracts. At that time, Ms. Hankey was a strong supporter of the consolidation due to no changes being implemented to the county's business practices or the eligibility criteria. More specifically, she advised of a recent placement of two (2) offenders who were deemed as ineligible for program funding due to no longer being under the jurisdiction of MDOC Probation. She was not aware of a requirement of placement or an eligibility criterion nevertheless, she reviewed both the boilerplate for FY 2012 and the Community Corrections Act, MCL 791.408(a), in which neither of these documents indicated that an

offender must be on active Probation. Rather section 8.4 of the Community Corrections Act states, "...to encourage the participation in community corrections programs of offenders who would likely be sentenced to imprisonment in a state correctional facility or jail..." Ms. Hankey stressed the use of the word offender by the Legislature rather than probationer, which would elude one to believe that a person would not have to be on probation to be eligible for programs.

Ms. Hankey continued with reading the Community Corrections Act by stating, "...offenders who would likely be sentenced to imprisonment which means either of the following: a felon who receives a prison disposition that appears to be in place of incarceration in a state correctional facility or jail, according to historical local sentencing pattern or a currently incarcerated felon who is granted early release from incarceration to a community corrections program or is granted early release from incarceration as a result of a community corrections program." Ms. Hankey stated that an individual's probation was revoked as the Judge imposed a sentence consisting of a short jail term followed by community corrections programming. Consequently, this offender was ineligible for such programming.

Ms. Hankey previously conversed with Administrator Brzozowski and discussed a public proposed solution that he would provide in writing. Contained within this response, which was consulted with MDOC Office of Legal Affairs, it states that to provide services using state funds and resources to offenders not under jurisdiction would be a lending of the credit of the state and a violation of the constitution 1963 article 9, section 18. Ms. Hankey pointed out to the board that a lending of credit involves the agreement to pay in advance an indeterminate amount or for an unspecified length of time; however, the appropriations are available and within the fiscal year. Ms. Hankey asked for clarification of this decision from the board. She further stated that interestingly enough the MDOC Office of Legal Affairs indicated that this lending of credit was prohibited by the state constitution; however, within the CCAB contract the lending of credit was contained in a minimum of three (3) provisions. More specifically, in sections 2.027, 2.068, and 2.152, this allows the state to extend a line of credit, but not the reverse for the counties. Oakland County was able to revise such statements in their contract.

Although, some alternatives were discussed between Ms. Hankey and Administrator Brzozowski, none of which seemed to be a good use of resources and/or manpower during this time of fiscal hardship. As another concern, Ms. Hankey fears that within the next fiscal year, the contracts will be amended with the providers to exclude the CCABs and will not be able to accept anyone who is not currently on probation. Doing so may result in the state dictating the county CCAB eligibility criteria, rather than leaving the discretion of services with the provider.

Mr. Inman asked Ms. Hankey if offenders were allowed into the programs mentioned before this situation and if there was a notice provided stating that these offenders were not reimbursable for programming. Ms. Hankey was in agreement with that statement and continued by stating that in the last 16 years offenders who were not currently under probation supervision were privy to program services. This issue has come to the forefront within the last few months along with concern that does not leave the provider responsible for the debt. Thus far, this debt has been eliminated by providing funding with county monies. However, this was not a viable option. Recently, an offender was provided transportation to a Washtenaw County program and was declined such programming. Meanwhile the family was transporting the offender back to jail when the offender absconded.

Mr. Inman stated that a response would be forthcoming from the MDOC. Administrator Brzozowski commented that there have been some internal changes. Kevin Weissenborn and Rebecca Donaldson were appointed to review the existing contracts to ensure allowable reimbursement as stated in the contracts and within the stipulations of PA 511. The providers were notified that the offender must be under MDOC jurisdiction, which resulted in the providers refusing placement for these offenders. Administrator Brzozowski consulted with the MDOC Legal Affairs Office and was advised that in accordance to the existing contract language that there is an inability to provide services to those who are not currently under the jurisdiction of the department. In response to Ms. Hankey's inquiry, Administrator Brzozowski offered two (2) options. First, to work locally with the sentencing court by not revoking probation upon violation rather sentence the offender to a jail term followed by a release into a residential program upon successful completion of both, at which time, probation can be revoked. As an unfavorable second option, have the state award the counties residential funds by allowing the local counties to administer such funding.

Mr. Brzozowski further commented about the P.A. 511 Statute mentioned by Ms. Hankey in regards to an offender being on active probation. Contained within section 719.409, under jurisdiction of sentencing court, it states, "...the sentencing court that places a person in a community corrections program shall retain jurisdiction over the person as a probationer..." Mr. Brzozowski informed the board of impending issues, as many programs funded by community corrections are not provided to active probationers. P.A. 511 does contain existing language to support Mr. Brzozowski's proclamation.

Ms. Debra Walling asked Ms. Hankey what offenses were involved to merit placement in programming without probation supervision. Ms. Hankey explained that it was a HYTA status offender where the judge was acting at the request of the probation department for a revocation of probation. The judge, who was familiar with the case, preferred to place the offender into programming to avoid detention as the offender was serving on a drug offense case. Ms. Hankey emphasized the need for this offender to partake in residential services to address substance abuse issues.

Mr. Stuart Dunnings inquired if a person is on probation, does that constitute as an open case for SCAO (State Court Administrative Office) reporting? Ms. Brigitte Officer confirmed this information. Mr. Dunnings continued by asking what happens to an offender who is sentenced. Ms. Officer answered by stating upon sentencing, the case is closed; however, under active probation supervision the sentencing judge can violate the offender. Mr. Dunnings advised that there is a great concern among the Lansing judges about the number of open cases that are being reported to SCAO. If an offender is on probation, that is considered as an open case.

Mr. DeBoer added that historically this has been an ongoing problem and that the offender has needed to be on active supervision in order to receive CCAB services as well as the addition of special condition/s. Mr. DeBoer asked Ms. Hankey, if an offender is not currently under active supervision, how is an offender violated? Ms. Hankey responded with stating that it is a failure to comply with their sentence as ordered by the judge and a warrant request is presented to the judge. Ms. Officer added that essentially the judge is closing the offender's case. Upon violation of the judge's order/s, a new case is opened.

Mr. Thomas Clement questioned the origination of the jurisdiction, are the offenders held in contempt of court by the judges and how is this enforced? To summarize his inquiry, Mr. Clement asked if probation is revoked and if the offender selects to discontinue the program, is the offender called before the judge? Ms. Hankey responded with saying that a warrant is issued only if the offender absconds. When probation is revoked, it is part of a structured sentence, they are being released early, and the offender needs to complete the remainder of their sentence. Mr. Clements followed up by asking when an offender completes the ordered residential programming, is there an "or else" alternative if said programming is not completed? Ms. Hankey stated that if the offender fails to complete the ordered residential programming, then the offender would complete their sentence in jail.

## **VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Ms. Mary Sabai, the CCAB Manager for Ingham County/City of Lansing, announced that she is stepping down from her duties as the President of Michigan Association for Community Corrections Advisory Boards after serving two (2) years. Mr. Andrew Verheek, Community Corrections Planner for Kent County Community Corrections, will act as the interim President.

An extension of appreciation was conveyed to the Director and the Board Members for their continued support of the CCABs and for the increase in funding for FY 2011 of \$1.2 million. Mr. Verheek expressed their concern for the House Subcommittee's recommendation to reduce their funding by \$1.2 million for FY 2013. A continued willingness was extended to work with the Board and the State to achieve a common goal of reducing prison commitments and jail utilization.

## **IX. OLD BUSINESS**

Administrator Brzozowski revisited a discussion from the August board meeting about having the CCABs report recidivism information and program outcomes. OCA distributed a questionnaire to the CCABs and compiled the collected information and the results are as follows:

- 39 or 78% of the CCABs returned the questionnaire
- 31 or 80% reported insufficient staffing to obtain recidivism data
- A majority reported that the running of the LEIN for the purpose of collecting recidivism data is a major obstacle

Administrator Brzozowski indicated that the MDOC LEIN Administrator advised that the LEIN policy does not allow for the use of LEIN for purely statistical research. Because of this information, the study session in October was cancelled.

Mr. Inman reiterated the challenge to obtain the needed information does exist.

## **X. NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. Jon Campbell asked Mr. Inman if a resolution is in place to remedy the issue presented by Ms. Hankey. Mr. Inman understands that the issue has been presented to Administration and currently a piece of legislation is requiring supervision of the MDOC. In the interim, Mr. Inman suggested such cases be handled internally by the local

CCABs in terms of maintaining the probation or this may merit administration involvement.

Ms. Hankey added that they have already taken some preventive measures that involve unnecessary paperwork. She advocated revisiting some issues and the Community Corrects Act with Administrator Brzozowski to make some updates that would influence several programs as this contains outdated information.

Mr. Inman stated that previously the Michigan Association of Counties considered revisiting P.A. 511 but those attempts were unsuccessful. Mr. Campbell suggested communication from all parties and jurisdictions to ensure that this same issue does not repeat itself.

## **XI. ADJOURN**

Move to Adjourn by Mr. Inman with a second by Mr. Clement.

VOTE: Motion passed unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.