



**Michigan Prisoner ReEntry Initiative**

**QUARTERLY STATUS REPORT**

Pursuant to Public Act 245 of 2008  
Section 403 (2)

**Second Quarter Fiscal Year 2009**

**Michigan Prisoner ReEntry Initiative (MPRI)**  
**QUARTERLY STATUS REPORT**  
Pursuant to Public Act 245 of 2008, Section 403 (2)

**Section No. 1: MPRI Model Implementation Progress Snapshot**

The **VISION** of the Michigan Prisoner ReEntry Initiative (MPRI) is that every prisoner released from prison will have the tools needed to succeed in the community.

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

The **GOALS** of the Michigan Prisoner ReEntry Initiative are to:

- **Promote public safety** by reducing the threat of harm to persons and their property by released offenders in the communities to which those offenders return.
- **Increase success rates of offenders** who transition from prison by fostering effective risk management and treatment programming, offender accountability, and community and victim participation.

**A. Creating Safer Neighborhoods & Better Citizens: A Comprehensive Approach**

Michigan is a leader in prisoner re-entry and is the first state in the nation to converge the three major schools of thought on prisoner re-entry to develop and fully implement a comprehensive model of prisoner transition planning.

The MPRI Model:

- Begins with the three-phase re-entry approach of the Department of Justice's Serious and Violent Offender ReEntry Initiative (SVORI).
- Further delineates the transition process by adding the seven decision points of the National Institute of Corrections' Transition from Prison to Community Initiative (TPCI) model.
- Incorporated into its approach the policy statements and recommendations from the Report of the ReEntry Policy Council that is coordinated by the Council of State Governments.

In this way, the MPRI represents a synergistic model for prisoner re-entry that is deeply influenced by the nation's best thinkers on how to improve former prisoners' success.

To develop the MPRI Model, Michigan had the tremendous benefit of technical assistance grants from the National Governors Association (NGA) and the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) that provide substantial resources for consultation, research, training, and technical assistance. As a result of the grant from NGA, the MPRI also utilized zip-code level parolee mapping of Michigan conducted by the Urban Institute as part of our intensive strategic-planning process. As a result, the knowledge base created by the MPRI is unprecedented.

Michigan is poised for success combining a strong mandate from the Governor, a powerful policy framework, and strong community buy in. The challenge now is statewide implementation on a scale of 10,000 prisoners per year transitioning successfully from prison.

## **B. The Three Phases and Seven Decision Points of the MPRI Model**

The MPRI Model involves improved decision making at seven critical decision points in the three phases of the custody, release, and community supervision/discharge process.

### **I. GETTING READY PHASE**

The **institutional phase** describes the events and responsibilities which occur during the offender's imprisonment from admission until the point of the parole decision and involves the first two major decision points:

*1. Assessment and classification:* Measuring the offender's risks, needs, and strengths.

#### **PROGRESS SNAPSHOT:**

Currently, every offender entering the Michigan Department of Corrections' (MDOC) Reception and Guidance Centers is assessed using the validated risk assessment, COMPAS. The COMPAS is also administered with offenders prior to parole consideration. To date, almost half of the current prisoner population have been assessed using this tool, and every offender transitioning home through MPRI is assessed prior to release.

*2. Prisoner programming:* Assignments to reduce risk, address need and build on strengths.

#### **PROGRESS SNAPSHOT:**

In 2008, all active programs offered by MDOC were assessed using the Program Evaluation Tool designed by MDOC in partnership with Dr. Marilyn VanDieten, Orbis Partners and Becki Ney, Center for Effective Public Policy. This tool determines the degree to which a program curriculum is likely to reduce offender risk. In 2009, the goal is to determine the program capacity that will be required to ensure that all prisoners who need programming are able to participate prior to release.

## II. GOING HOME PHASE

The **transition to the community or re-entry phase** begins approximately two months before the offender'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, criminal attitudes and thinking and to develop pro-social connections and lifestyles. This phase involves the next two major decision points:

- 3. Prisoner release preparation:** Developing a strong, public-safety-conscious parole plan.

### PROGRESS SNAPSHOT:

Each prisoner that is assigned to an In-Reach Facility works with an Institutional Parole Agent and community-based Transition Team to develop an individualized Transition Accountability Plan (TAP) that describes the needs, goals, tasks, and activities that each offender will complete upon release. Approximately 60% of all returning prisoners transition through an MPRI In-Reach Facility. Most In-Reach Facilities are located near the home of the returning prisoner.

In 2009, MDOC is partnering with Family Justice and the Michigan Domestic Violence, Prevention, and Treatment Board to develop a "family-focused" model of prisoner re-entry. Research has shown that strong, pro-social supports are critical to community stability and likely to interrupt the inter-generational cycle of crime. By testing family-focused approaches, MDOC hopes to learn what works to strengthen families, encourage offender success, and keep families and communities safe.

- 4. Release decision making:** Improving parole release guidelines.

### PROGRESS SNAPSHOT:

MDOC and the Office of the Parole Board have been working with the Center for Effective Public Policy to design the packet of information that the Parole Board will review during release decision making. Once this packet has been pilot-tested in Michigan, revised parole guidelines will be considered.

## III. STAYING HOME PHASE

The **community 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 and social supports to assure continued success. The Staying Home Phase involves the final three major decision points of the transition process:

**5. Supervision and services:** Providing flexible and firm supervision and services.

**PROGRESS SNAPSHOT:**

In 2006, MPRI launched the Staying Home Phase. Since that time, approximately 13,000 returning prisoners have transitioned home and MDOC has invested over \$75 million in services for returning prisoners.

MDOC Field Operations Administration has been piloting revised supervision standards. These standards are based on the principles of effective practice and are captured in the MPRI Collaborative Case Management Model. As additional parole and probation agents are trained in Collaborative Case Management throughout 2009, MDOC policy on supervising offenders in the community will be revised to reflect these new, evidence-based standards.

**6. Revocation decision making:** Using graduated sanctions to respond to behavior.

**PROGRESS SNAPSHOT:**

Using graduated responses to offender behavior has long been a practice of MDOC; however, beginning in 2006 with the launch of MPRI, additional resources became available in the community to manage to parolee behavior. As a result, technical violations of parole conditions that resulted in a return to prison have been reduced.

**7. Discharge and aftercare:** Determining community responsibility to “take over” case.

**PROGRESS SNAPSHOT:**

Working collaboratively with community-based partners and social support networks to develop strong connections with returning citizens is an important objective of MPRI and strategies for strengthening these connections will continue to be explored as offenders discharge from parole.

**Section No. 2: Early Indications of the Impact of the MPRI Model**

Given the investment made to implement the MPRI Model – with more yet to come to be fully up-to-scale – it has been very important to track early indicators that the MPRI Model will positively affect parolee behavior. Because of the commitment to data-driven practice, MDOC has tracked parolee success since MPRI was launched in 2005.

Preliminary tracking of MPRI outcomes relies on matched comparisons to baseline recidivism data, reflecting the fact that failure rates vary according to offender characteristics and backgrounds. The baseline year against which to compare outcomes was 1998 parole releases, to

ensure that the extended period for baseline outcome tracking would not reach into the genesis year of the MPRI (i.e., 2003). In that year, initial MPRI-driven changes in parole practices already began to be implemented, such as paroling most offenders in early- to mid-week to enable immediate reporting to agents and employers, adoption of graduated sanctions based on behavior and risk, and provision of more intervention options for deteriorating paroles).

In addition, the analysis is done by cohort, to reflect stages of model implementation and so that offenders are being compared to others with comparable time at risk of failure. At this point, results are presented only for the overall impact of MPRI (by cohort) because it is premature to attempt to disaggregate the outcomes by specific site or program.

In 2009, MDOC will partner with an independent evaluation team to develop an evaluation of the MPRI Model that will analyze other indicators of parolee behavior (such as arrest and re-conviction rates, employment retention, access to housing, degree of supportive social networks, etc.) so that MDOC and MPRI stakeholders can better understand what works to improve offender behavior and tailor the future implementation of MPRI to incorporate the lessons learned from the evaluation.

#### **A. Recidivism Levels of Offenders who Participated in the MPRI and Have Been Released**

*(UPDATE THROUGH 3/31/2009)* The follow up of MPRI-related offenders who are released to the community is being done by systematically tracking individual offender release cohorts since the MPRI is being implemented in stages to build toward the full MPRI Model. For example, the Intensive ReEntry Units (IRU's) that were implemented in 2005 were actually "precursors" to the MPRI because, while they served as a testing ground for some MPRI practices, they had not implemented the full MPRI Model.

Similarly, much of the activity for the first and second rounds of official MPRI pilot sites and subsequent initial statewide implementation was concentrated on Phases II and III of the MPRI Model because the new, dynamic risk/needs assessment instrument (COMPAS) – that is the lynchpin of Phase I at the point of reception into prison – had not been fully implemented yet. Thus, as each cohort of MPRI-related cases transitions to parole with the escalating benefit of the MPRI Model in place, it is expected that progressively improving recidivism outcomes will be apparent.

In recognition of variable failure rates among offenders with different characteristics, and in light of the fact that the prisoners chosen for the MPRI by the Parole Board tend to be moderate to high risk for re-offense, the Office of Research and Planning has imposed statistical controls on the comparisons to the overall baseline to account for the presence of offender characteristics that are demonstrated to have a strong relationship to differentiations within the baseline failure rates. These statistical controls enable the analysis to refine the comparisons to the baseline by offender subgroups with matched characteristics, rather than just comparing all cases to the overall baseline.

While this complicated undertaking will continue to be refined, Office of Research and Planning analysts have already determined that the two most significant general factors identified

so far in the differentiation between release outcomes are a history of previous return to prison as a parole violator and county of release.

In the case of county of release, the differentiation is likely driven by local prosecutorial charging and plea bargaining practices as well as local issues such as economic/employment and housing prospects within depressed areas. The formal MPRI evaluation will eventually include examination of local community dynamics such as these.

In the case of history of prior parole failure, supplementary analysis of the 1998 baseline recidivism data shows that parolees who have a history of being returned to prison as parole violators (for either technical violations or new sentences) have a 24% greater likelihood of again failing on parole when next released, compared to parolees with no prior history of parole failure. This is consistent with the risk principle, wherein if the risk, needs and strengths of past violators are not adequately addressed before again returning them to the community, then more often than not they will continue to fail until something changes. This repetitive cycle of misbehavior is precisely what the MPRI is designed to stop – via its features of dynamic risk assessment, transition accountability planning, program intervention and community in-reach in advance of the next release.

As proof of performance that the MPRI is targeting offenders who are otherwise likely to fail on parole, 56.2% of the IRU and MPRI cases paroled through February of 2009 had a history of prior parole failure, while only 34.5% of the 1998 baseline paroles had a history of prior parole failure.

**When controlling for a history of prior parole failure and time at risk, the overall MPRI/IRU recidivism outcomes through March of 2009 show a 30% relative rate reduction in total returns to prison against the 1998 baseline (across all of the release cohorts as a group.) This translates into an absolute reduction of 1,482 fewer returns to prison so far when compared to baseline expectations (a numerical reduction that will continue to grow if these results are sustained over a full three-year follow-up period.)**

Table 1 shows the more detailed status and recidivism levels of the first eleven offender release cohorts for standard IRU/MPRI releases through February of 2009. It is important to recognize that adequate follow-up time must pass before reliable recidivism outcomes can be established, since relatively few offenders are returned to prison during the first several months following release.

It is also important to reiterate that these outcome results are based on preliminary tracking methodology. They represent neither statistically significant findings derived from rigorous evaluation, nor definitive demonstration of the cause and effect of MPRI on offender success. While very encouraging, these preliminary results will eventually have to be subjected to more statistical controls and a more sophisticated array of methodologies, as well as broader outcomes measures (e.g., intermediate outcomes such as offender employment, and additional recidivism outcomes such as re-arrests and re-convictions), and of course full completion of standardized, uniform follow-up periods by each of the individual cohorts.

As of the end of March 2009, only the first 1,196 standard IRU/MPRI cases paroled in 2005 and 2006 had been released long enough to enable a full three years of follow-up as required by P.A. 245 of 2008 Section 408. This is only 7% of all standard IRU/MPRI releases to date, and these early cases were limited to serving as a testing ground for MPRI practices since the full MPRI model had not been implemented yet at the time of their releases.

Table 1: Quarterly Status/Recidivism Levels of Released MPRI-Related Participants<sup>1</sup>

	Number of Cases To Date	Number Released Thru 2/28/09	Returned to Prison Thru 3/31/09		Baseline Returns Expected Within period		Improvement So Far Against Baseline	
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>IRU 1<sup>st</sup> Cohort</b> (2005 IRU releases)	687	687	329	47.9%	389	56.6%	-60	-15.4%
<b>IRU 2<sup>nd</sup> Cohort</b> (2006 IRU releases)	1,412	1,412	591	41.9%	768	54.4%	-177	-23.0%
<b>IRU 3<sup>rd</sup> Cohort</b> (2007 IRU releases)	637	637	192	30.1%	283	44.4%	-91	-32.2%
<b>MPRI Pilot 1<sup>st</sup> Cohort</b> (1 <sup>st</sup> round 1 <sup>st</sup> wave)	160	152	70	46.1%	78	51.3%	-8	-10.3%
<b>MPRI Pilot 2<sup>nd</sup> Cohort</b> (1 <sup>st</sup> round 2 <sup>nd</sup> wave)	806	806	356	44.2%	434	53.8%	-78	-18.0%
<b>MPRI Pilot 3<sup>rd</sup> Cohort</b> (1 <sup>st</sup> round 3 <sup>rd</sup> wave)	2,460	2,460	726	29.5%	1,051	42.7%	-325	-30.9%
<b>MPRI Pilot 4<sup>th</sup> Cohort</b> (2 <sup>nd</sup> round 1 <sup>st</sup> wave)	697	697	224	32.1%	283	40.6%	-59	-20.8%
<b>MPRI Statewide FY 2007 (post-IRU)</b>	698	698	142	20.3%	271	38.8%	-129	-47.6%
<b>MPRI Community Placement Program</b>	655	655	183	27.9%	273	41.7%	-90	-33.0%
<b>MPRI Statewide FY 2008 (All MPRI)</b>	5,541	5,541	670	12.1%	1,087	19.6%	-417	-38.4%
<b>MPRI Statewide FY 2009 (All MPRI)</b>	5,022	2,478	49	2.0%	97	3.9%	-48	-49.5%

<sup>1</sup> These are standard IRU and official MPRI releases. Specialized MPRI subpopulations, such as the inmates in the MPRI Mentally Ill Demonstration Project and in the Special Alternative Incarceration Program (SAI) will be reported separately in other MPRI-related evaluation reports.



### ***First IRU Offender Release Cohort (2005 Releases)***

All offenders released to parole from the IRU's in 2005 represent the first pre-MPRI offender release cohort that is being tracked. The first of these offenders transitioned to parole in February of 2005. A full 3-year follow-up period has now been completed for this first MPRI-related cohort. The 3-year results for this cohort show a 15% relative rate reduction in returns to prison against the overall baseline when controlling for a history of prior parole failure. That translates into 60 fewer returns to prison than baseline expectations, and an absolute rate reduction of 8.7% for this initial MPRI-related cohort (i.e., 47.9% returned to prison within 3 years after release, compared to baseline expectations of 56.6% returned to prison within 3 years after release, when controlling for a history of prior parole failure).

### ***Second IRU Offender Release Cohort (2006 Releases)***

All offenders released to parole from the IRU's in 2006 represent the second pre-MPRI cohort to be tracked. There are 1,412 cases in this cohort, and about 42% returned to prison through the end of March 2009. This represents a 23% relative rate improvement in returns to prison so far against the overall baseline when controlling for a history of prior parole failure and time at risk.

### ***Third IRU Offender Release Cohort (2007 Releases)***

All offenders released to parole from the IRU's in 2007 represent the third pre-MPRI cohort to be tracked. This cohort of 642 released cases was closed out at the end of May 2007 because the IRU locations were then re-designated as "MPRI Statewide" pilot site facilities. About 30% had returned to prison through the end of March 2009. This represents a 32% relative rate improvement in returns to prison so far against the overall baseline when controlling for a history of prior parole failure and time at risk.

### ***First MPRI Round 1 Pilot Site Offender Release Cohort***

The first official MPRI pilot site offender release cohort consisted of 160 offenders (20 at each of eight pilot sites). Six of these offenders had their paroles suspended prior to release and received continuances instead; two due to pending charges, three due to institutional misconduct, and one due to failure to complete the statutory GED educational requirement. Two more of the original 160 were paroled, but ultimately as non-MPRI cases.

These first official MPRI offenders began paroling in November and December of 2005, and all had transitioned to parole by the end of April 2006. About 46% had returned to prison through the end of March 2009. This represents a 10% relative rate improvement so far in returns to prison for this initial official MPRI cohort against the overall baseline, when controlling for a history of prior parole failure and time at risk.

### ***Second MPRI Round 1 Pilot Site Offender Release Cohort***

The 2<sup>nd</sup> wave of first round MPRI pilot site cases began to be released in larger numbers in May 2006, and all 806 cases had transitioned to parole by the end of September 2006. Through the end of March 2009, about 44% had returned to prison. This represents an 18% relative rate improvement so far against the overall baseline when controlling for a history of prior parole failure and time at risk. In total, over 1,800 prisoners were targeted (paroled/engaged/ identified) for the MPRI in FY 2006, with each release cohort (4-6 month cycles) benefiting from fuller implementation of the complete MPRI Model.

### ***Third MPRI Round 1 Pilot Site Offender Release Cohort***

The 3<sup>rd</sup> wave of first round MPRI pilot site cases began to be released in October 2006, and all 2,460 had transitioned to parole by the end of September 2007. Less than 30% of these cases had returned to prison by the end of March 2009. This represents a 31% relative rate improvement so far against the overall baseline when controlling for a history of prior parole failure and time at risk.

### ***First MPRI Round 2 Pilot Site Offender Release Cohort***

The 1<sup>st</sup> wave of second round MPRI pilot site cases began to be engaged with the seven new pilot sites in October 2006, and all 697 had paroled by the end of September 2007, with about 32% returned to prison by the end of March 2009. This represents a 21% relative rate improvement so far against the overall baseline when controlling for a history of prior parole failure and time at risk.

### ***FY 2007 MPRI Statewide Offender Release Cohort***

In the first half of 2007, the IRU locations were re-designated as “MPRI Statewide” facilities, so a new offender release cohort was started in June 2007 for tracking paroles from those locations. Through September of 2007, all 698 MPRI Statewide FY 2007 cases were paroled, and only about 20% had been returned to prison by the end of March 2009. This represents a 48% relative rate improvement in returns to prison so far against the overall baseline when controlling for a history of prior parole failure and time at risk.

### ***MPRI Community Placement Program Offender Release Cohort***

The MPRI Community Placement Program (CPP) was a system of integrated transitional services coupled with rigorous drug testing and sanctions. The CPP was restricted to offenders who were serving active prison sentences for only drug crimes or other nonviolent, non-weapons-related crimes who were already past their earliest release dates due to either previous denial of parole or earlier return to prison as violators of parole conditions.

The program consisted of four phases which assessed, referred, and placed parolees into community-based transitional residential housing and services. The initial phase was the standard MPRI In-Reach phase, followed by placement in a community-based programming

center, and then eventual transition to an approved home placement (with electronic monitoring as necessary) and access to programming, assistance and services. The final phase allowed for periods of return to the community-based programming center if necessary for reasons such as rule noncompliance, family conflict or loss of home status.

Paroles to the CPP began in June 2007, and all 655 cases had paroled to the CPP by the end of December 2007, with about 28% returned to prison so far through March 2009. This represents a 33% relative rate improvement in returns to prison so far against the overall baseline when controlling for a history of prior parole failure and time at risk.

#### ***FY 2008 MPRI Statewide Offender Release Cohort***

In FY 2008, the MPRI was implemented statewide (meaning that every county was covered by the initiative). Thus, all offenders identified, engaged and released under the MPRI during FY 2008 constituted a new comprehensive statewide offender release cohort to be tracked. A total of 5,541 MPRI Statewide FY 2008 cases were paroled, and about 12% had returned to prison through March 2009. This represents a 38% relative rate improvement in returns to prison so far against the overall baseline when controlling for a history of prior parole failure and time at risk.

#### ***FY 2009 MPRI Statewide Offender Release Cohort***

In FY 2009, the MPRI is moving up to scale (meaning that every offender sent to prison is now being assessed under the initiative and the full MPRI model is now approaching complete implementation). Thus, all offenders identified, engaged and released under the MPRI during FY 2009 constitute a new comprehensive statewide offender release cohort to be tracked. A total of 5,022 MPRI Statewide FY 2008 cases have been identified and engaged so far, and 2,478 of them were paroled by the end of February 2009. Only 2% had returned to prison through March 2009. This represents a 50% relative rate improvement in returns to prison so far against the overall baseline when controlling for a history of prior parole failure and time at risk.

## B. MPRI-Related Offender Release Cohorts by Crime Group

Table 2 shows the principal crimes for which sentences were being served among those offenders transitioned to parole so far from the first eleven offender release cohorts. Sentences for drug and other nonassaultive crimes are understandably the most common for these initial offender release cohorts. After successes are achieved and parole board confidence in positive outcomes is increased, it is anticipated that the mix of offenses will gradually include a higher proportion of assaultive cases.

*Table 2: Crime Groups for MPRI-Related Participants Released Thru 2/28/09*

	Sex	Other Assaultive	Drug	Other Nonassaultive	Total
<b>IRU 1<sup>st</sup> Cohort</b> (2005 IRU releases)	42 6.1%	202 29.4%	127 18.5%	316 46.0%	687 100%
<b>IRU 2<sup>nd</sup> Cohort</b> (2006 IRU releases)	65 4.6%	451 31.9%	226 16.0%	670 47.5%	1,412 100%
<b>IRU 3<sup>rd</sup> Cohort</b> (2007 cases so far)	33 5.2%	194 30.5%	115 18.0%	295 46.3%	637 100%
<b>MPRI Pilot 1<sup>st</sup> Cohort</b> (1 <sup>st</sup> round 1 <sup>st</sup> wave)	0 0.0%	33 21.7%	38 25.0%	81 53.3%	152 100%
<b>MPRI Pilot 2<sup>nd</sup> Cohort</b> (1 <sup>st</sup> round 2 <sup>nd</sup> wave)	31 3.8%	217 26.9%	147 18.2%	411 51.0%	806 100%
<b>MPRI Pilot 3<sup>rd</sup> Cohort</b> (1 <sup>st</sup> round 3 <sup>rd</sup> wave)	125 5.1%	848 34.5%	414 16.8%	1,073 43.6%	2,460 100%
<b>MPRI Pilot 4<sup>th</sup> Cohort</b> (2 <sup>nd</sup> round 1 <sup>st</sup> wave)	46 6.6%	217 31.1%	123 17.6%	311 44.6%	697 100%
<b>MPRI Statewide FY 2007</b>	38 5.4%	263 37.7%	112 16.0%	285 40.8%	698 100%
<b>MPRI Community Placement Program</b>	0 0%	0 0%	186 28.4%	469 71.6%	655 100%
<b>MPRI Statewide FY 2008 (All MPRI)</b>	493 8.9%	1,795 32.4%	912 16.5%	2,341 42.2%	5,541 100%
<b>MPRI Statewide FY 2009 (All MPRI)</b>	274 11.1%	747 30.1%	375 15.1%	1,082 43.7%	2,478 100%

## C. MPRI Comprehensive Evaluation

To date, research efforts have focused on MDOC technical assistance and support regarding MPRI implementation issues, as well as long- and short-term preliminary tracking of offender outcomes, specifically returns to prison during a three year follow-up period. Given the MPRI strategy to phase in the systemic Model changes, this approach was both practical and productive. However, work is underway to enhance and expand the MPRI research efforts in several ways, as outlined below.

Many of the elements of the MPRI Comprehensive Evaluation will be developed and piloted at the MPRI Learning Site, which began operations in April 2009. The Learning Site is the first site at which offenders are participating in all aspects of the MPRI model, including Phase I (institutional phase), with assessment, case planning, treatment and progress monitoring. In addition to presenting an opportunity for operational testing and development, this is a chance to develop, test and implement the measurement of multiple aspects of the MPRI model and to incorporate those measures into the comprehensive evaluation.

**PROGRESS SNAPSHOT:**

Prior to the formal implementation of the Learning Site, random samples for the Learning Site participants and the Comparison Group were identified. In addition, because offenders will be leaving the Learning Site and Comparison Group to parole periodically, a strategy to replenish both groups was developed. The replenishment strategy will maintain both groups at full enrollment while maintaining the representativeness of both groups in order to facilitate ongoing research efforts. Work with the Michigan Council on Crime and Delinquency (MCCD) to develop continuous quality measures is continuing.

Expanded Measures of Offender Behavior. Measurement will be enhanced in several areas. First, outcome measures will be expanded to include new criminal arrests, convictions and non-prison dispositions. These enhancements will significantly broaden the range of offender behavior being measured and, as such, will provide a more comprehensive assessment of the relationship between MPRI participation and improvements in public safety.

**PROGRESS SNAPSHOT:**

Data on returns to prison, new criminal convictions and dispositions and new felony arrests has been obtained from multiple data sources. An analytical approach has been developed. The data integrity and analysis will be tested on a single cohort of cases and refined before being applied to the entire group of IRU/MPRI cases and the baseline cohort.

In addition, additional statistical controls will be incorporated into the analysis to enhance the ability to target interventions and isolate outcomes for specific groups of offenders. Additional controls could include gender, age, offense type, prefix and other offender characteristics, as well as local community factors.

Second, other intermediate measures of offender behavior such as employment acquisition and retention, earnings, residential stability, family support, and participation in treatment, will be developed and tracked. These measures will allow assessment of how well offender needs are being addressed and the extent to which offenders are engaging in pro-social behaviors that have been shown to reduce involvement in illegal activity.

Ten-Year Trend Analysis. While the current and expanded outcome tracking provides measurement of outcomes for baseline and current MPRI cases, it does not provide information on trends over time. Thus, a ten-year trend analysis of site-specific data will be conducted and used to enable localized interpretation of the offender behavior data, and to understand the impact that singular events can have on crime trends in specific communities.

Data will also be retrospectively collected on outcomes and characteristics of offenders that have returned to each community in the years since the 1998 baseline year in order to establish ten-year trend histories.

In addition to these basic analyses of trends, more sophisticated statistical analysis and modeling techniques will be used to identify more detailed aspects of the basic trends. For example, techniques such as Latent Growth Curve Analysis can identify different “trajectories” of change, which are valuable in developing site-specific expectations against which to compare actual outcomes, and thereby more accurately determine program effects.

Additional data will be collected on events that affect the criminal justice system such as high profile criminal events, major economic/employment downturns, and changes in disposition and return to prison rates. These data will be plotted over time and provide a contextual framework to better understand shifts in criminal justice trends.

Comprehensive evaluation of MPRI impact. The comprehensive evaluation will assess the impact of MPRI system-wide, using multiple comparison groups and extensive statistical controls to isolate the specific impact of MPRI on offender success rates. The comprehensive evaluation will build on lessons learned from the Learning Site and the enhanced measures discussed above.

The evaluation will be constructed around a survival model (also known as a hazard, time to failure, or event history model) that assesses the rates at which recidivism occurs and the time from “treatment” to failure. The survival model approach will allow comparisons of the impact of differing types and intensities of MPRI exposure for discrete groups of offenders. It also allows the inclusion of a wide array of offender level data such as demographics, risk, criminal history and program and treatment participation and performance. This combination of methods is expected to allow researchers to make well informed judgments about whether MPRI worked, for whom and, perhaps most importantly, why. Planning for the comprehensive evaluation is ongoing.

An important component of the overall research plan is enhancement of the MDOC data collection system to allow for the effective tracking of all necessary data elements. Piloting the enhanced data collection system in the Learning Site will ensure that the system is ready to be launched statewide to improve the tracking of key variables.