

# **OFFENDER SUCCESS**

## **SPECIAL ALTERNATIVE INCARCERATION OS In-Reach Facility Male and Female**

### **ANNUAL REPORT -2017-**

**Pursuant to: PA 107 of 2017  
Article V, Sec. 611  
MCL 791.234a (9)**

**Heidi Washington, Director**

## ***REPORT HIGHLIGHTS***

- 503 SAI male prisoners from 65 counties and 264 male probationers from 34 counties were enrolled in the program.
- 27.8% of the male prisoners, 26.9% of the male probationers, and 10.1% of the In Reach male prisoners (IRM) enrolled in the program were serving for drug related offenses.
- 457 SAI male prisoners and 227 male probationers successfully completed the program. The successful completion rates were 94.0% for SAI male prisoners and 90.1% for male probationers.
- 348 In Reach male prisoners (IRM) from 43 counties were enrolled in the program.
- 302 IRM prisoners successfully completed the program. The successful completion rate was 87.3%.
- The program is cost effective as compared to prison.
- 133 male offenders earned their GED Certificates while enrolled in the program.
- 90 SAI female prisoners from 32 counties and 35 female probationers from 20 counties were enrolled in the program.
- 34.4% of the female prisoners 45.7% of the female probationers and 0% of the In Reach female prisoners (IRF) enrolled in the program were serving for drug related offenses.
- 74 SAI female prisoners and 26 female probationers successfully completed the program (includes prisoners/probationers enrolled in 2016 but graduated in 2017). The successful completion rates were 82.2% for SAI female prisoners and 74.2% for female probationers.
- 4 In Reach female prisoners (IRF) from 4 counties enrolled in the program during calendar year 2017.
- 6 IRF prisoners successfully completed the program (includes prisoners enrolled in 2016 but graduated in 2017). The successful completion rate is 85.0% for IRF prisoners.
- The program is cost effective as compared to prison.
- 149 offenders earned their GED Certificates while enrolled in the program.
- There was an increase of 4 prisoners/probationers/IRF intakes into the program in 2017 compared 2016.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Special Alternative Incarceration	4-6
Program Cost Effectiveness	6
Evening Educational and Re-Entry Programming	7
<b>Male-</b> Summary of 2017 Probationer Program Statistics	7
<b>Male-</b> Summary of 2017 SAI Prisoner Program Statistics	8
<b>Male-</b> Summary of 2017 In-Reach Male Prisoner (IRM) Statistics	9
<b>Male-</b> Probationer Admissions by Offense Type	10
<b>Male-</b> Prisoner Admissions by Offense Type	11
<b>Male-</b> In Reach Prisoner Admission by Offense Type	12
<b>Female-</b> Summary of 2017 Probationer Program Statistics	13
<b>Female-</b> Summary of 2017 SAI Prisoner Program Statistics	13
<b>Female-</b> Summary of 2017 In-Reach Prisoner (IRM) Statistics	14
<b>Female-</b> Probationer Admissions by Offense Type	15
<b>Female-</b> Prisoner Admissions by Offense Type	16
<b>Female-</b> In Reach Prisoner Admission by Offense Type	17
Comparison of Outcomes SAI-Prison vs. Non-SAI	18-19
<b>APPENDICES A-N (Males and Females)</b>	
A. 2017 Admissions by County – Probationer	20-23
B. 2017 Admissions by County – SAI Prisoner	24-27
C. 2017 Admission by County – In Reach Prisoners	28-31
D. 2017 Admissions by Month	32-33
E. 2017 Admissions by Gender	34
F. 2017 Monthly Population Totals	35-36
G. 2017 Program Outcomes by County - Probationer	37-40
H. 2017 Program Outcomes by County – Prisoner	41-44
I. 2017 Program Outcomes by County-In Reach Prisoner	45-48
J. 2017 Monthly Program Outcomes - Prisoner	49
K. 2017 Monthly Program Outcomes – Probationer	50
L. 2017 Monthly Program Outcomes – In Reach Prisoners	51
M. 2017 Graduates by Gender	52-53
N. Comparative Program Outcomes - 2016 and 2017	54-56

## Special Alternative Incarceration Program\*

The Special Alternative Incarceration Program (SAI) has been established as an Offender Success (OS) 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 OS 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:

<p><b>SAI</b></p> <p><b>In-reach facility:</b> Focus on individual risks and needs. Provides programming to address these risks and needs.</p> <p><b>1. Assessment and classification:</b> 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.</p> <p><b>2. Offender programming (Male):</b> The programming menus at SAI consist of the following to meet the goals of OS and the programming standards. These programs are delivered in a 90-day period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thinking Matters (Cognitive Behavioral Program)</li> <li>• Cage Your Rage (Cognitive Behavioral Program)</li> <li>• Journaling -Thinking Reports (Cognitive Behavioral Program)</li> <li>• Domestic Violence (Bridges)</li> <li>• Victim Awareness</li> <li>• Family Reunification Education Workshop</li> <li>• Family Focus Meetings</li> <li>• Premarital Interpersonal Choices and Knowledge (PICK a Partner)</li> <li>• Smart Steps for Step Families</li> <li>• Advanced Substance Abuse Therapy (ASAT) provided by Catholic Charities</li> <li>• GED</li> <li>• Employment Readiness</li> <li>• Pre-Release Vocational Educational Planning</li> <li>• Getting it Right</li> <li>• Employment Counseling</li> <li>• Winning at Work</li> </ul> <p><b>Offender programming (Female):</b> The programming menus at SAI consist of the following to meet the goals of OS and the programming standards. These programs are delivered in a 90-day period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Family Reunification Meetings</li> <li>• Family Focus Workshops</li> <li>• Substance Abuse treatment provided by SHAR</li> </ul>
---

- GED
- Employment Readiness & Digital Literacy
- Seeking Safety
- Moving On
- Meridians
- Self Determination
- Systematic Training for Effective Parenting
- New Direction/New Freedom provided by Prison Fellowship

**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 OS 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.

**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 male facility:**

- 83 custody staff
- 13 Administrative staff
- 03 Maintenance staff
- 05 Food Service staff (Trinity- Private Contract)
- 07 Healthcare staff
- 09 Education staff

**Current staffing level female facility:**

- 09 Custody staff
- 01 Administrative staff
- 01 Food Service staff (Trinity- Private Contract)
- 07 Healthcare staff (full time and part time combined)
- 01 Education staff

## **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 (Male)**

While enrolled in the program, all 1,115 male offenders admitted in 2017, participated in programming classes

consisting of Thinking Matters, Smart Steps for Step Families, Family Reunification Workshop, PICK a Partner, Pre-Release, Advanced Substance Abuse Therapy, Employment Readiness, Cage Your Rage, Domestic violence (Bridges), Victim Awareness and Journaling.

Of those completing all mandatory GED test modules, 133 male offenders 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.

## **EVENING EDUCATIONAL AND SELF-HELP PROGRAMMING (Female)**

While enrolled in the program, all 129 female offenders admitted in 2017, participated in programming classes consisting of STEP Parenting (if needed), Self Determination, Moving On, Seeking Safety, Family Reunification, Phase II Substance Abuse (if needed), Meridians (if needed), Family Focus, Employment Readiness and Digital Literacy.

16 female offenders, 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 2017 MALE PROBATIONER PROGRAM STATISTICS**

Male probationer program statistics for 2017 are presented in the attached appendices. These key data are summarized as follows:

Of the 264 probationers enrolled in the program:

1. 118 (44.7%) were African-American
2. 137 (51.9%) were Caucasian
3. 6 (2.3%) were Hispanic
4. 3 (1.1%) were of other races

Probationers sentenced in 34 counties enrolled in the program.

Probationer age at sentencing ranged from 18 years to 56 years, with the 18-22 year age group comprising 47.0% of all admissions.

As of December 31, 2017, 58 male probationers were enrolled in the program.

Of the 264 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, 2017).

1. 227 (90.1%) successfully completed the program
2. 2 (1.2%) voluntarily withdrew
3. 23 (8.7%) were terminated as rule violators

Ten probationers were terminated for medical reasons, and seven 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 2017 SAI MALE PRISONER PROGRAM STATISTICS**

SAI male prisoner program statistics for 2017 are presented in the attached appendices. These key data are summarized as follows:

Of the 503 prisoners enrolled in the program:

1. 166 (33.0%) were African-American
2. 324 (64.4%) were Caucasian
3. 0 (0.0%) were Hispanic
4. 13 (2.6%) 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 70 years, with the 18-22 year age group comprising 17.1% of all admissions.

As of December 31, 2017, 109 prisoners were enrolled in the program.

Of the 503 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, 2017).

1. 457 (94.0%) successfully completed the program
2. 9 (1.8%) voluntarily withdrew
3. 20 (4.2%) were terminated as rule violators

Six SAI male prisoners were terminated for medical reasons, and ten 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 2017 IN-REACH MALE PRISONER (IRM) PROGRAM STATISTICS**

IRM prisoner program statistics for 2017 are presented in the attached appendices. These key data are summarized as follows:

Of the 348 IRM prisoners enrolled in the program:

1. 262 (75.3%) were African-American
2. 83 (23.9%) were Caucasian
3. 0 (0.0%) were Hispanic
4. 3 (.8%) were of other races

IRM prisoners sentenced in 43 counties enrolled in the program.

IRM Prisoner age at sentencing ranged from 18 years to 57 years, with the 18-22 year age group comprising 10.9% of all admissions.

As of December 31, 2017, 67 IRM prisoners were enrolled in the program.

Of the 348 IRM 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, 2017).

1. 302 (87.3%) successfully completed the program
2. 3 (.9%) voluntarily withdrew
3. 41 (11.8%) were terminated as rule violators

Five IRM prisoners were terminated for medical reasons, and Three IRM prisoners were 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 (Male)

The sentence for each of the 264 male probationers who entered the program during 2017 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
1. Drug Offenses	32.6%
2. Home Invasion	23.7%
3. Assault	12.9%
4. Unlawful Driving	8.0%
5. Robbery	3.1%
6. Larceny	3.4%
7. Fraud	1.9%
8. Weapons	3.4%
9. Breaking & Entering	3.4%
10. Miscellaneous	7.6%

## SAI PRISONER ADMISSIONS BY OFFENSE TYPE (Male)

The controlling sentence for each of the 503 SAI male prisoners who entered the program during 2017 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
1. Drug Offenses	29.8%
2. Home Invasion	14.3%
3. Assault	16.3%
4. Unlawful driving	11.1%
5. Robbery	8.0%
6. Larceny	3.0%
7. Fraud	.8%
8. Weapons	9.7%
9. Breaking & Entering	3.0%
10. Miscellaneous	4.0%

## IN-REACH PRISONER ADMISSIONS BY OFFENSE TYPE (Male)

The controlling sentence for each of the 348 In Reach male prisoners who entered the program during 2017 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
1. Drug Offenses	12.9%
2. Home Invasion	20.4%
3. Assault	18.7%
4. Unlawful driving	2.6%
5. Robbery	22.7%
6. Larceny	2.9%
7. Fraud	1.4%
8. Weapons	4.0%
9. Breaking & Entering	2.9%
10. Miscellaneous	11.5%

## **SUMMARY OF 2017 FEMALE PROBATIONER PROGRAM STATISTICS**

Female probationer program statistics for 2017 are presented in the attached appendices. These key data are summarized as follows:

Of the 35 probationers enrolled in the program:

1. 10 (28.5%) were African-American
2. 23 (65.7%) were Caucasian
3. 0 (0.0%) were Hispanic
4. 2 (5.7%) were of other races

Probationers sentenced in 24 counties enrolled in the program.

Probationer age at sentencing ranged from 18 years to 25 years, with the 18-22-year age group comprising 62.5% of all admissions.

As of December 31, 2017, 1 female probationers were enrolled in the program.

Of the 35 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, 2017).

1. 26 (74.2%) successfully completed the program
2. 0 (0.0%) voluntarily withdrew
3. 9 (25.7%) were terminated as rule violators

Five (5) probationers were terminated for medical reasons, and zero probationers was terminated as unqualified

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

## **SUMMARY OF 2017 SAI FEMALE PRISONER PROGRAM STATISTICS**

SAI female prisoner program statistics for 2017 are presented in the attached appendices. These key data are summarized as follows:

Of the 90 prisoners enrolled in the program:

1. 17 (18.8%) were African-American
2. 71 (78.8 %) were Caucasian
3. 0 (0.0%) were Hispanic
4. 2 (2.2%) were of other races

Prisoners sentenced in 32 counties enrolled in the program.

Prisoner age at sentencing ranged from 20 years to 58 years, with the 18-22 year age group comprising 3.3% of all admissions.

As of December 31, 2017, 9 SAI female prisoners were enrolled in the program.

Of the 90 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, 2017).

1. 80 (88.8%) successfully completed the program
2. 0 (0.0%) voluntarily withdrew
3. 5 (5.5%) was terminated as a rule violator

Five (5) SAI female prisoners were terminated for medical reasons, and one SAI female 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 2017 IN REACH FEMALE PRISONER (IRF) PROGRAM STATISTICS**

IRF prisoner program statistics for 2017 are presented in the attached appendices.  
These key data are summarized as follows:

Of the 4 IRF prisoners enrolled in the program:

1. 2 (50.0%) were African-American
2. 2 (50.0%) were Caucasian
3. 0 (0.0%) were Hispanic
4. 0 (0.0%) were of other races

IRF prisoners sentenced in 4 counties enrolled in the program.

IRF prisoner age at sentencing ranged from 22 years to 39 years, with the 18-22 year age group comprising 25.0% of all admissions.

As of December 31, 2017, 0 IRF female prisoners were enrolled in the program.

Of the 4 IRF female prisoners who either completed or were terminated from the program:

1. 2 (50.0%) successfully completed the program
2. 0 (0.0%) voluntarily withdrew
3. 0 (0.0%) were terminated as rule violators

Two (2) IRF female prisoner was terminated for medical reasons and Zero 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 (Female)

The sentence for each of the 35 female probationers who entered the program during 2017 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
	Females
1. Drug Offenses	51.9%
2. Home Invasion	14.2%
3. Assault	11.4%
4. Unlawful Driving	5.7%
5. Robbery	5.7%
6. Larceny	0.0%
7. Fraud	2.8%
8. Weapons	2.8%
9. Breaking & Entering	0.0%
10. Miscellaneous	11.4%

## SAI PRISONER ADMISSIONS BY OFFENSE TYPE (Female)

The controlling sentence for each of the 90 SAI female prisoners who entered the program during 2017 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
	Females
1. Drug Offenses	66.6%
2. Home Invasion	3.3%
3. Assault	1.1%
4. Unlawful driving	4.4%
5. Robbery	5.5%
6. Larceny	3.3%
7. Fraud	3.3%
8. Weapons	2.2%
9. Breaking & Entering	0.0%
10. Miscellaneous	11.1%

## IN-REACH PRISONER ADMISSIONS BY OFFENSE TYPE (Female)

The controlling sentence for each of the 4 In Reach female prisoners who entered the program during 2017\* 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
	IRF
1. Drug Offenses	0.0%
2. Home Invasion	25.0%
3. Assault	0.0%
4. Unlawful driving	0.0%
5. Robbery	0.0%
6. Larceny	0.0%
7. Fraud	25.0%
8. Weapons	50.0%
9. Breaking & Entering	0.0%
10. Miscellaneous	0.0%

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

In 2008 the SAI program was substantially modified to bring it in 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%
<b>Returned to Prison Technical Parole Violator</b>	38	<b>3.8%</b>	43	<b>4.3%</b>	695	<b>5.0%</b>
<b>Returned to Prison Parole Violator New Sentence</b>	53	<b>5.3%</b>	61	<b>6.1%</b>	624	<b>4.5%</b>
<b>New Conviction</b>	130	<b>12.9%</b>	174	<b>17.3%</b>	1,674	<b>12.0%</b>
<b>New Arrest</b>	317	<b>31.5%</b>	371	<b>36.9%</b>	3,787	<b>27.1%</b>

DATA SOURCE: JFA Institute, Special Alternative Incarceration Program: Second Year Process and Impact Evaluation (2012)

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 2010-2009 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.

## 2017 ADMISSIONS BY COUNTY –PROBATIONER (Males)

**MALES**

Sentencing County	Number of Admissions	% of Total Admissions
Alcona	0	0.0%
Alger	0	0.0%
Allegan	3	1.1%
Alpena	0	0.0%
Antrim	0	0.0%
Arenac	0	0.0%
Baraga	0	0.0%
Barry	1	0.4%
Bay	10	3.8%
Benzie	0	0.0%
Berrien	16	6.1%
Branch	4	1.5%
Calhoun	2	0.7%
Cass	0	0.0%
Charlevoix	0	0.0%
Cheboygan	0	0.0%
Chippewa	0	0.0%
Clare	0	0.0%
Clinton	1	0.4%
Crawford	0	0.0%
Delta	0	0.0%
Dickinson	0	0.0%
Eaton	4	1.5%
Emmet	0	0.0%
Genesee	21	8.0%
Gladwin	0	0.0%
Gogebic	0	0.0%
Grand Traverse	0	0.0%
Gratiot	1	0.4%
Hillsdale	0	0.0%
Houghton	0	0.0%
Huron	0	0.0%
Ingham	36	13.6%
Ionia	7	2.7%
Iosco	0	0.0%
Iron	0	0.0%
Isabella	0	0.0%
Jackson	9	3.4%
Kalamazoo	7	2.7%
Kalkaska	0	0.0%
Kent	11	4.2%
Keweenaw	0	0.0%
Lake	0	0.0%
Lapeer	2	0.7%

**2017 ADMISSIONS BY COUNTY –PROBATIONER – Cont. (Males)**

**MALES**

<b>Sentencing County</b>	<b>Number of Admissions</b>	<b>% of Total Admissions</b>
Leelanau	0	0.0%
Lenawee	1	0.4%
Livingston	2	0.7%
Luce	0	0.0%
Mackinac	0	0.0%
Macomb	30	11.4%
Manistee	1	0.4%
Marquette	0	0.0%
Mason	1	0.4%
Mecosta	1	0.4%
Menominee	0	0.0%
Midland	2	0.7%
Missaukee	0	0.0%
Monroe	20	7.6%
Montcalm	11	4.2%
Montmorency	0	0.0%
Muskegon	4	1.5%
Newaygo	0	0.0%
Oakland	8	3.0%
Oceana	0	0.0%
Ogemaw	0	0.0%
Ontonagon	0	0.0%
Osceola	0	0.0%
Oscoda	0	0.0%
Otsego	0	0.0%
Ottawa	2	0.7%
Presque Isle	0	0.0%
Roscommon	0	0.0%
Saginaw	8	3.0%
St. Clair	1	0.4%
St. Joseph	6	2.2%
Sanilac	0	0.0%
Schoolcraft	0	0.0%
Shiawassee	1	0.4%
Tuscola	1	0.4%
Van Buren	0	0.0%
Washtenaw	7	2.7%
Wayne	22	8.3%
Wexford	0	0.0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**2017 ADMISSIONS BY COUNTY –PROBATIONER (Female)**

**FEMALES**

**Sentencing County                      Number of Admissions    % of Total Admissions**

Alcona	0	0.0%
Alger	0	0.0%
Allegan	1	2.9%
Alpena	0	0.0%
Antrim	0	0.0%
Arenac	0	0.0%
Baraga	0	0.0%
Barry	0	0.0%
Bay	2	5.7%
Benzie	0	0.0%
Berrien	1	2.9%
Branch	0	0.0%
Calhoun	0	0.0%
Cass	1	2.9%
Charlevoix	0	0.0%
Cheboygan	0	0.0%
Chippewa	0	0.0%
Clare	1	2.9%
Clinton	0	0.0%
Crawford	0	0.0%
Delta	0	0.0%
Dickinson	0	0.0%
Eaton	0	0.0%
Emmet	0	0.0%
Genesee	3	8.7%
Gladwin	0	0.0%
Gogebic	0	0.0%
Grand Traverse	1	2.9%
Gratiot	0	0.0%
Hillsdale	0	0.0%
Houghton	0	0.0%
Huron	0	0.0%
Ingham	6	17.1%
Ionia	0	0.0%
Iosco	0	0.0%
Iron	0	0.0%
Isabella	0	0.0%
Jackson	1	2.9%
Kalamazoo	3	8.6%
Kalkaska	0	0.0%
Kent	1	2.9%
Keweenaw	0	0.0%
Lake	0	0.0%
Lapeer	0	0.0%

**2017 ADMISSIONS BY COUNTY –PROBATIONER – Cont. (Females)**

**FEMALES**

<b>Sentencing County</b>	<b>Number of Admissions</b>	<b>% of Total Admissions</b>
Leelanau	0	0.0%
Lenawee	0	0.0%
Livingston	0	0.0%
Luce	0	0.0%
Mackinac	0	0.0%
Macomb	6	17.1%
Manistee	0	0.0%
Marquette	0	0.0%
Mason	0	0.0%
Mecosta	1	2.9%
Menominee	0	0.0%
Midland	0	0.0%
Missaukee	0	0.0%
Monroe	3	8.5%
Montcalm	2	5.7%
Montmorency	0	0.0%
Muskegon	0	0.0%
Newaygo	0	0.0%
Oakland	1	2.9%
Oceana	0	0.0%
Ogemaw	0	0.0%
Ontonagon	0	0.0%
Osceola	0	0.0%
Oscoda	0	0.0%
Otsego	0	0.0%
Ottawa	0	0.0%
Presque Isle	0	0.0%
Roscommon	0	0.0%
Saginaw	0	0.0%
St. Clair	0	0.0%
St. Joseph	0	0.0%
Sanilac	0	0.0%
Schoolcraft	0	0.0%
Shiawassee	0	0.0%
Tuscola	0	0.0%
Van Buren	0	0.0%
Washtenaw	0	0.0%
Wayne	1	2.9%
Wexford	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100%</b>

## 2017 ADMISSIONS BY COUNTY – SAI PRISONER (Males)

MALES Sentencing County	Number of Admissions	% of Total Admissions
Alcona	0	0.0%
Alger	0	0.0%
Allegan	5	0.9%
Alpena	2	0.4%
Antrim	1	0.2%
Arenac	0	0.0%
Baraga	0	0.0%
Barry	4	0.8%
Bay	1	0.2%
Benzie	0	0.0%
Berrien	26	5.2%
Branch	4	0.8%
Calhoun	8	1.6%
Cass	3	0.6%
Charlevoix	2	0.4%
Cheboygan	0	0.0%
Chippewa	0	0.0%
Clare	7	1.4%
Clinton	3	0.6%
Crawford	1	0.2%
Delta	0	0.0%
Dickinson	0	0.0%
Eaton	6	1.2%
Emmet	3	0.6%
Genesee	21	4.2%
Gladwin	5	0.9%
Gogebic	1	0.2%
Grand Traverse	11	2.2%
Gratiot	6	1.2%
Hillsdale	7	1.4%
Houghton	4	0.8%
Huron	0	0.0%
Ingham	10	2.0%
Ionia	4	0.8%
Iosco	1	0.2%
Iron	2	0.4%
Isabella	7	1.4%
Jackson	17	3.4%
Kalamazoo	18	3.6%
Kalkaska	2	0.4%
Kent	31	6.2%
Keweenaw	0	0.0%
Lake	1	0.2%
Lapeer	2	0.4%

APPENDIX B

## 2017 ADMISSIONS BY COUNTY – SAI PRISONER – Cont. (Males)

<b>MALES</b> Sentencing County	<b>Number of Admissions</b>	<b>% of Total Admissions</b>
Leelanau	0	0.0%
Lenawee	8	1.6%
Livingston	5	0.9%
Luce	0	0.0%
Mackinac	2	0.4%
Macomb	11	2.2%
Manistee	4	0.8%
Marquette	4	0.8%
Mason	2	0.4%
Mecosta	3	0.6%
Menominee	1	0.2%
Midland	1	0.2%
Missaukee	1	0.2%
Monroe	24	4.8%
Montcalm	7	1.4%
Montmorency	0	0.0%
Muskegon	11	2.2%
Newaygo	12	2.4%
Oakland	20	4.0%
Oceana	2	0.4%
Ogemaw	4	0.8%
Ontonagon	0	0.0%
Osceola	2	0.4%
Oscoda	0	0.0%
Otsego	2	0.4%
Ottawa	5	0.9%
Presque Isle	1	0.2%
Roscommon	2	0.4%
Saginaw	10	2.0%
St. Clair	8	1.6%
St. Joseph	3	1.2%
Sanilac	0	0.0%
Schoolcraft	0	0.0%
Shiawassee	6	1.2%
Tuscola	7	1.4%
Van Buren	11	2.2%
Washtenaw	19	3.8%
Wayne	75	14.8%
Wexford	1	0.2%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

APPENDIX B

**2017 ADMISSIONS BY COUNTY – SAI PRISONER (Female)**

<b>FEMALES</b>		
<b>Sentencing County</b>	<b>Number of Admissions</b>	<b>% of Total Admissions</b>
Alcona	0	0.0%
Alger	0	0.0%
Allegan	2	2.2%
Alpena	1	1.1%
Antrim	0	0.0%
Arenac	0	0.0%
Baraga	0	0.0%
Barry	0	0.0%
Bay	0	0.0%
Benzie	0	0.0%
Berrien	3	3.3%
Branch	0	0.0%
Calhoun	5	5.5%
Cass	0	0.0%
Charlevoix	0	0.0%
Cheboygan	0	0.0%
Chippewa	0	0.0%
Clare	0	0.0%
Clinton	0	0.0%
Crawford	0	0.0%
Delta	0	0.0%
Dickinson	0	0.0%
Eaton	1	1.1%
Emmet	0	0.0%
Genesee	3	3.3%
Gladwin	0	0.0%
Gogebic	0	0.0%
Grand Traverse	2	2.2%
Gratiot	0	0.0%
Hillsdale	1	1.1%
Houghton	0	0.0%
Huron	0	0.0%
Ingham	5	5.5%
Ionia	1	1.1%
Iosco	1	1.1%
Iron	1	1.1%
Isabella	1	1.1%
Jackson	3	3.3%
Kalamazoo	8	8.8%
Kalkaska	0	0.0%
Kent	7	7.7%
Keweenaw	0	0.0%
Lake	0	0.0%
Lapeer	0	0.0%

## 2017 ADMISSIONS BY COUNTY – SAI PRISONER – Cont.

FEMALES		
Sentencing County	Number of Admissions	% of Total Admissions
Leelanau	0	0.0%
Lenawee	0	0.0%
Livingston	0	0.0%
Luce	0	0.0%
Mackinac	0	0.0%
Macomb	2	2.2%
Manistee	0	0.0%
Marquette	0	0.0%
Mason	0	0.0%
Mecosta	1	1.1%
Menominee	0	0.0%
Midland	0	0.0%
Missaukee	0	0.0%
Monroe	7	7.7%
Montcalm	0	0.0%
Montmorency	0	0.0%
Muskegon	1	1.1%
Newaygo	3	3.3%
Oakland	5	5.5%
Oceana	0	0.0%
Ogemaw	1	1.1%
Ontonagon	0	0.0%
Osceola	1	1.1%
Oscoda	0	0.0%
Otsego	0	0.0%
Ottawa	0	0.0%
Presque Isle	0	0.0%
Roscommon	0	0.0%
Saginaw	0	0.0%
St. Clair	3	3.3%
St. Joseph	1	1.1%
Sanilac	0	0.0%
Schoolcraft	0	0.0%
Shiawassee	0	0.0%
Tuscola	0	0.0%
Van Buren	6	6.6%
Washtenaw	0	0.0%
Wayne	15	15.1%
Wexford	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>100%</b>

## 2017 ADMISSIONS BY COUNTY – IN REACH PRISONER (Males)

### IRM MALES

Sentencing County	Number of Admissions	% of Total Admissions
Alcona	0	0.0%
Alger	2	0.6%
Allegan	0	0.0%
Alpena	0	0.0%
Antrim	1	0.3%
Arenac	0	0.0%
Baraga	0	0.0%
Barry	0	0.0%
Bay	1	0.3%
Benzie	0	0.0%
Berrien	13	3.7%
Branch	1	0.3%
Calhoun	3	0.9%
Cass	1	0.3%
Charlevoix	0	0.0%
Cheboygan	1	0.3%
Chippewa	3	0.9%
Clare	1	0.3%
Clinton	0	0.0%
Crawford	0	0.0%
Delta	0	0.0%
Dickinson	0	0.0%
Eaton	2	0.6%
Emmet	0	0.0%
Genesee	16	4.6%
Gladwin	1	0.3%
Gogebic	0	0.0%
Grand Traverse	1	0.3%
Gratiot	5	1.4%
Hillsdale	0	0.0%
Houghton	0	0.0%
Huron	0	0.0%
Ingham	12	3.4%
Ionia	1	0.3%
Iosco	0	0.0%
Iron	0	0.0%
Isabella	2	0.6%
Jackson	14	4.0%
Kalamazoo	12	3.4%
Kalkaska	0	0.0%
Kent	33	9.5%
Keweenaw	0	0.0%
Lake	1	0.3%
Lapeer	2	0.6%

APPENDIX C

## 2017 ADMISSIONS BY COUNTY – IN REACH PRISONER – Cont. (Males)

### IRM MALES

Sentencing County	Number of Admissions	% of Total Admissions
Leelanau	0	0.0%
Lenawee	0	0.0%
Livingston	1	0.3%
Luce	0	0.0%
Mackinac	0	0.0%
Macomb	17	4.9%
Manistee	0	0.0%
Marquette	2	0.6%
Mason	0	0.0%
Mecosta	0	0.0%
Menominee	0	0.0%
Midland	1	0.3%
Missaukee	0	0.0%
Monroe	3	0.9%
Montcalm	1	0.3%
Montmorency	0	0.0%
Muskegon	10	2.8%
Newaygo	1	0.3%
Oakland	38	10.8%
Oceana	1	0.3%
Ogemaw	0	0.0%
Ontonagon	1	0.3%
Osceola	0	0.0%
Oscoda	0	0.0%
Otsego	0	0.0%
Ottawa	2	0.6%
Presque Isle	0	0.0%
Roscommon	0	0.0%
Saginaw	20	5.7%
St. Clair	7	2.0%
St. Joseph	1	0.3%
Sanilac	0	0.0%
Schoolcraft	0	0.0%
Shiawassee	2	0.6%
Tuscola	0	0.0%
Van Buren	1	0.3%
Washtenaw	9	2.6%
Wayne	100	28.6%
Wexford	1	0.3%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>100%</b>

## 2017 ADMISSIONS BY COUNTY – IN REACH PRISONER (Females)

### IRF FEMALES

Sentencing County	Number of Admissions	% of Total Admissions
Alcona	0	0.0%
Alger	0	0.0%
Allegan	0	0.0%
Alpena	0	0.0%
Antrim	0	0.0%
Arenac	0	0.0%
Baraga	0	0.0%
Barry	0	0.0%
Bay	0	0.0%
Benzie	0	0.0%
Berrien	1	.25%
Branch	0	0.0%
Calhoun	0	0.0%
Cass	0	0.0%
Charlevoix	0	0.0%
Cheboygan	0	0.0%
Chippewa	0	0.0%
Clare	0	0.0%
Clinton	0	0.0%
Crawford	0	0.0%
Delta	0	0.0%
Dickinson	0	0.0%
Eaton	0	0.0%
Emmet	0	0.0%
Genesee	0	0.0%
Gladwin	0	0.0%
Gogebic	0	0.0%
Grand Traverse	0	0.0%
Gratiot	0	0.0%
Hillsdale	0	0.0%
Houghton	0	0.0%
Huron	0	0.0%
Ingham	3	.75%
Ionia	0	0.0%
Iosco	0	0.0%
Iron	0	0.0%
Isabella	0	0.0%
Jackson	0	0.0%
Kalamazoo	0	0.0%
Kalkaska	0	0.0%
Kent	0	0.0%
Keweenaw	0	0.0%
Lake	0	0.0%
Lapeer	0	0.0%


APPENDIX C

**2017 ADMISSIONS BY COUNTY – IN REACH PRISONER – Cont. (Females)**

**IRF FEMALES**


<b>Sentencing County</b>	<b>Number of Admissions</b>	<b>% of Total Admissions</b>
Leelanau	0	0.0%
Lenawee	0	0.0%
Livingston	0	0.0%
Luce	0	0.0%
Mackinac	0	0.0%
Macomb	0	0.0%
Manistee	0	0.0%
Marquette	0	0.0%
Mason	0	0.0%
Mecosta	0	0.0%
Menominee	0	0.0%
Midland	0	0.0%
Missaukee	0	0.0%
Monroe	0	0.0%
Montcalm	0	0.0%
Montmorency	0	0.0%
Muskegon	0	0.0%
Newaygo	0	0.0%
Oakland	0	0.0%
Oceana	0	0.0%
Ogemaw	0	0.0%
Ontonagon	0	0.0%
Osceola	0	0.0%
Oscoda	0	0.0%
Otsego	0	0.0%
Ottawa	0	0.0%
Presque Isle	0	0.0%
Roscommon	0	0.0%
Saginaw	0	0.0%
St. Clair	0	0.0%
St. Joseph	0	0.0%
Sanilac	0	0.0%
Schoolcraft	0	0.0%
Shiawassee	0	0.0%
Tuscola	0	0.0%
Van Buren	0	0.0%
Washtenaw	0	0.0%
Wayne	0	0.0%
Wexford	0	0.0%
	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>

### 2017 ADMISSIONS BY MONTH (Males)





Appendix D


### 2017 ADMISSIONS BY MONTH Females




Appendix D



### 2017 MONTHLY POPULATION TOTALS (Males)



## 2017 MONTHLY POPULATION TOTALS (Females)



Appendix F

## 2017 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	2	0	1	0	0	3
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	6	0	0	1	0	7
Benzie	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berrien	11	0	0	0	0	11
Branch	4	0	0	0	0	4
Calhoun	2	0	0	0	0	2
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	1	0	0	0	0	1
Crawford	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delta	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dickinson	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eaton	3	0	0	0	0	3
Emmet	0	0	0	0	0	0
Genesee	13	1	0	2	1	17
Gladwin	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gogebic	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Traverse	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gratiot	1	0	0	0	0	1
Hillsdale	0	0	0	0	0	0
Houghton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Huron	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ingham	26	5	0	3	0	34
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	5	2	0	0	0	7
Kalamazoo	4	0	0	0	0	5
Kalkaska	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	7	1	1	0	0	9
Keweenaw	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lapeer	1	0	0	0	0	1

**2017 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	0	1	0	0	0	1
Livingston	2	0	0	0	0	2
Luce	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mackinac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Macomb	20	5	0	0	1	26
Manistee	1	0	0	0	0	1
Marquette	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mason	1	0	0	0	0	1
Mecosta	1	0	0	0	0	1
Menominee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Midland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missaukee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monroe	17	0	0	1	0	18
Montcalm	8	1	0	0	0	9
Montmorency	0	0	0	0	0	0
Muskegon	3	0	0	1	0	4
Newaygo	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oakland	7	0	0	0	0	7
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	7	0	0	0	0	7
St. Clair	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Joseph	5	0	0	0	0	5
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	2	2	0	0	1	5
Wayne	12	2	0	0	1	15
Wexford	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	176	20	2	9	4	211

## 2017 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	1	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	0	2
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	1	0	0	0	0	1
Charlevoix	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cheboygan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chippewa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clare	0	1	0	0	0	1
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	2	0	0	1	0	3
Gladwin	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gogebic	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Traverse	0	0	0	1	0	1
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	6	0	0	0	0	6
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	1	0	0	0	1
Kalamazoo	1	0	0	1	0	2
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

APPENDIX G

**2017 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	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	6	0	0	0	0	6
Manistee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marquette	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mason	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mecosta	0	1	0	0	0	1
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	1	0	3
Montcalm	2	0	0	0	0	2
Montmorency	0	0	0	0	0	0
Muskegon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Newaygo	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oakland	1	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	0	0	0	0	1
Wexford	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>35</b>

APPENDIX G

## 2017 PROGRAM OUTCOMES BY COUNTY – SAI 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	3	0	0	0	0	3
Alpena	1	0	0	0	0	1
Antrim	1	0	0	0	0	1
Arenac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baraga	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barry	4	0	0	0	0	4
Bay	1	0	0	0	0	1
Benzie	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berrien	19	2	0	0	0	21
Branch	4	0	0	0	0	4
Calhoun	8	0	0	0	0	8
Cass	1	1	0	0	0	2
Charlevoix	2	0	0	0	0	2
Cheboygan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chippewa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clare	7	0	0	0	0	7
Clinton	1	0	0	0	0	1
Crawford	1	0	0	0	0	1
Delta	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dickinson	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eaton	4	1	0	0	0	5
Emmet	3	0	0	0	0	3
Genesee	19	0	0	0	0	19
Gladwin	4	1	0	0	0	5
Gogebic	1	0	0	0	0	1
Grand Traverse	8	1	0	0	1	10
Gratiot	6	0	0	0	0	6
Hillsdale	5	0	0	1	0	6
Houghton	2	1	0	0	0	3
Huron	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ingham	6	1	0	0	0	7
Ionia	4	0	0	0	0	4
Iosco	1	0	0	0	0	1
Iron	0	0	0	0	0	0
Isabella	5	0	1	0	1	7
Jackson	16	0	0	0	0	16
Kalamazoo	12	0	0	0	1	13
Kalkaska	1	0	0	0	0	1
Kent	23	3	1	1	0	28
Keweenaw	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake	2	0	0	0	0	2
Lapeer	2	0	0	0	0	2

**2017 PROGRAM OUTCOMES BY COUNTY – SAI MALE PRISONER – Cont.**

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
Leelanau	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lenawee	7	0	1	0	0	8
Livingston	4	0	1	0	0	5
Luce	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mackinac	2	0	0	0	0	2
Macomb	5	1	0	0	0	6
Manistee	1	0	0	1	0	2
Marquette	3	0	0	0	0	3
Mason	2	0	0	0	0	2
Mecosta	2	0	0	0	0	2
Menominee	1	0	0	0	0	1
Midland	1	0	0	0	0	1
Missaukee	1	0	0	0	0	1
Monroe	18	1	0	0	1	20
Montcalm	7	0	0	0	0	7
Montmorency	0	0	0	0	0	0
Muskegon	8	0	0	0	0	8
Newaygo	10	1	0	0	0	11
Oakland	17	0	0	0	0	17
Oceana	1	0	0	0	0	1
Ogemaw	3	0	0	0	0	3
Ontonagon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Osceola	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oscoda	0	0	0	0	0	0
Otsego	2	0	0	0	0	2
Ottawa	4	0	0	0	0	4
Presque Isle	1	0	0	0	0	1
Roscommon	2	0	0	0	0	2
Saginaw	7	0	0	0	0	7
St. Clair	8	0	0	0	0	8
St. Joseph	4	0	0	0	0	4
Sanilac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schoolcraft	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shiawassee	4	0	1	0	0	5
Tuscola	5	0	0	1	0	6
Van Buren	7	1	2	0	0	10
Washtenaw	16	0	1	1	0	18
Wayne	57	2	0	1	3	63
Wexford	1	0	0	0	0	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>426</b>

APPENDIX H

## 2017 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	1	0	0	0	0	1
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	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	4	1	0	0	0	5
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	1	0	0	0	0	1
Emmet	0	0	0	0	0	0
Genesee	3	0	0	0	0	3
Gladwin	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gogebic	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Traverse	1	0	0	1	0	2
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	3	1	0	0	0	4
Ionia	0	0	0	1	0	1
Iosco	1	0	0	0	0	1
Iron	1	0	0	0	0	1
Isabella	1	0	0	0	0	1
Jackson	2	1	0	0	0	3
Kalamazoo	6	1	0	1	0	8
Kalkaska	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	7	0	0	0	0	7
Keweenaw	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lapeer	0	0	0	0	0	0

**2017 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	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	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	1	0	0	0	0	1
Menominee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Midland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missaukee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monroe	7	0	0	0	0	7
Montcalm	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montmorency	0	0	0	0	0	0
Muskegon	1	0	0	0	0	1
Newaygo	3	0	0	0	0	3
Oakland	5	0	0	0	0	5
Oceana	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ogemaw	1	0	0	0	0	1
Ontonagon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Osceola	1	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Clair	2	1	0	0	0	3
St. Joseph	1	0	0	0	0	1
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	5	1	0	0	0	6
Washtenaw	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wayne	12	1	0	2	0	15
Wexford	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>90</b>

## 2017 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	1	1	0	0	0	2
Allegan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alpena	0	0	0	0	0	0
Antrim	1	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0
Benzie	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berrien	9	1	0	1	0	11
Branch	1	0	0	0	0	1
Calhoun	2	0	0	0	0	2
Cass	1	0	0	0	0	1
Charlevoix	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cheboygan	1	0	0	0	0	1
Chippewa	3	0	0	0	0	3
Clare	1	0	0	0	0	1
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	2	0	0	0	0	2
Emmet	0	0	0	0	0	0
Genesee	14	0	0	0	0	14
Gladwin	1	0	0	0	0	1
Gogebic	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Traverse	1	0	0	0	0	1
Gratiot	4	0	0	0	0	4
Hillsdale	0	0	0	0	0	0
Houghton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Huron	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ingham	7	0	0	0	0	7
Ionia	1	0	0	0	0	1
Iosco	0	0	0	0	0	0
Iron	0	0	0	0	0	0
Isabella	2	0	0	0	0	2
Jackson	7	6	0	0	0	13
Kalamazoo	6	4	0	0	0	10
Kalkaska	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	26	3	0	0	0	29
Keweenaw	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lapeer	1	0	0	0	0	1

**2017 PROGRAM OUTCOMES BY COUNTY – IN REACH MALE 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	1	0	0	0	0	1
Luce	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mackinac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Macomb	10	4	0	1	0	15
Manistee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marquette	2	0	0	0	0	2
Mason	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	2	1	0	0	0	2
Montcalm	0	1	0	0	0	1
Montmorency	0	0	0	0	0	0
Muskegon	7	1	0	0	0	8
Newaygo	1	0	0	0	0	1
Oakland	33	5	0	0	0	38
Oceana	1	0	0	0	0	1
Ogemaw	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ontonagon	1	0	0	0	0	1
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	15	2	1	0	0	18
St. Clair	4	0	0	0	0	4
St. Joseph	1	0	0	0	0	1
Sanilac	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schoolcraft	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shiawassee	0	0	0	0	1	1
Tuscola	0	0	0	0	0	0
Van Buren	1	0	0	0	0	1
Washtenaw	6	1	1	0	0	8
Wayne	67	11	1	2	1	82
Wexford	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>297</b>

## 2017 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	0	0	0	0	0	0
Benzie	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berrien	0	1	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	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	2	1	0	0	0	3
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	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kalkaska	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0	0	0	0	0
Keweenaw	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lapeer	0	0	0	0	0	0

**2017 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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wexford	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>

## 2017 MONTHLY PROGRAM OUTCOMES – SAI PRISONER (Males)

### MALE

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
JANUARY	48	1	2	0	1	52
FEBRUARY	27	1	1	0	4	33
MARCH	28	2	1	1	0	32
APRIL	42	1	1	0	0	44
MAY	55	3	0	0	2	60
JUNE	42	1	0	1	1	45
JULY	38	0	0	1	0	39
AUGUST	49	2	1	0	0	52
SEPTEMBER	28	1	0	1	1	31
OCTOBER	40	3	2	0	0	45
NOVEMBER	26	1	1	1	1	30
DECEMBER	34	4	0	1	0	39
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>502</b>

## 2017 MONTHLY PROGRAM OUTCOMES – SAI PRISONER (Female)

### FEMALE

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified/	Totals
JANUARY	5	0	0	0	0	5
FEBRUARY	5	0	0	0	0	5
MARCH	3	0	0	0	0	3
APRIL	2	0	0	2	0	4
MAY	8	1	0	0	0	9
JUNE	9	2	0	0	0	11
JULY	4	1	0	2	0	7
AUGUST	7	2	0	0	0	9
SEPTEMBER	7	0	0	0	0	7
OCTOBER	5	0	0	0	0	5
NOVEMBER	8	0	0	0	0	8
DECEMBER	2	0	0	0	0	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>75</b>

## 2017 MONTHLY PROGRAM OUTCOMES – PROBATIONER (Males)

<b>MALE</b>						
	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
JANUARY	25	3	0	1	0	29
FEBRUARY	12	1	1	0	1	15
MARCH	21	3	0	1	0	25
APRIL	18	1	0	1	0	20
MAY	16	4	0	1	2	23
JUNE	14	4	0	1	1	20
JULY	12	0	0	1	0	13
AUGUST	25	1	0	2	0	28
SEPTEMBER	15	2	1	2	0	20
OCTOBER	19	3	0	0	1	23
NOVEMBER	25	0	0	0	1	26
DECEMBER	25	1	1	1	0	28
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>270</b>

## 2017 MONTHLY PROGRAM OUTCOMES – PROBATIONER (Female)

<b>FEMALE</b>						
	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
JANUARY	1	0	0	0	0	1
FEBRUARY	2	0	0	0	0	2
MARCH	2	0	0	0	0	2
APRIL	3	1	0	0	0	4
MAY	0	0	0	3	0	3
JUNE	0	0	0	1	0	1
JULY	1	0	0	0	0	0
AUGUST	2	1	0	0	0	3
SEPTEMBER	1	0	0	0	0	1
OCTOBER	2	1	0	1	0	4
NOVEMBER	2	0	0	1	0	3
DECEMBER	1	0	0	0	0	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25</b>

## 2017 MONTHLY PROGRAM OUTCOMES – IN REACH PRISONER (Males)

### IRM

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
JANUARY	30	2	1	0	1	34
FEBRUARY	27	2	0	0	0	29
MARCH	12	3	0	0	0	15
APRIL	34	1	0	0	0	35
MAY	22	3	0	1	0	26
JUNE	26	3	0	0	1	30
JULY	7	0	0	3	0	10
AUGUST	33	9	1	0	0	43
SEPTEMBER	31	6	1	0	0	38
OCTOBER	26	6	0	1	0	33
NOVEMBER	39	3	0	0	1	43
DECEMBER	15	3	0	0	0	18
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>348</b>


## 2017 MONTHLY PROGRAM OUTCOMES – IN REACH PRISONER (Female)

### IRF

	Successful Completion	Rule Violator	Voluntary Withdrawal	Medical Termination	Unqualified	Totals
JANUARY	1	0	0	0	0	1
FEBRUARY	1	0	0	0	0	1
MARCH	0	0	0	0	0	0
APRIL	0	0	0	0	0	0
MAY	2	0	0	0	0	2
JUNE	0	0	0	0	0	0
JULY	0	0	0	0	0	0
AUGUST	0	0	0	0	0	0
SEPTEMBER	0	0	0	0	0	0
OCTOBER	0	0	0	0	0	0
NOVEMBER	0	1	0	0	0	1
DECEMBER	0	1	0	0	0	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>


APPENDIX L

# 2017 GRADUATES (Males)



APPENDIX M

### 2017 GRADUATES BY GENDER (FEMALE)



## COMPARATIVE PROGRAM OUTCOMES – SAI PRISONER/PROBATIONER MALES 2016 AND 2017

	Prisoners		Probationers	
	2017	2016	2017	2016
<b><u>Terminations</u></b>				
Successful Completions	457 (94.0 %)	477 (90.5%)	227 (90.1%)	241 (89.9%)
Voluntary Withdrawals	9 (1.9 %)	4 (0.8%)	2 (.8%)	6 (2.2%)
Rule Violators	20 (4.1 %)	46 (8.7%)	23 (9.1%)	21 (7.8%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>527</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>268</b>
<b><u>Unqualified</u></b>				
Medical Terminations	6	9	10	10
Unqualified by statute	10	16	7	6
<b>Total Program Exits</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>552</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>284</b>

## COMPARATIVE PROGRAM OUTCOMES – IN REACH PRISONER MALES 2016 AND 2017

	IRM Prisoners	
	2017	2016
<b><u>Terminations</u></b>		
Successful Completions	302 (87.3%)	397 (89.0%)
Voluntary Withdrawals	3 (0.9%)	5 (1.1%)
Rule Violators	41 (11.8%)	44 (9.9%)
<b>Total</b>		
	346	446
<b><u>Unqualified</u></b>		
Medical Terminations	5	6
Unqualified by statute	3	6
<b>Total Program Exits</b>		
	354	458

## COMPARATIVE PROGRAM OUTCOMES – SAI PRISONER FEMALES 2017 AND 2016

	2017	Prisoners 2016	2017	Probationers 2016
<b><u>Terminations</u></b>				
Successful Completions	74 (82.2%)	56(71.8%)	26 (74.2%)	28 (77.8%)
Voluntary Withdrawals	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Rule Violators	6 (6.6%)	1(1.6%)	3 (8.6%)	1(1.6%)
Total	80	57	29	29
<b><u>Unqualified</u></b>				
Medical Terminations	4	5	6	14
Unqualified by statute	0	0	0	0
Total Program Exits	84	62	35	62

APPENDIX N