

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE
Pursuant to P.A. 63 of 2011
Section 611
Community Reentry Programs

Section 611 of 2011 P.A. 63 requires that the Department of Corrections provide individual reports for the community reentry program, the electronic tether program, and the special alternative to incarceration program, including information on:

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

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

The Residential Reentry Program (RRP) is currently operating at two sites. In 2006, the former Tuscola prison camp (closed in 2005) was reopened as the Tuscola Residential Reentry Program (TRRP). In 2008, the last Technical Rule Violator (TRV) center, Lake County TRV, changed its focus to reentry by becoming the Lake County Residential Reentry Program (LCRRP).

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

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

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

Currently, the Department contracts with the Clinton County Jail and Ingham County Jail to house parole violators for an average stay of about 30 days. Two field agents are assigned to the jails to supervise the IDRPs population. The field agents at the jails assist field agents in the community by developing an updated release plan for the parolee, which includes updated placement information, and outpatient or residential substance abuse recommendations based on assessments to determine level of care needed.

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

Table 1 - New Community Reentry Program Participants Monthly By Location

	IDRP				RRP				Total	
	Clinton		Ingham		Lake County		Tuscola			
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Jan	61	61	187	202	114	108	69	60	431	431
Feb	52	49	138	149	103	91	59	60	352	349
Mar	62	59	201	207	121	112	109	65	493	443
Apr	60	57	197	188	141	88	64	106	462	439
May	53	56	178	218	92	91	62	87	385	452
Jun	60	64	200	230	133	112	71	72	464	478
Jul	63	58	202	215	117	98	76	75	458	446
Aug	53	69	204	225	108	132	55	70	420	496
Sep	58	49	216	210	111	113	75	95	460	467
Oct	62	58	178	191	119	84	64	68	423	401
Nov	61	55	186	175	113	104	43	77	403	411
Dec	48	40	188	149	95	111	66	79	397	379
Total	693	675	2,275	2,359	1,367	1,244	813	914	5,148	5,192
Avg	57.8	56.3	189.6	196.6	113.9	103.7	67.8	76.2	429.0	432.7

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

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

Length of Time Since Release from Prison	2010		2011	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0-6 Months	258	18.3%	292	20.4%
7-12 Months	300	21.3%	279	19.5%
13-18 Months	238	16.9%	248	17.3%
19+ Months	614	43.5%	611	42.7%
Total	1,410	100.0%	1,430	100.0%

Tables 3 through 5 look at only the new RRP participants and present active sentence information for the parolees at the time of their admission to the RRP. In 2011, the 2,158 new RRP participants had 4,700 active sentences, with similar distributions to 2010 participants.

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

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

Minimum Term Groups*	2010		2011	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0-12 Months	1,120	25.1%	1,063	22.6%
13-24 Months	2,094	47.0%	2,297	48.9%
25-36 Months	575	12.9%	621	13.2%
37-60 Months	396	8.9%	413	8.8%
61-120 Months	218	4.9%	258	5.5%
121+ Months	55	1.2%	45	1.0%
Life	1	0.0%	3	0.1%
Total Offenses	4,459	100.0%	4,700	100.0%

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

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

Offense Type	2010			2011		
	Number	Percent	Average Term*	Number	Percent	Average Term*
Nonassaultive	2,356	52.8%	22.2	2,544	54.1%	22.1
Drug	744	16.7%	19.5	670	14.3%	22.5
Assaultive	1,359	30.5%	40.7	1,486	31.6%	40.5
Total Offenses	4,459	100.0%	27.4	4,700	100.0%	27.0

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

Sentencing Guidelines (SGL) information has been captured in OMNI on a statewide basis since October of 2002, thus 2003 is the first available, full year of the 1999 Legislative Sentencing Guidelines. Unfortunately, roughly 35% of the sentencing dates for the 2010 and 2011 new RRP participants are from before 2003 and additional complications, such as a mix of sentences with and without SGL data, and the change in handling of SGLs with regard to probation violations, make interpreting SGL sentencing characteristics dubious at this time. Regardless, Table 5 shows that most of the actual sentences agree with the SGL ranges, though this comparison is not that useful since it represents about two-fifths of the sentences for new RRP participants.

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

Actual Sentence vs. SGL Range	2010		2011	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Below Range	163	8.7%	180	8.9%
Within Range	1572	84.1%	1720	84.9%
Above Range	135	7.2%	127	6.3%
Total with SGLs	1,870	41.9%	2,027	43.1%
Unknown SGLs	2,589	58.1%	2,673	56.9%
Total Offenses	4,459	100.0%	4,700	100.0%

Table 6 reverts back to entire Community Reentry Program data and shows that in 2011, there were 3,079 parolees that successfully completed the IDRP and 2,006 parolees that successfully completed the RRP. The 2011 average successful stay for parolees in the IDRP was 26.8 days (down from 28.0 days in 2010), and for the RRP 66.5 days (down from 68.7 days in 2010).

Table 6 - Monthly Successful Community Reentry Program Terminations by Location

	IDRP				RRP				Total	
	Clinton		Ingham		Lake County		Tuscola		2010	2011
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011		
Jan	60	60	183	218	82	100	52	44	377	422
Feb	55	44	141	154	102	95	71	43	369	336
Mar	60	65	198	173	120	108	74	77	452	423
Apr	59	55	190	209	133	98	67	78	449	440
May	51	55	180	184	89	94	58	69	378	402
Jun	59	63	207	237	145	102	85	73	496	475
Jul	64	61	181	206	100	87	52	52	397	406
Aug	59	68	219	246	135	120	71	82	484	516
Sep	51	53	231	192	119	93	70	61	471	399
Oct	62	53	149	216	100	100	67	82	378	451
Nov	65	57	187	184	106	125	63	67	421	433
Dec	44	51	187	175	124	88	62	68	417	382
Total	689	685	2,253	2,394	1,355	1,210	792	796	5,089	5,085
Avg	57.4	57.1	187.8	199.5	112.9	100.8	66.0	66.3	424.1	423.8

Unsuccessful IDRP and RRP terminations occurred in about 1.8% of all terminations for 2011 (down from 2.0% in 2010). Parolees failed the RRP after an average of 39.3 days in 2011, compared to 30.7 days in 2010. Typical reasons for unsuccessful terminations from the RRP include:

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

Table 7 - Monthly Unsuccessful Community Reentry Program Terminations by Location

	IDRP				RRP				Total	
	Clinton		Ingham		Lake County		Tuscola		2010	2011
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011		
Jan	0	0	4	0	4	2	6	1	14	3
Feb	1	1	1	0	3	2	4	3	9	6
Mar	0	0	1	0	5	0	3	9	9	9
Apr	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	9	3	10
May	1	0	1	0	6	0	6	8	14	8
Jun	0	1	0	0	2	0	3	11	5	12
Jul	0	0	3	0	0	6	2	2	5	8
Aug	2	0	1	0	1	0	6	9	10	9
Sep	0	0	0	4	2	0	6	5	8	9
Oct	0	0	3	0	4	3	4	4	11	7
Nov	1	0	3	0	3	1	1	2	8	3
Dec	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	6	2	7
Total	6	2	20	4	31	16	41	69	98	91
Avg	0.5	0.2	1.7	0.3	2.6	1.3	3.4	5.8	8.2	7.6

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

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

	IDRP				RRP				Total	
	Clinton		Ingham		Lake County		Tuscola			
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Jan	61	59	188	154	280	238	140	121	669	572
Feb	58	63	188	149	284	232	123	140	653	584
Mar	60	57	192	176	274	234	155	154	681	621
Apr	59	59	196	155	281	223	152	154	688	591
May	60	60	196	189	278	220	150	149	684	618
Jun	61	60	185	182	263	228	133	139	642	609
Jul	60	58	191	191	280	233	155	155	686	637
Aug	53	59	174	170	252	242	133	159	612	630
Sep	59	57	171	188	242	260	132	161	604	666
Oct	59	60	187	161	257	240	125	152	628	613
Nov	54	58	165	152	261	190	104	146	584	546
Dec	58	47	170	126	232	189	106	145	566	507
Avg	58.5	58.1	183.6	166.1	265.3	227.4	134.0	147.9	641.4	599.5

Return to prison statistics measure a parolee's outcome at the conclusion of a standard follow-up period. Table 9 replicates a portion of the **Three-Year Follow-Up Outcomes of Offenders Who Paroled in 1998 to 2007 by Year** reported in the Department's 2010 Statistical Report (the most recent available). The table shows that offenders paroled in 2007 had a Total Failure Rate of 36.1% (Absconds 2.8%, Technical Violators 13.6%, and New Sentence Violators 19.7%) after a full three-year follow up period. New Community Reentry Program participants in 2007 would have had similar recidivism rates.

Table 9 - (portion of) Three-Year Follow-Up Outcomes of Offenders Who Paroled in 1998 to 2007 by Year

Year Paroled	Total Cases	Success Total	Failure Total	Absconds	Technical Violators	New Sentence
2003	11,207	51.6%	48.4%	9.2%	20.4%	18.7%
2004	10,818	50.6%	49.4%	8.7%	20.9%	19.9%
2005	9,800	55.7%	44.3%	3.6%	19.6%	21.1%
2006	9,694	60.3%	39.7%	3.2%	15.2%	21.3%
2007	11,805	63.9%	36.1%	2.8%	13.6%	19.7%

See 2010 Statistical Report at
<http://www.michigan.gov/corrections/0,4551,7-119-1441---,00.html>

The Community Reentry Program impacts prison admissions by intervening and diverting eligible parole violators who would otherwise be returned to prison. At the end of 2011, the average time before reparole for a parole technical violator was 15.6 months. The 2011 average successful RRP stay was 66.5 days, or 2.2 months, which saved an average of 13.4 months per parole technical violator RRP participant.

The IDRP programs operated at the following locations during 2010 and 2011:

IDRP – Clinton County		Capacity: 60 beds
1347 East Townsend Road St. Johns, MI 48879		
2010 Staffing		2011 Staffing
1.0	Parole Probation Officer-E	1.0
IDRP - Ingham County		Capacity: 190 beds
640 North Cedar Mason, MI 48854		
2010 Staffing		2011 Staffing
1.0	Parole Probation Officer-E	1.0

The following RRP Centers were operated during 2010 and 2011:

Lake County Residential Reentry Program		Capacity: 300 beds
4153 South M-37 Baldwin, MI 49304		
2010 Staffing		2011 Staffing
1.0	Parole Probation Manager 2	1.0
4.3	Parole Probation Officer – E	5.0
1.0	Correction Shift Supervisor 1	1.0
10.0	Corrections Officers	10.0
1.0	Secretary E8	1.0
17.3	Total Lake County Residential Reentry Staff	18.0

Tuscola Residential Reentry Program		Capacity: 160 beds
2420 Chambers Road Caro, MI 48723		
2010 Staffing		2011 Staffing
1.0	Parole Probation Manager 13	1.0
3.0	Parole Probation Officers	3.0
3.0	Correction Shift Supervisor 1	3.0
1.0	Correction Shift Supervisor 2	1.0
2.0	Corrections Program Coordinator	2.0
24.0	Corrections Officers	24.0
3.0	Food Service Leader Prisoner	3.0
1.0	Maintenance Mechanic – A	1.0
1.0	Secretary 8	1.0
39.0	Total Tuscola Residential Reentry Staff	39.0