

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE
Pursuant to P.A. 252 of 2014
Article V, Section 611
Electronic Tether / Monitoring Program

Section 611 of 2014 P.A. 252 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 by type of offender. 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.

This report will focus on the offenders on Curfew Monitoring (previously referred to as Radio Frequency (RF) electronic monitoring). There are three broad offender types on Curfew Monitoring: probationers, parolees, and contractual. Following a switch to a new vendor in September 2014, probationers and parolees are no longer divided by whether they participated in the Special Alternative Incarceration (SAI) program or not. Curfew Monitoring may have been imposed as an initial condition of sentencing or release; alternatively, Curfew Monitoring may have been imposed as a sanction for violation behavior. Global Positioning System (GPS) electronic monitoring is excluded from this report as a separate report is required for GPS monitoring.

The Electronic Monitoring Center is staffed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. Monitored probationers and parolees are assigned to and supervised by field agents throughout the State, but all monitoring of the equipment, alert processing and notification, and inventory control is managed through the Monitoring Center. The Center handles all Law Enforcement Information Network (LEIN) notification activity in the Department, due to their alert processing and notification responsibilities. The Center also contracts to provide monitoring services for Community Electronic Monitoring (CEM) and for the Regional Detention Services System (RDSS).

The offender counts in this report come from the monitoring vendor's database. In September 2014 a conversion to a new electronic monitoring vendor required the deactivation and reactivation of all cases, rendering it impossible to calculate new participants and terminations

for that month. Therefore, no numbers are available for September 2014 in Tables 1 and 2. Table 1 breaks down the new Curfew Monitoring participants by month and type of offender.

Table 1 - New Curfew Monitoring Participants Monthly By Offender Type

	Parole*		Probation*		CEM		RDSS		Total	
	2013	2014	2013	2014	2013	2014	2013	2014	2013	2014
Jan	348	339	149	139	8	3	35	19	540	500
Feb	241	293	135	115	11	5	29	20	416	433
Mar	310	305	121	121	11	7	13	13	455	446
Apr	329	322	149	116	7	5	22	13	507	456
May	335	271	177	107	12	11	27	14	551	403
Jun	269	289	133	127	9	13	27	17	438	446
Jul	356	277	153	132	7	4	23	19	539	432
Aug	293	188	157	99	9	5	27	27	486	319
Sep	345	**	146	**	5	**	19	**	515	**
Oct	455	332	187	185	5	7	29	52	676	576
Nov	275	278	129	158	9	8	21	30	434	474
Dec	282	317	125	141	5	5	16	26	428	489
Total	3,838	3,211	1,761	1,440	98	73	288	250	5,985	4,974
Avg	319.8	267.6	146.8	130.9	8.2	6.6	24.0	22.7	498.8	452.2

* Parole SAI and Probation SAI statistics were included in the traditional Parole and Probation statistics.

** Unavailable due to the replacement of BI monitoring equipment with 3M monitoring equipment.

Table 2 shows the monthly Curfew Monitoring terminations by offender type.

Table 2 - Monthly Curfew Monitoring Terminations by Offender Type

	Parole*		Probation*		CEM		RDSS		Total	
	2013	2014	2013	2014	2013	2014	2013	2014	2013	2014
Jan	373	333	153	156	19	4	38	32	583	525
Feb	280	314	141	133	9	7	23	14	453	468
Mar	266	292	137	149	13	4	37	17	453	462
Apr	310	327	142	134	8	6	33	15	493	482
May	378	357	168	138	11	4	18	20	575	519
Jun	324	334	154	131	12	12	34	25	524	502
Jul	374	339	169	133	9	10	27	18	579	500
Aug	308	320	148	131	8	9	27	17	491	477
Sep	285	**	129	**	6	**	22	**	442	**
Oct	335	311	167	18	6	2	22	20	530	351
Nov	348	275	140	24	6	8	24	31	518	338
Dec	303	352	140	71	7	8	18	35	468	466
Total	3,884	3,554	1,788	1,218	114	74	323	244	6,109	5,090
Avg	323.7	323.1	149.0	110.7	9.5	6.7	26.9	22.2	509.1	462.7

* Parole SAI and Probation SAI statistics were included in the traditional Parole and Probation statistics.

** Unavailable due to the replacement of BI monitoring equipment with 3M monitoring equipment.

Below are typical reasons for unsuccessful terminations on Curfew Monitoring:

- Administrative terminations occur when the offender is unable to continue for reasons beyond their control, such as, loss of home placement, hospitalized, or commitment to a treatment program.
- Substance abuse violations
- Curfew violations
- Tampering with tether device
- Abscond violation
- New felony

The monthly new monitoring participants and monthly Curfew Monitoring terminations resulted in the end of month Curfew Monitoring populations shown in Table 3.

Table 3 - End of Month Curfew Monitoring Populations by Offender Type

	Parole*		Probation*		CEM		RDSS		Total	
	2013	2014	2013	2014	2013	2014	2013	2014	2013	2014
Jan	1,133	1,010	471	452	13	8	65	38	1,682	1,508
Feb	1,067	993	458	434	16	6	72	48	1,613	1,481
Mar	1,107	1,015	442	414	13	7	54	43	1,616	1,479
Apr	1,133	1,003	449	392	11	8	45	40	1,638	1,443
May	1,062	941	462	371	13	12	53	38	1,590	1,362
Jun	1,009	903	444	367	10	14	49	30	1,512	1,314
Jul	1,008	835	428	366	8	10	44	34	1,488	1,245
Aug	981	827	437	368	8	7	43	42	1,469	1,244
Sep	1,045	946	461	409	8	4	46	9	1,560	1,368
Oct	1,094	1,070	484	472	7	8	53	82	1,638	1,632
Nov	1,028	1,113	479	514	9	8	52	80	1,568	1,715
Dec	1,008	1,126	464	494	9	8	52	72	1,533	1,700
Avg	1,056.3	981.8	456.6	421.1	10.4	8.3	52.3	46.3	1,575.6	1,457.6

* Parole SAI and Probation SAI statistics were included in the traditional Parole and Probation statistics.

Return to prison statistics measure an offender's outcome at the conclusion of a standard follow-up period, however, this is not a relevant measure for most Curfew Monitoring participants as return to prison is only relevant for parolees and parolees from SAI. Table 4 replicates a portion of the **Three-Year Follow-Up Outcomes of Offenders Who Paroled in 1998 to 2010 by Year** table reported in the Department's 2013 Statistical Report (the most recent available). The table shows that offenders paroled in 2010 had a Return to Prison Rate of 29.0% (Technical Violators 15.5% and New Sentence Violators 13.5%) after a full three-year follow up period. New Curfew monitoring participants (parolees and parolees from SAI) for 2010 are the most recent participants that can have a three year follow-up period, however, they would have paroled from a mixture of years from 2010 and earlier. Thus, these new participants for 2010 will have a failure rate that averages the recidivism rates for paroles in 2010 and earlier.

Table 4 - (portion of) Three-Year Follow-Up Outcomes of Offenders Who Paroled in 1998 to 2010 by Year

Year Paroled	Total Cases	Success Total	Failure Total	Absconds	Technical Violators	New Sentence	Return to Prison
2006	9,694	60.3%	39.7%	3.2%	15.2%	21.3%	36.5%
2007	11,805	63.9%	36.1%	2.8%	13.6%	19.7%	33.2%
2008	11,044	66.2%	33.8%	2.2%	13.6%	17.9%	31.5%
2009	12,829	67.8%	32.2%	1.6%	15.0%	15.6%	30.6%
2010	11,552	69.6%	30.4%	1.4%	15.5%	13.5%	29.0%

See 2013 Statistical Report, Table D3 at
<http://www.michigan.gov/corrections/0,45517-119-1441--,00.html>

Curfew Monitoring of offenders impacts jail utilization by preserving jail beds for offenders that pose a more serious risk to the public. Curfew Monitoring provides the Courts with an option that falls between probation and jail and additionally provides a sanction for noncompliant probationers. Curfew Monitoring impacts prison admissions by diverting eligible parole violators who would otherwise be returned to prison as technical violators.

Electronic Monitoring Center

2013 Staffing		2014 Staffing
1.0	Parole Probation Manager 3	1.0
1.0	Parole Probation Manager 4	1.0
3.0	Departmental Supervisor-2	3.0
4.0	Parole Probation Officer-A	4.0
1.0	Departmental Analyst-A	0.0
0.0	Departmental Specialist	1.0
6.0	Departmental Technician-A	6.0
37.0	Departmental Technician-E	37.0
2.0	General Office Assistant 7	2.0
1.0	Secretary-A	1.0
56.0	Total Electronic Monitoring Center Staff	56.0