



119 Pere Marquette  
Lansing, MI 48912  
(517) 485-4477  
(517) 485-4488 Fax  
ppa@publicpolicy.com

www.michpri.com

## Improving Comprehensive Planning and Community Development through Stakeholder Feedback

**Paul Elam, MPRI Project Manager**  
**April 29, 2008**

## Improving MPRI Practices

- Since MPRI implementation in 2005, MDOC has looked to align its practices with the mission and vision of MPRI.
- In 2008 MDOC sought feedback from key leaders and stakeholders to improve comprehensive planning and community development practices by:
  - Administering a statewide survey of local MPRI co-chairs and community coordinators
  - Organizing a series of follow-up focus groups with these same key leaders and stakeholders
  - Forming a comprehensive planning and Phase III quality assurance workgroup



## Survey Process

- Survey distributed to all co-chairs and community coordinators during January 2008.
- Total of 41 responses:
  - 9 administrative agencies
  - 9 community coordinators
  - 5 community co-chairs
  - 3 parole co-chairs
  - 4 warden co-chairs
  - 10 other (designees or steering team members)



## Focus Group Process

- Three focus groups were conducted during January 2008 after the surveys were submitted and analyzed.
- Total of 20 participants:
  - 4 administrative agencies
  - 6 community coordinators
  - 4 community co-chairs
  - 5 parole co-chairs
  - 1 warden co-chair



## Workgroup Process

- A stakeholder workgroup met on March 10 and March 21 to review the data collected through the survey and focus groups.
- The workgroup was charged with providing ideas to improve the MPRI comprehensive planning and community development process.
- Total of 14 participants:
  - 3 administrative agencies
  - 2 parole co-chairs
  - 1 warden co-chair
  - 3 community coordinators
  - 3 MDOC administrators



## MPRI Accomplishments and Areas for Improvement

- Significant accomplishments
  - MPRI comprehensive planning
  - MPRI implementation and monitoring
- Not much progress
  - MPRI local governance and accountability

Source: 2008 MPRI Comprehensive Planning and Community Development Process Survey; N=41



## MPRI Accomplishments and Areas for Improvement

### ■ MPRI comprehensive planning process

- Respondents feel significant accomplishments have been made in the following areas due to the current MPRI comprehensive planning process:
  - Leveraging additional community resources
  - Identifying local needs
  - Developing a comprehensive implementation plan
  - Securing new MDOC MPRI funds for re-entry

Source: 2008 MPRI Comprehensive Planning and Community Development Process Survey; N=41



## MPRI Accomplishments and Areas for Improvement

### ■ MPRI implementation and monitoring process

- Respondents feel significant accomplishments have been made in the following areas due to the current MPRI implementation and monitoring process:
  - Establishing local level data collection
  - Ensuring fiscal accountability to MDOC
  - Establishing data reporting to MDOC

Source: 2008 MPRI Comprehensive Planning and Community Development Process Survey; N=41



## MPRI Accomplishments and Areas for Improvement

- MPRI local governance and accountability process
  - Respondents feel there have been no significant accomplishments made as a result of the current MPRI local governance and accountability process.
  - Respondents are least satisfied with the current local governance and accountability structure; efforts should be made to improve:
    - Consensus decision-making
    - Accountability of community coordinators and co-chairs for their roles and responsibilities

Source: 2008 MPRI Comprehensive Planning and Community Development Process Survey; N=41



## Areas for Improvement

1. Comprehensive planning process
2. Local governance structure
3. Accountability and quality assurance
4. Fidelity to the MPRI model
5. Fiscal oversight at the local level
6. Working with the MDOC

Source: 2008 MPRI Comprehensive Planning and Community Development Process Survey; N=41



## Recommendations for Improvement

- Public Education and Outreach
- Communication and Collaboration
- Enhancing Service Delivery to Improve Offender Outcomes

Source: 2008 MPRI Comprehensive Planning and Community Development Process Focus Groups; N=20



## Public Education and Outreach

- Increase public education and outreach
  - There needs to be more accountability related to educating the community and the MDOC on the importance of returning successful parolees to the community; every 6 months there should be a community forum to update stakeholders on the process, progress, and outcomes at the state and local level.

Source: 2008 MPRI Comprehensive Planning and Community Development Process Focus Groups; N=20



## Public Education and Outreach

- Bring messages from the “taking action meetings” to the community level; service providers need this information also
- Establish a quality train-the-trainer process to share key messages at the local level
  - Several major stakeholders are aware of the MPRI in local communities, but many community members are still not educated and knowledgeable of the MPRI.
  - People have defined the MPRI based on what they believe it is, because the public at large is not educated.

Source: 2008 MPRI Comprehensive Planning and Community Development Process Focus Groups; N=20



## Communication and Collaboration

- Improve collaboration among MPRI stakeholders
  - There is a need for better communication up and down the chain of command and within groups (community coordinators, fiscal agents, community co-chairs, and other groups).
- Web-enable OMNI
  - Need for community data entry and sharing

Source: 2008 MPRI Comprehensive Planning and Community Development Process Focus Groups; N=20



## Communication and Collaboration

- Improve communication between parole and providers
  - More collaboration between in-reach facilities, parole agents, and community partners to clarify areas of accountability.

Source: 2008 MPRI Comprehensive Planning and Community Development Process Focus Groups; N=20



## Communication and Collaboration

- Develop a process that allows community coordinators to remain objective in facilitating a community-driven comprehensive planning process
  - There is a need to make the comprehensive planning process owned by local stakeholders and community members.

Source: 2008 MPRI Comprehensive Planning and Community Development Process Focus Groups; N=20



## Enhancing Service Delivery to Improve Offender Outcomes

- Increase time for prisoner in-reach
  - Returning prisoners are not receiving the programming that is described in the MPRI model, and the time allotted for in-reach is not adequate to fully prepare the returning prisoner for transition.

Source: 2008 MPRI Comprehensive Planning and Community Development Process Focus Groups; N=20



## Enhancing Service Delivery to Improve Offender Outcomes

- Improve in-reach facilities compliance with the MPRI model
  - In-reach facilities are still doing business as usual by not providing adequate access, communication, and paperwork necessary to effectively transition prisoners back into the community.

Source: 2008 MPRI Comprehensive Planning and Community Development Process Focus Groups; N=20



## Enhancing Service Delivery to Improve Offender Outcomes

- Develop a statewide system for tracking intermediate measures/outcomes and providing feedback
  - MPRI sites are not aware whether or not their goals are being achieved or not due to the lack of quantitative outcome data. Web-enabled OMNI would help solve this.

Source: 2008 MPRI Comprehensive Planning and Community Development Process Focus Groups; N=20



## Workgroup Improvement Ideas

- **Idea 1:** MPRI Phase III should focus on effective services, collaboration, and public education and outreach.
- **Idea 2:** Performance measures should be developed for each of the three core activities.
- **Idea 3:** The process of MPRI Phase III comprehensive planning and community development should be written into MDOC policy and procedure.



## Workgroup Improvement Ideas

- **Idea 4:** The fiscal and program management and oversight of MDOC's contracts with Administrative Agencies need to be fortified, and the infrastructure and capacity for this work need to be enhanced.
- **Idea 5:** The role of the Steering Team needs to be better defined. MPRI-funded providers should not be Steering Team members in order to protect MPRI from conflict of interest allegations.



## Workgroup Improvement Ideas

- **Idea 6:** All MPRI community sites need to have 4 co-chairs including the Administrative Agency, the In-reach Facility Warden or designee, the FOA Area Manager or designee, and a community leader. The roles of each co-chair need to be defined and clarified.
- **Idea 7:** MDOC needs to train MDOC Co-chairs to be effective community leaders and strong co-chairs. This includes providing training for MDOC staff that are appointed to serve on the board of Administrative Agencies.



## Workgroup Improvement Ideas

- **Idea 8:** One integrated data system needs to be established as both a case management tool and as a performance measurement tool for MDOC and community partners.
- **Idea 9:** Develop a local governance structure that enhances and supports the roles of the four Co-Chairs, the Steering Team, the Community Coordinator, the Advisory Council, and the community at large.



## Workgroup Improvement Ideas

- **Idea 10:** Role of the Community Coordinator is critical, but the responsibilities for this position must be more clearly defined in the following areas:
  - Community collaboration and brokering
  - Quality assurance
  - Public outreach and education
  - Leveraging formal and informal resources to support and expand Phase III
  - Building community capacity and willingness to take responsibility for reducing offenders' risk





119 Pere Marquette, Suite 1C  
Lansing, MI 48912-1270  
(517) 485-4477  
Fax (517) 485-4488  
[www.publicpolicy.com](http://www.publicpolicy.com)

[www.michpri.com](http://www.michpri.com)