

**Follow-Up of the Audit of the  
Orange County Corrections  
Department  
Work Release Center**

**Report by the  
Office of County Comptroller**

**Martha O. Haynie, CPA  
County Comptroller**

County Audit Division

J. Carl Smith, CPA  
Director

Christopher J. Dawkins, CPA  
Deputy Director

Wendy D. Kittleson, CISA, CIA  
IT Audit Manager

Audit Team:

Deborah W. Owens, CPA, Audit Supervisor  
Michael J. Celentano, CISA, IT Audit Supervisor

**Report No. 408  
June 2010**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Transmittal Letter .....	3
Implementation Status of Previous Recommendations For Improvement .....	4
Introduction .....	7
Scope and Methodology .....	8
Follow-Up To Previous Recommendations For Improvement.....	9
1. A Study on the Appropriateness of the Inmate Subsistence Amount Should Be Conducted .....	10
2. Inmate Eligibility Should Be More Carefully Reviewed .....	10
3. Inmate Files Should Be Consolidated .....	11
4. Daily Rosters Should Be Retained .....	12
5. Passwords to the Database Should Be Changed at Regular Intervals.....	13
6. The Work Release Access Database Should Be Documented .....	14
7. Check Processing Procedures Should Be Reviewed .....	15
8. Inmate Medical Summaries Should Be Retained.....	16
9. Job Check Monitoring Should Be Enhanced.....	17
10. Verification of Inmate Pay to Hours Worked Should Be Performed.....	19
Additional Recommendations for Improvement .....	22
1. The IMS Classification Screen Verification Should Be Reviewed For Accuracy .....	23
2. The Vendor's Corrections to the IMS System Should Be Tested and Implemented .....	25
3. System Anomalies Need to Be Corrected.....	26
4. The Review Process to Analyze Proper Completion of IMS Classification Screens Should Be Enhanced .....	28

June 30, 2010

Richard T. Crotty, County Mayor  
And  
Board of County Commissioners

We have conducted a follow-up of the Audit of the Orange County Corrections Department Work Release Center. Our original audit, No. 370, included the period of January 1, 2004 to November 30, 2004. Testing of the status of the previous Recommendations for Improvement was performed for the period April 1, 2008 through August 31, 2008.

We conducted this audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

The accompanying Follow-Up to Previous Recommendations for Improvement presents a summary of the previous conditions and the previous recommendations. We determined that seven of the ten original recommendations were fully or partially implemented. From our review and in this report, we have included four additional recommendations relating to the new Inmate Management System (IMS).

We appreciate the cooperation of the personnel of the Corrections Department during the course of the audit.

Martha O. Haynie, CPA  
County Comptroller

c: Ajit Lalchandani, County Administrator  
Michael McCoy, Director of Public Safety  
Michael Tidwell, Chief of Corrections  
Dr. Jill Hobbs, Manager, Community Corrections Division  
Lee Isbell, Manager, Inmate Programming and Support Division

**IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF  
PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS  
FOR IMPROVEMENT**

**FOLLOW-UP AUDIT OF ORANGE COUNTY CORRECTIONS DEPARTMENT WORK RELEASE CENTER  
STATUS OF PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

NO.	PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTATION STATUS			
		IMPLEMENTED	PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED	NOT IMPLEMENTED	NOT APPLICABLE
1.	We recommend the Corrections Department conducts a study of the subsistence amount charged to inmates at the Work Release Center to determine whether the amount charged needs to be adjusted.	✓			
2.	We recommend the Corrections Department reviews its classification process to ensure only eligible inmates are permitted to serve their sentence at the Work Release Center.	✓			
3.	We recommend the Work Release Center considers developing a centralized filing system and placing the control of the inmate files under the direction of one or two employees.	✓			
4.	We recommend the Work Release Center maintains copies of daily Alpha Rosters, either in paper or electronic format.			✓	
5.	We recommend the Work Release Center develops and implements policies and procedures requiring all developed and purchased applications have adequate password controls.			✓	
6.	We recommend the Work Release Center develops and implements a policy requiring documentation of all user developed reports, spreadsheets, models, and programs.			✓	
7.	We recommend the Work Release Center consults with the Comptroller's Office to determine whether the process of preparing inmate checks could be made more efficient.	✓			

**FOLLOW-UP AUDIT OF ORANGE COUNTY CORRECTIONS DEPARTMENT WORK RELEASE CENTER  
STATUS OF PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>IMPLEMENTATION STATUS</b>			
		<b>IMPLEMENTED</b>	<b>PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED</b>	<b>NOT IMPLEMENTED</b>	<b>NOT APPLICABLE</b>
8.	We recommend the Work Release Center ensures current medical summary forms are maintained for inmates residing at the Center.	✓			
9.	We recommend the Work Release Center develops a system to better track their inmate job monitoring efforts to ensure these checks are performed as required.		✓		
10.	We recommend the Work Release Center collects pay stubs from all inmates when paychecks are submitted for deposit. Further, periodic reconciliations should be performed of the hours inmates sign out for work to the hours of pay received.		✓		

# INTRODUCTION

---

## INTRODUCTION



### Scope and Methodology

The scope was limited to an examination of the status of the previous Recommendations for Improvement from the Audit of the Orange County Orange County Corrections Department Work Release Center, Report No. 370, issued in February of 2006. Testing of the status of the previous recommendations was performed for the audit period April 1, 2008 through August 31, 2008.

We interviewed personnel in the Classifications Division and the Work Release Center, reviewed source documents, and performed the tests necessary to determine the implementation status of the previous recommendations. We have described the specific methodologies utilized during our review after the implementation status of each recommendation in the Follow-Up to Previous Recommendations for Improvement section of this report.

On June 16, 2010, subsequent to our review period, we were informed of approximately \$650 of cash that was found in an office file cabinet. Although the funds have since been secured and deposited, our audit did not include the testing and evaluation of procedures used to receipt, record, and deposit these funds.



**FOLLOW-UP TO PREVIOUS  
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR  
IMPROVEMENT**



**1. A Study on the Appropriateness of the Inmate Subsistence Amount Should Be Conducted**

During our initial audit, we noted the Corrections Department had not conducted a study to determine whether they were collecting a reasonable amount of subsistence from the inmates. The Center had been charging the same amount since it began operation in 1982.

**We Recommend** the Corrections Department conducts a study of the subsistence amount charged to inmates at the Work Release Center to determine whether the amount charged needs to be adjusted.

**Status:**

Implemented. Although the subsistence fee was not increased, a study was performed with results communicated to management to consider a fee increase in August of 2007. The study indicated the subsistence fee should be increased to \$11.51 per day (up from \$7.15 per day). The subsistence fee was not increased because there were several other fee changes at the time, but will be revisited at a later date.

**Management's Response:**

We concur and as noted in the follow-up of Audit report this item has already been implemented.

**2. Inmate Eligibility Should Be More Carefully Reviewed**

During our initial audit, we found that three of the 30 inmates reviewed did not meet the criteria to serve their sentence at the Work Release Center. Administrative Order 07-93-58-1 of the Circuit Court of the Ninth Judicial Circuit specifies the eligibility criteria for work release. When we informed management of the three ineligible inmates their histories

---

## STATUS OF PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT



Follow-Up Audit of the Orange County  
Corrections Department Work Release Center

---

were promptly reviewed and the inmates were returned to the main correctional facility.

**We Recommend** the Corrections Department reviews its classification process to ensure only eligible inmates are permitted to serve their sentence at the Work Release Center.

**Status:**

Implemented. We selected a sample of inmates who had served their sentence at the Center during the audit period. We reviewed the criminal histories for each of these inmates for adherence to the criteria specified in the administrative order regarding work release eligibility. All inmates in our sample met the required eligibility criteria.

**Management's Response:**

We concur and as noted in the follow-up of Audit report this item has already been implemented.

### **3. Inmate Files Should Be Consolidated**

During our previous audit, we noted the Work Release Center maintained a number of inmate files in several locations throughout the Center based on various activities. Once inmates were no longer at the Center, all files were placed together in one folder and stored. These closed files may contain up to four copies of the same documents and some files were missing documentation or contained documents belonging to another inmate.

**We Recommend** the Work Release Center considers developing a centralized filing system and placing the control of the inmate files under the direction of one or two employees.



**Status:**

Implemented. Although the Fiscal Office maintains a limited inmate file while the inmate is at the Work Release Center, a centralized filing system located in a secured area under the direction of a few employees has been established.

**Management's Response:**

We concur and as noted in the follow-up of Audit report this item has already been implemented.

**4. Daily Rosters Should Be Retained**

During our initial audit we found Alpha Rosters of current inmates were not retained to document the daily headcounts and could not be recreated by the system for a particular day.

**We Recommend** the Work Release Center maintains copies of daily Alpha Rosters, either in paper or electronic format.

**Status:**

Not Implemented. The daily headcounts are performed using a report from the old Access database, although the new Inmate Management System (IMS) is often used in reconciling the count. These reports are not retained because inmate information can be easily accessed in IMS. We ran a report in IMS for a date in which an Access report had been retained by the auditor. Although we were able to reconcile the reports, we noted several record keeping inconsistencies involving inmate housing moves.

**We Again Recommend** the Work Release Center maintains copies of daily Alpha Rosters, either in paper or electronic format. In addition, daily Roster record keeping inconsistencies arising from inmate housing moves should be corrected.

**Management's Response:**

We concur and this item has been implemented.

Staff have begun printing and filing a copy of the list of all inmates assigned to the Work Release Center daily. These records are being maintained in the Work Release Administration files and will be maintained until such time they are turned over to the Facility Records Custodian for final retention.

**5. Passwords to the Database Should Be Changed at Regular Intervals**

During our previous audit, we found strong password controls were not utilized, as the Center did not require employees to change their password to the Work Release Access database at least every 30 days or when the owner believes the password may have been compromised.

**We Recommend** the Work Release Center develops and implements policies and procedures requiring all developed and purchased applications have adequate password controls.

**Status:**

Not Implemented. Management's response in the previous audit was that the Fiscal section of IMS was to go live within a few months and would completely replace the Work Release Access database system.

At the time of our fieldwork the database had neither been replaced with an application that contains the above security features related to passwords nor had the database been updated to require password changes. Although in progress, discussion with management indicates the Access database will not be replaced in the near future.

**We Again Recommend** the Work Release Center develops and implements policies and procedures requiring all

---

**STATUS OF PREVIOUS  
RECOMMENDATIONS  
FOR IMPROVEMENT**



Follow-Up Audit of the Orange County  
Corrections Department Work Release Center

---

developed and purchased applications have adequate password controls.

**Management's Response:**

We concur and implementation is pending.

The Inmate Management System (IMS) contains a Work Release fiscal module that provides the suggested security and requires users to change their password every forty-five (45) days. We have been testing the IMS Work Release fiscal module over the past three years and although the latest version of the IMS was recently implemented, problems continue to exist within the fiscal module. The vendor is working on the problems and testing will continue. Once all problems are fixed, we will accomplish parallel processing and will transition to the new system after validating it. We anticipate implementation of the new Fiscal Module no later than June 30, 2010. If for any reason it is determined that the IMS Work Release Fiscal module cannot be implemented, we will consider other means for implementing this suggestion.

**6. The Work Release Access Database Should Be Documented**

During our initial audit we noted there was no written manual or other documentation on the Work Release Access database. Two employees working at the Center developed the database system in-house and the system was never documented.

**We Recommend** the Work Release Center develops and implements a policy requiring documentation of all user developed reports, spreadsheets, models, and programs.

**Status:**

Not Implemented. As noted above, management responded that the Fiscal section of IMS was to go live within a few



months and would completely replace the Access database system precluding the need to document the database.

When our fieldwork concluded the database had not been replaced nor had documentation been developed in anticipation of the IMS fiscal module. Although the conversion is in progress, discussion with management indicates the Access database will not be replaced in the near future.

**We Again Recommend** the Work Release Center develops and implements a policy requiring documentation of all user developed reports, spreadsheets, models, and programs.

**Management's Response:**

We concur and implementation is underway.

As stated in item # 5, transition to the IMS Work Release fiscal module is pending and we anticipate implementation no later than June 30, 2010. Upon implementation, IMS will completely replace the WRC Access Database system; thus, there will be no need to document the access database. The IMS contains "Help Files" that document how the WRC and fiscal modules of the application are to be utilized and maintained. Part of the expectation of the IMS WRC Fiscal module is that the DSI Company will provide documentation regarding the system.

**7. Check Processing Procedures Should Be Reviewed**

During the original audit adequate controls were in place but we found the check preparation process to be inefficient. The process required two to three reviews by the supervising fiscal coordinator, a review by the unit supervisor, and two trips to the Comptroller's Office to deliver and retrieve checks every week.

---

**STATUS OF PREVIOUS  
RECOMMENDATIONS  
FOR IMPROVEMENT**



Follow-Up Audit of the Orange County  
Corrections Department Work Release Center

---

**We Recommend** the Work Release Center consults with the Comptroller's Office to determine whether the process of preparing inmate checks could be made more efficient.

**Status:**

Implemented. The Corrections Department emails the check disbursement summary to the Comptroller's accounts payable section where an interface is run and the checks are printed from the County's pooled account. The Work Release checking account has been closed but Finance performs a monthly reconciliation of the pooled account to the bank statement. We noted that there is no reconciliation performed between the balance in the Work Release Access database and the Trust Fund in the County's financial records. The Access database is a subsidiary record to the Trust Fund and the two should be regularly reconciled as a control for verifying inmate deposits and withdraws. In addition, we noted interest earned on the account is allocated to the various funds which use the account; however the interest allocated to the Work Release Trust Fund is not reported to Inmate Fiscal Operations.

**We Also Recommend** the Corrections Department consults with the Comptroller's Office to determine a method of reconciling the balance of inmate accounts to the Work Release Trust Fund in the County's financial system.

**Management's Response:**

We concur and as noted in the follow-up of Audit report this item has already been implemented.

**8. Inmate Medical Summaries Should Be Retained**

We could not locate two medical summary forms for our sample of 30 inmates during our initial audit. These forms reveal any major health conditions of an inmate to the staff.





**We Recommend** the Work Release Center ensures current medical summary forms are maintained for inmates residing at the Center.

**Status:**

Implemented. IMS allows staff to make entries indicating whether an inmate is physically and medically able to serve his or her sentence at the Center. We verified that staff had determined medical eligibility for a sample of 30 inmates and made the appropriate entry in the system. Inmates with serious medical conditions are not permitted to serve their sentence at the Center.

**Management's Response:**

We concur and as noted in the follow-up of Audit report this item has already been implemented.

**9. Job Check Monitoring Should Be Enhanced**

During our initial audit, we could not determine whether the Center was performing the required inmate job checks. We reviewed job verification data maintained by the Vocational Placement Center, but found no evidence of bi-weekly phone checks for almost half of the inmates in our sample. In addition, over half of the inmates in our sample that were required to have monthly field checks to verify their employment had no record of such a visit being conducted. These checks were mandated in the Work Release Center Standard Operating Job Placement Procedures.

**We Recommend** the Work Release Center develops a system to better track their inmate job monitoring efforts to ensure these checks are performed as required.

**Status:**

Partially Implemented. We reviewed a sample of 18 inmate jobs to determine whether a sufficient number of job checks

---

**STATUS OF PREVIOUS  
RECOMMENDATIONS  
FOR IMPROVEMENT**



Follow-Up Audit of the Orange County  
Corrections Department Work Release Center

---

had been performed. Community Corrections Officers are required to complete at least one field check within a 30 day period and one phone check in the two weeks of the month in which the field check is not performed. We found six field checks and eight phone checks had not been performed during the required time.

We noted that the Center is updating their procedures to eliminate phone checks. Phone calls between Center staff and employers are already being made several times during the month concerning payroll issues, schedule changes, and other matters.

**We Again Recommend** the Work Release Center develops a system to better track their inmate job monitoring efforts to ensure that field checks are performed as required. In addition, the Center's policies and procedures should be updated as soon as possible to reflect the change in phone check requirements.

**Management's Response:**

We concur and implementation is pending.

New procedures are in place that will enhance the job check tracking process and provide verification of completed checks. All field and phone checks are currently being entered into the IMS and completed checks can be easily verified.

Although completed field and phone checks can be "verified" in IMS, the system does not provide a report that accurately determines which inmates are due for additional checks. Until such time as the IMS system is capable of providing a tracking mechanism, staff has begun utilizing a "Field Report" to track phone/field checks. The Field Report is generated daily and contains the inmate name, housing location, employer information, employment start date, last phone check date and last field check date. A Senior Community Corrections Officer prints and reviews this report daily, determines which checks are due, and then coordinates or conducts the checks. Completed checks are



hand written on the Field Report as they are completed and entered electronically later in the day. The field reports and the hand written information are available for review. The Work Release Facility SOP # 601-03 "Job Placement Procedures" is in the process of being revised and will reflect the new procedures once completed.

**10. Verification of Inmate Pay to Hours Worked Should Be Performed**

During our initial audit we found there was no verification of the number of hours inmates worked to the number of hours in which inmates were paid. In addition, pay stubs were not collected when inmates turned in paychecks for deposit. We attempted to recalculate a sample of paychecks deposited for ten inmates and found paychecks for two of the inmates could have reflected fewer hours worked than they had signed out of the Center claiming to work.

**We Recommend** the Work Release Center collects pay stubs from all inmates when paychecks are submitted for deposit. Further, periodic reconciliations should be performed of the hours inmates sign out for work to the hours of pay received.

**Status:**

Partially Implemented. Although the Center does not collect pay stubs from all inmates and does not reconcile the number of hours inmates worked to hours paid, they do ensure working inmates deposit a pay check. In addition, IMS contains inmate work schedules and inmates are not permitted to leave the Center unless they are scheduled for work. To determine whether the number of hours inmates were out of the Center to work appeared reasonable for the hours the inmates were paid, we compared information from check copies in eight inmate files to the inmates' work schedules, commute times, pay rates and departure and arrival times. In all eight cases, hours inmates were out of the facility agreed to the inmates' schedules and pay checks.

---

## STATUS OF PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT



Follow-Up Audit of the Orange County  
Corrections Department Work Release Center

---

**We Again Recommend** the Work Release Center collects pay stubs from all inmates when paychecks are submitted for deposit. Further, periodic reconciliations should be performed of the hours inmates sign out for work to the hours of pay received.

### **Management's Response:**

We partially concur and some process modifications are underway.

The new IMS WRC system contains data fields for inputting employer, pay rate, hours worked, etc., and the ability for inmates to clock in and out of the facility using the system. The Department is in the process of implementing the new version of IMS and transitioning into the WRC Fiscal module at this time. Once the new version is fully implemented and the WRC Fiscal module is online, we will determine the best business practice for getting this information into the system. Provided the system works as anticipated, the Department will be able to compare the number of hours worked versus the number of hours an inmate was signed out of the facility and significant variances will be addressed by WRC administrative staff. Also, a report will be produced that will identify which inmates turned in money orders and not a traditional check; so further verification of pay to hours work can be conducted.

However, the recommendation to have all inmates turn in a pay stub is not feasible, although desirable. Unfortunately some businesses that hire WRC inmates such as labor pools and lawn services pay in cash. If this occurs, the inmate is instructed to purchase a money order and deposit the same at the WRC. Every effort is made to ensure that hours worked are tracked with these employers as well. If for any reason we cannot implement the WRC Fiscal module, we will have to determine other means for this verification.

### **Auditor's Comment:**

Especially in cash payment relationships, the Work Release Center should seek to ensure that all inmates are employed

---

**STATUS OF PREVIOUS  
RECOMMENDATIONS  
FOR IMPROVEMENT**



Follow-Up Audit of the Orange County  
Corrections Department Work Release Center

---

by employers that are following IRS payroll tax withholding rules.

**ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR  
IMPROVEMENT**

---

## **1. The IMS Classification Screen Verification Should Be Reviewed For Accuracy**

During the prior audit, the Center's Classification Unit used graphical decision trees to manually assign inmate custody levels. Since that time, the process utilizes the Corrections Department IMS system to assign inmate custody levels by having classification officers answer questions on the IMS classification screen.

The design of the IMS classification screens address an inmate's initial classification and routine reclassifications (mitigating). In addition, problematic inmates undergo "aggravating reclassifications" to adjust their custody level to a more secure environment. This IMS design was to mirror the results of the graphical decision trees by using answers to questions that translate into point scoring to arrive at a custody level.

We compared the previously used manual decision trees and IMS classification screens to determine if the system provided the same inmate custody levels. The following differences were noted:

- A) Inmates not sentenced for their offense retain their "Medium Custody 5" level using the manual (mitigating) reclassification decision trees. The IMS reclassification screen, however, guides the user through additional questions. If their responses are "No", the reclassification remains at Medium Custody 5. Depending upon which of the additional questions are answered with a "Yes" response, the inmate is assigned to a lower risk classification of "Minimum Custody 6" to "Minimum Custody 8."
- B) Inmates assigned to a "Maximum Custody 2" level who does not exhibit a marked improvement in attitude and compliance maintains this level using the decision tree. The IMS reclassification screen raises the custody level for an individual meeting this criterion to "Maximum Custody 1." This conflicts with

---

## ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT



Follow-Up Audit of the Orange County  
Corrections Department Work Release Center

---

the defined purpose of a mitigating reclassification which is to either retain or lower the custody level of the inmate.

- C) The manual reclassification decision tree lists custody levels by number (1 through 8). The IMS reclassification screen lists literal and numeric designations such as Capital Felon Custody 1 and Maximum Custody 1. Capital Felon Custody 1 and Maximum Custody 1 are separate classifications (the former being life sentenced and death row inmates who are not reclassified). Both numerical and literal descriptions are used interchangeably by classifications officers when describing inmate custody levels. Using the numeric 1 in two separate literal descriptions in the IMS reclassification screen may cause confusion when identifying the level of inmate custody.

We were advised experienced classification officers typically reach a conclusion regarding an inmate custody level during their review of criminal records and system notes while completing the IMS classification screen. As such, if an unexpected result is obtained, the officer may answer questions to force a score to the expected custody level or in some cases, manually override the IMS custody level. However, a less experienced classification officer may follow the questions literally and not know what the expected inmate custody level should be. Relying solely on the results of the IMS classification screen may result in an incorrect inmate custody level.

**We Recommend** the design of the IMS reclassification computerized process be reviewed to ensure the desired outcomes are met.

**Management's Response:**

We concur with the recommendation made by the Comptroller and have contacted the Corrections Department ISS Unit to follow up on this recommendation.



We have verified some differences between the reclassification decision tree and the computerized process in IMS. In response, we have contacted our ISS Unit to follow up on this with DSI who converted the information from the Objective Jail Reclassification Tree into the IMS system. DSI has been made aware of the differences and has advised that DSI will have a fix by April 30, 2010 for ISS to put in testing.

## **2. The Vendor's Corrections to the IMS System Should Be Tested and Implemented**

An inmate's custody level is established by an initial classification upon booking into the Corrections Department facility. At periodic intervals, the inmate's records and notes are reviewed and a classification officer determines whether a reclassification is warranted or simply a review where the inmate's custody level remains unchanged.

We noted that three percent (686 of 21,402) of these reviews had a custody level that did not match the expected custody level based on point totals assigned by classification officers. Of these, 518 classifications were for minimum custody levels 6, 7 and 8. These custody levels are combined in the IMS reclassification screen and result in a point total of zero. The reclassification range table that converts point totals to custody levels does not address zero scores. Therefore, classification officers are forced to make additional entries in the reclassification screen so the score will exceed zero and a custody level can then be assigned by IMS.

We were advised that the IMS vendor had worked on correcting this condition but it never went into a production environment.

**We Recommend** the vendor's correction for zero scores be placed into production after adequate testing has been performed.



**Management's Response:**

We concur with the recommendation made by the Comptroller, and in response have contacted our ISS Unit to follow up on this recommendation. Custody levels 6, 7 and 8 are combined in the reclassification screen. Therefore, the classification officers are forced to make additional entries in the reclassification screen so the score will exceed zero and a custody level can be assigned. DSI had previously worked on correcting this, but it needed to be tested and was never pushed out to production. In response, we have contacted our ISS Unit to follow up on this with DSI. DSI has been made aware of this and has advised that they will push out a fix so that it can be tested and placed into production. DSI will have a fix by April 30, 2010 for ISS to put in testing.

**3. System Anomalies Need to Be Corrected**

We noted anomalies within IMS where inmate custody levels did not coincide with the scores arrived at by classification officers. Inmates were assigned both higher and lower custody levels as a result. The table below provides three examples of the Score to Classification relationship.

Inmate Classification per IMS	Score from Answered Questions	Classification Based on Score
MinCus6	1	MinCus7
HMDCus3	40	MedCus4
MaxIIcus2	70	MaxIcus1

Inmate custody levels are calculated by IMS using weighted values (scores) derived from answered questions on the IMS classification screens. The system converts the score to a custody level using tables that contain a score value range and an associated custody level. Each custody level has a unique score value range associated with it. There are separate tables for each type of classification performed (initial classification and reclassification).

---

**ADDITIONAL  
RECOMMENDATIONS  
FOR IMPROVEMENT**

Follow-Up Audit of the Orange County  
Corrections Department Work Release Center

---

When this problem was discussed with Corrections Department's staff and the Vendor, the Vendor was unable to identify a cause for the discrepancies. As such, Correction's management suggested that classification officers check the inmate custody level assigned by IMS until a cause is identified and a correction is implemented.

**We Recommend** the Corrections Department continue to work with the IMS vendor to determine why certain score anomalies occur. In addition, until a fix is implemented, classification officers should recheck all custody scores obtained.

**Management's Response:**

We concur in part with the recommendation made by the Comptroller, and in response have contacted our ISS Unit and requested a report be created.

Custody levels are calculated in IMS by using weighted values derived by answered questions in the classification screen. The system calculates the custody level based on a range of scores associated with each custody. A number of anomalies within IMS were identified where the inmate custody level did not coincide with the scores when the classification officer completed a reclass or a review of the inmate's record. In order to try and determine the cause, these records need to first be identified. We have requested that the Corrections Department ISS Unit have an exception report created to identify these records so they can be reviewed as they occur.

DSI was also made aware of this concern and advised that a query could be created in IMS (Power Search) that could be routinely run to check for these anomalies.

We have met with ISS to request such a report. Once the records are identified, they will have to be reviewed to try and determine the cause of the anomalies so that it can be corrected. This report will be available by April 15, 2010.

---

**4. The Review Process to Analyze Proper Completion of IMS Classification Screens Should Be Enhanced**

An analysis of score results by classification officer identified one officer with a 57 percent rate of occurrence of nonstandard scores. The next highest classification officer had an 11 percent rate of occurrence. Non-standard scores identify conditions where IMS classification screens were either not completed or score review directives were not followed during the classification process by the classification officer.

The IMS classification screen questionnaires are designed to guide the classification officer through to completion based on their “Yes” or “No” responses. There is an accumulated score based on those answers that the system uses to calculate the inmate custody level. When classification officers do not follow the guidance within the IMS classification screen, non-standard scores result.

We were advised that periodic supervisory reviews of criminal records and system notes are performed to verify the accuracy of custody levels assigned to inmates. However, no review is currently conducted to determine if classification officers are properly completing each screen. Such a review could help to identify problems and training opportunities.

The IMS classification screens provide the steps to follow to arrive at an inmate’s custody level. Not following the established process may result in possible incorrect inmate custody levels.

**We Recommend** the Corrections Department enhances the existing periodic review process to include an analysis to determine if IMS classification screens are properly completed.



**Management's Response:**

We concur with the recommendation made by the Comptroller's Office. Non-standard scores are likely due to staff's failure to complete the IMS classification screens, fields or questions, as well as failure to comply with directives regarding review and reclassification of inmates. Therefore, staff has been reminded of the proper procedures and has been trained.

In addition, Corrections Department ISS has been asked to develop an additional Crystal report that will review the current active records to determine if any issues remain after training was put in place. Once the report is created, a query will be run routinely to identify when additional training may be needed, especially as new classification staff are hired. This will enable the classification supervisors to enhance the review process. The report is expected to be available by April 15, 2010.

**Management's Additional Response:**

We thank you for the time and effort expended by your office while conducting the WRC follow-up audit. We concur with the outcome of the audit and have implemented virtually all recommendations for improvement. Please be aware the majority of the items pending correction/implementation are dependent upon the new IMS System upgrades and enhancements being initiated.