MICHIGAN

OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL

AUDIT REPORT

PERFORMANCE AUDIT
OF THE

ACCURACY OF PRISONER RELEASE DATES

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND
DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

October 2005

THOMAS H. MCTAVISH, C.P.A.
AUDITOR GENERAL

47-591-04

"...The auditor general shall conduct post audits of financial transactions and accounts of the state and of all branches, departments, offices, boards, commissions, agencies, authorities and institutions of the state established by this constitution or by law, and performance post audits thereof."

– Article IV, Section 53 of the Michigan Constitution

Audit report information may be accessed at:
http://audgen.michigan.gov

Michigan

Office of the Auditor General

REPORT SUMMARY

Performance Audit

Accuracy of Prisoner Release Dates

Department of Corrections and Department of Information Technology

Report Number:
47-591-04

Released:
October 2005

The Department of Corrections (DOC) had approximately 50,900 prisoners housed in prisons and camps as of December 2004. A prisoner's release date is based upon the committed offense, date of offense, and laws enacted at the time of the offense. DOC enters prisoner and sentencing information into the Offender Management Network Information System (OMNI). The sentencing information is transferred electronically to the Corrections Management Information System (CMIS). CMIS performs the computation of the prisoner release date.

Audit Objective:
To assess the effectiveness of DOC's efforts to ensure the accuracy of prisoner release dates.

Audit Conclusion:
DOC was moderately effective in its efforts to ensure the accuracy of prisoner release dates.

Material Condition:
DOC did not ensure that CMIS was programmed to correctly and completely compute prisoner release dates for all types of sentences. As a result, CMIS inaccurately computed some prisoner release dates resulting in the early release of these prisoners. (Finding 1)

Reportable Conditions:
DOC did not ensure that CMIS had sufficient data edits. Inaccurate data in CMIS could adversely affect prisoner release dates and Parole Board decisions. (Finding 2)

DOC did not always accurately input release date adjustments into CMIS and did not verify the completeness and accuracy of sentencing information received from the courts and make necessary corrections as approved by the courts. Consequently, CMIS contained inaccurate and incomplete information, which could result in DOC releasing prisoners before or after the correct release date. (Finding 3)

DOC did not develop complete CMIS audit trails of data used in the recomputations of prisoner release dates and the individual responsible for each recomputation. Without a complete audit trail, DOC cannot identify what information was added or changed and cannot identify who made changes to release dates. (Finding 4)

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Audit Objective:
To assess the effectiveness of CMIS and OMNI access controls in preventing inappropriate access to information affecting release dates.

Audit Conclusion:
CMIS and OMNI access controls were not effective in preventing inappropriate access to information affecting release dates.

Material Condition:
DOC had not established a comprehensive information systems security program and complete access controls over CMIS and OMNI. As a result, DOC cannot ensure the security of CMIS and OMNI data, including confidential personal prisoner and employee data. (Finding 5)

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Agency Response:
Our audit report contains 5 findings and 5 corresponding recommendations. DOC's preliminary response indicated that it agrees with all 5 of the recommendations.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

A copy of the full report can be obtained by calling 517.334.8050 or by visiting our Web site at: http://audgen.michigan.gov

Michigan Office of the Auditor General
201 N. Washington Square
Lansing, Michigan 48913

Thomas H. McTavish, C.P.A.
Auditor General

Scott M. Strong, C.P.A., C.I.A.
Deputy Auditor General

STATE OF MICHIGAN
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL
201 N. WASHINGTON SQUARE
LANSING, MICHIGAN 48913
(517) 334-8050
FAX (517) 334-8079

THOMAS H. MCTAVISH, C.P.A.
AUDITOR GENERAL

October 18, 2005

Ms. Patricia L. Caruso, Director
Department of Corrections
Grandview Plaza Building
Lansing, Michigan
and
Ms. Teresa M. Takai, Director
Department of Information Technology
Landmark Building
Lansing, Michigan

Dear Ms. Caruso and Ms. Takai:

This is our report on the performance audit of the Accuracy of Prisoner Release Dates, Department of Corrections and Department of Information Technology.

This report contains our report summary; description of prisoner release process; audit objectives, scope, and methodology and agency responses; comments, findings, recommendations, and agency preliminary responses; and a glossary of acronyms and terms.

Our comments, findings, and recommendations are organized by audit objective. The agency preliminary responses were taken from the Department of Corrections' responses subsequent to our audit fieldwork. The *Michigan Compiled Laws* and administrative procedures require that the audited agency develop a formal response within 60 days after release of the audit report.

We appreciate the courtesy and cooperation extended to us during this audit.

Sincerely,

Thomas H. McTavish, C.P.A.
Auditor General

This Page Left Intentionally Blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACCURACY OF PRISONER RELEASE DATES
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND
DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

	Page
INTRODUCTION	
Report Summary	1
Report Letter	3
Description of Prisoner Release Process	6
Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses	8
COMMENTS, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES	
Accuracy of Prisoner Release Dates	11
1. Release Date Computations	11
2. Data Edits	15
3. Sentence and Release Date Adjustment Information	17
4. Audit Trails	19
Effectiveness of Access Controls	20
5. Security Program and Access Controls	20
GLOSSARY	
Glossary of Acronyms and Terms	24

Description of Prisoner Release Process

The Department of Corrections (DOC) had approximately 50,900 prisoners housed in prisons and camps as of December 2004. These prisoners will remain in the prisons and camps until they are released to parole or community residential programs or discharged. A prisoner's release date is based upon the committed offense, date of offense, and laws enacted at the time of the offense. During the intake of a prisoner, DOC enters prisoner and sentencing information* into the Offender* Management Network Information System (OMNI). The sentencing information is transferred electronically to the Corrections Management Information System (CMIS). CMIS performs the computation of the prisoner release date.

The primary function of both correctional facility and central records office staff is to ensure the accurate computation of a prisoner's release date. Facility records office staff are responsible for maintaining the prisoners' institutional files, inputting information into CMIS that affects the computation of release dates, and performing a release date computation audit prior to each prisoner's release from the facility. Central records office staff are responsible for maintaining the prisoners' central office files and auditing 5% of the facility records office release date computation audits. Central records office staff also provide guidance to facility records office staff regarding new procedures and laws related to the computation of release dates.

In January 2005, DOC created the Intake Processing Unit to centrally review and audit all new and amended sentencing information input into CMIS by facility records office staff. The Intake Processing Unit is also responsible for reviewing the initial release date computations.

The systems involved in prisoner release date computation include:

a. <u>CMIS</u>

CMIS is an information processing system that DOC uses to store and process prisoner information. CMIS contains data for all persons incarcerated in a Michigan prison or camp, on parole, or in a community placement facility. Information contained within CMIS is used across all administrative functions of

** See glossary at end of report for definition.*

DOC. Some of the CMIS modules include time computation, misconduct* reporting, crime victim notification, health care, and mental health.

b. OMNI

OMNI is an information processing system that DOC uses to maintain records pertaining to prisoners, probationers, and parolees. OMNI is primarily used for the intake of prisoners into the correctional system as well as management of parolees and probationers. Some of the OMNI modules include case administration, legal documents, offender intake, offender tracking, central office activities, and offender callout*.

The Department of Information Technology (DIT) provides information technology support services to DOC for CMIS and OMNI, including system development and maintenance, database administration, and user code maintenance.

** See glossary at end of report for definition.*

Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses

Audit Objectives

Our performance audit* of the Accuracy of Prisoner Release Dates, Department of Corrections (DOC) and Department of Information Technology (DIT), had the following objectives:

1. To assess the effectiveness* of DOC's efforts to ensure the accuracy of prisoner release dates.

2. To assess the effectiveness of Corrections Management Information System (CMIS) and Offender Management Network Information System (OMNI) access controls in preventing inappropriate access to information affecting release dates.

Audit Scope

Our audit scope was to examine the information processing and other records related to the accuracy of prisoner release dates. Our audit was conducted in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and, accordingly, included such tests of the records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

Audit Methodology

Our audit procedures, performed from August 2004 through March 2005, included examination of records related to the accuracy of prisoner release dates primarily for the period October 1, 2003 through March 31, 2005. To accomplish our audit objectives, our audit methodology included the following phases:

1. Preliminary Review and Evaluation Phase

   We conducted a preliminary review of DOC's efforts to ensure the accuracy of prisoner release dates. We obtained an understanding of the process used by DOC to compute prisoner release dates. We used the results of our review to determine the extent of our detailed analysis and testing.

** See glossary at end of report for definition.*

2. Detailed Analysis and Testing Phase

We performed an assessment of the effectiveness of DOC's efforts to ensure the accuracy of prisoner release dates and an assessment of the effectiveness of the access controls over CMIS and OMNI in preventing inappropriate access to information affecting release dates:

a. Accuracy of Prisoner Release Dates:

(1) We evaluated policies, procedures, and processes related to prisoner release date computations.

(2) We examined and tested prisoner release date computations.

(3) We analyzed selected data fields related to computation of release dates on CMIS and OMNI to determine its accuracy and completeness.

(4) We assessed controls over the transfer of data between CMIS and OMNI.

b. Effectiveness of Access Controls:

We examined and performed testing of the management of access controls over CMIS and OMNI.

3. Evaluation and Reporting Phase

We evaluated and reported on the results of the detailed analysis and testing phase.

Agency Responses

Our audit report contains 5 findings and 5 corresponding recommendations. DOC's preliminary response indicated that it agrees with all 5 of the recommendations.

The agency preliminary response that follows each recommendation in our report was taken from the agencies' written comments and oral discussion subsequent to our audit fieldwork. Section 18.1462 of the *Michigan Compiled Laws* and Department of Management and Budget Administrative Guide procedure 1280.02 require DOC and DIT to develop a formal response to our audit findings and recommendations within 60 days after release of the audit report.

COMMENTS, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES

ACCURACY OF PRISONER RELEASE DATES

COMMENT

Background: A release date is the date a prisoner is released to parole or discharged from a Department of Corrections (DOC) prison or camp. Release dates are computed in the Corrections Management Information System (CMIS) and stored within CMIS and the Offender Management Network Information System (OMNI). Prisoner release dates are affected by release date adjustments*, including misconducts, forfeitures*, restorations*, and dead time*. The complexity of the computation of a prisoner release date is magnified in cases in which the prisoner is convicted of more than one crime and the crimes are subject to different release date computation types, such as disciplinary credits*, disciplinary time* (commonly known as "truth in sentencing"), drug law credits*, and good time credits*, and factors such as concurrent sentences*, consecutive sentences*, gun law sentences*, habitual offender*, and proposition B*. The rules for computing release dates are different for each computation type. Furthermore, there are a number of outside influences that affect sentences, including clarity of sentencing information from the courts and law changes from the Legislature that impact the computation of release dates.

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness of DOC's efforts to ensure the accuracy of prisoner release dates.

Conclusion: DOC was moderately effective in its efforts to ensure the accuracy of prisoner release dates. Our assessment disclosed one material condition*. DOC did not ensure that CMIS was programmed to correctly and completely compute prisoner release dates for all types of sentences (Finding 1). Our assessment also disclosed reportable conditions* related to data edits, sentence and release date adjustment information, and audit trails (Findings 2 through 4).

FINDING

1. Release Date Computations

   DOC did not ensure that CMIS was programmed to correctly and completely compute prisoner release dates for all types of sentences. As a result, CMIS inaccurately computed some prisoner release dates resulting in the early release of these prisoners.

** See glossary at end of report for definition.*

Our audit disclosed:

a. CMIS did not compute release dates correctly for certain consecutive sentences. We conducted an analytical review of prisoners convicted under disciplinary time laws and paroled between October 2003 and August 2004 to identify cases with potential computation errors. We identified 7 cases with errors and determined that DOC released these 7 prisoners from 39 to 147 days early for a combined total of 663 days early. Our review also identified 1 prisoner convicted under disciplinary credit laws who was released an estimated 161 days early. These prisoners were convicted of crimes such as escape; embezzlement; manufacture, delivery, or possession of a narcotic; larceny; and bad check writing.

   After bringing our test results to management's attention, DOC immediately recomputed the release dates and informed the Parole Board of the 8 prisoners who were released early. The Parole Board either extended the parole or reincarcerated the prisoners.

   Also after bringing our test results to management's attention, DOC informed us that it identified 15 other prisoners with release date computation errors. The release date errors ranged from a total of 380 days late to 1,014 days early. Of these 15 prisoners, 8 prisoners are currently in prison and 7 are currently released on parole.

b. CMIS was not programmed to compute release dates for certain prisoners with sentences involving escape, drug offenses, consecutive sentences, and jail time credits*. Correctional facility and central records office staff must manually compute release dates for these sentences. In addition, DOC did not maintain a listing of those sentences that require manual calculation and monitor them to ensure that release dates were accurately and consistently computed. Therefore, DOC cannot be assured that these release dates are accurate.

c. CMIS-calculated release dates did not always agree with the release dates calculated using methods identified in the DOC time computation manual. DOC developed a time computation manual that documents some release

** See glossary at end of report for definition.*

date computation rules and provides two nonautomated methods for computing release dates for simple cases. DOC has the choice of using either nonautomated time computation methods to audit the accuracy of the CMIS-computed release dates. However, the two methods result in different release dates.

We selected 3 computation types then randomly selected and recomputed release dates for 4 of 4,428 prisoners convicted under disciplinary credit laws who were paroled between October 2003 and August 2004. We computed release dates using the two methods in DOC's time computation manual and informal computation rules provided by DOC. We compared our results to the release dates computed by CMIS. For each of the 4 cases, the two methods resulted in different release dates, neither of which matched the release dates computed by CMIS. The differences between the release dates computed using the time computation manual and the release dates computed by CMIS ranged from 1 to 11 days. Although we tested release dates of only 4 prisoners, we believe that a significant number of other prisoners would have release date differences because the two nonautomated methods do not agree and the two methods do not match how CMIS is computing release dates. None of the 4 prisoners were released before their earliest release date*. The 4 prisoners were convicted of crimes such as murder (second degree), felony firearm, breaking and entering, home invasion, possession of a narcotic, and unlawful driving away.

d. DOC did not completely define and document its prisoner release date computation rules. Michigan laws provide the foundation for the release date computation; however, the laws do not provide DOC with complete instruction on how to compute release dates. Without defined and documented release date computation rules, DOC cannot ensure that CMIS is programmed to accurately calculate release dates and DOC could not conclude whether the manual computations or the CMIS computations were correct. For example, DOC had not fully documented rules to identify how to:

(1) Manually compute complex release dates, such as for a prisoner sentenced for more than one crime.

** See glossary at end of report for definition.*

(2) Determine the start date of a prisoner's second, third, or subsequent sentence.

(3) Compute release dates for prisoners earning credits on only a portion of the sentence term.

DOC implemented CMIS in the early 1980's to maintain prisoner information and compute prisoner release dates. In 1995, DOC developed a departmentwide automation plan that included, among other things, replacing CMIS. However, since 1995, DOC's automation projects did not include a new system or a full upgrade to the existing system, CMIS, for release date computations. DOC has been aware of CMIS release date computation problems for several years. While the other automation projects were important, release date computations are significant to DOC's mission. DOC requested $1.5 million for fiscal year 2004-05 and fiscal year 2005-06 from the Office of the State Budget to fund the replacement of CMIS. However, the requests did not include justification for the funding, such as an explanation of the effects of not replacing CMIS, sufficient to convince the Office of the State Budget and the Legislature of the need for a new or upgraded system.

To improve CMIS programming, DOC should establish a project team to identify, evaluate, interpret, and document the laws and informal rules related to release date computations. In addition, DOC management should approve and, when necessary, obtain legal counsel opinions of the defined and documented prisoner release date computation rules. Further, DOC should develop written guidance for and provide training to all staff responsible for the computation of release dates.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that DOC ensure that CMIS is programmed to correctly and completely compute prisoner release dates for all types of sentences.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

DOC agrees and informed us that it is taking steps to comply using alternative corrective action. DOC also informed us that in 1998, the Legislature passed "truth in sentencing," which required convicted felons to serve 100% of their minimum

sentence, and consequently, DOC's Data Processing Division performed a major rewrite of CMIS release date computations. DOC further informed us that it continued to evaluate release date calculation problems as they were identified and made programming changes and upgrades as deemed necessary. DOC stated that in 2002, when OMNI was first populated with parole and probation offenders, it made a decision to defer major program revisions to CMIS as it did not feel that it would be an effective use of taxpayer dollars to perform major program development on outdated mainframe technology. DOC also stated that it decided to perform major program development using the new client server technology that was used to develop OMNI. DOC indicated that in 2003, as part of the fiscal year 2004-05 budget request, it requested $1.5 million to convert CMIS to OMNI. DOC also indicated that due to budget negotiations between the executive branch and the Legislature, it received $328,700 less than requested. DOC informed us that the approved funding included funds to convert CMIS release date computations and other programs to OMNI using in-house development staff. DOC also informed us that in May 2005, it formed a project team to define, evaluate, interpret, and document the laws and informal rules related to release date computations. DOC stated that the project team would ensure that the new system is designed and implemented to correctly compute prisoner release dates for all sentence types using client server technology. DOC also stated that the project team consists of DOC legal counsel, records office managers and staff, business owners for Field Operations and Correctional Facilities, and DIT staff. DOC further stated that written guidance and training would be developed and provided to staff responsible for computing release dates on an ongoing basis as this effort continues.

FINDING

2. Data Edits

DOC did not ensure that CMIS had sufficient data edits. Inaccurate data in CMIS could adversely affect prisoner release dates and Parole Board decisions.

Data edits could detect and identify inaccurate or missing information. Edits also help ensure complete data processing and the integrity of the CMIS database. We reviewed the data on CMIS and found:

a. CMIS did not reject invalid offense date and sentence date combinations. We found 813 sentences representing 718 offenders in which the offense date in CMIS was later than the sentence date. Of the 813 sentences, 182 belonged to active offenders still in prison or camp, on parole, or in community residential programs.

   After we brought the test results to management's attention, DOC informed its facility records offices of these sentences and provided instructions to make corrections. DOC informed us that it would review the 182 cases of active offenders. DOC also informed us that some of the corrections resulted in changes to prisoner release dates.

b. CMIS did not reject invalid offense date and corrected date combinations. We found 29,440 sentences representing 23,715 offenders in which the offense date on CMIS was later than the corrected date. The corrected date, which is the sentence date minus any jail time credits, should be later than or the same as the offense date. The following table summarizes the number of sentences for which the offense date was later than the corrected date for active sentences:

Difference in Number of Days Between the Offense Date and the Corrected Date	Number of Sentences
1 to 3 days	8,992
4 to 90 days	2,251
91 to 300 days	334
301 to 500 days	158
501 to 6,064 days	57
Total	11,792

   After we brought the test results to management's attention, DOC informed its facility records offices of these sentences and provided instructions to make corrections. However, DOC informed us that differences of three days or less

are acceptable and would not be reviewed. DOC also informed us that the majority of these errors occurred because of inaccurate judgment of sentence* (JOS) documentation as well as inconsistent counting of jail time credits between DOC and the courts. DOC should continue to work with the courts to resolve instances in which the CMIS offense date is later than the CMIS corrected date.

c. CMIS did not edit all data fields. We found invalid data in the following fields: controlling sentence code, sentence status, proposition B flag, and reason for good time change.

d. DOC, in conjunction with DIT, did not completely document the CMIS data dictionary. The CMIS data dictionary provides users with information about CMIS data, including acceptable values for each data field. Our review disclosed values that were not defined in the CMIS data dictionary for fields such as review flag, compiled law code, sentence status, and proposition B flag. DOC and DIT informed us that the values were valid. However, they were unable to provide an explanation of what the values represented for some of the data fields.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that DOC ensure that CMIS has sufficient data edits.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

DOC agrees and informed us that it is taking steps to comply using alternative corrective action. DOC also informed us that the time computation project team will ensure that the new time computation system contains sufficient data edits.

FINDING

3. Sentence and Release Date Adjustment Information

DOC did not always accurately input release date adjustments into CMIS and did not verify the completeness and accuracy of sentencing information received from the courts and make necessary corrections as approved by the courts.

** See glossary at end of report for definition.*

Consequently, CMIS contained inaccurate and incomplete information, which could result in DOC releasing prisoners before or after the correct release date.

Facility records office staff input sentencing information into CMIS from the JOS document prepared by the courts at the time of sentencing. Records office staff also input into CMIS adjustments that affect release dates, such as misconducts, forfeitures, restorations, and dead time. Records office staff review the accuracy and completeness of release date adjustments during audits of prisoner release dates. Our review disclosed:

a. DOC did not always contact the courts for clarification of incomplete or incorrect sentencing information on the JOS. We sampled 30 paroled prisoners of all computation types and compared case file information to data recorded on CMIS. We noted 12 cases in which clarification was needed; however, DOC did not contact the courts for 6 of the 12 cases. DOC should obtain clarification from the courts when sentencing information, such as type of crime, term of sentence, and indication of consecutive or concurrent sentencing, is unclear.

   During December 2004, DOC established new staff positions responsible for obtaining clarification of sentencing information for new sentences. Although the staff are not responsible for the clarification of sentences issued prior to January 2005, records office staff review all prisoners' cases before their release. DOC informed us that the new staff positions are also responsible for contacting the courts for all JOS clarifications.

b. DOC did not always accurately input release date adjustments into CMIS. We reviewed files of 30 paroled prisoners of all computation types. DOC did not input forfeitures for 2 of the 30 prisoners. As a result, DOC did not increase the minimum and maximum release dates for these 2 prisoners a total of 113 and 238 days, respectively.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that DOC always accurately input release date adjustments into CMIS and verify the completeness and accuracy of sentencing information received from the courts and make necessary corrections as approved by the courts.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

DOC agrees and informed us that it complied with the creation of the Records Specialist Intake Processing Audit Unit in December 2004. DOC also informed us that the Unit is responsible for reviewing all sentencing documentation upon receipt from the courts to ensure completeness and accuracy and to ensure that the courts have complied with statutory requirements. DOC further informed us that the Unit would conduct follow-up with the courts as necessary. DOC stated that the Unit audits the input of sentencing information into the system by facility staff and takes appropriate steps when errors are discovered. DOC also stated that facility record office supervisors are responsible for verifying the accuracy of a prisoner's release date as part of the prisoner release screening process. DOC further stated that an instructional memorandum was issued, which defined all steps that must be taken when completing a prisoner release screening time computation audit.

FINDING

4. Audit Trails

DOC did not develop complete CMIS audit trails of data used in the recomputation of prisoner release dates and the individual responsible for each recomputation. Without a complete audit trail, DOC cannot identify what information was added or changed and cannot identify who made changes to release dates.

Audit trails should electronically capture a history of changes to prisoner release dates and identify the individual that made the change, the date and time of the change, and a "before-and-after" image of release dates and release date adjustment information.

Facility records office staff are required to recompute prisoner release dates when a prisoner is within 30 days of parole or discharge, when a prisoner is transferred to a DOC community residential program, or when an amended JOS is received. During a release date recomputation, records office staff delete from CMIS all release date adjustments, such as misconducts, forfeitures, restorations, and dead time. Then the records office staff re-enter these adjustments using the time review and disposition forms in the prisoner's hard-copy file. By deleting all release date adjustments from CMIS, DOC assumes that the hard-copy file is complete and that all adjustment documents will be re-entered. This process creates the risk

that accidentally or intentionally lost or misplaced documents will not be re-entered and release dates will be inaccurate.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that DOC develop complete CMIS audit trails of data used in the recomputation of prisoner release dates and the individual responsible for each recomputation.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

DOC agrees and informed us that it is taking steps to comply using alternative corrective action. DOC also informed us that the time computation project team would ensure that the new time computation system contains an audit trail of all time computation transactions entered and provide identification of the individual responsible for making the entry.

EFFECTIVENESS OF ACCESS CONTROLS

COMMENT

Background: Access controls protect data from unauthorized modification, loss, or disclosure by restricting or detecting inappropriate access attempts. Effective controls include granting access to data and program files only to the extent necessary for individuals to perform their assigned duties.

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness of CMIS and OMNI access controls in preventing inappropriate access to information affecting release dates.

Conclusion: CMIS and OMNI access controls were not effective in preventing inappropriate access to information affecting release dates. Our assessment disclosed one material condition related to security program and access controls (Finding 5).

FINDING

5. Security Program and Access Controls

DOC had not established a comprehensive information systems security program and complete access controls over CMIS and OMNI. As a result, DOC cannot

ensure the security of CMIS and OMNI data, including confidential personal prisoner and employee data.

A comprehensive security program begins with the appointment of an executive level information security officer. The security program is developed based on the results of comprehensive and periodic risk assessments of data security needs. A comprehensive security program would also define and implement effective policies and procedures for granting access to CMIS and OMNI. Our review disclosed:

a. DOC had not established a security officer position. A security officer position is given the responsibility and authority to implement information security policies, standards, and operating procedures for safeguarding all information systems resources.

b. DOC, in conjunction with DIT, did not restrict and monitor DIT access to production data. We noted that 9 DIT information technology development staff acted as CMIS security administrators and assigned access rights to CMIS and OMNI production systems. As a result, DIT development staff could gain unauthorized access to confidential information. DOC, in conjunction with DIT, should assign security functions to individuals independent of information technology development.

c. DOC did not define and document to whom all OMNI profiles* should be assigned or restricted. Furthermore, DOC did not identify risks of access to sensitive OMNI information. The OMNI reference manual states that an employee can only have one profile in the system. However, we noted 249 employees with more than one profile. Allowing employees to have multiple profiles could result in inappropriate access to sensitive employee and prisoner information.

d. DOC did not maintain complete and accurate lists of individuals who can appropriately authorize access to CMIS and OMNI. As a result, DOC cannot ensure that all CMIS and OMNI user access was properly authorized.

** See glossary at end of report for definition.*

e. DOC did not require authorizations for all electronic access requests and did not remove access of users who no longer required access within a reasonable time period.

f. DOC did not require either DOC or DIT staff to store access request forms containing confidential employee social security numbers in a secure location.

g. DOC did not require DIT to encrypt CMIS password files. As a result, passwords were vulnerable to theft, which could result in unauthorized access to data.

Without a comprehensive security program and complete access controls, DOC management cannot ensure that its controls are operating as intended and that sensitive information will remain confidential.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend DOC establish a comprehensive information systems security program and complete access controls over CMIS and OMNI.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

DOC agrees and informed us that it will comply by establishing a comprehensive security program and access controls over CMIS and OMNI. DOC informed us that in June 2005 an automated data systems section was formed. The section will establish an information security officer function, perform risk assessments of data security needs, and define and implement policies and procedures for granting access to CMIS and OMNI. DOC also informed us that the automated data systems section would also ensure that DIT access to production data is restricted and monitored; define and document to whom all OMNI profiles should be assigned and restricted; enhance the access authorization and removal of users' processes; ensure the security of employees' social security numbers if used for access requests; and request DIT to encrypt CMIS password files.

GLOSSARY

Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

CMIS	Corrections Management Information System.
concurrent sentence	A sentence served along with or at the same time as any other sentence.
consecutive sentence	A sentence served subsequent to any other sentence.
dead time	A period of time not served due to a prisoner being on escape status, parole abscond status, or bond release status.
disciplinary credit	A type of release date computation in which prisoners may earn regular credit and special credit reductions per month from their sentence term.
disciplinary time	A type of release date computation in which prisoners do not receive credit reductions on their sentence term; commonly known as "truth in sentencing."
DIT	Department of Information Technology.
DOC	Department of Corrections.
drug law credit	A type of release date computation in which prisoners may earn credit reductions from their sentence term for certain drug offenses.
earliest release date	The earliest date a prisoner is eligible for release based upon all possible earned credit reductions.
effectiveness	Program success in achieving mission and goals.
forfeiture	The loss of previously earned credits resulting from a prisoner being found guilty of a major misconduct.

good time credit	A type of release date computation in which prisoners may earn, on an inclining scale, regular and special credits each month of their sentence.
gun law sentence	A type of release date computation in which a determinate sentence is imposed for violation of possession of a firearm in the commission of a felony.
habitual offender	A type of release date computation that allows for lengthening the term of a sentence imposed for repeat offenders.
jail time credit	Time granted to a prisoner by the sentencing judge for time served in custody prior to sentencing.
judgment of sentence (JOS)	The minimum and maximum term imposed by the judge.
material condition	A reportable condition that could impair the ability of management to operate a program in an effective and efficient manner and/or could adversely affect the judgment of an interested person concerning the effectiveness and efficiency of the program.
misconduct	A violation by a prisoner of DOC prisoner rules.
offender	A prisoner, parolee, or probationer.
offender callout	A listing of offender activities for a given day.
OMNI	Offender Management Network Information System.
OMNI profile	An OMNI application privilege assigned to a user that allows the user to view, enter, edit, or delete records in OMNI.

performance audit	An economy and efficiency audit or a program audit that is designed to provide an independent assessment of the performance of a governmental entity, program, activity, or function to improve public accountability and to facilitate decision making by parties responsible for overseeing or initiating corrective action.
proposition B	A statutory amendment that prevents certain prisoners from earning good time credits.
release date adjustments	Events which occur during a prisoner's incarceration that impact release dates, such as misconducts, forfeitures, restorations, and dead time.
reportable condition	A matter that, in the auditor's judgment, represents either an opportunity for improvement or a significant deficiency in management's ability to operate a program in an effective and efficient manner.
restoration	A reinstatement of disciplinary credits or good time credits that were previously forfeited.
sentencing information	Information pertaining to a prisoner's sentence, such as type of offense, sentence imposed by the court, and jail time credit.

This Page Left Intentionally Blank

This Page Left Intentionally Blank

This Page Left Intentionally Blank

STATE OF MICHIGAN

OFFICE of the AUDITOR GENERAL