



# MICHIGAN

OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL



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

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 can be accessed at:

*<http://audgen.michigan.gov>*



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

March 22, 2012

Mr. Daniel H. Heyns, Director  
Department of Corrections  
Grandview Plaza Building  
Lansing, Michigan  
and  
John E. Nixon, C.P.A., Director  
Department of Technology, Management, and Budget  
George W. Romney Building  
Lansing, Michigan

Dear Mr. Heyns and Mr. Nixon:

This is our report on our follow-up of the 2 material conditions (Findings 1 and 5) and 2 corresponding recommendations reported in the performance audit of the Accuracy of Prisoner Release Dates, Department of Corrections (DOC) and Department of Information Technology (DIT). That audit report was issued and distributed in October 2005. Additional copies are available on request or at <<http://www.audgen.michigan.gov>>. In March 2010, subsequent to our performance audit, Executive Order No. 2009-55 renamed the Department of Management and Budget as the Department of Technology, Management, and Budget (DTMB). It also transferred all of the authority, powers, duties, functions, responsibilities, records, personnel, property, equipment, and appropriations of DIT to DTMB and abolished DIT.

Our follow-up disclosed that DOC and DTMB had partially complied with both recommendations. Reportable conditions exist relating to release date computations (Finding 1) and security program and access controls (Finding 5).

If you have any questions, please call me or Scott M. Strong, C.P.A., C.I.A., Deputy Auditor General.

Sincerely,

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



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### ACCURACY OF PRISONER RELEASE DATES DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND DEPARTMENT OF TECHNOLOGY, MANAGEMENT, AND BUDGET FOLLOW-UP REPORT

	<u>Page</u>
Report Letter	1
Introduction	4
Purpose of Follow-Up	4
Background	4
Scope	6
Follow-Up Results	
Accuracy of Prisoner Release Dates	7
1. Release Date Computations	7
Effectiveness of Access Controls	9
5. Security Program and Access Controls	9
Glossary of Acronyms and Terms	12

**ACCURACY OF PRISONER RELEASE DATES  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND  
DEPARTMENT OF TECHNOLOGY, MANAGEMENT,  
AND BUDGET  
FOLLOW-UP REPORT**

**INTRODUCTION**

This report contains the results of our follow-up of the material conditions\* and corresponding recommendations and the agencies' preliminary responses as reported in our performance audit of the Accuracy of Prisoner Release Dates, Department of Corrections (DOC) and Department of Information Technology (DIT), 47-591-04, which was issued and distributed in October 2005. That audit report included 2 material conditions (Findings 1 and 5) and 3 other reportable conditions\*.

**PURPOSE OF FOLLOW-UP**

The purpose of this follow-up was to determine whether DOC and the Department of Technology, Management, and Budget (DTMB) have taken appropriate corrective measures in response to the 2 material conditions and 2 corresponding recommendations.

**BACKGROUND**

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's release date.

\* See glossary at end of report for definition.

In 2008, DOC established the Central Time Computation Unit (CTCU) to perform all sentencing time computations for prisoners to ensure the accurate computation of prisoner release dates. CTCU has three sections that involve time computation. The Sentence Processing Unit (SPU) is responsible for entering a prisoner's sentence into CMIS. The Quality Certification Unit (QCU) is responsible for auditing and certifying prisoner files. The Administration and Specialists Unit is responsible for addressing any issues or questions that arise from SPU or QCU.

The systems involved in prisoner release date computations are:

1. CMIS

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, on parole, or in a community placement facility in Michigan. Information contained within CMIS is used across all administrative functions of DOC. Some of the CMIS modules include time computation, misconduct reporting, crime victim notification, health care, and mental health.

2. OMNI

OMNI is an information processing system that DOC uses to maintain records pertaining to prisoners, parolees, and probationers. OMNI is primarily used for the intake of prisoners into the correctional system as well as the 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.

In March 2010, Executive Order No. 2009-55 renamed the Department of Management and Budget (DMB) as the Department of Technology, Management, and Budget (DTMB). It also transferred all of the authority, powers, duties, functions, responsibilities, records, personnel, property, equipment, and appropriations of DIT to DTMB and abolished DIT.

DTMB provides information technology support services to DOC for CMIS and OMNI, including system development and maintenance and database administration.

## **SCOPE**

Our fieldwork was performed between August and October 2011. We interviewed employees from DOC and DTMB to determine the status of compliance with our audit recommendations. We reviewed policies, procedures, and processes related to the computation of prisoner release dates. We also reviewed the management of access controls over CMIS and OMNI.

## **FOLLOW-UP RESULTS**

### **ACCURACY OF PRISONER RELEASE DATES**

#### **RECOMMENDATION AND RESPONSE AS REPORTED IN OCTOBER 2005:**

##### **1. Release Date Computations**

#### **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.

### **FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION**

We concluded that DOC had partially complied with the recommendation and that a reportable condition exists. Our follow-up disclosed:

- a. DOC had not complied with the recommendation as it relates to part a. of the finding. DOC informed us that, in conjunction with DTMB, it programmed CMIS to correctly compute release dates for certain consecutive sentences. However, DOC could not provide us with documentation to corroborate that it implemented the changes.
- b. DOC had partially complied with the recommendation as it relates to part b. of the finding. CMIS is still not programmed to compute release dates for certain prisoners with sentences involving escape, drug offenses, consecutive sentences, and jail time credits. CTCU staff manually calculate the release dates for prisoners with these sentences. However, DOC developed a listing of those sentences that require manual calculation. In addition, DOC established step-by-step instructions identifying how to manually compute release dates for sentences involving escape, drug offenses, consecutive sentences, and jail time credits.
- c. DOC had complied with the recommendation as it relates to part c. of the finding. DOC rewrote the time computation manual and established a single nonautomated time computation method to audit the accuracy of the CMIS-computed release dates. In addition, the records office manual specifies that the CMIS-calculated release date is deemed accurate as long as the nonautomated time computation method is within 14 days of the CMIS-calculated release date. DOC informed us that it allows a variance because the nonautomated time computation method calculates an approximate release date because of the complexities of the time computation calculation.

- d. DOC had complied with the recommendation as it relates to part d. of the finding. DOC defined and documented its prisoner release date computation rules in the records office manual and in informal guidance with step-by-step instructions identifying how to:
- (1) Manually compute complex release dates, such as for a prisoner sentenced for more than one crime.
  - (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.

## **EFFECTIVENESS OF ACCESS CONTROLS**

### **RECOMMENDATION AND RESPONSE AS REPORTED IN OCTOBER 2005:**

#### 5. Security Program and Access Controls

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

We recommend that 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.

## **FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION**

We concluded that DOC had partially complied with the recommendation and that a reportable condition exists. Our follow-up disclosed:

- a. DOC had complied with the recommendation as it relates to part a. of the finding. DOC appointed a security officer in 2009 with the responsibility and authority to implement information security policies, standards, and operating procedures for safeguarding all DOC information resources.
- b. DOC had partially complied with the recommendation as it relates to part b. of the finding. In 2009, DOC established a security officer and transferred the responsibility for security administration of CMIS and OMNI from DTMB to DOC. In addition, DOC drafted informal procedures for reviewing OMNI users who have administrator access to production data to ensure that the access is needed for their job responsibilities. DOC informed us that it conducts reviews of OMNI users periodically. However, DOC only had documentation that it reviewed certain administrators' access in June 2011. DOC did not have documentation of any other reviews.
- c. DOC had partially complied with the recommendation as it relates to part c. of the finding. DOC did not define and document to whom all OMNI profiles should be assigned. We noted that DOC had defined and documented to whom 83 (72%) of 115 OMNI profiles should be assigned but had not defined and documented the other 32 profiles. In addition, DOC did not identify incompatible profiles or assess the risk of users having more than one profile. We identified 13 users who were inappropriately assigned more than one OMNI profile.
- d. DOC had not complied with the recommendation as it relates to part d. of the finding. DOC did not maintain complete and accurate lists of individuals who can authorize access to CMIS and OMNI. We randomly selected 20 of the 214 individuals who can authorize access to CMIS and OMNI and determined that 4 (20%) of the 20 individuals no longer worked for DOC.

- e. DOC had partially complied with the recommendation as it relates to part e. of the finding. DOC requires that all electronic access requests come from individuals listed on the authorized requester list. However, DOC had not established policies or procedures for performing reviews of user access or documented whether user access reviews were being performed.
- f. DOC had complied with the recommendation as it relates to part f. of the finding. We verified that DOC maintains and stores access request forms in a secure location.
- g. DOC had not complied with the recommendation as it relates to part g. of the finding. DOC, in conjunction with DTMB, did not encrypt the CMIS password files. DTMB informed us that the departments had purchased and installed encryption software; however, the software was not completely functional during our follow-up. DTMB informed us that the encryption software will be fully implemented as revisions are made to the client server system.

## Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

CMIS	Corrections Management Information System.
CTCU	Central Time Computation Unit.
DIT	Department of Information Technology.
DOC	Department of Corrections.
DTMB	Department of Technology, Management, and Budget.
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.
OMNI	Offender Management Network Information System.
QCU	Quality Certification Unit.
reportable condition	A matter that, in the auditor's judgment, is less severe than a material condition and falls within any of the following categories: an opportunity for improvement within the context of the audit objectives; a deficiency in internal control that is significant within the context of the objectives of the audit; all instances of fraud; illegal acts unless they are inconsequential within the context of the audit objectives; significant violations of provisions of contracts or grant agreements; and significant abuse that has occurred or is likely to have occurred.

sentencing information      Information pertaining to a prisoner's sentence, such as type of offense, sentence imposed by the court, and jail time credit.

SPU      Sentence Processing Unit.









