

PERFORMANCE AUDIT  
OF  
CORRECTIONS OFFICERS'  
SUPPLEMENTAL PAY AND RETIREMENT  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

April 1998

## EXECUTIVE DIGEST

# CORRECTIONS OFFICERS' SUPPLEMENTAL PAY AND RETIREMENT

---

**INTRODUCTION** This report, issued in April 1998, contains the results of our performance audit\* of Corrections Officers' Supplemental Pay and Retirement, Department of Corrections.

---

**AUDIT PURPOSE** This performance audit was conducted as part of the constitutional responsibility of the Office of the Auditor General. Performance audits are conducted on a priority basis related to the potential for improving effectiveness\* and efficiency\* .

---

**BACKGROUND** The Department of Corrections operates 38 prisons that house over 40,000 prisoners.

Each prison is required to maintain specific staffing levels of corrections officers for duty 24 hours each day. In order to maintain these staffing levels, it is generally necessary to incur a certain amount of overtime. In addition, overtime can occur because of essential special assignments\* (ESAs). The ESAs include supervising construction, guarding prisoners who are in hospitals, and monitoring emergencies. Provisions in the bargaining agreement limit

\* See glossary on page 25 for definition.

the Department's ability to use officers from other prisons to provide coverage for the ESAs.

In 1976, the State Employee's Retirement Act was amended to provide additional retirement benefits for State employees responsible for guarding and overseeing prisoners. The State deemed employees in these covered positions\* to be exposed to additional personal risks. These positions include corrections officers and those Department employees who can demonstrate that they meet certain criteria relating to risks associated with housing prisoners.

Also, the State compensation plan includes special pay for corrections officers and those Department employees who can demonstrate that they meet certain other criteria relating to their contact with prisoners.

The prisons had over 13,000 employees as of May 3, 1997, of which over 7,900 were corrections officers. During fiscal year 1995-96, the Department expended over \$38 million on overtime and \$2.6 million on special pay.

---

**AUDIT OBJECTIVES,  
CONCLUSIONS, AND  
NOTEWORTHY  
ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

**Audit Objective:** To assess the effectiveness of the Department's efforts to monitor and control the use of overtime.

**Conclusion:** We concluded that the Department's efforts to monitor and control overtime were generally ineffective. We identified the following material condition\* :

- The Department did not have effective procedures to ensure that overtime data was properly reported by

\* See glossary on page 25 for definition.

prisons. Also, the Department did not have procedures to monitor, compare, and analyze the costs involved with overtime usage at all prisons (Finding 1).

The Department concurs with the finding and has informed us that it has taken steps to comply with the corresponding recommendations by establishing and filling a central office overtime coordinator position. However, the Department disagrees with the audit conclusion that efforts to monitor and control overtime were generally ineffective.

**Noteworthy Accomplishments:** The Department has implemented practices that have resulted in a \$2.5 million decrease in overtime at the prisons from fiscal year 1994-95 to fiscal year 1995-96.

**Audit Objective:** To assess the effectiveness of the Department's controls to ensure that employees are included in the proper retirement classification, as required by law.

**Conclusion:** We concluded that the Department's efforts to ensure that only eligible employees are included in the proper retirement classification were generally ineffective. We identified the following material condition:

- The Department was not effective in monitoring and controlling the use of covered positions (Finding 2).

The Department responded that it will monitor the retirement codes of employees who become ineligible for covered position status because of their age. Also, the Department informed us that it has reminded prison personnel offices to obtain central office

approval for all new appointments to covered service for any classifications which are not specifically mentioned in the statute as eligible.

**Audit Objective:** To assess the effectiveness of the Department's controls to ensure that only eligible employees receive supplemental pay.

**Conclusion:** We concluded that the Department's efforts to ensure that only eligible employees receive supplemental pay were generally effective. However, we noted reportable conditions\* related to the use of supplemental pay and bargaining agreement issues (Findings 3 and 4).

---

**AUDIT SCOPE AND  
METHODOLOGY**

Our audit scope was to examine the procedures and records related to the Department of Corrections' supplemental pay and retirement. 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.

Our methodology included examinations of the pay and retirement records and activities for individuals employed by the Department during the period October 1, 1994 through July 31, 1997.

To accomplish our objectives, we obtained extracts of various payroll data from the Personnel-Payroll Information System for Michigan and examined the information to determine the variations in the amount of overtime among

prisons, job classes\* , shifts, and other related areas. We also obtained and examined data maintained by the Department to document the reasons for the overtime. In addition, we assessed the reasonableness, in relation to the statutory requirements, of those individuals who were included in covered positions for retirement purposes. Also, we evaluated the propriety of the payments to those individuals who received supplemental pay.

We interviewed Department personnel at the central office and at the following six prisons: Brooks Correctional Facility, Carson City Correctional Facility, Egeler Correctional Facility, Mound Correctional Facility, Oaks Correctional Facility, and Western Wayne Correctional Facility. We reviewed how the prisons implemented the Department's overtime policies and tracked overtime usage. We also reviewed policies related to the designation of covered positions and supplemental pay.

---

**AGENCY RESPONSES**

Our audit report includes 4 findings and 5 corresponding recommendations. The Department agreed with all of the findings and informed us that it will take action to implement the applicable recommendations.

\* See glossary on page 25 for definition.

This page intentionally left blank

Mr. Kenneth L. McGinnis, Director  
Department of Corrections  
Grandview Plaza  
Lansing, Michigan

Dear Mr. McGinnis:

This is our report on the performance audit of the Corrections Officers' Supplemental Pay and Retirement, Department of Corrections.

This report contains our executive digest; description of agency; 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 agency's 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.

AUDITOR GENERAL

This page intentionally left blank

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### **CORRECTIONS OFFICERS' SUPPLEMENTAL PAY AND RETIREMENT**

#### INTRODUCTION

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Digest	1
Report Letter	7
Description of Agency	10
Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses	11

#### COMMENTS, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES

Efforts to Monitor and Control Overtime	13
1. Overtime Analysis	13
Controls Over Retirement Classification	16
2. Use of Covered Positions	16
Controls Over Supplemental Pay	20
3. Use of Supplemental Pay	20
4. Bargaining Agreement Issues	22

#### GLOSSARY

Glossary of Acronyms and Terms	25
--------------------------------	----

## Description of Agency

The Department of Corrections operates 38 prisons that house over 40,000 prisoners. The prisons had over 13,000 employees as of May 3, 1997, of which over 7,900 employees were corrections officers.

Each prison is required to maintain specific staffing levels of corrections officers for duty 24 hours each day. In order to maintain these staffing levels, it is generally necessary to incur a certain amount of overtime. Overtime can result from training, leave, vacancies, and essential special assignments (ESAs). The ESAs include supervising construction, guarding prisoners who are in hospitals, and monitoring emergencies. The number of ESAs change each day based on the particular needs for that prison. Provisions in the bargaining agreement limit the Department's ability to use officers from other prisons to provide coverage for the ESAs.

In 1976, the State Employee's Retirement Act was amended to provide additional retirement benefits for State employees responsible for guarding and overseeing prisoners. The State deemed employees in these covered positions to be exposed to additional personal risks. These positions include correctional officers and those Department employees who can demonstrate that they meet certain criteria relating to risks associated with housing prisoners.

Also, the State compensation plan includes special pay for corrections officers and those Department employees who can demonstrate that they meet certain other criteria relating to their contact with prisoners.

During fiscal year 1995-96, the Department expended over \$38 million on overtime and \$2.6 million on special pay. The amount expended on overtime as a portion of the 38 prisons' total payroll ranged from 2.3% to 11.7% for fiscal year 1995-96.

## Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses

### Audit Objectives

Our performance audit of the Corrections Officers' Supplemental Pay and Retirement, Department of Corrections, had the following objectives:

1. To assess the effectiveness of the Department's efforts to monitor and control the use of overtime.
2. To assess the effectiveness of the Department's controls to ensure that employees are included in the proper retirement classification, as required by law.
3. To assess the effectiveness of the Department's controls to ensure that only eligible employees receive supplemental pay.

### Audit Scope

Our audit scope was to examine the procedures and records related to the Department of Corrections' supplemental pay and retirement. 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 were conducted during May through August 1997 and included examinations of the pay and retirement records and activities for individuals employed by the Department during the period October 1, 1994 through July 31, 1997.

We obtained extracts of various payroll data from the Personnel-Payroll Information System for Michigan and examined the information to determine the variations in the amount of overtime among prisons, job classes, shifts, and other related areas. We also obtained and examined data maintained by the Department to document the reasons for the overtime. In addition, we assessed the reasonableness, in relation to the statutory requirements, of those individuals who were included in covered positions

for retirement purposes. Also, we evaluated the propriety of the payments to those individuals who received supplemental pay.

We interviewed Department personnel at the central office and at the following six prisons: Brooks Correctional Facility, Carson City Correctional Facility, Egeler Correctional Facility, Mound Correctional Facility, Oaks Correctional Facility, and Western Wayne Correctional Facility. We reviewed how the prisons implemented the Department's overtime policies and tracked overtime usage. We also reviewed policies related to the designation of covered positions and supplemental pay.

### Agency Responses

Our audit report includes 4 findings and 5 corresponding recommendations. The Department agreed with all of the findings and informed us that it will take action to implement the applicable recommendations.

The agency preliminary response which follows each recommendation in our report was taken from the agency's 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 the Department of Corrections 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

## EFFORTS TO MONITOR AND CONTROL OVERTIME

### COMMENT

**Audit Objective:** To assess the effectiveness of the Department of Corrections' efforts to monitor and control the use of overtime.

**Conclusion:** We concluded that the Department's efforts to monitor and control overtime were generally ineffective. We identified one material condition related to overtime analysis.

**Noteworthy Accomplishments:** The Department has implemented practices that have resulted in a \$2.5 million decrease in overtime at the prisons from fiscal year 1994-95 to fiscal year 1995-96.

### FINDING

#### 1. Overtime Analysis

The Department did not have effective procedures to ensure that overtime data was properly reported by prisons. Also, the Department did not have procedures to monitor, compare, and analyze the costs involved with overtime usage at all prisons.

We determined that the Department paid more than \$38 million on overtime in fiscal year 1995-96. Individual prison overtime expenditures ranged from 2.3% to 11.7% of total payroll costs.

Department staff informed us that they had been collecting data that identifies the reasons for overtime since March 1997. However, the Department had not analyzed this data. In addition, the Department had not taken an active role to ensure that the data collected was comparable among the prisons.

Our analysis of the overtime data for 6 prisons for fiscal year 1995-96 disclosed:

- a. The Department did not require the prisons to report overtime information in the prescribed fashion. As a result, the individual prisons submitted their overtime information in a variety of formats. Only 1 of the 6 prisons that we analyzed used the form designated by the Department for reporting overtime. This severely limited the usefulness of the reported overtime information for comparative, trend, or other analyses.
- b. Five of the 6 prisons did not correctly report reasons for overtime. We reviewed the first shift for the pay period ended May 3, 1997. The following schedule shows the high level of inconsistency with Department policy for the 5 prisons:

Reason for Overtime	Per Department Policy	Per Prison Report	Difference
In-service training	35	35	0
Regularly scheduled day off	15	1	14
Sick leave	33	36	(3)
Other leave	32	31	1
ESAs	34	56	(22)
Staff vacancies	83	65	18
Annual leave	3	2	1
Loaned to another shift	0	3	(3)
Other	0	7	(7)

Inconsistencies in reporting the reasons for overtime make the reports ineffective as a management tool for helping to control overtime.

- c. The Department did not determine why some prisons incurred minimal overtime usage. The Department needs to evaluate the practices of these prisons to determine if they could be used to effectively reduce overtime Statewide. For example, our review noted that some prisons provided training during the employees' regular shift, which reduced overtime costs.

- d. The Department did not analyze payroll data to determine the reasons that employees were incurring unusual amounts of overtime. Our review at the 6 prisons noted variances in the amount of overtime incurred by employees in individual classifications, including security classifications. For example, at 1 prison, food service workers had 14.2% of the overtime and storekeepers had 1.0% of the overtime. At another prison, food service workers had 4.1% of the overtime and storekeepers had 5.7% of the overtime. These types of variances do not necessarily indicate improprieties, but they do indicate a need for analysis.

The Department needs to acquire accurate and consistent overtime data to identify those prisons that incur overtime costs that fall outside the Department's established parameters. The Department could then analyze this data to determine the causes of the overtime, its related impact of the prisons' budgets, and develop practices to reduce overtime.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

We recommend that the Department develop and implement effective procedures to ensure that overtime data is properly reported by prisons.

We also recommend that the Department develop and implement procedures to monitor, compare, and analyze the costs involved with overtime usage at all prisons.

### **AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

The Department disagrees with the audit conclusion that the Department's efforts to monitor and control overtime were generally ineffective. The Department has established many effective practices to monitor and control unnecessary overtime which has resulted in reductions of overtime over the past several years despite an increase in prison growth. In addition, it is important to note that reducing overtime does not necessarily result in reduced payroll costs as incurring overtime in certain circumstances is more cost effective than hiring additional staff. The Department has been very proactive in staffing at the most efficient levels.

However, the Department does concur with this finding and has taken steps to comply with the corresponding recommendations by establishing and filling a

central office overtime coordinator position. The Department has also established an Overtime Committee that will review and make recommendations regarding the standardization and streamlining of existing overtime reports. This will allow the Department to develop and implement procedures that will assist central office management, regional prison administrators, and wardens in minimizing payroll costs by developing additional strategies to avoid unnecessary overtime.

## **CONTROLS OVER RETIREMENT CLASSIFICATION**

### **COMMENT**

**Audit Objective:** To assess the effectiveness of the Department's controls to ensure that employees are included in the proper retirement classification, as required by law.

**Conclusion:** We concluded that the Department's efforts to ensure that only eligible employees are included in the proper retirement classification were generally ineffective. We identified one material condition related to the use of covered positions.

### **FINDING**

#### **2. Use of Covered Positions**

The Department was not effective in monitoring and controlling the use of covered positions.

Section 38.45 of the *Michigan Compiled Laws* defines a "covered position" as a position assigned to a work station inside the security perimeter\* of a State prison designated as "medium\*," "close\*," or "maximum\* ." It can also include a position in a State prison that requires the employee to be in direct contact with prisoners more than 50% of the employee's work time while performing supervisory or disciplinary duties. Individuals who are in covered positions can retire younger, with fewer years of State service and with higher pension benefits, than other State employees.

\* See glossary on page 25 for definition.

Our review disclosed:

- a. Fifty-one (29%) of the 177 employees included in our test at six prisons did not meet the statutory requirements to be included as covered positions. These employees included human resource developers (training officers), business managers, administrative assistants, office managers, physical plant managers, plant superintendents, student assistants, and a data coding operator. Documentation was not available to support the inclusion of these employees in the covered position status.

Prison personnel and central office administrators have the responsibility to assess each employee position description and related documentation to ensure that the position meets the criteria prior to approving the position as a covered position.

In addition, our analysis of information related to minimum\* security prison employees and the Department's central office employees identified 45 individual job classifications that were included in covered status that did not appear to meet the statutory requirements for covered position status. These 45 included various classifications, such as human resource developers, secretaries, medical records examiners, and word processors. Employees in these classifications should not typically be included in covered status without sufficient documentation to support such a determination. We tested 23 employees who were in covered positions at two minimum security prisons from the 45 job classifications. We determined that documentation was not available to support the inclusion of any of the 23 employees in covered positions.

- b. The Department makes supplemental contributions to the retirement system for employees who would not qualify for the supplemental early retirement allowance based on age, length of service, or job duties.

Section 38.46 of the *Michigan Compiled Laws* requires that an employee meet one of two sets of conditions to qualify for a supplemental early retirement

\* See glossary on page 25 for definition.

allowance\* . The first set of conditions requires the employee to be at least 51 years old but less than 62, with 25 or more years of covered service, and with the last 3 years of credited service in a covered position. The second set of conditions requires the employee to be 56 years of age but less than 62, with 10 or more years of covered service, and with the last 3 years of credited service in a covered position.

Our analysis of records for all employees in covered status as of May 3, 1997 noted:

- (1) Fifteen employees were 62 years of age or older and, therefore, would not meet the retirement criteria to receive supplemental benefits. These employees would have met the criteria if they would have retired prior to age 62.
- (2) Ten employees who were over 62 years of age should not have been included in covered status when hired because they would not have qualified for the supplemental early retirement based on either their age at the date of hire or their years of qualified service.
- (3) Three (13.6%) of 22 employees examined who were between the ages of 58 and 61 would never qualify for the supplemental retirement benefits because, when hired, these individuals could not have qualified for supplemental benefits based on either their age at the date of hire or their years of qualified service. We selected the 22 employees from a total of 679 employees in covered positions who were between the ages of 58 and 61.
- (4) Four employees in the corrections shift supervisor classification were working primarily as training officers outside the security perimeter. Corrections shift supervisors are required under the statute to be covered, but employees whose primary function is training (human resource developers) are not covered.

\* See glossary on page 25 for definition.

- c. The Department did not have a method to monitor the status change transactions that were processed by prisons. Some prison personnel office employees changed employee retirement codes in the Personnel-Payroll Information System for Michigan to covered position status without central office approval. Michigan Department of Corrections Personnel Advisory Memo CP-6 requires prior approval by the central office for transactions affecting covered positions.

The Department recognized problems with covered positions and began to take action in 1996. These steps included identifying employees in covered positions who were at least 62 years old and requesting that the related personnel offices remove the covered position status. The Department identified 97 covered positions that did not meet eligibility requirements. The Department requested clarification from the Office of the State Employer, Department of Management and Budget, as to whether the Department could remove a covered position if the employee did not qualify. As of August 26, 1997, the Office of the State Employer had not formally responded to this request.

The Department contributed \$118 million to the retirement system in fiscal year 1996-97. The inclusion of ineligible employees in covered positions unnecessarily inflates the amount of the Department's contributions made to fund the employee retirement program by an estimated \$460,000 annually. In addition, employees may receive retirement benefits to which they are not entitled.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

We recommend that the Department improve its effectiveness in monitoring and controlling the use of covered positions.

### **AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

In 1996, the Department determined that some of its employees did not currently meet the eligibility requirement for covered position status and obtained advice from the Office of the State Employer. The Office advised the Department not to remove covered service status from employees who remain in the same position for which it was granted, regardless of whether the granting of the status was proper at the time, until the Office had an opportunity to review an issue concerning the continuing economic benefit clause contained in collective

bargaining agreements. The Office has continued to advise the Department not to remove covered status from employees who remain in the same position for which it was granted. In addition, the auditor's total annual projection is based on a presumption that all positions within 45 classifications at minimum security prisons and the central office are ineligible based on their review of a few position descriptions for 12 classifications. Although each position within a classification carries similar duties, each position differs in relation to the supervision of prisoners.

However, the Department will monitor the retirement codes of employees who became ineligible for covered position status because of their age. The Department has also reminded prison personnel offices to obtain central office approval for all new appointments to covered service for any classifications which are not specifically mentioned in the statute as eligible. In addition, it is important to note that covered service status has not been available to newly hired State employees since the implementation of the defined contribution retirement program in April 1997.

## **CONTROLS OVER SUPPLEMENTAL PAY**

### **COMMENT**

**Audit Objective:** To assess the effectiveness of the Department's controls to ensure that only eligible employees receive supplemental pay.

**Conclusion:** We concluded that the Department's efforts to ensure that only eligible employees receive supplemental pay were generally effective. However, we noted reportable conditions related to the use of supplemental pay and bargaining agreement issues.

### **FINDING**

#### **3. Use of Supplemental Pay**

The Department did not ensure that employees were given supplemental pay in accordance with Department of Civil Service guidelines.

The Department of Civil Service has established specific criteria for those employees who meet special working conditions, including working in secured areas, to receive supplemental pay. Individuals in the Department of Corrections who meet 1 of the 7 criteria can receive supplemental pay. Supplemental pay is an amount paid above the hourly rate to employees responsible for custody and supervision of prisoners on a regular and recurring basis.

We reviewed the employees at 6 prisons who were not responsible for the custody and supervision of prisoners, but who received supplemental pay. Our review disclosed:

- a. In 3 prisons, 14 employees receiving supplemental pay did not meet the criteria of either having their work station within the security perimeter or supervising prisoners. Nine of these employees were non-exclusively represented employees\* who were determined to be eligible by the Department of Civil Service based on information provided by the Department of Corrections. The Department paid over \$10,000 annually to these 14 employees.
- b. In our analysis of the minimum security prisons, we identified 45 individual job classifications that were included in supplemental pay status that did not appear to meet the requirements. These classifications included human resource developers, secretaries, medical records examiners, and word processors. Employees in these classification should not typically receive supplemental pay without sufficient documentation to support such a determination. We tested 20 employees from the 45 job classifications who received special pay at two minimum security prisons. We determined that documentation was not available to support the receipt of any special pay for any of the 20 employees. If our test results are representative of the total population, we estimate that the maximum amount that the Department paid to employees in these classifications at the minimum security prisons who did not appear to meet the criteria was \$74,000 annually.

\* See glossary on page 25 for definition.

These ineligible supplemental payments occurred because the Department did not have a uniform approval process for special pay. The determination of eligibility was the responsibility of individual prisons, the central office, or the Department of Civil Service based on information provided by the Department of Corrections. This resulted in several inconsistent and improper guideline interpretations by the prison administrators, the central office, and the Department of Civil Service.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

We recommend that the Department ensure that employees are given supplemental pay in accordance with Department of Civil Service guidelines.

### **AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

The auditor's projection in item b. is based on a presumption that all positions within 45 classifications at minimum security prisons and the central office are ineligible based on their review of a few position descriptions for 12 classifications. Although each position within a classification carries similar duties, each differs in relation to regular and recurring contact with prisoners.

The Department will obtain advice from the Office of the State Employer as to whether the Department can cease payment of the supplemental pay benefit once it has been granted. If the Department is advised that it can remove the benefit from employees who do not currently meet the eligibility requirements, the Department will remove the benefit. In addition, all requests for supplemental pay status will be approved by the central office's personnel office for all represented employees. The Department of Civil Service will continue to approve all requests for supplemental pay status for all non-exclusively represented employees.

### **FINDING**

#### **4. Bargaining Agreement Issues**

The Department did not have an effective process to address bargaining agreement issues, which occur during contract negotiations, that conflict with Department of Civil Service provisions.

In the late 1970s, the State Civil Service Commission added a \$.40 per hour special premium to corrections officers' base pay rates. This was done to reduce the number of gross pay adjustments processed and the related recordkeeping by the Department for the officers. As a result, the State Compensation Manual subsequently stated that, if individuals worked in the security unit (i.e., corrections officers), they would not be eligible for the \$.40 premium because it had previously been added to the base pay for those related job classes.

Our review of the current State Compensation Manual, prepared by the Department of Civil Service, provides for a special premium pay of \$.40 per hour for individuals whose work station is within the security perimeter of a prison or who routinely supervise prisoners.

We also noted that the State Compensation Manual specifically precludes the payment of the prison premium rate\* (\$.40 per hour) and the high security rate\* (\$.50 per hour) to the same individual. Therefore, the intent is for corrections officers working in the high security facilities to receive only an extra \$.10 per hour.

The current corrections officers' contract that was negotiated between the union and the Office of the State Employer contains a provision which was added during the bargaining process, dating back to December 1987, that allows for a \$.50 per hour supplement for high security areas. In contrast, other bargaining department agreements provide for the addition of only \$.10 per hour for work in high security prisons.

As a result of the added \$.50 provision, the Department paid over \$5.5 million of premium pay to corrections officers between October 1, 1994 and May 3, 1997. Although the bargaining agreement provides the basis for corrections officers to receive the \$.50 per hour instead of \$.10 per hour in high security areas, it is contrary to the intent and spirit of the special pay concept.

\* See glossary on page 25 for definition.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

We recommend that the Department develop an effective communication process with the Office of the State Employer to address bargaining agreement issues, which arise during contract negotiations, that conflict with Department of Civil Service provisions.

## **AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

Although the Department is not responsible for bargaining agreement negotiations, the Department will inform the Office of the State Employer, which is responsible for the negotiations, that the current corrections officers' contract appears to contain language which is contrary to Department of Civil Service provisions.

## Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

administrative segregation	A separate housing unit in a higher security level prison in which prisoners are confined to their cells at all times except for limited reasons.
close	The designation of a prison for a classification of prisoners who have a sentence of more than 60 months and can be managed in the general population.
covered position	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>(1) A position in the classified service with a classification of corrections officer; resident unit officer; corrections medical aide; corrections shift supervisor; corrections security specialist; deputy prison warden; or departmental administrator - prison warden.</li><li>(2) A position that is assigned to a workstation inside the security perimeter of a State prison designated as "medium," "close," or "maximum."</li><li>(3) A position within a State prison that requires the employee to be in direct contact with prisoners for more than 50% of the employee's work time performing supervisory or disciplinary duties.</li></ol>
effectiveness	Program success in achieving mission and goals.
efficiency	Achieving the most outputs and outcomes practical for the amount of resources applied or minimizing the amount of resources required to attain a certain level of outputs or outcomes.

essential special assignments (ESAs)	Special assignments above the normal authorized staffing complement, usually covering assignments not on the staffing charts. ESAs include supervising construction, guarding prisoners who are in hospitals, and monitoring emergencies.
high security rate	A \$.50 per hour premium above the hourly rate for those employees responsible for custody and supervision of prisoners on a regular and recurring basis in levels 4, 5, and 6 and administrative segregation work units; also known as the G-rate.
job classes	Department of Civil Service class titles.
material condition	A serious reportable condition which could impair the ability of management to operate a program in an effective and efficient manner and/or could adversely affect the opinion of an interested person concerning the effectiveness and efficiency of the program.
maximum	The designation of a prison for a classification of prisoners who need close supervision because of the likelihood that they may try to escape.
medium	The designation of a prison for a classification of prisoners who generally have longer sentences than do minimum security prisoners and who need more supervision, but who are not likely to escape.
minimum	The designation of a prison for a classification of prisoners who can live with a minimal amount of security.
non-exclusively represented employees	Employees not represented by a bargaining unit.

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.
prison premium rate	A \$.40 per hour premium above the hourly rate for those employees responsible for custody and supervision of prisoners on a regular and recurring basis; also known as the P-rate.
reportable condition	A matter coming to the auditor's attention that, in his/her judgment, should be communicated because it represents either an opportunity for improvement or a significant deficiency in management's ability to operate a program in an effective and efficient manner.
security perimeter	The wall or fenced perimeter of a prison. All areas inside this area would be considered inside the security perimeter.
supplemental early retirement allowance	A temporary straight life supplemental retirement allowance terminating at age 62.
supplemental pay	A per hour premium amount above the hourly rate for those employees responsible for custody and supervision of prisoners on a regular and recurring basis.