

## EXECUTIVE DIGEST

### CENTRAL RECORDS DIVISION

---

**INTRODUCTION** This report contains the results of our performance audit of the Central Records Division, Michigan Department of State Police, for the period October 1, 1993 through January 31, 1996.

---

**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 Central Records Division has three primary responsibilities:

1. To maintain the State's Criminal History Records\* system as required by Section 28.242 of the *Michigan Compiled Laws*.

2. To maintain the State's pistol registration records system as required by Section 28.429 of the *Michigan Compiled Laws*.
3. To maintain the Uniform Crime Reporting\* program as required by Sections 28.251 - 28.258 of the *Michigan Compiled Laws*.

As of January 31, 1996, the Division had 67 full- and part-time employees. Spending authorizations for fiscal year 1994-95 were \$4.9 million for Division operations and \$2.4 million for the Criminal Justice Data Center to maintain the Automated Fingerprint Identification System\*.

---

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

**Audit Objective:** To determine if the Criminal History Records system, which includes the Automated Fingerprint Identification System records, was complete, accurate, and current.

**Conclusion:** We concluded that the Criminal History Records system, including the Automated Fingerprint Identification System records, was not complete, accurate, and current. We identified one material condition\*:

- The Division did not ensure that local law enforcement agencies and courts submitted complete arrest and disposition information on a timely basis (Finding 1).

We also identified three reportable conditions\* involving routine audits to verify the completeness of records, information reporting training for staff of local criminal justice

agencies\*, and the return of fingerprints to accused individuals who are not found guilty (Findings 1 through 3).

**Noteworthy Accomplishments:** During our audit period, the Division revised the computerized Criminal History Records system to provide better data analysis and automated the fingerprint identification records to increase the Division's effectiveness and efficiency.

**Audit Objective:** To determine if the pistol registration records system was complete, accurate, and current.

**Conclusion:** We concluded that the Division's pistol registration records system was complete, accurate, and current.

**Noteworthy Accomplishments:** During 1994, the Division began implementation of the Automated Pistol Registration System (APRS). APRS is currently in operation. The system is partially completed, and there are APRS terminals located at 31 sites which receive input from 160 agencies. This system currently inputs approximately 50% of the pistol registrations at the site location. The remainder of the registrations are entered centrally by Division personnel.

APRS allows local law enforcement agencies to enter pistol registration information and to access the State's central gun file to obtain pistol registration information. APRS provides for an automatic criminal history check on all applicants for concealed weapons permits or pistol purchase permits.

**Audit Objective:** To determine if the Uniform Crime Reporting program was accurate and complete.

**Conclusion:** We concluded that the Uniform Crime Reporting program was accurate and complete.

**Noteworthy Accomplishments:** The Division received a federal grant award to improve its uniform crime reporting. The Division has used the federal grant money to develop and implement the Michigan Incident Crime Reporting (MICR) program, a computerized reporting system for use by local law enforcement agencies throughout the State. This program will enhance the timeliness of submission of data on criminal activities in the State. Currently, one third of all agencies use the MICR program. The Division provides continuing training to local agencies and is adding agencies to the MICR program on a regular basis.

---

**AUDIT SCOPE  
AND  
METHODOLOGY**

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of the Central Records Division for the period October 1, 1993 through January 31, 1996. 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.

To accomplish our objectives, our methodology included: a review of State and federal data and reporting requirements related to the Division's Criminal History Records system and other systems; analytical reviews and testing of Division

records; interviews with both Division and selected criminal justice agency staff to evaluate information reporting and gathering procedures; and a review of reports on similar criminal history record functions in other states.

---

**AGENCY  
RESPONSES  
AND PRIOR AUDIT  
FOLLOW-UP**

Our audit report contains 3 findings and 4 corresponding recommendations. The agency preliminary response indicated agreement with these findings and recommendations.

The Division had complied with 11 of the 12 prior audit recommendations. The other recommendation is repeated in this report.