PERFORMANCE AUDIT
OF THE

# OAKS CORRECTIONAL FACILITY, CAMP PUGSLEY, AND CAMP SAUBLE

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

May 2000

47-222-99

EXECUTIVE DIGEST

# OAKS CORRECTIONAL FACILITY, CAMP PUGSLEY, AND CAMP SAUBLE

**INTRODUCTION**

This report, issued in May 2000, contains the results of our performance audit* of the Oaks Correctional Facility (OCF), Camp Pugsley (CP), and Camp Sauble (CS), Department of Corrections (DOC).

**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**

DOC has jurisdiction over OCF, located in Manistee County; CP, located in Grand Traverse County; and CS, located in Mason County. The warden, who is the chief administrative officer for these facilities, is appointed by the DOC director.

The mission* of the facilities is to protect the public by providing a safe, secure, and humane environment for staff and prisoners. OCF, which opened in March 1992, is a maximum security (level V)* facility for males, with a capacity of 744 prisoners. General population prisoners

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

and administrative segregation prisoners are housed in individual cells, whereas prisoners in protective housing are housed two to a cell within a secured, fenced perimeter. CP and CS, which were placed under the jurisdiction of OCF in August 1997, have capacities of 154 and 156 minimum security (level I)* male prisoners, respectively, within a fenced perimeter.

For fiscal year 1998-99, OCF, CP, and CS operating expenditures were approximately $25.1 million, $2.7 million, and $2.8 million, respectively. As of October 28, 1999, OCF, CP, and CS had 393, 36, and 38 employees, respectively.

In February 2000 (subsequent to the completion of our audit fieldwork), DOC initiated plans to convert CP to an independent secure level I facility that will be administered by a separate warden.

## AUDIT OBJECTIVES AND CONCLUSIONS

**Audit Objective:** To assess the effectiveness of OCF's, CP's, and CS's safety and security operations.

**Conclusion: We concluded that OCF's, CP's, and CS's safety and security operations were generally effective in preventing escapes and protecting employees and prisoners from serious injury.** However, we noted reportable conditions* related to security and firearm certification (Findings 1 and 2).

**Audit Objective:** To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of OCF's, CP's, and CS's prisoner care and maintenance operations.

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

**Conclusion: We concluded that OCF's, CP's, and CS's prisoner care and maintenance operations were generally effective and efficient.** However, we noted a reportable condition related to safety inspections and preventive maintenance (Finding 3).

**Audit Objective:** To assess the effectiveness of OCF's Reforming Education Strengthening Through Alternative Restructured Treatment (RESTART) Program.

**Conclusion: We concluded that OCF's RESTART Program was generally effective.**

## AUDIT SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of the Oaks Correctional Facility, Camp Pugsley, and Camp Sauble. 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 audit procedures included examination of OCF, CP, and CS records and activities for the period October 1997 through October 1999. Our audit methodology included a preliminary review of facility operations. This included discussions with various facility staff regarding their functions and responsibilities and a review of program records, DOC policy directives, and facility operating procedures. To gain an understanding of facility activities and to form a basis for selecting certain operations for audit, we conducted tests of records related to safety and security, prison operations, prisoner care, and maintenance activities for compliance with applicable

policies and procedures in an effective and efficient manner. Also, we examined the results of OCF's annual evaluation of its RESTART Program. In addition, we developed a survey (see supplemental information) requesting input from certain individuals and businesses regarding their association with the facilities.

**AGENCY RESPONSES**

Our audit report includes 3 findings and 6 corresponding recommendations. DOC's preliminary response indicated that OCF has complied or will comply with the 6 recommendations.

Mr. Bill Martin, Director
Department of Corrections
Grandview Plaza
Lansing, Michigan

Dear Mr. Martin:

This is our report on the performance audit of the Oaks Correctional Facility, Camp Pugsley, and Camp Sauble, 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; description of survey and summary of survey responses, presented as supplemental information; 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.

Sincerely,

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

This page left intentionally blank.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## OAKS CORRECTIONAL FACILITY, CAMP PUGSLEY, AND CAMP SAUBLE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

INTRODUCTION


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Executive Digest | 1 |
| Report Letter | 5 |
| Description of Agency | 8 |
| Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses | 10 |


COMMENTS, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES


| | |
|---|---|
| Safety and Security Operations | 12 |
| 1. Security | 12 |
| 2. Firearm Certification | 15 |
| Prisoner Care and Maintenance Operations | 16 |
| 3. Safety Inspections and Preventive Maintenance | 16 |
| RESTART Program | 18 |


SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION


| | |
|---|---|
| Description of Survey | 21 |
| Summary of Survey Responses | 22 |


GLOSSARY


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

## Description of Agency

The Department of Corrections (DOC) has jurisdiction over Oaks Correctional Facility (OCF), located in Manistee County; Camp Pugsley (CP), located in Grand Traverse County; and Camp Sauble (CS), located in Mason County. The warden, who is the chief administrative officer for these facilities, is a classified State employee under the State's civil service system. The warden is appointed by the DOC director.

The three facilities share a records office, a personnel office, and a training office. The deputy warden oversees security, housing, prisoner programs, and camp programs. The administrative officer oversees the business office, physical plant, warehouse, and food service operations.

The mission of the facilities is to protect the public by providing a safe, secure, and humane environment for staff and prisoners. OCF, which opened in March 1992, is a maximum security (level V) facility for males, with a capacity of 744 prisoners. General population prisoners and administrative segregation prisoners are housed in individual cells, whereas prisoners in protective housing are housed two to a cell. The facility is secured with double chain-link fences, razor ribbon wire, electronic detection systems, five gun towers that are staffed 24 hours per day, and an armed response vehicle that constantly patrols the facility perimeter. CP and CS, which were placed under the jurisdiction of OCF in August 1997, have capacities of 154 and 156 minimum security (level I) male prisoners, respectively, within a fenced perimeter.

OCF provides education programs to prisoners including adult basic education, general educational development (GED) completion, and special education. Also, OCF is the site of a pilot program, Reforming Education Strengthening Through Alternative Restructured Treatment (RESTART), whose goal is to divert prisoners away from more expensive segregation.

OCF, CP, and CS offer several types of programming to address the needs of the prisoners. Among the programs offered are group psychotherapy, substance abuse, job skills, and alcoholics anonymous. Also, prisoner services, such as legal/general library services, religious services, and recreational activities, are available to eligible prisoners.

OCF prisoners in general population or protective housing are required to maintain a work or school assignment. All camp prisoners are required to maintain a work assignment. The following work assignments comprise the majority of those available at the facilities: yard crew, porter, food service, laundry, library clerk, barber, prisoner clothing repair, and unit maintenance. In addition, eligible camp prisoners are assigned to public work and OCF work assignments.

For fiscal year 1998-99, OCF, CP, and CS operating expenditures were approximately $25.1 million, $2.7 million, and $2.8 million, respectively. As of October 28, 1999, OCF, CP, and CS had 393, 36, and 38 employees, respectively.

In February 2000 (subsequent to the completion of our audit fieldwork), DOC initiated plans to convert CP to an independent secure level I facility that will be administered by a separate warden.

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

Audit Objectives

Our performance audit of the Oaks Correctional Facility (OCF), Camp Pugsley (CP), and Camp Sauble (CS), Department of Corrections (DOC), had the following objectives:

1. To assess the effectiveness of OCF's, CP's, and CS's safety and security operations.

2. To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of OCF's, CP's, and CS's prisoner care and maintenance operations.

3. To assess the effectiveness of OCF's Reforming Education Strengthening Through Alternative Restructured Treatment (RESTART) Program.

Audit Scope

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of the Oaks Correctional Facility, Camp Pugsley, and Camp Sauble. 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 August through November 1999 and included examination of OCF, CP, and CS records and activities for the period October 1997 through October 1999.

To establish our audit objectives and to gain an understanding of OCF, CP, and CS activities, we conducted a preliminary review of OCF, CP, and CS operations. This included discussions with various facility staff regarding their functions and responsibilities and a review of program records, DOC policy directives, and facility operating procedures. To gain an understanding of facility activities and to form a basis for selecting certain operations for audit, we conducted tests of records related to safety

and security, prison operations, prisoner care, and maintenance activities for compliance with applicable policies and procedures in an effective and efficient manner.

To assess the effectiveness of OCF's, CP's, and CS's safety and security operations, we conducted tests of records related to firearms inventories and employee firearm certification at OCF. We also examined records related to prisoner and cell searches and employee searches. On a test basis, we inventoried keys and critical and dangerous tools. In addition, we reviewed visitor safety, telephone monitoring systems, and documentation of items taken into and out of the facilities.

To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of OCF, CP, and CS prisoner care and maintenance operations, we conducted tests of records and reviewed preventive maintenance, disaster management, inventory controls, fire safety procedures, emergency backup tests, food service operations, prisoner care, and cash receipts. Also, we analyzed prisoner store financial information and inventory controls and reviewed controls over the prisoner funds accounting system.

To assess the effectiveness of OCF's RESTART Program, we examined the results of OCF's annual evaluation of its Program.

In addition, we developed a survey (see supplemental information) requesting input from certain individuals and businesses regarding their association with the facilities.

Agency Responses

Our audit report includes 3 findings and 6 corresponding recommendations. DOC's preliminary response indicated that OCF has complied or will comply with the 6 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 DOC 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

## SAFETY AND SECURITY OPERATIONS

### COMMENT

**Background:** Oaks Correctional Facility (OCF), Camp Pugsley (CP), and Camp Sauble (CS) operate under the policy directives established by the Department of Corrections (DOC), as well as operating procedures that were developed at each facility. DOC policy directives and local operating procedures have been implemented to help ensure the security of keys, tools, and firearms. OCF, CP, and CS staff conduct periodic searches of prisoners, housing units, and prisoner belongings to detect contraband* . All visitors must register when entering the facilities and are subject to search. DOC policy directives provide for periodic random searches of employees entering and exiting the facilities.

**Audit Objective:** To assess the effectiveness of OCF's, CP's, and CS's safety and security operations.

**Conclusion: We concluded that OCF's, CP's, and CS's safety and security operations were generally effective in preventing escapes and protecting employees and prisoners from serious injury.** However, we noted reportable conditions related to security and firearm certification.

### FINDING

1. **Security**

   OCF did not ensure that CP complied with DOC policy directives that require prisoner searches and prisoner counts, random monitoring of prisoner telephone calls, weekly tool reports, and accounting for supervisory keys on each shift. Also, OCF did not ensure that CP and CS monitored the use of gate manifests* to control the movement of items into and out of CP and CS.

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

DOC policy directives require prisons and camps to establish various systems to help ensure that security is not compromised. For example, policy directives require custody officers* to complete a minimum number of prisoner searches and prisoner counts, to conduct random monitoring of prisoner telephone calls, to prepare weekly tool reports, and to account for keys on each shift. In addition, OCF operating procedure requires staff to use gate manifests to control the movement of supplies, materials, and equipment into and out of the security perimeter.

Our review of security measures at CP and CS disclosed:

a. A custody officer on the third shift at CP did not document whether CP conducted the required number of prisoner searches. Our review of the prisoner search records for the two-week period ended August 15, 1999 disclosed that the third shift yard officer did not document whether CP conducted any prisoner searches for the 10 days worked. DOC policy directive requires that the officer conduct five prisoner searches per shift. Also, CP's first and third shifts had not documented that they conducted unscheduled random formal prisoner counts for this same time period. DOC policy directive requires each shift to complete weekly unscheduled random formal prisoner counts.

b. CP telephone monitoring records showed that staff did not document whether CP monitored the 50 monthly prisoner telephone calls as required by DOC policy directive. Our review of the telephone monitoring records for the period March through August 1999 disclosed that staff documented that CP monitored only 2 to 16 telephone calls per month.

c. CP did not ensure that weekly tool reports for the excess storage area were submitted to the tool control officer as required by DOC policy directive. This storage area, which contained mostly rakes and shovels, was outside the perimeter of CP and was rarely used. However, prisoners who worked outside the perimeter had access to the storage area.

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

d. CP did not ensure that supervisory staff accounted for all supervisory keys on each shift as required by DOC policy directive. Our review of August 1999 records disclosed 21 (27%) of 79 occasions in which supervisory staff did not document the shift checks of supervisory keys.

e. CP and CS staff did not use gate manifests to track items brought into and removed from CP and CS. CP and CS did not establish a procedure outlining when gate manifests should be used and who is responsible for issuing, approving, and accounting for these documents. At the time of our review, gate manifests were not controlled or reconciled. However, CP and CS used the gate manifests generally for prisoner property and, as a result, CP and CS informed us that they did not need to control and reconcile manifests.

Implementing required security measures would help improve the security of CP and CS staff, prisoners, and visitors.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that OCF ensure that CP comply with DOC policy directives that require prisoner searches and prisoner counts, random monitoring of prisoner telephone calls, weekly tool reports, and accounting for supervisory keys on each shift.

We also recommend that OCF ensure that CP and CS monitor the use of gate manifests to control the movement of items into and out of CP and CS.

## AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Effective February 2000, OCF no longer has responsibility for CP. CP now has its own warden as it will be converted to a secure level I facility in the near future.

CP agreed with our recommendations and will comply by initiating monthly internal reporting measures to confirm that prisoner searches and unscheduled formal prisoner counts, monitoring of prisoner telephone calls, weekly tool reports, and supervisory key checks were completed as required. CP will also comply by establishing and monitoring the use of appropriate accounting measures for gate manifests.

Although DOC policy directives do not require camps to use gate manifests, OCF will comply by ensuring that CS establishes and monitors the use of appropriate accounting measures for gate manifests.

## FINDING

### 2. Firearm Certification

OCF did not ensure that all custody officers were annually recertified in the use of firearms required for their positions. Also, the shift supervisor did not always confirm the proper firearm certification of the custody officers assigned to firearm positions.

DOC policy directive and OCF operating procedures require that various custody officers must be annually recertified in the use of handguns, shotguns, or rifles prior to being issued these firearms. Custody officers who may be assigned to a mobilization squad, the emergency response team, a tower, the perimeter security vehicle, or a transportation detail must be annually recertified in the use of the firearms assigned to those details.

Our review of the two-week period ended February 14, 1999 disclosed that shift supervisors assigned 6 custody officers to nine assignments that could have required the use of a firearm for which the officers had not been annually recertified to use. All 6 of these officers had previously been certified to use the appropriate firearm; however, 5 of the custody officers were not recertified until at least 16 to 70 days after their assignment. The remaining custody officer has not been recertified since October 1997.

OCF operating procedure requires the shift supervisor to review each assignment involving an armed position and to initial the daily assignment work sheet confirming the proper firearm certification of the custody officers, prior to the beginning of the shift. We noted that a supervisor had not initialed the daily assignment work sheet for armed positions indicating that the officers were certified on 33 of the 42 assignments reviewed.

Proper firearm certification is essential to help ensure the safety and security of staff and prisoners.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that OCF ensure that all custody officers are annually recertified in the use of firearms required for their positions.

We also recommend that the shift supervisor confirm the proper firearm certification of the custody officers assigned to firearm positions.

## AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

OCF agreed with our recommendations and informed us that it has complied. The OCF training officer now monitors expiration dates to ensure that all custody officers are annually recertified for use of the firearms required for their positions. OCF will also ensure that supervisors initial the daily assignment work sheets to verify that staff have current firearm certifications before assignment to a position involving possible firearm use.

# PRISONER CARE AND MAINTENANCE OPERATIONS

## COMMENT

**Background:** OCF, CP, and CS have developed procedures involving preventive maintenance, disaster planning, fire safety, food service activities, power plant operations, prisoner accounting, and prisoner store operations.

**Audit Objective:** To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of OCF's, CP's, and CS's prisoner care and maintenance operations.

**Conclusion: We concluded that OCF's, CP's, and CS's prisoner care and maintenance operations were generally effective and efficient.** However, we noted a reportable condition related to safety inspections and preventive maintenance.

## FINDING

### 3. Safety Inspections and Preventive Maintenance

OCF did not retain documentation that weekly and monthly fire safety inspections and quarterly tests of fire detection and fire alarm systems were performed. Also,

OCF had not required CP to develop a written preventive maintenance plan and to submit the plan to DOC for approval.

DOC policy directive requires facilities to conduct weekly and monthly fire safety inspections and quarterly tests of fire detection and fire alarm systems in all areas of the facilities.

Our review of inspections and preventive maintenance disclosed:

a. OCF did not retain documentation of safety inspections and fire alarm tests. Specifically:

   (1) OCF did not have documentation of 7 (10%) of the 72 weekly fire safety inspection reports for the three OCF buildings reviewed.

   (2) OCF did not retain documentation of 6 (33%) of the 18 monthly fire safety inspections for these three buildings, 6 (60%) of the 10 monthly inspection reports for CP, and 2 (20%) of 10 monthly reports for CS. CP and CS staff informed us that the OCF fire safety inspector performed these inspections; however, the fire safety inspector did not provide them with a copy of the inspection report.

   (3) The OCF fire safety inspector did not document that CP performed quarterly tests of fire detection and fire alarm systems on the fire safety inspection reports.

   Our review of the related monthly and annual fire inspection reports did not disclose any significant problems. However, completion of required safety inspections is necessary to detect and correct equipment and structural deficiencies in a timely manner. In addition, these inspections may help OCF identify potential safety hazards to staff, prisoners, and visitors.

b. Although CP had a preventive maintenance system, it had not developed a written preventive maintenance plan and submitted the plan to DOC for approval.

DOC policy directive 04.03.100 states that each facility shall develop a written preventive maintenance plan and submit it to the Physical Plant Division in the DOC central office for approval. The plan is to be designed to provide economical use of all equipment and to ensure that all equipment will operate effectively during emergency situations. Also, the plan must include regularly scheduled inspections and maintenance tasks for 11 areas.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that OCF retain documentation that weekly and monthly fire safety inspections and quarterly tests of fire detection and fire alarm systems were performed.

We also recommend that OCF require CP to develop a written preventive maintenance plan and to submit the plan to DOC for approval.

### AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Effective February 2000, OCF no longer has responsibility for CP. CP now has its own warden as it will be converted to a secure level I facility in the near future.

OCF and CP agreed with our recommendations and informed us that they have complied regarding safety inspections. OCF and CP have established monitoring reports to ensure that weekly and monthly fire safety inspections are conducted as required as well as quarterly tests of fire detection and fire alarm systems in all areas of the facilities involved.

CP informed us that it has submitted a preventative maintenance plan to the DOC central office for approval.

## RESTART PROGRAM

### COMMENT

**Background:** OCF had implemented the Reforming Education Strengthening Through Alternative Restructured Treatment (RESTART) Program in June 1998. The ultimate goal of the RESTART Program is to reduce the recurring need for administrative

segregation placement by altering the behavior of prisoners who successfully complete the Program. The RESTART Program is designed for a selective group of prisoners who voluntarily agree to abide by the terms and conditions of the Program in return for which, upon completion, the prisoner is guaranteed reclassification to general population as opposed to continued placement in administrative segregation. Prisoners who volunteer for this special administrative segregation program are expected to make a dedicated and honest attempt to make internal changes that will allow them to more satisfactorily complete their sentence in an institutional environment. The RESTART Program is an eight-week, voluntary program consisting of physically strenuous activity and strict discipline, patterned after military basic training, combined with intensive programming. The first phase is three weeks in length with much of the programming being provided in the cell. The second phase is five weeks in length and provides the opportunity for group programming options and work assignments along with group dining privileges.

**Audit Objective:** To assess the effectiveness of OCF's Reforming Education Strengthening Through Alternative Restructured Treatment (RESTART) Program.

**Conclusion: We concluded that OCF's RESTART Program was generally effective.**

# SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

## Description of Survey

We developed a survey requesting input from certain individuals and businesses regarding their association with the Oaks Correctional Facility (OCF), Camp Pugsley (CP), and Camp Sauble (CS).

We mailed surveys to 46 individuals and businesses located in the vicinity of OCF and received 18 responses. A review of these responses indicated that most respondents were highly satisfied with OCF and its administration of CP and CS. The responses also indicated that public concerns were generally addressed in a timely manner. However, some responses identified concerns involving communication between the facilities and the community. Also, there was concern about the use of the shooting range in the early hours of the morning. We referred these community concerns to the warden for follow-up and provided a summary of this survey information to the warden.

We also mailed surveys to 41 individuals and businesses located in the vicinity of CP and CS and received 22 and 16 responses, respectively. A review of the responses indicated that many respondents had no opinion regarding CP or CS or were concerned about safety but did not know who to contact. Some responses indicated a need to notify the community of problems or emergency situations related to the facilities. We referred these community concerns to the warden for follow-up and provided a summary of this survey information to the warden.

OAKS CORRECTIONAL FACILITY,
CAMP PUGSLEY, AND CAMP SAUBLE
Department of Corrections
Summary of Survey Responses

| | Copies of Survey Distributed at Each Location | Number of Responses | Response Rate |
|---|---|---|---|
| OCF | 46 | 18 | 39% |
| CP | 41 | 22 | 54% |
| CS | 41 | 16 | 39% |

The total number of responses for each item may not agree with the number of responses reported above because some respondents did not answer all questions.

1. How would you rate your satisfaction with the frequency of contacts between you or your organization and the Oaks Correctional Facility, Camp Pugsley, or Camp Sauble?

| | Highly Satisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Highly Dissatisfied | No Opinion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OCF | 10 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| CP | 10 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| CS | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

2. How satisfied are you with how management of the Oaks Correctional Facility, Camp Pugsley, or Camp Sauble have addressed your individual concerns?

| | Highly Satisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Highly Dissatisfied | No Opinion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OCF | 9 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| CP | 9 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| CS | 9 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 |

3. How satisfied are you with the timeliness in which your individual concerns are addressed by the Oaks Correctional Facility, Camp Pugsley, or Camp Sauble?

| | Highly Satisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Highly Dissatisfied | No Opinion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OCF | 7 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| CP | 9 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| CS | 9 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 |

4. How satisfied are you with the Oaks Correctional Facility, Camp Pugsley, or Camp Sauble process to notify the community of any problems or emergency situations related to the facilities?

| | Highly Satisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Highly Dissatisfied | No Opinion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OCF | 7 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| CP | 7 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| CS | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

5. Do you have any specific safety or security concerns that have not been addressed by Oaks Correctional Facility, Camp Pugsley, or Camp Sauble personnel?

| | Yes | No | No Opinion |
|---|---|---|---|
| OCF | 2 | 14 | 1 |
| CP | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| CS | 1 | 15 | 0 |

6. If you visited the Oaks Correctional Facility, Camp Pugsley, or Camp Sauble were you satisfied with the security provided to you while at the facilities?

| | Highly Satisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Highly Dissatisfied | No Opinion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OCF | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| CP | 10 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| CS | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

7. Overall, how satisfied are you with the extent of communication between the Oaks Correctional Facility, Camp Pugsley, or Camp Sauble and the community?

| | Highly Satisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Highly Dissatisfied | No Opinion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OCF | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| CP | 8 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| CS | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

## Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

| | |
|---|---|
| **contraband** | Property which is not allowed on facility property or in visiting rooms by State law, rule, or DOC policy. For prisoners, this includes any property which they are not specifically authorized to possess, authorized property in excessive amounts, or authorized property which has been altered without permission. |
| **CP** | Camp Pugsley. |
| **CS** | Camp Sauble. |
| **custody officers** | Corrections officers who do not work in a housing unit. These officers are assigned to the prison yard, school, control center, visiting room, bubble (central point of entry into and exit from the facility), etc. |
| **DOC** | Department of Corrections. |
| **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. |
| **gate manifest** | A record used to control materials and supplies entering and leaving the facility through the front gates and sallyport. |
| **maximum security (level V)** | A classification of prisoners who need close supervision because of the likelihood they may try to escape or because they are difficult to control. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **minimum security (level I)** | A classification of prisoners who can live in facilities with a minimum amount of security. They are normally relatively near parole. |
| **mission** | The agency's main purpose or the reason the agency was established. |
| **OCF** | Oaks Correctional Facility. |
| **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. |
| **reportable condition** | A matter coming to the auditor's attention that, in the auditor's 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. |
| **RESTART** | Reforming Education Strengthening Through Alternative Restructured Treatment. |