



# MICHIGAN

OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL

## AUDIT REPORT



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>*



Michigan  
*Office of the Auditor General*  
**REPORT SUMMARY**

*Performance Audit*

*Criminal History Records Database, Warrants Database, and Traffic Crash Reporting System Within the Criminal Justice Information Center Michigan Department of State Police*

Report Number:  
551-0130-08

Released:  
May 2009

*The purpose of the Criminal Justice Information Center (CJIC) is to provide accurate, comprehensive, and timely information and analysis for criminal justice and public safety purposes. The enactment of legislation in recent years has made the accuracy of criminal records vital not only to criminal justice agencies but also to citizens and private sector businesses.*

***Audit Objective:***

To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of CJIC's efforts to ensure the accuracy of the Criminal History Records Database (CHRD).

***Audit Conclusion:***

We concluded that CJIC's efforts to ensure the accuracy of CHRD were effective and efficient. However, we noted one reportable condition (Finding 1).

***Reportable Condition:***

CJIC had not implemented a complete performance measurement process to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of its efforts in ensuring accurate CHRD data (Finding 1).

***Noteworthy Accomplishments:***

From 2004 to 2007, CJIC worked with local law enforcement agencies, county prosecutors, and courts to automate the reporting process for CHRD. In addition, CJIC encouraged local law enforcement

agencies to use Live Scan devices when performing fingerprinting and created interfaces between local systems and CHRD. As a result, over 97% of arrests, charges, and dispositions are reported to CHRD electronically. This initiative improved timeliness and accuracy as CHRD data had one point of entry, thus reducing the possibility of errors.

In addition, beginning in 2007, CJIC collaborated with the State Court Administrative Office to create a reporting mechanism between the Judicial Data Warehouse, local courts, and CHRD. As a result, CJIC located over 43,000 missing dispositions and electronically added them to CHRD. This initiative greatly improved the completeness of records in CHRD.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

***Audit Objective:***

To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of CJIC's efforts to ensure the validity of warrants in the Warrants Database.

**Audit Conclusion:**

We concluded that CJIC's efforts to ensure the validity of warrants in the Warrants Database were effective and efficient. Our report does not include any reportable conditions related to this audit objective.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

**Audit Objective:**

To assess the efficiency of CJIC's maintenance of the Traffic Crash Reporting System (TCRS).

**Audit Conclusion:**

We concluded that CJIC was moderately efficient in maintaining TCRS. We noted one reportable condition (Finding 2).

**Reportable Condition:**

CJIC should increase the emphasis on potential cost savings when evaluating grant applications from local law enforcement agencies. Also, CJIC should evaluate the effectiveness of previous grant awards results. (Finding 2)

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

**Agency Response:**

Our audit report contains 2 findings and 3 corresponding recommendations. CJIC's preliminary response indicated that it agrees with all of the recommendations.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

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



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

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

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



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

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

May 19, 2009

Colonel Peter C. Munoz, Director  
Michigan Department of State Police  
714 South Harrison Road  
East Lansing, Michigan

Dear Colonel Munoz:

This is our report on the performance audit of the Criminal History Records Database, Warrants Database, and Traffic Crash Reporting System Within the Criminal Justice Information Center, Michigan Department of State Police.

This report contains our report summary; description; audit objectives, scope, and methodology and agency responses and prior audit follow-up; 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



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### **CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS DATABASE, WARRANTS DATABASE, AND TRAFFIC CRASH REPORTING SYSTEM WITHIN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION CENTER MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE**

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	
Report Summary	1
Report Letter	3
Description	6
Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses and Prior Audit Follow-Up	9
COMMENTS, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES	
Effectiveness and Efficiency of Efforts to Ensure Accuracy of the Criminal History Records Database	13
1. Performance Measures	13
Effectiveness and Efficiency of Efforts to Ensure Validity of Warrants in the Warrants Database	16
Efficiency of CJIC's Maintenance of the Traffic Crash Reporting System	16
2. TCRS Grant Awards	16
GLOSSARY	
Glossary of Acronyms and Terms	21

## Description

The Criminal Justice Information Center (CJIC), Michigan Department of State Police (MSP), is responsible for ensuring the quality of the data maintained in databases accessible through the Law Enforcement Information Network\* (LEIN). The purpose of CJIC is to provide accurate, comprehensive, and timely information and analysis for criminal justice and public safety purposes. The enactment of legislation in recent years has made the accuracy of criminal records vital not only to criminal justice agencies but also to citizens and private sector businesses. CJIC maintains the integrity of all records through training, restricted access, system edit checks, and audits.

CJIC maintains the following databases and system accessible through LEIN to help support its purpose:

a. Criminal History Records Database (CHRD)

CHRD provides Statewide information on arrests, charges, and court dispositions to law enforcement agencies, courts, and other users. Criminal history records are available electronically to other states and federal law enforcement agencies through the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) and the Interstate Identification Index. Law enforcement agencies access NCIC to conduct national instant criminal background checks. The public can also access Michigan's Internet Criminal History Access Tool (ICHAT) and query individuals for crimes committed in Michigan. In Michigan, CHRD is updated and accessed by over 750 law enforcement agencies; 240 circuit, district, and probate courts; 83 county prosecuting attorneys; jails; and prisons.

The arrest, charge, and court disposition segments provide a summary of a criminal history record. Law enforcement agencies fingerprint arrested individuals and send their fingerprints to CJIC for comparison to fingerprints in the State and national fingerprint databases. A fingerprint match provides an immediate positive identification of the individual for the law enforcement agency. With a match, the arrest data is added to the criminal history record. Without a match, the arrest data is used to create a new criminal history record. After receiving the arrest data, prosecutors decide whether to charge the individual with a crime. Prosecutors can

\* See glossary at end of report for definition.



electronically add the charge data to the arrest data, or CJIC staff will enter the data into CHRd. If the prosecutor decides to charge the individual with a crime, the arrest and charge data is sent to the courts. After the judicial disposition is rendered, courts may enter the disposition into CHRd electronically or send the disposition to CJIC for entry into CHRd by CJIC staff.

Section 28.241 of the *Michigan Compiled Laws* states that MSP is responsible for the collection, filing, and preserving of criminal identification and records filed with MSP by local law enforcement agencies, local prosecuting attorneys, and courts. To ensure complete and accurate criminal records, Section 28.245a of the *Michigan Compiled Laws* authorizes MSP to perform random performance audits of the criminal and juvenile history record information submitted by local law enforcement agencies and courts required under Act 289, P.A. 1925.

b. Warrants Database

Section 28.254 of the *Michigan Compiled Laws* states that law enforcement agencies shall report all wanted person\* records to MSP. The Warrants Database contains information on wanted persons, including charges assessed by a prosecutor and a description of physical characteristics of the wanted person. A law enforcement agency or a court may enter warrants directly into LEIN after a court authorizes an arrest warrant.

To ensure the accuracy and validity of the Warrants Database, federal and State regulations require validation of warrants within 60-90 days and then annually thereafter. CJIC's process for validating warrants is to send, either manually or electronically, a portion of the warrants to each entering agency monthly to ensure that all warrants are reviewed and validated annually. The local law enforcement agency then validates the warrant and responds back to CJIC. As of August 2008, the Warrants Database contained data on over one million active warrants maintained by over 700 local law enforcement agencies.

c. Traffic Crash Reporting System (TCRS)

Sections 257.622, 324.81143, and 324.82132 of the *Michigan Compiled Laws* require that all law enforcement agencies in Michigan submit traffic crash reports on motor vehicle, off-road vehicle, and snowmobile accident data, respectively, to

\* See glossary at end of report for definition.

MSP. MSP is responsible for collecting data and reporting statistics related to traffic crashes. Law enforcement agencies reported approximately 324,000 crashes for the year ended December 31, 2007 via traffic crash reports. A traffic crash report is required when the driver of a motor vehicle or the operator of an off-road vehicle or snowmobile involved in an accident injures or kills any person or damages property totaling \$1,000 or \$100 or more, respectively.

Summary and detailed crash statistics for the State of Michigan are compiled from the data collected. Detailed traffic crash data is sent to the Department of State and linked to individual driving records. The Michigan Department of Transportation and local road commissions use the data to analyze high crash locations and to bill for damage to government property. Law enforcement agencies use the data to plan traffic enforcement actions to reduce crashes, with the goal of saving lives and reducing injuries. Crashes resulting in injury are matched with Medicaid eligible recipients at the Department of Community Health to bill the appropriate no-fault carrier for reimbursement of expenses under the Medicaid program. The Department of Natural Resources uses data received to analyze snowmobile and off-road vehicle and car/deer crashes. Many of these initiatives are under the umbrella of the Governor's Traffic Safety Advisory Committee, which develops the strategic highway safety plan and sets goals, in part, based on traffic crash data.

Data can also be purchased by authorized customers through the Department of State. The data is used for such purposes as insurance underwriting, manufacturer recalls, legal proceedings, car rental decisions by car rental companies, employment screenings, and verification of an individual's information for preventing fraud or recovering debt.

For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2008, the Criminal History Section and the Criminal Justice Information System Field Services Unit expended \$6.7 million in administering their responsibilities, including administering CHRD and the Warrants Database, and had 30 full-time equated employees. The Crash Unit expended \$1.4 million in administering its responsibilities, including maintaining TCRS, and had 15 full-time equated employees.

## Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses and Prior Audit Follow-Up

### Audit Objectives

Our performance audit\* of the Criminal History Records Database (CHRD), Warrants Database, and Traffic Crash Reporting System (TCRS) Within the Criminal Justice Information Center (CJIC), Michigan Department of State Police (MSP), had the following objectives:

1. To assess the effectiveness\* and efficiency\* of CJIC's efforts to ensure the accuracy of CHRD.
2. To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of CJIC's efforts to ensure the validity of warrants in the Warrants Database.
3. To assess the efficiency of CJIC's maintenance of TCRS.

### Audit Scope

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of the Criminal History Records Database, Warrants Database, and Traffic Crash Reporting System. We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. Our audit procedures, conducted from May through December 2008, generally covered the period October 1, 2006 through October 17, 2008.

We performed our audit procedures to evaluate MSP's efforts in ensuring the accuracy of CHRD data and validity of warrants in the Warrants Database. Although we tested the validity of selected warrants in the Warrants Database, such testing was not intended to provide sufficient, appropriate evidence to render an opinion on the validity of the entire database. Rather, the testing was used to support our conclusion of CJIC's efforts to ensure the validity of the warrants in the Warrants Database.

\* See glossary at end of report for definition.

## Audit Methodology

We conducted a preliminary review of CJIC's operations to formulate a basis for defining the audit objectives and scope. Our review included interviewing CJIC personnel and reviewing applicable statutes, reports, policy and procedures, and other reference materials.

To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of CJIC's efforts to ensure the accuracy of CHRDR, we reviewed CJIC's process for verifying the completeness and accuracy of the data and recording revisions to criminal history records. We summarized CJIC's CHRDR revisions by type for two months to gain an understanding of the volume and types of revisions made to the criminal history records by CJIC. We assessed the ability of CHRDR users to process data revisions in lieu of having CJIC process all revisions. To measure CJIC resources applied to CHRDR, we analyzed monthly personnel activity reports that quantified staff time allocated to CHRDR. We reviewed the effectiveness of CJIC's process to identify CHRDR records that were missing court dispositions.

To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of CJIC's efforts to ensure the validity of warrants in the Warrants Database, we observed and reviewed CJIC's process for validating the accuracy of warrants, including a review of CJIC's process for following up with law enforcement agencies that did not validate their warrants by the due date. We tested the validity of warrants in the Warrants Database during our visits to three law enforcement agencies. In addition, we performed a match of warrant data with Department of Community Health death records to determine the validity of outstanding warrants.

To assess the efficiency of CJIC's maintenance of TCRS, we compiled CJIC's costs for processing traffic crash reports and correcting errors. To assess whether CJIC collected unnecessary data, we interviewed TCRS users to determine what data was critical for their needs and reviewed State statutes and federal law to determine whether data collected was required. We evaluated whether data required to be collected was necessary for TCRS users.

We analyzed traffic crash report errors for local law enforcement agencies before and after electronic conversion and identified the impact on error rates for local law enforcement agencies submitting data electronically to determine if efficiencies were gained by CJIC and by local agencies implementing an electronic reporting format. We reviewed CJIC's process and criteria for selecting which local law enforcement agencies

would receive grant funding to allow the local law enforcement agency to input traffic crash data electronically instead of recording the data manually and then mailing the form to CJIC for processing. Our review of CJIC's process for selecting agencies to receive grant funding to implement electronic crash reporting was designed to determine if CJIC considered efficiencies to be gained by MSP when evaluating which agencies to grant funds to for electronic reporting.

When selecting activities or programs for audit, we use an approach based on assessment of risk and opportunity for improvement. Accordingly, we focus our audit efforts on activities or programs having the greatest probability for needing improvement as identified through a preliminary review. Our limited audit resources are used, by design, to identify where and how improvements can be made. Consequently, we prepare our performance audit reports on an exception basis. To the extent practical, we add balance to our audit reports by presenting noteworthy accomplishments for exemplary achievements identified during our audits.

#### Agency Responses and Prior Audit Follow-Up

Our audit report contains 2 findings and 3 corresponding recommendations. CJIC's preliminary response indicated that it agrees with all of the recommendations.

The agency preliminary response that 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 the State of Michigan Financial Management Guide (Part VII, Chapter 4, Section 100) require MSP to develop a formal response to our audit findings and recommendations within 60 days after release of the audit report.

We released our prior performance audit of the Criminal Justice Information Center, Michigan Department of State Police (55-130-02), in February 2003 and the follow-up report (55-130-02F) in September 2005. Within the scope of this audit, we followed up 1 of the 5 prior audit recommendations. MSP had complied with the prior audit recommendation by developing controls and procedures to help ensure the accuracy of CHRD data; however, within the scope of our audit, we did not conclude whether the controls and procedures resulted in increased accuracy of CHRD data.

COMMENTS, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS,  
AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES

## **EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF EFFORTS TO ENSURE ACCURACY OF THE CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS DATABASE**

### **COMMENT**

**Audit Objective:** To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the Criminal Justice Information Center's (CJIC's) efforts to ensure the accuracy of the Criminal History Records Database (CHRD).

**Audit Conclusion:** **We concluded that CJIC's efforts to ensure the accuracy of CHRD were effective and efficient.** However, our audit disclosed one reportable condition\* related to performance measures (Finding 1).

**Noteworthy Accomplishments:** From 2004 to 2007, CJIC worked with local law enforcement agencies, county prosecutors, and courts to automate the reporting process for CHRD. In addition, CJIC encouraged local law enforcement agencies to use Live Scan devices when performing fingerprinting and created interfaces between local systems and CHRD. As a result, over 97% of arrests, charges, and dispositions are reported to CHRD electronically. This initiative improved timeliness and accuracy as CHRD data had one point of entry, thus reducing the possibility of errors.

In addition, beginning in 2007, CJIC collaborated with the State Court Administrative Office to create a reporting mechanism between the Judicial Data Warehouse\*, local courts, and CHRD. This process used the data in the Judicial Data Warehouse to electronically update CHRD with data from dispositions that were recorded prior to the courts having the ability to electronically update data to CHRD. As a result, CJIC located over 43,000 missing dispositions and electronically added them to CHRD. This initiative greatly improved the completeness of records in CHRD.

### **FINDING**

1. **Performance Measures**

CJIC had not implemented a complete performance measurement process to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of its efforts in ensuring accurate CHRD data.

\* See glossary at end of report for definition.

Program efficiency and effectiveness can often be evaluated and improved by having a comprehensive evaluation process. A comprehensive evaluation process would help CJIC ensure that its efforts are aligned with its criminal justice and public safety goals.

A process to evaluate effectiveness and efficiency should include performance indicators\* for measuring outputs\* and outcomes\*; performance standards\* that describe the desired level of outputs and outcomes based on management expectations, peer group performance, and/or historical performance; a system to accurately gather relevant output and outcome data; a comparison of actual data to performance standards; and a reporting of the comparison results to management, including proposals for program modifications to improve efficiency and effectiveness.

The following table summarizes CJIC outputs for calendar years 2007 and 2008:

<u>Type of Activity</u>	<u>2007 Outputs</u>	<u>2008 Outputs</u>
Follow-up transactions when data edits send the transaction to the problem queue	31,431 (a)	40,056
Contacts from employers or licensing agencies regarding applicant fingerprints	33,197	25,261
CJIC manual entry from hard copy fingerprint cards	22,394	23,128
Additional activity because the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) rejected an applicant finger print	15,383	17,968
Contacts from law enforcement agencies regarding corrections to criminal history records	8,105 (b)	12,672
Fingerprint requests processed	761,655	762,083

(a) Outputs compiled beginning March 2007.

(b) Outputs compiled beginning May 2007.

\* See glossary at end of report for definition.



Our review of CJIC's efforts disclosed that it could establish a more complete performance measurement process to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of its efforts in ensuring the accuracy of CHRD:

- a. CJIC should implement a process to evaluate improvements in the accuracy of CHRD data as a result of increased implementation of automated systems that allow all courts and local prosecuting attorney offices to directly enter data into CHRD.
- b. CJIC should use its electronic capabilities to identify CHRD data anomalies as a method of providing targeted training to local law enforcement agencies to enhance the accuracy of CHRD. CJIC relied on its staff to identify training opportunities for local agencies based on requested data revisions.
- c. CJIC should evaluate potential efficiencies that could be achieved by helping to ensure that county prosecuting attorneys and courts that had electronic capabilities make corrections to criminal history records electronically rather than submitting data revision requests to CJIC for manual processing.

Compiling and analyzing performance-related data would help CJIC identify areas to improve its efficiency and help provide CJIC with additional program data for evaluating program effectiveness and initiating program modifications.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

We recommend that CJIC implement a complete performance measurement process to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of its efforts in ensuring accurate CHRD data.

### **AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

CJIC agrees with the recommendation.

## **EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF EFFORTS TO ENSURE VALIDITY OF WARRANTS IN THE WARRANTS DATABASE**

### **COMMENT**

**Audit Objective:** To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of CJIC's efforts to ensure the validity of warrants in the Warrants Database.

**Audit Conclusion:** We concluded that CJIC's efforts to ensure the validity of warrants in the Warrants Database were effective and efficient. Our report does not include any reportable conditions related to this audit objective.

## **EFFICIENCY OF CJIC'S MAINTENANCE OF THE TRAFFIC CRASH REPORTING SYSTEM**

### **COMMENT**

**Audit Objective:** To assess the efficiency of CJIC's maintenance of the Traffic Crash Reporting System (TCRS).

**Audit Conclusion:** We concluded that CJIC was moderately efficient in maintaining TCRS. Our audit disclosed one reportable condition related to TCRS grant awards (Finding 2).

### **FINDING**

#### **2. TCRS Grant Awards**

CJIC should increase the emphasis on potential cost savings when evaluating grant applications from local law enforcement agencies. Evaluating each agency's volume of crash reports and crash report errors, and the associated costs, would assist CJIC in awarding grants to agencies that would have the greatest effect on reducing CJIC's costs and improving the accuracy of the data in TCRS.

Also, CJIC should evaluate the effectiveness of previous grant award results. Evaluating the results of previous grant awards would allow CJIC to demonstrate cost efficiencies and improvements in TCRS data accuracy.

Sections 18.1483(b) and 18.1485(1) of the *Michigan Compiled Laws* require that State departments establish an internal accounting and administrative control system to promote operational efficiency within each department. Operational efficiency would include minimizing CJIC costs while ensuring the accuracy of TCRS data.

Beginning in fiscal year 2006-07, the Michigan Department of State Police (MSP) received federal funds to award grants to enable local law enforcement agencies to electronically submit traffic crash reports to TCRS. During fiscal years 2008-09 and 2007-08, CJIC evaluated 36 and 27 grant applications, respectively, and awarded approximately \$1 million in grants each fiscal year to 10 and 9 grantees, respectively. CJIC informed us that the grant awards were competitive and that it based awards on the following criteria: work plans, technology readiness, lead agency and partnership information, cost per crash, accuracy of number of crash reports submitted, number of agencies being brought onto electronic submission, geographic area represented, and vendor information.

The volume of crash reports submitted and number of error corrections requested by law enforcement agencies directly impacts CJIC and local law enforcement agency costs to process reports and to correct data errors. Our review disclosed that traffic crash report errors declined 93% for reports submitted electronically. However, CJIC's grant application assessment process did not emphasize the elimination of CJIC and local law enforcement agency costs related to the volume of crash reports processed or data errors corrected when determining which agencies should receive grant awards. The following table summarizes traffic

crash reporting data from January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2007 for the 10 grants awarded during fiscal year 2008-09:

Grantee	Number of		Errors per Crash Report	Grant Amount Awarded	Cost per	
	Traffic Crash Reports	Data Errors			Traffic Crash Report	Data Edit Error
Grantee 1	1,135	142	0.13	\$ 73,500	\$ 64.76	\$517.61
Grantee 2	6	52	8.67	14,113	\$2,352.17	\$271.40
Grantee 3	5,166	49,586	9.60	262,773	\$ 50.87	\$ 5.30
Grantee 4	1,254	13,531	10.79	60,100	\$ 47.93	\$ 4.44
Grantee 5	6,411	58,071	9.06	234,288	\$ 36.54	\$ 4.03
Grantee 6	3,074	26,041	8.47	84,000	\$ 27.33	\$ 3.23
Grantee 7	173	2,411	13.94	6,336	\$ 36.62	\$ 2.63
Grantee 8	1,026	9,507	9.27	24,021	\$ 23.41	\$ 2.53
Grantee 9	1,808	14,120	7.81	29,908	\$ 16.54	\$ 2.12
Grantee 10	76,748	776,616	10.12	208,902	\$ 2.72	\$ 0.27
Total	96,801	950,077		\$997,941		

As noted in the preceding table, CJIC awarded grants to local law enforcement agencies with both high and low volumes of crash reports and data errors per crash report. However, we identified 9 applicants that, based on their volumes of crash reports and data error corrections, would have provided CJIC with higher gains in efficiency than some of the agencies that it awarded grants:

Applicant	Number of		Errors per Crash Report	Grant Amount Requested	Cost per	
	Traffic Crash Reports	Data Errors			Traffic Crash Report	Data Edit Error
Applicant 1	4,737	46,025	9.72	\$ 64,300	\$13.57	\$1.40
Applicant 2	3,495	33,055	9.46	\$ 59,703	\$17.08	\$1.81
Applicant 3	3,699	29,884	8.08	\$ 59,473	\$16.08	\$1.99
Applicant 4	3,295	29,459	8.94	\$ 80,060	\$24.30	\$2.72
Applicant 5	4,784	54,629	11.42	\$156,824	\$32.78	\$2.87
Applicant 6	2,187	18,362	8.40	\$ 61,552	\$28.14	\$3.35
Applicant 7	5,458	46,400	8.50	\$191,230	\$35.04	\$4.12
Applicant 8	5,778	35,958	6.22	\$163,469	\$28.29	\$4.55
Applicant 9	3,904	39,826	10.20	\$296,128	\$75.85	\$7.44

As indicated by the preceding tables, CJIC could increase its efficiency by considering the volume of local law enforcement crash reports and data errors when determining which agencies should receive grant awards. For example, CJIC would have reduced its work load to a greater extent by awarding a grant to Applicant 1 as compared to Grantee 1 based on the number of traffic crash reports (4,737 and 1,135, respectively) and the number of data errors (46,025 and 142, respectively). Another method of determining relative efficiency is to consider the amount of requested grant funds. As shown in the preceding tables, when considering the amount of requested grant funds, Applicant 1's grant cost per data edit error was \$1.40 while Grantee 1's grant cost per data edit error was \$517.61.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

We recommend that CJIC increase the emphasis on potential cost savings when evaluating grant applications from local law enforcement agencies.

We also recommend that CJIC evaluate the effectiveness of previous grant award results.

### **AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

CJIC agrees with the recommendations. CJIC informed us that the grants are administered by MSP's Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP). CJIC will coordinate with OHSP to review the criteria for the grant award process and evaluate the effectiveness of previous grant award results.

# GLOSSARY

## Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

CHRD	Criminal History Records Database.
CJIC	Criminal Justice Information Center.
effectiveness	Program success in achieving mission and goals.
efficiency	Achieving the most outputs and outcomes practical with the minimum amount of resources.
Judicial Data Warehouse	A database that allows the judiciary to collect information about pending and closed cases throughout Michigan.
Law Enforcement Information Network (LEIN)	The computer system and the series of computer terminal locations that allow criminal justice agencies to enter and access data.
MSP	Michigan Department of State Police.
NCIC	National Crime Information Center.
OHSP	Office of Highway Safety Planning.
outcome	An actual impact of a program.
output	A product or a service produced by a program.
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.

performance indicator	Information of a quantitative or qualitative nature used to assess achievement of goals and/or objectives.
performance standard	A desired level of output or outcome.
reportable condition	A matter that, in the auditor's judgment, 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.
TCRS	Traffic Crash Reporting System.
wanted person	An individual who has a signed court order authorizing his/her arrest.









