



# MICHIGAN

OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL

## AUDIT REPORT

PERFORMANCE AUDIT  
OF

PRISONER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

August 2014



Doug A. Ringler, C.P.A., C.I.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*

Report Number:  
 471-0310-13

*Prisoner Education Programs*

*Department of Corrections*

Released:  
 August 2014

*Prisoner education programs assist prisoners in the development of their academic, workplace, and social competencies to facilitate the transition from prison to the community. Prisoner education programs include academic education, special education, career and technical education, and pre-release programs. Various prisoner education programs are offered at 30 of the Department of Corrections' (DOC's) correctional facilities.*

Audit Objective		Audit Conclusion	
To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of DOC's efforts to provide academic and vocational education to prisoners.		Moderately effective and efficient	
Findings Related to This Audit Objective	Material Condition	Reportable Condition	Agency Preliminary Response
DOC had not implemented all the components of a comprehensive process to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of its prisoner education programs ( <a href="#">Finding 1</a> ).		X	Agrees
DOC did not identify and investigate correctional facilities that did not maintain prisoner classroom enrollments at the recommended capacity ( <a href="#">Finding 2</a> ).		X	Agrees
DOC did not request Title I (State Agency Program for Neglected and Delinquent Children and Youth) federal funding for all eligible prisoners. Also, DOC did not ensure that it enrolled otherwise eligible prisoners in the required hours of educational instruction in order to obtain additional Title I federal funding ( <a href="#">Finding 3</a> ).		X	Agrees

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

**Doug A. Ringler, C.P.A., C.I.A.**  
Auditor General

**Laura J. Hirst, C.P.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

DOUG A. RINGLER, C.P.A., C.I.A.  
AUDITOR GENERAL

August 19, 2014

Mr. Daniel H. Heyns, Director  
Department of Corrections  
Grandview Plaza Building  
Lansing, Michigan

Dear Mr. Heyns:

This is our report on the performance audit of Prisoner Education Programs, Department of Corrections.

This report contains our report summary; a description of programs; our audit objective, scope, and methodology and agency responses and prior audit follow-up; comment, findings, recommendations, and agency preliminary responses; and a glossary of abbreviations and terms.

The agency preliminary responses were taken from the agency's response at the end of our audit fieldwork. The *Michigan Compiled Laws* and administrative procedures require that the audited agency develop a plan to comply with the audit recommendations and submit it within 60 days after release of the audit report to the Office of Internal Audit Services, State Budget Office. Within 30 days of receipt, the Office of Internal Audit Services is required to review the plan and either accept the plan as final or contact the agency to take additional steps to finalize the plan.

We appreciate the courtesy and cooperation extended to us during this audit.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Doug Ringler". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Doug Ringler, C.P.A., C.I.A.  
Auditor General



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### **PRISONER EDUCATION PROGRAMS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	
Report Summary	1
Report Letter	3
Description of Programs	6
Audit Objective, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses and Prior Audit Follow-Up	8
COMMENT, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES	
Effectiveness and Efficiency of Efforts to Provide Academic and Vocational Education to Prisoners	12
1. Evaluation Process	13
2. Classroom Utilization	16
3. Title I Federal Funding	18
GLOSSARY	
Glossary of Abbreviations and Terms	22

## Description of Programs

Educational Services, within the Department of Corrections' (DOC's) Correctional Facilities Administration, administers the prisoner education programs. Its mission\* is to facilitate the transition from prison to the community by assisting prisoners in the development of their academic, workplace, and social competencies through effective and cost-efficient programs.

Educational Services operates schools in 30 of 32 DOC correctional facilities and enrolls prisoners in academic education, special education, career and technical education\* (CTE), and pre-release programs based on eligibility criteria and enrollment guidelines:

### 1. Academic Education

Educational Services provides academic education programs to prisoners who do not have a high school diploma or a General Educational Development\* (GED) certificate. Academic education programs include GED test preparation, English as a second language, and other components of adult basic education\* (ABE). Educational Services provided academic education programs at all 30 of the correctional facility schools and had an average monthly enrollment of 4,973 and 4,976 prisoners for fiscal years 2010-11 and 2011-12, respectively.

Section 791.233(f) of the *Michigan Compiled Laws* generally prohibits a prisoner from being paroled unless he or she has either earned a high school diploma or earned its equivalent in the form of a GED certificate. This requirement may be waived under certain conditions.

### 2. Special Education

Educational Services provides special education programs to eligible prisoners in accordance with the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act. Educational Services provided special education programs at 13 of the 30 correctional facility schools and had an average monthly enrollment of 303 and 276 prisoners for fiscal years 2010-11 and 2011-12, respectively.

\* See glossary at end of report for definition.

3. Career and Technical Education

Educational Services provides career and technical education (CTE) programs that provide prisoners with job skills that are marketable in the community, including auto mechanics, building trades, business education technology, custodial maintenance, food technology and hospitality, horticulture, machine tooling, optical technology, and welding. In addition, prisoners may enhance their CTE experience by participating in service learning projects that provide goods and services to State and local government agencies and nonprofit organizations. Service learning projects include building components and growing plants for Habitat for Humanity houses, building cabins and growing trees and plants for the Department of Natural Resources, and refurbishing donated vehicles for Goodwill Industries. Educational Services offered CTE programs at all 30 correctional facility schools and had an average monthly enrollment of 1,678 and 1,689 prisoners for fiscal years 2010-11 and 2011-12, respectively.

4. Pre-Release

Educational Services provides a pre-release program to prisoners who are near parole and who choose to participate. The pre-release program provides prisoners with information in the areas of self-awareness, job-seeking and job-keeping skills, and community reintegration. Educational Services provided a pre-release program at 28 correctional facilities and 3,637 and 2,878 prisoners completed the pre-release program during fiscal years 2010-11 and 2011-12, respectively.

DOC expended \$29.9 million and \$28.6 million from the State's General Fund and \$1.1 million and \$0.9 million from federal grants on prisoner education programs at an average cost of \$4,146 and \$3,965 per enrolled prisoner during fiscal years 2010-11 and 2011-12, respectively. As of September 30, 2012, Educational Services had 225 full-time equated positions.

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

### Audit Objective

The objective of our performance audit\* of Prisoner Education Programs, Department of Corrections (DOC), was to assess the effectiveness\* and efficiency\* of DOC's efforts to provide academic and vocational education to prisoners.

### Audit Scope

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of the prisoner education programs. 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 conclusion based on our audit objective. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusion based on our audit objective. Our audit procedures, which included a preliminary survey, audit fieldwork, report preparation, analysis of agency responses, and quality assurance, generally covered the period October 1, 2010 through June 10, 2013.

### Audit Methodology

We conducted a preliminary survey of the prisoner education programs to formulate a basis for defining the audit objective and scope. Our preliminary survey included interviewing Educational Services personnel and reviewing DOC's annual reports to the Legislature. We also reviewed the programs' mission and performance measures\*, applicable laws and procedures, and prisoner education files and researched other states' prison education programs. We analyzed expenditures, teacher classroom hours, and classroom enrollments.

To accomplish our audit objective, we reviewed DOC's efforts to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of its prisoner education programs. We reviewed and verified selected enrollment and education program completion counts in the annual legislative reports. Also, we analyzed pre-release program records for all prisoners paroled from October 1, 2010 through February 28, 2013 and for all prisoners enrolled in its pre-release program from October 1, 2010 through June 10, 2013.

\* See glossary at end of report for definition.

We judgmentally selected eight correctional facilities and interviewed principals, teachers, secretaries, and the classification director to gain an understanding of various educational processes. In addition, we reviewed documentation including the academic and career and technical education (CTE) monthly reports, prisoner enrollment and attendance records, teacher and classroom utilization reports, General Educational Development (GED) completion certificates and exemption forms, CTE completion forms, waiting lists, and progress plotters\*. The eight correctional facilities that we visited included Alger Correctional Facility, Cooper Street Correctional Facility, G. Robert Cotton Correctional Facility, Macomb Correctional Facility, Marquette Branch Prison, Richard A. Handlon Correctional Facility, Thumb Correctional Facility, and Women's Huron Valley Correctional Facility. We did not project the results of our visits to the remaining correctional facilities.

In addition, we analyzed data obtained from DOC's Offender Education Tracking System\* (OETS) and selected a statistical sample of 39 of 1,706 prisoners and reviewed their educational progress and compliance with Section 791.233(f) of the *Michigan Compiled Laws* for prisoners paroled who had not earned their GED certificate. We did not project the sample results to the remaining population.

We judgmentally selected one month and randomly selected two months and reviewed the utilization of teacher classroom hours and classroom enrollments at all correctional facilities. Also, we analyzed expenditures by facility and by program and calculated the average cost of prisoners' education based on the average number of prisoners enrolled in education programs. In addition, we summarized prisoners in OETS who were eligible for Title I federal funding and compared it with DOC's list of Title I funded prisoners.

When selecting activities or programs for audit, we direct our efforts based on risk and opportunities to improve the operations of State government. Consequently, we prepare our performance audit reports on an exception basis.

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

Our audit report contains 3 findings and 4 corresponding recommendations. DOC's preliminary response indicates that it agrees with all the recommendations.

\* See glossary at end of report for definition.

The agency preliminary response that follows each recommendation in our report was taken from the agency's written comments and oral discussion at the end of 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 DOC to develop a plan to comply with the audit recommendations and submit it within 60 days after release of the audit report to the Office of Internal Audit Services, State Budget Office. Within 30 days of receipt, the Office of Internal Audit Services is required to review the plan and either accept the plan as final or contact the agency to take additional steps to finalize the plan.

We released our prior performance audit of the Prisoner Education Program, Department of Corrections (47-310-03), in August 2005. DOC complied with 2 of the 7 prior audit recommendations. We rewrote 2 prior audit recommendations for inclusion in Findings 1 and 3 of this audit report. We determined that the 3 other prior audit recommendations were no longer applicable.

COMMENT, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS,  
AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES

## EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF EFFORTS TO PROVIDE ACADEMIC AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION TO PRISONERS

### COMMENT

**Audit Objective:** To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the Department of Corrections' (DOC's) efforts to provide academic and vocational education to prisoners.

**Audit Conclusion:** We concluded that DOC's efforts to provide academic and vocational education to prisoners were moderately effective and efficient.

Our audit conclusion was based on our audit efforts as described in the audit scope and audit methodology sections and the resulting reportable conditions\* noted in the comment, findings, recommendations, and agency preliminary responses section.

We noted three reportable conditions in the six areas of the prisoner education programs that we reviewed. In our professional judgment, these matters are less severe than material conditions\* but represent either deficiencies in internal control\* that are significant within the context of the audit objective or opportunities for improvement. The reportable conditions related to the evaluation process, classroom utilization, and Title I federal funding (Findings 1 through 3).

We evaluated the qualitative and quantitative factors of DOC's prisoner education programs related to DOC's efforts to monitor and evaluate its prisoner education programs; completion of General Educational Development (GED), adult basic education (ABE), career and technical education (CTE), and pre-release programs; classroom utilization and wait lists; teacher utilization rates; Title I eligibility and enrollment; and the cost of prisoner education programs. We also considered the constraints of operating education programs in a prison environment, including security risks and interruptions to education caused by prisoner transfers and disciplinary actions.

In reaching our conclusion on effectiveness, we considered that DOC had not implemented all of the components to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of its prisoner education programs; that DOC's teacher hour utilization rate was 94% and its classroom utilization rate was 90%, but DOC had classroom space available for

\* See glossary at end of report for definition.

approximately 765 additional prisoners and had approximately 7,500 prisoners on its prisoner education wait lists per month; and that for fiscal years 2010-11 and 2011-12 combined, DOC received approximately \$437,000 of Title I federal funding for 432 prisoners but did not request federal funding for an additional 431 eligible prisoners and did not enroll 339 otherwise eligible prisoners in at least 15 hours of educational instruction. In addition, we considered other audit evidence that indicated that DOC provided educational instruction at 30 of its 32 correctional facilities to approximately 7,500 prisoners on a monthly basis; that approximately 1,675 prisoners (34% of prisoners enrolled in GED preparation) achieved their GED certificate annually, exceeding DOC's 30% goal; and that approximately 2,881 prisoners completed at least one section of a CTE program annually. We believe that the results of our audit efforts provide a reasonable basis for our audit conclusion for this audit objective.

## **FINDING**

### **1. Evaluation Process**

DOC had not implemented all the components of a comprehensive process to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of its prisoner education programs. As a result, DOC could not completely assess the strengths, weaknesses, needs, and overall effectiveness of the prisoner education programs.

Program effectiveness and efficiency can often be evaluated and improved by having a comprehensive evaluation process. Such a process should include performance measures that evaluate outputs\* and outcomes\* related to the program's vision, mission, goals\*, and objectives\*; performance standards\* that describe the desired level of outputs or outcomes based on management expectations, peer group performance, and/or historical performance; a performance measurement system\* to capture output and outcome data on a timely basis; an evaluation of the actual data with desired outputs and outcomes; a reporting of the evaluation results to management; and recommendations to improve effectiveness and efficiency or change desired performance standards.

Our review of DOC's efforts to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of its prisoner education programs disclosed:

- a. DOC had not established performance measures and gathered sufficient data to evaluate the outcomes of its prisoner education programs.

\* See glossary at end of report for definition.

DOC could gather and analyze prisoner post-release data, for example, data relating to employment status and continued education. DOC could then use this data to evaluate the impact that the prisoner education programs had on the prisoners and to identify program strengths and weaknesses. DOC's Prisoner Education Action Plan for fiscal years 2010-11 through 2012-13 indicates that DOC will identify a means of gathering post-release data for evaluating current programs and determining future programs. DOC indicated that it had not implemented a method to collect and analyze post-release data to evaluate its education programs because section II of DOC's Manual for Corrections Educators prohibited education staff from having overfamiliar contact with prisoners and parolees. DOC hired eight employment counselors in April and July 2013 whose responsibilities include collection of post-release data from prisoners who had participated in the education programs and who were paroled.

- b. DOC had not evaluated the effectiveness of its ABE program.

The U.S. Department of Education measures ABE educational gains by comparing a student's Educational Functioning Level\* (EFL) on pretests and posttests. In addition, the U.S. Department of Education and Michigan's Workforce Development Agency established annual performance standards as a percentage of ABE participants achieving EFL educational gains to evaluate the ABE program. DOC gathered ABE pretest and posttest data, and Michigan's Workforce Development Agency calculated and compared the data results with its established performance standards. However, DOC informed us that it had not used the results of the data comparison to formally evaluate its ABE program because DOC's emphasis had been on GED certifications.

- c. DOC had not established performance standards and compiled output data in sufficient detail to evaluate the effectiveness of its CTE programs.

DOC established performance standards based on historical data of CTE program completions and collected and reported CTE completion data to the Legislature. However, DOC did not differentiate between the number of prisoners who completed sections of a CTE program and the number of

\* See glossary at end of report for definition.

prisoners who completed an entire CTE program. DOC indicated that it included sections completed in its output data because prisoners were routinely transferred to other correctional facilities or were paroled and may not have the opportunity to complete the entire program.

- d. DOC had not evaluated correctional facilities' classroom utilization results, using DOC's recommended performance standards, on a frequent enough basis to maximize educational instruction to prisoners.

DOC had established classroom utilization performance standards for the number of prisoners enrolled per classroom, the number of hours of educational instruction per week, and a student-to-teacher ratio, and DOC collected data related to these performance standards on a monthly basis. Also, DOC evaluated classroom enrollment during the correctional facility educational reviews that it completed every three years; however, we believe that this is too infrequent to sufficiently evaluate classroom utilization. Our review of DOC's correctional facility educational reviews from October 1, 2010 through April 15, 2013 disclosed that 5 (29%) of 17 correctional facilities did not meet the monthly average enrollment standards. We performed an evaluation of DOC's correctional facility classroom utilization rates (see Finding 2).

### **RECOMMENDATION**

We recommend that DOC implement all the components of a comprehensive process to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of its prisoner education programs.

### **AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

DOC agrees with the recommendation and stated that it has taken steps to comply.

DOC agrees that gathering and analyzing post-release data, such as employment status and continued education, on parolees who participated in the education programs would be a good practice. As part of its employment readiness focus, DOC indicated that it has created an employment counselor position who will track this type of data.

DOC also agrees that using prisoner data reported to and performance standards established by the Workforce Development Agency to evaluate its ABE program is a good practice and informed us that it has been doing this informally. DOC indicated that, through its education manager and Academic Committee, it will formally document its efforts to annually monitor and evaluate EFL gains within its schools.

DOC indicated that it is updating its monthly reporting system to better differentiate between CTE tier completions and to track employment readiness completions.

DOC commented that it already has many components in place to monitor the effectiveness and efficiency of its prisoner education programs. DOC indicated that its processes include output and quality monitoring and reporting practices such as internal performance audits, school audits, boilerplate reporting, MiScorecard performance metric reporting, internal monthly reporting, the Michigan Adult Education Reporting System updating, DOC's Offender Education Tracking System (OETS) maintenance, biannual ABE testing, individual prisoner EFL tracking, prisoner GED completion and CTE completion tracking, and advisory committee meetings.

## **FINDING**

### **2. Classroom Utilization**

DOC did not identify and investigate correctional facilities that did not maintain prisoner classroom enrollments at the recommended capacity. As a result, we determined that up to an average of 765 additional prisoners could have received educational instruction toward earning their GED or vocational certifications.

DOC's Manual for Corrections Educators recommends enrolling a minimum of 15 prisoners in a classroom for educational instruction. Also, section 2 of DOC's Principal's Manual indicates that the school principals are responsible for maintaining classroom enrollments at the recommended capacity.

We reviewed the correctional facilities' monthly report for classroom enrollment data and prisoner education wait list data for all of DOC's correctional facilities for the months of February 2011, July 2012, and January 2013. Although DOC

correctional facilities enrolled approximately 6,950 prisoners in the education programs per month, we determined that they had classroom space available for an average of 762, 898, and 636 additional prisoners during February 2011, July 2012, and January 2013, respectively. Also, DOC correctional facilities had approximately 7,500 prisoners on their prisoner education wait lists per month.

We visited eight DOC correctional facilities and obtained an understanding of their enrollment processes and reviewed their prisoner enrollment and attendance records. We noted some inefficient enrollment processes at the correctional facilities that affected how timely they filled available classroom space. For example, one correctional facility reviewed classroom availability on a weekly basis, while other facilities filled classroom spaces as they became available or scheduled more than the minimum number knowing that prisoners routinely exit education programs. We also noted two facilities that did not fill classroom vacancies because of extended staff absences.

We recognize that security risks, transfers, paroles, disciplinary actions, and special education needs may hinder DOC's ability to maintain recommended classroom capacity.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

We recommend that DOC identify and investigate correctional facilities that did not maintain prisoner classroom enrollments at the recommended capacity.

### **AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

DOC agrees with the recommendation and stated that it will comply by updating its classroom enrollment standards and by requiring schools that fall below the classroom enrollment standards to explain the reasons on their monthly reports. DOC indicated that it will also consider overfilling classrooms and filling classroom spaces on a daily, rather than weekly, basis to the extent practical given space limitations and the demands on school administration staff.

DOC reiterated that, as noted in the audit report, its teacher hour utilization rate was 94% and its classroom utilization rate was 90%. DOC stated that it is unrealistic to expect facilities to achieve 100% compliance with the recommended classroom size as the Manual for Corrections Educators does not account for

necessary exemptions and differences between facilities. DOC informed us that it is updating its classroom utilization standards and reporting to better account for differences between facilities related to special education classes, the security levels of the facilities and their housing units, and classroom space limitations. Also, DOC indicated that other factors significantly affect its ability to maintain 100% enrollment, such as expanded space requirements for mental health treatment and violence prevention classes; staff leave usage; prisoner transfers; prisoner disciplinary issues; and movement schedules at facilities where it is important to prevent the mixing of prisoners at different security levels.

## **FINDING**

### **3. Title I Federal Funding**

DOC did not request Title I (State Agency Program for Neglected and Delinquent Children and Youth) federal funding for all eligible prisoners. Also, DOC did not ensure that it enrolled otherwise eligible prisoners in the required hours of educational instruction in order to obtain additional Title I federal funding. As a result, DOC could have received additional federal funding for up to 770 prisoners for fiscal years 2010-11 and 2011-12 combined that could have provided resources to enroll additional prisoners in educational instruction and reduce the number of prisoners on the education wait list.

Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, states that a State agency is eligible for federal funding for providing a free public education in adult correctional institutions for children and youth who are 21 years of age or younger, who do not have a high school diploma or GED certificate, and who are enrolled in 15 hours of instruction per week on the October 1 count date.

For fiscal years 2010-11 and 2011-12 combined, DOC received approximately \$437,000 of Title I federal funding for 432 prisoners who were enrolled in educational instruction on the October 1, 2009 or October 1, 2010 count dates. This enrollment count was based on DOC's query, initiated with the Department of Technology, Management, and Budget (DTMB), of the Offender Education Tracking System (OETS) database as of the respective count dates.

Our review of the OETS database as of the October 1 count dates indicated that an additional 770 prisoners, for a total of 1,202 prisoners, were 21 years old or younger and did not have a high school diploma or GED certificate. The 770 prisoners did not include prisoners who were previously enrolled in educational instruction but exited within 90 days of the October 1 count date because they were under a disciplinary process, being transferred between facilities, or in the process of entering or exiting prison. We further analyzed these 770 prisoners and determined:

- a. DOC did not identify 413 (34%) of the 1,202 prisoners who were enrolled in 15 or more hours of educational instruction as of the October 1 count dates and were, therefore, eligible for Title I federal funding. DOC did not know why its query, initiated with DTMB, did not identify these prisoners as eligible for Title I federal funding.
- b. DOC did not enroll 126 (10%) of the 1,202 prisoners in any educational instruction as of the October 1 count dates. DOC indicated that the prisoners may not have been enrolled in educational instruction because they were on a wait list for a classroom opening, there were conflicts with other assignments, or there were security risks.
- c. DOC did not enroll 197 (16%) of the 1,202 prisoners in at least 15 hours of educational instruction as of the October 1 count dates. DOC indicated that the prisoners may not have been enrolled for 15 hours because of classroom scheduling, conflicts with other assignments, or security risks.
- d. DOC or its contractor who provided educational instruction to the prisoners at the Special Alternative Incarceration Facility (SAI) did not identify 18 SAI prisoners who were eligible for Title I federal funding or enroll 16 other SAI prisoners, who would have been eligible for Title I federal funding, in at least 15 hours of educational instruction.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

We recommend that DOC request Title I (State Agency Program for Neglected and Delinquent Children and Youth) federal funding for all eligible prisoners.

We also recommend that DOC ensure that it enrolls otherwise eligible prisoners in the required hours of educational instruction in order to obtain additional Title I federal funding.

### **AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

DOC agrees with the recommendations and stated that it will comply. DOC informed us that it will work with DTMB to correct the query used to identify prisoners who are enrolled in 15 or more hours of educational instruction and are therefore eligible for Title I federal funding. DOC indicated that it will require each school to perform and report a monthly manual headcount of these prisoners and that DOC will annually compare the headcount reports to the query results to ensure that it requested Title I federal funding for all eligible prisoners.

DOC informed us that it will also send out a reminder every September to prompt schools to give priority enrollment to Title I eligible students leading up to count day. However, DOC indicated that enrolling and meeting the Title I requirements for all prisoners who would otherwise be eligible for funding is difficult because of safety and security concerns in higher security level facilities; classroom space limitations; prisoner transfers; and movement schedules at facilities where it is important to prevent the mixing of prisoners at different security levels. For example, the Thumb Correctional Facility has Holmes Youthful Trainee Act prisoners who cannot mix with the regular adult population; however, DOC informed us that it will attempt to address this by moving additional resources to that facility.

In addition, DOC stated that it is now operating the SAI school and will count these students going forward.

# GLOSSARY

## Glossary of Abbreviations and Terms

adult basic education (ABE)	Provides an opportunity for students older than 16 years with education competencies below the level of high school graduates to achieve education levels equivalent to those of high school graduates. ABE consists of five components, including high school completion, GED test preparation, adult literacy, English as a second language, and employment readiness.
career and technical education (CTE)	Programs that provide work skills for a specific job that is marketable in the community for future employment.
DOC	Department of Corrections.
DTMB	Department of Technology, Management, and Budget.
Educational Functioning Level (EFL)	A student's ABE literacy level used to measure a student's ABE educational gain by comparing pretests and posttests.
effectiveness	Success in achieving mission and goals.
efficiency	Achieving the most outputs and the most outcomes practical with the minimum amount of resources.
General Educational Development (GED)	The process of earning the equivalent of a high school diploma.
goal	An intended outcome of a program or an entity to accomplish its mission.

internal control	The plan, policies, methods, and procedures adopted by management to meet its mission, goals, and objectives. Internal control includes the processes for planning, organizing, directing, and controlling program operations. It also includes the systems for measuring, reporting, and monitoring program performance. Internal control serves as a defense in safeguarding assets and in preventing and detecting errors; fraud; violations of laws, regulations, and provisions of contracts and grant agreements; or abuse.
material condition	A matter that, in the auditor's judgment, is more severe than a reportable condition and could impair the ability of management to operate a program in an effective and efficient manner and/or could adversely affect the judgment of an interested person concerning the effectiveness and efficiency of the program.
mission	The main purpose of a program or an entity or the reason that the program or the entity was established.
objective	Specific outcome(s) that a program or an entity seeks to achieve its goals.
Offender Education Tracking System (OETS)	A module, within the Offender Management Network Information System, that is an information system used by DOC to store and manage prisoner education data.
outcome	An actual impact of a program or an entity.
output	A product or a service produced by a program or an entity.
performance audit	An audit that provides findings or conclusions based on an evaluation of sufficient, appropriate evidence against criteria. Performance audits provide objective analysis to assist management and those charged with governance and oversight in using the information to improve program

performance and operations, reduce costs, facilitate decision making by parties with responsibility to oversee or initiate corrective action, and contribute to public accountability.

performance  
measure

A composite of key indicators of a program's or an activity's inputs, outputs, outcomes, productivity, timeliness, and/or quality. Performance measures are a means of evaluating policies and programs by measuring results against agreed upon program goals or standards.

performance  
measurement  
system

A system for capturing and processing data to determine if a program or an entity is achieving its goals.

performance  
standard

A desired level of output or outcome.

progress plotter

A form used to track a prisoner's achievement of each fundamental element (sentence structure, use of verbs, capitalization, punctuation, etc.) for a specific subject (reading, writing, math, etc.)

reportable condition

A matter that, in the auditor's judgment, is less severe than a material condition and falls within any of the following categories: an opportunity for improvement within the context of the audit objectives; a deficiency in internal control that is significant within the context of the audit objectives; 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.

SAI

Special Alternative Incarceration Facility.



