
January 2014

Performance Audit
Recommendations and Corrective
Actions for Audit: 11-1

Sex Offender Supervision:

Corrections' Caseloads Were
Largely in Accordance with
Statutory Requirements, but
Monitoring Tools Could Be
Improved

Dated: 01/10/2011

Overview

The SAO makes recommendations designed to improve the operations of state government. For our work to produce benefits, auditees or the General Assembly must implement these recommendations although we cannot require them to do so. Nevertheless, a measure of the quality and persuasiveness of our performance audits is the extent to which these recommendations are accepted and acted upon. The greater the number of recommendations that are implemented, the more benefit will be derived from our audit work.

In 2010, the SAO began to follow-up on the recommendations issued in our performance audits. Experience has shown that it takes time for some recommendations to be implemented. For this reason, we perform our follow-up activities two and four years after the calendar year in which the audit report is issued (e.g., we followed up on recommendations contained in audit reports issued in calendar year 2008 in 2010 and 2012). Our annual performance reports summarize whether we are meeting our recommendation implementation targets.

Act 155 (2012) required that we post on our website “a summary of significant recommendations arising out of the...audit reports... and the dates on which corrective actions were taken related to these recommendations. Recommendation follow-up shall be conducted at least biennially and for at least four years from the date of the audit report.”

This report addresses the requirements of Act 155 to post the results of our recommendation follow-up work on our website. The report does not include follow-up on recommendations issued as part of the state’s financial statement audit and the federally mandated Single Audit, which are performed by a contractor. However, our new contract for this work requires the contractor to provide the results of its recommendation follow-up in the future. Accordingly, we expect that future reports will contain this data.

| Audit No., Name & Date | Rec # | Recommendation | Follow-Up Date | Status & Date | Review Comments |
|--|----------|--|-------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| 11-1 Sex Offender Supervision: Corrections' Caseloads Were Largely in accordance with Statutory Requirements, but Monitoring Tools Could Be Improved 1/10/2011 | 1 | <p>The Department of Corrections (DOC) should develop criteria for when it is appropriate to assign sex offenders to be supervised by probation and parole officers who do not specialize in sex offender management.</p> | 12/1/2013 | Partially Implemented 6/1/2012 | <p>DOC has not established criteria for when it is appropriate to assign sex offenders to be supervised by POs who do not specialize in sex offender management. However, per DOC official, all of such cases go through case staffing review process that involves review of pertinent information by Department of Corrections facility, probation and parole office and central office staff in order to make classification decisions about appropriate levels of supervision.</p> |
| | | | 2015 | | <p><i>The four-year recommendation/follow-up for this audit will be conducted in 2015.</i></p> |
| | 2 | <p>The Department of Corrections (DOC) should develop a report that tracks and clearly shows whether probation and parole officers' (PO) caseloads are within statutory limitations or modify an existing report to provide such information.</p> | 12/1/2013 | Implemented | <p>The current DOC Caseload Ratio Report includes the number of active and inactive cases assigned to probation officers. In addition, it compares the number of the assigned cases to the caseload limits of each probation officer and calculates the percentage of caseload capacity reached.</p> |
| | | | 2015 | | <p><i>The four-year recommendation/follow-up for this audit will be conducted in 2015.</i></p> |
| | 3 | <p>The Department of Corrections (DOC) should require probation and parole offices to establish written procedures for updating offender records in the DOC system, which would include responsibilities and standards related to the timely updating of offender records in the system.</p> | 12/1/2013 | Partially Implemented | <p>Per DOC, the Department's Probation and Parole Offices are not required to establish written procedures regarding timeliness of sex offender records updates in the DOC system. However, a number of the DOC Directives require system updates subsequent to case management activities, such as intake or offenders' residence checks.</p> |
| | | | 2015 | | <p><i>The four-year recommendation/follow-up for this audit will be conducted in 2015.</i></p> |

| Audit No., Name & Date | Rec # | Recommendation | Follow-Up Date | Status & Date | Review Comments |
|--|----------|--|-------------------|------------------|--|
| 11-1 Sex Offender Supervision: Corrections' Caseloads Were Largely in Accordance with Statutory Requirements, but Monitoring Tools Could Be Improved 1/10/2011 | 4 | The Department of Corrections (DOC) should develop and implement system-specific training for field office personnel. | 12/1/2013 | Not Implemented | Per DOC, the Department is currently in the process of replacing its database. Little or no resources are allocated for purposes other than maintenance of the current system. |
| | | | 2015 | | <i>The four-year recommendation/follow-up for this audit will be conducted in 2015</i> |
| | 5 | The Department of Corrections (DOC) should expeditiously devise an implementation strategy for its planned probation and parole officer (PO) training curriculum and the Probation and Parole Officer's Training and Resource Manual, outlining the tasks, milestones, and resources needed for their effective rollout. | 12/1/2013 | Implemented | DOC established a multi-faceted training approach, including basic instructions, online training, special competency trainings, annual and bi-annual conferences and on-going updates of DOC policies and directives. DOC training materials provide detailed overviews of its training curriculum and its milestones. Training progress of Department of Correction specialists is overseen by their supervisors and is monitored via Training Checklists and Training Record system. |
| | | | 2015 | | <i>The four-year recommendation/follow-up for this audit will be conducted in 2015.</i> |