

Performance Audit

Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp

**Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Department of Corrections**

July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009



Performance Audit

Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp

**Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Department of Corrections**

July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

September 3, 2010

The Honorable Edward G. Rendell
Governor
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Dear Governor Rendell:

The report contains the results of a performance audit of the Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp for the period of July 1, 2006, through December 7, 2009. The audit was conducted under authority provided in Section 402 of The Fiscal Code and in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* as issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

The report details our audit objectives, scope, methodology, findings, and recommendations. We note that the boot camp's education department did not verify inmates' graduation status and did not ensure compliance with all general education development testing center security procedures. In addition, we also determined that the success rate of the federally funded fiber optics vocational program could be only partially determined. The contents of the report were discussed with officials of the institution, and all appropriate comments are reflected in the report.

We appreciate the cooperation extended to us by the management and staff of the Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp and by others who provided assistance during the audit.

Sincerely,

JACK WAGNER
Auditor General

September 2010
Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Table of Contents

Background Information	3
Department of Corrections	3
Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp	3
Objectives, Scope, and Methodology	6
Audit Results	10
Inmate Education.....	10
Finding 1 – The boot camp’s education department did not verify inmates’ graduation status and did not ensure compliance with all GED testing center security procedures.	10
Finding 2 – Neither the boot camp nor the Department of Corrections could show the success rate of the federally funded fiber optics vocational program. ...	14
Act 86 Compliance.....	15
Finding 3 – Quehanna Boot Camp complied with the legislative requirements of Act 86 of 1996.....	16
Boot Camp Cost Effectiveness.....	16
Finding 4 – The boot camp program remained cost effective and provided a useful approach to relieving the overcrowding in the correctional system.	17
Hiring Practices	21
Finding 5 – Quehanna Boot Camp complied with federal and state civil service guidelines.	21
Employee Complaints	22
Finding 6 – Employee complaints were handled timely.....	22
Employee Incentives	22
Finding 7 – Quehanna Boot Camp calculated monetary incentives and one- time signing bonuses properly.....	22
Audit Report Distribution List.....	24

Background Information

Background Information

Department of Corrections

The Pennsylvania General Assembly created the Pennsylvania Bureau of Corrections with the passage of Act 408 of July 29, 1953, P.L. 1428, Section 1. In January 1981, responsibility for bureau operations was moved from the authority of the state's independently elected Attorney General and transferred to the Office of General Counsel under the Governor's jurisdiction. On December 30, 1984, the Governor signed Act 245 of 1984,¹ which elevated the Bureau of Corrections to cabinet level status as the Department of Corrections.

The main goal of the Department of Corrections is to maintain a safe and secure environment for both the incarcerated offenders and the staff responsible for them. In addition, the Department of Corrections believes that every inmate should have the opportunity to be involved in a program of self-improvement.

The Department of Corrections is responsible for all adult offenders serving state-imposed sentences of two years or more. As of June 30, 2009, it operated 25 correctional institutions, 1 regional correctional facility, 1 motivational boot camp, 1 training academy, and 13 community pre-release centers throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp

The Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp is a minimum-security facility for adult male and female offenders. It is located in the Township of Karthaus, Clearfield County, approximately 30 miles north of Clearfield.

The Commission on Accreditation for Corrections, a part of the American Correctional Association (ACA), accredits the camp. The Commission on Accreditation for Corrections (CAC) serves as the body that measures the commitment of candidate agencies and the

¹ 71 P.S. §310.1

September 2010
Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Background Information

extent of their compliance with ACA standards, it rules on applications for ACA accreditation, and it enforces ACA standards nationwide.²

As a program of the Department of Corrections, the boot camp shares the same mission as other Department of Corrections' facilities: to protect the public by confining persons committed to their custody in safe, secure facilities, and to provide opportunities for inmates to acquire the skills and values necessary to become law-abiding citizens; while respecting the rights of crime victims. The boot camp's voluntary six-month program is designed to enforce positive life-building skills in a regimented, disciplined environment in concert with intense drug and alcohol therapy and educational classes, ultimately providing each inmate with the opportunity and mental tools for positive change.

In the spring of 2005, the Quehanna began to receive male inmates from the general population of state prison inmates who did not participate in the boot camp program. In January 2006, the camp started housing female general population inmates who also did not participate in the boot camp program. As of June 30, 2009, the population consisted of 61 percent boot camp inmates, 31 percent state intermediate punishment program inmates, and 8 percent general population inmates.

Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp is located on approximately 30 acres of land. The physical plant consists of 12 housing units, education classrooms, control center, visiting room, dietary and dining halls, warehouse, laundry, infirmary, and administrative offices.

²“Standards and Accreditation for the Safe Operation of Correctional Facilities,” page 6, November 2, 2005, presented to the Commission on Safety & Abuse in America's Prisons by Jeffrey Washington, Deputy Executive Director, Acting Director, Standards & Accreditation, the American Correctional Association.

September 2010
 Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Background Information

The following schedule presents selected unaudited Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp operating statistics compiled by the Department of Corrections for the years ended June 30, 2007, 2008, and 2009:

	Using rounding		
	2007	2008	2009
Operating expenses³			
State share	\$14,401,173	\$16,150,697	\$17,070,756
Federal share	<u>2,516</u>	<u>6,587</u>	<u>5,390</u>
Total operating expenses	<u>\$14,403,689</u>	<u>\$16,157,284</u>	<u>\$17,076,146</u>
Inmate population at year-end	334	380	494
Inmate capacity at year-end	462	414	464
Percentage of capacity at year-end	72.3%	91.8%	106.5%
Average monthly inmate population	319	418	418
Average cost per inmate per year ⁴	\$45,153	\$38,654	\$40,852

³ Operating expenses were recorded net of fixed assets, an amount that would normally be recovered as part of depreciation. In addition, regional level and indirect charges were not allocated to the totals reported here.

⁴ Average cost per inmate per year was calculated by dividing total operating expenses by the average monthly inmate population.

Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

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.

We selected the audit objectives from the following general areas: client management, including inmate education; Act 86 compliance; facility management, including boot camp cost effectiveness; and personnel management, including hiring practices, complaints, and bonuses. The specific audit objectives were:

- To determine if the boot camp complied with the Department of Corrections' educational program objectives. (Findings 1 and 2)
- To assess compliance with the eligibility provisions of Act 86 of 1996. (Finding 3)
- To monitor the cost effectiveness of the boot camp program. As part of our effort, we also determined if the boot camp program could potentially relieve the overcrowding in the state correctional system. (Finding 4)
- To analyze hiring practices pursuant to federal and state guidelines and regulations. (Finding 5)
- To review employee complaints and suggestions and to evaluate the efforts to respond to them. (Finding 6)
- To determine the propriety and use of the bonuses and other pay incentives for employees. (Finding 7)

The scope of the audit covered the period from July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009, unless indicated otherwise in the individual findings. We opened field work on July 13, 2009, and we completed our analysis on December 7, 2009.

September 2010
Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

To accomplish our objectives, we obtained and reviewed records and analyzed pertinent regulations, policies, and guidelines, including the Department of Corrections' policy for inmate education,⁵ and lists of inmates enrolled in education during the 2007, 2008, and 2009 calendar years. We also reviewed the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and the 2009-2010 proposed educational program guidelines for education programs in adult state correctional institutions.

We obtained and reviewed legislation,⁶ the Department of Corrections' policies relevant to the Act 86 program,⁷ policies related to hiring practices,⁸ and also the list of new hires from July 1, 2008, through July 24, 2009.

We obtained and reviewed applicable Commonwealth and Department of Corrections' policies and procedures for employee complaints and suggestions,⁹ reviewed the applicable union contracts for grievance provisions,¹⁰ and obtained and reviewed grievance logs and

⁵ Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Corrections, Policy Number 7.6.1, "Delivery of Educational Services," Section 1, "Educational Program Objectives," revised December 2008.

⁶ Act 215 of 1990 and Act 86 of 1996.

⁷ Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Corrections, Policy Number 11.2.1, "Reception and Classification," effective April 1, 2003.

⁸ Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Governor's Office, Management Directive 580.10, "Rights of Certified Eligibles in the Classified Service," effective April 7, 1997;
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Governor's Office, Management Directive 580.2, "Civil Service Availability Survey/Interview Notice," effective January 1, 2009;
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Governor's Office, Management Directive 580.21, "Veterans' Preference on Classified Service Employment Lists," effective May 5, 2008;
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State Civil Service Commission, "Rules of the Civil Service Commission," Title 4, Part IV, Subparts A and B, effective March 13, 2004;
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Corrections, Policy Number 4.1.1, "Human Resources and Labor Relations," Section 39, "Recruitment, Selection, Placement, Reinstatement for Civil Service Positions," effective February 25, 2002.

⁹ Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Governor's Office, Management Directive 590.7, "Labor Relations – Grievance Administration," effective June 8, 2006;
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Corrections, Policy Number 4.1.1, "Human Resources and Labor Relations," effective February 25, 2002.

¹⁰ Memorandum of Understanding between Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and OPEIU Healthcare Pennsylvania, Local 112, effective July 1, 2007, to June 30, 2011;
Agreement between Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and The Service Employees International District 1199P, CTW, CLC Agreement between Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and Local 668 SEIU Pennsylvania Social Services Union, effective July 1, 2007, to June 30, 2011;
Master Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and Council 13, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, effective July 1, 2007, to June 30, 2011;

September 2010
Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

supporting documentation for all 100 grievances filed between January 1, 2007, and June 30, 2009.

Finally, we reviewed applicable Commonwealth and Department of Corrections' policies and procedures,¹¹ including the provisions in applicable union contracts¹² for employee incentive payments.

During the course of our audit work, we interviewed various facility management and staff, including the corrections classification program manager, business manager, and human resources analysts.

To test compliance with inmate education program requirements, we randomly selected and tested 39 of 721 inmates enrolled in education programs between January 2007 and August 2009. Our Act 86 audit work consisted of randomly selecting and testing the eligibility of 56 of 1,439 inmates enrolled in the boot camp from January 1, 2007, to June 30, 2009.

Agreement between Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Correctional Institution Vocational Education Association, Pennsylvania State Education Association, National Education Association, effective July 1, 2007, to June 30, 2011;

Collective Bargaining Agreement for Educational and Cultural Employees between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Federation of State Cultural and Educational Professionals Local 2382, American Federation of Teachers Pennsylvania AFL-CIO, effective July 1, 2007, to June 30, 2011;

Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and Pennsylvania State Corrections Officers Association, effective July 1, 2007, to June 30, 2011.

¹¹ Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Governor's Office, Executive Board Resolution Number CN-07-122, May 21, 2007.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Governor's Office, Executive Board Resolution Number CN-07-170, June 25, 2007.

¹² Memorandum of Understanding between Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and OPEIU Healthcare Pennsylvania, Local 112, effective July 1, 2007, to June 30, 2011;

Agreement between Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Service Employees International District 1199P, CTW, CLC, effective July 1, 2007, to June 30, 2011;

Agreement between Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and Local 668 SEIU Pennsylvania Social Services Union, effective July 1, 2007, to June 30, 2011;

Master Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and Council 13, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, effective July 1, 2007, to June 30, 2011;

Agreement between Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Correctional Institution Vocational Education Association, Pennsylvania State Education Association, National Education Association, July 1, 2007, to June 30, 2011;

Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and Pennsylvania State Corrections Officers Association, July 1, 2007, to June 30, 2011.

September 2010
Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

To monitor the cost effectiveness of the boot camp program, we analyzed Department of Corrections' financial and statistical data for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2007, 2008, and 2009, and reviewed the report entitled "Pennsylvania's Motivational Boot Camp, 2009 Report to the Legislature."

Our analysis of hiring practices consisted of a review of the list of new hires from July 1, 2008, through July 24, 2009, followed by our selection and testing of all nine civil service positions for compliance with Commonwealth policies. To test compliance with policies for handling employee complaints and suggestions, we obtained the camp's grievance logs and supporting documentation for all grievances filed. A review of the documentation revealed that 100 grievances were filed between January 1, 2007, and June 30, 2009.

To test compliance with the bonus provisions, we reviewed the June 2007 and June 2008 detailed employee complement reports and the bonuses and other cash payments made during the fiscal years ended June 30, 2007, and 2008.

Audit Results

Audit Results

Inmate Education

The Department of Corrections' Bureau of Correction Education provides comprehensive educational programming for inmates to assist their reintegration into society as responsible and productive citizens. Some of the Bureau of Correction Education's objectives are:

- To implement quality academic and/or traditional and non-traditional vocational education programs for an inmate based on the assessed needs of the individual.
- To prepare an inmate for the General Education Development (GED) examination.
- To provide opportunities for a qualified inmate to enroll in vocational-technical/business certificate programs.
- To provide opportunities for an inmate to participate in money smart class, pre-vocational and community orientation and reintegration programs.¹³

In addition, the Bureau of Correction Education requires each state correctional facility to develop an annual education program. The proposed education program document provides an integrated description of administrative and programmatic components.

Finding 1 – The boot camp's education department did not verify inmates' graduation status and did not ensure compliance with all GED testing center security procedures.

In order to determine the boot camp's compliance with education requirements for inmates, we selected and tested the records of 39 inmates and found that 13 of the 39 were listed as having passed the GED requirements and were enrolled in a money management class. The remaining 26 of 39 inmates were enrolled in the GED program.

¹³ Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Corrections, Policy Number 7.6.1, "Delivery of Educational Services," Section 1, "Educational Program Objectives," revised December 2008.

September 2010
Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Audit Results

Verification of high school graduation status. Department of Corrections' policy states that inmates committed to the Department on or after July 1, 2004, who do not have a verified GED certificate, high school diploma (HSD), or Commonwealth secondary diploma (CSD) will be considered a mandated GED student.¹⁴

Inmates who possess one of these certifications are not part of the mandated education program. However, all inmates at the boot camp are still enrolled in a Money Smart class, which is a consumer economics money-management program. We reviewed a sample of 13 files of inmates who were enrolled in the Money Smart class only. In more than half the files – 8 of 13 – there was nothing to evidence that the inmates had a high school diploma or equivalent, meaning that we could not confirm compliance with the following part of Corrections' policy:

- a. *The Education Counselor is to verify the status of a school-aged inmate who claims to hold a GED/HSD/CSD by using the Records Center within 60 working days.*
- b. *An adult inmate is responsible for obtaining proof of his/her GED/HSD/CSD. The Education Counselor will review the education files for existing verification. If no proof exists in the file, the inmate will be provided with the information necessary to obtain the documentation.*
- c. *An official college transcript verifying an Associate, Bachelors, Masters or Doctoral degree is an acceptable form of verification.*
- d. *An adult student who does not provide verification is considered a mandatory GED student until the status is verified.*¹⁵

Boot camp management stated that the Boot Camp's designated school guidance counselor is responsible for ensuring that all inmates verify high school graduation status. Although we agree that the guidance counselor was responsible to verify the inmates' high school graduation status, Boot Camp management should have followed up to ensure the duty would be performed and to determine why it had not been done.

¹⁴ Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Corrections, Policy Number 7.6.1, "Delivery of Educational Services," Section 1, "Educational Program Objectives," Subsection H, GED Mandate, Paragraph 1, revised December 2008.

¹⁵ Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Corrections, Policy Number 7.6.1, "Delivery of Educational Services," Section 1, "Educational Program Objectives," Subsection H, GED Mandate, Paragraph 7, "Verification," revised December 2008.

September 2010
Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Audit Results

GED testing center security procedures. The proposed education program document¹⁶ details procedures for various programs, including the institution's table of organization, guidelines for special education, and sample documents. Rider A of that document details the new institutional GED testing center security guidelines and procedures. We tested files for 26 inmates enrolled in the GED program and found the following instances of non-compliance:

- None of the files for the 26 inmates enrolled in the GED program we selected for testing had a signed memorandum of understanding as required. Specifically, all inmates scheduled for the GED test are required to sign an agreement between the inmate and the chief test examiner indicating that the inmate understands and agrees to the conditions of the test. This agreement also documents that the inmate was given a direct order not to cheat and that the inmate understands that order.
- Twenty files did not have a verification of eligibility form completed. An eligibility verification and authorization to release GED Information form should be completed by each inmate taking the GED test. This form, signed and dated by the inmate, states that an inmate has not obtained a high school or GED diploma, that the inmate has not taken the GED test more than three times during any calendar year, and authorizes the use of the GED results for treatment and programmatic planning purposes.
- Seventeen files did not contain surveillance logs – i.e., seating charts for each GED test given. The examiner is required to verify, with photo ID, the identity of each inmate taking the test, after which the chief examiner should complete a surveillance log recording the name and inmate number of each inmate taking the examination, the test form taken, and the test booklet number. The log helps to maintain the integrity and honesty of the inmates completing the exam. The school principal is required to maintain a file of all surveillance logs utilized for two years.

Boot camp management stated that the Boot Camp's school principal position has been vacant since July 2008, which has caused the non-compliance with these requirements. Although we understand that not having a school principal could cause non-compliance,

¹⁶ 2009-2010 Proposed Educational Program (PEP) Guidelines for Education Programs in Adult State Correctional Institutions, Section X, Appendices, Rider A, "Institutional GED Testing Centers Security Guidelines and Procedures."

September 2010
Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Audit Results

Boot Camp management should have ensured that all requirements and duties were effectively addressed even if the applicable positions were vacant.

Recommendation:

1. Boot camp management should require staff to complete and retain all documentation to ensure that all procedures are followed. The documentation requirements include the following:
 - The verification and documentation for inmates who possess a high school diploma or GED prior to incarceration at Quehanna Boot Camp.
 - The completion and retention of the memorandum of understanding prior to the inmate taking the GED examination.
 - The completion and retention of the verification of eligibility form.
 - The completion and retention of surveillance logs to record the activity of each GED testing session properly.

Response of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp management:

Per policy, 7.6.1 Delivery of Educational Services, all inmates are to present verification of a high school diploma or GED® to the Academic counselor or school principal. If the inmate is unsuccessful in furnishing the verification, the Corrections Education Records Center form is filled out by the inmate. The request is a written authorization by the inmate to acquire the necessary information to verify either their high school diploma or GED®.

From the time of the audit, all inmates who are pre-selected to participate in the formal GED® testing have signed the memorandum of understanding, which states the security procedures involving, not excluding, cheating, assigned seating, and proper conduct during the administration of the test, no breaks, as well as, verification of identification of each testing inmate. This is understood by each inmate as a direct order.

All inmates have read and signed the Eligibility Verification and Authorization to release form since July 2008 to the present. The GED® site examiner will implement the placement of each Eligibility Verification and Authorization to

September 2010
Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Audit Results

Release GED® Information form into the respective student file during the designated testing period.

Upon review of the Academic counselor's files, as well as the school principal's files, the surveillance logs of Quehanna's testing cycles have been placed in a centralized area within the Academic counselor's office.

Finding 2 – Neither the boot camp nor the Department of Corrections could show the success rate of the federally funded fiber optics vocational program.

In addition to educational opportunities, Quehanna Boot Camp also offers vocational programming to all qualified inmates. The vocational program is known as a “C-Tech” network cabling installer in the fiber optics field. The program is federally funded and is administered by a contracted provider. According to the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 proposed educational program, the program was initiated in the 2005-2006 year and has shown steady participation growth, as indicated in the following table:

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009
Total number of courses offered	5	4	5	7
Total number of students enrolled	99	80	100	140
Total number of students graduated	97	79	98	137
Total number of student withdrawals	2	1	2	3
Contract amount	\$145,716	\$117,500	\$147,000	\$205,500

Over a four-year period, 411 of the 419 students, or 98 percent, successfully completed the vocational program. From a program completion perspective, the program has been a success.

A vocational training program's success could also be measured by the number of graduates who obtain a position of employment in the trained field of study. We attempted to obtain statistical information to determine how many of the 411 inmates obtained employment in the fiber optics field after release from the boot camp. However, camp management stated that the Department of Corrections does not track the employment success rate of the program.

A measurable employment success rate would provide useful information to help determine the true success rate of the vocational program and would provide justification for

September 2010
Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Audit Results

continuing this program. We concluded that the Department of Corrections has not developed a measure of the success of this program or whether it should be continued.

Recommendation:

2. Quehanna Boot Camp in conjunction with the Department of Corrections should develop a job placement tracking system in order to monitor the success rate of the fiber optics vocational program.

Response of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp management:

The Pennsylvania Department of Corrections is currently participating [in] the development of a cooperative effort to establish an offender workforce development specialist program/study. One of the components targeted will involve a work study follow-up. The study is being conducted through and with the cooperation of the Pennsylvania State University. It is being spearheaded by Pennsylvania State University professor Greg Guenter, Ph.D.

Act 86 Compliance

Act 215 of 1990, known as the Motivational Boot Camp Act, authorized the establishment of the Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp. Act 86 of 1996 amended the provisions of Act 215 of 1990. The impetus behind the original act was the severe overcrowding in the state correctional system, and the desire to offer an alternative to traditional prison that would provide a more intensive rehabilitative setting conducive to reducing crime. The original act listed the following as program objectives:

To protect the health and safety of the Commonwealth by providing a program that will reduce recidivism and promote characteristics of good citizenship among eligible inmates.

To divert inmates who ordinarily would be sentenced to traditional forms of confinement under the custody of the department to motivational boot camps.

To provide discipline and structure to the lives of eligible inmates and to promote these qualities in the post-release behavior of eligible inmates.

September 2010
Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Audit Results

The program is an alternative to a traditional state incarceration sentence and allows eligible inmates to serve a reduced six-month sentence. The boot camp program primarily targets non-violent, youthful offenders in need of discipline and structure. Act 86 of 1996 amended the provisions of Act 215 of 1990 by addressing certain eligibility requirements as follows:

Expanded eligibility requirements to include an inmate who is serving a minimum sentence of not more than three years where that inmate is within two years of completing his minimum term.

Redefined eligibility requirements to exclude inmates convicted of the following crimes: the use of a deadly weapon, murder, voluntary manslaughter, drug delivery related to death, sexual assault, aggravated indecent assault, arson, burglary of a structure adapted or overnight accommodation in which any person is present at the time of the offense, robbery of a motor vehicle, and drug trafficking.

Finding 3 – Quehanna Boot Camp complied with the legislative requirements of Act 86 of 1996.

The review of files for 56 inmates selected for testing found that all 56 inmates met the eligibility requirements of Act 86. Specifically, the files contained documentation to show that all 56 inmates were 35 years of age or younger and that none had been sentenced to crimes that would render them ineligible for the program.

Boot Camp Cost Effectiveness

We audited the cost effectiveness of the boot camp program in previous audits. At that time, we determined that the boot camp was a cost effective alternative to traditional incarceration. In 2000, the Department of Corrections saved almost \$9,000 for each inmate assigned to the boot camp program. In a follow-up of our prior audit, we again examined boot camp operations to determine whether the boot camp was still cost effective. As noted earlier in the Act 86 Compliance objective, the boot camp program primarily targets non-violent, youthful offenders in need of discipline and structure. Accordingly, only a portion of the inmates in the Commonwealth's prisons are eligible to participate in the boot camp program.

September 2010
Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Audit Results

Finding 4 – The boot camp program remained cost effective and provided a useful approach to relieving the overcrowding in the correctional system.

Quehanna Boot Camp inmates are incarcerated an average of nine months. Boot Camp participants serve approximately two months of their sentence in a traditional Department of Corrections facility where they are processed and evaluated for participation in the boot camp program. After completion of the processing, they are transferred to Quehanna Boot Camp where they spend one month acclimating to the boot camp environment before the beginning of the boot camp program. They then spend six months in the actual boot camp program.

Because of the lack of beds, other non-violent youthful offenders in need of discipline and structure who otherwise could participate in the boot camp program at Quehanna continue to serve their sentence in a traditional Commonwealth facility, where they remain incarcerated for an average of 17.2 months.

Preliminary cost savings for inmate time served. When the cost of the average time served by each inmate at the Quehanna Boot Camp is compared to inmates with the same qualifying criteria who served their sentences in a traditional Commonwealth correctional facility, the Quehanna Boot Camp was more cost effective to operate than the other traditional correctional facilities. Quehanna Boot Camp inmates serve a total sentence that is more than eight months shorter, creating cost savings opportunities as summarized in Table 1 on the next page. The calculations illustrate the average cost savings for inmates serving their sentences in the boot camp program compared with the eligible inmates who remain in the traditional correctional facility.

Table 1 uses Quehanna Boot Camp and Department of Corrections average sentence data and average costs per year per inmate from the fiscal year ended June 30, 2007, for comparison purposes.

Boot camp program costs for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2008, and 2009, provided similar savings results. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2008, an average inmate sentence at the boot camp cost \$28,133 for the nine months. The average inmate cost at a regular correctional facility for 17.2 months cost \$48,969. The savings were **\$20,836** per inmate. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2009, the average boot camp cost was \$29,160 versus a regular correctional facility cost of \$47,671. Again, the camp saved **\$18,511** per inmate.

September 2010
 Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Audit Results

Table 1.
Preliminary Savings Calculation per Inmate

	Average sentence in years	Average cost per year	Average cost per inmate
Boot Camp Participant			
Time and costs in a traditional facility ¹⁷	0.1667	\$33,626	\$ 5,605
Time and costs at Quehanna Boot Camp ¹⁸	<u>0.5833</u>	\$44,593	<u>26,011</u>
Total for Boot Camp participant	0.7500		\$31,617
Traditional Facility Participant			
Time and costs in a traditional facility ¹⁹	1.4333	\$33,626	\$48,196
Average savings per Inmate			\$16,579

Department of Corrections statistics for the three years ended June 30, 2009, revealed that at year-end there were 234, 269, and 254 inmates, respectively, at the Quehanna Boot Camp. Assuming all eligible inmates completed the program, the Commonwealth would have saved over \$14 million as summarized in Table 2.

Table 2
Preliminary Savings Calculation per Year

Fiscal Year Ended	No. of Inmates	Savings per inmate	Total Savings
June 30, 2007	234	\$16,580	\$3,879,473
June 30, 2008	269	20,826	5,605,037
June 30, 2009	254	18,512	<u>4,701,860</u>
Total Savings			<u>\$14,186,370</u>

¹⁷ Two months in a regular correctional facility for inmate processing.

¹⁸ Seven-month boot camp program.

¹⁹ The average sentence was 17.2 months in a traditional correctional facility.

September 2010
Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Audit Results

Refined savings analysis with equal numbers of inmates. The calculated savings amounts for inmate time served in the boot camp program still do not fully explain the cost savings. Of their nine months total incarceration, inmates selected for participation at the boot camp program spend only seven months in the boot camp itself, meaning that the boot camp can run almost two cycles of inmates through the camp each year.

We developed an analysis that compared the costs and savings for two sets of inmates who met the qualifications for participation in a boot camp program. The first set of inmates participated in the boot camp program; the second set were housed in a traditional Commonwealth correctional facility. For comparison purposes, the total number of inmates in each set was equal at 1,005 inmates. Our analysis revealed that Quehanna Boot Camp could move up to four cycles of inmates consisting of 268, 234, 234, and 269 inmates through the camp over a 30-month period. At the same time, only two cycles of inmates consisting of 502 and 503 inmates could be moved through a traditional correctional facility over a 34.4 month period.

Using actual average Quehanna Boot Camp monthly costs for the 30-month period from June 2006 through November 2008, boot camp costs would have totaled \$29,869,044.²⁰ The analysis also used actual average Quehanna Boot Camp population data from June 2006 through November 2008. The boot camp could have released 1,005 inmates during the 30-month period.

At the same time, using actual average monthly costs from traditional correctional facilities net of the boot camp program costs for a 34.4-month period from June 2006 through April 2009, average correctional facility costs would have totaled \$48,189,899.²¹ The analysis set the population equal to 1,005 inmates to match the inmate population at Quehanna, and to keep the comparison as equal as possible. When identical numbers of inmates were compared, the use of the Quehanna Boot Camp created a savings of over \$18.3 million for the test period as illustrated in Table 3 on the next page.

²⁰ This figure includes 30 months of average costs for processing time at a traditional correctional facility and average costs at the Quehanna Boot Camp.

²¹ This figure includes 34.4 months of average costs for a traditional correctional facility.

September 2010
 Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Audit Results

Table 3.
Refined Comparison Results

	Quehanna Boot Camp	Average Correctional Facility	Boot Camp Savings
Total Inmates	1,005	1,005	
Average cost per inmate	\$29,720	\$47,950	
Total Cost and Savings	\$29,869,044	\$48,189,899	\$18,320,854
Total Months	30.0	34.4	4.40

The boot camp also provided an additional advantage in time savings. As illustrated in Table 3, the boot camp could release 1,005 inmates in 30 months while the traditional correctional facility needed 34.4 months, a savings of 4.4 months. Finally, use of the boot camp provided another advantage. The largest cycle of inmates during the period of June 2006 through November 2008 at the boot camp was 269 inmates. The largest cycle of inmates at the correctional facility was 503 inmates during the period of June 2006 and April 2009. The traditional correctional facility had to contain at least 503 beds at a time to release the same number of inmates released by the boot camp. However, the boot camp needed to contain only 269 beds (or a facility size only 53 percent as large as the traditional correctional facility) as summarized in Table 4.

Table 4.
Cumulative Released Inmates

Time period	Quehanna Boot Camp	Corrections Facility
By 6 months	0	0
By 12 months	268	0
By 18 months	502	502
By 24 months	736	502
By 30 months	1005	502
By 36 months	1005 ²²	1005
Minimum facility size needed	269	503
Facility capacity (beds) in percent	53%	100%

²² The released amount stayed the same because the analysis ended after 34.4 months and the boot camp did not have seven months past the 30-month time period to complete another cycle of inmates.

September 2010
Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Audit Results

Our analysis has led us to conclude that the Quehanna Boot Camp was both cost effective and efficient. It was cost effective because it could release 1,005 inmates at a cost that was \$18.3 million less than the average cost of a correctional facility. It was efficient because it could release 1,005 inmates in 4.4 fewer months, and with a facility that was only 43 percent of the size of a regular correctional facility.

Hiring Practices

The State Civil Service Commission was created to enhance governmental efficiency by attracting qualified employees and by hiring, retaining, and promoting them based on their ability to do their jobs. The Civil Service Act further established the commission as the independent administrator of the state's employment merit system. The commission also administers the veterans' preference program. The purpose of veterans' preference is to give veterans credit for their military training and service to their country.

Finding 5 – Quehanna Boot Camp complied with federal and state civil service guidelines.

Quehanna Boot Camp officials said the camp fills a civil service position by requesting one or more employment lists from the commission and then sending availability survey/interview notice forms to the candidates listed. The available candidates are interviewed and a selection is made based on the rule of three. The "rule of three" requires that the agency must hire one of the three highest-scoring available candidates. If a veteran is among the "rule of three," then mandatory veterans' preference is granted to qualified veterans over non-veterans. The selected candidate is hired after passing a pre-employment physical, criminal background check, and reference check.

We reviewed a listing of new hires that occurred from July 1, 2008, through July 24, 2009, and found that nine positions were civil service hirings. We tested the nine positions and found that all nine were hired according to State Civil Service Commission policies. All available veterans were given preference over non-veterans, and the rule of three was used for all positions.

September 2010
Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Audit Results

Employee Complaints

During our audit period, Quehanna Boot Camp employed more than 200 individuals. Approximately 90 percent of employees were classified as bargaining unit employees. There were eight different unions that covered bargaining unit employees, and membership was based on the type of position held. Each bargaining unit agreement included specific procedures to be used when handling employee complaints.

Finding 6 – Employee complaints were handled timely.

We obtained Quehanna Boot Camp’s grievance logs and supporting documentation for all grievances filed. A review of the documentation revealed that 100 grievances were filed between January 1, 2007, and June 30, 2009. We reviewed all 100 grievances and found that complaints were processed in a timely manner. The complaints reviewed were investigated and documented according to regulations. The camp’s human resources office handled all equal employment opportunity and sexual harassment complaints. A labor relations specialist handled union grievances. Grievances were filed with the employee’s applicable union following established procedures.

Employee Incentives

The Commonwealth has developed certain programs, incentives, and union contract stipulations in order to attract, retain, and reward medical and dental professionals. The quality assurance program provides monetary incentives based on years of service to attract, retain, and reward the medical and dental professionals. Nursing employees who obtain certification receive an annual incentive through their union contract. In addition, several union contracts had a one-time signing incentive (as discussed below) for all active employees as of July 1, 2007.

Finding 7 – Quehanna Boot Camp calculated monetary incentives and one-time signing bonuses properly.

Quehanna Boot Camp made a \$1,250 one-time incentive payment to full-time employees and a \$625 payment to part-time employees who were on active pay status as of July 1, 2007, or who were inactive but returned to active status prior to December 31, 2007.

September 2010
Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Audit Results

We determined that 54 employees were in active pay status as of July 1, 2007, and received \$1,250 one-time payments totaling \$67,500. An additional 20 management employees, also in active pay status as of July 1, 2007, received \$1,600 one-time payments totaling \$32,000. These payments were part of a management retention program²³ developed by the Department of Corrections. The retention program was designed to aid in the retention of managers during a period of rapid increase in inmate population and expansion of facilities. A review of payroll data for the 74 individuals disclosed these payments were accurately processed.

There were eight registered nurses on staff at Quehanna Boot Camp. A review of all eight nurses' records revealed that none of the individuals had the specific certifications that would make them eligible for annual monetary incentives available through the union contract.

²³ Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Governor's Office, Executive Board Resolution Number CN-07-170, June 25, 2007.

September 2010
Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General
Performance Audit of Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Audit Period: July 1, 2006, to December 7, 2009

Audit Report Distribution List

Audit Report Distribution List

The Honorable Edward G. Rendell
Governor

The Honorable Jake Corman
Chair
Senate Appropriations Committee
Senate of Pennsylvania

The Honorable Jay Costa
Democratic Chair
Senate Appropriations Committee
Senate of Pennsylvania

The Honorable Dwight Evans
Chair
House Appropriations Committee
Pennsylvania House of Representatives

The Honorable William F. Adolph, Jr.
Republican Chair
House Appropriations Committee
Pennsylvania House of Representatives

The Honorable Robert M. McCord
State Treasurer
Pennsylvania Treasury Department

The Honorable Shirley Moore Smeal
Acting Secretary
Pennsylvania Department of Corrections

John Kaschak
Director of Audits
Office of Comptroller Operations
Office of the Budget

Quehanna Motivational Boot Camp
Randall Britton
Superintendent

This report is a matter of public record and is accessible at www.auditorgen.state.pa.us or by contacting the Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General, Office of Communications, 318 Finance Building, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120. Telephone: 717-787-1381.