

U.S. Department of Justice

Federal Bureau of Prisons

PROGRAM REVIEW DIVISION

Washington, DC 20534

September 30, 2009

MEMORANDUM FOR VANESSA P. ADAMS, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
PROGRAM REVIEW DIVISION

//s//

FROM: Lloyd Boyle, Supervisory Special Agent
Office of the General Counsel
Office of Internal Affairs

SUBJECT: Operational Review Report
Program Review Division
August 24-28, 2009

This is the report of the Program Review Division Operational Review conducted August 24-28, 2009. There was one repeat deficiency identified during this review.

Your response to the operational review report is due October 30, 2009 (30 calendar days after receipt of the report). The response shall be prepared and follow-up measures must be instituted in accordance with PS 1210.20, Management Control and Program Review Manual, Chapter 2. This includes:

- a. A statement indicating what actions were taken to correct the repeat deficiency as it appeared in the last review, and why these actions were not effective. Certify that this deficiency has been corrected and describe the administrative controls that have been implemented to ensure the deficiency remains corrected.
- b. A certification that all deficiencies have been corrected. This can be a blanket statement, with exceptions noted. Your response should be sent to BOP-PRD/Correspondence and include a strategic action plan for the deficiencies if they cannot be corrected within 30 calendar days.

cc: BOP-PRD/Assistant Director
BOP-PRD/Executive Asst
BOP-PRD/PRB Admin
BOP-PRD/Program Analysis
BOP-PRD/Quality Assurance
BOP-PRD/Strategic Mgt-Planning

REVIEWER ASSURANCE STATEMENT

As Reviewer-In-Charge, I certify this review was conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards utilizing Program Review Branch - Central Office Guidelines, dated February 28, 2007, and Planning and Analysis Branch - Central Office Guidelines, dated February 28, 2006. Findings of noncompliance with policy or inadequate controls identified in the report are supported by evidence that is sufficient and reliable. The evidence is contained in the operational review working papers filed in the Central Office.

I further certify, within the scope of the operational review, I have reasonable assurance, except for any findings noted in this report, the Program Review Division is operated in accordance with applicable law and policy; and property and resources are efficiently utilized and adequately safeguarded. An adequate system of internal controls is in place to promote continued compliance and ensure resources are protected from fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement.

Lloyd Boyle, Supervisory Special Agent
Office of the General Counsel
Office of Internal Affairs

Members of the Review Team:

Connie Way Gaston, Core Section Chief, PRD
Paul Joseph, Core Section Chief, PRD
Alice Lowe, Core Section Chief, PRD
Mike Richter, Core Section Chief, PRD
Jeffrey Crawford, Management Analyst, PAB, PRD
Carl Stevens, Examiner, Safety Section, PRD
Steve Luttrell, Examiner, CFM Information Systems, PRD
Frank Marrone, Evaluation Specialist, Program Review Branch, PRD
Jeffrey Sackett, Examiner, Food Service Section, PRD
Eddie Samalio, Examiner, Health Services Section, PRD

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Program Review Division is located in the Central Office of the Bureau of Prisons. The Program Review Division is comprised of the Program Review Branch (PRB), and the External Auditing Branch (EAB), which includes responsibility for the Office of Management and Budget's A-123 initiatives. The previous operational review was conducted August 5-7, 2008.

GENERAL COMMENTS

A comprehensive review was conducted of the Program Review Division operation. The results were based upon a thorough review of the operation, performance of vital functions, and strength of internal controls. This is evidenced by the few deficiencies noted in this report.

Internal controls are such that there are limited procedural deficiencies, and adequate administrative and monitoring controls are in place to effectively identify and respond to areas of noncompliance.

Program and operational strengths noted within PRD include management and support services, increased levels of communication, and fund control. Also, new training initiatives have been implemented within the Division in conjunction with regular staff meetings. These training sessions have included topics on computer issues, new technology, performance evaluations, TRUFACS, TRULINCS, BEMR, and OIA. This training has been successful in providing examiners with an overview of institution operations outside of their respective disciplines. The training is intended to broaden the knowledge of institution operations for examiners that conduct program reviews in these areas and staff who are planning to further their careers outside of PRD.

The administrator and deputy administrators provide administrative oversight of program review practices and procedures. Weekly core section chief meetings, as well as regular examiner meetings, continue to facilitate effective communication throughout the division. The core section chiefs provide technical direction to assist examiners in their efforts to conduct effective and thorough program reviews. They provide leadership and direction to the review examiners to make certain the highest professional standards are achieved. Program review examiners are responsive to institution, region, and central office correspondence and staff requests for information. Examiners routinely meet established deadlines by closely monitoring review activities through each step of the program review process.

Institution accreditation managers who were surveyed and involved in an initial accreditation or the intensive reaccreditation process in the last year praised assistance provided by the PRD accreditation managers. Some staff interviewed indicated they could not have gotten through the process without the guidance and assistance provided by the EAB staff.

Interviews regarding the STP process revealed information is available; however, there could be more interaction and dissemination of information to clarify the process and STP updates.

Program Review Automated Information System (PRAIS) data screens did not have all data entered in required fields (i.e., missing SHU review dates, scanning dates). Improvement is needed when entering data into PRAIS, to include the maintenance of working directories, the scanning of review documents to ensure the accuracy of the information, and electronic files.

REPEAT DEFICIENCY

- Not all quality assurance reviews were conducted and documented. (P1210.23, CH 2)

DEFICIENCIES

PROGRAM REVIEW BRANCH

- A review of 30 program review scanning dates in PRAIS for working papers revealed 3 contained no dates, and 4 were scanned late. Additionally, numerous other review scanning date entries were missing in some review sections. (CRM, Page 48 - Program Review Time Line)
- PRAIS data screens revealed RIC names were not entered or incorrect for 6 of 30 program reviews. Additionally, the Review Schedule by Section with RIC report reflects numerous RIC data missing for review sections. (PROP dated 03/04/08)