

# **STATE OF LOUISIANA**

## **OFFICE OF STATE INSPECTOR GENERAL**



### **DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONS, CORRECTIONS SERVICES**

#### **MISUSE OF POSITIONS**

**Date Released:**

**January 12, 2007**

**File No. 1-06-0020**

# STATE OF LOUISIANA

## OFFICE OF STATE INSPECTOR GENERAL



### DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONS, CORRECTIONS SERVICES

#### MISUSE OF POSITIONS

**Sharon B. Robinson, CPA  
State Inspector General**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "KB", written over a horizontal line.

**Approved by:  
Governor Kathleen Babineaux Blanco**

**November 16, 2006**

**File No. 1-06-0020**

## Table of Contents

<b>Letter to the Governor</b>	
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	1
<b>Background</b> .....	3
<b>Scope and Methodology</b> .....	3
<b>Findings and Recommendations</b>	
LCIW Misuse of Positions.....	5
Improper Retirement Classifications.....	11
<b>Appendix A – Summary of Significant Personnel Actions</b>	
<b>Appendix B – Response</b>	



*State of Louisiana*  
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF STATE INSPECTOR GENERAL  
Sharon B. Robinson, CPA  
(225) 342-4262  
1-800-354-9548  
FAX (225) 342-6761

KATHLEEN BABINEAUX BLANCO  
GOVERNOR

JERRY LUKE LEBLANC  
COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATION

November 16, 2006

Honorable Kathleen Babineaux Blanco  
Governor of the State of Louisiana  
P.O. Box 94004  
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9004

Re: Case No. 1-06-0020

Dear Governor Blanco:

This report addresses concerns raised about the operations of the Louisiana Correctional Institute for Women (LCIW). The report includes nine recommendations that, if implemented, could help improve LCIW.

We provided a report draft to the secretary of the Department of Public Safety and Corrections, Corrections Services. The department's response is included as Appendix B.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon B. Robinson, CPA  
State Inspector General

SBR/aa

Enclosure

## **Executive Summary**

### **Audit Initiation**

On March 30, 2006, the Office of State Inspector General began investigating a complaint alleging that two Department of Public Safety and Corrections, Corrections Services employees' job histories contain questionable personnel actions. One employee works for Dixon Correctional Institute and the other for Louisiana Correctional Institute for Women (LCIW). The complaint also alleged these two employees might be enrolled in the wrong retirement system.

Our audit objective was to determine the validity of the allegations. We did not substantiate any improper personnel or retirement actions with the Dixon employee. We did substantiate improper personnel and retirement actions with the LCIW employee and other LCIW employees.

### **Summary of Findings**

- LCIW uses some of its positions in a manner that violates Department of State Civil Service hiring and promotion procedures. In addition, LCIW either could not provide written justification or provided misleading justification for some of the position changes.
- LCIW is not ensuring that only employees who are in security-related positions are enrolled in the Corrections secondary retirement component of the Louisiana State Employees Retirement System (LASERS). In addition, LASERS lacks policies and procedures that address the classification of employees who own a position in one retirement component, but are detailed (temporarily assigned) to a position in another component.



## **Background**

The Department of Public Safety and Corrections is comprised of three major areas: Corrections Services, Public Safety Services, and Youth Services. Corrections Services serves to provide custody, control, and care of law offenders to ensure the safety of the public.

There are thirteen adult institutions under the authority of Corrections Services. Corrections Services Headquarters supports the management and operations of the adult institutions.

Louisiana Correctional Institute for Women (LCIW), located in St. Gabriel, opened in 1973. The prison is located on a 200-acre tract of land. LCIW currently has 291 employees with a 2007 fiscal year operating budget of over \$20 million.

The LCIW warden, Mr. Johnnie Jones, has been on administrative leave (suspended with pay) since April 18, 2006. Prior to going on administrative leave, Warden Jones, as appointing authority, was responsible for approving all LCIW position appointments and other related personnel actions.

## **Scope and Methodology**

We conduct our audits in accordance with *Principles and Standards for Offices of Inspector General* as promulgated by the Association of Inspectors General.

Our audit scope included reviewing personnel actions and retirement system membership for the Dixon employee and LCIW employee named in the complaint. Due to findings associated with the LCIW employee, we expanded our scope to include personnel and retirement system activities of certain other LCIW employees. Our audit included LCIW personnel activities covering the period June 1996 through August 2006, and retirement system activities covering the period January 2004 to August 2006.

Our audit procedures included:

1. Reviewing pertinent state laws, rules, and regulations;
2. Interviewing pertinent employees of various state agencies;
3. Researching personnel and retirement information in the Integrated State Information System - Human Resources (ISIS HR);
4. Reviewing personnel files and other documents as we considered necessary.



## **LCIW Misuse of Positions**

LCIW uses some of its positions in a manner that violates Department of State Civil Service hiring and promotion procedures. In addition, LCIW either could not provide written justification or provided misleading justification for some of the position changes.

As a result, unqualified or less qualified personnel are placed in jobs. In addition, employees are credited with qualifying experience they do not possess, paid more or less than they deserve based on the duties actually performed, and are given improper salary increases. Furthermore, we found LCIW overpaid two employees at least \$31,567.

## **Hiring Practices**

LCIW hired employees into security-related positions, but had them performing clerical, accounting, and other administrative support duties. Civil Service Rule 5.2(d) requires that allocation of positions shall be based on those duties being actually certified as true by the appointing authority.

Security-related positions include job titles such as corrections cadet, corrections sergeant, and security officer. Employees occupying these positions are supposed to be working in the security areas of the prison performing duties that include the supervision, control, and custody of offenders.

The corrections cadet (entry level) and corrections sergeant (journeyman level) are classified positions. The security officer is an unclassified hourly position that Civil Service authorizes prisons to use on an as-needed basis to cover shifts for vacancies occurring from short-term illness, vacations, summer camps, or weekend military drill in the security area.

The following are examples of employees that LCIW hired into security-related positions but had them performing clerical, accounting, and other administrative support duties.

### **Karen Dunbar**

LCIW initially hired Ms. Dunbar as a typist clerk on June 17, 1996. She remained in this job title from June 17, 1996, through January 2, 2000, except for some short intermittent separations from state service and a detail to an accounting specialist position from November 1, 1999, through January 1, 2000. She served in an unclassified student position from January 3, 2000 to February 16, 2003. On February 17, 2003, LCIW placed Ms. Dunbar into a security officer position. She remained in this position 16 months until LCIW appointed her non-competitively, on a probationary basis, to a corrections cadet position on June

21, 2004. On June 22, 2004, the day after being hired as a corrections cadet, she was detailed to an accounting specialist position and remained in this detail six months until December 19, 2004.

Civil Service defines “details to special duty” or “details” as referenced in this report, as the temporary assignment of an employee to perform the duties and responsibilities of a position other than the one which he is regularly assigned, without prejudice to his rights in his regular position.

According to Ms. Dunbar, since she started in 1996, she has always performed the same primary duty of maintaining the inmates’ financial accounts. She stated she has never performed security duties.

Ms. Dunbar further stated the reason LCIW placed her in the corrections cadet position was to allow her time to obtain permanent status (minimum of six months from probationary appointment) and to take the required Civil Service test for the accounting specialist position. She said LCIW Deputy Warden Loetia Young and a former LCIW human resources manager instructed her in these matters. She said they knew the accounting specialist position was coming available and wanted her in permanent status when it did.

The former LCIW human resources manager confirmed that the purpose of the personnel actions with Ms. Dunbar was to allow her time to obtain a test score for the accounting specialist position. He also said that once Ms. Dunbar obtained permanent status, LCIW could fill the accounting specialist position internally from a promotional list rather than through the probational list. He also stated that Ms. Dunbar had already been performing the duties of the accounting specialist position.

Deputy Warden Young acknowledged that she instructed Ms. Dunbar to apply for the corrections cadet position although LCIW never intended for her to work in a security capacity. Deputy Warden Young said Ms. Dunbar was familiar with the accounting specialist duties.

For LCIW to have hired Ms. Dunbar to the accounting specialist position prior to her permanent status, she had to meet certain Civil Service requirements. She needed a certifiable test score of 90 or above or had to rank in the top five grade groups for all candidates taking the exam. After obtaining permanent status, which she did six months later on December 21, 2004, Ms. Dunbar only required a passing test score. Ms. Dunbar received a passing score of 79 on October 27, 2004, and LCIW promoted her to the accounting specialist position on February 28, 2005.

Ms. Dunbar’s June 22, 2004 detail may have violated Civil Service Policy Standards for Details to Special Duty. The standards state that details are not intended to be used for the sole purpose of “getting an employee qualified.” The standards warn agencies to avoid detailing probational employees if the detail would be a circumvention of the hiring rules. As an example, a probational employee hired in one job then detailed into a job for which he/she could not make a competitive grade.

LCIW was unable to provide us the written justification for Ms. Dunbar's June 22 detail. Civil Service Rule 8.16(d)(2) requires agencies to keep written justification for all details. The former LCIW human resources manager stated he is sure that Warden Jones told him to detail Ms. Dunbar. He said he would have prepared the documentation for the warden's signature and it should be in the personnel file. Warden Jones could offer no explanation of the detail and the reason.

**Overpayment** - Ms. Dunbar's salary increased from a bi-weekly rate of \$706 to \$1085 or approximately 54% with the June 22, 2004, detail to the accounting specialist position. According to Corrections Services Headquarters officials, Ms. Dunbar was entitled to her former salary as a previous permanent employee. However, we found LCIW erroneously used Ms. Dunbar's former monthly rate of \$1085 as the bi-weekly rate for the salary calculations. As a result, Ms. Dunbar should have only received a 15% bi-weekly salary increase to \$812, the entry-level rate for the accounting specialist. We calculated that Ms. Dunbar was overpaid approximately \$20,769 between June 22, 2004 and June 18, 2006 (approximately two years).

LCIW provided misleading written justification for a second detail of Ms. Dunbar to an accounting specialist position on December 22, 2004. This misleading justification may violate Civil Service Rule 14.1(j) that forbids any person from making a false statement, certificate, mark, or rating, to any appointment or employment.

According to the justification memorandum (no date shown) approved by Warden Jones, this second detail was to serve as a testing period to determine if Ms. Dunbar could handle the functions of the job. However, Ms. Dunbar has performed the same primary duties of maintaining the inmates' financial accounts since being hired in June 1996. The memorandum also stated the detail was needed to determine the employee's capabilities to function as a supervisor. However, Ms. Dunbar has never supervised anyone in her activities including this detail.

Warden Jones stated the human resources managers draft the justifications for details. He signs them after they bring them to him. He also said he believes they use generic language.

Appendix Table A-1 summarizes Ms. Dunbar's job history.

#### Trulinda Johnwell

LCIW hired Trulinda Johnwell as a student worker on June 10, 2002. She remained in this position until she was placed in a security officer position on September 2, 2002. LCIW placed Ms. Johnwell into the corrections cadet position on April 14, 2003. She held this position for approximately six months.

According to Ms. Johnwell, she has never performed security duties at LCIW although she had these job titles. She stated while in these positions, she performed clerical duties. Her hire into the corrections cadet position resulted in

a 44% pay increase. Ms. Johnwell was promoted to an office coordinator position on October 27, 2003.

Appendix Table A-2 summarizes Ms. Johnwell's job history.

#### Tonia Hudson

Ms. Hudson worked as a clerk chief from February 11, 2002, until October 31, 2002. On November 1, 2002, LCIW assigned her to a corrections cadet position. Three days later, on November 4, 2002, LCIW detailed Ms. Hudson into an accounting specialist position.

LCIW was unable to provide us with the written justification for this detail. This violates Civil Service Rule 8.16(d)(2) that requires agencies to keep written justification for all details.

Ms. Hudson stated she spent three days in the corrections cadet position but never performed security duties. She said she was detailed into the accounting specialist position because there was a need for someone to handle payroll. Warden Jones stated he was not familiar with these personnel actions.

**Overpayment** - During our audit, Corrections Services Headquarters informed us that LCIW has overpaid Ms. Hudson approximately \$10,798 for the period November 4, 2002, through May 16, 2006. The overpayment was caused by two significant actions. First, when LCIW detailed Ms. Hudson on November 4, 2002, it improperly increased her salary 11% when she was only entitled to a 7% increase. Second, on June 4, 2003, LCIW increased her salary 10.5% with no associated personnel action (change in GS level, position number, job title).

Appendix Table A-3 summarizes Ms. Hudson's job history.

#### Cheryl Hasten

LCIW hired Ms. Hasten into a security officer position on January 17, 2005. She remained in this job title until May 22, 2005. As a security officer, Ms. Hasten performed purchasing duties involving ISIS. On May 23, 2005, LCIW placed Ms. Hasten in a purchasing technician position. Ms. Hasten said she has never performed security duties at LCIW.

#### Nashia Steib

Ms. Steib represents a unique example of an LCIW employee occupying a security-related position but performing administrative duties. Unlike the previous named employees, Ms. Steib actually performed security-related duties for a portion of her LCIW work history.

LCIW had a need for personnel in its medical records section to comply with American Correctional Association (ACA) accreditation requirements. In an attempt to satisfy this need, LCIW moved three employees to the section. One of

the employees was Ms. Steib. She had been a corrections sergeant since October 27, 2003, performing security duties.

Ms. Steib stated LCIW reassigned her to the medical records section in January 2005 to assist with organizing the medical records, which were in disarray. Ms. Steib has remained a corrections sergeant despite performing record management duties.

Warden Jones stated it would be difficult to get the required positions for the medical records section considering the budget cuts the prison has incurred. Warden Jones stated it is common for security personnel to work in other capacities within the prison. He stated other prisons are doing this also. He said if there were a particular need, he would fill the need. He said he has fewer employees to perform the same tasks.

## **Promotion Practice**

LCIW has promoted two employees to the corrections sergeant position who did not meet the minimum requirements. Civil Service Rule 9.2(a) states, permanent appointment of a probationary employee shall begin upon certification by the appointing authority that the employee has met the required standard of work during the probationary period.

### **Karen Dunbar**

Civil Service minimum qualifications for the corrections sergeant job title require that applicants possess at least six months experience in a security capacity. However, LCIW promoted Ms. Dunbar from a corrections cadet position to a corrections sergeant position on December 21, 2004, without her having any security experience. Although Ms. Dunbar has held correctional job titles, she has always performed administrative support duties at LCIW. This personnel action resulted in a 7% salary increase to which Ms. Dunbar was not entitled.

Warden Jones stated the promotion to corrections sergeant from the corrections cadet position is automatic. When questioned about the legality of the action considering Ms. Dunbar not being qualified, he stated that he relies on his human resource section to advise him of what he can do.

LCIW Administrative Director Robyn Walker, who served as Ms. Dunbar's supervisor, signed a form certifying that Ms. Dunbar met the Civil Service requirements for reallocation to the corrections sergeant position effective December 21, 2004. Ms. Dunbar also signed the form. This action may violate Civil Service Rule 14.1(j) prohibiting any person from making a false statement, mark, or rating, to any appointment or employment.

According to Ms. Walker, she was not sure if she should sign the form since she (Walker) was not a security supervisor. She said Human Resource Manager Linda Trotter and Deputy Warden Loetia Young told her the form was just a formality.

Appendix Table A-1 summarizes Ms. Dunbar's job history.

Trulinda Johnwell

On October 14, 2003, LCIW promoted Ms. Johnwell to a corrections sergeant position without her meeting the requirements for the job. Ms. Johnwell did not have the required six months of security experience. According to Ms. Johnwell, she has never performed security duties for LCIW. Ms. Johnwell received an associated 7% pay increase to which she was not entitled. Warden Jones approved this personnel action.

Appendix Table A-2 summarizes Ms. Johnwell's job history.

Recommendations:

Corrections Services Headquarters should:

1. Review LCIW employees' actual job duties, particularly those working in administrative support areas, to ensure the positions are allocated to the proper job titles.
2. Ensure LCIW discontinues the practice of using security-related positions for non-security duties.
3. Evaluate the human resource needs of its prisons and take action to ensure human resource utilization is efficient and in the best interest of the state.
4. Develop and initiate a plan to recover overpayments to Ms. Karen Dunbar and Ms. Tonia Hudson.
5. Consider requiring LCIW to provide it all personnel actions involving details and the associated written justification for review and approval.
6. Closely monitor LCIW personnel action activities particularly successive salary increases that appear above the norm.

## Improper Retirement Classifications

LCIW is not ensuring that only employees who are in security-related positions are enrolled in the Corrections secondary retirement component of the Louisiana State Employees Retirement System (LASERS). In addition, LASERS lacks policies and procedures that address the classification of employees who own a position in one retirement component, but are detailed (temporarily assigned) to a position in another component.

LSA-R.S. 11:601 provides for a secondary retirement component to the regular LASERS system that restricts membership to wardens, correctional officers, probation and parole officers, and security personnel employed by DPSC. LASERS refers to this component as the Corrections secondary retirement component. DPSC administration staff and regular employees are not eligible for the secondary component and should be enrolled as regular LASERS members.

The following table depicts some key differences in the regular system and the Corrections secondary retirement component:

	<b>Regular Retirement System</b>	<b>Corrections Secondary Retirement Component</b>
<b>Eligible for Retirement</b>	After 30 years of state service at any age	After 25 years of state service at any age
<b>Benefit Rate</b>	2.5% per year of creditable service	3.33% per year of creditable service
<b>Employees' Contribution Rate</b>	7.5% of earned compensation	9.0% of earned compensation
Source: Prepared by Inspector General's staff using information obtained from LASERS		

Retirement benefits are calculated using three factors; employees' years of service, the applicable benefit rate, and average compensation of an employee's highest three years. For example, an employee retiring after 30 years of state service in the regular retirement system, whose highest monthly average compensation was \$2,000, would have monthly benefits calculated as follows:

$$\$2,000 \times 30 \text{ years} \times 2.5\% = \$1,500$$

The following table shows the amount of time an employee would have to work to receive 100% of his/her salary in the two retirement components:

**Employee John Doe**

	<b>Average Compensation</b>	<b>Years of Service</b>	<b>Benefit Rate</b>	<b>Benefit</b>
<b>Regular Retirement System</b>	\$2,000	40 years	2.5%	\$2,000
<b>Corrections Secondary</b>	\$2,000	30 years	3.33%	\$2,000
Source: Prepared by Inspector General's staff using information obtained from LASERS				

We found the following two employees were improperly enrolled in the Corrections secondary retirement component:

Karen Dunbar

Ms. Dunbar began contributing to the Corrections secondary component on June 21, 2004, the date she was hired into the corrections cadet position. LCIW detailed Ms. Dunbar to an accounting specialist position the next day. Ms. Dunbar remained in the secondary component despite not performing correctional duties and being detailed to an accounting specialist position. On February 28, 2005, LCIW promoted her to the accounting specialist position. However, LCIW did not enroll Ms. Dunbar into regular LASERS until June 2006, after our audit work began.

Dean Lehrke

Mr. Lehrke served as a correctional officer for another DPSC prison for approximately two and one half years. During that time, Mr. Lehrke was a member of the Corrections secondary component. On June 6, 2005, he transferred to LCIW to work as a warehouse manager. On that date, LCIW should have ensured Mr. Lehrke was transferred to the regular LASERS system. As of October 5, 2006, Mr. Lehrke is still improperly enrolled in the Corrections secondary component.

According to a LASERS official, it is the agencies' responsibility to submit a membership registration form to notify LASERS of an employees' retirement status change. LCIW did not complete the documents and submit them to LASERS for both employees. LCIW Human Resource Manager Linda Trotter could not explain why this was not done. She assumed it was an oversight.

**Recommendations:**

Corrections Services Headquarters should:

7. Ensure LCIW develops procedures to promptly notify LASERS of position changes affecting an employees' retirement system classification.

8. Transfer Mr. Dean Lehrke from the Corrections secondary retirement component to the regular LASERS system.
9. Work with LASERS to develop formal written policies and procedures that address how the department should classify employees who “own” a position in one retirement component but are detailed to a position in another component.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Summary of Significant Personnel Actions**

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONS, CORRECTIONS SERVICES

The tables in this Appendix provide an overview of some significant personnel actions that took place for some of the employees mentioned in this report. (Note: Shaded sections represent an irregularity in duties performed, or in retirement classification.)

Table A-1 ■ Karen Dunbar 's significant personnel actions

<b>Date</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Duties Performed</b>	<b>Retirement Plan</b>	<b>Bi-weekly Salary</b>
6/17/1996	Initial Hire	Typist Clerk 3	Administrative	Regular State Employees	\$462.46
1/3/2000	Unclassified Appointment	Student Worker	Administrative	None	\$492.00*
2/17/2003	Reassigned	Unclassified Security Officer	Administrative		\$652.00*
6/21/2004	Hired	Corrections Cadet	Administrative	Corrections Officers	\$706.40
6/22/2004	Detailed	Accounting Specialist	Administrative		\$1,085.00
12/20/2004	Ended detail	Corrections Cadet	Administrative		\$1,085.00
12/21/2004	Promoted	Corrections Sergeant	Administrative		\$1,207.38
12/22/2004	Detailed	Accounting Specialist	Administrative		\$1,207.38
10/27/2004	Passed required exam				\$1,207.38
2/28/2005	Promoted	Accounting Specialist	Administrative	Corrections Officers	\$1,291.90

Source: Prepared by Inspector General's staff using information obtained from ISIS, personnel files, and LASERS.  
 \* May be more or less depending on number of hours worked in the bi-weekly period.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONS, CORRECTIONS SERVICES

Table A-2 ■ Trulinda Johnwell 's significant personnel actions

<b>Date</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Duties Performed</b>	<b>Retirement Plan</b>	<b>Bi-weekly Salary</b>
6/10/2002	Initial Hire	Student Worker	Administrative	None	\$492.00*
9/02/2002	Reassigned	Security Officer	Administrative		\$492.00*
4/14/2003	Hired	Corrections Cadet	Administrative	Corrections Officers	\$706.40
10/14/2003	Promoted	Corrections Sergeant	Administrative		\$785.60
10/27/2003	Promoted	Office Coordinator	Administrative	Regular State Employees	\$785.60

Source: Prepared by Inspector General's staff using information obtained from ISIS, personnel files, and LASERS.  
 \* May be more or less depending on number of hours worked in the bi-weekly period.

Table A-3 ■ Tonia Hudson 's significant personnel actions

<b>Date</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Duties Performed</b>	<b>Retirement Plan</b>	<b>Bi-weekly Salary</b>
8/27/2001	Hired	Health Info Processor	Administrative	Regular State Employees	\$525.60
2/11/2002	Transferred	Clerk Chief	Administrative		\$562.40
11/1/2002	Assigned	Corrections Cadet	Administrative		\$706.40
11/4/2002	Detailed	Accounting Specialist	Administrative		\$787.20
7/7/2003	Promoted		Administrative		\$904.00

Source: Prepared by Inspector General's staff using information obtained from ISIS, personnel files, and LASERS.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Response**

DEPARTMENT OF  
PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONS

KATHLEEN BABINEAUX BLANCO, GOVERNOR



RICHARD L. STALDER, SECRETARY

November 13, 2006

Sharon B. Robinson, CPA  
State Inspector General  
Division of Administration  
P. O. Box 94095  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-9095

Dear Ms. Robinson:

Re: Case No. 1-06-0020

This letter is in response to the audit report dated October 23, 2006 concerning findings at the Louisiana Correctional Institute for Women (LCIW). On April 20, 2006 the Department started consolidating various functions at LCIW and Elayn Hunt Correctional Center (EHCC). The Headquarters Human Resources Office (HDQ HR) conducted a detailed review of all personnel files and the Department was in the process of addressing several irregularities discovered from the review prior to the Inspector General's audit. A natural outgrowth of the consolidation effort was to place LCIW administrative support functions under the supervisors of the appropriate manager at EHCC. The formal chain of command is as follows: LCIW Administrative Managers in administrative support areas will receive supervision from corresponding managers at EHCC; EHCC managers will report to the Assistant Warden over Administration at EHCC; who will report to the Deputy Warden at EHCC. The Deputy Warden reports to Warden Leger at LCIW. This chain of command will improve the efficiency of operations at LCIW.

The Department concurs with the findings on the misuse of positions and the improper retirement classifications of employees at LCIW. The Department's Human Resources Director is currently working with Warden Leger to ensure that the findings are corrected. Attached is a corrective action plan based on the recommendations in the report. HDQ HR has established ISIS-HR Quality Assurance and Data Integrity Review ISIS reports that must be reviewed by HDQ HR staff and the Unit Human Resources Managers. Please see attached ISIS-HR reports.

If you have any questions concerning the plan, please contact me at 225-342-6739.

Sincerely,

Bernard E. "Trey" Boudreaux, III  
Undersecretary

BEB:CTD

Attachments

cc: Richard L. Stalder, Secretary  
Mariana Leger, Correction Warden - LCIW  
Shannon S. Templet, Human Resources Director

## PLAN OF ACTION BASED ON INSPECTOR GENERAL'S RECOMMENDATIONS

### **1. Review LCIW employees' actual job duties, particularly those working in administrative support areas, to ensure the positions are allocated to the proper job titles.**

- The Headquarters Human Resources Office will conduct desk audits on the employees to ensure they are properly allocated to the position in which they currently occupy.
- The Headquarters Human Resources Office will mandate that all position descriptions be updated in accordance with Department Regulation A-02-027 (Position Descriptions).

### **2. Ensure LCIW discontinues the practice of using security-related positions for non-security duties.**

- Warden Leger has instructed all employees that the institution will no longer have a practice of using security related positions to perform non-security duties.

### **3. Evaluate the human resource needs of its prisons and take action to ensure human resource utilization is efficient and in the best interest of the state.**

- The Headquarters Human Resources Office will continue to make monthly visits to the LCIW Human Resources Office and provide a formal response to Warden Leger.
- The Headquarters Human Resources Office has initiated a review of bi-weekly quality assurance reports through the ISIS HR system to review all personnel transactions made at the unit human resources offices. It will be mandated that all unit human resources managers review these reports.

- The Headquarters Human Resources Office will hold (2) two semi-annual Human Resources meetings to update all Human Resources Managers regarding new trends, policy and procedure and/or revisions to Civil Service Rules, State and Federal law.
- 4. Develop and initiate a plan to recover overpayments to Ms. Karen Dunbar and Ms. Tonia Hudson.**
- The Human Resources Director and Warden Leger have met with both employees to explain the issues relating to the irregularities in the personnel actions. The Department has initiated a plan to correct the personnel actions and formalize a recoupment plan.
- 5. Consider requiring LCIW to provide all personnel actions involving details and the associated written justification for review and approval.**
- During monthly visits to LCIW, the Headquarters Human Resources Office will review all details to special duty to ensure proper justification and documentation meet Department Regulations and Civil Service Rules.
- 6. Closely monitor LCIW personnel action activities particularly successive salary increases that appear above the norm.**
- The Headquarters Human Resources Office has initiated a review of bi-weekly quality assurance reports through the ISIS HR system to review all personnel transactions made at LCIW. All salary increases will be reviewed on a bi-weekly basis.
- 7. Ensure LCIW develops procedures to promptly notify LASERS of position changes affecting an employees' retirement system classification.**
- The Headquarters Human Resources Office has instructed the LCIW Human Resources office to follow the current procedure where employees will complete a new enrollment document when moving from a job in one retirement eligibility to another job in different retirement eligibility.

**8. Transfer Mr. Dean Lehrke from the Corrections secondary retirement component to the regular LASERS system.**

- Retirement contributions for Mr. Dean Lehrke have been corrected.

**9. Work with LASERS to develop formal written policies and procedures that address how the department should classify employees who “own” a position in one retirement component but are detailed to a position in another component.**

- The Department follows LASERS policy that employees can only participate in the retirement component for a position in which they own.

**ISIS-HR  
QUALITY ASSURANCE  
AND  
DATA INTEGRITY  
REVIEW**

---

Department of Public Safety and Corrections  
Corrections Services

*Headquarters Human Resources Division*

**Purpose:** To ensure that data entry into the ISIS-HR system reflects appropriate use of all Civil Service Rules, Departmental Regulations, and State and Federal Laws. It is imperative for all aspects of an employee's personnel record in ISIS-HR to be accurate in order to provide the employee with a timely and accurate payroll check.

---

**Goals:** Several Goals have been identified throughout this document. Please note that specific reports may be recommended for multiple goals, therefore, it may not be necessary to execute the report more than once.

---

It is highly recommend that all reports are exported to Excel in order to manipulate data for auditing purposes.

### **GOAL: Identify any irregular increases to an employees basic pay**

**Recommended Report:** ZP52 (Basic Pay Audit Report)

**Date Parameters:** 1<sup>st</sup> day of pay period thru 1<sup>st</sup> date of the next pay period

**Variants:** DOC-HDQ-QA (Quality Assurance)

*Instructions:* Determine which Salary % Changes are inconsistent with Civil Service Rules

- Sort by Salary % Change and *delete* all correct pay changes from spreadsheet.
  - 4% Merits
  - Normal Pay Level Changes such as 7%, 10.5% and 14%. Ensure that the correct pay reason reflects the % change (promotions, demotions, reallocations, and details). For example, a reason of Lateral from PS107 to PS107 should not reflect a % change.
  - 11% (merit and reallocation to sergeant)
  - 0% change – majority of these will be new hires. The salary % change will reflect 0% since the employee did not receive a payroll result in the previous pay period
- Document and Review Irregularities
  - Delete any pay changes that were created via “delimiting” due to the creation of a new pay record. (the begin date will be earlier that the pay period in review) CAUTION: if the record looks incorrect due not remove from spreadsheet; at this point it may be helpful to sort the report by personnel number.
  - Indicate on the spreadsheet justification for irregularities.

**Any errors should be emailed to the appropriate unit and for immediate correction. A summary of irregular findings should be forwarded to supervisor.**

### **GOAL: Identify irregularities in employees retirement withholding**

**Recommended Report: ZP57 (Benefits Retirement Participation Report)**

**Date Parameters: Current Date**

*Instructions:* Review report to ensure that all employees are in the correct retirement system and appropriate Pre-Tax % is being withheld.

- Ensure that employees are coded with the correct personnel subarea. Please note that there will be some exceptions to this rule on a case by case basis
  - Correctional Officer 2100/2130
    - Correctional Officer Job Titles
    - Probation and Parole Job Titles
    - Warden Job Titles
    - Prison Enterprise Job Titles
  - Regular Leave 2100/2130
    - Non Security Job Titles
  
- Ensure that benefit plans correspond to Pre-Tax % and Job Title
  - LASE = 7.5% non security hired before 07/01/06
  - LAS6 = 8% non security hired after 07/01/06
  - LCO1/LCO2 = 9% CSOs, Wardens, PnP, and PE
  - NORT = 0%
  - LASD = 0%
  - SSOC = 0%
  - TRSL = 0%

**Any errors should be emailed to the appropriate unit and for immediate correction. A summary of irregular findings should be forwarded to supervisor.**

**GOAL: Identify irregularities between ISIS Personnel Administration and Organizational Management**

**Recommend Report: ZX02 (Mismatch Report)**

**Date Parameters: Current Date**

*Instructions:* Review report for errors. All errors should be discussed with the appropriate unit and corrected immediately. **Please note:** *There will occasionally be acceptable errors due to pending reallocations, job corrections, or other personnel changes. There may also be acceptable errors based on ISIS-HR restrictions. Please contact your supervisor for assistance.*

**GOAL: Ensure that annual leave payments are paid upon separation**

**Recommend Reports:        ZP64 (Employee Wage Type Results Report)  
                                      ZP13 (Action Reason/Pay Reason Report)**

*Instructions:* Employees should be paid up to 300 hours of annual leave upon separation or transfer to another state agency. (Transfers between DOC agencies – no payment made) Review the list of employees who separated during the pay period in review and determine the following:

- Is the employee separated on the ZP13 and no annual leave payout is shown on the ZP64?
  - Check leave balances in ISIS to determine if there was available annual leave to be paid.
- Is the employee showing an annual leave payout on the ZP64 and not showing separated/transferred on the ZP13
  - Check to see if the employee was separated in a different pay period and the unit held the annual payment.
  - Check to see if the employee did not separate and received money with no separation.
  - Check to see if the employee was paid annual leave at the regular rate of pay and not detail pay if detailed.
  - Ensure that annual leave payouts were paid at the regular rate of pay and not detail pay.

**ZP64 (Employee Wage Type Results Report)**

**Date Parameters: Pay Period in review**

**Note: Include Off Cycles**

*(Off cycle dates should reflect the day after the previous pay period AFS post date to the date of the current pay period AFS post date) For example PP01-2006 enter dates 01/05/2006 to 01/18/2006*

**Wage Types: 500 and 500\* (this is not a date range) each should be entered as a single entry.**

**ZP13 (Action Reason/Pay Reason Report)**

**Date Parameters: Pay Period in Review**

**Selection Criteria: Action    (S9) separation -p  
    (Z8) Transfer1/Losing P-P  
    (Z1) Transfer1/Losing P-NP  
    (Z2) Transfer2/Losing P-NP**

**Any errors should be emailed to the appropriate unit and for immediate correction. Summary of irregular findings should be forwarded to supervisor.**

**GOAL: Ensure the proper use of Detail to Special Duty**

**Recommend Reports:**           ZP28 (Detail to Special Duty Report)  
  ZP44 (Contract Audit Report)  
  ZP19 (Position Data by Personnel Subarea Report)  
  ZP13 (Action Reason/Pay Reason Report)

**ZP28 (Detail to Special Duty Report)**  
**Date Parameter: Current Date**  
**Selection Criteria: Detail to Special Duty**  
**Select Display Variant: DOC-QA**

*Instructions:* All employees currently on detail to special duty must appear on the ZP28 DSD Report. Using multiple recommended reports determine if any employee is missing from the ZP28 Report. Furthermore employees must have the following entries on the ZP28 Report:

- ✓ Contract Text (detail to special duty)
- ✓ Detailed Job and Job Title and Position
- ✓ Original Job and Job Title and Position
- ✓ Relationship of BOWN
- ✓ Informational Wage Type (stating detail) and InfoWT Amount
- ✓ Contract Start and End Date with a Valid Until Date
- ✓ Relationship Start Date and End Date

**Important Dates:**   Valid until date should always be 1 year from the detail start date. (Unless extended by Civil Service, which the year will differ)

**ZP44 (Contract Audit Report)**  
**Date Parameter: Current Date**  
**Select Variant: DOC-QA (QA Detail Contract)**

*Instructions:* Any employees on the ZP44 not appearing on the ZP28?

**ZP19 (Position Data by Personnel Subarea Report)**  
**Date Parameter: Current Date**  
**Select Display Variant: DOC-BOWN**

*Instructions:* Any employees showing BOWNs not appearing on the ZP28?

**ZP13 (Action Reason/Pay Reason Report)**

**Date Parameter: Current pay period in review**

**Additional Date Parameters: Use Change Date**

**Select Variant: DOC-QA (DOC Quality Assurance Details)**

*Instructions:* Any employee detailed this pay period not appearing on the ZP28 or ZP44? Or any employee Returned from detail that should be removed from the ZP29 and ZP44?

***SPECIAL PRIORITY:***

1. Identify and Probational Details (specifically those from Corrections Cadet)
2. Valid Until Dates – units must be notified 2 months in advanced of upcoming expirations. HDQ-HR will need to request extensions from Civil Service Director.

**Any errors should be emailed to the appropriate unit and for immediate correction. Summary of irregular findings should be forwarded to supervisor.**

This public document was published at a total cost of \$67.63. Six copies of this public document were published in this first printing at a cost of \$67.63. The total cost of all printings of this document, including reprints is \$67.63. This document was published by the Office of State Inspector General, State of Louisiana, Post Office Box 94095, 224 Florida Street, Suite 303, Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9095 to report its findings under authority of LSA-R.S. 39:7-8. This material was printed in accordance with the standards for printing by state agencies established pursuant to LSA - R.S. 43:31.

A copy of this report has been made available for public inspection at the Office of State Inspector General and is posted on the Office of State Inspector General's website at [www.doa.louisiana.gov/oig/inspector.htm](http://www.doa.louisiana.gov/oig/inspector.htm). Reference should be made to Case No. 1-06-0020. If you need any assistance relative to this report, please contact Bruce J. Janet, CPA, State Audit Director at (225) 342-4262.

## **REPORT FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE**

To report alleged fraud, waste, abuse, or mismanagement relative to state programs or operations, use one of the following methods:

- Complete complaint form on web site at [www.doa.Louisiana.gov/oig/inspector](http://www.doa.Louisiana.gov/oig/inspector)
- Write to Office of State Inspector General, P. O. Box 94095, Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9095
- Call the Office of State Inspector General at (225) 342-4262