

## **SCOPE OBJECTIVES FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW:** **DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**

### Performance Review Requirement

In 2013, the Alaska State Legislature passed House Bill 30 (HB 30) requiring the Division of Legislative Audit (DLA) to conduct performance reviews of all state departments at least once every ten years. During the course of the review, the department is required to provide a list of programs or elements of programs supported by general funds that can be cut without affecting the ability of the department to fulfill its mission or reduce required services to the public. The legislation further outlines the order in which each agency is to be reviewed, starting with the Department of Corrections in 2014.

In accordance with the legislation, DLA is required to establish performance review teams. Teams may include both DLA staff and outside contractors. DLA has authority to solicit for contractors which will be selected based on their knowledge of performance review processes and their expertise with the issues covered by the agency under review. A Request For Proposal (RFP) process will be followed to select successful contractors.

Substantive differences exist between the “performance audits” DLA has been conducting for many years, and the “performance reviews” required of the legislation. A performance review is a systematic assessment of the appropriateness, effectiveness and efficiency of a department, agency or program and is meant to provide information that can improve the entity’s performance. Performance reviews are also used to assist governments in the decision-making process as they evaluate the programs and corresponding budgets the entity administers.

The performance reviews required in HB 30 do not provide the same high-level of assurance provided by an audit and are not conducted in accordance with audit standards. In addition, the results of these performance reviews will reflect the opinion of the review team and not that of the legislative auditor. The legislation requires the review team to analyze materials from eight specific sources as it conducts the review. A complete list of these sources is included in Appendix A. It also includes a list of 21 areas of review that could be included in the final report. The list of potential areas for inclusion in the report is included in Appendix B.

Each preliminary performance review report must be sent to the Legislative Budget and Audit Committee (LBAC) by December 16 of the review year. A timeline will be developed to ensure the committee has adequate time to review the report before it is broadly distributed. The report is confidential until finalized and released by the LBAC. Copies of the final report must be sent to the chairs or co-chairs of the senate and house finance committees one week prior to the beginning of session.

### Methodology

To fulfill the requirements of HB 30, DLA will identify review teams consisting of both DLA staff and independent contractors. DLA has hired a Project Manager (PM) who will be a member of each team. The PM will facilitate the work of the contractors and ensure the reviews are completed timely and in accordance with statutory requirements.

DLA will select independent contractors to conduct the actual reviews and prepare the preliminary report. An RFP will be issued in accordance with legislative procurement requirements to solicit and select potential

contractors. The role of the Legislative Auditor (LA) will be to provide general supervision to the Project Manager and the contractors.

A Scope document will be prepared for each review by the PM in consultation with the LA and must be approved by the LBAC. To develop the Scope, the PM has identified the required review items within HB 30 and developed review objectives for each item. Although HB 30 includes discretion for the items that may be included in the review report, each of the 21 items identified will be accounted for in some manner. A crosswalk is included in Appendix C that maps the required element to a Review Objective. The approved Scope will be used to develop the details of the RFP and the contract.

Given the timeline for the review, it is expected that the RFP process will be completed by November 2013 and a contractor selected in December 2013. Work on the review by the independent contractor is expected to begin on January 15, 2014.

As part of the required process for each of the reviews, public hearings must be facilitated by either the LBAC or the house or senate finance committees to gather public comment on the agency under review. The committees must determine which committee will take the lead for facilitating the public hearings.

The preliminary report of the contractor's recommendations will be transmitted by the Contractor in time for discussion during the LBAC's committee meeting in October 2014. The final report will be presented for release in December 2014. A project timeline for the Department of Corrections performance review is included in Appendix D.

#### Background Information – Alaska Department of Corrections

The mission of the Alaska Department of Corrections is to enhance the safety of the state's communities. The department's core services are to provide secure confinement, reformatory programs, and a process of supervised community reintegration.

Alaska is one of six states that operates a unified correctional system. Under a unified system, both sentenced and unsentenced individuals are housed within the state system. The department reports that in 2010 it booked 38,000 offenders into its facilities. As of January 2012, 6,005 offenders were either in prison, at a community residential center (CRC), or were being electronically monitored (EM). In addition, 6,195 offenders were on probation or parole.

Structurally, the department has 1,708 staff. It operates 13 facilities statewide, opening its newest facility Goose Creek Correctional Center (GCCC) in July, 2013, at Point MacKenzie. Prior to the opening of GCCC, the department had contracted with a private facility in Hudson, Colorado to house over 1,050 inmates. Since opening, many of these prisoners have been returned to Alaska but the transition has not yet been finalized. The department also has 13 field probation offices and operates electronic monitoring programs in seven communities. As part of the unified correction system, the department also contracts with local cities for 15 regional jails and six community residential centers.

In FY 2014, the department had an overall operating budget of \$323 million.

Two of the most prominent programs offered by the department include treatment for substance abuse (known as Life Success Substance Abuse Treatment - LSSAT) and the Offender Reentry Program (ORP). The LSSAT

program serves more than 1,000 inmates per year. The department reports that recent research suggests that approximately 86% of the prison population has substance abuse related problems. The department significantly expanded the program in 2011. Demand continues to exceed capacity for the program.

In December 2011, the department began the Offender Reentry Program (ORP) with the express purpose of reducing recidivism. According to the department, the ORP is a comprehensive approach to managing offenders. The program uses a three-phase approach, focusing on the issues that could contribute to the inmate reoffending (criminogenic needs such as unemployment), barriers to behavioral change, and other factors necessary for successful transition from prison.

### Review Objectives

#### **Review Objective 1: Evaluate the success of the agency in achieving its mission through the effective and efficient delivery of its core services, goals, programs and objectives**

The review team will evaluate whether the department's core services, goals, programs and objectives provided in response to AS 37.07.050 are efficient and effective. The review team will provide suggestions for improvement to any area that it identifies as either not effective or not efficient, including alternate goals, programs or objectives as applicable.

#### **Review Objective 2: Determine whether the agency's results-based measures demonstrate effectiveness and efficiency of the agency's core services, goals, programs and objectives**

The review team will evaluate the result's based measures submitted by the department in response to AS 37.07.050 and:

- Determine whether the measures demonstrate the effectiveness of the department's core services, goals, programs and objectives;
- Determine whether the measures demonstrate the department's efficiency in providing core services and programs;
- From the information reviewed, make recommendations on alternate results-based measures that may better demonstrate the department's effectiveness or efficiency in meeting its core services, goals, programs and objectives; and
- Identify whether the results-based measures required under AS 37.07 are useful in conducting the department performance review, and if not, explain why they are not useful.
  - Should the review team find the results-based measures were not useful in conducting the performance review, the team shall provide recommendations identifying other currently available information or indicators that could be used in the future to better demonstrate the department's effectiveness or efficiency in fulfilling its core services, goals, programs and objectives

#### **Review Objective 3: Evaluate the appropriateness of the budget reductions proposed by the agency in response to AS 44.66.020(c)(2)**

The review team will be asked to review and evaluate the following:

- Did the agency prioritize in accordance with the statute when it developed the recommended cuts provided to the review team?
  - Program does not serve a current need;
  - Program is not authorized by the Constitution or otherwise in statute; or
  - Program is not essential to the department mission or delivery of the department's core services

- Do the recommended cuts reflect a good faith effort by the department to identify areas that can effectively be reduced without threatening the department's ability to meet its mission?

**Review Objective 4: List agency programs or activities (*actions*) not authorized by statute and identify other authority for those actions**

The review team will review the list of agency programs and activities submitted by the department to the Project Manager and determine whether the programs and activities included on the list are essential to fulfilling the department's mission or core service requirements; and whether the program or activity has or can be assigned effectiveness measures.

**Review Objective 5: Identify agency authority to collect fees, conduct inspections, enforce state law, or impose penalties**

The review team will identify the regulatory authority of the department to collect fees; whether the department is collecting fees at this time; and for what purpose current fees are collected. The review team will also identify the parameters under which the department may develop and require a fee and make recommendations as to whether the collection of a new fee or increase in an existing fee will provide resources to improve the effectiveness or efficiency of the department.

**Review Objective 6: Recommend improvements to agency practices and procedures, including means to decrease regulatory burdens or restrictions without decreasing public service and safety**

Upon review of national best practices and after consultation with department management and national industry leaders, the review team will provide recommendations to improve practices or procedures that will increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the department. To fulfill this objective, the contractor will evaluate DOC's delivery of inmate health care services and the department's Life Success Substance Abuse Treatment (LSSAT) program and compare each to national best practices. Upon review of each, the team shall determine whether there are external factors (such as private insurance restrictions, sentencing guidelines or restrictions, etc) limiting the effectiveness and efficiency of the identified program or service and recommend relevant changes to improve each as applicable.

As part of this objective, the team will also list regulatory restrictions that impede the department's ability to adopt a more effective or efficient practice or procedure in any area that arises to the team's attention during the overall review and pertains to a core service, program or goal of the department.

**Review Objective 7: Identify areas in which programs and jurisdiction of agencies overlap and assess the quality of interagency cooperation in those areas**

The review team will identify areas supporting a core service or program within the department for which the program or service has shared jurisdiction with another agency or department and determine the level of interagency cooperation between the department and other agencies. To fulfill this objective the team will identify no more than three areas that meet the following criteria:

- Department provides a service to an inmate (such as adult basic education) that is finalized or continued at another state or local publicly funded facility;
- Department receives or transfers inmates or staff members from or to another publicly funded facility; or
- Department has chosen to contract with another state or local publicly funded entity to deliver an identified service within the correctional system.

As part of this process, the team will interview department employees and/or individuals with extensive knowledge of the department to help identify areas of overlap. The team will also survey individuals at the department and at the external agencies that interact with the department to assess the level of cooperation between the entities. Recommendations will be developed to help improve the quality of interagency cooperation as applicable.

**Review Objective 8: Evaluate whether agency promptly and effectively addresses complaints**

The review team will evaluate the department's policy and procedures for addressing complaints, and any available data that reveals the number, type and resolution of complaints received by the department and individual state facilities. The team will also contact the Ombudsman and gather the nature, number and resolution of complaints received by the Ombudsman regarding the department or any of the individual state facilities. It is also assumed that information regarding complaints will be gathered during the public hearings and as applicable, be incorporated into the report.

**Review Objective 9: Evaluate to what extent the agency encourages and uses public participation in rulemaking and other decision making**

To fulfill this objective, the review team will evaluate two administrative rules adopted within the last three years that impact both inmates and members of the public, as well as one capital project undertaken within the last five years and identify whether the department followed the statutory requirements for public comment into the process. As applicable to each rule and capital project chosen, the team will evaluate whether public notice of the opportunity to provide comment was distributed through either written or electronic notification; whether the notice was distributed in a timely manner and encompasses all relevant population centers; and whether the opportunity to provide public comment was scheduled at a time and location where members of the general and affected population could reasonably participate without undue hardship. The review team will also identify if there were areas where the department could have included greater public involvement, and the potential benefit to the department or those covered by the rule or capital project from soliciting more public involvement.

**Review Objective 10: Evaluate agency's process for implementing technology and recommend new types or uses of technology to improve agency efficiency and effectiveness**

The review team will identify national best practices in correctional facilities that utilize specific technology to improve the effective and efficient operation of correctional facilities and/or the core services of the department. The evaluation of national best practices will take into consideration the version or release number of all software recommended as a best practice and the availability of that same version or release number at this time. The evaluation should also consider for each best practice technology identified: how long the technology had been in use prior to being identified as a best practice; initial cost of the recommended technology when it was originally adopted; and the maintenance costs incurred since the technology was adopted. The review team will make recommendations on technology improvements that could improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the department, and include estimated costs for the acquisition and maintenance of the recommended improvement.

**Review Objective 11: Identify services provided by programs and functions duplicated by another government agency or private entity and recommend the most effective and efficient way to perform those services**

Upon review of national best practices, discussion with industry experts, and interviews with department personnel, the review team will identify any programs or functions performed by the department that have a material impact on the department's budget and are duplicated by another government agency or private

entity. The review team will make recommendations as to the most effective and efficient way for the identified service to be performed. The team will also evaluate information brought forward during the scheduled public hearings to determine whether services with a material impact on the department's budget are being duplicated, and if so, how the duplication should be addressed.

**Review Objective 12: Evaluate whether the agency priorities reported to the Legislature under AS 37.07.050(a)(13) and the list of programs or elements of programs provided under AS 44.66.020(c)(2) are consistent with the results of the review**

The review team will compare the department's priorities submitted to the legislature under AS 37.07 with the list of programs the department identified for budget reduction to ensure that the recommended cuts are consistent with the results of the performance review. The review team will identify any areas in which it disagrees with the department's budget reductions and detail the team's rationale for the disagreement with the identified reduction.

**Review Objective 13: Identify agencies that could be terminated or consolidated, reductions in costs, and potential program or cost reductions based on policy changes**

After completion of the performance review, the review team will identify whether there are any programs, divisions, or services that the team reviewed while conducting the evaluation of the department that could either be terminated or consolidated in order to improve overall department effectiveness or efficiency. If the team recommends elimination or consolidation of programs or elements of programs, it shall provide for each recommendation an estimate of the financial implication of the action; whether the action results in either one-time or long-term savings to the department and the state; and whether costs are transferred to another agency. To the extent possible, information submitted by the department in response to AS 37.07.050(b) shall be used to identify relationships and potential areas for review.

In addition to implications for the state, the team will also identify whether the action to terminate or consolidate a program or element of a program would either affect federal funding or instigate federal intervention.

**Review Objective 14: Identify the extent to which statutory, regulatory, budgetary or other changes are necessary to enable the agency to better serve the interests of the public and to correct problems identified during the review**

As an essential part of the review process, the team will interview key department staff to identify whether there are statutory, regulatory, budgetary or other restrictions impeding the department's ability to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the department. It is also anticipated that information will be derived through the public hearing process that will also identify areas for potential improvement as well. The team will determine the extent to which each potential area for modification has impacted the department's performance and review the department's historical attempts to address the issue. The team will provide recommendations in those areas that it determines could lead to greater department effectiveness or efficiency.

**Review Objective 15: Identify any other elements appropriate to a performance management review**

The review team shall evaluate the extent to which the department has created and has been following a long-term operational or strategic plan, and a long-term capital development and/or improvements plan, and determine whether the department has met the goals or objectives identified within the relevant plans. The review team shall also, as practical and applicable, evaluate the long-term financial plan submitted in response to AS 37.07.020 and determine whether the department is meeting the objectives outlined in the financial plan.

**Review Objective 16: Evaluate the agency process for development of capital projects**

The review team will determine the extent to which a formal process exists for the development of capital projects, and if a process exists, determine whether the department has followed the process when implementing its last three capital projects exceeding \$1,000,000. If a formal process exists, the team will determine whether the process is within the control of the department or has been developed in response to federal or other guidelines outside of the control of the department; and the level of public involvement in the process. The team will only be looking at the process for developing the project, it will not be looking at whether the department met state procurement requirements.

A crosswalk is included in Appendix C identifying the statutory elements the review team may include in the report and where those items are included in the corresponding Review Objectives above. The crosswalk also identifies if an element for potential inclusion in the report has been omitted from review and the rationale for excluding the item.

**Public Hearings**

For each agency review, the legislation requires the review team to work through the LBAC or the senate or house finance committees to schedule public hearings in Juneau, Anchorage, Fairbanks and other locations as determined by the committee. The expressed purpose is to review agency activities and identify problems or concerns.

Given that the review will run concurrently during the legislative session making it more challenging to schedule hearings in outlying cities, a meeting will be scheduled in Juneau during session to provide the review team with initial feedback. To accommodate both the legislative schedule and the timeline for completing the performance review, this meeting should be held fairly early in the session. To accomplish this, the following broad schedule is proposed (final dates to be determined by the participating committee(s)):

CITY/LOCATION	SUGGESTED MEETING
Juneau	First two weeks of February 2014 (2/3-2/14)
Anchorage	First two weeks of May 2014
Fairbanks	First two weeks of May 2014
Bethel	First two weeks of May 2014

# **APPENDIX A**

## HB 30 Required Materials Review

Statute Reference	Item for Review	Submitting Party
AS 44.66.040(b)(1)	All material provided by agency in response to AS 44.66.020(c)	Agency
AS 44.66.040(b)(2)	10-yr growth history and 10-yr projection of agency expenses by funding source	OMB
AS 44.66.040(b)(3)	Organizational charts, personnel charts by location that show the number of positions and the functions of each position, and a list of transfers of personal services funding to or from other line items during preceding 10 yrs	OMB
AS 44.060.040(b)(4)	Summary audit information and recommendations	DLA
AS 44.66.040(b)(5)	List of any financial issues relating to the agency's operating or capital expenditures	DLF
AS 44.66.040(b)(6)	Explanation of function and procedure for dedicated funds or any other agency special funds	DLF
AS 44.66.040(b)(7)	10-yr history of any budget ratifications or supplemental budget requests	DLF
AS 44.66.040(b)(8)	Analysis and summary of confidential information review team may request from DLA (through LBAC)	DLA

---

*Source: House Bill 30*

# **APPENDIX B**

## HB 30 Potential Review and Report Elements

Statute Reference	Description	Responsible Party
AS 44.66.040(d)(1)	Evaluate success of agency in achieving its mission through effective and efficient delivery of core services, goals, programs and objectives	Review Team
AS 44.66.040(d)(2)	Determine whether agency's results-based measures demonstrate effectiveness and efficiency of agency's core services, goals, programs, and objectives, and recommend changes if necessary	Review Team
AS 44.66.040(d)(3)	Determine whether results-based measures were useful in conducting review and recommend changes if necessary	Review Team
AS 44.66.040(d)(4)	Evaluate appropriateness of budget reductions proposed by the agency in response to AS 44.66.020(c)(2)	Review Team
AS 44.66.040(d)(5)	Determine whether agency acted in good faith to correct problems identified in previous audit	Review Team
AS 44.66.040(d)(6)	List agency programs or actions not authorized by statute and identify authority for those actions	Review Team
AS 44.66.040(d)(7)	Identify agency authority to collect fees, conduct inspections, enforce state law, or impose penalties	Review Team
AS 44.66.040(d)(8)	Recommend improvements to agency practices and procedures, including means to decrease regulatory burdens or restrictions without decreasing public service and safety	Review Team
AS 44.66.040(d)(9)	Identify areas where programs and jurisdiction of agencies overlap and assess the quality of interagency cooperation in those areas	Review Team
AS 44.66.040(d)(10)	Evaluate whether agency promptly and effectively addresses complaints	Review Team
AS 44.66.040(d)(11)	Evaluate to what extent agency encourages and uses public participation in rulemaking and other decision making	Review Team
AS 44.66.040(d)(12)	Evaluate agency's process for implementing technology and recommend new types or uses of technology to improve agency efficiency and effectiveness	Review Team
AS 44.66.040(d)(13)	Identify services provided by programs and	Review Team

<b>Statute Reference</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>
	functions duplicated by another government agency or private entity and recommend most effective and efficient way to perform services	
AS 44.66.040(d)(14)	Evaluate whether agency priorities reported to legislature under AS 37.07 and list of programs or elements of programs provided in response to review requirements are consistent with results of performance review	Review Team
AS 44.66.040(d)(15)	Identify agencies that could be terminated or consolidated, reductions in costs, and potential program or cost reductions	Review Team
AS 44.66.040(d)(16)	Identify reductions and efficiencies recommended from performance review	Review Team
AS 44.66.040(d)(17)	Identify extent to which statutory, regulatory, budgetary, or other changes are necessary to enable agency to better serve interests of public and to correct problems identified during review	Review Team
AS 44.66.040(d)(18)	Analyze how review team's recommendation to terminate agency or terminate any program within agency would affect federal funding or instigate federal investigation	Review Team
AS 44.66.040(d)(19)	Include draft legislation to correct problems identified in report that shall be introduced by the senate and house finance committees	Project Manager
AS 44.66.040(d)(20)	Identify areas that need in-depth review to provide complete information to LBAC for consideration in audit process	Review Team
AS 44.66.040(d)(21)	Identify any other elements appropriate to a performance management review	Review Team
AS 44.66.040(a)(5)	Evaluate agency process for development of capital projects (analysis required but not required in report)	Review Team

*Source: House Bill 30*

# APPENDIX C

**CROSSWALK OF HB 30 REQUIREMENTS AND SCOPE REVIEW OBJECTIVES**

<b>STATUTE REFERENCE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>REVIEW OBJECTIVE</b>
<b>ALLOWABLE REVIEW TEAM REPORT ELEMENTS</b>		
AS 44.66.040(d)(1)	Evaluate success of the agency in achieving its mission through the effective and efficient delivery of its core services, goals, programs and objectives	RO 1
AS 44.66.040(d)(2)	Determine whether agency's results-based measures demonstrate effectiveness and efficiency of core services, goals, programs, and objectives; recommend changes if necessary	RO 2
AS 44.66.040(d)(3)	Determine whether results-based measures were useful in conducting the review and recommend changes if necessary	RO 2
AS 44.66.040(d)(4)	Evaluate appropriateness of budget reductions proposed by the agency in response to HB 30 requirements	RO 3
AS 44.66.040(d)(5)	Determine whether agency acted in good faith to correct problems from previous audit or review	One focused audit - no need to evaluate
AS 44.66.040(d)(6)	List agency programs or actions not authorized by statute and identify authority for actions	RO 4
AS 44.66.040(d)(7)	Identify authority to collect fees, conduct inspections, enforce state law, or impose penalties	RO 5
AS 44.66.040(d)(8)	Recommend improvements to agency practices and procedures, including means to decrease regulatory burdens or restrictions without decreasing public service and safety	RO 6
AS 44.66.040(d)(9)	Identify areas in which programs and jurisdiction of agencies overlap and assess the quality of interagency cooperation in those areas	RO 7
AS 44.66.040(d)(10)	Evaluate whether the agency promptly and effectively addresses complaints	RO 8
AS 44.66.040(d)(11)	Evaluate to what extent the agency encourages and uses public participation in rulemaking and other decision making	RO 9
AS 44.66.040(d)(12)	Evaluate agency's process for implementing technology and recommend new types or uses of technology to improve agency efficiency and effectiveness	RO 10
AS 44.66.040(d)(13)	Identify services provided by programs and functions duplicated by another government agency or private entity and recommend the most effective and efficient way to perform those services	RO 11
AS 44.66.040(d)(14)	Evaluate whether the agency priorities reported to the legislature under AS 37.07 and the list of programs or elements of programs provided in response to review requirements are consistent with the results of the performance review	RO 12
AS 44.66.040(d)(15)	Identify agencies that could be terminated or consolidated, reductions in costs, and potential program or cost reductions based on policy changes	RO 13
AS 44.66.040(d)(16)	Identify reductions and efficiencies recommended as a result of the performance review	Incorporated in ROs
AS 44.66.040(d)(17)	Identify extent to which statutory, regulatory, budgetary, or other changes are necessary to enable agency to better serve interests of public and to correct problems identified during the review	RO 14
AS 44.66.040(d)(18)	Analyze how the review team's recommendation to terminate the agency or terminate any program within the agency would affect federal funding or instigate federal investigation	RO 13
AS 44.66.040(d)(19)	Include draft legislation to correct problems identified in the report that shall be introduced by the senate and house finance committees	PM will work with leg staff
AS 44.66.040(d)(20)	Identify areas that need in-depth review in order to provide complete information to the LBAC for consideration in the audit process	In RFP
AS 44.66.040(d)(21)	Identify any other elements appropriate to a performance management review	RO 15
<b>REQUIRED FOR REVIEW BY REVIEW TEAM</b>		
AS 44.66.040(a)(4)	Analyze the agency priorities reported to the Legislature under AS 37.07	RO 12
AS 44.66.040(a)(5)	Evaluate the agency process for development of capital projects	RO 16

# APPENDIX D

## **Department of Corrections Performance Review Timeline**

Develop Scope – submit for approval – 9/15/13

Develop deliverable list and submission schedule – 9/15/13

Establish budget – 9/20/13

Draft RFP – 9/30/13

Submit draft RFP to legal – final draft from legal by 10/15/13

Draft contract – 9/30

Submit draft contract to legal – final draft from legal by 10/15/13

Submit requests to agency and stakeholders for required information – 9/20/13 – due by 11/1/13

Submit Scope to subcommittee – 10/01/13

Submit Scope to committee – 10/16/13

Release RFP – 11/4/13

Identify RFP selection committee – 11/6/13

Announce contractor – 12/16/13

Contract signed by all parties – 12/20/13

### **DOC PERFORMANCE REVIEW CONTRACT TO BEGIN 1/15/14**

Establish and engage tracking systems – 1/30/14

*Establish public engagement/stakeholder sessions  
February – May 2014*

Initial draft report to Project Manager and Legislative Auditor – 8/1/14

Initial draft report to Department for comment – 8/15/14

Draft preliminary report from contractor to Legislative Auditor - 9/5/14

October 16, 2013

Final preliminary report from contractor – 9/19/14

Confidential preliminary draft to committee – 10/15/14

*Submit Report to Chairs of the Senate and House Finance Committees - (one week before the first day of session)*

*Submit Report to Legislature – (first day of session)*