

# Illinois Department of Corrections



## Records Digitization Impact Study

**Public Act 103-0071**

December 29, 2023

**JB Pritzker**

*Governor*

**Latoya Hughes**

*Acting Director*



*In collaboration with the Illinois Department of Innovation and Technology*

# Table of Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Overview</b> .....  | <b>3</b>  |
| <b><u>Section I – Identifying Records, Systems, and Applications</u></b> .....                                 | <b>6</b>  |
| <u>Defining “Record”</u> .....   | 6         |
| <u>Developing a Master Record File</u> .....   | 9         |
| <i>Reception and Classification</i> .....  | 9         |
| <i>Transfer, Interagency and Third-Party Documents, and Continuous Review</i> .....                            | 11        |
| <i>Intra-agency and Facility Documents</i> .....   | 14        |
| <u>Data, Information, and Records Management Systems</u> .....   | 17        |
| <u>Electronic Records Management System</u> .....  | 20        |
| <u>Current Non-Master File Records Management</u> .....  | 22        |
| <i>Preliminary Records Mapping</i> .....   | 23        |
| <i>Interagency Data Sharing and Compatibility</i> .....  | 26        |
| <u>Current Digitized Records</u> .....   | 28        |
| <b><u>Section II – Identifying Records, Systems, and Applications</u></b> .....                                | <b>32</b> |
| <u>Indexing</u> .....  | 32        |
| <i>Information Related to Individuals’ Sentencing and Court Documents</i> .....                                | 33        |
| <i>Healthcare and Other Related Needs and Services</i> .....   | 34        |
| <i>Programmatic Needs and Services: Assessment, Assignment Protocols, Case Management, and Contracts</i> ..... | 34        |
| <i>Work Assignments</i> .....  | 35        |
| <i>Sentence Credits</i> .....  | 35        |
| <i>Disciplinary Infractions and Procedures</i> .....   | 36        |
| <i>Pre-Release Documentation and Processes</i> .....   | 36        |
| <i>Cell Assignments and Institutional Transfers</i> .....  | 37        |
| <i>Writs, Warrants and Other External Institutional Movement Types</i> .....                                   | 37        |
| <i>Prisoner Review Board (PRB) Hearing Outcomes, Board Orders, and Correspondence</i> .....                    | 37        |
| <i>Mandatory Supervised Release/Parole Documentation</i> .....   | 38        |
| <u>Digitizing Existing Records</u> .....   | 39        |
| <u>Digitizing New Records</u> .....  | 40        |
| <u>Overlap: Laws, Regulations, Policies, and Directives</u> .....  | 41        |
| <i>Past and Present Need: Policies and Directives Unit</i> .....   | 41        |
| <b><u>Section III – Fiscal Considerations, Resource Limitations, and Third-Party Assistance</u></b> .....      | <b>43</b> |
| <u>Strategic Value of Engaging Outside Consultants in Corrections System Transformation</u> .....              | 43        |
| <i>Seamless Integration with Gartner Consulting</i> .....  | 44        |
| <u>Introduction to Budgeting for Digital Transformation in Corrections</u> .....                               | 45        |
| <i>Financial Implications of Digital Transformation</i> .....  | 46        |
| <i>Budgeting for Compliance with Public Act 103-0071</i> .....   | 47        |
| <i>Unique Challenges to Navigate</i> .....   | 49        |
| <i>Risk Management and Cost Mitigation</i> .....   | 51        |
| <b><u>Conclusion</u></b> .....   | <b>52</b> |

## Overview

Public Act 103-0071, passed June 9, 2023, (“the Act” or “P.A. 103-0071”) essentially requires the digitization<sup>1</sup> of all Illinois Department of Corrections (“DOC” or “The Department”) records over approximately five-years. The Act amends the Illinois Unified Code of Corrections, Section 3-5-1 “Master Record File”<sup>2</sup>, and presents the following timeline (**all subject to appropriation on or before each date**):

- **On or before January 1, 2024** – [the Department] shall conduct a study on the best way to digitize all Department of Corrections records and the impact of that digitizing on State agencies, including the impact on the Department of Innovation and Technology. The study shall be completed on or before [the above date].
- **On or before January 1, 2025** – the Department of Corrections shall digitalize all newly committed persons' master record files who become incarcerated and all other new information that the Department maintains concerning its correctional institutions, facilities, and individuals incarcerated.<sup>3</sup>
- **On or before July 1, 2027** – the Department of Corrections shall digitalize all medical and dental records in the master record files and all other information that the Department maintains concerning its correctional institutions and facilities in relation to medical records, dental records, and medical and dental needs of committed persons.
- **On or before July 1, 2029** – the Department of Corrections shall digitalize all information in the master record files and all other information that the Department maintains concerning its correctional institutions and facilities.<sup>4</sup>

This report serves as the required study under subsection (k), discussing the best way to digitize all Department records and the impact on state agencies in doing so.

Generally, the Act impacts the following areas directly and indirectly:

1. Records storage, retention, management systems, and tracking;

---

<sup>1</sup> See definition of “digitization process” from State Records Commission regulations under 44 Il. Admin. Code, § 4400.20, “Digitization Process – The methods, tools and procedures by which a digital surrogate is created for an original record. Examples include scanning and encoding of audio/video signals into digital data.”

<sup>2</sup> 730 ILCS 5/3-5-1(g)-(k).

<sup>3</sup> The Department uses the term “individual in custody” to refer to people in its care. That said, the Department is taking great efforts to transition away from and wholly remove other nomenclature.

<sup>4</sup> Under subsection (j), “the Department of Corrections shall adopt rules to implement [the above subsections (g) – (k) in the Act] *if appropriations* are available to implement these provisions.” 730 ILCS 5/3-5-1(j)(emphasis added).

2. Records medium conversion and unaccounted for records;
3. Records access, authority levels, privacy/information security, and transmission (data and information governance);
4. Records availability for other justice agencies, courts, and third-parties;
5. Updating administrative rules, directives, and forms;
6. Staffing, training, responsibility/modified reporting structures;
7. Accountability and auditing.

This is a non-exhaustive list; and because digitization is a statutory mandate, this study falls neatly between a high-level Data and Information Governance<sup>5</sup> “Gap analysis” and a “Feasibility Study.”<sup>6</sup> The study serves as an early assessment of the gap between DOC’s current status with records digitization and the “goal” or project end to realize the July 1, 2029, statutory mandate, while simultaneously reviewing current resources and impacts on state agencies.

Through this study, the following conclusions have become clear:

- The Department currently lacks a necessary uniform, electronic records management system;
- There are too many unknown factors pertaining to records definition(s), locations, accurate inventory, and control;
- Considerable financial undertaking and parallel, external agency coordination;
- The subject-matter expertise and required project management present a significant need for third-party assistance to achieve the Act’s digitization mandate.

Section I of this report will discuss the definition of “record” and the creation of master files, current software applications and non- vs. digitized records handling, and the overall need for an electronic records management system. Section II addresses the minimum approach toward

---

<sup>5</sup> For example purposes only, *see* “Data Governance,” [What is Data Governance? | Google Cloud](#); *see also* “information governance,” [Definition of Information Governance - IT Glossary | Gartner](#)

<sup>6</sup> For example purposes only, *see* Michalson’s Regulatory Compliance Gap Analysis description [Regulatory Compliance Gap Analysis \(michalsons.com\)](#); *see also* Project Management description on general Feasibility Study [What is Feasibility Study in Project Management and Its Types? | Simplilearn](#).

meeting the Act's digitization mandate, while expanding on the need for extensive indexing and inventorying. Finally, Section III covers fiscal considerations and how essential third-party assistance is to fully achieve the mandate.

## Section I – Identifying Records, Systems, and Applications

### Defining “Record”

The DOC is an Illinois Civil Administrative Code department<sup>7</sup> within Illinois State Government authorized to manage the state’s adult prison system. Specifically, DOC is charged with housing, caring for, and supervising incarcerated people in Illinois, while managing the supervision of individuals during mandatory supervised release.<sup>8</sup> As a unique code department, DOC operates with duties akin to a law enforcement agency, a large municipality, and a health and human services agency. The Department is also the nexus for a diverse set of records which are both internally generated and externally received from other justice agencies,<sup>9</sup> courts, and third-party entities.

Under the Illinois State Records Act, 5 ILCS 160/2, “records” cover a variety of mediums containing information, intended to be broadly inclusive:

all books, papers, born-digital electronic material, digitized electronic material, electronic material with a combination of digitized and born-digital material, maps, photographs, databases, or other official documentary materials, regardless of physical form or characteristics, made, produced, executed, or received by any agency in the State in pursuance of State law or in connection with the transaction of public business and preserved or appropriate for preservation by that agency or its successor as evidence of the organization, function, policies, decisions, procedures, operations, or other activities of the State or of the State Government, or **because of the informational data contained therein.** (Emphasis added).

---

<sup>7</sup> Illinois Civil Administrative Code, 20 ILCS 5/5-15

<sup>8</sup> *See generally* Illinois Unified Code of Corrections, 730 ILCS 5/*et seq.*

<sup>9</sup> Although not extensively discussed here, DOC provides data to various external agencies such as the Illinois State Police under the Criminal Identification Act, 20 ILCS 2630/*et seq.* (“correctional information” under Section 2.1(e), “ethnic and racial data” under Section 4.5, etc.), and the Illinois Criminal Justice Authority under the Illinois Reporting of Deaths in Custody Act, 730 ILCS 210/3-5(e); DOC also produces statutorily mandated reports made public on DOC’s website ([Reports \(illinois.gov\)](http://Reports.illinois.gov)), and an annual report to the Governor and General Assembly covering a number of areas. 730 ILCS 5/3-5-3.1.

As an administrative code department, DOC is a “public body” subject to the Illinois Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 ILCS 140/2(a). The Department maintains “public records,” defined as the following:

all records, reports, forms, writings, letters, memoranda, books, papers, maps, photographs, microfilms, cards, tapes, recordings, **electronic data processing records, electronic communications, recorded information** and all other documentary materials pertaining to the transaction of public business, regardless of physical form or characteristics, having been prepared by or for, or having been or being **used by, received by, in the possession of, or under the control of any public body.** (Emphasis added.)

5 ILCS 140/2(c).<sup>10</sup> Storage, maintenance, and release of the Department’s records is largely governed by FOIA, Article 5 of the Unified Code of Corrections, and Title 20, Chapter I, subpart a, Part 107, subpart D of the Illinois Administrative Code.<sup>11</sup> At the same time, retention and destruction of Department records is governed by the State Records Commission’s regulations<sup>12</sup> and the 1988 Records Retention Schedule, Application Number 86:123 which covers all “adult correctional centers” and related.<sup>13</sup> The over 200-page retention schedule covers a broad spectrum of records, including—but not limited to—the following: repair and maintenance files, personnel files, purchase orders and sub-orders, roster management documents, water

---

<sup>10</sup> See also definition of State Agency under the Illinois State Auditing Act, 30 ILCS 5/1-7:

Sec. 1-7. “State agencies” means all officers, boards, commissions and agencies created by the Constitution, whether in the executive, legislative or judicial branch, but other than the circuit court; all officers, departments, boards, commissions, agencies, institutions, authorities, universities, bodies politic and corporate of the State; and administrative units or corporate outgrowths of the State government which are created by or pursuant to statute, other than units of local government and their officers, school districts and boards of election commissioners; all administrative units and corporate outgrowths of the above and as may be created by executive order of the Governor.

Under Section 1-13, the Act governs such matters as compliance audits to “address agency management representations, assertions, and supporting evidence regarding . . . (c) whether the audited agency has generally complied with applicable laws and regulations . . .”.

<sup>11</sup> Administrative directives further supplement records governance statewide and the facility level. See A.D. 02.95.101, General Provisions.

<sup>12</sup> Title 44, Subtitle C, Chapter IV, Part 4400, “State Records Commission” under the Illinois Administrative Code.

<sup>13</sup> See A.D. 02.95.102, Records Retention Schedule; see also A.D. 02.95.105, Storage of Records.

consumption reports, general and specific correspondence, “subject files” covering a wide-range of reports and guidelines specific to the Office of Assistant Warden of Programs for each facility, and numerous others records.<sup>14</sup>

Article 5 and the relevant administrative code sections predominantly address the “master record file,” (“master file”) maintained for every individual presently or formerly in the Department’s custody.<sup>15</sup> Each individual’s master file contains a wide range of information including but not limited to ethnic and racial data, medical records, education, and criminal history.<sup>16</sup> Depending on the context, some of this information would be considered protected health information (“PHI”) under the Federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (“HIPAA”),<sup>17</sup> personally identifiable information (“PII”) under Federal Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards,<sup>18</sup> and/or personal information (“PI”) under Illinois’ Personal Information Protection Act<sup>19</sup> to name only a few relevant laws.<sup>20</sup> Prohibited disclosure of information or data breaches may result in substantial fines and other regulatory and civil enforcement.

---

<sup>14</sup> Some records may move to microfilm, subject to the current records retention schedule. *For Microform Terminology discussion, see* [3. Microform Terminology | Association for Library Collections & Technical Services \(ALCTS\) \(ala.org\)](#)

<sup>15</sup> 730 ILCS 5/3-5-1

<sup>16</sup> *See also* Vital Records Act, 410 ILCS 535/*et seq.*, specifically sections (1)(1) and (10), and (26)(1) and (2), defining “vital records,” “institution,” and discussing deceased confined individuals and release of “dead human bod[ies].”

<sup>17</sup> Pub. L. No. 104-191, § 264, 110 Stat.1936.

<sup>18</sup> 2 CFR 200.79 – Federal Uniform Guidance.

<sup>19</sup> 815 ILCS 530/*et seq.*; *cf.* A.D. 01.02.108, Identity Protection.

<sup>20</sup> *For example, see* Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)( 20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99); *see also* U.S. Department of Education guidance, “Prison Education Programs Questions and Answers,” (<https://www2.ed.gov/policy/highered/reg/hearulemaking/2009/pep-q-and-a.html>).



## Developing a Master Record File

### *Reception and Classification*

Turning directly to master files, when an individual is received from a county jail for admission to a DOC Reception and Classification (“R&C”) facility, specific documents must accompany the individual. *See* 20 Il. Admin. Code, § 107, Records of Offenders. This collection of documents is used to create the individual’s master file.

In creating a master file, the mittimus<sup>21</sup> is reviewed to first ensure authenticity and rule out any gross error that would prevent DOC from accepting the individual. Once the integrity of the mittimus is confirmed, it is further reviewed to ensure the statutory citation number and description are accurate, the sentencing structure conforms to statute, and missing mittimuses are identified and requested; jail credits and pre-trial sentence credits are also noted. Once any discrepancies are resolved, the sentence of the individual is hand-calculated in accordance with A.D. 01.07.400, Sentence Calculation for Individuals in Custody. This information, including sentencing date, conviction and sentence, and custody date are entered into the tracking system of record, Offender 360 (“O360”). O360 calculates the individual’s release date based on the information entered, and then this date is reconciled with the hand-calculation. Along with the calculation sheet, these documents are maintained in the master file as the DOC “holding document,” serving as authorization to detain and order to incarcerate. Simultaneously, the individual is assigned a DOC number, or if previously incarcerated, their previous DOC number

---

<sup>21</sup> 735 ILCS 5/2-1801 Mittimus. (a) In all cases, including criminal, quasi-criminal and civil, when a person is imprisoned, incarcerated, confined or committed to the custody of a sheriff, warden, Department of Corrections or other executive officer by virtue of a judgment or order which is signed by a judge, a copy of such judgment or order shall, in each case, constitute the mittimus, and no separate mittimus need be issued.

is utilized, and any alias information is entered or updated, as appropriate. *See* A.D. 01.07.220, Central Numbering System.

Subsequently, the Classification process begins with utilizing numerous screening tools,<sup>22</sup> in accordance with A.D. 05.05.105, Individual in Custody Classification Process, to determine security and escape level, *see* A.D. 05.05.110, Escape Level Designations, predatory/vulnerable status, *see* A.D. 04.01.301, Sexual Abuse and Harassment Prevention and Intervention Program, and ultimately the appropriate parent facility.<sup>23</sup> The collection of this data is entered into O360 to create the individual's classification. However, the screening tools used to collect the data and the criminal history are placed in the master file, along with the final classification report. The individual in custody completes numerous forms, including family history, emergency contact information, and signs to allow for trust fund account creation and issuance of funds. *See* A.D. 02.42.110, Individual in Custody Trust Fund Authorization. Emergency contact information is entered into O360, but the entire completed and signed orientation forms and packet receipt (DOC 0291), is placed in the master file. *See* A.D. 04.01.105, Facility Orientation.

The individual is also screened by the Bureau of Identification ("B of I"), in accordance with A.D. 01.07.805, Identification of Individuals in Custody, and a B of I file is created. Demographic and physical descriptive information is entered into O360, photographs are taken and entered in Photo ID, and fingerprints are taken using Livescan Digital Fingerprint System.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Screening tools include: Prison Screening Tool ("PST"), Ohio Risk Assessment System ("ORAS"), Texas Christian University Criminal Thinking Scales ("TCU-CTS"), etc., *see* A.D. 04.01.102, Risk and Need Assessment.

<sup>23</sup> Parent facility normally refers to the first facility where an individual is assigned after leaving the reception center, or the subsequent facility that an individual may be transferred to. Parent facility may also refer to the facility an individual is released from while on mandatory supervised release.

<sup>24</sup> *For informational purposes only, see [What Is Live Scan? \(accuratebiometrics.com\)](http://www.whatislivescan.com); see also Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act, 740 ILCS 14/et seq.*

Photo ID and Livescan information populates into O360, however, older demographic information is maintained in the B of I file.<sup>25</sup>

All paperwork generated during the intake and classification process is received by the Record Office for inclusion in the master file, in accordance with A.D. 01.07.110, Record Maintenance – Master File Organization. The individual is also screened by medical and mental health professionals, and these observations and findings are used to create their medical chart.

*Transfer, Interagency and Third-Party Documents, and Continuous Review*

Once the individual in custody has completed the classification process, the individual is transferred along with their master file, B of I file, and medical chart to their parent institution. *See generally* 20 Il. Admin. Code, § 503, Classification and Transfers *and* A.D. 05.06.112, Individual in Custody Transfer Procedures. Transfer of master files is completed in accordance with 20 Il. Admin. Code, § 107.310, Access to Records, A.D. 01.07.930, Master File of Violators, and the CTU (“Central Transportation Unit”) manual. A DOC 0066 - Master and Medical File Receipt, is completed during the records transfer to maintain chain of custody for the files.

Once the master file is received at the parent institution it is reviewed and the file intake process is completed in accordance with the Record Office manual. The face sheet of the master file is updated to reflect the transfer of the individual, as well as all vital information, including, but not limited to Warrants/detainers, Victim Notification, *see* A.D. 01.07.125, Victim or Concerned Citizen Notification Prior to Release, registry requirements pursuant to A.D. 01.07.115, Sex Offender Registration, Orders of Protection, and MSR<sup>26</sup> term. While this

---

<sup>25</sup> In the event Livescan is not functioning, there are paper forms (Fingerprint Card FD-249 and Custodial Card ISP 6-409) that may be utilized.

<sup>26</sup> Mandatory Supervised Release; *see* 730 ILCS 5/5-4.5 *et seq.*

information is also entered in O360, those individuals with numerous past incarcerations may have information listed in O360 that is not germane to the current term of incarceration, but still relevant to the individual in custody's overall criminal history. The mittimus is further reviewed and the sentence calculation checked, any discrepancies not addressed at the R&C or areas of the mittimus that require interpretation are addressed by the parent facility and an amended mittimus is requested, if needed. When the certified amended mittimus is received, it is again scrutinized to ensure its authenticity and integrity.

In addition to the mittimus, the record office receives by mail, writs of habeas corpus for individuals needed in court proceedings. The information contained on these legal documents are entered in O360, but the official document is placed in the master file and copies provided for transport authorization. *See* A.D. 01.07.215, Information Packets for Escorted Writs, Furloughs or Day Releases; *also* A.D. 05.03.123, Transporting Individuals in Custody on Court Writs, Escorted Medical Furloughs and Immediate Emergency Transfers. Likewise, individuals requiring medical treatment outside the facility require authorization. While the appointment information is entered into O360, the signed transportation authorization is maintained in the master file. In addition, the Individual Count Adjustment Form (DOC 0194) is also generated for all movement outside the facility,<sup>27</sup> while the movement is entered into O360. This form contains numerous, required signatures to authorize the movement of an Individual in Custody from the secure facility.

The record office also receives by mail Appellate Court Mandates and opinions that are reviewed and interpreted. If these opinions affect the calculation, by changing the conviction or

---

<sup>27</sup> This form also includes the "type" of movement. Parole, Discharge, "turn-over to," Medical Furlough, Funeral Furlough, Writ, etc.

sentencing structure,<sup>28</sup> appropriate information will be entered into O360; however, the official document is maintained in the masterfile as directed in the Record Office manual and in accordance with A.D. 01.07.240, Release of Individuals in Custody by Reversal or Reversal and Remand. Paperwork is also received from the Administrative Review Board (“ARB”) (DOC0610) regarding revocation and restoration of Earned Statutory Sentence Credit. *See* A.D. 01.07.427, Restoration of Earned Statutory Sentence Credit; *also* A.D. 01.07.428, Revocation of Good Conduct Credits.<sup>29</sup> The results of these finding are entered into O360 but the signed forms authorizing revocation of time/credit and/or restoration of time/credit is maintained in the master file for calculation authorization purposes. The ARB also provides Grievance Response Memos, and the result of these findings may be entered into O360 due to an amended disciplinary action,<sup>30</sup> but the signed memo and authorization must be maintained in the master file as the official response. *See* A.D. 04.01.114, Local Individual in Custody Grievance Procedures.

Documents received from the Prisoner Review Board (“PRB”) including Clemency Hearings, Youthful Parole Hearings, Joe Coleman Hearings, etc., are maintained in the master file but not all are entered into O360, *unless* they facilitate release. Ultimately, these signed decisions are maintained in the master file. MSR and/or Parole violator orders are entered into O360 along with the required stipulations; however, the actual document with authorizing signature must be maintained in the master file. Likewise, once an individual in custody is on MSR, the Prisoner Review Board can authorize early discharge from MSR. While these orders are entered into O360, the order with authorizing signatures is maintained in the discharged file.

---

<sup>28</sup> DOC Legal is involved in mandate and opinion review/interpretation. Information may also come directly from the legal department.

<sup>29</sup> Approved Revocation/Restoration of credits may require another calculation of time which is also maintained in the file (time adjustments are input into O360).

<sup>30</sup> Updates to the Disciplinary Tracking System (“DTS”) may also be required, thus resulting in a change to the Individual’s Disciplinary Card which is ultimately placed in the master file.

DOC is also subject to a great number of subpoenas for information contained within the master file. The subpoenas request original documents from the master file in addition to digitalized data and are fulfilled *always* in consultation with DOC Legal. If an individual has a warrant or detainer, this information is entered into O360, but the signed warrant and/or detainer is maintained in the master file. These documents are required when releasing an individual to another agency. *See* A.D. 01.07.260 – Interstate Agreement on Detainer; *also* A.D. 01.07.110, Review of Master File Record Prior to Release and the Record Office Manual.

#### *Intra-agency and Facility Documents*

While at the parent institution, numerous documents are generated throughout the facility that ultimately are received in the record office for placement within the master file. Most of these documents include, for example:

- visiting lists,
- phone lists,
- attorney phone call sheets,
- grievances,
- Restrictive Housing logs,
- double celling forms,
- job assignment vote sheets.

These documents are not entered into O360 and are to be filed directly into the master file. Also filed directly in the master file are finalized Individual disciplinary reports and final summaries. The Disciplinary Tracking System maintains the digitalized final summaries and history; however, the actual disciplinary report must be scanned into this system. Additionally, summaries are printed for signatures. Therefore, while disciplinary actions are entered into

O360, the signed final summary and original disciplinary report are filed in the master file. *See* 20 Il. Admin. Code, § 504, Administration of Discipline; *also* A.D. 01.07.620, Calculation of Demotion and Restoration of Grade. Regarding A.D. 01.07.620, while final dates are entered on O360, the actual grades demotions and restorations are still hand calculated and kept on the Grade Status Card (DOC 0210) which is maintained in the master file.

Some documents received such as escape risk reviews, Prison Rape Elimination Act (“PREA”) screenings are entered into O360, but the screening tools used are placed in the master file. Additionally, documents such as Earned Program Sentence Credit (“EPSC”) goal statements are entered<sup>31</sup> into O360 but signed goal statements and attendance calendars are paper documents placed in the master file. Likewise, EPSC work calendars are entered as time adjustments for calculation purposes but are not entered into O360 at all and exist only in the master file and those calendars must be maintained to allow for review and calculation accuracy.

Moreover, the size of the master file will bear proportionality to the length of an individual’s sentence. While some individuals are sentenced to short term incarceration, others may be sentenced to substantially longer periods up to and including life. The size of the master file is dependent on numerous factors such as an individual’s pursuit of rehabilitation and re-entry services, receipt of disciplinary reports, grievance submissions, and other activities that may generate significant paperwork and can produce numerous master file volumes. For example, an individual that has been incarcerated for 20 years may have 12 to 15 master file volumes (including volumes of medical records) requiring dedicated banker boxes and other

---

<sup>31</sup> Data entry into O360 is not exclusive to the Records Office. For example, EPSC contracts are entered by the program administrator, while the Records Office performs any calculations. Job assignment calendars are entered into O360 by job supervisors and calculations are completed by Records.

storage implements for transport when transferring facilities; undoubtedly, these files contain thousands of pieces of paper.

If the individual in custody is approved to transfer to another facility, the same process is followed as the transfer from the R&C to the parent facility, including transferring of files. *See* 20 Il. Admin. Code, § 107.310, Access to Records; *also* A.D. 01.07.930, Master File of Violators; and *also* CTU manual. A DOC 0066 - Master and Medical File Receipt, is utilized during transfer of records to maintain chain of custody of the files. Each new facility again completes the master file intake review to ensure the accuracy of the calculation based on the information in the file, utilizing the mittimus along with any revocation or restoration of time from the ARB, and any awards of Earned Discretionary Sentence Credit (“EDSC”) and/or EPSC<sup>32</sup> awards. These original documents are also compared to the corresponding time adjustments listed in O360 to verify accuracy.

When an individual in custody reaches his release date, the master file is reviewed in its entirety in accordance with A.D. 01.07.111, Review of Master File Prior to Release. This includes a review of the Law Enforcement Automated Data System (“LEADS”) to ensure the individual is not wanted by another law enforcement agency. The completion of this checklist and review of the full calculation is confirmed through the original documents (mitts, EPSC awards, etc.) in the master file before the Record Office Supervisor confirms the individual has completed their sentence and should be released. During this Release Process, the Field Services Representative also completes additional release procedures and MSR paperwork with the Individual as outlined in A.D. 04.50.115, Release Procedures. These signed documents informing and admonishing the individual in custody of his rights and responsibilities are

---

<sup>32</sup> *See* 730 ILCS 5/3-6-3(a)(3), (4), and generally.



maintained in the master file. These original signed documents, specifically the Project Safe Neighborhoods Notification Letter (DOC 0144), as well as the Sex Offender Registration Act Notification Form (ISP 4-84c), and the Illinois Murderer and Violent Offender against Youth Registration Act Notification form (ISP 5-75), if applicable, are often requested by other law enforcement agencies in pursuit of additional criminal charges when the Parolee fails to comply with the conditions of their release and/or violates additional Illinois Statutes.

Many of our processes as outlined in the Departmental Rules under the Illinois Administrative Code and consequently in the Administrative and Institutional Directives require original signed forms to be maintained, even if the information is entered into O360. In short, authorizing documentation must be kept. Additionally, a great deal of generated paperwork is not entered into O360 at all but is maintained in the master file and is subject to review and subpoena.

### Data, Information, and Records Management Systems

Ultimately when defining the term “record,”<sup>33</sup> the focus shifts to “information” or “data.”<sup>34</sup> Outside of the records *medium* or *format* by which information is contained, identifying the substance of that information and the systems that govern it is essential to the digitization process. Under the American Correctional Association’s (“ACA”)<sup>35</sup> Performance-Based Standards and Expected Practices for Adult Correctional Institutions, Performance Standard 1E

---

<sup>33</sup> See International Organization for Standardization, ISO 15489-1:2016 “records” definition: “information created, received, and maintained as evidence and as an asset by an organization or person, in pursuit of legal obligations or in the transaction of business;” and generally “records management” under ISO15489-1: 2001, “[the] field of management responsible for the efficient and systematic control of the creation, receipt, maintenance, use and disposition of records, including the processes for capturing and maintaining evidence of and information about business activities and transactions in the form of records.” See also ISO 23081-2:2009, 8.1 Metadata Model.

<sup>34</sup> See [data - Glossary | CSRC \(nist.gov\)](#)

<sup>35</sup> See [About Us \(aca.org\)](#), the ACA is the world’s largest and oldest accreditation body for the corrections industry; of note, these standards will be referenced should DOC pursue further ACA accreditation at its facilities.

“Case Records” discusses measures needed for appropriate security, access, and control of an individual in custody’s “case file” records.<sup>36</sup> However, Standard 1F “Information Systems and Research” extensively covers how maintaining *effective systems* for data and information storage and retrieval are critical to correctional operations.<sup>37</sup> From policy-making and research, to indexing and incident command—the ACA standards’ attention to effective records management systems identifies the breadth of information received and produced by correctional agencies. In short, DOC records expand well beyond an individual in custody’s master file.

In the law enforcement agency context, the Bureau of Justice Assistance’s definition of a records management systems (“RMS”) is the following:

RMS is an agency-wide system that provides for the storage, retrieval, retention, manipulation, archiving, and viewing of information, records, documents, or files pertaining to law enforcement operations. RMS covers the entire life span of records development—from the initial generation to its completion. An effective RMS allows single entry of data, while supporting multiple reporting mechanisms.

Since the Bureau’s first version of the *Standard Functional Specifications for Law Enforcement Records Management Systems*, discussion on standard specifications were limited to “law enforcement operations.”<sup>38</sup> This excludes an agency’s “general business functions, such as budget, finance, payroll, purchasing, and human resources functions” but still covered duty roster and vehicle fleet maintenance among other operational needs.

As written, the Act’s digitization mandate covers general business functions and other high priority needs in the corrections space. Aside from the master files and medical records,

---

<sup>36</sup> 5-ACI-1E(01 through 05)

<sup>37</sup> 5-ACI-1F(01 through 18)

<sup>38</sup> See BJA Standard Functional Specifications for Law Enforcement Records Management Systems, “Introduction,” [leitsc law enforcement rms systems.pdf \(ojp.gov\)](#); also version II, [Standard Functional Specifications for Law Enforcement Records Management Systems Version II \(ojp.gov\)](#). In 2021, a third version had been jointly created by Integrated Justice Information Systems (IJIS) Institute Law Enforcement Advisory Committee (LEAC) and International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS) Committee. [Publications - IJIS Institute](#).

subsection (i) states, “all other information that the Department maintains concerning its correctional institutions and facilities.” Thankfully, in 2015 the National Institute of Justice<sup>39</sup> worked with the RAND corporation to develop research identifying needs and innovation in the corrections technology space.<sup>40</sup> This research identified five main categories and numerous sub-categories:

- facilities operations and population services;
- person-worn equipment and weapons/force;
- information and communications, vehicles, and;
- doctrine, tactics, management, and behavioral knowledge development and training.<sup>41</sup>

Forty-eight total high-priority needs were identified across community<sup>42</sup> and institutional corrections. Beyond core-level data specific to individuals in custody, the five categories further identify a need for effective records management systems to cover several areas. These areas are similar to the Bureau of Prisons’ (“BOP”) justice records systems accounted for in the Code of Federal Regulations (“CFR”), including but not limited to medical/mental health records; commissary accounts, fees, and financial obligations; facility access control/entry; physical plant operations and maintenance; investigations/intelligence, and others.<sup>43</sup> The referenced ACA standards, ISO-standards, and prior-mentioned reports all directly and indirectly address records

---

<sup>39</sup> The U.S. Department of Justice’s research, development, and evaluation agency. [Home | National Institute of Justice \(ojp.gov\)](#).

<sup>40</sup> Jack Harne, [Identifying Technology Needs and Innovations to Advance Corrections | National Institute of Justice \(ojp.gov\)](#); *discussing* Jackson, Brian A., Joe Russo, John S. Hollywood, Dulani Woods, Richard Silbergliitt, George B. Drake, John S. Shaffer, Mikhail Zaydman, and Brian G. Chow, *Fostering Innovation in Community and Institutional Corrections: Identifying High-Priority Technology and Other Needs for the U.S. Corrections Sector*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2015. [https://www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_reports/RR820.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR820.html). Also available in print form.

<sup>41</sup> *See NIJ and RAND Corp. graphic: Figure 1. Main Categories and Subcategories of the Criminal Justice Technology Taxonomy | National Institute of Justice (ojp.gov)*

<sup>42</sup> [Community Corrections \(Probation and Parole\) | Bureau of Justice Statistics \(ojp.gov\)](#).

<sup>43</sup> *See example* DOJ Systems of Records, [JUSTICE Privacy Act Issuance \(govinfo.gov\)](#).

standardization and overall movement toward effective electronic records management systems and solutions.

### Electronic Records Management System

Due to the broad scope of records that DOC governs, an effective electronic records management system is needed to fully comply with the Act’s digitization mandate.

Comparatively, in 2005, the National Archives and Records Administration (“NARA”) released the *Records Management Service Components Requirements Development Project Final Report*<sup>44</sup> in support of the E-Government Electronic Records Management (“ERM”) initiative #24.<sup>45</sup> In 2017, NARA Requirements Working Group released the Universal ERM requirements to do the following:

- provide standards for agencies and existing Shared Services functional areas to manage their electronic records;
- help vendors determine capabilities for their ERM tools;
- help agencies identify the best tools to procure for their needs.<sup>46</sup>

The requirements were “derived from existing statutes, standards, NARA regulations, policy, and guidance,” exist as a baseline for federal agencies developing their own system requirements tailored to agency needs, and addresses six “sections” based upon the “lifecycle of electronic records management:”

1. Capture
2. Maintenance and Use
3. Disposal
4. Transfer
5. Metadata
6. Reporting

---

<sup>44</sup> [National Archives and Records Administration](#)

<sup>45</sup> [Electronic Records Management Initiative \(ERM\) | National Archives](#)

<sup>46</sup> [Universal Electronic Records Management \(ERM\) Requirements | National Archives](#); third version of requirements released in June 2023.

The Universal ERM requirements address the “born-digital and digitized analog records,”<sup>47</sup> distinction, and presents digitization requirements as “‘program’ requirements, relating to the design and implementation of an agency’s ERM policies and procedures, or ‘system’ requirements, providing technical guidance to vendors in creating ERM tools and specifications for agencies to consider when procuring them.”<sup>48</sup>

Over the span of two decades, the E-Government ERM initiative continues to be realized, with universal ERM requirements released after a decade of effort. The requirements further distinguish “must haves” versus “should haves” in an agency’s ERM. Ambitious projects such as NARA’s work on the ERM initiative and overarching records digitization efforts require answering many questions. Tackling scope, maintaining versus transitioning legacy records and systems,<sup>49</sup> integration, identifying records keepers and officers, confidential and sensitive information designations, determining stakeholders, and a whole host of other areas must be addressed throughout the digitization process.

NARA’s approach is not new to Illinois. The State Records Commission’s regulations,<sup>50</sup> appendices, and the Illinois Secretary of State’s (“SOS”), State Archives - Records Management Division’s *Records Management Reference Manual*,<sup>51</sup> all outline ERM system requirements while providing general guidance. For example, under the manual’s “Managing Paper and

---

<sup>47</sup> Compare definition of “born digital” to “analog record,” under 44 Il. Admin. Code, § 4400.20, “Born-Digital Records – Records created in a digital format, as opposed to those created in other media and then converted to digital surrogates. Examples include word processing documents, electronic spreadsheets and digital photographs.” and “Analog Records – Records created and maintained on a physical medium. Examples include paper documents, analog motion picture film, analog photographs and analog audio tape.” See also from Yale Primary Sources, [What does “born digital” mean? | Primary Sources at Yale](#);

<sup>48</sup> Supra fn. 28.

<sup>49</sup> 44 Il. Admin Code, § 4400.80(j).

<sup>50</sup> 44 Il. Admin Code, §§ 4400.10-4400.80, and appendices A-F. Notably, 44 Il. Admin. Code, § 4400.80, “Management of Electronic Records” was effective February 11, 2015.

<sup>51</sup> See [Records Management Reference Manual for Illinois State Government Agencies \(ilsos.gov\)](#) (Authorized for print in April 2023).

Electronic Records in the Office” section, SOS provides guidance specific to records identification, e-mail guidelines, metadata, and databases. These regulations and the manual are not consistently referenced across DOC’s current administrative directives governing records.<sup>52</sup> At best, significant work remains ahead when reconciling current Illinois Administrative Code regulations with DOC policy and procedures to fully realize the Act’s mandate.

### Current Non-Master File Records Management

The Department currently operates under a hybrid model for records management. While remaining largely paper-dependent, DOC uses a state-maintained intranet<sup>53</sup> and leverages commercial off-the-shelf (“COTS”) products such as Microsoft 365 productivity software. *See* this report’s following section, Current Digitized Records. DOC relies heavily on Sharepoint, Teams, Onedrive, and other programs for secure file-sharing and collaboration; additionally, DOC uses state-maintained network drives for information storage, particularly for legacy documents. Further, DOC uses some limited, customized system solutions such as “Offender360,” CHAMPS.,<sup>54</sup> the State Disciplinary Tracking System, AMS/Docuware, and P.E.A.R.L.<sup>55</sup> These systems generally fall under the umbrella of individual in custody information management<sup>56</sup> and predominately track and process data including, but not limited to, “correctional information,”<sup>57</sup> disciplinary and grievance information, some master file data,<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> *Infra* fn. 59.

<sup>53</sup> DOC’s intranet serves as a repository for master copies of policies, forms, memorandum, ACA and NCCH standards, application access points, and links to state interface systems such as OneNet for e-training.

<sup>54</sup> The Case History and Management Program, an internal case management system, permitting DOC end users to enter notes specific to an individual in custody covering numerous topics and interactions (i.e., grievance notes, general counseling/non-PHI notes, mail distribution, phone list checks, etc.).

<sup>55</sup> Electronic health records system used at Decatur and Logan facilities. DOC does not currently possess a statewide EHR.

<sup>56</sup> *See* fn. 25; additionally, all systems and solutions are subject to the Illinois Department of Innovation and Technology’s cybersecurity protocols and other IT requirements for state us. *See generally* [Security \(illinois.gov\)](https://www.illinois.gov)

<sup>57</sup> 20 ILCS 2630/2.1(e)

<sup>58</sup> 730 ILCS 5/3-5-1

information from L.E.A.D.S.,<sup>59</sup> and health information. While these customized solutions rely on data entry at varying frequencies from staff across several units, they generally do not serve as the point-of-origin for many records produced or maintained by the Department.

In contrast, several documents and reports are not generated by a system but instead completed via relatively standardized electronic templates or printed forms that are later completed and non-OCR<sup>60</sup> scanned. These standardized forms are internally approved for use alongside various administrative directives through a formal review process which is administered by the Policies and Directives Unit under the Compliance Office.<sup>61</sup> Policies and forms have “owners” or administrators who submit recommendations and changes during a quarterly review process. Several of these forms are used to capture and manage information, and the “records” generated are subject to various policies that generally organize access, storage, and retention of those records.<sup>62</sup>

### *Preliminary Records Mapping*

Over the last few months, the Department conducted a limited, preliminary “records mapping.” The purpose of this effort was to take an internal “snapshot” of records and current information management systems. Divisions, offices, shared services, groups, and other DOC

---

<sup>59</sup> The Law Enforcement Agencies Data System is a “statewide, computerized telecommunications system designed to provide services, information, and capabilities to the law enforcement and criminal justice community.” 20 Il. Admin. Code, § 1240.10(a). The Illinois State Police is granted authority to create rules, regulations, and overall govern/maintain criminal identification information and criminal history in the State of Illinois which includes Illinois’ access to L.E.A.D.S. [LEADS 3.0 \(illinois.gov\)](https://www.illinois.gov). See 20 ILCS 2605/2605-10, 2605-15, 2605-40(1); 20 ILCS 2630/*et seq*; 20 ILCS 2635/*et seq*; see also U.S. Department of Justice regulations regarding justice agency access to criminal justice information systems under 28 CFR 20, Subpart A.

<sup>60</sup> Optical character recognition.

<sup>61</sup> See generally A.D. 01.01.101, Administrative Directives.

<sup>62</sup> See generally A.D. 02.95.101, General Provisions; A.D. 02.95.102, Records Retention Schedule; A.D. 02.95.105, Storage of Records; and A.D. 02.95.107, Access to Stored Records; for reference, forms appear as “DOC####.”

units were asked to identify DOC Records they touch/maintain, and include the following information:

1. a short description of each record,
2. who maintains/is responsible for the record (if a specific party)
3. where the record is located
4. Any forms-libraries associated with the record.

The following is a sample from various returns on the mapping request (here, removing location data for security purposes):

| <b>Record</b>                  | <b>Description</b>  |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Investigative Reports          | Report that provides facts and supporting evidence to an administrative or criminal investigation |
| Investigative Case Letters     | Summary of the investigation  |
| Investigative Case Attachments | Supporting investigative documents  |
| Subpoenas                      | Request for records   |
| Subpoena Log                   | List of info requested, when it was requested, sent & received back                               |
| Illinois State Police Case Log | Active DOC cases that went to ISP   |

#### **Accounts Payable – Paper-Based Files**

- Invoice Voucher Packets – All invoices and associated backup documentation (OFD/Purchase Order/Receiving Report). [REDACTED]
- Travel Vouchers – Central office maintains a copy of every travel voucher for both central office and the correctional centers
- Agency File Balancing Reports – Central office maintains a copy of the daily voucher tapes with agency head approval
- Court of Claims Records – Central office maintains a copy of each court of claims case along with the departmental response
- These records are maintained by the Accounts Payable division [REDACTED]



| Form Number        | Description   | Maintained By                                 |
|--------------------|---|---|
| DOC 0434           | incident report   | author and Shift Supervisor or Superintendent |
| DOC 0126           | Notification of Absence   | EFA, OC, timekeeping                          |
| DOC 0129           | Report of Overtime, compensatory time or other adjustments to pay | EFA, OC, Timekeeping                          |
| DOC 0147           | Earned Program Sentence Credit Determination                      | Educators, EFAs                               |
|                    | Memorandums   | EFA, OC                                       |
|                    | Letterheads   | EFA, OC                                       |
| DOC 0133           | Roll Call or Sign in Sheet  | EFA, OC, Timekeeping                          |
| DOC 0473           | Assignment Payroll Sheet  | Educators                                     |
| DOC 0013           | Request for Change of Status of Equipment                         | EFA, OC, Property                             |
| DOC 0020           | Equipment Transfer Permit   | EFA, OC, Property                             |
| IL 401-0105        | Order for Delivery  | EFA, OC                                       |
| DOC 0313           | Offender Injury Report  | Educator, OAEVS, Facility                     |
| FMLA documentation |   | completing employee and Human Resources       |
| DOC 0547           | Staff Development and Training Sanction Approval Request          | EFA & Training Coordinator                    |
| DOC 0053           | Employee Request for Training by an Outside Source                | EFA & Training Coordinator                    |
| DOC 0220           | Employee Training Record  | EFA & Training Coordinator                    |
| Meeting minutes    | Word Document on Letter Head or Memorandum                        | all staff                                     |

| Department      | Location | Title of Paperwork   | Description of Paperwork  |
|-----------------|----------|--|---|
| Victim Services |          | Know Your Rights As a Victim or Witness (English)  | Letter/Form completed by victim/witness   |
|                 |          | Know your Rights as a Victim or Witness (Spanish)  | Letter/Form completed by victim/witness   |
|                 |          | Mail Stop and Phone Restriction Request (English)  |   |
|                 |          | Mail Stop and Phone Restriction Request (Spanish)  |   |
|                 |          | SAO Victim Information for IDOC Form   | Information of Victim   |
|                 |          | DHS Information & Request for Notification of the Conditional Release or Discharge of a Person | Form completed by victim to DHS - Division of Mental Health/Victim Notification Coordinator                                 |
|                 |          | IDOC Victim Services Brochure  | Important information for victims - PRB, Victim Services, Attorney General, Illinois State Police                           |
|                 |          | New Introduction Letter - Statewide Global Positioning Program                                 | Letter to victim/witness about their eligibility to participate in individual in custody monitoring and victim notification |

| Department           | Location | Title of Paperwork            | Description of Paperwork   |
|----------------------|----------|-------------------------------|--|
| Constituent Services |          | Constituent Services Database | Microsoft Excel spreadsheets completed monthly/yearly with requests received by family/friends of individuals in custody           |
|                      |          | Lockdown Report               | Microsoft Excel spreadsheet of monthly facility Lockdown information   |
|                      |          | Monthly Tracking Log          | Microsoft Excel spreadsheet that tracks the concerns received by webmaster, email and phone calls to Constituent Services monthly. |
|                      |          | Letters from family/friends   | Scanned letters received from family/friends.  |

The records mapping revealed a highly localized, siloed approach to records management. Although administrative directives provide a floor for records administration at each operational level of the Department, the combination of varying consent decrees,<sup>63</sup> software solutions potentially too specific to some groups, unique excel spreadsheets, facility-specific document generation,<sup>64</sup> “islands” of third-party record submissions, and point-of-contact bottlenecks with non-transferred historical knowledge—all undermine any effective records management system.

Implementing an ERM system requires elimination of siloes, identifying records creators and owners, significantly reducing non-standardized document use, addressing local standard operating procedures (“SOP”s) that may be out of alignment with policy,<sup>65</sup> capturing records, and potentially sunseting currently used solutions. Moreover, addressing justice agencies, courts, and third-party entities with consistent messaging on DOC’s movement toward standardization in record submissions will support ERM efforts in the long run.

#### *Interagency Data Sharing and Compatibility*

As the Department moves forward with the Act’s record’s digitization mandate, a critical aspect is ensuring ERM and general records systems *compatibility* with the IT systems of other law enforcement units such as the Illinois State Police, local law enforcement agencies, and other justice agencies.<sup>66</sup> Effective data sharing hinges on interoperable systems that can communicate

---

<sup>63</sup> [consent decree | Wex | US Law | LII / Legal Information Institute \(cornell.edu\)](#); essentially, the Department complies with disparate decrees that, respectfully, can create blind spots when reconciling newly generated records and policies.

<sup>64</sup> Notably, DOC facilities were not formally required to respond to the records mapping request. That said, many facility operations differ depending on population and physical plant needs. For example, some facilities have their own waste-water treatment plants, while others have medical care geared toward specific populations. In turn, unique records are received from third-party entities (such as regulators and consultant groups) and/or generated internal to those operations. Similarly, on-going discussions occur concerning records from closed facilities.

<sup>65</sup> See A.D. 01.11.103, Facility and External Review Process, discussing Facility-based reviews versus Compliance - Office of Administrative Directive Standards external reviews.

<sup>66</sup> *Supra* fn. 9, regarding brief discussion on criminal justice data sharing, correctional information, LEADS, and the State Police authority.

seamlessly. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (“NIST”) underscores the importance of interoperability in law enforcement IT systems for efficient data exchange. This requires a unified approach to adopting compatible data formats and communication protocols, facilitate real-time, accurate information flow.

The success of this digital initiative also depends on the timeliness and precision of data sharing. DOC’s ability to operate effectively is significantly enhanced by receiving and accurate information from external law enforcement agencies. Following the guidelines set forth by the FBI’s Criminal Justice Information Services (“CJIS”) Division, it is imperative that all involved parties have systems capable of promptly updating and transmitting relevant data, such as criminal records and incident report, to the Department’s digital platform. This level of responsiveness is crucial for maintaining the integrity and efficacy of law enforcement operations.<sup>67</sup>

To achieve these goals, adhering to industry best practices in law enforcement data sharing is essential. This includes establishing secure, encrypted channels for data transmission, as recommended by the International Association of Chiefs of Police (“IACP”), to safeguard sensitive information. Moreover, regular training and protocol updates are necessary to ensure all stakeholders are aligned in their data management approaches. By committing to these best practices, the Department and its law enforcement partners can ensure a secure, efficient, and standardized process for data sharing, which is fundamental to the success of the digital transformation project.

---

<sup>67</sup> For informational purposes, see FBI publication “Law Enforcement Records Management System,” (2016) [Law Enforcement Records Management Systems \(RMSs\) — FBI](#).

Current Digitized Records

In addition to records created via enterprise-wide software utilized by DOC such as Microsoft 365, DOC also owns dozens of agency-specific applications. The following is a list of active DOC applications with descriptions of each:

| No. | DOC Application                               | Description  |
|-----|---|--|
| 1   | Statewide Disciplinary Tracking Application   | Viewable Disciplinary Card from Intranet.  |
| 2   | Disciplinary Tracking                         | The Disciplinary Tracking System is used by facility Adjustment Committees to track individual in custody disciplinary tickets.  |
| 3   | Inmate Children                               | This children of individual in custody application is used by the Adult section of the Division of Women and Family Services to track data on female individual in custody's children. The application assists in identifying programming needs for this population.                   |
| 4   | Video Visitation System                       | Charter 1130- video visitation, MP3s, Law Library, trust fund and electronic messaging.  |
| 5   | Sick Bank                                     | The Sick Bank application tracks employee sick time that is banked, loaned, and withdrawn.   |
| 6   | Correctional Officer Trainee Application      | Web application used to accept applications for Correctional Officer Trainees and Youth Supervisor Trainees. Applications are then periodically imported into the COTS applications.   |
| 7   | Fund Accounting and Commissary Trading System | FACTS provides accounting functions for various locally held funds, including the Individual in Custody Trust Fund, Individual in Custody Commissary Fund, Employee Commissary Fund, Individual in Custody Benefit Fund, Employee Benefit Fund, and Individual in Custody Travel Fund. |
| 8   | Security Application                          | The Application Security Manager tracks and manages all staff access privileges to PowerBuilder developed applications and their databases. The Security Logon component is utilized by all PowerBuilder developed applications for login processing.                                  |
| 9   | Publication Tracking                          | PUBS tracks the review and approval status of publications requested by individuals in custody. This application is utilized by facility and General Office Individual in Custody Issue's staff.   |
| 10  | DOC Website                                   | Provides internet access to public information about individuals in custody and correctional facilities.   |

|    |                                     |   |
|----|-------------------------------------|---|
| 11 | Headcount Tracking                  | The Headcount Tracking application is used by General Office Administrative Services staff to track staffing levels and vacancies by PIN number, facility, allocation number, etc.  |
| 12 | Case History and Management Program | The Case History and Management Program (CHAMP) provides an avenue for Program Services professionals to enhance the communications regarding individual in custody information beginning at the point of incarceration, continuing through community reintegration             |
| 13 | Inmate Grievance Tracking           | IGRV provides the means for tracking and managing individual in custody grievances. This application is used by facility Clinical Services staff and General Office Individual in Custody Issue's staff.  |
| 14 | Cumulative Counseling               | The Case History and Management Program (CHAMP) provides an avenue for Program Services professionals to enhance the communications regarding individual in custody information beginning at the point of incarceration, continuing through community reintegration to society. |
| 15 | GAAP Reporting                      | Generates reports for use by Payroll staff at the end of each fiscal year listing current employees and payroll figures for accumulated time.   |
| 16 | Automated Roster Management         | ARMS assists correctional facility security staff supervisors in the preparation and maintenance of correctional officers' schedules. ARMS allows the scheduling of security personnel for posts defined by the facility and produces the master roster,                        |
| 17 | Drug Screening                      | The Employee Drug Screening Application is used by Central Screening staff to track all drug tests for employees and applicants. It provides a history of tests and their results.  |
| 18 | Payroll Reporting                   | Reporting system for employee payroll and personnel information.  |
| 19 | Livescan                            | The Livescan application captures digital fingerprints for individuals in custody received at adult and juvenile reception centers and prints out fingerprint cards. This application interfaces with Illinois State Police.  |
| 20 | Offender 360                        | Cloud based individual in custody tracking system.  |
| 21 | Employee Inquiry                    | Allows management staff access to staff photos and information.   |
| 22 | Employee Grievance Tracking         | The Employee Grievance Application tracks the employee grievance process (third level or higher) for General Office Labor Relations staff.  |
| 23 | Arrest Tracking                     | Tracks employee arrests for General Office Background Investigations Unit.  |

|    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 24 | DOC Intranet                              | Provides internal access to DOC policies and procedures and other internal information.  |
| 25 | Affirmative Action Reporting              | Tracks personnel actions which impact affirmative action reporting. Utilized by each facility and General Office Affirmative Action staff.   |
| 26 | Payroll Vouchers                          | The Payroll Voucher System creates electronic and printed payroll vouchers for each facility from DHS data.  |
| 27 | Tool Program                              | The Tool Program is used by institutional staff to track tools used at correctional facilities.  |
| 28 | Overtime Equalization                     | Overtime Equalization tracks voluntary and involuntary overtime worked by facility employees and provides the means for offering and assigning overtime in accordance with union contracts.  |
| 29 | Automated Restoration/Revocation Tracking | ARTS provides the means for tracking revocation and restoration of good time earned by individuals in custody. This application is used by facility Records Office staff and General Office Individual in Custody Issue's staff.                                 |
| 30 | Offender Inquiry                          | An individual in custody inquiry interface allows users to view photos of both adult and juvenile individuals in custody. The current photo as well as all previous photos can be viewed. Some demographic data for the individual in custody is also displayed. |
| 31 | Drug Intervention                         | Used by adult, juvenile, and ATC staff to track individual in custody drug testing and subsequent referrals and/or treatment.  |
| 32 | Correctional Officer Trainee Screening    | COTS allows the tracking of Correctional Officer applications, scoring of applicants, and hiring of trainees for Adult and Juvenile facilities. This application is used by General Office Central Screening staff.  |
| 33 | Photo ID                                  | The Photo ID System is used to store and retrieve individual in custody and employee photos, and create identification badges for employees, individuals in custody, contractual staff, and volunteers.  |
| 34 | Ecological Compliance Assessment Tool     | Compliance Assessment Tool   |
| 35 | Institutional Graphics                    | Institutional Graphics displays various individual in custody data, such as escape risk, STG <sup>68</sup> data, housing, and assignment information, in a graphic form for facility management.   |
| 36 | Prevailing Wage                           | Application developed to replace manual card file used by General Office Payroll Supervisor to track union prevailing wages by region within the State of Illinois, job  |

---

<sup>68</sup> Security Threat Group.

|    |                               |   |
|----|-------------------------------|---|
|    |                               | title/position and time period. Includes all pertinent, current DOC titles.   |
| 37 | Keys and Locks Control System | KLS provides key and lock tracking for each facility.   |
| 38 | RTA Fleet Management System   | RTA Fleet Management System is used statewide to track vehicle inventory, fuel, and repairs costs for the DOC fleet including personally assigned vehicles. |

Through utilization of these enterprise and DOC-specific applications, DOC owns many records that are already digitized. Even so, there is a significant volume of non-digital records—mostly paper—maintained by DOC that are not included in any existing digitized solutions, most notably master record files for individuals in custody.

## **Section II – Indexing, Digitizing, and General Framework**

### **Indexing**

The Department has attempted to gather information through preliminary records mapping and other avenues to identify the locations and types of records that will be digitized once the funding has been allocated. To fully comply with the mandate and move toward an electronic records management system, records must be effectively *indexed*. “Records” are defined and described in the above sections, but mainly are comprised of the following:

- information related to individuals’ sentencing and court documents,
- healthcare and other related needs and services,
  - medical
  - mental health
  - dental
  - disability
- programmatic needs and services including assessment, assignment protocols, case management, and contracts,
  - education
  - substance abuse and other treatment modes
  - cognitive and behavioral programs
  - family and community reintegration programs
  - civic engagement programs
- work assignments,
- sentence credits,
- disciplinary infractions and procedures,
- pre-release documentation and processes,
- cell assignments and institutional transfers
- writs, warrants and other external institutional movement types
- Prisoner Review Board (PRB) hearing outcomes, orders, and correspondence
- Mandatory Supervised Release/Parole documentation,
  - Field-based case management systems
  - Electronic monitoring
  - Program attendance/achievements
  - Community and law enforcement correspondence
- General business and operational functions<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> See prior Data, Information, and Records Management Systems sub-section discussing “business” and “operations” broad categories of records.



This pre-index list is non-exhaustive and subject to previously discussed records management policies and DOC's current retention schedule. The below provides further explanation on index sections, specific documents, and overall Department needs when addressing scanning and document paper-medium migration.<sup>70</sup>

#### *Information Related to Individuals' Sentencing and Court Documents*

The Department of Corrections is in receipt of numerous documents related to sentencing which are provided by the courts including pre-sentence reports (when available), sentencing documents, mittimus information, additional related conditions and recommendations by the judiciary, and other attending medical, transitional, and jail credit information. DOC has attempted to initiate electronic records transfer processes with the largest committing county (Cook) but those efforts do not necessarily capture all documents, encompass all areas beneficial to the individual in custody, and represent just over 40% of total DOC admissions. More importantly, Cook is just one of 102 counties statewide, meaning, there are still 101 counties for which automatic data transfers are not operating or anticipated. DOC maintains the O360 system as the electronic tracking system of record in accordance with electronic database standards available at the time of adoption (2015).

#### *Healthcare and Other Related Needs and Services*

Pursuant to a consent decree,<sup>71</sup> DOC is required to implement an electronic health records system and various initiatives to enhance the Department's ability to provide timely and

---

<sup>70</sup> 44 Ill. Admin. Code, § 4400.80(i)(6) "Format Migration – Systems used to store and access electronic records must allow for the migration of stored records, and their associated metadata, notes and attachments, from one file format to another." For example purposes only, see further discussion in the following White Paper: [idc-paperfree-wp-dec-2019.pdf \(alarisworld.com\)](https://www.alarisworld.com/idc-paperfree-wp-dec-2019.pdf).

<sup>71</sup> See *Lippert v. Jeffreys, et al.*, 10-CV-4603 (N.D.Ill.).

responsive healthcare to all individuals in custody. This build-out is in process and development is ongoing. Currently, paper-based medical records are housed within the healthcare units at a majority of DOC facilities and are not accessible to statewide oversight efforts and data processing requests. Paper-based healthcare records are burdensome, commingled and compiled with and predominantly maintained by the Department's contract vendor, and certain documents will need to be scanned while others should contain information which will eventually be manually entered into the medical database. In addition, the University of Illinois – Chicago and Southern Illinois University maintain health record databases for many subpopulations,<sup>72</sup> which supports research in those areas. Still, additional efforts will be needed to incorporate those into the centralized database supporting the entire population.

*Programmatic Needs and Services: Assessment, Assignment Protocols, Case Management, and Contracts*

Individual needs are identified in the initial intake process and further enhanced through the individualized assessment using the Ohio Risk Assessment System (“ORAS”) tool.<sup>73</sup> Once an individual is assessed and assigned to a parent facility, they can enroll or be placed on a waitlist for programs designed to address their specific needs and prepare them for eventual release. While many of the indicators supporting program services are embedded in the current tracking system of record, there are many millions of supporting documents contained in master files and other storage units throughout the system. Much of this information will need to be scanned and stored in a way that is accessible to staff as program attendance and completion is calculated for sentence credits and other programmatic reasons.

---

<sup>72</sup> The university databases follow appropriate information security protocols, abiding by HIPAA and other relevant laws and regulations.

<sup>73</sup> ORAS risk and needs assessment tool <https://cech.uc.edu/content/dam/refresh/cech-62/ucci/overviews/oras-overview.pdf>

Historical documentation is essential as new laws and regulations require DOC to have the ability to review past performance and conduct in relation to sentence credit awards and enable staff and Individuals to access information related to Prisoner Review Board reviews and other discretionary procedures. In addition to specific programmatic documentation, DOC has a standalone CHAMPS system which contains the internal case management system. This system is fundamentally electronic but is contained outside the standard tracking system of record (O360).

#### *Work Assignments*

Work assignments are a unique subset of the programming section of the master file and provide opportunities for reentry training and enhancements, but also contribute toward sentence credits and early release paradigms. Work assignments since 2015, with the advent of O360, are contained and calculated electronically within the tracking system of record; however, many records of historical work assignments are unavailable in electronic formats and paper records/documents are relied upon for continuous calculation of recent and future sentence credit calculations. These documents are contained in the master files and will need to be scanned and stored in a format available for future use.

#### *Sentence Credits*

The legislature has recently enacted multiple layers of opportunities for Individuals to receive sentence credits for activities earned/performed prior to DOC's ability to track and calculate that historical bonus time. Much of this documentation is evidenced via paper format contained within master files, and some within the Individual's personal paperwork, which follow Individuals as they transition between parent facilities and, eventually, follow them out to MSR/parole. DOC is currently navigating this retrospective review process, attempting to fully

account for all applicable participatory accomplishments and actively award credits for performance earned, attended, and completed.

#### *Disciplinary Infractions and Procedures*

The Disciplinary Tracking System (“DTS”) is a standalone database containing documentation and outcomes for hearings related to rule infractions while housed within DOC facilities. It is imperative to incorporate the DTS indicators within the overall tracking system of record in the overall digitization plan as outcomes of these incidents impact future release dates and are directly correlated with restrictive housing assignments and durations. While this database is currently electronic and housed in a universally accessible prototype, it is not incorporated in a way that systematically calculates time adjustments and informs the PRB when they infer release decisions and conditions.

#### *Pre-Release Documentation and Processes*

The Illinois Legislature has indicated through affirmative actions, that pre-release procedures are essential both in a documentary format and with a comprehensive purview to adequately prepare Individuals for civic engagement, social accountability, and criminal justice paradigms. Numerous references for legislative mandates, DOC procedures, and PRB orders are documented via form assignments and references unassailable if future challenges and assertions are attempted. DOC does not currently have the ability or budget to transition legally signed documents into an electronic format. Documents utilized prior to release are manually signed in consultation with field services staff and those documents are contained within master files and will need to be scanned moving forward.

#### *Cell Assignments and Institutional Transfers*

Individuals are housed in a transitional nature with cell assignments and transfers contingent on numerous internal and external factors related to historical relationships, housing needs, facility provisions, and exigent circumstances. Currently, this data is relegated to the tracking system of record in historical perspectives and future-facing assignments. Digitization of the assignment and transfer scenarios are already captured in a rudimentary system that, unfortunately, can be manipulated to produce most anticipated queries.

#### *Writs, Warrants and Other External Institutional Movement Types*

Individuals are admitted to DOC with various external criminal justice attachments including concurring cases with various law enforcement jurisdictions, pending cases incurred while released on MSR/parole, or even as witnesses in unrelated cases. Warrants attached to DOC-related cases, unrelated cases, and ongoing investigations are captured in the tracking system of record, but documents are likely not scanned and stored in a way that references are precipitated in an efficient manner. In addition, Individuals move outside of DOC institutions for various reasons including healthcare, bereavement, interstate, and federal considerations. All external movements are currently captured and processed in the tracking system of record.

#### *Prisoner Review Board (PRB) Hearing Outcomes, Board Orders, and Correspondence*

The Prisoner Review Board is an external state agency wholly integrated within DOC procedures per state mandate. The PRB is charged with pre-release, early release, special release, and victim recognition processes and hearings. While the PRB documents and hearings are not primarily integrated within the tracking system of record, the outcomes are mostly recorded manually by DOC staff based on paper document processes. PRB appointees conduct public, verbal hearings and record those outcomes on paper which is signed and turned over to

DOC staff for documentation and tracking. The pre-release hearings are documented on paper, signed manually, and transcribed into O360. Correspondence related to Individual applications for leniency, medical, or other release considerations are not currently captured in any automated or manual format – only the decision outcomes may be recorded when the PRB determines that correspondence is part of the official record. It is highly recommended that interactions with the PRB be documented within DOC’s tracking system of record and attached to the Individual’s master file for future retention and documentation purposes.

#### *Mandatory Supervised Release/Parole Documentation*

The Illinois Legislature has identified numerous documents and areas of interest required to be signed, tracked, and maintained by DOC from those with impending releases from the Department. Areas including PRB orders, civic responsibilities and education, suitable housing and conditions, as well as persons that are protected from contact (orders of protection) are all served, and signatures recorded prior to release. While on release, additional documents related to parole conditions and mandates, address changes, police interactions, progressive discipline and rewards, and other documentation incidents are collected via manual signatures obtained in the field.

Every document requiring an individual in custody signature will need to be scanned and coded into the tracking system of record in a way that can be coded and attached to an individual file and disseminated in a way to enable reports and classifications to proceed. This process is currently limited to aggregate data compilations provided by the external parole tracking system—Automated Management System (“AMS”)—which is a stand-alone system, not fully integrated into O360 but does enable some data sharing capabilities. AMS provides high-level, interactive, automated systems for tracking phone, electronic, and in-person case management

trackers, and agent safety and backup systems supported by a 24/7 live operator staffing structure. AMS is a multi-decade contract provider for parole operations which has the ability to easily modify and incorporate parole tracking mechanisms into the DOC tracking system of record.

### Digitizing Existing Records

Indexing and digitizing may be parallel efforts, as records are identified and migrated to a different medium. However, to successfully digitize the existing *non-digital* records maintained by DOC, a methodical approach is necessary to ensure completeness, security, and searchability before the physical digitization activity commences. In consultation with a third-party entity, DOC will at minimum utilize a multi-step process for this effort:

1. **Gap assessment:** DOC will research and catalog the categories and medium type of non-digital records the Department maintains that are not already digitized in an existing application. This assessment will ensure that the entire universe of existing records is accounted for.
2. **Data review and classification:** After the initial discovery phase, DOC will review the types of data contained in each category of cataloged non-digital records. This step is necessary to implement data management and governance controls, which will ensure the protection and appropriate use of data. Some of the data will contain personal information, medical information, or other types of sensitive information. Effective data governance will safeguard risk mitigation and security considerations and include access controls and decision rights protocols.
3. **Naming standardization:** For each type of record, DOC will determine and implement a file-naming protocol so that records that are scanned can be appropriately tagged for easy retrieval after digitization.

Following this preparation phase, the records will be ready for digitization. Outside resources will be critical in performing the physical scanning and storing of the new digital records. They will work with DOC to ensure that all Department categorization, governance, and naming protocols are followed.

The cost to digitize existing paper records is later discussed in Section III of this report. Still, to obtain an accurate cost estimate specific to existing records, a fulsome inventory of those same records must first be conducted. Costs for the services and storage will be driven by record volume, in addition to the licensing costs.

### Digitizing New Records

While the above framework will be utilized for the digitization of existing DOC non-digital records, as discussed in previous sections—DOC will also need to identify, procure, and implement new systems to minimize the creation of new non-digital records. With the data collected during the gap assessment phase above, DOC can prioritize system needs to meet the digitization mandate.

The largest source of non-digital records that will need to be mitigated is the influx of records from counties when individuals are transferred to the custody of DOC. For long-term sustainability of DOC records digitization efforts, these records ideally will be transmitted to DOC electronically in the future via an online portal or exchange. To effectively transition from the current state, this effort will involve significant collaboration with county partners to gather both process and system requirements before a technology solution to create master record files for each individual in custody can be budgeted and implemented. Parallel workstreams will also be pursued so that new records concerning DOC’s correctional institutions and facilities can be created from the outset in a digital format to the greatest extent possible.

### Overlap: Laws, Regulations, Policies, and Directives

The Overview and Section I segments of this report highlighted, in part, the patchwork of laws, regulations, and policies that define and govern “records.” To achieve the Act’s mandate,



departments within DOC—aided by a third-party consulting entity as discussed in Section III—will need to catalogue these governing guardrails, a practice commonly referred to as “regulatory mapping.”<sup>74</sup> One specific division, the Policies and Directives Unit (“PDU”) under DOC’s Compliance office, will undoubtedly bear a great burden in this effort.

*Past and Present Need: Policies and Directives Unit*

The Policies and Directives Unit was created in 1981 to standardize and centralize departmental policy and procedures approved by the Director and to codify its rules as mandated by the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. With the development of department-wide policies and procedures, divisional policy manuals approved by the respective Deputy Directors were superseded. The unit was charged with ensuring written policies and procedures were developed in compliance with State and federal statutes, current practices, and national standards issued by the American Correctional Association. The unit’s activities were overseen by an Assistant Deputy Director until a Unit Manager was appointed in June, 1982. In June 2001, Forms Management was assigned to the unit in an effort to standardize department forms and ensure only appropriately reviewed and approved forms were issued. In July 2006, due to a Shared Services Agreement, PDU became responsible for all Department of Juvenile Justice rules, policies, and forms.

The primary mission of PDU is to coordinate the development, review, and approval of standardized departmental policy, procedures, and forms; to conduct periodic reviews of existing policy, procedures, and forms and to revise same when necessary to ensure continued compliance with state and federal statutes and regulations, consent decrees, and labor

---

<sup>74</sup> For informational purposes only, see “Regulatory Mapping is Integral to Compliance Functions,” <https://www.complianceweek.com/download?ac=5774>

agreements; to ensure departmental policies, procedures, and forms are clear, concise, accurate, and consistent and that they appropriately address administrative, operational, and security issues; and to maintain a permanent historical record of department rules, administrative directives, and forms.

The unit currently has over 500 administrative directives, governed by over 20 different statutes, 800 forms, and 42 department rules. The unit is responsible for drafting new or revising all administrative directives, department rules, or forms. That process includes conducting extensive internal reviews, coordinating statutory rulemaking processes, publishing approved policies, procedures, and forms, maintaining a historical file for each section listed above, and maintaining all cross-reference indices.

The Act's mandate will require reconciling DOC's administrative directives with Illinois' regulations on electronic records management, potentially pursuing rulemaking for DOC's current regulations,<sup>75</sup> and updating the State Archives' records retention schedule for the Department. These efforts will require cross-functional collaboration with DOC divisions and other state agencies, third-party consultation, and potential new hires in the privacy officer and administrative roles.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> See guidance on Illinois' Joint Committee on Administrative Rules: [TABLE OF CONTENTS \(ilga.gov\)](#).

<sup>76</sup> For informational purposes only, see [Establishing a Privacy Officer Function Within a Justice or Public Safety Entity: Global Advisory Committee Recommended Responsibilities and Training \(ojp.gov\)](#).

## **Section III – Fiscal Considerations, Resource Limitations, and Third-Party Assistance**

### **Strategic Value of Engaging Outside Consultants in Corrections System Transformation**

The Department is at a pivotal point with the implementation of Public Act 103-0071. The decision to engage outside consultants is not just a strategic choice but a necessity for several compelling reasons.

#### **1. Consistency in Project Management**

In the dynamic environment of state agencies, where staff turnover can be high, consultants provide a level of stability and continuity crucial for long-term project success. They bring a dedicated focus to the project, ensuring that the vision and objectives remain clear and on track throughout the project lifecycle. This consistency is vital for maintaining momentum and achieving the desired outcomes within set timelines.

#### **2. Expertise and Specialization in Digital Transformation**

The complexity of digital transformation in a corrections environment demands specialized knowledge that internal teams may not possess. Consultants offer expertise in the latest technological advancements and industry standards, ensuring that DOC's transformation is both cutting-edge and practical. They can provide tailored solutions that address the unique challenges of the corrections system, such as integrating advanced security protocols into new digital platforms.

#### **3. Navigating the Unique Challenges of the Corrections Environment**

A secure prison environment presents distinct challenges, including the need for robust security measures, reliable communication systems, and efficient data management. Consultants with experience in corrections systems, like Gartner Consulting, understand these nuances. They can navigate these complexities effectively, ensuring that the digital transformation aligns with operational realities and stringent security needs of the corrections system.

#### **4. Advanced Risk Management and Compliance Strategies**

Consultants bring a proactive approach to risk management, identifying potential challenges and compliance issues early in the project. Their experience in similar environments allows them to anticipate and mitigate risks effectively, ensuring that the project adheres to all legal and regulatory requirements. This foresight is crucial in the highly regulated and sensitive environment of corrections.

## 5. Driving Cultural and Organizational Change

The success of a digital transformation project in the corrections environment extends beyond technology implementation; it also involves managing cultural and organizational change. Consultants are skilled in change management, ensuring that staff at all levels are prepared for and supportive of new systems and processes. This includes comprehensive training programs, communication strategies, and support systems to facilitate a smooth transition.

## 6. Benefiting from Broad Industry Insight and Proven Best Practices

Outside consultants bring a wealth of knowledge from their experience across various sectors. This exposure to broad industry insights and best practices ensures that DOC's transformation strategy is informed by successful models and innovative approaches used in similar settings. Consultants can benchmark against these models, adapting and applying best practices to meet the specific needs of the corrections environment.

### *Seamless Integration with Gartner Consulting*

Recognizing the strategic value of these benefits, the Department has engaged Gartner Consulting for this critical initiative. Gartner's extensive experience in IT consulting and digital transformations, particularly in the public sector, positions them as an ideal partner for the Department. Their previous successful engagements with other Departments of Corrections, such as the Minnesota Department of Corrections, demonstrate their capability to handle the unique challenges of a secure correctional facility environment effectively.<sup>77</sup>

Gartner Consulting's role will be multifaceted, encompassing not only the technological aspects but also strategic planning, risk management, and change management. Their involvement is expected to ensure a seamless integration of new technologies and processes, enhancing the operational efficiency, security, and compliance of the corrections system.

---

<sup>77</sup> For informational purposes only, see IT Project Portfolio Summary State of Minnesota (October 2017), [report-mnit-enterprise-project-portfolio-10-2017\\_tcm38-346695.pdf](#); see also Report of the State of Minnesota Blue Ribbon Council on Information Technology (June 2020), [Report of the Blue Ribbon Council on Information Technology, June 2020 \(mn.gov\)](#); see also [Minnesota IT Services to receive \\$130M for modernizing state services | StateScoop](#).

## Introduction to Budgeting for Digital Transformation in Corrections

As the Department prepares to undertake the monumental task of digitizing its records in compliance with Public Act 103-0071, the importance of securing an adequate budget cannot be overstated. This Act represents a significant shift from traditional, paper-based systems to advanced digital solutions, a transformation that is both necessary and complex. The success of this initiative hinges on the allocation of sufficient resources to cover every aspect of the transition.

The prior sections of this report extensively discussed the scope of this digital transformation extending well beyond the mere digitization of existing records. This effort encompasses the integration of sophisticated technology systems capable of securely managing and storing vast amounts of digital data. This process involves substantial investment in hardware, software, and cybersecurity measures, each component crucial to the project's overall efficacy.

However, the financial implications of this transformation go beyond initial technological investments. A key aspect often overlooked is the human element – the training and adaption of staff to new digital systems. This is a critical component that demands significant investment, both in terms of time and money. Moreover, the budgeting process must consider the ongoing costs associated with maintaining and updating these systems. Regular system maintenance, software upgrades, and technical support are essential to ensure the longevity and effectiveness of the digital infrastructure.

At minimum, the consequences of underfunding such a project would be dire. Inadequate budgeting can lead to a myriad of issues, the most significant being the development of a solution that fails to meet the legislative intent of the Act. An underfunded project may result in a system that is neither secure nor efficient, potentially jeopardizing sensitive data and hindering the

operational capabilities of DOC.<sup>78</sup> Furthermore, insufficient funding can lead to incomplete implementation, where critical components of the digital transformation are left unaddressed, thereby compromising the overall integrity and functionality of the system.

As we proceed to discuss the specific financial aspects and considerations of this digital transformation, it is crucial to keep in mind the far-reaching impact of the budgeting decisions that end up being made. These decisions will not only determine the immediate success of the project but will also have lasting implications on the operational efficiency and compliance of the Department with Public Act 103-0071.

### *Financial Implications of Digital Transformation*

**Initial Investment:** DOC's transition to expanded digital systems, considering its scale – a monthly intake and release of approximately 1,500 individuals, a current population of 30,000 individuals in custody, and oversight of 15,000 individuals on parole – requires a substantial initial investment. This includes:

- **Hardware and Software Costs:** With DOC being comprised of dozens of facilities, the hardware requirements (servers, computers, scanners) are significant. Additionally, specialized software for document management and security is essential. Based on industry standards reported by Deloitte, the cost of such technology infrastructure can be substantial, especially when tailored to the scale and specific needs of a large correctional system.
- **Digital Infrastructure and Security:** Establishing a secure digital infrastructure is key. Given the sensitive nature of correctional data, investments in cybersecurity and data protection are non-negotiable. Gartner's research indicates that cybersecurity costs can account for up to 10% of total IT spending, a figure that could be higher in a high-security environment like corrections.
- **Training and Development:** Training DOC staff across all facilities to proficiently use the new digital systems is a major undertaking. Considering the size of the workforce and the complexity of the systems, the training costs could be significant. The 2020 Training Industry Report suggests that the cost of training in specialized fields can exceed the

---

<sup>78</sup> *Supra* fn. 72, p. 15 of Minnesota's Blue-Ribbon Report discusses the state's exemplary response to a 2019 ransomware attack affecting the state's DOC and the critical need for effective cybersecurity measures.

average, and for an organization the size of DOC, this could represent a considerable portion of the transformation budget.

- **Ongoing Maintenance and Support:** The costs for maintaining and supporting the digital infrastructure, including software updates and technical support, are ongoing expenses. For an organization of DOC's size, these costs can be substantial. According to Gartner, ongoing maintenance costs typically range from 5% to 10% of the initial investment annually, but this could be higher given the complexity and security needs of the correctional environment.
- **Potential Savings:** Despite the high initial and ongoing costs, the long-term savings can be significant. McKinsey & Company highlights that digital transformation can lead to operational efficiencies, such as reduced manual processing, lower storage costs, and improved data accessibility. For the Department, this could translate into significant cost reductions over time, considering the volume of records and the operational scale of the facilities.

#### *Budgeting for Compliance with Public Act 103-0071*

At present, DOC estimates the total financial cost for the digital project to meet the Act's mandate, to be approximately \$250 million. This estimate is divided into two main categories: expenses for the system, licenses, and staff training, which are expected to be covered by the General Revenue Fund, and costs for capital improvements, payable from the Capital Development Fund. For the General Revenue Fund expenses, our current estimates, based on the scope and scale of the project, include up to approximately \$120 million for initial technology investment, \$15 million for staff training, \$12 million for annual maintenance/licensing, and \$103 million for infrastructure upgrades and buildouts. However, given the complexities and scale of this undertaking, it's important to note that these costs are subject to change as the project progresses and more detailed information becomes available. Projections are further explained below:

**Cost Estimation:** The budget for the Department's digital transformation must encompass several critical components, reflecting the extensive scope of the project.

**Initial Technology Investment (Estimated \$60 million to \$120 million):** This includes the procurement of high-end performance servers for data storage, secure networking equipment, desktop computers, and scanners for digitizing existing records. Software costs cover licenses for document management systems, cybersecurity solutions, and database software. Additionally, expenses for setting up secure data centers and implementing robust network security protocols are included in this category.

**Training and Development (Estimated \$7 million to \$15 million):** This budget covers the development of customized training programs, hiring external trainers or consultants specializing in correctional system IT solutions, and creating training materials. Costs for conducting workshops, online training modules, and continuous education programs for staff to stay updated with the new systems are also included.

**Ongoing Maintenance and Support (Estimated 5% to 10% of initial investment annually, approximately \$3 million to \$12 million):**

This includes annual software license renewals, costs for technical support services, system upgrades, and cybersecurity monitoring services. Regular hardware maintenance, replacement costs for outdated equipment, and expenses for cloud storage services also fall under this category.

**Funding Source:** Diverse funding sources such as general revenue fund and capital bond fund, and consideration of public-private partnerships are essential. DOC can look at models like the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, which has successfully utilized a mix of these sources for their IT projects.

**Phased Implementation Strategy:** A phased approach, starting with pilot programs and then expanding, allows for budget adjustments based on early outcomes. This strategy also helps in managing the financial impact more effectively.



### *Unique Challenges to Navigate*

To achieve the Act's ambitious requirements, the Department faces a series of intricate challenges and dependencies that are crucial to acknowledge while navigating this transformative journey.

**Challenges in Funding, Procurement Processes, and External Collaboration:** The successful execution of this large-scale digital transformation hinges on several critical factors, including adequate funding, efficient procurement processes, and effective collaboration with external parties. Securing necessary funding, subject to state budget allocations and appropriations, is a process fraught with variability. The government procurement process, essential for ensuring transparency and value, is often lengthy and involves multiple stages and parties, which can extend the project timeline.

Additionally, the Department's efforts are dependent on the cooperation and support from technology vendors, consultants, and other state agencies. The coordination across these entities introduces variables that are often beyond the Department's direct control. Delays in technology delivery, support from external agencies, and the integration of efforts across multiple parties are significant factors that can influence the feasibility of meeting the mandated deadlines.

**Navigating Complexities in Implementation:** Implementing the Act's mandates is a multifaceted endeavor that extends beyond technological upgrades. It involves redefining existing operational processes and ensuring that the new digital systems are seamlessly integrated into the daily functions of the Department. This process requires not only technological expertise but also change management skills to ensure staff adaptability and system usability. The complexity of aligning new digital systems with the existing infrastructure, coupled with the need to train a large workforce, adds layers of challenges that can impact the project timeline. The Department is

committed to overcoming these hurdles through meticulous planning and execution, yet these operational complexities are critical considerations in the project's progression.

**Proactive Communication and Revised Planning in the Face of Delays:** Despite these challenges, the Department remains steadfast in its commitment to fulfilling the requirements of the Act. If unforeseen complexities impact our ability to meet the established timelines, the Department is dedicated to communicating these issues promptly and transparently. Recognizing the importance of accountability, the Department will not only identify the specific areas causing delays but also provide a revised, realistic timeline that is achievable within the constraints encountered. This approach ensures that all stakeholders are kept informed and that the project continues to progress with clarity and adjusted expectations. The Department's dedication to achieving the goals set forth by the Act is unwavering, and this commitment extends to maintaining open lines of communication and adapting our strategies to meet the challenges head on.

The overall financial and highly collaborative planning for DOC's compliance with Public Act 103-0071 is a complex, yet vital endeavor. The estimated budget ranges for initial technology investment, training and development, and ongoing maintenance and support reflect the comprehensive nature of this digital transformation project. By securing adequate funding and adopting a phased implementation strategy, DOC can ensure a successful transition to a digital system. This transformation, while requiring a significant upfront investment, promises long-term operational efficiencies and cost savings, aligning with DOC's commitment to modernization and compliance with legislative mandates.

### *Risk Management and Cost Mitigation*

**Identifying Financial Risks:** The Department will respond proactively to potential financial risks such as technological obsolescence, cost overruns, and project delays. Drawing from lessons learned by the New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision, DOC will implement early warning systems to detect such risks.

- **Mitigation Strategies:** DOC will employ robust project management practices including regular stakeholder engagements and progress reviews to promptly address any project overruns or delays. Flexible contracts with technology vendors, allowing for adjustments in response to project dynamics, will be a key strategy.
- **Contingency Planning:** A contingency reserve, set at 10-15% of the total project budget, will be established to manage unexpected costs. This approach aligns with industry best practices for large scale projects.

### *Long-term Financial Benefits*

**Operational Efficiency:** The Department is committed to achieving significant long-term cost savings through improved operational efficiency, drawing inspiration from the success of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice in reducing manual processing costs post-digitization.

- **Data Security and Compliance:** Enhanced data security measures will be a cornerstone of DOC's digital transformation, aiming to reduce the risk of costly data breaches. The approach will be heavily based on the strategies employed by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, focusing on stringent compliance with legal standards.
- **Sustainability and Scalability:** The digital transformation will be designed for long-term sustainability, taking cues from the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections. This will ensure the systems adaptability to future technological advancements and operational growth.

Through prudent financial stewardship, the Department seeks operational excellence that promotes growth and flexibility in the evolving data-driven landscape which continues to shape public safety.

## Conclusion

The Department is poised to undertake a comprehensive and well-structured financial planning process for its compliance with Public Act 103-0071. By adopting best practices in budget and financial management, as demonstrated by other state correctional systems, and through regular stakeholder engagements, DOC will effectively navigate the complexities of this large-scale digital transformation. The commitment to proactive risk management, combined with a focus on long-term operational efficiencies and compliance benefits, underscores the strategic importance of this investment.

Overall, this report analyzes the impacts of digitizing DOC records from an *inter-* and *intra-*agency perspective, while addressing key questions that stakeholders will have and underscoring the significance of this investment. The conclusions listed in the overview remain the same. That said, the last listed conclusion bears repeating:

- The subject-matter expertise and required project management present a significant need for third-party assistance to achieve the Act's digitization mandate

In the technology space, correctional agencies possess unique needs that require experience and skilled assistance. There will be blind-spots and current unknowns beyond this required study that a third-party will help recognize and address. To that end, the Department's approach is not simply about meeting immediate needs but is a forward-looking strategy that aligns with its broader commitment to modernization and legislative compliance.