Draft Enterprise Background Screening Project Plan

Project #: G-1213EOG-005

Project Purpose: Identify opportunities for improved efficiencies and economies related to the background screening process.

Scope: The background screening process for individuals where the payment of screening is the responsibility of the State of Florida.

Step #	WP#	Project Step Title	Workpaper Purpose	Scope and Methodology
Fieldwo		-		
2	1	Livescan Devices	Identify all Livescan devices owned and operated within the State of Florida. Specifically, device vendors and service providers evaluated by FDLE to include State of Florida city, county and state government entities.	Scope: Define scope to capture period for which we will request FDLE provide data on devices submitting for State agencies. 1-2 Years??? livescan devices as of April 15, 2013. Methodology: Interview FDLE CJIS Program members to identify devices. Include questions in the survey for agencies to identify livescan devices used. Compile list of livescan devices operated within the State.
2	2	Becoming a Service Provider utilized by the State of Florida	Document the process to become a Livescan service provider.	Methodology: Interview FDLE CJIS members to establish the process a vendor/service provider must follow. Contact a sample of service providers/vendors to identify any issues and/or concerns with the process. Note. Where are we considering the actual cost of doing background checks?
2	3	Cost Variances	Identify the cost variances of charges among service provider utilized by the State of Florida.	Methodology: Contact vendors/service providers to obtain cost/service charges for fingerprinting. Include questions in the survey for agencies to identify cost/service they are charged and/or charge for fingerprinting. Analyze the charges for variance. Isolate cost variances in fingerprint card printing versus electronic submission to FDLE.
2	4	Livescan Equipment Cost	Identify the average cost to purchase, setup, train staff, maintain and operate Livescan equipment. Is the cost different for state agencies versus private service providers?	Contact DMS to determine which vendors are approved for purchase of Live Scan equipment by State Agencies. Compare that list against the 10 vendors listed on the FDLE website. Obtain pricing from those approved DMS vendors and a few others listed on the FDLE website. Request a breakdown to: purchase, setup, train, maintain and operate the equipment. Ask for private and governmental pricing (where applicable). Also contact a sample of state agencies who have their own LiveScan equipment to find out their actual costs (if possible to ascertain) to: purchase, setup, train, maintain and operate the equipment.

2	5 Livescan Operational Evaluation	Identify and document potential risks for state agencies to own and operate Livescan equipment versus utilize private service providers. (i.e. risk associated with initial cost), training (i.e. vendor offered training and internal state personnel training), equipment maintenance, staffing resources, screening rejects due to bad fingerprints, over-riding LiveScan fingerprint validity checks, etc.	Review applicable authoritative references and survey responses, as well as interview relevant subject matter experts to identify and document the potential impacts for state agencies to own and operate Livescan equipment versus utilize private service providers. The evaluation will outline operational impacts to include the pro's and con's for management to consider when making the determine to perform fingerprinting "in house" versus outsource. Document card processing versus print submission process.
2	6 Equipment Leveraging to Contain Cost	Determine if Livescan equipment is being leveraged and shared among city, county and state government entities to contain costs where geographically appropriate. Determine if there are MOU's and/or associated fees to cover overhead, staffing resources, etc.	Using the survey mechanism referenced in WP # 10, identify instances of Livescan equipment leveraging between city, county and state government. The scope is limited to those instances of equipment leveraging for which state agencies acknowledge within their unique survey response. The survey responses will not be validated for the purposes of this project step. The survey design must help ensure Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) language/documents/information is collected and must isolate cost charges from the governmental entity performing the Livescan fingerprint processing. Furthermore, the survey design must support the presentation of equipment leveraging by at least one defined geographical criteria such as: city, county, region, etc. The survey design should take into consideration that the following minimum data elements must be available within he survey responses. The auditor will aggregate the data into one spreadsheet/file to adequately illustrate the following: - Number of instances of equipment leveraging sorted by Agency; - Categorize each instance with either the city, county or anther state entity (in column that may be sorted); - Geographical/state location assignment - Costs of each instance to determine the statewide average (in column that may be sorted; - Does an MOU exist for each instance (in a column that may be sorted); and - Other MOU criteria determined critical to the accomplishment of this workpaper's purpose.

2	7 Fingerprint Reten		and risk management benefits that may be attained by CJIS non-sworn as well as non-CJIS agencies opting to voluntarily retain fingerprints.	 Identify agencies that are required by statutes to retain fingerprint records at FDLE. Identify agencies that retain fingerprint records at FDLE but are not required by statutes to retain fingerprints. Identify costs, including FBI fees, associated with initial fingerprint screenings. Identify costs associated with retaining fingerprint files at FDLE. Identify costs, including FBI fees, associated with mandatory 5 year fingerprint rescreening for personnel that do not have their records retained at FDLE. Compare the cost of retaining fingerprint records at FDLE with the mandatory 5 year fingerprinting rescreening costs. Determine if there is a material cost difference between the costs of retaining fingerprint records at FDLE compared to the fingerprinting rescreening costs. For agencies that are not required to retain fingerprints, identify the benefits associated with retaining fingerprint records at FDLE. For agencies that are not required to retain fingerprints, identify the risks associated with not retaining fingerprint records at FDLE.
2	8 Fingerprint Accep	•	Collect data to compare rejection rate cost with the cost of fingerprint retention.	TBD - Contingent upon what data can be obtained from FDLE. Can the rejection rate data be delineated by agency and service provider?

2	9 Screening Standards and Exemptions	Evaluate authoritative references to identify and isolate legal and liability conflicts related to screening standards and employment exemptions.	Methodology: Survey the agencies to find out what Federal Authority Florida Statute they use to screen their employees If the agency uses Chapter 435 of the Florida Statutes, ask if the screening standards listed in 435.04 are relevant to the majority of positions
			held in the agency. If the answer to the above question is no, solicit information from the agency regarding their screening standards. Survey the agencies to find out the answers to the questions above as they pertain to their contractors. Survey the agencies to find out if they grant exemptions to their contractors. If the answer to the above question is yes, solicit feedback about any liability or indemnity concerns that comes with granting exemptions to contractors.
2	10 Survey Agencies	Develop a survey to be distributed to agencies to collect information determined "needed" to execute other project steps.	Work with the other team members to developed, distribute and compiled survey response data to achieve project objectives.
2	Clearinghouse	Obtain a good understanding regarding the "Care Provider Background Screening Clearinghouse", particulary the genesis of the statutory requirement, details regarding the retention of care provider criminal history/screening results and what is the current status of the system development and implementation. Answer the question: "Why can the State of Florida retain criminal history/screening results for "Care Providers" regulated or managed in some manner by the state, but we cannot retain the same information for State of Florida employees?"	Interview the appropriate individuals at AHCA and FDLE to achieve the workpaper purpose.