

13. (continued)

3. The subgrantee (City of St. Petersburg) establish control or monitor the receipt and expenditure of project income.

This implementing agency need to be audited immediately to determine how much money has been collected and expended as project income. In reviewing the check book system and bookkeeping system, some of the expenditures would be unallowable under LEAA guidelines. Therefore, it is my recommendation that those expenditures that are unallowable under LEAA guidelines be charged to other sources of income.

Also a review of personnel indicates that some employees of the implementing agency have the same last names which could result in nepotism.

FISCAL MONITORING CHECKLIST

Grantee: City of St. Petersburg
 Project Title: Straights, Inc.
 Grant Number: 76-A4-13-EB01

YES NO N/A

ACCOUNTING SYSTEM AND FINANCIAL RECORDS

- Does the subgrantee maintain a file that includes the approved subgrant application, subgrant award documents, special conditions, requests for funds, quarterly reports, requests for adjustments, and related correspondence? _____
- Has the subgrantee submitted fiscal reports on schedule? _____
- Is the subgrantee expending and accounting for subgrant funds in a manner consistent with the subgrant budget, project objectives, and fiscal guidelines? _____
- Does the subgrantee's accounting system provide information needed to adequately identify the receipt and expenditure of funds for each subgrant? _____
- Does the accounting system provide accurate and current financial reporting information? _____
- Do entries in accounting records refer to subsidiary records and/or documentation which support the entry and which can be readily located? _____
- Is the accounting system integrated with an adequate system of internal controls to safeguard the funds and assets covered, check the accuracy and reliability of accounting data, promote operational efficiency, and encourage adherence to prescribed management policies? _____
- Do the accounting records separate LEAA and match receipts, expenditures, and balances? _____
- Is supporting documentation maintained in sufficient detail to show the nature of each project receipt and expenditure? _____
- Are vouchers and supporting documents cancelled or stamped after payment to prevent them from being processed again for payment? _____
- Does the accounting system provide controls to ensure that project funds are not:
 - a. Obligated in excess of the total funds available from the subgrant. _____
 - b. Obligated in excess of the total funds available for a major cost category (e.g. personnel, travel, etc.) _____
 - c. Expended for costs which were not included in the latest approved project budget. _____
 - d. Expended after the end of the approved subgrant period unless such funds were properly obligated at the end of the approved subgrant period. _____
 - e. Expended after termination of the authorized 90-day liquidation period. _____

CONTROL

YES NO N/A

Is authority and assignment of responsibility clearly defined for the following:

- a. Signing checks?
- b. Certifying purchase orders and vouchers?
- c. Drawing checks?
- d. Posting entries in the accounting records?
- e. Maintaining inventory records?
- f. Reconciling bank accounts?

PROCUREMENT PROCEDURES

Are procedures adequate to ensure that procurements made with the subgrant funds adhere to the procurement standards in Attachment G, Supplement 1, of Federal Management Circular 74.7?

PROJECT INCOME

Is income earned on projects financed in whole or in part with LEAA funds?

X _____

If so, has the income been included in the related BCJPA approved subgrant budget?

X _____

Are appropriate records maintained to account for project income?

_____ X _____

PERSONNEL

Has the subgrantee adopted procedures for assuring that:

- a. Employment arrangements coincide with the approved subgrant budget and the subgrantee's usual policies.
- b. Compensation to employees is reasonable and consistent with approved subgrant budget and with that paid for similar work in other activities of the unit of government.

Does the subgrantee have written job descriptions for project employees?

Are there written personnel policies prohibiting employment of individuals that would result in:

- a. Nepotism?
- b. Conflict of interest?

Do the payroll records and source documents include the following:

- a. Adequate time and attendance accounting for full-time, part-time, intermittent employees, and for individual consultants?
- b. Individual payroll record forms?
- c. A payroll register?

PROPERTY CONTROL

Are adequate inventory records maintained on property purchased with subgrant funds? _____

Are management procedures for identifying and controlling project property adequate? _____

Have maintenance procedures been implemented to keep the property in good condition? _____

any items which "NO" was checked, provide an explanation below. Reference the explanation the related item number.

19 position budgeted

1. Consist of personnel only and indirect costs

Personnel	45,794	2,633	2,633	51,060
Indirect costs	<u>1,600</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>1,600</u>
	<u>47,394</u>	2,633	2,633	52,660

Project Income Budget

Personnel	29,598
Professional	4,052
Travel	1,500
Equipment	4,500
Other Operating Expenses	<u>42,180</u>
TOTAL	81,830

The Board of Directors have elected to change a \$375.00 fee all persons accepted into the program. This fee will be collected based on an individuals (or his family's) ability to pay. No child will be denied into the program because of an inability to pay these fees.

Building donated six months free

Department of Administration

Division of State Planning

BUREAU OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE

Bryant Building
620 South Reidman Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
Telephone (904) 493-6331

ON-SITE MONITORING ABSTRACT

Date of Report March 1, 1978

Monitored By Mack W. Gardner, Jr. M.G.

1A
3/17

1. Project Title Straight, Inc.
2. Grant Number 76-A4-13-EB01
3. Grant Amount \$ 52,660 LEAA \$ 47,394 Match \$ Local 2,633
State 2,633
4. Subgrantee City of St. Petersburg
5. Implementing Agency Straight, Inc.
6. Project Director Mr. James Hartz
7. Year of Funding 1 2 3 4 5
8. Prior Funds Awarded \$ -0-
9. Approved Subgrant Period May 1, 1977 thru April 30, 1978
10. Number of Required Monitoring Visits 2 Monitoring Trip Number 2
11. Date(s) of Visit March 1, 1978
12. Persons Interviewed (Names and Length of Interviews):
Mr. James Hartz, Project Director, 3 hours
Mr. James Holley, HRS District Representative, 4 hours
Representatives from the City of St. Petersburg Office, 2 hours
One Project Client, 20 minutes

13. Overall Assessment of the Project (Administration and Effectiveness):

See Attached

14. General Recommendations:

See Attached

ON-SITE MONITORING CHECKLIST

Project Title _____

Grant Number _____

YES NO N/A

GENERAL PROJECT ACTIVITY

- | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. Is this project fully operational as of this date? Explain. | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 2. Does project implementation coincide with that indicated in the project application timetable? Explain. | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 3. Are the specific objectives of the project being met in accordance with the subgrantee's application? Explain. | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 4. Are the objectives as stated in the application consistent with those of the Project Director? Explain. | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 5. Are all general and special conditions placed on the subgrant at the time of award satisfied? Explain. | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 6. Has the subgrantee submitted all Progress and Fiscal Reports on schedule? Explain. | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 7. Is the project director aware of what is expected from him in terms of Quarterly Progress Reports and Final Reports? Explain. | ___ | ___ | ___ |

Additional Questions and Comments

1. Request HRS Monitoring Report on Straight, Inc. (76-A4-13-EB01)?

This request was denied. I was informed that the report was confidential and could not be released without a HRS attorney's approval. The HRS Representative (Mr. James Holley) attempted to obtain permission from the HRS attorney to release the report but was denied approval to release the report to me.

2. Why was an Interim Drug License issued to Straight, Inc.?

I was told by the HRS representative (Mr. Holley) that Straight, Inc. was up for the licensing programmatically. In addition a new license needed to be issued to cover the new facility at Straight, Inc.'s new location. Simultaneously an investigation was completed by a HRS representative (Mr. Holley). This investigation brought to light certain problems (I have no idea what problems existed because I was denied the HRS report). Based upon these problems an Interim Drug License was issued for 90 days. The Interim Drug License has all the privileges that a regular drug license has except the time frame. HRS representatives met with Straight, Inc.'s board and an agreement was reached. The agreement was that Straight, Inc. would resolve the problems found by the HRS representative (Mr. Holley) by March 27, 1978. At such time HRS will review the resolution of problems and proceed with the decision of whether or not to issue regular drug license. It is my understanding that the license was not revoked. An Interim Drug License was issued mainly based upon relocation of the facility and partially programmatic review.

3. Who is collecting or has data been collected for evaluation purposes?

Project staff is collecting data for evaluation purposes. I did review the data collection instruments. A large portion of the data is available for the evaluator's (consultant) review. All data requested by the evaluator that does not exist will be forwarded to the evaluator (consultant) in reasonable time for him to complete his evaluation of the project (by the end of the subgrant period April 20, 1978). I met with the evaluator (consultant) and am pleased with his responses to evaluate the project. I feel comfortable that he is equipped to handle the evaluation. The evaluator (consultant) has assured me that the evaluation can be completed on time provided Straight, Inc. submits any additions concerning data that may not be available at this time. The evaluation will address the measurable objectives as outlined in the subgrant application.

4. What mechanism does Straight, Inc. use to get clients?

Clients are referred from various sources: doctors, parents, clergymen, courts, and self-referral.

5. What criteria does Straight, Inc. use to select or screen clients?

Straight, Inc. has the authority to reject or select clients, even those referred by the courts. Straight, Inc. use the following criteria to select clients:

- A. It must be substantiated that the client is a drug or alcohol abuser.
- B. Family participation (in some instances, Families do not participate but in most cases parents participate).

Clients may be rejected if parents are not cooperative, if substantiating evidence is available indicating that a client is not a substance abuser, or if the client himself is not cooperative.

6. Does Straight, Inc. waive client fees as indicated in the subgrant application?

It is my understanding that there are not standard criteria for waiving client fees. Clients fees are waived based upon the project directors recommendations or opinions. An example was given by the project director where a client fee was waived. This case involved a parent with two clients in the program. The project director felt that the parent's income was too low to pay fees for both clients; therefore, the fees for one was waived. At the time of this on-site visit the project director was unable to provide an estimated percentage of clients in the program with fee waivers.

7. Are allegations true or false that clients are restricted from leaving the project or running away by handcuffing or tying them to beds, etc.?

In discussion with the HRS representative (Mr. Holley) no evidence was available to substantiate these allegations. Mr. Holley indicated that this information was disclosed by "old comers," however, he did not follow-up these allegations in his investigation. Further allegations by alleged eye-witnesses that Straight, Inc. staff members had been seen escorting clients back to residential quarters in handcuffs could not be confirmed by the HRS representative (Mr. Holley). These allegations were not followed up by the HRS representative (Mr. Holley).

8. Was a spot check of clients by a BCJPA representative made to ascertain whether or not clients were receiving services as outlined in the project application?

A spot check was made by the writer with a client. The spot check disclosed that the client had received services as outlined in the subgrant application. The client was very happy about services received from the project and indicated that the project had helped tremendously in improving attitudes of self-perception, respect for others, and preventing further use of various kinds of drugs. The client is in the upper level of the program and indicated during the stay in the project, handcuffing or other restrictive methods to prevent clients from leaving the project or running away, had not been detected. The client indicated that on occasions clients hands were held by other clients in an attempt to prevent running away or leaving. No indications were made that staff utilized restrictive methods to hold clients.

9. What criteria is used for selecting staff?

It is my understanding that the project director and senior staff members make decisions on selecting new staff mainly by subjective opinion. Staff job descriptions are attached to the BCJPA subgrant file; however, these job descriptions do not spell specific objective job classification criteria to include (minimum education levels, prior drug training experience, etc.).

10. What percentage of the project staff consist of ex-project clients?

Seventy-five percent of the project staff comes from the project as ex-clients. The total junior staff is made up of ex-clients. Two-thirds of the senior staff consist of ex-clients.

Other Comments

There were no indication that EEO was significant. By this I mean that there were no minorities (Blacks, etc.) in the project or on the project staff. I do not recall seeing any EEO posters displayed or any such materials relating to non-discrimination.

Although Straight, Inc. request funding for only one year the project has project generated income. Thus, LEAA funds will continue after this one year.

Department of Administration

Division of State Planning

BUREAU OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE

Bryant Building
620 South Peridian Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32394
Telephone (904) 456-6001

C. J. ...

KP
161

ON-SITE MONITORING ABSTRACT

Date of Report 1/18/78

Monitored by Mack Gardner

1. Project Title Straight, Inc.

2. Grant Number 76-A4-13-EB01

3. Grant Amount \$ 52,660 LEAA \$ 47,394 Match \$ 5,266

4. Subgrantee City of St. Petersburg

5. Implementing Agency Straight, Inc.

6. Project Director Mr. James Hartz

7. Year of Funding 1 2 3 4 5

8. Prior Funds Awarded \$ -0-

9. Approved Subgrant Period May 1, 1977 to April 30 1978

0. Number of Required Monitoring Visits 2 Monitoring Trip Number 2

1. Date(s) of Visit January 18, 1978

2. Persons Interviewed (Names and Length of Interviews):

Mr. Steve Higgins	Grants Program Coordinator	1 hour
Ms. Pat Rankin	Grants Accountant	1 hour
Mr. Jeff Symons	Chief of Grants	3 hours
Mr. James Hartz	Project Director	4 hours

3. Overall Assessment of the Project (Administration and Effectiveness):

Administratively the project could use some assistance in setting up separate accounts for PGI, LEAA, and contributions. It appears that the project is effective to some degree; but there is a need for improvement in the area of evaluation.

4. General Recommendations:

1. Separate accountability be maintained for expenditure of LEAA, PGI, and contribution funds.
2. If an evaluator is not hired prior to the end of the subgrant period that funds identified in the budget for consultation revert to the BCJPA.
3. If this project ever request additional funding an EEO plan must be submitted and approved by the BCJPA

ON-SITE MONITORING CHECKLIST

Project Title Straight, Inc.

Grant Number 76-A4-13-EB01

GENERAL PROJECT ACTIVITY

YES NO N/A

1. Is this project fully operational as of this date? Explain.

X

2. Does project implementation coincide with that indicated in the project application timetable? Explain.
There is some delay in getting an evaluation program in operation.

X

3. Are the specific objectives of the project being met in accordance with the subgrantee's application? Explain.

X

Objectives are being met in all areas except evaluation. An evaluator has not been hired as of this date. It is anticipated that the evaluator will be hired the 15th of March 1978 and the project ends April 30, 1977.

4. Are the objectives as stated in the application consistent with those of the Project Director? Explain.

X

5. Are all general and special conditions placed on the subgrant at the time of award satisfied? Explain.

X

Only one special condition was placed on this subgrant. This special condition was satisfied 1/19/78.

6. Has the subgrantee submitted all Progress and Fiscal Reports on schedule? Explain.

X

The third quarterly progress report was due 1/15/78. This report will be forwarded prior to January 31, 1978.

7. Is the project director aware of what is expected from him in terms of Quarterly Progress Reports and Final Reports? Explain.

X

The project director is aware of what is expected of him. He has prepared previous reports.

YES NO N/A

8. Are the number of clients being serviced consistent as proposed in the original application? Explain who and how many. X ___ ___

The number of clients being served are consistent as proposed. At present these are approximately 230 clients served; however, all clients are white except two Puerto Rican. There are no black clients served.

9. Has the project received requested technical assistance? Explain. X ___ ___

No technical assistance has been requested from LEAA; however, assistance has been received from the Pinellas MPU, the City of St. Petersburg, and a local advisory Council.

10. Does the project need technical assistance? Explain. X ___ ___

The project needs technical assistance in the fiscal area.

11. Have any programmatic modifications been made since the date of award? Explain. X ___ ___

The client fee has changed from \$350 to \$400 as of October 1, 1977. There was a change of subgrant period from December 1, 1976 - November 30, 1977 to May 1, 1977 to April 30, 1978. A staff change has also been made. (Took out program director and added a senior staff person program coordinator. A fifth level of treatment has been incorporated in the treatment program for clients.

12. Is the project receiving assistance and coordinating with state, regional, and local resources? Explain. X ___ ___

13. Does the subgrantee intend to assume the costs of this project? Explain. X ___ ___

This is suppose to be the only funding from LEAA. Provisions are being made by the project to continue funding on its own.

14. Summarize the services provided and quantitative impact to date.

Two hundred thirty clients have received services during the subgrant period. The project provides intense counseling service in a semi-controlled environment. Of the 350 clients expected to participate in the program, approximately 100 are expected to be referrals from the Juvenile Court System.

10. If the employees spend considerable time away from their offices performing project duties, do they prepare reports for their supervisor disclosing weekly or monthly activities (number of persons contacted, purposes, etc.)? Explain. X

No evidence of reports to project director by staff were made available. Meetings are held when needed by the project director.

11. Are suitable payroll records maintained (attendance sheet, etc.)? Explain. X

Payroll and other financial records are maintained but no determination can be made at this point of whether funds are being provided out of the appropriate area of funding. No separate accountability of LEAA vs. contributions vs. PRI can be determined.

EVALUATION:

1. Are procedures, as outlined in the evaluation section of the subgrant application and/or any applicable special conditions being followed? Explain. X

The evaluator should have been hired or selected during the second month of the subgrant period; however, the grant period will end April 30, 1978 and an evaluator has not been hired. This is still in the selection process. See attachment.

2. As per the subgrant application, are data collection procedures being followed? If not, explain any deviations and give estimate of the effect of non-compliance upon the final evaluation. X

According to the project director this aspect of evaluation will be taken care of by the evaluator once hired.

3. On a random sample basis, has a BCJPA representative checked the data collection process (i.e., taken one card/sheet etc., which represents a person receiving or who has received services, and actually contacting him, ascertaining the extent, dates, and results of the services provided)? Explain result of spot-check. X

See above.

4. Are reports on the progress of the evaluation available? Explain. X

The evaluation process is not underway, therefore, no reports on the progress of the evaluation are available.

5. Are qualitative techniques utilized? Is there any attempt to assess impact? Explain. X

It is my opinion that this can not be determined. I found no attempt to assess impact.

YES	NO	N/A
	X	

6. Are quantitative techniques utilized? Explain.

See above.

7. Are regularly scheduled progress meetings held to discuss evaluation data as related to possible modifications of improvements of the project? Explain.

	X	
--	---	--

No meetings are held to discuss evaluation resulting from the delayed hiring of an evaluator as outlined in the subgrant award application.

BUDGET RELATED

1. Are detailed inventory records maintained on equipment purchased with project funds? Proper documentation provided the BCJPA? Explain.

X		
---	--	--

Only one type wrtier is listed under equipment. Records will be maintained an this item.

2. Is the subgrantee expending funds in conformance with the approved budget? Explain.

	?	
--	---	--

This cannot be determined at this point because separate accountability of contributions, LEAA, or pGI funds are not being maintained.

3. Have individual consultants been employed? Explain the nature of their services, the rate of payment.

	X	
--	---	--

Any consultant evaluator is to be hired, but this person has not been hired as of this date. No services have been provided.

4. If the project has generated income, is it reflected in a BCJPA approved budget? Explain.

X		
---	--	--

The project has an approved PSI budget by BCJPA, however, there are some problems with separate accountability.

IMPACT (Complete #1 and/or #2)

1. Has the project had any effect on reducing crime? Explain.

	?	
--	---	--

This project has not been evaluated to determine if any effect or reducing crime has occurred.

2. How has the project impacted on the Criminal Justice System? Explain.

The project has provided the courts with alternatives to sentencing thus reducing overcrowding in Pinellas penal institutions.