

Archived Information

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL (OIG)

<p>Goal: To promote the efficient and effective use of taxpayer dollars in support of American education by providing independent and objective assistance to the Congress and the Secretary of Education in assuring continuous improvement in program delivery, effectiveness, and integrity.</p> <p>Legislation: Inspector General Act of 1978.</p>	Funding History (\$ in millions)			
	Fiscal Year	Appropriation	Fiscal Year	Appropriation
	1985	\$0	2000	\$34
	1990	\$0	2001	\$36
	1995	\$0	2002 (Requested)	\$38

Program Description

The Office of Inspector General promotes the efficient and effective use of taxpayer dollars in support of American education by providing independent and objective assistance to the Secretary of Education and the Congress in assuring continuous improvement in program delivery, effectiveness, and integrity.

The Inspector General serves as the principal advisor to the Secretary on matters related to promoting economy, efficiency and effectiveness and preventing and detecting fraud and abuse in the administration of Departmental programs and operations. To do this, the Office of Inspector General:

- Conducts independent audits, investigations, inspections, analyses, and other reviews of Departmental programs and operations.

- Provides leadership and coordination and recommends policies for activities to achieve its mission, including review of existing and proposed legislation and regulations and making recommendations on their impact on programs and operations.

- Inform the Secretary and the Congress about problems needing corrective action and progress of corrective actions in Departmental programs and operations.

Program Performance

OBJECTIVE 1: OIG PRODUCTS AND SERVICES ARE USED BY THE DEPARTMENT, CONGRESS, AND OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES TO IMPROVE THE EFFICIENCY, EFFECTIVENESS, AND INTEGRITY OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND OPERATIONS.

Indicator 1.1 The number and percentage of significant recommendations accepted and implemented will increase.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
<i>Recommendations accepted</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
FY 1998:	50 (67%)			
FY 1999:	70 (71%)	Continuing increase		
FY 2000:	274 (94%)	Continuing increase		
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		
FY 2002:				
<i>Recommendations implemented</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
FY 1998:	25 (13%)			
FY 1999:	62 (37%)	Continuing increase		
FY 2000:	94 (49%)	Continuing increase		
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		
FY 2002:				

Indicator 1.2 Customers will be satisfied with OIG products and services.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: Insufficient data collected to report actual performance.</p> <p>Explanation: This measure and the methodology used is under review to determine if it will be modified or retained.</p>	<p>Source: Information will come from the party audited. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> FY 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> Unknown.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Collected from agency data system.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: In the past, an audit questionnaire was included with OIG audits. The response was poor. To obtain better responses, we have worked with the Office of Chief Information Officer to develop an email survey. The success will depend upon the cooperation of those audited.</p>
FY 1999:	Not available	No target set		
FY 2000:	Insufficient Data	Insufficient data		
FY 2001:				
FY 2002:				
Indicator 1.3 Resources (as measured by the percentage of staff time) will be deployed in accordance with the Work Plan.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: Significant change in performance from FY 1999 to FY 2000. The increase reflects an increased emphasis on reviewing the Department's operations and EDP systems.</p> <p>Explanation: This number was calculated by taking the total number of staff hours that the office charged to jobs in the Work Plan and dividing it by the hours that were spent on Goal 1.</p> <p>The OIG Work Plan baseline is at the start of the fiscal year, October 1. The actual performance achieved will rarely reach 100 percent because the Work Plan covers a two-year period, and new jobs are identified that take precedence for reasons such as risk or need for immediate completion.</p>	<p>Source: Time and Travel Reporting System. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> FY 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> Spring 2002.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Collected from agency data system.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Based on self-reported data generated by ED staff.</p>
FY 1998:	48%			
FY 1999:	46%	Continuing increase		
FY 2000:	63%	Continuing increase		
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		
FY 2002:				

Indicator 1.4 The number, percentage, or both, of Work Plan assignments initiated will increase.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: No significant change in performance from FY 1999 to FY 2000.</p> <p>Explanation: This indicator measures the degree to which OIG work done during the fiscal year related to Objective 1 (Improvement of programs and operations) is work identified in the annually updated OIG Work Plan. Annually, the OIG prepares a Work Plan that contains projects deemed to be the most important. The denominator of the percentage is the number of projects from a prior Work Plan plus any additions to the current Work Plan. The numerator is the number of audit projects started. This indicator includes those projects where the objectives were intended to improve programs or operations. This information reflects only jobs that are coded as Objective 1.</p> <p>The OIG Work Plan baseline is at the start of the fiscal year, October 1. The actual performance achieved will never reach 100 percent because the Work Plan covers a 2-year period, and new jobs are identified which take precedence for reasons such as risk or need for immediate completion.</p>	<p>Source: OIG report on Work Plan Project Status Sheets. All work is listed in Work Plan Project Status Sheets by audit project number.</p> <p><i>Frequency:</i> Annually.</p> <p><i>Next collection update:</i> FY 2001.</p> <p><i>Date to be reported:</i> Spring 2002.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Collected from agency data system.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The calculation is of projects not resources. The calculation does not indicate the degree to which OIG resources are devoted to projects included in the OIG Work Plan.</p>
FY 1998:	61%			
FY 1999:	62%	Continuing increase		
FY 2000:	63%	Continuing increase		
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		
FY 2002:				

OBJECTIVE 2: OIG’S WORK DISCLOSES SIGNIFICANT FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE; RESULTS IN ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS; AND PROMOTES DETERRENCE. WORK DISCLOSES SIGNIFICANT FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE AND RESULTS IN ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS OR OTHER SIGNIFICANT CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AS MEASURED BY THE FOLLOWING INDICATORS.

Indicator 2.1 The number and percentage of cases presented for enforcement actions that are accepted by enforcement officials will increase.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
FY 1998:	79 (69%)		<p>Status: Performance percentage similar to FY1999 with an increase in the number of cases presented.</p> <p>Explanation: The OIG receives and reviews allegations of fraudulent conduct involving funds disbursed through the Department’s programs and of misconduct by Department employees and contractors. Preliminary investigative activity determines which allegations have merit, and formal criminal, civil, and administrative investigations are initiated.</p> <p>In FY 99, the civil prosecutions of the clients of two financial aid consultants primarily accounted for the <u>increase</u> in their percentage of cases accepted for enforcement action. The percentage is calculated as the total number of cases accepted for an enforcement action divided by the number of cases presented to enforcement officials during the year.</p> <p>Source: Agents are required to report in a timely manner instances in which investigative cases are presented to, and accepted or declined for action by, enforcement officials. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> FY 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> Spring 2002.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Collected from agency data system.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Agents, supervisors and desk officers need to ensure that agents are reporting these items in an appropriate and timely fashion. Review of ICTS data as part the 90-day case review process includes reviewing the timely and accurate reporting of data.</p>
FY 1999:	82 (80%)	Continuing increase	
FY 2000:	140 (82%)	Continuing increase	
FY 2001:		Continuing increase	
FY 2002:			

Indicator 2.2 The number and percentage of presented cases resulting in enforcement actions (e.g., indictments, civil filings, convictions, adverse personnel actions, suspensions and debarments) will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: Number of cases resulting in enforcement action similar to the previous fiscal year with a lower percentage resulting in enforcement action.</p> <p>Explanation: In FY 2000, the civil prosecution of the clients of two financial aid consultants primarily accounted for the increase in the number of cases presented for enforcement action. The enforcement action taken as a result of the cases presented and accepted will often occur outside of the FY being measured. This results in fluctuations in the percentage figures for enforcement actions.</p> <p>Many investigations by the OIG result in prosecutorial activity (indictments, information, pre-trial diversions, and convictions), civil proceedings, personnel actions, and suspension and debarments. The percentage is calculated as the total number of enforcement actions divided by the number of cases presented for enforcement action in each fiscal year.</p>	<p>Source: Enforcement actions are initiated by sources outside the OIG. Therefore, the OIG relies on action and documentation from officials from the Department of Justice and the Department of Education. When enforcement actions occur, agents are required to report the items in the ICTS in a timely manner. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> FY 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> Spring 2002.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Collected from agency data system.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Agents, supervisors, and desk officers must ensure that these data are inputted in the ICTS system in a timely and accurate manner. Review of ICTS data as part the 90-day case review process adds to the timely and accurate reporting of data.</p>
FY 1998:	33 (29%)			
FY 1999:	50 (49%)	Continuing increase		
FY 2000:	48 (33%0)	Continuing increase		
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		
FY 2002:				

Indicator 2.3 The amount of monetary penalties, settlements, and recoveries will increase.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: Performance decreased from FY 1999.</p> <p>Explanation Given the nature of our investigative work, this indicator must be used judiciously and in conjunction with other indicators. Criminal prosecution is not undertaken primarily to recover money. We have deleted performance targets for monetary recoveries to avoid the appearance of a lack of objectivity.</p> <p>Enforcement actions that result in a conviction or civil settlements/judgments typically include court-ordered restitution and fines, and the payment of civil penalties. Additionally, OIG audits result in sustained questioned costs and sustained unsupported costs. These monetary figures are compiled into a total to determine a financial assessment of enforcement and corrective actions initiated by OIG work.</p>	<p>Source: Semiannual Report to Congress (Audit Tracking System, Investigative Tracking System, Common Audit Resolution System, and Department of Justice). <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> FY 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> Spring 2002.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Collected from agency data system.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Agents, auditors, supervisors, and desk officers must ensure that these data are inputted in the ICTS and ATS systems in a timely and accurate manner. Review of ICTS data as part of the 90-day case review process adds to the timely and accurate reporting of data.</p>
FY 1998:	\$67 million			
FY 1999:	\$24 million			
FY 2000:	\$51.3 million			
FY 2001:				
FY 2002:				
Indicator 2.4 The number and percentage of significant recommendations in compliance audits accepted.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Compliance audits accepted</i>			<p>Status: Performance improved from FY 1999. Increase occurred because of increased emphasis by the Department on resolution and follow-up. Some corrective actions take time to fully implement and others require additional information for auditors to fully resolve. Recommendations related to reports issued in prior fiscal years and for which corrective action was initiated may now just be at the completion stage.</p> <p>Explanation: Definitions of significant monetary and nonmonetary recommendations and calculation of percentages are the same as in Indicator 1.1 above. This information is only for jobs related to Goal 2.</p>	<p>Source: OIG audit files that are provided to our office by the regions and by the Department. A spreadsheet was prepared with the data that were used in determining this information. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> FY 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> Spring 2002.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Collected from agency data system.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The measure includes only recommendations from audit products. Significant recommendations from other OIG services, such as quick response projects and consulting, are not included in this measure. The classification of OIG work as Improvement or Integrity is somewhat subjective. Some work relates to both areas.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
FY 1998:	21 (75%)			
FY 1999:	10 (77%)	Continuing increase		
FY 2000:	27 (81%)	Continuing increase		
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		
FY 2002:				
<i>Compliance audits implemented</i>				
FY 1998:	8 (6%)			
FY 1999:	16 (13%)	Continuing increase		
FY 2000:	22 (79%)	Continuing increase		
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		
FY 2002:				

Indicator 2.5 The amount of dollar recoveries sustained versus recommended in Federal audits.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: Performance increased from FY 1999.</p> <p>Explanation: The percentage recoveries sustained may fluctuate from fiscal year to fiscal year. Dollars sustained do not always fall within the same fiscal year as when they were recommended</p> <p>This indicator measures OIG's sustainment rate. The dollars recommended for recovery in audits that were resolved during the fiscal year are compared with the dollars that the Department agreed should be recovered. The dollars recommended for recovery includes question costs, unsupported costs, and other recommended recoveries. Dollars recommended for recovery does not include better use of funds (BUF).</p>	<p>Source: OIG Audit Tracking System. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> FY 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> Spring 2002.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Collected from agency data system.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The measure includes only OIG audit products that contained dollar recoveries.</p>
FY 1998:	68%			
FY 1999:	47%	Continuing increase		
FY 2000:	70%	Continuing increase		
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		
FY 2002:				
Indicator 2.6 The degree to which resources (percentage of staff time) were deployed in accordance with the Work Plan.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: Change in performance from FY 1999 to FY 2000 reflects the increased emphasis on OIG Work Plan reviews of the Department's operations and EDP systems as shown in Indicator 1.3. Indicator 1.3 reflects a 23% increase in that area of our Workplan, which results in a corresponding decrease in indicator 2.4.</p> <p>Explanation: The OIG Work Plan baseline is at the start of the fiscal year, October 1. The actual performance achieved will never reach 100 percent because the Work Plan covers a 2-year period and new jobs are identified that take precedence for reasons such as risk or need for immediate completion. This number was calculated by taking the total number of staff hours that the office charged to jobs in the Work Plan and dividing it by the hours that were worked on for Goal 2</p>	<p>Source: OIG Time and Travel Reporting System <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> FY 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> Spring 2002.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Collected from agency data system.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Based on self-reported data generated by ED staff.</p>
FY 1998:	52%			
FY 1999:	54%	Continuing increase		
FY 2000:	28%	Continuing increase		
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		
FY 2002:				

