Archived Information

Office of the Inspector General (OIG) - 2002

Goal 8: FY 2002 OIG Performance Report

Objective 8.1 of 2: To Improve the Department's Programs and Operations.

ndicator 8.	1.1 of 5: Percentage of OIC	Work Plan Goal 1 a	assignments initiated	
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
% of first year Work Plan assignments initiated coinciding with the Performance Report			Status: Target not met	Additional Source Information: OIG Time and Travel Reporting
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Explanation: This is a new measure. While the target was substantially met, we will assess over time the appropriate target level.	System Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2003
	%	%		
2002	62	65		Data Available: November 2003 Information is validated internally.
ndicator 8.			assignments that yield significant	
	Targets and Performance	e Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quali
	ear Work Plan assignments in formance Report producing lations. Actual Performance		Explanation: Significant monetary recommendation is defined as recovering monetary amounts of questioned, unsupported, or other dollars of \$300,000 or more. It also	Additional Source Information: OIG Audit and Analysis and Inspection Reports Frequency: Other. Collection Period: 2003
rear		Targets		
2002	% 76	% 75		
			recommendation to establish/implement control techniques to prevent recurrence of the condition that results in the monetary finding or better use of funds of \$500,000 or more. Significant nonmonetary recommendation is a recommendation to establish/implement procedures or control techniques to (1) improve the effective or efficient delivery of program services; (2) safeguard assets or prevent fraud, waste, or abuse; or (3) improve the integrity, accuracy, and completeness of management data involving a program, or a significant component of any program, funded at \$500,000 or more annually	November 2003 Validation done internally. Limitations: The measure includes only recommendations from audit and inspection reports. Significant recommendations from other OIG services, suc as quick response projects and advice and technical assistance are not included in this measure.
	t accepted during the curr	ent fiscal year.	cant recommendations from OIG	
	Targets and Performance	e Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Qual
Significant recommendations accepted during the FY that coinciding with Report time frame. Accepted recommendations can be from OIG work in the current or a			Status: Target exceeded	Additional Source Information: OIG audit

previous fis	cal year.		1	<u>.</u>
Year 2002	Actual Performance % 99	Performance Targets % 80	269 recommendations	Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: November 2003 Internal OIG validation Limitations: Based on self-reported data generated by ED staff
	.1.4 of 5: The number and _l e by the Department.	percentage of signif	ficant recommendations implemen	nted within one year of
	Targets and Performance	e Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
.The signific	cant recommendations imple	mented during the	Status: Target exceeded Progress:	Additional Source Information: OIG audit and inspection records
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	i rogress.	Frequency: Annually.
	%	%	220 implemented	Collection Period: 2002
2002	82	70]	- 2003 Data Available: November 2003 Validated by OIOG personnel
	.1.5 of 5: Percentage of res Departmental programs ar		g that OIG Goal 1 activity had a fa	orable impact in
	Targets and Performance	e Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Response from surveyed program officials, senior managers, and selected members of Congress.			Information: A	Additional Source Information: Annual
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	development	survey
	%	%	Explanation: The OIG is	
2002		75	developing a more comprehensive survey, which is designed to provide information about OIG performance in a number of areas instead of the one overall impact measure.	

Objective 8.2 of 2: To Protect the Integrity of the Department's Programs and Operations.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 9: Percentage of OIG Work Plan Goal 2 assignments initiated.						
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality		
Percentage of first year Work Plan assignments initiated.			Status: Target exceeded	Additional Source		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Progress:	Information: OIG Time and Travel Reporting System		
2002	67	65]	1		
			287 cases	Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: November 2003 Data is validated		

				internally
!:4 0	0.0 of 0. Downstern of Old	2 Wards Blass Card O		
ndicator 8.	Targets and Performance		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of first year Work Plan assignments completed for the FY that produced significant recommendations			Status: Target not met Explanation: Number of goal 2	Additional Source Information: OIG audits and inspections
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	recommendations insufficient (1 of 2)for statistical significance	Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002
2002	% 50	% 75	_	- 2003 Data Available: November 2003 Data validated internally.
				Limitations: The measure includes only recommendations from audit and inspection reports. Significant recommendations from other OIG services, such as quick response projects and advice and technical assistance are not included in this measure.
	2.3 of 9: The number and pitive actions. Targets and Performance	<u>-</u>	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Qualit
Referrals du	uring the FY Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Status: Target exceeded Progress:	Additional Source Information: OIG Investigative Case Tracking System
	%	%	1	
2002	83	75	287 cases	Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: November 2003 Information is validated internally
	2.4 of 9: The number and tive actions that are accep		stigations that are referred for crin	ninal, civil, or
	Targets and Performance	e Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Measures, as based on close case universe		Status: Target not met	Additional Source	
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Progress: There was a Inform	Information: OIOG Investigative Case Tracking System
	%	%	statistic was derived. It is now based on the closed case	Frequency: Annually.
2002	68	85	universe that coincides with the Performance Report timelines. This is our baseline data and we will determine over time the	Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: November 2003

			appropriate annual target.	Data is validated internally
			oted cases that result in judicial ac suspensions and debarments).	tions (e.g. indictments,
	Targets and Performance	e Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Measure, a	s based on close case unive	rse	Status: Target exceeded	Additional Source Information: OIG Investigative Case Tracking System
	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	%	%	4	Frequency: Annually.
2002	83	80	J	Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: November 2003 Data is validated internally
Indicator 8	2.6 of 9: Amount of monet	ary penalties, settle	ements, and recoveries.	Į.
	Targets and Performance	e Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Amount of court-ordered or administrative penalties/settlements and actual monetary recoveries from investigations. Performance			Explanation: Given the nature of our investigative work, this indicator must be used	Additional Source Information: Semi- annual Report to Congress (Audit Tracking System, Investigative
Year	Actual Performance	Targets	judiciously and in conjunction with other indicators. Criminal prosecution is not undertaken primarily to recover money. We	Case Tracking System, Common Audit Resolution System, and Department of Justice).
2002	Millions 34.38	No Target		
			have deleted performance targets for monetary recoveries to avoid the appearance of a lack of objectivity.	Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: November 2003 Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies. Numbers are validated internally and by the department of Justice.
	cepted by the Department	during the current f	1	r
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
significant recommendations accepted during FY 2002. Accepted recommendations can be from OIG work in the current or a previous fiscal year			Status: Target exceeded Progress:	Additional Source Information: OIG audits and inspections
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets %	68 recommendations	Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
2002	% 68	% 80	1	Data Available:
2002		- 55]	November 2003 Data is validated internally

			icant monetary recommendation	<u> </u>
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
monetary compliance recommendations implemented			Status: Target exceeded	Additional Source
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Progress:	Information: OIG audit and inspection reports
2002	% 100	% 80	3 recommendations	Frequency: Annually. Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 Data Available: November 2003 Information is validated internally Limitations: Not a statistically significant number of recommendations.
	.2.9 of 9: Percentage of res the integrity of the Departi		g that OIG Goal 2 activity had a fa d operations.	avorable impact in
	Targets and Performance	e Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
% of surveyed program officials, senior managers, selected members of Congress and their staffs.			Status: Unable to judge	Additional Source Information: survey
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Progress: New survey is being developed.	results Frequency: Annually.
	%	%	Explanation: The OIG is	Collection Period: 2002
2002		75	developing a more comprehensive survey, which is designed to provide information about OIG performance in a	- 2003 Data Available: November 2003