

Section III

Evaluations and Additional Information

Overview

This section contains a description of major program evaluations completed during FY 2014, a list of acronyms used in this report, and a list of Department websites. A program evaluation, as defined in OMB Circular A-11, is an individual, systematic study to assess how well a program is working to achieve intended results or outcomes. Program evaluations are often conducted by experts external to the program either inside or outside an agency. Evaluations can help policymakers and agency managers strengthen the design and operation of programs and can help determine how best to spend taxpayer dollars effectively and efficiently. Most Department evaluations are conducted either by the Office of the Inspector General or the Government Accountability Office.

Major Program Evaluations Completed During FY 2014

Office of the Inspector General (OIG) Risk Assessment of DOJ Charge Card Programs

The OIG released a report in FY 2014 that assessed the risk of misuse of the Department's charge cards. The assessment identified specific issues relating to purchasing methods and recommended that DOJ take additional actions to reduce the risk of illegal, improper, or erroneous purchases and payments. The OIG's report covered four types of purchasing methods used by DOJ: (1) purchase cards, which are generally centrally billed accounts used to buy items and services; (2) travel cards, which are usually individually billed accounts used by employees to pay for costs associated with official travel; (3) integrated cards, which combine the features of purchase and travel cards in a single account (within DOJ, integrated cards are used only by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF)); and (4) convenience checks, which can be written from specially-designated purchase or integrated card accounts to pay for goods and services from vendors that do not accept charge cards.

DOJ employees used these four methods to purchase a total of more than \$900 million in goods and services in fiscal year 2013. The report identified specific areas where DOJ may need to take action to reduce the risk of illegal, improper or erroneous purchases and payments. The report also found that DOJ needs to ensure that charge card bills are reconciled properly and that card holders receive the required training regarding the use of their centrally billed accounts. Additionally, OIG found a limited number of instances where charge card accounts had not been closed after the employee had left service.

The OIG made four recommendations to DOJ and its components to improve internal controls and help reduce the risk of fraud, waste, and misuse in this area. These recommendations included ensuring that card holders receive required training and that appropriate officials are

notified when employees leave service so they may promptly close the accounts. DOJ agreed with all four recommendations.

OIG Review of the U.S. Government's Handling of Intelligence Information Leading Up to the Boston Marathon Bombings

Following the April 15, 2013 Boston Marathon bombings, the Intelligence Community Inspectors General Forum, with the support of the Director of National Intelligence, determined that the Inspectors General of the Intelligence Community, CIA, DHS, and DOJ would conduct a coordinated review of the handling and sharing of information available to the U.S. Government prior to the bombings. The review examined the information available to the U.S. government before the bombings and the information sharing protocols and procedures followed between and among the intelligence and law enforcement agencies. In a report issued in April 2014, the OIGs concluded that the FBI, CIA, DHS, and the National Counterterrorism Center generally shared information and followed procedures appropriately. They identified a few areas where broader information sharing between agencies may have been required, or where broader information sharing in the future should be considered.

OIG Report on the FBI Laboratory

The OIG issued a third report (published since 1997) related to alleged irregularities by the FBI Laboratory. The report addresses the effort by the Department from 1996 to 2004 to remedy improprieties in the lab analysis of evidence, or in the testimony by FBI Laboratory personnel, that was used to support convictions in federal and state criminal cases. Based on a congressional request, the OIG analyzed how a Department Task Force in operation during 1996 through 2004 managed the identification, review and follow-up of cases involving their use in criminal prosecutions of scientifically unsupportable analysis and overstated testimony by 13 FBI Laboratory examiners the Task Force determined had been criticized in an OIG report published in 1997. The OIG had found serious deficiencies in the Department's and FBI's design, implementation, and overall management of the case review process. The OIG's report found that the Department and FBI had not taken sufficient steps to ensure that the capital cases were the Task Force's top priority and were treated with urgency; the Task Force did not review all cases involving an FBI Laboratory examiner who been identified in the OIG's 1997 report to be consistently problematic; and that the Department failed to ensure that prosecutors made appropriate and timely disclosures to affected defendants, particularly in cases where the prosecutor determined that FBI Laboratory analysis or testimony was material to the conviction and the report of the independent scientists established that such evidence was unreliable. While the OIG noted that almost all of the problems it identified with the Department's and the FBI's design and management of the FBI Laboratory case review occurred over 15 years, the Department and FBI have worked cooperatively with the OIG to expedite potentially remedial actions regarding additional review of cases and notification to defendants whose convictions may have been tainted by unreliable scientific analyses and testimony.

OIG Report on FBI Sentinel Program

The OIG issued its 10th report on Sentinel, the FBI's electronic information and case management system, since its development began in 2006. Since its initial deployment in July 2012, Sentinel's budget has increased from \$451 million to \$551.4 million. This OIG report examined Sentinel's effect on the FBI's daily operations, while reviewing the project costs and updates made since July 2012. The FBI employees surveyed for this audit reported that Sentinel has had an overall positive impact on the FBI's operations. Sentinel users surveyed did, however, express dissatisfaction with two major functions of Sentinel: search and indexing.

Sentinel's search function is intended to provide users the capability to locate cases and specific case-related information within Sentinel. The OIG found that only 42 percent of the respondents to the OIG's survey who used Sentinel's search functionality often received the results they needed. Sentinel users also expressed concerns with the system's indexing function, which involves the relationship between any two identifiers, such as the relationship between a person and that person's address. Forty-one percent of survey respondents reported that they spent more time indexing in Sentinel than they did in the FBI's Automated Case Support system, the system that Sentinel replaced. A majority of the Special Agents surveyed reported that Sentinel actually decreased their daily productivity and attributed this to the increased administrative burden posed by indexing, which has left them with less time for investigative activities. More than a third of the survey respondents also reported that Sentinel was missing features that they believed are critical to their duties, including features related to Sentinel's integration with other FBI Information Technology systems. The OIG made three new recommendations to help the FBI ensure that its business processes are aligned with Sentinel's design and functionalities, and that Sentinel's search and indexing functions efficiently meet the needs of its employees. The FBI agreed with the recommendations.

Government Accounting Office (GAO) Review of Resource and Coordination Efforts of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF)

The GAO evaluated ATF's priorities for criminal investigations, how those priorities have changed since ATF was transferred from the Department of Treasury to DOJ in 2003, its staffing, and the extent to which it uses data to monitor the timeliness and outcomes of "delayed denial investigations" (i.e. investigations of persons who improperly purchased firearms when the background check did not initially determine that the individual is legally prohibited from possessing a firearm). The resulting report, "Enhancing ATF Data Collection to Improve the Management of Investigation," recommended ATF develop a mechanism to better monitor the timeliness and outcomes of delayed denial investigations. ATF concurred and took immediate steps—via policy changes and the development of new queries for its case management system—to improve data collection and oversight of these investigations. These steps will allow supervisors in the field to closely monitor individual cases and managers at headquarters to monitor trends and conduct programmatic reviews. ATF is also in the process of developing a new case management system that will have even more robust data collection and analysis capabilities.

OIG Audit of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) Adjudication of Registrant Actions

In May 2014, the OIG released a review of DEA's process to adjudicate administrative actions against businesses and professionals that register with the DEA to handle controlled substances. The OIG report found that the DEA's adjudicative process comports with applicable laws and regulations but the overall time it takes the DEA to adjudicate registrant actions is very lengthy. The OIG also found that DEA generally does not have timeliness standards in place and, where it does, the agency consistently failed to meet them. The Controlled Substances Act of 1970 requires registration with the DEA by businesses that import, export, manufacture, or distribute controlled substances; health care practitioners entitled to dispense, administer, or prescribe controlled pharmaceuticals; and pharmacies entitled to fill prescriptions. If the DEA finds that a registrant or applicant has violated the law, it may issue an order to show a cause why registration should not be revoked, suspended, or denied. If the violation poses an imminent threat to public health or safety, the DEA may issue an immediate suspension order, which deprives the registrant of the right to deal in controlled substances immediately. Orders to show cause and immediate suspension orders are collectively known as "registrant actions."

The OIG issued three recommendations in the report to improve the DEA's ability to effectively and efficiently adjudicate all registrant actions in a timely manner and mitigate the potential adverse effects of delays on the DEA, registrants, and the public. The recommendations were as follows:

1. Establish timeliness guidelines for adjudicating all orders to show cause.
2. Establish policy and procedures, including timeliness guidelines, for forwarding a case to the Office of the Administrator for final decision when a hearing is waived or terminated.
3. Institute a formal process for tracking the timeliness of each adjudication from the initial registration action to the DEA's final decision and for periodically assessing timeliness.

DEA continues to address the remaining two recommendations.

OIG Review of the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces Fusion Center (OFC)

In 2014 the OIG completed a Review of the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces Fusion Center. The OIG conducted this review to examine the OFC's operations and assess its process for sharing its analytical products. The review's scope included aspects of DEA's Special Operations Division (SOD) and the International Organized Crime Intelligence and Operations Center that relate to the OFC's mission. After the review was completed, it provided several recommendations that were intended to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of operations and the utility of its analytic products. The recommendations were that the OFC

- 1) establish procedures to identify and prioritize requests in investigations with a nexus to high-value drug trafficking targets, such as targets linked to CPOTs and their associates;
- 2) work with SOD to define the management and workflow responsibilities of the SOD/OFC Section (OSF), including what actions the OSF section can and should take to allow appropriate information sharing between SOD and OFC and increase the intelligence value of OFC products;
- 3) improve the capabilities of its product workflow system or make other process improvements

to collect accurate product workflow data on product requests and disseminations processed by the OSF section at SOD; 4) modify the warning statement on OFC products and provide additional guidance to make clear the conditions under which investigators may show the products to federal prosecutors; 5) work with its member agencies to revise its staffing agreements to further encourage member agencies to assign experienced Intelligence Analysts to the center and minimize vacancies in Intelligence Analyst positions; 6) develop and implement consistent approval standards for OFC products and explore ways to further streamline the approval process; 7) establish written protocols on how to process product requests if OFC staff members are unable to establish contact with the requester within a reasonable period of time; and 8) develop and implement product feedback mechanisms that will enable the OFC to gather substantive information on how the products contributed to investigations, including suggestions for improvement. OCDETF has responded to all of the recommendations and provided a recent status update in December 2014.

OIG Evaluation of the Bureau of Prison's (BOP) Efforts to Prevent Sexual Abuse of Inmates by Staff

The OIG undertook an evaluation of BOP's efforts to deter staff sexual abuse of inmates. It was recommended that BOP develop and/or clarify procedures and guidelines for safeguarding and treating victims of sexual abuse by staff, ensure that reporting mechanisms for sexual abuse of inmates by staff are in place and fully utilized when necessary by reporting parties, and improve training in managing female offenders and for female staff in male prisons. Where necessary, revise and update any documentation, including the Special Investigative Supervisors (SIS) Manual, and training courses pertaining to this issue. It was further recommended that BOP establish a national goal for reducing staff sexual abuse of federal inmates and that prison officials should periodically conduct operational reviews to assess the strengths and weaknesses of their sexual abuse prevention program. Finally, wardens should conduct after-action reviews of their responses to criminal staff sexual abuse incidents and that a letter to the U.S. Probation Office be part of the pre-sentencing investigative report for each BOP staff member convicted of a sexual abuse crime.

With the exception of clarifying guidance in the program statement and SIS Manual surrounding procedures for reporting staff sexual abuse, all the recommendations have been addressed.

OIG Review of BOP Employee Discipline System

The objectives of the review were to determine how BOP investigates allegations of employee misconduct and disciplines employees who are found to have committed misconduct.

Recommendations for this review include the following:

- Reinforce the existing policy that BOP employees report allegations of employee misconduct to the proper authorities as required.
- Require that BOP Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) forward cases with sustained allegations through the full adjudicative phase.
- Ensure that when the deciding official mitigates the proposed discipline, the decision letter contains an adequate explanation of the reasons.

- Remove the CEO from reviewing and approving investigative reports of employee misconduct for cases in which they will act as the deciding official by implementing an alternative review process that preserves the independence of the investigative and adjudicative phases.
- Reinforce the existing policy that all required documents be maintained in the inmate's disciplinary files.
- Develop procedures to ensure that discipline is imposed consistently BOP-wide, and review discipline for consistency across the agency periodically after these procedures are implemented.
- Establish written time guidelines for the investigative and adjudicative phases of the disciplinary process.
- Require that the BOP Program Review Division periodically review a sample of closed disciplinary case files.

With the exception of the recommendation asking for the development of procedures to ensure that discipline is imposed consistently, the evaluation was closed on December 19, 2013. The remaining open recommendation will be closed once the OIG is provided a copy of the reference guidance memorandum or directive that describes the process and the procedures BOPS's regional offices and the Labor Management Relations Board will take to complete this annual random sample review.

OIG Audit of the National Institute of Justice's (NIJ) Oversight of the Solving Cold Cases with DNA Program

The OIG conducted this audit to evaluate NIJ's oversight of its Cold Case DNA program. The audit covered Cold Case DNA program awards from FYs 2010 through 2012. The OIG also conducted six external grant audits of Cold Case DNA program recipients to determine whether reimbursements were allowable and to evaluate program performance and accomplishments.

The primary objectives of this audit was to 1) evaluate the NIJ's implementation and oversight of the Solving Cold Cases with DNA Grant Programs; 2) determine the reduction in the number of unanalyzed "cold cases" as a result of NIJ funding, and 3) evaluate the level of reliance each grantee has on NIJ funding to solve cold cases and the future sustainability of grantee cold case efforts. The OIG made three recommendations to assist NIJ in its oversight of the Cold Case DNA program. The OIG recommended that NIJ:

1. Enhance its monitoring efforts to include verification of the allowable uses of funds. Put \$651,949 in unspent funds to a better use.
2. Enhance its monitoring efforts of Federal Financial Reports, drawdowns, and Grant Adjustment Notices to include identification of issues related to program implementation, including no or slow spending and multiple requests for program extensions or scope changes.
3. Enhance its monitoring efforts to include verification of the accuracy of performance reporting. This included requiring Cold Case DNA program award recipients to submit supporting documentation for the performance metrics along with progress reports.

Evaluation of Services for Domestic Minor Victims of Human Trafficking

RTI International conducted a participatory process evaluation of three programs funded by the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Victims of Crime (OVC) to identify and provide services to victims of sex and labor trafficking who are U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents under the age of eighteen. The following programs were included in the evaluation; Standing Against Global Exploitation Everywhere Project (San Francisco), the Salvation Army Trafficking Outreach Program and Intervention Techniques Program (Chicago), and the Streetwork Project at Safe Horizon (New York).

The goals of the evaluation were to document program implementation in three programs, identifying promising practices for service delivery programs, and inform delivery of current and future efforts to serve this population; particularly describing the service needs and experiences of young people within the programs. The evaluation found OVC-funded programs demonstrated success in connecting to some young people, though the diversity amongst trafficked minors made it a struggle to reach others. As a result, it is unlikely that a single program can meet the needs of all minor victims. The programs applied unique strategies to engage minors and respond to their needs. RFI International recommended strategies for improving coordinated community response; continued development of trafficking-specific programs; enhancements to service delivery to trafficked young people; enhancements for support and long-term self-sufficiency for trafficked young people; and strategies for law enforcement, juvenile justice, child welfare and education.

Las Vegas Smart Policing Initiative: Impact of Police Saturation

The University of Nevada – Las Vegas conducted a process and impact evaluation to examine the effectiveness of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department's (LVMPD) Saturation Team. Over the course of the Las Vegas Smart Policing Initiative (SPI) project, the Saturation Team conducted directed patrol and other proactive activities in 12 hot spots located within LVMPD's jurisdiction. The impact evaluation addressed: (1) the impact of the Saturation Team on calls for service in those hot spots, and (2) the impact of the Saturation Team on citizen perceptions of crime and police activity.

The evaluation utilized an experimental design. Twenty-four hot spots of crime and disorder were identified within LVMPD's jurisdiction. Twelve of these hot spots were randomly assigned to receive the Saturation Team's intervention while the remaining 12 served as the control group. The Saturation Team operated in each hot spot of the experimental group for a period of 60 days. The calls for service analyses produced mixed results. Some analyses suggested that calls for disorderly offenses were lower in experimental areas, but these results were not consistent. Other analyses suggested that calls for certain types of offenses increased in experimental areas, but it is unclear whether this was due to differences in actual criminal activity or to the influence of police presence on citizens' willingness to call the police. Survey data indicate that residents in the experimental areas reported seeing police more often than those in the control areas. Residents in the experimental areas also reported seeing police interact with citizens more often.

Effectiveness of Correctional Education, and Where Do We Go From Here? The Results of a Comprehensive Evaluation

The RAND Corporation completed an evaluation designed to measure the effectiveness of correctional education for incarcerated adults and juveniles, and to understand concerns and emerging needs. The RAND Corporation comprehensively examined the current state of correctional education for incarcerated adults and juveniles, current and emerging trends in the field, and what can be done to improve the field moving forward. The goals of this evaluation were met. The study shows that correctional education for incarcerated adults reduces the risk of post-release re-incarceration (by 13 percentage points) and does so cost-effectively (a savings of five dollars on re-incarceration costs for every dollar spent on correctional education). And when it comes to post-release employment for adults—another outcome key to successful reentry—researchers found that correctional education may increase such employment.

Key insights from the survey include the recognition that the 2008 recession and its long aftermath have had dramatic and negative effects on correctional education spending; that there is a growing emphasis on providing vocational education programming that will lead to industry or nationally recognized certifications; that the importance of computer technology in correctional education is growing but use of technology is mixed and access to the Internet by incarcerated students is very limited; that states have significant concerns about how ready they are to implement the new 2014 General Education Development (GED) exam and computer-based testing; and that while a large number of states are providing postsecondary education, most is paid for by inmates or their families, not by states or the federal government.

Acronyms

A

ABT	Aryan Brotherhood of Texas
ACTS	Automated Case Tracking System
AFF/SADF	Assets Forfeiture Fund and Seized Asset Deposit Fund
AMBER	America's Missing: Broadcasting Emergency Response
APP	Annual Performance Report
APR	Annual Performance Plan
ATF	Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives
ATR	Antitrust Division

B

BIA	Board of Immigration Appeals
BJA	Bureau of Justice Assistance
BOP	Bureau of Prisons

C

CASE	Case Access System for EOIR
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CEOS	Child Exploitation Obscenity Section
CI	Counterintelligence
CISPP	Counterintelligence Strategic Partnership Program
CIV	Civil Division
COPS	Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
CPC	Capacity Planning Committee
CPOT	Consolidated Priority Organization Target
CRM	Criminal Division
CRS	Community Relations Service
CRT	Civil Rights Division
CTAS	Coordinated Tribal Assistance Solicitation

D

DC	District of Columbia
DCTAT	Data Collection and Technical Assistance Tool
DEA	Drug Enforcement Administration

DHS Department of Homeland Security
DOJ Department of Justice

E

ENRD Environment and Natural Resources Division
EOIR Executive Office for Immigration Review
EOUSA Executive Office for the United States Attorneys

F

FASAB Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
FBI Federal Bureau of Investigation
FBWT Fund Balance with U.S. Treasury
FCSC Foreign Claims Settlement Commission
FPI Federal Prison Industries, Inc.
FTE Full-Time Equivalent
FY Fiscal Year

G

GAO Government Accountability Office
GPRAMA GPRAMA Modernization Act of 2010

H

HRSP Human Rights and Special Prosecution Section

I

ICITAP International Criminal Investigative Training Assistance Program
ICM Interactive Case Management System
IHP Institutional Hearing Program
INTERPOL International Criminal Police Organization
ISRAA Integrated Statistical Reporting and Analysis Application

L

LVMPD Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

M

MAR Monthly Administrative Report

N

N/A Not Applicable
NCIC National Crime Information Center
NCMEC National Center for Missing and Exploited Children
NGIC National Gang Intelligence Center
NIBIN National Integrated Ballistic Information Network
NICS National Instant Criminal Background Check System
NIPF National Intelligence Priority Framework
NSD National Security Division

O

OBDs Offices, Boards and Divisions
OCDETF Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces
OIG Office of the Inspector General
OJP Office of Justice Programs
OJJDP Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
OMB Office of Management and Budget
OPA Office of the Pardon Attorney
OSG Office of the Solicitor General
OTJ Office of Tribal Justice
OVW Office on Violence Against Women

P

PDS Psychology Data System

R

RDAP Residential Drug Abuse Program
RMIS Resource Management Information System

S

SCA	Second Chance Act
SENTRY	Bureau of Prisons' primary mission-support database
SIS	Special Investigative Supervisors
SOD	Special Operations Division
SOIC	Sex Offender Investigation Coordinator
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
SSA	Security Sector Assistance

T

TAX	Tax Division
TNLC	Tribal Nations Leadership Council

U

USAO	United States Attorneys' Offices
USC	United States Code
USMS	United States Marshals Service
UST	United States Trustee

V

VAWA	Violence Against Women Act
------	----------------------------

Department Component Websites

Component	Website
American Indian and Alaska Native Affairs Desk (OJP)	www.ojp.usdoj.gov/programs/aiana.htm
Antitrust Division	www.justice.gov/atr/index.html
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives	www.atf.gov/
Bureau of Justice Assistance (OJP)	www.bja.gov/
Bureau of Justice Statistics (OJP)	www.bjs.gov/
Civil Division	www.justice.gov/civil/index.html
Civil Rights Division	www.justice.gov/crt/
Community Oriented Policing Services - COPS	www.cops.usdoj.gov/
Community Capacity Development Office (OJP)	www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ccdo/welcome_flash.html
Community Relations Service	www.justice.gov/crs/index.html
Criminal Division	www.justice.gov/criminal/
Diversion Control Program	www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/
Drug Enforcement Administration	www.justice.gov/dea/
Environment and Natural Resources Division	www.justice.gov/enrd/
Executive Office for Immigration Review	www.justice.gov/eoir/
Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys	www.justice.gov/usao/eousa/
Executive Office for U.S. Trustees	www.justice.gov/ust/
Federal Bureau of Investigation	www.fbi.gov/
Federal Bureau of Prisons	www.bop.gov/
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States	www.justice.gov/fcsc/
INTERPOL Washington	www.justice.gov/interpol-washington/
Justice Management Division	www.justice.gov/jmd/
National Criminal Justice Reference Service (OJP)	www.ncjrs.gov/
National Institute of Corrections	www.nicic.gov/
National Institute of Justice (OJP)	www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/
National Security Division	www.justice.gov/nsd/
Office of the Associate Attorney General	www.justice.gov/asg/index.html
Office of the Attorney General	www.justice.gov/ag/
Office of the Deputy Attorney General	www.justice.gov/dag/
Office of Information Policy	www.justice.gov/oip/oip.html
Office of the Inspector General	www.justice.gov/oig/
Office of Intelligence Policy and Review	www.justice.gov/nsd/oipr-redirect.htm
Office of Justice Programs	www.ojp.usdoj.gov/
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJP)	www.ojjdp.gov/
Office of Legal Counsel	www.justice.gov/olc/index.html
Office of Legal Policy	www.justice.gov/olp/
Office of Legislative Affairs	www.justice.gov/ola/
Office of the Pardon Attorney	www.justice.gov/pardon/
Office of Professional Responsibility	www.justice.gov/opr/index.html
Office of Public Affairs	www.justice.gov/opa/index.html
Office of the Solicitor General	www.justice.gov/osg/
Office of Tribal Justice	www.justice.gov/otj/index.html
Office for Victims of Crime (OJP)	www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ovc/
Office on Violence Against Women	www.ovv.usdoj.gov/
Tax Division	www.justice.gov/tax/
U.S. Attorneys	www.justice.gov/usao/
U.S. Marshals Service	www.justice.gov/marshals/
U.S. Parole Commission	www.justice.gov/uspc/