



**U.S. DEPARTMENT
OF EDUCATION**
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Semiannual Report to Congress, No. 61

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Kathleen S. Tighe

Inspector General

November 2010

This report is in the public domain. Authorization to reproduce it in whole or in part is granted. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, the citation should be: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Inspector General, *Semiannual Report to Congress, No. 61*.

Please Note:

The Inspector General's *Semiannual Report to Congress, No. 61* is available on the ED/OIG Web site at www.ed.gov/offices/oig.

Message to Congress

On behalf of the U.S. Department of Education (Department) Office of Inspector General (OIG), I am pleased to provide this Semiannual Report on the activities and accomplishments of this office from April 1, 2010, through September 30, 2010. The audits, inspections, investigations, and related work highlighted in the report are products of our continuing commitment to promoting accountability, efficiency, and effectiveness in Department programs and operations.

Over the last 6 months, OIG issued 28 audit products that identified nearly \$600,000 in financial recommendations. We also closed 64 investigations of fraud or corruption involving Department programs and operations, securing more than \$36 million in settlements, fines, restitutions, recoveries, forfeitures/seizures, and savings.

As you know, OIG work has garnered attention during the last 6 months, particularly in the area of higher education. I was honored to testify before two Congressional committees on our higher education efforts, and I appreciated the opportunity to describe the long history of work this office has conducted to help improve the performance of the Federal student aid programs. We will continue to focus significant audit, inspection, and investigative resources in this vital area throughout fiscal year (FY) 2011 to help ensure that Federal student aid programs operate as effectively as possible so that students entitled to receive these funds can make their dreams of a higher education a reality.

Another significant area is our work related to the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009* (Recovery Act). We are well into the second phase of our Recovery Act efforts, which is examining use of funds and the quality of the data reported by States and subrecipients. The response to our efforts continues to be very positive, with a number of State and local educational agencies taking immediate action to address our findings and implement our recommendations. We were also pleased to have completed an assignment with a number of our IG colleagues for the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board on the quality of data reported by Recovery Act recipients. This effort identified areas for improvement to help enhance the quality of data being reported by Recovery Act recipients. In addition, as expected, allegations of possible fraud related to Recovery Act funds are increasing as Recovery Act dollars are expended and have thus far resulted in our opening 39 cases for criminal and civil investigation.

OIG also completed other important work over the last 6 months that we describe in this Semiannual Report. This includes reviews of the Federal Student Aid office's (FSA) capacity to effectively process and manage the increased number of student loans made and serviced under the William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program. Our efforts found that FSA had sufficient capacity and processes in place to manage the increases in volume it anticipated, but we cautioned that it

should regularly review volume capacity and enhance its systems accordingly if the actual loan volume is higher than estimated. We also issued a report calling on the Department and the Pennsylvania Department of Education to designate the Philadelphia School District as a high-risk grantee. We believe that this recommendation was warranted due to recent audit findings at the Philadelphia School District and the need for the District to ensure that the Federal funds it expends reach the intended recipients and achieve the desired results. We also had significant investigative results involving fraud in the Federal student aid program and fraudulent activity within SEAs, LEAs, and their contractors. We describe some of the more significant cases in this report.

I have now completed my first 6 months as Inspector General of this organization, and I am very pleased with the work we have conducted and the direction in which we are heading. In addition to the audit and related work we present in this report, we also issued key reports that provide insight into our goals and strategies for the years ahead, including our Strategic Plan for FY 2011 through FY 2015. The Strategic Plan provides the roadmap by which we plan to accomplish our mission over the next 5 years; our Annual Plan for FY 2011 presents the major initiatives and priorities this office intends to undertake to assist the Department in fulfilling its responsibilities to America's taxpayers and students; and our FY 2011 Management Challenges report discusses the most significant challenges facing the Department. Through the audits, inspections, investigations and other reviews, and the overall direction we present in these reports, we will continue to tackle areas of concern within the Department's programs and operations and recommend actions the Department should take to address any weaknesses that our efforts identify.

We greatly appreciate the interest and support of the Congress, Secretary Duncan, and Deputy Secretary Miller. We look forward to working with you in meeting the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead.



Kathleen S. Tighe
Inspector General

Table of Contents

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| OVERVIEW | 1 |
| RECOVERY ACT EFFORTS | 3 |
| Internal Reports | 4 |
| External Reports | 5 |
| Report Coordinated with the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board | 6 |
| Investigations | 7 |
| FEDERAL STUDENT AID PROGRAMS AND OPERATIONS | 9 |
| FSA Operations | 9 |
| FSA Program Participants | 10 |
| Congressional Testimony | 12 |
| Investigations | 13 |
| ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS | 19 |
| Elementary and Secondary Education | 19 |
| State Educational Agencies | 19 |
| Local Educational Agencies | 19 |
| Adult Education | 20 |
| Investigations | 20 |
| INTERNAL DEPARTMENTAL OPERATIONS | 23 |
| Information Technology Security and Management | 23 |
| Contract Reviews | 24 |
| Other Internal Reports | 25 |
| Non-Federal Audits | 25 |
| Noteworthy OIG Efforts | 26 |
| CAROI Guide | 26 |
| Hugh Monaghan Honored | 26 |
| FY 2010 CIGIE Award Winners | 26 |
| ANNEXES | 30 |
| REQUIRED TABLES | 31 |

We present the work that OIG concluded during this reporting period in five sections: (1) efforts associated with the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009* (Recovery Act); (2) Federal student aid programs and operations; (3) elementary, secondary, and adult education programs; (4) other internal operations, including information technology (IT) security and management; and (5) a compilation of tables of the audits, inspections, investigations, and other reports we completed during this reporting period, as required by the *Inspector General Act of 1978*, as amended (*IG Act*).

RECOVERY ACT EFFORTS

As a result of the Recovery Act's increase in education funding, the Department, State and territorial educational agencies (SEAs), more than 13,800 public school districts, and all other Recovery Act fund recipients must provide adequate management and oversight of and effective accounting for how those funds are expended. During this reporting period, we issued several reports focused on Departmental management of specific Recovery Act operations, including a review of the Department's implementation of the Recovery Act's State Fiscal Stabilization Fund and the Race to the Top peer review process, both of which found the Department to be in compliance with applicable laws and regulations but also identified areas for further improvement. In addition, we issued reports on Recovery Act-related efforts in two States: Louisiana's internal controls over Recovery Act funding and Wisconsin's use of Recovery Act funds. You will find more on these reviews in the Recovery Act section of this report, along with summaries of some of our investigative cases involving Recovery Act funds.

FEDERAL STUDENT AID PROGRAMS AND OPERATIONS

The Federal student aid programs underwent a major change this year with the passage of legislation prohibiting the origination of new Federal Family Education Loan Program (FFELP) loans after June 30, 2010, and requiring that all new Federal student loans formerly originated under the FFELP now be originated under the William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program (Direct Loan Program.) We completed two reviews related to the Direct Loan Program: an assessment of the Department's efforts to ensure the effective processing of student loans under the Direct Loan Program; and a technical assessment of the Department's loan origination processing system capacity and contingency plans. In both efforts, we found the Department's efforts to be appropriate, but we recommended it continue to monitor and enhance its capabilities as necessary. We also issued two reports related to the *Ensuring Continued Access to Student Loans Act of 2008* (ECASLA) that identified actions that the Department must take to fully comply with specific provisions of the law's requirements, and a review of lender agreements involving two proprietary institutions that found violations of the

lender inducement provisions of the *Higher Education Act of 1965*, as amended (HEA). You will find more on the findings of our work involving Federal student aid programs and operations, as well as summaries of Inspector General Tigue's testimony before two Congressional committees, and information on our more significant investigative cases of fraud involving Federal student aid program funds in this section of the report.

ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS

We concluded several reviews involving specific SEAs and a local educational agency (LEA), including the Arkansas Department of Career Education's use of Federal adult education funds in which we identified more than \$500,000 in unsupported costs and the Georgia Department of Education's ED Facts submissions in which we identified weaknesses in data quality and reporting processes. We also issued a special report calling for the Department to work with the Pennsylvania Department of Education to designate the Philadelphia School District as a high-risk grantee. You will find more details on these reports, as well as summaries of some of our more significant investigations involving fraud or corruption in Federal education programs in this section of our report.

INTERNAL DEPARTMENTAL OPERATIONS

We have highlighted the audits and reviews we completed regarding the Department's IT security and management and other internal operations in this section of this report. These efforts identified weaknesses regarding specific aspects of the Department's 10-year, \$500 million IT infrastructure contract known as the Education Department Utility for Communications, Applications, and Technology Environment, or EDUCATE, including ineffective implementation of the Managed Security Services Provider contract and discrepancies in the vendor's desktop services pricing. We also provide summaries of our review of Departmental controls over the transit benefits program; weaknesses involving the Department's process for handling compromised privileged accounts; its ability to prevent the bypassing of Web filters in order to access blocked Web sites; and the results of our quality control reviews of single audits of Department grantees and Federal student aid program participants. Finally, we provide information on other noteworthy OIG efforts, including recent acknowledgements and awards for our staff, services, and products.

REQUIRED TABLES

The final section of our report provides a compilation of tables of the audits, inspections, other reports, and investigations we concluded over the last 6 months, as required by the *IG Act*.

Copies of the reports discussed in this Semiannual Report to Congress are available on the OIG Web site. For more information on our work and activities, please contact the OIG Congressional Liaison at (202) 245-7023 or visit our Web site at www.ed.gov/oig.

Recovery Act Efforts

The Recovery Act was signed into law on February 17, 2009, and provides approximately \$98.2 billion in new funding for Department programs and operations, including programs authorized by the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*, as amended (ESEA), the HEA, the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004*, as amended, and the *Rehabilitation Act of 1973*. In August 2010, Congress passed legislation that included the Education Jobs Fund, which appropriated \$10 billion in additional support for local school districts to prevent teacher layoffs and to help offset reductions in State and local education budgets. Together, these two initiatives provide an unprecedented level of Federal education funding for State and local education operations, and we will work to ensure that funding is properly monitored and accounted for, and achieves the desired results.

As discussed in previous Semiannual Reports to Congress, OIG staff continues to work with Department leaders and our counterparts in the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and other Federal agencies to evaluate whether Recovery Act dollars are expended in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and Department guidance. During this reporting period, we continued to participate as a member of the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board (Recovery Board) and we led a multi-agency review of the processes used by Recovery Act recipients for compiling and reporting selected data. We discuss the findings of this effort below. We also continued to participate in an advisory capacity on a Department Recovery Act work group and worked closely with the Department to create materials aimed at helping Recovery Act fund recipients identify potential waste, fraud, and abuse, and report any suspicions to the OIG immediately. We created a special fraud awareness tutorial, Q&As, and fraud awareness posters and flyers, which we provided to SEAs, LEAs, and other grant recipients and made available on the Department's and our Web sites.

Over the last 6 months, OIG continued with the second phase of our Recovery Act work, conducting audits at the State and local levels (i.e., Governors' offices, SEAs, LEAs, and other grantees) to determine whether Recovery Act funds were used in accordance with applicable laws and regulations, and whether data reported were accurate, reliable, and complete. We issued the first of these reports in September, in which we found that the State generally used and accounted for the funds appropriately, but we identified areas that could be improved. Audits are underway in additional States and we expect to issue these reports in the coming months. In addition, OIG investigators are currently examining allegations of waste, fraud, and abuse involving Recovery Act funds and taking appropriate action to ensure that anyone who steals or intentionally misuses Recovery Act funds is held accountable for their unlawful actions. To date, OIG has identified 39 cases for further investigation. You will find summaries of several of these cases below.

RECOVERY ACT-RELATED REPORTS

Internal Reports

The Department's Process for Screening and Selecting Peer Reviewers for the Race to the Top Grant Program

We found that the Department's process for screening and selecting peer reviewers for Phase 1 of the Race to the Top (RTT) discretionary grant program competition was generally appropriate and effective in identifying conflicts of interest. However, we found that the Department did not perform a check of selected RTT peer reviewers against the General Services Administration's Excluded Parties List System (EPLS) or adequately document formal approval of its peer reviewer roster before it began the application review process. The verification and documentation processes the Department did perform occurred only after the initial application review and rating were completed and after the Department had publically announced the RTT finalists. The Department agreed that an issue existed with the timeliness of the EPLS verification; however, it did not believe that the issue impacted the integrity or quality of either the competition or the review process. Although we acknowledge that no RTT peer reviewers were found in the EPLS, the integrity of the review process could have been compromised if one of the peer reviewers had been debarred or suspended from doing business with the Federal Government.

The Department's Implementation of the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program

In our audit of the Department's implementation of the Recovery Act's State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) program, we found that its initial implementation was generally appropriate in the three areas we examined. Those three areas were: (1) calculation of State allocations; (2) review of applications for initial funding; and (3) program staffing and monitoring plans. We did, however, identify where the Department's processes could be improved. While the Department's process indicated that reviewers verified that all required data and related information were provided, it did not provide assurance that steps were taken to assess whether the data were reasonably

supported. This lack of assurance could impact the Department's ability to determine whether States are complying with maintenance-of-effort requirements. We noted that our audit found that 3 of the 16 States/Commonwealth reviewed appeared to have insufficient or questionable supporting data. Further, although it appeared that Department staffing efforts had been adequate during the initial implementation of the program, we noted that the time required to implement and monitor the SFSF program could impact the ability of the staff to effectively manage existing programs. Finally, we found that complete documentation was not maintained in the official grant file; doing so ensures that all relevant matters are considered. The Department did not concur with our overall findings or recommendations.

Department's Progress in Implementing Corrective Actions for Prior Audits of Programs that Subsequently Received Funding under the Recovery Act

In March of 2009, OIG issued a memorandum to the Department identifying 152 recommendations made in OIG audits for which corrective actions had not yet been implemented. The purpose of this memorandum was to assist the Department in implementing Office of Management and Budget (OMB) requirements that call for agencies to expedite final actions on findings from prior OIG audits and investigations affecting programs funded by the Recovery Act or explain why they cannot or should not take such actions. During this reporting period, we issued a report that found that the Department had made progress in completing corrective actions on its internal audits, but that the majority of corrective actions for external audits, including SEAs and LEAs, had not been implemented. In total, corrective actions for 99 of the 152 recommendations (65 percent) had not yet been completed.

Department staff stated that no specific efforts were made to expedite implementation of corrective actions from audits of programs that subsequently

received funding under the Recovery Act. Although the Department had included consideration of prior audits in its risk mitigation plan, other than the list provided by OIG through the March 2009 memorandum, the Department had not identified all relevant prior audits, such as single or compliance audits, or audits conducted by the GAO. Furthermore, the Department had not assessed the status of its progress in this area, although such an assessment was included in its risk mitigation plan. Without a complete list of the audits, corrective actions to be implemented, and an assessment of progress made, the Department cannot ensure that corrective actions were being expedited as required by OMB.

We recommended that the Department take actions to meet OMB requirements and to enhance effective implementation of risk management activities, including that it identify uncompleted corrective actions regarding weaknesses or deficiencies by entities or programs that subsequently received funding under the Recovery Act. The Department agreed with the importance of addressing significant audit findings in a timely manner and stated it would work with OIG to address the recommendations presented in the report.

Focusing on Subrecipient Monitoring

During this reporting period, we provided the Department with information on weaknesses involving SEA subrecipient monitoring that our Recovery Act work had identified. SEAs are required to monitor subrecipient activities in order to provide reasonable assurance that each subrecipient is in compliance with Federal requirements and achieving performance goals. The most common problem our audits identified was that some States had not sufficiently modified existing program monitoring methods to provide reasonable assurance of subrecipient compliance with Recovery Act requirements. Other issues we identified included: (1) State monitoring plans addressing only programmatic and not fiscal issues, (2) States not reviewing supporting documentation or verifying expenditures before making Recovery Act payments, and (3) States not determining which State entity would be responsible for monitoring subrecipients' use of SFSF funds. We encouraged the Department to use the information presented in this report and our individual State Recovery Act reports when assessing risk and planning monitoring visits to States. The Department stated that the information presented in this report and the individual State audit reports was very helpful.

External Reports

Louisiana

Our audit of internal controls regarding education-related Recovery Act funds in Louisiana found that the agencies reviewed had systems of internal control in place or were designing control systems to provide for the proper administration and use of education-related Recovery Act funds. However, we also found that the Louisiana Department of Education could improve oversight of LEAs and improve controls over data quality; the Office of Governor's Division of Administration needed to perform reviews of its subrecipients; the Office of Louisiana Rehabilitation Services lacked sufficient controls over tracking Recovery Act funds; and the Algiers Charter School Association, one of four LEAs we reviewed, used sole-source contracting without sufficient justification and did not verify

whether vendors were debarred or suspended from receiving Federal funds. Based on these findings, we made a number of recommendations to enhance controls over Recovery Act requirements. State officials did not agree with all of our findings or recommendations.

Wisconsin

Our audit found that although the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) made a proactive effort to ensure compliance with Recovery Act requirements, DPI's distribution of SFSF funds did not allow for proper tracking of expenditures at the State and LEA levels as required by the Recovery Act. This occurred because DPI was instructed by the State legislature to distribute SFSF funds to LEAs expeditiously and in doing so, DPI did not properly

account for two components of the SFSF program and it reimbursed LEAs for expenditures based only on pools of cost categories. In addition, we found that DPI needed to improve its monitoring of Recovery Act funds and implement comprehensive subrecipient monitoring procedures for the SFSF program. We also determined that DPI and the Wisconsin Governor's Office needed to improve their procedures to ensure all required data are accurate, reliable, and complete. We made several recommendations to address these issues, including

that the Department require the Governor's Office and DPI to implement procedures to ensure its Recovery Act funds are properly accounted for and tracked. We also recommended that they be required to conduct reviews on the SFSF funds distributed to LEAs in FY 2008-2009 to determine whether the funds were used for allowable activities and accrued within the period of availability and return any unallowable cost. Wisconsin officials did not fully agree or disagree with our findings or recommendations.

Report Coordinated with Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board

Data Quality - Recipient Efforts to Report Reliable and Transparent Information

This multi-agency review sought to determine whether the processes used by Recovery Act recipients for compiling and reporting selected data reasonably assured compliance with the reporting requirements of Section 1512 of the Recovery Act. It found that enhancements were needed to ensure the accuracy of jobs reports. The review focused on five specific reporting provisions: number of jobs created or retained; total amount of Recovery Act funds received or invoiced; total amount of Recovery Act funds spent; project status; and final report. Our staff led this review with participation from OIG staff from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. Department of Labor, and the National Science Foundation.

The team selected for its review 20 grant recipients and 9 Federal contractors for a total of 29 recipients that received awards from the home agencies of the participating OIGs. The entities were selected based on several factors, including the amount of Recovery Act funds awarded, an analysis of Section 1512 data each reported, and prior audit experience. The Recovery Act funding for these recipients ranged from hundreds of thousands of dollars to several billion dollars. We determined that all 29 recipients generally reported consistent and reliable information in 4 of the 5 areas reviewed. Reporting the number of jobs that were created or retained, however, proved to be problematic for most recipients, with only 7 of the

29 reporting data consistent with applicable Federal guidance. To address this issue, we recommended providing guidance on how to estimate jobs by using alternative processes that can produce reasonable jobs estimates and clarifying whether recipients are to report jobs estimates for lower-tier subrecipients and small vendors. The review also described two specific areas where the current reporting process may not result in optimal transparency for users of Recovery.gov: (1) recipient reporting of funds spent in cases where funds advanced to subrecipients had resulted in more Recovery Act funds appearing to be invested in the economy than actually were; and (2) recipient reporting of subrecipient jobs that may not have accurately portrayed actual employment impacts by individual Congressional districts when recipients and subrecipients are located in different districts. We made several recommendations to the Recovery Board to further enhance the quality of data being reported and to improve transparency. These included that the Board work with OMB, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council, and Federal agencies, as warranted, to provide more comprehensive technical assistance to recipients and subrecipients on effective processes and controls for jobs data reporting. Because the recipients in our sample were not selected using statistical sampling methods, the results cannot be generalized. We therefore recommended that the Board consider conducting a comprehensive review of recipient reported information on the number of jobs using such statistical sampling methods in order to assess the reliability of reported jobs data for all reporting entities.

New York—City University of New York Employee Indicted for Fraud

A former employee at the City University of New York Research Foundation who was hired to work as an instructor in the In School Youth, Prep for Success Program at Medgar Evers College in Brooklyn was indicted for attempting to defraud the school and the Department of Recovery Act funds. The man allegedly presented and attempted to have processed a fraudulent Grant Award Notification (GAN) in the amount of \$745,700. The employee provided the GAN to the Foundation to claim the award, and during its award process, the Foundation learned from the Department that the GAN was fraudulent.

Federal Student Aid Fraud

The following cases involve Federal student aid funding, a portion of which was either applied for or obtained after passage of the Recovery Act. The Recovery Act increased funding for the Pell Grant Program.

Arkansas—Man Sentenced for ID Theft

A man pled guilty and was sentenced in Faulkner County Court for using the identity of his cousin to fraudulently apply for and receive student financial aid from the University of Central Arkansas (UCA.) Turned in to police by his cousin, the man was sentenced to 12 months in prison, followed by 72 months of probation, and was ordered to pay \$1,490 in fines and fees.

Michigan—Woman Indicted for Operating a \$100,000 Fraud Ring

A woman was indicted in Michigan for orchestrating a fraud scheme at the University of Phoenix. She allegedly recruited at least 50 individuals to act as “straw students” at the school

in order to apply for and receive Federal financial aid for purported attendance in on-line classes. The participating individuals had no intention of actually taking classes. The ringleader allegedly completed and submitted admission forms, financial aid applications, and supporting documentation of those “straw” students, falsely representing that the individuals were high school graduates or held a General Educational Development certificate (GED). When the straw students received the financial aid checks, they allegedly kicked back a portion of the proceeds to the ringleader. As a result of these fraudulent efforts, the scheme’s participants received more than \$100,000 in Federal student aid to which they were not entitled.

Wisconsin—Owner of Diploma Mill/Sham Proprietary School Indicted

The owner and operator of Wisconsin University High School (WUHS), an entity the owner held out to be a legitimate institution for people to obtain a high school diploma, was indicted for allegedly using the school as a front by which to operate a Federal student aid fraud scheme. The man allegedly charged individuals \$150 to enroll in the school and 2 weeks later, receive a diploma certificate. He allegedly used the personal identifying information provided by approximately 255 individuals who enrolled at WUHS to apply for and receive Federal financial aid for their purported attendance at two on-line colleges. On each form, the man listed the address of WUHS, causing student aid refund checks to be mailed directly to him. The former owner allegedly deposited the checks into his bank accounts for personal use. The owner’s alleged actions enabled him to fraudulently receive more than \$300,000 in Federal student aid.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Participation on Committees, Work Groups, and Task Forces

■ Departmental Groups

- ◆ *Department Metrics and Monitoring Team* - OIG staff participate in an advisory capacity on this team that meets weekly to coordinate Recovery Act funds oversight efforts and develop reports for posting on the Recovery.gov Web site.

■ Inspector General Community

- ◆ *Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board (Recovery Board)* - Inspector General Tighe is a member of the Recovery Board and a member of the Accountability Committee of the Board, which provides advice and recommendations to the Board regarding preventing and detecting fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement and with regard to a referral management system. OIG staff also participate on a work group composed of all of the Offices of Inspector General that provide Recovery Act oversight, and a subgroup focused on Recovery Act grant funds.

■ Federal and State Law Enforcement-Related Groups

- ◆ *The Recovery Act Fraud Working Group of the U.S. Department of Justice's Financial Fraud Enforcement Task Force* - OIG staff participate on this working group focused on improving efforts across the government to investigate and prosecute significant financial crimes involving Recovery Act funds, ensuring just and effective punishment for those who perpetrate financial crimes, recovering proceeds for victims, and addressing financial discrimination in the lending and financial markets.

Review of Legislation, Regulations, Directives, and Memoranda

- Provided technical assistance to the Department on its cash management FAQs for SEAs and LEAs.

Federal Student Aid Programs and Operations

The Federal student aid programs underwent a significant change in 2010 with the passage of legislation prohibiting the origination of new FFELP loans after June 30, 2010, and requiring that all new Federal student loans formerly originated under the FFELP be originated under the Direct Loan Program. As a result, the Department must have the capacity to originate and serve the increased Direct Loan volume. Work completed during this reporting period showed that the Federal Student Aid office (FSA) had enhanced its capacity and processes but should continue to monitor and enhance its capabilities as necessary. In addition, it must also ensure that participants in the Federal student aid programs comply with all applicable laws, regulations, and guidance. Work conducted during this reporting period showed this to be a challenge with the participants we reviewed. Summaries of these and other efforts are provided below, along with information on our more significant investigations involving Federal student aid fraud.

FSA Operations

Efforts to Ensure the Effective Processing of Student Loans Under the Direct Loan Program

Our assessment of whether FSA's efforts to ensure that the Common Origination and Disbursement (COD) system could effectively process 100 percent of student loan volume under the Direct Loan program found that FSA had taken actions to do so. The COD system is the Department's system for processing originations and disbursements of Federal student loans and grants. In addition, we concluded that FSA was providing appropriate technical assistance to impacted schools and had reasonable plans in place to accommodate schools that experienced challenges in successfully transitioning to the Direct Loan program. We also noted that FSA had a COD contingency plan in place that documented disaster recovery procedures intended to assist in resuming critical data processing support with the least amount of delay if data processing operations were disrupted. Although we did not have any recommendations for the Department, we did note that FSA relies completely on the COD system to originate loans which could result in processing delays if the system experienced any difficulties.

Technical Assessment of the Direct Loan Program's Origination Process

We assessed the ability of the COD system to satisfy storage, volume, and network bandwidth capacity

requirements based on FSA's estimate that it would originate 30.3 million loans in FY 2010 and found it to be adequate to handle the estimated volume. We also reviewed the current COD contingency plan and the results of the most recent COD disaster recovery test. We found that if FSA's estimate of 30.3 million originations is accurate and its contingency plans are implemented as written, the level of risk in exceeding Direct Loan origination capacity is low. We did, however, express concern about the actual origination volume compared to the projected monthly activity. For example, we noted that the monthly activity for October 2009 through January 2010 showed that 4.37 percent fewer applications were received than were projected, while February through May 2010 showed that 21.6 percent more applications were received than were projected. We suggested that FSA promptly review the data and if FSA identified a significant increase in applications received over applications projected, it should review the volume capacity and revise accordingly.

Controls Over Loan Purchases Under ECASLA

This audit determined that FSA had established and implemented adequate controls and system edits to reasonably ensure that the Department did not purchase ineligible loans under the ECASLA Loan Purchase Commitment Program. Conversely, our

audit also identified significant weaknesses in the system edits that were in place to reasonably ensure that lenders participating in the Loan Participation Purchase Program complied with the loan eligibility requirements. We concluded that these weaknesses had a minimal impact on the number and amount of ineligible loans in which the Department purchased participation interests. Specifically, we found that FSA did not ensure that the loans in which it purchased a participation interest were made for eligible loan periods; were submitted as “new” loan records only once; had a cumulative amount of disbursements, net of cumulative reductions (e.g., cancellations, borrower payments), equal to the outstanding borrower principal balance on the loan and equal to or less than the original loan amount; had eligible first and anticipated final disbursement dates; and had interest rates that did not exceed allowable limits.

During the audit, we informed FSA of our preliminary findings which led FSA to implement revised system edits concerning first disbursement dates, anticipated final disbursement dates, and interest rates. We determined that FSA’s revised system edits addressed the weaknesses we identified regarding the first disbursement dates and loan interest rates and partially addressed the weaknesses we identified regarding the anticipated final

disbursement dates. To that end, we made two additional recommendations for FSA to fully address the weaknesses identified and to ensure that it did not purchase ineligible loans. FSA agreed with our findings and stated it would take appropriate corrective action.

Reporting Requirements for the ECASLA Loan Purchase Programs

We issued an alert memorandum to inform the Department that it had not met all reporting requirements for the loan purchase programs authorized by ECASLA. Specifically, we found that the Department did not prepare and issue the required quarterly reports and annual purchase program cost estimates. ECASLA requires the Department to prepare and transmit these reports to appropriate Congressional committees and make them available to the public. These reports are needed not only to assess the loan purchase programs’ costs neutrality, but also to provide policymakers with information needed to assess the effectiveness of the programs. Based on our findings, we recommended that the Department prepare the reports and estimates, transmit them to the appropriate Congressional committees, and make them available to the public. The Department concurred with our recommendations.

FSA Program Participants

Accrediting Agencies

In our last Semiannual Report to Congress, we provided information on the results of our examinations at two of the seven regional accrediting agencies which found that neither agency established minimum requirements for the definition of program length or credit hour hours. This could result in inflated credit hours, the improper designation of full-time student status, the over-awarding of Federal student aid funds, and excessive borrowing by students especially with distance, accelerated, and other programs not delivered through the traditional classroom format. During this reporting period, we issued the third and final report in our series -- a review of the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools’ (HLC) definition of program length and credit hours, which found the same result.

The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

HLC accredits 1,022 institutions in Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, Nebraska, Ohio, Oklahoma, New Mexico, South Dakota, Wisconsin, West Virginia, and Wyoming. In 2008, institutions accredited by HLC received \$27.5 billion in Federal student aid. Although we found that HLC provided general guidance informing institutions that they should be able to justify the lengths of their programs and their credit hour assignments in comparison to practices common to other accredited higher education institutions, HLC’s standards

for accreditation and related policies did not establish the definition of a credit hour or set minimum requirements for program length and the assignment of credit hours. HLC also did not provide specific guidance to peer reviewers on how to evaluate the appropriateness of an institution's processes for determining program length and assigning credit hours or on the minimum level of acceptability for accreditation when evaluating these processes. Further, while HLC maintained self-studies and team reports as documentation of its evaluation of institutions' program lengths and credit hours, the amount of information varied as it related to program length and credit hours that institutions and peer reviewers included in these respective documents.

Also as presented in our last Semiannual Report to Congress, our review identified a serious issue regarding HLC's decision to accredit American InterContinental University despite its identification of problems with the school's assignment of credit hours to certain undergraduate and graduate courses. Following our suggestion, the Department conducted an evaluation of HLC and determined that the issue identified in our report was not an isolated incident. The Department gave HLC two options for coming into compliance: (1) to accept a set of corrective actions determined by the Department; or (2) the Department would initiate a limitation, suspension, or termination action. In May 2010, HLC accepted the Department's corrective action plan.

Review of Lender Agreements Identified Inducements

Our audits of lender agreements at the Everest Institute (Everest) and the National Aviation Academy-New England (NAA-NE), both proprietary schools located in Massachusetts, identified inducements prohibited by the HEA, which we promptly brought to the Department's attention in an alert memorandum, and through final reports at each institution. In each report, we informed the Department that agreements between two lenders,

Sallie Mae, Inc. (SLM) and Student Loan Xpress, Inc. (SLX), and Corinthian Colleges, Inc. (Corinthian), the parent company of Everest, contained three inducement violations. During the time of our review, Corinthian was also the parent company of WyoTech-Bedford, which became NAA-NE when it was purchased by NAA.

We did not identify any noncompliance by Everest or NAA-NE relating to the inducement provisions of the HEA, but found that the violations were on the part of the lenders. Specifically we found that: (1) SLM offered parents an inducement to borrow PLUS loans in violation of the HEA when it entered into an agreement with Corinthian that parents of Corinthian students could obtain a \$500 credit toward their closing costs of a new home loan from SLM if the parents obtained a PLUS loan from SLM; and (2) SLX induced Corinthian to secure FFELP loans. An agreement between Corinthian and SLX offered Credit Risk Subsidy Program loans to WyoTech's and Everest's high-risk student borrowers. This agreement required Corinthian to pay a premium to share the risk of student default on private student loans with SLX. The agreement contained a provision that allowed SLX to temporarily terminate the agreement if private student loans that SLX made to Everest or to WyoTech students exceeded 15 percent of the total amount of all SLX's educational loans at each respective school, including loans made under the FFELP. Another provision in the agreement allowed SLX to immediately terminate the agreement if the school's Federal cohort default rate exceeded 15 percent. As a result, SLX provided an inducement for Corinthian to encourage students to apply for FFELP loans with SLX to secure private loan funds and to maintain the ratio of private loans to all education loans (including FFELP), as described in the agreement. In a second and separate agreement between SLX and Corinthian, it was established that SLX would help Corinthian develop a Web site and would provide Corinthian with administrative reports for each campus it owned. Although the Web site was not designed to facilitate students' applications for SLX's FFELP loans, the service SLX provided was intended to induce Corinthian and secure its students' loan applications.

Based on our findings, we recommended that FSA take appropriate administrative action regarding SLM's inducement violation and determine whether the SLX Credit Risk Subsidy Program agreement and Web site service agreement issues were resolved with the Department by a prior Determination and Voluntary Disposition, dated March 23, 2009, and take appropriate administrative action for any issue not resolved by the Determination and Voluntary Disposition. FSA concurred that the agreements examined by OIG need further review and appropriate action. However, FSA did not agree with our recommendation for actions against SLM and SLX under the HEA and suggested other substantive action.

Baker College's Compliance with Selected Provisions of the HEA and Corresponding Regulations

This audit determined that for distance education students who officially withdrew or dropped out, Baker College, a non-profit institution based in Michigan, did not correctly identify when students began and ceased attendance when (1) determining students' eligibility for Federal student aid disbursements; and (2) performing return of Federal student aid calculations. We found that Baker College had not maintained records that adequately supported its

determination of attendance for its distance education students during award year 2006-2007 and that it had incorrectly identified when distance education students who unofficially withdrew or dropped out began and ceased attendance during award year 2007-2008. We recommended that FSA require Baker College to develop and implement written policies and procedures for its automated attendance system and to return \$9,790 of Federal student aid funds it disbursed to ineligible students and to students for whom the school's attendance records did not support retention of all Federal student aid funds after student withdrawal. We also recommended that the school be required to review its records for distance education students who received Federal student aid for other years and (1) identify students with unsupported periods of attendance; (2) determine the amount of Federal student aid disbursed to students who were not entitled to receive the funds because of insufficient attendance documentation; (3) identify the amount of Federal student aid program funds disbursed to students who were not entitled to receive the funds because of reduced student eligibility; and (4) return those amounts to the Department and lenders, as appropriate. Baker College officials disagreed with all of our findings and recommendations.

Congressional Testimony

Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives

On June 17, Inspector General Tighe testified before the House Committee on Education and Labor on OIG work involving standards for program length and the definition of a credit hour—critically important issues in the Federal student aid programs, as the amount of Federal aid a student can receive is based on the number of credit hours for which a student is enrolled. Inspector General Tighe told the Committee that this issue has become more significant in recent years due to the explosion of on-line education, making credit hour assignment difficult, its comparison to traditional classroom delivery a challenge, and its value increasingly important in order to ensure that students and taxpayers get what they are paying for.

Inspector General Tighe reported that OIG had conducted extensive work involving accrediting agencies for over two decades. She highlighted the most recent work we conducted to provide the Department and Congress with facts on the definition of a credit hour for the 2009-2010 higher education negotiated rulemaking sessions. Inspector General Tighe explained that OIG examined three of the seven regional accrediting agencies to determine what guidance regarding program length and credit hours they provided to institutions and peer reviewers and the documentation they maintained to demonstrate how they evaluated institutions' program length and credit hours. She noted that OIG found that none of the agencies established minimum requirements for credit hours but that the Department proposed a definition of a credit hour in its recent higher education Notice of Proposed

Rulemaking. Inspector General Tighe informed the Committee that OIG would evaluate whether the new definition is effective in protecting students and taxpayers.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, U.S. Senate

On June 24, Inspector General Tighe testified before the U.S. Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions on the issue of waste and fraud involving for-profit postsecondary institutions. The sole participant on the first of two panels, Inspector General Tighe discussed OIG's long history of work involving for-profit postsecondary institutions, and the predominant cases of fraud that its work has identified, which included falsification of eligibility -- where schools falsify student enrollment, attendance, high-school diplomas, ability-to-benefit exam results, and satisfactory academic progress in order to qualify students to obtain or continue to maintain Federal student aid; refund violations -- when a student ceases to attend an institution, the institution must determine whether a refund is owed, calculate the amount of the unearned Federal student aid, and then return those funds to the Department, the loan holder, or to another applicable participant in Federal student aid programs within a specified number of days (failure to

pay refunds is a criminal offense under the HEA); 90/10 Rule violations -- where an institution miscalculates or devises other creative accounting schemes to make it appear that at least 10 percent of the institution's income is derived from sources other than Federal funds (failure to comply with this rule could lead to a loss of eligibility to participate in the Federal student aid programs); incentive compensation - where recruiters receive financial incentives for increasing enrollment at the school; and issues related to distance education -- determining whether a student in distance education has enrolled for purposes of obtaining a credential or is just completing sufficient on-line activity to receive a disbursement of Federal student aid to use for other purposes. Institutions are obligated to return any Federal student aid received if a student does not begin attendance during the period for which aid was awarded as well as document attendance in at least one class during a payment period.

Inspector General Tighe also acknowledged the Department's issuance of a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for the Federal student aid programs; a number of the new rules address program integrity issues related to proprietary schools. Inspector General Tighe told the Committee that OIG would comment on the final rules and monitor their implementation.

Investigations

School and School Officials

Arizona - Grand Canyon University Agrees to \$5.2 Million Settlement

In August, Grand Canyon University officials agreed to pay \$5.2 million to settle a *False Claims Act* case brought on behalf of the Government by a former University employee turned whistleblower charging that the school had violated the HEA's ban on incentive compensation. According to the whistleblower, the for-profit University provided salary increases to its recruiters based solely on the number of students the recruiters enrolled.

Illinois - Former Owner of the Cannella School of Hair Design Pled Guilty and Agreed to \$4.9 Million Settlement

The former owner and operator of the Cannella School of Hair Design pled guilty to charges related to student financial aid fraud. Further, together with his wife, the former owner signed a settlement agreeing to repay more than \$4.9 million that they obtained as a result of the fraud and debaring the two from receiving future Government contracts. These actions are a result of our investigation which found that the former owner enrolled students who did not have the required high school diploma or GED by paying Ability-to-Benefit (ATB) administrators to falsify ATB results in order to increase enrollment and the amount of Federal student aid the school would receive. The former

owner also instructed at least one witness to provide false information to the OIG special agents who conducted the investigation.

Missouri - Former Vatterott College-Kansas City Director Sentenced

The former Campus Co-Director of Vatterott College's Kansas City branch was sentenced to 1 year in prison, 3 years of supervised release, and was ordered to pay more than \$361,900 in restitution for his role in a student financial fraud scheme. For more than a year, the former director and two other school employees assisted ineligible students to enroll in the school and apply for Federal student aid, thereby increasing the amount of aid the school received. The conspirators fraudulently enrolled students who did not have a high school diploma or GED and instructed them to lie on their Federal student aid applications forms to falsely indicate that they had dependants in order to obtain additional Pell Grant funds. As a result of these fraudulent efforts, numerous ineligible students and students who claimed fictional dependents were enrolled which enabled the school to receive approximately \$345,000 in Federal student aid to which it was not entitled.

New Jersey - New Jersey City University Employee and Husband Indicted in Embezzlement Scheme Involving Nearly a Half a Million Dollars

A former office manager for the New Jersey City University Student Government Organization and her husband were indicted by a grand jury for allegedly running a scheme to steal hundreds of thousands of dollars from the school. Between 2007 and 2010, the former employee allegedly issued 237 checks, many of which were made payable to her husband, as well as to other individuals who participated in this scheme totaling more than \$424,800.

New York - Owner of Willsey Institute Sentenced in Multi-Million Dollar Fraud Scheme

The owner, director, and president of the Willsey Institute, a proprietary school located in Staten

Island, was sentenced to 2 years in prison and 3 years of supervised release for theft of Federal funds. She also agreed to forfeit her home and was ordered to pay \$2 million in restitution. Our investigation found that for over 7 years, the owner submitted and caused to be submitted fraudulently altered student aid documentation in order to obtain Pell Grants, which she used to make payments on personal debt, credit cards, and the mortgage on her home. She directed her staff to submit financial aid documents for individuals who did not attend the school, and created fictitious student files, attendance records and grades in order to receive the aid and grants to which the school was not entitled.

Pennsylvania - Bloomsburg University Agrees to \$38,000 Settlement

In April, Bloomsburg University agreed to pay \$38,000 to settle claims that it failed to report or return improperly disbursed Federal student aid funds. The settlement follows the 2007 conviction of a former assistant baseball coach who engaged in the fraudulent acquisition of Federal student aid through the Federal Work Study program. Despite being aware of the assistant coach's conduct, and despite the school's Director of Financial Aid recommending that over \$30,000 be returned to the Department, Bloomsburg failed to either report the coach's fraudulent acts or voluntarily return the funds that the school improperly disbursed. In signing the settlement, Bloomsburg agreed to effectuate an extensive series of internal policy changes aimed at increasing the transparency of the Federal student aid funds it receives and ensuring that accountability for the proper use of Federal student aid funding exists at all levels of the school's administration.

Pennsylvania - Former Financial Aid Director of Widener University Sentenced

The former Financial Aid Director of Widener University was sentenced for filing false tax returns by failing to claim income he earned as an independent financial aid consultant. Our investigation found that for tax years 2004-2006, the former official provided materially

false tax returns resulting in his failure to pay more than \$109,000 in Federal income taxes. His unreported income originated from various student loan lenders, including Student Loan Express, which was selected as Widener's Preferred Lender under the School as Lender Program while he was Widener's Financial Aid Director. These payments were made to his private business through which he was hosting and providing loan seminars to lenders while employed at Widener University. The former Financial Aid Director was sentenced to 12 months of home detention, 3 years of supervised probation, and was ordered to pay more than \$109,100 in restitution.

Tennessee - HD Adcock and Associates Officials Indicted for Fraud Involving Hundreds of Thousands of Dollars

The former Chief Executive Officer and Executive Director of HD Adcock and Associates, a corporation of cosmetology schools operating at nine locations throughout the South, were indicted on charges related to a scheme to defraud the Department of more than \$464,900 in Federal student aid. For more than 3 years, the two allegedly created false GED or equivalent proof of education to enroll ineligible students into the school and thereby increase the amount of Federal student aid the school received. They also allegedly falsified student attendance records and failed to disclose when students had stopped attending the school in order to retain unearned Federal student aid. Their alleged efforts allowed more than \$464,900 in Federal student aid to be disbursed to the corporation for individuals that were not entitled to receive them.

Washington State - Three Crown College Officials Indicted, Another Convicted for Roles in Federal Student Aid Fraud Scheme

The Financial Aid Director at Crown College, a now-defunct for-profit school, pled guilty for her role in a scheme where she and three other school officials falsely represented themselves and others as students in order to apply for and receive Federal financial aid. They allegedly did so believing that the College would be closed

shortly after they received the aid and planned to apply for loan discharges once the school officially closed. When the school remained open, they attempted to conceal their activity by making it appear as though they were attending classes. The other officials indicted for participating in the scheme were the Vice President, the Admissions Director/Registrar, and the Fiscal Manager/Bookkeeper. As a result of their fraudulent efforts, the officials received more than \$65,000 in Federal student aid to which they were not entitled.

Fraud Rings

Alabama - Actions Taken Against Conspirators in Fraud Scheme at Several Alabama Schools

One individual was sentenced, another pled guilty, and two others were indicted for their roles in a student aid fraud scheme involving several colleges and universities in Alabama, including Troy State University, Regions University, Jacksonville State University, and Tuskegee University, where one of the conspirators was employed as an Admissions Counselor. The individuals completed fraudulent Federal student aid application forms for individuals they knew never intended to attend the institutions, claiming that these individuals had high school diplomas or GEDs. Based on this fraudulent information, Federal student aid checks were issued, which the conspirators would deposit into their personal bank accounts. As a result of their fraudulent efforts, the Department awarded more than \$200,000 in Federal student aid. The former Tuskegee University employee was the first of the conspirators to be sentenced, receiving 3 years of probation and ordered to pay more than \$122,000 in restitution.

Arizona - All Participants in Massive Fraud Scheme at Rio Salado College Sentenced

In previous Semiannual Reports to Congress, we reported that 64 individuals had been indicted for their roles in a \$538,000 student aid fraud scheme at Rio Salado College. As of September 1, all participants have been sentenced, including the ringleader. Our investigation found that the ringleader recruited individuals to act as “straw students” at the school in order to apply for and receive Federal financial aid. The ringleader completed and submitted admission forms, financial aid applications, and supporting documentation of those straw students containing forged documents and false statements. She then assumed the identity of those individuals to access Rio Salado’s on-line classes in order to generate records of the individuals’ participation in on-line classes, which caused Rio Salado school officials to authorize financial aid payments to those individuals. When the straw students received the financial aid checks, they kicked back a significant portion of the proceeds to the ringleader. The ringleader was sentenced to 41 months in prison and was ordered to pay more than \$581,000 in restitution.

California - Actions Taken Against Participants in Fraud Scheme at Los Rios Community College District

Six individuals were indicted, two of whom pled guilty for their roles in a \$200,000 fraud scheme at the Los Rios Community College District, an accredited higher education district with campuses that include American River College, Cosumnes River College, and Sacramento City College. The scheme’s alleged ringleader orchestrated a scam in which individuals with no intention of attending any of the Los Rios schools applied for admission in order to receive Federal student aid. The ringleader also allegedly obtained stolen identity information of other individuals for the purpose of applying for additional Federal student aid. The ringleader completed all paperwork and enrollment necessary to obtain the Federal student aid and had the funds sent to addresses she controlled. When the student aid checks came in, the

ringleader met with the straw students at a bank, cashed the checks, and gave a percentage of the proceeds to the scheme participants. As a result of these fraudulent efforts, the individuals received more than \$200,000 in Federal student aid to which they were not entitled.

Colorado - Two Individuals Sentenced for Roles in Fraud Scheme at Metropolitan State College

Two individuals were sentenced for their roles in a fraud scheme at Metropolitan State College, where the mother of one of the individuals was employed in the school’s Office of Financial Aid. She was also a co-conspirator in the scheme. The two individuals and others acquired personal identifying information from family members and others in order to apply for and receive Federal student aid. None of the individuals were actually attending the school and none had even applied. Most of these individuals, but not all, willingly participated in the scam. The conspirators filled out fraudulent student aid forms using those identities as well as their own, and had the checks sent either to themselves or directly to the Office of Financial Aid where they were retrieved. The proceeds of the checks were divided between the conspirators, and on occasion, the person in whose name the application was made. As a result of these fraudulent efforts, the conspirators received more than \$130,000 in Federal student aid. The two individuals were sentenced to a period of home detention, 5 years of probation, and were each ordered to pay more than \$62,000 in restitution.

Contractors

Colorado - Former Debt Collector Sentenced

A former employee of NCO Financial Systems, Inc., a debt collection agency, was sentenced for fraudulently consolidating student loans while employed by NCO. Our investigation found that the former debt collector forged a number of student borrowers’ signatures on Direct Loan consolidation promissory notes without the borrowers’ knowledge or permission. The

company received a collection fee from the Department for the consolidations, and the former debt collector earned a bonus from NCO for working the accounts. The former employee was sentenced to 10 months of home detention, 3 years of supervised release, and was ordered to pay more than \$64,700 in restitution.

Unlawful Access to NSLDS

Iowa - Actions Taken Against Former Contractors for Unlawfully Accessing Data System to Obtain Information on President Obama

Seven former FSA Call Center employees pled guilty, another was sentenced, and another was convicted and now awaits sentencing for unlawfully accessing the National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS). The contractors were employees of Vangent, Inc., a contractor responsible for maintaining a call center for student borrowers and for the debt collection of student loans. The former employees, who were located in Vangent's Iowa City office, exceeded their authorized access into NSLDS when they used their accounts to look up the personal information of President Barack Obama and/or First Lady Michelle Obama without a legitimate business need or appropriate authority. The first of the former contractors to be sentenced was ordered to perform 250 hours of community service and was assessed \$25.

Texas - Former Baylor University Employee Sentenced

A former employee in Baylor University's Office of Student Financial Services was sentenced to 2 years of probation, 200 hours of community service, and was ordered to pay a \$250 fine for unlawfully accessing NSLDS. The woman exceeded the authorized use of her Baylor-issued NSLDS identification by using it at her part-time job at the Brazos Higher Education Service Corporation.

Other Individuals

Alaska - Woman Sentenced for Three Quarters of a Million Dollars Fraud Scheme

A former Miss Anchorage, Truman Scholar, and Rhodes Scholar was sentenced to 57 months in prison, 3 years of probation, and was ordered to pay more than \$745,000 in restitution for charges related to her multi-year student aid fraud scheme. The scheme involved using two social security numbers (SSNs) she was assigned to apply for and receive Federal and private student aid. In 2003, the woman applied for and received an SSN through a special program for victims of domestic violence and harassment. Individuals who receive new SSNs under this program are advised to stop using their previous SSNs. Yet despite this regulation, the woman did not inform her student loan lenders of her name and SSN change and continued to obtain loans under both names, misrepresenting to the lenders that the individuals were two different people, and using one name to cosign a loan applied for in the other name. She then used those funds for non-educational purposes, which included investing in a Citigroup/Smith Barney Investment Account based in Hong Kong and investing in a for-profit business.

New York - Former Mayoral Candidate Sentenced

A former New York City Mayoral candidate was sentenced to 4 years of probation, 300 hours of community service, and a \$100 assessment for Federal student aid fraud. The investigation found that between 2008 and 2009, the former candidate submitted fraudulent student aid application forms in order to obtain approximately \$41,000 in student loans to which he was not entitled.

New York - Longtime Fugitive Sentenced for Role in Multi-Million Fraud Scheme

A former town official who had been a fugitive for 11 years was sentenced to 27 months in prison for his participation in a long-running fraud scheme involving more than \$11 million in Federal education funds. The former official was arrested in London, then extradited, arraigned,

and ordered to prison last year after being a fugitive since 1997, when he and six others were charged with participating in a massive conspiracy to defraud the Department and other government agencies. The conspirators created entities to fraudulently receive Federal and State funds. One of their schemes involved the creation of a fictitious postsecondary institution called the Toldos Yakof Yosef for the purpose of collecting Pell Grants. Five of the conspirators were sentenced to prison and one last conspirator remains a fugitive.

Washington, D.C. - Professor and Policy Advisor Sentenced for Multiple Frauds

An assistant professor at Williams College, who was also a visiting researcher at Yale Law School and senior policy fellow for a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, was sentenced for student aid fraud, bank fraud, and social security fraud involving three quarters of a million dollars. Our investigation found that the professor used multiple false names and social security numbers to obtain both Federal and private student loans totaling more than \$294,000, and obtained more than 90 credit cards using the same fraudulent identities to make purchases of more than \$500,000. The former policy fellow was sentenced to 50 months in prison, 60 months of supervised release, and was ordered to pay more than \$759,600 in restitution.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Participation on Committees, Work Groups, and Task Forces

- Departmental Groups
 - ◆ *OIG-FSA Risk Project* - OIG staff work with FSA staff to identify risks and reduce fraud and abuse in Federal student aid programs.

Review of Legislation, Regulations, Directives, and Memoranda

- Provided technical assistance on Department's proposals for the 2009-2010 HEA Negotiated Rulemaking session.

Elementary, Secondary, and Adult Education Programs

With the significant increase in education funding that the States, SEAs, and LEAs are receiving through the Recovery Act and the Education Jobs Fund in addition to their annual allotments, effective accountability in how these entities expend all Federal education funds they receive is vital. Work we conducted over the last 6 months shows that accountability is still an issue for the entities we reviewed. Summaries of our findings are provided below, along with information on our more significant investigations involving Federal elementary, secondary and postsecondary education program funds.

Elementary and Secondary Education

Grantees and Subrecipients

State Educational Agencies

Georgia Department of Education's Controls Over Performance Data Entered in ED Facts

This audit determined that neither the Georgia Department of Education (GADOE) nor the Clayton County Public School District (Clayton) had sufficient internal controls in place to ensure that they had provided accurate information into ED Facts. As a result, GADOE and Clayton reported inaccurate or unsupported data on dropout rates, graduation rates, and discipline incidents. Without sufficient controls to ensure the accuracy of data, GADOE and the Department could be making planning, policy, and management decisions based on inaccurate or unreliable data. To address the weaknesses identified in our report, we made a number of recommendations, including that the Department require GADOE to establish and implement systems of internal control to ensure that LEAs identify and report accurate data. GADOE did not concur with all of our findings or recommendations.

Local Educational Agencies

Philadelphia School District Should Be Designated as a High-Risk Grantee

In January 2010, we issued an audit of the Philadelphia School District (PSD) which found that it did not have adequate fiscal controls in place to account for Federal education grant funds, as we identified more than \$17 million in unallowable costs and more than \$121 million in inadequately documented costs. We also reported PSD's noncompliance with laws, regulations, and other guidance. Subsequently, during this reporting period, we issued an alert memorandum to the Department strongly suggesting that it work with the Pennsylvania Department of Education to designate PSD as a high-risk grantee. We made this recommendation based on: (1) the significance of the findings in our audit report; (2) the fact that other recent reviews conducted by the State and GAO found the same or similar problems; and (3) the fact that we saw no evidence that PSD had developed any new policies and procedures to address weaknesses identified in these reports. Furthermore, it is estimated that PSD will receive more than \$331 million in education-related Recovery Act funds. Designating PSD as a high-risk grantee will help provide reasonable assurance that these Recovery Act funds, as well as other Federal funds, are safeguarded and used only for reasonable, allowable, and adequately documented purposes. The Department generally concurred with our recommendations.

Adult Education

Arkansas' Adult Education and Family Literacy Act Program

We determined that the Arkansas Department of Career Education (ADCE) did not adequately monitor the performance of providers receiving Federal adult education funds and did not ensure that Federal adult education funds were awarded in compliance with the *Adult Education and Family Literacy Act* (AEFLA) for the time period reviewed. According to the AEFLA, to be considered an eligible provider, a literacy council's program must show demonstrated effectiveness. Despite this, ADCE awarded seven literacy councils new grants even though these grant recipients did not meet the definition of effectiveness during the previous grant period. In addition, ADCE did not ensure that more than \$521,000 in adult education funds was expended in accordance with the AEFLA,

regulations, and guidance. As a result, neither the State nor the Department was assured that the providers met the requirements of the grant.

Our recommendations included that the Department require ADCE to enhance its monitoring process to assure that providers meet the required benchmarks before being awarded new grants and that ADCE take appropriate actions if providers do not meet the required benchmarks. We also recommended that ADCE return to the Department more than \$13,000 in unallowable costs identified through our audit and provide adequate documentation to support more than \$508,000 in inadequately documented costs or return the inadequately documented amount to the Department. ADCE did not agree with all of our findings or recommendations.

Investigations

Schools and School Officials

Illinois - Triumphant Charter School Principal Sentenced

The former principal of the Triumphant Charter School in Chicago was sentenced for theft involving Federal funds. Our investigation found that the former principal used her school's American Express card for personal use, including almost \$30,000 in charges for items at stores such as Louis Vuitton and Coach, jewelry, diet pills, and hair care and cosmetics. She then paid the credit card bill with money received from the Department, the State, and Chicago Public Schools. The former principal was sentenced to 3 years of probation, and was ordered to pay more than \$48,300 in restitution.

Kentucky - Former University of Louisville Dean Sentenced to Prison and Ordered to Pay More Than \$2 Million in Restitution

A former University of Louisville Dean was sentenced to 63 months in prison for embezzling more than \$2 million in Federal education funds. Our investigation found that between 2001 and

2008, the former dean and a co-conspirator used a company known as the National Center on Public Education and Prevention (NCPEp) to embezzle and to launder more than \$1.6 million in Federal funds belonging to the University of Rhode Island, Congressional earmark funds directed to the University of Louisville, and additional funds designated for the Illinois Rock Island County Council on Addiction. The two accomplished their scheme by claiming payment for work performed by NCPEp when no actual services were provided. As a result of their fraudulent efforts, more than \$2 million in funds were deposited into bank accounts in the name of NCPEp that were controlled by the two conspirators. The former dean was also charged with tax evasion for using NCPEp to conceal income from the Internal Revenue Service. In addition to the prison sentence, the former dean was also ordered to pay more than \$2.2 million in restitution.

Louisiana - Former Charter School Business Manager Sentenced

The former business manager of the Langston Hughes Academy Charter School in New Orleans was sentenced to 60 months in prison, 3 years of

supervised release, and was ordered to pay more than \$673,000 for theft from an organization receiving Federal funds. Our investigation determined that over the course of a 14-month period, the former business manager embezzled more than a half a million dollars from the school by making unauthorized cash withdrawals from the school's bank account. In an effort to conceal the theft, the former business manager manipulated the school's records by making the withdrawals appear to be payments to vendors for items such as textbooks.

Ohio - Settlement Agreements Totaling More Than \$308,000 Reached with Minister Local School District and its former Treasurer

The Minister Local School District and its former treasurer entered into settlement agreements with the U.S. Department of Justice to settle claims that the District and the former treasurer violated the *False Claims Act*. The settlements are a result of our investigation which found that the District's former superintendent and the former treasurer devised a scheme to create a charter school within the District in order for the District to apply for and receive Federal and State charter school funds that the District would otherwise not have been eligible to receive. The charter school existed in name only and there were no alternative facilities, instructors, or curriculum for the students. The funds that the District received were spent on capital projects items that benefitted the District, including lighting upgrades, installation of ceiling fans, cameras, and computer equipment. Through the settlements, the District agreed to pay more than \$297,900, and the former treasurer agreed to pay \$11,000.

Pennsylvania - Public Corruption Investigative Effort Yielding Results

OIG, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Internal Revenue Service, and a team of Federal prosecutors are working together to fight public corruption in northeastern Pennsylvania. During this reporting period, three individuals were sentenced for their roles in separate corruption schemes involving Federal education funds:

- **Former Wilkes-Barre Area School District Board Member Sentenced** The former board member was sentenced as a result of the investigation which found that he accepted a \$5,000 payment from an individual seeking to be hired as a teacher in the District. The former official was sentenced to 5 months home detention, 2 years of probation, 75 hours of community service, and was ordered to pay a \$10,000 fine.
- **Wilkes-Barre Area School District Contractor Sentenced** The president of King Paint and Glass Company, a Wilkes-Barre Area School District contractor, was sentenced to 5 months in prison, 2 years of supervised release, and was ordered to pay a \$10,000 fine for providing and installing free carpet in the home of a district board member as a reward for the board member's support in awarding his company a District contract.
- **Former Valley Forge Christian College Director of Information Technology Sentenced** The former director was sentenced for leading school purchasing officials to believe that the price of the technology-related equipment provided by a vendor was fair and reasonable when the price of the equipment had been inflated so the vendor could pay kickbacks to the former director. The former director was sentenced to 6 months of home confinement, 2 years of probation, and was ordered to pay more than \$27,200 in restitution.

Other Individuals

New York - Man Sentenced for Fraud Involving New York Department of Education Funds

During this reporting period, a man was sentenced to serve approximately 1 year in prison, 2 years of supervised release, and was ordered to pay \$275,000 in restitution for bank fraud involving New York Department of Education (NYDOE) funds. Our investigation

revealed that the man used a New York City Department of Education bank account number that caused more than \$600,000 in payments to be made to several of his credit card accounts and other vendors. The man, who was not an employee of the NYDOE, not only used the account to make payments on his own bills but shared the account number with friends who used the account number to make payments and withdraw funds from the account.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Participation on Committees, Work Groups, and Task Forces

- Federal and State Audit-Related Groups and Entities
 - ◆ *Association of Government Accountants (AGA) Intergovernmental Partnership for Management and Accountability* - OIG staff participate in this partnership that works to open lines of communication among Federal, State, and local governmental organizations with the goal of improving performance and accountability.

Review of Legislation, Regulations, Directives, and Memoranda

- ESEA Reauthorization – We made suggestions regarding *Investing in Innovation (Title VI, Part B)*, *Academic Excellence in Core Subjects (Title IV)*, and *Migrant Education (Title I, § 2203(b))*.

Internal Departmental Operations

OIG conducts annual reviews of the Department's IT security and management, as well as other reviews of Departmental operations. These reviews seek to help the Department accomplish its objectives by ensuring the reliability, integrity, and security of its data; its compliance with applicable policies and regulations; and that it is effectively, efficiently, and fairly using the taxpayer dollars with which it has been entrusted. Below you will find summaries of the reports we issued over the last 6 months involving IT security and management and the Department's management of other programs. You will also find the results of the quality control reviews of single audits of Department grantees that we conducted during this reporting period.

Information Technology Security and Management

During this reporting period, we completed two audits and two special projects related to the Department's IT security and management. Because of the sensitive nature of these efforts, for security purposes and to maintain the integrity of the Department's critical data structures, we discuss only the general/public aspects of our work and findings.

Weaknesses in the Process for Handling Compromised Privileged Accounts

We conducted an investigative project to determine whether compromised privileged accounts were used by unauthorized individuals and to evaluate the Department's process for handling such accounts. Privileged account users can access, view, enter, or modify more than just the account owner's personal data. We found that FSA did not identify all individuals whose data were potentially compromised; that the Department and FSA failed to conduct adequate log reviews of compromised privileged accounts to identify unauthorized activity; that FSA kept inadequate records of its remediation efforts for compromised privileged accounts; and that two-factor authentication had not yet been required for remote access to Department and FSA systems. To ensure that compromised privileged accounts are properly identified and analyzed to prevent unauthorized access to Department systems, we made a number of recommendations, including that the Department identify all potentially compromised personally identifiable information and revise

its current methodology to better identify suspicious activity that indicated unauthorized access into privileged accounts.

Bypassing of Web Content Filtering

The Department provides employees with appropriate Internet access to facilitate their work. Through web content filtering, the Department blocks employees' access to certain sites, such as personal email, social networking sites, and blogs. The Department's Security Policy Handbook outlines its policies related to the use of the Internet by Department employees. During this reporting period, we conducted a special assignment that found that multiple users throughout the Department had circumvented web filtering, predominantly to access email and social networking sites. We made several recommendations for the Department to address this situation, including that it educate users that bypassing web filtering is a violation of Department policy that can expose the user and the Department to risks.

Security Controls for Data Protection Over the Virtual Data Center

We performed a review of Security Controls for Data Protection over the Virtual Data Center (VDC) to determine whether the Department and FSA had effective IT security controls. The VDC serves as the host facility for FSA systems that process student financial aid applications (grants, loans, and work-study), provide schools

and lenders with eligibility determinations, and support payments from and repayment to lenders. We found that FSA had adequate operational controls in place for the VDC over maintenance and personnel security and had adequate safeguards in place over physical and environmental controls. However, we found that FSA did not have adequate operational controls in place over configuration management, system and information integrity, contingency planning, media protection, and awareness and training. In addition, we determined that FSA needed to improve technical safeguards over access controls, systems and communications protection, identification and authentication, and audit and accountability. Without adequate operational and technical security controls in place, the Department's systems and information are vulnerable to attacks that could lead to a loss of confidentiality due to unauthorized access to data and to a possible loss of integrity through data modification or limited availability from unauthorized access and excessive use of system resources. Also, there is increased risk that unauthorized activities may occur that reduce the reliability of Department systems and data being maintained by the VDC. FSA concurred with the majority of our findings and the recommendations we made to address weaknesses identified.

Application Controls Over the Department's Financial Management System

Our review determined that the Department had effective internal controls over the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of data and the overall management of the IT function for its Financial Management System (FMS), which provides consolidated data to support key management analysis and is the only source within the Department to obtain a comprehensive financial picture of an institution across all FSA programs. However, in reviewing selected IT security safeguards, we found that FSA did not have adequate controls in place over the security awareness and training and personnel security clearances for FMS users and lacked proper procedures to verify clearances for external FMS users. The lack of adequate controls over training and clearances potentially left FMS data vulnerable to malicious or inexperienced users with unverified access and inadequate training. We also found that FSA did not ensure adequate physical and environmental controls at a contractor facility. Although FSA took action to address this issue with the contractor, its prior inaction left Department assets vulnerable to loss and injury. Based on our findings, we made a number of recommendations, including that FSA ensure that procedures are in place to verify all users granted FMS responsibilities have an approved security level that is at or above the FMS responsibilities to which they are assigned. FSA agreed with a majority of our findings and recommendations.

Contract Reviews

Desktop Services Pricing Under the EDUCATE Contract

While responding to allegations regarding the Department's management of the EDUCATE contract, we became aware that the Department may not have effectively assessed the reasonableness of the EDUCATE contractor's proposed prices for desktop services over the life of the contract. Specifically, the Department may not have effectively validated aspects of the Independent Government Cost Estimate pertaining to desktop services prices; performed market research regarding desktop

services costs; or resolved potential weaknesses identified in the contractor's proposed pricing for desktop services. As a result, the Department may be paying the EDUCATE contractor unreasonable prices for desktop services. We shared these findings with the Department and recommended that it review the estimated costs for desktop services over the remaining life of the EDUCATE contract and consider re-negotiating pricing for the services before the next option year of the contract is exercised. The Department concurred with our recommendations.

Implementation of the Managed Security Services Provider Contract

While reviewing the Department's corrective actions in response to a 2007 OIG report related to a Department IT system, we became aware that the Department had not effectively implemented the Managed Security Services Provider (MSSP) contract. The MSSP provides system security functions for the agency's network and information systems, including monitoring and management of intrusion detection systems and firewalls, overseeing patch management and upgrades, performing security assessments, and responding to emergencies. We found that

the Department had terminated the initial contract because of contractor performance problems and that the subsequent contractor had been unable to provide the level of service required by the contract. As a result, the Department paid for services it had not received and had not ensured that its IT network is adequately protected. Based on our findings, we made several recommendations, including that the Department formally review and evaluate alternatives for obtaining MSSP services and proceed with a solution that best serves the interests of the Department in a cost-effective manner. The Department generally concurred with our findings and recommendations.

Other Internal Reports

Controls Over the Department's Transit Benefits Program

Our audit found that controls over the Department's transit benefits program were inadequate. Specifically, the Department's controls did not ensure that only current employees received transit benefits, that employees were not participating simultaneously in the transit benefits and subsidized parking programs, and that employees on extended leave had adjusted their benefits. As a result, the Department paid more than \$118,900 in benefits to individuals who were not entitled to them. We also identified a need for the Department to improve controls over the application, withdrawal, and recordkeeping processes, and that it did not always perform verifications to ensure that data on

transit benefits applications were valid and accurate. In addition, the Department failed to maintain adequate records over excess funds collected from employees withdrawing from the program and did not ensure that the data maintained in the transit benefits database were accurate. As the Department relies on these data to manage its transit benefits program and to identify employee program participants, inaccurate data can compromise the integrity of the program. To correct the weaknesses identified, we made a number of recommendations, including that the Department review the transit benefits database to ensure only current Department employees are included and immediately remove former employees. The Department concurred with most of our findings and recommendations.

Non-Federal Audits

Quality Control Reviews

The Single Audit Act of 1984, as amended, requires entities, such as State and local governments, universities, and non-profit organizations that expend \$500,000 or more in Federal funds in one year to obtain an audit, referred to as a "single audit." Additionally, for-profit institutions and their servicers that participate in the Federal student aid programs and for-profit lenders and their servicers that participate in the FFELP are required to undergo annual audits performed by independent public accountants (IPAs) in accordance with audit guides issued by the OIG. These audits provide the Federal

government with assurance that recipients of Federal funds comply with laws, regulations, and other requirements that are material to Federal awards. To help assess the quality of the thousands of single audits performed each year, OIG conducts quality control reviews (QCRs) of a sample of audits. During this reporting period, we completed 43 QCRs of audits conducted by 38 different IPAs, or offices of firms with multiple offices. We concluded that 16 (37 percent) were acceptable or acceptable with minor issues, 20 (47 percent) were technically deficient, and 7 (16 percent) were substandard.

Noteworthy OIG Efforts

CAROI Guide

In May, the Association of Government Accountants' (AGA) Partnership for Intergovernmental Management and Accountability issued a guide geared to provide government officials with a concrete tool to improve programs and to deal with fiscal and programmatic challenges entitled "Guide to Improving Program Performance and Accountability Through Cooperative Audit Resolution and Oversight." The guide is based on OIG's Cooperative Audit Resolution and Oversight Initiative (CAROI)—the collaborative method that provides alternative and creative approaches to resolve audit findings and their underlying causes. Created by OIG in the 1990s, CAROI is designed to avoid costly litigation, lengthy adversarial discussion and nonproductive impasses, as well as to make permanent corrective action the norm. The CAROI process promotes continuous dialogue, innovative solutions, horizontal lines of communication, and a fundamental commitment to serving education's ultimate customer -- the learner. The AGA worked closely with OIG staff and other government officials in developing the guide.

National State Auditors Association Honors OIG Director

In June, the National State Auditors Association adopted a resolution honoring Hugh Monaghan, Director of OIG's Non-Federal Audit Team, who passed away earlier this year. The resolution honored Hugh for his noteworthy Federal career, lifetime of service to improve non-Federal audit oversight, and his overall contributions to the profession of government auditing. Stating that Hugh was "a stalwart supporter and friend of the members of the Association," they noted how generously he shared his knowledge with all members of his profession, and said he would be much missed by the State audit community.

CIGIE Award Winners

The Council of Inspectors General for Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE) selected four OIG project teams and honored another OIG employee who was part of an IG community-wide training team with 2010 Awards for Excellence. The CIGIE awards acknowledge the contributions of Inspectors General to improve Federal

government programs and operations and to fight waste, fraud, and abuse of taxpayer dollars. CIGIE bestows a limited number of awards each year, and we were honored to have five of our efforts highlighted:

- **Award for Excellence for Audit - OIG Cash Management Audit Team.** The team identified critical cash management issues in California, including management of Recovery Act funds and heightened awareness of these issues in the education and audit communities nationwide;
- **Award for Excellence for Investigation - Puerto Rico International Identity Theft Trafficking Team.** The team's investigative efforts led to prosecution of multi-national fraud ring members whose crimes included stealing identity-related documents of children, teachers, and administrators from 50 schools in Puerto Rico;
- **Award for Excellence for Multiple Disciplines - Community Integrated Service Program Public Corruption Team.** The team's investigative and audit work led to the prosecution of 10 Puerto Rico Department of Education public officials and family members for committing fraud involving nearly \$500,000 in Federal and State funds;
- **Award for Excellence for Multiple Disciplines - U.S. Department of Education Office of Inspector General Recovery Act Team** - This award recognized the many members of the OIG staff involved in planning and implementing an OIG-wide strategy to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the administration of the Recovery Act; and
- **Barry J. Snyder Award** – This award recognized a group of OIG staffers from around the IG community, including our Training Coordinator, for their outstanding cooperative efforts in developing and executing Introductory Auditor Training for the IG community.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Participation on Committees, Working Groups, and Task Forces

■ Departmental Groups

- ◆ *Department of Education Senior Assessment Team* - OIG staff participates in an advisory capacity on this team, which provides oversight of the Department's assessment and reports on internal controls and provides input to the Senior Management Council concerning the overall assessment of Department's internal control structure, as required by the *Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act of 1982*, and OMB Circular A-123, Management's Responsibility for Internal Control.

■ Inspector General Community

- ◆ *CIGIE* - OIG staff play an active role in CIGIE efforts. Inspector General Tighe is a member of CIGIE's Audit Committee, Investigations Committee, Information Technology Committee, and also the Interagency Coordination Group for Guam Realignment. In addition, IG Tighe is a member of the Suspension and Debarment Working Group, which is a Subcommittee of the Investigations Committee. OIG staff also chair the AIGI Investigations Subcommittee, the IT Subcommittee for Investigations, the Audit Committee's Financial Statement Audit Network Work Group, and CIGIE's Federal Audit Executive Council's (FAEC) Professional Development Committee. Staff also participate on the FAEC Financial Statement Audit Committee, the Financial Audit Manual Revisions Workgroup, and the CIGIE Council of Counsels to the Inspector General.

OIG staff also led the work group that updated the Inspector General Criminal Investigator Academy undercover operations training curriculum.

■ OMB

- ◆ *Interagency Task Force on Reporting Fraud, False Claims, and Significant Overpayments* - OIG staff participate on this task force that is analyzing and will make recommendations related to a proposal to mandate the reporting of fraud, false claims, and significant overpayments by grantees be included in Federal regulations.

■ Federal and State Audit-related Groups and Entities

- ◆ *Chief Financial Officers Council Federal Reporting Model Work Group* - OIG staff participate on this work group, which focuses on developing and implementing revisions to the Federal financial reporting model in order to better deliver financial information needed by taxpayers and decision makers.
- ◆ *Comptroller General's Advisory Council on Government Auditing Standards* - OIG staff serve on this Council, which provides advice and guidance to the Comptroller General on government auditing standards.

OTHER ACTIVITIES (continued)

- ◆ *DOD-OIG Financial Statement Audit Advisory Committee* - OIG staff participate on this Committee, which makes recommendations to help resolve accounting and auditing issues related to the U.S. Department of Defense OIG's (DoD-OIG) financial reporting and the financial statement audit, the system of internal controls, and compliance with laws and regulations that could have a material effect on the DoD-OIG's financial statements.
- ◆ *Intergovernmental Audit Forums* - OIG staff chair and serve as officers of a number of intergovernmental audit forums, which bring together Federal, State, and local government audit executives who work together to improve audit education and training and exchange information and ideas regarding the full range of professional activities undertaken by government audit officials. OIG staff chair the Midwestern Forum, the Southeastern Forum, and serve as an officers on the Southwestern Forum and the New Jersey-New York Forum.
- ◆ *Interagency Working Group for Certification and Accreditation* - OIG participates on this working group, which exchanges information relating to Federal forensic science programs that share intergovernmental responsibilities to support the mission of the National Science and Technology Council's Subcommittee on Forensic Science.

Reviews of Legislation, Regulations, Directives, and Memorandum

■ Legislative Measures

- ◆ *Draft Legislation Pertaining to Honest Services Fraud by Public Official* - We recommended that "public official" be defined to include anyone acting at the direction of the public official or on the public official's behalf as there could be situations where public officials use others to hide their actions.
- ◆ *S. 372, Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2009* - We provided comments regarding the Act's requirement that each Inspector General designate a Whistleblower Protection Ombudsman to advocate for the interests of agency employees or applicants who make protected disclosures. We commented that IGs are required to be neutral under the Inspector General Act, and thus should not advocate for any individual's interest, and also that an Ombudsman is not needed because IGs already provide outreach and information on whistleblower protection.
- ◆ *H.R. 5815, Testimonial Subpoena Authority* - We commented that testimonial subpoena authority could be a useful tool, particularly in audits or investigations of third parties, such as contractors or grantees. We further commented that the U.S. Department of Justice's (DOJ) concern about OIGs' use of testimonial subpoenas potentially compromising

OTHER ACTIVITIES (continued)

cases was addressed by the requirement that DOJ approve each use of the subpoena authority before it is exercised.

- ◆ *S. 3480, Protecting Cyberspace as a National Asset Act of 2010* - We commented that the requirement that agency heads and inspectors general provide all information relevant to national information security to the Director of US-Computer Emergency Readiness Team upon request did not address grand jury secrecy requirements under the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

■ CIGIE

- ◆ *Suspension and Debarment Working Group Draft Survey* - We reviewed and approved a survey about use of suspensions and debarments by agencies and OIGs' role in promoting suspension and debarment as a remedy.
- ◆ *Procedures to Obtain Assistance from another OIG in the Execution of Search and Arrest Warrants* - We commented that the duration of the assistance provided by one IG to another must be agreed upon by both IGs and that it generally should not exceed 5 days, and that a request for assistance must contain the draft operational plan. An earlier comment we made about the applicability of the procedures was addressed by CIGIE clarifying that they only apply to search and arrest warrants.

- ◆ *Recommended Practices for OIG Hotlines Report* - We provided comments regarding definitions of whistleblower and whistleblower reprisal and the importance of maintaining the confidentiality of those who contact OIG Hotlines.

- ◆ *Guidelines on Undercover Operations* - Our AIG-I incorporated comments, responded to questions, and assisted the CIGIE Investigations Committee in getting these Guidelines published in July 2010.

■ Office of Management and Budget

- ◆ *Directive on Enhancing Payment Accuracy through a 'Do Not Pay List'* - We made suggestions that language be included in the directive and related guidance that addresses the type of payee receiving the payment, provides agency flexibility regarding database checks, and takes into account conditions under which the results of the database check could have no impact on the recipient's eligibility for a payment.

■ Department

- ◆ *Electronically Stored Information (ESI) Policy Team Charter* - We commented on the Department's Email Extender, which indexes every employee's e-mail immediately when it is sent or received.

Annexes

Annex A - Contract-Related Audit Products with Significant Findings

The following is provided in accordance with Section 845 of the , which requires each Inspector General to include information in its Semiannual Reports to Congress on final contract-related audit reports that contain significant findings. OIG issued two such reports over the last 6 months.

Report Number: ED-OIG/L19K0004

Date Issued: 6/1/2010

Subject: Desktop Services Pricing Under the EDUCATE Contract

Finding: The Department may not have effectively assessed the reasonableness of the EDUCATE contractor's proposed prices for desktop services over the life of the contract. Specifically, the Department may not have effectively validated aspects of the Independent Government Cost Estimate pertaining to desktop services prices; performed market research regarding desktop services costs; and resolved potential weaknesses identified in the contractor's proposed pricing for desktop services. As a result, the Department may be paying the EDUCATE contractor unreasonable prices for desktop services. We did not specifically identify any unsupported, questioned, or disallowed costs.

Report Number: ED-OIG/L19K0011

Date Issued: 9/24/2010

Subject: Implementation of the Managed Security Services Provider Contract

Finding: The Department had not effectively implemented the Managed Security Services Provider contract. We found that the Department had terminated the initial contract because of contractor performance problems and that the subsequent contractor had been unable to provide the level of service required by the contract. As a result, the Department paid for services it had not received and had not ensured that its IT network is adequately protected. We did not specifically identify any unsupported, questioned, or disallowed costs.

Annex B- Peer Review Results

Title IX, Subtitle I, Sec. 989C of the (Public Law No. 111-203) requires the Inspectors General to disclose the results of their peer reviews in their Semiannual Reports to Congress.

No peer reviews were conducted during this reporting period. Our last peer reviews were conducted in February 2008 on our investigative processes and July 2009 for our audit processes. The recommendations offered in our investigations peer review have all been implemented. No recommendations were offered in the peer review of our audit processes.

Required Tables

Reporting Requirements of the Inspector General Act, as amended

| Section | Requirement (<i>Table Title</i>) | Table Number |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 5(a)(1) and 5(a)(2) | Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies | N/A |
| 5(a)(3) | Uncompleted Corrective Actions <i>Recommendations Described in Previous Semiannual Reports to Congress on which Corrective Action Has Not Been Completed</i> | 1 |
| 5(a)(4) | Matters Referred to Prosecutive Authorities <i>Statistical Profile FY 2010</i> | 6 |
| 5(a)(5) and 6(b)(2) | Summary of Instances where Information was Refused or Not Provided | N/A |
| 5(a)(6) | Listing of Reports <i>Audit, Inspection, and Evaluation Reports on Department Programs and Activities (April 1, 2010, through September 30, 2010)</i> | 2 |
| 5(a)(7) | Summary of Significant Audits | N/A |
| 5(a)(8) | Questioned Costs <i>Audit, Inspection, and Evaluation Reports with Questioned Costs</i> | 3 |
| 5(a)(9) | Better Use of Funds <i>Audit, Inspection, and Evaluation Reports with Recommendations for Better Use of Funds</i> | 4 |
| 5(a)(10) | Unresolved Reports <i>Unresolved Reports Issued Prior to April 1, 2010</i> | 5-A |
| | Summary of Unresolved Reports Issued During the Previous Reporting Period Where Management Decision Has Not Yet Been Made | 5-B |
| 5(a)(11) | Significant Revised Management Decisions | N/A |
| 5(a)(12) | Significant Management Decisions with which OIG Disagreed | N/A |
| 5(a)(13) | Unmet Intermediate Target Dates Established by the Department Under the <i>Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996</i> | N/A |

Table 1: Recommendations Described in Previous Semiannual Reports to Congress on which Corrective Action Has Not Been Completed

Section 5(a)(3) of the IG Act, as amended, requires identification of significant recommendations described in previous Semiannual Reports on which management has not completed corrective action.

| Report Number | Report Title (Prior Semiannual Report (SAR) Number and Page) | Date Issued | Date of Management Decision | Number of Significant Recommendations | | Projected Action Date |
|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| | | | | Open | Completed | |

AUDIT REPORTS

Federal Student Aid (FSA)

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------|---|---|------------|
| A19H0008 | FSA's Performance as a Performance Based Organization (Report addressed to the Office of the Under Secretary (OUS)) (SAR 58, page 31) | 12/11/2008 | 6/15/2009 | 1 | 3 | 11/30/2010 |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------|---|---|------------|

Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO)

| | | | | | | |
|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------|---|---|------------|
| A17H0003 | Financial Statement Audits FY 2007 and FY 2006 of the Department and FSA (FSA also designated as an action official) (SAR 56, page 25) | 11/15/2007 | 9/26/2008 | 2 | 3 | 11/30/2010 |
| A17I0001 | Financial Statement Audits FY 2008 and FY 2007 – of the Department (FSA also designated as an action official) (SAR 58, page 31) | 11/14/2008 | 5/15/2009 | 2 | 4 | 11/30/2010 |

Office of the Chief Information Office (OCIO)

| | | | | | | |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|---|----|------------|
| A04H0018 | Reliability of Cost and Benefit Information in the Department's IT Investment Exhibit 300s (SAR 59, page 42) | 7/30/2009 | 9/18/2009 | 4 | 1 | 10/29/2010 |
| A11I0006 | Incident Handling and Privacy Act Controls over External Web Sites (SAR 59, page 42) | 6/10/2009 | 9/9/2009 | 4 | 14 | 11/30/2010 |

INSPECTION REPORTS

Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE)

| | | | | | | |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|---|---|------------|
| I13I0001 | Review of OPE's Awarding of Prior Experience Points in the 2006 Educational Opportunity Centers and Talent Search Grant Competitions (SAR 57, page 27) | 9/8/2008 | 3/3/2009 | 5 | 1 | 12/31/2011 |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|---|---|------------|

OIG Product Web Site Availability Policy

OIG final issued products are generally considered to be public documents accessible on OIG's Web site unless sensitive in nature or otherwise subject to Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) exemption. Consistent with the FOIA, and to the extent practical, OIG redacts exempt information from the product so that non-exempt information contained in the product may be made available on the OIG Web site.

Table 2: Audit, Inspection, Evaluation, and Other Reports and Products on Department Programs and Activities (April 1, 2010, through September 30, 2010)

Section 5(a)(6) of the IG Act, as amended, requires a listing of each report completed by OIG during the reporting period.

| Report Number | Report Title | Date Issued | Questioned Costs ¹ | Unsupported Costs | Number of Recommendations |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| AUDIT REPORTS | | | | | |
| FSA | | | | | |
| A02J0001 | Everest Institute's Lender Agreements | 8/4/10 | | | None ² |
| A02J0005 | National Aviation Academy – New England's Lender Agreements | 8/19/10 | | | 1 ² |
| A03J0005 | FSA's Controls Over Loan Purchases Under the ECASLA (<i>OPE also designated as an action official</i>) | 7/2/10 | | | 10 |
| A05I0012 | Baker College's Compliance with Selected Provisions of the HEA and Corresponding Regulations | 8/24/10 | \$9,790 | | 5 |
| A11J0005 | System Application Controls over the Financial Management System | 9/28/10 | | | 6 |
| A11J0006 | Security Controls for Data Protection over the Virtual Data Center | 9/29/10 | | | 24 |
| Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) | | | | | |
| A02K0005 | Use of Recovery Act Funds and Reporting in Wisconsin (<i>Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) also designated as an action official</i>) | 9/29/10 | | | 7 |
| A06K0001 | Systems of Internal Control Over Selected Recovery Act Funds in Louisiana (<i>OSERS also designated as an action official</i>) | 9/29/10 | | | 8 |
| A19J0001 | Department's Implementation of the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program | 9/24/10 | | | 4 |
| A19K0006 | Department's Process for Screening and Selecting Peer Reviewers for the Race to the Top Grant Program | 8/16/10 | | | 1 |
| Office of Management (OM) | | | | | |
| A19I0001 | Controls Over the Department's Transit Benefits Program | 6/1/10 | | | 21 |

| Report Number | Report Title | Date Issued | Questioned Costs ¹ | Unsupported Costs | Number of Recommendations |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development (OPEPD) | | | | | |
| A04J0003 | Georgia Department of Education's Controls Over Performance Data Entered in ED Facts (<i>Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools (OSDFS), OESE, and OSERS also designated as action official</i>) | 4/7/10 | | | 9 |
| Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) | | | | | |
| A06J0001 | Arkansas' Adult Education and Family Literacy Act Program | 5/28/10 | \$13,027 | \$570,376 | 7 |

OTHER REPORTS AND PRODUCTS

| FSA | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|--|--|----------------|
| A03K0001 | Closure of Audit of the Characteristics of Loans Purchased under the Authority of the ECASLA (<i>Audit Closure Memorandum</i>) | 4/30/10 | | | None |
| L02K0001 | Lender Agreements between Sallie Mae and Student Loan Xpress and Corinthian Colleges, Inc., Contained Inducements (<i>Alert Memorandum</i>) | 7/9/10 | | | 2 ² |
| S18K0001 | Technical Assessment Review of the Direct Loan Program's Origination Process (<i>Special Project – OPE also designated as an action official</i>) | 6/30/10 | | | None |
| X19K0008 | FSA's Efforts to Ensure the Effective Processing of Student Loans Under the Direct Loan Program (<i>Management Information Report</i>) | 9/16/10 | | | None |
| OCFO | | | | | |
| F03K0014 | Education Statistics Services Institute (ED-05-CO-0044) and National Assessment of Educational Progress Education Statistics Services Institute (ED-05-CO-0053) Cost Proposal (<i>Independent Memorandum Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures</i>) | 9/30/10 | | | None |
| L20K0003 | Department Progress in Implementing Corrective Actions for Prior Audits of Programs that Subsequently Received Funding Under the Recovery Act (<i>Alert Memorandum – Office of the Secretary (OS)/Risk Management Service (RMS) also designated as an action official</i>) | 7/12/10 | | | 4 |

| Report Number | Report Title | Date Issued | Questioned Costs ¹ | Unsupported Costs | Number of Recommendations |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| OCIO | | | | | |
| L19K0004 | Desktop Services Pricing Under the EDUCATE Contract (<i>Alert Memorandum - OCFO also designated as an action official</i>) | 6/1/10 | | | 2 |
| L19K0011 | Implementation of the Managed Security Services Provider Contract (<i>Alert Memorandum - OCFO also designated as an action official</i>) | 9/24/10 | | | 4 |
| L21K0001 | Bypassing of Web Content Filtering (<i>Investigative Program Advisory Report (IPAR) FSA also designated as an action official</i>) | 7/20/10 | | | 2 |
| L21K0002 | Weaknesses in the Process for Handling Compromised Privileged Accounts (<i>IPAR - Addressed to the Office of the Deputy Secretary (ODS) and FSA</i>) | 9/24/10 | | | 4 |
| ODS | | | | | |
| S20K0002 | Recovery Act Data Quality: Recipient Efforts to Report Reliable and Transparent Information (<i>Special Project performed at the request of the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board</i>) | 9/13/10 | | | 12 ³ |
| OPE | | | | | |
| X13J0003 | Review of The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and School's Standards for Program Length (<i>Management Information Report</i>) | 5/24/10 | | | None |
| OPEPD | | | | | |
| L03K0004 | Reporting Requirements for the ECASLA Loan Purchase Programs Have Not Been Met (<i>Alert Memorandum - FSA and OPE also designated as action officials</i>) | 6/4/10 | | | 2 |
| OS | | | | | |
| L03K0002 | Philadelphia School District Designation as a High Risk Grantee (<i>Alert Memorandum</i>) | 4/16/10 | | | 2 |
| X05J0019 | Subrecipient Monitoring under the Recovery Act (<i>Management Information Report</i>) | 6/4/10 | | | None |
| TOTALS: | | | \$22,817 | \$570,376 | 137 |

Description of Products

Agreed - Upon Procedures Engagements are agreed-upon procedures engagements in which a practitioner is engaged by a client to issue a report of findings based on specific procedures performed on the subject matter. Reports generated from field pricing support work are commonly referred to as "pre-awards." Field pricing support work is performed and reported as agreed-upon procedures engagements in accordance with the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants standards.

Alert Memoranda are used to communicate to the Department significant matters identified that require the attention when the identified matters are not related to the objectives of an on-going assignment or are otherwise outside the scope of the ongoing assignment. The matter may have been identified during an audit, attestation, inspection, data analysis, or other activity.

Audit Closure Memoranda are used to notify the audited entity of OIG's decision to terminate the audit without issuing an audit report.

Investigative Program Advisory Reports (IPAR) – are used to report any systemic program or regulatory weaknesses, abuses, or deficiencies in the administration of Department programs or operations that are identified at any time during an investigation.

Management Information Reports - are used to provide the Department with information and suggestions when a process other than an audit, attestation, or inspection is used to develop the report. For example, OIG staff may compile information from previous OIG audits and other activities to identify overarching issues related to a program or operational area and use a MIR to communicate the issues and suggested actions to the Department.

Special Projects are those by which OIG staff may perform work that is not classified as an audit, attestation, inspection, or any other type of alternative product. Depending on the nature and work involved, the special project may result in a report issued outside OIG. Information presented in the special project report varies based on the reason for the special project (e.g., response to congressional inquiry, other evaluation and analysis, etc.). The report may contain suggestions.

NOTE: No Inspection reports were issued during this reporting period.

¹For purposes of this table, questioned costs may include other recommended recoveries. Please see footnotes 2 and 3 under Table 3 for additional information regarding questioned and unsupported costs. During this reporting period, no OIG report was issued identifying a better use of funds (BUF).

²A02J0001 identified no findings or recommendations, but did reference scope limitations due to the auditors not being provided all requested information. A02J0005 identified one non-monetary finding and recommendation and also referenced scope limitations due to the auditors not being provided all requested information. Concerns identified during the conduct of both audits A02J0001 and A02J0005 were raised to FSA in alert memorandum L02K0001, issued July 9, 2010.

³S20K0002 made 12 recommendations to be considered by the Recovery Board that are not subject to the Departmental resolution process.

Table 3: Audit, Inspection, and Evaluation Reports with Questioned or Unsupported Costs¹

Section 5(a)(8) of the IG Act, as amended, requires for each reporting period a statistical table showing the total number of audit and inspection reports, the total dollar value of questioned and unsupported costs, and responding management decision.

| | | Number | Questioned ² Costs | Unsupported ³ Costs |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| A. | For which no management decision has been made before the commencement of the reporting period | 53 | \$1,052,887,241 | \$446,149,929 |
| B. | Which were issued during the reporting period | 2 | \$593,193 | \$570,376 |
| | Subtotals (A + B) | 55 | \$1,053,480,434 | \$446,720,305 |
| C. | For which a management decision was made during the reporting period | 9 | \$340,803,620 | \$3,731,683 |
| | (i) Dollar value of disallowed costs | | \$338,869,633 | \$2,403,150 |
| | (ii) Dollar value of costs not disallowed | | \$1,933,987 | \$1,328,533 |
| D. | For which no management decision was made by the end of the reporting period | 46 | \$712,676,814 | \$442,988,622 |

¹None of the products reported in this table were performed by the Defense Contract Audit Agency.

²Questioned costs are identified during an audit, inspection, or evaluation because of: (1) an alleged violation of a law, regulation, contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or other agreement or document governing the expenditure of funds; (2) such cost not being supported by adequate documentation; or (3) the expenditure of funds for the intended purpose being unnecessary or unreasonable. OIG considers that category (3) of this definition would include other recommended recoveries of funds, i.e., recovery of outstanding funds and/or revenue earned on Federal funds, or interest due the Department.

³Unsupported costs are costs that, at the time of the audit, inspection, or evaluation, were not supported by adequate documentation.

Table 4: Audit, Inspection, and Evaluation Reports with Recommendations for Better Use of Funds¹

Section 5(a)(9) of the IG Act, as amended, requires for each reporting period a statistical table showing the total number of audit, inspection, and evaluation reports and the total dollar value of recommendations that funds be put to better use by management.

| | | Number | Dollar Value |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|---------------------|
| A. | For which no management decision was made before the commencement of the reporting period | 2 | \$13,327,577 |
| B. | Which were issued during the reporting period | 0 | \$0 |
| | Subtotals (A + B) | 2 | \$13,327,577 |
| C. | For which a management decision was made during the reporting period: | | |
| | (I) Dollar value of recommendations that were agreed to by management; | 0 | \$0 |
| | (II) Dollar value of recommendations that were not agreed to by management | 0 | \$0 |
| D. | For which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period | 2 | \$13,327,577 |

¹None of the products reported in this table were performed by the Defense Contract Audit Agency and no inspection or evaluation reports identifying better use of funds were issued during this reporting period.

Table 5-A: Unresolved Audit, Inspection, and Evaluation Reports Issued Prior to April 1, 2010

Section 5(a)(10) of the IG Act, as amended, requires a listing of each report issued before the commencement of the reporting period for which no management decision had been made by the end of the reporting period. Summaries of the audit and inspection reports issued during the previous SAR period follow in Table 5-B.

| Report Number | Report Title (Prior SAR Number and Page) | Date Issued | Total Monetary Findings | Number of Recommendations |
|---------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
|---------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|

NEW SINCE LAST REPORTING PERIOD

AUDIT REPORTS

| OCFO | | | | |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|---------------|----|
| A09I0010 | Center for Civic Education's Administration of the We the People Program and Cooperative Civic Education and Economic Education Exchange Program (OSDFS also designated as an action official) (SAR 60, page 38) | 11/20/09 | \$5,938,537 | 30 |
| | Current Status: The Department tracking system (AARTS) shows that OCFO's administrative stay was approved on 7/28/2010. | | | |
| OESE | | | | |
| A02J0006 | New York State System of Internal Control Over Recovery Act Funds (SAR 60, page 39) | 11/10/09 | | 7 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that the program determination letter (PDL) is currently with OGC for review. | | | |
| A02J0009 | New York State LEAs Systems of Internal Control Over Recovery Act Funds (SAR 60, page 39) | 2/17/10 | | 16 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that resolution activities continue to be in process. | | | |
| A03H0010 | Philadelphia School District's Controls Over Federal Expenditures (OSERS, OSDFS, and OPE also designated as action officials) (SAR 60, page 39) | 1/15/10 | \$138,769,898 | 27 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us the PDL is clearing the internal review process. AARTS shows that OESE's administrative stay was approved by OCFO on 7/28/2010. | | | |
| A03J0010 | Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Recovery Act Audit of Internal Controls over Selected Funds (OSERS, OS/RMS, and OCFO also designated as action officials) (SAR 60, page 39) | 3/15/10 | | 8 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that resolution activities continue to be in process. | | | |
| A04J0004 | Virgin Islands Department of Education's Current Efforts to Address Prior Audit Findings (SAR 60, page 39) | 11/13/09 | | 3 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us the PDL is clearing the internal review process. | | | |

| Report Number | Report Title (Prior SAR Number and Page) | Date Issued | Total Monetary Findings | Number of Recommendations |
|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| A04J0010 | Tennessee Recovery Act Audit Internal Controls over Selected Funds (Recommendations were made to OESE in conjunction with OSERS) (SAR 60, page 39) | 12/15/09 | | 2 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that resolution activities continue to be in process. | | | |
| A05J0011 | Systems of Internal Control Over Selected Recovery Act Funds in the State of Indiana (OSERS also designated as an action official) (SAR 60, page 40) | 1/14/10 | | 7 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that resolution activities continue to be in process. | | | |
| A05J0012 | Systems of Internal Control Over Selected Recovery Act Funds in the State of Illinois (OSERS also designated as an action official) (SAR 60, page 40) | 2/23/10 | | 4 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that resolution activities continue to be in process. | | | |
| A06J0013 | Systems of Internal Control Over Selected Recovery Act Funds in the State of Texas (SAR 60, page 40) | 1/27/10 | | 5 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that resolution activities continue to be in process. | | | |
| A09J0004 | Colorado Department of Education's Use of Federal Funds for State Employee Personnel Costs (OSERS, OVAE, Office of English Language Acquisition, Office of Innovation and Improvement (OII), OSDFS, and National Center for Educational Statistics also designated as action officials) (SAR 60, page 40) | 2/26/10 | \$23,961,710 | 5 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that resolution activities continue to be in process. AARTS shows that OESE's administrative stay was approved by OCFO on 9/30/2010. | | | |
| A09J0006 | State and Local Controls over Recovery Act Funds in California (OCFO and OSERS also designated as action officials) (SAR 60, page 40) | 1/15/10 | | 7 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that resolution activities continue to be in process. | | | |
| A19I0002 | Office of Indian Education's Management of the Professional Development Grant Program (SAR 60, page 40) | 2/2/10 | | 14 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that this is an internal audit being tracked by AARTS. OESE Program Team continues to update the corrective action plan. | | | |

| Report Number | Report Title (Prior SAR Number and Page) | Date Issued | Total Monetary Findings | Number of Recommendations |
|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| OSERS | | | | |
| A04J0009 | Puerto Rico Recovery Act Audit, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration (SAR 60, page 40) | 12/14/09 | | 11 |
| | Current Status: OSERS informed us the PDL was issued on 6/30/2010. However, for OCFO, the other program office involved with this audit, required documentation needs to be certified through AARTS before the audit can be officially resolved. | | | |

REPORTED IN PREVIOUS SARs

AUDIT REPORTS

| FSA | | | | |
|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------------|----|
| A02H0007 | Technical Career Institutes, Inc.'s Administration of the Federal Pell Grant and FFELP (SAR 57, page 25) | 5/19/08 | \$6,458 | 13 |
| | Current Status: FSA informed us it is currently working on this audit. | | | |
| A02H0008 | Touro College's Title IV HEA Programs, Institutional and Program Eligibility (SAR 58, page 31) | 10/30/08 | \$36,026,364 | 5 |
| | Current Status: FSA informed us it is currently working on this audit. | | | |
| A03I0006 | Special Allowance Payments to Sallie Mae's Subsidiary, Nellie Mae, for Loans Funded by Tax-Exempt Obligations (SAR 59, page 41) | 08/03/09 | \$22,378,905 | 3 |
| | Current Status: AARTS shows that FSA's administrative stay expired on 9/30/2010. | | | |
| A04B0019 | Advanced Career Training Institute's Administration of the Title IV HEA Programs (SAR 47, page 13) | 9/25/03 | \$7,472,583 | 14 |
| | Current Status: FSA is working on resolving this audit. | | | |
| A04E0001 | Review of Student Enrollment and Professional Judgment Actions at Tennessee Technology Center at Morristown (SAR 49, page 14) | 9/23/04 | \$2,458,347 | 7 |
| | Current Status: FSA informed us that it is still waiting on a policy decision to address and resolve this audit. | | | |
| A05E0013 | Audit of the Administration of the Student Financial Assistance Programs at the Ivy Tech State College Campus in Gary, Indiana, during the Period July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003 (SAR 50, page 21) | 2/25/05 | \$1,645,160 | 3 |
| | Current Status: FSA informed us that it uploaded closure documents into AARTS on 9/23/2009 and still needs to locate additional document(s) to upload into AARTS in order for audit to be closed. | | | |

| Report Number | Report Title (Prior SAR Number and Page) | Date Issued | Total Monetary Findings | Number of Recommendations |
|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| A05G0017 | Capella University's Compliance with Selected Provisions of the HEA and Corresponding Regulations (SAR 56, page 25) | 3/7/08 | \$589,892 | 9 |
| | Current Status: FSA informed us that it is currently working on this audit. | | | |
| A05H0018 | Walden University's Compliance with Selected Regulations and Dep't Guidance (SAR 58, page 31) | 1/21/09 | \$1,185,473 ¹ | 10 |
| | Current Status: FSA informed us that it is currently working on this audit. AARTS shows that FSA's administrative stay was approved by OCFO on 9/30/2010. | | | |
| A05I0011 | Special Allowance Payments to the Kentucky Higher Education Student Loan Corporation for Loans Made or Acquired with the Proceeds of Tax-Exempt Obligations (SAR 59, page 41) | 05/28/09 | \$9,018,400 | 4 |
| | Current Status: AARTS shows that FSA's administrative stay expired on 9/30/2010. | | | |
| A0670005 | Professional Judgment at Yale University (SAR 36, page 18) | 3/13/98 | \$5,469 | 3 |
| | Current Status: FSA informed us it is waiting on outcome of the Secretary's decision of school's appeal of Professional Judgment finding for Saint Louis University before it can resolve this audit. | | | |
| A0670009 | Professional Judgment at University of Colorado (SAR 37, page 17) | 7/17/98 | \$15,082 | 4 |
| | Current Status: FSA informed us it is waiting on the Secretary's decision on school's appeal of this audit which pertains to a Professional Judgment finding. | | | |
| A06D0018 | Audit of Saint Louis University's Use of Professional Judgment from July 2000 through June 2002 (SAR 50, page 21) | 2/10/05 | \$1,458,584 | 6 |
| | Current Status: FSA informed us it is waiting on the Secretary's decision on school's appeal of this audit which pertains to a Professional Judgment finding. | | | |
| A0723545 | State of Missouri, Single Audit Two Years Ended June 30, 1991 | 4/1/93 | \$1,048,768 | 18 |
| | Current Status: FSA informed us that it continues to work on this audit. | | | |
| A0733123 | State of Missouri, Single Audit Year Ended June 30, 1992 | 3/7/94 | \$187,530 | 18 |
| | Current Status: FSA informed us that it continues to work on this audit. | | | |
| A09I0009 | TUI University's Administration of the HEA, Title IV Programs (SAR 59, page 41) | 08/05/09 | \$923,379 | 14 |
| | Current Status: FSA informed us it is currently working on this audit. AARTS shows that FSA's administrative stay was approved by OCFO on 9/14/2010. | | | |

| Report Number | Report Title (Prior SAR Number and Page) | Date Issued | Total Monetary Findings | Number of Recommendations |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| N0690010 | Inspection of Parks College's Compliance with Student Financial Assistance Requirements (SAR 40, page 18) | 2/9/00 | \$169,390 | 1 |
| | Current Status: FSA informed us that it is working to get this resolved in AARTS and expects to have it closed by 12/31/2010. | | | |
| OCFO | | | | |
| A05I0013 | Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville's Compliance with Selected Provisions of the Law and Regulations for the Upward Bound, Upward Bound Math-Science, and Talent Search Programs (OCFO and OPE also designated as action officials) (SAR 59, page 41) | 04/30/09 | \$931,744 | 15 |
| | Current Status: OCFO informed us that resolution activities continue to be in process. | | | |
| A06H0002 | Review of Project GRAD USA's Administration of Fund for the Improvement of Education Grants (Oll also designated action office) (SAR 57, page 26) | 7/21/08 | \$31,384,603 | 11 |
| | Current Status: AARTS shows that OCFO's administrative stay was approved on 7/28/2010. | | | |
| A09H0019 | Los Angeles Unified School District's Procedures for Calculating and Remitting Interest Earned on Federal Cash Advances (SAR 58, page 31) | 12/2/08 | \$6,302,406 ² | 15 |
| | Current Status: AARTS shows that OCFO's administrative stay was approved on 7/28/2010. | | | |
| A09H0020 | California Department of Education Advances of Federal Funding to Local Educational Agencies (SAR 58, page 31) | 3/9/09 | \$728,651 ³ | 10 |
| | Current Status: OCFO informed us that resolution activities continue to be in process. | | | |
| OESE | | | | |
| A02G0002 | Audit of New York State Education Department's Reading First Program (SAR 54, page 31) | 11/3/06 | \$215,832,254 | 8 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us the Program Team continues to work with OGC to resolve issues. | | | |
| A02I0034 | Tennessee Department of Education Controls Over State Assessment Scoring (OPEPD also designated as an action official) (SAR 59, page 42) | 05/28/09 | | 9 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us the PDL is currently in OGC for review. | | | |
| A03G0006 | The Department's Administration of Selected Aspects of the Reading First Program (OCFO also designated as an action official) (SAR 54, page 31) | 2/22/07 | | 3 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that this is an Internal Audit being tracked by AARTS. OESE Program Team is working with OGC on this audit. | | | |

| Report Number | Report Title (Prior SAR Number and Page) | Date Issued | Total Monetary Findings | Number of Recommendations |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| A04G0012 | Audit of Mississippi Department of Education's Emergency Impact Aid Program Controls and Compliance (SAR 55, page 28) | 8/8/07 | \$3,192,395 | 4 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that resolution activities are in process. | | | |
| A04G0015 | Audit of Georgia Department of Education's Emergency Impact Aid Program Controls and Compliance (SAR 56, page 26) | 10/30/07 | \$9,977,242 | 9 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that resolution activities are in process. | | | |
| A04H0011 | Puerto Rico Department of Education's Administration of Contracts Awarded to Excellence in Education, Inc. and the University of Puerto Rico's Cayey Campus (SAR 57, page 26) | 5/20/08 | \$189,011 | 10 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that the PDL is currently with OGC for review. | | | |
| A04H0017 | Puerto Rico Department of Education's Administration of Title I Services Provided to Private School Students (SAR 58, page 31) | 10/9/08 | \$821,714 | 15 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that the PDL is clearing OESE internal review process. | | | |
| A04I0041 | Puerto Rico Department of Education's Compliance with Title I - Supplemental Educational Services (SAR 59, page 42) | 04/21/09 | \$16,092 | 8 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that the PDL is clearing OESE internal review process. | | | |
| A04I0042 | Virgin Islands Department of Education's Administration of Property Purchased with Federal Funds (SAR 59, page 42) | 08/17/09 | \$4,304 | 10 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that the PDL is currently with OGC for review. | | | |
| A04I0043 | Florida Department of Education Controls Over State Assessment Scoring (SAR 59, page 42) | 09/30/09 | | 8 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that the PDL is currently with OGC for review. | | | |
| A05G0020 | Audit of the Alabama State Department of Education's and Two Selected LEAs' Compliance with Temporary Emergency Impact Aid Program Requirements (SAR 55, page 28) | 9/27/07 | \$4,579,375 | 5 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that resolution activities are in process. | | | |

| Report Number | Report Title (Prior SAR Number and Page) | Date Issued | Total Monetary Findings | Number of Recommendations |
|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| A05G0033 | Illinois State Board of Education's Compliance with the Title I, Part A, Comparability of Services Requirements (SAR 55, page 29) | 6/7/07 | \$16,809,020 | 8 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that the PDL issued July 9, 2010. The required documentation needed for resolution of this audit must be certified through AARTS. | | | |
| A05H0010 | The School District of the City of Detroit's Use of Title I, Part A Funds Under the ESEA (SAR 57, page 26) | 7/18/08 | \$53,618,859 | 21 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that resolution activities are in process. | | | |
| A05H0025 | Harvey Public Schools District's Use of Selected Department Grant Funds (OSERS and OCFO also designated as action officials) (SAR 58, page 31) | 11/25/08 | \$317,093 ⁴ | 9 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that the PDL is currently with OGC for review. | | | |
| A05I0016 | Illinois State Board of Education's Oversight of Subrecipients (OSERS also designated as an action official) (SAR 59, page 42) | 09/23/09 | \$667,876 | 9 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that the PDL is clearing the internal review process. | | | |
| A06E0008 | Audit of the Title I Funds Administered by the Orleans Parish School Board (SAR 50, page 23) | 2/16/05 | \$73,936,273 | 7 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that the PDL was issued 9/22/2010. The required documentation needed for resolution of this audit must be certified through AARTS. | | | |
| A06F0016 | Arkansas Department of Education's Migrant Education Program (SAR 53, page 25) | 8/22/06 | \$877,000 | 2 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that the PDL is currently with OGC for review. | | | |
| A06G0009 | Audit of the Temporary Emergency Impact Aid for Displaced Students Requirements at the Texas Education Agency and Applicable LEAs (SAR 55, page 29) | 9/18/07 | \$10,270,000 | 4 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that resolution activities are in process. | | | |
| A06G0010 | Louisiana Department of Education's Compliance with Temporary Emergency Impact Aid for Displaced Students Requirements (SAR 55, page 29) | 9/21/07 | \$6,303,000 | 4 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that resolution activities are in process. | | | |
| A06H0011 | Adequacy of Fiscal Controls Over the Use of Title I, Part A Funds at Dallas Independent School District (SAR 59, page 42) | 04/14/09 | \$3,524,636 | 6 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that the PDL is clearing the internal review process. | | | |

| Report Number | Report Title (Prior SAR Number and Page) | Date Issued | Total Monetary Findings | Number of Recommendations |
|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| A06H0017 | Adequacy of Houston Independent School District's Fiscal Controls over Accounting for and Using Federal Funds (OVAE, OELA, Office of Special Education Programs, and OSDFS also designated as action officials) (SAR 59, page 42) | 06/30/09 | \$152,280 | 9 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us it is obtaining signatures for the final PDL. | | | |
| A07H0017 | St. Louis Public School District's Use of Selected Department Grant Funds (OSERS also designated as an action official) (SAR 57, page 26) | 9/29/08 | \$765,001 | 7 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that the PDL is clearing the internal review process. | | | |
| A09I0012 | Wyoming Department of Education Controls Over State Assessment Scoring (SAR 59, page 42) | 07/10/09 | | 2 |
| | Current Status: OESE informed us that resolution activities are in process. | | | |
| OPE | | | | |
| A07B0011 | Audit of Valencia Community College's Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs Matching Requirement (SAR 47, page 15) | 5/8/03 | \$1,822,864 | 5 |
| | Current Status: OPE informed us that it is working on resolving this report. | | | |
| OSERS | | | | |
| A02B0014 | Audit of the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration (SAR 45, page 18) | 6/26/02 | \$15,800,000 | 5 |
| | Current Status: OSERS informed us that the PDL should be finalized by 12/31/2010 - Rehabilitation Services Administration. | | | |
| A02E0020 | The Virgin Islands Department of Health's Administration of the Infants and Toddlers Program (SAR 51, page 28) | 9/28/05 | *5 | 17 |
| | Current Status: We did not receive a response from OSERS on this audit during this reporting period. | | | |

| Report Number | Report Title (Prior SAR Number and Page) | Date Issued | Total Monetary Findings | Number of Recommendations |
|---------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
|---------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|

INSPECTION REPORTS

REPORTED IN PREVIOUS SARs

| OGC | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------|
| I13I0004 | Inspection to Evaluate the Adequacy of the Department's Procedures in Response to Section 306 of the FY 2008 Appropriations Act – Maintenance of Integrity and Ethical Values Within the Department (OGC was designated as the action official by OS) (SAR 57, page 27) | 4/21/08 | \$0 | 2 |
| | Current Status: We did not receive a response from OGC on this inspection during this reporting period. | | | |
| Total | | | \$712,083,622 | 535 |

¹Audit Report A05H0018 identified a total of \$1,185,473 (\$1,129,970 in questioned costs and \$55,503 in unsupported costs). As \$912,430 of the \$1,185,473 was recovered from the auditee during the audit, \$273,043 remains to be recovered.

²Audit Report A09H0019 identified \$6,302,406 in other recommended recoveries and no questioned costs.

³Audit Report A09H0020 identified \$728,651 in other recommended recoveries, \$13,000,000 in annual better use of funds, and no questioned costs.

⁴Audit Report A05H0025 identified \$33,726 in other recommended recoveries and no questioned costs.

⁵Audit report A02E0020 identified \$327,577 in one-time better use of funds.

Table 5-B: Summaries of Audit, Inspection, and Evaluation Reports Issued During the Previous Reporting Period (October 1, 2009 through March 31, 2010) Where Management Decision Has Not Yet Been Made

Section 5(a)10 of the IG Act, as amended, requires a summary of each audit, inspection, or evaluation report issued before the commencement of the reporting period for which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period. These are the narratives for new entries. Details on previously reported reports can be found in Table 5-A of this Semiannual Report.

| Report Title, Number, and Date Issued | Summary |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Departmental Program Management | |
| <p>Office of Indian Education's Management of the Professional Development Program. ED/OIG: A19I0002</p> <p>Issued: 2/2/2010</p> | <p>We determined that the Department's Office of Indian Education needed to undertake significant efforts to improve its management of the Indian Education Professional Development (IEPD) grant program. We made a number of recommendations, including that the Department review the structure of the IEPD grant program office and make changes, as appropriate, to ensure that the program was managed consistent with statutory requirements, and that IEPD work with OMB and Department officials to approve its system of records used to track grant recipients of funds. The Department concurred with our findings and recommendations.</p> <p>Current Status: <i>OESE informed us that this is an internal audit being tracked by AARTS. OESE Program Team continues to update the corrective action plan.</i></p> |
| Recovery Act-Related | |
| <p>State and Local Controls over Recovery Act Funds in California. ED-OIG: A09J0006</p> <p>Issued: 1/15/2010</p> | <p>We found that the State and local agencies reviewed had systems of internal controls in place or were designing control systems to provide for the proper administration and use of education-related Recovery Act funds. However, we found that (1) the California Department of Education (CDE) needed to ensure that LEAs receive Title I and SFSF funds when needed to pay program costs and timely remit interest earned on cash advances; (2) CDE and the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) needed to ensure that timely and adequate subrecipient monitoring procedures were implemented for Recovery Act subgrants to LEAs, as well as ensure that subrecipients (and its employees) are informed of Recovery Act whistleblower protection and OMB requirements for referrals to Inspectors General; and (3) CDE needed to ensure that LEAs implement adequate controls regarding the appropriate use of Recovery Act funds involving retirement plans and undocumented personnel costs for multi-funded employees. Our recommendations included that the CDE implement planned enhancements to existing ESEA Title I and IDEA program monitoring practices to provide timely oversight of LEA compliance with fiscal requirements related to cash management and the appropriate use of and accounting for Recovery Act funds. CDE and OPR concurred with our findings and recommendations.</p> <p>Current Status: <i>OESE informed us that resolution activities continue to be in process.</i></p> |
| <p>Systems of Internal Control Over Selected Recovery Act Funds in the State of Illinois. ED-OIG: A05J0012</p> <p>Issued: 2/23/2010</p> | <p>We found that the State of Illinois had been proactive in its efforts to ensure the proper administration of ARRA funds. However, we found that the Illinois State Board of Education's (ISBE) system of internal controls (1) was not adequate to ensure that LEAs were complying with Federal cash management requirements; and (2) ISBE could strengthen its subrecipient monitoring to ensure compliance with Recovery Act requirements, as our work at two LEAs showed that the LEAs were not tracking their SFSF expenditures. We made a number of recommendations, including that the ISBE strengthen procedures for monitoring excess cash balances at LEAs before approving cash disbursements and that ISBE instruct LEAs to track SFSF expenditures so that all necessary information could be accurately reported, as required by the Recovery Act. ISBE did not agree or disagree with our findings and recommendations but did describe corrective actions it was taking to resolve the findings.</p> <p>Current Status: <i>OESE informed us that resolution activities continue to be in process.</i></p> |

| Report Title, Number, and Date Issued | Summary |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Systems of Internal Control Over Selected Recovery Act Funds in the State of Indiana.</p> <p>ED-OIG: A05J0011</p> <p>Issued: 1/14/2010</p> | <p>We found that the State has been proactive in its efforts to ensure the proper administration of Recovery Act funds; however, we also found that (1) the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) could improve its procedures to ensure compliance with Federal cash management requirements; (2) IDOE had not finalized the revisions to its IDEA monitoring guide to cover Recovery Act IDEA funds, did not plan to monitor SFSF distributed to LEAs as extensively as it planned to monitor other funds, and did not adequately monitor LEAs' support for personnel expenditures; and (3) the Bureau of Rehabilitative Services did not revise its current system or develop new systems for reporting data for funds received under the Recovery Act Vocational Rehabilitation program. We made a number of recommendations, including that the Department require the IDOE to develop and implement monitoring procedures to ensure that LEAs are properly reporting complete and accurate SFSF information and spending SFSF in accordance with Recovery Act requirements, and follow up with LEAs if they fail to spend SFSF in accordance with Recovery Act requirements. IDOE and Indiana OMB did not indicate disagreement with the findings and recommendations and stated their commitment to complying with all Federal recommendations and guidelines for the disbursement and reporting of Recovery Act funds.</p> <p>Current Status: <i>OESE informed us that resolution activities continue to be in process.</i></p> |
| <p>New York State System of Internal Control Over Recovery Act Funds</p> <p>ED-OIG: A02J0006</p> <p>Issued: 11/10/2009</p> | <p>We found that the New York State Education Department (NYSED) and the Governor's Office were making a proactive effort to ensure the proper administration of Recovery Act funds; however, we also found (1) NYSED needed to strengthen its controls over cash management at LEAs to ensure adequate oversight of Recovery Act and other Federal funds; (2) NYSED had not yet made sufficient progress in establishing controls to ensure compliance with Recovery Act reporting requirements; and (3) the Governor's office had not yet defined the roles of State agencies administering SFSF. Our recommendations included that the Department require the NYSED to develop and implement procedures to determine whether expenditures charged to the Recovery Act are allowable and properly supported prior to payment, and develop and implement monitoring procedures that address Recovery Act requirements, including those requirements specific to the SFSF program.</p> <p>Current Status: <i>OESE informed us that the PDL is currently with OGC for review.</i></p> |
| <p>New York State LEAs Systems of Internal Control Over Recovery Act Funds.</p> <p>ED-OIG: A02J0009</p> <p>Issued: 2/17/2010</p> | <p>Our audits at three LEAs -- the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE), the Kiryas Joel Union Free School District (Kiryas Joel), and the Harborfields Central School District (Harborfields) -- concluded that NYCDOE and Harborfields had designed systems of internal controls that were generally sufficient but we found that the controls over data quality, cash management, and use of funds need to be strengthened. We recommended those LEAs establish additional data quality processes and controls to ensure their readiness in complying with all Recovery Act reporting requirements. At Kiryas Joel, however, we found that the LEA had insufficient controls in many areas related to data quality, cash management, and use of funds. It also lacked adequate internal controls to ensure compliance with Recovery Act reporting requirements, lacked adequate controls to safeguard payroll checks and did not have sufficient controls to minimize the risk of funds being improperly disbursed. We also found that Kiryas Joel's accounting software did not have adequate controls to prevent the use of duplicate check numbers for payroll and non-payroll expenses. We made a number of recommendations for each LEA, which the NYSED did not specifically concur or disagree with. However, NYSED stated that it was prepared to implement all of our recommendations.</p> <p>Current Status: <i>OESE informed us that resolution activities continue to be in process.</i></p> |

| Report Title, Number, and Date Issued | Summary |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Internal Controls over Selected Recovery Act Funds</p> <p>ED-OIG: A03J0010</p> <p>Issued: 3/15/2010</p> | <p>We found that the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) and the Governor's Office were making a proactive effort to ensure the proper administration of Recovery Act funds; however, we determined that (1) the Comptroller's Office could strengthen its controls over cash management; (2) PDE's monitoring instruments needed to be strengthened in order to address Recovery Act requirements; (3) PDE did not have a policy to ensure that data deficiencies were disclosed to the Department; and (4) the Governor's Office should define the roles and responsibilities of Commonwealth agencies administering SFSF. Based on our findings, we made a number of recommendations, including that the Department require PDE to develop and implement procedures to monitor subrecipients' fiscal internal controls and use of funds for Recovery Act grant programs. PDE did not agree with our findings and recommendations.</p> <p>Current Status: <i>OESE informed us that resolution activities continue to be in process.</i></p> |
| <p>Puerto Rico Recovery Act, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration.</p> <p>ED-OIG: A04J0009</p> <p>Issued: 12/14/2009</p> | <p>We found that Puerto Rico's Vocational Rehabilitation Administration's (VRA) internal controls needed improvement to provide reasonable assurance of compliance with Recovery Act requirements. Specifically, VRA did not withhold appropriate income taxes from payments; ensure that financial data were reliable for reporting purposes; develop and communicate reporting and job creation or retention guidance; update information system policies and procedures; ensure that time between receipt and payout of Federal funds was minimized; and develop a monitoring plan to ensure compliance with Recovery Act requirements. We recommended that each of these weaknesses be addressed, many of which the VRA concurred with or had taken action to address.</p> <p>Current Status: <i>OSERS informed us the PDL was issued on 6/30/2010. However, for OCFO, the other program office involved in this audit, required documentation needs to be certified through AARTS before the audit can be officially resolved.</i></p> |
| <p>Tennessee Recovery Act Audit, Internal Controls over Selected Funds.</p> <p>ED-OIG: A04J0010</p> <p>Issued: 12/15/2009</p> | <p>We found that the Tennessee Department of Education's (TDOE) needed to improve its communication with LEAs to ensure awareness of reporting requirements for suspected fraud and the reporting procedures for estimating the number of jobs created or retained, programmatic performance, and financial data. We recommended that the Department require the TDOE to formally communicate to the LEAs that they must report suspected fraud of Recovery Act funds to the OIG and ensure that the LEAs understand the Recovery Act reporting requirements. TDOE concurred with our finding and recommendations.</p> <p>Current Status: <i>OESE informed us that resolution activities continue to be in process.</i></p> |
| <p>Texas Recovery Act Audit, Internal Controls over Selected Funds</p> <p>ED-OIG: A06J0013</p> <p>Issued: 1/27/2010</p> | <p>We found that the State had been proactive in its efforts to ensure the proper administration of Recovery Act funds; however we identified areas for improvement: (1) Texas Education Agency (TEA) could improve its oversight of LEAs to ensure compliance with Recovery Act requirements, as we identified issues at two of the three LEAs we visited; (2) the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) could improve its monitoring of subrecipients and its collection and reporting systems to ensure compliance with Recovery Act reporting requirements; and (3) THECB needed to modify its policies and procedures to ensure adequate oversight of recipients of SFSF government services funds to ensure those funds were safeguarded. Based on these findings, we made a number of recommendations, with which the Governor's office did not fully agree.</p> <p>Current Status: <i>OESE informed us that resolution activities continue to be in process.</i></p> |

| Report Title, Number, and Date Issued | Summary |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Virgin Islands Department of Education's Current Efforts to Address Prior Audit Findings.</p> <p>ED-OIG: A04J0004</p> <p>Issued: 11/13/2009</p> | <p>Our report highlighted issues that could affect Recovery Act funds provided to the Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDE) that were identified through six audits of the VIDE issued between 2003 and 2008, and in a 2009 audit of the VIDE's actions to address the recommendations made in those reports. Our 2009 report found that while VIDE had implemented some controls to address prior audit findings, it had not sufficiently addressed or taken the necessary actions to resolve prior recommendations in the areas of financial management, human capital, and property management and procurement. As a result, VIDE lacked sufficient internal controls to manage Departmental funds, programs, and activities, which could adversely impact its management of Recovery Act funds. With its history of unsatisfactory performance in the administration of the Department's programs and its status as a high-risk grantee, VIDE requires closer monitoring and oversight. To that end, we made a number of suggestions to all of which the Department agreed.</p> <p>Current Status: <i>OESE informed us the PDL is clearing the internal review process.</i></p> |
| Elementary and Secondary Education Act-Related | |
| State Educational Agencies | |
| <p>Colorado Department of Education's Use of Federal Funds for State Employee Personnel Costs.</p> <p>ED-OIG: A09J0004</p> <p>Issued: 2/26/2010</p> | <p>We determined that the Colorado Department of Education (CoDE) did not properly expend selected Federal education funds in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and Department guidance for the time period reviewed. We found that the CoDE inappropriately charged employee personnel costs to Federal education programs based on predetermined time and effort allocations instead of charging the programs based on the actual activity of each employee. Because CoDE could not provide documentation for employees' actual activities on Federal programs, we were unable to determine the allowability of more than \$23 million in personnel costs charged to Department grants for the time period reviewed. We made a number of recommendations to address these weaknesses, including that the CoDE provide documentation, based on actual work performed, supporting the personnel costs for CoDE employees that should have been charged to Federal education grants for the time period reviewed or return more than \$23 million to the Department. The CoDE generally concurred with our finding and our recommendations.</p> <p>Current Status: <i>OESE informed us that resolution activities continue to be in process. AARTS shows that OESE's administrative stay was approved by OCFO on 9/30/2010.</i></p> |
| Local Educational Agencies | |
| <p>Philadelphia School District's Controls Over Federal Expenditures ED-OIG: A03H0010</p> <p>Issued: 1/15/2010</p> | <p>For the time period reviewed, we found that the Philadelphia School District did not have adequate fiscal controls in place, and expenditures from selected Federal education grant funds totaling more than \$138 million were either unallowable or inadequately supported. We determined that the District: (1) did not have written policies and procedures for certifying personnel costs charged to Federal grants; (2) supplanted State and local funds with Federal funds; (3) did not adequately enforce its policies and procedures for a number of its internal operations, such as travel reimbursement and contract management; and (4) did not have written policies and procedures for various fiscal processes, such as monitoring of budgets and charging of transportation costs. We recommended that the District return more than \$17 million in unallowable costs to the Department, and that it provide adequate documentation to support more than \$121 million in inadequately supported expenditures or return that amount to the Department. The District did not concur with all of our findings.</p> <p>Current Status: <i>OESE informed us the PDL is clearing the internal review process. AARTS shows that OESE's administrative stay was approved by OCFO on 7/28/2010.</i></p> |

| Report Title, Number, and Date Issued | Summary |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Other Federal Education Program Grantees | |
| <p>Center for Civic Education's Administration of the We the People Program and Cooperative Civic Education and Economic Education Exchange Program.</p> <p>ED-OIG: A09I0010</p> <p>Issued: 11/20/2009</p> | <p>Our audit found that the Center for Civic Education (CCE) did not administer its Federal grant awards for its <i>We the People Program</i> and the <i>Cooperative Civic Education and Economic Exchange Program</i> in compliance with applicable requirements. We determined that CCE (1) did not have a financial management system that met required standards for administering Federal education grants; (2) held cash beyond its immediate needs, charged unallowable costs to the grants, and did not have adequate support for other charges; (3) of the \$7.4 million in charges to the grants that we reviewed, 80 percent of the charges were unallowable (\$1.2 million) or unsupported (\$4.7 million); and (4) did not have adequate support for personnel costs that were charged to grants using predetermined percentages or for the allocation of other costs that benefited more than one CCE program or activity. We made 30 recommendations to address the weaknesses identified, including that the Department consider designating CCE as a high-risk grantee because CCE had not implemented a financial management system that meets required standards. CCE did not agree with all of our findings or recommendations.</p> <p>Current Status: <i>AARTS shows that OCFO's administrative stay was approved on 7/28/2010.</i></p> |

Table 6: Statistical Profile: Fiscal Year 2010 (October 1, 2009, through September 30, 2010)

| Audits, Inspections, Other Products | October 1, 2009 – March 31, 2010 | April 1, 2010 September 30, 2010 | Fiscal Year 2010 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Audit Reports Issued | 22 | 13 | 35 |
| Inspection Reports Issued | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Questioned Costs | \$18,808,951 | \$22,817 | \$18,831,768 |
| Unsupported Costs | \$149,861,194 | \$570,376 | \$150,431,570 |
| Recommendations for Better Use of Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Products Issued <i>Other products include Alert Memoranda, Management Information Reports, Special Project Reports, and Investigative Program Advisory Reports</i> | 15 | 15 | 30 |
| Reports Resolved By Program Managers | 6 | 20 | 26 |
| Questioned Costs Sustained | \$624,873 | \$336,466,483 | \$337,091,356 |
| Unsupported Costs Sustained | \$1,188,806 | \$2,403,150 | \$3,591,956 |
| Additional Disallowances Identified by Program Managers | 0 | \$1,201,730 | \$1,201,730 |
| Management Commitment to the Better Use of Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Investigative Activity | | | |
| Cases Opened | 64 | 66 | 130 |
| Cases Closed | 58 | 64 | 126 ¹ |
| Cases Active at the End of the Reporting Period | 445 | 443 | 443 |
| Prosecutorial Decisions | 103 | 136 | 318 ² |
| Accepted | 35 | 72 | 170 |
| Declined | 68 | 64 | 148 |
| Investigative Results | | | |
| Indictments/Informations | 36 | 64 | 106 ³ |
| Convictions/Pleas | 108 | 49 | 159 ⁴ |
| Fines Ordered | \$315,250 | \$28,175 | \$344,025 ⁵ |
| Restitution Payments Ordered | \$6,262,401 | \$19,967,632 | \$26,319,715 ⁶ |
| Civil Settlements/Judgments (number) | 2 | 5 | 7 |
| Civil Settlements/Judgments (amount) | \$951,000 | \$10,511,638 | \$11,462,638 |
| Recoveries | \$291,445 | \$1,289,238 | \$2,065,507 |
| Forfeitures/Seizures | \$2,345,000 | 0 | \$2,345,000 |
| Estimated Savings | \$37,000 | \$4,509,711 | \$4,552,061 ⁷ |
| Suspensions Referred to Department | 2 | 23 | 25 |
| Debarments Referred to Department | 21 | 20 | 41 |

1 Includes 4 cases that were not reflected in SAR 60

2 Includes 79 instances that were not reflected in SAR 60

3 Includes 4 instances that were not reflected in SAR 60

4 Includes 2 instances that were not reflected in SAR 60

5 Includes \$600 that was not reflected in SAR 60

6 Includes \$89,681 that was not reflected in SAR 60

7 Includes \$5,350 that was not reflected in SAR 60



Anyone knowing of fraud, waste, or abuse involving U.S. Department of Education funds or programs should call, write or e-mail the Office of Inspector General.

Call Toll-Free:
The Inspector General Hotline
1-800-MISUSED
(1-800-647-8733)

Or E-Mail:
oig.hotline@ed.gov

Or Write:
Inspector General Hotline
U.S. Department of Education
Office of Inspector General
550 12th St. S.W.
Washington, DC 20024

Your report may be made anonymously or in confidence.

For information on identity theft prevention for students and schools, visit the Office of Inspector General Identity Theft Web site at www.ed.gov/misused.

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.
www.ed.gov