

Section III

Evaluations and Additional Information

Overview

This section contains a description of major program evaluations completed during FY 2013, a list of acronyms used in this report, and a list of Department websites. A program evaluation, as defined in OMB Circular A-11, is an individual, systematic study to assess how well a program is working to achieve intended results or outcomes. Program evaluations are often conducted by experts external to the program either inside or outside an agency. Evaluations can help policymakers and agency managers strengthen the design and operation of programs and can help determine how best to spend taxpayer dollars effectively and efficiently. Most Department evaluations are conducted either by the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) or the Government Accountability Office (GAO).

Major Program Evaluations Completed During FY 2013

Department's Use and Support of Unmanned Aircraft Systems

The OIG evaluated the current and planned policies for the use of unmanned aircraft systems (UASs) by Department components or by grant recipients who purchased UASs with Department grant funds, including guidelines and controls. The OIG conducted an audit of the domestic use of unmanned aircraft systems by the Department, as well as its support and provision of UAS to other law enforcement agencies and non-profit organizations. This was an audit involving multiple DOJ components. The report contains eight recommendations to DOJ to improve coordination among law enforcement and award-making components, and to facilitate the drafting of policies that protect individual privacy interests and ensure the admissibility of UAS-collected evidence in legal proceedings. Five of the eight recommendations were directed to the Office of Justice Programs (OJP):

1. assess and enhance its ability to track UAS-related awards;
2. enhance its reporting requirements and use reported information to measure the effectiveness of UAS-related awards;
3. require that grant applicants demonstrate they can meet the prerequisites necessary to become authorized to operate a UAS;
4. update the December 2012 award coordination memorandum with COPS to include OJP/National Institute of Justice as a participant in UAS award coordination efforts; and
5. notify the FBI, ATF, DEA, and USMS of future UAS awards and work with the components to identify and share relevant data derived from UAS awards.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation Foreign Terrorist Tracking Task Force

The OIG initiated an audit of the FBI's Foreign Terrorist Tracking Task Force (FTTTF) on October 6, 2011. The primary objective of the audit was to determine if the FBI: 1) has implemented a viable FTTTF strategy to locate and track suspected terrorists and their supporters, including coordination with FBI headquarters and field offices to enhance national security investigations; and 2) is following Department of Justice privacy policies in its management of information. The OIG determined that the FBI has implemented a strategy that provides significant value to the FBI by performing in-depth analyses that proactively identify national security threats and assist ongoing national security investigations. The OIG found limited coordination between the FTTTF and the National Security Branch operational division prior to FY 2011. However, the FTTTF has worked to improve its coordination with the entire National Security Branch, especially within the Counterterrorism Division. The audit resulted in seven recommendations to improve FTTTF support provided to field offices and the National Security Branch, including assigning additional FTTTF liaisons through the Counterterrorism Division; ensuring FTTTF information provided to field offices is timely and relevant; and establishing increased communication and coordination options between the FTTTF, field offices, and the National Security Branch.

GAO Audit of the Nationwide Suspicious Activity Reporting Initiative

The GAO initiated an audit of the Nationwide Suspicious Activity Reporting Initiative (NSI) on February 21, 2012. The primary objective of the audit was to determine: 1) to what extent have key stakeholder agencies defined the processes to collect, analyze, share, and maintain suspicious activity report (SAR) information under the NSI; and 2) to what extent have privacy and civil liberties-related protections for SAR information been established and followed; (3) to what extent has training been provided to NSI stakeholder entities so that these entities may fully participate in the NSI; and (4) how is the governance structure being leveraged to monitor and assess performance, manage funding, and ensure that the NSI does not duplicate other efforts to collect and share information. The GAO found that DOJ has largely implemented the NSI among fusion centers - entities that serve as the focal point within a state for sharing and analyzing suspicious activity reports and other threat information. GAO recommends that DOJ implement formalized mechanisms to provide stakeholders feedback on the suspicious activity reports they submit, mitigate risks from supporting two systems to collect and share reports that may result in the FBI not receiving needed information, more fully assess if training for line officers meets their needs, and establish plans and time frames for implementing measures that assess the homeland security results the initiative has achieved.

GAO Audit of DOJ Executives' Use of Aircraft for Non-mission Purposes

The GAO initiated an audit of DOJ's aviation assets on April 5, 2012. The primary objective of the audit was to determine: (1) how frequently did DOJ executives use DOJ aviation assets for non-mission or unofficial travel and what were the purposes and costs of such travel, and (2) how frequently did DOJ aviation assets fly between points within the greater Washington D.C. area and what were the purposes and costs of such trips. All Attorneys General (AG) and FBI Directors are "required use" travelers who are required by executive branch policy to use

government aircraft for all their travel, including travel for personal reasons, because of security and communications needs. However, while the AG has historically been required to use government aircraft for all types of travel, including personal travel, the FBI Director had, until 2011, the discretion to use commercial air service for his personal travel. GAO found that from fiscal years 2007 through 2011, three individuals who served as Attorney General and the Director of the FBI accounted for 95 percent (659 out of 697 flights) of all Department of Justice executive non-mission flights using DOJ aircraft at a total cost of \$11.4 million. Specifically, the AG and FBI Director collectively took 74 percent (490 out of 659) of all of their flights for business purposes, such as conferences, meetings, and field office visits; 24 percent (158 out of 659) for personal reasons; and 2 percent (11 out of 659) for a combination of business and personal reasons. In addition GAO found that all AGs and the FBI Director provided reimbursements for their personal travel in accordance with federal requirements.

Process and Outcome Evaluation of the use of NIBIN and its Effects on Criminal Investigations

Sam Houston State University completed an evaluation that examined the implementation of the National Integrated Ballistic Information Network (NIBIN) in criminal justice agencies; identified best practices for improving the effectiveness of NIBIN; and documented the ways criminal investigators utilize information produced by NIBIN to solve firearms cases. NIBIN is a national database of linked ballistics terminals. It comprises both a forensic analysis tool and a program managed by the Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF). The goals of the evaluation were to (1) describe the current state of NIBIN implementation (2) document the impediments and facilitators of successful NIBIN implementation, (3) determine the extent to which NIBIN helps investigators solve crimes and (4) describe best NIBIN practices for agency implementation and for investigations. While the goals of this evaluation were met, the study found that there was considerable variation in the local implementation of NIBIN and significant time delays in identifying hits. The delays in identifying hits have inhibited investigators' use of NIBIN hit reports. Although NIBIN has tremendous potential as a tactical and strategic tool, it is rarely used to its maximum potential for strategic purposes. Despite these issues, the study identified a number of NIBIN sites that use NIBIN effectively.

GAO Review on Tracking Travelling Sex Offenders

GAO initiated this review in February 2012 to determine how DOJ, Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Department of State collect, maintain, and share the information needed to track those sex offenders entering the United States who are required to register under Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act, what factors affect these agencies' ability to collect, maintain, and share the information, and what actions have been taken to address any inhibiting factors. In February 2013, GAO issued its Final Report entitled *Registered Sex Offenders: Sharing More Information will Enable Federal Agencies to Improve Notifications of Sex Offenders' International Travel*. The report concludes that none of the sources used by federal agencies (USMS, USNCB, ICE) to determine whether registered sex offenders are traveling outside the U.S. provide complete/comprehensive information. Additionally, GAO found that agencies rely on different information sources and do not share information with one another. The report recommends that ICE consider receiving notices from an automated system being developed by FBI, and that DOJ and DHS take steps to ensure that 1) ICE has access to the same

level of detail as USNCB does about each traveling sex offender and 2) USNCB and ICE have information on the same traveling sex offenders.

Evaluability Assessments of the Circles of Support and Accountability (COSA) Model

The Pennsylvania State University completed an evaluability assessment of the Circles of Support and Accountability (COSA) reentry program across five sites in the U.S. COSA is a restorative justice-based reentry program for high-risk sex offenders with little or no pro-social support. The goal of COSA is to enhance community safety by promoting the successful integration of offenders back into the community through support, advocacy, and meaningful accountability. This project aimed to conduct an evaluability assessment of COSA across five sites with the goal of assessing the readiness of COSA provision in the U.S. for rigorous evaluation. The assessment aimed to clarify program intent, explore program reality, examine program data capacity, analyze program fidelity, and propose potential evaluation designs for future evaluation.

The goals of this evaluation were met. All sites had implemented versions of the Correctional Services Canada model, adapted to suit their needs. The site reports suggest that VT-COSA alone could be considered to have high program fidelity, with COSA Fresno and COSA Lancaster demonstrating adequate fidelity, and Colorado COSA and COSA Durham demonstrating low fidelity. There are five potential obstacles that need to be addressed in order to conduct a successful experimental evaluation of COSA: (1) choice of outcomes; (2) significant differences in program implementation; (3) core member selection issues; (4) sample size, site capacity, and low baselines of recidivism; and (5) ownership of data. It is concluded that there is no methodological or ethical reason why a randomized control trial of COSA provision in the U.S. could not be conducted. The obstacles to a randomized control trial are all such that they can be addressed with a combination of realistic tightening of program implementation, rigorous experimental control, and an increase in real-world resources. Finally, three action recommendations for future evaluative activity are presented: (1) conduct an experimental evaluation of the Vermont COSA program alone; (2) conduct an experimental evaluation that combines the Vermont COSA and COSA Fresno programs; or (3) allow the fledgling sites to develop and conduct a multi-site evaluation of COSA in the future.

Evaluation of a Global Positioning System for Monitoring High-Risk Gang Offenders

Development Services Group, Inc. completed a quasi-experimental evaluation of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation Global Positioning System (GPS) monitoring program of High Risk Gang Offenders, which consisted of 375 gang offenders. Specifically, the goals of the study assessed the impact, fidelity, and costs of the GPS program, including the program's effectiveness in reducing gang offender recidivism and detecting technical parole violations. The reward provides positions for law enforcement, researchers, and practitioners. Additionally the reward reduces cost to monitoring of gang members. The goals of this evaluation were met. The findings indicate that during the two-year study period, subjects in the GPS group, while less likely than their control counterparts to be arrested in general or for a violent offense, were much more likely to violate their parole with technical and nontechnical violations. Descriptive statistics and summary analysis revealed more GPS parolees were

returned to custody during the study period. The cost analysis indicates the GPS program costs approximately \$21.20 per day per parolee, while the cost of traditional supervision is \$7.20 per day per parolee—a difference of \$14. However, while the results favor the GPS group in terms of recidivism, GPS monitoring also significantly increased parole violations. In other words, the GPS monitoring program is more expensive, but may be more effective in detecting parole violations. The process evaluation reveals the GPS program was implemented with a high degree of fidelity across the four dimensions examined: adherence, exposure, quality of program delivery, and program differentiation.

Cross-Jurisdictional Task Forces on the Border: An Evaluation of Two Efforts to Target Drugs and Violence in San Diego County

The San Diego Association of Governments completed a two-year evaluation of two law enforcement efforts (Chula Vista Police Department and San Diego County Sheriff's Department) funded to target crime stemming from the Southern Border of the United States. The project involved a three-year evaluation of two efforts to target crime stemming from the Southern Border of the United States – one which funded greater participation by local officers on four FBI-led Multi-Jurisdictional Task Forces (MJTFs) and another that created a new multi-jurisdictional team. As part of this evaluation, researchers documented the level of inter-agency collaboration and communication when the project began, gathered information regarding the benefits and challenges of MJTF participation, measured the level of communication and collaboration, and tracked a variety of outcomes specific to the funded MJTFs, as well as three comparison MJTFs. Multiple methods were used to achieve these goals including surveys of task forces, law enforcement stakeholders, and community residents; law enforcement focus groups; program observations; and analysis of archival data related to staffing costs; task force activities; task force target criminal history; and prosecution outcomes. The goals of the evaluation were met. Key outcomes from the study included a clearer understanding of the benefits of MJTFs as a vehicle to target high-level offenders without restraints that would otherwise exist related to jurisdictional boundaries or limited resources. Specifically, when federal and local agencies collaborate on a MJTF, there are greater opportunities for maximizing resources (i.e., force multiplier) and better deconfliction through information sharing. In addition, federal agencies benefit from the knowledge that local officers bring about the community and their level of contacts at their own agency; and locals benefit from the greater level of resources available from the task force and the ability to participate in higher level investigations. These benefits are even more important in border communities, which are a main point of entry and passageway to other U.S. cities and where the presence of a large number of federal, state, and local agencies make ongoing communication even more essential.

OIG Audit on the Department's and Components' Personnel Security Processes: (Phase 2, Contractor Security)

In January 2012, OIG began work on Phase 2 of its audit on DOJ's personnel security process. Phase 2 focused on the process as it relates to DOJ *contractors* (to include USMS Court Security Officers). Issued in March 2013, Evaluation and Inspections Report No. I-2013-003, *Review of the Department's Contractor Personnel Security Process*, concluded that: nearly 10 percent of adjudications for Public Trust contractor positions exceeded the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) 90-day timeliness requirement; components had not been

effectively tracking contractor security information; and no Department-wide security policy existed for contractors. OIG made four recommendations, three of which were directed at DOJ's Security and Emergency Planning Staff and one of which was directed at USMS. The report acknowledged that USMS had already begun to use OPM's investigative services to complete background investigations for its Court Security Officers and recommended that USMS continue to do so.

OIG Evaluation of the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002

The OIG completed their FY 2012 Information Technology Security Evaluation pursuant to the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002, involving the U.S. Trustee Program (USTP) and several other components of DOJ. The OIG's June 2013 reports (Limited Official Use) assessed the effectiveness of the USTP's implementation of information technology security controls established to protect the data within our information systems. OIG made 12 non-critical recommendations to improve the USTP's information technology security. Five of those recommendations have already been closed and the USTP is addressing the remaining seven recommendations.

Acronyms

A

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

B

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

C

CASE	Case Access System for EOIR
CFO	Chief Financial Officer
CIPA	Classified Information Procedures Act
CIV	Civil Division
COPS	Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
COSA	Circles of Support and Accountability
CPC	Capacity Planning Committee
CPOT	Consolidated Priority Organization Target
CRM	Criminal Division
CRS	Community Relations Service
CRT	Civil Rights Division
CTAS	Coordinated Tribal Assistance Solicitation

D

DC	District of Columbia
DEA	Drug Enforcement Administration

DHS Department of Homeland Security
DNA Deoxyribonucleic Acid
DOJ Department of Justice

E

ENRD Environment and Natural Resources Division
EOIR Executive Office for Immigration Review

F

FASAB Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
FBI Federal Bureau of Investigation
FBWT Fund Balance with U.S. Treasury
FCSC Foreign Claims Settlement Commission
FinCEN Financial Crimes Enforcement Network
FPI Federal Prison Industries, Inc.
FTE Full-Time Equivalent
FTTTF Foreign Terrorist Tracking Task Force
FY Fiscal Year

G

GangTECC National Gang Targeting, Enforcement, and Coordination Center
GAO Government Accountability Office
GMRA Government Management Reform Act
GPRA Government Performance and Results Act
GPRAMA GPRA Modernization Act of 2010
GPS Global Positioning System

H

HSBC Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation

I

IC Intelligence Community
ICE Immigrations and Customs Enforcement
ICM Interactive Case Management System
IHP Institutional Hearing Program

INTERPOL	International Criminal Police Organization
IPOL	INTERPOL Washington
IRS	Internal Revenue Service
ISRAA	Integrated Statistical Reporting and Analysis Application

J

JMD	Justice Management Division
-----	-----------------------------

L

LCD	Liquid Crystal Display
LCN	La Cosa Nostra
LCM	Lower of average cost or market value

M

MAR	Monthly Administrative Report
MJTF	Multi-Jurisdictional Task Forces

N

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

O

OBDs	Offices, Boards and Divisions
OCDETF	Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces
OIG	Office of the Inspector General
OJP	Office of Justice Programs
OJJDP	Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
OMB	Office of Management and Budget

OPA Office of the Pardon Attorney
OPM Office of Personnel Management
OSG Office of the Solicitor General
OTJ Office of Tribal Justice
OVW Office on Violence Against Women

P

PAR Performance and Accountability Report
PDS Psychology Data System
PIO Performance Improvement Officer

R

RDAP Residential Drug Abuse Program
RMIS Resource Management Information System

S

SAR Suspicious Activity Report
SAVE Council Advisory Council for Savings and Efficiencies
SCA Second Chance Act
SDTX Southern District of Texas
SENTRY Bureau of Prisons' primary mission-support database

T

TAX Tax Division
TNLC Tribal Nations Leadership Council

U

UAS Unmanned Aircraft Systems
USAs United States Attorneys
USAO United States Attorneys' Offices
USC United States Code
USMS United States Marshals Service
USNCB United States National Central Bureau
UST United States Trustee
USTP United States Trustee Program

VAWA

Violence Against Women Act

This page intentionally left blank.

Department Component Websites

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

This page intentionally left blank.