



Council of the  
**INSPECTORS GENERAL**  
on INTEGRITY and EFFICIENCY

**Agenda: CIGIE Inspection & Evaluation Committee Meeting**  
March 6, 2014 2pm at 1717 H Street, NW, 7th floor Room 7300

1) *Welcome and Introductions* -- The chairs thanked everyone for their critical support of the peer review pilot. Further, in addition to having all 12 committee member IGs or their representatives in attendance, 5 additional IGs were represented at the meeting.

2) *Update on the history of I&E peer review and status of the 2<sup>nd</sup> round of the I&E Pilot External Peer Review process* -- (b) (6) and (b) (6)

Recent History: I&E Committee first attempt at a pilot peer review process ran from 2006-2009. In that pilot, reviews were conducted of Homeland Security (2006) and State (2007). While the reviews provided good information to both agencies, in 2009 there wasn't sufficient support within the Committee to move ahead with a formal process and so the pilot was discontinued.

Current Pilot: In 2012, the Committee authorized a new pilot peer review program. To date, the current pilot has conducted reviews of 5 I&E units (2 in 2012 and 3 in 2013). Each review has been conducted by a team of reviewers from multiple OIGs.

- Summary of feedback from participants in round 2 of the pilot:
  - All reviewed units are using the results to direct improvements.
  - All participants agree: Multi-agency review teams reduced bias, increased objectivity, and team members said they learned from each other.
  - Representatives of units that were reviewed appreciated the consultative approach and said the review improved their respective I&E unit's credibility.
  - A "rules of engagement" memo or MOU should become part of all future reviews.

3) *Discussion and Decision: Proposal from the I&E Roundtable that the Committee concurrently conduct a 3<sup>rd</sup> round of the pilot process and operationalize a formal External Peer Review Process* -- Kathy Buller and Dan Levinson

The full Committee and other IGs present agreed to the I&E Roundtable's proposal that:

- The pilot will continue for a 3<sup>rd</sup> round and that the existing Process Oversight Work Group will make necessary changes to the Review Framework and,
- That concurrently, the Committee will form an executive level Peer Review Working Group (PRWG) to plan and operationalize a formal I&E External Peer Review process.

4) *Discussion and Decision: Next steps to formalize the I&E External Peer Review Process – Kathy Buller, Dan Levinson, (b) (6) and (b) (6)*

Next steps, listed below, were discussed and all present agreed that the process for formalizing the I&E Peer Review should begin as quickly as possible. Additionally they noted that it was a work in progress and that all questions could not be answered by this one discussion. At the meeting, six IGs representing large and small OIGs volunteered that they, or an evaluation executive, would participate in the PRWG.

The PRWG is tasked with developing a plan of operations and establishing a sustainable process to implement the formal I&E Peer Review process. The PRWG and the Process Oversight Work Group which is managing the pilot will collaborate as needed. Members are: Tonie Jones NEA; Dana Rooney-Fisher FLRA; Sven Johanson IC-IG; Deborah Outten-Mills DHS; Robert Peterson State; and AMB Kenneth Moorefield DoDIG (others may also participate).

- The Committee tasked the PRWG with:
  - Determining the frequency of reviews.
  - Determining what if any differences in the frequency of reviews based on the size of unit/stage of development of unit.
  - Establishing an initial schedule of reviews.
  - Finalizing the template for a “Rules of Engagement” memo
  - Determining the minimal level of detail for an external peer review while ensuring these reviews retain the needed/valued flexibility and continue to provide sufficient detail.
  - Deciding where work papers should be stored upon completion of an external peer review.
  - Determining where reports are sent – currently they are received by the OIG under review.
  - Finalizing the Framework
  - Updating the Quality Standards to include an External Review standard.

2. In addition, to fully operationalize this formal external peer review process the Committee and the PRWG should:

- Determine what to call these reviews—Roundtable recommends that since this is a consultative process we use the term “external reviews.”
- Determine if external peer reviews of I&E units should be included in the semiannual reports of the parent OIGs.
- Decide whether the formal process will be mandatory or voluntary (versus the voluntary pilot).
- Decide if these external reviews should be pass/fail—Roundtable generally believes that these reviews should not be pass/fail. Roundtable members find considerable value in the consultative nature of the reviews and believe that will be lost in a pass/fail environment.
- Work with the IC to either:
  - a. Make the two processes the same, but run separately, or
  - b. Bring the IC into the I&E Committee’s process, working with the IC to address any scheduling and security issues resulting from the classified environment in which they operate.

**Sign-In: I&E Committee Meeting March 6, 2014**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>OIG</b>	<b>Signature</b>
HHS OIG	Dan Levinson-IG	attended
	(b) (6)	attended
Peace Corps OIG	Kathy Buller-IG	attended
	Jim O'Keefe –AIG Evaluation	attended
State OIG	Emilia Disanto – Deputy IG	attended
	Robert Peterson – AIG for Inspections	
Interior OIG	Kim Elmore – AIG Audits, Inspections, and Evaluations	attended
EPA OIG	Carolyn Copper – AIG Office of Program Evaluation	attended
ARC OIG	Hubert Sparks – IG	attended
Intelligence Community IG	John “Sven” Johanson – Ex. Dir. IG Community Standards	attended
VA OIG	Sondra McCauley – AIG for Audits and Evaluations	attended
	Claire McDonald – DIG for Health Care Inspections	attended
	(b) (6)	attended
FCA OIG	Elizabeth Dean—IG	attended
Dept. of Homeland Security OIG	Deborah Otten-Mills – Acting AIG for Inspections	attended
	(b) (6)	Attended
NEA OIG	Tonie Jones – IG	attended
	(b) (6)	attended
FLRA OIG	Dana Rooney-Fisher – IG	attended

## Minutes: CIGIE Inspection & Evaluation Committee Meeting

March 14, 2013, 1:30 – 3:30 pm

at HHS OIG, room 5542, the OIG Conference Room

**Agenda item 1. I&E Training Team Proposal:** (b) (6) presented a proposal for a one-day I&E Training Conference. The Training Team anticipates a similar type of training as at our 2009 conference, held at a government facility, with the CIGIE Training Institute helping to defray the costs. The Team requests approval to ask for volunteers to staff a planning committee.

- Approved CIGIE Training Institute will help defray the cost, provide staff support – along with the I&E Training Team – ensure that CPE credits are calculated properly, and provide completion certificates to participants. Committee requested that this training provide opportunity for staff who are at all levels – new, mid-career, and veteran staffers in the I&E community. Also, we note that the American Evaluation Association annual meeting is in October in DC. The planning committee is requested to find a date in November after the AEA conference.

The following OIGs pledged volunteers to for the planning committee (please provide names and contact information to (b) (6):

- Homeland Security
- FHFA
- Interior

Also, it was agreed that (b) (6) should also reach out to the I&E Roundtable community for additional volunteers to staff the planning committee.

**Agenda item 2. Update/briefing on the Pilot Peer Review process** and discussion of/endorsement for changes the Process Oversight Workgroup would like to make to the 2nd round of the pilot process.

- Stuart Wright (HHS) and Jim O’Keefe (Peace Corps) discussed and took questions about the process, value, and results of the pilot peer reviews that were conducted of their offices during the first round of the pilot. Both reviews proved valuable and useful to their respective offices. Both HHS and Peace Corps are making suggested changes to their process/operations based on the results.
- (b) (6) reviewed a list of improvements and changes suggested for round 2 of the pilot (list follows at the end of the minutes).

Approved All items on the list were approved and the Process Oversight Work Group will incorporate the changes into the Framework and training materials.

- Kathy Buller led a discussion about longer term or “parking lot” issues that will need to be worked through as we continue the pilot process. There was agreement that the Committee will need to address and resolve these issues before the pilot is completed.

The issues of most significant concern were:

- The disproportionate burden on small IGs of adding another peer review to offices already challenged by the demands of the audit and investigation peer reviews
- Working with the Intelligence Community (IC) I&E units who are also involved in a pilot peer review process and determining if there should be a single CIGIE-wide process or if we can have different processes for the IC and non-IC I&E units?
- Should I&E units be reviewed under all Blue Book standards or just select standards? In the current I&E Committee-sponsored pilot, 7 of the 14 standards are being reviewed, whereas in the IC-sponsored pilot, the I&E unit under review chooses the standards it wants used for the review.

#### ➤ **Next Steps:**

- The Process Oversight Workgroup will:
  - Revise the Framework and training materials,
  - Establish a schedule for the 2<sup>nd</sup> round of peer reviews, including a date for training and a suggested timeframe in which the reviews should be conducted,
  - Continue working with the IC as we both further develop our pilot peer review processes,
  - Work with CIGIE Audit Committee colleagues to learn more about their peer review process,
  - Consider options for parking lot issues.
- The following units are scheduled to be reviewed in round 2: Veterans Affairs (both units), TIGTA, and Dept. of Interior. (b) will confirm.
- At least twelve reviewers will be needed to review the I&E units. The following units have offered reviewers: VA (offered 4 reviewers), Federal Reserve Board, Export-Import Bank, Interior, State, Homeland Security. (b) (6) will confirm and will reach out to the I&E Roundtable members for additional reviewers.
- Next Committee meeting will be after completion of the 2<sup>nd</sup> round of the Pilot Peer Review process has been completed and all participants de-briefed

(probably September-October). At the time the Process Oversight Workgroup will offer recommendations on next steps which may include:

- Conducting a 3<sup>rd</sup> round of the pilot
- Minimizing the burden on small IGs
- Other “parking lot issues”
- When and if we are ready to move from pilot review process to required review process

Suggested improvements and changes for round 2 of the pilot

- Require that all participants attend training
  - Add team building exercises to training
  - Add more time for the team to meet and time for the team to meet with the agency under review to the training
- Require that each team select a team leader. In addition, the Framework will define the role of the team leader to be the point person for communications between the I&E unit and the review team, and the person responsible for coordinating the development of a work plan and leading the report writing process.
- Require that each team develop a work plan that lays out a general approach and timeframes for completing the peer review. The work plan should ensure sufficient time to interview and collect data from the staff members in the reviewed I&E unit.
- Review teams are expected to conduct an onsite review. If the review team and the office under review feel this is not feasible the review team leader should inform the Process Oversight Workgroup about the alternative process/plan they will use that will allow the review team similar access to staff (e.g., extensive use of tele- and video-conferencing)
- All review team members must have extensive experience working with Blue Book standards.
- This is a pilot process and the process may undergo considerable change over time. Therefore reports should be considered confidential – meaning these reports are not to be shared with anyone outside of the review team, the I&E unit under review, and the Process Oversight Workgroup without permission of the unit head.
- Review Team will exit with the unit under review the week of the onsite review. The report will be provided in draft and the unit will have one or two weeks to react to and prepare written comments. The review team and the unit will then meet again to discuss the units written comments which will be included in the “final” report.
- Need commitment by Committee members and the I&E community of sufficient reviewers and agencies to be reviewed to continue the pilot.



*Council of the*  
**INSPECTORS GENERAL**  
*on INTEGRITY and EFFICIENCY*

**CIGIE I&E Committee Meeting December 5, 2011 – meeting minutes**

**Attending:** Dan Levinson -HHS, Kathy Buller-Peace Corps, Curtis Crider-EAC, Dana Rooney-Fisher-FLRA, Arthur Elkins-EPA, George Grob-FHFA (for Steve Linick), Donald Cairns-Interior (for Mary Kendall), Pat Christ-VA (for George Opfer), Bob Peterson-State (for Harold Geisel), Tony Castaldo-FRB (for Mark Bialek), Hubert Sparks-ARC, Stuart Wright-HHS, Jim O’Keefe-Peace Corps, (b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

- 1) Definition Project** – Kathy Buller presented the Roundtable’s revisions of the preface and definition for I&E in the *CIGIE Quality Standards for Inspection and Evaluation (Blue Book)*. Comments were very favorable and no additional changes were made. The committee voted to accept the revision. Dan and Kathy will present the new preface to the Blue Book at the Executive Council meeting on Dec. 7<sup>th</sup>.

**Next steps:** In January, the Roundtable will organize a workgroup to review the Blue Book and make any needed changes or updates. If Committee members want their office to be involved, please contact (b) (6)

- 2) Training** – (b) (6) provided an update of progress in developing a training curriculum for I&E staff. She is developing a training network in the I&E community, is working with a workgroup of Roundtable members, and is developing training plans focused on the coming year, 3-years out and 5-years out.
- 3) Website improvements**—(b) (6) informed the Committee that a workgroup of Roundtable members from Commerce, National Geospatial Agency, EEOC, Export Import Bank, and HHS has been formed and will hold their first meeting in December. Initially the workgroup will focus on identifying what information should be housed on the improved website then it will work with CIGIE to update the website accordingly.
- 4) Accomplishments 2011**—Updated the preface of the Quality Standards, including the definition for the terms inspection and evaluation; developed training framework with CIGIE I&E Training Academy director.
- 5) Goals 2012**—
  - Update standards (early 2012)
  - Update website (early 2012)
  - Continue development and implementation of CIGIE training framework/curriculum with the first class occurring during first half of 2012 (ongoing in 2012)

- d. Create or engage with existing subject matter subgroups to share knowledge and promote collaboration: e.g. -- intelligence, finance, health care, emergency preparedness (ongoing, begin early 2012)
- e. Explore developing a framework for external review of I&E units and their work (2<sup>nd</sup> half of 2012)





*Council of the*  
**INSPECTORS GENERAL**  
*on INTEGRITY and EFFICIENCY*

**Meeting Minutes: Inspections and Evaluations Committee,  
Monday, March 26, 2011, 11:00 a.m. HHS OIG Conference Room**

**1) Introduction – Dan Levinson and Kathy Buller**

Dan and Kathy welcomed everyone and noted that the main topic for this meeting was to discuss the “next steps” for proceeding with the development of an external review process for I&E units.

- Dan asked that the Committee re-approve the July 2009 document: “External Quality Control Reviews for Inspection and Evaluation Units – Proposed Framework” (2009 Framework) as a starting point for the Committee’s discussion.

The 2009 Framework was developed at the direction of the I&E Committee in 2009 using the CIGIE Quality Standards for Inspection and Evaluation. It was approved previously by the Committee and was used to conduct two pilot reviews in 2009. Further, the 2009 Framework was discussed at the February 23<sup>rd</sup> I&E Roundtable meeting and to ensure all I&E units were able to provide feedback the Roundtable surveyed its members. In summary, both at the Roundtable meeting and in feedback to the survey the I&E community is ready to implement a flexible, voluntary external review process.

- *Carl Clinefelter made a motion to re-approve the 2009 Framework and Arthur Elkins seconded the motion. All present voted in favor.*

**2) Review of 2009 External Review Pilot and Feedback from the I&E Roundtable --**

**Stuart Wright (HHS OIG) and Kathy Buller --** Stuart reviewed the 2009 process and the two pilot reviews. He noted that the reviewers spent approximately 20 hours to prepare and 32 hours on-site to conduct each review. The review team members were drawn from multiple OIGs. Bob Peterson from State, whose I&E unit was one that was reviewed, said that the review was valuable for his office. The review was tailored to gather information about concerns State OIG had about their office, and was not overly burdensome.

- a. Stuart and Kathy summarized the discussion in response to his presentation at the Roundtable’s February 23 meeting and responses to a survey sent to the I&E

community after that meeting. During the Roundtable meeting, those who participated in the discussion supported a flexible and voluntary external review process along with using the 2009 Framework as the basis for the process. The survey emailed after the meeting, resulted in nearly unanimous positive feedback from 16 I&E offices, supporting the idea of a voluntary and flexible process for external review and endorsing the 2009 Framework and.

- b. **Next Steps** – Kathy led a discussion on how the Committee will ensure that:
- sufficient I&E units volunteer to be reviewed,
  - I&E units volunteer sufficient staff to conduct the reviews,
  - the I&E community volunteers staff who can manage the external review process, and
  - the initial phase of the external review process is set up quickly and managed efficiently.
1. **Volunteers to be reviewed in 2012:** HHS, Peace Corps, and Interior. Additional volunteers are welcome
  2. **Volunteers to conduct reviews in 2012:** HHS, Peace Corps, Interior, State, and FCA. The Committee is interested in creating review teams of staff from multiple IGs – this will provide learning opportunities for staff from multiple I&E units and lessen the impact on individual I&E units of having a full team work on an external review. Additional volunteers are welcome
  3. **Volunteers to be reviewed/conduct reviews in 2013:** Federal Reserve Board. Other I&E units who were represented at the meeting are considering participating and all I&E units are invited to participate. Additional volunteers are welcome.
  4. **Number of reviews in 2012:** The Committee agreed that the pilot should run for two years. The goal would be to conduct 3-4 reviews in 2012 and 2013 for a total of 6-8 reviews over the 2 years.
  5. **Managing the process:** The Committee is looking for volunteers to help set-up and manage the process. These volunteers will use the 2009 Framework to establish necessary policies/procedures, identify team members and match them with I&E Units that will be reviewed.

EPA (which uses the Yellow Book for its I&E work) noted that it was recently peer reviewed under Yellow Book standards (as part of a larger Audit peer review), thus would not be reviewed as part of the pilot. However, EPA was supportive of the pilot and is willing to participate in other ways.

The Intelligence Community (IC) I&E units are developing an external review process within the IC. It is unknown if they would be interested in participating in this process.

**3) Update on progress towards meeting the Committee's 2012 Goals (10 minutes) – Elise Stein**

- **CIGIE I&E Training – update on progress** – (b) (6) The workgroup met with (b) (6) on March 20th to review the needs assessment circulated on February 21<sup>st</sup>. Based on the needs assessment, the workgroup is focusing on identifying three courses, with writing likely to be the first topic. Other topics will be proposed later this spring. Possible resources include the HHS OIG course Write-to the Point and other writing training identified by Interior OIG. Additionally, we will be working with the CIGIE Editors/Writers working group and are scheduled to meet with them in April to gain further insights into the community's needs.
  - CIGIE AI&E Academy sponsored a course on Fraud Awareness – which was fully “sold out” -- and is working on developing 2 other courses for this year.
- **I&E Website** – (b) (6) – The workgroup met on March 29th and is making progress towards identifying the types of items to be included on the website, such as FAQ's about the CIGIE I&E community and links to award winning I&E work.

*Attending:* Dan Levinson-HHS, Kathy Buller-Peace Corps, Carl Clinefleter-FCA, George Grob-FHFA (representing Steve Linick), Patricia Christ-VA (representing George Opfer), Emil George\_NLRB (representing Dave Berry), Arthur Elkins and Elizabeth Grossman-EPA, Erica Paulson-DHHS (Representing Charles Edwards), Anthony Castaldo-FRB (representing Mark Bialek), Bob Peterson-Dept. of State (representing Harold Geisel).

HHS OIG staff: Stuart Wright, Chair of the I&E Roundtable, (b) (6)

(b) (6)

## *CIGIE Inspection & Evaluation Committee Meeting*

### **Minutes of the January 6, 2011 meeting**

**Location:** Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Inspector General  
330 Independence Avenue SW

**Time:** 10:00 – 11:35 am

#### **I. Welcome and Introductions: Dan Levinson**

Dan welcomed all members and guests to the meeting. Dan provided a special welcome to Kathy Buller as this was her first meeting as Vice Chair of the Committee.

#### **II. I&E Survey – Findings and Results, Next Steps: (b) (6) HHS OIG**

In March 2010, a committee of staff from OIGs at FCA, HHS, HUD, Interior, NEA, and TIGTA surveyed CIGIE members about their I&E activities. The survey mimicked the last survey in 2007 so that comparisons could be made. Sixty-one of 69 IGs responded to the 2010 survey.

A brief summary of the survey findings is as follows:

- Forty-two of 69 OIGs conduct I&E work, which is up 35 percent from 2007.
- Like CIGIE, many IGs do not make a clear definitional distinction between inspections and evaluations.
- Issues of safety, security, emergency preparedness; IT; fraud, waste, and abuse; early implementation of regulations, procedures, or programs; and grants management cut across all OIGs.
- I&E units expect to produce 584 final evaluation and inspection reports in 2010, 107 more than 2007.
- Thirty-nine OIGs adhere to the Blue Book standards for I&E work while 3 OIGs use the GAO's "Government Auditing Standards" or Yellow Book.
- Eighty-one percent of OIGs adhere to or exceed CIGIE training standards outlined in the Blue Book.
- Ninety-three percent of I&E units conduct formal followup on recommendations, a significant increase from 65 percent in 2007.
- Respondents provided many ideas and suggestions to CIGIE. Specifically:
  - Identify and develop more I&E-focused training and provide more CIGIE-sponsored training events
  - Update the Standards to establish greater uniformity across the OIGs
  - Increase outreach and information exchange between OIGs

- Include a comprehensive link to all I&E units and reports online
- Increase interagency collaboration

The Committee approved the survey report for release and posting on the CIGIE website.

### **III. Update of the *Quality Standards for Inspection and Evaluation* – Next Steps: Dan Levinson**

In June 2010, CIGIE voted to accept the 2005 edition of the Quality Standards as the official standards for I&E work. It was noted that they would need to be updated to comport with IG Reform Act. In November 2010, the I&E Committee sent members of the RoundTable a data call to begin the process of updating the Standards to include technical revisions to meet the requirements in the IG Reform Act.

Based on the November data call, the following technical changes were made:

- Replaced references to PCIE/ECIE with CIGIE
- Noted that following the Blue Book standards was required for all I&E work
- Added the word “evaluation” after inspection making the new title – “Quality Standards for Inspection and Evaluation”

We did not make any substantive revisions to the standards. However, during the data call IGs suggested making the following substantive revisions at a future date:

- Strengthen training requirements for inspectors to match that for auditors
- Establish a system of peer review
- Develop distinct definitions for inspection and for evaluation

(b) (6) received a list of volunteers for working on these possible substantial changes so she will get started with those.

The Committee approved the updated standards for release and posting on the CIGIE website. Hard copies of the standards will be published by the CIGIE Executive Committee.

### **IV. I&E Committee Mission Statement: Dan Levinson**

CIGIE requested that each standing committee review its mission statement by January 10, 2010. The following statement was approved by the Committee:

Provides leadership for the CIGIE inspection and evaluation community’s effort to improve agency program effectiveness by maintaining professional standards; leading the development of protocols for reviewing management issues that cut across departments and agencies; promoting the use of advanced program evaluation techniques; and fostering awareness of evaluation and inspection practice in OIGs. The Committee provides input to the CIGIE Professional Development Committee on the training and the development needs of the CIGIE inspection and evaluation community.

### **V. Committee Meeting Frequency and Structure: Dan Levinson**

Over the past year we have conducted business primarily by e-mail. Are infrequent meetings sufficient along with email communication to serve the I&E Community and this committee?

It was decided that the I&E Committee should strive for meeting twice a year.

## **VI. Other**

During the discussion regarding updating the standards to include the word “evaluation”, there was a lively discussion on how IG offices define evaluation, inspection, and audit. In many offices, evaluations and inspections are not delineated – especially as they both must adhere to the Blue Book standards. However, in some offices there is a pervasive stereotype that evaluations are not as rigorous as audits and not held to the same standard. In some offices evaluations are considered more descriptive, while audits are more prescriptive. One issue is the fact that evaluations can often not calculate a return on investment like audits can.

To help gain consensus on these issues and to educate the CIGIE community at large about the rigor and the value of I&E work to OIGs, Kathy suggested the I&E Committee members participate in a panel at the next CIGIE Annual meeting where these issues could be presented.

# *CIGIE Inspection & Evaluation Committee Meeting*

## Minutes of the November 12, 2009 meeting

**Location:** Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Inspector General  
330 Independence Avenue SW

**Time:** 10:00 – 11:45 am

**Attendees:** 21

### **I. Welcome and Introductions: Dan Levinson**

Dan welcomed all members and guests to the meeting.

### **II. Presentation: (b) (6)**

- **DHS' Draft Inspection Plan Matrix for Assessing Federal Response Capabilities**

DHS, along with 7-10 other IG offices, drafted a survey questionnaire for assessing Federal agencies' ability to respond to a national disaster. Twelve Federal agencies have key Emergency Support Function roles and responsibilities outlined in the National Response Framework. This survey seeks to answer how well these 12 Federal agencies are poised to respond to a national emergency.

There are 3 main reasons DHS is undertaking this survey: 1) to provide a snapshot of the capabilities of the Federal government in responding to a national emergency, 2) FEMA is spearheading a project to revise the National Response Framework by August 2011. Any findings from DHS' project could hopefully be implemented into the revised framework, and 3) GAO has already conducted studies looking at FEMA and DHS capabilities to respond to a national disaster. DHS feels as though they could receive more comprehensive data than GAO so they would like to complete this report of all 12 agencies before GAO begins such a report.

If anyone would like to offer any comments on the draft survey, please contact (b) (6)

[Follow-up information: The draft matrix was later presented and approved at the full November CIGIE meeting.]

### **III. Roundtable's training conference feedback and next steps:**

- **How soon should the Committee sponsor training and should there be new topics and speakers or should the program content and format stay the same?**

Roundtable feedback: it would be beneficial to provide training in 2010 and the content should be altered. The next training could focus more on specific aspects of our work (i.e., survey design).

The committee agreed that the content should be changed for future trainings and that it would be beneficial to provide training in 2010.

- **Are there alternative training/networking considerations for the upcoming year?**

There was a suggestion for 2 ½ day trainings (as opposed to one 2-day training), one in early 2010 and one late in 2010. Possible topics include the I&E standards and how agencies meet each standard, and providing resources for agencies wanting to start an I&E unit. The survey results (discussed in Additional Issues) could also help guide the training.

- **Should any future conferences be turned over to the training academy or continue as part of the I&E Committee?**

Roundtable feedback: responsibility for providing future trainings should rest with the training academy.

However, the training academy is limited in the near term in their ability to assist. (b) (6) spoke with Mark Jones about this possibility. According to Mark, the training academy might be able to provide some funding but would be unable to provide any staff support until 2011.

HHS estimates that the 2009 training cost \$18,000. This included donated space and financial help from FDIC. HHS is willing to provide a leadership role for future trainings, but would appreciate staff contributions from other agencies.

#### **IV. IG Reform Act new I&E related provisions:**

- **I&E components are now required to report, in the semiannual, quantitative results of their activities, according to a uniform set of statistical categories<sup>1</sup>.**

The IG Act amendments enacted last October included a provision that has significant impact for I&E units. Specifically, I&E units are now required to report their recommendations in their semiannual report. These changes highlight an effort to regularize I&E reporting.

Dan offered the suggestion that it would be interesting to learn from the Hill staff regarding their reasoning for inserting “inspection and evaluation” language into the IG Reform Act.

#### **V. Adherence to professional standards developed by the Council**

- **How do we move forward with educating units and the IG Community about the application of the standards and integrating them into our work?**

One of the lessons we learned at the 2009 training was that not all I&E staff are knowledgeable about the quality standards.

One suggestion for future revisions to the standards is that they include a common description of the expectation of what it means to “meet” a standard, perhaps including a model for how to meet each standard could be met.

---

<sup>1</sup> IG Reform Act; § 5. Semiannual reports <http://www.ignet.gov/pande/leg/igactasof0609.pdf>



- **How do we move forward with the peer review process?**

At the last meeting, the Committee decided that the Roundtable should move forward with the peer review pilot. However, when Roundtable members were asked to volunteer to participate in the pilot, only 2 agencies volunteered to be reviewed.

The Committee believes that for now, we should not invest our energies in a peer review. We should first focus on educating I&E units about the application of the standards and integrating them into our work. There are so many new I&E units that we first need to make sure I&E units are at a place where they are comfortable getting reviewed by their peers.

There was one suggestion that we change the terminology. For instance, if I&E units saw it more of a consulting exercise and less of a peer review, they might be more apt to participate.

- **How can we promote the I&E function more effectively including:**

- **How can we use the I&E Web site more effectively to promote the I&E function and as a resource to the Community?**

The Web site could be used as more of a resource for IG offices that are newly developing an I&E unit. In this vein, it could be used more as a portal providing a centralized location to review standards, manuals, report formats, recent reports, etc. out of individual IG offices.

## **VI. Additional Issues**

There was consensus to undertake a new survey of I&E units regarding their staffing, structure, and their presence among OIG offices. The last survey was done 3 years ago.