

Research on the Current Situation of and Measures for Accountability

Audit of Military Cadres

Siyuan Wei, ChengweiLiu, TongyuJi

Military Economics Academy of PLA, Wuhan City, ubei Province, 430035, China

Key works. Research on the accountability audit of cadres

Abstract. Since the implementation of the accountability audit of military cadres, the relevant rules and regulations and mechanism have been constantly improved. A new way to comply with the trend of modern auditing in China and modernization construction of army has been developed. However, there are some problems that cannot be ignored in relation to the accountability audit of military cadres. This paper puts forward the ideas, measures, and proposals to strengthen the accountability audit of military cadres by analyzing the current situation of its development, the common problems, individual problems and their causes.

The accountability audit of military cadres refers to the audit of, supervision over, and evaluation of the authenticity, legality, and performance of the financial revenue and expenditure or the assets, liabilities, and profits and losses of the departments or organizations for which the cadres and leaders serve with economic accountability during their tenure of office by the military auditing body in accordance with the law, following the instructions of the superior audit department, and based on the actual situation of these departments or organizations. The comprehensive implementation of the *Regulations on Accountability Audit of Military Cadres* within the army in an orderly manner plays an important role in improving the supervision and management related mechanism, decision-making and management level for cadres, and promoting the construction of the Party conduct and of an honest and clean government within the army. The accountability audit, however, involves a lot of issues, great difficulty of implementation, and high requirements for the performance; therefore, and there are still many problems in its implementation.

Major problems in accountability audit of military cadres

With the launch of military-economic activities and the growing demand for accountability audit, the issues such as establishment of military audit institutions, staffing and funding have been major factors affecting the implementation of audit. Audit institutions at all levels see heavy workload, wide range of work, difficulty of obtaining audit related materials, and limitation related to the insufficient number of auditors and awareness of problems. It can be said that the rapid development of accountability, and insufficient number of auditors and the failure of meeting the needs for development due to the limited knowledge structure have become the major problems facing the accountability audit of military cadres currently.

"Audit before leaving office" and "audit before promotion" are principles that govern the accountability audit. Nevertheless the opposite is often the case in actuality, which hinders the implementation of audit. The audit that should be conducted before leaving office is mostly carried out after the leaders of the organization (department) leave the office. The audit is thwarted for people to be audited have left the organization (department) and the relevant information can hardly be verified. Auditors feel it difficult to conduct the auditing if the people to be audited have been

transferred to other positions already; therefore, the problems emerging during the leaders' or cadres' tenure of office cannot be properly disclosed. Even if they can be properly disclosed, the transfer has been done and the evaluation based on the audit cannot properly serve as the reference, which renders the accountability audit useless and ineffective. Furthermore, the transfer is often conducted for many leaders at the same time. The time is limited and task arduous for the accountability audit and it is hard for auditors to properly follow the auditing procedures. Therefore, the quality and effect of the audit cannot be guaranteed.

Auditors often follow the traditional auditing method to carry out accountability audit by checking the account books and vouchers. Conclusions are always acquired by checking the books and related matters, but comprehensive analysis is seldom made with much less than diversified methods. In addition, the audit evaluation provided by the auditors is mainly focused on the financial status of the entity audited and the performance of the individual audited, which, however, are seldom interrelated and lead to the auditors' failure of objectively judging if the audited cadres have fulfilled their duties. Insufficient auditing items, low auditing quality and inadequate analysis will significantly worsen the effect of auditing.

The audit standards are important to the accountability audit of the military cadres. Currently, Audit Standards for Accountability Audit of Military Cadres is followed in this regard according to which there are four performance grades—"excellent", "good", "mediocre" and "bad", but there is no clear judging criteria. Hence the evaluation is not done strictly. Furthermore, each auditor has different understanding of the Standards as influenced by the subjective factors and imposes different criteria when auditing the organization where the people to be audit work for. Therefore, different auditors tend to make different judgments and evaluation of the same organization and the performance of the same cadre. The lack of fairness and impartiality in auditing will whittle down the credibility as to the accountability audit of cadres.

(5) Insufficient application of audit finding

The accountability audit finding is one of the important bases for the inspection, selection and appointment of cadres in the department. It is also an important factor to strengthen financial decisions and prevent financial problems. However, the audit finding has little to do with effective supervision and management to various degrees in the accountability audit of the military cadres. The auditing procedures often become a mere formality and the finding cannot be properly applied. The "excellent" cadres based on the audit finding will not be acknowledged or awarded sometimes, and those with problems based on the finding not called to account. It will not only render the auditing in vain, but also reduce the confidence and enthusiasm of cadres in auditing who would then tend to not follow the principle and not discriminate between good and bad. The insufficient application of audit finding will severely weaken the influential role of auditing.

Major measures and proposals to strengthen the accountability audit of military cadres

Considering the actual situation in which the establishment of audit institutions and audit resource allocation fail to meet the needs of auditing, the audit methods must be improved and existing audit resources fully integrated. The traditional audit method used in the independent auditing by the audit institutions must be replaced with that featured by unified division of labor and unified auditing. A unified audit talent pool should be set up with unified auditing items, auditing program, human resource allocation, and implementation. Only by optimizing the talent and resource allocation can the limited manpower, material resources, and financial resources be properly allocated and utilized, and the contradiction between the heavy workload and insufficient auditing personnel be relieved. In addition, attention must be paid to the cultivation of audit talents and the

follow-up education for audit personnel, so as to expand the knowledge structure and enhance the competence of grassroots auditors, enable them to meet the current requirements for accountability audit of cadres, further increase the efficiency of auditing, avoid auditing risks, and promote the standardization construction.

Accountability audit is a dynamic work. Its focus should be placed on themeticulous accumulation of audit experience, analysisof audit problems and providing solutions, improvement of audit methods based on research, and improvement of audit quality. In practice, a variety of audit methods should be taken into consideration. The accountability audit should be combined with other regular audits,audit before leaving office with audit during the tenure of office, and audit with audit investigation, so as to save the relevant cost, increase efficiency, bring the auditing forward in time, highlight the audit emphasis, and know all about what is not reflected on the account books. The bundled way of auditing should be conducted, which means to audit taking into account both the cadres and the departments, in order to comprehensively and more accurately investigate how the cadres fulfill their liability in respective organizations and departments.

The accuracy and objectivity of the audit evaluation as an important part of the audit report are closely related to the quality of the report. They also play an important role in the inspection and appointment of cadres. Auditors should follow more scientific indicators as reference and adopt the methods featured by both qualitative and quantitative analyses. The qualitative analysis should be conducted in accordance with laws and regulations, and the quantitative indicators adopted and quantitative evaluation carried out. Scores respectively corresponding to the four grades in *Audit Standards for Accountability Audit of MilitaryCadres* including“excellent”, “good”, “mediocre” and “bad” should be defined, based on which to evaluate the economic accountability of cadres in an objective, fair, practical, and realistic manner and to make the standard clearer and more implementable. While the focus is placed on how the cadres to be audit fulfill their liabilities and if the exercise of power is reasonable and legitimate, the audit and evaluation of the effectiveness of their economic behavior should be fortified. The economics, efficiency, and effectiveness of cadres’ economic behavior should be included in the evaluation criteria.

Only by correctly applying the finding from the accountability audit of cadres and improving the relevant mechanism can the supervision over and management of them strengthened, their performance accurately assessed, the supervisory role of the competent departments given full play to, and the new issues and problems in the supervision and management be properly addressed. The audit finding should be combined with the evaluation, the principle of “audit before taking office” followed, and the audit quality guaranteed. The audit finding should be combined with the work to combat corruption and build a clean government, regular accountability audits conducted, and the construction of the Party conduct and of an honest and clean government further promoted. The audit finding should be combined with the standardization of the financial and economic orders so as to award the excellent, disclose problems, and investigate and punish the behaviors violating the law and discipline. In addition, importance should be attached to the feedback mechanism for the audit finding, so as to promote the rectification of audit related problems and its implementation, enhance the effectiveness of audit based supervision, and completely solve the problems of the divorce between the audit finding and its application.

References

- [1] Cai Chun, TianQiurong, and Liu Lei.“Economic Responsibility Auditing and Auditing Theory Innovations” [J]. *AuditingResearch*, 2011 (2) P9-11.

- [2] Li Jin, Lai Jijun, and Zhang Juan. “To Promote the Construction of a Clean and Honest Administration in Army with Accountability Audit” [J]. *Journal of Military Economics Academy*, 2011(3)P78.
- [4] Accountability audit joint conference office of the five central ministries and commissions; questions and answers relating to the accountability audit of cadres; China Modern Economic Publishing House, 2004.
- [5] Huang Liqin; “Study on Establishment of the Evaluation System for Accountability Audit of County-Level Cadres and Below”; *Oriental Party Construction*, 2004 (4).
- [6] ZhaiXigui; *Research on Development Strategy for Audit in China*; China Modern Economic Publishing House, 2009.