

REPORT NO. 2013-108
FEBRUARY 2013

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY

DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

Operational Audit



STATE OF FLORIDA
AUDITOR GENERAL
DAVID W. MARTIN, CPA

BOARD MEMBERS AND SUPERINTENDENT

Board members and the Superintendent who served during the 2011-12 fiscal year are listed below:

	<u>District No.</u>
Dr. Wilbert “Tee” Holloway	1
Dr. Dorothy Bendross-Mindingall	2
Dr. Martin S. Karp	3
Ms. Perla Tabares Hantman, Chair	4
Mr. Renier Diaz de la Portilla	5
Ms. Raquel A. Regalado	6
Mr. Carlos L. Curbelo	7
Dr. Marta Perez	8
Dr. Lawrence S. Feldman, Vice Chair	9

Mr. Alberto M. Carvalho, Superintendent

The audit team leader was Agustin Silva, CPA, and the audit was supervised by Ramon A. Gonzalez, CPA. Please address inquiries regarding this report to Gregory L. Centers, CPA, Audit Manager, by e-mail at gregcenters@aud.state.fl.us or by telephone at (850) 487-9039.

This report and other reports prepared by the Auditor General can be obtained on our Web site at www.myflorida.com/audgen; by telephone at (850) 487-9175; or by mail at G74 Claude Pepper Building, 111 West Madison Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1450.

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY
District School Board

SUMMARY

Our operational audit disclosed the following:

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Finding No. 1: Controls over awarding employee professional development credit could be enhanced.

PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENTS

Finding No. 2: District records did not always evidence that instructional personnel performance assessments at Miami Norland Senior High School were timely and accurate.

SAFETY AND SECURITY

Finding No. 3: The District did not timely obtain required background rescreenings for certain employees.

MOTOR VEHICLES

Finding No. 4: The District needed to enhance its vehicle fuel efficiency monitoring procedures.

FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING

Finding No. 5: Controls over facilities construction and maintenance activities could be enhanced.

BACKGROUND

The Miami-Dade County School District (District) is part of the State system of public education under the general direction of the Florida Department of Education. Geographic boundaries of the District correspond with those of Miami-Dade County. The governing body of the District is the Miami-Dade County District School Board (Board), which is composed of nine elected members. The appointed Superintendent of Schools is the executive officer of the Board.

During the 2011-12 fiscal year, the District operated 348 elementary, middle, high, and specialized schools; sponsored 109 charter schools; and reported 347,661 unweighted full-time equivalent students.

The District's financial statements and Federal awards for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012, were audited by other auditors.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Professional Development

Finding No. 1: Inservice Training Credit

Section 1012.98, Florida Statutes, establishes professional development protocols to improve the quality of professional development of District employees and requires the District to develop a professional development system in compliance with Florida Department of Education (FDOE) standards. State Board of Education (SBE) Rule 6A-5.071, Florida Administrative Code (FAC), requires that the District develop and maintain a master inservice training plan based on FDOE-adopted standards for high quality professional development. Pursuant to SBE

Rule 6A-5.071, FAC, inservice points may be awarded to employees for successful completion of professional development courses with one inservice point equivalent to one clock hour of participation or based on competencies demonstrated as specified by the master inservice plan. In addition, Board Policy 1242, *Professional Development*, requires the District to prepare a comprehensive professional development plan consistent with the FDOE-adopted standards.

The District's Office of Professional Development and Education Services is responsible for delivering inservice training to District employees and overseeing the quality of District-sponsored professional development to ensure compliance with the above requirements. The District's professional development liaison manual provides guidelines for the implementation of the comprehensive professional development plan, which includes the use of a professional development menu and course registration system. The manual includes information and procedures for training courses, roles and responsibilities of liaisons and administrators, and course evaluations. The manual also requires that course sessions be posted to the menu and registration system at least two weeks before the scheduled start date, and disallows credit of participants who do not preregister for courses. In addition, the manual requires that course participants complete an evaluation to receive credit for participation.

District personnel indicated that on August 4, 2011, the District sent a briefing to school principals explaining that changes in Florida law required administrators and instructional personnel to participate in certain instructional performance evaluation and growth system (IPEGS) training. On August 18 and 19, 2011, 20,230 instructional personnel viewed a 25-minute video course that addressed the new IPEGS changes. According to District personnel, the registration procedures were modified for this course in an effort to accommodate the high volume of participants and meet the law requirements before the beginning of the school year.

Controls over professional development courses were generally appropriate and sufficient. However, contrary to the District's professional development liaison manual, the 25-minute video course was not recorded in the professional development menu and registration system; course participants did not preregister for the course but registered subsequently in November and December 2011; and participants did not, of record, complete evaluations of the course.

While the employees signed rosters as proof of attending the video and were awarded four inservice professional development points, District records did not evidence the basis upon which the four points were awarded as the video consisted of only 25 minutes of instruction, which represented less than one inservice professional development point. Upon additional inquiry, we were provided school meeting agendas and individual professional development plans indicating that the IPEGS training included more time than the 25-minute video; however, District records did not identify timeframes, or include time records, evidencing actual time spent by the 20,230 employees participating in additional IPEGS training. As a result, District records did not evidence that the clock hours of training were enough to support awarding each of the 20,230 employees four inservice points, or a total of 80,920 inservice points.

When established procedures for the registration and evaluation of professional development courses are not followed and actual hours of training provided to instructional personnel are not adequately supported, there is increased risk that course participants may not meet the requirements for the renewal of education professional certificates. Insufficient professional development training may have also contributed to the performance assessment control deficiencies noted in Finding No. 2.

Recommendation: The District should enhance procedures to ensure that professional development training used to award inservice training credit is appropriately documented and administered in accordance with the District's professional development liaison manual. Such procedures should ensure that the registration and evaluation process for professional development courses follows the procedures prescribed in the professional development liaison manual, and that inservice training points awarded agree with the clock hours of course participation as required by SBE Rule 6A-5.071, FAC. Further, the District should contact the FDOE to determine appropriate action for any overawarded professional development credit that may have resulted from the District's handling of the IPEGS training.

Performance Assessments

Finding No. 2: Performance Assessments – Miami Norland Senior High School

Section 1012.34(3)(a), Florida Statutes, requires annual performance evaluations of most instructional personnel and requires that newly-hired instructional personnel be observed and evaluated at least twice in their first year of employment. The performance evaluation must be based on sound educational principles and contemporary research in effective educational practices.

The District used the IPEGS to assess, monitor, and provide meaningful feedback on instructional personnel performance. Instructional personnel are active participants with assessors in the evaluation process through collaborative meetings, input, and reflection. The District's IPEGS procedural handbook provides information and procedures in areas such as the IPEGS process, performance standards, individual professional development plans (IPDP), and evaluation forms. The handbook also includes an IPEGS timeline that provides the due dates for completion of performance assessments, evaluations, and observations of instructional employees. The 2011-12 IPEGS timeline required the assessor to meet with the employee, discuss the IPDP for the year by the end of the first grading period, October 27, 2011, and the IPDP form be signed and dated by the assessor and employee. Further, the second observation and postobservation meetings between the assessor and employee must have occurred by the end of the third grading period, March 29, 2012.

Our tests of the performance assessments completed for 34 instructional employees at Miami Norland Senior High School during the 2011-12 fiscal year disclosed certain control deficiencies in the performance assessment process, as follows:

- **Untimely Completion of Assessments for Nine Employees.** For one employee, the planning meeting document indicated the meeting occurred untimely as it was dated March 19, 2012, or 144 days after the October 27, 2011, due date. For another employee, a new employee, the first observation was dated January 27, 2012, or 92 days after the October 27, 2011, due date. For a third employee, a new employee, the second observation was completed timely on March 28, 2012; however, the postobservation meeting was not completed until May 9, 2012, or 41 days after the March 29, 2012, due date. In addition, the postobservation meetings for six other employees were untimely, ranging from 4 to 33 days after the March 29, 2012, due date. For one of these employees, the performance assessment disclosed that the employee contested whether the required observation was ever made by the assessor.
- **Inconsistencies in Observation and Postobservation Meeting Dates and Times for Six Employees.** For two employees, the observation forms indicated that the same assessor concurrently observed the employees on March 5, 2012, from 11:45 a.m. to 12:05 p.m., and the assessor wrote the same review notes for both employees. Also, for two other employees, the observation forms indicated that the same assessor concurrently observed the employees on January 31, 2012, from 8:10 a.m. to 8:30 a.m., and the assessor wrote the same review notes for both employees. Further, for two additional employees, the observation forms indicated that the same assessor concurrently observed the employees on December 14, 2011, from

12:50 p.m. to 1:50 p.m. The form for one of the employees indicated that the postobservation meeting took place on December 8, 2011, or six days before the employee was observed. According to assessors, the employee observations were performed, but times and dates were sometimes recorded incorrectly.

- **Documentation Insufficient for Two Employees' Assessments.** For one employee, the planning meeting document was not signed by the employee (only signed by the assessor) and not dated. For another employee, the planning meeting document was signed by the assessor and the employee, but the document was not dated.

Under the above conditions, the District had limited assurance that performance assessments for instructional personnel appropriately communicated the employees' accomplishments or shortcomings.

Recommendation: **The District should enhance procedures to ensure that performance assessments of instructional personnel follow the timelines prescribed in the IPEGS procedural handbook, and that observation forms completed by assessors reflect accurate and consistent information.**

Safety and Security

Finding No. 3: Background Rescreenings

Sections 1012.56(10) and 1012.465(2), Florida Statutes, require that instructional personnel renewing their teaching certificates and noninstructional personnel undergo background screenings every five years following the initial fingerprinting and screening upon employment. In a memorandum dated June 25, 2004, the FDOE recommended that school districts conduct background screenings for certified instructional employees every five years, at the time of renewal of their teaching certificates, and that background checks rescreenings be obtained for 20 percent of the noninstructional employees each year.

As of March 2012, the District had identified 2,142 instructional and noninstructional employees who had not obtained the required background rescreenings within the past five years. Fourteen of the employees, identified with the oldest background screening dates, had initial background screenings that occurred from calendar years 1991 through 1998 with no subsequent rescreening. Subsequent to our inquiry, District personnel indicated that an automated process was implemented in April 2012 to generate a weekly report identifying the employees whose fingerprint anniversary was approaching five years. District personnel indicated that the weekly report was submitted to the Office of Human Resources and the Office of Fingerprinting and the required background rescreenings were completed for the above employees. To confirm appropriate implementation of the automated process, we tested 20 of the 2,142 employees and noted that the required background rescreenings had been completed for all 20 employees tested.

Absent timely background screenings, there is an increased risk that instructional and noninstructional staff may have backgrounds that are not suitable for direct contact with students.

Recommendation: **The District should continue its efforts to timely obtain required background screenings for District employees.**

Motor Vehicles

Finding No. 4: Monitoring Fuel Efficiency

During the 2011-12 fiscal year, the District spent \$3.4 million on gasoline and \$6.3 million on diesel fuel. The principal system used for dispensing fuel to the District's fleet system is the Vehicle Information Transmitter (VIT). The VIT system uses a fuel tracking device installed in the fuel tank area of the vehicle to track fuel distributed through the fuel pumps located at the District's transportation centers. The tracking device activates the fuel pump and allows the user to obtain fuel without the use of a fuel card or pin number while capturing data that allow management to generate fuel consumption and exception reports for each vehicle.

The District's Department of Transportation (DOT) is responsible for reviewing the monthly fuel exception reports that identify vehicles that average less than 4 miles per gallon or more than 25 miles per gallon. The report provides the date and time of the fueling, odometer readings at the time of the fueling, miles driven, units of fuel consumed, and the average miles per gallon for each vehicle. The DOT submits the exception reports to the department that owns or utilizes the vehicle for investigation or to the corresponding vehicle repair shop to have the mileage verified and the VIT checked to ensure that the mileage readings from these devices match. If odometer reprogramming or VIT recalibration are necessary, the revised readings are entered in the District's fuel system to update the vehicle's fuel usage records.

Our review disclosed several instances for which fuel exception report discrepancies in average miles per gallon remained unresolved by management for several months prior to our inquiry. Subsequent to our inquiry, DOT personnel contacted the various departments and provided explanations and documentation for the discrepancies, which mainly related to inaccurate odometer readings. We were informed that, in most instances, the discrepancies resulted from mileage-related anomalies and VIT technical issues that required reprogramming of the VIT to synchronize it to the vehicle's odometer. However, when exception report discrepancies are not resolved timely, the control provided by the District's VIP system is limited and there is increased risk of unauthorized fuel usage. Similar findings were noted in our report Nos. 2008-158 and 2011-099.

Recommendation: **The District should continue its efforts to monitor fuel usage by timely documenting investigations and resolutions of discrepancies noted in fuel exception reports.**

Facilities Administration and Monitoring

Finding No. 5: Facilities Management

The Office of School Facilities (Office) is responsible for managing construction and renovation projects. During the 2011-12 fiscal year, the Office employed 160 full-time employees, including construction and energy management personnel, and the department's operating cost was \$11 million. Also, during this fiscal year, the District had expenditures totaling \$152.7 million for capital projects fund construction and renovation projects and, as shown on the District's Five-Year Facilities Work Plan as approved by the Board on September 5, 2012, the District plans to spend an additional \$313.5 million on construction and renovation projects over the next five fiscal years. At June 30, 2012, the historical cost of the District's educational and ancillary facilities was \$5.4 billion and, as shown on the FDOE's Florida Inventory of School Houses data, District facilities had an average age of 30 years.

The facilities maintenance department is responsible for ensuring facilities are safe and suitable for their intended use. The facilities maintenance department performed heating, ventilating, and air conditioning (HVAC), electrical, plumbing, and other repairs and maintenance-related jobs. During the 2011-12 fiscal year, the facilities maintenance department employed 884 full-time employees, including grounds and maintenance personnel, and the department's operating cost was \$76 million.

Given the significant commitment of public funds to construct and maintain educational facilities, it is important that the District establish written policies and procedures documenting processes for evaluating facilities construction methods and maintenance techniques to determine the most cost effective and efficient method or technique.

The District utilizes different delivery methods depending on project requirements and construction market conditions. A number of factors are considered which, depending on the specific characteristics of each project, may include various combinations of elements such as scope and magnitude, design complexity, scheduling, site conditions, and availability of prequalified contractors.

During the 2011-12 fiscal year, the District primarily used competitive bids to award contracts for the construction of new buildings and construction management at risk construction methods for renovation work. Board Policy No. 6330, *Architectural, Engineering, Landscape Architectural, Land Surveying, Construction Management, Program Management and Inspection Services*, provides for the Chief Facilities Officer, or his/her successor, or designee, to analyze the project requirements and make the determination regarding which design and construction delivery method to employ. The delivery method is identified at the time the architect/engineer of record is commissioned by the Board. In addition, maintenance-related jobs, such as HVAC replacement and repair, are routinely performed by maintenance personnel based on safety and suitability priorities. Our review disclosed that management procedures were generally adequate; however, written policies and procedures had not been established for evaluating the various construction methods or maintenance-related job techniques, and evaluation of alternative construction methods or maintenance techniques were not documented of record. While the project requirement analysis performed by District personnel may have been appropriate considering the District's typical construction projects and the local construction environment at the time of the evaluations, without Board-approved policies and procedures, and documented evaluations of alternative construction methods or maintenance techniques, there is an increased risk that the District may not use the most cost-effective and beneficial construction method or maintenance techniques.

Recommendation: The District should develop written policies and procedures requiring periodic evaluations of alternative facilities construction methods and significant maintenance-related job techniques, and document these evaluations.

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

The Auditor General conducts operational audits of governmental entities to provide the Legislature, Florida's citizens, public entity management, and other stakeholders unbiased, timely, and relevant information for use in promoting government accountability and stewardship and improving government operations.

We conducted this operational audit from January 2012 to November 2012 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

The objectives of this operational audit were to:

- Evaluate management's performance in establishing and maintaining internal controls, including controls designed to prevent and detect fraud, waste, and abuse, and in administering assigned responsibilities in accordance with applicable laws, rules, regulations, contracts, grant agreements, and other guidelines.
- Examine internal controls designed and placed in operation to promote and encourage the achievement of management's control objectives in the categories of compliance, economic and efficient operations, reliability of records and reports, and the safeguarding of assets, and identify weaknesses in those controls.
- Determine whether management had taken corrective actions for finding Nos. 1, 14, and 15 included in our report No. 2011-099.
- Identify statutory and fiscal changes that may be recommended to the Legislature pursuant to Section 11.45(7)(h), Florida Statutes.

This audit was designed to identify, for those programs, activities, or functions included within the scope of the audit, deficiencies in management's internal controls, instances of noncompliance with applicable laws, rules, regulations, contracts, grant agreements, and other guidelines, and instances of inefficient or ineffective operational policies, procedures, or practices. The focus of this audit was to identify problems so that they may be corrected in such a way as to improve government accountability and efficiency and the stewardship of management. Professional judgment has been used in determining significance and audit risk and in selecting the particular transactions, legal compliance matters, records, and controls considered.

For those programs, activities, and functions included within the scope of our audit, our audit work included, but was not limited to, communicating to management and those charged with governance the scope, objectives, timing, overall methodology, and reporting of our audit; obtaining an understanding of the program, activity, or function; exercising professional judgment in considering significance and audit risk in the design and execution of the research, interviews, tests, analyses, and other procedures included in the audit methodology; obtaining reasonable assurance of the overall sufficiency and appropriateness of the evidence gathered in support of our audit findings and conclusions; and reporting on the results of the audit as required by governing laws and auditing standards.

The scope and methodology of this operational audit are described in Exhibit A. Our audit included the selection and examination of various records and transactions occurring during the 2011-12 fiscal year. Unless otherwise indicated in this report, these records and transactions were not selected with the intent of statistically projecting the results, although we have presented for perspective, where practicable, information concerning relevant population value or size and quantifications relative to the items selected for examination.

An audit by its nature does not include a review of all records and actions of agency management, staff, and vendors, and as a consequence, cannot be relied upon to identify all instances of noncompliance, fraud, waste, abuse, or inefficiency.

PRIOR AUDIT FINDINGS

Regarding findings noted in our report No. 2011-099, we determined that management had taken corrective actions for Finding Nos. 1 and 15 but, as noted in current Finding No. 4, had not taken corrective action for prior Finding No. 14. All other areas of the District's operations affected by findings included in our report No. 2011-099 were not included in the scope of this audit. We will determine whether the District took adequate corrective actions for those findings as part of our 2012-13 fiscal year operational audit of the District.

AUTHORITY

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 11.45, Florida Statutes, I have directed that this report be prepared to present the results of our operational audit.



David W. Martin, CPA
Auditor General

MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

Management's response is included as Exhibit B.

EXHIBIT A
AUDIT SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

Scope (Topic)	Methodology
Information Technology (IT) policies and procedures.	Examined the District's written IT policies and procedures to determine whether they addressed certain important IT access control functions.
IT security awareness and training.	Determined whether a comprehensive IT security awareness and training program was in place.
Deactivation of employee IT access.	Reviewed procedures to prohibit former employees' access to electronic data files. Tested access privileges for former employees to determine whether their access privileges had been timely deactivated.
IT access privileges.	Reviewed procedures for monitoring access privileges to the District's application and network systems to determine whether access privileges were appropriately granted.
Electronic transfers and payments.	Reviewed District policies and procedures relating to electronic funds transfers and vendor payments. Tested supporting documentation to determine if selected electronic fund transfers and payments were properly authorized and supported, and complied with State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.0012, Florida Administrative Code.
Earmarked nonvoted capital outlay tax levy resources.	Applied analytical procedures, tested payments made from nonvoted capital outlay tax levy proceeds, and examined supporting documentation to determine whether the District complied with requirements related to the use of nonvoted capital outlay proceeds.
E-rate program.	Reviewed District policies and procedures and tested supporting documentation to determine whether the request and reimbursement of E-rate program funds were appropriately accounted for.
Compensation for appointed superintendents.	Determined whether the appointed Superintendent's compensation was in accordance with Florida law, rules, and Board policies.
Board member compensation.	Examined supporting documentation to determine whether Board members' salaries were in compliance with Section 1001.395, Florida Statutes.
Compensation and salary schedules.	Examined supporting documentation to determine whether selected employees were appropriately compensated, consistent with Board policies, salary schedules, and human resources records. For selected noninstructional employees, determined whether the employees met the education and experience requirements for the positions and verified that the positions were approved by the Board.
Bonuses.	Determined whether bonuses paid were in compliance with Section 215.425(3), Florida Statutes.
Performance assessments.	Examined supporting documentation for performance assessments of selected personnel for reasonableness and compliance with applicable Florida law, rules, and Board policies.

EXHIBIT A (CONTINUED)
AUDIT SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

Scope (Topic)	Methodology
Background checks.	Tested District and contractual personnel who had direct contact with students and examined supporting documentation to determine whether the District had obtained required fingerprint and background checks.
Magnet schools and related programs.	Examined approval process for selected magnet schools to determine District compliance with established Board policies and procedures. Reviewed District records to determine that the magnet schools met the State requirements for maximum class sizes and the District student teacher ratios.
Vehicle fuel efficiency monitoring.	Reviewed District records to determine the effectiveness of vehicle fuel efficiency monitoring.
Wireless communication devices.	Reviewed policies and procedures to determine whether the District limited the use of, and documented the level of service for, wireless communication devices. Also, determined whether the District refrained from payment of Federal, State, or local taxes or fees from which it was exempt. Tested cellular telephone billings to determine that cellular telephone usage was in accordance with established Board policies and procedures.
Interlocal agreements.	Reviewed an interlocal agreement to determine the reasonableness, public purpose, and budgetary authority of the agreement.
Construction processes.	Examined records and evaluated construction planning processes to determine whether processes were comprehensive, including consideration of restricted resources and other alternatives to ensure the most economical and effective approach, and met District's short-term and long-term needs.
Identifying and prioritizing facility maintenance needs, including identification and timely resolution of health and safety deficiencies, and tracking maintenance jobs.	Evaluated procedures for identifying facility maintenance needs and establishing resources to address those needs. Determined whether procedures relating to health and safety complied with Federal and State requirements and maintenance and operations department staff received proper training. Reviewed procedures to determine that the District is aware of and prepares for the permitting and inspection requirements of the Florida Building Code.
Evaluating maintenance department staffing needs.	Reviewed procedures for evaluating maintenance department staffing needs. Determined whether such procedures included consideration of appropriate factors and performance measures that were supported by factual information.

EXHIBIT B
MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE



Miami-Dade County Public Schools

giving our students the world

Superintendent of Schools
 Alberto M. Carvalho

Miami-Dade County School Board

Perla Tabares Hantman, Chair
 Dr. Martin Karp, Vice Chair
 Dr. Dorothy Bendross-Mindingall
 Susie V. Castillo
 Carlos L. Curbelo
 Dr. Lawrence S. Feldman
 Dr. Wilbert "Tee" Holloway
 Dr. Marta Pérez
 Raquel A. Regalado

February 13, 2013

Mr. David W. Martin, CPA
 Auditor General, State of Florida
 G74 Claude Pepper Building
 111 West Madison Street
 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1450

Dear Mr. Martin:

Attached are our responses to the preliminary and tentative findings and recommendations of the operational audit of the Miami-Dade County District School Board for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012. We appreciate the recommendations and advice provided by your audit staff, as we are fully committed to improving the effectiveness and efficiency of our internal operations and performance.

For any questions or comments regarding this correspondence, please contact Dr. Daniel Tosado, Chief of Staff, at 305-995-1206, Mr. Jose F. Montes de Oca, Chief Auditor, at 305-995-1437, or my office at 305-995-1429. We thank you in advance for the opportunity to respond to your draft report.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Alberto M. Carvalho".

Alberto M. Carvalho
 Superintendent of Schools

AMC:mtg
 L776

Attachment

cc: Dr. Daniel Tosado
 Mrs. Valtena G. Brown
 Mr. Jaime G. Torrens
 Ms. Enid Weisman
 Mr. Jose F. Montes de Oca

School Board Administration Building • 1450 N.E. 2nd Avenue • Miami, Florida 33132
 305-995-1000 • www.dadeschools.net

**EXHIBIT B (CONTINUED)
MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE**

**MIAMI-DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO PRELIMINARY AND TENTATIVE AUDIT FINDINGS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE OPERATIONAL AUDIT OF THE
MIAMI-DADE COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012**

Finding No. 1: Inservice Training Credit

In-service points awarded for successful completion of a component shall be assigned as follows: (a) One (1) in service point shall be equivalent to one (1) clock hour of participation, or as specified by the master in service plan based on competency(ies) demonstrated. This indicates that there are two distinct routes to awarding master plan points: clock hours or competency driven. This interpretation has been verified with the Senior Educational Program Director, Florida Department of Education, Educator Recruitment, Development, and Retention.

The master in service component used for the IPEGS Update training was #1-410-318 and four master plan points were to be awarded. The course description stated that the update training would provide information and practice opportunities on the implementation of legislatively-driven revisions to the Instructional Performance Evaluation and Growth System (IPEGS). The update IPEGS session was specifically designed for instructional professionals who have previously been trained in IPEGS. This was not IPEGS training but rather an update. The 25-minute video was an introduction to a process that also included: discussions at faculty meetings, review of the newly revised IPEGS manual and resources on the IPEGS website, and the completion of the new Individual Professional Development Plan which replaced the Goal Setting component in IPEGS. The follow-up work could vary from person to person and could in fact, take longer than 3.5 hours to complete. While the administration believes the points were awarded appropriately, the documentation of the follow-up may not have been sufficient and procedures will be strengthened in the future to demonstrate competencies measured by a component.

The second issue discussed in the finding is the deviation from the normal registration process. The finding references the Professional Development (PD) Liaison Manual several times. This manual includes guidelines for professional development and was developed by staff in the Professional Development Department. The PD Menu and Registration System works efficiently for individuals when registering for individual courses 48 hours prior to the training, and provides the safeguards necessary to assure that the Master In-service Plan is implemented; however, it was never designed to accommodate critical mass registration. For this reason, the Professional Development Department has, on a few occasions, developed an alternate tracking system to accommodate district-wide tracking of professional development. Each time, the essential process of matching signatures on paper sign-in sheets or rosters is compared to electronic tracking of individuals involved in the training. Once the matching is complete, the names of individuals receiving master plan points is then input into the PD

**EXHIBIT B (CONTINUED)
MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE**

Menu and Registration System, so that the files can be transmitted to the Staff Development System on the mainframe's legacy system. This was the case for the IPEGS Update training and for other trainings that involved a critical mass of teachers such as the Summer HEAT program. Administration will revise the PD Liaison Manual to include the specific guidelines that could be used in the future in the event that a new legislative change requires the training of a critical mass of instructional personnel within a short timeframe.

Finding No. 2: Performance Assessments-Miami Norland Senior High School

The three issues addressed in this audit finding are: the untimely completion of assessments; inconsistencies in observation and post observation meeting dates and times; and documentation that was considered insufficient for a few employees' assessments. The instrument used to assess, monitor and provide feedback to instructional personnel is IPEGS where instructional personnel are active participants in their evaluation process. This is a collaborative procedure that promotes self-growth, instructional effectiveness, and improvement of overall job performance.

Since all three issues cited in this audit finding address the timelines prescribed in the *IPEGS Procedural Handbook*, the following actions will be taken for all Region and school-site administrators in the District:

- IPEGS timeline procedures will be reviewed for all Region and school-site personnel by the Office of Professional Development and monitored by the appropriate Region personnel to ensure compliance.
- Principals will ensure that IPEGS timelines are adhered to and followed by monitoring the IPEGS Observation Logs on a weekly basis.
- Principals will also ensure that planning meeting documents are signed by both the assessor and employee and are dated appropriately.
- Documentation for all aspects of the IPEGS process will be closely monitored to ensure that the correct forms are used in this evaluation process. In addition, assessors will record appropriate dates and times of all observations conducted to ensure that IPEGS timeline guidelines are adhered to.
- Finally, periodic mini-reviews of documentation will be implemented by Region personnel in schools to ensure compliance.

Finding No. 3: Background Rescreening

The District implemented corrective action to address the number of employees identified who had not been re-fingerprinted in a timely manner. Upon identification of those employees, the District immediately began to process those employees whose digital fingerprint results needed to be electronically submitted to the Florida Department of Law Enforcement. In addition, employees whose fingerprint results had not been retained digitally were immediately notified and given a reasonable timeline to be digitally fingerprinted at various locations across Miami-Dade County. All employees

**EXHIBIT B (CONTINUED)
MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE**

identified were re-fingerprinted by April 2012. Moving forward, recent enhancements through an automated process will capture a listing of people whose fingerprint anniversary is approaching five years and a weekly report will be sent to the Office of Human Resources to ensure complete compliance.

Finding No. 4: Monitoring Fuel Efficiency

As a result of the Auditor General's Finding No. 4, Monitoring Fuel Efficiency, the Department of Transportation created monthly reports showing vehicles which have average miles per gallon either below or above defined standards. These reports are provided to each transportation center and District department for review and appropriate action. Subsequent corrective actions may include recalibration of the Vehicle Information Transmitter (VIT), verification of mileage and/or outside fueling, or repair of vehicle.

Staff has verified that monthly Fuel Mileage Exception Reports have been sent to M-DCPS departments for review and that work orders to repair vehicles whose fuel mileage was outside defined parameters have been completed.

The Department of Transportation will continue to monitor these reports and provide such information to District departments in its ongoing efforts to reduce unauthorized fuel usage and improve efficiency.

Finding No. 5: Facilities Management

The Office of School Facilities (OSF) appreciates the Auditor General's review and conclusion that, as it relates to selection of delivery methods, management procedures are generally adequate. The audit acknowledges that OSF uses different delivery methods depending on project requirements such as scope and magnitude as well as construction market conditions. During the recent economic downturn, the District has benefitted financially from the use of "hard bids" for several major construction projects.

As a process enhancement, management agrees with the audit's recommendation that periodic evaluations of construction delivery methods and techniques be conducted. Written protocol will be formulated upon which delivery method decisions can be based in the future.