

JENKINTOWN SCHOOL DISTRICT

MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT

JUNE 2014

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

EUGENE A. DEPASQUALE - AUDITOR GENERAL

DEPARTMENT OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL





Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General Harrisburg, PA 17120-0018 Facebook: Pennsylvania Auditor General Twitter: @PAAuditorGen

EUGENE A. DEPASQUALE AUDITOR GENERAL

The Honorable Tom Corbett Governor Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120 Dr. Douglas Moore, Board President Jenkintown School District West and Highland Avenues Jenkintown, Pennsylvania 19046

Dear Governor Corbett and Dr. Moore:

We conducted a performance audit of the Jenkintown School District (District) to determine its compliance with certain relevant state laws, regulations, contracts, grant requirements, and administrative procedures (relevant requirements). Our audit covered the period April 17, 2009 through October 24, 2013, except as otherwise indicated in the report. Additionally, compliance specific to state subsidies and reimbursements was determined for the school years ended June 30, 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012. Our audit was conducted pursuant to Section 403 of The Fiscal Code, 72 P.S. § 403, and in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Our audit found that the District complied, in all significant respects, with relevant requirements. However, we identified one (1) matter unrelated to compliance that is reported as an observation. A summary of the results is presented in the Executive Summary section of the audit report.

Our audit observation and recommendations have been discussed with the District's management, and their responses are included in the audit report. We believe the implementation of our recommendations will improve the District's operations and facilitate compliance with legal and administrative requirements. We appreciate the District's cooperation during the conduct of the audit.

Sincerely,

EUGENE A. DEPASOUALE

Eugent J-Pager

Auditor General

June 19, 2014

cc: JENKINTOWN SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of School Directors

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	. 1
Audit Scope, Objectives, and Methodology	. 2
Findings and Observations	. 5
Observation – The District Lacks Sufficient Internal Controls Over Its Student Record Data	. 5
Status of Prior Audit Findings and Observations	. 8
Distribution List	. 9

Audit Work

The Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General conducted a performance audit of the Jenkintown School District (District) in Montgomery County. Our audit sought to answer certain questions regarding the District's compliance with certain relevant state laws, regulations, contracts, grant requirements, and administrative procedures.

Our audit scope covered the period April 17, 2009 through October 24, 2013, except as otherwise indicated in the audit scope, objectives, and methodology section of the report. Compliance specific to state subsidies and reimbursements was determined for the 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12 school years.

District Background

The District encompasses approximately 0.5 square miles. According to 2010 federal census data, it serves a resident population of 4,422. According to District officials, the District provided basic educational services to 618 pupils through the employment of 62 teachers, nineteen (19) full-time and part-time support personnel, and six (6) administrators during the 2011-12 school year. The District received \$1.95 million in state funding in the 2011-12 school year.

Audit Conclusion and Results

Our audit found that the District complied, in all significant respects, with certain relevant state laws, regulations, contracts, grant requirements, and administrative procedures. However, we identified one (1) matter unrelated to compliance that is reported as an observation.

Observation: The District Lacks
Sufficient Internal Controls Over Its
Student Record Data. Our review of the
Jenkintown School District's controls over
student record data integrity found that
internal controls need to be improved
(see page 5).

Status of Prior Audit Findings and Observations. There were no findings or observations in our prior audit report.

Scope

What is a school performance audit?

School performance audits allow the Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General to determine whether state funds, including school subsidies, are being used according to the purposes and guidelines that govern the use of those funds. Additionally, our audits examine the appropriateness of certain administrative and operational practices at each local education agency (LEA). The results of these audits are shared with LEA management, the Governor, the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and other concerned entities.

Objectives

What is the difference between a finding and an observation?

Our performance audits may contain findings and/or observations related to our audit objectives. Findings describe noncompliance with a statute, regulation, policy, contract, grant requirement, or administrative procedure. Observations are reported when we believe corrective action should be taken to remedy a potential problem not rising to the level of noncompliance with specific criteria.

Our audit, conducted under authority of Section 403 of The Fiscal Code, 72 P.S. § 403, is not a substitute for the local annual audit required by the Public School Code of 1949, as amended. We conducted our audit in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Our audit covered the period April 17, 2009 through October 24, 2013, except for the verification of professional employee certification, which was performed for the period July 1, 2008 through September 3, 2013.

Regarding state subsidies and reimbursements, our audit covered the 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12 school years.

While all districts have the same school years, some have different fiscal years. Therefore, for the purposes of our audit work and to be consistent with Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) reporting guidelines, we use the term *school year* rather than fiscal year throughout this report. A school year covers the period July 1 to June 30.

Performance audits draw conclusions based on an evaluation of sufficient, appropriate evidence. Evidence is measured against criteria, such as laws and defined business practices. Our audit focused on assessing the District's compliance with certain relevant state laws, regulations, contracts, grant requirements, and administrative procedures. However, as we conducted our audit procedures, we sought to determine answers to the following questions, which serve as our audit objectives:

- ✓ Were professional employees certified for the positions they held?
- Did the District, and any contracted vendors, ensure that current bus drivers were properly qualified, and did they have written policies and procedures governing the hiring of new bus drivers?

- ✓ Were votes made by the District's Board of School Directors free from apparent conflicts of interest?
- ✓ Did the District have sufficient internal controls to ensure that the membership data it reported to PDE through the Pennsylvania Information Management System was complete, accurate, valid, and reliable?
- ✓ Were there any declining fund balances that may pose a risk to the District's fiscal viability?
- ✓ Did the District take appropriate steps to ensure school safety?
- ✓ Did the District have a properly executed and updated Memorandum of Understanding with local law enforcement?
- ✓ Were there any other areas of concern reported by independent auditors, citizens, or other interested parties?

Government Auditing Standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our results and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our results and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

The District's management is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal controls to provide reasonable assurance that the District is in compliance with certain relevant state laws, regulations, contracts, grant requirements, and administrative procedures (relevant requirements). In conducting our audit, we obtained an understanding of the District's internal controls, including any information technology controls, as they relate to the District's compliance with relevant requirements that we consider to be significant within the context of our audit objectives. We assessed whether those controls were properly designed and implemented. Any deficiencies in internal controls that were identified during the conduct of our audit and determined to be significant within the context of our audit objectives are included in this report.

Methodology

What are internal controls?

Internal controls are processes designed by management to provide reasonable assurance of achieving objectives in areas such as:

- Effectiveness and efficiency of operations.
- Relevance and reliability of operational and financial information.
- Compliance with certain relevant state laws, regulations, contracts, grant requirements, and administrative procedures.

In order to properly plan our audit and to guide us in possible audit areas, we performed analytical procedures in the areas of state subsidies and reimbursements, pupil transportation, pupil membership, and comparative financial information.

Our audit examined the following:

- Records pertaining to pupil transportation, pupil membership, bus driver qualifications, professional employee certification, state ethics compliance, financial stability, reimbursement applications, tuition receipts, and deposited state funds.
- Items such as board meeting minutes and policies and procedures.

Additionally, we interviewed select administrators and support personnel associated with the District's operations.

Observation

Criteria relevant to the observation:

Pupil membership classifications must be maintained and reported in accordance with the Pennsylvania Department of Education's (PDE) guidelines and instructions, since membership is a major factor in determining state subsidies and reimbursements. Beginning in 2009-10, PDE required that child accounting data be collected in a database called the Pennsylvania Information Management System (PIMS).

According to PDE's PIMS User Manual, all Pennsylvania local education agencies must submit data templates in PIMS to report child accounting data. PIMS data templates define fields that must be reported. Four important data elements from the Child Accounting perspective are: District Code of Residence; Funding District Code; Residence Status Code; and Sending Charter School Code. In addition, other important fields used in calculating state education subsidies are: Student Status; Gender Code; Ethnic Code Short; Poverty Code; Special Education; Limited English Proficiency Participation; Migrant Status; and Location Code of Residence. Therefore, PDE requires that student records are complete with these data fields.

The District Lacks Sufficient Internal Controls Over Its Student Record Data

The Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) bases all local education agencies' (LEA) state subsidy calculations on the student record data it receives in the Pennsylvania Information Management System (PIMS). PIMS is a statewide longitudinal data system or "data warehouse," designed to manage individual student data for each student served by Pennsylvania's Pre-K through Grade twelve (12) public education systems.

PDE began calculating the LEA's state subsidy using the data that LEAs enter into PIMS beginning in the 2009-10 school year. Therefore, it is vitally important that the student information entered into this system is accurate, complete, and valid. LEAs must have strong internal controls in place to ensure the integrity of this data and to mitigate the risk of erroneous reporting. Without such controls, the LEA cannot be assured it receives the proper state subsidy.

Our review of the Jenkintown School District's (District) controls over student record data integrity found that internal controls need to be improved. Specifically, our review found that:

- 1. The District does not have adequate procedures in place to ensure continuity over its PIMS data submission in the event of a sudden change in personnel or child accounting vendors.
- 2. Registration testing disclosed two (2) students placed out of the District whose cumulative files were incomplete. Specifically, these students had not completed the District's registration procedures, which are designed to ensure that each student is a resident of the District. Registration procedures also provide the necessary basic information for input into the District's student information system, which is ultimately transmitted to PDE through PIMS. District personnel indicated this was overlooked since these students don't attend District classes.

Additionally, according to the *Federal Information System Controls Audit Manual*, a business entity should implement procedures to reasonably assure that: (1) all data input is done in a controlled manner; (2) data input into the application is complete, accurate, and valid; (3) incorrect information is identified, rejected, and corrected for subsequent processing; and (4) the confidentiality of data is adequately protected.

3. The District does not have procedures in place to review data input into the student information system for consistency and accuracy. District personnel indicated that the District's very small size is prohibitive in providing for staff redundancies.

It is the responsibility of District management to have in place appropriate internal policies and procedures to ensure that student data is accurate, collected timely, and reported correctly. Without such internal controls, the District cannot be assured that it is reporting the correct student data to PDE or that it is receiving the correct state subsidy.

Recommendations

The Jenkintown School District should:

- Establish procedures to ensure continuity over its PIMS data submission in the event of a sudden change in personnel.
- 2. Ensure that every student completes the District registration process regardless of their educational placement.
- 3. Establish procedures to review data entered into the student information system for consistency and accuracy.

Management Response

Management stated the following:

1. "The District does not have adequate procedures in place to ensure continuity over its PIMS data submission in the event of a sudden change in personnel or child accounting vendors.

Response: The Jenkintown School District has an agreement with the Montgomery County Intermediate Unit (IU) #23 to provide technical assistance and back up for personnel in the event of a need created by any circumstance. This agreement is in place since the IU provides the data warehouse software and the data is stored on their server.

2. Registration testing disclosed students placed out of the district whose cumulative files were incomplete.

Response: The district agrees that two students placed out of district at the IU in 2004 and 2005, respectively, did not have registration material in their file in the district. These students are well known to the district and all of their information was in the student information system [software]. The oversight was corrected immediately and procedures put in place so student data will be collected at registration.

3. The district does not have procedures in place to review data input into the student information system for consistency and accuracy.

Response: Student data input is reviewed by the secretary of each school. There is not a formal process in place to check data. Based on our size there was no need to develop a formal process. PIMS data has been submitted on time and accurately with no problems or corrections needed for the past two years. A formal process of review of has been established."

Auditor Conclusion

We are encouraged that the District has put into place a formal process of review. We will follow up on the status of our recommendations during our next cyclical audit of the District.

ur prior audit of the Jenkintown School District resulted in no findings or observations.					

Distribution List

This report was initially distributed to the Superintendent of the District, the Board of School Directors, our website at www.auditorgen.state.pa.us, and the following stakeholders:

The Honorable Tom Corbett Governor Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Harrisburg, PA 17120

The Honorable Carolyn Dumaresq Acting Secretary of Education 1010 Harristown Building #2 333 Market Street Harrisburg, PA 17126

The Honorable Robert M. McCord State Treasurer Room 129 - Finance Building Harrisburg, PA 17120

Ms. Lori Graham Acting Director Bureau of Budget and Fiscal Management Pennsylvania Department of Education 4th Floor, 333 Market Street Harrisburg, PA 17126

Dr. David Wazeter Research Manager Pennsylvania State Education Association 400 North Third Street - Box 1724 Harrisburg, PA 17105

Mr. Lin Carpenter
Assistant Executive Director for Member Services
School Board and Management Services
Pennsylvania School Boards Association
P.O. Box 2042
Mechanicsburg, PA 17055

This report is a matter of public record and is available online at www.auditorgen.state.pa.us. Media questions about the report can be directed to the Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General, Office of Communications, 231 Finance Building, Harrisburg, PA 17120; via email to: news@auditorgen.state.pa.us.