

MOUNT PLEASANT AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT
WESTMORELAND COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA
PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT

JANUARY 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 Mr. Robert M. Gumbita, Board President Mount Pleasant Area School District 271 State Street Mount Pleasant, Pennsylvania 15666

Dear Governor Corbett and Mr. Gumbita:

We conducted a performance audit of the Mount Pleasant Area 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 November 22, 2010 through August 15, 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, 2012, 2011, 2010, and 2009. 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. A summary of the results is presented in the Executive Summary section of the audit report.

We appreciate the District's cooperation during the conduct of the audit.

Sincerely,

EUGENE A. DEPASQUALE

Eugent O-Pager

**Auditor General** 

January 23, 2014

cc: MOUNT PLEASANT AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of School Directors

# **Table of Contents**

	Page
Executive Summary	. 1
Audit Scope, Objectives, and Methodology	. 2
Findings and Observations	. 5
Status of Prior Audit Findings and Observations	. 6
Distribution List	. 8

### **Audit Work**

The Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General conducted a performance audit of the Mount Pleasant Area School District (District) in Westmoreland 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 and to determine the status of corrective action taken by the District in response to our prior audit recommendations.

Our audit scope covered the period November 22, 2010 through August 15, 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 2011-12, 2010-11, 2009-10, and 2008-09 school years.

### **District Background**

The District encompasses approximately 105 square miles. According to 2010 federal census data, it serves a resident population of 17,888. According to District officials, the District provided basic educational services to 2,096 pupils through the employment of 143 teachers, 52 full-time and part-time support personnel, and nine (9) administrators during the 2011-12 school year. The District received \$13.8 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. We report no findings or observations in this report.

### Status of Prior Audit Findings and

Observations. With regard to the status of our prior audit recommendations to the Mount Pleasant Area School District (District) from an audit released on June 21, 2011, we found that the District had taken appropriate corrective action in implementing our recommendations pertaining to unmonitored vendor system access and logical access control weaknesses (see page 6).

### 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 November 22, 2010 through August 15, 2013, except for the verification of professional employee certification which was performed for the period July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013.

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

- ✓ 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?
- ✓ Did the District take appropriate corrective action to address recommendations made in our prior audit?

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.

Lastly, to determine the status of our audit recommendations made in a prior audit report released on June 21, 2011, we performed additional audit procedures targeting the previously reported matters.

# **Findings and Observations** For the audited period, our audit of the Mount Pleasant Area School District resulted in no findings or observations.

### **Status of Prior Audit Findings and Observations**

Our prior audit of the Mount Pleasant Area School District (District) released on June 21, 2011, resulted in one (1) observation. As part of our current audit, we determined the status of corrective action taken by the District to implement our prior audit recommendations. We performed audit procedures and interviewed District personnel regarding the prior observation. As shown below, we found that the District did implement our recommendations related to unmonitored vendor system access and logical access control weaknesses.

### **Auditor General Performance Audit Report Released on June 21, 2011**

Observation	<b>Unmonitored Vendor System Access and Logical Access Control</b>
	Weaknesses

### Observation Summary: Our prior audit of the District found that the outside vendor for the

District's critical student accounting applications could access the system at any time without the District's knowledge. In addition, the

District's internal controls needed improvement.

### Recommendations: Our audit observation recommended that the District should:

- 1. Generate monitoring reports such as firewall logs.
- 2. Maintain documentation showing terminated employees were removed in a timely fashion.
- 3. Develop policies and procedures requiring written authorization when adding, deleting, or changing a userID.
- 4. Allow upgrades to the District's system only after receipt of written authorization from appropriate District officials.
- 5. Store back-up tapes in a secure, off-site location.
- 6. Establish separate information technology policies and procedures for controlling the activities of vendors, and have the vendor sign this policy, or require the vendor to sign the District's Acceptable Use Policy.
- 7. Include provisions in the District's Acceptable Use Policy for privacy, accountability, authentication, and violations.

- 8. Establish policies and procedures to analyze the impact of proposed program changes in relation to other business critical functions.
- 9. Implement a security policy and system parameter settings to require all users, including vendors to change passwords on a regular basis.
- 10. Consider implementing additional environmental controls around the network server sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the manufacturer of the server and to ensure warranty coverage. Specifically, the District should install fire alarms in the computer room.

### **Current Status:**

During our current audit, we found that the District did implement our prior recommendations.

### **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 <a href="www.auditorgen.state.pa.us">www.auditorgen.state.pa.us</a>. 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.