# Performance Audit of CLAY COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT FINAL REPORT



# August 28, 2020

Updates Findings and Recommendations in September 4, 2019 Report

**RESSEL & ASSOCIATES, LLC** 

| EXE | CUTIVE | SUMMARY   | E-i                          |
|-----|--------|---|------------------------------|
| BAC | KGROU  | ND AND INTRODUCTION   | B-1                          |
| 1.0 | PROGR  | AAM ECONOMY, EFFICIENCY, AND EFFECTIVENESS  | 1-1                          |
|     | 1.1    | Districtwide Support for Areas Under Review.1.1.1Management Reports to School Board .1.1.2School Board Policies.                | 1-2                          |
|     | 1.2    | <ul> <li>Facilities Planning, Use, and Construction</li></ul>   | 1-5<br>1-12<br>1-15          |
|     | 1.3    | Safety and Security Improvements1.3.1Police Department  |                              |
|     | 1.4    | Technology Implementation and Upgrades1.4.1E-Rate Funding   |                              |
|     | 1.5    | Service Bond Indebtedness<br>1.5.1 Debt Ratios  |                              |
| 2.0 | PRO    | GRAM DESIGN AND STRUCTURE   |                              |
|     | 2.1    | Districtwide Support for Areas Under Review<br>2.1.1 Districtwide Staffing Allocations<br>2.1.2 Legal Services and Expenditures | 2-5<br>2-11                  |
|     | 2.2    | <ul> <li>Facilities Planning, Use, and Construction</li></ul>   | 2-13<br>2-17<br>2-18<br>2-21 |
|     | 2.3    | Safety and Security Improvements2.3.1Staffing and Organization Structure  |                              |
|     | 2.4    | Technology Implementation and Upgrades2.4.1Staffing and Organization Structure  |                              |
|     | 2.5    | Service Bond Indebtedness   |                              |

|     |     | 2.5.2 Intergovernmental Collaboration  |              |
|-----|-----|--|--------------|
| 3.0 | ALT | ERNATIVE DELIVERY METHODS  |              |
|     | 3.1 | Districtwide Support for Areas Under Review<br>3.1.1 Alternative Methods Documentation           |              |
|     | 3.2 | Facilities Planning, Use, and Construction<br>3.2.1 Facility and Maintenance Contracted Services |              |
|     | 3.3 | <ul><li>Safety and Security Improvements</li></ul>   |              |
|     | 3.4 | Technology Implementation and Upgrades3.4.1Outsourcing of Technology Services                    |              |
|     | 3.5 | Service Bond Indebtedness  |              |
| 4.0 | GOA | ALS, OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES   | 4-1          |
|     | 4.1 | Districtwide Support for Areas Under Review4.1.1Strategic Planning4.1.2Financing Strategies      |              |
|     | 4.2 | <ul> <li>Facilities Planning, Use, and Construction</li></ul>                                    |              |
|     | 4.3 | <ul><li>Safety and Security Improvements</li></ul>   | 4-22         |
|     | 4.4 | Technology Implementation and Upgrades4.4.1Technology Planning                                   |              |
|     | 4.5 | <ul> <li>Service Bond Indebtedness</li></ul>   | 4-27<br>4-30 |
| 5.0 | REP | ORTING ACCURACY AND ADEQUACY   | 5-1          |
|     | 5.1 | Districtwide Support for Areas Under Review  | 5-2          |

# **Table of Contents**

|     |      | 5.1.1 Open Records Policy and Procedures                                    |
|-----|------|---|
|     |      | 5.1.2 District Website  |
|     |      | 5.1.3 Citizens Advisory Committee   |
|     | 5.2  | Facilities Planning, Use, and Construction                                  |
|     |      | 5.2.1 Terminology   |
|     |      | 5.2.2 Vendor/Contractor Information   |
|     | 5.3  | Safety and Security Improvements  |
|     |      | 5.3.1 Systems and Information Sharing                                       |
|     | 5.4  | Technology Implementation and Upgrades                                      |
|     |      | 5.4.1 Business Technology   |
|     | 5.5  | Service Bond Indebtedness   |
|     |      | 5.5.1 External Audits   |
| 6.0 | PROG | RAM COMPLIANCE  |
|     | 6.1  | Districtwide Support for Areas Under Review                                 |
|     |      | 6.1.1 Discretionary Sales Tax Resolution                                    |
|     |      | 6.1.2 Dissemination of Information to the Public                            |
|     | 6.2  | Facilities Planning, Use, and Construction                                  |
|     |      | 6.2.1 Contract Management   |
|     |      | 6.2.2 Role of Building Official and Project Managers                        |
|     | 6.3  | Safety and Security Improvements  |
|     |      | 6.3.1 Compliance Monitoring   |
|     | 6.4  | Technology Implementation and Upgrades                                      |
|     |      | 6.4.1 Updated Policies and Procedures                                       |
|     | 6.5  | Service Bond Indebtedness   |
|     |      | 6.5.1 Financial Advisory Services   |
|     | 6.6  | Charter School Funds  |
|     |      | 6.6.1 Distribution and Reporting Mechanisms for Charter School Funds . 6-26 |

# APPENDICES

| Appendix A: | Case Study of the Fleming Island High School Project         |
|-------------|--|
| Appendix B: | Case Study of the Keystone Heights Elementary School Project |
| Appendix C: | Case Study of the Discovery Oaks Elementary School Project   |
| Appendix D: | Clay County School District School Capacity - August 2019    |
| Appendix E: | Clay County School District Response to Audit                |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In compliance with Florida statutes requiring a performance audit when a school district passes a surtax resolution, the Florida Office of Program Policy Analysis and Governmental Accountability (OPPAGA) selected Ressel & Associates, LLC to conduct a performance audit of the Clay County School District (CCSD) in July 2019. The performance audit report for CCSD was published on September 4, 2019.

The 2019 resolution failed to obtain the approval of County Commission; however, CCSD passed a subsequent resolution in June 2020 that was approved by the County Commission. Ressel & Associates was retained to update its audit findings. This report provides the initial audit findings and overlays the updated findings and observations to reflect current conditions.

Ressel & Associates, LLC conducted the performance audit and follow-up in accordance with the requirements of Ch. 2018-118, *Laws of Florida*, found codified in s. 212.055(11), *Florida Statutes*, passed during the 2018 session and amended during the 2020 session of the Florida Legislature with the findings and observations organized in the following six chapters:

- Chapter 1 Program Economy, Efficiency, and Effectiveness
- Chapter 2 Program Design and Structure
- Chapter 3 Alternative Delivery Methods
- Chapter 4 Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures
- Chapter 5 Reporting Accuracy and Adequacy
- Chapter 6 Program Compliance

# **CHAPTER 1 - PROGRAM ECONOMY, EFFICIENCY, AND EFFECTIVENESS**

**Chapter 1** presents audit findings related to the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of the program areas under review. As part of field work, Ressel & Associates examined the District's internal monitoring structure including management reporting and the results of internal and external audits and operational performance reviews. In addition, Ressel & Associates evaluated program performance and costs and thoroughly researched the strengths and weaknesses associated with past projects of similar size and complexity.

**Finding on program economy, efficiency, and effectiveness:** In its September 4, 2019 evaluation, Ressel & Associates found that past growth-management strategies for building core facilities surrounded by portable classrooms have resulted in an untenable situation. The District has been unable to fully comply with the State's Portable Reduction Act, portable classrooms are deteriorating with age, and costs for maintenance and utilities continue to rise. Plans for the reduction of portables need to be well-documented and implemented as soon as practically possible.

The Ressel Team also found that Board policies and operational procedures are, in many cases, outdated and incomplete. Case studies of three recent or ongoing facilities projects show that facility projects are being brought in on time and within budget. To manage the many projects envisioned in the Surtax resolution additional monitoring and internal controls will be required to maintain this level of performance.

In its August 28, 2020 follow-up audit, Ressel & Associates concluded that its previous findings remain essentially unchanged.

## **Observations and Recommendations**

1.1 **September 4, 2019:** Management Reports to the Board provide appropriate detail for Board to take action at meetings.

August 28, 2020 Update: Management Reports continue to provide the Board appropriate levels of detail for Board decision-making.

1.2 **September 4, 2019:** With the exception of Section 1 of the School Board Policy Manual, the policies of the Clay County School Board are very outdated.

*Recommendation 1-1*: Promptly update the Board's Policy Manual and include a review by legal staff.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** The School Board Policy Manual remains very outdated; although some updates to policy have occurred, no systematic review of outdated policies is planned in the immediate future. Therefore, Recommendation 1-1 still applies.

- 1.2.1 **September 4, 2019:** Case Studies of three projects indicate that past projects have come in on time and within budget; contract management recommendations made by the Auditor General are being addressed in part by documented operating procedures; however, more work is required:
  - Although CCSD administrators said they follow Florida Statues requiring an appraisal on purchases of land greater than \$100,000, no general guidance relating the need for land appraisals is found in Board Policy or procedures.

*Recommendation 1-2*: Implement a Board Policy regarding the need for appraisals prior to all real property purchases, and document the process to be followed in the Facilities and Construction Procedures Manual.

August 28, 2020 Update: Appraisal requirements are now detailed in the Facility Planning and Construction Manual, as recommended.

• CCSD created the Facilities Planning and Construction Procedures Manual to address recommendations made by the Auditor General's Operational Audit Report No.

2019-115 dated February 2019 that contained findings specifically relating to the Discovery Oaks Elementary project.

*Recommendation 1-3*: Update the procedures to ensure that newly hired or contracted Project Managers understand how they are expected to provide adequate and appropriate oversight, as well as maintain project documentation.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** CCSD's Facilities Planning and Construction Procedures Manual finalized in 2019 addresses the Auditor General's findings and is being used during new employee training. Recommendation 1-3 is substantially complete, however the need to continually update the manual as needed still applies.

1.2.2 **September 4, 2019:** Ressel & Associates found that CCSD has complied with state reporting requirements for facilities and a review of the internal assessments of facility condition and need is based on supported facts. The District could, however, benefit from a cost analysis when assessing final project strategies and designs. While not required for locally funded facility projects, using this type of information in the decision-making process is generally considered an industry best practice.

*Recommendation 1-4*: Conduct the additional analysis outlined in the state guidelines as due diligence to confirm the building and renovation plans for the Surtax and to maximize state PECO funding in the future.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** No additional analysis has been performed since CCSD's initial assessments of the facility conditions used to create the ED FIRST needs list for the Surtax. Therefore, Recommendation 1-4 still applies.

1.2.3 **September 4, 2019:** CCSD's past growth management strategies have resulted in an inordinate number of temporary/portable facilities. The District has taken steps to replace older, costly buildings. Administrators, however, explained that they have been unable to fully comply with the Florida Statute 1013.21 (Reduction of Relocatable Facilities in Use) due to the cost of replacing portables with permanent classroom facilities.

*Recommendation 1-5*: Establish a more specific plan for reducing portables that includes goals and progress reports.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** Ressel & Associates found no appreciable change in the number and condition of portables currently in use by CCSD; the administration pointed to the Surtax projects as the only viable plan for the reduction of portables. Therefore, Recommendation 1-5 still applies.

1.2.4 **September 4, 2019:** The District's process for handling deferred maintenance and preventative maintenance is not keeping pace with the growing needs of the District.

*Recommendation 1-6*: Establish a schedule for roofing, HVAC, and other replacement needs, and annually provide the full list to the Board with recommendations for funding options.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** CCSD's process for the handling of deferred maintenance continues to be based on the most pressing needs and funding availability; preventative maintenance continues to be conducted as time and resources are available. Therefore, Recommendation 1-6 still applies.

1.3.1 **September 4, 2019:** CCSD conducted a well-documented cost-benefit analysis to determine if it was more cost effective and efficient to hire its own police force rather than contracting with various Sheriff's offices for Security Resource Officers (SRO).

**August 28, 2020 Update:** The CCSD Police Department was formed and became operational in June 2019 with officers in schools in August 2019. The analysis of costs has proven to be accurate and, at this time, operational costs remain on target.

1.4.1 **September 4, 2019:** In recent years, the Information and Technology Services Department (ITS) staff started applying for and receiving E-rate funding and as a result has substantially increased resources available for technology upgrades.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** CCSD continues to apply for and receive E-Rate funding, which during the last year was used to fund the dark fiber project designed to improve the infrastructure between the school sites.

1.5.1 **September 4, 2019:** Based on best practices and the State's Benchmarks for debt, CCSD has the capacity for new debt; establishing benchmarks for acceptable levels of debt, however, could improve decision making and debt management during this anticipated high-growth period.

*Recommendation 1-7*: Establish an acceptable debt ratio benchmark against which the District can monitor and manage debt in the future.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** CCSD has not yet established benchmarks for acceptable levels of debt; administrators indicated that at such time as additional debt is needed and issued, the need for a benchmark will be evaluated. Therefore, Recommendation 1-7 still applies.

# **CHAPTER 2 - PROGRAM DESIGN AND STRUCTURE**

**Chapter 2** presents findings related to program design and structure. As part of the audit, Ressel & Associates examined the organization and management structure of the District as a whole and the component units within the organization that are now or will be responsible for the program areas identified in the Surtax Resolution. The examination included contracted and other external services that are now or will be used in the implementation of the projects outlined in the Resolution. In addition, the Ressel Team assessed the procurement and contracting function to determine its capacity for handling the volume and complexity of work anticipated in the Resolution.

**Finding on program design and structure:** In its September 4, 2019 evaluation, Ressel & Associates found that the current design and structure of the program areas under review are effective and overall CCSD has adequate staffing. However, staffing levels need careful review and possible reallocation as, over the past five years, staffing at the Administrative and Professional levels have grown, whereas staffing in the Maintenance and Facility Planning and Construction support areas are low and have remained static over the same five-year period. These support areas require more staff to meet current needs and will need additional staff and expertise to manage the envisioned Surtax-related projects.

In its August 28, 2020 follow-up audit, Ressel & Associates concluded that its previous findings remain essentially unchanged with the exception of the following: reorganization of the leadership team has resulted in some positions being eliminated or downgraded; a limited number of new positions have been created to address the identified needs in the support areas as identified in the original audit and to address the needs brought about due to COVID-19. The support areas continue to require staff to meet current needs and will need additional staff and expertise to manage the envisioned Surtax-related projects.

# **Observations and Recommendations**

2.1.1 **September 4, 2019:** Florida Department of Education reports indicate that CCSD is adequately staffed overall, with the total number of full-time staff increasing by only 5.0 percent over the last five years as compared to a student growth rate of 6.8 percent. However, increases in the number of Administrator and Professional staff positions have outpaced enrollment, while most positions in the support areas have remained unchanged or declined.

*Recommendation 2-1:* Analyze the number of administrators, instructional and operational staff versus the statutory and operational needs to determine where reductions can be made that will allow for adequate staffing in critical areas of need.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** The new Superintendent has eliminated some administrative and professional staff positions, however, the increase in the number of administrator and professional staff positions that the District reports to the FLDOE continues to outpace the increase in student enrollment. Therefore, Recommendation 2-1 still applies.

2.1.2 **September 4, 2019:** The Board continues to incur significant legal expenses, including Surtax referendum costs, even though they have a full-time school board attorney.

*Recommendation 2-2:* Create guidelines for legal services, assign an administrator to monitor legal expenditures, and conduct a thorough analysis of in-house and outsourced legal expenditures to determine:

• how legal expenditures can be reduced; and

• whether the District should contract all legal expenditures and not have a full-time attorney.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** Legal expenses continue to rise, and there are no written procedures in place to ensure that legal expenses are controlled to the extent possible. Therefore, Recommendation 2-2 still applies.

2.2.1 **September 4, 2019:** Even with contracted services, CCSD Maintenance Department staffing levels are low based on Florida Department of Education standards.

*Recommendation 2-3:* Adopt appropriate staffing levels and eliminate some outsourced duties to compensate for the additional cost of staff as appropriate.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** CCSD's Maintenance Department allocated staffing levels remain low based on Florida Department of Education standards and the situation is further exacerbated by vacancies in critical areas. Therefore, Recommendation 2-3 still applies.

2.2.2 **September 4, 2019:** The CCSD job descriptions in the Maintenance Department are not current, which means that the job descriptions cannot be used to accurately evaluate employee performance.

*Recommendation 2-4:* Once new Maintenance Department job descriptions are approved, implement a districtwide three-year review cycle for all job descriptions.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** Job descriptions for Maintenance Department staff positions are now updated and contain the level of detail necessary to use when evaluating its employees; modifications to the job descriptions for lead positions are in progress. Human Resources is in the process of implementing a cyclical review of all district job descriptions every two years. Although this will be an ongoing process, Recommendation 2-4 is substantially complete.

2.2.3 **September 4, 2019:** Maintenance Department salaries in CCSD are not competitive with the private sector or peer school Districts.

*Recommendation 2-5:* Conduct a compensation and classification study to ensure salary levels are sufficient to attract and retain qualified staff.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** CCSD's Maintenance Department salaries remain below market averages despite the increases provided by the Board to all support staff for the 2019-20 fiscal year. Therefore, Recommendation 2-5 still applies.

2.2.4 **September 4, 2019:** Tours of nine schools in the District where specific renovations and repairs were identified as needs in the list of projects to be paid for with Surtax proceeds, confirmed the primary needs and revealed that the facilities were clean, fresh smelling, and the outer structures were being presentably maintained to the extent possible.

August 28, 2020 Update: No additional tours were conducted during the update process.

2.2.5 **September 4, 2019:** The Facility Planning and Construction area is understaffed to handle the volume of projects envisioned in the Surtax Referendum.

*Recommendation 2-6:* Determine the correct mix of contracted services and full-time staff to address the envisioned Surtax project needs.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** The Facility Planning and Construction area remains understaffed to handle the volume of projects envisioned in the Surtax Referendum; critical vacancies exist today that are also negatively impacting the department. Therefore, Recommendation 2-6 still applies.

2.3.1 **September 4, 2019:** The Clay County School District has comprehensive staffing in place to address its compliance with the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School Public Safety Act legislated in Senate Bills 5026 and 7030, as well as for emergency management.

*Recommendation 2-7:* Periodically reassess the structure and staffing levels as Surtax safety and security related improvements are implemented.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** The Clay County School District continues to have sufficient staffing in place to address its compliance with the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School Public Safety Act; recent restructuring of the organization has increased efficiency. The periodic reassessment process is functioning as intended and should be continued as stated in Recommendation 2-7.

2.4.1 **September 4, 2019:** The current organization structure and staffing levels for the Information and Technology Services Department (ITS) are adequate and appropriate to support the District's technology needs.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** The current organization structure remains appropriate; overall staffing levels for the Information and Technology Services Department (ITS) are only minimally sufficient to support the technology demands associated with the COVID-19 response.

*Updated Recommendation:* Reassess staffing levels in the Information and Technology Services area in light of COVID-19 and determine if a combination of new positions and/or contracted services are needed to ensure continuity of services.

2.5.1 **September 4, 2019:** The Business Services Department appears to be adequately staffed to handle the day-to-day finance related operations of the District; a contract for a Financial Advisor is used to supplement staff expertise in the debt service arena.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** The Business Services Department remains adequately staffed to handle the day-to-day finance related operations of the District; staffing required to handle the increased workload associated with accounting for and monitoring the revenues and expenditures associated with the Surtax is being considered at this time.

2.5.2 **September 4, 2019:** CCSD has established a collaborative relationship with local area governments through the concurrency process, which is designed to track and mitigate the impact of growth on the District and community in general.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** CCSD's collaborative relationship with local governments remains strong despite an organizational change that occurred following the departure of the former Superintendent.

# **CHAPTER 3 - ALTERNATIVE DELIVERY METHODS**

**Chapter 3** presents audit findings related to alternative delivery methods used in the program areas under review. As part of the field work, Ressel & Associates examined the programs and services currently being provided through shared service or outsourced/contract arrangements and also assessed what, if any activities or services, might be delivered in an alternative method. Further, Ressel & Associates evaluated the manner in which the District assesses alternative delivery methods.

**Finding on alternative delivery methods:** In its September 4, 2019 evaluation, Ressel & Associates found that CCSD is actively pursuing alternative delivery methods to meet the District's growing needs. Processes for assessing the costs and benefits, and feasibility of such decisions were found to be reasonable and adequate. Formally documenting the required criteria and justification process would provide decision makers a consistent, organized method for future evaluations.

In its August 28, 2020 follow-up audit, Ressel & Associates concluded that its previous findings remain essentially unchanged.

#### **Observations and Recommendations**

3.1.1 **September 4, 2019:** CCSD has made extensive use of contract services, outsourcing and other alternative delivery methods throughout the District by analyzing both the benefits of in-house staff options as well as external options. Formally documenting the current process in policy or procedure would ensure continuity in the future.

*Recommendation 3-1:* Document in policy or procedure the process for justifying both contract services and the creation of new positions, which examines the full cost and benefits of both options.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** CCSD continues to make use of contract services, outsourcing and other alternative delivery methods by analyzing both the benefits of in-house staff options as well as external options. No formal policy or procedure has been adopted; therefore Recommendation 3-1 still applies.

3.2.1 **September 4, 2019:** The District's use of outsourcing is the result of staffing constraints and its inability to perform some functions with in-house staff.

August 28, 2020 Update: CCSD continues to use contracted services to supplement staffing needs when staffing shortages and critical needs arise.

3.3.1 **September 4, 2019:** The District's inter-local agreement for School Resource Officers with the Orange Park and Green Cove Spring Police Departments are in place for 2019-20.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** The District's inter-local agreement for School Resource Officers with the Orange Park and Green Cove Spring Police Departments are in place for the 2020-21 School Year.

3.3.2 **September 4, 2019:** The District has sought and used funds from state and local sources to address immediate safety-related needs when operating funds were not sufficient to meet the need.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** The District has received and is using the \$12 million in property tax millage to address immediate safety-related needs when operating funds were not sufficient to meet the need.

3.4.1 **September 4, 2019:** The Information and Technology Services Department outsources work to vendors where it makes sense financially or from a capacity perspective.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** Outsourcing of some Information and Technology Services Department services continues, with the primary focus being on services that do not require extensive training on processes or system.

# **CHAPTER 4 - GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**Chapter 4** presents findings related to goals, objectives and performance measures. As part of the field work, Ressel & Associates examined major Districtwide planning efforts and the manner in which management measures day-to-day performance and budgets, and the system of internal controls used to ensure that the program areas under review are meeting their goals and objectives.

**Finding on goals, objectives, and performance measures:** In its September 4, 2019 evaluation, Ressel & Associates found the planning efforts of the District are beginning to take shape under the leadership of the Superintendent; however, linkages between the various plans and clear and measurable strategies and objectives for accomplishing the goals do not currently exist. Board policies and procedures are outdated or, in some instances, are missing key elements. While all bid and contract documentation examined as part of the case studies were found to be in compliance with State and local purchasing guidelines, the decentralized purchasing functions currently handled by the Facilities Planning and Construction Department will require additional central office oversight and a stronger system of internal control to handle the volume and complexity of the purchasing processes for the envisioned Surtax-related projects.

In its August 28, 2020 follow-up audit, Ressel & Associates concluded that CCSD has addressed some of the previous findings, specifically by adopting new purchasing policies and implementing a stronger system of internal controls over the decentralized purchasing function. Purchasing procedures clarifying central office oversight responsibilities are still needed to address the volume and complexity of the purchasing processes for the envisioned Surtax-related projects. Establishing linkages between the various plans and clear and measurable strategies and objectives for accomplishing the goals has not been addressed.

# **Observations and Recommendations**

4.1.1 **September 4, 2019:** The February 2018 Strategic Plan is embraced by senior staff, yet the Plan contains no measurable objectives and to date has not had an annual update.

*Recommendation 4-1:* Provide a formal update to the February 2018 Strategic Plan including both accomplishments and any modifications, and with the approval of the Board, revise the structure of the Plan to include measurable outcomes and budget linkages.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** A November 2019 Newsletter provided a list of accomplishments for the 2018-19 school year based on the February 2018 Strategic Plan; however, no changes nor updates were incorporated into the Plan which continues to contain no measurable objectives. Therefore, Recommendation 4-1 still applies.

4.1.2 **September 4, 2019:** CCSD has plans for financing priority needs in the first five years of the Surtax; however, financing strategies adopted and adhered to by the Board are needed to ensure adequate and appropriate financing to address CCSD's long-term needs.

*Recommendation 4-2:* In cooperation with the School Board, develop a more comprehensive, long-term, strategic funding plan for funding and prioritization of the identified \$600 million in total needs.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** CCSD's administration is discussing and solidifying plans for financing priority needs both in terms of short and long-term needs; however, financing strategies adopted and adhered to by the Board are needed to ensure adequate and appropriate financing to address CCSD's long-term needs. Therefore, Recommendation 4-2 still applies.

4.2.1 **September 4, 2019:** CCSD's Educational Facilities Plan complies with the State's reporting requirements but is not laid out in the form and format of a typical Facility Master Plan, and the document does not contain linkages to the educational goals of the District.

*Recommendation 4-3:* Develop a Long-Range Facility Master Plan that incorporates its educational goals.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** CCSD's Educational Facilities Plan complies with state reporting requirements but the District does not have a formal Long-Range Facility Plan that links to CCSD's educational goals and contains strategies for attaining those goals. Therefore, Recommendation 4-3 still applies.

4.2.2 **September 4, 2019:** The Clay County School District has a coordinated energymanagement plan.

August 28, 2020 Update: CCSD has an energy management plan and continues to partner with the Cenergistics group to improve energy efficiency throughout the district.

4.2.3 **September 4, 2019:** The Maintenance Operations and Procedural manual has not been updated since 2012 but efforts to update those procedures are currently underway.

*Recommendation 4-4:* Complete the update of the *Maintenance Operations and Procedural Manual* on a three-year basis with specific procedures for each trade.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** CCSD has completed an update to the Maintenance Operations and Procedural Manual and plans are in place to present the updated manual to the Board in the coming months. Therefore, Recommendation 4-4 is considered to be in progress.

4.2.4 **September 4, 2019:** The Maintenance Department implemented a new work order system within the last few months, and is currently working with *Asset Essentials* to develop a good system for measuring performance using this new work order system.

*Recommendation 4-5:* Continue to work with *Asset Essentials* to identify data needs and develop reports that can be used to monitor turnaround times, completion of work performed, and quality of work performed collectively and by technician.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** CCSD has used the *Asset Essentials* work order system for more than a year; the system is producing monthly, quarterly and now annual reports that provide management accurate measures of departmental performance. While the usefulness of the reports will improve as more data is accumulated in the system, Recommendation 4-5 is considered complete.

4.2.5 **September 4, 2019:** The District drafted a Facility Planning and Construction Manual in response to the Auditor General's findings; however, the value of the procedures will be enhanced as staff embrace the concept of using the document as a tool for continual improvement.

*Recommendation 4-6:* Reassess the concept of procedures for the purpose of training and protection of institutional knowledge as implementation of the Facility Planning and Construction Procedures Manual is completed.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** CCSD's Facility Planning and Construction Manual was updated in October 2019 to include a more detailed project checklist; additional revisions and additions are currently being considered. Therefore, Recommendation 4-6 is complete, but the ongoing need for continual updates still applies.

4.3.1 **September 4, 2019:** CCSD Safety and Security functions are in transition for the new school year, and at this point, internal performance measures have not been fully developed.

*Recommendation 4-7:* The Operations Safety and Security and Police Department should continue to collaboratively develop performance measures that are tied to District goals, strategies, and initiatives.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** CCSD Safety and Security functions remain in transition, and the overall strategic plan and performance measures continue to evolve at this time. Therefore, Recommendation 4-7 still applies.

4.3.2 **September 4, 2019:** The District is using a tracking tool to monitor its compliance with SB 7030 implementation.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** The District continues to effectively use its tracking tool to monitor its compliance with SB 7030 implementation.

4.4.1 **September 4, 2019:** Although there were a number of documents referred to by the Director of Information Technology Services as various planning documents, none of these documents appear to be a comprehensive Technology Master plan and none of the individual plans are directly linked to the CCSD Strategic Plan. During the course of this study a more comprehensive plan was drafted.

*Recommendation 4-8:* Once the Technology Plan for July 2019 through June 2024 is adopted, continue to update the plan annually as progress is made and new initiatives are added.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** The draft Technology Plan presented to Ressel & Associates in August 2019 has been modified by the new administration and is on the Board Agenda for adoption on September 3, 2020. Therefore, Recommendation 4-8 is in progress.

4.5.1 **September 4, 2019:** While the School Board's Fund Balance Policy seeks to comply with the minimum requirements of Section 1011.015, F.S., the Policy does not specify what the Board considers an optimum fund balance.

*Recommendation 4-9:* Establish a fund balance policy in keeping with the GFOA recommendation that articulates a framework and process for building and maintaining the unrestricted fund balance at an acceptable level.

August 28,2020 Update: The School Board's Fund Balance Policy complies with the minimum requirements of Section 1011.015, F.S.; however, no changes have been made

to the policy to define an optimum fund balance. Therefore, Recommendation 4-9 still applies.

4.5.2 **September 4, 2019:** Board policies and administrative procedures do not address key aspects of the District's purchasing functions, and in some instances current practices are not in line with the intent of policy nor are they conducive to a strong system of internal control.

*Recommendation 4-10:* Update Board Purchasing Policies and Administrative Procedures to address the missing components and clarify the roles and responsibilities of all parties to the purchasing process.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** Revised Board Purchasing Policies have been adopted, and when administrative purchasing procedures are finalized and fully implemented, they will provide an internal control structure necessary to provide reasonable assurance that the district's interests will be protected during the purchasing and contracting process. Therefore, Recommendation 4-10 is considered partially complete, however the creation of administrative procedures is still needed to complete the recommendation.

4.5.3 **September 4, 2019:** Based on an examination of bid and contract documents as part of the three case studies conducted by Ressel & Associates, the team found that CCSD complied with purchasing statutes. However, additional central office oversight of the construction bidding and contracting processes will be needed to manage the volume and complexity of Surtax projects.

*Recommendation 4-11:* Centralize the competitive bid and contracting functions for all departments within the Purchasing Department.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** Ressel & Associates found that the revised Board Purchasing Policies recognize and address the need for more central office oversight of the competitive bidding and contracting functions; while formal procedures are pending, CCSD staff have begun to outline the internal control structure in the draft Purchasing Handbook based on the policy revisions. Therefore, Recommendation 4-11 is considered to be in progress, however procedural changes clarifying central office oversight responsibilities are still needed.

# **CHAPTER 5 - REPORTING ACCURACY AND ADEQUACY**

**Chapter 5** presents findings related to reporting accuracy and adequacy. During the performance audit, Ressel & Associates examined Districtwide information systems as well as any ancillary systems used in each of the functional areas under review to determine if the systems are meeting the business needs of the organization and are capable of delivering timely, accurate and useful information for management and stakeholders. The auditor also examined the District's website and other tools used to keep the general public informed about ongoing projects and business activities. The Open Records processes were also assessed for responsiveness and accuracy.

**Finding on reporting accuracy and adequacy:** In its September 4, 2019 evaluation, Ressel & Associates found no instances of non-compliance. However, policies relating to the handling of Open Records requests need to be reviewed and updated. A review of information provided to the public on the District website and through public requests found that information being provided is accurate and complete. Enhancements to the information available on the website are recommended to further improve communication with targeted groups for specific purposes, such as potential vendors and contractors.

In its August 28, 2020 follow-up audit, Ressel & Associates concluded that its previous findings remain essentially unchanged. Progress is being made to provide more information for potential vendors and contractors on the CCSD website; changes should be available to the public by early September.

## **Observations and Recommendations**

5.1.1 **September 4, 2019:** The Clay County School District has a 2012 Board-approved document that serves as policy for open record requests.

*Recommendation 5-1:* Adopt an updated Open Records Policy that includes the role of legal counsel regarding the process and the formal designation of a District Records Management Officer.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** The Clay County School District continues to rely on a 2012 document that serves as procedure for open record requests; the Director of Information and Technology Services (ITS) is assigned to handle Open Records requests, and his job description, as updated, designates this position as the District's Custodian of Records. Therefore, Recommendation 5-1 still applies.

5.1.2 **September 4, 2019:** With few exceptions, the District's website is up-to-date and easy to navigate; access to older Board meeting agendas and minutes may prove helpful to the public.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** The District's website remains up-to-date in most instances and easy to navigate; the process in place to maintain the website appears effective and efficient.

5.1.3 **September 4, 2019:** The Clay County School District has not been successful in the use of citizen advisory committees in recent years.

*Recommendation 5-2:* Inform the public of the importance of the Surtax Oversight Committee, establish clear guidelines for the role and responsibility of the committee and when the Board appoints the Oversight Committee, provide training for committee members as to their valuable role and responsibilities. **August 28, 2020 Update:** The Clay County School District is making effective use of a new ad hoc citizen advisory committee, the Smart Restart Task Force, to work collaboratively with the District on issues concerning the opening of schools; an Oversight Committee relating to the Surtax is envisioned but will not be formed until the Surtax passes. Therefore, Recommendation 5-2 still applies.

5.2.1 **September 4, 2019:** The terminology used by CCSD officials when referring to District needs and planning efforts relating to the Surtax projects and growth needs need clarification and consistency.

*Recommendation 5-3:* Bring consistency to the terminology used when referencing the two phases of the envisioned projects to improve community understanding.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** CCSD publications and internal communications consistently use the term ED FIRST when referring to Surtax-related projects; New Growth is now being consistently used when referring to the 30-year projected growth needs formerly referred to as the Penny Project. Therefore, Recommendation 5-3 is complete.

5.2.2 **September 4, 2019:** All vendors and contractors wishing to do business with the District must go through a prequalification process before they are able to submit a bid; making the information on the Website more visible to vendors/contractors could be a tool for increasing participation.

*Recommendation 5-4:* Expand the Webpage to include more information for vendor/contractors, and more easily accessible vendor/contractor information regarding the process for doing business with CCSD.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** Information relating to the vendor prequalification process and other helpful information for vendors seeking to do business with CCSD continues to be limited, however significant changes to the Purchasing website are in progress and should be available on-line by early September 2020. Therefore, Recommendation 5-4 is in progress.

5.3.1 **September 4, 2019:** CCSD has systems and procedures in place regarding the sharing of information, however the program could be enhanced by making it easier for students, staff and community members to report suspicious activity by more prominently displaying local phone numbers and local and state tip lines on CCSD's website.

*Recommendation 5-5:* Enhance the website to prominently provide a mechanism and instructions to students, staff and the community members for reporting suspicious behavior.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** CCSD's systems and procedures remain in place regarding the sharing of information; a state-required link to the Child and Families Abuse Hotline was placed on the OneClay Portal page to ensure that parents see that link, however, no other local links have been added for staff and community members to report suspicious behavior. Therefore, Recommendation 5-5 is considered only partially implemented.

5.4.1 **September 4, 2019:** Business technology in the District is improving with the conversion to Business Plus.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** CCSD's Business Plus system is now fully operational with both the Human Resource and Payroll functions fully converted from the legacy system in July 2019; according to staff, the new system has resulted in a stronger system of internal controls, noting that implementing position controls has increased budgetary control overall.

5.5.1 **September 4, 2019:** CCSD's external audits revealed that over the last four years, the District has received unmodified opinions on its annual external audits.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** A review of 2019 audited financials showed that for the fifth consecutive year, CCSD has received an unmodified opinion on its annual external audits; corrective actions to address identified findings are taken by the administration and board in a timely manner.

# **CHAPTER 6 - PROGRAM COMPLIANCE**

**Chapter 6** presents findings related to program compliance. As part of the audit, Ressel & Associates assessed the District's compliance with Florida Statute Title XIV, 212.055: Discretionary sales surtaxes; legislative intent; authorization and use of proceeds. Ressel & Associates further assessed the adequacy of processes and internal controls used to ensure compliance with and remediate instances of non-compliance with federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations; contracts; grant agreements; and local policies and procedures applicable to the program areas under review.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** In addition to updating the findings from the September 4, 2019 report, the observations found in **Sections 6.1.1** and **6.1.2** provide Ressel & Associates' assessment of the amended resolution and the associated communication regarding the Surtax referendum that will be held in November 2020. Also, in response to 2020 legislative changes requiring school districts to share a portion of the Surtax revenues with eligible charter schools, Ressel & Associates assessed the adequacy of the district's plans and systems for distributing funds to district charter schools and the mechanisms for charter schools to report how the funds are used.

**Finding on program compliance:** In its September 4, 2019 evaluation of the program areas and processes reviewed, Ressel & Associates found no areas of non-compliance with related federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations; contracts; grant agreements; and local policies as they relate to general operations and small to mid-sized construction and renovation projects. However, controls will need to be enhanced in order to handle the volume and complexity of the projects envisioned in the Surtax Resolution. The administration has taken reasonable steps to plan for increased needs in terms of Building Officials and Project

Managers. Further efforts are required to address the need for additional oversight and monitoring of the competitive bidding and construction management processes.

In its August 28, 2020 follow-up audit, Ressel & Associates concluded that its previous findings on program compliance remain essentially unchanged, although the Clay County Commissioners have approved an Amended Surtax Resolution which will be placed on the ballot in November 2020. The amended resolution remains in compliance in all aspects and includes a statement of CCSD's intent to share a portion of the Surtax proceeds with eligible charter schools, as required by law. In examining the District's plan for handling the calculation, distribution and reporting of charter school funds, Ressel & Associates found that the district has a plan and the system in place to administer the charter school's proportionate share of the proceeds, however some guidance from the Florida Department of Education and/or legal counsel may be required to ensure that the district is fully complying with the intent of the legislation.

# **Observations and Recommendations**

- 6.1.1 August 28, 2020 OBSERVATION: On June 4, 2020, the Clay County School Board passed an amended Discretionary Sales Surtax Resolution, which was approved by the Clay County Commissioners on June 9, 2020. The amended resolution complies with the requirements of Title XIV, 212.055 of the Florida Government Code.
- 6.1.2 **August 28, 2020 OBSERVATION:** The District has not yet published detailed Surtax-related information for review by the public.

*Recommendation 6-1:* At the appropriate time, publish a detailed list of proposed uses of the Surtax proceeds, display these data on the District website homepage, appoint an Oversight Committee for the Clay County School District to monitor Surtax expenditures, and report back on the use of Surtax funds to the Board and community on at least a quarterly basis.

6.2.1 **September 4, 2019:** Contract management for major projects is carried out by the Facility Planning and Construction group without the benefit of a formal construction audit.

*Recommendation 6-2:* Arrange for construction audits to provide the Board and the public assurances that the projects and the project management activities are being accomplished effectively and efficiently, and within all legal guidelines.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** Oversight for contract management of major projects continues to be carried out by the Facility Planning and Construction group without the benefit of formal construction audits. Therefore, Recommendation 6-2 still applies.

6.2.2 **September 4, 2019:** The Facilities Planning and Construction Department relies heavily on the Code Enforcement Department to conduct all compliance inspections relating to fire codes and State Requirements for Education Facilities (SREF); as Surtax projects are

undertaken, a clear delineation of the roles and responsibility of the Building Official and Project Managers in compliance monitoring are needed.

*Recommendation 6-3:* Update the job descriptions for the Building Official and the Project Manager positions to clearly delineate the roles and responsibilities for compliance monitoring and ensure that new employees are trained to assume those responsibilities.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** The compliance monitoring roles and responsibilities of the Building Official and Project Managers have not been clearly defined or delineated. Therefore, Recommendation 6-3 still applies.

6.3.1 **September 4, 2019:** In its evaluation, Ressel & Associates found the Clay County School District (CCSD) has adequate safety and security procedures in place to ensure compliance with Florida statutes, local policies, and inter-local agreements.

August 28, 2020 Update: CCSD's safety and security procedures were updated in early August 2019 to reflect the creation of the Police Department and continue to ensure compliance with Florida statutes, local policies, and inter-local agreements.

6.4.1 **September 4, 2019:** Although the ITS Department has documented certain operating procedures and is in the process of updating its procedures, the procedures available to the auditors at the time of the study were not yet complete.

*Recommendation 6-4:* Continue to update and document Information and Technology Services procedures.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** Operating procedures for Information Technology remain a work-in-progress. Therefore, Recommendation 6-4 still applies.

6.5.1 **September 4, 2019:** CCSD uses the financial advisory services of Ford & Associates to ensure that the District remains in compliance with bonding covenants, principal and interest payments.

**August 28, 2020 Update:** CCSD continues to use the services of a Financial Advisor to ensure that the District remains in compliance with bonding covenants, principal and interest payments.

6.6.1 August 28, 2020 OBSERVATION: CCSD has three district charter schools and a methodology for determining the pro rata amount of the distribution of funds based on enrollment at each of the eligible charter schools and a pre-existing system for the distribution, accounting and reporting of the use of those funds.

*Recommendation 6-5:* Draft procedures detailing the processes that will be used by CCSD to account for, distribute and monitor the Surtax proceeds to be shared with charter schools.

# **BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION**

# **BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION**

# INTRODUCTION

In compliance with Florida statutes requiring a performance audit when a school district passes a surtax resolution, the Florida Office of Program Policy Analysis and Governmental Accountability (OPPAGA) selected Ressel & Associates, LLC to conduct a performance audit of the Clay County School District (CCSD) in July 2019. The performance audit report for CCSD was published on September 4, 2019. The initial resolution failed to obtain the approval of County Commission; however, CCSD passed a subsequent resolution in June 2020 that was approved by the County Commission. Ressel & Associates was retained to update its audit findings. This report provides the initial audit findings and overlays the updated findings and observations to reflect current conditions.

**2019 Performance Audit.** In June 2019, Ressel & Associates responded to a Request for Quote (RFQ) issued from the Florida Office of Program Policy Analysis and Governmental Accountability (OPPAGA) for a performance audit of the Clay County School District. Ressel & Associates was awarded the contract and immediately began work on the project by drafting a work plan which was first approved by OPPAGA. The work plan was then provided to the District's leadership.

As stated in the RFQ, the work plan addressed the requirements of Ch. 2019-169, *Laws of Florida*, found codified in s. 212.055(11), *Florida Statutes*, passed during the 2019 session of The Florida Legislature. The relevant portion states as follows:

212.055Discretionary sales surtaxes; legislative intent; authorization and use of proceeds.— It is the legislative intent that any authorization for imposition of a discretionary sales surtax shall be published in the Florida Statutes as a subsection of this section, irrespective of the duration of the levy. Each enactment shall specify the types of counties authorized to levy; the rate or rates which may be imposed; the maximum length of time the surtax may be imposed, if any; the procedure which must be followed to secure voter approval, if required; the purpose for which the proceeds may be expended; and such other requirements as the Legislature may provide. Taxable transactions and administrative procedures shall be as provided in s. 212.054.

(11) PERFORMANCE AUDIT.— (a) To adopt a discretionary sales surtax under this section, an independent certified public accountant licensed pursuant to chapter 473 shall conduct a performance audit of the program associated with the proposed surtax. (b)1. At least 180 days before the referendum is held, the county or school district shall provide a copy of the final resolution or ordinance to the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability. 2. Within 60 days after receiving the final resolution or ordinance, the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability shall procure the certified public accountant and may use carryforward funds to pay for the services of the certified public accountant. 3. At least 60 days before the referendum is held, the performance audit must be completed and the audit report, including any findings, recommendations, or other accompanying documents, must be made available on

the official website of the county or school district. 4. The county or school district shall keep the information on its website for 2 years from the date it was posted. 5. The failure to comply with the requirements under subparagraph 1. or subparagraph 3. renders any referendum held to adopt a discretionary sales surtax void. (c) For purposes of this subsection, the term "performance audit" means an examination of the program conducted according to applicable government auditing standards or auditing and evaluation standards of other appropriate authoritative bodies. At a minimum, a performance audit must include an examination of issues related to the following: 1. The economy, efficiency, or effectiveness of the program. 2. The structure or design of the program to accomplish its goals and objectives. 3. Alternative methods of providing program services or products. 4. Goals, objectives, and performance measures used by the program to monitor and report program accomplishments. 5. The accuracy or adequacy of public documents, reports, and requests prepared by the county or school district which relate to the program. 6. *Compliance of the program with appropriate policies, rules, and laws. (d) This subsection* does not apply to a referendum held to adopt the same discretionary surtax that was in place during the month of December immediately before the date of the referendum.

**Statutory Charge.** In accordance with s. 212.055(11), Florida Statutes, and Government Auditing Standards (2011 Revision) issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, the certified public accountant must conduct a performance audit of the Clay County School District program areas within the administrative unit(s) which will receive funds through the referendum approved by Resolution adopted by the Clay County School Board on July 8, 2019, attached hereto and incorporated herein as Appendix 2. The performance audit must evaluate the district administrative unit(s) related to new construction, reconstruction and improvement of school facilities including land acquisition; safety and security improvements; technology implementation and upgrades; and service bond indebtedness.

Audit fieldwork must include interviews with program administrators, review of relevant documentation, and other applicable methods as needed to soundly document and clearly and credibly communicate related findings and recommendations related to each of the issues described in 2.2.1.1 through 2.2.1.6. Each of the six finding statements must clearly, directly, and succinctly provide an overall conclusion regarding the program(s) performance based on an evaluation of the items identified under the applicable research task.

On July 8, 2019, the Clay County School Board passed a resolution calling for a Surtax Referendum.

Based on the referendum approved by Resolution and adopted by the Clay County School Board on July 8, 2019, the performance audit evaluated CCSD's administrative unit(s) related to Facilities Maintenance and Construction, Technology, Safety and Security and Bonded Indebtedness. The referendum failed to receive approval of the Clay County Commissioners for inclusion on the November 2019 ballot.

**2020 Performance Audit Update.** A similar school board resolution to the one in 2019 was approved on June 9, 2020, by the Clay County Commissioners for inclusion on the November 2020 ballot. The amended resolution addressed a legislative statutory change requiring that a

portion of the revenues collected must be shared with eligible charter schools as follows (the relevant amended wording is underlined):

212.055(6) SCHOOL CAPITAL OUTLAY SURTAX.—

(a) The school board in each county may levy, pursuant to resolution conditioned to take effect only upon approval by a majority vote of the electors of the county voting in a referendum, a discretionary sales surtax at a rate that may not exceed 0.5 percent.

(b) The resolution must include a statement that provides a brief and general description of the school capital outlay projects to be funded by the surtax. <u>The resolution must include a</u> <u>statement that the revenues collected must be shared with eligible charter schools based on their proportionate share of the total school district enrollment.</u> The statement must conform to the requirements of s. 101.161 and shall be placed on the ballot by the governing body of the county.

In response, OPPAGA amended the contract with Ressel & Associates to update the original Performance Audit report. Included in the Scope of Work for the Status Update is a review of the mechanisms for distributing to and reporting the use of surtax distributions for charter schools as required by the amended statute.

This performance audit with the subsequent update is organized in the following six chapters:

- Chapter 1 Program Economy, Efficiency, and Effectiveness
- Chapter 2 Program Design and Structure
- Chapter 3 Alternative Delivery Methods
- Chapter 4 Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures
- Chapter 5 Reporting Accuracy and Adequacy
- Chapter 6 Program Compliance

# METHODOLOGY

**2019 Performance Audit.** Ressel & Associates began the original audit in July 2019 by developing a detailed work plan which was approved by OPPAGA and then shared with Clay County School District (CCSD) administrators. During the initial conference call with the Superintendent and key administrators, the District named the Chief of Staff as Project Manager for the audit and she and staff began the process of gathering data on the preliminary data request list created by Ressel & Associates.

During this same visit, administrators and Ressel & Associates collaboratively identified a list of peer school districts to use for comparison purposes based on their size and/or proximity to CCSD. Following that discussion, the Ressel team began gathering additional data from the Florida Department of Education and directly from the following peer school districts (**NOTE**: Peer districts were selected based on Florida Department of Education Statistics and CCSD preference):

- Alachua County School District
- Lake County School District
- Marion County School District
- St. Johns County School District

• Santa Rosa County School District

While comparison data were not used to evaluate CCSD, the information, when analyzed along with the data gathered by the District, provided valuable insights into the challenges and opportunities that may exist in the Clay County School District.

During the week of July 22, 2019, the Ressel Team conducted onsite interviews, observations and tours, and reviewed a wide array of policy and program documents. Additional telephone interviews and onsite visits occurred on an as-needed basis to ensure that all relevant data were collected and recorded.

While onsite, the Ressel Team visited nine District sites accompanied by the Building Official and the Director of Maintenance. These are shown below:

Site visits and walk-throughs of:

- Green Cove Junior High School
- Charles E. Bennett Elementary School
- W.E. Cherry Elementary School
- Orange Park High School

Drive-by visits and external assessments of:

- Swimming Pen Creek Elementary School
- Clay High School
- Lake Asbury Elementary School
- Lake Asbury Junior High School
- Orange Junior High School

In addition, the Ressel Team conducted case studies of three major capital outlay projects:

• Fleming Island High School - Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE) Project;

• Keystone Heights Elementary School - Parking Lot; and

• Discovery Oaks Elementary School – New Construction. The case studies examine the projects from start to finish, and identify lessons learned, if any, and how CCSD responded. The three case studies are included in the **Appendices**.

Findings, observations and recommendations were developed and presented in the original report in compliance with Yellow Book standards for performance audits. The original performance audit with management's response to the findings and recommendations was made available to the Clay County School Board on September 4, 2019.

**2020 Performance Audit Update.** The update to the performance audit began in July 2020 with the drafting of a new work plan based on the findings, observations and recommendations contained in the original report. The intent of the update was to determine if the identified conditions found during the original audit continued to exist. Where changes had occurred,

Ressel & Associates was charged with ascertaining and reporting the current conditions relating to each area of the original review.

Of note, former Superintendent Addison Davis became Superintendent of Hillsborough County Public Schools in February 2020.

On February 24, 2020, Governor DeSantis appointed David Broskie, a 30-year veteran administrator with CCSD, as Superintendent of the Clay County School District effective March 2, 2020, until an August 2020 election occurs to select the next Superintendent. A number of the former Superintendent's leadership team also left the district, meaning that there has been internal movement to fill those vacancies on an interim or permanent basis.

Based on the constraints in place during the COVID-19 pandemic, the work plan was designed to be carried out virtually, specifying the data to be examined and interviews to be conducted in an effort to ascertain and report current conditions.

Data gathering and analysis, interviews and group and individual on-line sessions were conducted in July and August 2020. Based on the results of these activities, Ressel & Associates prepared a draft report which CCSD administrators reviewed for accuracy in late August. A final report with the District's response letter was electronically delivered to CCSD and OPPAGA on August 28, 2020.

# PEER COMPARISON DATA

The data presented in this section has been updated to include the most recent data available from the Florida Department of Education in July 2020.

The Clay County School District is a fast-growing district. As shown in **Exhibit 1**, among its peers, only St. Johns and Santa Rosa School Districts have grown at a faster rate over the last five years.

| District                          | # of<br>Students<br>2015–16 | # of<br>Students<br>2016–17 | # of<br>Students<br>2017–18 | # of<br>Students<br>2018–19 | # of<br>Students<br>2019–20 | % Change |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|
| St. Johns County School District  | 36,593                      | 38,546                      | 40,189                      | 41,908                      | 43,644                      | 19.27%   |
| Santa Rosa County School District | 26,740                      | 27,473                      | 27,995                      | 28,479                      | 29,054                      | 8.65%    |
| Clay County School District       | 36,638                      | 37,052                      | 37,521                      | 38,264                      | 38,691                      | 5.60%    |
| Lake County School District       | 42,462                      | 42,516                      | 43,174                      | 43,947                      | 44,798                      | 5.50%    |
| Alachua County School District    | 29,305                      | 29,485                      | 29,764                      | 29,845                      | 29,761                      | 1.56%    |
| Marion County School District     | 42,786                      | 43,040                      | 43,119                      | 42,941                      | 43,273                      | 1.14%    |

# Exhibit 1 Growth Rates in Florida Public Schools 2015-16 to 2019-20 School Years

Source: Florida Department of Education, July 2020.

Of its peers, the Clay County School District has the second lowest total revenue and the second highest percentage of its revenue from local sources (**Exhibit 2**).

#### Exhibit 2 Revenues - All Governmental Funds 2018-19 School Year

|                                   | Total<br>Federal | % of<br>Total | Total<br>State | % of<br>Total | Total<br>Local | %<br>of Total | Total         |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| District                          | Revenues         | Revenues      | Revenues       | Revenues      | Revenues       | Revenues      | Revenues      |
| Santa Rosa County School District | \$25,010,450     | 9.11%         | \$163,791,557  | 59.67%        | \$85,703,260   | 31.22%        | \$274,505,267 |
| Marion County School District     | \$68,328,363     | 15.20%        | \$222,914,151  | 49.58%        | \$158,341,735  | 35.22%        | \$449,584,249 |
| Lake County School District       | \$51,771,053     | 11.21%        | \$218,843,280  | 47.38%        | \$191,314,313  | 41.42%        | \$461,928,645 |
| Alachua County School District    | \$44,911,845     | 13.89%        | \$142,635,364  | 44.11%        | \$135,841,218  | 42.01%        | \$323,388,427 |
| Clay County School District       | \$26,775,213     | 9.13%         | \$125,966,380  | 42.96%        | \$140,502,354  | 47.91%        | \$293,243,948 |
| St. Johns County School District  | \$22,657,352     | 4.92%         | \$185,894,164  | 40.40%        | \$251,558,766  | 54.67%        | \$460,110,282 |

Source: Financial Profiles of Florida School Districts 2018-19 Financial Data Statistical Report, Florida Department of Education, July 2020.

**Exhibit 3** explores expenditures by category. As can be seen, the Clay County School District was in the middle of total expenditures for the 2018-19 school year.

## Exhibit 3 Expenditures - All Governmental Funds 2018-19 School Year

|                                   | # of<br>Students | Total<br>Current | Total<br>Capital | Total<br>Debt | Total         |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|
| District                          | 2018-19          | Expenditures     | Outlay           | Service       | Expenditures  |
| Santa Rosa County School District | 28,479           | \$253,197,081    | \$17,810,198     | \$8,874,059   | \$279,881,338 |
| Alachua County School District    | 29,845           | \$288,983,950    | \$15,767,702     | \$6,389,614   | \$311,141,266 |
| Clay County School District       | 38,264           | \$313,812,371    | \$19,121,405     | \$6,608,319   | \$339,542,096 |
| Lake County School District       | 43,947           | \$386,165,290    | \$15,330,390     | \$20,295,160  | \$421,790,840 |
| St. Johns County School District  | 41,908           | \$355,475,162    | \$49,829,867     | \$22,900,737  | \$428,205,766 |
| Marion County School District     | 42,941           | \$417.875.829    | \$10.096.186     | \$13,343,979  | \$441,315,994 |

Source: Financial Profiles of Florida School Districts 2018-19 Financial Data Statistical Report, Florida Department of Education, July 2020.

**Exhibits 4 and 5** explore Categorical Program Revenues. In addition to general support of education, the state allocates funds to a number of specific programs. Listed here are the funds allocated to specific areas of interest in the overall educational program.

As shown in **Exhibit 4**, Class Size Reduction constitutes the single largest categorical revenue source; CCSD remains in the middle of its peers in this category.

**Exhibit 5** shows that CCSD is also in the middle of its peers in total Categorical Program Revenues.

#### Exhibit 4 Categorical Program Revenues 2018-19 School Year

| District                          | Class Size<br>Reduction -<br>Operating | Florida Digital<br>Classrooms | Florida<br>Teachers<br>Classroom<br>Supply | Instructional<br>Materials | Research-based<br>Reading<br>Instruction | Safe<br>Schools |
|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-----------------|
| Santa Rosa County School District | \$29,888,638                           | \$851,272                     | \$537,397                                  | \$2,389,453                | \$1,275,965                              | \$1,420,743     |
| Alachua County School District    | \$30,634,805                           | \$865,537                     | \$567,005                                  | \$2,383,342                | \$1,312,815                              | \$1,902,948     |
| Clay County School District       | \$40,409,424                           | \$974,918                     | \$722,103                                  | \$3,186,901                | \$1,717,998                              | \$1,908,991     |
| Marion County School District     | \$43,560,385                           | \$1,035,792                   | \$826,774                                  | \$3,384,872                | \$1,814,629                              | \$2,397,270     |
| St. Johns County School District  | \$44,833,644                           | \$1,017,752                   | \$782,446                                  | \$3,632,199                | \$1,893,275                              | \$2,033,948     |
| Lake County School District       | \$47,033,740                           | \$1,046,457                   | \$826,028                                  | \$3,660,639                | \$1,927,595                              | \$2,328,720     |

Source: Financial Profiles of Florida School Districts 2018-19 Financial Data Statistical Report, Florida Department of Education, July 2020.

### Exhibit 5 Categorical Program Revenues 2018-19 School Year

| District                          | School<br>Recognition | Student<br>Transportation | Supplemental<br>Academic<br>Instruction | Voluntary<br>Pre-K<br>Program | Mental<br>Health<br>Assistance | Total<br>Categorical<br>Program<br>Revenue |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Alachua County School District    | \$890,459             | \$3,813,820               | \$8,314,160                             | \$984,159                     | \$743,676                      | \$52,412,726                               |
| Santa Rosa County School District | \$882,682             | \$6,767,541               | \$2,389,453                             | \$1,275,965                   | \$718,556                      | \$53,279,506                               |
| Clay County School District       | \$2,204,340           | \$7,286,825               | \$9,914,107                             | \$778,035                     | \$936,284                      | \$70,039,926                               |
| St. Johns County School District  | \$3,229,751           | \$9,738,108               | \$8,084,576                             | \$1,157,459                   | \$1,011,711                    | \$77,414,869                               |
| Marion County School District     | \$678,616             | \$10,183,200              | \$8,086,631                             | \$460,628                     | \$1,043,478                    | \$79,344,868                               |
| Lake County School District       | \$1,383,423           | \$8,906,511               | \$10,078,878                            | \$1,395,572                   | \$1,062,257                    | \$79,649,820                               |

Source: Financial Profiles of Florida School Districts 2018-19 Financial Data Statistical Report, Florida Department of Education, July 2020.

**Exhibits 6, 7,** and **8** examine facility and technology-related allocations and appropriations with relevance to the program areas under review. The Clay County School District is the highest in facilities and construction appropriations (**Exhibit 6**); the second highest on instruction-related technology appropriations (**Exhibit 7**); and next to lowest in administrative technology Services Appropriations (**Exhibit 8**).

#### Exhibit 6 Facilities Acquisition and Construction (7400) General Fund Appropriations 2019-20 School Year

|                                   |             | Employee  | Purchased   | Energy   | Materials<br>and<br>Other | Capital     |             |             |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|----------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| District                          | Salaries    | Benefits  | Services    | Services | Supplies                  | Outlay      | Other       | Total       |
| Santa Rosa County School District | \$0         | \$0       | \$2,290     | \$0      | \$0                       | \$24,072    | \$0         | \$26,362    |
| Lake County School District       | \$275,901   | \$114,504 | \$161,822   | \$0      | \$844                     | \$457,539   | \$238       | \$1,010,847 |
| Alachua County School District    | \$45,521    | \$14,804  | \$0         | \$300    | \$0                       | \$8,600     | \$1,100,500 | \$1,169,726 |
| Marion County School District     | \$566,400   | \$193,146 | \$118,159   | \$5,500  | \$15,900                  | \$486,769   | \$1,000     | \$1,386,874 |
| St. Johns County School District  | \$1,122,659 | \$396,183 | \$3,511,437 | \$11,450 | \$7,600                   | \$8,475     | \$25,065    | \$5,082,869 |
| Clay County School District       | \$588,072   | \$168,648 | \$817,270   | \$2,000  | \$17,001                  | \$4,357,742 | \$1,000     | \$5,951,733 |

Source: School District Summary Budget, Florida Department of Education, July 2020.

## Exhibit 7 Instruction-Related Technology (6500) General Fund Appropriations 2019-20 School Year

|                                   |             |             |             |          | Materials |             |           |             |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
|                                   |             |             |             |          | and       |             |           |             |
|                                   |             | Employee    | Purchased   | Energy   | Other     | Capital     |           |             |
| District                          | Salaries    | Benefits    | Services    | Services | Supplies  | Outlay      | Other     | Total       |
| Lake County School District       | \$1,034,609 | \$351,031   | \$0         | \$0      | \$42,617  | \$9,211     | \$104,572 | \$1,385,640 |
| Marion County School District     | \$1,453,025 | \$533,836   | \$644,777   | \$6,000  | \$29,000  | \$151,500   | \$43,000  | \$2,861,138 |
| Alachua County School District    | \$2,659,941 | \$768,618   | \$219,725   | \$3,500  | \$39,520  | \$74,455    | \$1,300   | \$3,767,059 |
| Santa Rosa County School District | \$1,799,071 | \$644,094   | \$538,273   | \$13,792 | \$34,108  | \$1,137,799 | \$418     | \$4,167,555 |
| Clay County School District       | \$2,348,697 | \$692,512   | \$1,258,199 | \$0      | \$96,454  | \$100,734   | \$0       | \$4,579,438 |
| St. Johns County School District  | \$4,044,785 | \$1,405,658 | \$3,735,021 | \$4,000  | \$0       | \$274,400   | \$0       | \$9,463,864 |

Source: School District Summary Budget, Florida Department of Education, July 2020.

## Exhibit 8 Administrative Technology Services (8200) General Fund Appropriations 2019-20 School Year

| District                          | Salaries    | Employee<br>Benefits | Purchased<br>Services | Energy<br>Services | Materials<br>and<br>Other<br>Supplies | Capital     | Other    | Total       |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|
|                                   |             |                      |                       |                    |                                       | Outlay      |          |             |
| St. Johns County School District  | \$348,295   | \$126,257            | \$315,571             | \$0                | \$5,500                               | \$316,580   | \$475    | \$1,112,678 |
| Clay County School District       | \$910,057   | \$273,618            | \$213,209             | \$5,500            | \$28,735                              | \$1,750     | \$630    | \$1,433,500 |
| Alachua County School District    | \$975,328   | \$267,927            | \$200,000             | \$0                | \$0                                   | \$0         | \$0      | \$1,443,255 |
| Santa Rosa County School District | \$1,270,078 | \$360,389            | \$1,654,431           | \$0                | \$72,606                              | \$339,150   | \$1,248  | \$3,697,902 |
| Lake County School District       | \$936,389   | \$401,915            | \$1,953,680           | \$0                | \$52,664                              | \$1,101,751 | \$10,600 | \$4,457,000 |
| Marion County School District     | \$1,578,903 | \$463,087            | \$2,754,642           | \$2,000            | \$20,950                              | \$1,768,016 | \$20,100 | \$6,607,698 |

Source: School District Summary Budget, Florida Department of Education, July 2020.

**Exhibits 9** examines safety and security-related allocations. These allocations are consistent with peer districts.

#### Exhibit 9 Safe Schools Allocation 2019-20 School Year

|                                   |                       | 2016           | Allocation<br>Based On | 2019-20            | Allocation<br>Based On | Total Safe            |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| District                          | Allocation<br>Minimum | Crime<br>Index | Crime<br>Index         | Unweighted<br>FTE* | Unweighted<br>FTE      | Schools<br>Allocation |
| Santa Rosa County School District | \$250,000             | 2,059          | \$193,778              | 28,671             | \$1,101,250            | \$1,545,028           |
| Clay County School District       | \$250,000             | 4,113          | \$387,085              | 38,300             | \$1,471,066            | \$2,108,151           |
| St. Johns County School District  | \$250,000             | 3,362          | \$316,407              | 42,847             | \$1,645,746            | \$2,212,153           |
| Alachua County School District    | \$250,000             | 9,758          | \$918,351              | 29,245             | \$1,123,268            | \$2,291,619           |
| Lake County School District       | \$250,000             | 7,789          | \$733,044              | 44,487             | \$1,708,713            | \$2,691,757           |
| Marion County School District     | \$250,000             | 8,903          | \$837,885              | 43,252             | \$1,661,297            | \$2,749,182           |

Source: 2019-20 FEFP Third Calculation Safe Schools Allocation, Florida Department of Education, July 2020.

**Exhibits 10** through **13** compare various facility-related factors, including the number and types of facilities as well as energy costs. As can be seen, in **Exhibit 13**, CCSD has the third newest facilities behind Lake and St. Johns School Districts.

# Exhibit 10 Annual Energy Cost Information 2017-18 School Year

|                                   |           |           |             |          |             |             |        | Square Foot |            | Cost Per COFTE |          |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|----------|-------------|-------------|--------|-------------|------------|----------------|----------|
|                                   | Natural   | Bottled   |             | Heating  |             | F.I.S.H.    |        | Co:<br>All  | st<br>Elec | All            | Elec     |
| District                          | Gas       | Gas       | Electricity | Oil      | All Energy  | GSF         | COFTE  | Energy      | Only       | Energy         | Only     |
| St. Johns County School District  | \$50,279  | \$93,962  | \$5,807,648 | \$34,559 | \$5,986,449 | \$6,353,499 | 38,728 | \$0.94      | \$0.91     | \$154.58       | \$149.96 |
| Lake County School District       | \$129,492 | \$38,443  | \$7,499,221 | -        | \$7,667,155 | \$7,946,498 | 39,887 | \$0.96      | \$0.94     | \$192.22       | \$188.01 |
| Clay County School District       | -         | \$3,775   | \$6,880,700 | \$99,467 | \$6,983,942 | \$6,743,458 | 35,308 | \$1.04      | \$1.02     | \$197.80       | \$194.88 |
| Marion County School District     | \$68,735  | \$53,817  | \$8,024,459 | \$110    | \$8,147,121 | \$7,587,841 | 40,608 | \$1.07      | \$1.06     | \$200.63       | \$197.61 |
| Santa Rosa County School District | \$163,659 | \$9,711   | \$5,847,942 | -        | \$6,021,312 | \$4,398,171 | 26,805 | \$1.37      | \$1.33     | \$224.63       | \$218.16 |
| Alachua County School District    | \$278,710 | \$104,091 | \$7,606,225 | -        | \$7,989,026 | \$5,477,066 | 26,033 | \$1.46      | \$1.39     | \$306.89       | \$292.18 |

Source: District Financial Report, Florida Department of Education, July 2020.

# Exhibit 11 Number of Total Classrooms As of June 30, 2017

| District                          | K-3 Core<br>Classrooms | 4-8 Core<br>Classrooms | 9-12 Core<br>Classrooms | ESE Core<br>Classrooms | Total Core<br>Classrooms | Total Non-<br>Core<br>Classrooms | Total<br>Classrooms |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|
|                                   |                        |                        |                         |                        |                          |                                  |                     |
| Santa Rosa County School District | 488                    | 533                    | 293                     | 106                    | 1,420                    | 108                              | 1,528               |
| Alachua County School District    | 562                    | 473                    | 290                     | 144                    | 1,469                    | 163                              | 1,632               |
| St. Johns County School District  | 747                    | 671                    | 369                     | 115                    | 1,902                    | 265                              | 2,167               |
| Clay County School District       | 702                    | 598                    | 494                     | 199                    | 1,993                    | 194                              | 2,187               |
| Marion County School District     | 772                    | 701                    | 421                     | 205                    | 2,099                    | 252                              | 2,351               |
| Lake County School District       | 772                    | 809                    | 420                     | 168                    | 2,169                    | 259                              | 2,428               |

Source: Florida Inventory of School Houses, Florida Department of Education, July 2020.

## Exhibit 12 Number of Facility Types As of June 30, 2017

| Facility Type            | Santa Rosa<br>County<br>School<br>District | St. Johns<br>County<br>School<br>District | Clay<br>County<br>School<br>District | Alachua<br>County<br>School<br>District | Marion<br>County<br>School<br>District | Lake<br>County<br>School<br>District |
|--------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| Vacant                   | 0  | 1   | 0                                    | 3                                       | 0                                      | 1                                    |
| PreKSE                   | 1  | 0   | 0                                    | 0                                       | 0                                      | 0                                    |
| Kindergarten             | 0  | 0   | 0                                    | 1                                       | 0                                      | 0                                    |
| Elementary               | 16   | 19  | 26                                   | 21                                      | 30                                     | 24                                   |
| Middle                   | 7  | 7   | 6                                    | 6                                       | 8                                      | 10                                   |
| Junior High              | 0  | 0   | 0                                    | 0                                       | 0                                      | 1                                    |
| Senior High              | 4  | 6   | 6                                    | 6                                       | 8                                      | 8                                    |
| Exceptional Student      | 1  | 0   | 0                                    | 2                                       | 1                                      | 1                                    |
| Combination              | 2  | 3   | 1                                    | 3                                       | 2                                      | 1                                    |
| Alternative Education    | 0  | 1   | 2                                    | 0                                       | 0                                      | 1                                    |
| Adult Education          | 0  | 0   | 0                                    | 0                                       | 1                                      | 0                                    |
| County Administration    | 3  | 4   | 2                                    | 1                                       | 6                                      | 2                                    |
| Warehouse                | 0  | 0   | 0                                    | 0                                       | 0                                      | 0                                    |
| Maintenance              | 0  | 2   | 0                                    | 0                                       | 0                                      | 0                                    |
| Transportation           | 0  | 2   | 3                                    | 0                                       | 1                                      | 3                                    |
| Food Service             | 0  | 0   | 0                                    | 0                                       | 0                                      | 0                                    |
| Community Service        | 0  | 0   | 0                                    | 6                                       | 1                                      | 0                                    |
| Joint Use                | 0  | 0   | 0                                    | 0                                       | 0                                      | 0                                    |
| Multiple Use Support     | 0  | 0   | 3                                    | 3                                       | 5                                      | 10                                   |
| VoTech                   | 1  | 1   | 0                                    | 0                                       | 0                                      | 1                                    |
| State School             | 0  | 0   | 0                                    | 0                                       | 0                                      | 0                                    |
| Other                    | 0  | 0   | 0                                    | 0                                       | 0                                      | 0                                    |
| Leased to another entity | 0  | 0   | 0                                    | 0                                       | 0                                      | 1                                    |
| Agriculture Farm         | 0  | 0   | 0                                    | 0                                       | 0                                      | 0                                    |
| Total                    | 35   | 46  | 49                                   | 52                                      | 63                                     | 64                                   |

Source: Florida Inventory of School Houses, Florida Department of Education, July 2020.

# Exhibit 13 Age of Permanent Facilities As of June 30, 2017

|                                   |           | SQFT<br>1-10 | SOFT    | SOFT 21- |            | SFT 41- |          |         |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|--------------|---------|----------|------------|---------|----------|---------|
|                                   | Total     | Yrs          | 11-20   | 30 Yrs   | SQFT 31-   | 50 Yrs  | SQFT >50 |         |
| District                          | NSF       | Old          | Yrs Old | Old      | 40 Yrs Old | Old     | Yrs Old  | Avg Age |
| Lake County School District       | 7,054,335 | 13.3%        | 49.1%   | 15.8%    | 3.6%       | 5.9%    | 12.2%    | 24      |
| St. Johns County School District  | 5,317,884 | 21.5%        | 29.7%   | 22.9%    | 8.4%       | 3.6%    | 14.0%    | 26      |
| Clay County School District       | 4,892,646 | 16.1%        | 31.8%   | 15.9%    | 11.3%      | 16.5%   | 8.5%     | 28      |
| Marion County School District     | 6,757,375 | 15.2%        | 19.7%   | 27.3%    | 11.6%      | 9.0%    | 17.3%    | 31      |
| Santa Rosa County School District | 4,022,095 | 3.1%         | 24.9%   | 23.5%    | 13.9%      | 15.9%   | 18.6%    | 35      |
| Alachua County School District    | 5,033,979 | 3.6%         | 11.4%   | 20.0%    | 9.3%       | 24.9%   | 30.9%    | 41      |

Source: Florida Inventory of School Houses, Florida Department of Education, July 2020.

Exhibit 14 shows that many of the District's relocatable facilities are over 40 years old.

## Exhibit 14 Age of Relocatable Facilities As of June 30, 2017

| District                          | Total<br>NSF | SQFT 1-10<br>Yrs Old | SQFT 11-20<br>Yrs Old | SQFT >20<br>Yrs Old | Avg<br>Age |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------|
| St. Johns County School District  | 311,879      | 29.70%               | 67.30%                | 3.00%               | 10         |
| Santa Rosa County School District | 65,629       | 36.70%               | 39.50%                | 23.80%              | 23         |
| Lake County School District       | 397,672      | 12.50%               | 17.30%                | 70.20%              | 26         |
| Alachua County School District    | 226,925      | 20.30%               | 15.00%                | 64.80%              | 34         |
| Clay County School District       | 1,314,373    | 0.90%                | 1.20%                 | 97.90%              | 43         |
| Marion County School District     | 364,299      | 0.00%                | 5.10%                 | 94.90%              | 44         |

Source: Florida Inventory of School Houses, Florida Department of Education, July 2020.

**Exhibit 15** shows the number of relocatable classrooms in each District. As can be seen, the Clay County School District has almost as many portable facilities as all peer school districts combined. In contrast, Florida's largest school district, Miami-Dade School District, reports only 361 portables in 2017-18.

#### Exhibit 15 Number of Relocatable Classrooms\* As of June 30, 2017

| District                          | K-3<br>Core<br>Classrooms | 4-8<br>Core<br>Classrooms | 9-12<br>Core<br>Classroom | ESE<br>Core<br>Classroom | Total<br>Core<br>Classrooms | Total<br>Non-<br>Core<br>Classrooms | Total<br>Classrooms |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Santa Rosa County School District | 14                        | 14                        | 16                        | 5                        | 49                          | 1                                   | 50                  |
| Marion County School District     | 30                        | 28                        | 3                         | 9                        | 70                          | -                                   | 70                  |
| Alachua County School District    | 59                        | 9                         | 3                         | 3                        | 74                          | -                                   | 74                  |
| Lake County School District       | 148                       | 112                       | 44                        | 14                       | 318                         | 1                                   | 319                 |
| St. Johns County School District  | 147                       | 128                       | 66                        | 5                        | 346                         | 7                                   | 353                 |
| Clay County School District       | 187                       | 324                       | 205                       | 99                       | 815                         | 30                                  | 845                 |

Source: Florida Inventory of School Houses, Florida Department of Education.

\* Includes all satisfactory replaced relocatables.

**Exhibits 16** through **19** examine full-time staffing levels and categories for relocation of the peer school districts. As can be seen, CCSD has the second highest number of instructional, support and administrative staff. The Marion County School District has the highest number of staff in the support and administrative categories and the Lake County School District has the highest number of staff in the instructional category.

|                                   | Other<br>Professional Staff |                   |             | Administrative<br>Support | Service | Skilled<br>Crafts | Unskilled | Total Support |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------|-------------------|-----------|---------------|
| District                          | Non-Instructional           | Paraprofessionals | Technicians | Workers                   | Workers | Workers           | Laborers  | Staff         |
| Alachua County School District    | 150                         | 72                | 54          | 227                       | 326     | 66                | 29        | 924           |
| Santa Rosa County School District | 71                          | 637               | 44          | 187                       | 41      | 35                | 1         | 1,016         |
| Lake County School District       | 240                         | 51                | 62          | 409                       | 437     | 58                | 39        | 1,296         |
| St. Johns County School District  | 160                         | 393               | 51          | 284                       | 774     | 47                | 19        | 1,728         |
| Clay County School District       | 209                         | 593               | 50          | 314                       | 743     | 52                | 4         | 1,965         |
| Marion County School District     | 259                         | 960               | 54          | 509                       | 1,019   | 113               | 23        | 2,937         |

## Exhibit 16 Support Staff in Florida's Public Schools 2019-20 School Year

Source: Full-Time Staff in Florida's Public Schools, Florida Department of Education, July 2020.

# Exhibit 17 Administrative Staff in Florida's Public Schools 2019-20 School Year

| District                          | Officials,<br>Administrators<br>and Managers-<br>Instructional | Officials,<br>Administrators<br>and Managers-<br>Non-<br>Instructional | Officials,<br>Administrators,<br>Managers Total | Consultants/<br>Supervisors<br>of<br>Instruction | Principals | Assistant<br>Principals | Deans/<br>Curriculum<br>Coordinators | Total<br>Administrative<br>Staff |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|--|------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Santa Rosa County School District | 12   | 6  | 18  | 11   | 34         | 40                      | 0                                    | 103                              |
| Alachua County School District    | 16   | 25   | 41  | 9  | 51         | 59                      | 4                                    | 164                              |
| St. Johns County School District  | 30   | 29   | 59  | 7  | 42         | 70                      | 7                                    | 185                              |
| Lake County School District       | 18   | 19   | 37  | 7  | 47         | 95                      | 4                                    | 190                              |
| Clay County School District       | 16   | 48   | 64  | 13   | 44         | 72                      | 6                                    | 199                              |
| Marion County School District     | 30   | 26   | 56  | 16   | 58         | 91                      | 1                                    | 222                              |

Source: Full-Time Staff in Florida's Public School, Florida Department of Education, July 2020.
| 2019-20 School Year               |                        |                       |                          |          |          |          |                                 |               |                                |  |                        |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------|----------|----------|---------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------|
|                                   | Elementary<br>Teachers | Secondary<br>Teachers | Exceptional<br>Education | Other    | Total    |          | Visiting<br>Teachers/<br>Social | School        | Librarians/<br>Audio<br>Visual | Other<br>Professional<br>Instructional | Total<br>Instructional |
| District                          | (PK-6)                 | (7-12)                | Teachers                 | Teachers | Teachers | Guidance | Workers                         | Psychologists | Workers                        | Staff                                  | Staff                  |
| Alachua County School District    | 793                    | 487                   | 236                      | 51       | 1,567    | 56       | 8                               | 0             | 43                             | 120                                    | 1,794                  |
| Santa Rosa County School District | 811                    | 652                   | 429                      | 71       | 1,963    | 66       | 7                               | 10            | 30                             | 109                                    | 2,185                  |
| St. Johns County School District  | 1,034                  | 1,012                 | 453                      | 74       | 2,573    | 99       | 13                              | 17            | 37                             | 250                                    | 2,989                  |
| Marion County School District     | 1,165                  | 1,016                 | 371                      | 40       | 2,592    | 98       | 18                              | 24            | 48                             | 219                                    | 2,999                  |
| Clay County School District       | 1,135                  | 942                   | 501                      | 69       | 2,647    | 103      | 18                              | 20            | 41                             | 174                                    | 3,003                  |
| Lake County School District       | 1,210                  | 1,045                 | 471                      | 81       | 2,807    | 95       | 23                              | 17            | 39                             | 273                                    | 3,254                  |

#### Exhibit 18 Instructional Staff in Florida's Public Schools 2019-20 School Year

Source: Full-Time Staff in Florida's Public School, Florida Department of Education, July 2020.

| District                                | Alachua<br>County<br>School<br>District | Santa<br>Rosa<br>County<br>School<br>District | Lake<br>County<br>School<br>District | St. Johns<br>County<br>School<br>District | Clay<br>County<br>School<br>District | Marion<br>County<br>School<br>District |
|---|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| Officials, Administrators and Managers  | 41                                      | 18  | 37                                   | 59  | 64                                   | 56                                     |
| Consultants, Supervisors of Instruction | 9                                       | 11  | 7                                    | 7   | 13                                   | 16                                     |
| Principals                              | 51                                      | 34  | 47                                   | 42  | 44                                   | 58                                     |
| Assistant Principals                    | 59                                      | 40  | 95                                   | 70  | 72                                   | 91                                     |
| Deans, Curriculum Coordinators          | 4                                       | -   | 4                                    | 7   | 6                                    | 1                                      |
| Elementary Teachers (PK-6)              | 793                                     | 811   | 1,210                                | 1,034                                     | 1,135                                | 1,165                                  |
| Secondary Teachers (7-12)               | 487                                     | 652   | 1,045                                | 1,012                                     | 942                                  | 1,016                                  |
| Exceptional Student Education Teachers  | 236                                     | 429   | 471                                  | 453                                       | 501                                  | 371                                    |
| Other Teachers                          | 51                                      | 71  | 81                                   | 74  | 69                                   | 40                                     |
| Guidance Counselors                     | 56                                      | 66  | 95                                   | 99  | 103                                  | 98                                     |
| Social Workers                          | 8                                       | 7   | 23                                   | 13  | 18                                   | 18                                     |
| School Psychologists                    | -                                       | 10  | 17                                   | 17  | 20                                   | 24                                     |
| Librarians/ Audio-Visual Workers        | 43                                      | 30  | 39                                   | 37  | 41                                   | 48                                     |
| Instructional Professional Staff        | 120                                     | 109   | 273                                  | 250                                       | 174                                  | 219                                    |
| Non-Instructional Professional Staff    | 150                                     | 71  | 240                                  | 160                                       | 209                                  | 259                                    |
| Paraprofessionals                       | 72                                      | 637   | 51                                   | 393                                       | 593                                  | 960                                    |
| Technicians                             | 54                                      | 44  | 62                                   | 51  | 50                                   | 54                                     |
| Clerical/ Secretarial                   | 227                                     | 187   | 409                                  | 284                                       | 314                                  | 509                                    |
| Service Workers                         | 326                                     | 41  | 437                                  | 774                                       | 743                                  | 1,019                                  |
| Skilled Crafts Workers                  | 66                                      | 35  | 58                                   | 47  | 52                                   | 113                                    |
| Laborers, Unskilled                     | 29                                      | 1   | 39                                   | 19  | 4                                    | 23                                     |
| Total                                   | 2,882                                   | 3,304   | 4,740                                | 4,902                                     | 5,167                                | 6,158                                  |

#### Exhibit 19 Total Full-Time Staff by Category in Florida's Public Schools 2019-20 School Year Will re-sort smallest to largest

Source: Full-Time Staff in Florida's Public School, Florida Department of Education, July 2020.

**Exhibit 20** shows the list of referenda in peer school districts.

#### Exhibit 20 Referenda in Last 10 Years in Comparison School Districts

| District                             | Referendum<br>(Yes/No)                               | # of<br>Referenda | Issues  | Years   | Amount   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|---|---|--|
| Clay County School<br>District       | Yes (1 mill<br>property tax)                         | 1                 | Safety and Security and other operational expenses  | Four years (July<br>1, 2019-June 30,<br>2023                              | \$12 million<br>annually   |
|                                      | November 2020  | Pending           | New construction, reconstruction<br>and improvement of school<br>facilities including land<br>acquisition; safety and security<br>improvements; technology<br>implementation and upgrades;<br>and service bond indebtedness   | 30 years<br>(January 1, 2021<br>– December 31,<br>2050)                   | \$403,929,990  |
| Alachua County<br>School District    | Yes (Half-cent<br>Sales Tax)                         | 1                 | Safety and security improvements;<br>repair, renovation and remodeling<br>of Board-owned schools, including<br>modernization of classrooms,<br>science labs and other spaces;<br>technology; elimination of portable<br>classrooms; new construction; land<br>acquisition and improvement | 2019-2030   | Estimated \$20<br>million annually<br>over 12-year<br>period   |
| Lake County School<br>District       | Yes (Property Tax<br>and County 1 cent<br>Sales Tax) | 2                 | Safety and security (Property Tax);<br>capital projects and purposes<br>(District's allowance of County 1-<br>cent sales tax)   | 2019-2022<br>(Property Tax);<br>2018-2033<br>(County 1 cent<br>Sales Tax) | Approximately<br>\$16 million<br>annually (Property<br>Tax);<br>Approximately<br>\$5.3 million to the<br>District (County 1<br>cent sales tax) |
| Marion County School<br>District     | Yes (Millage<br>Referendum)                          | 1                 | Additional safe school measures;<br>faculty competitive pay and raises,<br>the arts programs; library media<br>services; vocational programs  | 2019-2023   | Estimated \$18<br>million annually<br>for four-year<br>period  |
| St. Johns County<br>School District  | Yes (Half-cent<br>Sales Tax)                         | 1                 | New construction; safety and<br>security improvements; building<br>expansions, renovation; and<br>technology upgrades   | 2016-2025   | \$13 million<br>annually over 10-<br>year period   |
| Santa Rosa County<br>School District | Yes (Half-cent<br>Sales Tax)                         | 1                 | New school district facilities,<br>renovations, and additions; land<br>acquisition and improvements;<br>technology equipment upgrades;<br>and design and engineering costs  | 2019-2028   | Approximately<br>\$9.1 million<br>annually over 10-<br>year period   |

Source: Phone calls to Comparison Districts, July 2019.

### CHAPTER 1: PROGRAM ECONOMY, EFFICIENCY, AND EFFECTIVENESS

### 1.0 PROGRAM ECONOMY, EFFICIENCY, AND EFFECTIVENESS

**Chapter 1** presents audit findings related to the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of the program areas under review. As part of field work, Ressel & Associates examined the District's internal monitoring structure including management reporting and the results of internal and external audits and operational performance reviews. In addition, Ressel & Associates evaluated program performance and costs and thoroughly researched the strengths and weaknesses associated with past projects of similar size and complexity.

The specific audit evaluation tasks are provided below:

- 1. Reviewed any management reports/data that program administrators use on a regular basis and determine whether this information is adequate to monitor program performance and cost;
- 2. Determined whether the program is periodically evaluated using performance information and other reasonable criteria to assess program performance and cost;
- 3. Reviewed findings and recommendations included in any relevant internal or external reports on program performance and cost;
- 4. Determined whether program administrators have taken reasonable and timely actions to address any deficiencies in program performance and/or cost identified in management reports/data, periodic program evaluations, audits, etc.;
- 5. Evaluated program performance and cost based on reasonable measures, including best practices;
- 6. Evaluated the cost, timing, and quality of current program efforts based on a reasonably sized sample of projects to determine whether they were of reasonable cost and completed well, on time, and within budget; and
- 7. Determined whether the school district has established written policies and procedures to take maximum advantage of competitive procurement, volume discounts, and special pricing agreements.

**Finding on program economy, efficiency, and effectiveness:** In its September 4, 2019 evaluation, Ressel & Associates found that past growth-management strategies for building core facilities surrounded by portable classrooms have resulted in an untenable situation. The District has been unable to fully comply with the State's Portable Reduction Act, portable classrooms are deteriorating with age, and costs for maintenance and utilities continue to rise. Plans for the reduction of portables need to be well-documented and implemented as soon as practically possible.

The Ressel Team also found that Board policies and operational procedures are, in many cases, outdated and incomplete. Case studies of three recent or ongoing facilities projects show that facility projects are being brought in on time and within budget. To manage the many projects envisioned in the Surtax resolution additional monitoring and internal controls will be required to maintain this level of performance.

In its August 28, 2020 follow-up audit, Ressel & Associates concluded that its previous findings remain essentially unchanged.

In this chapter, program economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the Clay County School District is presented in the following functional areas:

- 1.1 Districtwide Support for Areas Under Review
- 1.2 Facilities Planning, Use, and Construction
- 1.3 Safety and Security Improvements
- 1.4 Technology Implementation and Upgrades
- 1.5 Service Bond Indebtedness

#### 1.1 DISTRICTWIDE SUPPORT FOR AREAS UNDER REVIEW

In this section the following topics are addressed:

- 1.1.1 Management Reports to the School Board
- 1.1.2 School Board Policies

#### 1.1.1 Management Reports to School Board

## September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: Management Reports to the Board provide appropriate detail for Board to take action at meetings.

During the performance audit, Ressel & Associates reviewed agenda items which included management reports and presentation materials presented to the Board over the last 12 months as well as selected past reports relevant to this audit.

Some of the more data intensive reports and presentations reviewed included the following:

- First Coast Expressway Presentation by Superintendent October 2018
- Budget presentations for the last three years and Preliminary for 2019-20
- Various presentations made by Operations relating to the assessed deferred maintenance and projected growth needs
- Police Department Scenarios January 2019
- School Impact Fee Technical Report April 2017

As can be seen, several were budget presentations with detailed budget timelines, proposed millage levy information, and information on capital outlay items".

This review found management reports to be sufficiently detailed. No instances were found to suggest that the data are not accurate or complete.

## **<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u>** Management Reports continue to provide the Board appropriate levels of detail for Board decision-making.

Board members confirmed that they continue to receive detailed reports to take action at meetings. Recent examples include:

- Smart Restart Reports on plans to reopen school for Fall 2020
- Monthly Financial Reports
- Personnel Consent Agenda encompasses all revisions to job descriptions and change in personnel assignments for all employees (report submitted monthly)
- Pre-Qualification of Contactors Operations based (report submitted monthly)

#### 1.1.2 <u>School Board Policies</u>

## September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: With the exception of Section 1 of the School Board Policy Manual, the policies of the Clay County School Board are very outdated.

Effective district management requires sound, clearly written and legally valid policies. The State of Florida mandates that each school board adopt policies that govern the operation of its schools and make them accessible to all school employees and the public. (Administrative Procedure Act, Chapter 120, Florida Statutes).

The Clay County School District has a policy manual (entitled School Board Rules). The school board's responsibility for maintaining the policy manual has been assigned to the Coordinator of Strategic Planning and Community Partnerships who prepares drafts of proposed or revised policies with input from other senior staff.

The Clay County School Board has a policy (rule) that provides guidelines for the development of proposed policies or policy amendments, and their submission to and adoption by the Board (School Board Rule 1.02F). This policy states:

All School Board policies shall be reviewed <u>with regularity</u> by the Superintendent or his or her designee(s). The review shall be for the purpose of identifying and correcting deficiencies in Board policies, clarifying and simplifying policies, deleting obsolete, unnecessary or redundant policies, and ensuring their compliance with statutory and other legal requirements.

A review of the Clay County School Board Rules Manual found that, in general, policies (rules) have been developed sporadically primarily when legislation warrants an update. The complete

school board rules manual has not been completely updated since 1981. A review of the manual found that the majority of policies are very out-of-date.

In 1998, MGT of America conducted a Performance Audit of the Clay County School District for OPPAGA. MGT stated an identical finding over a decade ago. In other words, in 1998, the manual contained many 1981 policies. MGT recommended that the District:

...conduct a comprehensive review of the district's policy manual to purge policies that are no longer needed, eliminate areas of duplication in policy, and assess the need for additional policies.

Clear, updated policies should provide a framework for Board and school district decisions. Generally, school board policy manuals necessitate a complete comprehensive review at least every ten years. With the exemption of Section 1 of the Manual which was completely updated in 2018 and 2019 over a two-year period, no other Board policy sections have been purged by the Board.

As the result the School Board of Clay County continues to rely on outdated policies, and therefore, many old administrative procedures created by senior staff.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 1-1:**

#### Promptly update the Board's Policy Manual and include a review by legal staff.

The Florida School Board Association should be consulted about the procedures used by other Florida schools to update their board policy manual.

## <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> The School Board Policy Manual remains very outdated; although some updates to policy have occurred, no systematic review of outdated policies is planned in the immediate future.

The Board's Policy Manual has not been systematically reviewed or updated and remains substantially as described in the September 2019 Report. Board members and the Board attorney stated that they know a major overhaul needs to be accomplished, but there have been higher priorities (e.g., the Superintendent's departure causing changes in personnel and COVID-19).

Policy changes that have been made in the last year have primarily resulted from legislative changes, noted areas of non-compliance, or Board/administrative issues. For example, the external auditor reported a significant deficiency in the FY 2018-19 Audit Report dealing with the current Purchasing Policy not complying with Federal Uniform Guidelines. To avoid a repeat audit finding in the FY 2019-20 external audit, the Board Attorney and Business Services staff submitted a compliant version of the Purchasing Policy to the Board for approval at the June 25, 2020 Board meeting. Additional changes to the Purchasing Policy are scheduled for presentation to the Board in August to clarify the Superintendent's role and responsibilities and outline appropriate purchasing methodologies for professional services and other issues pointed out in the original Performance Audit.

As a second example, the IT Director stated that he and the Board attorney are aware that the District is not in compliance with FERPA regulations and have drafted language to bring them into compliance. This policy revision is expected to go to the Board in September.

Other policies that have been updated over the last year include:

- SB Policy 4.06H, Homeless Students, revisions approved on 9/5/19 agenda.
- SB Policy 2.00 Human Resources, 2.00 Appendices A, B, & C, 3.00 Employee Relations revisions approved on 11/7/19 agenda.
- SB Policy 6.01 (B)1(a) Annual Architect/Engineer Selection revisions approved on 12/12 19 agenda.
- SB Policy 1.03 (B) The Superintendent of Schools, Salary of the Superintendent, 1.03 (C) The Superintendent of Schools, School Board Appointment of Temporary Interim Superintendent revisions approved on 3/5/20 agenda.
- SB Policy 5.02A Business Affairs, Purchasing revisions approved on 6/25/20 agenda.

Additionally, the following policy revisions are on the August 5, 2020 agenda: 5.02A Business Affairs Purchasing, 5.03B Business Affairs School Activity Accounts, and 5.02C Business Affairs Use of School Buildings, Grounds and Equipment

This reactive approach to policy changes makes the District more at risk with non-compliance such as for required annual legislative changes. To be more proactive, the Florida School Board Association can be consulted to provide purging and updating services as they do for many other Florida school districts.

## Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 1-1 still applies.

#### 1.2 FACILITIES PLANNING, USE, AND CONSTRUCTION

In this section the following topics are addressed:

- 1.2.1 Case Studies of Past Projects
- 1.2.2 Department of Education Oversight
- 1.2.3 Portables
- 1.2.4 Deferred Maintenance

#### 1.2.1 <u>Case Studies of Past Projects</u>

Ressel & Associates conducted case studies of three major capital outlay projects.

• Fleming Island High School - Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE) Project

- Keystone Heights Elementary School Parking Lot
- Discovery Oaks Elementary School New Construction

The case studies examine the projects from start to finish, and identify lessons learned, if any, and how CCSD responded to correct any missteps in the process.

In general, the projects were well-managed. Highlights of each case study are presented here. Full copies of the case studies can be found in **Appendices A** through **C** of this report.

# September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: Case Studies of three projects indicate that past projects have come in on time and within budget; contract management recommendations made by the Auditor General are being addressed in part by documented operating procedures, however, more work is required.

The management of recent projects provide evidence of the District's ability to effectively and efficiently manage the project envisioned in the Surtax Reference.

#### Fleming Island High School - Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE) Project

**Project Description:** The Fleming Island High School AICE Project is a new construction addition of an AICE testing facility on the existing Fleming Island High School site. AICE, Advanced International Certificate Education, is a set of challenging college-level classes for high school students of Education developed by Cambridge Assessment, a non-profit department of the University of Cambridge in England.

The strategic location of the AICE building site to Fleming High School was important because Fleming Island High used funds earned and received from their AICE program to build the testing facility for the students. As this project is a testing facility, CCSD student station capacity did not change as a result of this building addition.

To the recollection of current CCSD staff, this project ran relatively smoothly with the projected final completion date scheduled for January 21, 2019 with actual final completion on March 14, 2019. Fleming Island High School was an active school campus during construction, and unexpected site conditions were discovered. Storm drain repairs had to be addressed after damage was uncovered. Multiple storm drains located adjacent to the building needed repairs. Required storm drains repair was added to the original contract and funded by CCSD Local Capital Improvement Funds (LCIF).

Project Start Date: April 26, 2018
Expected Final Project Completion Date: January 21, 2019
Actual Project Completion Date: March 14, 2019
Projected Project Cost: \$1,082,636
Final Actual Project Cost: \$1,126,427
Project Cost Variance: \$43,791, or approximately 4%, and within District tolerance of 10%
Location: 2233 Village Square Parkway, Orange Park, FL 32003

Land Size: 60 Acre Total School Site Building/Addition Size: 6,175 Square Feet Gross Construction Type: Addition/New Construction Type II Funding Source(s): AICE Funds (New Construction) /LCIF Funds (Erosion Control)

**Lessons Learned:** District staff anticipate no process changes but highlight the importance of scheduling for weather contingences and unforeseen challenges especially relative to storms. In summary, storm drains failed at the boxes and the ground around storm drain boxes opened and created sinkholes from drainage issues due to Hurricanes Irma and Matthew. Fleming Island and Fleming Island High School flooding is an ongoing issue due to the nature of the site. District staff is addressing any problems as they arise. If funding allows, exploratory studies of the existing storm water pipe are desired in an effort to catch any failures in the early stages of impact instead of waiting for complete failure.

#### Keystone Heights Elementary School - Parking Lot

**Project Description:** The Keystone Heights Elementary School parking lot improvement project was substantially complete August 9, 2019 with final completion expected August 24, 2019. This project is important because traffic during parent pick up was disrupting and crowding the surrounding neighborhood streets and properties.

Keystone Heights is located in a remote area of Clay County and, as such, presented challenges with a lack of contractor interest and higher than normal prices. Construction ran smoothly; however, a water main had to be relocated by the local utility company.

Project Start Date: May 14, 2019 Expected Project Substantial Completion Date: August 9, 2019 Actual Project Substantial Completion Date: August 9, 2019 Projected Final Project Cost: \$475,443 Final Actual Project Cost: Not available until Final Completion Project Cost Variance: Not available until Final Completion Location: Keystone Heights Elementary Land Size: .71 acre Construction Type: Site Improvements (New Parent Pickup/Parking) Funding Source(s): LCIF (1.5 mil) Funds (Local Capital)

**Lessons Learned:** The land for this project was apparently strategically important to the school because of its proximity to the school and safety concerns. In an effort to effectively drive purchase negotiations, Facilities staff wisely obtained a property appraisal resulting in a purchase price significantly lower than the original sales offer. Facilities staff are updating the District Facilities and Construction Procedures Manual and plan to include guidance on property acquisition to ensure consistency and efficiency. Further, the Project Manager plans to observe site use to help implement new traffic patterns and report to engineer on any issues.

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: Although CCSD administrators said they follow Florida Statues requiring an appraisal on purchases of land greater than \$100,000, no general guidance relating the need for land appraisals is found in Board Policy or procedures.

Section 1013.14(b), Florida Statutes, requires one appraisal on purchases of land greater than \$100,000.

The parking lot expansion purchase was for approximately .71 acres of land adjacent to Keystone Heights Elementary School. Although this offer fell below the legal threshold for an appraisal, an appraisal obtained by the seller valued the property at \$33,000 in November 2017. The District's appraiser, Moody Appraisal Group, valued the property at \$15,000 in January 2018.

At its May 2018 regular School Board meeting, the School Board of CCSD granted authority to purchase the property for \$30,000 to improve the Keystone Heights Elementary school parking lot. In addition, \$8,000 was authorized for installation of a fence to secure the property perimeter.

Clearly there were negotiations on the price which were aided by the appraisals. In the absence of a documented policy or procedure, staff made the wise decision to pursue an independent appraisal to ensure that the District's interests were protected.

A Board Policy requiring appraisals on all real property purchases would ensure that property is purchased at or near market value, and would eliminate any perception of favoritism.

#### RECOMMENDATION

**Recommendation 1-2:** 

Implement a Board Policy regarding the need for appraisals prior to all real property purchases, and document the process to be followed in the Facilities and Construction Procedures Manual.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> Appraisal requirements are now detailed in the Facility Planning and Construction Manual.

The Facility Planning and Construction Manual contains the following guidance relating to appraisals:

"When acquiring real property by purchase, exchange, or donation, the Director of Facilities and Construction may secure professionally prepared appraisal reports estimating the market value of the real property being considered for acquisition as of a specific date. The School Board may waive securing an appraisal report unless otherwise required by Florida law.

Real property appraisal reports shall be secured from qualified real property appraisers licensed or registered in the State of Florida. The report shall comply with requirements of State of Florida statutes and regulations.

In the case of real property acquisitions of less than \$100,000.00, donations and tax property acquisitions, real property appraisal reports are not required but are encouraged and considered good practice.

The Director of Facilities and Construction may secure as many real estate appraisal reports for any real property tract or parcel as is necessary for evaluation and decision-making purposes.

Real property may be purchased or acquired by other means for more or less than appraisal value upon School Board approval.

Before acquisition of the property, the School Board shall obtain at least one appraisal by an appraiser approved pursuant to FS. 253.025(8) for each purchase in an amount greater than \$100,000 and not more than \$500,000. For each purchase in an amount in excess of \$500,000, the board shall obtain at least two appraisals by appraisers approved pursuant to FS. 253.025(8). If the agreed to purchase price exceeds the average appraised value, the School Board is required to approve the purchase by no less than four votes."

## Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 1-2 is substantially complete.

#### **Discovery Oaks Elementary School**

**Project Description:** The Discovery Oaks Elementary School is a new school construction project located in the Orange Park area of Clay County called Oakleaf. The District projects student capacity at 862, with school built to accommodate STEAM, Science, Technology, Engineering, Art and Math programs, upon its final completion July 30, 2018. The Oakleaf location was chosen because of high growth in the area.

The Discovery Oaks Elementary School presented timeline and scheduling challenges. This project had to be completed in 12 months in order to open on time for the 2018-19 school year. A typical timeline for a school this size is approximately 18 months. Weather also presented challenges in that Hurricane Irma and Tropical Storm Emily both struck the area during the early stages of construction, August and September 2017. Discovery Oaks Elementary school was built in an Enhanced Hurricane Protected Area (EHPA) in order to harden the cafeteria/multipurpose space and add a 400 kilowatt generator. Days were added to the original contract to accommodate changes due to weather, but the school was finished in time for the beginning of school year.

Project Start Date: June 29, 2017 Expected Final Completion Date: July 2, 2018 Actual Project Final Completion Date: July 30, 2018 Original Contract Amount: \$20,770,188 (includes Sitework Cost \$2,564,555) Final/Actual Project Cost: \$21,014,300 Project Cost Variance: \$244,112, approximately 1%, and within District tolerance of 10% Location: 950 Plantation Oaks Parkway, Orange Park, FL 32065 Land Size: 63 acre Building/Addition Size: 110,000 Square Feet Construction Type: Type 2 New Construction Funding Source(s): Impact Fees and LCIF

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: CCSD created the Facilities Planning and Construction Procedures Manual to address recommendations made by the Auditor

## General's Operational Audit Report No. 2019-115 dated February 2019 that contained findings specifically relating to the Discovery Oaks Elementary project.

Subsequent to completion of Discovery Oaks Elementary School, the District underwent an operational audit conducted by the Florida Auditor General. Auditor General Operational Audit Report No. 2019-115 dated February 2019 noted four findings relative to selected District Facilities Management processes and administrative activities. **Exhibit 1-1** provides a summary of those findings.

The Auditor General recommended closer monitoring of construction payment requests, enhancement of the subcontractor selection process, better documentation of subcontractor licenses, and enhancement of controls over negotiating, monitoring, and documenting reasonableness of general conditions costs.

According to Facilities staff, Auditor General findings and recommendations have been discussed and analyzed to develop recommended procedures. Draft and final procedures provided to Ressel & Associates address the majority of concerns. For example, procedures contain language addressing the need to compare and monitor CME pay requests relative to GMP and subcontracts.

#### Exhibit 1-1 Summary of 2018 Auditor General Findings relating to Construction Management

#### CLAY COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

#### SUMMARY

This operational audit of the Clay County School District (District) focused on selected District processes and administrative activities and included a follow-up on findings noted in our report No. 2017-069 and management letter comments in the 2016-17 financial audit report. Our operational audit disclosed the following:

**Finding 1:** District personnel did not compare construction management entity (CME) pay requests to the CME guaranteed maximum price (GMP) contracts and subcontractor contracts for the Discovery Oaks Elementary School Project. The CME GMP contracts were \$20.8 million, including \$18.6 million for subcontractor services.

**Finding 2:** District construction administration monitoring procedures for the Discovery Oaks Elementary School Project did not include District personnel attendance at the subcontractor bid openings or documented comparisons of the subcontractor bids and contracts to verify that the CME used a competitive selection process to select subcontractors and that the selected bid and contract amounts agreed.

**Finding 3:** The District did not verify the licenses of subcontractors before they commenced work on the Discovery Oaks Elementary School Project.

**Finding 4:** The District needs to enhance controls over negotiating, monitoring, and documenting the reasonableness of CME general conditions costs.

Source: Auditor General Operational Audit Report No. 2019-15, February 2019.

In some instances, however, CCSD management response to the findings were to defer to the contracts with the Architect and Construction Managers. For example, for Finding 3, Management gave the following response:

#### **District Response:**

The District contracted with a Construction Manager for this project. Utilizing this approach, the CM is legally and financially responsible for the performance of the subcontractors on the project. The CM is charged with the responsibility of bidding, selecting and contracting with the subcontractors. These responsibilities include ensuring that subcontractors have the required license, insurance and bonds. District staff deems this to be a contractual responsibility of the CM. Utilizing the CM at-risk concept, the District is currently not required by either state or local Board policy to do so. The district does receive the subcontractor license information from the CM on the project Building Permit Application. District procedures are being developed to ensure this information is verified by District personnel prior to issuance of the Permit. As the audit finding states, all of the subcontractors that were checked had the appropriate license.

In this regard, the question then becomes "Who is monitoring the CM contract, and what is the District's responsibility for ensuring that the CM is fulfilling the terms and conditions of the contract?"

The procedures manual addresses the review of invoices for payment by staff but does not address <u>how</u> CMs are to be monitored and managed, and what level of due diligence is needed to ensure compliance with all contract terms and conditions. For example, the procedures require the Project Manager to perform inspections relating to permitting, but do not establish expectations for periodic and ongoing on-site monitoring visits throughout the life of the project. Interviews and project documentation confirmed that Project Managers are on-site conducting this level of monitoring on an ongoing basis, but that expectation is not discussed in the manual.

In another example, the procedures contain a number of references and checklists regarding the items that are to be maintained in the project files, but there is no mention of periodic checks by management to ensure that those files are complete and well organized.

As employees or contractors are brought in to assist with the management of the many projects envisioned in the Surtax resolution, having clearer guidelines and expectations will be needed for training and accountability purposes.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 1-3:**

Update the procedures to ensure that newly hired or contracted Project Managers understand how they are expected to provide adequate and appropriate oversight, as well as maintain project documentation.

#### **<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u>** CCSD's Facilities Planning and Construction Procedures Manual finalized in 2019 addresses the Auditor General's findings and is being used during new employee training.

According to the Interim Assistant Superintendent for Operations, the Facility Planning and Construction group has filled one Project Manager position in the last year and used the Facilities Planning and Construction Procedures Manual in the training process. New checklists are also being created that outline the processes for closing out projects based on feedback from the new employee who has prior experience in another Florida school district. In addition, the new Project Manager has been asked to review the current manual and provide management with suggestions for other improvements. The project checklist portion of the manual was updated in October 2019, and staff indicated that as procedural changes are adopted and new checklists are created, the department will modify the manual and periodically present the manual to the Board for approval.

Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 1-3 is substantially complete, however the need to continually update the manual as needed still applies.

#### 1.2.2 <u>Department of Education Oversight</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: Ressel & Associates found that CCSD has complied with state reporting requirements for facilities and a review of the internal assessments of facility condition and need is based on supported facts. The District could, however, benefit from a cost analysis when assessing final project strategies and designs. While not required for locally funded facility projects, using this type of information in the decision-making process is generally considered an industry best practice.

The Facility Planning and Construction Department conducts an Educational Plant Survey every five years as required by the Florida Department of Education (DOE). The Plant Survey provides detailed facility information for each school site, the use of existing facilities and projects future facility needs. The most recent Educational Facilities Plant Survey was conducted in 2016 and is valid through 2021. The next scheduled 5-Year Plant Survey is due to be conducted in 2021.

Florida school districts that receive State Public Education Capital Outlay Funding (PECO) are required to follow certain state requirements provided in Florida Statute (1013.31) that in summary include, but are not limited to:

- a documentation of need by the School District;
- a cost analysis of replacing or renovating the facility to meet the need;
- approval by the Florida Department of Education

The following excerpts from the Florida Department of Education's application for *Room Condition Change Building Replacement/Raze* (Exhibit 1-2) describe some of the basic reporting and approval requirements.

As shown, the guidelines are built to ensure that districts have done their due diligence in terms of pre-construction planning, construction management, and analyzing the costs and benefits of renovation versus new construction.

CCSD conducted an internal needs assessment and prepared a comprehensive list of needs that form the basis for the projects to be addressed by the Surtax Referendum. Through tours of a sample of CCSD facilities and a review of the details associated with the CCSD needs assessment, Ressel & Associates found no instances where the district-developed needs assessment were inaccurate or misleading. The details of the CCSD assessment, however, may not meet the FLDOE requirements shown above, but are not currently relevant since the projects, as envisioned, will be funded with local funds.

#### Exhibit 1-2 Excerpts from Application for Room Condition Change Building Replacement/Raze

#### B. CONDITION CHANGE (Not applicable to community colleges)

- 1. RATIONALE (provide the following information, as appropriate, to justify changing the condition of spaces):
  - i. In order to change the space condition from satisfactory to unsatisfactory the district must certify that the space is no longer physically safe or suitable for occupancy:
    - 1. Unsatisfactory space is typically designated as such due to compromising effects on the structural integrity, safety, or excessive physical deterioration of a building.
    - 2. Typically, space condition should be the same, either satisfactory or unsatisfactory, for all rooms in a permanent building.
    - 3. Space that has been determined to be unsatisfactory should not be occupied.
    - 4. Application of a facility replacement formula, such as the Castaldi generalized formula for modernization or other similar facilities study, does not necessarily mean that the condition of the identified spaces is unsatisfactory. The condition code cannot be changed simply due to the results of a planned replacement unless the integrity of the space meets the criteria identified to classify the space as unsatisfactory.
  - ii. In order to change the space condition from unsatisfactory to satisfactory the district must certify that the space has been successfully reconditioned to meet all applicable regulations regarding occupancy requirements.

#### C. RAZE/REPLACE PERMANENT BUILDING(S)

- 1. RATIONALE (provide the following information, as appropriate, to justify razing/replacing permanent buildings):
  - i. Detailed explanation of need for the proposed project and the expected benefit to the district/community college.
  - ii. General scope of the proposed project.
  - iii. Building age and year of construction.
  - iv. Existing capacity of building(s), include the number of student stations, classrooms, and other instructional spaces.
  - v. Current number of students housed and the projected number of students to be housed in the affected building(s).
  - vi. Current educational plant survey recommendations and capacity.
  - vii. What alternatives have been considered besides razing/replacement and why are the alternatives not feasible?
  - viii. School board/community college board approval of the concept of razing/replacing permanent buildings.
  - ix. Building condition/engineer study (optional).
  - x. Impact if the proposed project is not approved. OEF Form RCC-BRR March 2008 Page 3
  - xi. Other relevant data; identify any major systems (include date, if applicable) that have been replaced or upgraded, e.g., electrical, HVAC, fire alarm, roof, plumbing, drainage, etc. Provide a general scope of work for any previous remodeling, renovation, and addition, and year completed.
- 2. COST ANALYSIS (Building by Building):
  - i. Castaldi Analysis (or other cost analysis formula to support the proposed project).
  - ii. The following five questions must be addressed:
    - 1. How many years will modernization extend the useful life of the modernized building(s)?
    - 2. Does the existing building(s) lend itself to improvement, alteration, remodeling, and expansion? If no, explain why not.
    - 3. Explain how a modernized and a replacement building(s) fits into a well-conceived long-range plan of the district/community college?
    - 4. What is the percentage derived by dividing the cost for modernization by the cost for a replacement building?

- A committee of district officials and independent citizens from outside the school attendance zone has determined that the replacement of the building(s) is financially justified and no other alternative is feasible? (Not applicable to community colleges)
   iii Datailed scene of work for modernization of the aviating building(s)
  - iii. Detailed scope of work for modernization of the existing building(s).
  - iv. FISH building plan and/or schematic drawings of the existing building with FISH room numbers.

Source: Florida Department of Education, <u>http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7735/urlt/0075339-unsatisfactorybuilding.pdf</u>.

Recent changes to Florida Statutes Chapter 1013 relating to Educational Facilities removed certain reporting and approval requirements by the Florida Department of Education when districts use local funds.

As shown in **Exhibit 1-3** the state's PECO funding allocations have dropped dramatically since 2008-09, and *were not funded by the Legislature for the 2018-19 school year*.

#### Exhibit 1-3 Historic Public Education Capital Outlay and Debt Service Trust Fund Allocations Clay County School District FY 2008-09 through 2018-19

| PECO                      |             |           |             |         |         |         |           |           |             |           |         |
|---------------------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|---------|
| Allocations               | 2008-09     | 2009-10   | 2010-11     | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15   | 2015-16   | 2016-17     | 2017-18   | 2018-19 |
| Repair and<br>Renovations | \$1,933,808 | \$724,455 | \$2,062,385 | \$0     | \$0     | \$0     | \$716,917 | \$871,725 | \$1,296,083 | \$864,848 | \$0     |
| New<br>Construction       | \$4,309,693 | \$0       | \$0         | \$0     | \$0     | \$0     | \$0       | \$0       | \$0         | \$0       | \$0     |

Source: Florida Department of Education, Appropriation History and Projections <u>http://www.fldoe.org/finance/fco/appropriation-</u> <u>history-projections.stml</u>

Although the state projections indicate that CCSD is eligible for approximately \$1 million per year in combined new construction and maintenance funds, future PECO funding remains in the hands of the Legislature. Should funding be made available, CCSD would be required to follow the state guidelines shown above.

Although the State guidelines are not currently applicable, the Castaldi or similar cost analysis is an industry best practice as it provides a detailed analysis of what structures can be reasonably and affordably renovated to meet educational needs, versus those where it is simply cheaper and more efficient to raze the structure and rebuild from the ground up. Conducting this type of cost analysis, particularly on core facilities older than 25 years, would provide the District leaders with additional information on which to base their final project strategies and designs.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 1-4:**

Conduct the additional analysis outlined in the state guidelines as due diligence to confirm the building and renovation plans for the Surtax and to maximize state PECO funding in the future.

## <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> No additional analysis has been performed since CCSD's initial assessments of the facility conditions used to create the ED FIRST needs list for the Surtax.

Staff indicated that additional analysis, including the preparation of Castaldi reports when facilities are demolished, will be required and performed once the Surtax is passed and projects are prioritized.

## Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 1-4 still applies.

#### 1.2.3 Portables

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: CCSD's past growth management strategies have resulted in an inordinate number of temporary/portable facilities. The District has taken steps to replace older, costly buildings. Administrators, however, explained that they have been unable to fully comply with the Florida Statute 1013.21 (Reduction of Relocatable Facilities in Use) due to the cost of replacing portables with permanent classroom facilities.

In the 1980s, all new CCSD facilities were built with a core infrastructure (cafeteria, media center, gym, and administrative offices) surrounded by portables. The plan was to replace portable buildings one wing at a time with a permanent building wing. That never happened at some campuses. The current infrastructure is, in some instances, insufficient to support the number of students on those campuses. A list of all schools, their capacities and the number of portables on each campus can be found in **Appendix D; Exhibit 1-4** summarizes the number of portables currently in use at each school level.

| School Level       | Number of Portable Classrooms |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| Elementary School  | 488                           |
| Junior High School | 111                           |
| High School        | 287                           |
| Total              | 886                           |

#### Exhibit 1-4 Portable Classrooms in Use by School Level August 2019

Source: Clay County School District Facilities Planning and Construction Department, 2018-19.

**Exhibit 1-5** shows the number of satisfactory portables for CCSD as compared to its peer districts.

|                                   |            |            |           |           |                   | Total Non- |            |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|------------|------------|
|                                   | K-3 Core   | 4-8 Core   | 9-12 Core | ESE Core  | <b>Total Core</b> | Core       | Total      |
| District                          | Classrooms | Classrooms | Classroom | Classroom | Classrooms        | Classrooms | Classrooms |
| Clay County School District       | 187        | 324        | 205       | 99        | 815               | 30         | 845        |
| Alachua County School District    | 59         | 9          | 3         | 3         | 74                | -          | 74         |
| Lake County School District       | 148        | 112        | 44        | 14        | 318               | 1          | 319        |
| Marion County School District     | 30         | 28         | 3         | 9         | 70                | -          | 70         |
| St. Johns County School District  | 147        | 128        | 66        | 5         | 346               | 7          | 353        |
| Santa Rosa County School District | 14         | 14         | 16        | 5         | 49                | 1          | 50         |

#### Exhibit 1-5 Peer District Comparison of Satisfactory Portables Clay County School District

Source: Florida Inventory of Schools, 2017.

**Exhibit 1-6** shows that CCSD ranks fourth in the state in the total number of portables when compared to other school districts, however in terms of the percent of all classrooms housed in portables, CCSD is number one among that group. Further, the Florida districts with more total portable classrooms have significantly higher student enrollment.

|                   |                       |                        |                        | Acceptab               | le Portables          |                          |                                  |                     |                         |                     | Ratio of                                |
|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---|
| District          | Number of<br>Students | K-3 Core<br>Classrooms | 4-8 Core<br>Classrooms | 9-12 Core<br>Classroom | ESE Core<br>Classroom | Total Core<br>Classrooms | Total Non-<br>Core<br>Classrooms | Total<br>Classrooms | Permanent<br>Classrooms | Total<br>Classrooms | Portables to<br>Permanent<br>Classrooms |
| Clay County       | 38,264                | 187                    | 324                    | 205                    | 99                    | 815                      | 30                               | 845                 | 1,342                   | 2,187               | 38.6%                                   |
| Orange County     | 209,114               | 1,026                  | 465                    | 367                    | 34                    | 1,892                    | 80                               | 1,972               | 10,316                  | 12,288              | 16.1%                                   |
| Palm Beach County | 194,186               | 660                    | 387                    | 219                    | 35                    | 1,301                    | 23                               | 1,324               | 9,337                   | 10,661              | 12.4%                                   |
| Broward County    | 270,978               | 500                    | 533                    | 401                    | 17                    | 1,451                    | 44                               | 1,495               | 11,980                  | 13,475              | 11.1%                                   |
| Duval County      | 130,245               | 133                    | 127                    | 129                    | 24                    | 413                      | 7                                | 420                 | 6,287                   | 6,707               | 6.3%                                    |
| Miami-Dade County | 350,458               | 146                    | 179                    | 32                     | 4                     | 361                      | -                                | 361                 | 17,766                  | 18,127              | 2.0%                                    |

Exhibit 1-6 Ranking of Statewide Acceptable Portables

Source: Florida Inventory of School Houses, June 30, 2017; and Florida Department of Education Student Enrollment by District, 2018-19.

From an educational perspective, researchers say that portable classrooms do not deter student learning or the teachers' ability to teach. CCSD has made every effort to equip the portable classrooms with the same technology and learning environment as permanent classrooms. The decision to build campuses with portable classrooms surrounding a core facility has, however, created a number of financial, safety and health-related challenges for CCSD. Most significantly, as portables are aging, the maintenance costs are rising as the energy efficiency declines. Another major challenge noted by researchers are health concerns, specifically relating to air quality and mold, both of which are ongoing maintenance issues for CCSD.

Although disaggregated information on the cost of maintaining the portables and the related energy costs were not available at the time of this audit, anecdotally, the Maintenance Department indicated that the portable classrooms are continually requiring roof, air conditioner, flooring and wall repairs and replacements. In the future, the Maintenance Department's new work order system will have the capability of tracking the actual costs for Maintenance, and administrators indicated that more data to support the growing costs will be available by campus and facility.

In terms of safety, the chain link fencing that forms the parameter around the facilities are easy to scale, as evidenced by the vandalism observed during campus tours. Because only the very youngest students have restrooms in their portable classrooms, all other students housed in portable classrooms must make use of "gang bathrooms," which are also housed in portable facilities. Further, even some younger students must walk unaccompanied between and among the classrooms to go to the front office or cafeteria, use the restroom and the like. Cameras are in use for surveillance and patrols are ongoing by officers and guardians, however, the risk exists for an intruder to scale the fence and hide under or around these buildings.

In recognition of the high costs associated with the use of older portable classrooms, the Florida Legislature enacted the following:

#### 1013.21 Reduction of relocatable facilities in use.—

(1)(a) It is a goal of the Legislature that all school districts shall provide a quality educational environment for their students such that, by July 1, 2003, student stations in relocatable facilities exceeding 20 years of age and in use by a district during the 1998-1999 fiscal year shall be removed and the number of all other relocatable student stations at over-capacity schools during that fiscal year shall be <u>decreased by half</u>.

The Legislature finds, however, that necessary maintenance of existing facilities and public school enrollment growth impair the ability of some districts to achieve the goal of this section within 5 years. Therefore, the Legislature is increasing its commitment to school funding in this act, in part to help districts reduce the number of temporary, relocatable student stations at over-capacity schools.

The Legislature intends that local school districts also increase their investment toward meeting this goal. Each district's progress toward meeting this goal shall be measured annually by comparing district facilities work programs for replacing relocatables with the state capital outlay projections for education prepared by the Office of Educational Facilities. District facilities work programs shall be monitored by the Office of Educational Facilities to measure the commitment of local school districts toward this goal. As shown in **Exhibit 1-3** above, there has been no State PECO funding allocated to the District for "new construction" since 2008-09, which Administrators said had impacted CCSD's ability to fund the construction of permanent classrooms needed to retire portables.

The District's criteria for reducing the number of portables are addressed in its *Educational Facility Plan (EFP) for 2019-20 to 2023-24* and its ED F.I.R.S.T. initiative. The FLDOE recommends replacement of relocatable units 20 year old and older. The Clay County School Board has a policy to replace these older relocatable units. But, in the *April 2017 School Impact Fee Technical Report*, in doing so:

...elimination of the existing 9,851 student stations in relocatable classrooms 20 years old and older would increase the overall utilization rate from 85.8 percent to 111.9 percent, and create an undersupply of 3,843 student stations. The EFP says that the number of student stations will decrease as a result of the planned initiative to remove 20+ year old portables from their inventory.

How and when those classrooms will be removed is not described in the plan, nor is the issue of the undersupply of student stations should that plan be implemented.

In the District's April 2017 School Impact Fee Technical Report School District of Clay County, Florida report to the CCSD School Board, the District stated, "these older and aging relocatable units are considered to be inefficient and costly to operate and beyond productive renovation."

**Exhibit 1-7** shows how much the District spends moving portables and the associated cost of disconnecting and reconnecting them (plumbing, electrical, electronics - intercom, fire alarm, telecommunications, ramps/stairs, new sidewalks, and any remodeling needed to meet program needs at the new location).

| Fiscal Year | Expenses  |
|-------------|-----------|
| 2015-16     | \$242,278 |
| 2016-17     | \$143,841 |
| 2017-18     | \$198,378 |
| Total       | \$584,497 |

#### Exhibit 1-7 Relocatable Expenses by Fiscal Year

Source: CCSD Facilities, Planning, and Construction Department, August 2019.

The Florida Community Planning Act (Chapter 2011-139, Laws of Florida) under Section 15 relating to school concurrency and amending Section 163.3180, Florida Statutes, provides the following:

...a school district that includes relocatable facilities in its inventory of student stations shall include the capacity of such relocatable facilities as provided in S.1013.35(2)(b)2.f.,

provided the relocatable facilities were purchased after 1998 and the relocatable facilities meet the standards for long-term use pursuant to S.1013.20.

Inasmuch as 9,851 student stations are in relocatable classrooms 20 years old and older and purchased well before 1998, this language appears to support disqualifying these existing relocatable classrooms and student stations from the County inventory, resulting in elimination of current over-capacity conditions.

In its Educational Facilities Plan, CCSD noted that:

... with enrollments projected to increase substantially in the future and with implementation of a policy to reduce and eventually eliminate the aging relocatable units, additional student station capacity will be needed to accommodate future enrollment growth.

...41 percent of the District's student stations identified in Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) are housed in satisfactory relocatable buildings. A 2017 approved Spot Survey has begun the process of removing 20 + year old relocatable buildings from our elementary classroom inventory. This year we expect to remove over 30 of these assets.

Without considering growth, to currently bring CCSD to a 10 percent portable ratio, approximately 600 portables would need to be replaced with permanent classrooms. Clearly, the cost of replacing 600 classrooms with permanent facilities is prohibitive.

However, according to the Coordinator of Planning and Intergovernmental Relations, the District's plan for removing 50 portables a year has only just begun. While they fell short of meeting this goal in 2018-19, they did eliminate 32 portables. During interviews, administrators gave a number of scenarios for eliminating portables, but in the absence of a documented and potentially Board-approved strategy, meeting the goal will be difficult.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 1-5:**

Establish a more specific plan for reducing portables that includes goals and progress reports.

## <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> Ressel & Associates found no appreciable change in the number and condition of portables currently in use by CCSD; the administration pointed to the Surtax projects as the only viable plan for the reduction of portables.

Facility reports from the Florida Department of Education's website have not been updated since September 4, 2019, and information provided by CCSD as part of the audit update contained no changes from the information provided last year. Staff indicated that there has been only minimal movement of portables among campuses to accommodate student shifts but no change in the total number of portables in use by the district overall.

According to the new Superintendent and several members of his leadership team, the Surtax referendum is the only viable way for CCSD to reduce the district's reliance on portables; adding wings to existing schools and constructing new schools will be required before any useable

portables can be decommissioned. Documenting the intent and estimating the number of portables that can be removed during each phase of the ED FIRST project would provide the public information regarding how and when portables will be removed from service, particularly those that are approaching their service life.

Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 1-5 still applies.

#### 1.2.4 <u>Deferred Maintenance</u>

## September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The District's process for handling deferred maintenance and preventative maintenance is not keeping pace with the growing needs of the district.

The average age of CCSD schools is 40 years, with some as old as 100 years. The nearly 900 portables vary in age, but administrators said some were at least 50 years old. Maintaining the roofs, HVAC systems, chillers and the like is an ongoing challenge. During the annual budget cycle, the Maintenance and Facilities Planning and Construction Departments develop a list of Capital projects to be undertaken during the coming year. **Exhibit 1-8** provides an excerpt from the 2019-20 budget presentation to illustrate.

As shown, these projects generally include the replacement of some roofs, Chillers and HVAC units, but these items are not based on a systematic replacement cycle, but on extreme need. A limited amount of preventative maintenance is performed by custodians on each campus such as changing air conditioner filters. Maintenance technicians are scheduled to periodically perform some more complex preventative maintenance on chillers and air conditioners, and a limited number of contracts exist for outside contractors to perform periodic preventative maintenance (See **Chapter 3: Alternative Delivery Methods** for a detailed list).

#### Exhibit 1-8 Excerpt of Proposed Capital Maintenance Items 2019-20 Proposed Budget



Source: First Public Hearing for the Adoption of Millage and the Approval of the 2019-20 Tentative Budget, July 2019.

Maintenance uses an *Asset Essentials* work order system to manage its workload. Its goal is to address all work order items within five days. In reality, management said it is more like 7-10 days. The majority of work orders are related to "break fix" situations, and priority is given to life safety, etc. Consequently, scheduled preventative Maintenance generally is not a priority.

The US Department of Energy publishes a Best Practices Guide that provides insights regarding the advantages of preventative maintenance (**Exhibit 1-9**).

#### **Exhibit 1-9** Advantages and Disadvantages of Preventative Maintenance

#### Advantages

- Cost effective in many capital-intensive processes.
- Flexibility allows for the adjustment of maintenance periodicity.
- Increased component life cycle.
- Energy savings.
- Reduced equipment or process failure.
- Estimated 12% to 18% cost savings over reactive maintenance program.

#### Disadvantages

- Catastrophic failures still likely to occur.
- Labor intensive.
- Includes performance of unneeded maintenance.
- Potential for incidental damage to components in conducting unneeded maintenance.

As shown above, proactive maintenance of aging equipment and roofs is less costly and less disruptive than reactive maintenance with system fail. Coupled with potential energy savings and the opportunity to upgrade and enhance equipment installed many years ago, the advantage to adopting a plan for the cyclical replacement plan outweighs the disadvantages.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 1-6:**

## Establish a schedule for roofing, HVAC, and other replacement needs, and annually provide the full list to the Board with recommendations for funding options.

## <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> CCSD's process for the handling of deferred maintenance continues to be based on the most pressing needs and funding availability; preventative maintenance continues to be conducted as time and resources are available.

Board members interviewed as part of the Ressel team's follow-up said they received the capital maintenance budget list during the annual budget cycle but had never been provided a full list of deferred maintenance needs. The Maintenance Director said that many of the deferred maintenance needs are contained in the ED FIRST project list and would be addressed as each of the schools are renovated.

Source : <u>https://www.energy.gov/eere/femp/downloads/operations-and-</u> maintenance-best-practices-guide

Staffing levels in the Maintenance Department remain low based on FLDOE standards, which continues to inhibit the staff's ability to perform preventative maintenance. According to the Director of Maintenance, the majority of the 21,500 work orders completed between June 2019 and June 2020 continue to be "break-fix" repairs that generally take precedence over the preventative maintenance.

Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 1-6 still applies.

#### 1.3 <u>SAFETY AND SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS</u>

The economy efficiency and effectiveness of the Police Department is present in this section of the chapter.

#### 1.3.1 <u>Police Department</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: CCSD conducted a well-documented cost-benefit analysis to determine if it was more cost effective and efficient to hire its own police force rather than contracting with various Sheriff's offices for Security Resource Officers (SRO).

New laws made it necessary for the District to increase police presence on campuses. Florida Chapter 1006.12 requires safe-school officers at each public school. This can be either/or a combination of a school resource officer (SRO) through inter-local agreements with law enforcement agencies, and a school safety officer that the district may employ school safety officers. CCSD employs 42 police officers and contracts with two law enforcement offices for five SROs. Problems with old SRO contracts also made the need for a careful look at the contracting process in general.

The Auditor General recommended that:

... "the District should establish procedures to require and ensure that School Resource Officers (SRO) contracts set forth the required SRO service times. In addition, prior to payment, school personnel with direct knowledge of the SRO services should document satisfactory receipt of the services."

Findings and recommendations in the Auditor General Report regarding SROs are no longer relevant since the district made the decision to create its own police force and assign one police officer to each school.

The millage rate increase went to voters in August 2018, and will bring in approximately \$12 million annually. As shown in **Exhibit 1-10**, in January 2019, CCSD took five options to the Board based on the following five scenarios shown in the exhibit:

| Option Description  | Staffing   | Cost<br>Year One | Cost<br>Year Two |
|---|--|------------------|------------------|
| Option A: Police Chief and high level staff oversee SRO contracts   | 3 Central Office; SRO Contracts provide<br>current campus-level coverage | \$4,260,374.66   | \$3,964,653.26   |
| Option B: Police Force provides Officers<br>Supplemented by SROs from 2<br>municipalities only                | 47 Staff including 37 Officers   | \$6,102,705.86   | \$4,214,352.06   |
| Option C: Police Force provides Officers<br>with NO Supplemental SROs   | 58 Staff including 47 Officers   | \$6,979,875.98   | \$4,640,834.78   |
| Option D: Police Force provides Officers<br>Supplemented by SROs including Clay<br>County Officers            | 34 Staff including 27 Officers   | \$6,794,809.80   | \$5,421,650.20   |
| Option E: Police Chief and high level staff<br>oversee SRO contracts<br>Source: CCSD Police Chief, July 2019. | 3 Central Office; SRO Contracts provide<br>enhanced campus coverage      | \$6,029,143.74   | \$5,888,859.54   |

#### Exhibit 1-10 Police Cost Benefit Analysis

Source: CCSD Police Chief, July 2019.

Option A was presented as a base line by which to compare the various options. Based on this analysis, the Board ultimately selected Option B as it was clear that it was more cost effective to continue only two of the inter-local agreements for SROs with the Orange Park Police Department and the Green Cove Springs Police Department, as it was clear that hiring additional staff to cover those schools (Option C) was most costly.

Conducting this analysis and presenting the options to the Board allowed the administration and Board to come to agreement on a cost beneficial manner in which to address safety and security need of the district.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> The CCSD Police Department was formed and became operational in June 2019 with officers in schools in August 2019. The analysis of costs has proven to be accurate and, at this time, operational costs remain on target.

As shown above in **Exhibit 1-10**, the cost estimates for Option B were \$6.1 million in year one and \$4.3 in year two. During the first year of operation, the Police Department expenditures were \$154,000 under budget; in Year 2, \$4.3 million is budgeted with \$3.3 million in salary and benefits.

#### 1.4 <u>TECHNOLOGY IMPLEMENTATION AND UPGRADES</u>

#### 1.4.1 <u>E-Rate Funding</u>

#### September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: In recent years, the Information and Technology Services Department (ITS) staff started applying for and receiving E-rate funding and as a result has substantially increased resources available for technology upgrades.

The E-rate Program is one of four universal service programs funded through the federal Universal Service Fund (USF). The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) appointed the Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC) as the permanent administrator of the USF and the universal service programs, including the E-rate Program.

The Schools and Libraries (E-rate) Program provides discounts to assist eligible schools to obtain affordable internet access and telecommunications services. E-rate funds the following service types: Data Transmission Services and/or Internet Access, Internal Connections, Managed Internal Broadband Services, and Basic Maintenance of Internal Connections.

The E-rate Program supports connectivity, which is the conduit or pipeline for communications using telecommunications services or the internet. The school is responsible for providing resources such as the end-user equipment (computers, telephones, etc.), software, professional development, electrical capacity, and the other elements that are necessary to effectively use the requested eligible services and equipment.

Up until three or four years ago, the CCSD had not applied for maximum E-rate funding. E-rate Category 1 is for services such as high speed data circuits, and Category 2 is for internal connections such as wireless access points, cabling, and firewalls.

Category 1 E-rate funding increased from approximately \$1.5 million to \$2.4 million due to the increased number of devices distributed to the schools requiring high bandwidth to be provided. District devices have increased over 29,000 since 2015.

Category 2 E-rate started in Clay in 2016 but on a per-project application basis. CCSD received Category 2 funding every year but last year as they strategically planned for maximum attention to the upcoming communications infrastructure dark fiber project.

The District is in final review of the dark fiber application process. ITS staff expects final approval for the dark fiber project which will allow for districtwide infrastructure upgrades.

## <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> CCSD continues to apply for and receive E-Rate funding, which during the last year was used to fund the dark fiber project designed to improve the infrastructure between the school sites.

In November 2019, the Superintendent announced that CCSD had received the Dark Fiber Infrastructure Grant Award, and the Information and Technology Services web page contains an announcement that the leased Dark Fiber (WAN) contract was awarded to ENA, a company that specializes in this type of work.

For FY 2020, E-Rate funds will be used to replace and install UPS Battery Backups and update and improve the district's Wireless Infrastructure.

#### 1.5 <u>SERVICE BOND INDEBTEDNESS</u>

In this section, debt and debt service are discussed in terms of debt ratios.

#### 1.5.1 Debt Ratios

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: Based on best practices and the State's Benchmarks for debt, CCSD has the capacity for new debt; establishing benchmarks for acceptable levels of debt, however, could improve decision making and debt management during this anticipated high-growth period.

**Exhibit 1-11** Provides a comprehensive look at CCSD's current debt and debt service obligations.

| Type of Debt                     | Outstanding<br>Amount of<br>Debt | Annual Debt<br>Service<br>Principal | Annual Debt<br>Service<br>Interest | Total Debt<br>Service | *Years<br>Remaining to<br>Pay Off |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| STATE BO                         | ARD OF EDUCA                     | TION CAPITAL O                      | OUTLAY BONDS                       | **                    |                                   |
| Series 2009-A                    | \$0                              | -                                   | -                                  | -                     |                                   |
| Series 2011-A                    | \$229,400                        | \$45,000                            | \$8,200                            | \$53,200              | 4                                 |
| Series 2014-B                    | \$13,260                         | \$13,000                            | \$260                              | \$13,260              | 1                                 |
| Racetrack - Series 2010-A        | \$2,827,269                      | \$120,000                           | \$95,955                           | \$215,955             | 13                                |
| Total SBOE Capital Outlay Bonds  | \$3,069,929                      | \$178,000                           | \$104,415                          | \$282,415             |                                   |
|                                  | CERTIFICATI                      | ES OF PARTICIPA                     | TION                               |                       |                                   |
| COP-REFUND 2012/LAJH & OHS -     |                                  |                                     |                                    |                       |                                   |
| Series 2012                      | \$24,986,238                     | \$885,000                           | \$876,662                          | \$1,761,662           | 9                                 |
| COP-REFUND 2004/2005A 12/18/2014 | \$14,321,126                     | \$540,000                           | \$339,124                          | \$879,124             | 8                                 |
| COP-REFUND 2000/2005B Series     |                                  |                                     |                                    |                       |                                   |
| 2017                             | \$4,290,665                      | \$2,397,000                         | \$70,625                           | \$2,467,625           | 6                                 |
| Total COPS                       | \$43,598,028                     | \$3,822,000                         | \$1,286,411                        | \$5,108,411           |                                   |
|                                  | CAPITAL                          | LEASES PAYABL                       | E                                  |                       |                                   |
| Synovia Bus GPS Lease            | \$273,888                        | \$123,938                           | \$13,006                           | \$136,944             | 2                                 |
| Dell Financial Services Lease    | \$520,535                        | \$497,925                           | \$22,609                           | \$520,535             | 1                                 |
| Dell Financial Services Lease    | \$1,012,752                      | \$458,382                           | \$47,993                           | \$506,376             | 2                                 |
| Total Capital Lease Payables     | \$1,807,174                      | \$1,080,246                         | \$83,609                           | \$1,163,854           |                                   |
| Dues and Fees                    | \$149,300                        |                                     |                                    | \$16,100              |                                   |
| Total Debt                       | \$46,817,257                     | \$4,000,000                         | \$1,390,826                        | \$5,406,926           |                                   |

#### Exhibit 1-11 Current Debt Estimate for End of Fiscal Year 2019

Source: Assistant Superintendent for Business Services, August 2019.

\* Years Remaining to be paid off include the current 2019-20 debt service obligations.

\*\*The State Bonds and the Race Track Bonds are paid with pass thru funds to the district.

To assess the financial position of the District in terms of overall debt and debt service, it is important to look at demographics of the District and its tax base. **Exhibit 1-12** uses the debt and debt service amounts shown in **Exhibit 1-11** to calculate relevant ratios.

#### Exhibit 1-12 Debt and Debt Service Ratios for Clay County Public Schools

| DEMOGRAPHICS   |                  |
|--|------------------|
| Population of Clay County, Florida *   | 209,524          |
| Assessed Property Value in Clay County, Florida *                            | \$15,027,575,127 |
| Assessed Taxable Property Value in Clay County, Florida *                    | \$10,614,446,287 |
| Total Clay County School District Estimated Revenues 2019-20 (All Funds)     | \$369,456,044    |
| Total Clay County School District Estimated Expenditures 2019-20 (All Funds) | \$387,985,310    |
| DEBT RATIOS:   |                  |
| Total Debt as a Percent of Assessed Property Value                           | 0.31%            |
| Total Debt as a Percent of Taxable Property Value                            | 0.44%            |
| Debt per Capita – Clay County, Florida                                       | \$223.45         |
| Total Debt as a Percent of Estimated Revenues (All Funds)                    | 12.67%           |
| Total Debt as a Percent of Estimated Expenditures (All Funds)                | 12.07%           |
| Total Debt Service as a Percent of Estimated Revenues (All Funds)            | 0.04%            |
| Sources: * Population and Property Values Clay County Property Appraiser 201 | 8 Annual Report  |

Sources: \* Population and Property Values, Clay County Property Appraiser 2018 Annual Report; \*\* Estimated Revenues and Expenditures, 2019-20 Tentative Budget Presentation.

While there are no statutory guides relating to debt ratios and capacities for Florida school districts, the State of Florida's Benchmark Debt Ratio for the State as a whole —debt service to revenues available to pay debt —is set at 6 percent. Reports are issued each year to show the type of debt outstanding, the debt service amounts anticipated for the years and how the current ratios compare to the benchmark. CCSD ratio of .04 percent is well under the state's benchmark.

For many districts, an internal benchmark is used to evaluate the financial position and capacity for new debt in the coming year. In reviewing the financial statements of larger growing districts, Miami-Dade, for example, annually prepares a Debt Ratio Report which is presented as part of the unaudited portion of the Annual Financial Reports. As shown, CCSD ratios for *Total Debt as a Percent of Assessed Property Value, Total Debt as a Percent of Taxable Property Value, and Debt per Capita* compare very favorably to those of the Miami-Dade School District (see **Exhibit 1-13**).

If, for example, CCSD set its own debt service benchmark at no more than 1 or 2 percent, the Certificates of Participation anticipated for the purchase of new buses and the debt serviced by the Surtax would be added and an assessment would be made as to whether the new debt could be serviced within the benchmark.

As CCSD moves forward with issuing debt that will be serviced by the Surtax proceeds, adopting benchmarks or goals for an acceptable debt ratio would aid the Board and administration in making decisions about issuing new debt versus maximizing revenues from other funding streams such as Impact Fees.

#### Exhibit 1-13 Miami-Dade Debt Ratios

|   | ENT DEBT RATIOS AND BC<br>MI-DADE COUNTY - COMPU<br>OVERLAPPING DEBT F<br>(amounts expressed i<br>(Unaudite   | TATION OF DIRECT AND<br>FOR LAST YEAR<br>in thousands)     | r  |  |
|---|---|--|----|--|
| Factors:  |   |  |    |  |
| The School Board of Miami-Dad<br>State Board of Education Capi<br>General Obligation Bonds<br>Certificates of Participation<br>Capital Leases Payable |   |  | \$ | 11,477<br>969,024<br>2,595,271<br>44,316 |
| Total Direct Debt   |   |  | \$ | 3,620,088                                |
| Overlapping Debt (1):   |   |  |    |  |
| Miami-Dade County (2)<br>Total Outstanding Debt<br>Estimated Percentage Applicat  | ole (3)   | \$ 15,421,736<br>12.25%                                    |    |  |
| Total Overlapping Debt  |   |  | \$ | 1,889,478                                |
| Total Direct and Overlapping D  | Debt  |  | \$ | 5,509,566                                |
| Population of Miami-Dade Count  | by .  |  |    | 2,769,813                                |
| Assessed Property Value   |   |  | \$ | 345,804,142                              |
| Assessed Taxable Property Valu  | le  |  | \$ | 297,825,035                              |
| DEBT RATIOS:  | PERCENTAGE OF<br>ASSESSED PROPERTY<br>VALUE   | PERCENTAGE OF<br>ASSESSED TAXABLE<br>PROPERY VALUE,<br>NET | Pf | ER CAPITA (4)                            |
| Direct Debt   | 1.05%   | 1.22%  | \$ | 1,307                                    |
| Overlapping Debt  | 0.55%   | 0.63%  | \$ | 682                                      |
| Direct and Overlapping Debt   | 1.59%   | 1.85%  | \$ | 1,989                                    |
| <ul> <li>(2) Most recent data available for</li> <li>(3) Percent of the County's Gen<br/>the Miami-Dade County's CA</li> </ul>                        | e those whose geographic area c<br>or Miami-Dade County is as of Se<br>eral Obligation Bonds to the Cour<br>IFR.<br>er capita. Net bonded debt per ca | ptember 2017.<br>nty's total primary government d          |    |  |
| SOURCE(S): The School Board<br>and Miami-Dade C   | of Miami-Dade County - Office of  | f the Controller   |    |  |

Source: Miami Dade 2018 Comprehensive Audited Financial Statement, Table II.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 1-7:**

Establish an acceptable debt ratio benchmark against which the District can monitor and manage debt in the future.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> CCSD has not yet established benchmarks for acceptable levels of debt; administrators indicated that at such time as additional debt is needed and issued, the need for a benchmark will be evaluated.

As shown above, no new debt has been issued in a number of years and a number of the issues will be paid off in the coming years. As the District considers the need to issue bonds to finance the highest priority ED FIRST projects, the administration indicated that establishing a benchmark for the level of acceptable debt may be reconsidered.

Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 1-7 still applies.

### CHAPTER 2: PROGRAM DESIGN AND STRUCTURE

### 2.0 PROGRAM DESIGN AND STRUCTURE

**Chapter 2** presents findings related to program design and structure. As part of the audit, Ressel & Associates examined the organization and management structure of the District as a whole and the component units within the organization that are now or will be responsible for the program areas identified in the Surtax Resolution. The examination included contracted and other external services that are now or will be used in the implementation of the projects outlined in the Resolution. In addition, the Ressel Team assessed the procurement and contracting function to determine its capacity for handling the volume and complexity of work anticipated in the Resolution.

The specific audit evaluation tasks performed are provided below.

- 1. Reviewed program organizational structure to ensure the program has clearly defined units, minimizes overlapping functions and excessive administrative layers, and has lines of authority that minimize administrative costs.
- 2. Assessed the reasonableness of current program staffing levels given the nature of the services provided and program workload.

**Finding on program design and structure:** In its September 4, 2019 evaluation, Ressel & Associates found that the current design and structure of the program areas under review are effective and overall CCSD has adequate staffing. However, staffing levels need careful review and possible reallocation as, over the past five years, staffing at the Administrative and Professional levels have grown, whereas staffing in the Maintenance and Facility Planning and Construction support areas are low and have remained static over the same five-year period. These support areas require more staff to meet current needs and will need additional staff and expertise to manage the envisioned Surtax-related projects.

In its August 28, 2020 follow-up audit, Ressel & Associates concluded that its previous findings remain essentially unchanged with the exception of the following: reorganization of the leadership team has resulted in some positions being eliminated or downgraded; a limited number of new positions have been created to address the identified needs in the support areas as identified in the original audit and to address the needs brought about due to COVID-19. The support areas continue to require staff to meet current needs and will need additional staff and expertise to manage the envisioned Surtax-related projects.

In this chapter, program design and structure in the Clay County School District is presented in the following functional areas:

- 2.1 Districtwide Support for Areas Under Review
- 2.2 Facilities Planning, Use, and Construction
- 2.3 Safety and Security Improvements
- 2.4 Technology Implementation and Upgrades
- 2.5 Service Bond Indebtedness
### 2.1 DISTRICTWIDE SUPPORT FOR AREAS UNDER REVIEW

This section addresses CCSD's districtwide program design and structure in the following subsections:

- 2.1.1 Districtwide Staffing Allocations
- 2.1.2 Legal Services and Expenditures

### September 4, 2019

The School Superintendent in the Clay County School District is an elected position. During fieldwork conducted for Ressel & Associates' September 4, 2019 evaluation, the Clay County School District Superintendent was Addison Davis, who had been Superintendent since the November 2016 election. The Superintendent was Chief of Schools in the Duval County School District when he was elected. Superintendent Davis took a position as the superintendent of Hillsborough County Public Schools in March 2020. A number of the members of his former leadership team also left the district, and there has been internal movement to fill those vacancies on an interim or permanent basis.

The districtwide organizational chart for the central office as of September 2019 is shown in **Exhibit 2-1**. **Exhibit 2-2** presents the 2020-21 organization structure.

The responsibilities of each Division are articulated in School Board Policy 1.04:

The Clay County District Schools ("District") Offices shall be organized into five (5) divisions, each to be headed by an administrator recommended by the Superintendent, and appointed by the School Board. The five (5) divisions are:

- 1. Business Affairs, Curriculum and Instruction, Operations, Human Resources, and Climate and Culture. The division heads shall be directly responsible to the Superintendent. The Division of Business Affairs shall be responsible for the management of the business affairs of the District. The services of this division shall include financial services, purchasing services, insurance, and property control services.
- 2. The Division of Curriculum and Instruction shall be responsible for directing and coordinating all of the instructional programs of the District, and for services which directly support the instructional programs. Curriculum and Instruction ensures that the organization focuses on the delivery of a relevant, responsive, and effective curriculum based on state standards. Curriculum and Instruction will be responsible for training all certified staff members on curriculum and standards.



Exhibit 2-1 2019-20 Central Office Organization Clay County School District

Source: Clay County School District, Superintendent's Office, July 2019.

- 3. The Division of Operations shall be responsible for providing school facility planning and construction, maintenance services, custodial services, student transportation services, food and nutrition services, and safety management for the District.
- 4. The Division of Human Resources shall be responsible for providing personnel services to the instructional, support, administrative, and supervisory personnel of the District. The services of this division include recruitment, employment, salary, and labor relations. The Division of Human Resources is responsible for managing people within the organization and recruiting and retaining diverse, high quality personnel.
- 5. The Division of Climate and Culture shall be responsible for student services, including mental health, exceptional student education, and student discipline. This division shall also be responsible for information technology and managing all data. The services of this division shall include reviewing, compiling, and intersecting district-based student behavior and performance data.

Each division shall be organized into departments directed by personnel who are directly responsible to the administrative head of the division.

Senior staff meets once a week as a Cabinet and the Superintendent also meets individually with each Assistant Superintendent on a weekly basis.

#### August 28, 2020 UPDATE:

As stated above, Addison Davis became Superintendent of Hillsborough County Public Schools in February 2020.

On February 24, 2020, Governor DeSantis appointed David Broskie, a 30-year veteran administrator with CCSD, as Superintendent of the Clay County School District effective March 2, 2020, until an August 2020 election occurs to select the next Superintendent. The current organizational chart created by Mr. Broskie is shown in Exhibit 2-2.





Source: Clay County School District, Superintendent's Office, July 2020.

\*Works with both School Board and Superintendent.

### 2.1.1 <u>Districtwide Staffing Allocation</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: Florida Department of Education reports indicate that CCSD is adequately staffed overall, with the total number of full-time staff increasing by only 5.0 percent over the last five years as compared to a student growth rate of 6.8 percent. However, increases in the number of Administrator and Professional staff positions have outpaced enrollment, while most positions in the support areas have remained unchanged or declined.

Annually, Florida school districts self-report the number of full-time staff in each category to the Florida Department of Education (DOE). The categories are defined by DOE, however, school districts have some discretion when assigning staff to the categories, therefore, the data are generally useful in making broad comparisons.

**Exhibit 2-3** provides full-time staffing levels as reported to DOE in the fall of 2018 by CCSD and its peers. While the number of staff by category is presented, the ratio of students to staff by category, calculated by Ressel & Associates, allows for a more relevant comparison.

### Exhibit 2-3 Number of Full-Time Staff Clay County School District and Peer School Districts 2018-19 School Year

| District/ Category                                   | Clay<br>County<br>School<br>District | Alachua<br>County<br>School<br>District | Lake<br>County<br>School<br>District | Marion<br>County<br>School<br>District | St. Johns<br>County<br>School<br>District | Santa<br>Rosa<br>County<br>School<br>District |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Student Count  | 38,264                               | 29,845                                  | 43,947                               | 42,941                                 | 41,908                                    | 28,479  |
| Administrators                                       |                                      |   |                                      |  |   |   |
| Officials, Administrators and Managers-Instructional | 18                                   | 18                                      | 17                                   | 33                                     | 29  | 12  |
| Officials, Administrators and Managers-Non           |                                      |   |                                      |  |   |   |
| instructional  | 40                                   | 23                                      | 18                                   | 20                                     | 28  | 5   |
| Officials, Administrators, Managers - Total          | 58                                   | 41                                      | 35                                   | 53                                     | 57  | 17  |
| Consultants/ Supervisors of Instruction              | 10                                   | 7                                       | 8                                    | 14                                     | 6   | 14  |
| Principals   | 45                                   | 41                                      | 46                                   | 56                                     | 40  | 35  |
| Assistant Principals                                 | 71                                   | 53                                      | 94                                   | 94                                     | 63  | 41  |
| Community Education Coordinators                     | 7                                    | 1                                       | 2                                    | 3                                      | 8   |   |
| Total Administrators                                 | 191                                  | 143                                     | 185                                  | 220                                    | 174                                       | 107   |
| Student to Administrator Ratio                       | 200.3                                | 208.7                                   | 237.6                                | 195.2                                  | 240.9                                     | 266.2   |
| Teachers   |                                      |   |                                      |  |   |   |
| Elementary Teachers (PK-6)                           | 1,104                                | 740                                     | 1,172                                | 1,140                                  | 988                                       | 889   |
| Secondary Teachers (7-12)                            | 916                                  | 440                                     | 1,011                                | 992                                    | 969                                       | 702   |
| Exceptional Student Education Teachers               | 484                                  | 226                                     | 389                                  | 410                                    | 388                                       | 441   |
| Other Teachers                                       | 55                                   | 7                                       | 68                                   | 35                                     | 74  | 82  |
| Total Teachers                                       | 2,559                                | 1,413                                   | 2,640                                | 2,577                                  | 2,419                                     | 2,114   |
| Student to Teacher Ratio                             | 15.0                                 | 21.1                                    | 16.6                                 | 16.7                                   | 17.3                                      | 13.5  |
| Professional Staff                                   |                                      |   |                                      |  |   |   |
| Guidance Counselors                                  | 98                                   | 56                                      | 97                                   | 98                                     | 97  | 65  |
| Social Workers                                       | 13                                   |   | 15                                   | 16                                     | 11  | 6   |
| School Psychologists                                 | 19                                   | 2                                       | 15                                   | 18                                     | 18  | 12  |
| Librarians /Audio-Visual Workers                     | 43                                   | 43                                      | 38                                   | 47                                     | 36  | 32  |
| Other Professional Staff - Non-Administrative        |                                      |   |                                      |  |   |   |
| Instructional  | 160                                  | 114                                     | 279                                  | 289                                    | 237                                       | 120   |
| Non-Instructional                                    | 193                                  | 139                                     | 188                                  | 173                                    | 149                                       | 69  |

### Exhibit 2-3 (Continued) Number of Full-Time Staff Clay County School District and Peer School Districts 2018-19 School Year

| District/ Category                     | Clay<br>County<br>School<br>District | Alachua<br>County<br>School<br>District | Lake<br>County<br>School<br>District | Marion<br>County<br>School<br>District | St. Johns<br>County<br>School<br>District | Santa<br>Rosa<br>County<br>School<br>District |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Total Professional Staff               | 526                                  | 354                                     | 632                                  | 641                                    | 548                                       | 304   |
| Student to Professional Ratio          | 72.7                                 | 84.3                                    | 69.5                                 | 67.0                                   | 76.5                                      | 93.7  |
| Support Staff                          |                                      |   |                                      |  |   |   |
| SROs                                   | 29                                   | 2                                       | 4                                    |  |   | 2   |
| Paraprofessionals                      | 588                                  | 52                                      | 39                                   | 961                                    | 360                                       | 684   |
| Technicians                            | 45                                   | 46                                      | 54                                   | 60                                     | 49  | 52  |
| Administrative Support Workers         | 306                                  | 213                                     | 401                                  | 505                                    | 282                                       | 189   |
| Service Workers                        | 747                                  | 317                                     | 429                                  | 1,002                                  | 728                                       | 49  |
| Skilled Crafts Workers                 | 57                                   | 70                                      | 77                                   | 110                                    | 47  | 36  |
| Laborers, Unskilled                    | 6                                    | 15                                      | 31                                   | 24                                     | 20  | 1   |
| Total Support Staff                    | 1,778                                | 715                                     | 1,035                                | 2,662                                  | 1,486                                     | 1,013   |
| Student to Support Staff Ratio         | 21.5                                 | 41.7                                    | 42.5                                 | 16.1                                   | 28.2                                      | 28.1  |
| Total Full-Time Staff                  | 5,054                                | 2,625                                   | 4,492                                | 6,100                                  | 4,627                                     | 3,538   |
| Student to Total Full-Time Staff Ratio | 7.6                                  | 11.4                                    | 9.8                                  | 7.0                                    | 9.1                                       | 8.0   |

Source: Florida Department of Education, 2019; Student to Staff Ratios calculated by Ressel & Associates.

#### Exhibit 2-4 Full-Time Staffing by Category Clay County School District 2014-15 to 2018-19 School Years

| Clay County School District                              | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 5-Year<br>Change | %<br>Change |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------|-------------|
| Number of Students                                       | 35,835  | 36,638  | 37,052  | 37,521  | 38,264  | 2,429            | 6.8%        |
| Number of Schools Graded "A"                             | 18      | 7       | 12      | 18      | 26      | 8                | 44.4%       |
| Administrators   |         |         |         |         |         |                  |             |
| Officials, Administrators and Managers-Instructional     | 11      | 11      | 13      | 14      | 18      | 7                | 63.6%       |
| Officials, Administrators and Managers-Non instructional | 36      | 39      | 39      | 43      | 40      | 4                | 11.1%       |
| Officials, Administrators, Managers - Total              | 47      | 50      | 52      | 57      | 58      | 11               | 23.4%       |
| Consultants/ Supervisors of Instruction                  | 6       | 7       | 7       | 10      | 10      | 4                | 66.7%       |
| Principals   | 42      | 42      | 43      | 45      | 45      | 3                | 7.1%        |
| Assistant Principals                                     | 65      | 63      | 69      | 72      | 71      | 6                | 9.2%        |
| Community Education Coordinators                         |         |         | 2       | 8       | 7       | 7                | 100.0%      |
| Total Administrators                                     | 160     | 162     | 173     | 192     | 191     | 31               | 19.4%       |
| Student to Administrator Ratio                           | 224.0   | 226.2   | 214.2   | 195.4   | 200.3   | (23.6)           | -10.6%      |
| Teachers   |         |         |         |         |         |                  |             |
| Elementary Teachers<br>(PK-6)                            | 1,066   | 1,044   | 1,059   | 1,073   | 1,104   | 38               | 3.6%        |
| Secondary Teachers (7-12)                                | 903     | 889     | 911     | 938     | 916     | 13               | 1.4%        |
| Exceptional Student Education Teachers                   | 501     | 505     | 500     | 490     | 484     | (17)             | -3.4%       |
| Other Teachers   | 1       | 4       | 13      | 29      | 55      | 54               | 5400.0<br>% |
| Total Teachers   | 2,471   | 2,442   | 2,483   | 2,530   | 2,559   | 88               | 3.6%        |
| Student to Teacher Ratio                                 | 14.5    | 15.0    | 14.9    | 14.8    | 15.0    | 0.5              | 3.1%        |

### Exhibit 2-4 (Continued) Full-Time Staffing by Category Clay County School District 2014-15 to 2018-19 School Years

| Clay County School District                   | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 5-Year<br>Change | %<br>Change |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------|-------------|
| Professional Staff                            |         |         |         |         |         |                  |             |
| Guidance Counselors                           | 93      | 94      | 93      | 92      | 98      | 5                | 5.4%        |
| Social Workers                                | 11      | 12      | 11      | 11      | 13      | 2                | 18.2%       |
| School Psychologists                          | 20      | 20      | 20      | 14      | 19      | (1)              | -5.0%       |
| Librarians /Audio-Visual Workers              | 39      | 36      | 36      | 39      | 43      | 4                | 10.3%       |
| Other Professional Staff - Non-Administrative |         |         |         |         |         |                  |             |
| Instructional                                 | 141     | 154     | 170     | 166     | 160     | 19               | 13.5%       |
| Non-Instructional                             | 120     | 109     | 144     | 148     | 193     | 73               | 60.8%       |
| Total Professional Staff                      | 424     | 425     | 474     | 470     | 526     | 102              | 24.1%       |
| Student to Professional Staff Ratio           | 84.5    | 86.2    | 78.2    | 79.8    | 72.7    | (12)             | -13.9%      |
| Support Staff                                 |         |         |         |         |         |                  |             |
| SROs  |         |         |         |         | 29      | 29               | 100.0%      |
| Paraprofessionals                             | 582     | 578     | 595     | 626     | 588     | 6                | 1.0%        |
| Technicians                                   | 52      | 48      | 48      | 42      | 45      | (7)              | -13.5%      |
| Administrative Support Workers                | 298     | 288     | 301     | 306     | 306     | 8                | 2.7%        |
| Service Workers                               | 760     | 753     | 743     | 721     | 747     | (13)             | -1.7%       |
| Skilled Crafts Workers                        | 58      | 59      | 56      | 56      | 57      | (1)              | -1.7%       |
| Laborers, Unskilled                           | 7       | 5       | 5       | 5       | 6       | (1)              | -14.3%      |
| Total Support Staff                           | 1,757   | 1,731   | 1,748   | 1,756   | 1,778   | 21               | 1.2%        |
| Student to Support Staff Ratio                | 20.4    | 21.2    | 21.2    | 21.4    | 21.5    | 1.1              | 5.5%        |
| Total Full-Time Staff                         | 4,812   | 4,760   | 4,878   | 4,948   | 5,054   | 242              | 5.0%        |
| Student to Total Full-Time Staff Ratio        | 7.4     | 7.7     | 7.6     | 7.6     | 7.6     | 0.1              | 1.7%        |

Source: Florida Department of Education, 2019; Student to Staff Ratios and Change Number and Percentages Calculated by Ressel & Associates.

As shown, over the last five years the total number of full-time staff has increased by 5.0 percent as compared to an increase in student enrollment of 6.8 percent. The Administrator category has, however, increased by 19.4 percent and the Professional category has increased by 24.1 percent in comparison to a student growth rate of 6.8 percent over the same time period. The Superintendent indicated that he restructured the administrative organization to provide additional oversight of the schools. **Exhibit 2-4** shows the number of CCSD schools receiving a Grade of "A" rose from seven in 2015-16 to 26 in 2018-19, which loosely corresponds to the increase in the number of Administrators and Professionals.

Sustaining this growing number of Administrators and Professionals may present challenges in the future as many of the positions found in the Support staff category, which includes the positions that are traditionally found in the maintenance and custodial areas, have decreased. This trend is problematic since CCSD has added a new school and is experiencing growing needs relating to aging facilities. This issue is discussed in greater detail in subsection **2.2.1 Maintenance Staffing Levels** below. Overall the Support category shows an increase of 1.2 percent, all of which is attributable to the addition of School Resource Officers (SROs) that were not reported to DOE until 2017-18.

One possible strategy for controlling salary costs, which cannot be paid from the Surtax proceeds, is reallocating some administrator positions to fully staff the operational functions to handle the current maintenance and support functions as well as the influx of new projects and the growing number of school facilities envisioned by the Surtax resolution.

The Superintendent pointed out that some of the administrative positions were added to address State requirements and were being paid for through grant funds. With that in mind, the DOE numbers point to the need for a realignment of staffing to ensure that scarce resources are used to adequately staff both the instructional and operational areas of the District. Further analysis of staffing levels and trends will be needed in order to confirm the best way to achieve overall staffing effectiveness and efficiency.

### RECOMMENDATION

### **Recommendation 2-1:**

Analyze the number of administrators, instructional and operational staff versus the statutory and operational needs to determine where reductions can be made that will allow for adequate staffing in critical areas of need.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> The new Superintendent has eliminated some administrative and professional staff positions, however, the increase in the number of administrator and professional staff positions that the District reports to the FLDOE continues to outpace the increase in student enrollment.

The new Superintendent has made a concerted effort to reorganize and streamline the administration since March 2020. The administrative positions which were changed by the current Superintendent include the following:

- the position of Coordinator of Strategic and Community Partnership was deleted;
- the position of Assistant Superintendent of Instruction was changed to Chief Academic Officer (CAO) with a Chief of Elementary Education reporting to the CAO:
- the position of Assistant Superintendent of Climate and Culture was changed to a Director reporting to the CAO;
- the IT Director now reports directly to the Superintendent and technically the Director of Assessment and Accountability, who used to report to the Assistant Superintendent of Climate and Culture, does as well; and
- the position of Director of Safety and Security was changed to Supervisor reporting to the Police Chief.

Based on the data that the District reported to the Florida Department of Education, through 2019-20, the total number of full-time staff overall increased by 7.4 percent over the past six years as compared to student growth rate of 8.0 percent. However, as shown, increases in the number of administrators and professional positions continue to outpace enrollment. The new Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources said the District is establishing a plan of action to review all administrative titles, using FLDOE guidelines, to better align with neighboring districts. The District will use the findings to reallocate job titles and revise job descriptions.

While not envisioned at the time that the original report was issued, COVID-19 has required the District to reallocate staff to meet the critical needs. For example, additional custodians are needed to sanitize schools. The Board approved seven additional custodial positions to act as floaters, entered into a contract for custodial services at the central office level and reassigned those staff to the schools, and entered into a contract for grounds maintenance to free the custodians previously assigned to perform grounds maintenance to the schools.

Staffing shortages and vacancies remain in the Maintenance Department and are discussed later in this chapter.

### Exhibit 2-5 (Updated) Number of Full-Time Staff Clay County School District and Peer School Districts 2019-20 School Year

| District/Category   | Clay County<br>School District | Alachua<br>County School<br>District | Lake County<br>School District | Marion County<br>School District | St. Johns<br>County School<br>District | Santa Rosa<br>County School<br>District |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
| Student Count   | 38,691                         | 29,761                               | 44,798                         | 43,273                           | 40,631                                 | 29,054                                  |
| Administrators  |                                |                                      |                                |                                  |  |   |
| Officials, Administrators and<br>Managers-Instructional     | 16                             | 16                                   | 18                             | 30                               | 30                                     | 12                                      |
| Officials, Administrators and<br>Managers-Non-Instructional | 48                             | 25                                   | 19                             | 26                               | 29                                     | 6                                       |
| Officials, Administrators,<br>Managers - Total              | 64                             | 41                                   | 37                             | 56                               | 59                                     | 18                                      |
| Consultants/Supervisors of<br>Instruction                   | 13                             | 9                                    | 7                              | 16                               | 7                                      | 11                                      |
| Principals  | 44                             | 51                                   | 47                             | 58                               | 42                                     | 34                                      |
| Assistant Principals  | 72                             | 59                                   | 95                             | 91                               | 70                                     | 40                                      |
| Community Education Coordinators                            | 6                              | 4                                    | 4                              | 1                                | 7                                      | 0                                       |
| Total Administrators  | 199                            | 164                                  | 190                            | 222                              | 185                                    | 103                                     |
| Students to Administrator Ratio                             | 194.4                          | 181.5                                | 235.8                          | 194.9                            | 219.6                                  | 282.1                                   |
| Teachers  |                                |                                      |                                |                                  |  |   |
| Elementary Teachers (PK-6)                                  | 1,135                          | 793                                  | 1,210                          | 1,165                            | 1,034                                  | 811                                     |
| Secondary Teachers (7-12)                                   | 942                            | 487                                  | 1,045                          | 1,016                            | 1,012                                  | 652                                     |
| Exceptional Student Education<br>Teachers                   | 501                            | 236                                  | 471                            | 371                              | 453                                    | 429                                     |
| Other Teachers  | 69                             | 51                                   | 81                             | 40                               | 74                                     | 71                                      |
| Total Teachers  | 2,647                          | 1,567                                | 2,807                          | 2,592                            | 2,573                                  | 1,963                                   |
| Student to Teacher Ratio                                    | 14.6                           | 19.0                                 | 16.0                           | 16.7                             | 15.8                                   | 14.8                                    |
| Professional Staff  |                                |                                      |                                |                                  |  |   |
| Guidance Counselors   | 103                            | 56                                   | 95                             | 98                               | 99                                     | 66                                      |
| Social Workers  | 18                             | 8                                    | 23                             | 18                               | 13                                     | 7                                       |
| School Psychologists  | 20                             | 0                                    | 17                             | 24                               | 17                                     | 10                                      |
| Librarians/Audio-Visual Workers                             | 41                             | 43                                   | 39                             | 48                               | 37                                     | 30                                      |
| Other Professional Staff - Non-<br>Administrative           |                                |                                      |                                |                                  |  |   |
| Instructional   | 174                            | 120                                  | 273                            | 219                              | 250                                    | 109                                     |
| Non-Instructional   | 209                            | 150                                  | 240                            | 259                              | 160                                    | 71                                      |
| Total Professional Staff                                    | 565                            | 377                                  | 687                            | 666                              | 576                                    | 293                                     |
| Student to Professional Staff Ratio                         | 68.5                           | 78.9                                 | 65.2                           | 65.0                             | 70.5                                   | 99.2                                    |

### Exhibit 2-5 (Continued) (Updated) Number of Full-Time Staff Clay County School District and Peer School Districts 2019-20 School Year

| District/Category                | Clay County<br>School District | Alachua<br>County School<br>District | Lake County<br>School District | Marion County<br>School District | St. Johns<br>County School<br>District | Santa Rosa<br>County School<br>District |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
| Support Staff                    |                                |                                      |                                |                                  |  |   |
| SROs                             | 0                              | 0                                    | 0                              | 0                                | 0                                      | 0                                       |
| Paraprofessionals                | 593                            | 72                                   | 51                             | 960                              | 393                                    | 637                                     |
| Technicians                      | 50                             | 54                                   | 62                             | 54                               | 51                                     | 44                                      |
| Administrative Support Workers   | 314                            | 227                                  | 409                            | 509                              | 284                                    | 187                                     |
| Service Workers                  | 743                            | 326                                  | 437                            | 1,019                            | 774                                    | 41                                      |
| Skilled Craft Workers            | 52                             | 66                                   | 58                             | 113                              | 47                                     | 35                                      |
| Laborers, Unskilled              | 4                              | 29                                   | 39                             | 23                               | 19                                     | 1                                       |
| Total Support Staff              | 1,756                          | 774                                  | 1,056                          | 2,678                            | 1,568                                  | 945                                     |
| Student to Support Staff Ratio   | 22.0                           | 38.5                                 | 42.4                           | 16.2                             | 25.9                                   | 30.7                                    |
| Total Full-Time Staff            | 5,167                          | 2,882                                | 4,740                          | 6,158                            | 4,902                                  | 3,304                                   |
| Student to Full-Time Staff Ratio | 7.5                            | 10.3                                 | 9.5                            | 7.0                              | 8.3                                    | 8.8                                     |

Source: Florida Department of Education, July 2020,

### Exhibit 2-6 (Updated) Full-Time Staffing by Category Clay County School District 2014-15 to 2019-20 School Years

| Clay County School District                                  | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 6-Year<br>Change | %<br>Change |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------|-------------|
| Number of Students   | 35,835  | 36,638  | 37,052  | 37,521  | 38,264  | 38,691  | 2,856            | 8.0%        |
| Administrators   |         |         |         |         |         |         |                  |             |
| Officials, Administrators and Managers-<br>Instructional     | 11      | 11      | 13      | 14      | 18      | 16      | 5                | 45.5%       |
| Officials, Administrators and Managers-<br>Non-instructional | 36      | 39      | 39      | 43      | 40      | 48      | 12               | 33.3%       |
| Officials, Administrators, Managers -<br>Total               | 47      | 50      | 52      | 57      | 58      | 64      | 17               | 36.2%       |
| Consultants/ Supervisors of Instruction                      | 6       | 7       | 7       | 10      | 10      | 13      | 7                | 116.7%      |
| Principals   | 42      | 42      | 43      | 45      | 45      | 44      | 2                | 4.8%        |
| Assistant Principals   | 65      | 63      | 69      | 72      | 71      | 72      | 7                | 10.8%       |
| Community Education Coordinators                             |         |         | 2       | 8       | 7       | 6       | 6                |             |
| Total Administrators   | 160     | 162     | 173     | 192     | 191     | 199     | 39               | 24.4%       |
| Student to Administrator Ratio                               | 224.0   | 226.2   | 214.2   | 195.4   | 200.3   | 194.4   | -29.5            | -13.2%      |
| Teachers   |         |         |         |         |         |         |                  |             |
| Elementary Teachers (PK-6)                                   | 1,066   | 1,044   | 1,059   | 1,073   | 1,104   | 1,135   | 69               | 6.5%        |
| Secondary Teachers (7-12)                                    | 903     | 889     | 911     | 938     | 916     | 942     | 39               | 4.3%        |
| Exceptional Student Education Teachers                       | 501     | 505     | 500     | 490     | 484     | 501     | 0                | 0.0%        |
| Other Teachers   | 1       | 4       | 13      | 29      | 55      | 69      | 68               | 6800.0%     |
| Total Teachers   | 2,471   | 2,442   | 2,483   | 2,530   | 2,559   | 2,647   | 176              | 7.1%        |
| Student to Teacher Ratio                                     | 14.5    | 15.0    | 14.9    | 14.8    | 15.0    | 14.6    | 0.1              | 0.8%        |

### Exhibit 2-6 (Continued) (Updated) Full-Time Staffing by Category Clay County School District 2014-15 to 2019-20 School Years

| Clay County School District                       | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 6-Year<br>Change | %<br>Change |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------|-------------|
| Professional Staff                                |         |         |         |         |         |         |                  |             |
| Guidance Counselors                               | 93      | 94      | 93      | 92      | 98      | 103     | 10               | 10.8%       |
| Social Workers                                    | 11      | 12      | 11      | 11      | 13      | 18      | 7                | 63.6%       |
| School Psychologists                              | 20      | 20      | 20      | 14      | 19      | 20      | 0                | 0.0%        |
| Librarians /Audio-Visual Workers                  | 39      | 36      | 36      | 39      | 43      | 41      | 2                | 5.1%        |
| Other Professional Staff - Non-<br>Administrative |         |         |         |         |         |         |                  |             |
| Instructional                                     | 141     | 154     | 170     | 166     | 160     | 174     | 33               | 23.4%       |
| Non-Instructional                                 | 120     | 109     | 144     | 148     | 193     | 209     | 89               | 74.2%       |
| Total Professional Staff                          | 424     | 425     | 474     | 470     | 526     | 565     | 141              | 33.3%       |
| Student to Professional Staff Ratio               | 84.5    | 86.2    | 78.2    | 79.8    | 72.7    | 68.5    | -16.0            | -19.0%      |
| Support Staff                                     |         |         |         |         |         |         |                  |             |
| SROs  |         |         |         |         | 29      |         |                  |             |
| Paraprofessionals                                 | 582     | 578     | 595     | 626     | 588     | 593     | 11               | 1.9%        |
| Technicians                                       | 52      | 48      | 48      | 42      | 45      | 50      | -2               | -3.8%       |
| Administrative Support Workers                    | 298     | 288     | 301     | 306     | 306     | 314     | 16               | 5.4%        |
| Service Workers                                   | 760     | 753     | 743     | 721     | 747     | 743     | -17              | -2.2%       |
| Skilled Crafts Workers                            | 58      | 59      | 56      | 56      | 57      | 52      | -6               | -10.3%      |
| Laborers, Unskilled                               | 7       | 5       | 5       | 5       | 6       | 4       | -3               | -42.9%      |
| Total Support Staff                               | 1,757   | 1,731   | 1,748   | 1,756   | 1,778   | 1,756   | -1               | -0.1%       |
| Student to Support Staff Ratio                    | 20.4    | 21.2    | 21.2    | 21.4    | 21.5    | 22.0    | 1.6              | 8.0%        |
| Total Full-Time Staff                             | 4,812   | 4,760   | 4,878   | 4,948   | 5,054   | 5,167   | 355              | 7.4%        |
| Student to Total Full-Time Staff Ratio            | 7.4     | 7.7     | 7.6     | 7.6     | 7.6     | 7.5     | 0.0              | 0.6%        |

Source: Florida Department of Education, July 2020,

### Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 2-1 still applies.

### 2.1.2 Legal Services and Expenditures

## September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The Board continues to incur significant legal expenses, including Surtax referendum costs, even though they have a full-time school board attorney.

School boards are required by law to have legal representation. Most large school districts have a full-time board attorney on staff. These larger districts often outsource certain special legal services, such as risk management, workers' compensation, and special education legal issues. Smaller districts tend to outsource their school board attorney on a contractual or hourly basis.

Clay County School Board Policy 1.02 D states:

The School Board shall obtain an attorney, from outside its own membership, who shall act as legal advisor to the School Board and the Superintendent. The School Board shall provide a

written contract for its attorney. Special counsel may be retained to assist the Board Attorney in any litigation or other matters when specifically approved by the School Board.

(Ref. F.S. §§ 1001.41, 1001.43(10), 1012.22, 1012.23, 1012.26) [Amended 06/07/18]

For six of the past eight years, the Clay County School Board has used a full-time, in-house attorney. Despite in-house legal counsel, outsourced legal expenditures are significantly high, as shown in **Exhibit 2-7**.

### Exhibit 2-7 Legal Expenditures by Year Clay County School District 2011-12 Through 2018-19 School Years

|                                  | 2011-12   | 2012-13   | 2013-14   | 2014-15   | 2015-16   | 2016-17   | 2017-18   | 2018-19   |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| School Board<br>Attorney & Staff | \$149,350 | \$149,350 | \$149,350 | \$149,350 | \$72,000* | \$48,000* | \$159,512 | \$175,554 |
| Outsourced<br>Expenditures       | \$224,642 | \$166,235 | \$58,759  | \$158,020 | \$138,887 | \$162,006 | \$109,271 | \$144,089 |
| Subtotal                         | \$373,992 | \$315,585 | \$208,109 | \$307,370 | \$210,887 | \$210,006 | \$268,783 | \$319,643 |
| Benefits for Attorney<br>& Staff | \$43,386  | \$43,386  | \$43,386  | \$43,386  | *         | *         | \$37,378  | \$36,917  |
| Total                            | \$417,378 | \$358,972 | \$251,495 | \$350,756 | \$210,887 | \$210,006 | \$306,161 | \$356,560 |

Source: CCSD Finance Office, August 2019.

\*School board attorney outsourced

In its 1998 Performance Audit of the Clay County School District, MGT praised the District for very low legal expenditures. In FY1996 legal costs were \$79,564 and in FY1997 they were \$67,746.

Currently, all human resources litigation, special education services, workers' compensation, tort claims and bus accidents are examples of services being outsourced—no matter if the legal counsel was an employee or not.

Recently, in July 2019, the School Board contracted with another firm to provide legal advice regarding placement of a one-half cent surcharge referendum on the ballot. The fee for these services is \$350.00 per hour. In other Florida school districts (e.g., Lee and Martin) such Surtax services were provided by the Board attorney.

The Clay County School District has no guidelines for use of legal services through administrative procedures or other means. Also, there was no evidence that the Administration and Board is monitoring external legal expenditures to show they are contained and controlled.

Without an effective monitoring system for legal services, expenditures tend to escalate.

### RECOMMENDATION

### **Recommendation 2-2:**

Create guidelines for legal services, assign an administrator to monitor legal expenditures, and conduct a thorough analysis of in-house and outsourced legal expenditures to determine:

- how legal expenditures can be reduced; and
- whether the District should contract all legal expenditures and not have a full-time attorney.

### <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> Legal expenses continue to rise, and there are no written procedures in place to ensure that legal expenses are controlled to the extent possible.

Board members and the Board Attorney said that a review of both in-house and outsourced legal expenditures and the creation of guidelines have yet to be accomplished. The administration said they intend to document in writing the current practice of bringing all legal issues to the school board attorney for review. Once reviewed, the board attorney will determine if the issue will be handled in-house or will recommend outsourcing to outside counsel when it is in the best interest of the District.

No additional Surtax referendum legal costs have occurred since Summer 2019; however, when the Surtax passes, all agreed that additional legal services may be needed and Ressel and Associates believes that these services should be handled by the in-house attorney.

### Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 2-2 still applies.

### 2.2 FACILITIES PLANNING, USE, AND CONSTRUCTION

Section 2.2 examines the Maintenance and Facilities functions as follows:

- 2.2.1 Maintenance Staffing Levels
- 2.2.2 Maintenance Job Descriptions
- 2.2.3 Maintenance Salary Levels
- 2.2.4 School Tours
- 2.2.5 Facility Planning and Construction Staffing Levels

### 2.2.1 <u>Maintenance Staffing Levels</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: Even with contracted services, CCSD Maintenance Department staffing levels are low based on Florida Department of Education standards.

**Exhibit 2-8**, which has been updated to reflect the organization structure at the beginning of the 2020-2021 School Year, the Maintenance Department reports to the Assistant Superintendent of Operations.





Source: Clay County School District, July 2020.

In July 2019, the CCSD Maintenance Department had a total of 79 employees, supporting 42 schools and several ancillary buildings. In July 2020, there are 83 employees, including 4 new positions dedicated to the maintenance of the school kitchens.

With nearly 40 percent of all classrooms in the district housed in aging portables, the maintenance workload increases, accordingly. Roofing, carpet, blinds, awnings, siding, painting, technology, air conditioning (BARD) systems, and electrical replacement are more frequent for portable classrooms.

Exhibit 2-9 provides the Florida Department of Education Maintenance Staffing Guidelines.

Exhibit 2-9



Source: FLDOE, Florida Center for Community Design +Research, Chapter 6.0.

According to the District's 2018-19 Maintenance staffing analysis and the Florida Inventory of Schools (FISH), CCSD has a total of 6,305,015 gross square feet (GSF). As shown in the Maintenance Organization Chart, the Maintenance Department has 79 positions, including the Director and grounds staff, which are considered by FLDOE in a separate formula. This equates to 90,072 square feet per one Maintenance employee; the State is one to 45,000 square feet. In their analysis, CCSD determined that based on a total of 6,305,015 GSF, they should be staffed with 140 tradesmen and 21 support personnel, for a total of 161 FTEs.

In CCSD **Exhibit 2-10** illustrates this disparity between the State's recommended guidelines and the District.

|   | FLDOE<br>Recommended | CCSD Actual<br>2019-20 |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|
| Maintenance Technicians & Leads                       | 140                  | 70                     |
| Support/Administration Total                          | 21                   | 9                      |
| Total   | 161                  | 79                     |
| CCSD square feet                                      |                      | 6,305,015              |
| Total sf/45,000 square feet per one Technician & lead | 45,000               | 90,071                 |

### Exhibit 2-10 State Recommended Square Footage Allocation Compared to Clay County School District Maintenance Staff

Source: FLDOE Maintenance and Operations Guidelines, 2018-19.

For 2019-20, Maintenance has 70 technicians and nine (9) support personnel. But, due to the increased demand for kitchen repairs, Maintenance is allocating one lead and three technicians,

some of which have not been filled. Currently, CCSD has nine vacancies for HVAC technicians, Building Automation (BAS) System Specialist, BAS Technician, Electrical Technician Assistant, Painter, Carpenter, and Cafeteria Kitchen Equipment Technicians. This will bring their 2019-20 count to 72 technicians.

In its 2017 *Elevate Clay: A Reflection of the First Six Months*, the Superintendent recognized the need for more staffing and qualified technicians in Maintenance, namely for a Building Automation Specialist (BAS) to address computerized infrastructure to control heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC), security cameras, lighting, and bell schedules, in most of its schools. When fully staffed, this position will also help the District implement more effective energy management.

In its review, Ressel & Associates found that the Maintenance Department staffing levels are insufficient to meet the demands of CCSD facilities.

### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 2-3:**

Adopt appropriate staffing levels and eliminate some outsourced duties to compensate for the additional cost of staff as appropriate.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> CCSD's Maintenance Department allocated staffing levels remain low based on Florida Department of Education standards and the situation is further exacerbated by vacancies in critical areas.

Over the last year, four positions were added and dedicated to the maintenance of the school kitchens and are budgetarily charged to the Food Service Fund but remain under the supervision of the Director of Maintenance. This change now allows the HVAC and other technicians to focus their attention on the schools. With this addition, the total staffing in the department rose from 79 to 83 positions, including the Director.

As shown in the updated organization chart (Exhibit 2-8), there are currently six vacancies in the department, some of which have been unfilled for several months.

For 2020-21, Maintenance has 75 allocated technician positions and eight (8) support personnel. Applying the same standards as shown above, CCSD technicians are servicing 84,067 square feet as compared to the standard of 45,000 square feet (**Exhibit 2-11**).

|                                 | FLDOE       | CCSD Actual |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
|                                 | Recommended | 2020-21     |
| Maintenance Technicians & Leads | 140         | 75          |
| Support/Administration Total    | 21          | 8           |
| Total                           | 161         | 83          |
| CCSD square feet                |             | 6,305,015   |
| Total sf/45,000 square feet     | 45,000      | 84,067      |
| per one Technician & lead       | 45,000      | 04,007      |

| Exhibit 2-11   |
|--|
| State Recommended Square Footage Allocation                      |
| <b>Compared to Clay County School District Maintenance Staff</b> |

Source: FLDOE Maintenance and Operations Guidelines, 2018-19.

From June 2019 to June 2020, Maintenance received over 23,000 work orders, of which approximately 21,500 were completed. The Maintenance Director said that when there are no staff available to make a critical repair, piggyback contracts are used to fill the need, particularly if there are health and safety concerns and speed is of the essence. A Piggyback contract is one where another governmental entity assigns an existing contract's rights to purchase services or commodities to another governmental entity. For example, if a neighboring school district has a contract with an HVAC contractor, CCSD is allowed to purchase the same services through the original contract.

While contracts like these provide workload flexibility during peak periods, the reality for CCSD is that the lower than standard staffing levels are requiring the use of contract services on a more routine basis. CCSD administrators should continue to work with the Board to adopt appropriate staffing levels and eliminate some outsourced duties that are currently being used to compensate for understaffing in some critical areas.

Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 2-3 still applies.

### 2.2.2 <u>Maintenance Job Descriptions</u>

## September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The CCSD job descriptions in the Maintenance Department are not current, which means that the job descriptions cannot be used to accurately evaluate employee performance.

With the exception of the Building Automation Specialist, whose job description was last updated in 2018 and the HVAC technician whose job description was last updated in 2003, the majority of the other job descriptions were last updated more than 20 years ago.

Administrators recognized the need and during the course of this audit developed 32 updated job descriptions that are scheduled to go to the Board for approval in September 2019.

Ideally, school districts should refresh their job descriptions as new positions and responsibilities are added, and to keep up with current technology and skill sets. According to the Human

Resources Department, the District typically updates the job descriptions when a vacancy occurs, and the position is being posted.

The industry best practice is to systematically review all job descriptions over a three-year period, with approximately one-third of the job descriptions being reviewed each year to ensure that new duties and responsibilities as well as new technology, equipment, or certifications are reflected. When job descriptions are current, supervisors and employees have a clear set of expectations against which performance can be evaluated.

### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 2-4:**

Once new Maintenance Department job descriptions are approved, implement a districtwide three-year review cycle for all job descriptions.

**August 28, 2020 UPDATE:** Job descriptions for Maintenance Department staff positions are now updated and contain the level of detail necessary to use when evaluating its employees; modifications to the job descriptions for lead positions are in progress. Human Resources is in the process of implementing a cyclical review of all district job descriptions every two years.

From September through November of 2019, the Board approved changes to the updated Maintenance Department's job descriptions and they were loaded onto the Human Resources website. Job descriptions for lead positions are not yet approved by the Board, however these positions were upgraded and are assuming new roles and responsibilities as a result. Management indicated that these will be finalized within the coming months and submitted with the next batch of job descriptions going to the Board for approval.

Human Resources staff indicated that a district-wide project is underway to review and revise all CCSD job descriptions, and when the task is completed the intent is to require the departments to review and revise, as necessary, all job descriptions within each department every two years.

### Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 2-4 is substantially complete, although this will be an ongoing process.

### 2.2.3 <u>Maintenance Salary Levels</u>

### September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: Maintenance Department salaries in CCSD are not competitive with the private sector or peer school districts.

Maintenance pay structure is based on a step scale which is set per Clay Educational Staff Professional Associate (union) negotiations with School Board approval. Some years there have been no step increases. According to management, Maintenance staff received a one-step pay increase in 2018-19, As shown in **Exhibit 2-12**, when compared to its peer districts, CCSD Maintenance average salaries are low for selected trades. Other positions not reflected in this exhibit include painters, pest control operators, roofers, plumbers, and locksmiths.

According to the Chief Financial Officer, salary scales districtwide have not been reviewed for many years. Adjustments to the salaries for individual positions are adjusted based on budgetary requests, identified areas of concern, etc. Budgetary constraints and the District's desire to keep classrooms and teachers the priority were the two reasons given by staff for salaries remaining low in the operational areas.

In 1994, the District hired a consulting firm to evaluate its salary rates. According to management the rates established at that time, still exist today. After the 2008 recession, one step raises were rare. There was also a time with Maintenance employees had not gotten a salary increase in nearly seven years, between 2008 and 2014. Every employee received a step increase unless they were topped out on the pay scale, plus a \$500 bonus. Due to a more robust economy, management says they cannot compete with private sector wages.

### Exhibit 2-12 Florida Department of Education Salary Comparisons 2018-19 School Year

|                                   | Custodian/    |             | A/C Technician<br>and Boiler |             |             |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| District                          | Groundskeeper | Electrician | Mechanic                     | Mechanic    | Carpenter   |
| Clay County School District       | \$24,942.90   | \$40,136.57 | \$33,583.33                  | \$36,019.46 | \$35,070.83 |
| Alachua County School District    | \$27,906.13   | \$50,075.20 | \$44,861.94                  | \$43,101.38 | \$40,016.06 |
| Lake County School District       | \$23,563.53   | \$42,491.01 | \$38,802.85                  | \$36,495.49 | \$32,611.55 |
| Marion County School District     | \$26,634.98   | \$40,854.67 | \$42,300.58                  | \$41,241.51 | \$39,681.60 |
| St. Johns County School District  | \$28,349.40   | \$47,517.12 | \$46,924.42                  | \$42,966.00 | \$47,517.12 |
| Santa Rosa County School District | \$24,886.60   | \$46,991.41 | \$52,638.37                  | \$43,570.33 | N/A         |
| Average Salary                    | \$26,047.26   | \$44,677.66 | \$43,185.25                  | \$40,565.70 | \$38,979.43 |
| Percent below Peer District       | -4%           | -11%        | -29%                         | -13%        | -11%        |

Source: Florida Department of Education, Average Salaries for Select District Level Administrative Staff, 2018-19.

As a result, nine vacancies in the Maintenance area remain unfilled including one Building Automation Systems Technical Assistant; two HVAC Technicians; one Electrical Technician Assistant; one Painter; one Carpenter; and three Cafeteria Kitchen Equipment Technicians.

### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 2-5:**

Conduct a compensation and classification study to ensure salary levels are sufficient to attract and retain qualified staff.

**<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u>** CCSD's Maintenance Department salaries remain below market averages despite the increases provided by the Board to all support staff for the 2019-20 fiscal year.

CCSD has not conducted a comprehensive compensation and classification study in the last year. Some salary and benefit increases that went into effect for the 2019-20 Fiscal Year have resulted in some overall improvements to the salaries for support staff:

- A 25-cent increase in the hourly rate for all support staff plus a step increase cost of \$2.5 million annually.
- A significant increase in the Board's contribution to employee health coverage cost of \$4.8 million annually.

These increases, however, were given to all support employees and did not sufficiently address the considerable gap between CCSD salaries in the trades areas and the salaries paid by the private sector as well as neighboring school districts.

The Director of Maintenance conducted an informal study of salaries for his area and presented that information to the Board at a workshop in January 2020. **Exhibit 2-13** provides a sample of slides from that presentation that clearly show the gap between CCSD salaries for the trades in comparison to the prevailing wage in Florida and in neighboring school districts.

| Wage Comparison of Trades<br>(Wage Stagnation for CCSB)                      |                       |   |                       |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| NE FLA Building Trade<br>Training Program in 201                             | Approximate<br>8 wage | CCSB grade B23 Step 5<br>with (5) yrs. experience in<br>Trade in 2019 | Approximate<br>wage   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 YR Electrical Apprentic  | e \$17.94             | 5 YR Electrical Apprentice  | \$13.98               |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 YR HVAC Apprentice   | \$19.15               | 5 YR HVAC Apprentice  | \$13.98               |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 YR Plumbing Apprentic  | e \$19.28             | 5 YR Plumbing Apprentice  | \$13.98               |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 YR Carpenter Apprentie   | e \$18.10             | 5 YR Carpenter Apprentice   | \$13.98               |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |                       |   |                       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wage Comparison of Trades<br>(Within local school districts of equal size)   |                       |   |                       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flagler County School District verifiable experience in any one of 9 trades. |                       | St Johns County Schools verifiable<br>experience in any of 9 trades   |                       |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |                       |   |                       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Facilities Specialist 2  | \$13.86 (3 yrs. exp.) | Maintenance Mechanics   | \$18.39 (3 yrs. exp.) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Facilitates Specialist 3   | \$16.94 (4 yrs. exp.) | Maintenance Mechanics   | \$18.69 (4 yrs. exp.) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Facilitates Specialist 4   | \$20.11 (6 yrs. exp.) | Maintenance Mechanics   | \$19.23 (6 yrs. exp.) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Facilitates Specialist 5   | \$22.63 (8 yrs. exp.) | Maintenance Mechanics   | \$19.84 (8 yrs. exp.) |  |  |  |  |  |

Exhibit 2-13 Excerpts from Salary Presentation

Source: Director of Maintenance, July 2020.

Board minutes from the January 28, 2020 meeting contain the following statement, "*The District's highly experienced employees are approaching retirement, and Operations is facing the challenge of an inability to compete with the market. Restructuring salary schedules is a possible option to overcoming the current obstacle to engagement and retention of employees.*"

The current leadership team inherited Board adopted salary and pay scales that are significantly lower than the salaries in competing peer school districts and significantly lower than the private sector. As retirements or resignations occur, CCSD continues to have difficulty recruiting and filling the positions with qualified candidates. The Human Resources Department confirmed that they posted an HVAC and an Electrical position on April 22, 2020 and had no qualified applicants as of July 28, 2020. Human Resources further confirmed that to maintain equity between all district classifications, a more comprehensive compensation and classification study coupled with union negotiations to allow differentiated salaries for the positions would be needed.

### Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 2-5 still applies.

### 2.2.4 <u>School Tours</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: Tours of nine schools in the District where specific renovations and repairs were identified as needs in the list of projects to be paid for with Surtax proceeds, confirmed the primary needs and revealed that the facilities were clean, fresh smelling, and the outer structures were being presentably maintained to the extent possible.

Ressel & Associates conducted site visits of Green Cove Springs Junior High School, Charles E. Bennett Elementary School, W.E. Cherry Elementary School, and Orange Park High School and drove by to observe the structure, grounds and parameter security of five other facilities including Swimming Pen Creek Elementary School, Clay High School, Lake Asbury Elementary School, Lake Asbury High School, and Orange Park Junior High School.

Green Cove Springs Junior High School was built in 1952 and last renovated in 1992. It has seven portables. The campus was clean; no notable smells, dust, mold, or sanitation issues. The windows are need of replacement in that they cannot be updated with Plexiglas panes, and there is evidence of recent vandalism (i.e. broken windows). Renovations of the restrooms including plumbing, floors, and fixtures had been done recently. Gym, hallway, and cafeteria floors had been stripped and waxed. Some corroded steel beams on the walkway coverings were noted. Plywood was used to cover original sliding glass doors to classrooms for safety reasons, although plywood is not a sturdy material. Front office shatter-resistant film, buzzer system, and cameras in the halls have been installed. However, the kitchen back door leads to a public street without *any* fencing, making it vulnerable to access. The District identified \$5,165,804 in needed upgrades in its *Penny Project Development 30-Year Plan* for Green Cove Springs Junior High School.

Charles E. Bennett Elementary School was built in 1954 and has 17 portables. It serves as a secondary hurricane shelter and its new wing is outfitted with hurricane shutters. The campus was clean; no notable smells, dust, mold, or sanitation issues. Restrooms, classrooms, floors, fixtures, etc., were in excellent shape, but windows are not. The front office has shatter-resistant film and a buzzer system, but classrooms do not have window film or curtains on classroom doors. The kitchen is very clean but in need of a renovation as it is small for the number of children it serves, and its ventilation system does not meet code. The District identified \$2,661,366 in needed HVAC, roofing, fencing, school safety hardening, and the like, in its *Penny Project Development 30-Year Plan* for Charles E. Bennett Elementary School.

W.E. Cherry Elementary School was built in 1961, renovated in 1966, and has 32 portables. There is a fenced-in pond where goats are kept to keep growth under control. The campus was clean; no notable smells, dust, mold, or sanitation issues. Front office has shatter-resistant film and a buzzer system, but the counter next to the secure door can be easily jumped over. Front office space is cramped. Some corroded steel beams on the walkway coverings were noted. The kitchen and cafeteria are very clean, but its ventilation system does not meet code. In one classroom a stand-alone air conditioning unit was being held together with electrical tape and shims. Tarping covered the outdoor courts were filled with holes and sagging. The District identified \$6,113,866 in needed upgrades in its *Penny Project Development 30-Year Plan* for W.E. Cherry Elementary School.

Orange Park High School was built in 1974 and has 24 portables. At the time of the site visit, the school was getting a new roof and tile. The restrooms were old but clean; no notable smells, dust, mold, or sanitation issues. The Ressel team observed a 20-year old air conditioning unit in the gym, and an antiquated boiler and chiller system. The athletic stadium was in bad shape and it need of demolition. The District identified \$14,545,429 in needed upgrades in its *Penny Project Development 30-Year Plan* for Orange Park High School.

For the age of the facilities and the high number of portables, the campuses are clean, look fairly neat from the exterior, and did not smell. Security hardware, such as buzzer systems and card swipes, are in the front entrance of front offices. While cameras were noticed in hallways and around the campuses, not much security equipment was on the periphery. Fencing is low and not sturdy in a lot of cases, making buildings prone to vandalism because of easy access. In some cases there was open access from roads to buildings, portables, and classrooms. Some stadiums are crumbling. HVACs, boiler, and chillers are in bad shape at some schools. And, kitchen ventilation systems were not to code.

Despite these challenges and the observed need for repairs, renovations and new structures, the custodial and maintenance staff on the campuses visited clearly took pride in their work, and invited the team to visit specific areas of the campus where the floors had been refinished or stripped and waxed during the summer, etc.

In its site visits of selected campuses, Ressel and Associates LLC found that needs assessment and plans are in place to address the infrastructure needs and upgrades, and, despite their age, the campuses looked good overall. August 28, 2020 UPDATE: No additional tours were conducted during the update process.

### 2.2.5 <u>Facility Planning and Construction Staffing Levels</u>

### September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The Facility Planning and Construction area is understaffed to handle the volume of projects envisioned in the Surtax Referendum.

Exhibit 2-14 shows the current organizational structure of Facilities Planning and Construction.

### Exhibit 2-14 Facilities and Construction Management Organizational Chart Clay County School District July 2019



Source: Clay County School District Operations Division Staff, July 2018

As shown, the Building Official and the Director of Facilities report to the Assistant Superintendent for Operations.

Staffing within Facilities is limited to the Director and five staff members. One of the Project Manager positions is currently vacant.

The Building Official works directly with the Facilities group and is responsible for fire code compliance and State Requirements for Education Facilities (SREF) standards.

For projects that impact the design of schools, the Building Official reviews architectural drawings to ensure compliance with SREF, secures permits, inspects the construction projects to

ensure that the construction moves forward according to the design and adherence to SREF and fire code standards and inspects the properties when construction is complete to certify that the project meet code.

The Project Manager's duties are to oversee the entire project from beginning to end—including the selection of architects and engineers to begin the project, selecting a construction manager, monitoring the progress of work and authorizing progress payments, and closing out the project files when the project is complete.

The contracted architect supplements the staff by assisting staff to prepare bid documents, monitor construction in progress, and sign off on progress billings. The Construction Manager is contractually responsible for monitoring and directing the day-to-day work of the subcontractor. CCSD's Project Manager is responsible for overseeing these and all other contracted positions.

Over the last few years, Facilities Planning and Construction has directed the work of one new school construction project and number of smaller projects. Based on the Case Study performed of three recent projects, the structure and staffing level appear to have been sufficient for the work performed.

For future projects envisioned in the Surtax resolution, multiple large projects will be simultaneously in progress—meaning that each of the two project managers will be required to handle a much larger workload. The Building Official, in addition to regularly inspecting existing campuses for fire and whatever else, will be required to review all architectural designs, and spent considerable time at the construction site. To have a single person responsible for inspecting new and existing construction will be physically impossible assuming that as many as three to five major projects could be ongoing simultaneously.

CCSD staff recognized the need for reorganization of the facilities planning and construction functions and began addressing the need to help ensure the organizational capacity for effective planning and management of capital projects, including those envisioned in the referendum. One of the options discussed in ED F.I.R.S.T is the use of contract services to supplement staffing in this area.

In July 2017, the Superintendent issued his *Reflection on The First Six Months*, where he emphasized the priority to add capacity to Facilities and Construction Management:

The Code Enforcement Department needs an additional inspector who is licensed as a building inspector and who can become a Fire Safety Inspector within one year. The department will continue to provide the annual inspections and any inspections and plan review required for the new construction planned 2017-2018 and beyond. The Code Enforcement Department will need to either contract with a locally licensed Fire Safety Inspector to help or hire a full-time inspector who can become licensed as a Fire Safety Inspector. The potential growth and work that is required for Clay County Schools to be safe is very big and getting bigger every day. The next step is to make the schools the safest and most productive teaching environment it can be and to be a model for the rest of the state of Florida.

Facilities staff also expressed the need for additional Project Managers and potentially legal assistance in the bidding, contracting processes. Because the need for these services may have ebbs and flows during this period, a mix of full-time staff, supplemented by contract services, may be appropriate. In the Martin County School District, contract Building Officials are used because the demand for construction related services were only intermittent. Since Surtax dollars cannot be used to pay for staff, an additional benefit for contracting with Surtax dollars is the possibility of charging the contracting expenses to the project rather than using scarce operating dollars to pay for additional salaries.

Hiring experts as full-time employees, when the need is intermittent or may no longer be needed once a project ends, can result in overstaffing once the projects are completed. Contracting for temporary service of an expert when the expertise is required for more than a year could also be more costly than hiring a full-time employee. Determining the correct mix to ensure that adequate staff is available when needed is necessary when undertaking a large number of projects at one time.

### RECOMMENDATION

### **Recommendation 2-6:**

Determine the correct mix of contracted services and full-time staff to address the envisioned Surtax project needs.

## <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> The Facility Planning and Construction area remains understaffed to handle the volume of projects envisioned in the Surtax Referendum; critical vacancies exist today that are also negatively impacting the department.

While the organizational structure of the Facility Planning and Construction area is unchanged, the leadership reorganization following the departure of the former Superintendent have left the department without a Director or Coordinator of Planning and Intergovernmental Relations. In March 2020, the Director was elevated to the position of Interim Assistant Superintendent for Operations and is currently serving in both capacities. The Coordinator of Planning and Intergovernmental Relations was promoted to Supervisor of Safety and Security but continues to serve in both roles until a replacement can be named. The Project Manager position that was vacant in 2019, however, has now been filled.

In discussions with staff, no formal plans have been made to accommodate the increased workload associated with the envisioned Surtax projects. The idea being discussed, however, involves the replication of the positions currently in Facility Planning and Construction and creating a group dedicated to the planning, purchasing, project management and monitoring of all ED FIRST projects. How that will work and the source of funds that can be used to pay for these additional positions remains under discussion.

Formal planning and resolution of the funding sources and the potential use of contract services to supplement staff are critical issues that will require immediate attention to adequately manage the envisioned ED FIRST projects.

### Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 2-6 still applies.

### 2.3 <u>SAFETY AND SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS</u>

This section examines the staff levels and organizational structure of the groups that deliver safety and security related functions for the district.

### 2.3.1 <u>Staffing and Organization Structure</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The Clay County School District has comprehensive staffing in place to address its compliance with the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School Public Safety Act legislated in Senate Bills 5026 and 7030, as well as for emergency management.

Under the new structure being implemented for the 2019-20 school year, each school has an assigned police officer assigned to it. In addition to 40 CCSD officers, the District has an interlocal agreement for School Resource Officers (SROs) with the Green Cove Springs Police Department's for the Charles E. Bennett Elementary and Green Cove Junior High Schools; and an inter-local agreement with the Orange Park Police Department for three officers at Grove Park Elementary, Orange Park Elementary, and Orange Park Junior High Schools.

With the implementation of an in-house Police Department, the inter-local agreement with Clay County Sheriff's Department for SROs will expire September 30, 2019. Of the total 47 police officers, four serve as relief employees. The Chief of Police manages the inter-local agreements.

Section 1006.12, Florida Statutes, requires safe-school officers at each public school:

For the protection and safety of school personnel, property, students, and visitors, each district school board and school district superintendent shall partner with law enforcement agencies or security agencies to establish or assign one or more safe-school officers at each school facility within the district, including charter schools.

(1) SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER.—A school district may establish school resource officer programs through a cooperative agreement with law enforcement agencies.

(2) SCHOOL SAFETY OFFICER.—A school district may commission one or more school safety officers for the protection and safety of school personnel, property, and students within the school district. The district school superintendent may recommend, and the district school board may appoint, one or more school safety officers.

(b) A school safety officer has and shall exercise the power to make arrests for violations of law on district school board property and to arrest persons, whether on or off such property, who violate any law on such property under the same conditions that deputy sheriffs are authorized to make arrests. A school safety officer has the authority to carry weapons when performing his or her official duties. (c) A district school board may enter into mutual aid agreements with one or more law enforcement agencies as provided in chapter 23. A school safety officer's salary may be paid jointly by the district school board and the law enforcement agency, as mutually agreed to.

(3) SCHOOL GUARDIAN.—At the school district's or the charter school governing board's discretion, as applicable, pursuant to s. 30.15, a school district or charter school governing board may participate in the Coach Aaron Feis Guardian Program to meet the requirement of establishing a safe-school officer...upon satisfactory completion of the requirements under s. 30.15(1)(k) and certification by a sheriff."

CCSD has assigned a police officer at each campus, including SROs from two police departments, and guardians at 24 of its campuses, and is in compliance with this law. Job descriptions are in place for police officers and guardians, and all guardians have completed the certification process. As shown in the following exhibits, the staffing levels meet the legal requirements of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas Act.

Exhibit 2-15 shows the organizational chart for the CCSD Police Department.



**Exhibit 2-16** shows the organizational chart for the Operations Safety and Security Department. Guardians are assigned to 13 elementary schools, six junior high schools, and eight high schools, with one guardian serving in a relief position.





Source: CCSD Operations Safety and Security Department, July 2019.

Duties for the Guardians are outlined in the administrative procedures for the Clay County District Schools Guardian Program.

This position is tasked to ensure that all mandated requirements by the Office of Safe Schools within the Department of Education are implemented and followed as defined as well as all safety & security policies/directives of the Clay County School Board and the Superintendent of Schools. The armed School Safety Officer position shall have no law enforcement authority, except to the extent necessary to prevent or actively respond to an active assailant incident on Clay County District Schools' properties. The School Safety Officer will work collectively with the Principal at each school to identify and implement strategies related to ensuring safety on campus while maintaining a peaceful environment, deter crime, and conduct preliminary inquiries into violations of school board policies on school property or at school-sponsored events. The School Safety Officer will have the responsibility for performing a variety of duties related to protecting students, school staff, visitors, equipment, facilities, and school grounds at the request of the site administrator and under the supervision and direction the Director of Support Services.

The organization structure and staffing levels were established based on projected need. Initially, the administration considered having the Guardians report to the Police Chief, but decided to set up the current structure because the Guardian Program was established in 2018, before the Police Department was established. However, after the first year of operation, the administration said it plans to assess the plan and make adjustments to the structure as well as staffing levels based on actual experience. Further, administrators said they used a similar approach for annual reviews under the former SRO structure.

Experience may show that some schools require more or less staff, and the type of staff assigned to each campus may vary as well. Either in January 2020 or prior to the 2020-21 school year, administrators said they will address the appropriateness of the guardians reporting structure once it is fully operational.

Additionally, as the safety and security-related projects envisioned in the Surtax are implemented (campuses are hardened, perimeters are secured and surveillance camera systems are strengthened), the staffing types and levels, schedules and the like may also change.

### RECOMMENDATION

### **Recommendation 2-7:**

Periodically reassess the structure and staffing levels as Surtax safety and security-related improvements are implemented.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> The Clay County School District continues to have sufficient staffing in place to address its compliance with the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School Public Safety Act; recent restructuring of the organization has increased efficiency.

To be more efficient, the Safety and Security function has been moved under the Police Department and the Director of Safety and Security has been reclassified as a Supervisor reporting to the Police Chief. The new organizational chart is shown in **Exhibit 2-17**.

### Exhibit 2-17 (Updated) Department of Operations Police Department Clay County School District



Source: CCCS Department of Operations, July 2020.

Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, the periodic reassessment process is functioning as intended and should be continued as stated in Recommendation 2-6.

### 2.4 <u>TECHNOLOGY IMPLEMENTATION AND UPGRADES</u>

This section examines the organization and staffing levels of the Information and Technology Services Department.

### 2.4.1 <u>Staffing and Organization Structure</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The current organization structure and staffing levels for the Information and Technology Services Department (ITS) are adequate and appropriate to support the District's technology needs.

The organizational structure of the Information and Technology Services Department (ITS) has undergone recent changes. The ITS Director came into the District about two years ago—at

which time he found the department to be dated and not well organized. To improve operational efficiency, an initial change was made to restructure the Information and Technology Services Department to better meet District needs.

One focus of the organizational changes was to improve work processes districtwide, especially for installation and school-level support. ITS now refers to the organizational structure as having "project-based leadership", in which an employee can be a project leader of one team and team member of another. ITS employees function in cross-functional teams with teams established to align best available talent to the knowledge and skills needed for a particular task. Focus group discussions indicated employee satisfaction with this model as it provides for continual training, cross training, and a dynamic work environment in which teams can formulate strategies and responses in a timely manner. Since technology is imbedded in substantially all aspects of the District, proactive and timely services are vital.

For a better alignment of ability and integration of functions and resources, what is now the ITS Electronics Unit was moved from the Maintenance Department to ITS effective July 1, 2019. The management and support of electronics (such as audio-visual equipment and projectors is more compatible with ITS duties for the connectivity between computers and the electronics). This integration improves efficiencies by streamlining service coordination thus allowing users to work through one rather than two departments.

**Exhibit 2-18** shows the 2019-20 organizational structure of the Information and Technology Department. According to District records and staff, there are a total of 54 Information and Technology Services positions with 22 of those functioning primarily as device support for districtwide staff and approximately 42,000 students in 42 schools.

These 22 positions are responsible for school staff, student, and district staff computers and are referred to as "Break/Fix" technicians. The remaining positions are responsible for functions relative to electronics, wired and wireless infrastructure, and instructional technology and software.





**Exhibit 2-19** shows the District's current inventory of devices. While the District device "break/fix" staff can vary depending on user needs, the device to dedicated technical support staff ratio is approximately 1,917 students to 1 technician, which is high in comparison the older industry standard published in 2012-13 by School Dude of 814:1. With the advent of the Chromebook or other hand-held device model and many schools approaching a 1:1 ratio of students to computers, this model is changing. The 2012-13 study looked at an acceptable ratio of approximately 2,000 students per technician. Based on the current staffing of 22 "break-fix" technicians, the ITS Department meets that standard.

| Exhibit 2-19                           |
|--|
| <b>Inventory of CCSD Devices</b>       |
| Supported by the Technology Department |

| Description        | Count  |  |
|--------------------|--------|--|
| Computer - Teacher | 2,797  |  |
| Computer - Student | 34,589 |  |
| Computer - Staff   | 1,102  |  |
| Computer - Lab     | 1,650  |  |
| Computer - Other   | 2,044  |  |
| Grand Total        | 42,182 |  |

Source: Device Inventory, ITS Department, July 2019.

Source: CCSD ITS Department, July 2019.

CCSD has a goal, and has begun implementing an allocation of computers to students on a 1:1 ratio. As more devices are added, services and support for those devices will increase and fuel the need for enhanced staffing resources.

One indicator to determine adequate District information and technology services staffing levels is to review open help desk tickets through an aging report. Open items greater than 30 days that are specifically due to a lack of internal technology resources would indicate whether the department is staffed adequately. Without this aging information, Ressel & Associates is relying on District estimated averages of  $1 \frac{1}{2}$  to 2 days between the time a help desk ticket is opened and when it is closed. Focus group discussions indicated the belief that help desk tickets are only one indicator as help desk tickets are usually used for requests of a routine nature.

# **August 28, 2020 UPDATE:** The current organization structure remains appropriate; overall staffing levels for the Information and Technology Services Department (ITS) are only minimally sufficient to support the technology demands associated with the COVID-19 response.

In March 2020, the former Director left the district to join the former superintendent in the Hillsborough County School District; the current Director was appointed from within and now reports directly to the Superintendent. Under the former Superintendent there was a Director of Assessment and Accountability that also reported to the Assistant Superintendent for Climate and Culture with technology-related responsibilities for student assessments and state reporting. The two areas work collaboratively, but with the reorganization, the Director of Assessment and Accountability reports directly to the Superintendent and works more directly with the academic leadership. The structure of the technology related functions in place for the 2020-21 school year is shown in **Exhibit 2-20**.





Source: CCSD ITS Department, July 2020.

The current ITS Director is part of the Superintendent's leadership team, and both the academic leadership and the ITS Director bring forward mutual information, issues and concerns relating to assessment and state reporting to the leadership team as a whole.

Openings in the ITS Department include:

Coordinator 1 Student Information Services (the new Director's former position) Coordinator 1 Operational Infrastructure (Military Deployment) Technology Specialist School Support (Military Deployment)

The two positions on military deployment are technically not vacant positions but the positions cannot be filled in their absence, therefore, the department is operating with three fewer people at this time.

To accommodate the COVID-19 response with reduced staff, projects have been placed on hold and staff reassigned to assist in managing the response.

The Director said that a lesson-learned during the COVID-19 process was, as the schools closed down, there was a need for centralized management of some school student information. He explained that the District has plans to centralize some of the roles related to things like student registration to optimize the efficiency of the process. The adoption of a new Student Information System (SIS) in the next year will facilitate this change, which the ITS Director said may require more staff to be allocated to the ITS function but would facilitate the efforts of both functional groups.

The Director provided examples of the technology-related challenges that the department is dealing with in regard to the COVID-19 response:

- Managing inventories of computers and other devices that are being checked out to families and students for use in their homes;
- Setting up a system for the repair and replacement of failed devices that are not physically located in the schools fielding trouble calls for the devices at the home and facilitating a device swap at a central site and making repairs;
- Developing systems and processes for tracking virtual attendance using remote learning tools and Chrome Books to see who is logged in and for how long;
- Facilitating the instructional side of the house and working with the vendors to make the systems work.
- Determining which families have internet access and acquiring and disseminating hot spots for students that have no internet access at the home; and
- Establishing protocols for handling the needs of students in rural areas of Clay County with no cell access, meaning hot spots will not work.

Hiring temporary employees or issuing vendor contracts to supplement their staffing needs is not practical, according to the Director, as the training involved to bring an individual up to speed on their systems and structures can take from six months to a year. Consequently, the Director has responded by placing some projects on hold and reallocating staff to address the current critical needs.

### RECOMMENDATION

**Updated Recommendation:** Reassess staffing levels in the Information and Technology Services area in light of COVID-19 and determine if a combination of new positions and/or contracted services are needed to ensure continuity of services.

### 2.5 <u>SERVICE BOND INDEBTEDNESS</u>

In this section, Ressel & Associates examines the organizational structure and staffing for functional areas with responsibility for planning and implementing the envisioned Surtax projects.

- 2.5.1 Staffing and Structure of Business Affairs
- 2.5.2 Intergovernmental Collaboration

### 2.5.1 <u>Staffing and Structure of Business Affairs</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The Business Services Department appears to be adequately staffed to handle the day-to-day finance related operations of the District; a contract for a Financial Advisor is used to supplement staff expertise in the debt service arena.

As shown in **Exhibit 2-21**, which was updated to reflect the organization structure in place for Fiscal Year 2020-21, the Assistant Superintendent for Business Services is responsible for Financial Accounting and Budgeting, Payroll and Benefits, Purchasing, Risk Management, Asset Management and the Auditing of Internal Accounts.



### UPDATED Exhibit 2-21 Business Services Organization

Source: CCSD Assistant Superintendent for Business Services, July 2020.

The Facility Planning and Construction Department has a Capital Program Accountant that reports directly to the Assistant Superintendent for Operations and is responsible for tracking all Capital outlay funding from both general and capital revenue sources, processing purchase orders and invoices for Capital projects, oversees the competitive bidding and contracting processes, and prepares and submits state required reports relating to funding and facilities. This position is independent of Business Affairs but works closely with the Business Affairs staff.

The Business Services Purchasing Section handles all competitive bidding for all but capital projects, which are handled exclusively in Facility Planning and Construction. The Purchasing/Material Supervisor said that she and her staff are not familiar with the competitive bidding laws that govern construction related contracts. Their only role in that process is to open competitive sealed bids. Capital purchasing is addressed in greater detail in **Chapter 4: Program Performance and Monitoring**.

The Director of Finance is responsible for receiving and accurately recording revenues and will be the individual responsible for recording Surtax proceeds. She and her staff currently control the revenue and expenditure flows from federal, state and local sources and is in the automated workflow for expenditures to ensure that all expenditures are coded to the correct accounts.
Business Services also uses a Financial Advisor, Ford and Associates, to provide advice and support for investment and debt related activities on an ongoing basis. The Department also periodically seeks assistance from Bond Counsel as needed.

Business Services staff was heavily involved in the conversion of the accounting and payroll systems from Terms to Business Plus. The primary business accounting systems were brought online in November 2017, but payroll continued to run through terms until January 2019. Staff has been required to work in both the new Business Plus system and the legacy terms system for nearly two years. According to staff, the transition required a great deal of time and effort, but overall they said the system should improve the workload and flow of work when all of the modules are working as intended. At this time, staff said they are still training and working closely with campus staff to educate them on the new system.

In all, the staffing levels within the Business Services Department appear adequate, and each of the individuals interviewed during the audit were knowledgeable of their job.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> The Business Services Department remains adequately staffed to handle the day-to-day finance related operations of the District; staffing required to handle the increased workload associated with accounting for and monitoring the revenues and expenditures associated with the Surtax is being considered at this time.

In anticipation of the potential increase in workload as a result of the Surtax, staffing changes/additions are being considered.

Additional workload areas identified by the Assistant Superintendent for Business Services associated directly with the processing and recording of Surtax revenues and expenditures include:

- recording, depositing and investing revenues as they are received;
- distribution, tracking and reporting for the portion of the Surtax that is to be shared with charter schools;
- issuing long term debt that will be serviced by Surtax proceeds in collaboration with the contracted Financial Advisor and legal counsel;
- participating in the competitive bidding and contracting processes associated with the envisioned ED FIRST projects;
- monitoring, recording and processing invoices and progress payments for an increased number of contracts.

As discussed in Chapter 6 of this report, CCSD is considering the addition of an internal or external construction auditor with expertise in the construction field to validate the work of the contract manager, assess risks, and seek to identify any leakages in the process, which could include overbillings, unauthorized material substitutions and the like. According to staff in both the Operations and Business Services area, oversight for an employee or contracted service would likely fall under Business Services as the function is that of an internal auditor.

#### 2.5.2 Intergovernmental Collaboration

September 4, 2020 OBSERVATION: CCSD has established a collaborative relationship with local area governments through the concurrency process, which is designed to track and mitigate the impact of growth on the District and community in general.

Planning for growth is an ongoing challenge for any high growth local government. In Florida, local governments are required to maintain a "concurrency management system" to keep track of the impacts of new development on concurrency facilities.

In 2005, the Florida Legislature passed Section 163.3180 (13), F.S. that requires adequate school facilities to be in place within three years of construction of new homes.

Clay County prepares and maintains the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, which is intended to be a guide for the future growth of Clay County. The Public School Facilities Element (PSF) portion of that plan [*emphasis added*]

...establishes the public school concurrency system requirements, <u>including an adopted level</u> of service (LOS) standard for public schools and procedures for establishing a long-term concurrency management system to achieve and maintain the adopted LOS. School concurrency requires coordinated school planning among the County, the School District and the municipalities within Clay County to ensure that public school capacity needs are met and that the public school facilities, necessary to achieve and maintain the adopted level of service for schools, are in place before or concurrent with the school impacts of new residential development.

<u>The PSFE focuses on coordinated planning among the School District, County and local</u> <u>governments to accommodate future student growth needs in the public school system</u>. The PSF addresses school level of service; school utilization; school proximity and compatibility with residential development; availability of public infrastructure; colocation opportunities; and financial feasibility. Within Clay County, the local governments participating in school concurrency are Clay County, the Town of Orange Park, the City of Green Cove Springs, and Keystone Heights (hereinafter referred to as "Local Governments).

The Coordinator for Planning and Government Relations represents the District in this process and acts as liaison between CCSD and the local municipalities and the county, attending all Commission and Council Meetings.

Responsibilities outlined in his job description include, but are not limited to, the following:

- serves as liaison and coordinate the School District's requirements with the County and each Municipality on interlocal agreements, developer agreements, State of Florida comprehensive plan elements, school concurrency and educational facility planning and communication;
- coordinates requirements and discussions on mitigation resolution for all development within the County and each Municipality;

- coordinates site acquisitions and site donations according to District need and act as land agent for all School Board property; and
- maintains and administers the educational impact fee ordinance coordinating with the developers and local building departments, the payment and receipt of impact fees and permitting.

Having a dedicated employee to maintain a close relationship with the County and municipalities through the concurrency processes is a positive methodology for staying on top of evolving issues and growth scenarios which could have a direct impact on projects to be financed with proceeds from the Surtax.

# <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> CCSD's collaborative relationship with local governments remains strong despite an organizational change that occurred following the departure of the former Superintendent.

The individual that formerly held the position of Coordinator for Planning and Government Relations moved to the position of Supervisor of Safety and Security, reporting directly to the Chief of Police. Understanding the critical and unique nature of the Coordinator for Planning and Government Relations position, he continues to fill both roles and will continue to do so until a new person is brought into the coordinator position and is fully trained to assume these duties.

Board agendas and minutes examined for the prior year contain numerous references to agreements signed by the District and local developers. One example, from the May 7, 2020 Board agenda gives the following description, which illustrates the District's continued efforts to work collaboratively with the County and local developers to accommodate growth:

"In November 2019, Armstrong Development Inc. contacted the Clay County School Board's Planning department seeking approval for their Integra Multi-family phase II project.

It was determined "inadequate capacity (student stations) at Discovery Oaks and contiguous elementary schools" specifically, 3 student stations.

In accordance with the Clay County Interlocal Agreement for Coordinated Planning (CCIA), to remedy the issue, a PSM agreement may be entered into between the School Board and the developer. Negotiations between the School Board's Planning department and Armstrong Development Inc. in accordance CCIA's calculation methodology, resulted in a mutually agreeable resolution. The sum of \$69,312.00 would be paid to the School Board's impact fee account to mitigate the capacity deficit. In return, the School District would ensure sufficient capacity to accommodate the elementary students generated by the Integra Multi-family phase II project."

## CHAPTER 3: ALTERNATIVE DELIVERY METHODS

## 3.0 ALTERNATIVE DELIVERY METHODS

**Chapter 3** presents audit findings related to alternative delivery methods used in the program areas under review. As part of the field work, Ressel & Associates examined the programs and services currently being provided through shared service or outsourced/contract arrangements and also assessed what, if any activities or services, might be delivered in an alternative method. Further, Ressel & Associates evaluated the manner in which the District assesses alternative delivery methods.

The specific audit evaluation tasks performed are provided below.

- 1. Determined whether program administrators have formally evaluated existing in-house services and activities to assess the feasibility of alternative methods of providing services, such as outside contracting and privatization, and determine the reasonableness of their conclusions.
- 2. Determined whether program administrators have assessed any contracted and/or privatized services to verify effectiveness and cost savings achieved and determine the reasonableness of their conclusions.
- 3. Determined whether program administrators have made changes to service delivery methods when their evaluations/assessments found that such changes would reduce program cost without significantly affecting the quality of services.
- 4. Identified possible opportunities for alternative service delivery methods that have the potential to reduce program costs without significantly affecting the quality of services, based on a review of similar programs in peer entities (e.g. other counties, school districts, etc.).

**Finding on alternative delivery methods:** In its September 4, 2019 evaluation, Ressel & Associates found that CCSD is actively pursuing alternative delivery methods to meet the District's growing needs. Processes for assessing the costs and benefits, and feasibility of such decisions were found to be reasonable and adequate. Formally documenting the required criteria and justification process would provide decision makers a consistent, organized method for future evaluations.

In its August 28, 2020 follow-up audit, Ressel & Associates concluded that its previous findings remain essentially unchanged.

In this chapter, alternative delivery methods in the Clay County School District are presented in the following functional areas:

- 3.1 Districtwide Support for Areas Under Review
- 3.2 Facilities Planning, Use, and Construction
- 3.3 Safety and Security Improvements

- 3.4 Technology Implementation and Upgrades
- 3.5 Service Bond Indebtedness

#### 3.1 DISTRICTWIDE SUPPORT FOR AREAS UNDER REVIEW

#### 3.1.1 <u>Alternative Methods Documentation</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: CCSD has made extensive use of contract services, outsourcing and other alternative delivery methods throughout the District by analyzing both the benefits of in-house staff options as well as external options. Formally documenting the current process in policy or procedure would ensure continuity in the future.

As shown by the list of contracted and outsourced services that follow in this chapter, CCSD is actively working to identify areas that can benefit from alternative delivery methods. In reviewing the considerable research and documentation associated with a number of these initiatives, the Ressel Team found evidence that District leaders are using sound approaches for making initial decisions, are establishing measurable expectations for future evaluation, and are then using those measures to evaluate whether the programs are achieving the desired results. One recent example is the presentation made to the Board that provided the costs and benefits of five staffing scenarios; on one end a scenario for retaining a full contingency of contracted School Resource Officers (SROs) and one on the opposite end of the spectrum with no contracted SROs. Based on the costs and benefits provided, decision-makers selection an option in the middle.

When determining whether to outsource certain tasks, administrators in the operations areas stated that the rationale was generally based on a need to get the job done in a timely manner. In the Maintenance Department, for example, staffing levels in the District are not sufficient to handle all of the repairs, renovations and preventative maintenance that are inherent for a district of this size.

Some of the contracted services reviewed were related to the District's inability to hire fully certified people for key positions.

According to industry experts, when there is need for highly technical services or the need is intermittent and would not occupy the time of a full-time employee, it may be more cost effective to contract for the service. Or, if the demand is ongoing with peaks that would demand an excessively large staff, a contract service that can guarantee coverage during peak periods may be more cost effective. However, the recent proposal to outsource some or all of the grounds keeping functions in an effort to free up custodial staff for inside cleaning duties is an example of a process where a formal assessment would be beneficial. Since the assumption is that existing staff would continue to clean buildings, there are no savings related to salaries and benefits, so the question becomes one of hiring additional staff to work exclusively on the grounds, or contract for an all-inclusive contract where the contractor would pay their own employees, use their own equipment, provide their own gas, etc. On the other hand, to keep the function in-house would require new salary and benefit costs for employees and would continue to incur the cost of purchasing, maintaining, and operating the equipment.

According to administrators, prior to any contracted service, CCSD has organizational controls in place that require senior staff members to identify actual need, perform a gap analysis, examine previous outcomes, project expected outcomes and the financial impact, and ensure that the proposal is strategically aligned with the District goals and objectives. Evidence of how this process has been used can be seen in the options and proposal brought to the Board relating to the creation of a Police Department. Documenting this methodology in policy or procedure will ensure the continuity of this process into the future.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 3-1:**

Document in policy or procedure the process for justifying both contract services and the creation of new positions, which examines the full cost and benefits of both options.

# <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> CCSD continues to make use of contract services, outsourcing and other alternative delivery methods by analyzing both the benefits of in-house staff options as well as external options.

Although no policy or procedures have been documented over the last year, one of the recent examples of a cost and benefit analysis is the assessment made when deciding whether to contract for or hire more staff to cover groundskeeping so that custodial staff could be dedicated to cleaning and sanitizing the schools.

The Maintenance Director prepared the following document (**Exhibit 3-1**) showing the cost for creating a department in-house. CCSD then issued an Invitation to Bid on July 2, 2019. Based on the three bids received, the contract was awarded to ABM Industry Groups at the September 5, 2019 Board meeting at a significantly lower cost than the cost to perform those services in-house.

Other contracted services include but are not limited to:

- Custodial Services for select Administration Buildings
- Refuse Collection Services

| Exhibit 3-1  |
|--|
| Analysis of In-House Cost to Provide Groundskeeping Services |

| grounds areas at all District Sites   |  |   |                                |                                |  |                                  |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| TITLE   | Band/<br>Step  | Hourty  | Daily                          | Annual                         | Soc Sec<br>7.65%                                   | Regular<br>Retirement<br>8.26%   | Department<br>Annual Cost<br>per Each   | Action Taken   | Annual<br>Additional Fun  |
| Heavy Equipment Operators (B22) to perform the work at all schools (4 - 3 person crews)   |  |   |                                |                                |  |                                  |   |  |   |
| Hvy Equip Oper  |  |   | -                              |                                |  |                                  | \$ 29,179.76  | Add (x12)  |   |
| Est   | imated Mai   | int. Departr  | ment Cost I                    | Differential As                | suming non   | e are in DROP                    |   |  | \$350,157.1   |
| ad Grounds Person (B  | 32) to man   | ase the cho   | ibbe bee e                     | tional persons                 |  |                                  |   |  |   |
| LEAD Mowing Teo   |  | -   |                                |                                | -  | \$ 2,894.43                      | \$ 40,616.60  | Add  |   |
| Est   | imated Mai   | int. Departr  | ment Cost I                    | Differential As                | suming non   | e are in DROP                    |   | •  | \$ 40,616.6   |
|   |  |   |                                |                                |  |                                  |   |  |   |
| dministrative Scty (B2  | -  |   |                                |                                |  |                                  | ¢ 21.022.16   |  |   |
| Admin Secretary   |  |   | -                              |                                |  |                                  | \$ 31,033.16<br>\$ 31,033.16  | AOC  | \$ 31.033.1   |
| LSU LSU   | imateu Mai   | nic beparti   | ment cost t                    | Anterential As                 | suming non   | e are in DROP                    | \$ 51,055.10  |  | \$ 51,055.1   |
| Supervisor II to handle the addition of supervisory work load to the department   |  |   |                                |                                |  |                                  |   |  |   |
| pervisor II to handle t   | he addition  | of supervis   | sory work le                   | oad to the dep                 | artment  |                                  |   |  |   |
| Supervisor II   | Admin  | \$ -  | \$ -                           | \$74,305.00                    | \$5,684.33   |                                  |   | Add  |   |
| Supervisor II   | Admin  | \$ -  | \$ -                           | \$74,305.00                    | \$5,684.33   | \$ 6,137.59<br>e are in DROP     |   | Add  | \$ 86,126.9   |
| Supervisor II   | Admin  | \$ -  | \$ -                           | \$74,305.00                    | \$5,684.33   |                                  |   | Add  | \$ 86,126.9   |
| Supervisor II   | Admin  | \$ -  | \$ -                           | \$74,305.00                    | \$5,684.33<br>suming non                           | e are in DROP                    |   | Add  |   |
| Supervisor II   | Admin<br>imated Mai  | \$<br>int. Departr  | S -<br>ment Cost I             | \$74,305.00                    | \$5,684.33<br>suming non                           | e are in DROP                    | \$ 86,126.93  | Add  |   |
| Supervisor II<br>Est  | Admin<br>imated Mai  | \$<br>int. Departr  | S -<br>ment Cost I             | \$74,305.00                    | \$5,684.33<br>suming non                           | e are in DROP                    | \$ 86,126.93  | Add  |   |
| Supervisor II<br>Est  | Admin<br>imated Mai<br>Is recurrin   | S -<br>int. Departr   | S -<br>ment Cost I             | \$74,305.00                    | \$5,684.33<br>suming non                           | e are in DROP                    | \$ 86,126.93  |  | \$507,933.8   |
| Supervisor II<br>Est  | Admin<br>imated Mai<br>Is recurring<br>at approxim   | S -<br>int. Departr   | S -<br>ment Cost I             | \$74,305.00                    | \$5,684.33<br>suming non                           | e are in DROP                    | \$ 86,126.93<br>onal personnel<br>\$ 35,000.00  |  | \$507,933.8   |
| Supervisor II<br>Est<br>nal equipment need<br>Add 4 pickup trucks   | Admin<br>imated Mai<br>Is recurring<br>at approxin<br>ailers   | \$ -<br>int. Departing<br>g every 5-<br>mately                    | S -<br>ment Cost I             | \$74,305.00                    | \$5,684.33<br>suming non                           | e are in DROP                    | \$ 86,126.93<br>onal personnel<br>\$ 35,000.00<br>\$ 6,000.00   | Add (x4)   | \$507,933.8<br>\$140,000.0<br>\$24,000.0  |
| Supervisor II<br>Est<br>al equipment need<br>Add 4 pickup trucks<br>Add 4 equipment tra   | Admin<br>imated Mai<br>Is recurring<br>at approxin<br>ailers<br>lawn edger:  | \$ -<br>int. Departr<br>g every 5-<br>mately<br>s                 | S -<br>ment Cost I             | \$74,305.00                    | \$5,684.33<br>suming non                           | e are in DROP                    | \$ 86,126.93<br>onal personnel<br>\$ 35,000.00<br>\$ 6,000.00<br>\$ 400.00  | Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)   | \$507,933.8<br>\$140,000.0<br>\$ 24,000.0<br>\$ 1,600.0   |
| Supervisor II<br>Est<br>nal equipment need<br>Add 4 pickup trucks<br>Add 4 equipment tra<br>Add 4 gas powered   | Admin<br>imated Mai<br>Is recurring<br>at approxim<br>ailers<br>lawn edger:<br>weed wack                             | \$ -<br>int. Departr<br>g every 5-<br>mately<br>s                 | S -<br>ment Cost I             | \$74,305.00                    | \$5,684.33<br>suming non                           | e are in DROP                    | \$ 86,126.93<br>onal personnel<br>\$ 35,000.00<br>\$ 6,000.00<br>\$ 400.00<br>\$ 400.00                           | Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)                                     | \$507,933.8<br>\$140,000.0<br>\$24,000.0<br>\$1,600.0<br>\$1,600.0  |
| Supervisor II<br>Est<br>nal equipment need<br>Add 4 pickup trucks<br>Add 4 equipment tr<br>Add 4 gas powered<br>Add 4 gas powered   | Admin<br>imated Mai<br>is recurrin;<br>at approxin<br>ailers<br>lawn edger;<br>weed wack<br>blowers                  | S -<br>int. Departr<br>g every 5-<br>mately<br>s<br>ers           | S -<br>ment Cost I             | \$74,305.00                    | \$5,684.33<br>suming non                           | e are in DROP                    | \$ 86,126.93<br>onal personnel<br>\$ 35,000.00<br>\$ 6,000.00<br>\$ 400.00<br>\$ 400.00<br>\$ 300.00              | Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)                         | \$507,933.8<br>\$140,000.0<br>\$ 24,000.0<br>\$ 1,600.0<br>\$ 1,600.0<br>\$ 1,200.0                         |
| Supervisor II<br>Est<br>al equipment need<br>Add 4 pickup trucks<br>Add 4 equipment tra<br>Add 4 gas powered<br>Add 4 gas powered<br>Add 4 gas powered  | Admin<br>imated Mai<br>is recurrin;<br>at approxin<br>ailers<br>lawn edger:<br>weed wack<br>blowers<br>ercial lawn r | 5 -<br>int. Departr<br>g every 5-<br>mately<br>s<br>ers<br>mowers | 5 -<br>ment Cost I<br>10 years | \$74,305.00<br>Differential As | \$5,684.33<br>suming non<br>Estimated              | e are in DROP                    | \$ 86,126.93<br>onal personnel<br>\$ 35,000.00<br>\$ 6,000.00<br>\$ 400.00<br>\$ 400.00<br>\$ 300.00              | Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)             | \$507,933.8<br>\$140,000.0<br>\$24,000.0<br>\$1,600.0<br>\$1,600.0<br>\$1,600.0<br>\$1,200.0<br>\$96,000.0  |
| Supervisor II<br>Est<br>al equipment need<br>Add 4 pickup trucks<br>Add 4 equipment tra<br>Add 4 gas powered<br>Add 4 gas powered<br>Add 4 gas powered<br>Add 4 gas powered<br>Add 4 gas powered  | Admin<br>imated Mai<br>is recurrin;<br>at approxin<br>ailers<br>lawn edger:<br>weed wack<br>blowers<br>ercial lawn r | 5 -<br>int. Departr<br>g every 5-<br>mately<br>s<br>ers<br>mowers | 5 -<br>ment Cost I<br>10 years | \$74,305.00<br>Differential As | \$5,684.33<br>suming non<br>Estimated              | e are in DROP                    | \$ 86,126.93<br>onal personnel<br>\$ 35,000.00<br>\$ 6,000.00<br>\$ 400.00<br>\$ 400.00<br>\$ 300.00              | Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)             | \$507,933.8<br>\$140,000.0<br>\$24,000.0<br>\$1,600.0<br>\$1,600.0<br>\$1,600.0<br>\$1,200.0<br>\$96,000.0  |
| Supervisor II<br>Est<br>al equipment need<br>Add 4 pickup trucks<br>Add 4 equipment tra<br>Add 4 gas powered<br>Add 4 gas powered<br>Add 4 gas powered<br>Add 4 gas powered<br>Add 12 - 60° comme | Admin<br>imated Mai<br>is recurrin;<br>at approxin<br>ailers<br>lawn edger:<br>weed wack<br>blowers<br>ercial lawn r | 5 -<br>int. Departr<br>g every 5-<br>mately<br>s<br>ers<br>mowers | 5 -<br>ment Cost I<br>10 years | \$74,305.00<br>Differential As | \$5,684.33<br>suming non<br>Estimated<br>s, parts) | e are in DROP<br>cost for additi | \$ 86,126.93<br>onal personnel<br>\$ 35,000.00<br>\$ 6,000.00<br>\$ 400.00<br>\$ 400.00<br>\$ 300.00              | Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)<br>Add (x4) | \$507,933.8<br>\$140,000.0<br>\$24,000.0<br>\$1,600.0<br>\$1,600.0<br>\$1,600.0<br>\$96,000.0<br>\$45,000.0 |
| Supervisor II<br>Est<br>al equipment need<br>Add 4 pickup trucks<br>Add 4 equipment tr<br>Add 4 gas powered<br>Add 4 gas powered<br>Add 4 gas powered<br>Add 4 gas powered<br>Add 4 gas powered   | Admin<br>imated Mai<br>is recurrin;<br>at approxin<br>ailers<br>lawn edger:<br>weed wack<br>blowers<br>ercial lawn r | 5 -<br>int. Departr<br>g every 5-<br>mately<br>s<br>ers<br>mowers | 5 -<br>ment Cost I<br>10 years | \$74,305.00<br>Differential As | \$5,684.33<br>suming non<br>Estimated<br>s, parts) | e are in DROP<br>cost for additi | \$ 86,126.93<br>onal personnel<br>\$ 35,000.00<br>\$ 6,000.00<br>\$ 400.00<br>\$ 400.00<br>\$ 300.00<br>\$ 300.00 | Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)<br>Add (x4)<br>Add (x4) | ,   |

Source: Director of Maintenance, July 2020.

Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 3-1 still applies.

#### 3.2 FACILITIES PLANNING, USE, AND CONSTRUCTION

**Section 3.2** examines the alternative delivery methods used by the Facility and Maintenance Planning and Construction Departments.

#### 3.2.1 <u>Facility and Maintenance Contracted Services</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The District's use of outsourcing is the result of staffing constraints and its inability to perform some functions with in-house staff.

The Facility and Maintenance functions of the District make use of a number of contracted services; however, it does not appear that the District is performing a formal cost benefit analysis to determine whether the work could be done more economically in-house. Another contributing factor is that these jobs require specific certifications that staff do not have, and the staffing levels are low given the size of the Clay County School District.

Examples of contracts include:

- HVAC installations and service;
- HVAC water systems;
- storm drain repair;
- paint purchases;
- boilers;
- fire sprinkler systems;
- chiller maintenance and repair;
- waste and wastewater treatment;
- roofing;
- carpet and tile;
- electrical;
- structural inspections;
- plumbing construction;
- site work and excavation;
- portable relocation;
- trash collection;
- asbestos resurveys;
- video surveillance and access control systems;
- grounds maintenance and landscaping (pending board approval);
- custodial services for administrative buildings;
- tree trimming (active bid).
- architects;
- engineers; and
- piggy-back contracts.

According to the Director of Maintenance, professional services such as architect, engineers, tree trimming, boiler inspection, fire sprinkler inspection, and HVAC chiller inspection and repair are specific skills that are not needed on a regular basis; however, they require a certain level of proficiency as well as certification to complete work in a timely manner. In these cases, it makes business sense to outsource these. Some Maintenance contracts, such as site work, require specific equipment, which is large and costly for the District to maintain and operate.

In two instances, the Maintenance Department determined that it was best to keep annual fire alarm inspections and the Building Automation System (HVAC controls) responsibilities in house. Both had been outsourced two to three years ago, but they determined that with proper training and certification they could do it more efficiently and cheaper. Once the CCSD Maintenance Team was qualified they did not renew the contracts for these jobs. Currently, the

District is determining whether to outsource grounds keeping. Mowing requires a lot of staff and equipment to maintain district campuses and buildings on a weekly basis.

The Maintenance and Facility Department's use of alternative delivery methods to meet needs has resulted in the district being able to meet some of its growing needs. As noted in the **Recommendation 3-1** formalizing the cost benefit analysis process should help decision-makers decide with staffing versus contracting is most efficient.

# <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> CCSD continues to use contracted services to supplement staffing needs when staffing shortages and critical needs arise.

From June 2019 to June 2020, Maintenance received over 23,000 work orders, of which approximately 21,500 were completed. The Maintenance Director said that when there are no staff available to make a critical repair, piggyback contracts are used to fill the need, particularly if there are health and safety concerns and speed is of the essence. A Piggyback contract is one where another governmental entity assigns an existing contract's rights to purchase services or commodities to another governmental entity. For example, if a neighboring school district has a contract with an HVAC contractor, CCSD is allowed to purchase the same services through the original contract.

While contracts like these provide workload flexibility during peak periods, the reality for CCSD is that the lower than standard staffing levels are requiring the use of contract services on a more routine basis.

CCSD has addressed shortages in the custodial area, particularly in light of the need for more custodial staff to clean and sanitize the facilities as part of the COVID-19 response, with a combination of contracts and the authorization of addition staffing positions. In order to dedicate more custodians to cleaning facility, a September 2019 contract for groundskeeping services, described above in the update to **Section 3.1.1**, eliminated the need for custodial staff to perform those duties. In addition, management said the district is testing the concept of outsourcing some custodial services by letting a contract for just the administrative facilities. The additional benefit was that custodial staff who wanted to remain in the district could fill vacancies at the school level. Finally, the Board authorized seven new floater positions that will be used to fill in at the schools when needed to ensure that all facilities are thoroughly cleaned and sanitized as part of the COVID-19 response plan.

On the other hand, the Information and Technology Services Director has not been able to make use of contract services to meet the critical demands brought about by the response to COVID-19. The training time of between six months and a year that is required to bring a contractor up to speed with their process and systems would not benefit the organization.

#### 3.3 <u>SAFETY AND SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS</u>

Alternative delivery methods used in the Safety and Security area include:

- 3.3.1 Inter-local Agreements
- 3.3.2 Alternative Funding Sources

#### 3.3.1 Inter-local Agreements

# September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The District's inter-local agreements for School Resource Officers with the Orange Park and Green Cove Spring Police Departments are in place for 2019-20.

Per State law, school districts must have a School Resource Officer at each campus. The District conducted a cost-benefit analysis to determine if hiring its own police force was cost-effective. In doing so, they determined that continuing the Green Cove Springs and Orange Park inter-local agreements was more cost effective rather than hiring more police officers for the Charles E. Bennett Elementary, Green Cove Junior High, Grove Park Elementary, Orange Park Elementary, and Orange Park Junior High schools. (The inter-local agreement with Clay County Sheriff's Department will expire September 30, 2019.)

#### <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> The District's inter-local agreements for School Resource Officers with the Orange Park and Green Cove Spring Police Departments are in place for the 2020-21 School Year.

The new interlocal-agreements have been signed for the 2020-21 school year, with no appreciable change in the number of SROs that will be provided or the total cost. The Police Chief believes that contracting for these services rather than hiring additional officers is more cost effective.

#### 3.3.2 <u>Alternative Funding Sources</u>

#### September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The District has sought and used funds from state and local sources to address immediate safety-related needs when operating funds were not sufficient to meet the need.

The Florida Legislature allocated funds to assist school districts with the rollout of Senate Bill 7026, Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School Public Safety Act. CCSD received a \$1.3 million grant.

To date, they have used those funds on:

- security cameras and surveillance;
- enhance perimeter hardening, fencing, and gate control;
- impact-resistance window film; and
- emergency communications systems.

Beginning in January 2020, the District will receive approximately \$12 million in property tax millage to fund safety and security hardening of schools, including: security cameras, perimeter doors, signage, access control; lockdown devices; and window film. It expects to receive \$5,780,000 for each of the two years following. In its Penny Project Development 30-Year Plan, the District identified \$10,929,000 in funding it needs to secure its schools including: security

alarms; controlled access; external PA system; exterior campus lighting, traffic signage; pavement marking; fencing; safety nets, and, cover walkways.

In its evaluation, Ressel & Associates found the District has taken reasonable and timely steps to seek funding and secure its campuses.

# <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> The District has received and is using the \$12 million in property tax millage to address immediate safety-related needs when operating funds were not sufficient to meet the need.

The District has received and is using the \$12 million in property tax millage to fund safety and security hardening of schools including security cameras, emergency communication systems, fencing, and gate control. No additional funding has been sought or received.

#### 3.4 <u>TECHNOLOGY IMPLEMENTATION AND UPGRADES</u>

#### 3.3.3 <u>Outsourcing of Technology Services</u>

#### September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The Information and Technology Services Department outsources work to contractors where it makes sense financially or from a capacity perspective.

ITS staff implemented the Business Plus system to improve efficiencies across the District and provide a more reliable financial management system. The AS400 legacy system was previously maintained by now retired programmers who CCSD contracted with to program the move to the Business Plus system. The contractors were used for a period of nine months during the initial transition. According to staff, using contractors knowledgeable of the district and the AS400 made financial and practical sense.

ITS also bid and contracted for cabling services to enhance the District technology infrastructure. The bid was opened September 12, 2017 with services performed on an hourly basis.

Exhibit 3-2 shows the recent hourly costs for the outsourced services.

#### Exhibit 3-2 Technology Outsourcing Summary July 2019

| Service              | Provider                       | Costs  |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Programming Services | Retired Programmer Contractors | \$60 per hour  |
| Structured Cabling   | Network Cabling Services       | \$55 per hour for technicians<br>\$45 per hour for helpers |

Source: CCSD Information and Technology Services Department, July 2019

Making use of contractors at an hourly rate when the work is intermittent and required specialized expertise, is an effective and efficient way to address one-time needs.

#### <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> Outsourcing of some Information and Technology Services Department services continues, with the primary focus being on services that do not require extensive training on processes or system.

The ITS Director said he is not opposed to bringing in contractors to assist in filling immediate needs. Although many of the current needs are immediate, they require individuals with unique knowledge of the district's systems and processes. Therefore, rather than bringing in contractors, projects and other non-immediate needs have been placed on hold so that current employees can be dedicated to handling the COVID-19 response.

#### 3.5 <u>SERVICE BOND INDEBTEDNESS</u>

**September 4, 2019 General Statement:** Ressel & Associates found no observable weaknesses or deficiencies in the debt service issuance, refunding or management processes. CCSD is using standard financing options and has strategically used refunding when appropriate. Refunding of bonds is the process of retiring or redeeming an outstanding bond issue at maturity by using the proceeds from a new debt issue.

CCSD's Financial Advisor monitors the market and alerts the District when bonds might be refunded or refinanced at a lower rate of interest, thereby saving the District money on interest payments and in some cases lowering the amount of debt service payments. When advised of such opportunities, the Assistant Superintendent for Business Affairs prepares a proposal to the Board for consideration. If approved, she then works through the Financial Advisor and Bond Counsel to take appropriate action.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> There have been no appreciable changes in the conditions that were in place at the time of the initial audit.

## CHAPTER 4: GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

## 4.0 GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Chapter 4** presents findings related to goals, objectives and performance measures. As part of the field work, Ressel & Associates examined major districtwide planning efforts and the manner in which management measures day-to-day performance and budgets, and the system of internal controls used to ensure that the program areas under review are meeting their goals and objectives.

The specific audit evaluation tasks are provided below.

- 1. Reviewed program goals and objectives to determine whether they are clearly stated, measurable, can be achieved within budget, and are consistent with the county's or school district's strategic plan.
- 2. Assessed the measures, if any, the county or school district uses to evaluate program performance and determine if they are sufficient to assess program progress toward meeting its stated goals and objectives.
- 3. Evaluated internal controls, including policies and procedures, to determine whether they provide reasonable assurance that program goals and objectives will be met.

**Finding on goals, objectives, and performance measures:** In its September 4, 2019 evaluation, Ressel & Associates found the planning efforts of the District are beginning to take shape under the leadership of the Superintendent; however, linkages between the various plans and clear and measurable strategies and objectives for accomplishing the goals do not currently exist. Board policies and procedures are outdated or, in some instances, are missing key elements. While all bid and contract documentation examined as part of the case studies were found to be in compliance with State and local purchasing guidelines, the decentralized purchasing functions currently handled by the Facilities Planning and Construction Department will require additional central office oversight and a stronger system of internal control to handle the volume and complexity of the purchasing processes for the envisioned Surtax-related projects.

In its August 28, 2020 follow-up audit, Ressel & Associates concluded that CCSD has addressed some of the previous findings, specifically by adopting new purchasing policies and implementing a stronger system of internal controls over the decentralized purchasing function. Purchasing procedures clarifying central office oversight responsibilities are still needed to address the volume and complexity of the purchasing processes for the envisioned Surtax-related projects. Establishing linkages between the various plans and clear and measurable strategies and objectives for accomplishing the goals has not been addressed. In this chapter, the program performance and monitoring of the Clay County School District is presented in the following functional areas:

- 4.1 Districtwide Support for Areas Under Review
- 4.2 Facilities Planning, Use, and Construction
- 4.3 Safety and Security Improvements
- 4.4 Technology Implementation and Upgrades
- 4.5 Service Bond Indebtedness

#### 4.1 DISTRICTWIDE SUPPORT FOR AREAS UNDER REVIEW

This section of the report addresses program performance and monitoring as follows:

- 4.1.1 Strategic Planning
- 4.1.2 Financing Strategies

#### 4.1.1 <u>Strategic Planning</u>

# September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The February 2018 Strategic Plan is embraced by senior staff, yet the Plan contains no measurable objectives and to date has not had an annual update.

Although not required in law or in Board policy, most Florida school districts have districtwide strategic plans. **Exhibit 4-1** provides the components of an effective strategic plan.

| Area of Review      | Component of the Plan | Specific Focus of the Review                              |
|---------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Where are we now?   | Internal/External     | Situation Inventory/Environmental Scan                    |
|                     | Assessment            | Customer Analysis   |
|                     |                       | Quality Assessment and Benchmarking                       |
|                     |                       | Strategic Issues  |
|                     | Mission               | Broad Comprehensive Statement of the                      |
|                     |                       | School District's Purpose                                 |
|                     |                       | Core Values and Actions to Achieve                        |
|                     |                       | Mission   |
|                     |                       | Employees and Management Involvement                      |
| Where do we want to | Vision                | Identifies the School District's Uniqueness               |
| be?                 |                       | when Combined with the Mission and                        |
|                     |                       | Principles  |
|                     |                       | A Compelling Image of the Desired Future                  |
|                     | Strategic Plan        | • The Desired Result After Three or More                  |
|                     | Framework/ Goals and  | Years   |
|                     | Objectives            | • Specific and Measurable Targets for                     |
|                     |                       | Accomplishment  |
|                     |                       | <ul> <li>Leads to Quality Initiative Goals and</li> </ul> |
|                     |                       | Objectives  |

Exhibit 4-1 Overview of an Effective Strategic Plan

| Area of Review       | Component of the Plan   | Specific Focus of the Review                    |
|----------------------|-------------------------|---|
| How do we get there? | Action Plan             | Activities to Accomplish Goals and              |
|                      |                         | Objectives                                      |
|                      |                         | • Detailed Action Plans with Linkage to         |
|                      |                         | Budget  |
|                      |                         | Leads to Resource Allocation                    |
| How do we measure    | Performance Measures    | Ensures Accountability and Continuous           |
| our progress?        |                         | Improvement-linked Performance Targets          |
|                      | Monitoring and Tracking | Methods to Measure Results                      |
|                      |                         | <ul> <li>Systems to Monitor Progress</li> </ul> |
|                      |                         | Compilation of Management Information           |
|                      |                         | Maintains Plan on Track Toward Goals            |

#### Exhibit 4-1 (Continued) Overview of an Effective Strategic Plan

Source: Created by Evergreen Solutions, 2016.

The vision, mission, and core values of the February 2018 Strategic Plan are identified in **Exhibit 4-2.** The Plan's five goals are included in **Exhibit 4-3.** 

#### Exhibit 4-2 Vision, Mission, and Core Values Clay County School District 2018 Strategic Plan

# OUR VISION The School District of Clay County exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills. OUR MISSION Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility. OUR CORE VALUES

Collaboration: We work together to achieve our common mission

*Equity:* We create environments that ensure equal opportunities and celebrate diversity *Excellence:* We expect the highest standards across our entire organization, from the Superintendent to student

Integrity: We build positive relationships based on respect, transparency and honesty

Innovation: We build robust and sustainable systems to solve problems and overcome challenges

Source: Clay County School District website, 2019.

#### Exhibit 4-3 Strategic Plan Goals Clay County School District

| <b>GOAL 1:</b> Develop Great Educators and Leaders                                 |
|--|
| GOAL 2: Improve management of district-wide operations and facilities              |
| <b>GOAL 3:</b> Establish a respectful climate and culture that provides equity and |
| access to all  |
| GOAL 4: Create effective data systems and train individuals to leverage            |
| information  |
| GOAL 5: Develop and support great educators, support personnel, and leaders        |
| Source: Clay County School District website, 2019.                                 |

Each goal is supported by one or more strategies; with each strategy having many initiatives. **Exhibit 4-4** includes the strategies and initiatives for **GOAL 2**.

Comparing the Clay County School District 2018 Strategic Plan to the components of an effective plan, it is clear that several components are missing:

- Most initiatives are not quantifiable.
- Initiatives have no timelines.
- Initiatives have no linkage to the budget.

It is particularly noteworthy that the reduction of portable classrooms, a significant issue for CCSD and a focus for the State, is not addressed in the Strategic Plan.

As can be seen in **Exhibit 4-4**, the initiatives are not quantifiable. For example, Initiative 2.2.5 states:

Increase the number of buses retrofitted with air conditioning.

By having such an initiative in vague terms, staff has no guidance as to:

- the number of buses to be retrofitted;
- the deliverable due date (or if it is spread out over several years); and
- the necessary fiscal resources needed each year to accomplish this initiative.

#### Exhibit 4-4 Clay County School District February 2018 Strategic Plan Strategies and Initiatives of Goal 2

| GOAL 2: Imp       | GOAL 2: Improve management of district-wide operations and facilities   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Strategy 2.1:     | Improve technology in all classrooms and district buildings   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.1.1: | Upgrade all output switches in schools in order to improve speed and access of internet   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.1.2: | Develop and implement technology plan to increase wireless access points in all classrooms  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.1.3: | Implement Digital Classroom Plan to decrease student-to-device ratio  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.1.4: | Develop and implement plan to provide all staff with portable devices upon hire   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.1.5: | Develop and implement plan to upgrade the CAT wiring in all buildings   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Strategy 2.2:     | Improve efficiency and reliability of operations to all district stakeholders   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.2.1: | Construction of Discovery Oaks Elementary School on time and within budget  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.2.2: | Develop and implement plan to become more energy efficient  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.2.3: | Develop and implement a plan to communicate and acquire School Board approval for redistricting plan to accommodate Discovery Oaks Elementary School                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.2.4: | Restructure leadership in the Transportation Department   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.2.5: | Increase the number of buses retrofitted with air conditioning  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.2.6: | Establish and implement new recruiting plan for hiring, training, and retaining bus drivers   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.2.7: | Acquire and implement new work order system for Maintenance Division to improve efficiency of services  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Strategy 2.3:     | Improve security and safety of all district and school buildings  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.3.1: | Increase the number of campuses with camera surveillance  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.3.2: | Increase the number of campuses with front office access controls   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.3.3: | Develop and implement a plan to install security systems at all schools   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.3.4: | Develop and implement School Safety Plans   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.3.5: | Develop and implement a plan for Code Red Drills  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Strategy 2.4: En  | sure effective and efficient use of resources for fiscal stability  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.4.1: | Design and implement fiscal practices and policies that enable the district to maximize efficiency  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.4.2: | Raise the school district's reserve fund balance above 5% threshold   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.4.3: | Implement new business systems to meet the school district's financial needs including human resources and position control requirements                              |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.4.4: | Maintain open communication by publishing the school district budget, monthly and annual financial reports, and annual audit reports on the school district's website |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.4.5: | Develop and implement plan to upgrade the CAT wiring in all buildings   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.4.6: | Develop and implement technology plan to increase wireless access points in all classrooms  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.4.7: | Work to reduce audit findings annually and eliminate repeat findings  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative 2.4.8: | Provide quarterly financial updates and an annual budget workshop for the School Board  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source: Clay      | County School District website, 2019.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |

According to documented Board Agendas, Workshop Minutes and emails provided by the administration, School Board Members were involved in reviewing, refining, and final approval

of the Strategic Plan between November and February of 2018. Several Board members, however, told the auditors that they would have appreciated more direct involvement.

While the plan has not been formally updated, cabinet members said they meet quarterly with the Superintendent to specifically update targets, initiatives, and projects in the Strategic Plan, during which they must defend their current progress and focus.

The Superintendent has provided an annual update via the State of Schools events in January of 2018 and 2019. Additionally, the Superintendent provides monthly updates on related accomplishments at every School Board meeting.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 4-1:**

Provide a formal update to the February 2018 Strategic Plan including both accomplishments and any modifications, and with the approval of the Board, revise the structure of the Plan to include measurable outcomes and budget linkages.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> A November 2019 Newsletter provided a list of accomplishments for the 2018-19 school year based on the February 2018 Strategic Plan; however, no changes nor updates were incorporated into the Plan which continues to contain no measurable objectives.

The CCSD issued a Newsletter to the community in November 2019 sharing the accomplishments of the Strategic Plan for the 2018-19 school year (*www.oneclay.net/page/5324*). However, the original plan itself has not been modified and the original plan continues to be provided on the CCSD website.

An excerpt of the November 2019 Newsletter for Goal 1 is shown in Exhibit 4-5.

The Newsletter does not provide information regarding the projects that are underway but not complete, nor does it set the stage for what the district is planning to focus on for the coming year.

There is no indication that the Strategic Plan is a living document that is reviewed and modified when obstacles are encountered or needs dramatically change, as has been the case since the pandemic. District administrators said that since the Plan will not be updated until 2023, no changes nor updates were incorporated into the Plan; instead updates will be incorporated into the yearly newsletter with accomplishments tied to the strategic plan goals.

Exhibit 4-5 Excerpt of the Newsletter for Goal 1



Source: Clay County School District website www.oneclay.net/page/5324, 2020.

# Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 4-1 still applies.

#### 4.1.2 <u>Financing Strategies</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: CCSD has plans for financing priority needs in the first five years of the Surtax; however, financing strategies adopted and adhered to by the Board are needed to ensure adequate and appropriate financing to address CCSD's long-term needs.

The Financial Advisor has issued a preliminary document showing that leveraging the Surtax through bonded indebtedness could raise approximately \$128 million to fund a portion of the \$300 million in identified needs in the Surtax Resolution. In addition, CCSD prepared a 30-Year list of projected needs totaling \$600 million, which included new schools to address growth over that time period. Staff has put together a project list totaling approximately \$180 million in priority items that they believe should be addressed in the first five years, with the gap in revenues from debt service being supplemented by Impact Fees and Local Capital Improvement Funds (LCIF).

Exhibit 4-6 provides details on the Five-Year Financing Plan.

|                | Estimated First 5-Year Project Needs   |  |  |  |  |
|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| \$182,446,650  | TOTAL Estimated 5-Year Needs   |  |  |  |  |
| \$128,000,000  | 8,000,000 Potential Bond Proceeds  |  |  |  |  |
| (\$54,446,650) | Need Remaining After Bond Proceeds   |  |  |  |  |
|                | Anticipated Annual Revenue Stream  |  |  |  |  |
| \$13,664,133   | (a) Estimated Annual Sales Tax Surtax Proceeds   |  |  |  |  |
| \$5,000,000    | (b) Estimated Annual Supplement from LCIF and Impact Fees  |  |  |  |  |
| \$18,664,133   | Total Available Revenue Each Year  |  |  |  |  |
| (\$7,200,000)  | (c) Less Estimated Annual Debt Service on New Bond Issue   |  |  |  |  |
| \$11,464,133   | (d) Estimated Amount Available After Debt Service Each Year to Address<br>5-Year and Other Ongoing Capital Needs |  |  |  |  |
| \$57,320,665   | TOTAL 5-Year Available Revenues After Debt Service (d) x 5 years   |  |  |  |  |
|                | Summary  |  |  |  |  |
| (\$54,446,650) | Need Remaining After Bond Proceeds   |  |  |  |  |
| \$57,320,665   | Estimated 5-Year Revenues After Debt Service   |  |  |  |  |
| \$2,874,015    | Excess Revenues Available to Address Pricing Increases and Other<br>Project Costs, As Needed                     |  |  |  |  |

#### Exhibit 4-6 CCSD Five-Year Financing Plan

Source: Adapted by Ressel & Associates from Facility Planning and Construction Planning Document, August 2019.

Assuming no additional debt will be issued against the Surtax, the District will be left with approximately \$415 million in needs related to the Surtax projects *and* the growth projections that the district estimates at approximately \$600 million in total. Because these are projections that extend over many years, the initial estimates could grow over time with inflation and the rising cost of construction.

As a result of this gap between needs and revenues, carefully constructed strategies, supported by the Board, will be needed to ensure ability of CCSD to meet those needs. Strategies will have to

include both cost cutting and revenue maximization components. Some of these strategies are discussed below.

**Local Capital Improvement Funds (LCIF):** Today, CCSD uses only a portion of the \$14 million generated annually through LCIF to fund capital projects. While entirely legal to use the funds for other purposes, in addition to the approximately \$6 million in projects that are funded annually from this fund, property insurance, the cost of some debt service, bus replacements, some Maintenance salaries and a number of other legal and appropriate expenses are also being paid from this fund. According to staff, the decision to pay for some of these costs with LCIF funds was made when the fund balance had become dangerously low, and legally using these funds to supplement the operational needs would accelerate the rebuilding of the fund balance.

**Impact Fees:** Impact fees which currently generate approximately \$6 million per year are proceeds from a one-time tax imposed on all new residential and commercial construction by local governments to defray the cost of growth's "impact" on vital services such as schools, parks, roads, ambulance and fire service and other infrastructure needs. As new development occurs the proceeds from impact fees will grow. A report generated by Urbanomics, Inc., in April 2017, and presented to the Board, recommended impact fee increases based on various factors including fees charged by other school districts. This recommendation was not approved by the Board and the Board's decision to change the collection cycle for these fees caused a cash flow issue for the construction that was underway for the new elementary school.

**Redistricting:** The Superintendent presented a no-cost option for temporarily addressing overcrowding and the potential for eliminating some portables to the Board in October 2018. In the past, redistricting was used only when a new school was constructed, and boundaries had to change accordingly. As shown in other sections of this report, CCSD has campuses that are severely overcrowded, while other linger around 85 percent occupancy. The Superintendent pointed out that by leveling the attendance through redistricting, the District could better address the educational needs of the students, save money by reducing the number of portables in use districtwide, and temporarily stave off the need for new facilities until funding from Impact Fees and state per-pupil funding rises to a point where new construction is possible.

**E-Rate and Other Grants:** E-Rate is the commonly used name for the Schools and Libraries Program of the Universal Service Fund, which is administered by the Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC) under the direction of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). The program provides discounts to assist schools and libraries in the United States to obtain affordable telecommunications and Internet access. According to the Director of ITS, the District had not applied for or received E-Rate funding until recently. CCSD is using this funding to improve the technology infrastructure, and may be useful in the future for funding some technology needs for new schools. The Superintendent also alluded to the need to generate more community partnerships as way to mitigate the cost of growth.

While this list is not inclusive, there is potential for strategic planning related to each. In some cases, past decisions may have been sound at the time; however, developing a long term strategy that maximizes revenues and/or minimizes the drain on resources that can and should be directed to capital improvements will provide the administration and Board a standard by which to compare all related decisions. For example, if one of the strategies is to maximize impact fees,

recommendations brought to the Board should contain evidence of how this recommendation will further that goal.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 4-2:**

In cooperation with the School Board, develop a long-term, strategic funding plan for funding and prioritization of the identified \$600 million in total needs.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> CCSD's administration is discussing and solidifying plans for financing priority needs both in terms of short and long-term needs; however, financing strategies adopted and adhered to by the Board are needed to ensure transparency as well as adequate and appropriate financing to address CCSD's total needs.

**Exhibit 4-7** provides the most recent estimates for leveraging the surtax proceeds. As shown, CCSD has identified \$182 million in projects that will need to be completed during the first five years; however, sharing some of the surtax revenues with the two eligible charter schools reduces the amount of money available for CCSD's use for its other stated needs.

|                | Estimated First 5-Year Project Needs  |  |  |  |  |
|----------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| \$182,446,650  | TOTAL Estimated 5-Year Needs (From Proposed Surtax Project List)                          |  |  |  |  |
| \$128,000,000  | Potential Bond Proceeds   |  |  |  |  |
| \$54,446,650   | (a) Need Remaining After Bond Proceeds  |  |  |  |  |
|                | Anticipated Annual Revenue Stream   |  |  |  |  |
| \$13,600,000   | Estimated Annual Sales Tax Surtax Proceeds  |  |  |  |  |
| \$5,000,000    | Estimated Annual Impact Fees  |  |  |  |  |
| \$18,300,000   | Estimated Annual LCIF   |  |  |  |  |
| \$1,000,000    | Capital Outlay and Debt Service   |  |  |  |  |
| \$37,900,000   | (b) Total Available Revenue Each Year   |  |  |  |  |
| (\$14,000,000) | Annual Obligations (Debt Service, Property Casualty, DW Equipment, Maint/PM salaries, Bus |  |  |  |  |
| (\$14,000,000) | Lease Purchase, GPS, Enterprise Resource Software, DW Technology)                         |  |  |  |  |
| (\$7,000,000)  | Less amount needed for ongoing deferred maintenance (Capital Budget), scheduled and       |  |  |  |  |
| (\$7,000,000)  | unscheduled maintenance (Acts of God), additional staffing for Surtax projects, etc.      |  |  |  |  |
| (\$7,200,000)  | Less Estimated Annual Debt Service on New Bond Issue                                      |  |  |  |  |
| (\$544,000)    | Less Proportionate Share for Charter Schools (4%)   |  |  |  |  |
| (\$28,744,000) | (c) Total Obligations Each Year   |  |  |  |  |
| \$9,156,000    | (d) Total Estimated Amount Available After Debt Service Each Year to Address 5-Year       |  |  |  |  |
| \$9,150,000    | and Other Ongoing Capital Needs ( (d) = (b) - (c) )                                       |  |  |  |  |
| \$45,780,000   | (e) TOTAL 5-Year Available Revenues After Debt Service x 5 years ( (e) = (d) x 5)         |  |  |  |  |
|                | Summary   |  |  |  |  |
| \$54,446,650   | (a) Need Remaining After Bond Proceeds  |  |  |  |  |
| \$45,780,000   | (e) Estimated 5-Year Revenues After Ongoing Obligations                                   |  |  |  |  |
| (\$8,666,650)  | Five-Year Deficit   |  |  |  |  |

#### Exhibit 4-7 CCSD Preliminary Five-Year Financing Plan

Source: Assistant Superintendent of Business Services and Interim Assistant Superintendent for Operations, August 2020.

The information presented here is by no means final and will change over time. For example, because of the growth in Clay County, some of the original estimates for the amount of tax dollars that can be generated from the one-half cent sales tax could change over time and positively or negatively impact the total amount of tax proceeds, which in turn would impact the amount shared with charter schools and the amount available during any given year to address new, unexpected maintenance needs.

A more detailed analysis of each of the component line items is currently being developed by the Operations and Business Services areas, in collaboration.

These estimates have not been taken to the Board for their review and discussion. Obtaining the Board's approval for the plan is needed to ensure their commitment to the plan; however, as discussed above, these estimates need to be regularly updated and provided to the Board as well as the Oversight Committee throughout the term of the Surtax.

Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 4-2 still applies.

#### 4.2 FACILITIES PLANNING, USE, AND CONSTRUCTION

Program performance and managing are examined here in the following areas:

- 4.2.1 Educational Facilities Plan
- 4.2.2 Energy Management
- 4.2.3 Maintenance Procedures
- 4.2.4 Maintenance Work Order System
- 4.2.5 Planning and Construction Management

#### 4.2.1 <u>Educational Facilities Plan</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: CCSD's Educational Facilities Plan complies with the State's reporting requirements but is not laid out in the form and format of a typical Facility Master Plan, and the document does not contain linkages to the educational goals of the District.

Although the Educational Facilities Plan is in the form and format established by the State and contains a wealth of information on growth projections, current and future facility needs, and schematic drawings, the pieces are not linked nor presented in the form of a comprehensive facility master plan. In addition, there are no linkages to the District's educational goals and priorities as stated in the strategic plan readily apparent in all cases.

At a minimum, a Facilities Master Plan should address:

• laws, policies, and other guidelines (and annual changes) that impact facility planning and goals (i.e., class size, amenities by grade level, safety and security, etc.);

- the strategy required to meet the need for facilities improvements and for the capital investments necessary to support existing and projected educational needs;
- educational goals of the District to satisfy the needs of students, parents, educators, administrative staff, and the community;
- alternatives in allocating facility resources to achieve the District's goals and objectives; and
- realistic plans to help CCSD provide for its short- and long-range facility needs.

While many of these items are addressed in CCSD planning documents, in some instances, strategies and approaches for addressing specifics are fragmented. For example, the District and State reports show a utilization rate for each school based on the school's total capacity—including portables (See **Appendix D**). However, those reports do not discuss the District's position on the educational suitability of portables, the cost of maintaining portables (energy costs, custodial, etc.), or the capacity of the core infrastructure (cafeterias, rest rooms, auditoriums) and the stress that portables place on that infrastructure. A Long-Range Facility Master Plan would detail the parameters for the acceptable use, highlight the schools at or above those parameters, and lay out plans accordingly.

In many other districts, a Facilities Planning Committee comprised of key staff, community members, and experts in the field are brought in to ensure that priorities reflect community and district goals. Once developed, the Plan should be continually updated on an annual basis, with a new year added to the plan each year.

In its evaluation, Ressel & Associates found that although the District follows all state report guidelines and requirements to produce an annual *Educational Facilities Plan* in compliance with Section 1013.35, Florida Statutes, it does not have a long-range facility master plan that links the various documents and presents a comprehensive picture of facility and construction priorities, standards, and budgets—as well as growth and other planning projections and documents.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 4-3:**

Develop a Long-Range Facility Master Plan that incorporates its educational goals.

# **<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u>** CCSD's Educational Facilities Plan complies with state reporting requirements but the District does not have a formal Long-Range Facility Plan that links to CCSD's educational goals and contains strategies for attaining those goals.

The first step in creating a Long-Range Facility Master Plan is conducting a thorough needs assessment. As shown in **Exhibit 4-8**, CCSD has invested a great deal of effort in assessing the condition and needs in each of its facilities.

Assessing the condition of each facility and calculating the cost of the needed repairs and upgrades is generally the costliest phase of the planning process, yet CCSD was able to conduct this assessment in-house with existing staff. CCSD has also developed growth projections for future schools that will be needed in addition to the basic repair and renovation needs identified above.

In its evaluation, Ressel & Associates found that, based on the elements of a strategic plan provided above, these projections and assessments provide much needed information, however:

- the planned improvements are not yet linked directly to the educational goals of the District to satisfy the needs of students, parents, educators, administrative staff, and the community;
- CCSD has not fully explored alternatives in allocating facility resources to achieve the District's goals and objectives; and
- planned improvements are not yet prioritized with realistic plans to help CCSD provide for its short- and long-range facility needs.

#### Exhibit 4-8 ED FIRST 30-Year Project Development Plan Keystone Feeder Pattern

| KEYSTONE FEEDER PATTERN  |                                   |                                   |                     |                 |  |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| PROPOSED PROJECT/UPGRADE   | Keystone<br>Heights<br>JrSr. High | Keystone<br>Heights<br>Elementary | McRae<br>Elementary | TOTAL           |  |
| OFFICIAL INITIALS  | КНН                               | KHE                               | MRE                 |                 |  |
| YEAR BUILT   | 1974                              | 1956                              | 1996                |                 |  |
| AGE  | 46                                | 64                                | 24                  | 44.7            |  |
| Number of Instructional Units                                    | 67                                | 55                                | 35                  | 157             |  |
| Fire Alarm   | \$6,000.00                        | \$16,000.00                       | \$6,000.00          | \$28,000.00     |  |
| Camera (Elem-85k; Jr - 100k; Sr -125k)                           | \$40,000.00                       | \$60,000.00                       | \$-                 | \$100,000.00    |  |
| Security Alarm (50k)   | \$50,000.00                       | \$50,000.00                       | \$50,000.00         | \$150,000.00    |  |
| Controlled Access (55k)  | \$55,000.00                       | \$55,000.00                       | \$55,000.00         | \$165,000.00    |  |
| External Pa Communication  | \$0                               | \$0                               | \$0                 | \$0             |  |
| Exterior Campus Lighting (Update to Led)                         | \$100,000.00                      | \$30,000.00                       | \$30,000.00         | \$160,000.00    |  |
| Traffic Signage  | \$1,000.00                        | \$1,000.00                        | \$1,000.00          | \$3,000.00      |  |
| Pavement Marking   | \$5,000.00                        | \$5,000.00                        | \$5,000.00          | \$15,000.00     |  |
| Fencing  | \$10,000.00                       | \$5,000.00                        | \$10,000.00         | \$25,000.00     |  |
| Safety Netting (Athletic)  | \$50,000.00                       | \$0                               | \$0                 | \$50,000.00     |  |
| Covered Walkway Upgrades   | \$6,000.00                        | \$40,000.00                       | \$0                 | \$46,000.00     |  |
| # Of HVAC Iu's   | 75                                | 60                                | 45                  | \$180.00        |  |
| HVAC Bard Units (5k)   | \$375,000.00                      | \$300,000.00                      | \$225,000.00        | \$900,000.00    |  |
| Other HVAC   | \$1,250,000.00                    | \$140,000.00                      | \$70,000.00         | \$1,460,000.00  |  |
| HVAC Controls Jr.H - \$170,000 Sr.H -\$180,000                   | \$0                               | \$0                               | \$0                 | \$0             |  |
| Roofing - Major Structure (Lifespan 20 Years; Metal 30+)         | \$972,000.00                      | \$850,000.00                      | \$0                 | \$1,822,000.00  |  |
| Kitchen Equipment 1 Serv Ln - \$225k; 2 Serv Ln - \$260k; 3 Serv |                                   |                                   |                     |                 |  |
| Ln - \$300k; 4 Serv Ln - \$335k                                  | \$335,000.00                      | \$0                               | \$225,000.00        | \$560,000.00    |  |
| Kitchen Renovation   | \$100,000.00                      | \$0                               | \$100,000.00        | \$200,000.00    |  |
| Cafeteria Expansion  | \$0                               | \$0                               | \$0                 | \$0             |  |
| Cafeteria Seating Es: Cap/4*\$600 S: Cap/12*1500                 | \$79,750.00                       | \$25,500.00                       | \$58,500.00         | \$163,750.00    |  |
| # of Restrooms in Need of Reno                                   | 20                                | 6                                 | 6                   | 32              |  |
| Restroom Renovation (\$35k Per)                                  | \$700,000.00                      | \$210,000.00                      | \$210,000.00        | \$1,120,000.00  |  |
| # of Water Fountains (\$800)/ Filling Stations (\$2,500)         | \$15,500.00                       | \$10,000.00                       | \$10,000.00         | \$35,500.00     |  |
| Painting Upgrade   | \$100,000.00                      | \$50,000.00                       | \$50,000.00         | \$200,000.00    |  |
| Technology Infrastructure & Device Refresh                       | \$465,116.28                      | \$465,116.28                      | \$465,116.28        | \$1,395,348.84  |  |
| Classroom Technology Upgrades (3.5k Per Class)                   | \$234,500.00                      | \$192,500.00                      | \$122,500.00        | \$549,500.00    |  |
| Digital Signage (35k +10k For Power)                             | \$45,000.00                       | \$45,000.00                       | \$45,000.00         | \$135,000.00    |  |
| Tvpr Upgrades  | \$25,000.00                       | \$25,000.00                       | \$25,000.00         | \$75,000.00     |  |
| Elementary Physical Education Upgrades (\$100k)                  | \$0                               | \$100,000.00                      | \$100,000.00        | \$200,000.00    |  |
| Shade Structures (Permanent)                                     | \$0                               | \$100,000.00                      | \$100,000.00        | \$200,000.00    |  |
| Stage Floors & Curtains  | \$10,000.00                       | \$10,000.00                       | \$10,000.00         | \$30,000.00     |  |
| School Furniture Replacement (\$7,500 Per Es Classroom; \$10,000 |                                   |                                   |                     |                 |  |
| Per Hs Classroom; \$10,000 Per Media Center)                     | \$680,000.00                      | \$422,500.00                      | \$272,500.00        | \$1,375,000.00  |  |
| Court Resurfacing (\$25k/Court)                                  | \$100,000.00                      | \$25,000.00                       | \$25,000.00         | \$150,000.00    |  |
| Gym Flooring Replacement   | \$100,000.00                      | \$100,000.00                      | \$0                 | \$200,000.00    |  |
| Stadium/Gym Seating Upgrades                                     | \$225,000.00                      | \$0                               | \$0                 | \$225,000.00    |  |
| Track Upgrades   | \$350,000.00                      | \$0                               | \$0                 | \$350,000.00    |  |
| Field Upgrades (Fb/Bb/Sf @\$9/Sf)                                | \$900,000.00                      | \$0                               | \$0                 | \$900,000.00    |  |
| Capital Improvements - Permanent Classroom Addition (2m Per 8)   | \$6,000,000.00                    | \$4,000,000.00                    | \$2,000,000.00      | \$12,000,000.00 |  |
| CCSD Project Needs Expenditure Per School/Cost Center            | \$13,387,048.28                   | \$7,334,757.28                    | \$4,272,722.28      | \$24,994,527.84 |  |

Source: ED First Project Development 30-Year spreadsheet, July 2020.

## Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 4-3 still applies.

#### 4.2.2 <u>Energy Management</u>

# September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The Clay County School District has a coordinated energy-management plan.

In the District's strategic plan Goal 2 to improve management of districtwide operations is Initiative 2.2.2: to develop and implement plan to become more energy efficient.

According to *Evaluate Clay! A Reflection of the First Six Months*, CCSD has reduced its energy consumption by partnering with the Cenergistics group. The effort has been successful by combining energy saving projects such as new technology lighting, energy management controls, and conservative scheduling with modified behavior. When compared to January-May 2015 (when the Cenergistics was launched) the district used 5,500,842 kilowatts (KWH) less in 2019 at 22,153,352 KWH compared to 27,654,194 KWH in 2015. **Exhibit 4-9** shows the District's KWH cost savings since it launched its savings program. Moreover, the Districts' recycling program has taken off, reducing 2017-18 refuge consumption by \$170,920 as compared to 2011-12, a peak year.

| Year  | Total KWH Used | KWH Cost Savings |
|-------|----------------|------------------|
| 2015  | 71,493,256     | \$0              |
| 2016  | 65,813,656     | \$5,679,600      |
| 2017  | 61,932,047     | \$9,561,209      |
| 2018  | 61,551,360     | \$9,941,896      |
| Total | 260,790,319    | \$25,182,705     |

#### Exhibit 4-9 Kilowatt Usage and Cost Savings Clay County School District

Source: Director of Maintenance; BL-14 Executive Energy Profile, August 2019.

When looking at all of its energy consumption from 2016 to 2019 to date, the District has also realized cost savings in water (potable water) and sewer in addition to electricity as shown in **Exhibit 4-10**.

#### Exhibit 4-10 Clay County School District Energy Savings January 2016-May 2019

|          | Use         |            |                | Cost         |             |                |                  |                  |
|----------|-------------|------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Utility  | Actual      | Avoidance  | %<br>Avoidance | Actual       | Avoidance   | %<br>Avoidance | Other<br>Savings | Total<br>Savings |
| Electric | 211,138,475 | 31,925,139 | 13.1           | \$22,220,204 | \$3,415,756 | 13.1           |                  | \$3,415,756      |
| Water    | 46,755      | (1,999)    | -4.5           | \$179,373    | -\$3,663    | -2.1           |                  | -\$3,663         |
| Water &  |             |            |                |              |             |                |                  |                  |
| Sewer    | 268,912     | (44,128)   | -19.6          | \$2,870,083  | \$130,083   | 4.4            | \$10,439         | \$141,246        |

Source: School District of Clay County Overall Program Summary CAP, January 2016-May 2019.

This year, CCDS received recognition that 28 of 41 of the District's Brick and Mortar Schools were energy efficient and received Energy Star Certification.

While the District is already looking toward new opportunities for further reducing energy costs, administrators said this was the first time ever that Clay County Schools were recognized for making these significant improvements.

## <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> CCSD has an energy management plan and continues to partner with the Cenergistics group to improve energy efficiency throughout the district.

As shown in **Exhibit 4-11**, CCSD has the third lowest energy costs per square foot of its peers, yet is maintaining the largest number of portable classrooms, which are typically more difficult to heat and cool.

| School District                      | Natural<br>Gas | Bottled Gas | Electricity | Heating Oil |             | Florida<br>Inventory<br>of School<br>Houses<br>Gross<br>Square Feet | Per Sq. Ft<br>All Energy | Per Sq. Ft.<br>Electric | Total<br>Satisfactory<br>Portable<br>Classrooms<br>FY 2017 |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| St. Johns County School<br>District  | \$50,279       | \$93,962    | \$5,807,648 | \$34,559    | \$5,986,449 | 6,353,499   | \$0.94                   | \$0.91                  | 50   |
| Lake County School<br>District       | \$129,492      | \$38,443    | \$7,499,221 | \$0         | \$7,667,155 | 7,946,498   | \$0.96                   | \$0.94                  | 319  |
| Clay County School<br>District       | \$0            | \$3,775     | \$6,880,700 | \$99,467    | \$6,983,942 | 6,743,458   | \$1.04                   | \$1.02                  | 845  |
| Marion County School<br>District     | \$68,735       | \$53,817    | \$8,024,459 | \$110       | \$8,147,121 | 7,587,841   | \$1.07                   | \$1.06                  | 70   |
| Santa Rosa County School<br>District | \$163,659      | \$9,711     | \$5,847,942 | \$0         | \$6,021,312 | 4,398,171   | \$1.37                   | \$1.33                  | 353  |
| Alachua County School<br>District    | \$278,710      | \$104,091   | \$7,606,225 | \$0         | \$7,989,026 | 5,477,066   | \$1.46                   | \$1.39                  | 74   |

#### Exhibit 4-11 Florida School District Annual Energy Cost Information 2017-18 School Year

Source: Florida School District Annual Energy Cost Information for 2017-18 School Year, July 2020.

Staff reported that despite some requests for more campus and classroom control of room temperatures, having Cenergistics to monitor and control the room temperature centrally has made a significant difference in utility usage and costs. The five-year contract with the Cenergistics group will expire in 2021 and staff indicated that the intent is to renegotiate a contract at that time.

#### 4.2.3 <u>Maintenance Procedures</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: Maintenance Operations and Procedural manual has not been updated since 2012 but efforts to update those procedures are currently underway.

The *Maintenance Department's Operations and Procedural Manual* has not been updated since 2012. In reviewing the various chapters, much of it reads like an employee handbook for Maintenance employees in general, without specific procedures for each trade.

The Manual does contain good guidelines, such as safety on the job, but is not a step-by-step procedures manual. For example, there are no details provided for grounds-keeping tasks, nor what is required when performing HVAC systems inspections. Maintenance management said that no formal employee training is in place for its technicians but on-the-job training is provided.

Efforts to update the manual remained in progress at the time of on-site work, however staff indicated that a draft was nearing completion and would be presented to the School Board for review in September 2019.

The existence of procedures does not, in itself, ensure that the trades are doing their jobs and following procedure correctly. Procedures, do, however, establish minimum standards for performing the job, provide a basic training manual for new employees, and with regular use, can help the District to identify and document changes in the types of equipment being maintained, and address new technologies that may become available.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 4-4:**

Complete the update of the *Maintenance Operations and Procedural Manual* and implement a plan for updates on a three-year basis with specific procedures for each trade.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> CCSD has completed an update to the *Maintenance Operations and Procedural Manual* and plans are in place to present the updated manual to the Board in the coming months.

Revision #5 to the Manual was completed in May 2020, but presentation to the Board was delayed due to the pandemic and other pressing needs. As drafted, **Exhibit 4-12** provides an excerpt from the Table of Contents to illustrate the breadth of topics addressed.

Each section of the manual contains specific steps and procedures for performing the tasks. Report forms and legal references are provided as attachments within the Manual, as follows:

| • Clay County District Schools Safe Drive | r Plan Attachment A          |
|---|------------------------------|
| Driver's Vehicle Report                   | Attachment B                 |
| • Florida Statutes 316.061                | Attachment C                 |
| Property Vandalism/Theft/Other Loss Re    | eport Attachment D           |
| Fuel Report                               | Attachment E                 |
| Florida Statutes 386 Part II              | Attachment F                 |
| • 29 CFE 1926.502 Duty to Have Fall Pro   | tection Attachment G         |
| • 29 CFR1910.147 Control of Hazardous 1   | Energy Standard Attachment H |
|   |                              |

The May 2020 version of the Manual establishes minimum standards for performing the job, provides a basic training manual for new employees and provides safety protocols designed to protect the technician as well as the students and staff in close proximity to the work site.

#### Exhibit 4-12 Maintenance Operations and Procedural Manual Table of Contents

| USE OF DEPARTMENT VEHICLES                                     | 7  |
|--|----|
| MAINTENANCE OF DISTRICT- OWNED VEHICLES                        | 7  |
| VEHICLE SECURITY   | 8  |
| FUEL STATION OPERATIONS, REFUELING OF DISTRICT- OWNED VEHICLES | 9  |
| USE OF MAINTENANCE FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT                    | 10 |
| EMPLOYEE/VISITORS ACCESS TO MAINTENANCE FACILITIES             | 11 |
| INJURIES TO EMPLOYEES AND STUDENTS                             | 12 |
| SMOKING IN VEHICLES AND AT WORK LOCATIONS                      | 13 |
| SAFETY IN THE WORKPLACE  | 13 |
| INTERFACE WITH HIGHER AUTHORITY                                | 13 |
| WORKING HOURS  | 14 |
| LUNCH MEAL   | 15 |
| USE OF INAPPROPRIATE LANGUAGE AROUND SCHOOLS                   | 15 |
| APPROPRIATE GROOMING STANDARDS                                 | 15 |
| REPORTING IN AT SCHOOLS  | 16 |
| DRIVING ON SCHOOL GROUNDS                                      | 16 |
| SCHOOL BOARD KEYS AND SECURITY ACCESS BADGES                   | 16 |
| WORK REQUESTED BY SCHOOL BOARD DEPARTMENT AND SCHOOLS          | 17 |
| ORDERING MATERIALS/SUPPLIES                                    | 18 |
| ASSIGNED TOOLS   | 18 |
| LEAVE  | 18 |
| EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT OR RESIGNATION                             | 19 |
| EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE   | 19 |
| EMPLOYEE TRAINING  | 20 |
| EMPLOYEE ADVANCEMENT POTENTIAL                                 | 20 |
| MAINTENANCE SAFETY MANUAL                                      | 21 |
| GENERAL RULES FOR MAINTENANCE PERSONNEL                        | 29 |
| GENERAL SAFETY PRECAUTIONS                                     | 31 |
| HAND AND POWER TOOLS   | 33 |
| PORTABLE LADDERS, SCAFFOLDS, AND FALL PROTECTION               | 37 |
| HANDLING MATERIALS   | 40 |
| COMPRESSED GAS AND WELDING                                     | 42 |
| VEHICLE OPERATION  | 46 |
| WORK AREA PROTECTION   | 52 |
| HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION                            | 54 |
| PERSONAL PROTECTIVE DEVICES                                    | 58 |
| FIRE PREVENTION AND PROTECTION                                 | 60 |
| CHLORINE   | 63 |
| HAZARDOUS ENERGY CONTROL - LOCKOUT – TAGOUT                    | 63 |
| Source: Director of Maintenance, July 2020.                    |    |

Source: Director of Maintenance, July 2020.

# Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 4-4 is considered to be in progress.

#### 4.2.4 Maintenance Work Order System

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The Maintenance Department implemented a new work order system within the last few months, and is currently working with *Asset Essentials* to develop a good system for measuring performance using this new work order system.

To meet its strategic plan goal to improve management of district-wide operations, the District acquired *Asset Essentials* in March 2019.

Asset Essentials is a software program that District staff uses to submit and track progress on work orders. The work order process is fully online. A predesignated, onsite requester (i.e., head custodian or school administrator) enters a work request, which is forwarded to the appropriate lead. The lead assigns it to a technician who completes the work, enters action taken, parts used, and labor hours used, and saves it in a completed status. The lead will check the work order for accuracy, add other charges or comments if needed, and save the work order into the Archived status.

Maintenance runs monthly reports to track incoming work orders, preventative maintenance, work completed, labor costs, and parts costs. Staff also run quarterly reclass reports for the Finance Department that provide a breakdown, per school and districtwide, of labor, parts, and non-inventory costs.

To meet its strategic plan goal to improve management of district-wide operations, the District acquired *Asset Essentials* in March 2019.

Asset Essentials is a software program that District staff uses to submit and track progress on work orders. The work order process is fully online. A predesignated, onsite requester (i.e., head custodian or school administrator) enters a work request, which is forwarded to the appropriate lead. The lead assigns it to a technician who completes the work, enters action taken, parts used, and labor hours used, and saves it in a completed status. The lead will check the work order for accuracy, add other charges or comments if needed, and save the work order into the Archived status.

Maintenance runs monthly reports to track incoming work orders, preventative maintenance, work completed, labor costs, and parts costs. Staff also run quarterly reclass reports for the Finance Department that provide a breakdown, per school and districtwide, of labor, parts, and non-inventory costs.

While *Asset Essentials* has worked well, and implementation is in the early stages, management is still exploring way that they can use the system to measure internal performance by work orders processed. Currently, the department is running monthly reports for turnaround time, man hours and expenditures and is broken down by trade. These reports are helpful in gauging what work is completed and what is outstanding. According to the Director of Maintenance, no policy or procedure exists for assigning Maintenance priorities; work is assigned daily, as needed, however the system has capabilities that can assist in the process.

Additionally, other users have been able to use the system to identify ways to streamline processes. For example, one District found that some technicians had long drive times from the central warehouse to the schools they served, which meant less time on task in the schools. By either parking service vehicles at the schools that were being serviced or allowing technicians to take service vehicles home, much of the drive time could be eliminated. Having the ability to track this type of data with *Asset Essentials* can help management set priorities and goals based on a continual evaluation of its workload, improve productivity, streamline maintenance activities, and effectively manage its preventative and deferred maintenance effectively.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 4-5:**

Continue to work with *Asset Essentials* to identify data needs and develop reports that can be used to monitor turnaround times, completion of work performed, and quality of work performed collectively and by technician.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> CCSD has used the *Asset Essentials* work order system for more than a year; the system is producing monthly, quarterly and now annual reports that provide management accurate measures of departmental performance.

**Exhibit 4-13** provides the annual statistics gathered in the new system for June 2019 through June 2020. Similar reports are available on a monthly basis, and more detailed reports providing specifics by trade can also be extracted from the system.

#### Exhibit 4-13 Maintenance Status Report June 2019 through June 2020

|         | 1                    |        |       |            |            |           |                 |               |   |  |
|---------|----------------------|--------|-------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------------|---------------|---|--|
|         |                      | Total  |       |            |            |           |                 |               |   |  |
|         |                      | New WO |       | Total      |            |           |                 |               |   |  |
|         |                      | this   | Total | Archived / | Completion | Total Man |                 |               |   |  |
| Section | Work Catergory Shop  | Month  | PMs   | Completed  | Rate       | Hours     | Labor Cost      | Parts Cost    | Total Cost  |  |
| 2       | Bldg Automation Sys  | 153    | 20    | 100        | 65%        | 1306      | \$14,248.16     | \$ 141.61     | \$ 14,389.77  |  |
| 3       | Carpentry            | 2251   | 0     | 2076       | 92%        | 9321      | \$187,170.16    | \$ 74,756.82  | \$ 261,926.98   |  |
| 4       | Com Kitchen Equ      | 897    | 87    | 878        | 98%        | 3180      | \$66,640.19     | \$ 15,248.29  | \$ 81,888.48  |  |
| 5       | Custodial Equ Repair | 732    | 1     | 717        | 98%        | 3379      | \$88,473.65     | \$ 10,076.93  | \$ 98,550.58  |  |
| 6       | Electrical           | 3473   | 389   | 3198       | 92%        | 9102      | \$189,346.37    | \$ 52,028.38  | \$ 241,374.75   |  |
| 7       | Electronics          | 1354   | 39    | 1355       | 100%       | 13163     | \$284,180.67    | \$ 90,975.79  |   |  |
| 9       | HVAC                 | 3571   | 599   | 3338       | 93%        | 9680      | \$178,682.88    | \$ 153,216.50 |   |  |
| 10      | Hvy Equ / Grounds    | 866    | 38    | 844        | 97%        | 7341      | \$142,292.39    | \$ 18,282.54  | and the second se |  |
| 11      | Locksmith            | 2416   | 0     | 2337       | 97%        | 4946      | \$115,244.72    | \$ 46,513.70  | \$ 161,758.42   |  |
| 12      | Maint Warehouse      | 66     | 0     | 78         | 118%       | 104       | \$11,191.81     | \$ -          | \$ 11,191.81  |  |
| 13      | Metal Shop           | 285    | 0     | 276        | 97%        | 1655      | \$56,355.56     | \$ 698.94     | \$ 57,054.50  |  |
| 14      | Painting             | 786    | 0     | 748        | 95%        | 8532      | \$180,589.06    | \$ 29,396.62  | \$ 209,985.68   |  |
| 15      | Pest Control         | 1217   | 0     | 1181       | 97%        | 688       | \$13,749.02     | \$ 54,385.33  | \$ 68,134.35  |  |
| 16      | Plumbing             | 4086   | 1145  | 3610       | 88%        | 7839      | \$165,341.03    | \$ 57,060.57  | \$ 222,401.60   |  |
| 17      | Roofing              | 913    | 0     | 831        | 91%        | 6331      | \$155,069.21    | \$ 12,674.21  | \$ 167,743.4  |  |
|         |                      |        |       |            |            |           |                 |               |   |  |
|         | Totals:              | 23066  | 2318  | 21567      | 95%        | 86567     | \$ 1,848,574.89 | \$ 615,456,23 | \$ 2,464,031.12   |  |

Source: Director of Maintenance, July 2020.

Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 4-5 is considered to be complete, although, the usefulness of the reports will improve as more data is accumulated in the system.

#### 4.2.5 Planning and Construction Management

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The District drafted a Facility Planning and Construction Manual in response to the Auditor General's findings; however, the value of the procedures will be enhanced as staff embraces the concept of using the document as a tool for continual improvement.

At the time of on-site work, staff was in the process of drafting a procedures manual, but indicated that the document was being prepared to address the auditor's recommendations and to ward off future findings. A review of the final document found that the document contains detail specifically in response to the AG's findings however actual day-to-day processes are not well documented.

Prior to the creation of the Procedures Manual, CCSD contracted with the former Director of Facilities to assist with specific projects and to provide training for newer staff. One of the key functions of well-documented procedures is the protection of institutional knowledge. As a result of recent transitions in staff and absence of sufficient and current procedural guidance, the institutional knowledge of the district is diminished. Recent retirements and changes in personnel have negatively impacted the working knowledge of staff as they adjust to their new roles and responsibilities and implementation of new work processes. Staff told the auditors that because staffing in the department has only been one-deep for a number of years, the workload demands made sharing of institutional knowledge and succession planning difficult.

As processes and procedures change with time, changes in statutes or policies, and changes in technology, a continually updated procedures manual provides a tool whereby the changes as well as the reasoning behind the changes can be documented.

Another key function of procedures is accountability. Detailed and complete procedures provide all employees clear guidance with district expectations and protocols. Clearly stated procedures help produce compliance and instill a sense of direction and urgency. Consequently, procedures should be assessed for risk by legal staff or other experts, particularly in areas where the complexity, amount of funding, and legal requirements are more critical. At this time, the newly created procedures have not undergone a legal review.

In creating and continually updating procedures, an opportunity exists for reassessing the processes and looking for ways to streamline operations, improve controls, or simply remove redundancies. In a dynamic environment, periodic review of the process and procedures counters the attitude that "we have always done it this way."

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 4-6:**

Reassess the concept of procedures for the purpose of training and protection of institutional knowledge as implementation of the Facility Planning and Construction Procedures Manual is completed.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> CCSD's Facility Planning and Construction Manual was updated in October 2019 to include a more detailed project checklist; additional revisions and additions are currently being considered.

Staffing changes have left the department short-staffed, but the Interim Assistant Superintendent who continues to serve as the Director until such time as the position can be filled, indicated that the manual was used to train the newest Project Manager that was hired this year. Staff said that additional revisions are being considered and will be added to the manual as the new processes are adopted. Potential procedural changes resulting from the adoption of the new Purchasing Policy in August 2020, for example, may change the manner in which some approvals and paperwork flow through the department.

# Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 4-6 is complete, but the ongoing need for continual updates still applies.

#### 4.3 <u>SAFETY AND SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS</u>

The program and performance of the safety and security functions under review are presented as follows:

- 4.3.1 Internal Performance Measures
- 4.3.2 SB 7030 Compliance Monitoring

#### 4.3.1 Internal Performance Measures

# September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: CCSD Safety and Security functions are in transition for the new school year, and at this point, internal performance measures have not been fully developed.

Goal 2 of the District's Strategic Plan is to Improve Management of District-wide Operations and Facilities. The strategy for doing so is to improve safety and security of all district and school buildings.

Those initiatives are:

- *increase the number of campuses with camera surveillance;*
- *increase the number of campuses with front office access controls;*
- develop and implement a plan to install security systems at all schools;
- *develop and implement School Safety Plans;*
• *develop and implement a plan for Code Red Drill.* 

Although the administration has acknowledged a long list of accomplishments in the area, not the least of which is the implementation of a new Police Department, the Operations Safety and Security and Police Departments have not yet established performance measures tied to the strategic plan's strategies.

Performance measures should be tied to District goals and should, at a minimum, contain linkages to accomplish those goals.

With the implementation of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas Act, the District will be responsible for reporting threat assessment data and School Environmental Safety Incident Report, Florida Safe Schools Assessment Tool, and Mental Health Assistance Allocation Annual Report. Safety and Security measures could be tied to these requirements.

Currently, the Director of Operations Safety and Security indicated that the strategic plan for safety and security is evolving with his transition into his new position. Further, he stated that, once the District completes all the state-mandated requirements, they will incorporate those related goals into the Strategic Plan.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 4-7:**

The Operations Safety and Security and Police Department should continue to collaboratively develop performance measures that are tied to District goals, strategies, and initiatives.

## <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> CCSD Safety and Security functions remain in transition, and the overall strategic plan and performance measures continue to evolve at this time.

The Police Department is still in transition. The Director of Safety and Security has been downgraded to Supervisor under the Police Chief. The Safety and Security Supervisor and the Police Chief indicated that the Strategic Plan for Safety and Security continues to evolve with the transition of roles.

As the District completes all the state-mandated requirements as assisted by the Florida Safe Schools Assessment Tool (FSSAT), they plan to incorporate those related goals and performance measures into the Strategic Plan during the current school year.

## Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 4-7 still applies.

#### 4.3.2 SB 7030 Compliance Monitoring

## September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The District is using a tracking tool to monitor its compliance with SB 7030 implementation.

CCSD uses a tracking tool to monitor its implementation of SB 7030 legislative requirements for:

- FortifyFL App;
- School Environmental Safety Incident Report;
- Behavioral Threat Assessment Instrument;
- Transfer of Student Records;
- Initial Student Registration;
- Drills for Active Shooter and Hostage Situations;
- School Safety Specialist Duties;
- Active Assailant Response Plan;
- Behavioral Threat Assessment Instrument;
- Threat Assessment Team Duties;
- Safe-School Officers;
- Zero Tolerance Policy;
- Florida Safe Schools Assessment Tool; and
- Mental Health Assistance Allocation Plan.

In its review, Ressel & Associates LLC found no concerns for the District's handling of the implementation of safety and security measures required by law. To date, the District is on target to meet these legislative requirements, except where they are waiting on guidance and tools from the Department of Education Office of Safe Schools. Police officers and guardians are assigned to schools and each has written job descriptions. The Climate and Culture Department is providing mental health and threat assessment training.

## <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> The District continues to effectively use its tracking tool to monitor its compliance with SB 7030 implementation.

CCSD administrators, including safety and security employees, reported that they have met the legislative requirements and the department continues to provide training as required and necessary.

#### 4.4 <u>TECHNOLOGY IMPLEMENTATION AND UPGRADES</u>

This section examines the technology-related planning efforts of the district.

#### 4.4.1 <u>Technology Planning</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: Although there were a number of documents referred to by the Director of Information Technology Services as various planning documents, none of these documents appear to be a comprehensive Technology Master plan and none

## of the individual plans are directly linked to the CCSD Strategic Plan. During the course of this study a more comprehensive plan was drafted.

In response to a request for master planning documents, staff provided individual project plans and documents for the roll out of various software and hardware projects, such as a *Risk Assessment Plan* and the 2016-17 Digital Classroom Plan, however, upon further discussion, the Director provided an outdated School District of Clay County, District Technology Plan, July 2013-2016 which had little or no real relevance to the technology environment of the District today.

The District's Strategic Plan contains the following strategies specific to instructional technology, however a number of other strategies throughout the plan speak indirectly to improved technology. For example, one strategy is to implement a work order system for Maintenance – a project that has been completed.

#### Strategy 2.1: Improve technology in all classrooms and district buildings.

- *Initiative 2.1.1: Upgrade all output switches in schools in order to improve speed and access of internet*
- *Initiative 2.1.2: Develop and implement technology plan to increase wireless access points in all classrooms*
- Initiative 2.1.3: Implement Digital Classroom Plan to decrease student-to-device ratio
- *Initiative 2.1.4: Develop and implement plan to provide all staff with portable devices upon hire*

#### Initiative 2.1.5: Develop and implement plan to upgrade the CAT wiring in all buildings

A comprehensive technology master plan integrates business and instructional program needs and sets out a vision for the ideal state in both environments, and takes into account:

- operational needs (instructional and business);
- growth factors;
- financial constraints and opportunities;
- evolving technologies;
- level of Support and Service Needs;
- regulatory and Security Requirements; and
- linkages to other planning documents.

The individual project plans provided to the Ressel Team do not meet these guidelines, but some information contained in those documents could provide a framework for a comprehensive plan. For example, in the project description for the dark fiber project, the description of needs and the rationale for building a more robust network provide a basis for other infrastructure improvements in the future.

Technology is evolving rapidly and in some instances schools in particular become caught up in the move to technology for technologies sake. Creating a vision for the desired technology environment today and five to ten years in the future will ensure that individual projects and initiatives actually move the District in the intended direction.

At the time of this report, management provided a copy of a comprehensive Technology Plan for July 2019 through June 2024. The document had not yet been approved and adopted, but plans are underway to present the document to the Board within the month.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 4-8:**

Once the Technology Plan for July 2019 through June 2024 is adopted, continue to update the plan annually as progress is made and new initiatives are added.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> The draft Technology Plan presented to Ressel & Associates in August 2019 has been modified by the new administration and is on the Board Agenda for adoption on September 3, 2020.

The new Director of Information Technology had worked in the Information Technology Department for a period of three years before he was appointed to his position as Director in July 2020. He recognized the Technology Plan as a document that he and other staff members had worked on but had no direct knowledge of the plan being presented to the Board for approval. As the new Director of Information Technology is transitioning into his position, he has made modifications to the document and the modified Technology Plan for 2020-2025 is on the September 3, 2020 Consent Agenda for the Board's review and approval. The modified document contains elements of a comprehensive planning document and direct links to the districtwide strategic plan.

The Board's approval will confirm the plan and linkages between the budgets necessary to implement the plan and the approved goals provide the Board assurance that the administration is moving toward the achievement of those goals.

## Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 4-8 is in progress.

#### 4.5 <u>SERVICE BOND INDEBTEDNESS</u>

Program and performance monitoring for areas directly involved in the financial functions of the district's operations are presented here as follows:

- 4.5.1 Fund Balance
- 4.5.2 Internal Controls Over Purchasing
- 4.5.3 Central Office Oversight of Bidding and Contracting

#### 4.5.1 Fund Balance

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: While the School Board's Fund Balance Policy seeks to comply with the minimum requirements of Section 1011.015, F.S., the policy does not specify what the Board considers an optimum fund balance.

Over the last five years, CCSD has made a concerted effort to increase the Fund Balance in the General Fund to meet or exceed State guidelines.

Excerpts from the Auditor General's Single Audit for FY 2015 illustrate the problem [*Emphasis Added*]:

- At the end of the current fiscal year, the fund balance of the General Fund totals \$6,584,542.68, which is \$753,025.35 less than the prior fiscal year balance. <u>The General</u> <u>Fund total assigned and unassigned fund balances, which represents net current</u> <u>financial resources available for general appropriation by the Board, was</u> <u>\$5,089,673.43, or 2.08 percent of total General Fund revenues</u>.
- Finding 1: At June 30, 2015, and at the end of each of the two previous fiscal years (June 30, 2013, and June 30, 2014), the District's General Fund total assigned and unassigned fund balances have been only slightly over 2 percent of the Fund's total revenues. As a result, the District has had fewer resources for emergencies and unforeseen situations than other school districts of comparable size. <u>Similar findings were noted in audit</u> reports for the 2012-13 and 2013-14 fiscal years.

Excerpts from the Auditor General's Single Audit for FY 2018 illustrate the improvements [*Emphasis Added*]:

At the end of the current fiscal year, <u>unassigned fund balance is \$12,452,270.63</u>, while the total fund balance is \$28,634,578.83. As a measure of the General Fund's liquidity, it may be useful to compare the total assigned and unassigned fund balances to General Fund total revenues. <u>The total assigned and unassigned fund balance is</u> <u>\$19,678,182.91, or 7.1 percent of the total General Fund revenues</u>, while total fund balance represents 10.4 percent of total General Fund revenues. The assigned and unassigned fund balance increased by \$4,179,896.12, or 27 percent, while the total fund balance increased by \$5,620,108.43, 24.4 percent, during the fiscal year.

The School Board Policy Manual contains the following policy statement:

The Superintendent shall use the following guidelines in preparing the budget for School Board consideration and adoption:

- a. Balanced Operating Fund Budget. The operating budget should be prepared to be in compliance with Chapter 1011, Florida Statutes.
- b. Targeted Minimum Operating Fund Balance. The District shall endeavor to maintain a minimum operating fund balance budget in compliance with Section 1011.051, Florida Statutes.

#### Section 1011.051, F.S., reads as follows:

*Guidelines for General Funds*—The district school board shall maintain a general fund ending fund balance that is sufficient to address normal contingencies.

 $\underline{l}(1)$  If at any time the portion of the general fund's ending fund balance not classified as restricted, committed, or nonspendable in the district's approved operating budget is projected to fall below 3 percent of projected general fund revenues during the current fiscal year, the superintendent shall provide written notification to the district school board and the Commissioner of Education.

(2)(a) If at any time the portion of the general fund's ending fund balance not classified as restricted, committed, or nonspendable in the district's approved operating budget is projected to fall below 2 percent of projected general fund revenues during the current fiscal year, the superintendent shall provide written notification to the district school board and the Commissioner of Education. Within 14 days after receiving such notification, if the commissioner determines that the district does not have a plan that is reasonably anticipated to avoid a financial emergency as determined pursuant to S. <u>218.503</u>, the commissioner shall appoint a financial emergency board that shall operate under the requirements, powers, and duties specified in S.<u>218.503</u>(3)(g).

Although Policy is silent on an actual percentage, CCSD's Strategic Plan, Initiative 2.4.2 contains a goal to: "Raise the school district's reserve fund balance above 5% threshold."

The language of the law leaves the definition of "sufficient" undefined. The Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) in its publication, *Fund Balance Guidelines for the General Fund* makes the following recommendation:

GFOA recommends that governments establish a formal policy on the level of unrestricted fund balance that should be maintained in the general fund for GAAP and budgetary purposes.3 Such a guideline should be set by the appropriate policy body and articulate a framework and process for how the government would increase or decrease the level of unrestricted fund balance over a specific time period. In particular, governments should provide broad guidance in the policy for how resources will be directed to replenish fund balance should the balance fall below the level prescribed.

Appropriate Level. The adequacy of unrestricted fund balance in the general fund should take into account each government's own unique circumstances. For example, governments that may be vulnerable to natural disasters, more dependent on a volatile revenue source, or potentially subject to cuts in state aid and/or federal grants may need to maintain a higher level in the unrestricted fund balance. Articulating these risks in a fund balance policy makes it easier to explain to stakeholders the rationale for a seemingly higher than normal level of fund balance that protects taxpayers and employees from unexpected changes in financial condition. Nevertheless, GFOA recommends, at a minimum, that general-purpose governments, regardless of size, maintain <u>unrestricted budgetary fund balance in their general fund of no less than two months of regular general fund operating revenues or regular general fund operating expenditures...</u>

While the significant improvements in the financial position of the District's General Fund balance are notable, based on the GFOA guidelines and proposed General Fund budgeted expenditures for 2019-20, of approximately \$320 million, two months of operating expenditures would equate to approximately \$54 million. While CCSD had met its goal of bringing the fund balance in line with state minimum requirements, CCSD's audited financial statements for FY 2018 reported an unassigned fund balance of approximately \$12.5 million or approximately one fourth of GFOA's recommended optimum number.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 4-9:**

Establish a fund balance policy in keeping with the GFOA recommendation that articulates a framework and process for building and maintaining the unrestricted fund balance at an acceptable level.

<u>August 28,2020 UPDATE:</u> The School Board's Fund Balance Policy complies with the minimum requirements of Section 1011.015, F.S., however no changes have been made to the policy to define an optimum fund balance.

According to the Audited Financial Report for Fiscal Year 2019: "the unassigned fund balance of the General Fund, representing the net current financial resources available for general appropriation by the Board, total \$13,321,742.45, which is 4.64 percent of total General Fund revenues."

According to the Assistant Superintendent for Business Affairs, the district ended the 2019-20 fiscal year with an unassigned fund balance of 5 percent. **Exhibit 4-14**, which is an excerpt from the Budget Presentation, provides a history of CCSD's fund balance over time.

#### Exhibit 4-14 Clay County School District Unreserved Fund Balance History FY 2011 to FY 2021 Projected

### CLAY COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOLS



Source: Board Presentation, First Public Hearing for the Adoption of Millage and Approval of the 2020-2021 Tentative Budget, July 2020

The statutory minimum fund balance establishes a threshold where state intervention is indicated. Adopting a defined optimum fund balance is a tool used to manage the district's resources safely and effectively.

## Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 4-9 still applies.

#### 4.5.2 Internal Controls Over Purchasing

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: Board policies and administrative procedures are outdated and do not address key aspects of the District's purchasing functions; in some instances current practices are not in line with the intent of policy nor are they conducive to a strong system of internal control.

School Board Policy Section V: Business Affairs contains a Purchasing Section that provides general guidance on purchasing. The Introductory paragraph stipulates the role and responsibility of the Purchasing Director as follows:

#### A. Purchasing

1. The Director of Purchasing will be responsible for organizing and administering acquisitions for the district in accordance with responsibility and authority delegated by the District's Superintendent, School Board and resultant policies. The procedures outlined in the handbook regarding centralized purchasing approved by the School Board will be used by the District Purchasing Department in its conduct of business.

Although Policy refers to the position as Director of Purchasing, the current head of that department is the Purchasing/Material Supervisor, therefore, it is unclear whether Policy intends for the Supervisor or perhaps the Assistant Superintendent for Business Services to be the responsible party.

Policy as well as the *Handbook of Procedures Regarding Centralized Purchasing/Warehouse of Clay County Schools* that reiterate policy, stipulate when competitive bidding is required. Although the language may imply that the Board must approve all contracts and purchases above \$50,000, the policy is not explicit on that point:

Except as authorized by law or rule, competitive solicitations shall be requested from three (3) or more reputable sources for any authorized commodities or contractual services exceeding \$50,000 or more. The School Board may not divide the procurement of commodities or contractual services so as to avoid this monetary threshold requirement. For expenditures less than \$50,000 and when practical, quotations will be requested as follows:

- \$15,000-\$24,999 documented telephone quotes from 2 or more qualified vendors
- \$25,000-\$39,999 written quotes from 3 or more qualified vendors
- \$40,000 formal written sealed quotes

Purchasing staff stated that some purchases and contracts can be signed by the Superintendent, however it is their practice to bring all larger purchases to the Board for approval. During interviews, staff responses regarding what items went to the Board were varied, with \$50,000 being the predominant response, however, the absence of clear language in policy is an opportunity for misinterpretation.

Policy is also silent on any aspect of construction bidding or contracting. During interviews, the Purchasing/Material Supervisor indicated that neither she nor her staff was familiar with the specific purchasing laws relating to those types of purchases. Facilities handles their own advertisements and develop their own solicitation documents using a pre-approved template, etc. Policy makes no mention of the laws or guidelines for soliciting or contracting with Architects.

Policy also requires that all contractors be prequalified. Although the prequalification requirement is found in Section VI of the Policy Manual which deals specifically with Support Services, staff said that all vendors are required to be prequalified. Purchasing is involved with the pre-qualification of all contractor/vendors wanting to do business with the district, including those wishing to do business with the Facilities group. The process for Facilities is directed by Facilities with review and signoff by Purchasing, but it is the Facilities group that takes the final request for prequalification packet for their contractors to the Board for review and approval.

Policy and Purchasing Procedures also require sealed bids and bid evaluations to be handled by Purchasing:

#### **Purchasing Procedures**

*C. Receipt for Bids - Sealed bids are to be received in the <u>Office of the Purchasing Agent</u> at the designated place, date, and time as set forth in all bid invitations.* 

D. Evaluation of Bids - All competitive bids for materials and services shall be evaluated by the <u>Director or Purchasing</u> and staff members involved in the use of materials on bid. The Purchasing Director shall make recommendations to the Board for awarding of contracts, giving careful consideration to prices, quality of materials, services, responsibility of bidder, and other factors consistent with good purchasing practices. The School Board of Clay County is not necessarily bound by the recommendations.

The Purchasing/Material Supervisor stated that, although Facilities handles much of the bidding process, she is responsible for opening sealed bids in accordance with policy. Facilities staff indicated that they contract with the Architect for a project, and the Architect is the one who is responsible for handling the majority of the competitive bid process.

As described above, policy and procedures are missing key purchasing components:

- threshold for purchases requiring Board approval; and
- acceptable solicitation and contracting methods for professional and construction services.

In addition, Board Policy does not appear to intend for the Facilities area to operate autonomously, but rather vests the responsibility and authority with the Purchasing/Material Supervisor.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 4-10:**

## Update Board Purchasing Policies and Administrative Procedures to address the missing components and clarify the roles and responsibilities of all parties to the purchasing process.

Every effort should be made during this process to ensure that internal controls are strong in terms of separation of duties, so that no individual or department is operating without significant oversight by the Purchasing Department.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> Revised Board Purchasing Policies have been adopted, and when administrative purchasing procedures are finalized and fully implemented, they will provide an internal control structure necessary to provide reasonable assurance that the district's interests will be protected during the purchasing and contracting process.

As noted in **Section 5.5.1 External Audits** of this report, the external auditor identified a significant deficiency relating to the federal purchasing requirements as shown in **Exhibit 4-15**.

| SECTION III - FEDERAL AWAR | D FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS  |
|----------------------------|--|
|                            |  |
| Finding Number             | 2019-1   |
| CFDA Number                | 84.027 and 84.173 - Special Education Cluster  |
| Program Title              | Special Education Cluster  |
| Compliance Requirements    | Procurement, Suspension, and Debarment   |
| Pass-Through Entity        | Florida Department of Education (FDOE)   |
| Federal Grant/Contract     |  |
| Number and Grant Year      | 262,263,267, 1725104600 - 2019   |
| Finding Type               | Non-Compliance and Significant Deficiency  |
| Questioned Costs           | None   |
| Finding                    | The District's purchase policy did not adhere to the uniform guidance for<br>purchasing requirements.  |
| Criteria                   | Requirements for procurement using federal funds are found in the<br>Uniform Grant Guidance at 2 CFR 200.317-200.326.  |
| Condition                  | The District did not comply with Federal regulations established in 2 CFR 200. The District's policy over procurement was last amended December 16, 2014, and did not reference being in compliance with the Uniform Guidance. |
| Cause                      | During our audit, we did note the District was in the process of amending their policy to be in compliance with the Uniform Guidance. However, this was not completed as of the beginning of the fiscal year July 1, 2018.     |
| Effect                     | Not in compliance with the procurement requirements established in the<br>Uniform Guidance for Federal Grants.   |
| Recommendation             | We would recommend the District complete updating their procurement policy to ensure they are in compliance with the Uniform Guidance.   |

#### Exhibit 4-15 Federal Award Finding External Audit for Fiscal Year 2018-19

Source: CCSD Annual Financial Audit FY 2018-19

To avoid a repeat finding in the FY 2020 external audit, revisions to the Purchasing Policy had to be completed prior to July 1, 2020. Revisions to the policy were presented at the May 2020 Board meeting and a Notice was approved stating that a Public Hearing on the Policy revision would take place during the June 25, 2020 Board meeting. At the June 2020 meeting, the Policy revision was adopted.

In addition to referencing the Code of Federal Regulations: 2 CFR 200.316; 2 CFR 200.317; 2 CFR 200.318; 2 CFR 200.319; 2 CFR 200.320; 2 CFR 200.321; 2 CFR 200.322; 2 CFR 200.323; 2 CFR 200.324; 2 CFR 200.325; 2 CFR 200.326, these initial changes to the policy addressed one of the two missing elements identified by Ressel & Associates in its original report: policy and procedures should include acceptable solicitation and contracting methods for professional and construction services.

The following excerpts from the initial policy revision provide the following guidance:

"Sealed, competitive bids shall be obtained when the purchase of, and contract for, single items of supplies, materials, or equipment which amounts to \$50,000 and when the Board determines to

*build, repair, enlarge, improve, or demolish a school building/facility the cost of which will exceed \$50,000.*"

"The District may use competitive proposal procedures for qualifications-based procurement of architectural/engineering (A/E) professional services whereby competitors' qualifications are evaluated and the most qualified competitor is selected, subject to negotiation of fair and reasonable compensation. The method, where price is not used as a selection factor, can only be used in procurement of A/E professional services. It cannot be used to purchase other types of services though A/E firms are a potential source to perform the proposed effort."

The second set of revisions, approved by the Board on August 6, 2020, overlays the first revision specifying the authority of the Superintendent and his/her designee relating to purchase orders and contracts, adds FL DOE Rule 6A-1.012 regrading Competitive Solicitation Exemptions, and changes the reference to the Director to Supervisor of Purchasing.

Of note, the reference in policy to the use of blanket purchase orders is removed and the policy now requires requisitions and purchase orders for both competitive and non-competitive purchases, meaning that the central office will now review all requisitions in advance of the issuance of a purchase order. Further, the policy clarifies that "the Superintendent is authorized to issue purchase orders where the total amount does not exceed \$500,000 that is in compliance with purchasing procedures and does not exceed the applicable appropriation in the District budget."

The policy also amends the thresholds for purchases requiring an informal quote from \$15,000 to \$24,999 to \$10,000 to \$24,999, which means that more goods and services will be competitively purchased.

The revised policy places great significance on the Purchasing Handbook as ultimate authority for Purchasing, with only limited exceptions:

15. Procedures as outlined in the Purchasing Handbook shall be the authority for procurement. The policies as stated above will serve as supplemental policies to the Purchasing Handbook. Florida Statutes, State Board of Education Rules, and Federal Regulations are the governing requirements complied with and, in the case of conflict, will take precedence over the Purchasing Handbook.

The Supervisor of Purchasing indicated that she obtained a comprehensive sample Handbook from a neighboring district and has already begun the process of drafting a CCSD Purchasing Handbook based on that sample. The sample contains a section on Construction and Contracting and her plan is to collaborate with the Facility Planning and Construction group to document their procedures based on the revised Purchasing Policy when it is approved by the Board.

Ressel & Associates found the proposed Purchasing Policies contain the level of detail and internal controls needed to address the complexity of the purchasing requirements of the proposed Surtax-related projects.

Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 4-10 is considered to be partially complete, however the creation of administrative procedures is still needed to complete the recommendation.

#### 4.5.3 <u>Central Office Oversight of Bidding and Contracting</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: Based on an examination of bid and contract documents as part of the three case studies conducted by Ressel & Associates, the team found that CCSD complied with purchasing statutes. However, additional central office oversight of the construction bidding and contracting processes will be needed to manage the volume and complexity of Surtax projects.

As noted in the September 4, 2019 observation found in **Section 4.5.2** above, current Board Policies and Administrative procedures lack clarity regarding the roles and responsibilities of the Superintendent as well as other staff. The practice of authorizing the Facilities Department to handle all of its own solicitation, contracting and contract management functions does not provide for an adequate separation of duties, as the same individuals are involved in issuing and negotiating contracts, monitoring the contracts and paying the contractors. There are approvals by Business Affairs staff prior to the issuance of a check to a contractor, but staff said their review primarily involves ensuring the right funds are being used for the right purposes rather than validating the quality and quantity of work performed. Consequently, the *opportunity* exists in the current system for an individual to manipulate the system for their own gain or the gain of the contractor.

The processes within Facilities include the following high-level steps that are in some case derived from the newly developed procedure manual and staff interviews:

- Prequalification of Contractors: Contractors must be prequalified in order to respond to an Invitation to Bid (ITB), Request for Qualifications (RFQ) or a Request for Proposal (RFP).
- Board Approves the Capital Projects list with dollars attributed to each project during the budget cycle; if emergency needs are identified mid-year, these also go to the Board for approval. Procedure is silent on this component.
- Architects and Engineers:
  - Request for Qualifications is advertised.
  - Two interviews are held with a specified number of bidders (Interviewers include representatives from Facilities, Planning & Construction; Maintenance; Code Enforcement; User representative, as needed; and a School Board Member (final interview only)
  - Typically, an annual contract is given to the winning contractor where price is set by contract as a percent of the assigned project cost. Procedure is silent on whether a

standard contract is used, however staff indicated that a template prepared by legal staff is used rather than a standard AIA contract.

- Project Delivery Method is determined by Facility Staff
  - Checklist in procedure does not stipulate who makes the final decision
- Construction Manager: Procedure is silent on the solicitation methods and steps however Board Policy VI: Support Services provides a framework. The following outline was provided by staff during interviews:
  - The project design is prepared by the Architect and brought to the Board for approval; if modifications are required, the final design is brought back to the Board for approval.
  - The Architect works with facility staff to draft the scope of work and prepares the final solicitation documents.
  - Once approved by Facilities, the Architect advertises the bid and answers all questions from the potential bidders.
  - Sealed bids come in and are opened by Purchasing.
  - Various departments check the bids to determine if the bid complies (i.e., is insurance adequate, etc.)
  - According to staff, evaluation is strictly based on price, so low bid wins. Board Policy contains language that bids are evaluated by a committee and decisions are based on multiple criteria. Additionally, Policy discusses contract negotiations following the selection of the recommended contractor.
  - Contract is drafted and goes to the Board for approval. Staff indicated that AIA contracts are used for the construction manager. The School Board Attorney said that he reviews every contract that goes to the Board; however, none of these steps are outlined in policy or procedure.
  - Once approved the contract is signed and work begins.
  - Progress invoices are reviewed by the architect and sent to Facilities Project Manager (PM) for approval. PM reviews, signs and sends to Accounts Payable for payment. CCSD's Business Plus accounting system contains workflows for signoffs by appropriate staff.

In addition, although the Board Attorney said that he reviews all contracts before they are sent to the Board for approval, he said he is not involved with solicitations, evaluations and negotiation processes. There is, however, considerable reliance by CCSD staff on the Architects and Engineers in this process.

This decentralized purchasing process has worked for CCSD primarily because a small group of dedicated individuals with a significant amount of institutional knowledge was able to make it work. Ressel & Associates has found that Purchasing Best Practices often include these common elements:

- well documented policies and procedures;
- fully trained staff;
- centralized oversight and monitoring to ensure legal and policy compliance; and
- a strong IT system with encumbrance and accounting controls.

The administration has an IT system with strong encumbrance and accounting controls and has recognized that the volume and complexity of the Surtax-related projects will require additional staff resources, some of which will be under contract. Consequently, continuing to operate a decentralized purchasing system when key staff is no longer able to manually control every aspect of the process opens the District to significant risk.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 4-11:**

## Centralize the competitive bid and contracting functions for all departments within the Purchasing Department.

Purchasing staff should be trained to handle construction related bidding and contracting functions, or staff should be hired with the type of expertise needed to provide central oversight of those functions currently handled by Facilities Planning and Construction.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> Ressel & Associates found that the revised Board Purchasing Policies recognize and address the need for more central office oversight of the competitive bidding and contracting functions; while formal procedures are pending, CCSD staff have begun to outline the internal control structure in the draft Purchasing Handbook based on the policy revisions.

Facilities Planning and Construction continues to handle the bidding and contracting process for that area; however, policy and procedural changes are being implemented to provide more central office oversight of the construction bidding and contracting processes.

In addition to the changes noted above, Purchasing Policy revisions approved by the Board at the August 2020 meeting address contracting and provide a significant level of central office oversight of the contracting function:

#### *"Contract Review*

All contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the School Board Attorney and/or the Supervisor of Purchasing to ensure legality, compliance with Board policy, and to ensure the Board interests are protected before the authorized signatory may execute the contract.

#### **Board Authorized Contracts**

All contracts having a value of \$100,000 or more shall be authorized by the Board at a regular or special meeting and signed by the Board Chairman.

#### **Delegated** Authority

All approved contracts having a value of less than \$100,000 and contracts described in Board Authorized Contracts above that are exempt from requirement for Board authorization, may be executed by the Superintendent or appropriate District administrator based on the value of the contract."

Enforcement of the policy requiring a requisition to be entered and approved in advance of initiating purchases will allow the District's Business Plus computer system's online approval process to channel the requisitions and purchase orders through the appropriate chain of command, thereby increasing the level of internal control. Procedurally determining when a requisition is entered for large projects and how the legal requirements will be met for the posting and solicitation processes will be a matter to be worked out and documented in the Purchasing Handbook.

Another issue not addressed in policy that will need to be addressed in the Purchasing Handbook is the School Attorney's level of involvement in the bidding and contract negotiation processes.

Ressel & Associates finds that the policies and pending procedures have the potential to provide an adequate level of central office oversight of the bidding and contracting processes.

Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 4-11 is considered to be in progress, however procedural changes clarifying central office oversight responsibilities are still needed.

### CHAPTER 5: REPORTING ACCURACY AND ADEQUACY

### 5.0 REPORTING ACCURACY AND ADEQUACY

**Chapter 5** presents findings related to reporting accuracy and adequacy. During the performance audit, Ressel & Associates examined districtwide information systems as well as any ancillary systems used in each of the functional areas under review to determine if the systems are meeting the business needs of the organization and are capable of delivering timely, accurate and useful information for management and stakeholders. Ressel & Associates also examined the District's website and other tools used to keep the general public informed about ongoing projects and business activities. The Open Records processes were also assessed for responsiveness and accuracy.

The specific audit evaluation tasks are provided below.

- 1. Assessed whether the program has financial and non-financial information systems that provide useful, timely, and accurate information to the public.
- 2. Reviewed available documents, including relevant internal and external reports, that evaluate the accuracy or adequacy of public documents, reports, and requests prepared by the county or school district related to the program.
- 3. Determined whether the public has access to program performance and cost information that is readily available and easy to locate.
- 4. Reviewed processes the program has in place to ensure the accuracy and completeness of any program performance and cost information provided to the public.
- 5. Determined whether the program has procedures in place that ensure that reasonable and timely actions are taken to correct any erroneous and/or incomplete program information included in public documents, reports, and other materials prepared by the county or school district and that these procedures provide for adequate public notice of such corrections.

**Finding on reporting accuracy and adequacy:** In its September 4, 2019 evaluation, Ressel & Associates found no instances of non-compliance. However, policies relating to the handling of Open Records requests need to be reviewed and updated. A review of information provided to the public on the District website and through public requests found that information being provided is accurate and complete. Enhancements to the information available on the website are recommended to further improve communication with targeted groups for specific purposes, such as potential vendors and contractors.

In its August 28, 2020 follow-up audit, Ressel & Associates concluded that its previous findings remain essentially unchanged. Progress is being made to provide more information for potential vendors and contractors on the CCSD website; changes should be available to the public by early September.

In this chapter, the reporting accuracy and adequacy of CCSD is presented in the following functional areas:

- 5.1 Districtwide Support for Areas Under Review
- 5.2 Facilities Planning, Use, and Construction
- 5.3 Safety and Security Improvements
- 5.4 Technology Implementation and Upgrades
- 5.5 Service Bond Indebtedness

#### 5.1 DISTRICTWIDE SUPPORT FOR AREAS UNDER REVIEW

Reporting accuracy and adequacy is addressed in this section in the following areas:

- 5.1.1 Open Records Policy and Procedures
- 5.1.2 District Website
- 5.1.3 Citizens Advisory Committee

#### 5.1.1 **Open Records Policy and Procedures**

#### September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The Clay County School District has a 2012 Boardapproved document that serves as policy for open record requests.

Sections 1001.42 and 1001.43, Florida Statutes as well as Chapter 119, Florida Statutes provide specific guidelines for open records requests.

In CCSD, the IT Department is responsible for open records requests. Requests are logged into a spreadsheet. The only information on the District's website regarding public records requests states the following:

Public record requests may be directed to the Public Records Custodian, Clay County District Schools, 900 Walnut Street, Green Cove Springs, Florida 32043, ATTN: PRR; Phone: 904 336 6504; E-Mail: PRR@myoneclay.net. Clay County District Schools complies with the state statute for public records according to Chapter 119.

At the time of onsite work, no School Board Policy relating to Open Records was found on CCSD's Policy webpage. Administrators later located a 2012 Board-approved document entitled *Training for Open Records Requests*, and uploaded it to the Board's Policy page. The document, authored by a former Deputy Superintendent, outlines very detailed procedures for responding to requests, redacting information that is not subject to open records, estimating labor and copying costs, and invoicing for the cost of preparing the requested documents.

Most school districts in Florida have adopted a policy on Open Records Requests that includes information such as the following:

• All public records shall be available for inspection and copying under the supervision of the custodian (or designee) of the public records at reasonable times during the normal business hours.

- Records that are presently provided by law to be confidential or prohibited from being inspected by the public are exempt from production.
- The Board attorney should review requests, as needed.
- A request to inspect or copy a public record may be made verbally or in writing.
- Requests for public records shall be fulfilled in a limited reasonable amount of time.
- The maximum cost of duplication prescribed by law shall be charged and collected before the work is completed.
- In addition to the actual cost of duplication, a special service charge shall be imposed for the cost of the extensive use of information technology resources or of clerical or administrative personnel.
- A request for information is a request in which the requested information does not already exist in public record form. A specific request for information may or may not have a record that can fulfill the request and if a record exists it will be provided as permitted by law.
- All district records will be maintained in accordance with the GS1-SL and GS7 records retention schedules established by the Florida Department of State.
- The Superintendent or designee is authorized to establish processes and procedures to implement this policy.

*Training for Open Records Requests*, although adopted by the Board, is not presented in the form of a policy, but rather appears to guide staff in basic handling procedures. In addition, the document does not specifically assign a District Records Management Officer or address records retention, the time frame required for responses or the handing of requests to inspect records versus those requesting hard or electronic copies.

In addition, the IT Department has handling procedures which include information on the contact person for public information requests with a cross-reference to the website, a tentative timeline tor response, cost to be charged in any, and how information will be shared through Google. As stated in **Subsection 1.1.2** of this report, the Policy Manual of the Clay County School Board is very outdated and lacks several important policies.

An example Board policy used in another school district for public information requests is shown in **Exhibit 5-1**.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 5-1:**

Adopt an updated Open Records Policy that includes the role of legal counsel regarding the process and the formal designation of a District Records Management Officer.

#### Exhibit 5-1 Example Public Records Policy

- (1) Any District employee or agent possessing, maintaining or controlling public records is the custodian of said records.
- (2) Requests for information and questions regarding the District shall be submitted to the Superintendent's office located at 75 North Pace Boulevard, Pensacola, Florida 32505.
- (3) Except as otherwise provided by law, all records of the Board are public records. Requests for inspection and copying of public records of the Board as a whole shall be submitted to the Superintendent's office. Requests for inspection and copying of records pertaining to individual Board members shall be submitted to the individual board member.
- (4) Responses to requests shall be made by the custodian of the requested public records as quickly as possible. Sufficient time shall be allowed to determine whether the records, documents, or information requested is by law confidential, or otherwise exempt from disclosure.
- (5) The Deputy Superintendent is designated as the District Records Management Liaison Officer ("RMLO"). District personnel are encouraged to confer with the General Counsel and the RMLO as necessary to ensure compliance with this section.
- (6) Copies of public records shall be furnished upon the payment of the cost for duplication and any other service charge or fee set by Section 119.07(4), F.S. (7) Schools and departments shall maintain records in accordance with Section 257.36, F.S.; governing retention and disposition of records.

Source: Escambia County School District Policy Manual, 2019.

# <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> The Clay County School District continues to rely on a 2012 document that serves as procedure for open record requests; the Director of Information and Technology Services (ITS) is assigned to handle Open Records requests and his job description, as updated, designates this position as the District's Custodian of Records.

Board members and the Board attorney confirmed that, to date, no Open Records policy has been developed nor adopted by the Board as recommended. The ITS Director assumed this new position in July 2020 and has started addressing shortcomings in policy with the Board Attorney, beginning with updates to the Student Code of Conduct. These revisions are planned to be part of a comprehensive Records Policy (both private and open records). The job description for the ITS Director is being revised based on the duties assigned during the most recent reorganization. A draft of the job description indicates the following duty:

#### 10. Manage Private and Open Records as the Official Custodian of Records for the district.

As a new Open Records Policy is developed, the Superintendent indicated that the designation would be addressed at that time.

## Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 5-1 still applies.

#### 5.1.2 District Website

#### September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: With few exceptions, the District's website is up-todate and easy to navigate; access to older Board meeting agendas and minutes may prove helpful to the public.

Significant information is available for the community, teachers, students, and staff—including excellent portals. One exception, which was previously identified, relates to the Board Policy Manual. Only Section 1 of the Board Policy Manual is easy to navigate. The other sections have yet to be revised and cannot be pulled individually from the website.

Another exception, which is addressed in **Chapter 6**, is the absence of visible information on the Surtax.

## <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> The District's website remains up-to-date in most instances and easy to navigate; the process in place to maintain the website appears effective and efficient.

The District's website continues to be up-to-date and easy to navigate. As one recent example, information on COVID-19 back-to-school options are clearly described. Additionally, archived Board Meeting Agendas and Minutes are now easier to find.

The process for maintaining an up-to-date website includes one individual on the IT staff who works with the Communications Office to keep the website up-to-date. Budget for maintaining the website falls under IT, but both offices can update the website. The content for changes to a department's site are the responsibility of the department staff, but the uploading and design of how that would appear on the website would be up to IT or Communications to implement. Content updates are the responsibility of the user department, but when IT staff notice outdated information, they initiate a change.

#### 5.1.3 <u>Citizen Advisory Committees</u>

## September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The Clay County School District has not been successful in the use of citizen advisory committees in recent years.

CCSD indicated in the adopted Surtax resolution that an Oversight Committee would be appointed by the School Board, but administrators said that plans for the appointment of an Oversight Committee and the identification of potential committee members by the Board have been put on hold pending the final decision regarding the timing of the referendum.

Although not required by law, most school districts use community-based advisory committees for a number of purposes. Generally, these advisory committees are comprised of community members appointed by the School Board or Superintendent and are charged with overseeing some aspect of a school district's operations.

External advisory committees are generally comprised of community experts in the field; outcomes from these committees help to drive the District's continual improvement efforts.

The two committees most other school districts have that are engaged with capital projects are a Construction Advisory Committee and the Finance Advisory Committee. Each is described below:

- Construction Advisory Committee: The purpose of a Construction Advisory Committee is to provide input, advice, and support to a district's Capital Plan. This Committee could also review proposed new construction and renovation projects, as well as review plans for compliance with safety-to-life issues.
- Finance Advisory Committee: The purpose of a Finance Advisory Committee is to provide input, advice, and support in the preparation of the capital and operation budget for the district. Generally, community representatives with expertise in Finance are asked to serve on a committee of this type.

In addition, many district superintendents have effectively used a Business Roundtable or Business Advisory Committee to provide advice on community-related business issues among CEOs in a community.

The Clay County School District has no effective model for using committees of this type. In fact, last year the CCSD District Advisory Committee was disbanded due to ineffectiveness and lack of volunteers who asked to serve on the Committee.

During interviews with Board members and administrators, the Ressel Team heard that, based on past experiences, some Clay County citizens may be disenchanted with their role and responsibilities as members of an ineffective advisory committee. As such, the Clay County community may be skeptical as to whether this new Surtax Oversight Committee can be effective in carrying out its charge. Documenting clear expectations for the committee and providing training for prospective members could dispel this perception and establish a framework for its success.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 5-2:**

Inform the public of the importance of the Surtax Oversight Committee, establish clear guidelines for the role and responsibility of the committee and when the Board appoints the Oversight Committee, provide training for committee members as to their valuable role and responsibilities.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> The Clay County School District is making effective use of a new ad hoc citizen advisory committee, the Smart Restart Task Force, to work collaboratively with the District on issues concerning the opening of schools; an Oversight Committee relating to the Surtax is envisioned but will not be formed until the Surtax passes.

Since the September Report, only one advisory committee has been appointed—the Smart Restart Task Force. This ad hoc Task Force was created to work on "back-to-school" issues relating to COVID-19. It is comprised of many community members, including parents and business leaders. The Task Force has several subcommittees (e.g., school nurses, nutrition services). District administrators and Board members stated that this group has been invaluable in helping them to determine strategies for opening schools during this very difficult time. Parents feel involved in supporting administrators in making difficult decisions regarding the safety of students and staff.

To date, a Surtax Oversight Committee has yet to be appointed, but each Board member confirmed that this Committee will be created when the Surtax passes.

Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 5-2 still applies.

#### 5.2 FACILITIES PLANNING, USE, AND CONSTRUCTION

This section addresses reporting accuracy and adequacy in the following areas:

- 5.2.1 Terminology
- 5.2.2 Vendor/Contractor Information

#### 5.2.1 <u>Terminology</u>

## September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The terminology used by CCSD officials when referring to District needs and planning efforts relating to the Surtax projects and growth needs need clarification and consistency.

When the Ressel Team initially began work, a number of documents and references made to initiatives led to some confusion among the team members about which project lists related directly to the Surtax referendum. In the documentation requested and received from the district, the team received one project needs document entitled *ED F.I.R.S.T Proposed Projects* and another called *PENNY PROJECT DEVELOPMENT 30 YEAR*.

Both ED F.I.R.S.T and the "Penny Project" are terms used somewhat interchangeably by staff in reference to the envisioned Surtax projects; however the Penny Project document contains the 30-Year needs assessment, only a portion of which is included in the Surtax resolution. When asked about this, staff indicated that the penny reference was actually a reference to the half-cent Sales Surtax but the document itself includes the full \$600 million in needs including needs relating to projected growth.

While using this terminology appears to be an attempt on the part of the administration to create a "branding" concept for the projects, inconsistencies in numbers and naming conventions may have an opposite effect.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

**Recommendation 5-3:** 

Bring consistency to the terminology used when referencing the two phases of the envisioned projects to improve community understanding.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> CCSD publications and internal communications consistently use the term ED FIRST when referring to Surtax-related projects; New Growth is now being consistently used when referring to the 30-year projected growth needs formerly referred to by the term Penny Project.

The language change can be seen in the following Quick Facts document found on CCSD's website (Exhibit 5-2).

Exhibit 5-2 ED FIRST Quick Facts

## THE HALF-CENT FOR SCHOOLS: NUCATION FACILITIES INFRASTRUCTURE RESTRICTED SALES TAX



Clay County District Schools has become a preferred district. Funding is needed to build new schools due to expected growth in student enrollment over the next decade. Doing so will also relieve potential overcrowding in schools. Clay County's schools are in sad shape. Old, outdated classrooms, inadequate science labs, leaking roofs, air conditioners that constantly break down, portables crowding out playgrounds, students eating lunch at 10:00 in the morning—the evidence is everywhere. With the majority of schools at 50 years or older, more than \$318 million in facility renovations has been identified as needed right now as well as an additional \$300 million in new schools to meet anticipated growth in the next 5-10 years.

Our students need and deserve schools that are safe, updated, comfortable and promote learning. That's why ED.F.I.R.S.T. Half-Cent for Schools will be on the ballot in **November 2020**, It's a restricted half-cent sales tax that would raise money to revitalize local schools and can only be used for capital improvement projects listed in the referendum. That means renovating and remodeling classrooms, science labs, media centers and other spaces; replacing and repairing deteriorating roofs, air conditioners and other items; replacing portables with permanent classrooms; and other improvements to our existing schools.

#### Exhibit 5-2 (Continued) ED FIRST Quick Facts

#### CLAY COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOLS PROPOSED HALF CENT SALES TAX QUICK FACTS

| Deferre   | ed Maintenance – Outdated Facilities Must Be Renovated and Upgraded  |
|-----------|--|
| 0         | Approximately \$300 million plus in identified need for repairs and maintenance                                |
| 0         | Average facility age: Approximately 38 years old   |
|           | <ul> <li>Oldest school: Orange Park Elementary 91 years</li> </ul>   |
|           | <ul> <li>25 percent of schools are approaching 50 years or older</li> </ul>                                    |
| 0         | State Funding Cuts Over Time   |
|           | \$0 for PECO (state's public education capital outlay) New Growth/\$0 for PECO Maintenance                     |
|           | Impact Fees are low and generate only \$5 million a year   |
| 0         | District has 900 plus portables, which are inefficient, unsightly, and impossible to harden for safety         |
| 0         | Third most portables in the state (Miami-Dade (1 <sup>st</sup> ) and Orange County-Orlando (2 <sup>nd</sup> )) |
|           |  |
| New G     | rowth – New Schools  |
| 0         | Approximately \$300 million in new growth  |
| 0         | There is a need for 5-7 schools in the next 10 years   |
| 0         | Clay named Fastest Growing County in Florida   |
| 0         | Number of Projected New Homes: 15,534  |
| 0         | Number of Projected New Students: 6,636  |
|           |  |
| Source: ( | CCSD Website https://www.oneclay.net/domain/5229, July 2020.   |

Staff told the Ressel team that the decision to discontinue the use of the term "Penny Project" was based on the fact that its use was confusing to staff and community members since the Surtax is actually a one-half cent tax.

## Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 5-3 is complete.

#### 5.2.2 <u>Vendor/Contractor Information</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: All vendors and contractors wishing to do business with the District must go through a prequalification process before they are able to submit a bid; making the information on the Website more visible to vendors/contractors could be a tool for increasing participation.

Section VI of Board Policy requires contractors to be prequalified and outlines the steps that a vendor/contractor must go through to be prequalified. The policy also stipulates that the qualification will be effective for one year after the date of approval. The pre-qualification process is managed by the Administrative Secretary in Facilities Planning and Construction.

The general process described by staff includes the following:

- An interested vendor/contractor accesses a packet of information describing what they need to provide and the forms they need to complete and return.
- The forms are mailed to the district and processed by the Administrative Secretary.

- The packet is distributed to various groups for review and signoff (Insurance, Purchasing, School Board Attorney)
- The packet is returned to the Administrative Secretary and sign off is sought from the Assistant Superintendent of Operations, Director of Maintenance, Purchasing/Material Supervisor, Risk Manager and the Board Member assigned to sign after Board approval.
- Assuming the packet is signed off on by all parties, the vendor/contractor is sent a Pre-Qualification Certificate that is valid for one year.
- Each year the vendor/contractor must reapply and the process begins again.
- If for any reason the vendor/contractor is disqualified at any point, the Administrative Secretary sends a notice to staff that this vendor/contractor is no longer eligible for purchases, and a hold is placed on the Business Plus system to prevent purchases from that vendor/contractor.

The prequalification process appears to add additional controls, and the vendor/contractors that are currently doing business with the district are well aware of the process. Although staff said that all vendors and contractors, whether for construction projects or general purchasing, must go through the prequalification process, CCSD's Purchasing webpage contains no reference to the need for prequalification prior to doing business with the district.

Exhibit 5-3 shows the instructions provided to vendor/contractors wishing to be pre-qualified.

#### Exhibit 5-3 Vendor Pre-Qualification Instructions

| For pre-qualification in Clay County, you must submit at a minimum one copy of the following, in the following order:  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| 1. A copy of any and all state licenses you hold.  |  |  |  |
| 2. If you wish to do work over \$300,000.00, a letter from your surety company showing the name of the company who will be bonding you and the amount, single and aggregate, they will bond you for (see above School Board Policy for bonding amounts and ratings).                         |  |  |  |
| 3. A company profile (you may use the AIA Document 305A or any format you wish for this). At a minimum, you should list your company name, address, phone numbers, fax, <u>email</u> , how long you have been in business, what service you provide and who the officers of the company are. |  |  |  |
| 4. The Sworn Statement of Public Entity Crimes (above) signed and notarized.   |  |  |  |
| 5. A list of projects completed by your company in the past five years. If the list is extremely long, you may pull out similar work and submit that.  |  |  |  |
| 6. A statement regarding any litigation or claims against your company in the past five years. If there has been none, you must state that.  |  |  |  |
| 7. Insurance certificate showing your liability, automobile and workers comp coverage (see School Board Policy above for limits).  |  |  |  |
| 8. A statement saying that everything submitted is true and correct and this must be signed and notarized.   |  |  |  |
| Also, PLEASE submit a new <u>W-9</u> and <u>New Vendor Questionnaire</u> with your package, so we can forward it to the Business Affairs Division for a Vendor ID Number.  |  |  |  |
| This pre-qualification is good for <b>one year</b> from approval by the School Board.  |  |  |  |
| To renew your pre-qualification, you must update and resubmit all of the above.  |  |  |  |
| Please submit your packages to:  |  |  |  |
| Clay County District Schools<br>Michelle Todd, Administrative Secretary<br>Facility Planning and Construction<br>925 West Center Street<br>Green Cove Springs, FL 32043  |  |  |  |
| For questions, please call (904) 336-6851.   |  |  |  |

Source: Facilities Planning and Construction, August 2019.

The information provided on the Facilities Planning and Construction website contains a reference to the address where the prequalification information needs to be sent, but there is no verbiage with it to explain the process nor was the link to the information packet readily found. (See **Exhibit 5-4**) At the bottom of the page, following the list of staff contacts, is a link to the Prequalification forms and instructions. However, without knowing that the forms are at the bottom of the page, a potential new vendor/contractor may not intuitively go to that file to obtain the additional information.

Exhibit 5-4 Reference on CCSD Website to Vendor/Contractor Pre-Qualification



Source: https://www.oneclay.net/Page/4101

Many school districts have a link on the Purchasing Webpage referred to as "Doing Business with the District" that provides a guide for any vendor wishing to be considered. For example, the Lee County School District, FL has a page for vendors or potential vendors (*https://www.leeschools.net/cms/One.aspx?portalId=676305&pageId=1390333*) that provides:

- Links to Purchasing Policies and Procedures
- Vendor Registration forms (similar to pre-qualification)
- Links to current and recent Solicitations and Awards
- Fingerprinting requirements
- Other information such as how and when payments are processed, etc.

In conversations with administrators in the Lee County School District, it was apparent that the reason for the webpage was two-fold: 1) reduce the number of phone calls from vendors, and; 2) increase participation among the vendor community as a whole. In their opinion, broadening the number of contractors/vendors bidding on projects resulted in more competitive bids.

As CCSD moves forward with the many projects envisioned in the Surtax Resolution, expanding the vendor base to ensure that a sufficient pool of vendors is available to use when multiple projects run simultaneously.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 5-4:**

Expand the Webpage to include more information for vendor/contractors, and more easily accessible vendor/contractor information regarding the process for doing business with CCSD.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> Information relating to the vendor prequalification process and other helpful information for vendors seeking to do business with CCSD continues to be limited, however significant changes to the Purchasing website are in progress and should be available online by early September 2020.

Ressel & Associates observed no substantive changes to the Purchasing or Facility Planning and Construction websites, however screen shots of the proposed new webpages that are being worked on with the Information Technology and Services Division indicate that CCSD is in the process of updating the website. As shown in **Exhibit 5-5**, the mockup for the "Doing Business with the District" page has a series of links to pages containing relevant information, including a link to the Purchasing Policy that was recently revised.





Mock Up of Doing Business With the District Webpage

Source: CCSD Purchasing Department, August 2020.

While there is still work to be done, copies of the new links and pages are evidence that CCSD has embraced the concept of a more informative webpage for vendors seeking to do business

with the district. Staff indicated that every effort is being made to have the major portions of the new Purchasing pages available in early September, with the understanding that the opening of school will remain a priority for the ITS department.

Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 5-4 is in progress.

#### 5.3 <u>SAFETY AND SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS</u>

This section discusses the system and information sharing practices relating to safety and security functions.

#### 5.3.1 Systems and Information Sharing

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: CCSD has systems and procedures in place regarding the sharing of information, however the program could be enhanced by making it easier for students, staff and community members to report suspicious activity by more prominently displaying local phone numbers and local and state tip lines on CCSD's website.

Sensitive and confidential information such as various emergency response plans are not and should not be shared with the public as this information could place the District at risk should it fall into the hands of someone with evil intent. Further, student information is not shared in compliance with federal privacy requirements. If the District receives a request for information regard incidents or planning documents, the practice is to direct the individual to submit an open records request and depending on the type of report, any confidential information would be redacted.

CCSD's Police Department uses *TraCS* software, which provides the ability to record, retrieve, and manage incident information for law enforcement. *TraCS* is also used by other county law enforcement agencies, improving the District's ability to exchange confidential and sensitive information.

The District does not have a hotline to report threats and suspicious activity. During interviews, staff indicated that threats are to be reported to the CCSD Police Department number through a 24-hour dispatch; however, the CCSD website does not list the CCSD Police Department in its list of departments. (See Exhibit 5-6)

If the inquirer knows to look under Safety and Security, there is a link that has been added for Reporting Suspicious Behavior, and that link instructs the inquirer to call the CCSD Police Department or use the state's *FortifyFL* application, which notifies law enforcement and school officials immediately.

| Exhibit 5-6   |
|---|
| Webpages Relating to Reports of Suspicious Behavior |

| 2  | Employee Benefits                                      | E F H I L M O P R S T<br>• Operations   | Safety and Security  |
|--|--|---|--|
| 21st Century Community<br>Learning Centers | English for Speakers of Other                          | P   | Home   |
| Learning Centers                           | Languages  | Payroll   | rone   |
|  | <ul> <li>Exceptional Student Education</li> </ul>      | Print Center  | Colored Construction and the local and the                           |
| Academic Services                          | F  | Professional Learning   | Safety and Security Leadership                                       |
| Academies of Clay                          | <ul> <li>Facility Planning and Construction</li> </ul> | Property Control  |  |
| Accounts Payable                           | <ul> <li>Food and Nutrition Services</li> </ul>        | Psychological Services  | Safety and Security Staff  |
| Adult and Community Education              | н  |   |  |
| Assessment                                 | Health Services  | Purchasing  | Department Information   |
|  | Human Resources  | R   | N.   |
| Business Affairs                           | 1  | Risk Management   | Report Suspicious Activity   |
|  | Information and Technology                             | s   |  |
| Calendars                                  | Services   | Safety and Security   | Emergency  |
| Career and Technical Ed                    | <ul> <li>Instructional Resources</li> </ul>            | <ul> <li>School Board Attorney's Office</li> </ul>  |  |
|  |  | Image: Second | 925 Center St.<br>Green Cow Springs, FL 32043<br>Phone: 904-336-0100 |
|  |  | "As part of the District's orgoing efforts to strengthen<br>the safety and security of all facilities, I am excited to<br>share a resource with you that is now available<br>called FortHFL. This is an applicat can be downloaded<br>for FREE and Is available on the student portal. The<br>purpose of the tool is to allow all citizens to report<br>suspicious activity in their community, including at<br>school.   | Quick Links  |
|  |  | Please know that this program is ONLY to report suspicious<br>activity that is viewed as a potential threat and not to be   | FortifyFL  |

Source: CCSD Website, August 2019.

When a call is placed to the CCSD Police Department after hours, the Superintendent and Director of Operations and Safety and Security are notified.

According to the Assistant Superintendent for Climate and Culture, the District launched a bullying hotline in 2018-19, and students are routinely reminded about it. However, he indicated that it is rarely used because, in most instances, students will report these incidents to an adult on campus. A search of the website located the Bully Prevention link under Student Services, but as with the information on reporting suspicious behavior, the individual must search to find that link.

Many school districts around the state and nation have been able to avert a major catastrophic event because someone in the school system or community reported bullying and/or suspicious behavior. In several instances, a search of Florida schools found a number of links on the home page along with links to cafeteria calendars, transportation services and the like.

Placing the links for reporting suspicious behavior and bullying in a more prominent location on the CCSD website and adding the CCSD Police Department to the departmental list, would provide a readily available manner for reporting such things.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 5-5:**

Enhance the website to prominently provide a mechanism and instructions to students, staff and the community members for reporting bullying and suspicious behavior.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> CCSD's systems and procedures remain in place regarding the sharing of information; a state-required link to the Child and Families Abuse Hotline was placed on the OneClay Portal page to ensure that parents see that link, however, no other local links have been added for staff and community members to report suspicious behavior.

In Spring 2020, the State required all school districts to prominently display a link to the Children and Families ABUSE hotline on the district website. The district determined that most parents access the OneClay Portal frequently, and placed the link on the sign-on page of the OneClay Portal on CCSD's website. Both the Police Chief and the Supervisor of Safety and Security stated that no other links have been added to the website, either on the home page or OneClay Portal page.

Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 5-5 is considered to be partially implemented and the recommendation still applies.

#### 5.4 <u>TECHNOLOGY IMPLEMENTATION AND UPGRADES</u>

This section addresses the business technology in use by the district at this time.

#### 5.4.1 <u>Business Technology</u>

## September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: Business technology in the District is improving with the conversion to Business Plus.

In 2016, the District made the decision to replace the Legacy Terms business software. Business Plus was selected and the conversion of the accounting and purchasing modules from Terms to Business Plus was completed in November of 2017. Payroll continued to run through Terms until January 2019 when the first payroll was produced through the new system. Due to the mid-year conversion, the two payroll systems continue to be used.

Converting to the new system with the more robust controls was an important move for the District in controlling over budget expenditures that were contributing to the dangerously low fund balance.

The encumbrance controls within Business Plus are being used effectively with work flows requiring approval and review by various levels of management. Depending on the type of purchase, the system electronically sends the purchasing requests through a chain of approvals. If the purchase is for an item valued at \$1,000 or more, the system will automatically alert the

individual responsible for tracking fixed assets. If the purchase amount requires a competitive bid, the system will stop the process until the appropriate quotes or bids are obtained.

Business Affairs Department staff indicated that training bookkeepers at the campus level to use the more robust system for entering requisitions, obtaining online approvals and monitoring budgets has been a challenge. While some employees would still like to buy what they want from a local store without prior approval, training and monitoring are helping them to understand and appreciate the system.

The Purchasing staff provided a copy of a 22-page *Welcome Back* document that is shared with Bookkeepers at the beginning of the year that provides helpful hints on the use of Business Plus. The Guide contains screen shots of the Business Plus system and most frequently used codes and instructions on various types of purchases. The guide also provides contact names and numbers for the individuals in Purchasing should the bookkeeper need assistance as well as contact information and purchasing guidance for ordering from pre-approved vendors.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> CCSD's Business Plus system is now fully operational with both the Human Resource and Payroll functions fully converted from the legacy system in July 2019; according to staff, the new system has resulted in a stronger system of internal controls, noting that implementing position controls has increased budgetary control overall.

As with any new system, the staff continue to work with the vendor on minor issues and modifications, however for the most part, staff said the system is helping CCSD to improve its internal controls and streamline many of its processes. The Assistant Superintendent for Business Affairs said one benefit of the integrated system is the position control feature that facilitates the annual forecasting and budgeting of staffing allocations, tracks positions as part of the District's position budgeting processes and ensures that only budgeted positions are filled.

This year was the first time they were able to use this feature during the annual budgeting process, which she indicated was especially beneficial as new and different types of positions are being added and positions are being shifted to accommodate COVID-19-related needs. Human Resources staff also commented on the fact that they are able to track and report vacancies more rapidly through the new system.

#### 5.5 <u>SERVICE BOND INDEBTEDNESS</u>

This section is intended to provide information regarding the external audits.

#### 5.5.1 <u>External Audits</u>

## September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: CCSD's external audits revealed that over the last four years, the District has received unmodified opinions on its annual external audits.

CCSD is subject to an Auditor General Single Audit every three years, and contracts for an independent external audit in the years where the AG is not scheduled. At this time, CCSD uses the audit service of Purvis Gray and Company for those audits.

As shown in **Exhibit 5-7**, CCSD has received unmodified opinions on its external audits over the last five years. Significant Deficiencies in Federal Awards were identified in two of the four years; an explanation of the finding is found below the chart.

|  | FY   | FY                                | FY   | FY            |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|---------------|
|  | 2014-15  | 2015-16                           | 2016-17  | 2017-18       |
| Auditor General Report/ Independent  | Auditor  | Purvis Gray &                     | Purvis Gray & Company  | Auditor       |
| Auditor  | General  | Company                           |  | General       |
| Type of Auditor's Report Issued – Financial<br>Statements  | Unmodified   | Unmodified                        | Except for the exclusion of<br>the discretely presented<br>component unit from the<br>scope of the audit, there was<br>no modification to the opinion<br>on the financial statements | Unmodified    |
| Material Weaknesses – Financial Reporting  | No   | No                                | No   | No            |
| Significant Deficiency – Financial<br>Reporting  | None Reported  | None Reported                     | None Reported  | None Reported |
| Material Non-Compliance – Financial<br>Statements  | No   | No                                | No   | No            |
| Material Weaknesses - Federal Awards   | No   | No                                | No   | No            |
| Significant Deficiency – Federal Awards  | Yes  | None Reported                     | Yes  | None Reported |
| Type of auditors report issued on<br>compliance for major programs   | Unmodified   | Unmodified for all major programs | Unmodified for all major programs  | Unmodified    |
| Any audit findings disclosed that are<br>required to be reported in accordance with 2<br>CFR 200.516(a)? (formerly Section 510(a)<br>of OMB Circular A-133)? | Yes  | No                                | Yes  | Yes           |
| Prior Year Audit Findings Corrected  | No   | Yes                               | N/A  | Yes           |
| Significant Deficiencies in 2014-15  | <ul> <li>Federal Awards Finding No. 2015-001: The District did not maintain required documentation to support salary and benefit charges for several District employees. <i>Report No. 2016-157 March 2016 Page iii</i></li> <li>Federal Awards Finding No. 2015-002: The District's contributions to its workers' compensation self-insurance program did not follow a consistent costing policy and were not allocated as a general administrative expense to all District activities, resulting in questioned costs of \$97,009.36 for the Child Nutrition Cluster, \$98,425.76 for the Special Education Cluster, and \$42,605.77 for the Title I Program.</li> <li>2016-17</li> </ul>                                 |                                   |  |               |
| Significant Deficiencies in 2016-17  | <b>Federal Awards Finding No. 2017-1:</b> the District received a communication from the Department of Defense Education Activity Headquarters that it had been reimbursed for certain salary and related benefit amounts that were in excess of the approved budget for one such grant project. Upon further inquiry it was also noted that there were allowable and budgeted costs for equipment and other items that were not captured in the project codes and, therefore, not reimbursed in accordance with the approved budget. These costs equaled or exceeded the amounts of salaries and related benefits that were incorrectly charged to the grant. The District did not overcharge the grant project in total. |                                   |  |               |
| Significant Deficiencies in 2018   | <b>Federal Awards Finding No. 2018-001:</b> The District did not comply with Federal regulations and follow a consistent costing policy for contributions to the District workers' compensation self-insurance program, resulting in Title I Program questioned costs totaling \$157,143.  |                                   |  |               |

#### Exhibit 5-7 Clay County School District Four Year Summary of Audit Results

Source: CCSD's Audited Financial Reports for Fiscal Years 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018. One of the Strategic Plan Strategies is as follows: Initiative 2.4.7: Work to reduce audit findings annually and eliminate repeat findings As shown in **Exhibit 5-7**, over the last four years there have been findings, however, when identified, the District has taken corrective action to prevent repeat findings.

The Auditor General also conducts operational audits that contain findings and recommendation for improving overall operations. Some of the same type of findings are provided each year in management letters. The identified findings may not be financial in nature, or rise to the level of a reportable condition. The findings are issued in both the management letter and the AG reports are intended to alert the district to areas where improvement is possible.

The most recent AG Operational Audit issued in February 2019 is available on the district's website as well as the AG website at *https://flauditor.gov/pages/Reports.aspx*.

The 2019 Operational Audit is referenced throughout this report where the findings and recommendation are relevant to areas under review. Ressel & Associates examined the district's response to the relevant AG recommendations, and comments and updates to the district's progress in implementing changes are reported in the appropriate sections of this report.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> A review of 2019 audited financials showed that for the fifth consecutive year, CCSD has received an unmodified opinion on its annual external audits; corrective actions to address identified findings are taken by the administration and board in a timely manner.

The Fiscal Year 2018-19 audit results are presented in **Exhibit 5-8**, and as shown, CCSD received an unmodified opinion for the fifth consecutive year.

#### Exhibit 5-8 Clay County School District Audit Results FY 2018-19

|   | FY 2018-19  |
|---|---|
| Auditor General Report/ Independent Auditor   | Purvis Gray & Company   |
| Type of Auditor's Report Issued – Financial Statements  | Unmodified  |
| Material Weaknesses – Financial Reporting   | No  |
| Significant Deficiency – Financial Reporting  | None Reported   |
| Material Non-Compliance – Financial Statements  | No  |
| Material Weaknesses – Federal Awards  | No  |
| Significant Deficiency – Federal Awards   | Yes   |
| Type of auditors report issued on compliance for major programs   | Unmodified  |
| Any audit findings disclosed that are required to be reported in accordance with 2 CFR 200.516(a)? (formerly Section 510(a) of OMB Circular A-133)? | Yes   |
| Prior Year Audit Findings Corrected   | Yes   |
| Significant Deficiencies in 2018-19   | <b>Federal Award Finding 2019-1:</b> The District's purchase policy did not adhere to the uniform guidance for purchasing requirements. |

Source: CCSD's Audited Financial Report for Fiscal Year 2019.
Significant Deficiencies in Federal Awards were identified in three of the last five years; an explanation of the finding is found in **Exhibits 5-7** and **5-8**.

As with the findings in previous years, the District has taken corrective action to prevent a repeat finding. Specifically, in May 2020, in response to the significant deficiency found for 2018-19, the School Attorney initiated a change to Policy 5.02A Purchasing in order to correct the deficiency prior to the end of the current fiscal year of June 30. The Board approved the policy revisions at the June 2020 Regular Board meeting. This topic is discussed in greater detail in Section 4.5.2 and 4.5.3 of this report.

The Auditor General also conducts operational audits that contain findings and recommendations for improving overall operations. Some of the same types of findings are provided each year in management letters. The identified findings may not be financial in nature or rise to the level of a reportable condition. The findings are issued in both the management letter and the AG reports and are intended to alert the district to areas where improvement is possible.

# CHAPTER 6: PROGRAM COMPLIANCE

# 6.0 PROGRAM COMPLIANCE

**Chapter 6** presents findings related to program compliance. As part of the performance audit, Ressel & Associates assessed the adequacy of processes and internal controls used to ensure compliance with and remediate instances of non-compliance with federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations; contracts; grant agreements; and local policies and procedures applicable to the program areas under review. Ressel & Associates further assessed the District's compliance with Florida Statute Title XIV, 212.055: Discretionary sales surtaxes; legislative intent; authorization and use of proceeds.

In addition to updating the findings from the September 4, 2019 report, the observations found in **Sections 6.1.1** and **6.1.2** provide Ressel & Associates' assessment of the amended resolution and the associated communication regarding the Surtax referendum that will be held in November 2020. Also, in response to 2020 legislative changes requiring school districts to share a portion of the Surtax revenues with eligible charter schools, Ressel & Associates assessed the adequacy of the district's plans and systems for distributing funds to district charter schools and the mechanisms for charter schools to report how the funds are used.

The specific audit evaluation tasks are provided below.

- 1. Determined whether the program has a process to assess its compliance with applicable (i.e., relating to the program's operation) federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations; contracts; grant agreements; and local policies.
- 2. Reviewed program internal controls to determine whether they are reasonable to ensure compliance with applicable federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations; contracts; grant agreements; and local policies and procedures.
- 3. Determine whether program administrators have taken reasonable and timely actions to address any noncompliance with applicable federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations; contracts; grant agreements; and local policies and procedures identified by internal or external evaluations, audits, or other means.
- 4. Determine whether program administrators have taken reasonable and timely actions to determine whether planned uses of the surtax are in compliance with applicable state laws, rules, and regulations.
- 5. Determine whether the school district has processes to distribute funds to district charter schools and mechanisms for charter schools to report how the funds are used.

**Finding on program compliance:** In its September 4, 2019 evaluation of the program areas and processes reviewed, Ressel & Associates found no areas of non-compliance with related federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations; contracts; grant agreements; and local policies as they relate to general operations and small to mid-sized construction and renovation projects. However, controls will need to be enhanced in order to handle the volume and complexity of the projects envisioned in the Surtax Resolution. The administration has taken reasonable steps to plan for increased needs in terms of Building Officials and Project Managers. Further efforts are required to address the need for additional oversight and monitoring of the competitive bidding and construction management processes.

In its August 28, 2020 follow-up audit, Ressel & Associates concluded that its previous findings on program compliance remain essentially unchanged although the Clay County Commissioners have approved an Amended Surtax Resolution which will be placed on the ballot in November 2020. The amended resolution remains in compliance in all aspects and includes a statement of CCSD's intent to share a portion of the Surtax proceeds with eligible charter schools, as required by law. In examining the District's plan for handling the calculation, distribution and reporting of charter school funds, Ressel & Associates found that the district has a plan and the system in place to administer the charter school's proportionate share of the proceeds, however some guidance from the Florida Department of Education and/or legal counsel may be required to ensure that the district is fully complying with the intent of the legislation.

In this chapter, program compliance for the Clay County School District is presented in the following functional areas:

- 6.1 Districtwide Support for Areas Under Review
- 6.2 Facilities Planning, Use, and Construction;
- 6.3 Safety and Security Improvements
- 6.4 Technology Implementation and Upgrades
- 6.5 Service Bond Indebtedness
- 6.6 Charter School Funds

# 6.1 DISTRICTWIDE SUPPORT FOR AREAS UNDER REVEW

In this chapter, the School Board, Legal Counsel and the School Leadership Team are involved in compiling documentation, passing a resolution in support of the Sales Surtax, and complying with the terms and conditions of the law in respect to Surtax. In this subsection the following areas are reviewed:

- 6.1.1 Discretionary Sales Tax Resolution
- 6.1.2 Dissemination of Information to the Public

# 6.1.1 Discretionary Sales Tax Resolution

<u>August 28, 2020 OBSERVATION:</u> On June 4, 2020, the Clay County School Board passed an amended Discretionary Sales Surtax Resolution, which was approved by the Clay County Commissioners on June 9, 2020. The amended resolution complies with the requirements of Title XIV, 212.055 of the Florida Government Code.

On July 8, 2019, the Clay County School Board passed a resolution calling for a Surtax Referendum. In its September 4, 2019 audit, Ressel and Associates found that the 2019 resolution substantially met the requirements in law at the time (Ressel and Associates' 2019 performance audit report provided a detailed analysis of the 2019 referendum). However, ultimately, the 2019 resolution failed to obtain the approval of Clay County Commission. CCSD passed a subsequent resolution on June 4, 2020, which was approved by the Clay County Commission on June 9, 2020. Ressel & Associates was retained to update its 2019 audit findings.

Identified facility, technology and safety and security needs of more than \$400 million coupled with a lack of funding from other sources prompted the request for a referendum. **Exhibit 6-1** provides a 10-year history of referenda for the Clay County School District and its peer school districts.

|                                   | Referendum                   | # of      |   |   |  |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|---|---|--|
| District                          | (Yes/No)                     | Referenda | Issues  | Years   | Amount   |
| Clay County School<br>District    | Yes (1 mill<br>property tax) | 1         | Safety and Security and other operational expenses  | Four years (July 1, 2019-June 30, 2023                  | \$12 million<br>annually                                     |
|                                   | November 2020                | Pending   | New construction, reconstruction<br>and improvement of school<br>facilities including land<br>acquisition; safety and security<br>improvements; technology<br>implementation and upgrades;<br>and service bond indebtedness   | 30 years<br>(January 1, 2021 –<br>December 31,<br>2050) | \$403,929,990  |
| Alachua County<br>School District | Yes (Half-cent<br>Sales Tax) | 1         | Safety and security improvements;<br>repair, renovation and remodeling<br>of Board-owned schools, including<br>modernization of classrooms,<br>science labs and other spaces;<br>technology; elimination of portable<br>classrooms; new construction; land<br>acquisition and improvement | 2019-2030   | Estimated \$20<br>million annually<br>over 12-year<br>period |

## Exhibit 6-1 Referenda in Last 10 Years in Comparison School Districts

#### Exhibit 6-1 (Continued) Referenda in Last 10 Years in Comparison School Districts

| District                             | Referendum<br>(Yes/No)                               | # of<br>Referenda | Issues   | Years  | Amount   |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Lake County School<br>District       | Yes (Property Tax<br>and County 1 cent<br>Sales Tax) | 2                 | Safety and security (Property Tax);<br>capital projects and purposes<br>(District's allowance of County 1-<br>cent sales tax)  | 2019-2022<br>(Property Tax);<br>2018-2033 (County<br>1 cent Sales Tax) | Approximately<br>\$16 million<br>annually (Property<br>Tax);<br>Approximately<br>\$5.3 million to the<br>District (County 1<br>cent sales tax) |  |
| Marion County School<br>District     | Yes (Millage<br>Referendum)                          | 1                 | Additional safe school measures;<br>faculty competitive pay and raises,<br>the arts programs; library media<br>services; vocational programs                               | 2019-2023  | Estimated \$18<br>million annually<br>for four-year<br>period  |  |
| St. Johns County<br>School District  | Yes (Half-cent<br>Sales Tax)                         | 1                 | New construction; safety and<br>security improvements; building<br>expansions, renovation; and<br>technology upgrades  | 2016-2025  | \$13 million<br>annually over 10-<br>year period   |  |
| Santa Rosa County<br>School District | Yes (Half-cent<br>Sales Tax)                         | 1                 | New school district facilities,<br>renovations, and additions; land<br>acquisition and improvements;<br>technology equipment upgrades;<br>and design and engineering costs | 2019-2028  | Approximately<br>\$9.1 million<br>annually over 10-<br>year period   |  |

Source: Phone calls to Comparison Districts, July 2019.

Florida law authorizes local governments to impose several types of local option taxes. In some cases, the Florida Department of Revenue administers the tax for the local government, and, in other cases, the local government administers the tax. When the Department administers the tax, its responsibilities include collecting the tax and distributing the funds to local governments to spend on locally authorized projects.

Title XIV, 212.055: "Discretionary sales surtaxes; Legislative Intent; authorization and use of proceeds" outlines the intended uses and restrictions on the uses of the proceeds from the School Capital Outlay Surtax:

It is the legislative intent that any authorization for imposition of a discretionary sales surtax shall be published in the Florida Statutes as a subsection of this section, irrespective of the duration of the levy. Each enactment shall specify the types of counties authorized to levy; the rate or rates which may be imposed; the maximum length of time the surtax may be imposed, if any; the procedure which must be followed to secure voter approval, if required; the purpose for which the proceeds may be expended; and such other requirements as the Legislature may provide. Taxable transactions and administrative procedures shall be as provided in s. <u>212.054</u>.

(6) SCHOOL CAPITAL OUTLAY SURTAX.—

(a) The school board in each county may levy, pursuant to resolution conditioned to take effect only upon approval by a majority vote of the electors of the county voting in a referendum, a discretionary sales surtax at a rate that may not exceed 0.5 percent.

(b)The resolution must include a statement that provides a brief and general description of the school capital outlay projects to be funded by the surtax. <u>The resolution must include</u> <u>a statement that the revenues collected must be shared with eligible charter schools based on</u> <u>their proportionate share of the total school district enrollment.</u> The statement must conform to the requirements of s. 101.161 and shall be placed on the ballot by the governing body of the county. The following question shall be placed on the ballot:

| FOR THE     | CENTS TAX |
|-------------|-----------|
| AGAINST THE | CENTS TAX |

The resolution providing for the imposition of the surtax must set forth a plan for use (c)of the surtax proceeds for fixed capital expenditures or fixed capital costs associated with the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of school facilities and campuses which have a useful life expectancy of 5 or more years, and any land acquisition, land improvement, design, and engineering costs related thereto. Additionally, the plan shall include the costs of retrofitting and providing for technology implementation, including hardware and software, for the various sites within the school district. Surtax revenues may be used to service bond indebtedness to finance projects authorized by this subsection, and any interest accrued thereto may be held in trust to finance such projects. Neither the proceeds of the surtax nor any interest accrued thereto shall be used for operational expenses. Surtax revenues shared with charter schools shall be expended by the charter school in a manner consistent with the allowable uses set forth in s. 1013.62(4). All revenues and expenditures shall be accounted for in a charter school's monthly or quarterly financial statement pursuant to s. 1002.33(9). The eligibility of a charter school to receive funds under this subsection shall be determined in accordance with s. 1013.62(1). If a school's charter is not renewed or is terminated and the school is dissolved under the provisions of law under which the school was organized, any unencumbered funds received under this subsection shall revert to the sponsor. Ch. 2020-10 LAWS OF FLORIDA Ch. 2020-10 2

(d) Surtax revenues collected by the Department of Revenue pursuant to this subsection shall be distributed to the school board imposing the surtax in accordance with law.

Exhibit 6-2 provides a copy of the June 2020 CCSD Resolution for the Surtax in its entirety.

#### AMENDED RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION CALLING FOR AND PROVIDING FOR THE HOLDING OF A REFERENDUM ELECTION TO BE HELD IN CLAY COUNTY, FLORIDA, AT THE GENERAL ELECTION ON NOVEMBER 3, 2020, TO DETERMINE IF THE ELECTORS IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF CLAY COUNTY, FLORIDA, APPROVE THE LEVY BY THE SCHOOL BOARD OF CLAY COUNTY, FLORIDA, OF A ONE-HALF CENT PER DOLLAR SALES SURTAX WHICH THE SCHOOL BOARD MUST SHARE WITH . ELIGIBLE CHARTER SCHOOLS BASED ON THEIR PROPORTIONATE SHARE OF TOTAL DISTRICT ENROLLMENT, TO BE USED TO FINANCE FUNDING OF FIXED CAPITAL EXPENDITURES OR FIXED CAPITAL COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CONSTRUCTION, RECONSTRUCTION OR IMPROVE-MENT OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND CAMPUSES WHICH HAVE A USEFUL LIFE EXPECTANCY OF FIVE (5) OR MORE YEARS AND ANY LAND ACQUISITION, LAND IMPROVEMENT, DESIGN, AND ENGINEERING COSTS RELATED THERETO, TO PURCHASE EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING COSTS OF PURCHASING, RETROFITTING AND PROVIDING FOR TECHNOLOGY IMPLEMENTATION, INCLUDING HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE, FOR THE VARIOUS SITES WITHIN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT, FOR SAFETY AND SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS, FOR SERVICING BOND INDEBTEDNESS TO FINANCE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY THIS RESOLUTION AND BY CHARTER SCHOOLS FOR ALLOWABLE USES AS SET FORTH IN S. 1013.62(4) F.S.; PROVIDING FOR NOTICE OF THE REFERENDUM ELECTION; PROVIDING FOR PLACES OF VOTING, INSPECTORS AND CLERKS; PROVIDING FOR AN OFFICIAL BALLOT: PROVIDING FOR ABSENTEE VOTING: PROVIDING FOR EARLY VOTING; PROVIDING FOR PRINTING OF BALLOTS; PROVIDING FOR REFERENDUM RESULTS; PROVIDING FOR REFERENDUM ELECTION PROCEDURE; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING A REPEALING CLAUSE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE

**BE IT RESOLVED**, by the School Board of Clay County, Florida ("the Board"), acting as the governing body of the School District of Clay County, Florida ("the District"), as follows:

**SECTION 1 – AUTHORITY FOR RESOLUTION**: This Resolution is adopted pursuant to Section 212.055(6), *Florida Statutes*, and other applicable provisions of law.

SECTION 2 – FINDINGS: It is hereby found and determined that:

A. The School Board of Clay County, Florida ("the Board"), through the District, has developed a long range capital outlay needs assessment establishing those needs on the basis of growth projected in Clay County,

Florida.

B. The School Board has determined that it has insufficient existing capital outlay funding to meet its established capital outlay needs of site acquisition, new construction, reconstruction and renovation of school facilities and technology and security acquisition, retrofitting and upgrades for school facilities, which needs are being driven by growth in Clay County, Florida.

C. The Board has experienced substantial funding reductions in recent years related to capital expenditures and fixed capital costs associated with new construction, reconstruction and improvement of school facilities, including safety and security improvements and technology upgrades.

D. Section 212.055(6), *Florida Statutes*, authorizes school boards, such as The School Board of Clay County, Florida (the "Board"), to levy a discretionary capital outlay sales surtax not to exceed one-half cent per dollar on all taxable transactions for the purpose of funding of fixed capital expenditures or fixed capital costs associated with the construction, reconstruction or improvement of existing schools and school facilities and campuses which have a useful life expectancy of five (5) or more years and land acquisition, land improvement, design and engineering costs related thereto, equipment, including costs of purchasing, retrofitting and providing for technology implementation, including hardware and software for the various sites within the school district, safety and security improvements and servicing bond indebtedness to finance the above referenced projects, upon approval by a majority vote of the electors of Clay County, Florida.

E. The levy of a one-half cent school capital outlay sales surtax as authorized by Section 212.055(6), Florida Statutes, for a period of thirty (30) years, commencing on January 1, 2021, and terminating on December 31, 2050, is necessary for the Board to provide sufficient funds to sustain its facilities and to fund new facilities needed to accommodate growing enrollment. The revenues collected must be shared with eligible charter schools based upon their proportionate share of total school district enrollment and may be expended by the charter schools in a manner consistent with the allowable uses set forth in s.1013.62(4), Florida Statutes. The sales surtax proceeds shall be used for the purpose of funding of fixed capital expenditures or fixed capital costs associated with the construction, reconstruction or improvement of existing schools and school facilities and campuses which have a useful life expectancy of five (5) or more years and land acquisition, land improvement, design and engineering costs related thereto, equipment, including costs of purchasing, retrofitting and providing for technology implementation, including hardware and software for the various sites within the school district, safety and security improvements and servicing bond indebtedness to finance the above-referenced projects, upon approval by a majority vote of the electors of Clay County, Florida. The plan for the use of the surtax proceeds is set forth in composite Exhibit A, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein. The revenues shared with eligible charter schools may be expended by the charter schools in a manner consistent with the allowable uses set forth in s.1013.62(4), Florida Statutes, which is more particularly described in Exhibit C, attached hereto and incorporated herein.

F. Neither the proceeds of the one-half cent school capital outlay sales surtax nor any interest accrued thereto shall be used for operational expenses

G. The levy of a one-half cent school capital outlay sales surtax is subject to the approval by the electors of Clay County at a referendum held as provided by Section 212.055(6), *Florida Statutes*, and if approved is hereby levied and shall be collected as authorized in the manner required by law.

H. A citizen advisory committee consisting of Clay County citizens, the purpose of which is to monitor and advise the Board and District staff on the expenditure of funds, shall be established and appointed pursuant to procedures established by School Board policy.

**SECTION 3 – PLAN FOR USE OF SALES SURTAX PROCEEDS**: The proceeds of the school capital outlay sales surtax, as authorized by Section 212.055(6), *Florida Statutes*, shall be used for the purpose of funding of fixed capital expenditures or fixed capital costs associated with the construction, reconstruction or improvement of existing schools and school facilities and campuses which have a useful life expectancy of five (5) or more years and land acquisition, land improvement, design and engineering costs related thereto, equipment, including costs of purchasing, retrofitting and providing for technology implementation, including hardware and software for the various sites within the school district, safety and security improvements and servicing bond indebtedness to finance the above-referenced projects. The plan for use of the surtax proceeds is set forth in composite Exhibit A which is attached hereto and incorporated herein. The revenues shared with eligible charter schools may be expended by the charter schools in a manner consistent with the allowable uses set forth in s.1013.62(4), Florida Statutes, which is more particularly described in Exhibit C, attached hereto and incorporated herein.

**SECTION 4 - LEVY OF SALES SURTAX**: Subject to approval of the electors of the District at a referendum held as provided in Section 212.055(6), *Florida Statutes*, a one-half cent school capital outlay surtax shall be levied by the Board and District and the same is hereby levied for a period commencing January 1, 2021, and shall remain in effect for a period of thirty (30) years, ending on December 31, 2050, and shall be collected as authorized and in the manner required by law.

**SECTION 5 - ELECTION ORDERED**: A referendum election is hereby directed to be held in Clay County to determine whether or not the Board may levy the Sales Surtax. The Board hereby requests the Clay County Board of County Commissioners to direct the Supervisor of Elections of Clay County to place the required referendum election on the ballot for the General Election on November 3, 2020, and to include the statement(s) contained in the "Notice of Election" attached hereto as Exhibit B, and to conduct said election pursuant to the provisions of the election laws of the State of Florida on the date designated in this resolution.

**SECTION 6 - NOTICE OF ELECTION** - Not less than thirty (30) days prior to said referendum election, notice of said election shall be given by publication in a newspaper of general circulation throughout the District. Such publication shall be made at least twice, once in the fifth week and once in the third week prior to the week of November 3, 2020, which notice shall be substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit B together with such additional information as the Supervisor of Elections of Clay County shall require. Any costs associated with the publication of the Notice of Election shall be paid by the Board.

**SECTION 7 - PLACES OF VOTING, INSPECTORS AND CLERKS**: The polls will be open at the voting places on the date of such referendum election from 7:00 a.m. until 7:00 p.m. All qualified electors residing within Clay County shall be entitled and permitted to vote at such referendum election on the proposition provided herein. The places of voting and the inspectors and clerks of the referendum election shall be those designated by the Supervisor of Elections of Clay County in accordance with law.

**SECTION 8 - OFFICIAL BALLOT**: The ballots to be used in the referendum election shall be in full compliance with the laws of the State of Florida, and shall be in substantially the following form:

OFFICIAL BALLOT LEVY ONE-HALF CENT SALES SURTAX FOR DISTRICT SCHOOL AND CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZED USES

SHALL A ONE-HALF CENT SALES SURTAX BE LEVIED IN CLAY COUNTY BY THE SCHOOL BOARD FOR THIRTY YEARS, BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2021, TO FINANCE DISTRICT SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION, RECONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION, AND REMODELING OF FACILITIES; SAFETY, SECURITY, TECHNOLOGY UPGRADES; LAND ACQUISITION AND IMPROVEMENT; AND ALLOWABLE STATUTORY USES FOR CHARTER SCHOOLS. A CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE WILL MONITOR EXPENDITURES. REVENUES COLLECTED MUST BE SHARED WITH ELIGIBLE CHARTER SCHOOLS BASED ON THEIR PROPORTIONATE SHARE OF TOTAL SCHOOL DISTRICT ENROLLMENT.

Instructions to Voters:

YES, FOR THE 1/2% (0.5 cents) TAX

\_\_\_\_ NO, AGAINST THE 1/2% (0.5 CENTS) TAX

**SECTION 9 - ABSENTEE VOTING:** Absentee electors participating in said referendum shall be entitled to cast their ballots in accordance with the provisions of the laws of the State of Florida with respect to absentee voting. The form of ballots to be used in such referendum election for absentee voters shall be the same as used at the polling places for such election.

**SECTION 10 – EARLY VOTING:** Adequate provision shall be made for early voting on dates and at times and locations designated and determined by the Supervisor of Elections. The form of ballots to be used in the referendum for early voting shall be the same as used in the polling places for the election.

**SECTION 11 - PRINTING OF BALLOTS**: The Supervisor of Elections of Clay County is authorized and directed to have printed a sufficient number of the aforesaid ballots for use of absentee electors entitled to cast such ballots in such referendum election and shall also have printed sample ballots and deliver them to the inspectors and clerks on or before the date and time for the opening of the polls for such referendum election for the voting places; and, further, is authorized and directed to make appropriate arrangements for the conduct of the election at the polling places specified.

**SECTION 12 - ELECTION PROCEDURE**: The Supervisor of Elections shall hold, administer and conduct the referendum election in the manner prescribed by law for holding elections in the Clay County. Returns shall show the number of qualified electors who voted at such referendum election on the proposition and the number of votes cast respectively for and against approval of the proposition. The returns shall be canvassed in accordance with law. Provision will be made for early voting as required by Section 101.657, *Florida Statutes*.

**SECTION 13 - REFERENDUM RESULTS**: If a majority of the ballots cast at such election shall be "FOR THE ONE-HALF CENT SURTAX,' the levy of such surtax shall be approved and said surtax shall be levied as provided by law.

**SECTION 14 - SEVERABILITY**: In the event that any word, phrase, clause, sentence or paragraph hereof shall be held invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such holding shall not affect any other word, clause, phrase, sentence or paragraph hereof.

**SECTION 15 - REPEALING CLAUSE**: All resolutions in conflict or inconsistent herewith are repealed insofar as there is conflict or inconsistency.

SECTION 16 - EFFECTIVE DATE: This amended resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption. However, the surtax authorized hereunder shall only be effective upon approval by a majority vote of the qualified electors of Clay County

Source: Clay County School District, July 2020

**Exhibit 6-3** examines the statutory requirements and provides an explanation of how the District has answered the requirements.

| Statutory Requirement  | District Initiative  |
|--|--|
| The resolution shall include a statement that<br>provides a brief and general description of the<br>school capital outlay projects to be funded by<br>the Surtax.  | The ballot question appears to comply with requirements.<br>BALLOT QUESTION:<br>Shall a one-half cent sales surtax be levied in Clay County by<br>the school board for thirty years, beginning January 1, 2021,  |
| The resolution must include a statement that<br>the revenues collected must be shared with<br>eligible charter schools based on their<br>proportionate share of the total school district<br>enrollment. | to finance district school construction, reconstruction,<br>renovation, and remodeling of facilities, safety, security,<br>technology upgrades, land acquisition and improvement and<br>allowable statutory uses for charter schools. A citizens<br>advisory committee will monitor expenditures. Revenues<br>collected must be shared with eligible charter schools based on<br>their proportionate share of total school district enrollment.<br>Instructions to Voters: |
| The statement shall conform to the requirements of s. $101.161$ and shall be placed on the ballot by the governing body of the county.   | <i>FOR the</i> 1/2% (0.5 CENTS) TAX<br><i>AGAINST the</i> 1/2% (0.5 CENTS) TAX<br>Clay County Commissioners approved the amended resolution<br>on June 9, 2020.  |

Exhibit 6-3 Statutory School Capital Outlay Requirements

# **Exhibit 6-3 (Continued)** Statutory School Capital Outlay Requirements

| Statutory Requirement   | District Initiative  |
|---|--|
| The resolution providing for the imposition of<br>the surtax must set forth a plan for use of the<br>surtax proceeds for fixed capital expenditures<br>or fixed capital costs associated with the   | The ballot language includes only acceptable uses of the surtax.   |
| construction, reconstruction, or improvement<br>of school facilities and campuses which have a<br>useful life expectancy of 5 or more years, and<br>any land acquisition, land improvement,<br>design, and engineering costs related thereto. | Proceeds will be used "to finance district school construction,<br>reconstruction, renovation, and remodeling of facilities, safety,<br>security, technology upgrades, land acquisition and<br>improvement and allowable statutory uses for charter<br>schools |
| The resolution must include a statement that<br>the revenues collected must be shared with<br>eligible charter schools based on their<br>proportionate share of the total school district   | <b>Exhibit 6-4,</b> below, provides a list of the planned projects.<br><i>Revenues collected must be shared with eligible charter</i><br><i>schools based on their proportionate share of total school</i>   |
| enrollment.   | <i>district enrollment.</i> " Section 6.6 of this chapter discusses Charter School Funding.  |
| Additionally, the Plan shall include the costs of<br>retrofitting and providing for technology<br>implementation, including hardware and<br>software, for the various sites within the school<br>district.                                    | The District's plan contains classroom technology retrofits including hardware and software improvements.  |
| Surtax revenues may be used to service bond<br>indebtedness to finance projects authorized by   | The District's planned use for the revenues is consistent<br>with statutory requirements.  |
| this subsection, and any interest accrued thereto<br>may be held in trust to finance such projects.   | CCSD plans to leverage the revenues through bonded<br>indebtedness and has preliminary information on the amount of<br>debt that may be supported by the Surtax revenues.  |
| Neither the proceeds of the surtax nor any<br>interest accrued thereto shall be used for  | The District's plans are consistent with statutory requirements.   |
| operational expenses.   | No operating expenditures are included in the envisioned projects.   |

Source: Compiled by Ressel & Associates, August 2020

Although a comprehensive spreadsheet with significant project details exists, **Exhibit 6-4** provides the list of proposed projects CCSD provided to County Commissioners in June 2020.

|  | PROPOSED PROJECT/UPGRADE   | TOTAL PR | ROJECTED INVESTMENT |
|--|--|----------|---------------------|
|  | FIRE ALARM   | \$       | 1,119,000.00        |
|  | CAMERA (Elem-85K; Jr - 100K; Sr -125K)   | \$       | 1,740,000.00        |
|  | SECURITY ALARM (50K)   | \$       | 2,040,000.00        |
| Sec. 2   | CONTROLLED ACCESS (55K)  | \$       | 2,240,000.00        |
| ADES   | EXTERNAL PA COMMUNICATION  | \$       | 80,000.00           |
| / UPGF   | EXTERIOR CAMPUS LIGHTING<br>(Update to LED)  | \$       | 2,160,000.00        |
| AFET   | TRAFFIC SIGNAGE  | \$       | 42,000.00           |
| S  | PAVEMENT MARKING   | \$       | 215,000.00          |
|  | FENCING  | \$       | 295,000.00          |
| and a second   | SAFETY NETTING (Athletic)  | \$       | 350,000.00          |
|  | COVERED WALKWAY UPGRADES   | \$       | 648,000.00          |
|  | # of HVAC IU's   | \$       |                     |
| FOOD & NUTRITION SERVICES ROOFING HVAC SAFETY UPGRADES | HVAC BARD UNITS (5K)   | \$       | 7,580,000.00        |
|  | OTHER HVAC   | \$       | 16,240,000.00       |
|  | HVAC CONTROLS Jr.H - \$170,000 Sr.H -<br>\$180,000   | \$       | 1,370,000.00        |
| ROOFING  | ROOFING - MAJOR STRUCTURE (Lifespan 20<br>years; Metal 30+)  | \$       | 14,302,600.00       |
|  | KITCHEN EQUIPMENT 1 serv in - \$225K;<br>2 serv in - \$260K; 3 serv in - \$300k; 4 serv in -<br>\$335k   | \$       | .9,790,000.00       |
| RVIC   | KITCHEN RENOVATION   | \$       | 2,100,000.00        |
| NUTRITION SE   | CAFETERIA EXPANSION  | \$       | 2,200,000.00        |
| FOOD &   | EXTERNAL PA COMMUNICATION EXTERIOR CAMPUS LIGHTING (Update to LED) TRAFFIC SIGNAGE PAVEMENT MARKING FENCING SAFETY NETTING (Athletic) COVERED WALKWAY UPGRADES # of HVAC IU's HVAC BARD UNITS (5K) OTHER HVAC HVAC CONTROLS Jr.H - \$170,000 Sr.H - \$180,000 ROOFING - MAJOR STRUCTURE (Lifespan 20 years; Metal 30+) KITCHEN EQUIPMENT 1 serv in - \$225K; 2 serv in - \$260K; 3 serv in - \$300k; 4 serv in - \$335k KITCHEN RENOVATION CAFETERIA SEATING ES:Cap/4*\$600 S: Cap/12*1500 # of RR's in need of reno | \$       | 2,153,050.00        |
| BING   | # of RR's in need of reno  | \$       |                     |
| PLUMBING   | RESTROOM RENOVATION (\$35K per)  | \$       | 10,640,000.00       |
|  | # of WATER FOUNTAINS (\$800)/ FILLING<br>STATIONS (\$2,500)  | \$       | 481,500.00          |

| Exhibit 6-4                  |
|------------------------------|
| Surtax Proposed Project List |

| PAINTING                       | PAINTING UPGRADE  |                        |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| PA                             |   | \$<br>2,525,000.00     |
| X                              | TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE & DEVICE<br>REFRESH                       | \$<br>20,000,000.00    |
| TECHNOLOGY                     | CLASSROOM TECHNOLOGY UPGRADES (3.5K<br>per class)                   | \$<br>7,857,500.00     |
| TECHA                          | DIGITAL SIGNAGE (35K +10K for power)                                | \$<br>1,845,000.00     |
|                                | TVPR UPGRADES   | \$<br>1,050,000.00     |
| PHYSICAL EDUCATION             | ELEMENTARY PHYSICAL EDUCATION<br>UPGRADES (\$100K)                  | \$<br>2,940,000.00     |
| PHYSICAL E                     | SHADE STRUCTURES (Permanent)  | \$<br>2,100,000.00     |
| DES                            | STAGE FLOORS AND CURTAINS   | \$<br>400,000.00       |
| RAL                            | SCHOOL FURNITURE REPLACEMENT  |                        |
| Ddf                            | (\$7,500 per ES classroom; \$10,000 per HS                          | \$<br>19,845,000.00    |
| FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS/UPGRADES | COURT RESURFACING (\$25k/court)                                     | \$<br>2,125,000.00     |
| VEME                           | GYM FLOORING REPLACEMENT  | \$<br>1,420,000.00     |
| MPRC                           | STADIUM/GYM SEATING UPGRADES  | \$<br>5,200,000.00     |
| ILITY                          | TRACK UPGRADES  | \$<br>2,800,000.00     |
| FAC                            | FIELD UPGRADES (FB/BB/SF @\$9/sf)                                   | \$<br>6,300,000.00     |
|                                | CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS - PERMANENT<br>CLASSROOM ADDITION (2M per 8)   | \$<br>119,100,000.00   |
| TAL                            | TRANSPORTATION CENTRALIZED<br>WAREHOUSE FACILITY                    | \$<br>25,000,000.00    |
| V CAPITAL                      | CENTRALIZED SERVICES FACILITY<br>(Build or Buy)                     | \$<br>20,000,000.00    |
| NEW                            | CCDS PROJECT NEEDS EXPENDITURE PER<br>SCHOOL/COST CENTER            | \$<br>318,293,650.00   |
|                                | NEW GROWTH CONSTRUCTION - WITHIN 10<br>YEARS - (5 Elem; 1 JH; 1HS ) | \$<br>300,000,000.00   |
| RY                             | TOTAL NEED  | \$<br>618,293,650.00   |
| SUMMARY                        | SALES TAX HALF CENT REVENUE (30 YR)<br>(\$13,464,333 First Year)    | \$<br>403,929,990.00   |
| SU                             | REMAINING NEED  | \$<br>(214,363,660.00) |

Source: Clay County School District, the-plan-exhibit-a-2.pdf, June 2020.

## 6.1.2 Dissemination of Information to the Public

#### <u>August 28, 2020 OBSERVATION:</u> The District has not yet published detailed Surtaxrelated information for review by the public.

There is no specific requirement in law for the publication of detailed information regarding the use of the Surtax funds except as required in the Surtax Resolution, but the legislative intent appears to be clear that the public be informed and kept informed throughout the process, as evidenced by excepts from Florida Statutes containing the following:

**212.055 Discretionary sales surtaxes; legislative intent; authorization and use of proceeds.**—It is the legislative intent that any authorization for imposition of a discretionary sales surtax shall be published in the Florida Statutes as a subsection of this section, irrespective of the duration of the levy. Each enactment shall specify the types of counties authorized to levy; the rate or rates which may be imposed; the maximum length of time the surtax may be imposed, if any; the procedure which must be followed to secure voter approval, if required; the purpose for which the proceeds may be expended; and such other requirements as the Legislature may provide. Taxable transactions and administrative procedures shall be as provided in s. <u>212.054</u>...

The District has Surtax information on the CCSD website home page about the projects envisioned in the Surtax (**Exhibit 6-5**). This document was placed on the website in 2019 and has not been modified since the amended resolution was passed. The publication continues to reflect the ballot language from the original resolution. The current ballot language includes the required statements regarding the sharing of funds with district charter schools.

The project list contained in the County Commissioners' packet provided a somewhat more detailed project list (**Exhibit 6-4**), in comparison to the original list provided in 2019, but that list has not been published on the CCSD website. Further, the current list assumes that the estimated Surtax proceeds will remain with the district, rather than being shared with the charter schools and provides no estimate of the amount that will be shared with charter schools.

While the amount that will be shared is approximately 4 percent of the proceeds based on the charter school's current enrollment, recognizing those reductions in the amount available to fund district needs is important.

## Exhibit 6-5

# THE HALF-CENT FOR SCHOOLS: EDUCATION FACILITIES INFRASTRUCTURE RESTRICTED SALES TAX



Clay County District Schools has become a preferred district. Funding is needed to build new schools due to expected growth in student enrollment over the next decade. Doing so will also relieve potential overcrowding in schools.

Ultimately, the goal is to ensure that we have safe, updated, and highquality learning environments for all Clay County District School students! Clay County's schools are in sad shape. Old, outdated classrooms, inadequate science labs, leaking roofs, air conditioners that constantly break down, portables crowding out playgrounds, students eating lunch at 10:00 in the morning—the evidence is everywhere. With the majority of schools at 50 years or older, more than \$318 million in facility renovations has been identified as needed right now as well as an additional \$300 million in new schools to meet anticipated growth in the next 5-10 years.

Our students need and deserve schools that are safe, updated, comfortable and promote learning. That's why ED.F.I.R.S.T. Half-Cent for Schools will be on the ballot in <u>November 2020</u>. It's a restricted half-cent sales tax that would raise money to revitalize local schools and can only be used for capital improvement projects listed in the referendum. That means renovating and remodeling classrooms, science labs, media centers and other spaces; replacing and repairing deteriorating roofs, air conditioners and other items; replacing portables with permanent classrooms; and other improvements to our existing schools.





# Exhibit 6-5 (Continued)

# WHY A HALF-CENT Sales Tax?

Decision-makers in Tallahassee have cut facilities funding to local schools by more than **\$168** million during the last ten years. No wonder the district hasn't been able to do much more than put a very small bandage on the problem. The half-cent sales tax is the only option available to Florida school districts for raising the amount of money needed to revitalize existing schools, relieve overcrowding, and properly maintain facilities over the long run.



More than twenty Florida districts already have a voter approved sales tax for facilities. If it's approved here, the half cent would raise the existing sales tax in Clay County to 7.5 cents. The half-cent would cost the average Clay County family about <u>\$5 PER \$1000 SPENT</u> —a small investment to ensure Clay County is relevant, prepared for expected growth, and has updated facilities to benefit our students, neighborhoods, and county for years to come!

# Ballot Language



Shall the School Board of Clay County levy a half-cent sales surtax to finance safety and security improvements; repair, renovation and remodeling of Board-owned schools, including modernization of classrooms, science labs and other spaces; technology; elimination of portable classrooms; new construction; land acquisition and improvement; and other school facilities projects; with oversight by an independent citizens' committee? The tax would begin January 1, 2021 and last thirty years.

For the Half-Cent Tax

Against the Half-Cent

# SAFETY AND SECURITY

Most of our schools were designed and built long before security became such an important consideration. The district has made many

safety related improvements such as fencing, gates, locked doors, cameras and other items; however, more needs to be done including limiting access to our campuses. That will take a lot more



resources than we have available and certainly much more than the state has provided. In fact, Safe Schools funding from the state wasn't even enough to cover the cost of having a full-time school resource officer/deputy in every school! That's why safety and security improvements are at the top of the Half-Cent for Schools ballot language. We want to ensure that teachers and students can focus on their primary mission teaching and learning!

# **COMMUNITY BENEFIT**

Good schools are vital to our community's wellbeing. They attract new residents, businesses, and jobs which all boost the local economy. They also raise local property values. If the sales tax passes it will create hundreds of local and private sector jobs. There will be a lot of work for the carpenters, electricians, roofers, plumbers, and other professionals who will actually be working on our schools. Most importantly, high quality schools will prepare Clay County's young people to be engaged and productive members of our community and society.



Source: CCSD Website, <u>https://www.oneclay.net/domain/5229</u>, August 2020.

According to former administrators, there is a complete communication plan in progress for ED FIRST that includes: project list documents, presentation schedules, community meetings, and

other web-based media. The current leadership have delayed the rollout of Surtax communication until after the results of the August 18, 2020 Superintendent election are known.

Open and detailed communication about the intended use of the Surtax proceeds and following through on the promise of an Oversight Committee are two factors needed to build trust with the community and comply with the intent of the law.

## August 28, 2020 RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 6-1:**

At the appropriate time, publish a detailed list of proposed uses of the Surtax proceeds, display these data on the District website homepage, appoint an Oversight Committee for the Clay County School District to monitor Surtax expenditures, and report back on the use of Surtax funds to the Board and community on at least a quarterly basis.

# 6.2 FACILITIES PLANNING, USE, AND CONSTRUCTION

## 6.2.1 <u>Contract Management</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: Contract management for major projects is carried out by the Facility Planning and Construction group without the benefit of a formal construction audit.

As noted in **Chapter 4: Program Performance and Monitoring,** the construction purchasing, project oversight and authorization to pay function is handled almost exclusively in the Facility Planning and Construction area. According to staff interviews, the contracted Architect plays a major role in the monitoring process. Not only does the Architect prepare designs, he or she also assists staff in preparing and evaluating bid documents as well as reviewing and approving payments to the Construction Manager (CM) before the invoices are submitted to the District. While this process may have worked well for single large projects or multiple smaller projects, managing more than \$100 million in projects over the next five years will stretch staff and contractor resources, which in turn could result in a greater risk of malfeasance.

Many Districts use the services of an internal or external construction auditor with expertise in the construction field to validate the work of the CM, assess risks, and seek to identify any leakages in the process, which could include overbillings, unauthorized material substitutions and the like. While the Architect appears to be performing some of the functions of a construction auditor, having an unrelated third party sign off on a project prior to the final payment to the CM could provide the Board and community stakeholders another level of assurance that all funds are being used in the manner intended.

The Auditor General's 2018 Operational Audit of CCSD included several recommendations including a need to enhance controls over negotiating, monitoring, and documenting the reasonableness of CME general conditions costs. The Department has created a Facility Planning and Construction Procedures Manual which includes a checklist of the critical steps starting with the bid process to the point when the district occupies the facility. However, the

process for monitoring the actual construction phases places a great deal of responsibility on the contractors.

According to staff interviews, the District does not have an internal auditor dedicated to the Facility Planning & Construction Department. However, the department is audited annually via FLDOE and results are published as appropriate. Administrators indicated in the ED FIRST plan that they intended to utilize contracted services for critical personnel required to execute the projects. Staff said that one such contracted position they had discussed was a construction auditor.

In light of the Surtax referendum and the potential for a number of very large projects, pre- and post-project construction audits are a best practice in the industry. For example, in the Lee County School District, the internal auditor examines all project documents and prepares a report to the Board recommending that the final payment to the contractor be authorized. If the audit finds issues, the final payment to the contractor, which is typically the amount of retainage, is withheld until all requirements are met.

To implement construction-related audits for all Surtax projects, as well as other projects of amounts greater than \$100,000, the District would need to contract for the services of a firm with construction auditing expertise or hire an in-house internal auditor with specific training and expertise in construction auditing.

## RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 6-2:**

Arrange for construction audits to provide the Board and the public assurances that the projects and the project management activities are being accomplished effectively and efficiently, and within all legal guidelines.

# <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> Oversight for contract management of major projects continues to be carried out by the Facility Planning and Construction group without the benefit of formal construction audits.

During interviews, staff in both the Operations and Business Services areas agreed that a construction auditor could add an additional level of oversight, but both areas saw the function as a form of internal audit, which would be best housed under the Business Services umbrella. Since the need for the auditor's services would be intermittent, both agreed that a contract service would provide more flexibility. The final decision on the use and organizational location has been deferred pending the outcome of the referendum.

# Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 6-2 still applies.

# 6.2.2 <u>Role of Building Official and Project Managers</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: The Facilities Planning and Construction Department relies heavily on the Code Enforcement Department to conduct all compliance inspections relating to fire codes and State Requirements for Education Facilities (SREF); as Surtax projects are undertaken, a clear delineation of the roles and responsibility of the Building Official and Project Managers in compliance monitoring are needed.

As discussed in **Chapter 2** of this report, the Facilities Planning and Construction Department is staffed by two Project Managers that are responsible for leading major projects; one of those positions is currently vacant.

The job descriptions for both the Building Official and the Project Manager positions were last updated in 2014. Two of the key job functions found in the Project Manager's job description are to:

- Ensure compliance with Florida Statutes, State Board Rules and the Florida Building Code for Educational Facilities.
- Certify to the Building Official that upon substantial completion, the project has been completed in accordance with the contract documents and the Florida Building Code.

According to the District's website:

The Code Enforcement Department is dedicated to providing a safe, healthy, motivational learning environment for all students, staff, and community by ensuring that all educational and ancillary facilities are safe and meet all standards established by state regulatory agencies.

The general duties of the Building Official include coordinating, overseeing and performing building inspections, plan examinations, and permitting operations for the purpose of enforcing codes, regulating building construction, and general code enforcement. SREF has very specific requirements where the Building Official is required to sign off on and report at various stages of the construction process.

The Building Official is generally out in the schools for the majority of his day conducting inspections relating to fire code, alerting campus staff and the Maintenance Department of potential issues and concerns, and ensuring that issues and concerns are addressed in a timely manner. When major projects require his attention, his priorities must shift.

As part of the case studies of three past projects (**See Appendices A through C**) the Ressel Team observed evidence of the Building Officials involvement in the original design approval, permitting and sign offs required at appropriate times during the project. The job duties of the Project Managers was less clearly defined, but involved close coordination with the Building Official. In all instances, these positions appeared to work collaboratively. However, as pressures increase with new projects, new people and new timelines, greater pressure will be placed on both the Project Managers and the Building Official. Hiring or contracting for additional help in this area is the topic of a recommendation in **Chapter 2**. Based on the Ressel Team observations, updating the job descriptions for both positions is also needed in order to clearly delineate the lines of responsibility between these two positions so that as new people are brought in to assist both areas, the expectations regard compliance monitoring are clear and understandable.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 6-3:**

Update the job descriptions for the Building Official and the Project Manager positions to clearly delineate the roles and responsibilities for compliance monitoring and ensure that new employees are trained to assume those responsibilities.

<u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> The compliance monitoring roles and responsibilities of the Building Official and Project Managers have not been clearly defined or delineated.

The job descriptions for the Building Official and Project Manager classification have not been updated since and February 2014 and January 2005, respectively.

Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 6-3 still applies.

## 6.3 <u>SAFETY AND SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS</u>

This section addresses the manner in which CCSD has ensured compliance with state and federal requirements for enhanced safety and security in the schools.

#### 6.3.1 <u>Compliance Monitoring</u>

#### September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: In its evaluation, Ressel & Associates found the Clay County School District (CCSD) has adequate safety and security procedures in place to ensure compliance with Florida statutes, local policies, and inter-local agreements.

Procedures, plans, and inter-local agreements are in place. SB 7030 implementation is underway. \$1.3 million in state grant was used in hardening schools and security measures to be in compliance with state guidelines.

Safety and Security planning and monitoring is the focus of both federal and state legislation—particularly following a number of violent school incidents in Florida and around the nation, as well as natural disasters.

In March 2018, the Florida Legislature and Governor enacted the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School Public Safety Act, Senate Bill 7026, mandating that all districts have Security Resource Officers (SRO) on each school campus and other requirements, such as:

- providing active shooter training to district staff;
- designating a school safety specialist for each district school;

- completing a security risk assessment for each school;
- establishing a threat assessment team with expertise in mental health counseling, academic instruction, law enforcement, and school administration;
- hiring security resource officers (SRO);
- training to identify signs of youth mental illness; and
- establishing school-based mental health care.

In May 2019, the Florida Legislature enacted Senate Bill 7030 for the Implementation of Legislative Recommendations of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School Public Safety Commission. In addition to the above, this legislation further requires:

- sheriffs to establish a school guardian program or contract with another sheriff's office that has established a program under a certain condition;
- the Office of Safe Schools to annually provide training for specified personnel; requiring district school boards and school district superintendents to partner with security agencies to establish or assign safe-school officers;
- revise requirements for school district zero-tolerance policies;
- the Florida Safe Schools Assessment Tool (FSSAT) to be the primary site security assessment tool for school districts.

To address these laws, CCSD put in place policies and administrative procedures, some of which are highly sensitive. The Ressel team examined the following documents and found them to meet or exceed the legal requirements:

- *Response to Active Assailant Plan.* This policy includes procedures to respond to an active assailant incident at a campus CCSD and to mitigate threats through an organized and uniform method in an effort to protect the lives of students, faculty, staff, and visitors, in an efficient and expedient manner. [S. 1006.07(4)(a), F.S.]. This statute also includes procedures for fire alarms, evacuation and drills.
- *Guardian Program*. These procedures outline the roles and responsibility of the school safety officers assigned to CCSD schools. Their role is to be visible on campus through patrolling and monitoring, provide support during a crisis or emergency situation, and serve on the School-level Threat Assessment Team, among many things (30.15 F.S.).
- *Emergency management*. CCSD is covered by Clay County Division of Emergency Management' emergency procedures (CEMP) outlined in the *Clay County Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan*. Clay County has an inter-local agreement for the use of emergency shelters at schools in the event of disasters. In Florida, all 67 counties have primary emergency management authority in 252, F.S. The school district

is an integral part of all their communication and activation as sited in the CEMP and many annexes.

- *Pet Friendly Shelter Inter-Agency Coordinating Procedure*. This procedure provides a safe haven for residents' pets during a disaster. It includes a process for registering pets in cooperation with Clay County Animal Services staff and the Emergency Operations Center.
- Special Population Inter-Agency Coordinating Procedure. In working with the Clay County Sheriff and Clay County Emergency Management, this outlines the process for sheltering persons that are currently registered as sexual predators, sexual offenders, or placed on house arrest during a disaster (775.215 F.S.).

In addition, the Florida Legislature allocated funds to assist school districts with the rollout of Senate Bill 7026 and later amended in Senate Bill 7030, which "award grants to schools to improve the safety and security of school buildings based upon recommendations of the security risk assessment." CCSD received a \$1.3 million grant, the purpose of which is for educational facilities security.

In keeping with the legislative intent for the additional allocation, the District has used these funds to:

- install additional security cameras and surveillance;
- enhance perimeter hardening, fencing, and gate control;
- install impact-resistance window film; and
- implement an emergency communications system.

The administration has taken reasonable and timely steps ensure that students, employees, and citizens are kept safe during crises and disasters and that a communication structure is in place as outlined in Florida Statutes and inter-local policies.

## <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> CCSD's safety and security procedures were updated in early August 2019 to reflect the creation of the Police Department and continue to ensure compliance with Florida statutes, local policies, and inter-local agreements.

Section 9 of the Board's Policy Manual contains 154 pages of approved procedures. Although not adopted as a policy, these procedures guide the operation of the Police Department. The Police Chief said they will be reviewed annually, but no changes are anticipated in August 2020.

# 6.4 <u>TECHNOLOGY IMPLEMENTATION AND UPGRADES</u>

## 6.4.1 <u>Updated Policies and Procedures</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: Although the ITS Department has documented certain operating procedures and is in the process of updating its procedures, the procedures available to the auditors at the time of the study were not yet complete.

The draft ITS Technology Services Manual, effective for 2019, contains references to Section VII: Information and Technology Services Policies, Employee Handbook, and Student Code of Conduct and procedures for "how to" guidance on subjects such as:

Common Tech Fixes

- Turn it off. Wait 10 seconds. Turn it on.
- Clear Your Cache
- Call the Service Desk (with contact number provided)
- Add (Map) a CCSD Network Printer
- Switch One Clay Portal Profiles
- Submit a Help Desk Ticket
- Password Reset
- 2019-2020 Student
- Communications
- Information
- Password Information
- Information

#### CCSD Phone Information

- Speed Dials and Voicemail
- Phone Directory
- Phone Book

#### OneClay Portal

- OneClay Portal Basics
- Add an APP
- Remove an APP

#### Application Information

- Accessing Applications
- i-Ready Troubleshooting Tips
- Achieve3000 Troubleshooting Tips

#### **Business Plus**

- Time and Attendance
- How to Login
- Additional Documentation
- Focus Information

#### Focus Information

- Focus Parent Portal Information
- For Help with Focus, Call Service Desk (with contact number provided)

#### Gmail-Staff Email

- How to Use Gmail
- Need to be added/removed to an email list
- Need to grant access

#### Getting Started with Google

A lack of written, appropriately communicated, procedures creates opportunities for miscommunications and lapses in system protocols. Inadequate controls over access and system security pose potentially disastrous impacts to CCSD.

Strong, effective information and technology procedures provide a pathway for compliance to ensure safety and security of the District's information system. Safety and security of District technology is imperative. Well documented district protocols give notice of expectations to all involved including district staff, vendors, contractors, bidders, and the general public.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 6-4:**

Continue to update and document Information and Technology Services procedures.

# <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE:</u> Operating procedures for Information Technology remain a work-in-progress.

Operating procedures in the technology area are not compiled in a single handbook, but rather, are produced by specific areas for specific purposes. For example, an entire set of procedures may address the Business Plus system and all of its modules.

In response to requests for current Technology Services procedures, the Ressel team was provided copies of the IT Incident Response Plan, last reviewed in June 2018, and the IT Disaster Response Plan, last reviewed in December 2019. While both documents contain confidential information that could not be shared with the Ressel team, the table of contents appeared comprehensive. According to the Director, these two manuals are updated annually or bi-annually. Other, more routine procedures, however, are individually addressed as technology, vendors and delivery methods change. The Director said his staff attempt to keep these procedures current, but there is no formal inventory of the procedures or a process to systematically review each procedure.

# Based on the Ressel & Associates' August 28, 2020 update, Recommendation 6-4 still applies.

# 6.5 <u>SERVICE BOND INDEBTEDNESS</u>

## 6.5.1 <u>Financial Advisory Services</u>

September 4, 2019 OBSERVATION: CCSD uses the financial advisory services of Ford & Associates to ensure that the District remains in compliance with bonding covenants, principal and interest payments.

CCSD, like many smaller governmental entities, does not have employees on staff with the expertise to navigate the market in terms of bonds, certificates of participation, capital leases and other long-term debt issuances.

As a result, the District has contracted for the services of Ford & Associates, a firm that advises CCSD on credit, structure, and sale of new debt issues, alerts them when refunding of debt is to the advantage of the district, and assists them in the budgeting and scheduling of repayments of principal and interest each year.

As shown in **Exhibit 6-6**, the financial advisor provides the District an updated list of due dates and payment requirements each year based on the debt series.

|          | The School Board of Clay County, Florida<br>Aggregate Certificate of Participation Lease Requirements |           |              |             |              |             |              |             |                     |
|----------|---|-----------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|---------------------|
|          | Serie   | s 2017    |              | -           |              | s 2012      |              | regate      | Annual              |
| Date     | Principal   | Interest  | Principal    | Interest    | Principal    | Interest    | Principal    | Interest    | <b>Debt Service</b> |
| 1/1/2019 |   | \$55,421  |              | \$176,942   |              | \$451,231   | \$0          | \$683,594   |                     |
| 7/1/2019 | \$2,352,000   | \$55,421  | \$529,000    | \$176,942   | \$860,000    | \$451,231   | \$3,741,000  | \$683,594   | \$5,108,188         |
| 1/1/2020 |   | \$35,312  |              | \$169,562   |              | \$438,331   | \$0          | \$643,205   |                     |
| 7/1/2020 | \$2,397,000   | \$35,312  | \$540,000    | \$169,562   | \$885,000    | \$438,331   | \$3,822,000  | \$643,205   | \$5,108,410         |
| 1/1/2021 |   | \$14,817  |              | \$162,029   |              | \$425,056   | \$0          | \$601,903   |                     |
| 7/1/2021 | \$335,000   | \$14,817  | \$554,000    | \$162,029   | \$3,085,000  | \$425,056   | \$3,974,000  | \$601,903   | \$5,177,805         |
| 1/1/2022 |   | \$11,953  |              | \$154,301   |              | \$347,931   | \$0          | \$514,185   |                     |
| 7/1/2022 | \$337,000   | \$11,953  | \$568,000    | \$154,301   | \$3,240,000  | \$347,931   | \$4,145,000  | \$514,185   | \$5,173,370         |
| 1/1/2023 |   | \$9,072   |              | \$146,377   |              | \$266,931   | \$0          | \$422,380   |                     |
| 7/1/2023 | \$349,000   | \$9,072   | \$581,000    | \$146,377   | \$3,400,000  | \$266,931   | \$4,330,000  | \$422,380   | \$5,174,760         |
| 1/1/2024 |   | \$6,088   |              | \$138,272   |              | \$215,931   | \$0          | \$360,291   |                     |
| 7/1/2024 | \$351,000   | \$6,088   | \$604,000    | \$138,272   | \$3,500,000  | \$215,931   | \$4,455,000  | \$360,291   | \$5,175,583         |
| 1/1/2025 |   | \$3,087   |              | \$129,847   |              | \$128,431   | \$0          | \$261,364   |                     |
| 7/1/2025 | \$361,000   | \$3,087   | \$617,000    | \$129,847   | \$3,670,000  | \$128,431   | \$4,648,000  | \$261,364   | \$5,170,729         |
| 1/1/2026 |   |           |              | \$121,239   |              | \$64,206    | \$0          | \$185,446   |                     |
| 7/1/2026 |   |           | \$4,287,000  | \$121,239   | \$635,000    | \$64,206    | \$4,922,000  | \$185,446   | \$5,292,891         |
| 1/1/2027 |   |           |              | \$61,436    |              | \$52,300    | \$0          | \$113,736   |                     |
| 7/1/2027 |   |           | \$4,404,000  | \$61,436    | \$665,000    | \$52,300    | \$5,069,000  | \$113,736   | \$5,296,472         |
| 1/1/2028 |   |           |              |             |              | \$39,000    | \$0          | \$39,000    |                     |
| 7/1/2028 |   |           |              |             | \$1,950,000  | \$39,000    | \$1,950,000  | \$39,000    | \$2,028,000         |
|          | \$6,482,000   | \$271,497 | \$12,684,000 | \$2,520,012 | \$21,890,000 | \$4,858,700 | \$41,056,000 | \$7,650,208 | \$48,706,208        |

#### Exhibit 6-6 Clay County School District 2018-19 Outstanding Certificate of Participation Repayment Schedule

Source: Assistant Superintendent for Business Services, August 2019.

As part of the planning process for the Sales Surtax, CCSD identified more than \$300 million in needs, much of which were immediate deferred maintenance needs that will require attention in the next few years. Understanding that proceeds from the Sales Surtax would result in only \$13 million annually, the resolution passed by the Board included using some of the proceeds to service debt. At the request of the district, the Financial Advisor issued a document containing information on the hypothetical issuance of bonds that could generate approximately \$128 million based on annual debt service of approximately \$7.2 million per year.

Using the services of the Financial Advisor in this way has helped the District to explore various options for financing that will provide the district the funds they need to address immediate needs.

In a document drafted in early August, the District laid out its *ED.F.I.RS.T. (First 5 Years)* "to bond out up to \$128 million to jumpstart critical projects and make needed repairs/ renovations." This prioritization and planning effort was predicated on the initial work of the Financial Advisor.

# <u>August 28, 2020 UPDATE</u>: CCSD continues to use the services of a Financial Advisor to ensure that the District remains in compliance with bonding covenants, principal and interest payments.

CCSD continues to contract for the services of Ford & Associates.

## 6.6 CHARTER SCHOOL FUNDS

The amended resolution addressed a legislative statutory change requiring that a portion of the revenues collected must be shared with eligible charter schools as follows (the relevant amended wording is underlined):

## 212.055(6) SCHOOL CAPITAL OUTLAY SURTAX.—

(a) The school board in each county may levy, pursuant to resolution conditioned to take effect only upon approval by a majority vote of the electors of the county voting in a referendum, a discretionary sales surtax at a rate that may not exceed 0.5 percent.

(b) The resolution must include a statement that provides a brief and general description of the school capital outlay projects to be funded by the surtax. <u>The resolution must include a</u> <u>statement that the revenues collected must be shared with eligible charter schools based on their</u> <u>proportionate share of the total school district enrollment.</u> The statement must conform to the requirements of s. 101.161 and shall be placed on the ballot by the governing body of the county. The statement must conform to the requirements of s. 101.161 and shall be placed on the ballot by the governing body of the county. The following question shall be placed on the ballot:

| FOR THE     | CENTS TAX |
|-------------|-----------|
| AGAINST THE | CENTS TAX |

(c) The resolution providing for the imposition of the surtax must shall set forth a plan for use of the surtax proceeds for fixed capital expenditures or fixed capital costs associated with the

construction, reconstruction, or improvement of school facilities and campuses which have a useful life expectancy of 5 or more years, and any land acquisition, land improvement, design, and engineering costs related thereto. Additionally, the plan shall include the costs of retrofitting and providing for technology implementation, including hardware and software, for the various sites within the school district. Surtax revenues may be used to service for the purpose of servicing bond indebtedness to finance projects authorized by this subsection, and any interest accrued thereto may be held in trust to finance such projects. Neither the proceeds of the surtax nor any interest accrued thereto shall be used for operational expenses. Surtax revenues shared with charter schools shall be expended by the charter school in a manner consistent with the allowable uses set forth in s. 1013.62(4). All revenues and expenditures shall be accounted for in a charter school's monthly or quarterly financial statement pursuant to s. 1002.33(9). The eligibility of a charter school to receive funds under this subsection shall be determined in accordance with s. 1013.62(1). If a school's charter is not renewed or is terminated and the school is dissolved under the provisions of law under which the school was organized, any unencumbered funds received under this subsection shall revert to the sponsor.

## 6.6.1 Distribution and Reporting Mechanisms for Charter School Funds

# <u>August 28, 2020 OBSERVATION:</u> CCSD has three district charter schools and a methodology for determining the pro rata amount of the distribution of funds based on enrollment at each of the eligible charter schools and a pre-existing system for the distribution, accounting and reporting of the use of those funds.

Currently, there are three charter schools in CCSD and the State channels most of the funding for these schools, including the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) funds and federal grants, to CCSD and the money is in turn forwarded to the individual schools based on predetermined formulas. The schools are as follows:

| Clay Charter Academy          | Serving K-8                                     |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Florida Cyber Charter Academy | Serving K-12 in a virtual environment           |
| St. John's Classical Academy  | K-10 for 2019-20 - adding a new grade each year |

The allocations envisioned in the statute states: "*revenues collected must be shared with eligible charter schools based on their proportionate share of the total school district enrollment.*"

**Eligibility:** As shown above, the law states, "*The eligibility of a charter school to receive funds under this subsection shall be determined in accordance with s. 1013.62(1).*"

1013.62 Charter schools capital outlay funding.—

(1) In each year in which funds are appropriated for charter school capital outlay purposes, the Commissioner of Education shall allocate the funds among eligible charter schools as specified in this section.

- (a) To be eligible for a funding allocation, a charter school must:
  - *1.a.* Have been in operation for 2 or more years;
- b. Be governed by a governing board established in the state for 3 or more years which operates both charter schools and conversion charter schools within the state;

*c.* Be an expanded feeder chain of a charter school within the same school district that is currently receiving charter school capital outlay funds;

d. Have been accredited by the Commission on Schools of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools; or

e. Serve students in facilities that are provided by a business partner for a charter school-in-the-workplace pursuant to s. 1002.33(15)(b).

According to the Assistant Superintendent for Business Services, the district has assumed all along that at least two of the charters will meet the eligibility requirements, but are uncertain about the Florida Cyber Charter Academy as it is a multi-campus school with its main office in Duval County. Further, Florida Cyber Charter Academy is a virtual school with no brick and mortar school sites and as such, receives its funding from the state based on a flat amount per student FTE rather than an allocation formula. CCSD does, however, claim the number of students that attend who are from CCSD in the district's student counts.

Nothing in the law cited above appears to exclude virtual charter schools, and given the uncertainty expressed by the school district, additional guidance on this issue is needed from the FLDOE.

**Student Enrollment:** There are many ways to count/report student enrollment data, including total students registered and enrolled on count dates, students in average daily attendance, average daily membership/enrolled, etc. Both FEFP and most federal grants are based on the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students, and this count is accumulated and reported back to the districts four times per year. FTE counts take into consideration many factors including extended year programs, student placements, and a host of other data which all school districts in Florida are very familiar with and rely on for funding purposes. FEFP funds are primarily generated by multiplying the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students. For example, a student in a severe needs Special Education classroom setting would be given a higher weight and funded accordingly.

In the absence of any specific guidance from FLDOE, the CCSD Assistant Superintendent for Business Services has determined that the use of the raw, unweighted FTE student count is the most accurate way to allocate funds to the charter schools. The FTE numbers are sent to the district four times per year, and will therefore change from quarter to quarter.

**Proportionate Share**: Dividing the FTE count in each of the charter schools by the total FTE count for the district provides the proportionate share of funding to be allocated to each school,

**Exhibit 6-7** provides the basic methodology that CCSD is planning to use to apportion the Surtax proceeds to the charter schools. The example provided is based on an annualized estimate of Surtax Proceeds of \$13.5 million; however, it should be noted that this number will fluctuate from month to month based on actual Surtax revenues sent to the district.

| Charter School                           | Unweighted FTE Count for<br>End of 2019-20 | Allocation Based on<br>FTE Count      | Estimated Allocation<br>based on \$13.5 M<br>Annual Revenue |
|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| Clay Charter Academy                     | 763.08                                     | 1.99%                                 | \$269,104.75  |
| Florida Cyber Charter<br>Academy         | 122.5                                      | 0.32%                                 | \$43,200.36   |
| St. John's Classical<br>Academy          | 671.32                                     | 1.75%                                 | \$236,745.03  |
| Clay County School<br>District FTE Total | 38,280.93                                  | Total Estimated<br>Charter Allocation | \$549,050.14  |

#### Exhibit 6-7 Calculating Proportionate Share of Surtax Proceeds to be Shared with Clay County Charter Schools

Source: CCSD Business Services, August 2020; Unweighted FTE Count from FLDOE 4<sup>th</sup> Calculation Recalibrated Final Report 71.345, August 2020.

**Distribution of Proceeds:** According to the Assistant Superintendent for Business Services, CCSD intends to distribute the Surtax proceeds to the eligible charter schools on a monthly basis as surtax revenues are received by the district.

The Business Plus system in use by the district for financial accounting purposes currently tracks incoming revenues and records the disbursement of funds to charter schools for FEFP and a variety of grants. CCSD administrators plan to establish accounting codes to record the receipt and disbursements in a manner mirroring the current processes.

**Reporting Requirements:** As shown above, the law states, "All revenues and expenditures shall be accounted for in a charter school's monthly or quarterly financial statement pursuant to *s*. 1002.33(9)."

Section 1002.33(9), F.S. is not new, and according to the Assistant Superintendent of Business Services, the district gets these reports monthly from the charter schools. CCSD staff review the information provided and the data is recorded in the district's accounting records (at a high level), and that information is then rolled into the annual financial statements of the district as a whole. For accounting purposes, the Surtax revenues and expenditures are reported in a specific cost center. Charter schools have only one object code which makes it difficult for CCSD to actually see the details regarding the use of funds. With federal grants, the district asks the charters to provide detailed backup on the use of funds as well as the projected use of the funds. This works well with grants where the charter schools send CCSD requests for reimbursement that are reviewed to determine if the expenditure meets the grant requirements. While the Surtax disbursements will be made directly, the Assistant Superintendent said that her staff will be requesting additional supporting documentation and reviewing the financial reports submitted by the charter schools to ensure that the schools are using the funds appropriately.

## August 28, 2020 RECOMMENDATION

#### **Recommendation 6-5:**

# Draft procedures detailing the processes that will be used by CCSD to account for, distribute and monitor the Surtax proceeds to be shared with charter schools.

In drafting the procedures, seek guidance from FLDOE regarding the eligibility of the Florida Cyber Charter Academy and notify each of the charter schools of its eligibility status.

Additionally, as additional guidance is provided by FLDOE, the procedure should be modified as needed. Once drafted, a meeting with the charter schools to review the procedure would allow them to provide feedback on their reporting requirements, etc.

# APPENDIX A: CASE STUDY OF THE FLEMING ISLAND HIGH SCHOOL PROJECT

# APPENDIX A CASE STUDY OF THE FLEMING ISLAND HIGH SCHOOL PROJECT

#### **General Information**

Project Name: Fleming Island High School AICE Project
Project Start Date: April 26, 2018
Expected Final Project Completion Date: January 21, 2019
Actual Project Completion Date: March 14, 2019
Projected Project Cost: \$1,082,636
Final Actual Project Cost: \$1,126,427
Project Cost Variance: \$43,791, or approximately 4%, and within District tolerance of 10%
Location: 2233 Village Square Parkway, Orange Park, FL 32003
Land Size: 60 Acre Total School Site
Building/Addition Size: 6,175 Square Feet Gross
Construction Type: Addition/New Construction Type II
Funding Source(s): AICE Funds (New Construction) /LCIF Funds (Erosion Control)

#### **Project Overview**

The Fleming Island High School AICE Project is a new construction addition of an AICE testing facility on the existing Fleming Island High School site. AICE, Advanced International Certificate Education, is a set of challenging college-level classes for high school students of Education developed by Cambridge Assessment, a non-profit department of the University of Cambridge in England.

The strategic location of the AICE building site to Fleming High School was important because Fleming Island High used funds earned and received from their AICE program to build the testing facility for the students. As this project is a testing facility, CCSD student station capacity did not change as a result of this building addition.

To the recollection of current CCSD staff, this project ran relatively smoothly with the original final completion date scheduled for January 21, 2019 with final completion on March 14, 2019. Fleming Island High School was an active school campus during construction, and unexpected site conditions were discovered. Storm drain repairs had to be addressed after damage was uncovered. Multiple storm drains located adjacent to the building needed repairs. Required storm drains repair was added to the original contract and funded by CCSD Local Capital Improvement Funds (LCIF).

#### Rationale

This project was important to meet dynamic programmatic needs for Fleming Island High School students and administration. The Cambridge AICE testing was interfering with other school testing. Scheduling complications and insufficient dedicated space were impediments to providing an environment most conductive to learning and assessment.

#### **Project Funding**

Funding for this project was substantially from AICE Funds with CCSD Local Capital Improvement Funds (LCIF) funding the erosion control necessary as a result of the damaged storm drains. The non-voted LCIF funds are advertised in the local newspaper for public review each year, and a public hearing is held prior to CCSD Board approval of the tentative budget.

#### **Procurement of Services**

Procurements of services were done by the Facility Planning and Construction Department staff in accordance with school board policies on Construction Manager Selection, Contractor Pre-Qualification, Bonding, and Purchasing. The School Board published a legal advertisement in a newspaper circulated in Clay County describing the need for professional services and explaining application procedures for interested professional firms considered by the School Board. The advertisement was published for three consecutive weeks prior to commencement of the selection procedure. The School Board considered all firms that timely submitted written requests to be considered for these professional services. Staff experienced no unexpected impediments during the process.

## **Contracts for Contractors and Service Providers Relevant to This Project**

Architectural Design and Services Brian Boatright Architect, Inc. 914 Plainfield Avenue Orange Park, FL 32073 Date Board Approved Ranking - October 5, 2017 Contract Execution – October 5, 2017 Amount of Contract - \$108,996.64

Mechanical Engineering Services Contractor Michael Gregory Engineering (Included in the Architect above)

Construction Manager Contractor Thomas May Construction Company 310 College Drive Orange Park, FL 32065 Date Board Approved Ranking – October 5, 2017 Contract Execution - April 5, 2018 Amount of Contract - \$1,082,616.00

#### Site Variables, Concerns, Issues

This project site was selected because of its proximity to the AICE program specific to Fleming Island High School. This site was approved by Fleming High School and the CCSD Facility Planning and Construction Department. Variables such as health, safety, and student needs were considered with the selection of this site as well as minimization of potential transportation costs and disruptions to student schedules. District school and administration staff were involved with the site selection, but not the general public at large directly, except for any opportunities during public School Board meetings.

There were safety and scheduling concerns with active construction close to an open campus and concerns with interference with the school's day to day activities. District staff worked with school and building officials to ensure safety and minimal disruptions.

The proximity of this site to the parking lot, however, provided opportunities to allow ease of access for testing on the weekends and allows the school to isolate this testing location from the main school campus when appropriate.

Unexpected site conditions did impact this project. Due to past hurricanes and tropical storms, there were several storm drains that failed and caused severe erosion control. This had to be corrected in order to complete the project. Another storm drain had to be relocated from under the corner of the new building.

#### **Construction Cost Estimates**

The AICE testing facility at Fleming Island High School was over the original contract of \$1,082,636 with the total actual at \$1,126,427, for a project cost variance of \$43,791, or approximately 4%, and within District tolerance of 10%.

The process involved in establishing the project cost and scheduling estimates includes the contractor who then works with the architect and subs. A Statement of Probable Construction Cost is the responsibility of the architect and their engineers as stated in Article I, item G 1.c (page 6) of the agreement with the architect dated October 5, 2017. The architect and project manager reviewed the schedule of values and change orders before approval.

Change orders were a result of the storm drain issues from the storms and working around the high school testing schedule.

## Permitting

Building Permits are obtained through the School District of Clay County's Internal Building Department. Plans are required to be reviewed and signed off by the Code Official. The Project Manager verifies insurance, bonds, and licenses. The bond is recorded at the courthouse and a building permit is issued by Clay County Schools Building Department. District officials experienced no permitting or approval impediments to this project.

#### **District Staff Project Responsibilities**

Clay School District staff positions involved with this project planning, performance and implementation and respective position project responsibilities were:

James Connell – Project Manager

Coordinated all school district department comments into the plans Liaison between the CM, architect/engineers, and the District

Tod Sweatland – Building Inspector/Plan Reviewer Reviewed and signed off on plans prior to construction Performed all required building inspections

Becky Smith - Project Accounting Assistant

#### **Lessons Learned and Impacts**

District staff anticipate no process changes but highlight the importance of scheduling for weather contingences and unforeseen challenges especially relative to storms.

In summary, storm drains failed at the boxes and the ground around storm drain boxes opened and created sinkholes from drainage issues due to Hurricanes Irma and Matthew. Fleming Island and Fleming Island High School flooding is an ongoing issue due to the nature of the site. District staff are addressing any problems as they arise. If funding allows, exploratory studies of the existing storm water pipe are desired in an effort to catch any failures in the early stages of impact instead of waiting for complete failure.
# APPENDIX B: CASE STUDY OF THE KEYSTONE HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROJECT

# APPENDIX B CASE STUDY OF THE KEYSTONE HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROJECT

### **General Information**

Project Name: Keystone Heights Elementary Parent/Pickup Parking Improvement Location: Keystone Heights Elementary
Project Start Date: May 14, 2019
Expected Project Substantial Completion Date: August 9, 2019
Actual Project Substantial Completion Date: August 9, 2019
Projected Final Project Cost: \$475,443
Final Actual Project Cost: Not available until Final Completion
Project Cost Variance: Not available until Final Completion
Land Size: .71 acre
Construction Type: Site Improvements (New Parent Pickup/Parking)
Funding Source(s): LCIF (1.5 mil) Funds (Local Capital)

### **Project Overview**

The Keystone Heights Elementary School parking lot improvement project as substantially complete on August 9, 2019 with final completion scheduled for August 24, 2019. The Keystone Heights parking improvement is to be completed by the end of summer, so it will be ready for the new school year. This project is needed to provide a safe clean area for parking and student pickup.

This project is located in the Keystone Heights area of Clay County and is important because the traffic during parent pick up was disrupting and crowding the surrounding neighborhood streets and properties. Keystone Heights is located in a remote area of Clay County and, as such, presented challenges with a lack of contractor interest and higher than normal prices. Construction has run smoothly; however, a water main had to be relocated by the local utility company.

#### Rationale

This project is important to keep a good relationship with the school and the City and surrounding neighborhoods. This project will alleviate long-term traffic and parking challenges the school has been experiencing.

#### **Project Funding**

Funding for this project is from Local Capital Improvement (LCIF); 1.5 millage funds which are the only funds eligible for expenditure on this type project. The non-voted LCIF funds are advertised in the local newspaper for public review each year, and a public hearing is held prior to approval of the tentative budget.

# **Community Collaboration**

District facilities staff held meetings with Keystone Heights school staff, parents, and the City of Keystone Heights to discuss school and community needs to ensure an appropriate design and agreement on the plan.

## **Procurement of Services**

Procurements of services were done by the Facility Planning and Construction Department staff in accordance with school board policies on Construction Manager Selection, Contractor Pre-Qualification, Bonding, and Purchasing. The School Board published a legal advertisement in a newspaper circulated in Clay County describing the need for professional services and explaining application procedures for interested professional firms considered by the School Board. The advertisement was published for three consecutive weeks prior to commencement of the selection procedure. The School Board considered all firms that timely submitted written requests to be considered for these professional services. Staff experienced no unexpected impediments during the process.

## **Contracts for Contractors and Service Providers Relevant to This Project**

Civil Engineering Design and Services

CHW, Inc., 1801 Research Drive, Alachua, FL 32615 Date Board Approved Ranking: August 3, 2017 (County Wide Engineer) Contract Execution: October 31, 2018 Amount of Contract: \$40,412.66

Contractor (in accordance with bid)
Besch & Smith Civil Group, Inc., 345 Cumberland Industrial Court, St. Augustine, FL 32095
Date Board Approved Contract: March 7, 2019
Contract Execution: May 14, 2019
Amount of Contract: \$475,443

## Site Variables, Concerns, Issues

This project site was selected because it is located adjacent to the Keystone Heights Elementary School property. The property had to be purchased in order to expand the parking lot and is an ideal location to expand the parent pick-up and parking because it is adjacent to the existing parent pick-up.

Variables such as the health, safety, and student needs were considered as well as cost and efficiency. The selected site will help make parent pickup and drop off safer for stakeholders and the surrounding neighborhood. The school and Keystone Heights communities were involved with the project discussions.

Although it was not unexpected, the local utility authority, Clay County Utility Authority (CCUA) had a water main running through the site. The water main had to be lowered and relocated in order to build the site according to engineer recommendations. Coordination

with the local utility authority was managed effectively with no cost overruns. Days were added to the contract in order to give the local utility authority time to move their water main. The contractor was able to work around the site while the main was moved.

#### Land Purchase

At its May 2018 regular School Board meeting, the School Board of CCSD granted authority to purchase of a portion of St. William Catholic Church property, through the Diocese of St. Augustine, for \$30,000 to improve the Keystone Heights Elementary School parking lot. In addition, \$8,000 was authorized for installation of a fence to secure the property perimeter. This purchase was approximately .71 acres of St. William Catholic Church grounds and is adjacent to Keystone Heights Elementary School.

Section 1013.14(b), Florida Statutes, requires one appraisal on purchase of land greater than \$100,000. Clearly this transaction falls below that threshold. The District's appraiser, Moody Appraisal Group, valued the property at \$15,000 in January 2018. The appraisal obtained by the Diocese of St. Augustine valued the property at \$33,000 in November 2017. There were negotiations, as the original offer by the Diocese was \$100,000.

#### **Construction Cost Estimates**

The Keystone Heights parking/pickup project is expected to come in on budget at the original cost of \$475,443 with no amendments to the project.

The process involved in establishing the project cost and scheduling estimates includes the contractor who then works with the architect and subs. A Statement of Probable Construction Cost is the responsibility of the architect and their engineers as stated in Article I, item G 1.c (page 6) of the agreement with the architect dated October 5, 2017. The Architect and Project Manager review the schedule of values and any change orders (none with this project) before approval.

#### Permitting

Permitting was required by St. Johns River Water Management and the required building permit was issued by the Clay County School District Building Official. The District has a positive working relationship with local permitting agencies and experienced no impediments with the permitting process.

#### **District Staff Project Responsibilities**

Clay School District staff positions involved with this project planning, performance and implementation and respective position project responsibilities are as follows:

Bryce Ellis – Project Manager

Coordinated all school District department comments into the plans Liaison between the CM, architect/engineers, and the District Tod Sweatland - Building Inspector/Plan Reviewer

Reviewed and signed off on plans prior to construction Performed all required building inspections

Becky Smith – Project Accounting Assistant

#### **Lessons Learned and Impacts**

District staff anticipate no process changes but highlight the established best practice of meeting with the school administration and the City to communicate project design, expectations, and outcomes.

The land for this project was apparently strategically important to the school because of its proximity to the school and safety concerns. In an effort to effectively drive purchase negotiations, Facilities staff wisely obtained a property appraisal resulting in a purchase price significantly lower than the original sales offer. Facilities staff are updating the District Facilities and Construction Procedures Manual and plan to include guidance on property acquisition to ensure consistency and efficiency.

Further, the Project Manager plans to observe site use to help implement new traffic patterns and report to engineer on any issues.

# APPENDIX C: CASE STUDY OF THE DISCOVERY OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROJECT

# APPENDIX C CASE STUDY OF THE DISCOVERY OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROJECT

#### **General Information**

Project Name: Discovery Oaks Elementary School Project Start Date: June 29, 2017 Expected Final Completion Date: July 2, 2018 Actual Project Final Completion Date: July 30, 2018 Original Contract Amount: \$20,770,188 (includes Sitework Cost \$2,564,555) Final/Actual Project Cost: \$21,014,300 Project Cost Variance: \$244,112, approximately 1%, and within District tolerance of 10% Location: 950 Plantation Oaks Parkway, Orange Park, FL 32065 Land Size: 63 acres Building/Addition Size: 110,000 Square Feet Construction Type: Type 2 New Construction Funding Source(s): Impact Fees and LCIF

#### **Project Overview**

The Discovery Oaks Elementary School is new school construction project located in the Orange Park area of Clay County called Oakleaf. This project was new construction and added 862 student capacity built to accommodate STEAM, Science, Technology, Engineering, Art and Math programs upon its completion July 30, 2018. The Oakleaf location was chosen because of high growth in the area.

The Discovery Oaks Elementary School presented timeline and scheduling challenges. This project had to be completed in 12 months in order to open on time for the 2018-19 school year. A typical timeline for a school this size is approximately 18 months. Weather also presented challenges in that Hurricane Irma and Tropical Storm Emily both struck the area during the early stages of construction, August and September 2017. Discovery Oaks Elementary school was built in an Enhanced Hurricane Protected Area (EHPA) in order to harden the cafeteria/multipurpose space and add a 400 kilowatt generator. Days were added to the original contract to accommodate changes due to weather, but the school was finished in time for the beginning of school year.

#### Rationale

This project was important to alleviate overcrowding due to extensive student growth in the Oakleaf area. The School was built to help relieve Plantation Oaks Elementary of its over 100 percent utilization. The School opened at 97 percent capacity and, because of the continued growth in this area, is expected to be at or over 100 percent capacity next school year.

## **Project Funding**

Funding for this project was from Impact Fees and Local Capital Improvement Funds (LCIF). LCIF funds are advertised in the local newspaper for public review each year. A public hearing is held prior to approval of the tentative budget.

#### **Community Collaboration**

School and local community discussions occurred during planning and construction of the Discovery Oaks Elementary School. District staff held a public meeting at Oakleaf Junior High to discuss the attendance zone of the Discovery Oaks Elementary School, and organized a school naming committee. CCSD facilities staff collaborated with other local governmental officials to facilitate the expedited project timeline. District staff and the Construction Manager communicated with the homeowners surrounding the site while construction was ongoing.

#### **Procurement of Services**

Procurements of services were done by the Facility Planning and Construction Department staff in accordance with School board policies on Construction Manager Selection, Contractor Pre-Qualification, Bonding, and Purchasing. The School Board published a legal advertisement in a newspaper circulated in Clay County describing the need for professional services and explaining application procedures for interested professional firms considered by the School Board. The advertisement was published for three consecutive weeks prior to commencement of the selection procedure. The School Board considered all firms that timely submitted written requests to be considered for these professional services. Staff experienced no unexpected impediments during the process.

#### **Contracts for Contractors and Service Providers Relevant to This Project**

Architectural Design and Services Contractor (Reuse of Plans) Bhide & Hall Architects Inc. 1329 Kingsley Avenue Suite C Orange Park, FL 32073 Contract Execution: February 2, 2017 Amount of Contract: \$852,800

Mechanical Engineering Services Contractor Star Works Engineering (included Above in Contractor) Contract Execution: February 2, 2017 Amount of Contract: The cost was included in the \$852,800 for Bhide above. Construction Manager Contractor Parrish McCall Constructors, Inc. 3455 S.W. 42nd Avenue Gainesville, FL 32608 Date Board Approved Ranking: April 6, 2017 Contract Execution: April 6, 2017 Amount of Contract: \$20,770,188

Building Official(s) Contractor Threshold Inspector: Ellis and Associates Anis Elkaz, E.I.T. Staff Project Manager, or Miguel A. Santiago, P.E. Director of Construction Services

Board Approved Ranking: District staff solicited quotes for Threshold inspection service following CCSD procurement rules.

Contract Execution - April 4, 2017 for \$7,500 Internal Inspector – Tod Sweatland - CCSD Building Official performed all required code inspections.

#### Site Variables, Concerns, Issues

This project site was donated to CCSD due to its location in the high growth Oakleaf area of Orange Parks and proximity to Plantation Oaks Elementary School. In addition to location, variables such as health, safety, and student needs were considered along with cost and efficiency. This site is conveniently located and is easily accessible for stakeholders.

Although it was not unexpected, results of a property survey showed the site was not entirely suitable for building. Of the 33 acres on this site, 19 acres are wetland conservation limiting available acreage for school construction.

CCSD staff worked with the Clay County Engineering Department for stoplight and school zone signage and with Clay County Utilities Authority (CCUA) for utilities.

The Construction Manager was in touch with the homeowner's association of the neighborhood directly adjacent to the school property and kept them up to date on schedule and if/when there would be early morning concrete pours and/or other atypical were disruptions.

## **Construction Cost Estimates**

Site work and underground utilities started while project specific design and value engineering took place. The site work package was \$2,564,555. Original total project cost was \$18,205,633, for a total of \$20,770.188.

Amendments include direct purchase of construction materials to realize tax savings of \$395,684 which was an increase in the original cost estimate of \$275,000.

The process involved in establishing project cost and scheduling estimates includes the contractor who then works with the architect and subs. A Statement of Probable Construction Cost is the responsibility of the Architect and their engineers as stated in Article I, item G 1.c (page 6) of the agreement with the architect dated February 2, 2017. Upon selection of Construction Manager, Parrish McCall worked with the architect and engineers to determine an initial cost. Parrish McCall was hired for pre-construction services to help value engineer and assist in pre-construction estimates. Construction Manager, Parrish McCall reviewed the schedule of values and any change orders before approval.

District officials developed and executed the accelerated timeline for completion of Discovery Oaks Elementary School in time for the first day of school August 14, 2018. Although not totally unexpected considering Florida weather during hurricane season, District staff and contractors experienced the added challenges of Hurricane Irma and Tropical storm Emily.

# Permitting

Building Permits are obtained through the School District of Clay County's Internal Building Department. Plans are required to be reviewed and signed off by the Code Official. The Project Manager verifies insurance, bonds, and licenses. The bond is recorded at the courthouse, and a building permit is issued by Clay County Schools Building Department.

Water Management Permitting is the responsibility of the Civil Engineer. The School District worked with the Civil Engineer and Construction Manager on documentation necessary to obtain required water management permits.

## **District Staff Project Responsibilities**

Clay School District staff positions involved with project planning, performance and implementation and respective position project responsibilities are as follows:

Bryce Ellis – Project Manager Coordinated all school District department comments into the plans Liaison between the CM, architect/engineers, and the District

Tod Sweatland – Building Inspector/Plan Reviewer Reviewed and signed off on plans prior to construction Performed all required building inspections

Becky Smith - Project Accounting Assistant

## **Lessons Learned and Impacts**

District staff identified changes to improve District project processes and implementation. Changes to the District's process for transparency and accountability include:

- Subcontractor review, contracts, and licenses were maintained on file in the Facilities office.
- CCSD Representative was present at the bid opening of subcontractors.

# APPENDIX D: CLAY COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT SCHOOL CAPACITY - AUGUST 2019

# APPENDIX D CLAY COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT SCHOOL CAPACITY AUGUST 2019

| Elementary Schools             | Year Built | Enrolled<br>June '19 | Enrolled<br>Aug '19 ** | Capacity | %<br>Capacity | Portables | Total SF |
|--------------------------------|------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------|---------------|-----------|----------|
| Argyle                         | 2005       | 713                  | 660                    | 825      | 80.00%        | 24        | 114,354  |
| Charles E. Bennett             | 1954       | 686                  | 612                    | 804      | 76.12%        | 17        | 112,135  |
| Clay Hill                      | 1984       | 403                  | 406                    | 474      | 85.65%        | 4         | 78,355   |
| Coppergate                     | 2005       | 562                  | 498                    | 725      | 68.69%        | 5         | 111,014  |
| Discovery Oaks                 | 2018       | 831                  | 825                    | 847      | 97.40%        | 0         | 104,121  |
| Doctors Inlet                  | 1977       | 625                  | 611                    | 735      | 83.13%        | 21        | 88,913   |
| Fleming Island                 | 1996       | 704                  | 720                    | 912      | 78.95%        | 32        | 144,617  |
| Grove Park                     | 1972       | 494                  | 466                    | 512      | 91.02%        | 14        | 97,751   |
| Keystone Heights               | 1956       | 841                  | 829                    | 823      | 100.73%       | 23        | 128,423  |
| Lake Asbury                    | 1986       | 882                  | 842                    | 970      | 86.80%        | 35        | 130,984  |
| Lakeside                       | 1974       | 726                  | 734                    | 876      | 83.79%        | 28        | 117,811  |
| McRae                          | 1996       | 554                  | 525                    | 550      | 95.45%        | 20        | 109,372  |
| Middleburg                     | 1938       | 571                  | 522                    | 650      | 80.31%        | 9         | 103,492  |
| Montclair                      | 1977       | 515                  | 462                    | 649      | 71.19%        | 24        | 79,505   |
| Oakleaf Village                | 2007       | 1076                 | 998                    | 1043     | 95.69%        | 12        | 156,555  |
| Orange Park                    | 1929       | 478                  | 484                    | 504      | 96.03%        | 14        | 71,435   |
| Patterson                      | 1992       | 1085                 | 1055                   | 1105     | 95.48%        | 36        | 123,535  |
| Plantation Oaks                | 2008       | 1031                 | 958                    | 992      | 96.57%        | 5         | 148,570  |
| Rideout                        | 2000       | 556                  | 474                    | 679      | 69.81%        | 4         | 103,969  |
| Ridgeview                      | 1983       | 579                  | 534                    | 565      | 94.51%        | 18        | 104,557  |
| S. Bryan Jennings              | 1967       | 522                  | 461                    | 676      | 68.20%        | 18        | 91,552   |
| Shadowlawn                     | 2007       | 724                  | 684                    | 863      | 79.26%        | 0         | 140,166  |
| Swimming Pen Creek             | 2002       | 502                  | 487                    | 547      | 89.03%        | 10        | 103,916  |
| Thunderbolt                    | 2000       | 940                  | 828                    | 1110     | 74.59%        | 25        | 142,743  |
| Tynes                          | 1994       | 1021                 | 983                    | 1004     | 97.91%        | 32        | 151,288  |
| W. E. Cherry                   | 1961       | 752                  | 688                    | 855      | 80.47%        | 32        | 89,827   |
| Wilkinson                      | 1989       | 832                  | 770                    | 810      | 95.06%        | 26        | 120,555  |
|                                |            |                      |                        |          |               |           |          |
| <b>Elementary School Total</b> |            | 19205                | 18116                  | 21105    | 85.62%        | 488       |          |

| Junior High Schools | Year Built | Enrolled<br>June '19 | Enrolled<br>Aug '19 ** | Capacity | %<br>Capacity | Portables | Total SF |
|---------------------|------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------|---------------|-----------|----------|
| Green Cove Springs  | 1952       | 774                  | 838                    | 922      | 90.89%        | 7         | 153,851  |
| Lake Asbury         | 2004       | 1110                 | 1167                   | 1334     | 87.48%        | 21        | 197,738  |
| Lakeside            | 1972       | 810                  | 861                    | 1204     | 71.51%        | 22        | 128,410  |
| Oakleaf             | 2005       | 1113                 | 1168                   | 1474     | 79.24%        | 35        | 182,628  |
| Orange Park         | 1970       | 744                  | 770                    | 1062     | 72.50%        | 15        | 136,186  |
| Wilkinson           | 1976       | 726                  | 765                    | 761      | 100.53%       | 11        | 155,389  |
|                     |            |                      |                        |          |               |           |          |
| Junior High Total   |            | 5277                 | 5569                   | 6757     | 83.69%        | 111       |          |

| High Schools              | Year<br>Built | Enrolled<br>June '19 | Enrolled<br>Aug '19 ** | Capacity | %<br>Capacity | Portables | Total<br>SF |
|---------------------------|---------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------|---------------|-----------|-------------|
| Bannerman Learning Center | 1958          | 353                  | 248                    | 332      | 74.70%        | 30        | 65,776      |
| Clay                      | 1971          | 1423                 | 1502                   | 1892     | 79.39%        | 15        | 247,085     |
| Fleming Island            | 2002          | 2151                 | 2057                   | 2375     | 86.61%        | 56        | 269,140     |
| Keystone Heights          | 1974          | 1150                 | 1190                   | 1399     | 85.06%        | 33        | 227,049     |
| Middleburg                | 1979          | 1673                 | 1711                   | 1637     | 104.52%       | 41        | 284,399     |
| Oakleaf                   | 2008          | 2495                 | 2579                   | 2459     | 104.88%       | 39        | 348,035     |
| Orange Park               | 1974          | 1568                 | 1547                   | 2343     | 66.03%        | 24        | 283,754     |
| Ridgeview                 | 1985          | 1456                 | 1469                   | 2254     | 65.17%        | 49        | 313,810     |
|                           |               |                      |                        |          |               |           |             |
| High School Total         |               | 12269                | 12303                  | 14691    | 84.52%        | 287       |             |

Source: Clay County School District Facilities Planning and Construction Department, 2018-19.

# APPENDIX E: CLAY COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT RESPONSE TO AUDIT



### **CLAY COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOLS**

900 WALNUT STREET, GREEN COVE SPRINGS, FL 32043 P (904) 336-6500 F (904) 336-6536 W oneclay.net

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS David S. Broskie

#### BOARD MEMBERS:

Janice Kerekes, District 1 Carol Studdard, District 2 Tina Bullock, District 3 Mary Bolla, District 4 Ashley Gilhousen, District 5

August 28, 2020

Ms. Betty Ressel, Managing Partner 11707 Oakwood Dr. Austin, TX 78753

RE: Response to the Performance Audit Report dated August 28, 2020

Clay County District Schools would like to thank Ressel and Associates, LLC, for taking the time to conduct the follow-up review to the original performance audit related to the potential surtax needed in Clay County to improve the facilities and infrastructure. After review of the performance audit observations and recommendations, the district accepts the updated observations and recommendations.

As the District continues to adjust to new leadership, during the global pandemic, we will work collaboratively with the school board and community stakeholders to manage and resolve the suggested observations and recommendations.

Once again, we appreciate the time and effort that Ressel and Associates, LLC, spent reviewing all elements related to the potential need of a surtax in Clay County District Schools. Our school district will continue to work diligently to provide a world-class education to all our students.

Respectfully,

Mr. David S. Broskie Superintendent of Schools