



*Office of the Vice President  
Finance & Administration*

**MEMORANDUM**

Date: February 23, 2017

To: New College of Florida Board of Trustees  
President O'Shea

From: John Martin *John*  
Barbara Stier *Barbara*

Subject: Summary of new College of Florida's Performance Based Funding Data Integrity Agreed-Upon Procedures Audit

The Integrity of data provided to the Board of Governors by each SUS institution is critical to the performance based funding decision-making process. In accordance with June 23, 2016 correspondence received from Board of Governors' Chairman Tom Kuntz, President O'Shea and Chairman Schulaner directed that a Data Integrity Audit be conducted by the College's independent audit firm, Mauldin & Jenkins, to:

- 1) Determine whether the processes established by the College ensure the completeness, accuracy and timeliness of data submissions to the Board of Governors that support performance funding metrics; and,
- 2) Provide an objective basis of support for the College's President and Board of Trustees' Chairman to sign the representations made in the Performance Based Funding – Data Integrity Certification to be submitted to the Board of Governors by in early March 15, 2017.

Chairman Kuntz's correspondence directed the Chair of the Board of Trustee and the Chief Audit Executive to set the scope and objectives. It was decided to retain the scope and objectives established in the previous year.

**Key Audit Findings**

There were no key audit findings.

**Conclusion**

In our opinion, based upon the work performed, the internal controls, processes and procedures in all material respects are functioning in a reliable manner to ensure completeness, accuracy, and timeliness of data submissions and meet Board of Governors' certification objectives.

Enclosure: Performance Based Funding Data Integrity Agreed-Upon Procedures Audit issued February 10, 2017  
Performance Based Funding Data Integrity Certification Form  
Florida Board of Governors' Letter dated June 23, 2016

**NEW COLLEGE OF FLORIDA  
INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT'S REPORT  
ON APPLYING  
AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES**

**SEPTEMBER 30, 2016**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT’S REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES .....	1
Report .....	2
Attachment I Metric Related Submissions Testing	



## INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT'S REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Board of Trustees  
New College of Florida  
Sarasota, Florida 34243

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the Board of Trustees of New College of Florida (the "College"), solely to assist the College in determining whether the College has processes established to ensure the completeness, accuracy and timeliness of data submissions to the Board of Governors (the "BOG") which support the Performance Funding Metrics of the College as of September 30, 2016. The College is responsible for all processes and procedures related to the complete, accurate and timely submission of data to the BOG. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was performed in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of the parties specified in this report. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

### **Our procedures and findings were as follows:**

We reviewed all of the BOG submissions relating to the Performance Funding Metrics identified and published by the State University System of Florida (the "SUS") specific to the certification. See Attachment I for a listing of the submissions tested as provided by the College to us.

- a) Verify the appointment of the Data Administrator by the College President and that duties related to these responsibilities are incorporated into the Data Administrator's official position description.
1. Review the Data Administrator's position description; note details of the description, paying special attention to responsibilities related to coordinating the gathering of data from departmental sources, quality assurance procedures applied and other data integrity checks prior to submission to the BOG.
  2. Determine if the Data Administrator was appointed by the President.
  3. Conclude on whether the Institutional Data Administrator's responsibilities include the requirements identified in BOG Regulation 3.007, SUS Management Information System. (For example, verify the Data Administrator's data submission statements indicated, "I certify that this file/data represents the position of this College for the term being reported.").

### **Procedures Performed**

- Reviewed the Position Description for the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment effective February 14, 2007. Verified description included the requirements identified in the BOG Regulation 3.007.
- Reviewed the original appointment for the Director of Institutional Research by the President dated July 11, 2003.
- Observed the State University Database System (the “SUDS”) submission screen and the “Submit for Approval” button that represents the College’s certification of complying with BOG regulation 3.007.
- Reviewed current organizational chart available via the President’s office, and discussed the Institutional Research and Assessment structure with the Director.

### **Findings**

No exceptions were identified as a result of applying these procedures.

b) Review the processes used by the Data Administrator to ensure the completeness, accuracy and timely submission of data to the Board of Governors.

1. Interview the Data Administrator and other key data managers to understand the internal processes in place to gather, test and ensure that only valid data, as defined by the BOG, is timely submitted to the BOG.
2. Identify and evaluate key processes over data input and submission. Consider evaluating the processes from the point of incoming information to the submission of the data file to the BOG.
3. Review internal records such as time management schedules and relevant correspondence which purport to demonstrate that complete and accurate data is timely submitted to the BOG. (See due dates addressed in the SUS data workshop).
4. According to BOG Regulation 3.007, prior to submitting the file, the universities shall ensure the file is consistent with the criteria established in the specifications document by performing tests on the file using applications/processes provided by the BOG Information Resource Management (IRM) office. Review process for timely and accurately addressing data file error reports.
5. Evaluate the results and document your conclusion on the data administrator’s processes.

### **Procedures Performed**

- Interviewed the following people who have significant responsibility for the data being reported and submitted to the BOG:
  - Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment
  - Director of Information Technology, Office of Information Technology
  - Director of Administrative Computing, Office of Information Technology

- Controller, Business Office
  - Associate Controller, Business Office
  - Registrar, Office of the Registrar
  - Acting Director of Operations, Office of Admissions and Financial Aid
  - Director of Financial Aid, Office of Admissions and Financial Aid
  - Director of Human Resources, Human Resources Department
- 
- For those interviewed, we discussed key internal controls and processes in place over data input, Banner access, SLATE (the Admission Department's recruitment software) access (when applicable), State University Database System (SUDS) access, validation tables, data submission procedures, error resolution, staff training, and other controls specific to the department and submission of accurate and timely data. Reviewed the metrics specific to each department to ensure controls are in place and a clear understanding exists to ensure only valid data is being submitted based on the data definitions.
  - Reviewed the Recurring Reporting Calendar created by the Office of Information Technology and maintained by the Institutional Research and Assessment Department (IRA) which is sent to department heads annually when the BOG submission schedule is produced. These calendar events detail the upcoming submissions due during the year to the BOG and who is responsible for the data being submitted. Department heads review the data requests and are responsible to ensure the data is accurate and ready for timely submission.
  - Reviewed submission schedule maintained by the IRA department.
  - Verified submission files tested were submitted by the Due Date as published by the State University System of Florida (SUS) and identified on the SUDS website.
  - Tested the submission file criteria definitions used by the College to ensure they meet the data definitions published by the SUS.
  - Obtained the data definition tables from the SUDS website and verified tables documented in the College processes agreed to the SUDS tables.
  - Reviewed processes over testing and validating data submissions and procedures for the resolution of errors prior to the final submission.

### **Findings**

No exceptions were identified as a result of applying these procedures.

c) Evaluate any available documentation including policies, procedures and desk manuals of appropriate staff; and assess their adequacy for ensuring data integrity for College data submissions to the Board of Governors.

1. Request the Data Administrator provide its policies, procedures, minutes of meetings, and any other written documentation used as resources to ensure data integrity; note whether these documents are sufficiently detailed, up-to-date and distributed to appropriate staff.
2. Evaluate the results and document your conclusion. If necessary, consider benchmarking with peer universities.

### **Procedures Performed**

- Discussed key processes with those interviewed to ensure procedures are in place to ensure data accuracy for their department.
- Ensured each department, that is key to the submission process, had written policy and procedures regarding data they are responsible for.
- We do not perform benchmarking as this is a process the College would perform.

### **Findings**

No exceptions were identified as a result of applying these procedures.

d) Review system access controls and user privileges to evaluate if they are properly assigned and periodically reviewed to ensure only those authorized to make data changes do so.

1. Obtain a list of individuals that have access to SUDS.
2. Obtain the definitions for the roles in the SUDS system.  
[http://www.flbog.edu/resources/ditr/suds/\\_doc/userguide.pdf](http://www.flbog.edu/resources/ditr/suds/_doc/userguide.pdf)
3. Review the procedures to grant system access and/or initiate, monitor and cancel user privileges.
4. Perform a test of system access controls and/or user privileges to determine if only appropriate employees have access or need the privilege.
5. Consider other IT systems and related system access controls or user privileges that may impact the data elements used for each measure reviewed.
6. Evaluate the results and conclude on the reasonableness of procedures and practices in place for the setup and maintenance of system access, specifically addressing employees with SUDS access.

### **Procedures Performed**

- Obtained a current listing of all those individuals who have access to the SUDS system from the BOG's application portal manager.
- Obtained the role definitions in the SUDS system for each type of user.
- Discussed procedures with the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment for granting access to the SUDS system and monitoring to ensure user privileges are terminated in a timely manner. Verified only she has administrative authority to change users in the system.
- Reviewed user listing and discussed with the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment to ensure only personnel that need access have access to the SUDS system and only a limited number have the ability to submit data.
- Reviewed Banner access/termination procedures with each department listed in section *b.* and ensured procedures are in place for authorization of adding a new user and timeliness of terminating personnel access.
- Verified email is sent to Data Custodians on a semi-annual basis requesting them to review Banner Users for their department to ensure access is proper and needed.
- Selected a sample four of users from those departments who are significant to the submissions being tested and verified authorization was obtained for the new user, proper workorder was initiated by an authorized person and determined class approved agreed to current Banner access privileges. These users were selected subsequent to our internal audit testing we performed as of March 31, 2016.
- Reviewed SLATE access/termination procedures with the Associate Dean of Enrollment Services and Director of Admissions in the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid and ensured procedures are in place for authorization of adding a new user and timeliness of terminating personnel access.
- Reviewed the October 2016 SLATE user listing.
- Verified that only the Acting Director of Operations has access to add new users.
- Selected a sample of four users to verify proper authorization was obtained for the user to be added to SLATE and verified employee requires access for their job duties.

### **Findings**

No exceptions were identified as a result of applying these procedures.

e) Testing of data accuracy.

1. Identify and evaluate data validity controls to ensure that data extracted from the primary systems of record are accurate and complete. This may include review of controls over code used to create the data submission. Review each measure's definition and calculation for the consistency of data submissions with the data definitions and guidance provided by the BOG.

2. As appropriate, select samples from data the College has submitted to the BOG for its Performance Funding Model. Vouch selected data to original source documents (this will most likely include the College's student and financial systems used to capture relevant information).
3. Evaluate the results of the testing and conclude on the completeness and accuracy of the submissions examined.

### **Procedures Performed**

For each submission file listed in Attachment I, we performed the following procedures for the specific metrics identified in the Performance Funding Metrics published by the SUS:

- Obtained complete submission file for time period being tested.
- Selected a sample size of thirty (30) data items to test for each file submission and each metric specific to the performance funding testing.
- Verified data reported in the submission files specific to the metrics identified by the SUS agreed to the source system Banner.
- Verified the data reported for each metric agreed with the SUDS data dictionary.

To determine the completeness of the files being submitted, we performed the following procedures:

- For each term and reported time frame, we obtained which was extracted from Banner and compared to submission files extracted by the Institutional Research and Analysis department. For each comparison we identified any person that was on the Banner report that was not in the file submission. We then selected a sample size based on the size of the file and errors returned and verified the student was properly omitted for the specific submission based on the current data definitions. Selected files and corresponding sample sizes are as follows:
  1. All students enrolled were compared to the Student Instruction (SIF) files submitted. Nineteen difference were identified and reconciled.
  2. All students who received Pell grants were compared to the Student Financial Aid (SFA) files submitted. No differences were identified.
  3. All students who had a degree awarded were compared to the Degrees Awarded (SIFD) files submitted. No differences were identified.
  4. All students admitted were compared to the Admissions (ADM) files submitted. Eleven differences were identified and reconciled.

### **Findings**

No exceptions were identified as a result of applying these procedures.

- f) Evaluate the veracity of the College Data Administrator's data submission statements that indicate, "I certify that this file/data represents the position of this College for the term being reported."
1. Interview the College data administrator to consider the reasonableness of the various coordination efforts with the data administrators staff, the other data custodians' staff, BOG IRM, and other knowledgeable individuals which form the basis for personal and professional satisfaction that data submitted to the BOG is complete, accurate and submitted timely.
  2. Inquire how the Data Administrator knows the key controls are in place and operating effectively. If not already done, consider verifying these key controls are in place and adequate to support the Data Administrator's assertions.

### **Procedures Performed**

- Interviewed personnel listed in section *b*. and verified communication with the Institutional Research and Assessment department is on-going and clear to ensure accurate and timely data submission. Also verified Data Administrator understands the key controls specific to the metrics being tested and that they are functioning.
- Verified with the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment her communication with the BOG and IRM to ensure data being submitted meets the data definitions.

### **Findings**

No exceptions were identified as a result of applying these procedures.

- g) Review the consistency of data submissions with the data definitions and guidance provided by the Board of Governors through the Data Committee and communications from data workshops.
1. Evaluate the College's procedures for periodically obtaining and communicating definitions and due dates as provided by the BOG through the Data Committee and communications from data workshops.
  2. Verify with the College Data Administrator that the most current data file definitions are used as a basis for preparation of data to be submitted to the BOG.
  3. Review SUDS most recent cumulative release notes and workshop agendas. <http://www.flbog.edu/resources/ditr/suds/>
  4. Request evidence of the most recent formal staff training/workshops, internal discussions or communications with other responsible employees and the BOG Data Committee necessary to ensure the overall integrity of data to be submitted to the BOG.
  5. Conclude as to the consistency of the submissions.

### **Procedures Performed**

- Reviewed the Recurring Reporting Calendar created by the Office of Information Technology and maintained by the IRA department sent to department heads. These calendar events detail the upcoming submissions due in the next year to the BOG and who is responsible for the data being submitted. Department heads review the data requests and are responsible to ensure the data is accurate and ready for timely submission.
- Obtained the most recent data definition tables on the SUDS website and verified data definitions outlined in the file processes agreed to the SUDS data tables.
- Verified the Institutional Research and Assessment Department's process of communication to department heads of the data definitions and any new or changed metric.
- Obtained the SUDS release notes and workshop agenda's during the testing period and verified any changes were properly incorporated into the data file submissions.
- Reviewed staff training with each personnel interviewed as listed in section *b*. in relation to both Banner and SUDS security and knowledge training.
- Our testing was performed on all file submissions with due dates from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016, for the specific metrics tested to review for consistency among data submissions.

### **Findings**

No exceptions were identified as a result of applying these procedures.

h) *Review the College Data Administrator's data resubmissions to the Board of Governors with a view toward ensuring these resubmissions are both necessary and authorized. This review should also evaluate how to minimize the need for data resubmissions.*

1. Interview the College data administrator about the types and quantity of recent data resubmissions and the level(s) of approvals necessary for corrective action.
2. Request and examine any correspondence between the College and the BOG IRM office related to data resubmissions that pertain to the performance metrics. Determine if these resubmissions problems tend to be reoccurring and what, if any, actions management has taken or plans to take in order to reduce them.
3. Conclude as to the frequency, need and authorization of the resubmission process.

### **Procedures Performed**

- Interviewed the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment about the resubmission procedures.
- During the testing period there was two file resubmissions. One was requested by the BOG due to a control totals that did not agree and one resubmission was initiated by New College in regards to the expenditure analysis.

- Reviewed data resubmission correspondence from the BOG and verified the files were properly resubmitted with no outstanding errors.
- Reviewed resubmissions to identify if there are recurring submission problems.

### **Findings**

No exceptions were identified as a result of applying these procedures.

- i) *Provide an objective basis of support for the president and board of trustees chair to sign the representations made in the Performance Based Funding–Data Integrity Certification.*
1. Review The Performance Based Funding (the “PBF”) Data Integrity Certification statement to identify additional procedures that should be designed to support the representations. (For example, #11 requests a certification that College policy changes and decisions impacting the PBF initiative were not made for the purposes of artificially inflating performance measures).

### **Procedures Performed**

- We reviewed the Data Integrity Certification and performed procedures agreed upon by the College to meet the objectives of the certification.

### **Findings**

- 2016-01 Mauldin & Jenkins was engaged to perform procedures that were provided by you and were outlined in our engagement letter, that management has identified to meet the objectives of the certification. The College must conclude as to the adequacy of these procedures and findings in meeting their certification objectives.

We were not engaged to and did not perform an audit, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the processes and procedures for the complete, accurate and timely submission of data to the BOG. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to management.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of New College of Florida’s Board of Trustees and management and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

*Mauldin & Jenkins, LLC*

New College of Florida  
Metric Related Submissions  
October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016

**Attachment I**

<b>Submissions Tested</b>				
<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Submission</b>	<b>Term or Year</b>	<b>Rept Time Frame</b>	<b>Sample Tested</b>
10/5/2015	SFA - Student Financial Aid File	Annual 2014	20142015	30
10/6/2015	IRD - Instruction & Research File <sup>(1)</sup>	Annual 2014	20142015	60
10/9/2015	SIFP - Student Instruction File Preliminary	Fall 2015	201508	30
1/20/2016	RET - Retention File <sup>(2)</sup>	Annual 2014	20142015	3
1/22/2016	SIF - Student Instruction File	Fall 2015	201508	30
2/19/2016	ADM - Admissions File	Spring 2016	201601	30
3/5/2016	SIFP - Student Instruction File Preliminary	Spring 2016	201601	30
6/16/2016	SIF - Student Instruction File	Spring 2016	201601	30
7/5/2016	SIFD - Degrees Awarded <sup>(3)</sup>	Spring 2016	201601	30
8/15/2016	OB - Operating Budget	Annual 2016	20162017	30
9/23/2016	ADM - Admissions File	Fall 2016	201608	30
<b>Additional Data Submissions tested for New College specific metrics</b>				
<b>Metric</b>	<b>Submitted Data</b>	<b>Term or Year</b>	<b>Rept Time Frame</b>	<b>Sample Tested</b>
Metric #6	STEM Data	Annual 2015	20152016	30
Metric #8b	ADM - Admissions File	Fall 2015	201508	30
Metric #9c	Common Data Set	Annual 2014	20142015	30

<sup>(1)</sup> Two (2) tables were tested from the IRD - Instruction & Research submitted file; therefore the sample size tested is 60. The tables tested were Workload Activities and Workload Person Funding.

<sup>(2)</sup> There were 3 changes to prior BOG data files and reports.

<sup>(3)</sup> The sample tested was additionally used to test Metric 10(d) specific to New College of Florida.



# Performance Based Funding

## March 2017 Data Integrity Certification

Name of University: **New College of Florida**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Please respond “Yes” or “No” for each representation below. Explain any “No” responses to ensure clarity of the representation you are making to the Board of Governors. Modify representations to reflect any noted audit findings.

Performance Based Funding Data Integrity Certification Representations			
Representations	Yes	No	Comment / Reference
1. I am responsible for establishing and maintaining, and have established and maintained, effective internal controls and monitoring over my university’s collection and reporting of data submitted to the Board of Governors Office which will be used by the Board of Governors in Performance Based Funding decision-making.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. These internal controls and monitoring activities include, but are not limited to, reliable processes, controls, and procedures designed to ensure that data required in reports filed with my Board of Trustees and the Board of Governors are recorded, processed, summarized, and reported in a manner which ensures its accuracy and completeness.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. In accordance with Board of Governors Regulation 1.001(3), my Board of Trustees has required that I maintain an effective information system to provide accurate, timely, and cost-effective information about the university, and shall require that all data and reporting requirements of the Board of Governors are met.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. In accordance with Board of Governors Regulation 3.007, my university shall provide accurate data to the Board of Governors Office.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5. In accordance with Board of Governors Regulation 3.007, I have appointed a Data Administrator to certify and manage the submission of data to the Board of Governors Office.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6. In accordance with Board of Governors Regulation 3.007, I have tasked	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

## Performance Based Funding Data Integrity Certification

Performance Based Funding Data Integrity Certification Representations			
Representations	Yes	No	Comment / Reference
my Data Administrator to ensure the data file (prior to submission) is consistent with the criteria established by the Board of Governors Data Committee. The due diligence includes performing tests on the file using applications/processes provided by the Board of Governors Information Resource Management (IRM) office.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
7. When critical errors have been identified, through the processes identified in item #6, a written explanation of the critical errors was included with the file submission.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
8. In accordance with Board of Governors Regulation 3.007, my Data Administrator has submitted data files to the Board of Governors Office in accordance with the specified schedule.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
9. In accordance with Board of Governors Regulation 3.007, my Data Administrator electronically certifies data submissions in the State University Data System by acknowledging the following statement, "Ready to submit: Pressing <b>Submit for Approval</b> represents electronic certification of this data per Board of Governors Regulation 3.007."	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
10. I am responsible for taking timely and appropriate preventive / corrective actions for deficiencies noted through reviews, audits, and investigations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
11. I recognize that the Board's Performance Based Funding initiative will drive university policy on a wide range of university operations - from admissions through graduation. I certify that university policy changes and decisions impacting this initiative have been made to bring the university's operations and practices in line with State University System Strategic Plan goals and have not been made for the purposes of artificially inflating performance metrics.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

