

Item # 60

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

SUBMITTED AT THE REQUEST OF

**FINANCE & ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
DEPARTMENT**

December 1, 2009

10:00 a.m.



DIVISION OF HUMAN RESOURCES

115 S. Andrews Avenue, Room 508 • Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301

MEMORANDUM

TO: Broward County Board of County Commissioners

FROM:  James R. Acton, Jr., Director
Human Resources Division

DATE: November 30, 2009

RE: Agenda Item No. 60 - December 1, 2009

Attached, please find the Consolidated Performance Review and Summary Rating Grid for the County Auditor. Thank you.

JRA:pj

Attachment

Board of County Commissioners, Broward County, Florida
Finance and Administrative Services Department
Division of Human Resources

EXECUTIVE PERFORMANCE REVIEW

COUNTY AUDITOR: *Evan A. Lukic*

Rating Period: October 1, 2008 – September 30, 2009

The County Auditor's report of accomplishments for this rating period is attached for review and consideration in evaluating the following performance measurements. Circle the applicable performance rating for each statement below.

PART I: PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS:

Performance rating as follows:

1 = Unsatisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 3 = Meets Expectations 4 = Exceeds Expectations 5 = Outstanding DK = Don't Know

❖ **COMMUNICATIONS WITH COUNTY COMMISSIONERS:**

Average Rating

- | | |
|--|-----|
| • To what degree is the County Auditor sensitive to the Board's concerns and priorities regarding matters which affect the County? | 4.0 |
| • How effectively does the County Auditor communicate, to the Board, recommendations on major financial issues, non-compliance liabilities and operational policies and procedures which affect the County? | 4.2 |
| • How well does the County Auditor respond to the Board's questions or concerns (individually and collectively) regarding the County's fiscal or other operation procedures? | 4.3 |
| • How well does the County Auditor provide the Board with oral or written reports of financial and performance audits of departments, divisions, offices and dependant agencies as established in the Charter and Administrative Code of Broward County? | 4.5 |
| • How well does the County Auditor keep the Board informed on the County's compliance with applicable policies and procedures, financial conditions and operational requirements concerns in anticipation for the future needs of the County? | 3.8 |

Average Section Rating: 4.2

Comments on Communications with County Commissioners:

Commissioner Lieberman: *Great audits on Crime Lab and BSO contracts. Pretrial audit missed some glaring issues.*

❖ **ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS:**

Average Rating

- | | |
|---|-----|
| • How well does the County Auditor's work product and interactions with the Board demonstrate knowledge of modern management controls, including organizational, operating and information system controls? | 4.2 |
| • How well does the County Auditor demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the County's various agencies and operations? | 4.5 |
| • How effectively does the County Auditor lead by example in maintaining personal integrity when conducting professional relationships and activities? | 4.3 |
| • How well does the County Auditor develop and maintain cooperative relationships with other public and private organizations upon which the County is dependent, seeks to serve, or conducts business? | 3.9 |
| • How effective is the County Auditor in demonstrating an awareness of cultural diversity within the County's operations and services? | 3.9 |

Average Section Rating: 4.2

Comments on Administrative Management and Intergovernmental Relations:

Commissioner Lieberman: *Sometimes involves himself in non-auditor issues.*

❖ <u>FISCAL OPERATIONS:</u>	Average Rating
• How well does the County Auditor exhibit a clear understanding of the County's financial resources?	3.9
• How well does the County Auditor present adequate information in support of recommendations regarding the financial aspects of County operations?	4.3
• How well does the County Auditor provide the Board, clear reports of financial analysis and information regarding operational requirements in order to assist the Board in making informed decisions regarding budget and management policies?	4.2
• How well does the County Auditor review internal controls and operations to ensure resources are being used effectively and within the adopted budget and management policies?	4.4
• How well does the County Auditor prepare a realistic annual budget?	4.1
• How well does the County Auditor control expenditures in accordance with the approved budget?	4.2
Average Section Rating:	<hr/> 4.2

Comments on Fiscal Operations:

❖ <u>MEDIA AND PUBLIC RELATIONS:</u>	Average Rating
• How well does the County Auditor respond to media and public inquires?	4.0
• How effective is the County Auditor in maintaining a positive and professional image and demeanor when communicating with the media and the public?	4.2
• How well does the County Auditor ensure the reliability and integrity of the information communicated in order to build positive relationships with the media?	4.3
Average Section Rating:	<hr/> 4.2

Comments on Media and Public Relations:

❖ <u>INITIATIVE AND STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT:</u>	Average Rating
• How well does the County Auditor demonstrate initiative and foresight in directing audits intended to determine whether activities, programs, goals and objectives, approved by the Board, are operating in compliance with applicable laws, policies and procedures, and are conducted in an efficient and effective manner?	4.3
• How effectively does the County Auditor review internal controls of administrative and accounting procedures established to ensure consistency, safeguard the County's assets, and deter the occurrence of fraudulent acts?	4.4
• How well does the County Auditor demonstrate a strategic focus in identifying opportunities to improve performance and foster accountability throughout the operations of the County?	4.0
• How clearly does the County Auditor exhibit an understanding of information technology, ensuring that it is appropriately integrated into plans to improve organizational operations?	3.8
Average Section Rating:	<hr/> 4.1

Comments on Initiative and Strategic Management:

Commissioner Lieberman: *Audits requested by Board Members don't seem to have same priority as other audits. By focusing intensely on some departments, auditor has missed broader evaluations.*

Commissioner Wexler: *The Auditor and his staff exhibit a clear understanding of information technology; integrating*

technology into the organization's operations is the responsibility of administration.

❖ **POLICY IMPLEMENTATION AND SERVICE DELIVERY:**

- How effectively does the County Auditor review and evaluate policies, programs, and services and provide recommendations to achieve the desired results? 4.2
- How adequately does the County Auditor evaluate current County operations and internal controls by making recommendations and changes to ensure that they are functioning effectively and efficiently? 4.3
- How well does the County Auditor evaluate strategic, fiscal and capital improvement plans for the County? 4.0
- How well does the County Auditor maintain a consistently high level of quality in work product and service delivery? 4.6

Average Section Rating: 4.3

Comments on Policy Implementation and Service Delivery:

Mayor Keech: *As I stated last year (along with Commissioner Ritter), Mr. Lukic needs to be careful that his recommendations do not attempt to set policy. The elected officials set policy not the Auditor, Attorney or County Administrator.*

PART II – ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND OBJECTIVES:

Please provide your comments regarding the County Auditor's report of accomplishments over the past rating period and the goals and objectives proposed by the County Auditor for the upcoming year.

COMMENTS ON ACCOMPLISHMENTS OVER THE PAST RATING PERIOD:

COMMENTS ON GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR THE NEXT RATING PERIOD:

PART III – OVERALL ANNUAL ASSESSMENT:

Please provide your comments regarding the County Auditor's **overall** performance during this rating period:

Evaluator's Comments:

Mayor Keechl: *Mr. Lukic is without a doubt an asset to Broward County.*

Commissioner Lieberman: *Mr. Lukic has identified some deficiencies which assisted the BOCC in revising policies, such as Crime Lab and Contract Services. He still needs to complete the evaluation on special details costs versus billing.*

Generally, his recommendations are on point. However, sometimes he avoids issues he should be involved in, such as the Faulkner reimbursement. It would also be helpful if he developed a schedule for completing reviews of all departments. He assisted the BOCC greatly by focusing in on some needed improvements.

Commissioner Wexler: *Mr. Lukic's reports continue to be high quality. He does an outstanding job in reviewing, assessing and recommending changes via his audits. He is also to be commended for surrounding himself with very competent, talented staff.*

Commissioner Rodstrom: *He delivers a high degree of service. His reports are thorough and well reasoned.*

Would encourage him to seek out those issues that are on the horizon to be voted on before the board.

Commissioner Wasserman-Rubin: *I believe that Mr. Lukic's performance, this year, has been more in keeping with the definition of a County Auditor.*

I also believe that there is a tendency to involve Mr. Lukic in matters that are not relative to his position as County Auditor; however, I do not blame Mr. Lukic, but the Commission itself; suggesting his involvement in issues other than what his job description requires.

Keep up the good work.

COUNTY AUDITOR: EVAN A. LUKIC

Consolidated Executive Performance Review
 Rating Period: October 1, 2008 - September 30, 2009

RATING GRID – Average Rating by Commissioner and by Factor

	Communications with County Commissioners:	Administrative Leadership and Intergovernmental Relations:	Fiscal Operations:	Media and Public Relations:	Initiative and Strategic Management:	Policy Implementation and Service Delivery:	Average Rating by Commissioner:
Ilene Lieberman District 1	3.7	3.6	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.4	4.0
Kristin D. Jacobs District 2	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Stacy Ritter District 3	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Ken Keechl District 4	3.4	3.6	3.7	DK	3.5	3.5	3.5
Lois Wexler District 5	4.5	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.3
Sue N. Gunzburger District 6	4.8	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	4.9
John E. Rodstrom, Jr. District 7	4.6	4.7	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.3
Diana Wasserman-Rubin District 8	4.0	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
<u>Average Rating by Factor</u>	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.2

* NR = No Response