



Florida Department of
TRANSPORTATION

Performance Goals for January to June 2014

**Audit Section
1/30/14**

Performance Matters Initiative

Established to:

- standardize performance management within the state;
- keep performance evaluations with employees throughout their state career;
- provide new levels of accountability and consistency across all agencies; and
- drive an enterprise-wide view of human capital management

SMART

- **S**pecific
- **M**easurable
- **A**chievable
- **R**elevant
- **T**ime Bound

FDOT Approach

- Subjective (all FDOT employees)
 1. DOT Values: (Integrity, Respect, Commitment, One FDOT, Trust, Customer Drive)
 2. Customer Service
 3. Dependability & Work Standards
 4. Communications & Relationship Building
 5. Leadership
 6. Creativity & Innovation

FDOT Approach

- SMART: Human Resource Goals
 - Hiring Results (Manager, Director, IG)
 - Vacancy Results (IG)
 - Training Results (Manager, Director, IG)
 - Employee Survey Results (Director, IG)

FDOT Approach

- **OIG SMART Goals**
 - Inspector General (9)
 - Audit Director (7)
 - Audit Manager (6)
 - Senior Auditor (4)
 - Auditor (3)
 - Forensic (3)
 - Data Mining (3)
 - External Liaison (3)

HOW MANY MEASURES?

	Subjective	SMART	Total
Inspector General	6	9	15
Audit Director	6	7	13
Audit Manager	6	6	12
Senior Auditor	6	4	10
Auditor	6	3	9
Forensic	6	3	9
Data Mining	6	3	9
External Liaison	6	3	9

Audit Section SMART Measures

- Customer Satisfaction
- Audit Findings
- Audit Work Plan
- Audit Timeliness
- Fieldwork Timeliness
- Senior Post Engagement Review
- Post Engagement Assessment
- Training by Data Miner
- RAMS Entry
- RAMS Quarterly Reports
- Request Responses

HOW MANY MEASURES?

	DOT Values	Customer Service	Dependability & Work Standards	Communications & Relationship Building	Leadership	Creativity & Innovation	Hiring Results	Vacancy Results	Training Results	Employee Results	Customer Survey Results	Audit Satisfaction	Audit Findings	Audit Work Plan	Audit Timeliness	Fieldwork Timeliness	Senior Post Engagement Review	Post Engagement Assessment	Training by Data Miner	RAMS Entry	RAMS Quarterly Reports	Request Responses	
IG																							
Aud. Dir.																							
Aud. Mgr.																							
Sr. Aud.																							
Audit																							
Forensic																							
Datamining																							
External																							

↙ Indicates relationship

• Indicates survey focus is different

Auditor Fieldwork SMART Goal

Fieldwork phase(s) completed within established/approved due date. The fieldwork phase begins with the manager's approval to start fieldwork of the engagement and ends with the approval by management to move to reporting phase.

Rating	Criteria (Rubric)
5	On average Fieldwork phase(s) is completed within 84% or less of the established/approved due date.
4	On average the Fieldwork phase is completed within 85 to 94% of the established/approved due date.
3	On average the Fieldwork phase is completed within 95% to 110% of the established/approved due date.
2	On average the Fieldwork phase is completed within 111 to 120% of the established/approved due date.
1	On average the Fieldwork phase is completed in a timeframe greater than 121% of the established/approved due date.

Post Engagement Assessments SMART

A Post Engagement Assessment will be conducted on each assigned and completed engagement.

Rating	Criteria (Rubric)
5	Average rating of 4.5 to 5.0
4	Average rating of 3.7 to 4.4
3	Average rating of 3.0 to 3.6
2	Average rating of 2.3 to 2.9
1	Average rating below 2.2

Auditor Post Engagement Assessment

PROJECT EVALUATION			
Criteria		Max Point	Actual Points
1	Audit plan steps requiring management approval were properly completed and approved.	10	
	Notes:		
2	Effectively researched the engagement and developed an appropriate scope, well-defined objectives and a well-designed engagement program.	15	
	Notes:		
3	Engagement objectives were achieved and supported.	10	
	Notes:		
4	Testing methodology was sufficient, documented and appropriately tied to the engagement objectives.	5	
	Notes:		
5	Summary work papers were concise, well organized, properly supported and referenced.	20	
	Notes:		
6	Regular communication concerning the project with the auditee/manager/senior/team occurred throughout the course of the engagement and is well-documented in the working papers.	15	
	Notes:		
7	Work paper review notes were properly cleared.	10	
	Notes:		
8	Cross-referenced report was properly prepared and supported.	5	
	Notes:		
9	Draft report for Director (between AIC and Manager) was accomplished within 3 re-submissions of the original work product.	10	
	Notes:		
TOTAL SCORE:		100	0

SCORING MATRIX	
Total Score	Rating
0-59	1
60-69	2
70-79	3
80-89	4
90-100	5

Auditor Post Engagement Assessment

1. Audit plan steps requiring management approval were properly completed and approved.
2. Effectively researched the engagement and developed an appropriate scope, well-defined objectives and a well-designed engagement program.
3. Engagement objectives were achieved and supported.
4. Testing methodology was sufficient, documented and appropriately tied to the engagement objectives.

Auditor Post Engagement Assessment

5. Summary work papers were concise, well organized, properly supported and referenced.
6. Regular communication concerning the project with the auditee/manager/senior/team occurred throughout the course of the engagement and is well-documented in the working papers.
7. Work paper review notes were properly cleared.
8. Cross-referenced report was properly prepared and supported.
9. Draft report for Director (between AIC and Manager) was accomplished within 3 re-submissions of the original work product.

Senior Auditor Post Engagement

EVALUATION OF SENIOR AUDITOR			
	Criteria	Max Point	Actual Points
1	Senior auditor review substantiated work performed met the engagement objectives.	15	
	Notes:		
2	Review comments were clear, meaningful and informative review comments.	15	
	Notes:		
3	Senior auditor review verified audit findings were factual and sufficiently supported by evidence.	20	
	Notes:		
4	Senior auditor review substantiated work papers were concise, sufficient, complete and signed off.	25	
	Notes:		
5	Cross-referenced report was completed according to office standards.	5	
	Notes:		
6	Senior auditor review of draft audit report was clear, concise, and meets office standards.	20	
	Notes:		
TOTAL SCORE:		100	0

SCORING MATRIX	
Total Score	Rating
0-59	1
60-69	2
70-79	3
80-89	4
90-100	5

Senior Auditor Post Engagement

1. Senior auditor review substantiated work performed met the engagement objectives.
2. Review comments were clear, meaningful and informative review comments.
3. Senior auditor review verified audit findings were factual and sufficiently supported by evidence.
4. Senior auditor review substantiated work papers were concise, sufficient, complete and signed off.
5. Cross-referenced report was completed according to office standards.
6. Senior auditor review of draft audit report was clear, concise, and meets office standards.

Customer Satisfaction SMART

Customer surveys are sent to the senior internal customer (district secretaries or central office program managers) following each completed OIG audit product. Surveys ask questions which focus on timeliness, sufficiency of the information provided and communication during the engagement. Customer satisfaction is rated on a 0 to 4 scale with 4 being “strongly agree” and 0 being strongly disagree.

Rating	Criteria (Rubric)
5	Average rating of 3.7 to 4.0.
4	Average rating of 3.4 to 3.6.
3	Average rating of 3.0 to 3.3.
2	Average rating of 2.7 to 2.9.
1	Average rating of Below 2.7.

Customer Survey

1. Coordination was appropriate.
2. Assignment took an acceptable amount of time.
3. There was minimal disruption to normal activities.
4. Received status reports or updates.
5. OIG staff demonstrated professionalism and respect.

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/inspectorgeneral/survey/assignmentevaluationsurvey.html>

Customer Survey

6. Findings, conclusions and opinions were supported by appropriate evidence.
7. Report was clear.
8. Recommendations were constructive and practicable.
9. OIG provided valuable information.

What is Next?


- Prior system close-out EPS: January 31
- **Accept new standards**: January 31
- Evaluation Periods
 - January to June 2014
 - July 2014 to June 2015

Peoplefirst - Notification

PeoplefirstNoReply@ngahrhosting.com

Acknowledge Receipt of Your Performance Expectations

To Sullivan, Kristofer

 If there are problems with how this message is displayed, click here to view it in a web browser.

People First



Review your performance expectations for the Jan 1 -June 30, 2014 Annual Performance Evaluation with your manager then acknowledge receipt.


Login to **People First** and select the *Performance & Talent Management* tab. Select the task in the My Tasks section. Review your performance expectations one last time and then complete the acknowledgement steps.

Please do not reply to this message. This e-mail is sent by an automated system and replies will not be received. For additional information, [click here](#).



Peoplefirst - Notification

 **My Tasks** 

Set performance expectations for your employees for the 2013-2014 Annual Performance Evaluation Plan (4) 

Acknowledge receipt of your performance expectations for the Jan 1 -June 30, 2014 Annual Performance Evaluation 02/07/2014

Peoplefirst – Acceptance

Welcome KRISTOFER SULLIVAN [Logout](#)

Org Chart Quick Find:

Employee Performance Expectations Acknowledgement KRISTOFER B SULLIVAN ▼ Jan 1 -June 30, 2014 Annual Performance Evaluation 2014 ▼ Review Period: 01/01/2014 - 06/30/2014

4	On average, engagements are completed within 85 to 94% of the established/approved due date.
3	On average, engagements are completed within 95% to 110% of the established/approved due date.

[Move to Next Section](#)

Acknowledgement

Instructions:

- Step 1: Check the box "I Acknowledge Receipt of My Performance Expectations."
- Step 2: Enter the date acknowledged.
- Step 3: Select "Acknowledge Receipt" to complete the process.

I Acknowledge Receipt of My Performance Expectations: * Check the box to acknowledge that you have discussed the performance expectations with your manager.

Date Acknowledged (MM/DD/YYYY): *

[Spell Check](#) [Print](#) [Save](#) [Acknowledge Receipt](#)

Peoplefirst - Notification



Instructions:

Review the following rating scales with the employee before completing the acknowledgement section.

Individual Performance Expectation Rating	Numeric Scale	Individual Performance Expectation Rating Scale Definitions
Exceptional	5	Employee consistently exceeds the performance expectation of the position. Examples include, but are not limited to: The employee requires little or no supervision from management in accomplishing his/her tasks and seeks opportunities to enhance the organization. The employee possesses highly advanced job knowledge. The employee is relied upon to solve complex problems and applies creativity and innovative approaches in formulating solutions.
Above Expectation	4	Employee consistently meets and often exceeds the performance expectation of the position. Examples include, but are not limited to: The employee requires minimal supervision from management in accomplishing his/her tasks. The employee possesses a thorough knowledge of the job, and often solves or assists in solving complex problems.
Meets Expectation	3	Employee consistently meets and may occasionally exceed the performance expectation of the position. Examples include, but are not limited to: The employee requires moderate supervision from management in accomplishing his/her tasks. The employee possesses sufficient knowledge and/or initiative to execute his/her duties and responsibilities.
Below Expectation	2	Employee exhibits inconsistent job performance, but has the capacity to improve to meet the performance expectation of the position. Examples include, but are not limited to: At times the employee requires close supervision where he/she should be operating on his/her own. The employee sometimes lacks the initiative, and/or job knowledge to execute his/her duties and responsibilities.
Unacceptable	1	Employee consistently fails to meet the designated performance expectation. Examples include, but are not limited to: The employee requires close supervision and his/her work requires continual correction. The employee's job knowledge is insufficient to meet daily requirements.
None Given	N	No longer applicable or unable to determine.

Overall Numeric Range	Overall Rating Title
4.50 - 5.00	Outstanding
3.50 - 4.49	Commendable
3.00 - 3.49	Satisfactory
2.50 - 2.99	Needs Improvement
2.49 and below	Unsatisfactory