



Salt Lake County
Auditor's Office

Chris Harding, CPA, CIA, CFE
Auditor

Richard Jaussi
Chief Deputy Auditor

Audit of Library Services Performance Indicators

04/05/2022

Audit of Library Services Performance Indicators

Council Direction & Agency Selection

Utah Code Ann. § 17a-19-206 states a county auditor, *“shall, under the direction and supervision of the county legislative body . . . provide performance audit services for a county office, department, division, or other county entity;”*

Salt Lake County Council Resolution:

“1) The Salt Lake County Council hereby directs the Salt Lake County Auditor to provide certain performance auditing services... regarding “outcomes and indicators” ...

2) The Salt Lake County Council may provide the Salt Lake County Auditor with a list of offices, departments, divisions, and their respective programs selected for performance audits ...”

Audit of Library Services Performance Indicators

Scope and Objectives

- January 1, 2018, through December 31, 2020
- The objective of the audit internal controls and procedures for collecting, calculating, and reporting performance indicator data to:
 - Determine if performance indicator data is accurate, relevant, and reliable.
 - Determine if performance indicator data is reported effectively to stakeholders and the public.

Strengths and Accomplishments

- ✓ Written strategic focus plan is on file that ties to performance indicators and outcomes.
- ✓ Regular board meetings to discuss performance, upcoming projects, and community needs. Minutes from board meetings are posted online.
- ✓ Library Services is actively involved with the Public Library Association (PLA) and helps develop and explore improved performance indicators with this national outreach.
- ✓ Security measures are in place to protect physical items as well as building use.
- ✓ With the exception of active patron data, performance measures recalculated to the figures reported, with only minor differences.

Audit of Library Services Performance Indicators

GASB Suggested Performance Reporting Characteristics

The Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) has established suggested characteristics for evaluating performance data reporting by state and local governmental entities. According to GASB, the suggested performance reporting characteristics should be used to assess the usefulness of performance data reporting for ensuring accountability and transparency to the public, and the overall effectiveness of accurately communicating actual performance results. The suggested characteristics include:

GASB Suggested Performance Reporting Characteristics

- Relevance
 - Reliability
 - Understandability
 - Comparability
 - Consistency
 - Timeliness
-

Audit of Library Services Performance Indicators




Audit Criteria and Definitions

Criterion	Definition
Accuracy	Performance indicator data was recalculated, and audit procedures were performed to determine if the recalculated data was within a +/- 5% margin of error compared to reported performance results.
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pertinent• Complete• Timely• Understandable
Reliability	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Impartial• Clearly Defined• Consistent

Audit of Library Services Performance Indicators

Performance indicators were rated in three different categories: accuracy, relevance, and reliability.

Performance Indicator Ratings and Definitions

Rating	Definition
	Performance indicator is accurate, relevant, or reliable – no issues or only minor issues noted.
	Performance indicator is accurate, relevant, or reliable – some minor or moderate issues that agency management should address.
	Performance indicator is <u>NOT</u> accurate, relevant, or reliable – significant issues were identified, and agency management should take corrective actions to address the issues as soon as possible.

Overall Conclusions

Findings	Impacted Relevance	Impacted Reliability
<p>Lack of review and approval processes</p> <p><i>Approval means that an independent person with proper authority has reviewed the supporting documentation and is satisfied that the transaction is appropriate, accurate and complies with applicable laws, regulations, policies and procedures.</i></p>		●
<p>Lack of written procedures</p> <p><i>Control activities are the actions established through policies and procedures that help ensure that management's directives to mitigate risks to the achievement of objectives are carried out, such as authorizations and approvals, verifications, reconciliations.</i></p>		●
<p>Performance measures were not clearly defined</p> <p><i>Understandable by an independent party without prior knowledge of the measure. Includes disclosure of pertinent factors such as changes in methodology, adjustments and estimates.</i></p>	●	●
<p>Adequate supporting documentation was not maintained</p> <p><i>Source data, dates, reports and emails are retained as well as methodology used and any adjustments or estimates.</i></p>		●
<p>Performance measures did not include clear targets, resources, and ownership</p> <p><i>Realistic: Clearly articulate timelines and the resources needed to achieve the desired level. (Service Efforts)</i></p> <p><i>Clear Ownership: Identify a position title that is responsible for actual performance results.</i></p> <p><i>Clear Trade-Offs: There should be documentation of the relationship between performance indicator targets under each objective. Focusing service efforts (time and resources) on one target may mean doing worse against another.</i></p>	●	●

Audit of Library Services Performance Indicators

Audit Criteria Results Library Services			
Performance Indicator	Accuracy	Relevant	Reliable
Circulation <i>The number of items checked out</i>	✓	✓	☑
Meeting Room Usage <i>The total number of rooms reserved</i>	✓	✓	☑
Public and Wireless Computer Sessions <i>The number of sessions activated</i>	✓	✓	☑
Library Visitors <i>The number of people that visit the 18 library branches</i>	✓	☑	✗
Program Attendance and Survey Outcomes <i>The number of attendees for each program and survey response averages</i>	✓	☑	✗
New and Active Patrons <i>The number of people who sign up to obtain a library card and the total number of patrons who had used their library card.</i>	✗	✓	✗

Library Visitors Example

Audit Criteria Results Library Services			
Performance Indicator	Accuracy	Relevant	Reliable
Library Visitors <i>The number of people that visit the 18 library branches</i>	✓	☑	✗

- ✓ **Accuracy-** Audit procedures were performed and determined that recalculated data was within a +/- 5% margin of error compared to reported performance results
- ✓ **Relevant-** Findings in this area included non-disclosure of estimated gate counts and not documenting and explaining the addition of virtual visitors in published indicator statistics.
- ✓ **Reliable-** Findings in this area related to lack of policies and procedures, data retention, documented reviews and approvals, specific resources and individuals responsible for achieving targets. The number of findings resulted in the overall finding regarding reliability.