September 27, 2021

## **Unannounced Onsite Observations of School Bus Safety Devices**

February 18, 2022

Report #2022-01



### MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the School District of Palm Beach County is to educate, affirm, and inspire each student in an equity-embedded school system.

Michael J. Burke Superintendent of Schools

#### **School Board Members**

Frank A. Barbieri, Jr., Esq., Chair Karen M. Brill, Vice Chair Marcia Andrews Alexandria Ayala Barbara McQuinn Debra L. Robinson, M.D. Erica Whitfield

### **Audit Committee Members**

David H. Talley, Chair Tammy McDonald, Vice Chair Mark Bymaster, CPA, CFE Leondrae D. Camel Alissa M. Dhawan, CPA, MBA Michael Dixon, CPA/PFS Kathleen Weigel, Ed.D.

Audit Committee Representatives

Frank A. Barbieri, Jr., Esq., School Board Chair Michael J. Burke, Superintendent of Schools Heather Frederick, CPA, Chief Financial Officer Shawntoyia Bernard, Esq., General Counsel Cory Friess, Principal Representative James Campbell, Ed.D., Principal Representative Justin Katz, CTA President

## September 27, 2021

## **Unannounced Onsite Observations of School Bus Safety Devices**

### **Table of Contents**

P	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY	1
SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY	1
BACKGROUND	2
CONCLUSIONS	
1. Nine Non-Working Safety Devices Found in Eight (9%) Sample Buses	4
2. Mandatory Safety Inspections Completed	6
3. 14% of <i>Daily Bus Driver and Attendant Pre/Post-Trip Inspection Reports</i> Not Available; and 38% Did Not Indicate Completion of the Post-trip Inspection	ı 7
<ol> <li>Bus Video Footage Surveillance Recordings Neither Retained Nor Provided in Compliance with District Policies</li> </ol>	8
EXHIBIT	
1. Bus Driver and Attendant Pre/Post-Trip Inspection Report	10
APPENDIX	
Management's Response	11

This page intentionally left blank.

### September 27, 2021 Unannounced Onsite Observations of School Bus Safety Devices

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Pursuant to the *Office of Inspector General's (OIG) 2021-2022 Work Plan*, and as part of the follow-up review of our *January 7, 2019, Unannounced Onsite Observations of School Bus Safety Devices* (Report #2019-08), we have performed unannounced observations of selected safety devices on sample school buses. The primary objective of this review was to determine if the safety devices on school buses were in working condition. These safety devices included (1) Post-Trip Passenger Check Systems (Child Alert Systems), (2) Student Crossing Arms, (3) Stop Sign Signal Arms, and (4) Video Camera Monitoring Systems. The review produced the following major conclusions:

#### 1. Nine Non-Working Safety Devices Found in Eight (9%) Sample Buses

On September 27, 2021, the OIG conducted unannounced on-site visits at all six District bus compounds to inspect certain safety devices on a total of 90 sample buses (15 sample buses at each location identified by staff as operational and had transported students on that day). The observations revealed that eight (9%) of the 90 sample buses had a total of nine non-working safety devices compared to 15% in our **2019 Observations**.

- On four buses, the Student Crossing Arms did not fully deploy perpendicular to the front bumper as required. Three extended only one-half the required distance and one extended three-fourths.
- On four buses, the Child Alert Systems did not emit an audible warning requiring the driver to ensure no students were left on the bus by walking to the back of the bus to deactivate the system.
- On one bus, the Digital Video Recorder (DVR) was not functioning. A technician fixed the device during the OIG's visit.

We reviewed the September 27, 2021, *Bus Driver and Attendant Pre/Post-trip Inspection Reports* and noted that none of the drivers reported any of the observed non-working safety devices for their buses. The OIG provided all observations results to the Maintenance Foreperson of each compound for immediate corrective action.

**Management's Response:** Management concurs. Transportation will continue to monitor safety devices for proper operational conditions and ensure drivers are performing required pre/post-trip inspection forms. We will continue to emphasize this in training for all employees in Transportation who drive a school bus. (See page 11.)

#### 2. Mandatory Safety Inspections Completed

The OIG reviewed the *School Bus Safety Inspection Forms* for the 90 sample buses most recently completed prior to our observations. We concluded that the mandatory inspections for these 90 buses (100%) were performed within the 30-school-day-interval by actively Certified Bus Safety Inspectors.

**Management's Response:** Management concurs that we are in compliance. Transportation reviewed the District MSI Form against Form 2020-IF and determined that no changes were made therefore, no revisions to the MSI Form were necessary. (See page 12.)

## 3. 14% of *Daily Bus Driver and Attendant Pre/Post-Trip Inspection Reports* Not Available; and 38% Did Not Indicate Completion of the Post-trip Inspection

Bus drivers are required to inspect the bus at least daily prior to the beginning of the first daily trip and document the results on the *Bus Driver and Attendant Pre/Post-Trip Inspection Report* (*PBSD 0454*) (*Report*). We requested the September 24, 2021 *Reports* for the 90 sample buses, which was the last school day before the onsite observations. However, a total of 12 (or 14%) *Reports* were not available for our review in three compounds. Two buses observed were designated as "spares" and had not been used for a route on September 24, 2021. Of the remaining 76 *Reports* reviewed, 29 (or 38%) did not indicate completion of the Post-trip Inspection, (See Table 3 on page 7).

**Management's Response:** Management concurs. Transportation will continue to monitor the operation to make sure the reports are properly completed each day. Additionally, the reports will be properly maintained daily and repairs of defective safety devices noted. Management will continue to emphasize this in training for all Transportation Coordinators/Supervisors. (See page 12.)

# 4. Bus Video Surveillance Recordings Neither Retained Nor Provided in Compliance with District Policies

School buses are equipped with a digital video camera and digital video recorder (DVR). The purchase bid specification required DVRs with storage capability of 30 days at 15 frames per second based on 6.5 hours minimum to 10 hours per day for 5.5 days per week. On October 6, 2021, nine days after our observations, we requested the video recordings for 12 of the observed buses for the date of observation from 9:00 a.m. through 10:30 a.m.

On October 12, 2021, six days after our request, staff acknowledged our request. On October 22, 2021, 16 days after our request, staff provided an update that DVR hard drives were being accessed. On October 28, 2021, we received the available recordings from four of the 12 selected buses. No data was provided for the remaining eight buses. Transportation and School Police are the primary users of the video surveillance to monitor and review behavior and activity inside the bus, as needed. According to Transportation staff, the DVR's had recorded over the older data to store new data. It appears that the DVR's hard drives are not of sufficient size to retain the required 30 days of video recordings.

**Management's Response:** Management concurs. Management continues to work through staffing changes that occurred at the beginning of the school year. Transportation responded as quickly as feasible and has made changes to improve response time to ensure compliance with the OIG and District Policy 1.092 (5)(e)(i). In addition, Transportation is currently working on a project that will allow for wireless on-demand video retrieval and also increased storage capacity of the DVRs for adequacy of recording time frame (30 days). (See page 13.)

Audit Committee's Comment: At the February 18, 2022, meeting, the Audit Committee recommended Transportation to automate the daily Pre/Post-Trip Inspections reporting procedures for school bus drivers.



THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL 3318 FOREST HILL BLVD., C-306. WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33406 (561) 434-7335 FAX: (561) 434-8652 www.palmbeachschools.org Hotline: (855) 561-1010 TERESA MICHAEL, CIG, CIGI, CFE INSPECTOR GENERAL SCHOOL BOARD FRANK A. BARBIERI, JR, ESQ, CHAIR KAREN M. BRILL, VICE CHAIR MARCIA ANDREWS ALEXANDRIA AYALA BARBARA McQUINN DEBRA L. ROBINSON, M.D. ERICA WHITFIELD

MICHAEL J. BURKE, SUPERINTENDENT

## **MEMORANDUM**

- **TO:** Honorable Chair and Members of the School Board Michael J. Burke, Superintendent of Schools Chair and Members of the Audit Committee
- FROM: Teresa Michael, Inspector General

**DATE:** February 18, 2022

SUBJECT: September 27, 2021, Unannounced Onsite Observations of School Bus Safety Devices

### PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY

Pursuant to the *Office of Inspector General's (OIG) 2021-2022 Work Plan*, and as part of the follow-up review of our *January 7, 2019, Unannounced Onsite Observations of School Bus Safety Devices* (Report #2019-08), we have performed unannounced observations of selected safety devices on sample school buses. The primary objective of this review was to determine if the safety devices on school buses were in working condition. These safety devices included (1) Post-Trip Passenger Check Systems, (2) Student Crossing Arms, (3) Stop Sign Signal Arms, and (4) Video Camera Monitoring Systems.

#### SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

We conducted this follow-up review in accordance with the *Principles and Standards for Offices* of *Inspector General, Quality Standards for Inspections, Evaluations, and Reviews,* as promulgated by the Association of Inspectors General. The review included unannounced onsite observations of selected safety devices on sample buses at all six transportation compounds on September 27, 2021. This review also included interviewing staff and reviewing:

- *Rule 6A-3.003, Florida Administrative Code (Fla. Admin. Code)* Certification as to Specifications of School Buses
- Florida School Bus Specifications, Effective January 2020
- Florida School Bus Specifications, Revised 2013
- *Fla. Admin. Code Rule 6A-3.0171.* Responsibilities of School Districts for Student Transportation
- School Board Policy 1.092 Inspector General
- School Board Policy 2.041 Public Records
- School Board Policy 3.21 Safe Operation of District School Buses
- State of Florida School Bus Safety Inspection Manual, 2020 Edition
- School District's School Bus Drivers and Bus Attendants Handbook

We discussed our observation results with staff during the review. Draft findings were sent to the District's Department of Transportation (Transportation) and the Chief Operating Office for review and comments. Management responses are included in the Appendix. We appreciate the courtesy and cooperation extended to us by staff during the review. The final draft report was presented to the Audit Committee at its February 18, 2022, meeting.

#### BACKGROUND

#### School Bus Safety Devices

To protect the safety of students, school buses are equipped with certain safety devices specifically designed for school buses as required by *Rule 6A-3.003, Fla. Admin. Code,* through reference by the Florida Department of Education's (FDOE's) *Florida School Bus Specifications*. This follow-up review covered the following safety devices on sample District school buses.

1. <u>Post-Trip Passenger Check System (also known as Child Alert System)</u>. The Child Alert System is required for all buses manufactured since 2005. The requirements for the Post-Trip Passenger Check System contained in the FDOE's *Florida School Bus Specifications*, states, *"The bus must be equipped with a system to require the driver to walk to the rearmost interior of the bus after each trip to deactivate the system via a push button and to ensure that no passengers are left on the bus."* 

FDOE's **School Bus Safety Inspection Manual** states, "Check for proper operation of posttrip passenger check system according to manufacturer's specification" and repair "if the system does not operate according to specifications, but requires disarming at rear of bus."<sup>1</sup>

- 2. <u>Student Crossing Arms and Stop Arm Signals</u>. As required by the FDOE's *Florida School Bus Specifications*, each school bus is required to be equipped with a Student Crossing Arm mounted to the right front bumper and Stop Arm Signals mounted to the left outside of the vehicle. Each signaling device **fully extends perpendicular to the vehicle** (emphasis added) when the bus is stopped and the red student warning lights are flashing. After activation, the Stop Arm Signal is extended on the left side of the bus which requires all oncoming vehicles to stop behind and in front of (for vehicles from opposite direction on undivided roads) the bus to allow students to cross the road. A fully-extended Student Crossing Arm requires students to move far enough in front of the bus as to be seen by the bus driver while crossing the road in front of the bus.
- 3. <u>Video Camera Monitoring (Camera) Systems</u>. Each District school bus is equipped with a Camera System, although this system is optional pursuant to the FDOE's *Florida School Bus Specifications*. The Camera starts automatically approximately 20 seconds after the bus ignition is turned on. The LED amber light on the Camera's panic button will flash, indicating that the system is recording. The bus driver is required to check the panic button of the Camera before and after every trip to ensure the Camera System is in proper working condition.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Inspection Procedure – Inside Bus A.16.d. at page 52.

#### **Prior OIG Reports**

<u>OIG Report #2017-03</u>. During Fiscal Year 2016, the OIG conducted two onsite observations of selected safety devices for sample buses during May 2016 and September 2016 (Report #2017-03: *Audit of School Bus Safety Inspections*). The OIG's observations revealed significant deficiencies in the inspections and maintenance of school buses performed by the District's Transportation Department. During the *2016 Audit*, we inspected the Camera and Post-Trip Passenger Check System on a total of 150 in-service sample buses and found that some of the sample buses had non-working devices. (See Table 1.)

 Table 1

 Summary of OIG Report #2017-03 On-Site Observations Results

		Numbe	er of Buses V	With Non-Work	ting Devices
Date of OIG	Number of		Non-Work	ing Passenger (	Check System (PCS)
On-Site	Sample Buses	Non-Working	System	Manually	Total
Observations	Inspected	Camera	Failure	Disconnected	Non-Working PCS
May 2016	89 (100%)	6 (7%)	27 (30%)	31 (35%)	58 (65%)
September 2016	61 (100%)	2 (3%)	10 (16%)	1 (2%)	11 (18%)
Total	150 (100%)	8 (5%)	37 (25%)	32 (21%)	<b>69 (46%)</b>

2. <u>OIG Report #2019-08</u>. During Fiscal Year 2019, the OIG followed-up on the 2016 Audit with unannounced site visits of all six bus compounds (Report #2019-08: *January 7, 2019 Unannounced On-Site Observations of School Bus Safety Devices*). In addition to the Camera and Post-Trip Passenger Check System, the Student Crossing Arm and Stop Sign Signal Arm were also observed in 60 in-service sample buses. We found that nine (15%) of the sample buses had 10 non-working safety devices (five Post-Trip Passenger Check Systems, three Student Crossing Arms and Stop Sign Signals, and two Camera Systems) which was down by 46% compared to the 2016 Audit. (See Table 2.)

 Table 2

 Summary of OIG Report #2019-08 On-Site Observation Results

		Numbe	er of Buses With	n Non-Working	Devices
Date of OIG	Number of		Non-V	Vorking Safety	Systems
<b>On-Site</b>	Sample Buses	Non-Working	Passenger	Crossing	Total
Observations	Inspected	Camera	Check	Arm	Non-Working
			System	Failure	
January 2019	60 (100%)	2 (3%)	5 (8%)	3 (5%)	8 (13%)

During this follow-up, we also reviewed the most recently completed School Bus Safety Inspection Forms for the 60 sample buses. The review concluded that the mandatory inspections for all 60 buses (100%) were performed within the 30-school-day interval required by **Rule 6A-3.0171(8)(c)**, Fla. Admin. Code, compared to 5% in the 2016 Audit. We also added a review of the Driver's Pre/Post Inspection Reports required by **Rule 6A-3.0171(2)(g)3.s, Fla. Admin. Code**. We found a total of 11 (or 18%) of the Reports for the 60 sample buses were not available for our review.

#### CONCLUSIONS

Comparing the results of this follow-up with the results of the **2019** Unannounced On-Site **Observations**, there were continued improvements in maintaining school bus safety devices. This follow-up review produced the following major conclusions.

#### 1. Nine Non-Working Safety Devices Found in Eight (9%) Sample Buses

On September 27, 2021, the OIG conducted unannounced on-site visits at all six District bus compounds to inspect certain safety devices on a total of 90 sample buses (15 sample buses at each location identified by staff as operational and had transported students on that day). The safety devices we reviewed on each bus included: (1) Post-Trip Passenger Check (Child Alert) System, (2) Student Crossing and Stop Sign Signal Arms, and (3) Video Camera Monitoring (Camera) System. The observations revealed that eight (9%) of the 90 sample buses had a total of nine non-working safety devices (see Table 3), compared to 15% in our **2019 Observations**.

	Number of	Numl	ber of Sample	e Buses With	Non-Working Saf	ety Devices
Bus Compound	Sample Buses	Child Alert	Student Crossing Arm	Stop Sign Signal Arm	Camera	Total
East (Note a)	15	2	-	-	1	3
North	15	1	-	-		1
South	15		1	-		1
Central	15		-	-		No Exceptions
Royal Palm	15	1 (Note b)	3 (Note b)	-	_	3
West	15	_	-	-	_	No Exceptions
Total	90 (100%)	4 (4%)	4 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	8 (9%)

 Table 3

 Summary of OIG September 27, 2021, Observation Results

Source: OIG On-Site Observations September 27, 2021.

*Note: a) One bus (#5112) of the initial 15 sampled would not re-start and safety devices could not be checked. Another bus was selected and substituted for review.* 

b) The bus with the non-working Post-Trip Passenger Check System noted at the Royal Palm Compound also had the Student Crossing Arm not working. <u>Crossing Arms Not Fully Deploying</u>. On four buses, the Student Crossing Arm did not fully deploy to perpendicular to the front bumper as required by the FDOE's *Florida School Bus Specifications, eff. January 2020*. Three arms extended only one-half the required distance and one extended three-fourths. (See Photo #1 and Photo #2 at page 5.)



#### Examples of Student Crossing Arms Not Fully Deployed

Photo #1



Photo #2

<u>Passenger Check System Not Operational</u>. On four buses, the Child Alert System did not emit an audible warning. The warning signal was designed to ensure no students remained on the bus by requiring the driver to walk to the back of the bus to deactivate the system. Without an operational warning signal, the driver does not have to walk to the back of the bus to deactivate the system and consequently may avoid performing the required visual check for any remaining student passengers.

<u>Drivers Did Not Report Non-Working Safety Devices</u>. We reviewed the September 27, 2021, *Bus Driver and Attendant Pre/Post-trip Inspection Reports (PBSD 0454)* (see Exhibit 1 on page 10.) for the eight buses that had non-working safety devices observed. All drivers failed to report the non-working devices for their buses.

<u>OIG Observation Results Provided to Staff for Immediate Corrective Actions</u>. To ensure the safety of all students and employees, the OIG provided all observation results to the Maintenance Foreperson of each compound for immediate corrective actions during the September 27, 2021, on-site observations. At the East compound, the non-working camera was fixed by a technician during the OIG's visit.

#### Recommendation

Transportation should ensure: (1) all safety devices are in proper operational condition when the buses are transporting students, and (2) bus drivers are properly performing the required pre- and post-trip inspections and documenting their inspection results on the *Bus Driver and Attendant Pre/Post-trip Inspection Report (PBSD 0454)*.

**Management's Response:** Management concurs. Transportation will continue to monitor safety devices for proper operational conditions and ensure drivers are performing required pre/post-trip inspection forms. We will continue to emphasize this in training for all employees in Transportation who drive a school bus. (See page 11.)

#### 2. Mandatory Safety Inspections Completed

The OIG reviewed the *School Bus Safety Inspection Forms* (*Forms*) for the 90 sample buses most recently completed prior to our observations. The *Forms* were dated from July 8 through September 24, 2021. We concluded technicians, all with active bus safety inspector certifications, completed mandatory inspections for the 90 buses (100%) within the required 30-day interval.

**Rule 6A-3.0171(8)(b), Fla. Admin. Code,** governing inspection and maintenance of school buses states, in relevant part, "the inspection shall be conducted in accordance with procedures and include all items listed in the State of Florida School Bus Safety Inspection manual, 2020 Edition...and documented on the Florida School Bus Safety Inspection Form (2020-IF), effective October 2020." (Emphasis added.)

We noted that Transportation uses a department-created form (*MSI Form*) that includes all the requirements of the *Form 2020-IF*. However, the District's *MSI Form* was last revised on January 28, 2020.

#### Recommendation

Although the current *MSI Form* includes all requirements of *Form 2020-IF*, Transportation should periodically review the *MSI Form* and related FDOE Rules to ensure full compliance with future changes to the form.

**Management's Response:** Management concurs that we are in compliance. Transportation reviewed the District MSI Form against Form 2020-IF and determined that no changes were made therefore, no revisions to the MSI Form were necessary. (See page 12.)

# 3. 14% of Daily *Bus Driver and Attendant Pre/Post-trip Inspection Reports* Not Available; and 38% Did Not Indicate Completion of the Post-trip Inspection

Pursuant to **Rule 6A-3.0171(2)3., Fla. Admin. Code**, all bus drivers are required "[t]o inspect the bus at least daily prior to the beginning of the first daily trip or more often as required by the school district and to report any defect affecting safety or economy of operation immediately to authorized service personnel" The District's procedures require bus drivers to perform daily pre- and post-trip inspections and to document the inspection results on the Bus Driver and Attendant Pre/Post-trip Inspection Report (PBSD 0454). (See Exhibit 1 on page 10.)

We requested Transportation provide the *Pre/Post-trip Inspection Reports* for September 24, 2021, (the last school day before the OIG's on-site observations) for each of the 90 sample buses. However, a total of 12 *Reports* (or 14%) were not available for our review in three compounds. Two sample buses observed in the West compound were designated as "spares" and had not been used for a route on September 24, 2021, therefore no *Reports* were prepared. Additionally, of the *Reports* we received for the remaining 76 sample buses, 29 (or 38%) did not indicate completion of the Post-trip Inspection. (See Table 4.)

		For Septemb	oer 24, 2021		
Bus	Number of Sample Buses	Pre/Post-trip Report Av	-	-	Inspection leted?
Compound	Inspected	Yes	No	Yes	No
East	15	12	3	9	3
North	15	15	0	8	7
South	15	14	1	8	6
Central	15	7	8	7	0
Royal Palm	15	15	0	11	4
West (Note)	15	13	0	4	9
Total	90 (100%)	76 (86%)	12 (14%)	47 (62%)	29 (38%)

Table 4Bus Driver and Attendant Pre/Post-trip Inspection ReportsFor September 24, 2021

Note: Two sample buses were designated as spares and had not operated on September 24, 2021.

#### Recommendation

Transportation coordinators/supervisors should monitor and review all daily *Bus Driver and Attendant Pre/Post-trip Inspection Reports* (PBSD 0454) to ensure full compliance with daily reporting required under Florida law. Transportation should ensure: (1) the *Reports* are properly completed daily and properly maintained, and (2) repairs of defective safety devices as noted on the *Reports* are performed before the buses are put back into service.

**Management's Response:** Management concurs. Transportation will continue to monitor the operation to make sure the reports are properly completed each day. Additionally, the reports will be properly maintained daily and repairs of defective safety devices noted. Management will continue to emphasize this in training for all Transportation Coordinators/Supervisors. (See page 12.)

# 4. Bus Video Surveillance Recordings Neither Retained Nor Provided in Compliance with District Policies

On October 6, 2021, nine days after our September 27, 2021, observations of selected buses, we requested the video footage for 12 of the observed buses for the date of observation from 9:00 a.m. through 10:30 a.m. On October 12, 2021, six days after our request, Transportation staff first acknowledged our request for the footage. On October 22, 2021, 16 days after our request, staff updated the OIG that DVR hard drives were still being accessed. On October 28, 2021, a full 22 days after the request, we received the available footage from the 12 selected buses.

Of the 12 bus DVRs, staff provided the requested date and time footage from four buses. For the remaining eight buses, Transportation staff reported the DVR had recorded over the older data to store new data.

*Florida Statute 119.021(2)(b), Fla. Admin. Code § 1B-24.003*, and *School Board Policy 2.041.3* govern the retention of public records within the District. Video surveillance recordings captured on school buses constitute public records that must be retained for 30 days. See *Policy 2.041.3* referencing *Information Technology Records Management Records Retention Schedule* (referencing *State of Florida's General Records Schedules* at GS1-SL Item #302).

Further, *Policy 2.041.3.e* requires District employees if "...aware of an audit or pending investigation and no records hold request has yet been made, the documents must be retained until the audit or investigation has been completed or per the District's retention schedule, whichever period of time is longer."

Transportation and School Police are the primary users of the video surveillance to monitor and review behavior and activity inside the bus, as needed. In 2014, to help ensure the safety of students and drivers, the District upgraded the entire fleet of school buses and equipped each with a digital video camera and digital video recorder (DVR). The purchase bid specification required DVRs with storage capability of 30 days at 15 frames per second (fps). In answer to a vendor's bid question, the district further expanded the storage description as "*Thirty (30)* days based on 6.5 [hours] min[imum] to ten (10) hours per day and 5.5 days per week. Ignition off recording, adjustable up to 15 minutes is required."

District Policy 1.092.5.e.i also states, "[t]he Office of Inspector General shall have immediate, complete and unrestricted access to all papers, books, records, documents, information, personnel, processes (including meetings), data, computer hard drives, emails, instant messages, facilities or other assets owned, borrowed, or used by the District, ...as deemed necessary in performing investigative and/or audit activities and other requested information, including automated or electronic data, pertaining to the business of the School Board and District within their custody." (Emphasis added.)

After delays of 6, 16, and 22 days, Transportation finally provided the OIG's access to the buses' video surveillance recordings. The belated responses revealed video surveillance recordings were only properly retained for 4 of the 12 buses. It appears that the DVR's hard drives are not of sufficient size to retain the required 30 days of video footage.

#### Recommendation

To enhance student and staff safety, the District should review currently installed DVRs for adequacy of storage capacity and confirm their ability to retain 30 days of video recordings as specified. Moreover, during its review, the District should also consider Transportation's lack of compliance with District policies governing both public records and cooperation with Inspector General to determine the extent to which the delay in responding to and ultimately providing the requested video surveillance recordings caused or contributed to the videos' unavailability. Properly retaining school bus video surveillance recordings pursuant to District retention policies and providing the recordings as required by law and policy limits District exposure to liability and assists staff with investigations related to on-board activity.

**Management's Response:** Management concurs. Management continues to work through staffing changes that occurred at the beginning of the school year. Transportation responded as quickly as feasible and has made changes to improve response time to ensure compliance with the OIG and District Policy 1.092 (5)(e)(i). In addition, Transportation is currently working on a project that will allow for wireless on-demand video retrieval and also increased storage capacity of the DVRs for adequacy of recording time frame (30 days). (See page 13.)

Audit Committee's Comment: At the February 18, 2022, meeting, the Audit Committee recommended Transportation to automate the daily Pre/Post-Trip Inspections reporting procedures for school bus drivers.

- End of Report -

Exhibit 1 Bus Driver and Attendant Pre/Post-trip Inspection Report

Vehicle # Odomete	er/Beginning #	Odometer/Ending #	Time/Pn		Time/Post-trip		Date
CHECK PRE TRIP I	NANAT (2014E) (2)	odometer/Ending w	10000-0	e-orp	1mer-bat-orp	CHECK	POST-TRIP
2. Lights     3. Horn     4. Wipers     5. Gauges     6. Heaters     7. Defrosters     8. Seats     9. Engine     10. GPS     SHOP REPORT Bus in service     Defect Corrected	12 Emergency Door 13 Emergency Equip 14 Emergency Exit E 15 Steering 16 Tire condition 17 Rims; Seals; Lug 18 Fluid Leaks 19 Transmission 20 Camera System Yes No Yes No Yes No	ament 23. Exhaus Suzzer 24. Muffler 25. Studen 26. Exterio	st Furnes : Tail Pipe It Mirror Ir Mirrors Dents Dents Igns Ing Arm	Secu	Bolts er 🗌 Studt. ieats		searched for children/ ost items Xisplayed empty sign Swept floor; cleaned but is needed Emptied trash can Closed all windows, natches and doors Exterior has no leaks or new damage Checked tire condition; ag nuts
Signature of Mechanic PBSD 0454 (Rev. 7/20/2	Date	(Require	o complete d)		e of Driver		Dele
and the second	Bus Driver an	E SCHOOL DISTRI nd Attendant Odometer/Ending #		ost-trip Ir		Repor	t Date
Vehicle # Odomet	Bus Driver ar	nd Attendant	Pre/Po	ost-trip Ir	spection		Date
and the second	Bus Driver ar	hield 21. Air Less 22. Fuel O orment 23. Exhaut 3uzzer 24. Mutther 25. Studer 26. Exterio	Pre/Pc Time/Pr aks dor st Fumes ; Tail Pipe at Mirror or Mirrors Dents ligns ng Arm	SST-trip Ir e-Inp 31. Air Ci Fror 32.Beit C 33. Seat 33. Seat 34. Car S 35. Safet 36. Whee Secu	Time/Post-trip conditioning nt Back utter(s) Beits er Studt. Seats	CHECK	(General Contraction of the Cont

#### Management's Response

CHOOL DIG	PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL	JOSEPH M. SANCHES, MBA CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER	MICHAEL J. BURKE SUPERINTENDENT
THEACH COUNT	CHIEF OPERATING OFFICE 3330 FOREST HILL BOULEVARD, B-302 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33406-5869		
	PHONE: 561-357-7573 / FAX: 561-357-756 WWW, PALM BEACHSCHOOLS, ORG		CEIVED
то:	TERESA MICHAEL INSPECTOR GENERAL		JAN 2 6 2022
FROM:	JOSEPH M. SANCHES, MBA	INSPE	ECTOR GENERAL
DATE:	JANUARY 26, 2022		
SUBJECT:	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE – AUDIT OBSERVATIONS	OF 2021 UNANNOUNCED ON-	SITE
Finding #1: <u>Recommend</u> Transportatio	on should ensure: (1) all safety device	Found in Eight (9%) Sample s are in proper operational o	Buses condition when the buse
Finding #1: <u>Recommend</u> Transportation are transport inspections a Inspection Reference	Nine Non-Working Safety Devices ation: on should ensure: (1) all safety device ting students, and (2) bus drivers are and documenting their inspection re eport (PBSD 0454).	Found in Eight (9%) Sample s are in proper operational o properly performing the re	Buses condition when the buse quired pre- and post-tri
Finding #1: <u>Recommend</u> Transportation are transport inspections a Inspection Re <u>Managemen</u>	Nine Non-Working Safety Devices ation: on should ensure: (1) all safety device ting students, and (2) bus drivers are and documenting their inspection re: eport (PBSD 0454). t Response:	Found in Eight (9%) Sample s are in proper operational o properly performing the re	Buses condition when the buse quired pre- and post-tri
Finding #1: <u>Recommend</u> Transportation are transport inspections a Inspection Ref <u>Management</u> Management Transportation drivers are portable	Nine Non-Working Safety Devices ation: on should ensure: (1) all safety device ting students, and (2) bus drivers are and documenting their inspection re: eport (PBSD 0454). t Response:	Found in Eight (9%) Sample s are in proper operational o properly performing the re sults on the Bus Driver and evices for proper operation vection forms. We will conti	Buses condition when the buse quired pre- and post-tri Attendant Pre/Post-tri al conditions and ensur
Finding #1: <u>Recommend</u> Transportation are transport inspections a Inspection Ref <u>Management</u> Management Transportation drivers are portable	Nine Non-Working Safety Devices ation: on should ensure: (1) all safety device ting students, and (2) bus drivers are and documenting their inspection re- eport (PBSD 0454). t Response: t concurs. on will continue to monitor safety de erforming required pre/post-trip insp	Found in Eight (9%) Sample s are in proper operational o properly performing the re sults on the Bus Driver and evices for proper operation vection forms. We will conti	Buses condition when the buse quired pre- and post-tri Attendant Pre/Post-tri al conditions and ensur

#### Management's Response

- Page 2 of 3 January 26, 2022 Management Response - Audit of 2021 Unannounced On-Site Observations Finding #2: Mandatory Safety Inspections Completed. **Recommendation:** Although the current MSI Form includes all requirements of Form 2020-IF, Transportation should periodically review the MSI Form and related FDOE Rules to ensure full compliance with future changes to the form. Management Response: Management concurs that we are in compliance. Transportation reviewed the District MSI Form against Form 2020-IF and determined that no changes were made therefore, no revisions to the MSI Form was necessary. Finding #3: 14% of Daily Bus Driver and Attendant Pre/Post-trip Inspection Reports Not Available; and 38% Did Not Indicate Completion of the Post-trip Inspection. **Recommendation:** Transportation coordinators/supervisors should monitor and review all daily Bus Driver and Attendant Pre/Post-trip Inspection Reports (PBSD 0454) to ensure full compliance with daily reporting required under Florida law. Transportation should ensure:(1) the Reports are properly completed daily and properly maintained, and (2) repairs of defective safety devices as noted on the Reports are performed before the buses are put back into service. Management Response: Management concurs. Transportation will continue to monitor the operation to make sure the reports are properly completed each day. Additionally, the reports will be properly maintained daily and repairs of defective safety devices noted. Management will continue to emphasize this in training for all Transportation Coordinators/Supervisors.

> The School District of Palm Beach County, Florida A Top High-Performing A-Rated School District An Equal Education Opportunity Provider and Employer

> > V

#### Management's Response

Page 3 of 3 January 26, 2022 Management Response – Audit of 2021 Unannounced On-Site Observations

Finding #4: Bus Video Footage Neither Retained nor Provided in Compliance with District Policies.

#### Recommendation:

To enhance student and staff safety, the District should review currently installed DVRs for adequacy of storage capacity and confirm their ability to retain 30 days of video recordings as specified. Moreover, during its review, the District should also consider Transportation's lack of compliance with District policies governing both public records and cooperation with Inspector General to determine the extent to which the delay in responding to and ultimately providing the requested video surveillance recordings caused or contributed to the videos' unavailability. Properly retaining school bus video surveillance recordings pursuant to District retention policies and providing the recordings as required by law and policy limits District exposure to liability and assists staff with investigations related to onboard activity.

#### Management Response:

Management concurs.

Management continues to work through staffing changes that occurred at the beginning of the school year. Transportation responded as quickly as feasible and has made changes to improve response time to ensure compliance with the OIG and District Policy 1.092 (5)(e)(i). In addition, Transportation is currently working on a project that will allow for wireless on-demand video retrieval and also increased storage capacity of the DVRs for adequacy of recording time frame (30 days).

JMS/SS/GO: SS

C: Shane Searchwell, Director of Transportation

The School District of Palm Beach County, Fiorida A Top High-Performing A-Rated School District An Equal Education Opportunity Provider and Employer