REPORT NO. 2013-175
APRIL 2013

BAY COUNTY
DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students

and

Student Transportation

For the Fiscal Year Ended
June 30, 2012

STATE OF FLORIDA
AUDITOR GENERAL
DAVID W. MARTIN, CPA

BOARD MEMBERS AND SUPERINTENDENT

Bay County District School Board members and the Superintendent of Schools who served during the 2011-12 fiscal year are listed below:

Member	District No.
Jerry L. Register, Vice Chair	1
Ginger Littleton	2
Joe Wayne Walker	3
Ryan Neves, Chair	4
Steven T. Moss	5

William V. Husfelt III, Superintendent

The examination team leader was J. David Hughes, CPA. Please address inquiries regarding this report to Nancy M. Reeder, CPA, CISA, CFE, Audit Manager, by e-mail at nancyreeder@aud.state.fl.us or by telephone at (850) 414-9941.

This report and other reports prepared by the Auditor General can be obtained on our Web site at www.myflorida.com/audgen; by telephone at (850) 487-9175; or by mail at G74 Claude Pepper Building, 111 West Madison Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1450.

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students and Student Transportation
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

ELL	English Language Learner
ESE	Exceptional Student Education
ESOL	English for Speakers of Other Languages
FAC	Florida Administrative Code
FES	Fluent English Speaker
FS	Florida Statutes
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IEP	Individual Educational Plan
JROTC	Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps
OJT	On-the-Job Training
PK	Prekindergarten

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students and Student Transportation
TABLE OF CONTENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

PAGE NO.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i

FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT 1

SCHEDULE A – POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND TEST RESULTS 4

SCHEDULE B – EFFECT OF PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS ON WEIGHTED FTE 6

SCHEDULE C – PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL 7

SCHEDULE D – FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS 11

SCHEDULE E – RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS 26

NOTES TO SCHEDULES 29

STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT 33

SCHEDULE F – POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND TEST RESULTS 36

SCHEDULE G – FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS 38

SCHEDULE H – RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS 43

NOTES TO SCHEDULES 44

MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

EXHIBIT A – MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE 46

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SUMMARY OF ATTESTATION EXAMINATION

Except for the material noncompliance described below involving teachers and reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were missing and could not be located for students in ESOL, Career Education 9-12 (OJT), and student transportation, the Bay County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements regarding the determination and reporting of full-time equivalent (FTE) students under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) and the number of students transported for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012:

- **Twenty of the 113 teachers in our sample did not meet State requirements governing certification, School Board approval of out-of-field teacher assignments, notification to parents regarding teachers' out-of-field status, or the earning of required in-service training points in ESOL strategies.**
- **Twenty of the 48 students in our ESOL sample and 14 of the 88 students in our Career Education 9-12 (OJT) sample had exceptions involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were missing and could not be located.**
- **Fifty-three of the 305 students in our student transportation sample had exceptions involving their reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding.**

Noncompliance related to reported FTE resulted in 47 findings. The resulting proposed net adjustment to the District's reported, unweighted FTE totaled to a negative 2.9833 but has a potential impact on the District's weighted FTE of a negative 25.8643. Noncompliance related to student transportation resulted in 8 findings and a proposed net adjustment of a negative 77 students.

Weighted adjustments to FTE are presented in our report for illustrative purposes only. The weighted adjustments to FTE do not take special program caps and allocation factors into account and are not intended to indicate the weighted FTE used to compute the dollar value of adjustments. That computation is the responsibility of the Department of Education. However, the gross dollar effect of our proposed adjustments to FTE may be estimated by multiplying the proposed net weighted adjustment to FTE by the base student allocation amount. For the Bay County District School Board, the estimated gross dollar effect of our proposed adjustments to reported FTE is a negative $89,988 (negative 25.8643 times $3,479.22).

We have not presented an estimate of the potential dollar effect of our proposed adjustments to student transportation because there is no equivalent method for making such an estimate.

The ultimate resolution of our proposed adjustments to FTE and student transportation and the computation of their financial impact is the responsibility of the Department of Education.

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF BAY COUNTY

The District was established pursuant to Section 1001.30, Florida Statutes, to provide public educational services for the residents of Bay County. Those services are provided primarily to prekindergarten through twelfth grade students and to adults seeking career education-type training. The District is part of the State system of public education under the general direction and control of the State Board of Education. The geographic boundaries of the District are those of Bay County.

The governing body of the District is the District School Board that is composed of five elected members. The executive officer of the Board is the elected Superintendent of Schools. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012, the District operated 45 schools serving prekindergarten through twelfth grade students, reported 25,512.20 unweighted FTE for those students, and received approximately $36.4 million in State funding through FEFP.

FLORIDA EDUCATION FINANCE PROGRAM (FEFP)

Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students

Florida school districts receive State funding through FEFP to serve prekindergarten through twelfth grade students (adult education is not funded by FEFP). FEFP was established by the Florida Legislature in 1973 to guarantee to each student in the Florida public school system the availability of programs and services appropriate to the student's educational needs which are substantially equal to those available to any similar student notwithstanding geographic differences and varying local economic factors. To provide equalization of educational opportunity in Florida, the FEFP formula recognizes: (1) varying local property tax bases, (2) varying program cost factors, (3) district cost differentials, and (4) differences in per-student cost for equivalent educational programs due to sparsity and dispersion of student population. The funding provided by FEFP is based upon the numbers of individual students participating in particular educational programs. A numerical value is assigned to each student according to the student's hours and days of attendance in those programs. The individual student thus becomes equated to a numerical value known as an unweighted FTE (full-time equivalent) student. For example, one student would be reported as one FTE if the student was enrolled in six classes per day at 50 minutes per class for the full 180-day school year (i.e., six classes at 50 minutes each per day is 5 hours of class a day or 25 hours per week that equals one FTE).

Student Transportation

Any student who is transported by the District must meet one or more of the following conditions in order to be eligible for State transportation funding: live two or more miles from school, be physically handicapped, be a Career Education 9-12 or an ESE student who is transported from one school center to another where appropriate programs are provided, or be on a route that meets the criteria for hazardous walking conditions specified in Section 1006.23(4), Florida Statutes. The District received approximately $3.9 million for student transportation as part of the State funding through FEFP.

DAVID W. MARTIN, CPA
AUDITOR GENERAL

AUDITOR GENERAL
STATE OF FLORIDA

G74 Claude Pepper Building
111 West Madison Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1450

PHONE: 850-488-5534
FAX: 850-488-6975

The President of the Senate, the Speaker of the
House of Representatives, and the
Legislative Auditing Committee

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT
BAY COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD
FLORIDA EDUCATION FINANCE PROGRAM (FEFP)
FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS

We have examined management's assertion, included in its representation letter dated August 27, 2012, that the Bay County District School Board complied with State requirements governing the determination and reporting of the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012. These requirements are found primarily in Sections 1011.60, 1011.61, and 1011.62, Florida Statutes; State Board of Education Rules, Chapter 6A-1, Florida Administrative Code; and the *FTE General Instructions 2011-12* issued by the Department of Education. As discussed in the representation letter, management is responsible for the District's compliance with State requirements. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the District's compliance based on our examination.

Our examination was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) and the standards applicable to attestation engagements contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and, accordingly, included examining, on a test basis, evidence about the District's compliance with the aforementioned State requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our examination provides a reasonable basis for our opinion. The legal determination of the District's compliance with these requirements is, however, ultimately the responsibility of the Department of Education.

COMPLIANCE

Our examination procedures disclosed the following material noncompliance:

1. Teachers

   Twenty of the 113 teachers in our sample did not meet State requirements governing certification, School Board approval of out-of-field teacher assignments, notification to parents regarding teachers' out-of-field status, or the earning of required in-service training points in ESOL strategies.[1]

2. Students

   Twenty of the 48 students in our ESOL sample[2] and 14 of the 88 students in our Career Education 9-12 (OJT) sample[3] had exceptions involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were missing and could not be located.

In our opinion, except for the material noncompliance mentioned above involving teachers and reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were missing and could not be located for students in ESOL and Career Education 9-12 (OJT), the Bay County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements governing the determination and reporting of the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012.

The results of our examination disclosed other noncompliance with the State requirements mentioned above. We considered this other noncompliance in forming our opinion regarding the District's compliance and it did not affect our opinion as stated above. All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed in SCHEDULE D. The impact of this noncompliance on the District's reported FTE is presented in SCHEDULES A, B, C, and D.

---

[1] *For teachers, see SCHEDULE D, Finding Nos. 6, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 42, 43, 44, 45, and 46.*

[2] *For ESOL, see SCHEDULE D, Finding Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 15, 21, 22, 23, 26, 37, 38, 39, and 47.*

[3] *For Career Education 9-12 (OJT), see SCHEDULE D, Finding Nos. 20, 27, 40, and 41.*

INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE

In accordance with attestation standards established by the AICPA and *Government Auditing Standards*, we are required to report significant deficiencies in internal control detected during our examination and identify those considered to be material weaknesses. The purpose of our examination was to express an opinion on the District's compliance with State requirements and did not include expressing an opinion on the District's related internal controls. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. Due to its limited purpose, our examination would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses.[4] However, the material noncompliance mentioned above is indicative of significant deficiencies considered to be material weaknesses in the District's internal controls related to teacher certification and reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were missing and could not be located for students in ESOL and Career Education 9-12 (OJT). Other noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is indicative of control deficiencies[4] and is also presented herein. The findings, populations, samples, and exception totals that pertain to material and other noncompliance are presented in SCHEDULES A and D.

The District's written response to this examination has not been subjected to our examination procedures and, accordingly, we express no opinion on it.

Pursuant to Section 11.45(4)(c), Florida Statutes, this report is a public record and its distribution is not limited. Attestation standards established by the AICPA require us to indicate that this report is intended solely for the information and use of the Legislative Auditing Committee, members of the Florida Senate and the Florida House of Representatives, the State Board of Education, the Department of Education, and applicable District management and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Respectfully submitted,



David W. Martin, CPA
April 11, 2013

---

[4] *A control deficiency in the entity's internal control over compliance exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect noncompliance on a timely basis. A significant deficiency is a control deficiency, or combination of control deficiencies, that adversely affects the entity's ability to comply with the aforementioned State requirements such that there is more than a remote likelihood that noncompliance that is more than inconsequential will not be prevented or detected by the entity's internal control. A material weakness is a significant deficiency, or combination of significant deficiencies, that results in a more-than-remote likelihood that material noncompliance will not be prevented or detected by the entity's internal control.*

SCHEDULE A

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND TEST RESULTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

REPORTED FTE

The funding provided by FEFP is based upon the numbers of individual students participating in particular educational programs. FEFP funds ten specific programs that are grouped under the following four general program titles: Basic, ESOL, ESE, and Career Education 9-12. Unweighted FTE represents FTE prior to the application of the specific cost factor for each program. (See SCHEDULE B and NOTES A3, A4, and A6.) The District reported 25,512.20 unweighted FTE at 45 schools to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012.

SCHOOLS AND STUDENTS

As part of our examination procedures, we sampled schools and students for testing FTE reported to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012. (See NOTE B.) The population of schools (45) consisted of the total number of schools in the District that offered courses in FEFP-funded programs. The population of students (8,572) consisted of the total number of students in each program at the schools in our samples. Our Career Education 9-12 data includes only those students who participated in OJT. Our populations and samples of schools and students are summarized as follows:

	Number of Schools		Number of Students		Students with	Unweighted FTE		Proposed
Programs	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Exceptions	Population	Sample	Adjustments
Basic	43	11	6,754	110	0	19,984.6300	82.4097	17.9189
Basic with ESE Services	44	12	1,081	67	1	4,081.6800	51.0468	2.3583
ESOL	35	10	120	48	20	327.5400	36.1440	(14.2331)
ESE Support Levels 4 and 5	25	10	469	233	11	518.4500	205.0674	(7.1858)
Career Education 9-12	9	3	148	88	14	599.9000	11.2003	(1.8416)
All Programs	45	13	8,572	546	46	25,512.2000	385.8682	(2.9833)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE A (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND TEST RESULTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

TEACHERS

We also sampled teachers as part of our examination procedures. (See NOTE B.) Specifically, the population of teachers (287) consisted of the total number of teachers at schools in our sample who taught courses in ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 or Career Education 9-12 or taught courses to ELL students. From the population of teachers, we sampled 113 and found exceptions for 20 of those teachers.

PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS

Our proposed adjustments present the net effects of noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures, including those related to our tests of teacher certification. Our proposed adjustments generally reclassify reported FTE to Basic education, except for noncompliance involving a student's enrollment or attendance in which case the reported FTE is taken to zero. (See SCHEDULES B, C, and D.)

Section 2 of the General Appropriations Act for the 2011-12 fiscal year (Chapter 2011-69, Laws of Florida) established the cost factors for that fiscal year as shown on SCHEDULE B. Generally, the cost factors are greater than or equal to 1.000, with Basic education cost factors being the lowest. However, for the 2011-12 fiscal year, the cost factor for Career Education 9-12 was 0.999. Chapter 2012-133, Laws of Florida, in part, amended Section 1011.62(13)(b), Florida Statutes, to add language providing that, beginning with the 2011-12 fiscal year, an audit adjustment may not result in the reclassification of special program FTE to basic program FTE if the special program cost factor is less than the basic program cost factor. Accordingly, for instances of noncompliance involving teachers not being properly certified and teaching Career Education 9-12 students out of field or parents of the students not being notified of the teachers' out-of-field status, we have presented disclosure Findings with no proposed adjustments. (See SCHEDULE D, Finding Nos. 19, 24, 35, and 36.)

The ultimate resolution of our proposed adjustments to FTE and the computation of their financial impact is the responsibility of the Department of Education.

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE B

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
EFFECT OF PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS ON WEIGHTED FTE
(For Illustrative Purposes Only)
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

No.	Program[1]	Proposed Net Adjustment[2]	Cost Factor	Weighted FTE[3]
101	Basic K-3	3.3245	1.102	3.6636
102	Basic 4-8	3.5624	1.000	3.5624
103	Basic 9-12	11.0320	1.019	11.2416
111	Grades K-3 with ESE Services	1.0000	1.102	1.1020
113	Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	1.3583	1.019	1.3841
130	ESOL	(14.2331)	1.161	(16.5246)
254	ESE Support Level 4	(5.1858)	3.550	(18.4096)
255	ESE Support Level 5	(2.0000)	5.022	(10.0440)
300	Career Education 9-12	(1.8416)	.999	(1.8398)
Total		(2.9833)		(25.8643)

[1] *See NOTE A6.*

[2] *These proposed net adjustments are for unweighted FTE. (See SCHEDULE C.)*

[3] *Weighted adjustments to FTE are presented for illustrative purposes only. The weighted adjustments to FTE do not take special program caps or allocation factors into consideration and are not intended to indicate the FTE used to compute the dollar value of adjustments. That computation is the responsibility of the Department of Education. (See NOTE A4.)*

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE C

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

		Proposed Adjustments[1]			
No.	**Program**	**#0081**	**#0091**	**#0131**	**Balance Forward**
101	Basic K-3	1.3854	.....	.....	1.3854
102	Basic 4-8	.9236	.....	1.8804	2.8040
103	Basic 9-12	.....	.....	.....	.0000
111	Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.....	1.0000	.....	1.0000
113	Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	.....	.....	.....	.0000
130	ESOL	(2.3090)	.....	(1.8804)	(4.1894)
254	ESE Support Level 4	.....	(1.0000)	.....	(1.0000)
255	ESE Support Level 5	.....	.....	.....	.0000
300	Career Education 9-12	.....	.....	.....	.0000
Total		.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000

[1] *These proposed adjustments are for unweighted FTE. (See NOTE A4.)*

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE C (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

		Proposed Adjustments[1]				
No.	**Brought Forward**	**#0241**	**#0281**	**#0291**	**#0341**	**Balance Forward**
101	1.3854	.....	.....	1.4757	.....	2.8611
102	2.8040	.4669	.....	.2915	.....	3.5624
103	.0000	.....	.....	.....	1.8500	1.8500
111	1.0000	.5000	(.5000)	.....	.....	1.0000
113	.0000	.....	.5000	.....	.....	.5000
130	(4.1894)	(.4669)	.....	(1.7672)	(1.8500)	(8.2735)
254	(1.0000)	(1.0000)	.5000	.....	.....	(1.5000)
255	.0000	.5000	(1.5000)	.....	.....	(1.0000)
300	.0000	.....	.....	.....	(.2000)	(.2000)
Total	.0000	.0000	(1.0000)	.0000	(.2000)	(1.2000)

[1] *These proposed adjustments are for unweighted FTE. (See NOTE A4.)*

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE C (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

		Proposed Adjustments[1]				
No.	**Brought Forward**	**#0471**	**#0491**	**#0531**	**#0551**	**Balance Forward**
101	2.8611	.4634	.....	.....	.....	3.3245
102	3.5624	.....	.....	.....	.....	3.5624
103	1.8500	.....	1.7294	3.6858	3.1000	10.3652
111	1.0000	.....	.....	.....	.....	1.0000
113	.5000	.....	.8583	.....	.....	1.3583
130	(8.2735)	(.4634)	(1.7294)	.....	(3.1000)	(13.5663)
254	(1.5000)	.....	.....	(3.6858)	.....	(5.1858)
255	(1.0000)	.....	(1.0000)	.....	.....	(2.0000)
300	(.2000)	.....	(.0666)	.....	(1.5750)	(1.8416)
Total	(1.2000)	.0000	(.2083)	.0000	(1.5750)	(2.9833)

[1] *These proposed adjustments are for unweighted FTE. (See NOTE A4.)*

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE C (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

		Proposed Adjustments[1]		
No.	**Program**	**Brought Forward**	**#0771**	**Total**
101	Basic K-3	3.3245	.....	3.3245
102	Basic 4-8	3.5624	.....	3.5624
103	Basic 9-12	10.3652	.6668	11.0320
111	Grades K-3 with ESE Services	1.0000	.....	1.0000
113	Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	1.3583	.....	1.3583
130	ESOL	(13.5663)	(.6668)	(14.2331)
254	ESE Support Level 4	(5.1858)	.....	(5.1858)
255	ESE Support Level 5	(2.0000)	.....	(2.0000)
300	Career Education 9-12	(1.8416)	.....	(1.8416)
Total		(2.9833)	.0000	(2.9833)

[1] *These proposed adjustments are for unweighted FTE. (See NOTE A4.)*

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

OVERVIEW

Management is responsible for determining and reporting the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) in compliance with State requirements. These requirements are found primarily in Sections 1011.60, 1011.61, and 1011.62, Florida Statutes; State Board of Education Rules, Chapter 6A-1, Florida Administrative Code; and the *FTE General Instructions 2011-12* issued by the Department of Education. Except for the material noncompliance involving teachers and reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were missing and could not be located for students in ESOL and Career Education 9-12 (OJT), the Bay County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements governing the determination and reporting of FTE for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012. All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed below and requires management's attention and action, as recommended on page 26.

Findings **Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)**

Our examination included the July and October 2011 surveys and the February and June 2012 surveys (see NOTE A5). Unless otherwise specifically stated, the Findings and Proposed Adjustments presented herein are for the October 2011 survey or the February 2012 survey or both. Accordingly, our Findings do not mention specific surveys unless necessary for a complete understanding of the instances of noncompliance being disclosed.

Hutchison Beach Elementary School (#0081)

1. [Ref. 8101] ELL Committees were not convened for three ELL students to consider the students' continued ESOL placements for a fourth year. We also noted that the assessments to determine the current English proficiency of two of the students were either not timely or were missing and could not be located. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.4618	
102 Basic 4-8	.9236	
130 ESOL	(1.3854)	.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Findings		**Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)**
Hutchison Beach Elementary School (#0081) (Continued)		
2. [Ref. 8102] The *ELL Student Plan* for one student did not identify any courses reported in Program No. 130 (ESOL) that were to employ ESOL strategies. We propose the following adjustment:		
101 Basic K-3	.9236	
130 ESOL	(.9236)	.0000
		.0000
Cedar Grove Elementary School (#0091)		
3. [Ref. 9101] One ESE student was not reported in accordance with the student's *Matrix of Services* form. We propose the following adjustment:		
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	1.0000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(1.0000)	.0000
		.0000
Lucille Moore Elementary School (#0131)		
4. [Ref. 13101] An ELL Committee was not convened for one ELL student to consider the student's continued ESOL placement for a sixth year. We propose the following adjustment:		
102 Basic 4-8	.9402	
130 ESOL	(.9402)	.0000
5. [Ref. 13102] The *ELL Student Plan* for one ELL student in the February 2012 survey was not prepared until April 4, 2012, which was after the reporting survey. We proposed the following adjustment:		
102 Basic 4-8	.4701	
130 ESOL	(.4701)	.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Findings		**Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)**
Lucille Moore Elementary School (#0131) (Continued)		
6. [Ref. 13171] One Language Arts teacher, who taught a course that included an ELL student, had earned only 161 of the 300 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by rule and the teacher's in-service training timeline. We propose the following adjustment:		
102 Basic 4-8	.4701	
130 ESOL	(.4701)	.0000
		.0000
St. Andrew School (#0241)		
7. [Ref. 24101] One ESE student was not reported in accordance with the student's *Matrix of Services* form. We propose the following adjustment:		
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.5000)	
255 ESE Support Level 5	.5000	.0000
8. [Ref. 24102] The file for one student did not contain a *Matrix of Services* form that corresponded to the student's November 19, 2011, IEP. We propose the following adjustment:		
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.5000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.5000)	.0000
9. [Ref. 24103] One ELL student was beyond the maximum six-year period allowed for State funding of ESOL. We propose the following adjustment:		
102 Basic 4-8	.4669	
130 ESOL	(.4669)	.0000
		.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Findings		**Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)**
Margaret K. Lewis Exceptional School (#0281)		
10. [Ref. 28101] Four ESE students were not reported in accordance with the students' *Matrix of Services* forms. We propose the following adjustment:		
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	(.5000)	
254 ESE Support Level 4	1.5000	
255 ESE Support Level 5	(1.0000)	.0000
11. [Ref. 28102] The file for one ESE student did not contain a valid *Matrix of Services* form that corresponded to the student's May 19, 2011, IEP. A subsequent *Matrix of Services* form was completed on February 1, 2012, that supported a reporting in Program No. 113 (Grades 9-12 with ESE Services). We propose the following adjustment:		
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	.5000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.5000)	.0000
12. [Ref. 28103] One ESE student was absent during the entire 11-day survey period and should not have been reported with the survey's results. We also noted that the student's *Matrix of Services* form incorrectly included one Special Considerations point for which the student was not eligible. The point was designated for students with a *Matrix of Services* form score of 21 points and a Level 5 rating in four domains. This student had a Level 5 rating in only three domains. We propose the following adjustment:		
255 ESE Support Level 5	(.5000)	(.5000)
13. [Ref. 28104] One ESE student had withdrawn from school on October 3, 2011, which was prior to the October 2011 survey; therefore, the student should not have been reported with the October 2011 survey results. We propose the following adjustment:		

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Findings		**Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)**
Margaret K. Lewis Exceptional School (#0281) (Continued)		
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.5000)	(.5000)
		(1.0000)
Oscar Patterson Elementary Magnet School (#0291)		
14. [Ref. 29171] One teacher taught Language Arts and Basic subject area courses to an ELL student but had not earned any of the 60 (for Basic subject areas) or 300 (for Language Arts) in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by rule and the teacher's in-service training timeline. Since the ELL student is one of the students proposed for adjustment in Finding No. 15 (Ref. 29101), we are presenting this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustment here.		.0000
15. [Ref. 29101] The *ELL Student Plans* for two ELL students were not prepared until October 19, 2011, and October 25, 2011, respectively, both of which were after the October 2011 survey. We propose the following adjustment:		
101 Basic K-3	.9838	
130 ESOL	(.9838)	.0000
16. [Ref. 29172] One Language Arts teacher taught a class that included an ELL student but had earned only 98 of the 300 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by the teacher's in-service training timeline. We also noted that the parents were not notified of the teacher's ESOL out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustment:		
102 Basic 4-8	.2915	
130 ESOL	(.2915)	.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Findings		**Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)**
Oscar Patterson Elementary Magnet School (#0291) (Continued)		
17. [Ref. 29173] One teacher taught Basic subject area courses to ELL students but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by rule and the teacher's in-service training timeline. We propose the following adjustment:		
101 Basic K-3	.4919	
130 ESOL	(.4919)	.0000
		.0000
Rutherford High School (#0341)		
18. [Ref. 34174] One teacher taught Basic subject area courses to an ELL student but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by rule and the teacher's in-service training timeline. Since the ELL student is one of the students proposed for adjustment in Finding No. 21 (Ref. 34102), we are presenting this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustment here.		.0000
19. [Ref. 34175] One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by the School Board to teach a Career Education course out of field. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We present this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustment.		.0000
20. [Ref. 34101] The files for three Career Education 9-12 (OJT) students did not contain timecards documenting that the students had worked during the reporting surveys. We propose the following adjustment:		
300 Career Education 9-12	(.2000)	(.2000)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Findings		**Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)**
Rutherford High School (#0341) (Continued)		
21. [Ref. 34102] ELL Committees were not convened to consider two students' continued ESOL placements for a fourth year. We also noted that the files for these two students did not contain *ELL Student Plans* that were valid for the 2011-12 school year. We propose the following adjustment:		
103 Basic 9-12	1.4750	
130 ESOL	(1.4750)	.0000
22. [Ref. 34103] The file for one ELL student did not contain sufficient documentation to support the student's ESOL placement. The student's file was missing the following documentation: (a) any formal placement records; (b) an *ELL Student Plan*; and (c) parental notification of their child's ESOL placement. We propose the following adjustment:		
103 Basic 9-12	.3750	
130 ESOL	(.3750)	.0000
		(.2000)
Northside Elementary School (#0471)		
23. [Ref. 47101] An ELL Committee was not convened to consider one student's continued ESOL placement for a fifth year. We propose the following adjustment:		
101 Basic K-3	.4634	
130 ESOL	(.4634)	.0000
		.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Findings	**Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)**
A. Crawford Mosley High School (#0491)	
24. [Ref. 49182] One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by the School Board to teach a Career Education course out of field. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We present this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustment.	.0000
25. [Ref. 49101] One student was reported incorrectly in Program No. 255 (ESE Support Level 5) in the October 2011 and February 2012 surveys based on the student's dual placement in both the Hospital and Homebound Program (when necessary) and a regular in-school schedule (when the Hospital and Homebound Program was not necessary). We determined that during the reporting surveys the student was attending school following the student's regular schedule and was not receiving Hospital and Homebound Program services at those times. We also noted the following exceptions:	
a. The *Matrix of Services* form in the student's file was only for the student's Hospital and Homebound Program placement and a separate *Matrix of Services* form was not prepared for the student's in-school placement.	
b. The *Physician's Statement* for the student had not been updated or renewed since it was first initiated in 2009.	
Accordingly, we propose the following adjustment:	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services 1.0000	
255 ESE Support Level 5 (1.0000)	.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Findings		**Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)**
A. Crawford Mosley High School (#0491) (Continued)		
26. [Ref. 49102] The *ELL Student Plans* for three students did not identify all courses reported in Program No. 130 that were to employ ESOL strategies. We also noted that the files for two of the three students did not contain documentation to justify the students' continued ESOL placements for a fifth year. We propose the following adjustment:		
103 Basic 9-12	1.0750	
130 ESOL	(1.0750)	.0000
27. [Ref. 49103] The timecard for one Career Education 9-12 (OJT) student in the February 2012 survey was missing and could not be located. We propose the following adjustment:		
300 Career Education 9-12	(.0666)	(.0666)
28. [Ref. 49104] One student was enrolled in JROTC for the first block period of the day and attended another District school for the remainder of the student's schedule. We reviewed the teacher's roll book for the JROTC course and noted that the student was penciled in but had no attendance activity or any other type of coding to support that the student had attended the course. Also, the course was not included in the student's transcript as attempted or otherwise completed. Consequently, we could not validate the attendance for this student in the JROTC course. We propose the following adjustment:		
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(.1417)	(.1417)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Findings		**Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)**
A. Crawford Mosley High School (#0491) (Continued)		
29. [Ref. 49171] One teacher who was appropriately approved to teach ELL students out of field had earned none of the 300 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by rule and the teacher's in-service training timeline. We propose the following adjustment:		
103 Basic 9-12	.1500	
130 ESOL	(.1500)	.0000
30. [Ref. 49172] One teacher taught an English class that included an ELL student but was not properly certified to teach ELL students and was not approved by the School Board to teach such students out of field. We also noted that: (a) the parents of the ELL student were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status, and (b) the teacher had earned none of the 300 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by rule and the teacher's in-service training timeline. We propose the following adjustment:		
103 Basic 9-12	.1417	
130 ESOL	(.1417)	.0000
31. [Ref. 49174] The parents of students taught by one out-of-field teacher in Chemistry were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We also noted that the class included ELL students but the teacher had earned none of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by rule and the teacher's in-service training timeline. We propose the following adjustment:		
103 Basic 9-12	.1500	
130 ESOL	(.1500)	.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Findings		**Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)**
A. Crawford Mosley High School (#0491) (Continued)		
32. [Ref. 49177] One teacher taught a Basic subject area course to ELL students but had earned only 33 of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by rule and the teacher's in-service training timeline. We propose the following adjustment:		
103 Basic 9-12	.2127	
130 ESOL	(.2127)	.0000
		(.2083)
New Horizons Learning Center (#0531)		
33. [Ref. 53171] One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by the School Board to teach Mathematics to classes of ESE students. We also noted that the parents were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustment:		
103 Basic 9-12	3.6858	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(3.6858)	.0000
		.0000
J. R. Arnold High School (#0551)		
34. [Ref. 55174] One teacher taught Basic subject area courses that included an ELL student but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by rule and the teacher's in-service training timeline. Since the ELL student is proposed for adjustment in Finding No. 39 (Ref. 55103), we are presenting this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustment here.		
		.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Findings	**Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)**
J. R. Arnold High School (#0551) (Continued)	
35. [Ref. 55178] One teacher did not hold a valid Florida teaching certificate and was not otherwise qualified to teach a Career Education course. We present this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustment.	.0000
36. [Ref. 55179] One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by the School Board to teach a Career Education course out of field. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We present this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustment.	.0000
37. [Ref. 55101] The file for one ELL student did not contain documentation to justify the student's continued ESOL placement for a fifth or sixth year. We also noted that an ELL Committee had not been convened to consider the student's continued ESOL placement. We propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12 .9500	
130 ESOL (.9500)	.0000
38. [Ref. 55102] An ELL Committee had not been convened recommending one student's continued ESOL placement for a fourth year. Consequently, the student's continued ESOL placement was not supported. We propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12 .9000	
130 ESOL (.9000)	.0000
39. [Ref. 55103] One student was assessed FES and a competent English reader and writer; however, an ELL Committee was not convened to consider the student's continued ESOL placement for a fourth year. We propose the following adjustment:	

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Findings		**Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)**
J. R. Arnold High School (#0551) (Continued)		
103 Basic 9-12	.9000	
130 ESOL	(.9000)	.0000

40. [Ref. 55104] The timecards for nine Career Education 9-12 (OJT) students were missing and could not be located. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	(1.5250)	(1.5250)

41. [Ref. 55105] The timecard for one Career Education 9-12 (OJT) student was not signed by either the student or the student's employer. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	(.0500)	(.0500)

42. [Ref. 55171] One teacher taught an English class that included an ELL student but was not properly certified to teach ELL students and was not approved by the School Board to teach such students out of field. We also noted that: (a) the parents of the ELL student were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status, and (b) the teacher had earned only 111 of the 300 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by rule and the teacher's in-service training timeline. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.0750	
130 ESOL	(.0750)	.0000

43. [Ref. 55172] The parents of students taught by one out-of-field teacher in ESOL were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We also noted that the teacher had earned none of the 180 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by rule and the teacher's in-service training timeline. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.0500	
130 ESOL	(.0500)	.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Findings		**Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)**
J. R. Arnold High School (#0551) (Continued)		
44. [Ref. 55173] One teacher taught a Basic subject area course that included an ELL student but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by rule and the teacher's in-service training timeline. We propose the following adjustment:		
103 Basic 9-12	.0750	
130 ESOL	(.0750)	.0000
45. [Ref. 55177] One teacher taught a Basic subject area course that included an ELL student but had earned only 32 of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by rule and the teacher's in-service training timeline. We propose the following adjustment:		
103 Basic 9-12	.1500	
130 ESOL	(.1500)	.0000
		(1.5750)
Newpoint Bay Charter High School (#0771)		
46. [Ref. 77171] One teacher taught a Basic subject area course that included an ELL student but did not earn the 60 in-service training points required in ESOL strategies until after the reporting surveys. Since the ELL student is proposed for adjustment in Finding No. 47 (Ref. 77101), we are presenting this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustment here.		
		.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Findings		**Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)**
Newpoint Bay Charter High School (#0771) (Continued)		
47. [Ref. 77101] The file for one ELL student did not contain documentation to justify the student's continued ESOL placement for a fifth year and an ELL Committee was not convened to consider the student's continued ESOL placement for either a fifth or sixth year. We also noted that the *ELL Student Plan* was not prepared until October 18, 2011, which was after the October 2011 survey. We propose the following adjustment:		
103 Basic 9-12	.6668	
130 ESOL	(.6668)	.0000
		.0000
Proposed Net Adjustment		(2.9833)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE E

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) only students who are in membership and in attendance at least 1 of the 11 days of a survey period are reported with that survey's results; (2) *ELL Student Plans* are reviewed and updated annually and properly maintained in the students' files; (3) *ELL Student Plans* are complete with the students' instructional time and course schedules attached; (4) parents are properly notified of their child's ESOL placement; (5) students' English language is assessed and ELL Committees are convened prior to the students entering their fourth, fifth, or sixth year of ESOL placement based on the students' individual ESOL anniversary dates; (6) students are reported in the proper funding categories for the correct amount of FTE and have adequate documentation to support that reporting, particularly with regard to students in ESOL and ESE Support Levels 4 and 5; (7) ESE students are reported in accordance with their *Matrix of Services* forms and those forms are properly scored and maintained in the students' files; (8) students are reported appropriately for their on-campus instruction based on the *Matrix of Services* form applicable to that placement; (9) students in Career Education 9-12 (OJT) are reported in accordance with timecards that are accurately completed, signed, and retained in readily-accessible files; (10) students in Career Education 9-12 (OJT) are reported in accordance with the students' time worked as documented on their timecards; (11) teachers are properly certified or, if out of field, are approved to teach out of field by the School Board; (12) parents are appropriately notified of teachers' out-of-field status; and (13) teachers earn in-service training points in ESOL strategies on a timely basis as required by rule and their in-service training timelines.

The absence of statements in this report regarding practices and procedures followed by the District should not be construed as acceptance, approval, or endorsement of those practices and procedures. Additionally, the specific nature of this report does not limit or lessen the District's obligation to comply with all State requirements governing FTE and FEFP.

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE E (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

REGULATORY CITATIONS

Reporting

Section 1011.60, FS .....Minimum Requirements of the Florida Education Finance Program

Section 1011.61, FS .....Definitions

Section 1011.62, FS .....Funds for Operation of Schools

Rule 6A-1.0451, FAC .....Florida Education Finance Program Student Membership Surveys

Rule 6A-1.04513, FAC .....Maintaining Auditable FTE Records

FTE General Instructions 2011-12

Attendance

Section 1003.23, FS .....Attendance Records and Reports

Rules 6A-1.044(3) and (6)(c), FAC .....Pupil Attendance Records

Rule 6A-1.04513, FAC .....Maintaining Auditable FTE Records

FTE General Instructions 2011-12

Comprehensive Management Information System: Automated Student Attendance Recordkeeping System

English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)

Section 1003.56, FS .....English Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient Students

Section 1011.62(1)(g), FS .....Education for Speakers of Other Languages

Rule 6A-6.0901, FAC .....Definitions Which Apply to Programs for English Language Learners

Rule 6A-6.0902, FAC .....Requirements for Identification, Eligibility Programmatic and Annual Assessments of English Language Learners

Rule 6A-6.0903, FAC .....Requirement for Classification, Reclassification, and Post Reclassification of English Language Learners

Rule 6A-6.0904, FAC .....Equal Access to Appropriate Instruction for English Language Learners

Career Education On-the-Job Attendance

Rule 6A-1.044(6)(c), FAC .....Pupil Attendance Records

Career Education On-the-Job Funding Hours

Rule 6A-6.055(3), FAC .....Definitions of Terms Used in Vocational Education and Adult Programs

FTE General Instructions 2011-12

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE E (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

REGULATORY CITATIONS (Continued)

Exceptional Education

Section 1003.57, FS	Exceptional Students Instruction
Section 1011.62, FS	Funds for Operation of Schools
Section 1011.62(1)(e), FS	Funding Model for Exceptional Student Education Programs
Rule 6A-6.03028, FAC	Provision of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) and Development of Individual Educational Plans for Students with Disabilities
Rule 6A-6.03029, FAC	Development of Family Support Plans for Children with Disabilities Ages Birth Through Five Years
Rule 6A-6.0312, FAC	Course Modifications for Exceptional Students
Rule 6A-6.0331, FAC	General Education Intervention Procedures, Identification, Evaluation, Reevaluation and the Initial Provision of Exceptional Education Services
Rule 6A-6.0334, FAC	Individual Educational Plans (IEPs) and Educational Plans (EPs) for Transferring Exceptional Students
Rule 6A-6.03411, FAC	Definitions, ESE Policies and Procedures, and ESE Administrators

Matrix of Services Handbook (2004 Revised Edition)

Teacher Certification

Section 1012.42(2), FS	Teacher Teaching Out-of-Field; Notification Requirements
Section 1012.55, FS	Positions for Which Certificates Required
Rule 6A-1.0502, FAC	Non-certificated Instructional Personnel
Rule 6A-1.0503, FAC	Definition of Qualified Instructional Personnel
Rule 6A-4.001, FAC	Instructional Personnel Certification
Rule 6A-6.0907, FAC	Inservice Requirements for Personnel of Limited English Proficient Students

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
NOTES TO SCHEDULES
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

NOTE A – SUMMARY

A summary discussion of the significant features of the District, FEFP, FTE, and related areas follows:

1. School District of Bay County

The District was established pursuant to Section 1001.30, Florida Statutes, to provide public educational services for the residents of Bay County, Florida. Those services are provided primarily to prekindergarten through twelfth grade students and to adults seeking career education-type training. The District is part of the State system of public education under the general direction and control of the State Board of Education. The geographic boundaries of the District are those of Bay County.

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012, the District operated 45 schools serving prekindergarten through twelfth grade students, reported 25,512.20 unweighted FTE, and received approximately $36.4 million in State funding through FEFP. The primary sources of funding for the District are funds from FEFP, local ad valorem taxes, and Federal grants and donations.

2. Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)

Florida school districts receive State funding through FEFP to serve prekindergarten through twelfth grade students (adult education is not funded by FEFP). FEFP was established by the Florida Legislature in 1973 to guarantee to each student in the Florida public school system the availability of programs and services appropriate to the student's educational needs which are substantially equal to those available to any similar student notwithstanding geographic differences and varying local economic factors. To provide equalization of educational opportunity in Florida, the FEFP formula recognizes: (1) varying local property tax bases, (2) varying program cost factors, (3) district cost differentials, and (4) differences in per-student cost for equivalent educational programs due to sparsity and dispersion of student population.

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
NOTES TO SCHEDULES
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

NOTE A - SUMMARY (Continued)

3. Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students

The funding provided by FEFP is based upon the numbers of individual students participating in particular educational programs. A numerical value is assigned to each student according to the student's hours and days of attendance in those programs. The individual student thus becomes equated to a numerical value known as an FTE. For example, for prekindergarten through third grade, one FTE is defined as one student in membership in a program or a group of programs for 20 hours per week for 180 days; for grade levels four through twelve, one FTE is defined as one student in membership in a program or a group of programs for 25 hours per week for 180 days.

4. Calculation of FEFP Funds

The amount of State and local FEFP funds is calculated by the Department of Education by multiplying the number of unweighted FTE in each educational program by the specific cost factor of each program to obtain weighted FTEs. Weighted FTEs are multiplied by the base student allocation amount and that product is multiplied by the appropriate cost differential factor. Various adjustments are then added to this product to obtain the total State and local FEFP dollars. All cost factors, the base student allocation amount, cost differential factors, and various adjustment figures are established by the Florida Legislature.

5. FTE Surveys

FTE is determined and reported during the school year by means of four FTE membership surveys that are conducted under the direction of district and school management. Each survey is a sampling of FTE membership for a period of one week. The surveys for the 2011-12 school year were conducted during and for the following weeks: survey one was performed for July 11 through 15, 2011; survey two was performed for October 10 through 14, 2011; survey three was performed for February 13 through 17, 2012; and survey four was performed for June 11 through 15, 2012.

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
NOTES TO SCHEDULES
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

NOTE A - SUMMARY (Continued)

6. Educational Programs

FEFP funds ten specific programs under which instruction may be provided as authorized by the Florida Legislature. The general program titles under which these specific programs fall are as follows: (1) Basic, (2) ESOL, (3) ESE, and (4) Career Education 9-12.

7. Statutes and Rules

The following statutes and rules are of significance to the administration of Florida public education:

Chapter 1000, FS .....K-20 General Provisions
Chapter 1001, FS .....K-20 Governance
Chapter 1002, FS .....Student and Parental Rights and Educational Choices
Chapter 1003, FS .....Public K-12 Education
Chapter 1006, FS .....Support for Learning
Chapter 1007, FS .....Articulation and Access
Chapter 1010, FS .....Financial Matters
Chapter 1011, FS .....Planning and Budgeting
Chapter 1012, FS .....Personnel
Chapter 6A-1, FAC .....Finance and Administration
Chapter 6A-4, FAC .....Certification
Chapter 6A-6, FAC .....Special Programs I

NOTE B - SAMPLING

Our examination procedures provided for the selection of samples of schools, students, and teachers using judgmental methods for testing FTE reported to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012. Our sampling process was designed to facilitate the performance of appropriate examination procedures to test the District's compliance with State requirements governing FTE and FEFP. The following schools were in our sample:

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
NOTES TO SCHEDULES
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

NOTE B - SAMPLING (Continued)

School Name/Description	Finding Number(s)
1. Hutchison Beach Elementary School	1 and 2
2. Cedar Grove Elementary School	3
3. Lucille Moore Elementary School	4 through 6
4. St. Andrew School	7 through 9
5. Margaret K. Lewis Exceptional School	10 through 13
6. Oscar Patterson Elementary Magnet School	14 through 17
7. Rutherford High School	18 through 22
8. Northside Elementary School	23
9. A. Crawford Mosley High School	24 through 32
10. New Horizons Learning Center	33
11. J. R. Arnold High School	34 through 45
12. Newpoint Bay Charter High School *	46 and 47
13. Chautauqua Learn & Serve Charter School *	NA

* Charter School

AUDITOR GENERAL
STATE OF FLORIDA

DAVID W. MARTIN, CPA
AUDITOR GENERAL

G74 Claude Pepper Building
111 West Madison Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1450

PHONE: 850-488-5534
FAX: 850-488-6975

The President of the Senate, the Speaker of the
House of Representatives, and the
Legislative Auditing Committee

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT
BAY COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD
FLORIDA EDUCATION FINANCE PROGRAM (FEFP)
STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

We have examined management's assertion, included in its representation letter dated August 27, 2012, that the Bay County District School Board complied with State requirements governing the determination and reporting of the number of students transported for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012. These requirements are found primarily in Chapter 1006, Part I, E., and Section 1011.68, Florida Statutes; State Board of Education Rules, Chapter 6A-3, Florida Administrative Code; and the *Student Transportation General Instructions 2011-2012* issued by the Department of Education. As discussed in the representation letter, management is responsible for the District's compliance with State requirements. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the District's compliance based on our examination.

Our examination was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) and the standards applicable to attestation engagements contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and, accordingly, included examining, on a test basis, evidence about the District's compliance with the aforementioned State requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our examination provides a reasonable basis for our opinion. The legal determination of the District's compliance with these requirements is, however, ultimately the responsibility of the Department of Education.

COMPLIANCE

Our examination procedures disclosed material noncompliance with the District's reported student ridership data as follows: 53 of the 305 students in our sample had exceptions involving their reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding. (See SCHEDULE G, Finding Nos. 1 through 8)

In our opinion, except for the material noncompliance mentioned above involving their reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding, the Bay County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements governing the determination and reporting of the number of students transported for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012.

The results of our examination disclosed other noncompliance with the State requirements mentioned above. We considered this other noncompliance in forming our opinion regarding the District's compliance and it did not affect our opinion as stated above. All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed in SCHEDULE G. The impact of this noncompliance on the District's reported number of transported students is presented in SCHEDULES F and G.

INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE

In accordance with attestation standards established by the AICPA and *Government Auditing Standards*, we are required to report significant deficiencies in internal control detected during our examination and identify those considered to be material weaknesses. The purpose of our examination was to express an opinion on the District's compliance with State requirements and did not include expressing an opinion on the District's related internal controls. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. Due to its limited purpose, our examination would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses.[1] However, the material noncompliance mentioned above is indicative of significant deficiencies considered to be material weaknesses in the District's internal controls related to their reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding. Other noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is indicative of control deficiencies[1] and is also presented herein. The findings, populations, samples, and exception totals that pertain to material and other noncompliance are presented in SCHEDULES F and G.

---

[1] *A control deficiency in the entity's internal control over compliance exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect noncompliance on a timely basis. A significant deficiency is a control deficiency, or combination of control deficiencies, that adversely affects the entity's ability to comply with the aforementioned State requirements such that there is more than a remote likelihood that noncompliance that is more than inconsequential will not be prevented or detected by the entity's internal control. A material weakness is a significant deficiency, or combination of significant deficiencies, that results in a more-than-remote likelihood that material noncompliance will not be prevented or detected by the entity's internal control.*

The District's written response to this examination has not been subjected to our examination procedures, and accordingly, we express no opinion on it.

Pursuant to Section 11.45(4)(c), Florida Statutes, this report is a public record and its distribution is not limited. Attestation standards established by the AICPA require us to indicate that this report is intended solely for the information and use of the Legislative Auditing Committee, members of the Florida Senate and the Florida House of Representatives, the State Board of Education, the Department of Education, and applicable District management and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Respectfully submitted,



David W. Martin, CPA
April 11, 2013

SCHEDULE F

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Student Transportation
POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND TEST RESULTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Any student who is transported by the District must meet one or more of the following conditions in order to be eligible for State transportation funding: live two or more miles from school, be physically handicapped, be a Career Education 9-12 or an ESE student who is transported from one school center to another where appropriate programs are provided, or be on a route that meets the criteria for hazardous walking conditions specified in Section 1006.23(4), Florida Statutes. (See NOTE A1.)

As part of our examination procedures, we sampled students for testing the number of students transported as reported to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012. (See NOTE B.) The population of vehicles (279) consisted of the total of the numbers of vehicles reported by the District for each survey. For example, a vehicle that transported students during the July and October 2011 and February and June 2012 surveys would be counted in the population as four vehicles. Similarly, the population of students (19,663) consisted of the total numbers of students reported by the District as having been transported for each survey. (See NOTE A2.) The District reported students in the following ridership categories:

Ridership Category	Number of Students Transported
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	868
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	498
IDEA (PK), Weighted	133
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	145
Teenage Parents and Infants	7
Two Miles or More	18,012
Total	19,663

Students with exceptions are students with exceptions affecting their ridership category. Students cited only for incorrect reporting of days in term, if any, are not included.

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE F (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Student Transportation
POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND TEST RESULTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Our examination results are summarized below:

	Students	
Description	With Exceptions	Proposed Net Adjustment
We sampled 305 of the 19,663 students reported as being transported by the District.	53	(35)
We also noted certain issues in conjunction with our general tests of student transportation that resulted in the addition of 42 students.	42	(42)
Total	95	(77)

Our proposed net adjustment presents the net effect of noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures. (See SCHEDULE G.)

The ultimate resolution of our proposed net adjustment and the computation of its financial impact is the responsibility of the Department of Education.

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE G

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Student Transportation
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

OVERVIEW

Management is responsible for determining and reporting the number of students transported in compliance with State requirements. These requirements are found primarily in Chapter 1006, Part I, E., and Section 1011.68, Florida Statutes; State Board of Education Rules, Chapter 6A-3, Florida Administrative Code; and the *Student Transportation General Instructions 2011-2012* issued by the Department of Education. Except for the material noncompliance involving their reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding, the Bay County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements governing the determination and reporting of students transported for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012. All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed below and requires management's attention and action, as recommended on page 43.

Findings | **Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments**

Our examination procedures included both general tests and detailed tests. Our general tests included inquiries concerning the District's transportation of students and verification that a bus driver's report existed for each bus reported in a survey. Our detailed tests involved verification of the specific ridership categories reported for students sampled from the July and October 2011 surveys and the February and June 2012 surveys. Adjusted students who were in more than one survey are accounted for by survey. For example, a student sampled twice (i.e., once for the October 2011 survey and once for the February 2012 survey) will be presented in our Findings as two sample students.

1. [Ref. 51] One student in our sample was incorrectly reported in the IDEA (PK), Unweighted ridership category in the October 2011 survey. However, we determined that the student lived more than two miles from his assigned school and should have been reported in the Two Miles or More ridership category. We propose the following adjustment:

October 2011 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	(1)	
Two Miles or More	1	0

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE G (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Student Transportation
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Findings		**Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments**
2. [Ref. 52] Two students in our sample were incorrectly reported in the IDEA (PK), Unweighted ridership category. The students were not IDEA students and were enrolled in a Voluntary Prekindergarten Education Program. Consequently, these students were not eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustments:		
October 2011 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	(1)	
February 2012 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	(1)	(2)
3. [Ref. 54] One student in our sample who was reported in the Two Miles or More ridership category lived less than two miles from his assigned school. Consequently, this student was not eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustment:		
June 2012 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
Two Miles or More	(1)	(1)
4. [Ref. 55] Twelve students in our sample were reported incorrectly in an IDEA-Weighted ridership classification. Ten of the students' IEPs did not support the students' IDEA-Weighted classifications and two of the students were not IDEA students. However, we were able to determine that seven of the students lived more than two miles from their assigned schools and were eligible for reporting in the Two Miles or More ridership category and three of the students were eligible for reporting in the IDEA (PK), Unweighted ridership category. The remaining two students lived less than two miles from school and were not otherwise eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustments:		

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE G (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Student Transportation
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Findings		**Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments**
October 2011 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(6)	
IDEA (PK), Weighted	(2)	
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	2	
Two Miles or More	4	
February 2012 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(3)	
IDEA (PK), Weighted	(1)	
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	1	
Two Miles or More	3	(2)

5. [Ref. 56] Seven students in our sample were reported in the IDEA (K-12), Unweighted ridership category; however, the students lived more than two miles from their assigned schools and should have been reported in the Two Miles or More ridership category. We propose the following adjustments:

October 2011 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(4)	
Two Miles or More	4	
February 2012 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(3)	
Two Miles or More	3	0

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE G (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Student Transportation
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Findings		**Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments**
6. [Ref. 57] Twenty-six students in our sample were incorrectly reported in the IDEA (K-12), Unweighted ridership category. The students were Speech Impaired, Language Impaired, Specific Learning Disabled, or Gifted and their IEPs did not indicate that specialized transportation was needed. The students lived less than two miles from their assigned school and were not otherwise eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustments:		
October 2011 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(19)	
February 2012 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(7)	(26)
7. [Ref. 58] Five students (four students were in our sample) were not found on the respective bus drivers' reports; thus, we could not validate the students as being transported. Consequently, these students were not eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustments:		
October 2011 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(1)	
IDEA (PK), Weighted	(1)	
February 2012 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(1)	
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	(2)	(5)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE G (Continued)

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Student Transportation
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Findings		**Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments**
8. [Ref. 59] We examined the reported ridership for all surveys as part of our general tests and noted that 41 students reported for State transportation funding did not have a matching demographic record in the State FTE database. We presented this information to transportation management who were unable to account for these students. Accordingly, we propose the following adjustments:		
July 2011 Survey		
20 Days in Term		
Two Miles or More	(1)	
4 Days in Term		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(2)	
Two Miles or More	(1)	
October 2011 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
Two Miles or More	(12)	
February 2012 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
Two Miles or More	(25)	(41)
Proposed Net Adjustment		(77)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE H

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Student Transportation
RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) only those students who are indicated as riding on the bus drivers' reports should be reported for State transportation funding; (2) transported students are reported in the correct ridership category; (3) bus driver reports are available, legible, and maintained in readily-accessible files; (4) only those students who are documented as enrolled in school during the survey week concerned and transported by the District at least one time during the 11-day survey window are reported for State transportation funding; (5) the distance from home to school for students classified in the Two Miles or More ridership category is verified prior to those students being reported; (6) students are reported on the correct bus that transports them to their assigned school of enrollment; (7) IEPs for Speech Impaired, Language Impaired, or Specific Disabled students who are reported in the IDEA (K-12), Unweighted ridership category indicate the need for transportation as it relates to the students' disabilities; (8) students reported in IDEA-Weighted classifications are appropriately documented as meeting one of the five criteria and as noted on the students' IEPs; (9) only PK students with disabilities or PK children of students enrolled in a Teenage Parents and Infants Program are reported for State transportation funding and proper documentation is maintained to support this reporting; and (10) transportation personnel review the District database for completeness and verify that all students have matching demographics to support that the students are properly enrolled and are otherwise eligible for State transportation.

The absence of statements in this report regarding practices and procedures followed by the District should not be construed as acceptance, approval, or endorsement of those practices and procedures. Additionally, the specific nature of this report does not limit or lessen the District's obligation to comply with all State requirements governing student transportation.

REGULATORY CITATIONS

Chapter 1006, Part I, E., FS .....Transportation of Public K-12 Students
Section 1011.68, FS .....Funds for Student Transportation
Chapter 6A-3, FAC .....Transportation
Student Transportation General Instructions 2011-2012

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Student Transportation
NOTES TO SCHEDULES
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

NOTE A – SUMMARY

A summary discussion of the significant features of student transportation and related areas follows:

1. Student Eligibility

Any student who is transported by bus must meet one or more of the following conditions in order to be eligible for State transportation funding: live two or more miles from school, be physically handicapped, be a Career Education 9-12 or an ESE student who is transported from one school center to another where appropriate programs are provided, or be on a route that meets the criteria for hazardous walking conditions specified in Section 1006.23(4), Florida Statutes.

2. Transportation in Bay County

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012, the District received approximately $3.9 million for student transportation as part of the State funding through FEFP. The District's transportation reporting by survey was as follows:

Survey Period	Number of Vehicles	Number of Students
July 2011	20	161
October 2011	129	9,679
February 2012	129	9,787
June 2012	1	36
Total	279	19,663

3. Statutes and Rules

The following statutes and rules are of significance to the District's administration of student transportation:

Chapter 1006, Part I, E., FS ..... Transportation of Public K-12 Students
Section 1011.68, FS ..... Funds for Student Transportation
Chapter 6A-3, FAC ..... Transportation

Bay County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Student Transportation
NOTES TO SCHEDULES
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

NOTE B – SAMPLING

Our examination procedures provided for the selection of samples of buses and students using judgmental methods for testing the number of students transported as reported to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012. Our sampling process was designed to facilitate the performance of appropriate examination procedures to test the District's compliance with State requirements governing students transported.

EXHIBIT A
MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

WILLIAM V. HUSFELT III
SUPERINTENDENT

1311 Balboa Avenue
Panama City, Florida
32401-2080

(850) 767-4100
Hearing Impaired Access
(800) 955-8770 Voice
(800) 955-8771 TDD

www.bay.k12.fl.us

Board Members:

Jerry Register
District 1

Ginger Littleton
District 2

Joe Wayne Walker
District 3

Ryan Neves
District 4

Steve Moss
District 5

April 11, 2013

Mr. David W. Martin, CRA
Auditor General
G74 Claude Pepper Building
111 West Madison Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1450

SUBJECT: FTE/Transportation Audit for Bay District Schools

Dear Mr. Martin:

In response to the FEFP Audit Summary of Findings pertaining to FTE (Schedule D), we have sent a copy of the findings to each principal/supervisor to work to correct these deficiencies so that the records will be correct next year. I am offering the following summary of findings and corrective actions:

Finding Number/s	***Corrective Action***
1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 15 21, 22, 23, 26, 37 38, 39	Training will be provided at the quarterly Guidance Counselor Meetings regarding: ELL Committees and their functions for placement of students, assessments needed to determine English proficiency needs, courses using ESOL strategies, ELL Student Plans, filing of information, parental notification of placement in ESOL, etc.
3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 25	Training will be provided at the quarterly Guidance Counselor Meetings.
3	Training will be provided at monthly data clerk meetings. The new data program FOCUS will provide data to review in this area.
6, 14, 16	Teachers and principals will receive notification when they are out-of-field for an ELL student and need to take courses toward ESOL endorsement and/or meeting their ESOL course requirements.
6, 14, 16, 17, 18, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 42, 43, 44, 45	The District will continue to provide ESOL courses through Beacon Learning Center. Currently, these courses are offered free-of-charge to Bay District teachers. The District

EXHIBIT A (CONTINUED)
MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

	continues to pay for the ESOL endorsement to be added to a teacher's certificate.
7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 25	Training will continue to be provided at monthly data clerk meetings on coding ESE students according to their matrix.
8	To assist in eliminating matrix problems, the ESE Department will continue to remind ESE teachers through meetings, newsletters, and the Resource Teacher that teachers MUST write a new matrix or review existing matrix for every student.
12, 13, 28	Teachers will receive training on the new data system for attendance and the principal will monitor the attendance through the FOCUS data program.
19, 24, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36, 42, 43	Teachers and principals will receive notification when teachers are out-of-field. Parents of students in the class being taught will also be notified that the teacher is out-of-field but otherwise, a qualified teacher.
20, 27, 40, 41	The supervising teacher for Career Education OJT students will develop an organized plan to record the receipt of timecards documenting that students worked during the reporting surveys and that all timecards are signed by the student and the student's employer.
24, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36	The District will send a semester out-of-field report to the District School Board for approval.
25	The ESE Resource Teacher will work with principals, teachers, and data clerks in the schools to remind Hospital/Homebound teachers that if services were provided during the survey periods, all files must include a yearly Physician's Statement for the student. Also, the Matrix of Services form must be filed for Hospital/Homebound and a separate one for in-school placement.

EXHIBIT A (CONTINUED)
MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

28	Training will continue to be provided at monthly data clerk meetings on coding students and data entries regarding transcripts. Attendance verification forms will be signed by the teacher.
35, 36	New out-of-field notification procedures are being implemented.
42, 43	The District will send a quarterly out-of-field report to the District School Board for approval.
46	District will continue to provide ESOL courses through Beacon Learning Center. Charter Schools are notified of the Auditor Findings and asked to correct deficiencies.
47	Charter schools are invited to attend, but are not required to attend training at the quarterly Guidance Counselor Meetings regarding: ELL Committees and their functions for placement of students, assessments needed to determine English proficiency needs, courses using ESOL strategies, ELL Student Plans, etc.

In response to the FEFP Audit Summary of Findings pertaining to Student Transportation (Schedule G), I am offering the following summary of findings and corrective actions:

Finding/s	***Corrective Action***
1-8	The District is reorganizing the Transportation Department for the 2013 – 2014 school year. The Executive Director for Operational Support Services will meet with the Supervisor of Transportation to provide additional employee training on verification procedures and reporting requirements. They will stress the importance of mandatory reports that are available, legible, and maintained in readily accessible files. Transportation will take corrective action as required to ensure that all students transported by buses or vans are accurately classified and reported in the correct ridership category for the number of days-

EXHIBIT A (CONTINUED)
MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

in-term. Additional training will be provided on reporting students in IDEA-weighted classifications, especially PK students enrolled in a voluntary PK program.
New practices are now in place to verify that students who are documented as enrolled in school and meet the two-mile distance requirement are transported at least one time during each survey week.
Transportation will ensure that all bus drivers' (FEFP) reports are maintained and secured in files that are only accessible by Transportation Specialists.

Please contact me if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

William V. Husfelt, III
Superintendent