

**FRANKLIN COUNTY
DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD**

Florida Education Finance Program
Full-Time Equivalent Student Enrollment
and
Student Transportation

For the Fiscal Year Ended
June 30, 2016



Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Auditor General

Board Members and Superintendent

During the 2015-16 fiscal year, Nina M. Marks served as Superintendent of the Franklin County Schools and the following individuals served as Board members:

<u>Board Member</u>	<u>District No.</u>
George Thompson, Vice Chair from 11-16-15	1
Pamela J. Marshall	2
Teresa Ann Martin, Vice Chair to 11-15-15	3
Stacy Kirvin	4
Pam Shiver, Chair	5

The team leader was Alice Pounds, CPA, and the examination was supervised by Aileen B. Peterson, CPA, CPM.

Please address inquiries regarding this report to J. David Hughes, CPA, Audit Manager, by e-mail at davidhughes@aud.state.fl.us or by telephone at (850) 412-2971.

This report and other reports prepared by the Auditor General are available at:

www.myflorida.com/audgen

Printed copies of our reports may be requested by contacting us at:

State of Florida Auditor General

Claude Pepper Building, Suite G74 • 111 West Madison Street • Tallahassee, FL 32399-1450 • (850) 412-2722

FRANKLIN COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page
No.

SUMMARY	i
INDEPENDENT AUDITOR’S REPORT ON FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT	1
SCHEDULE A – POPULATIONS, TEST SELECTION, AND TEST RESULTS	
Reported Full-Time Equivalent Student Enrollment	4
Schools and Students.....	4
Teachers.....	5
Proposed Adjustments	5
SCHEDULE B – EFFECT OF PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS ON WEIGHTED FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT	6
SCHEDULE C – PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL.....	7
SCHEDULE D – FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS	
Overview.....	8
Findings.....	8
SCHEDULE E – RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS	14
NOTES TO SCHEDULES.....	17
INDEPENDENT AUDITOR’S REPORT ON STUDENT TRANSPORTATION	20
SCHEDULE F – POPULATIONS, TEST SELECTION, AND TEST RESULTS.....	23
SCHEDULE G – FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS	
Overview.....	25
Findings.....	25
SCHEDULE H – RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS.....	29
NOTES TO SCHEDULES.....	30
MANAGEMENT’S RESPONSE	31

FRANKLIN COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CMW	Class Minutes, Weekly
DEUSS	Date Entered United States School
ELL	English Language Learner
ESE	Exceptional Student Education
ESOL	English for Speakers of Other Languages
FAC	Florida Administrative Code
FEFP	Florida Education Finance Program
FES	Fluent English Speaker
FTE	Full-Time Equivalent
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IEP	Individual Educational Plan
PK	Prekindergarten
SBE	State Board of Education

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 not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located for students in Basic with ESE Services, ESOL, ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, and student transportation, the Franklin County District School Board (District) complied, in all material respects, with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of the full-time equivalent (FTE) student enrollment and student transportation as reported under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016. Specifically, we noted:

- State requirements governing teacher 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 were not met for 6 of the 15 teachers in our test. Three of the 15 teachers (20 percent) in our test taught at the charter school and none of the 6 teachers with exceptions taught at the charter school.
- Exceptions involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. The table below shows the total number of students included in each of our tests, as well as the number and percentage of students who attended the charter school who were included in our tests. The table also shows the number of students with exceptions in each of our tests, as well as the number and percentage of students with exceptions who attended the charter school.

Program Tested	Number of Students Included in Test Who Attended the Charter School			Number of Students With Exceptions Who Attended the Charter School		
	Included in Test	Percentage	Percentage	With Exceptions	Percentage	Percentage
Basic with ESE Services	15	27%	27%	3	0%	0%
ESOL	8	38%	38%	7	29%	29%
ESE Support Levels 4 and 5	15	33%	33%	9	22%	22%
Totals	<u>38</u>			<u>19</u>		

- Exceptions involving the reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding for 83 of the 205 students in our student transportation test.

Noncompliance related to the reported FTE student enrollment resulted in 16 findings. The resulting proposed net adjustment to the District's reported, unweighted FTE totaled to negative .5000 (all applicable to the District school other than a charter school) but has a potential impact on the District's weighted FTE of negative 14.0380 (13.6118 applicable to the District school other than the charter school and .4262 applicable to the charter school). Noncompliance related to student transportation resulted in 9 findings and a proposed net adjustment of negative 471 students.

The weighted adjustments to the FTE student enrollment are presented in our report for illustrative purposes only. The weighted adjustments to the 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 the FTE may be estimated by multiplying the proposed net weighted adjustment to the FTE student enrollment by the base student allocation amount. The base student allocation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016, was \$4,154.45 per FTE. For the District, the estimated gross dollar effect of our proposed adjustments to the reported FTE student enrollment is negative \$58,320 (negative 14.0380 times \$4,154.45), of which \$56,549 is applicable to the District school other than a charter school and \$1,771 is applicable to the charter school.

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 the FTE student enrollment and student transportation and the computation of their financial impact is the responsibility of the Department of Education.

THE DISTRICT

The District was established pursuant to Section 1001.30, Florida Statutes, to provide public educational services for the residents of Franklin County, Florida. Those services are provided primarily to PK through 12th-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 SBE. The geographic boundaries of the District are those of Franklin 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. The District had one school other than a charter school and one charter school serving PK through 12th-grade students.

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016, State funding totaling \$769,859 was provided through the FEFP to the District for the District-reported 1,239.51 unweighted FTE as recalibrated, which included 339.13 unweighted FTE as recalibrated for the charter school. The primary sources of funding for the District are funds from the FEFP, local ad valorem taxes, and Federal grants and donations.

FEFP

FTE Student Enrollment

Florida school districts receive State funding through the FEFP to serve PK through 12th-grade students (adult education is not funded by the FEFP). The FEFP was established by the Florida Legislature in 1973 to guarantee to each student in the Florida public school system, including charter schools, the availability of programs and services appropriate to the student's educational needs that 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 costs for equivalent educational programs due to sparsity and dispersion of student population.

The funding provided by the FEFP is based on 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 student enrollment. For brick and mortar school students, one student would be reported as 1.0 FTE if the student was enrolled in six courses per day at 50 minutes per course for the full 180-day school year (i.e., six courses at 50 minutes each per day is 5 hours of class a day or 25 hours per week, which equates to 1.0 FTE). For virtual education students, one student would be reported as 1.0 FTE if the student has successfully completed six courses or credits or the prescribed level of content that counts toward promotion to the next grade. A student who completes less than six credits will be reported as a fraction of an FTE. Half-credit completions will be included in determining an FTE student enrollment. Credits completed by a student in excess of the minimum required for that student for graduation are not eligible for funding.

All FTE student enrollment is capped at 1.0 FTE except for the FTE student enrollment reported by the Department of Juvenile Justice for students beyond the 180-day school year. School districts report all FTE student enrollment regardless of the 1.0 FTE cap. The Department of Education combines all FTE student enrollment reported for the student by all school districts, including the Florida Virtual School Part-Time Program, using a common student identifier. The Department of Education then recalibrates all reported FTE student enrollment for each student to 1.0 FTE if the total reported FTE for the student exceeds 1.0 FTE. The FTE student enrollment reported for extended school year periods and the Department of Juvenile Justice FTE student enrollment reported beyond the 180-day school year is not included in the recalibration to 1.0 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 2 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 Florida Statutes. Additionally, Section 1002.33(20)(c), Florida Statutes, provides that the governing board of the charter school may provide transportation through an agreement or contract with the district school board, a private provider, or parents. The charter school and the sponsor shall cooperate in making arrangements that ensure that transportation is not a barrier to equal access for all students residing within a reasonable distance of the charter school as determined in its charter. The District received \$348,279 for student transportation as part of the State funding through the FEFP.



Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Auditor General

AUDITOR GENERAL STATE OF FLORIDA

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



Phone: (850) 412-2722
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

Report on Full-Time Equivalent Student Enrollment

We have examined the Franklin County District School Board's (District's) compliance with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of the full-time equivalent (FTE) student enrollment reported under the Florida Education Finance Program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016. 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 2015-16* issued by the Department of Education.

Management's Responsibility for Compliance

District management is responsible for the District's compliance with the aforementioned State requirements, including the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control to prevent, or detect and correct, noncompliance due to fraud or error.

Auditor's Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the District's compliance with State requirements based on our examination. Our examination was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and the standards applicable to attestation engagements contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the examination to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the classification, assignment, and verification of the full-time equivalent student enrollment reported by the District under the Florida Education Finance Program complied with State requirements in all material respects.

An examination involves performing procedures to obtain evidence about whether the District complied with State requirements. The nature, timing, and extent of the procedures selected depend on our judgment, including an assessment of the risks of material noncompliance, whether due to fraud or error. We believe that the evidence we obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a reasonable basis for

our opinion. Our examination does not provide a legal determination on the District's compliance with State requirements. The legal determination of the District's compliance with these requirements is the responsibility of the Department of Education.

Opinion

Our examination disclosed material noncompliance with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of full-time equivalent student enrollment as reported under the Florida Education Finance Program for teachers and students in our Basic with Exceptional Student Education Services, English for Speakers of Other Languages, and Exceptional Student Education Support Levels 4 and 5 tests involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located.

In our opinion, except for the material noncompliance with State requirements described in the preceding paragraph involving teachers and reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located for students in Basic with Exceptional Student Education Services, English for Speakers of Other Languages, and Exceptional Student Education Support Levels 4 and 5, the Franklin County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of the full-time equivalent student enrollment reported under the Florida Education Finance Program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016.

Other Reporting Required by Government Auditing Standards

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we are required to report all deficiencies that are considered to be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses¹ in internal control; fraud and noncompliance with provisions of laws or regulations that have a material effect on the District's compliance with State requirements; and any other instances that warrant the attention of those charged with governance; noncompliance with provisions of contracts or grant agreements that has a material effect on the District's compliance with State requirements; and abuse that has a material effect on the District's compliance with State requirements. We are also required to obtain and report the views of responsible officials concerning the findings, conclusions, and recommendations, as well as any planned corrective actions.

We performed our examination to express an opinion on the District's compliance with State requirements and not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the District's related internal control over compliance with State requirements; accordingly, we express no such opinion. Because of its limited purpose, our examination would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. 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 not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently

¹ A significant deficiency is a deficiency or a combination of deficiencies in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance. A material weakness is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis.

located for students in Basic with Exceptional Student Education Services, English for Speakers of Other Languages, and Exceptional Student Education Support Levels 4 and 5. Our examination disclosed certain findings that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards* and all findings, along with the views of responsible officials, are described in *SCHEDULE D* and *MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE*, respectively. The impact of this noncompliance with State requirements on the District's reported full-time equivalent student enrollment is presented in *SCHEDULES A, B, C, 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.

Purpose of this Report

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 American Institute of Certified Public Accountants require us to indicate that the purpose of this report is to provide an opinion on the District's compliance with State requirements. Accordingly, this communication is not suitable for any other purpose.

Respectfully submitted,



Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Tallahassee, Florida
April 20, 2017

SCHEDULE A

POPULATIONS, TEST SELECTION, AND TEST RESULTS FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Reported FTE

The funding provided by the FEFP is based on the numbers of individual students participating in particular educational programs. The FEFP funds ten specific programs that are grouped under the following four general program titles: Basic, ESOL, ESE, and Career Education 9-12. The unweighted FTE represents the FTE prior to the application of the specific cost factor for each program. (See *SCHEDULE B* and NOTE A3., A4., and A5.) For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016, the Franklin County District School Board (District) reported to the Department of Education 1,239.51 unweighted FTE as recalibrated, which included 339.13 unweighted FTE as recalibrated for the charter school, at one District school other than the charter school and one charter school.

Schools and Students

As part of our examination procedures, we tested the FTE student enrollment reported to the Department of Education for schools and students for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016. (See NOTE B.) The population of schools consisted of two brick and mortar schools in the District that offered courses, including a charter school, in the FEFP-funded programs. The population of students (1,355) consisted of the total number of students in each program at the schools and cost centers in our tests.

We noted the following material noncompliance: exceptions involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located for 3 of the 15 students in our Basic with ESE Services test,² 7 of the 8 students in our ESOL test,³ and 9 of the 15 students in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 test.⁴ Four of the 15 students (27 percent) in our Basic with ESE Services test attended the charter school and none of the 3 students with exceptions attended the charter school. Three of the 8 students (38 percent) in our ESOL test attended the charter school and 2 of the 7 students with exceptions (29 percent) attended the charter school. Five of the 15 students (33 percent) in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 test attended the charter school and 2 of the 9 students with exceptions (22 percent) attended the charter school.

Our populations and tests of schools and students are summarized as follows:

<u>Programs</u>	<u>Number of Schools</u>		<u>Number of Students at Schools Tested</u>		<u>Students With Exceptions</u>	<u>Recalibrated Unweighted FTE</u>		<u>Proposed Adjustments</u>
	<u>Population</u>	<u>Test</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Test</u>		<u>Population</u>	<u>Test</u>	
Basic	2	2	1,080	24	0	961.6200	21.0831	8.3546
Basic with ESE Services	2	2	243	15	3	217.7200	14.5000	(.4997)
ESOL	2	2	17	8	7	10.9400	5.1418	(4.4503)
ESE Support Levels 4 and 5	2	2	15	15	9	12.7200	12.2173	(3.2871)
Career Education 9-12	1	0	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>36.5100</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(.6175)</u>
All Programs	2	2	<u>1,355</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>1,239.5100</u>	<u>52.9422</u>	<u>(.5000)</u>

² For Basic with ESE Services, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 9 and 10 on SCHEDULE D.

³ For ESOL, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 4, 5, 15, and 16 on SCHEDULE D.

⁴ For ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 6, 7, 8, 11, and 14 on SCHEDULE D.

Teachers

We also tested teacher qualifications as part of our examination procedures. (See NOTE B.) Specifically, the population of teachers (40, of which 32 are applicable to the District school other than the charter school and 8 are applicable to the charter school) consisted of the total number of teachers at schools in our test who taught courses in ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, Career Education 9-12, or taught courses to ELL students.

We noted the following material noncompliance: State requirements governing teacher 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 were not met for 6 of the 15 teachers in our test.⁵ Three of the 15 teachers (20 percent) in our test taught at the charter school and none of the 6 teachers with exceptions taught at the charter school.

Proposed Adjustments

Our proposed adjustments present the net effects of noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures, including those related to our test of teacher qualifications. Our proposed adjustments generally reclassify the 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.*)

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

⁵ For teachers, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 1, 2, 12 and 13 on SCHEDULE D.

SCHEDULE B

EFFECT OF PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS ON WEIGHTED FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT

District School Other Than the Charter School			
No. Program (1)	Proposed Net Adjustment (2)	Cost Factor	Weighted FTE (3)
101 Basic K-3	1.9000	1.115	2.1185
102 Basic 4-8	3.2786	1.000	3.2786
103 Basic 9-12	1.8260	1.005	1.8351
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	(.5000)	1.115	(.5575)
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	.5003	1.000	.5003
130 ESOL	(3.1003)	1.180	(3.6584)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(2.0698)	3.613	(7.4782)
255 ESE Support Level 5	(1.7173)	5.258	(9.0296)
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.6175)</u>	1.005	<u>(.6206)</u>
Subtotal	<u>(.5000)</u>		<u>(13.6118)</u>

Charter School			
No. Program (1)	Proposed Net Adjustment (2)	Cost Factor	Weighted FTE (3)
101 Basic K-3	1.3500	1.115	1.5053
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	(.5000)	1.000	(.5000)
130 ESOL	(1.3500)	1.180	(1.5930)
254 ESE Support Level 4	1.5000	3.613	5.4195
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(1.0000)</u>	5.258	<u>(5.2580)</u>
Subtotal	<u>.0000</u>		<u>(.4262)</u>

Total of Schools			
No. Program (1)	Proposed Net Adjustment (2)	Cost Factor	Weighted FTE (3)
101 Basic K-3	3.2500	1.115	3.6238
102 Basic 4-8	3.2786	1.000	3.2786
103 Basic 9-12	1.8260	1.005	1.8351
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	(.5000)	1.115	(.5575)
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	.0003	1.000	.0003
130 ESOL	(4.4503)	1.180	(5.2514)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.5698)	3.613	(2.0587)
255 ESE Support Level 5	(2.7173)	5.258	(14.2876)
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.6175)</u>	1.005	<u>(.6206)</u>
Total	<u>(.5000)</u>		<u>(14.0380)</u>

- Notes: (1) See NOTE A7.
 (2) These proposed net adjustments are for unweighted FTE. (See *SCHEDULE C*.)
 (3) Weighted adjustments to the FTE are presented for illustrative purposes only. The weighted adjustments to the 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 A5.)

SCHEDULE C

PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT

<u>No.</u> <u>Program</u>	<u>Proposed Adjustments (1)</u>		
	<u>#0091</u>	<u>#9009*</u>	<u>Total</u>
101 Basic K-3	1.9000	1.3500	3.2500
102 Basic 4-8	3.2786	3.2786
103 Basic 9-12	1.8260	1.8260
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	(.5000)	(.5000)
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	.5003	(.5000)	.0003
130 ESOL	(3.1003)	(1.3500)	(4.4503)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(2.0698)	1.5000	(.5698)
255 ESE Support Level 5	(1.7173)	(1.0000)	(2.7173)
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.6175)</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>(.6175)</u>
Total	<u>(.5000)</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(.5000)</u>

Note: (1) These proposed net adjustments are for unweighted FTE. (See NOTE A5.)

*Charter School

SCHEDULE D

FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Overview

Management is responsible for determining that the FTE student enrollment as reported under the FEFP is in compliance with State requirements. These requirements are found primarily in Sections 1011.60, 1011.61, and 1011.62, Florida Statutes; SBE Rules, Chapter 6A-1, FAC; and the *FTE General Instructions 2015-16* 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 not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located for students in Basic with ESE Services, ESOL, and ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, the Franklin County District School Board (District) complied, in all material respects, with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of the FTE student enrollment as reported under the FEFP for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016. All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed below and requires management's attention and action as presented in *SCHEDULE E*.

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Our examination included the July and October 2015 reporting survey periods and the February and June 2016 reporting survey periods (See NOTE A6.). Unless otherwise specifically stated, the Findings and Proposed Adjustments presented herein are for the October 2015 reporting survey period or the February 2016 reporting survey period or both. Accordingly, our Findings do not mention specific reporting survey periods unless necessary for a complete understanding of the instances of noncompliance being disclosed.

Franklin County School (#0091)

1. [Ref. 9171] One teacher was not properly certified to teach classes that included ELL students and was not approved by the School Board to teach such students out of field. We also noted that the parents of the students had not been notified of the teacher's out-of-field status and the teacher had earned none of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by SBE Rule 6A-6.0907, FAC, and the teacher's in-service training timeline. Since the students involved are cited in Findings 4 (Ref. 9101) and 5 (Ref. 9102), we present this disclosure finding with no proposed adjustment.

.0000

Findings

Franklin County School (#0091) (Continued)

2. [Ref. 9174] One teacher was not properly certified to teach Elementary Education to classes that included ELL students and was not approved by the School Board to teach such students out of field. The teacher held certification in Physical Education but taught courses that required certification in Elementary Education and ESOL. We also noted that the parents of the students had not been notified of the teacher’s out-of-field status. Since the students involved are cited in Findings 4 (Ref. 9101) and 5 (Ref. 9102), we present this disclosure finding with no proposed adjustment.

.0000

3. [Ref. 9110] The course schedules for several students were incorrectly reported. The School’s bell schedule supported 1,800 CMW (Grades K-5) and 1,750 CMW (Grades 6-12) and met the minimum reporting of CMW; however, the students’ course schedules were not reported in agreement with the School’s bell schedule. The students were reported for varying CMW ranging from 1,350 to 1,800 CMW. Student course schedules, which are necessary for the recalibration process to work appropriately, should reflect the correct number of CMW according to the School’s bell schedule. Since most of the students were reported within the District for the entire school year and their reported FTE was recalibrated to 1.0, this incorrect reporting does not affect their ultimate funding level. As such, we present this disclosure finding with no proposed adjustment.

.0000

4. [Ref. 9101] The files for three ELL students did not contain evidence that the students’ parents were notified of the students’ ESOL placement. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	1.0918	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.0918)</u>	.0000

5. [Ref. 9102] The files for two ELL students did not contain *ELL Student Plans* covering the 2015-16 school year. We also noted that ELL Committees were not convened by October 1 to consider the students’ continued ESOL placements beyond 3 years from the students’ DEUSS. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.4500	
102 Basic 4-8	.9000	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.3500)</u>	.0000

Findings

Franklin County School (#0091) (Continued)

6. [Ref. 9103] We noted the following exceptions involving three ESE students:
- a. The file for one student did not contain a *Matrix of Services* form to support the student’s reporting in Program No. 255 (ESE Support Level 5).
 - b. One student was not reported in accordance with the student’s *Matrix of Services* form and the student’s *IEP* (completed on February 2, 2016) did not include a signature page.
 - c. The file for one student did not contain a *Matrix of Services* form to support the student’s reporting in Program No. 254 (ESE Support Level 4) in the October 2015 reporting survey period and the *Matrix of Services* form (completed on January 5, 2016) that covered the February 2016 reporting survey period was incomplete as it did not indicate the specific services to be provided under Domain C.

We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.2173	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	1.0000	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	.5000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(1.0000)	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.7173)</u>	.0000

7. [Ref. 9104] School records did not evidence that one ESE student was in attendance during the February 2016 reporting survey period. According to the software used by the District, Focus School Software, a customized Web-based system for student scheduling and recordkeeping, the attendance code for all 11 days of the reporting survey period indicated that attendance was not submitted for this student by the teacher. We propose the following adjustment:

255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.5000)</u>	(.5000)
-------------------------	----------------	---------

8. [Ref. 9105] The *Matrix of Services (Matrix)* forms in two ESE students’ files did not evidence review. Although School management subsequently provided us with other *Matrix* forms obtained from the teachers’ files that indicated review dates, we noted that the *Matrix* form for one student had information that conflicted with the *Matrix* form in the student’s file, and the *Matrix* form for the other student was reviewed prior to the student’s *IEP* that covered the February 2016 reporting survey period. Consequently, we could not determine that valid *Matrix* forms were completed. We propose the following adjustment:

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Franklin County School (#0091) (Continued)

112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	.5003	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	.5000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.5003)	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.5000)</u>	.0000

9. [Ref. 9106] The *IEP* (completed on January 27, 2015) for one ESE student did not include a signature page and the subsequent *IEP* was not completed until March 4, 2016, which was after the February 2016 reporting survey period. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	1.0000	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	<u>(1.0000)</u>	.0000

10. [Ref. 9107] The files for two ESE students did not contain *IEPs* covering the 2015-16 school year. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	1.0000	
102 Basic 4-8	1.0000	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	(1.0000)	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	<u>(1.0000)</u>	.0000

11. [Ref. 9108] 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	.5000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(.5000)</u>	.0000

12. [Ref. 9172/76] Two teachers were not properly certified to teach classes with ELL students and were not approved by the School Board to teach such students out of field. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teachers' out-of-field status and one of the teachers (Ref. 9176) had earned only 30 of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by SBE Rule 6A-6.0907, FAC, and the teacher's in-service training timeline. We propose the following adjustments:

<u>Ref. 9172</u>		
103 Basic 9-12	.2085	
130 ESOL	<u>(.2085)</u>	.0000
 <u>Ref. 9176</u>		
101 Basic K-3	.4500	
130 ESOL	<u>(.4500)</u>	.0000

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Franklin County School (#0091) (Continued)

13. [Ref. 9173/75] Two teachers were not properly certified and were not approved by the School Board to teach out of field. Specifically, we noted that:

- a. For one teacher (Ref. 9173), who was the teacher of record for a dual-enrolled course taught online through Embry-Riddle, we determined the teacher was a facilitator of the course and not the actual teacher of the course. Since we could not determine who actually taught the course, we were unable to determine whether the teacher was properly certified to teach the course.
- b. One teacher (Ref. 9175) held certification in Biology but taught a course that required certification in Music. We also noted that the parents of the student taught by this teacher were not notified of the teacher’s out-of-field status.

We propose the following adjustments:

<u>Ref. 9173</u>		
103 Basic 9-12	.6175	
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.6175)</u>	.0000
<u>Ref. 9175</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	.0695	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(.0695)</u>	.0000
		<u>(.5000)</u>

Apalachicola Bay Charter School (#9009)

14. [Ref. 900902] Two ESE students were not reported in accordance with the students’ *Matrix of Services* forms. We propose the following adjustment:

112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	(.5000)	
254 ESE Support Level 4	1.5000	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(1.0000)</u>	.0000

15. [Ref. 900903] The *ELL Student Plan* for one student was not prepared until October 21, 2015, which was after the October 2015 reporting survey period. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.4500	
130 ESOL	<u>(.4500)</u>	.0000

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Apalachicola Bay Charter School (#9009) (Continued)

16. [Ref. 900904] The file for one student did not contain documentation to support the student's ESOL placement. The 1st-grade student was assessed as an FES in the prior school year and an ELL Committee was not convened to consider the student's continued ESOL placement. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.9000	
130 ESOL	<u>(.9000)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>.0000</u>
Proposed Net Adjustment		<u>(.5000)</u>

SCHEDULE E

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that Franklin County District School Board (District) management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) only students who are in membership and are documented as being in attendance at least 1 day during the 11-day reporting survey period are reported for FEFP funding; (2) parents are timely notified of their children's ESOL placements; (3) ELL Committees are convened for students being considered for continuation of their ESOL placements (beyond the 3-year base period) by October 1 if the students' DEUSS falls within the first 2 weeks of the school year or within 30 school days prior to the students' DEUSS anniversary dates; (4) *IEPs*, *Matrix of Services* forms, and *ELL Student Plans* are complete and timely prepared; (5) students assessed as FES also have an ELL Committee convened that documents the need for such continued placement; (6) ESE students are reported in accordance with the students' *Matrix of Services* forms; (7) there is evidence of review of the *Matrix of Services* forms to ensure that the forms accurately and currently reflect the *IEP* services in effect during the reporting survey period; (8) teachers are appropriately certified or, if teaching out of field, are timely approved by the School Board to teach out of field; (9) parents are timely and appropriately notified of teachers' out-of-field status; (10) teachers of ELL students earn the number of in-service training points required by SBE Rule 6A-6.0907, FAC, and the teachers' in-service training timelines; (11) only the actual teacher who teaches the course is the reported teacher of record; and (12) students are reported for the instructional time that is provided and in agreement with school's bell schedule.

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 relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of the FTE student enrollment as reported under the FEFP.

REGULATORY CITATIONS

Reporting

Section 1007.271(21), Florida Statutes, *Dual Enrollment Programs*

Section 1011.60, Florida Statutes, *Minimum Requirements of the Florida Education Finance Program*

Section 1011.61, Florida Statutes, *Definitions*

Section 1011.62, Florida Statutes, *Funds for Operation of Schools*

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

SBE Rule 6A-1.045111, FAC, *Hourly Equivalent to 180-Day School Year*

SBE Rule 6A-1.04513, FAC, *Maintaining Auditable FTE Records*

FTE General Instructions 2015-16

Attendance

Section 1003.23, Florida Statutes, *Attendance Records and Reports*

SBE Rule 6A-1.044(3) and (6)(c), FAC, *Pupil Attendance Records*

SBE Rule 6A-1.04513, FAC, *Maintaining Auditable FTE Records*

FTE General Instructions 2015-16

Comprehensive Management Information System: Automated Student Attendance Recordkeeping System Handbook

ESOL

Section 1003.56, Florida Statutes, *English Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient Students*

Section 1011.62(1)(g), Florida Statutes, *Education for Speakers of Other Languages*

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

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

SBE Rule 6A-6.09021, FAC, *Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment for English Language Learners (ELLs)*

SBE Rule 6A-6.09022, FAC, *Extension of Services in English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Program*

SBE Rule 6A-6.0903, FAC, *Requirements for Exiting English Language Learners from the English for Speakers of Other Languages Program*

SBE Rule 6A-6.09031, FAC, *Post Reclassification of English Language Learners (ELLs)*

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

Career Education On-The-Job Attendance

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

Career Education On-The-Job Funding Hours

FTE General Instructions 2015-16

Exceptional Education

Section 1003.57, Florida Statutes, *Exceptional Students Instruction*

Section 1011.62, Florida Statutes, *Funds for Operation of Schools*

Section 1011.62(1)(e), Florida Statutes, *Funding Model for Exceptional Student Education Programs*

SBE Rule 6A-6.03028, FAC, *Provision of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) and Development of Individual Educational Plans for Students with Disabilities*

SBE Rule 6A-6.03029, FAC, *Development of Individualized Family Support Plans for Children with Disabilities Ages Birth Through Five Years*

SBE Rule 6A-6.0312, FAC, *Course Modifications for Exceptional Students*

SBE Rule 6A-6.0331, FAC, *General Education Intervention Procedures, Evaluation, Determination of Eligibility, Reevaluation and the Provision of Exceptional Student Education Services*

SBE Rule 6A-6.0334, FAC, *Individual Educational Plans (IEPs) and Educational Plans (EPs) for Transferring Exceptional Students*

SBE Rule 6A-6.03411, FAC, *Definitions, ESE Policies and Procedures, and ESE Administrators*

SBE Rule 6A-6.0361, FAC, *Contractual Agreements with Nonpublic Schools and Residential Facilities Matrix of Services Handbook (2015 Edition)*

Teacher Certification

Section 1012.42(2), Florida Statutes, *Teacher Teaching Out-of-Field; Notification Requirements*

Section 1012.55, Florida Statutes, *Positions for Which Certificates Required*

SBE Rule 6A-1.0502, FAC, *Non-certificated Instructional Personnel*

SBE Rule 6A-1.0503, FAC, *Definition of Qualified Instructional Personnel*

SBE Rule 6A-4.001, FAC, *Instructional Personnel Certification*

SBE Rule 6A-6.0907, FAC, *Inservice Requirements for Personnel of Limited English Proficient Students*

Virtual Education

Section 1002.321, Florida Statutes, *Digital Learning*

Section 1002.37, Florida Statutes, *The Florida Virtual School*

Section 1002.45, Florida Statutes, *Virtual Instruction Programs*

Section 1002.455, Florida Statutes, *Student Eligibility for K-12 Virtual Instruction*

Section 1003.498, Florida Statutes, *School District Virtual Course Offerings*

Charter Schools

Section 1002.33, Florida Statutes, *Charter Schools*

NOTES TO SCHEDULES

<p style="text-align: center;">NOTE A – SUMMARY FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT</p>

A summary discussion of the significant features of the Franklin County District School Board (District), the FEFP, the FTE, and related areas is described below.

1. The District

The District was established pursuant to Section 1001.30, Florida Statutes, to provide public educational services for the residents of Franklin County, Florida. Those services are provided primarily to PK through 12th-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 SBE. The geographic boundaries of the District are those of Franklin 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. The District had one school other than a charter school and one charter school serving PK through 12th-grade students. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016, State funding totaling \$769,859 was provided through the FEFP to the District for the District-reported 1,239.51 unweighted FTE as recalibrated, which included 339.13 unweighted FTE as recalibrated for the charter school. The primary sources of funding for the District are funds from the FEFP, local ad valorem taxes, and Federal grants and donations.

2. FEFP

Florida school districts receive State funding through the FEFP to serve PK through 12th-grade students (adult education is not funded by the FEFP). The FEFP was established by the Florida Legislature in 1973 to guarantee to each student in the Florida public school system, including charter schools, the availability of programs and services appropriate to the student's educational needs that 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.

3. FTE Student Enrollment

The funding provided by the FEFP is based on 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 student enrollment. For example, for PK through 3rd grade, 1.0 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 4 through 12, 1.0 FTE is defined as one student in membership in a program or a group of programs for 25 hours per week for 180 days. For brick and mortar school students, one student would be reported as 1.0 FTE if the student was enrolled in six courses per day at 50 minutes per course for the full 180-day school year (i.e., six courses at 50 minutes each per day is

5 hours of class a day or 25 hours per week, which equates to 1.0 FTE). For virtual education students, one student would be reported as 1.0 FTE if the student has successfully completed six courses or credits or the prescribed level of content that counts toward promotion to the next grade. A student who completes less than six credits will be reported as a fraction of an FTE. Half-credit completions will be included in determining an FTE student enrollment. Credits completed by a student in excess of the minimum required for that student for graduation are not eligible for funding.

4. Recalibration of FTE to 1.0

All FTE student enrollment is capped at 1.0 FTE except for the FTE student enrollment reported by the Department of Juvenile Justice for students beyond the 180-day school year. School districts report all FTE student enrollment regardless of the 1.0 FTE cap. The Department of Education combines all FTE student enrollment reported for the student by all school districts, including the Florida Virtual School Part-Time Program, using a common student identifier. The Department of Education then recalibrates all reported FTE student enrollment for each student to 1.0 FTE, if the total reported FTE for the student exceeds 1.0 FTE. The FTE student enrollment reported for extended school year periods and the Department of Juvenile Justice FTE student enrollment reported beyond the 180-day school year is not included in the recalibration to 1.0 FTE.

5. 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 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.

6. FTE Reporting Survey Periods

The FTE is determined and reported during the school year by means of four FTE membership survey periods that are conducted under the direction of district and school management. Each survey period is a testing of the FTE membership for a period of 1 week. The survey periods for the 2015-16 school year were conducted during and for the following weeks: survey period one was performed for July 6 through 10, 2015; survey period two was performed for October 12 through 16, 2015; survey period three was performed for February 8 through 12, 2016; and survey period four was performed for June 13 through 17, 2016.

7. Educational Programs

The 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: (1) Basic, (2) ESOL, (3) ESE, and (4) Career Education 9-12.

8. Statutes and Rules

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

Chapter 1000, Florida Statutes, *K-20 General Provisions*

Chapter 1001, Florida Statutes, *K-20 Governance*

Chapter 1002, Florida Statutes, *Student and Parental Rights and Educational Choices*

Chapter 1003, Florida Statutes, *Public K-12 Education*

Chapter 1006, Florida Statutes, *Support for Learning*

Chapter 1007, Florida Statutes, *Articulation and Access*

Chapter 1010, Florida Statutes, *Financial Matters*

Chapter 1011, Florida Statutes, *Planning and Budgeting*

Chapter 1012, Florida Statutes, *Personnel*

SBE Rules, Chapter 6A-1, FAC, *Finance and Administration*

SBE Rules, Chapter 6A-4, FAC, *Certification*

SBE Rules, Chapter 6A-6, FAC, *Special Programs I*

NOTE B – TESTING FTE STUDENT ENROLLMENT
--

Our examination procedures for testing provided for the selection of schools, students, and teachers using judgmental methods for testing the FTE student enrollment as reported under the FEFP to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016. Our testing process was designed to facilitate the performance of appropriate examination procedures to test the District's compliance with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of the FTE student enrollment as reported under the FEFP. The following schools were selected for testing:

<u>School</u>	<u>Findings</u>
1. Franklin County School	1 through 13
2. Apalachicola Bay Charter School*	14 through 16

* Charter School



Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Auditor General

AUDITOR GENERAL STATE OF FLORIDA

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



Phone: (850) 412-2722
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

Report on Student Transportation

We have examined the Franklin County District School Board's (District's) compliance with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of student transportation as reported under the Florida Education Finance Program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016. 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 2015-16* issued by the Department of Education.

Management's Responsibility for Compliance

District management is responsible for the District's compliance with the aforementioned State requirements, including the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control to prevent, or detect and correct, noncompliance due to fraud or error.

Auditor's Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the District's compliance with State requirements based on our examination. Our examination was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and the standards applicable to attestation engagements contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the examination to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the classification, assignment, and verification of student transportation reported by the District under the Florida Education Finance Program complied with State requirements in all material respects.

An examination involves performing procedures to obtain evidence about whether the District complied with State requirements. The nature, timing, and extent of the procedures selected depend on our judgment, including an assessment of the risks of material noncompliance, whether due to fraud or error. We believe that the evidence we obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a reasonable basis for

our opinion. Our examination does not provide a legal determination on the District's compliance with State requirements. The legal determination of the District's compliance with these requirements is, however, ultimately the responsibility of the Department of Education.

Opinion

Our examination disclosed material noncompliance with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of student transportation as reported under the FEFP involving the students' reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding.

In our opinion, except for the material noncompliance with State requirements described in the preceding paragraph involving the students' reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding, the Franklin County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of student transportation as reported under the Florida Education Finance Program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016.

Other Reporting Required by *Government Auditing Standards*

In accordance with attestation standards established by *Government Auditing Standards*, we are required to report all deficiencies that are considered to be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses⁶ in internal control; fraud and noncompliance with provisions of laws or regulations that have a material effect on the District's compliance with State requirements; and any other instances that warrant the attention of those charged with governance; noncompliance with provisions of contracts or grant agreements that has a material effect on the District's compliance with State requirements; and abuse that has a material effect on the District's compliance with State requirements. We are also required to obtain and report the views of responsible officials concerning the findings, conclusions, and recommendations, as well as any planned corrective actions.

We performed our examination to express an opinion on the District's compliance with State requirements and not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the District's related internal control over compliance with State requirements; accordingly, we express no such opinion. Because of its limited purpose, our examination would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. However, the material noncompliance mentioned above is indicative of significant deficiencies considered to be material weaknesses in the District's internal controls related to students' reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding. Our examination disclosed certain findings that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards* and all findings, along with the views of responsible officials, are described in *SCHEDULE G* and *MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE*, respectively. The impact of this noncompliance with State requirements on the District's reported student transportation is presented in *SCHEDULES F* and *G*.

⁶ A significant deficiency is a deficiency or a combination of deficiencies in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance. A material weakness is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis.

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

Purpose of this Report

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 American Institute of Certified Public Accountants require us to indicate that the purpose of this report is to provide an opinion on the District's compliance with State requirements. Accordingly, this communication is not suitable for any other purpose.

Respectfully submitted,



Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Tallahassee, Florida
April 20, 2017

SCHEDULE F

POPULATIONS, TEST SELECTION, AND TEST RESULTS STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

Any student who is transported by the Franklin County District School Board (District) must meet one or more of the following conditions in order to be eligible for State transportation funding: live 2 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(2), Florida Statutes. (See NOTE A1.)

As part of our examination procedures, we tested student transportation as reported to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016. (See NOTE B.) The population of vehicles (41) consisted of the total number of vehicles (buses, vans, or passenger cars) reported by the District for each reporting survey period. For example, a vehicle that transported students during the July and October 2015 and February and June 2016 reporting survey periods would be counted in the population as four vehicles. Similarly, the population of students (1,702) consisted of the total number of students reported by the District as having been transported for each reporting survey period. (See NOTE A2.) The District reported students in the following ridership categories:

<u>Ridership Category</u>	<u>Number of Students Transported</u>
IDEA – PK through Grade 12, Weighted	17
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>1,685</u>
Total	<u>1,702</u>

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 in our error-rate determination.

We noted the following material noncompliance: exceptions involving the reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding for 83 of 205 students in our student transportation test.⁷

⁷ For student transportation, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9 on SCHEDULE G.

Our examination results are summarized below:

<u>Description</u>	<u>Buses</u>	<u>Students</u>	
	<u>Proposed Net Adjustment</u>	<u>With Exceptions</u>	<u>Proposed Net Adjustment</u>
We noted that the reported number of buses in operation was overstated.	(8)	-	-
Our tests included 205 of the 1,702 students reported as being transported by the District.	-	83	(79)
In conjunction with our general tests of student transportation we identified certain issues related to 393 additional students.	-	<u>393</u>	<u>(392)</u>
Total	<u>(8)</u>	<u>476</u>	<u>(471)</u>

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.

SCHEDULE G

FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

Overview

Management is responsible for determining that student transportation as reported under the FEFP is in compliance with State requirements. These requirements are found primarily in Chapter 1006, Part I, E. and Section 1011.68, Florida Statutes; SBE Rules, Chapter 6A-3, FAC; and the *Student Transportation General Instructions 2015-16* issued by the Department of Education. Except for the material noncompliance involving the students' reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding, the Franklin County District School Board (District) complied, in all material respects, with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of student transportation as reported under the FEFP for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016. All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed below and requires management's attention and action as presented in *SCHEDULE H*.

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 period. Our detailed tests involved verification of the specific ridership categories reported for students in our tests from the July and October 2015 reporting survey periods and the February and June 2016 reporting survey periods. Adjusted students who were in more than one reporting survey period are accounted for by reporting survey period. For example, a student included in our tests twice (i.e., once for the October 2015 reporting survey period and once for the February 2016 reporting survey period) will be presented in our Findings as two test students.

1. [Ref. 51] Our general tests disclosed that five students (four students were in our test) were incorrectly reported in the IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted ridership category. The students were transported by privately owned passenger vehicles and as such were not eligible to be reported in a weighted ridership category. Additionally, there were no school attendance records for one of the students during the June 2016 reporting survey period to support that the student was in membership and thus eligible for student transportation funding. We determined that the remaining four students were otherwise eligible for reporting in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category. We propose the following adjustments:

<u>Findings</u>	<u>Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments</u>
October 2015 Survey	
<u>90 Days in Term</u>	
IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(1)
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	1
February 2016 Survey	
<u>90 Days in Term</u>	
IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(3)
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	3
June 2016 Survey	
<u>90 Days in Term</u>	
IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(1)
	(1)
2. [Ref. 52] Our general tests disclosed that 27 PK students (3 students were in our test) were incorrectly reported in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category. The students were not IDEA students and were not children of students enrolled in a Teenage Parent Program; consequently, the students were not eligible for State transportation funding. We also noted that 1 of the students was not listed on the bus driver's report. We propose the following adjustments:	
October 2015 Survey	
<u>90 Days in Term</u>	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(13)
February 2016 Survey	
<u>90 Days in Term</u>	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(14)
	(27)
3. [Ref. 53] Our general tests disclosed that 30 students (4 students were in our test) were not listed on the supporting bus drivers' reports. Consequently, we could not validate that the students were provided transportation. We propose the following adjustments:	
October 2015 Survey	
<u>90 Days in Term</u>	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(22)
February 2016 Survey	
<u>90 Days in Term</u>	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(8)
	(30)

Findings

4. [Ref. 54] The individual bus driver’s reports for eight bus drivers were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located; consequently, we were unable to verify the ridership of the 328 students (39 students were in our test) reported on these buses. We propose the following adjustments:

October 2015 Survey

Number of Buses in Operation (3)

90 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted (4)

All Other FEFP Eligible Students (102)

February 2016 Survey

Number of Buses in Operation (5)

(8)

90 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted (4)

All Other FEFP Eligible Students (218) (328)

5. [Ref. 55] We noted exceptions for 16 students in the June 2016 reporting survey period (14 students were in our test). Thirteen of the students were attending 3rd-grade Reading camp and were not eligible for State transportation funding and three students were reported on a bus driver’s report on which the days of ridership were not indicated. We also noted that all 16 students were incorrectly reported for 90 rather than 12 days in term. We propose the following adjustment:

June 2016 Survey

90 Days in Term

All Other FEFP Eligible Students (16) (16)

6. [Ref. 56] Our general tests disclosed that 51 students attending the Apalachicola Bay Charter School were incorrectly reported in the All Other FEFP Eligible students ridership category. The students lived less than 2 miles from school and were not otherwise eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustments:

October 2015 Survey

90 Days in Term

All Other FEFP Eligible Students (27)

<u>Findings</u>	<u>Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments</u>
February 2016 Survey	
<u>90 Days in Term</u>	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(24) (51)
7. [Ref. 57] Seven students in our test were incorrectly reported in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category. The students lived less than 2 miles from their assigned schools and were not otherwise eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustments:	
October 2015 Survey	
<u>90 Days in Term</u>	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(5)
February 2016 Survey	
<u>90 Days in Term</u>	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(2) (7)
8. [Ref. 58] Eleven students in our test were not marked as riding the bus during the reporting survey periods. Additionally, 2 of the students lived less than 2 miles from the students' assigned school and were not otherwise eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustments:	
October 2015 Survey	
<u>90 Days in Term</u>	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(4)
February 2016 Survey	
<u>90 Days in Term</u>	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(7) (11)
9. [Ref. 59] The <i>IEP</i> for one student in our test did not document that the student met at least one of the five criteria required for reporting in the IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted ridership category. We determined that the student was eligible for reporting in the All Others FEFP Eligible Students ridership category. We propose the following adjustment:	
October 2015 Survey	
<u>90 Days in Term</u>	
IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(1)
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>1</u> <u>0</u>
Proposed Net Adjustment	<u>(471)</u>

SCHEDULE H

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that Franklin County District School Board (District) management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) the number of buses in operation and the number of days in term are accurately reported and documentation is retained to support the ridership of the students on these buses; (2) only those students who are documented as enrolled in school and recorded on bus driver reports as having been transported by the District at least 1 day during the reporting survey period are reported for State transportation funding; (3) only students attending Department of Juvenile Justice or extended school year or ESE Programs are reported for State transportation funding in the summer reporting survey periods; (4) students reported in the IDEA – PK through Grade 12, Weighted ridership category are documented as meeting one of the five criteria required for reporting in a weighted ridership category as noted on the students' *IEPs*; (5) the distance from home to school is verified as being 2 miles or more prior to students being reported in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category; (6) only PK students who are classified as IDEA students or are PK students whose parents are enrolled in a Teenage Parent Program are reported for State transportation funding; and (7) students transported by passenger cars are not reported in the IDEA – PK through Grade 12, Weighted ridership category.

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 relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of student transportation as reported under the FEFP.

REGULATORY CITATIONS

Section 1002.33, Florida Statutes, *Charter Schools*
Chapter 1006, Part I, E., Florida Statutes, *Transportation of Public K-12 Students*
Section 1011.68, Florida Statutes, *Funds for Student Transportation*
SBE Rules, Chapter 6A-3, FAC, *Transportation*
Student Transportation General Instructions 2015-16

NOTES TO SCHEDULES

NOTE A - SUMMARY STUDENT TRANSPORTATION
--

A summary discussion of the significant features of student transportation and related areas is described below:

1. Student Eligibility

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 2 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(2), Florida Statutes.

2. Transportation in Franklin County

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016, the District received \$348,279 for student transportation as part of the State funding through the FEFP. The District's student transportation reported by survey period was as follows:

<u>Survey Period</u>	<u>Number of Vehicles</u>	<u>Number of Students</u>
July 2015	0	0
October 2015	19	857
February 2016	17	828
June 2016	<u>5</u>	<u>17</u>
Totals	<u>41</u>	<u>1,702</u>

3. Statutes and Rules

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

Section 1002.33, Florida Statutes, *Charter Schools*

Chapter 1006, Part I, E., Florida Statutes, *Transportation of Public K-12 Students*

Section 1011.68, Florida Statutes, *Funds for Student Transportation*

SBE Rules, Chapter 6A-3, FAC, *Transportation*

NOTE B – TESTING STUDENT TRANSPORTATION
--

Our examination procedures for testing provided for the selection of students using judgmental methods for testing student transportation as reported to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016. Our testing process was designed to facilitate the performance of appropriate examination procedures to test the District's compliance with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of student transportation as reported under the FEFP.

MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE



Franklin County District Schools

85 School Rd., Suite 1
Eastpoint, FL 32328

Superintendent Traci Moses
tramoses@franklin.k12.fl.us
(850)670-2810 ex. 4111
April 20, 2017

Ms. Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Auditor General

Dear Ms. Norman,

Please accept this letter in response to the Auditor General's Preliminary and Tentative report of Franklin County District School Board on March 27, 2017.

Full-Time Equivalent Student Enrollment:

The District agrees with findings 1-16.

The district will continue to do collaborative work between departments and district staff to ensure greater accuracy and future compliance.

Student Transportation:

The Transportation Department agrees with findings 1-9.

The district is currently reviewing current practices and procedures will be created regarding reporting FEFP transportation data to the state. District staff will be retrained on attendance collections, transportation program qualifiers for FEFP, and proper documentation maintenance. A multi-tiered verification process will be completed before the submission of transportation survey data to ensure accurate student transportation and bus reporting.

Per recommendations from this audit and to comply with all State requirements governing both student FTE and student transportation, the District will exercise more care to review procedures and train staff to prevent future errors in reporting.

Sincerely,

Traci Moses,
Superintendent

DISTRICT 1
GEORGE THOMPSON

DISTRICT 2
PAM MARSHALL

DISTRICT 3
TERESA ANN MARTIN

DISTRICT 4
STACY KIRVIN

DISTRICT 5
CARL WHALEY

The Franklin County School District does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, age, disability, pregnancy or marital status in its educational programs, services or activities, or in its hiring or employment practices. The district also provides equal access to its facilities to the Boy Scouts and other patriotic youth groups, as required by the Boy Scouts of America Equal Access Act. Questions, complaints or request for additional information regarding discrimination or harassment may be sent to: Karen Peddie, Director of Human Resources, 85 School Road, Eastpoint, Florida 32328 850-670-2810 X 4101, kpeddie@franklin.k12.fl.us