

**HENDRY 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, Paul K. Puletti served as Superintendent and the following individuals served as Board members:

<u>Board Member</u>	<u>District No.</u>
Dwayne E. Brown, Chair to 11-16-15	1
Dr. Sally Berg, Chair from 11-17-15, Vice Chair to 11-16-15	2
John Benkert	3
Stephanie Busin	4
Jon Basquin, Vice Chair from 11-17-15	5

The team leader was Olukemi T. Latilo, 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](mailto: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:

[FLAuditor.gov](http://FLAuditor.gov)

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**

**HENDRY COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD**  
**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Page  
No.

SUMMARY .....	i
<b>INDEPENDENT AUDITOR’S REPORT ON FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT .....</b>	<b>1</b>
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.....	9
Findings.....	9
SCHEDULE E – RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS .....	15
NOTES TO SCHEDULES.....	18
<b>INDEPENDENT AUDITOR’S REPORT ON STUDENT TRANSPORTATION .....</b>	<b>21</b>
SCHEDULE F – POPULATIONS, TEST SELECTION, AND TEST RESULTS.....	24
SCHEDULE G – FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS	
Overview.....	26
Findings.....	26
SCHEDULE H – RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS.....	30
NOTES TO SCHEDULES.....	31
MANAGEMENT’S RESPONSE .....	32

# HENDRY COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CMW	Class Minutes, Weekly
DEUSS	Date Entered United States School
DIT	Days in Term
ELL	English Language Learner
ESE	Exceptional Student Education
ESOL	English for Speakers of Other Languages
FAC	Florida Administrative Code
FEFP	Florida Education Finance Program
FTE	Full-Time Equivalent
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IEP	Individual Educational Plan
OJT	On-the-Job Training
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 ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, Career Education 9-12, and student transportation, the Hendry 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 8 of the 64 teachers in our test. The District did not report any charter schools; therefore, none of the teachers included in our test taught at charter schools.
- 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 12 of the 34 students in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 test, and all of the 16 students in our Career Education 9-12 test.
- Exceptions involving the reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding for 76 of the 309 students in our student transportation test.

Noncompliance related to the reported FTE student enrollment resulted in 19 findings. The resulting proposed net adjustment to the District's reported, unweighted FTE totaled negative 2.6556 but has a potential impact on the District's weighted FTE of negative 7.2939. Noncompliance related to student transportation resulted in 7 findings and a proposed net adjustment of negative 223 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 \$30,302 (negative 7.2939 times \$4,154.45).

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 Hendry County, Florida. Those services are provided primarily to PK through 12<sup>th</sup>-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 Hendry 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 12 schools other than charter schools, 1 cost center, and 2 virtual education cost centers serving PK through 12<sup>th</sup>-grade students. The District did not report any charter schools.

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016, State funding totaling \$32.1 million was provided through the FEFP to the District for the District-reported 7,110.71 unweighted FTE as recalibrated. 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 12<sup>th</sup>-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 \$1.4 million 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 Hendry 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.

An examination by its nature does not include a review of all records and actions of District management and staff and, as a consequence, cannot be relied upon to identify all instances of noncompliance, fraud, abuse, or inefficiency. Because of these limitations and the inherent limitations of internal control, an unavoidable risk exists that some material noncompliance may not be detected, even though the examination is properly planned and performed in accordance with attestation standards.

### ***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 Exceptional Student Education Support Levels 4 and 5, and Career Education 9-12 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 Exceptional Student Education Support Levels 4 and 5, and Career Education 9-12, the Hendry 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 weaknesses<sup>1</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

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 located for students in Exceptional Student Education Support Levels 4 and 5, and Career Education 9-12. 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  
September 27, 2017

# SCHEDULE A

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

### Reported FTE Student Enrollment

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 Hendry County District School Board (District) reported to the Department of Education 7,110.71 unweighted FTE as recalibrated at 12 District schools, 1 cost center, and 2 virtual education cost centers. The District did not report any charter schools.

### 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 (15) consisted of the total number of brick and mortar schools and cost centers in the District that offered courses as well as the virtual education cost centers in the District that offered virtual instruction in the FEFP-funded programs. The population of students (3,671) consisted of the total number of students in each program at the schools and cost centers in our tests. Our Career Education 9-12 student test data includes only those students who participated in OJT.

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 12 of the 34 students in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 test,<sup>2</sup> and all of the 16 students in our Career Education 9-12 test.<sup>3</sup>

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	15	7	2,734	57	3	5,065.9300	44.8470	14.3378
Basic with ESE Services	13	5	541	34	2	1,178.4400	28.9463	(.5899)
ESOL	10	4	338	91	9	630.7200	62.7370	(11.9602)
ESE Support Levels 4 and 5	11	5	41	34	12	18.3800	8.9880	(.5287)
Career Education 9-12	4	1	<u>17</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>217.2400</u>	<u>2.1124</u>	<u>(3.9146)</u>
All Programs	15	7	<u>3,671</u>	<u>232</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>7,110.7100</u>	<u>147.6307</u>	<u>(2.6556)</u>

<sup>2</sup> For ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 3, 12, 16, 17, and 18 on *SCHEDULE D*.

<sup>3</sup> For Career Education 9-12, the material noncompliance is described in Finding 13 on *SCHEDULE D*.

## **Teachers**

We also tested teacher qualifications as part of our examination procedures. (See NOTE B.) Specifically, the population of teachers (199) 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, and of the total number of teachers reported under virtual education cost centers in our test who taught courses in Basic, Basic with ESE Services, 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 8 of the 64 teachers in our test.<sup>4</sup>

## **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.

---

<sup>4</sup> For teachers, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, and 15 on *SCHEDULE D.*

## SCHEDULE B

---

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

<u>No. Program (1)</u>	<u>Proposed Net Adjustment (2)</u>	<u>Cost Factor</u>	<u>Weighted FTE (3)</u>
101 Basic K-3	3.9606	1.115	4.4161
102 Basic 4-8	7.6394	1.000	7.6394
103 Basic 9-12	2.7378	1.005	2.7515
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.0500	1.115	.0558
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	(.8399)	1.000	(.8399)
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	.2000	1.005	.2010
130 ESOL	(11.9602)	1.180	(14.1130)
254 ESE Support Level 4	.4199	3.613	1.5171
255 ESE Support Level 5	(.9486)	5.258	(4.9877)
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(3.9146)</u>	1.005	<u>(3.9342)</u>
Total	<u>(2.6556)</u>		<u>(7.2939)</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>Balance Forward</u>
	<u>#0020</u>	<u>#0161</u>	<u>#0191</u>	
101 Basic K-3	.....	1.6128	2.3478	3.9606
102 Basic 4-8	1.9804	5.6590	.....	7.6394
103 Basic 9-12	.....	.....	.....	.0000
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.....	.....	.....	.0000
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	(.9999)	.....	.....	(.9999)
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	.....	.....	.....	.0000
130 ESOL	(1.9804)	(7.2718)	(2.3478)	(11.6000)
254 ESE Support Level 4	.4999	.....	.....	.4999
255 ESE Support Level 5	.5000	.....	.....	.5000
300 Career Education 9-12	.....	.....	.....	.0000
Total	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>

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

<u>No.</u>	<u>Brought Forward</u>	<u>Proposed Adjustments (1)</u>			<u>Total</u>
		<u>#0201</u>	<u>#5201</u>	<u>#7004</u>	
101	3.9606	.....	.....	.....	3.9606
102	7.6394	.....	.....	.....	7.6394
103	.0000	2.7710	.....	(.0332)	2.7378
111	.0000	.....	.0500	.....	.0500
112	(.9999)	.....	.1600	.....	(.8399)
113	.0000	.....	.2000	.....	.2000
130	(11.6000)	(.3602)	.....	.....	(11.9602)
254	.4999	.....	(.0800)	.....	.4199
255	.5000	(.6086)	(.8400)	.....	(.9486)
300	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(3.9146)</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>(3.9146)</u>
Total	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(2.1124)</u>	<u>(.5100)</u>	<u>(.0332)</u>	<u>(2.6556)</u>

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

# 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 ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, and Career Education 9-12, the Hendry 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*.

### Findings

**Proposed Net  
Adjustments  
(Unweighted FTE)**

*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, 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.*

### LaBelle Middle School (#0020)

1. [Ref. 2002] The English language proficiencies of two ELL students were not assessed and ELL Committees were not convened within 30 school days prior to the students’ DEUSS anniversary dates to consider the students’ continued ESOL placements beyond 3 years from the students’ DEUSS. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.5671	
130 ESOL	<u>(.5671)</u>	.0000

2. [Ref. 2003] The *ELL Student Plan* for one ELL student was not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.2692	
130 ESOL	<u>(.2692)</u>	.0000

**Proposed Net  
Adjustments  
(Unweighted FTE)**

**Findings**

**LaBelle Middle School (#0020)** (Continued)

3. [Ref. 2004] Three 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	(.9999)	
254 ESE Support Level 4	.4999	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>.5000</u>	.0000

4. [Ref. 2070] The parents of students taught by one out-of-field teacher were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status in English. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	1.1441	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.1441)</u>	.0000
		<u>.0000</u>

**Westside Elementary School (#0161)**

5. [Ref. 16102] The English language proficiencies of four ELL students were not assessed and ELL Committees were not convened for two of the students within 30 school days prior to the students' DEUSS anniversary dates to consider the students' continued ESOL placements beyond 3 years from the students' DEUSS. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	1.6128	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.6128)</u>	.0000

6. [Ref. 16103] School records did not demonstrate that one ELL student's parents were notified of the student's ESOL placement. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.8064	
130 ESOL	<u>(.8064)</u>	.0000

7. [Ref. 16171] The parents of students taught by one out-of-field teacher were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status in Elementary Education. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	2.4192	
130 ESOL	<u>(2.4192)</u>	.0000

**Findings**

**Westside Elementary School (#0161)** (Continued)

8. [Ref. 16172] One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by the School Board to teach out of field. The teacher held certification in Speech but taught courses that required certification in Elementary Education. We also noted that the students' parents were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.8206	
130 ESOL	<u>(.8206)</u>	.0000

9. [Ref. 16173] One teacher taught Basic subject areas and Primary Language Arts to classes that included ELL students but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by SBE Rules 6A-6.0907 and 6A-1.0503(4)(b)2., FAC, and the teacher's in-service training timeline. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	1.6128	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.6128)</u>	.0000
		<u>.0000</u>

**Country Oaks Elementary School (#0191)**

10. [Ref. 19170] One teacher did not hold a valid Florida teaching certificate during the reporting survey periods and was not otherwise qualified to teach. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	2.3478	
130 ESOL	<u>(2.3478)</u>	.0000
		<u>.0000</u>

**Clewiston High School (#0201)**

11. [Ref. 20102] One ELL student's English language proficiency was not assessed and an ELL Committee was not convened within 30 school days prior to the student's DEUSS anniversary date to consider the student's continued ESOL placement beyond 3 years from the student's DEUSS. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.2890	
130 ESOL	<u>(.2890)</u>	.0000

**Proposed Net  
Adjustments  
(Unweighted FTE)**

**Findings**

**Clewiston High School (#0201)** (Continued)

12. [Ref. 20103] One ESE student was incorrectly reported in Program No. 255 (ESE Support Level 5) based on the student’s enrollment in the Hospital and Homebound Program. The student had been dismissed from the Program on February 10, 2016, and was enrolled in a Basic education program on February 11, 2016; consequently, the student should have been reported in Program No. 103 (Basic 9-12). We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.6086	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.6086)</u>	.0000

13. [Ref. 20104] The timecards were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located for 16 Career Education 9-12 students who participated in OJT. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(2.1124)</u>	(2.1124)
---------------------------	-----------------	----------

14. [Ref. 20170] One teacher taught a Basic subject area class that included an ELL student but 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. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.0712	
130 ESOL	<u>(.0712)</u>	.0000

15. [Ref. 20171/72] Two teachers were not properly certified and were not approved by the School Board to teach out of field in Television Production Technology (Ref. 20171) or Family and Consumer Science (Ref. 20172). We also noted that the students’ parents were not notified of the teachers’ out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustments:

<u>Ref. 20171</u>		
103 Basic 9-12	1.3420	
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(1.3420)</u>	.0000

<u>Ref. 20172</u>		
103 Basic 9-12	.4602	
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.4602)</u>	<u>.0000</u>

(2.1124)

**Findings**

**Countywide Exceptional Student Education (#5201)**

16. [Ref. 520102] School records did not demonstrate that five ESE students (two were in our Basic with ESE Services test and three were in our ESE Support Level 5 test) enrolled in the Hospital and Homebound Program received homebound instruction during the reporting survey periods. We also noted that the files for two of the students did not contain physicians' statements. We propose the following adjustment:

113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(.0800)	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.3200)</u>	(.4000)

17. [Ref. 520103] The files for four ESE students did not contain physicians' statements to support the students' placements in the Hospital and Homebound Program. We propose the following adjustment:

112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	.1600	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	.2800	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.4400)</u>	.0000

18. [Ref. 520104] One ESE student enrolled in the Hospital and Homebound Program was reported for 240 CMW (or .0800 FTE) of instruction in each the October 2015 and February 2016 reporting survey periods. However, the homebound instructor's contact log only supported 120 CMW (or .0500 FTE) of instruction during the October 2015 reporting survey period and no contact logs were available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located for the February 2016 reporting survey period. We also noted that the file for this student did not contain a physician's statement to support the student's placement in the Hospital and Homebound Program. We propose the following adjustment:

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.0500	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.0800)	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.0800)</u>	(.1100)
		<u>(.5100)</u>

**Proposed Net  
Adjustments  
(Unweighted FTE)**

**Findings**

**MyDistrict Virtual School (#7004)**

19. [Ref. 700402] The FTE for three Basic virtual education students was incorrectly reported. The students' courses were reported for .1000 FTE rather than .0834 FTE per semester course. However, the FTE for two of the students' courses was recalibrated and did not affect the overall funding. As a result, we propose the following adjustment for the remaining student's two courses:

103 Basic 9-12	<u>(.0332)</u>	<u>(.0332)</u>
		<u>(.0332)</u>
<b>Proposed Net Adjustment</b>		<b><u>(2.6556)</u></b>

## SCHEDULE E

---

### RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that Hendry County District School Board (District) management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) the English language proficiencies of students being considered for continuation of their ESOL placements (beyond 3-year base period) are timely assessed and ELL Committees are timely convened subsequent to these assessments; (2) *ELL Student Plans* are timely prepared and retained in the students' files; (3) ESE students are reported in accordance with the students' *Matrix of Services* forms; (4) parents are timely notified of their children's ESOL placements; (5) timely physicians' statements are on file for students reported in the Hospital and Homebound Program and the students' reported instructional minutes are based on established schedules as indicated by homebound instructors' contact logs in conjunction with the students' IEPs supporting students' continued enrollment in the Program; (6) students in Career Education 9-12 who participate in OJT are reported in accordance with timecards that are accurately completed, signed, and retained in readily-accessible files; (7) course schedules and FTE for virtual education students are accurately reported; (8) parents are timely notified when their children are assigned to out-of-field teachers; (9) teachers are properly certified or, if teaching out of field, are timely approved by the School Board to teach out of field; and (10) teachers of ELL students earn the appropriate in-service training points as required by SBE Rules 6A-6.0907 and 6A-1.0503(4)(b)2., FAC, and the teachers' 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 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 Hendry County District School Board (District), the FEFP, the FTE, and related areas is provided below.

### **1. The District**

The District was established pursuant to Section 1001.30, Florida Statutes, to provide public educational services for the residents of Hendry County, Florida. Those services are provided primarily to PK through 12<sup>th</sup>-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 Hendry 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 12 schools, 1 cost center, and 2 virtual education cost centers serving PK through 12<sup>th</sup>-grade students.

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016, State funding totaling \$32.1 million was provided through the FEFP to the District for the District-reported 7,110.71 unweighted FTE as recalibrated. 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 12<sup>th</sup>-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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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*

<b>NOTE B – TESTING FTE STUDENT ENROLLMENT</b>
--

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. LaBelle Middle School	1 through 4
2. Westside Elementary School	5 through 9
3. Country Oaks Elementary School	10
4. Clewiston High School	11 through 15
5. Countywide Exceptional Student Education	16 through 18
6. Hendry Virtual Instruction Program	NA
7. MyDistrict Virtual School	19



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 Hendry 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.

An examination by its nature does not include a review of all records and actions of District management and staff and, as a consequence, cannot be relied upon to identify all instances of noncompliance, fraud, abuse, or inefficiency. Because of these limitations and the inherent limitations of internal control, an unavoidable risk exists that some material noncompliance may not be detected, even though the examination is properly planned and performed in accordance with attestation standards.

### ***Opinion***

Our examination disclosed material noncompliance with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of student transportation as reported under the Florida Education Finance Program 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 Hendry 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 weaknesses<sup>5</sup> 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*

---

<sup>5</sup> 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.

*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*.

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  
September 27, 2017

# SCHEDULE F

---

## POPULATIONS, TEST SELECTION, AND TEST RESULTS STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

Any student who is transported by the Hendry 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 (119) consisted of the total number of vehicles (buses, vans, or passenger cars) reported by the District for all reporting survey periods. 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 (6,605) consisted of the total number of students reported by the District as having been transported for all reporting survey periods. (See NOTE A2.) The District reported students in the following ridership categories:

<u>Ridership Category</u>	<u>Number of Students Transported</u>
Teenage Parents and Infants	18
IDEA – PK through Grade 12, Weighted	235
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>6,352</u>
Total	<u>6,605</u>

Students with exceptions are students with exceptions affecting their ridership category. Students cited only for incorrect reporting of DIT, 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 76 of 309 students in our student transportation test.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> For student transportation, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 on SCHEDULE G.

Our examination results are summarized below:

<u>Description</u>	<u>Students</u>	
	<u>With Exceptions</u>	<u>Proposed Net Adjustment</u>
Our tests included 309 of the 6,605 students reported as being transported by the District.	76	(63)
In conjunction with our general tests of student transportation, we identified certain issues related to 164 additional students.	<u>164</u>	<u>(160)</u>
Total	<u>240</u>	<u>(223)</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 Hendry 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 218 students (59 students were in our test) were not eligible to be reported for State transportation funding. The 206 students reported for 19 DIT in the June 2016 reporting survey period were attending programs (3<sup>rd</sup>-grade summer reading camp or migrant summer outreach) that were not eligible for State transportation funding and 1 of these students was not listed on the supporting bus driver's report. The 8 PK students reported in the October 2015 and February 2016 reporting survey periods were not enrolled in an ESE Program nor were their parents enrolled in a Teenage Parent Program. The IEPs for the 4 students reported for 14 DIT in the June 2016 reporting survey period did not authorize extended school year services. We propose the following adjustments:

<u>Findings</u>		<u>Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments</u>
<b>October 2015 Survey</b>		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(3)	
<b>February 2016 Survey</b>		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(5)	
<b>June 2016 Survey</b>		
<u>19 Days in Term</u>		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(206)	
<u>14 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(3)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>(1)</u>	(218)

2. [Ref. 52] Our general tests disclosed that seven students (three students were in our test) who were reported in the IDEA – PK through Grade 12, Weighted ridership category were transported using private passenger vehicles. Consequently, the students were not eligible to be reported in a weighted ridership category. In addition, the IEP for one of these students did not indicate that the student met one of the five required criteria for a weighted classification. We determined that all seven students were otherwise eligible for reporting in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category. We propose the following adjustments:

<b>July 2015 Survey</b>		
<u>12 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(2)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	2	
<b>February 2016 Survey</b>		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(5)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>5</u>	0

3. [Ref. 53] Our general tests disclosed that one student was not listed on the supporting bus driver’s report. We propose the following adjustment:

<b>February 2016 Survey</b>		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(1)	(1)

**Students  
Transported  
Proposed Net  
Adjustments**

**Findings**

4. [Ref. 54] One student in our test was not marked as riding the bus during the October 2015 reporting survey period; consequently, the student should not have been reported for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustment:

**October 2015 Survey**

90 Days in Term

All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(1)	(1)
----------------------------------	-----	-----

5. [Ref. 55] The IEPs for nine students in our test who were reported in the IDEA – PK through Grade 12, Weighted ridership category did not indicate that the students met at least one of the five criteria required for weighted classification; however, we determined that the students were otherwise eligible for reporting in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category. We propose the following adjustments:

**October 2015 Survey**

90 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(1)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	1	

**February 2016 Survey**

90 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(6)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	6	

**June 2016 Survey**

14 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(2)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>2</u>	0

6. [Ref. 56] Three students in our test 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 to be reported for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustments:

**October 2015 Survey**

90 Days in Term

All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(2)	
----------------------------------	-----	--

**February 2016 Survey**

90 Days in Term

All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(1)	(3)
----------------------------------	-----	-----

**Students  
Transported  
Proposed Net  
Adjustments**

**Findings**

7. [Ref. 57] One student in our test was incorrectly reported in the Teenage Parents and Infants ridership category. The student was in kindergarten and lived 2 miles or more from school; therefore, the student should have been reported in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category. We propose the following adjustment:

**February 2016 Survey**

90 Days in Term

Teenage Parents and Infants

(1)

All Other FEFP Eligible Students

1

0

**Proposed Net Adjustment**

**(223)**

## SCHEDULE H

---

### RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that Hendry County District School Board (District) management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) only students classified as students with disabilities under the IDEA whose IEPs document the need for extended school year services and transportation as a related service while attending eligible instructional programs are reported for State transportation funding during the summer reporting survey periods; (2) only PK students who are classified as students with disabilities under the IDEA or whose parents are enrolled in a Teenage Parent Program are reported for State transportation funding; (3) students transported by private passenger vehicles are not reported in the IDEA – PK through Grade 12, Weighted ridership category; (4) only those students who are enrolled in eligible instructional programs and recorded on bus drivers' reports as having been transported by the District at least 1 day during the reporting survey period are reported for State transportation funding; (5) students reported in 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; (6) eligibility is verified prior to reporting students in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category based on living 2 miles or more from their assigned schools or meeting other eligibility criteria; and (7) only students who are teenage parents and enrolled in a Teenage Parent Program and their PK children are reported in the Teenage Parents and Infants 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

---

<b>NOTE A - SUMMARY STUDENT TRANSPORTATION</b>
--

A summary discussion of the significant features of student transportation and related areas is provided 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 Hendry County

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016, the District received \$1.4 million 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	1	2
October 2015	53	3,121
February 2016	52	3,231
June 2016	<u>13</u>	<u>251</u>
Totals	<u>119</u>	<u>6,605</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*

<b>NOTE B – TESTING STUDENT TRANSPORTATION</b>
--

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

---



## Hendry County School Board

**District Office**  
Hendry Co. Courthouse  
P.O. Box 1980  
LaBelle, FL 33975-1980  
(863) 674-4100  
FAX (863) 674-4103  
SUNCOM 744-4100

**Sub-Office**  
475 E. Osceola Ave.  
Clewiston, FL 33440-3140  
(863) 902-4244  
FAX (863) 902-4247  
SUNCOM 744-4244

---

September 22, 2017

Dear Auditor General Sherrill F. Norman:

The Hendry County District School Board received the preliminary and tentative report from your office on September 1, 2017. Your document included a list of examination findings, proposed adjustments, and recommendations. Based on the findings, proposed adjustments, and recommendations, we have prepared our proposed corrective actions.

Attached, you will find a written statement of corrective actions that the Hendry County District School Board will implement that addresses all 19 of the findings listed in your report. We also addressed the 7 findings pertaining to student transportation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Paul K. Puletti".

Paul K. Puletti, Superintendent  
Hendry County School District

RE/aa

**FTE Student Enrollment**: Corrective actions, for each of the 19 findings, are listed below:

Finding 1 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) will exercise more care to ensure: (1) that our ELL students are properly assessed; (2) that our ELL Committees are convened within 30 school days prior to the students' DEUSS anniversary dates for continuation of their ESOL placements (beyond 3-year base period).

Finding 2 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) will exercise more care to ensure that all ELL student plans are timely prepared and retained in the students' files to ensure they are available and easily located.

Finding 3 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) will exercise more care to ensure that all ESE students' are reported in accordance with the Matrix of Services forms.

Finding 4 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) will exercise more care to ensure that all parents are timely notified of their children's ESOL placements.

Finding 5 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) will exercise more care to ensure: (1) that our ELL students are properly assessed; (2) that our ELL Committees are convened within 30 school days prior to the students' DEUSS anniversary dates for continuation of their ESOL placements (beyond 3-year base period).

Finding 6 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) will exercise more care to ensure that all ELL parents are notified of their children's ESOL placements in a timely manner.

Finding 7 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) will exercise more care to ensure that all parents of students taught by one out-of-field teacher are notified of the teacher's out-of-field status in Elementary Education in a timely manner.

Finding 8 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) will exercise more care to ensure that all teachers are properly certified or approved by the Board to teach out-of-field. We will also ensure that parents of students taught by an out-of-field teacher are notified of the teacher's out-of-field status in Elementary Education in a timely manner.

Finding 9 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) will exercise more care to ensure that all teachers are properly certified and teachers of ELL students earn the appropriate in-service training points as required by SBE Rules and teacher's in-service training timeline.

Finding 10 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) will exercise more care to ensure that all teachers are properly certified.

Finding 11 -Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) will exercise more care to ensure that all ELL students' English language proficiency is properly assessed and that our ELL Committees are convened within 30 school days prior to the students' DEUSS anniversary dates for continuation of their ESOL placements (beyond 3-year base period).

Finding 12 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) will exercise more care to ensure that all ESE students are correctly reported by program number; we will ensure that that when students are dismissed from one program that the proper program designation changes are made; we will also ensure that timely physicians' statements are on file for students reported in the Hospital and Homebound Program and the students' reported instructional minutes are based on established schedules as indicated by homebound instructors' contact logs in conjunction with the students' IEPs supporting students' continued enrollment in the Program.

Finding 13 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) will exercise more care to ensure that all students in Career Education 9-12 who participate in OJT are reported in accordance with timecards that are accurately completed, signed, and retained in readily-accessible files.

Finding 14 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) will exercise more care to ensure that teachers of ELL students earn the appropriate in-service training points as required by SBE Rules 6A-6.0907 and 6A-1.0503(4)(b)2., FAC, and the teachers' in-service training timelines.

Finding 15 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) will exercise more care to ensure that teachers are properly certified or, if teaching out of field, are timely approved by the School Board to teach out of field.

Finding 16 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) will exercise more care to ensure that all ESE students enrolled in the Hospital and Homebound Program receive homebound instruction during the reporting periods; we will also ensure that timely physicians' statements are on file for students reported in the Hospital and Homebound Program.

Finding 17 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) will exercise more care to ensure that all ESE students enrolled in the Hospital and Homebound Program have physicians' statements on file.

Finding 18 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) will exercise more care to ensure that all ESE students enrolled in the Hospital and Homebound Program receive homebound instruction during the reporting periods; we will also ensure that timely physicians' statements are on file for students reported in the Hospital and Homebound Program and the students' reported instructional minutes are based on established schedules as indicated by homebound instructors' contact logs in conjunction with the students' IEPs supporting students' continued enrollment in the Program.

Finding 19 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) will exercise more care to ensure that all course schedules and FTE for virtual education students are accurately reported.

**Student Transportation:** Corrective actions, for each of the seven findings, are listed below:

Finding 1 - Corrective Action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) management will exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that only students classified as students with disabilities under the IDEA whose IEPs document the need for extended school year services and transportation as a related service while attending eligible instructional programs are reported for State transportation funding during the summer reporting survey periods; and only PK students who are classified as students with disabilities under the IDEA or whose parents are enrolled in a Teenage Parent Program are reported for State transportation funding.

Finding 2 - Corrective Action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) management will exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that only students transported by private passenger vehicles are not reported in the IDEA – PK through Grade 12, Weighted ridership category; and students reported in 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.

Finding 3 - Corrective Action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) management will exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that only those students who are enrolled in eligible instructional programs and recorded on bus drivers' reports as having been transported by the District at least 1 day during the reporting survey period are reported for State transportation funding;

Finding 4 - Corrective Action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) management will exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that only those students who are enrolled in eligible instructional programs and recorded on bus drivers' reports as having been transported by the District at least 1 day during the reporting survey period are reported for State transportation funding.

Finding 5 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) management will exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that only students reported in 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.

Finding 6 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) management will exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that eligibility is verified prior to reporting students in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category based on living 2 miles or more from their assigned schools or meeting other eligibility criteria.

Finding 7 - Corrective action:

The Hendry County District School Board (District) management will exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that only students who are teenage parents and enrolled in a Teenage Parent Program and their PK children are reported in the Teenage Parents and Infants ridership category. We will also ensure eligibility is verified prior to reporting students in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category based on living 2 miles or more from their assigned schools or meeting other eligibility criteria.