

Report No. 2018-032
November 2017

STATE OF FLORIDA AUDITOR GENERAL

Attestation Examination

**OSCEOLA 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, Melba Luciano served as Superintendent to February 29, 2016, and Dr. Debra Pace served as Superintendent Designee from March 1, 2016 until officially becoming Superintendent on March 21, 2016. The following individuals served as Board members:

<u>Board Member</u>	<u>District No.</u>
Jay Wheeler	1
Kelvin Soto, Vice Chair through 11-16-15	2
Tim Weisheyer, Chair through 11-16-15	3
Clarence Thacker, Chair from 11-17-15	4
Ricky Booth, Vice Chair from 11-17-15	5

The team leader was Gail S. Collier, 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:

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

**OSCEOLA 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.....	13
Findings.....	13
SCHEDULE E – RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS	27
NOTES TO SCHEDULES.....	30
INDEPENDENT AUDITOR’S REPORT ON STUDENT TRANSPORTATION	34
SCHEDULE F – POPULATIONS, TEST SELECTION, AND TEST RESULTS.....	37
SCHEDULE G – FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS	
Overview.....	39
Findings.....	39
SCHEDULE H – RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS.....	44
NOTES TO SCHEDULES.....	45
MANAGEMENT’S RESPONSE	46

OSCEOLA COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CELLA	Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment
CMW	Class Minutes, Weekly
DEUSS	Date Entered United States School
ELL	English Language Learner
ESE	Exceptional Student Education
ELA	English Language Arts
ESOL	English for Speakers of Other Languages
FAC	Florida Administrative Code
FEFP	Florida Education Finance Program
FSA	Florida Standards Assessments
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 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 Osceola 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 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 69 of the 234 students in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 test and 13 of the 60 students in our Career Education 9-12 test. Twenty-four (10 percent) of the 234 students in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 test attended charter schools and 9 (13 percent) of the 69 students with exceptions attended charter schools. None of the students in our Career Education 9-12 test attended charter schools.

Noncompliance related to the reported FTE student enrollment resulted in 51 findings. The resulting proposed net adjustment to the District's reported, unweighted FTE totaled negative 3.3498 (all applicable to District schools other than charter schools) but has a potential impact on the District's weighted FTE of negative 80.4287 (68.1164 applicable to District schools other than charter schools and 12.3123 applicable to charter schools). Noncompliance related to student transportation resulted in 10 findings and a proposed net adjustment of negative 39 students.

The weighted adjustments to the FTE student enrollment are presented in our report for illustrative purposes only. The weighted adjustments to the FTE student enrollment 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 adjustments 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 \$334,137 (negative 80.4287 times \$4,154.45), of which \$282,986 is applicable to District schools other than charter schools and \$51,151 is applicable to charter schools.

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 Osceola 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 Osceola 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 appointed Superintendent of Schools. The District had 48 schools other than charter schools, 17 charter schools, 1 cost center, and 3 virtual education cost centers serving PK through 12th-grade students.

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016, State funding totaling \$230.8 million was provided through the FEFP to the District for the District-reported 61,140.79 unweighted FTE as recalibrated, which included 10,245.86 unweighted FTE as recalibrated for charter schools. 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 \$11.1 million for student transportation as part of the State funding through the FEFP.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



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 Osceola 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 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 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 Osceola 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

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.

above is indicative of significant deficiencies considered to be material weaknesses in the District's internal controls related to 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
November 6, 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 Osceola County District School Board (District) reported to the Department of Education 61,140.79 unweighted FTE as recalibrated, which included 10,245.86 unweighted FTE as recalibrated for charter schools, at 48 schools other than charter schools, 17 charter schools, 1 cost center, and 3 virtual education cost centers.

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 (69) consisted of the total number of brick and mortar schools and cost centers in the District that offered courses, including charter schools, as well as the virtual education cost centers in the District that offered virtual instruction in the FEFP-funded programs. The population of students (27,147) 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 69 of the 234 students in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 test,² and 13 of the 60 students in our Career Education 9-12 test.³ Twenty-four (10 percent) of the 234 students in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 test attended charter schools and 9 (13 percent) of the 69 students with exceptions attended charter schools. None of the students in our Career Education 9-12 test attended charter schools.

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

Programs	Number of Schools		Number of Students at Schools Tested		Students With Exceptions	Recalibrated Unweighted FTE		Proposed Adjustments
	Population	Test	Population	Test		Population	Test	
Basic	68	21	19,917	240	0	43,311.2100	169.8129	53.7200
Basic with ESE Services	68	21	3,251	164	0	8,735.3300	134.3964	19.9502
ESOL	64	19	3,581	617	55	7,386.7600	431.6566	(51.2392)
ESE Support Levels 4 and 5	47	16	313	234	69	483.6000	173.8064	(23.6561)
Career Education 9-12	16	3	<u>85</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>1,223.8900</u>	<u>12.7820</u>	<u>(2.1247)</u>
All Programs	69	22	<u>27,147</u>	<u>1,315</u>	<u>137</u>	<u>61,140.7900</u>	<u>922.4543</u>	<u>(3.3498)</u>

² For ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 3, 5, 18, 21, 22, 26, 28, 30, 33, 35, 36, 39, 44, 45, 49, 50, and 51 on *SCHEDULE D*.

³ For Career Education 9-12, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 14, 15, 37, 41, and 42 on *SCHEDULE D*.

Teachers

We also tested teacher qualifications as part of our examination procedures. (See NOTE B.) Specifically, the population of teachers (1,148, of which 1,067 are applicable to District schools other than charter schools and 81 are applicable to charter schools) 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. From the population of teachers, we selected 302 and found exceptions for 12 teachers. Thirty-four of the 302 teachers in our test taught at charter schools and 4 (33 percent) of the 12 teachers with exceptions taught at charter schools.

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.

SCHEDULE B

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

District Schools Other Than Charter Schools			
No. Program (1)	Proposed Net Adjustment (2)	Cost Factor	Weighted FTE (3)
101 Basic K-3	8.7801	1.115	9.7898
102 Basic 4-8	23.1937	1.000	23.1937
103 Basic 9-12	3.6859	1.005	3.7043
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	6.7265	1.115	7.5001
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	6.1101	1.000	6.1101
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	3.4802	1.005	3.4976
130 ESOL	(33.1789)	1.180	(39.1511)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(14.9871)	3.613	(54.1484)
255 ESE Support Level 5	(5.0356)	5.258	(26.4772)
300 Career Education 9-12	(2.1247)	1.005	(2.1353)
Subtotal	(3.3498)		(68.1164)
Charter Schools			
No. Program (1)	Proposed Net Adjustment (2)	Cost Factor	Weighted FTE (3)
102 Basic 4-8	15.0923	1.000	15.0923
103 Basic 9-12	2.9680	1.005	2.9829
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	3.6334	1.115	4.0512
130 ESOL	(18.0603)	1.180	(21.3112)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(3.6334)	3.613	(13.1275)
Subtotal	.0000		(12.3123)
Total of Schools			
No. Program (1)	Proposed Net Adjustment (2)	Cost Factor	Weighted FTE (3)
101 Basic K-3	8.7801	1.115	9.7898
102 Basic 4-8	38.2860	1.000	38.2860
103 Basic 9-12	6.6539	1.005	6.6872
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	10.3599	1.115	11.5513
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	6.1101	1.000	6.1101
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	3.4802	1.005	3.4976
130 ESOL	(51.2392)	1.180	(60.4623)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(18.6205)	3.613	(67.2759)
255 ESE Support Level 5	(5.0356)	5.258	(26.4772)
300 Career Education 9-12	(2.1247)	1.005	(2.1353)
Total	(3.3498)		(80.4287)

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>#0042</u>	<u>#0101</u>	<u>#0152*</u>	
101 Basic K-337473747
102 Basic 4-8	.8216	.8432	10.0483	11.7131
103 Basic 9-120000
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	2.1401	.5864	2.7265
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services0000
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services0000
130 ESOL	(.8216)	(1.2179)	(10.0483)	(12.0878)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(2.6425)	(.5864)	(3.2289)
255 ESE Support Level 5	.50245024
300 Career Education 9-120000
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.)

*Charter School

No.	Brought Forward	Proposed Adjustments (1)				Balance Forward
		#0155*	#0201	#0251	#0302	
101	.3747	5.4744	5.8491
102	11.7131	5.0440	9.0793	5.4425	31.2789
103	.0000	2.1680	1.6556	3.8236
111	2.7265	2.7265
112	.0000	2.4998	.1861	2.6859
113	.00000000
130	(12.0878)	(7.2120)	(1.6556)	(8.3653)	(10.5842)	(39.9049)
254	(3.2289)	(3.2138)	1.0000	(5.4427)
255	.5024	(1.9310)	(1.4286)
300	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>(.6064)</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>(.6064)</u>
Total	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(.6064)</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(.4122)</u>	<u>(1.0186)</u>

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

*Charter School

Proposed Adjustments (1)

<u>No.</u>	<u>Brought Forward</u>	<u>#0311</u>	<u>#0501</u>	<u>#0701</u>	<u>#0811</u>	<u>Balance Forward</u>
101	5.84914303	.8394	7.1188
102	31.2789	4.86969095	.8028	37.8608
103	3.8236	3.8236
111	2.72655557	1.4441	4.7263
112	2.6859	.5317	1.0126	4.2302
113	.00000000
130	(39.9049)	(4.8696)	(1.3398)	(1.6422)	(47.7565)
254	(5.4427)	(1.0316)	(.5557)	(2.4567)	.4999	(8.9868)
255	(1.4286)	.4999	(.4999)	(1.4286)
300	<u>(.6064)</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>(.6064)</u>
Total	<u>(1.0186)</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(1.0186)</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>Balance Forward</u>
		<u>#0842</u>	<u>#0900*</u>	<u>#0904</u>	<u>#0922</u>	
101	7.1188	1.2613	8.3801
102	37.86084252	38.2860
103	3.8236	1.2146	5.0382
111	4.7263	3.6334	8.3597
112	4.2302	4.2302
113	.0000	2.0002	2.0002
130	(47.7565)	(.5962)	(1.6865)	(50.0392)
254	(8.9868)	(1.5002)	(3.6334)	(14.1204)
255	(1.4286)	(1.8586)	(3.2872)
300	<u>(.6064)</u>	<u>(.2120)</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>(.4906)</u>	<u>(1.3090)</u>
Total	<u>(1.0186)</u>	<u>(.9522)</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(.4906)</u>	<u>(2.4614)</u>

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

*Charter School

Proposed Adjustments (1)

<u>No.</u>	<u>Brought Forward</u>	<u>#0931</u>	<u>#0958</u>	<u>#0959*</u>	<u>#7004</u>	<u>Balance Forward</u>
101	8.3801	.4000	8.7801
102	38.2860	38.2860
103	5.03828000	.8157	6.6539
111	8.3597	.4447	1.5555	10.3599
112	4.2302	.9999	.5000	5.7301
113	2.0002	2.0002
130	(50.0392)	(.4000)	(.8000)	(51.2392)
254	(14.1204)	(1.4446)	(2.0555)	(17.6205)
255	(3.2872)	(3.2872)
300	<u>(1.3090)</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>(.8157)</u>	<u>(2.1247)</u>
Total	<u>(2.4614)</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(2.4614)</u>

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

*Charter School

<u>No.</u> <u>Program</u>	<u>Proposed Adjustments (1)</u>		
	<u>Brought Forward</u>	<u>#9041</u>	<u>Total</u>
101 Basic K-3	8.7801	8.7801
102 102 Basic 4-8	38.2860	38.2860
103 Basic 9-12	6.6539	6.6539
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	10.3599	10.3599
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	5.7301	.3800	6.1101
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	2.0002	1.4800	3.4802
130 ESOL	(51.2392)	(51.2392)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(17.6205)	(1.0000)	(18.6205)
255 ESE Support Level 5	(3.2872)	(1.7484)	(5.0356)
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(2.1247)</u>	<u>(2.1247)</u>
Total	<u>(2.4614)</u>	<u>(.8884)</u>	<u>(3.3498)</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 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 Osceola 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, 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.

Districtwide – Reporting of Bell Schedules

1. [Ref. 4203/10103/15504/30203/81104/84205/95802] Student course schedules were incorrectly reported for 7 of the 19 nonvirtual schools tested. The daily instructional and bell schedules provided for the schools supported a varying number of instructional minutes per week that met the minimum reporting of CMW; however, the students' course schedules were not reported in agreement with the daily instructional and bell schedules. We noted differences ranging from 220 CMW to 704 CMW. Student course schedules, which are necessary for the recalibration process to work properly, should reflect the correct number of CMW according to the school instructional and bell schedules. Since most of the students were reported at only one school for the entire school year and their reported FTE was recalibrated to 1.0, this incorrect reporting did not affect their ultimate funding level. As such, we present this disclosure finding with no proposed adjustment.

.0000

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Kissimmee Elementary School (#0042)

2. [Ref. 4201] An ELL Committee for one ELL student was not convened by October 1 to consider the student's continued ESOL placement beyond 3 years from the student's DEUSS. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.8216	
130 ESOL	(.8216)	.0000

3. [Ref. 4202] Four ESE students were not reported in accordance with the students' *Matrix of Services* forms. We propose the following adjustment:

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	2.1401	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(2.6425)	
255 ESE Support Level 5	.5024	.0000
		<u>.0000</u>

Thacker Avenue Elementary School for International Studies (#0101)

4. [Ref. 10101] ELL Committees for two ELL students 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	.3747	
102 Basic 4-8	.8432	
130 ESOL	(1.2179)	.0000

5. [Ref. 10102] 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	.5864	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.5864)	.0000
		<u>.0000</u>

Four Corners Charter Middle School (#0152)

6. [Ref. 15201] ELL Committees for three ELL students 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:

102 Basic 4-8	1.8564	
130 ESOL	(1.8564)	.0000

Findings

Four Corners Charter Middle School (#0152) (Continued)

7. [Ref. 15202] One student in our ESOL test was incorrectly reported in the ESOL Program. The student’s file contained an *ELL Committee Referral* form that included the ELL Committee’s recommendation for extension of services; however, the file did not evidence that at least two of the criteria specified in SBE Rule 6A 6.0902(2)(a)3., FAC, were met. In addition, English language assessment documentation dated September 4, 2015, supported that the student was a fluent English speaker and a competent English reader and writer, and that the student’s parents were notified of their child’s exit from the ESOL Program based on an ELL Committee recommendation. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.4014	
130 ESOL	<u>(.4014)</u>	.0000

8. [Ref. 15270/71] Two teachers taught Primary Language Arts to classes that included ELL students but were not properly certified to teach ELL students and were not approved by the Charter School Board to teach such students out of field until February 2, 2016, which was after the October 2015 reporting survey period. 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. 15271) had earned none of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by SBE Rule 6A-1.0503(4)(b)2., FAC, and the teacher’s in-service training timeline. We propose the following adjustments:

<u>Ref. 15270</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	2.9328	
130 ESOL	<u>(2.9328)</u>	.0000

<u>Ref. 15271</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	4.8577	
130 ESOL	<u>(4.8577)</u>	.0000

.0000

Avant-Garde Academy (#0155) Charter School

9. [Ref. 15501] ELL Committees for nine ELL students were not convened by October 1 (four students) or within 30 school days prior to the students’ DEUSS anniversary dates (five students) to consider the students’ continued ESOL placements beyond 3 years from the students’ DEUSS. We also noted that the English language proficiency of five of the students was not assessed within 30 school days prior to the students’ DEUSS anniversary dates. We propose the following adjustment:

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Avant-Garde Academy (#0155) Charter School (Continued)

102 Basic 4-8	1.8409	
103 Basic 9-12	.7500	
130 ESOL	<u>(2.5909)</u>	.0000

10. [Ref. 15502] One student in our ESOL test scored proficient on the March 2015 CELLA test and scored a Level 3 on the April 2015 FSA in ELA test. Also, an ELL Committee did not convene to consider the student’s continued ESOL placement. Consequently, the student was not eligible to be reported in the ESOL Program. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.2784	
130 ESOL	<u>(.2784)</u>	.0000

11. [Ref. 15570/71] Two teachers were not properly certified and were not approved by the Charter School Board to teach out of field. The teachers held certification in Music (Ref. 15570) or Business Education (Ref. 15571) but taught courses that required certification in ESOL (Ref. 15570) or Math (Ref. 15571). In addition, the letters notifying parents of the teachers’ out-of-field status did not identify the out-of-field subject areas. We propose the following adjustments:

<u>Ref. 15570</u>		
103 Basic 9-12	1.1396	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.1396)</u>	.0000

<u>Ref. 15571</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	3.2031	
130 ESOL	<u>(3.2031)</u>	.0000

.0000

St. Cloud High School (#0201)

12. [Ref. 20101] ELL Committees for two ELL students were not convened by October 1 (one student) or within 30 school days prior to the student’s DEUSS anniversary date (one student) to consider the students’ continued ESOL placements beyond 3 years from the students’ DEUSS. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.6475	
130 ESOL	<u>(.6475)</u>	.0000

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

St. Cloud High School (#0201) (Continued)

13. [Ref. 20102] One student in our ESOL test scored proficient on the February 2015 CELLA test and scored a Level 4 on the April 2015 FSA in ELA test, and an ELL Committee was not convened to consider the student's continued ESOL placement. Consequently, the student was not eligible to be reported in the ESOL Program. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.5989	
130 ESOL	<u>(.5989)</u>	.0000

14. [Ref. 20103] The timecards were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located for five Career Education 9-12 students who participated in OJT. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.5322)</u>	(.5322)
---------------------------	----------------	---------

15. [Ref. 20104] The timecard indicated the student did not work during the February 2016 reporting survey period for one Career Education 9-12 student who participated in OJT. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.0742)</u>	(.0742)
---------------------------	----------------	---------

16. [Ref. 20170] The parents of ELL students taught by one out-of-field teacher were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status in ESOL. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.4092	
130 ESOL	<u>(.4092)</u>	.0000
		<u>(.6064)</u>

Kissimmee Middle School (#0251)

17. [Ref. 25101] ELL Committees for five ELL students 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:

102 Basic 4-8	2.9460	
130 ESOL	<u>(2.9460)</u>	.0000

18. [Ref. 25102] 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	2.4998	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(2.4998)</u>	.0000

Findings

Kissimmee Middle School (#0251) (Continued)

19. [Ref. 25170/71] Two teachers were not properly certified and were not approved by the School Board to teach out of field. The teachers held certification in Elementary Education (Ref. 25170) or Emotionally Handicapped and Specific Learning Disabilities (Ref. 25171) but taught courses that required certification in General Science (Ref. 25170) or Reading, English, Math, General Science, and Social Science (Ref. 25171). We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teachers' out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustments:

<u>Ref. 25170</u>			
102 Basic 4-8	5.4193		
130 ESOL	<u>(5.4193)</u>		.0000
<u>Ref. 25171</u>			
102 Basic 4-8	.7140		
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(.7140)</u>		<u>.0000</u>
			<u>.0000</u>

Westside K-8 School (#0302)

20. [Ref. 30201] ELL Committees for 13 ELL students were not convened by October 1 (10 students) or within 30 school days prior to the students' DEUSS anniversary dates (3 students) to consider the students' continued ESOL placements beyond 3 years from the students' DEUSS. We also noted that the English language proficiency of 2 of the students was not assessed within 30 school days prior to the students' DEUSS anniversary dates, and 2 of the students scored proficient on the February 2015 CELLA test. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	1.6239		
102 Basic 4-8	5.0391		
130 ESOL	<u>(6.6630)</u>		.0000

21. [Ref. 30202] The on-campus portion of one ESE student's schedule who was provided both on-campus and homebound instruction was incorrectly reported in Program No. 255 (ESE Support Level 5). In addition, the student received less on-campus instruction during the October 2015 and February 2016 reporting survey periods than was reported. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.3327		
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	.1861		
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.9310)</u>		(.4122)

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Westside K-8 School (#0302) (Continued)

22. [Ref. 30205] One ESE student was not reported in accordance with the student's *Matrix of Services* form. We propose the following adjustment:

254 ESE Support Level 4	1.0000	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(1.0000)</u>	.0000

23. [Ref. 30270/71] The parents of ELL students taught by two out-of-field teachers were not notified of the teachers' out-of-field status in ESOL until November 1, 2015, which was after the October 2015 reporting survey period. We propose the following adjustments:

<u>Ref. 30270</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	.0707	
130 ESOL	<u>(.0707)</u>	.0000

<u>Ref. 30271</u>		
101 Basic K-3	3.8505	
130 ESOL	<u>(3.8505)</u>	.0000

(.4122)

Neptune Middle School (#0311)

24. [Ref. 31101] ELL Committees for three ELL students were not convened by October 1 (two students) or within 30 school days prior to the student's DEUSS anniversary date (one student) to consider the students' continued ESOL placements beyond 3 years from the students' DEUSS. We also noted that the English language proficiency of one of the students was not assessed within 30 school days prior to the student's DEUSS anniversary date. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	1.7420	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.7420)</u>	.0000

25. [Ref. 31102] The file for one ELL student did not contain documentation to support the student's continued ESOL placement. The student scored proficient on the February 2015 CELLA test and a Level 3 on the April 2015 FSA in ELA. Also, an ELL Committee was not convened to consider the student's continued ESOL placement. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.3709	
130 ESOL	<u>(.3709)</u>	.0000

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Neptune Middle School (#0311) (Continued)

26. [Ref. 31103] 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	.5317	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(1.0316)	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>.4999</u>	.0000

27. [Ref. 31170/71] The School's newsletter notifying parents of two teachers' out-of-field status did not identify ESOL as the area being taught out of field. We propose the following adjustments:

<u>Ref. 31170</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	2.4983	
130 ESOL	<u>(2.4983)</u>	.0000
 <u>Ref. 31171</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	.2584	
130 ESOL	<u>(.2584)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>.0000</u>

Hickory Tree Elementary School (#0501)

28. [Ref. 50101] 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	.5557	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(.5557)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>.0000</u>

Mill Creek Elementary School (#0701)

29. [Ref. 70101] ELL Committees for three ELL students were not convened within 30 school days prior to the student's DEUSS anniversary date (one student) or upon enrollment (two students) to consider the students' continued ESOL placements beyond 3 years from the students' DEUSS. We also noted that the English language proficiency of one of the students was not assessed within 30 school days prior to the student's DEUSS anniversary date. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.4303	
102 Basic 4-8	.9095	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.3398)</u>	.0000

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Mill Creek Elementary School (#0701) (Continued)

30. [Ref. 70102] Four ESE students were not reported in accordance with the students' *Matrix of Services* forms. We propose the following adjustment:

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	1.4441	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	1.0126	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(2.4567)</u>	.0000
		<u>.0000</u>

Pleasant Hill Elementary School (#0811)

31. [Ref. 81101] An ELL Committee for one ELL student was not convened by October 1 to consider the student's continued ESOL placement beyond 3 years from the student's DEUSS. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.8394	
130 ESOL	<u>(.8394)</u>	.0000

32. [Ref. 81102] One ELL student was reported in the ESOL Program beyond the maximum 6-year period allowed for State funding of ESOL. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.8028	
130 ESOL	<u>(.8028)</u>	.0000

33. [Ref. 81103] One ESE student was not reported in accordance with the student's *Matrix of Services* form. We propose the following adjustment:

254 ESE Support Level 4	.4999	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.4999)</u>	.0000
		<u>.0000</u>

Liberty High School (#0842)

34. [Ref. 84201] An ELL Committee for one ELL student was not convened by October 1 to consider the student's continued ESOL placements beyond 3 years from the student's DEUSS. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.5962	
130 ESOL	<u>(.5962)</u>	.0000

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Liberty High School (#0842) (Continued)

35. [Ref. 84202] Five ESE students were not reported in accordance with the students' *Matrix of Services* forms. We propose the following adjustment:

113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	2.0002	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(1.5002)	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.5000)</u>	.0000

36. [Ref. 84203] The on-campus portion of the schedules for two ESE students' who were provided both on-campus and homebound instruction was incorrectly reported in Program No. 255 (ESE Support Level 5). In addition, one of the students did not receive any on-campus instruction during the February 2016 reporting survey period and the other student received less on-campus instruction during the October 2015 reporting survey period than was reported. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.6184	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(1.3586)</u>	(.7402)

37. [Ref. 84204] The timecards were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located for two Career Education 9-12 students who participated in OJT. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.2120)</u>	<u>(.2120)</u>
		<u>(.9522)</u>

UCP of Central Florida (#0900) Charter School

38. [Ref. 90003] Our review of the School's attendance records disclosed that attendance activity for the PK students enrolled was not recorded daily in the District's student attendance system (Focus). Also, although the teachers did not maintain a manual record of students' attendance, the School did retain a log whereby the PK students were signed in and out daily by the students' parents. We reviewed the logs to validate the attendance of our test students and found that all the students were signed in by the parents at least 1 day during the reporting survey periods; therefore, we present this disclosure finding with no proposed adjustment.

.0000

39. [Ref. 90001] Nine ESE students were not reported in accordance with the students' *Matrix of Services* forms. We propose the following adjustment:

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

UCP of Central Florida (#0900) Charter School (Continued)

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	3.6334	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(3.6334)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>.0000</u>

Partin Settlement Elementary School (#0904)

40. [Ref. 90401] ELL Committees for four ELL students were not convened by October 1 (one student), within 30 school days prior to the student’s DEUSS anniversary date (one student), or upon enrollment (two students) to consider the students’ continued ESOL placements beyond 3 years from the students’ DEUSS. We also noted the English language proficiency of one of the students was not timely assessed. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	1.2613	
102 Basic 4-8	.4252	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.6865)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>.0000</u>

Harmony High School (#0922)

41. [Ref. 92201] The timecards were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located for four Career Education 9-12 students who participated in OJT. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.4667)</u>	(.4667)
---------------------------	----------------	---------

42. [Ref. 92202] More hours were reported than were supported by the timecard for one Career Education 9-12 student who participated in OJT. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.0239)</u>	<u>(.0239)</u>
		<u>(.4906)</u>

Flora Ridge Elementary School (#0931)

43. [Ref. 93101] The parents of one ELL student were not notified of the student’s ESOL placement until February 23, 2016, which was after the February 2016 reporting survey period. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.4000	
130 ESOL	<u>(.4000)</u>	<u>.0000</u>

Findings

Flora Ridge Elementary School (#0931) (Continued)

44. [Ref. 93102] Three ESE students were not reported in accordance with the students' *Matrix of Services* forms. We propose the following adjustment:

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.4447	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	.9999	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(1.4446)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>.0000</u>

Sunrise Elementary School (#0958)

45. [Ref. 95801] Three ESE students were not reported in accordance with the students' *Matrix of Services* forms. We propose the following adjustment:

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	1.5555	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	.5000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(2.0555)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>.0000</u>

Mavericks High School (#0959) Charter School

46. [Ref. 95901] School records demonstrated that attendance for students in Grades 9-12 was recorded daily rather than period-by-period, which is contrary to the requirements set forth in the Department of Education's *Comprehensive Management Information System: Automated Student Attendance Recordkeeping System Handbook*. School personnel explained that students are assigned to one classroom daily and work at their own pace on APEX Learning, a computer-based learning platform, for most of their coursework and that students swiped their cards upon arrival which recorded the students' attendance electronically using a School-based software (Maestro) for such purposes (i.e., source attendance). A printout of the absences from Maestro was provided to the data operator to manually record absences in the District's attendance system (Focus) which could, if needed, provide verification reports for each of the teachers (i.e., secondary attendance records). However, since the source attendance reports generated from Maestro were verified and signed by teachers as of the end of the reporting survey period and the students' attendance in Maestro defaults to absent necessitating the teacher to actively count the student, we were able to verify that all of our test students were in attendance at least 1 day of the reporting survey period. As a result, we present this disclosure finding with no proposed adjustment.

.0000

Findings

Mavericks High School (#0959) Charter School (Continued)

47. [Ref. 95902] Two ELL students' English language proficiency was not assessed upon the students' enrollment to consider the students' continued ESOL placements beyond 3 years from the students' DEUSS. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.8000	
130 ESOL	<u>(.8000)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>.0000</u>

Osceola Virtual Franchise (Secondary) (#7004)

48. [Ref. 700470] One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by the School Board to teach out of field. The teacher held certification in Social Science but taught a course that required certification in Business Education. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.8157	
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.8157)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>.0000</u>

Hospital and Homebound Program (#9041)

49. [Ref. 904101] The course schedules for seven students were incorrectly reported in program No. 255 (ESE Support Level 5) based on the students' placements in the Hospital and Homebound Program. The homebound teachers' contact logs for six of the students indicated the students did not receive any homebound instruction during the reporting survey periods and the homebound teacher's contact log for the other student was not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. We propose the following adjustment:

255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.4884)</u>	<u>(.4884)</u>
-------------------------	----------------	----------------

50. [Ref. 904102] The FTE for 20 students who were provided both online instruction through Edmentum's Plato Courseware (Plato) and one-on-one instruction in the home (home instruction) was incorrectly reported. The instruction provided through Plato was incorrectly reported in program No. 255 (ESE Support Level 5) and should have been reported in either Program No. 112 (Grades 4-8 with ESE Services) or Program No. 113 (Grades 9-12 with ESE Services). We also noted one or more of the following exceptions for 13 of the students:

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Hospital and Homebound Program (#9041) (Continued)

- a. The number of CMW reported for students receiving home instruction was incorrectly reported as 60 CMW of instruction or .0200 FTE. The instruction was provided for 60 minutes on a monthly basis, which converts to only 15 CMW of instruction or .0050 FTE.
- b. There were no activity logs to support instructional time provided through Plato.
- c. Home instruction contact logs indicated that students received home instruction for 2 hours (or .0200 FTE each) but were not reported.

We propose the following adjustment:

112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	.2800	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	.4800	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(1.1600)</u>	(.4000)

51. [Ref. 904103] 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	.1000	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	1.0000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(1.0000)	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.1000)</u>	.0000
		<u>(.8884)</u>

Proposed Net Adjustment

(3.3498)

SCHEDULE E

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that Osceola County District School Board (District) management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) students' course schedules are reported in accordance with the schools' daily instructional and bell schedules; (2) attendance procedures are properly followed and records are maintained in compliance with Florida Statutes, SBE rules, and the Department of Education's *Comprehensive Management Information System: Automated Student Attendance Recordkeeping System Handbook*; (3) the English language proficiency of students being considered for continuation of their ESOL placements (beyond the 3-year base period) is timely assessed and ELL Committees are timely convened subsequent to these assessments; (4) students assessed as English proficient are exited from the ESOL Program or retained in ESOL based on the placement recommendations of ELL Committees that have documented at least two of the criteria specified in SBE Rule 6A-6.0902(2)(a)3., FAC; (5) ELL students are not reported beyond the maximum 6-year period allowed for State funding of ESOL; (6) parents are timely notified of their children's ESOL placements; (7) ESE students are reported in accordance with the students' *Matrix of Services* forms; (8) online classes and the on-campus portion of students' schedules enrolled in the Hospital and Homebound Program are reported in the proper funding category for the proper amount of FTE; (9) instructor contact logs for students enrolled in the Hospital and Homebound Program are properly maintained and document the services students received; (10) students in Career Education 9-12 who participate in OJT are reported in accordance with timecards that are accurately completed and retained in readily accessible files; (11) teachers are properly certified or, if teaching out of field, are timely approved by the School Board or Charter School Board to teach out of field; (12) parents are timely notified when their children are assigned to teachers teaching out of field; and (13) ESOL teachers earn the in-service training points required by SBE Rule 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

NOTE A – SUMMARY FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT

A summary discussion of the significant features of the Osceola 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 Osceola 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 Osceola 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 appointed Superintendent of Schools. The District had 48 schools other than charter schools, 17 charter schools, 1 cost center, and 3 virtual education cost centers serving PK through 12th-grade students.

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016, State funding totaling \$230.8 million was provided through the FEFP to the District for the District-reported 61,140.79 unweighted FTE as recalibrated, which included 10,245.86 unweighted FTE as recalibrated for charter schools. 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>
Districtwide – Reporting of Bell Schedules	1
1. Kissimmee Elementary School	2 and 3
2. Thacker Avenue Elementary School for International Studies	4 and 5
3. Four Corners Charter Middle School*	6 through 8
4. Avant-Garde Academy*	9 through 11
5. St. Cloud High School	12 through 16
6. Kissimmee Middle School	17 through 19
7. Westside K-8 School	20 through 23
8. Neptune Middle School	24 through 27
9. Hickory Tree Elementary School	28
10. Mill Creek Elementary School	29 and 30
11. Pleasant Hill Elementary School	31 through 33
12. Liberty High School	34 through 37
13. UCP of Central Florida*	38 and 39
14. Partin Settlement Elementary School	40
15. Harmony High School	41 and 42
16. Flora Ridge Elementary School	43 and 44
17. Sunrise Elementary School	45
18. Mavericks High School*	46 and 47
19. Osceola Virtual Instruction Program	NA

20. Osceola Virtual Franchise (Secondary)	48
21. Osceola Virtual Instruction (Course Offerings)	NA
22. Hospital and Homebound Program	49 through 51
* 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 Osceola 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

In our opinion, the Osceola County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of student transportation 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 weaknesses⁴ 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. 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. 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. The impact of this noncompliance with State requirements on the District's reported student transportation is presented in *SCHEDULES F* and *G*.

⁴ 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
November 6, 2017

SCHEDULE F

POPULATIONS, TEST SELECTION, AND TEST RESULTS STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

Any student who is transported by the Osceola 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 (731) 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 (48,726) 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	76
Hazardous Walking	721
IDEA – PK through Grade 12, Weighted	3,417
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>44,512</u>
Total	<u>48,726</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.

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.	(3)	-	-
Our tests included 411 of the 48,726 students reported as being transported by the District.	-	36	(18)
In conjunction with our general tests of student transportation, we identified certain issues related to 26 additional students.	-	<u>26</u>	<u>(21)</u>
Totals	<u>(3)</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>(39)</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. The Osceola 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*.

**Students
Transported
Proposed Net
Adjustments**

Findings

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 six students were not marked as being transported on the bus drivers’ reports; consequently, the students were not eligible to be reported for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustment:

July 2015 Survey

10 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted

(6)

(6)

2. [Ref. 52] Our general tests disclosed that the reported number of buses in operation was overstated by three buses (one bus in the July 2015 reporting survey period and two buses in the October 2015 reporting survey period). The bus number reported in the July 2015 reporting survey period was linked to an existing route already reported with another bus number counted and included only one student rider who was not noted
(Finding Continues on Next Page)

Findings

on any other bus report. The two bus number identifiers (AM and PM) noted in the October 2015 reporting survey period were routes associated with city bus transportation; therefore, these bus number identifiers should not have been included in the count of buses in operation. We propose the following adjustments:

July 2015 Survey

Number of Buses in Operation (1)

2 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted (1) (1)

October 2015 Survey

Number of Buses in Operation (2)

(3)

3. [Ref. 53] Our general tests disclosed that 19 PK students were incorrectly reported in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category. The students were not identified as IDEA students. We determined that 5 of the students were eligible to be reported in the Teenage Parents and Infants ridership category and the remaining 14 students were not otherwise eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustments:

October 2015 Survey

90 Days in Term

Teenage Parents and Infants 1

All Other FEFP Eligible Students (6)

February 2016 Survey

90 Days in Term

Teenage Parents and Infants 4

All Other FEFP Eligible Students (13) (14)

4. [Ref. 54] Six students in our test were not listed (five students) or were not marked as being transported (one student) on the bus drivers' reports. Consequently, the students were not eligible to be reported for State transportation funding. 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)

**Students
Transported
Proposed Net
Adjustments**

Findings

February 2016 Survey

90 Days in Term

Hazardous Walking	(2)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>(2)</u>	(6)

5. [Ref. 55] Six students in our test were not in membership during the reporting survey period; consequently, the students were not eligible to be reported for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustments:

July 2015 Survey

2 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(2)	
--------------------------------------	-----	--

June 2016 Survey

8 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	<u>(4)</u>	(6)
--------------------------------------	------------	-----

6. [Ref. 56] Five students in our test were incorrectly reported in the Hazardous Walking ridership category. The students lived 2 miles or more from their assigned school and should have been reported in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category. We propose the following adjustments:

October 2015 Survey

90 Days in Term

Hazardous Walking	(3)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	3	

February 2016 Survey

90 Days in Term

Hazardous Walking	(2)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>2</u>	0

7. [Ref. 57] One student in our test was incorrectly reported in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category. The student lived less than 2 miles from the student's assigned school and was not otherwise eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustment:

October 2015 Survey

90 Days in Term

All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>(1)</u>	(1)
----------------------------------	------------	-----

Findings

8. [Ref. 58] The IEPs for 13 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 reporting in a weighted ridership category. District enrollment records evidenced that 1 of the students was not in membership during the June 2016 reporting survey period and was not otherwise eligible for State transportation funding, and the other 12 students were 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	(7)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	7	

June 2016 Survey

8 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(5)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>4</u>	(1)

9. [Ref. 59] The IEPs for four ESE students in our test did not authorize extended school year services; consequently, the students were not eligible for State transportation funding in the summer reporting survey periods. We propose the following adjustments:

July 2015 Survey

2 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(2)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(1)	

June 2016 Survey

8 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	<u>(1)</u>	(4)
--------------------------------------	------------	-----

10. [Ref. 60] One student in our test was incorrectly reported in the Teenage Parents and Infants ridership category. The student was not enrolled in a Teenage Parent Program; however, since the student lived 2 miles or more from the student's assigned school, the student was eligible to be reported in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category. We propose the following adjustment:

<u>Findings</u>		<u>Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments</u>
February 2016 Survey		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
Teenage Parents and Infants	(1)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Proposed Net Adjustment		<u>(39)</u>

SCHEDULE H

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that Osceola County District School Board (District) management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) students are reported in the correct ridership category based on grade level and eligibility criteria, and documentation is on file to support that reporting; (2) the number of buses in operation is accurately reported; (3) 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; (4) only those students who are in membership and are documented as having been transported at least 1 day during the reporting survey period are reported for State transportation funding; (5) only students who live less than 2 miles from their assigned school and cross a designated hazardous walking location are reported in the Hazardous Walking ridership category; (6) the distance from home to the students' assigned schools is verified as being 2 miles or more prior to reporting students in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category; (7) students reported in the IDEA – PK through Grade 12, Weighted ridership category are documented as having met one of the five criteria required for reporting in a weighted ridership category as noted on the students' IEPs; and (8) only ESE students whose IEPs authorize extended school year services or students attending nonresidential Department of Juvenile Justice programs are reported for State transportation funding in the summer reporting survey periods.

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 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 Osceola County

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016, the District received \$11.1 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	35	179
October 2015	321	24,315
February 2016	319	23,829
June 2016	<u>56</u>	<u>403</u>
Totals	<u>731</u>	<u>48,726</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

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF OSCEOLA COUNTY, FLORIDA

817 Bill Beck Boulevard • Kissimmee • Florida 34744-4492
Phone: 407-870-4600 • Fax: 407-870-4010 • www.osceolaschools.net

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

District 1 – Jay Wheeler
407-973-4141
District 2 – Kelvin Soto - Chair
407-870-4009
District 3 – Tim Weisheyer
407-361-0235
District 4 – Clarence Thacker
407-870-4009
District 5 – Ricky Booth – Vice Chair
407-870-4009



Superintendent of Schools
Dr. Debra P. Pace

November 6, 2017

Ms. Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Auditor General
Claude Denson Pepper Building, Room 476A
111 West Madison Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1450

Attn: J. David Hughes

Dear Ms. Norman:

The School District of Osceola County, Florida has reviewed the draft audit report of the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students, and Student Transportation for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2016.

The audit disclosed material concerns in the areas of Exceptional Student Education, Teacher Certification, English for Speakers of Other Languages, Career Education and student Transportation. The District recognizes the importance of compliance and is committed to continued improvement of our FTE processes. The District will take the following measures to mitigate any future concerns:

In the areas of Exceptional Student Education, Teacher Certification, English for Speakers of Other Languages and Career Education, the District will:

- continue its effort in conducting compliance training to district personnel and school level administrators in the areas of ESOL, ESE, Career Education and Teacher Certification;
- strengthen On-the-Job Training programs by periodically reviewing student timecards for accuracy and completeness;
- continue to thoroughly review ESE Matrix of Services before each FTE survey to ensure students are correctly reported and records are maintained and properly filed;
- review Hospital and Homebound procedures to ensure the accurate reporting of attendance for face to face teacher provision of services;
- continue to ensure that teachers are qualified and scheduled in accordance with their certifications;

Student Achievement – Our Number One Priority
Districtwide Accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
An Equal Opportunity Agency

Ms. Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
November 6, 2017
Page 2

- ensure Out-of-Field Reports are Board-approved and parent notifications are sent in a timely manner;
- ensure ESOL compliance requirements have been met according to each teacher's individual category and timeline;
- implement a data quality initiative comprised of both school and information system staff to verify the accuracy of state reported data and ensure course schedules are reported in accordance with instructional and bell schedules;
- continue to train teachers and data entry clerks to ensure attendance is taken daily and attendance procedures are followed and regularly monitored; and
- continue to provide training and on-going technical support to Charter Schools' staff to ensure students are reported correctly.

In the area of reporting student ridership in the transportation area, the District will:

- ensure students are placed in the appropriate ridership categories through an adequate review process,
- ensure weighted students are identified based on the criteria required for IDEA classification,
- continue to enhance the interaction and validation of data between the student information system and the student transportation management software, and
- ensure students are registered and passenger lists are filed in a timely manner, as required.

The District does not dispute any findings that are applicable to Osceola District Schools.

We would like to thank you and your staff for your assistance and recommendations.

Sincerely,



Dr. Debra P. Pace
Superintendent
The School District of Osceola County, Florida