

AUDITOR GENERAL WILLIAM O. MONROE, CPA



UNION COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

FLORIDA EDUCATION FINANCE PROGRAM (FEFP)
FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS

AND

STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

The governing body of the District is the District School Board, which is composed of five elected members. The executive officer of the Board is the elected Superintendent of Schools. The Board members and Superintendent of Schools who served during the examination period were: Sue R. Whitehead; Alvin A. Griffis; Marsan Carr, Vice-Chair to 11-15-04, Chair from 11-16-04; Allen Parrish, Vice-Chair from 11-16-04; Sandra R. Floyd, Chair to 11-15-04; and Carlton Faulk, Superintendent.

This examination was conducted by Jeremy A. Riggins, CPA, and supervised by J. David Hughes, CPA. Please address inquiries regarding this report to Joe Williams, CPA, Audit Manager, via e-mail at joewilliams@aud.state.fl.us or by telephone at (850) 414-9941.

This report, as well as other audit reports prepared by the Auditor General, can be obtained on our Web site (http://www.state.fl.us/audgen); by telephone at (850) 487-9024; or by mail at G74 Claude Pepper Building, 111 West Madison Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1450.

Union County District School Board **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS	NO NO
Independent Auditor's Report	1
Schedule A - Populations, Samples, and Audit Adjustments	3
Schedule B - Effect of Audit Adjustments on Weighted FTE	5
Schedule C - Audit Adjustments by School	6
Schedule D - Findings and Audit Adjustments	7
Schedule E – Recommendations and Regulatory Citations	11
Schedule F – Summary of Management's Response	13
Notes to Schedules	14
STUDENT TRANSPORTATION	
Independent Auditor's Report	18
Schedule A - Populations, Samples, and Audit Adjustments	20
Schedule B - Findings and Audit Adjustments	21
Schedule C – Recommendations and Regulatory Citations	23
Schedule D – Summary of Management's Response	24
Notes to Schedules	25
MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE	27

Union County District School Board LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

IEP – Individual Educational Plan

EP – Educational Plan

ESE – Exceptional Student Education

ESOL – English for Speakers of Other Languages

PK – Prekindergarten

OJT – On-the-Job Training

IDEA - Individuals with Disabilities Education Act



AUDITOR GENERAL STATE OF FLORIDA

WILLIAM O. MONROE, CPA
AUDITOR GENERAL

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



850/488-5534/SC 278-5534 Fax: 488-6975/SC 278-6975

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

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT UNION COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS

We have examined management's assertion, included in its representation letter dated May 17, 2006, that the Union County District School Board complied with the State requirements governing the determination and reporting of the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005. 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 issued by the Department of Education. As discussed in the representation letter, management is responsible for the District's compliance with State requirements. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the District's compliance based on our examination.

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

In our opinion, the Union County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements governing the determination and reporting of the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005.

The results of our examination disclosed instances of noncompliance with the State requirements mentioned above. We considered these instances of noncompliance in forming our opinion regarding management's assertion and these items did not affect our opinion as stated above. All of the instances of noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures are discussed in SCHEDULE D. The impact of those instances of noncompliance on the District's reported number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students is presented in SCHEDULE A, SCHEDULE B, SCHEDULE C, and SCHEDULE D.

This report is intended for the information of the Legislative Auditing Committee, members of the Florida Senate and the Florida House of Representatives, the State Board of Education, the Department of Education, and the Union County District School Board. Copies of this report are available pursuant to Section 11.45(4)(c), Florida Statutes, and its distribution is not limited.

Respectfully submitted,

William O. Monroe, CPA

William O. Momore

June 12, 2006

SCHEDULE A

Union County District School Board

FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

1. Basic	Description ¹	Number of <u>Schools</u>	% of <u>Pop.</u> (y	Number of Students w/Exceptions)	% of Pop. (Sample)	Number of $\underline{\text{Un}}$ weighted $\underline{\text{FTE}}^2$	% of Pop. (Sample)
Population	1 Davis						
Sample Size		5	100.009/-	1 011	100.00%	1 620 6259	100 00%
Net Audit Adjustments				•		*	
2. English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Population 0 0.00% 0 0.00% 0.000% 0.000 0.00% Sample Size* 0 0.00% 0 0.00% 0.000% 0.000 0.00% Net Audit Adjustments* (0) (0.00%) 0.000% 0.000 - 3. Exceptional - Basic with ESE Services Population* 5 100.00% 458 100.00% 419.1763 100.00% Sample Size* 4 80.00% 54 11.79% 48.5188 11.57% Net Audit Adjustments* (4) (7.41%) (.7799) - 4. Exceptional - ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 Population* 4 100.00% 32 100.00% (1.2668) - Sample Size* 4 100.00% 30 93.75% 21.9580 93.50% Net Audit Adjustments* (21) (70.00%) (1.2668) - 5. Vocational 9-12 On-the-Job Training (OJT) Population* 2 100.00% 26 100.00% 9.2558 100.00% Sample Size* 1 50.00% 12 46.15% 4.7404 51.22% Net Audit Adjustments* (2) (16.67%) (.6553) - 6. Vocational 9-12 (Excluding OJT) Population* 2 100.00% 76.7945 100.00% Sample Size* 0 0.00% 0.0000 0.00% Net Audit Adjustments* (2) (16.67%) (.6553) -							4.0370
Population	Net Mudit Majusun	ents -	-	(4)	(3.3370)	3.3692	-
Sample Size* 0 0.00% 0 0.00% .0000 0.00% Net Audit Adjustments** - - (0) (0.00%) .0000 - 3. Exceptional - Basic with ESE Services Population* 5 100.00% 458 100.00% 419.1763 100.00% Sample Size* 4 80.00% 54 11.79% 48.5188 11.57% Net Audit Adjustments* - - (4) (7.41%) (7799) - 4. Exceptional - ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 Population* 4 100.00% 32 100.00% 23.4856 100.00% Sample Size* 4 100.00% 32 100.00% 23.4856 100.00% Sample Size* 4 100.00% 30 93.75% 21.9580 93.50% Net Audit Adjustments* - - (21) (70.00%) (1.2668) - 5. Vocational 9-12 On-the-lob Training (OJT) Population* 2 100.00% 2 100.00% 9.2558 100.00% Sample Size* <td>2. English for Speake</td> <td>rs of Other</td> <td>Languages (I</td> <td>ESOL)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	2. English for Speake	rs of Other	Languages (I	ESOL)			
Net Audit Adjustments	Population ³	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	.0000	0.00%
3. Exceptional - Basic with ESE Services Population 5 100.00% 458 100.00% 419.1763 100.00% Sample Size 4 80.00% 54 11.79% 48.5188 11.57% Net Audit Adjustments (4) (7.41%) (7.799) - 4. Exceptional - ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 Population 4 100.00% 32 100.00% 23.4856 100.00% Sample Size 4 100.00% 30 93.75% 21.9580 93.50% Net Audit Adjustments (21) (70.00%) (1.2668) - 5. Vocational 9-12 On-the-Job Training (OJT) Population 2 100.00% 26 100.00% 9.2558 100.00% Sample Size 1 50.00% 12 46.15% 4.7404 51.22% Net Audit Adjustments (2) (16.67%) (.6553) - 6. Vocational 9-12 (Excluding OJT) Population 2 100.00% 76.7945 100.00% Sample Size 0 0.00% 0.0000 0.00% Net Audit Adjustments 0.0000 - All Programs Population 5 100.00% 2,330 100.00% 2,168.3480 100.00% Sample Size 4 80.00% 171 7.34% 141.3220 6.52%	Sample Size⁴	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	.0000	0.00%
Populations 5 100.00% 458 100.00% 419.1763 100.00% Sample Sizes 4 80.00% 54 11.79% 48.5188 11.57% Net Audit Adjustmentss - - (4) (7.41%) (.7799) - 4. Exceptional - ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 Populations 4 100.00% 32 100.00% 23.4856 100.00% Sample Sizes 4 100.00% 30 93.75% 21.9580 93.50% Net Audit Adjustmentss - - (21) (70.00%) (1.2668) - 5. Vocational 9-12 On-the-Job Training (OJT) Populations 2 100.00% 26 100.00% 9.2558 100.00% Sample Sizes 1 50.00% 12 46.15% 4.7404 51.22% Net Audit Adjustmentss - - - 76.7945 100.00% Sample Sizes 0 0.00% - - - 0.0000 0.00% Net Audit Adjustmentss - <td>Net Audit Adjustm</td> <td>ents⁵ -</td> <td>-</td> <td>(0)</td> <td>(0.00%)</td> <td>.0000</td> <td>-</td>	Net Audit Adjustm	ents ⁵ -	-	(0)	(0.00%)	.0000	-
Population	3 Evcentional Basic	with ESE	Samicas				
Sample Size¹ 4 80.00% 54 11.79% 48.5188 11.57% Net Audit Adjustments³ - (4) (7.41%) (.7799) - 4. Exceptional - ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 Population³ 4 100.00% 32 100.00% 23.4856 100.00% Sample Size⁴ 4 100.00% 30 93.75% 21.9580 93.50% Net Audit Adjustments³ - (21) (70.00%) (1.2668) - 5. Vocational 9-12 On-the-Job Training (OJT) Population³ 2 100.00% 26 100.00% 9.2558 100.00% Sample Size⁴ 1 50.00% 12 46.15% 4.7404 51.22% Net Audit Adjustments³ - (2) (16.67%) (.6553) - 6. Vocational 9-12 (Excluding OJT) Population³ 2 100.00% - - 76.7945 100.00% Sample Size⁴ 0 0.00% - - 0.0000 - All Programs Population³ 5				458	100.00%	419 1763	100.00%
Net Audit Adjustments's - - (4) (7.41%) (.7799) - 4. Exceptional - ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 Populations' 4 100.00% 32 32 32 100.00% 23.4856 100.00% Sample Size's 4 100.00% 30 93.75% 21.9580 93.50% Net Audit Adjustments's - - (21) (70.00%) (1.2668) - 5. Vocational 9-12 On-the-Job Training (OJT) Populations' 2 100.00% 26 100.00% 9.2558 100.00% Sample Size's 1 50.00% 12 46.15% 4.7404 51.22% Net Audit Adjustments's - - (2) (16.67%) (.6553) - 6. Vocational 9-12 (Excluding OJT) Populations' 2 100.00% - - - 76.7945 100.00% 5ample Size's 0 0.00% - - - 0.0000 0.00% 0.00% 1							
4. Exceptional - ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 Population ³ 4 100.00% 32 100.00% 23.4856 100.00% Sample Size ⁴ 4 100.00% 30 93.75% 21.9580 93.50% Net Audit Adjustments ⁵ (21) (70.00%) (1.2668) - 5. Vocational 9-12 On-the-Job Training (OIT) Population ³ 2 100.00% 26 100.00% 9.2558 100.00% Sample Size ⁴ 1 50.00% 12 46.15% 4.7404 51.22% Net Audit Adjustments ⁵ (2) (16.67%) (.6553) - 6. Vocational 9-12 (Excluding OIT) Population ³ 2 100.00% 76.7945 100.00% Sample Size ⁴ 0 0.00% 0.0000 0.00% Net Audit Adjustments ⁵ 0.0000 - **Net Audit Adjustments ⁵ 0.0000 - **All Programs Population ³ 5 100.00% 2,330 100.00% 2,168.3480 100.00% Sample Size ⁴ 4 80.00% 171 7.34% 141.3220 6.52%							
Population³ 4 100.00% 32 100.00% 23.4856 100.00% Sample Size¹ 4 100.00% 30 93.75% 21.9580 93.50% Net Audit Adjustments⁵ - - (21) (70.00%) (1.2668) - 5. Vocational 9-12 On-the-Job Training (OJT) Population³ 2 100.00% 26 100.00% 9.2558 100.00% Sample Size⁴ 1 50.00% 12 46.15% 4.7404 51.22% Net Audit Adjustments⁵ - - (2) (16.67%) (.6553) - 6. Vocational 9-12 (Excluding OJT) Population³ 2 100.00% - - 76.7945 100.00% Sample Size⁴ 0 0.00% - - 0.0000 0.00% Net Audit Adjustments⁵ - - - 0.0000 - Net Audit Adjustments⁵ - - - 0.0000 - All Programs Population³ 5 100.00% 2,330	rvet rudit rujusum	CIIts" -		(4)	(7.4170)	(.1177)	
Sample Size4 4 100.00% 30 93.75% 21.9580 93.50% Net Audit Adjustments5 - - (21) (70.00%) (1.2668) - 5. Vocational 9-12 On-the-Job Training (OJT) Population3 2 100.00% 26 100.00% 9.2558 100.00% Sample Size4 1 50.00% 12 46.15% 4.7404 51.22% Net Audit Adjustments5 - - (2) (16.67%) (.6553) - 6. Vocational 9-12 (Excluding OJT) Population3 2 100.00% - - 76.7945 100.00% Sample Size4 0 0.00% - - 0.0000 0.00% Net Audit Adjustments5 - - - - 0.0000 - All Programs Population3 5 100.00% 2,330 100.00% 2,168.3480 100.00% Sample Size4 4 80.00% 171 7.34% 141.3220 6.52%		Support Le					
Net Audit Adjustments ⁵ (21) (70.00%) (1.2668) - 5. <u>Vocational 9-12 On-the-Job Training (OJT)</u> Population ³ 2 100.00% 26 100.00% 9.2558 100.00% Sample Size ⁴ 1 50.00% 12 46.15% 4.7404 51.22% Net Audit Adjustments ⁵ (2) (16.67%) (.6553) - 6. <u>Vocational 9-12 (Excluding OJT)</u> Population ³ 2 100.00% 76.7945 100.00% Sample Size ⁴ 0 0.00% 0.0000 0.00% Net Audit Adjustments ⁵ 2 0.0000 - Net Audit Adjustments ⁵ 2 2,330 100.00% 2,168.3480 100.00% Sample Size ⁴ 4 80.00% 171 7.34% 141.3220 6.52%	Population ³	4	100.00%	32	100.00%	23.4856	100.00%
5. Vocational 9-12 On-the-Job Training (OJT) Population ³ 2 100.00% 26 100.00% 9.2558 100.00% Sample Size ⁴ 1 50.00% 12 46.15% 4.7404 51.22% Net Audit Adjustments ⁵ (2) (16.67%) (.6553) - 6. Vocational 9-12 (Excluding OJT) Population ³ 2 100.00% 76.7945 100.00% Sample Size ⁴ 0 0.00% 0.0000 0.00% Net Audit Adjustments ⁵ 1.0000 - Net Audit Adjustments ⁵ 1.0000 - All Programs Population ³ 5 100.00% 2,330 100.00% 2,168.3480 100.00% Sample Size ⁴ 4 80.00% 171 7.34% 141.3220 6.52%			100.00%	30	93.75%	21.9580	93.50%
Population³ 2 100.00% 26 100.00% 9.2558 100.00% Sample Size⁴ 1 50.00% 12 46.15% 4.7404 51.22% Net Audit Adjustments⁵ - - (2) (16.67%) (.6553) - 6. Vocational 9-12 (Excluding OJT) Population³ 2 100.00% - - 76.7945 100.00% Sample Size⁴ 0 0.00% - - 0.0000 0.00% Net Audit Adjustments⁵ - - - 0.0000 - Sample Size⁴ 4 80.00% 171 7.34% 141.3220 6.52%	Net Audit Adjustm	ents ⁵ -	-	(21)	(70.00%)	(1.2668)	-
Population³ 2 100.00% 26 100.00% 9.2558 100.00% Sample Size⁴ 1 50.00% 12 46.15% 4.7404 51.22% Net Audit Adjustments⁵ - - (2) (16.67%) (.6553) - 6. Vocational 9-12 (Excluding OJT) Population³ 2 100.00% - - 76.7945 100.00% Sample Size⁴ 0 0.00% - - 0.0000 0.00% Net Audit Adjustments⁵ - - - 0.0000 - Sample Size⁴ 4 80.00% 171 7.34% 141.3220 6.52%	5 Vocational 9-12 Or	n-the-Iob Ti	raining (OIT)			
Sample Size4 1 50.00% 12 46.15% 4.7404 51.22% Net Audit Adjustments5 - - (2) (16.67%) (.6553) - 6. Vocational 9-12 (Excluding OJT) Population3 2 100.00% - - 76.7945 100.00% Sample Size4 0 0.00% - - 0.0000 0.00% Net Audit Adjustments5 - - - - .0000 - All Programs Population3 5 100.00% 2,330 100.00% 2,168.3480 100.00% Sample Size4 4 80.00% 171 7.34% 141.3220 6.52%			0		100 00%	9 2558	100 00%
Net Audit Adjustments ⁵ (2) (16.67%) (.6553) - 6. Vocational 9-12 (Excluding OJT) Population ³ 2 100.00% 76.7945 100.00% Sample Size ⁴ 0 0.00% 0.0000 0.00% Net Audit Adjustments ⁵ 0000 - All Programs Population ³ 5 100.00% 2,330 100.00% 2,168.3480 100.00% Sample Size ⁴ 4 80.00% 171 7.34% 141.3220 6.52%							
Population³ 2 100.00% - - 76.7945 100.00% Sample Size⁴ 0 0.00% - - 0.0000 0.00% Net Audit Adjustments⁵ - - - - 0.0000 - All Programs Population³ 5 100.00% 2,330 100.00% 2,168.3480 100.00% Sample Size⁴ 4 80.00% 171 7.34% 141.3220 6.52%							
Population³ 2 100.00% - - 76.7945 100.00% Sample Size⁴ 0 0.00% - - 0.0000 0.00% Net Audit Adjustments⁵ - - - - 0.0000 - All Programs Population³ 5 100.00% 2,330 100.00% 2,168.3480 100.00% Sample Size⁴ 4 80.00% 171 7.34% 141.3220 6.52%	6 Venetional 0.12 (E	waludia o Ol	T\				
Sample Size ⁴ 0 0.00% 0.0000 0.00% Net Audit Adjustments ⁵ 0.0000 -		0 5	,			76 7045	100.000/
Net Audit Adjustments ⁵ 00000000	*			-	-		
All Programs Population ³ 5 100.00% 2,330 100.00% 2,168.3480 100.00% Sample Size ⁴ 4 80.00% 171 7.34% 141.3220 6.52%	*	-	0.00%	-	-		0.00%
Population³ 5 100.00% 2,330 100.00% 2,168.3480 100.00% Sample Size⁴ 4 80.00% 171 7.34% 141.3220 6.52%	Net Audit Adjustm	ents ⁵ -	-		- 	.0000	-
Population³ 5 100.00% 2,330 100.00% 2,168.3480 100.00% Sample Size⁴ 4 80.00% 171 7.34% 141.3220 6.52%	All Programs						
Sample Size ⁴ 4 80.00% 171 7.34% 141.3220 6.52%	C	5	100.00%	2.330	100.00%	2,168,3480	100.00%
			-				

SCHEDULE A (Continued)

Union County District School Board

FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

Description ¹	Number of Schools	% of <u>Pop.</u>	Number of Teachers (w/Exceptions)	% of Pop. (Sample)	Number of \underline{Un} weighted \underline{FTE}^2
Teacher Certification					
Population	5	100.00%	37	100.00%	-
Sample Size ⁴	4	80.00%	16	43.24%	-
Net Audit Adjustments ⁵	-	-	(2)	(12.50%)	-
Basic	-	-	-	-	.6010
ESE Support Levels 4 and 5	-	-	-	-	(.1220)
Vocational 9-12	-	-	-	-	<u>(.4790</u>)
					.0000
Non-Sampled Students (See Finding	<u>s No. 5</u>)				
Net Audit Adjustments ⁵	,				
Basic	-	-	-	-	.4051
ESE Support Levels 4 and 5	-	-	-	-	.1835
Vocational 9-12	-	-	-	-	<u>.0069</u>
			-	-	<u>.5955</u>
Net Audit Adjustments					<u>3.4827</u>

¹ See NOTE A6.

² Unweighted full-time equivalent (FTE) students represents FTE prior to the application of the applicable cost factor for each program. (See SCHEDULE B and NOTE A4.)

³ The population shown for the number of schools is the total number of schools in the District which offered the courses in the program specified (i.e., Basic, ESOL, ESE, and Vocational). The population shown for the number of students is the total number of students in each program at the schools in our sample. Our Vocational sample was limited to only those students who participated in OJT. The population shown for full-time equivalent (FTE) students is the total FTE for all of the District's schools (sample schools plus nonsample schools) as reported for each survey conducted for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005. The population shown for teachers is the total number of teachers at schools in our sample who taught courses in ESE or Vocational education or taught courses to LEP students. (See NOTE A5.)

⁴ See NOTE B.

⁵ Our audit adjustments generally reclassify reported FTE to Basic education for all exceptions except for those involving a student's attendance or enrollment (the audit adjustments for which take the reported FTE to zero).

SCHEDULE B

Union County District School Board

FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS EFFECT OF AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS ON WEIGHTED FTE

(For Illustrative Purposes Only)

No. Program ¹	Net Audit Adjustment ²	Cost <u>Factor</u>	Weighted <u>FTE</u> ³
102 Basic 4-8	1.8940	1.000	1.8940
103 Basic 9-12	4.7013	1.132	5.3219
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(.7799)	1.132	(.8828)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.7053)	3.948	(2.7845)
255 ESE Support Level 5	(.5000)	5.591	(2.7955)
300 Vocational 9-12	<u>(1.1274</u>)	1.187	(1.3382)
Total	<u>3.4827</u>		<u>(.5851</u>)

¹ See NOTE A6.

² These adjustments are for <u>un</u>weighted FTE. (See SCHEDULE C.)

³ Weighted FTE adjustments are presented for illustrative purposes only; they 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 audit adjustments. That computation is the responsibility of the Department of Education. (See NOTE A4.)

SCHEDULE C

Union County District School Board

FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

Audit Adjustments1

No. Program	<u>#0021</u>	<u>#0022</u>	<u>#7021</u>	<u>Total</u>
102 Basic 4-8			1.8940	1.8940
103 Basic 9-12	1.5917		3.1096	4.7013
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(1.5000)		.7201	(.7799)
254 ESE Support Level 4		.5000	(1.2053)	(.7053)
255 ESE Support Level 5		(.5000)		(.5000)
300 Vocational 9-12	<u>(.2250</u>)	<u></u>	<u>(.9024</u>)	<u>(1.1274)</u>
Total	<u>(.1333</u>)	<u>.0000</u>	<u>3.6160</u>	<u>3.4827</u>

¹ These adjustments are for <u>un</u>weighted FTE. (See NOTE A4.)

SCHEDULE D

Union County District School Board

FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

Overview

Management is responsible for determining and reporting the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) in compliance with State requirements. These requirements are found primarily in Sections 1011.60, 1011.61, and 1011.62, Florida Statutes; State Board of Education Rules, Chapter 6A-1, Florida Administrative Code; and the FTE General Instructions issued by the Department of Education. The Union County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements governing the determination and reporting of FTE for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005. All of the instances of noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures are discussed below and require management's attention and action, as recommended on page 11.

Net Audit
Adjustment
(Unweighted FTE)

Findings

Union County High School (#0021)

1. [Ref. 2101] One student's course schedule in the October survey was underreported by .0833 FTE due to an isolated data processing error. We made the following audit adjustments:

103 Basic 9-12 .0917 300 Vocational 9-12 .0833

2. [Ref. 2102] The EPs for three ESE Gifted students in the October survey were not prepared until November 5, 2004, after the October survey. We made the following audit adjustments:

103 Basic 9-12 1.5000 113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services (1.5000) .0000

3. [Ref. 2103] The supporting timecard for one student in OJT was missing and could not be located for the October survey week. (The timecard provided to us covered up to October 5, 2004, prior to the October survey week.) We made the following audit adjustment:

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Union County District School Board

FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

Net Audit
Adjustment
(Unweighted FTE)

Findings

Union County High School (#0021) (Continued)

300 Vocational 9-12 (.2166)

(.1333)

Lake Butler Middle School (#0022)

4. [Ref. 2201] One ESE student was not reported in accordance with the student's *Matrix of Services* form. We made the following audit adjustments:

254 ESE Support Level 4 255 ESE Support Level 5

.0000

.5000 (.5000)

Eckerd Comprehensive Youth Treatment Center (#7021)

- 5. [Ref. 702101] Thirty students in the July and June surveys (22 of whom were in our sample) were reported for an incorrect number of days-in-term. The students in the July survey were reported for a 20-day term and the students in the June survey were reported for a 5-day term. They should have been reported for a 22-day term and a 38-day term, respectively. We also noted the following exceptions involving 13 of the 30 students and all four surveys.
 - a. The *Matrix of Services* forms for six students, and the IEPs for five of those six, were missing and could not be located. We also noted that the course schedule for one of the students was not reported entirely in ESE, as it should have been.
 - b. Two students were not reported in accordance with their Matrix of Services forms.
 - c. The course schedules for four ESE students were reported incorrectly in both ESE and Basic education. The course schedules for ESE students should be reported entirely in ESE.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Union County District School Board

FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

Net Audit
Adjustment
(Unweighted FTE)

Findings

Eckerd Comprehensive Youth Treatment Center (#7021) (Continued)

d. The course schedule for one student in ESE was incorrectly omitted from the October survey due to an isolated data processing error.

We made the following audit adjustments:

102 Basic 4-8	1.8940	
103 Basic 9-12	2.5086	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	.7201	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(1.1663)	
300 Vocational 9-12	(.3404)	3.6160

6. [Ref. 702102] The course schedule for one ESE student in the February survey was reported incorrectly in both ESE and Vocational education. The course schedules for ESE students should be reported entirely in ESE. We made the following audit adjustments:

254 ESE Support Level 4	.0830	
300 Vocational 9-12	<u>(.0830</u>)	.0000

7. [Ref. 702170] The parents of the students taught Agriculture by one out-of-field teacher were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We made the following audit adjustments:

103 Basic 9-12	.2690	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.1220)	
300 Vocational 9-12	(.1470) .000	0

8. [Ref. 702171] One teacher in the February survey was not properly certified and was not approved by the School Board to teach out-of-field. The teacher held certification in ESE, but taught courses which required certification in Agriculture. We also noted that the parents of the students taught by this teacher were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We made the following audit adjustments:

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Union County District School Board

FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

Net Audit
Adjustment
(Unweighted FTE)

Findings

Eckerd Comprehensive Youth Treatment Center (#7021) (Continued)

103 Basic 9-12 .3320

300 Vocational 9-12 (.3320) .0000

3.6160

3.4827

SCHEDULE E

Union County District School Board

FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

Recommendations

We recommend that management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that:

(1) only eligible students, who were in attendance and membership during survey, are reported for State funding;

(2) timecards for students in OJT programs are properly completed and retained in readily accessible files; (3) students are reported in the proper funding categories and have adequate documentation to support their reporting, particularly with regard to students in ESE programs; (4) teachers are properly certified or, if out-of-field, have timely School Board approval to teach out-of-field; and (5) the parents of students taught by out-of-field teachers are properly notified of the teachers' out-of-field status prior to the survey concerned.

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

Regulatory Citations

porting	

Section 1011.60, F.S	Minimum Requirements of Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Section 1011.61, F.S	Definitions
Section 1011.62, F.S	Funds for Operation of Schools
Rule 6A-1.0451, F.A.C	FEFP Student Membership Surveys
Rule 6A-1.04513, F.A.C	Maintaining Auditable FTE Records

FTE General Instructions 2004-2005

Attendance

Section 1003.23, F.S.Attendance Records and Reports Rules 6A-1.044(3)&(6)(c), F.A.C. ...Pupil Attendance Records Rule 6A-1.04513, F.A.C.Maintaining Auditable FTE Records

FTE General Instructions 2004-2005

Comprehensive Management Information System: Automated Student Attendance Recordkeeping System

Vocational On-the-Job Attendance

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

SCHEDULE E (Continued)

Union County District School Board FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

Regulatory Citations (Continued)

Exceptional Education
Section 1003.57(5), F.SExceptional Students Instruction
Section 1011.62, F.SFunds for Operation of Schools
Section 1011.62(1)(e), F.SFunding Model for Exceptional Student Education Programs
Rule 6A-6.03028, F.A.CDevelopment of Individual Educational Plans for Exceptional Students
Rule 6A-6.03029, F.A.CDevelopment of Family Support Plans for Children with Disabilities Ages Birth Through Five Years
Rule 6A-6.0312, F.A.CCourse Modification for Exceptional Students
Rule 6A-6.0331, F.A.CIdentification and Assignment of Exceptional Students to Special Programs
Rule 6A-6.0334, F.A.CTemporary Assignment of Transferring Exceptional Students
Rule 6A-6.03411, F.A.CSpecial Programs and Procedures for Exceptional Students
Vocational On-the-Job Funding Hours
Rule 6A-6.055(3), F.A.CDefinitions of Terms in Vocational Education Program
FTE General Instructions 2004-2005
<u>Teacher Certification</u>
Section 1003.56, F.SEnglish Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient Students
Section 1011.62(1)(g), F.SEducation for Speakers of Other Languages
Section 1012.42(2), F.STeacher Teaching Out-of-Field; Notification Requirements
Section 1012.55, F.SPositions for Which Certificates Required
Rule 6A-1.0502, F.A.CNoncertificated Instructional Personnel
Rule 6A-1.0503, F.A.CQualified Instructional Personnel
Rule 6A-4.001, F.A.CInstructional Personnel Certification

SCHEDULE F

Union County District School Board

FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

Management agreed with our findings and recommendations.

A copy of management's response may be found beginning on page 27 of this report.

-13-

Union County District School Board FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS NOTES TO SCHEDULES

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

NOTE A - SUMMARY

A summary discussion of the significant features of the District, the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP), full-time equivalent (FTE) students, and related areas follows:

1. School District of Union County

The District was established pursuant to Section 1001.30, Florida Statutes, to provide public educational services for the residents of Union County, Florida. Those services are provided primarily to students attending kindergarten through high school, but also to adults seeking vocational-type training. The District is part of the State system of public education under the general direction and control of the State Board of Education. The geographic boundaries of the District are those of Union County. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005, the District operated five schools, reported 2,168.3480 unweighted full-time equivalent (FTE) students, and received approximately \$9 million in State funding under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) for those FTE. The primary sources of funding for the District are funds from FEFP, local ad valorem taxes, and Federal grants and donations.

2. Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)

Florida school districts receive State funding through the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP), which was established by the Florida Legislature in 1973. It is the intent of the law "to guarantee to each student in the Florida public school system the availability of programs and services appropriate to his educational needs which are substantially equal to those available to any similar student notwithstanding geographic differences and varying local economic factors." To provide equalization of educational opportunity in Florida, the FEFP formula recognizes (1) varying local property tax bases, (2) varying program cost factors, (3) district cost differentials, and (4) differences in per student cost for equivalent educational programs due to sparsity and dispersion of student population.

Union County District School Board FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS NOTES TO SCHEDULES

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

NOTE A - SUMMARY (Continued)

3. Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students

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

4. <u>Calculation of FEFP Funds</u>

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

5. <u>FTE Surveys</u>

FTE is determined and reported during the school year by means of four FTE membership surveys, which are conducted under the direction of district and school management. Each survey is a sampling of FTE membership for a period of one week. The surveys for the 2004-2005 school year were conducted during and for the following weeks: survey one was performed for July 12-16, 2004; survey two was performed for October 11-15, 2004; survey three was performed for February 7-11, 2005; and survey four was performed for June 13-17, 2005.

Union County District School Board FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS NOTES TO SCHEDULES

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

NOTE A - SUMMARY (Continued)

6. Educational Programs

The Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) funds ten specific programs under which instruction may be provided as authorized by the Florida Legislature. The general program titles under which these specific programs fall are as follows: (1) Basic; (2) English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL); (3) Exceptional; and (4) Vocational (9-12).

7. Statutes and Rules

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

Chapter 1000, F.SK-20 General Provisions
Chapter 1001, F.SK-20 Governance
Chapter 1002, F.SStudent and Parental Rights and Educational Choices
Chapter 1003, F.SPublic K-12 Education
Chapter 1006, F.SSupport for Learning
Chapter 1007, F.SArticulation and Access
Chapter 1010, F.SFinancial Matters
Chapter 1011, F.SPlanning and Budgeting
Chapter 1012, F.SPersonnel
Chapter 6A-1, F.A.CFinance and Administration
Chapter 6A-4, F.A.CCertification
Chapter 6A-6, F.A.CSpecial Programs I

NOTE B - SAMPLING

Our examination procedures provided for the selection of samples of schools, students, and teachers, using statistical and judgmental methods, for testing FTE reported to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005. Our sampling process was designed to facilitate the performance of appropriate examination procedures to test the District's compliance with State requirements governing FTE and the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP). The following schools were in our sample:

Union County District School Board FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS NOTES TO SCHEDULES

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

NOTE B - SAMPLING (Continued)

School Name/Description	Finding Number(s)
1. Union County High School	1 through 3
2. Lake Butler Middle School	4
3. Lake Butler Elementary School	NA
4. Eckerd Comprehensive Youth Treatment Center	5 through 8



WILLIAM O. MONROE, CPA

AUDITOR GENERAL

AUDITOR GENERAL STATE OF FLORIDA

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



850/488-5534/SC 278-5534 Fax: 488-6975/SC 278-6975

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

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT UNION COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

We have examined management's assertion, included in its representation letter dated May 17, 2006, that the Union County District School Board complied with State requirements governing the determination and reporting of the number of students transported for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005. 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* issued by the Department of Education. As discussed in the representation letter, management is responsible for the District's compliance with State requirements. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the District's compliance based on our examination.

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

In our opinion, the Union County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements governing the determination and reporting of the number of students transported for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005.

The results of our examination disclosed instances of noncompliance with the State requirements mentioned above. We considered these instances of noncompliance in forming our opinion regarding management's assertion and these items did not affect our opinion as stated above. All of the instances of noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures are discussed in SCHEDULE B. The impact of those instances of noncompliance on the District's reported number of transported students is presented in SCHEDULE A and SCHEDULE B.

This report is intended for the information of the Legislative Auditing Committee, members of the Florida Senate and the Florida House of Representatives, the State Board of Education, the Department of Education, and the Union County District School Board. Copies of this report are available pursuant to Section 11.45(4)(c), Florida Statutes, and its distribution is not limited.

Respectfully submitted,

William O. Monroe, CPA

William O. Momore

June 12, 2006

SCHEDULE A

Union County District School Board

STUDENT TRANSPORTATION POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

<u>Description</u>	Number of <u>Vehicles</u>	% of <u>Pop.</u>	No. of Students <u>Transp.</u>	% of Pop. (Sample)
Population ¹ Sample ²	44 20	100.00% 45.45%	2,339 100	100.00% 4.28%
General Tests Net Audit Adjustments	-	-	(3)	NM
<u>Detailed Tests</u> Students w/ Exceptions Net Audit Adjustments	- -	- -	1 (1)	(1.00%) (1.00%)
General and Detailed Tests Total Net Audit Adjustments	-	-	(4)	NM

NM - Not Meaningful

¹ The population figures for students are the totals of the figures reported for each survey conducted for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005. The District reported 2,339 students in the following ridership categories: 16 in IDEA (K-12), Weighted; 46 in IDEA (PK), Unweighted; and 2,277 in Two Miles or More. The District also reported operating a total of 44 vehicles (42 huses and 2 passenger cars).

² See NOTE B.

SCHEDULE B

Union County District School Board STUDENT TRANSPORTATION FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

Overview

Management is responsible for determining and reporting the number of students transported in compliance with State requirements. These requirements are found primarily in Chapter 1006 Part I, E., and Section 1011.68, Florida Statutes; State Board of Education Rules, Chapter 6A-3, Florida Administrative Code; and the *Student Transportation General Instructions* issued by the Department of Education. The Union County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements governing the determination and reporting of students transported for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005. All of the instances of noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures are discussed below and require management's attention and action, as recommended on page 23.

Students Transported Net Audit Adjustment

Findings

Our examination procedures included both general tests and detailed tests. For our general tests, we made inquiries concerning the District's transportation of students and reconciled the District's reported ridership totals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005, to the supporting records. Our general tests disclosed the instances of noncompliance discussed in finding No. 1. Our detailed tests of the specific ridership categories for students sampled from the October and February surveys disclosed the instances of noncompliance discussed in finding No. 2.

General Tests

1. [Ref. 51] Our reconciliation of the District's reported ridership for the October and February surveys to the supporting records disclosed certain posting and clerical errors for which we made the following audit adjustments:

October 2004 Survey

90 Days-in-Term
IDEA (PK), Unweighted 1
Two Miles or More (5)

February 2005 Survey

90 Days-in-Term IDEA (PK), Unweighted

<u>1</u> <u>(3)</u>

Net Audit Adjustments from General Tests

<u>(3)</u>

SCHEDULE B (Continued)

Union County District School Board STUDENT TRANSPORTATION FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

Students Transported Net Audit Adjustment

Findings

Detailed Tests

2. [Ref. 52] One student in the February survey was reported incorrectly in Two Miles or More. The student lived less than two miles from school and was not eligible to be reported for State transportation funding. We made the following audit adjustment:

February 2005 Survey

90 Days-in-Term Two Miles or More

<u>(1)</u> <u>(1)</u>

Net Audit Adjustments from Detailed Tests

<u>(1)</u>

SCHEDULE C

Union County District School Board STUDENT TRANSPORTATION RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

Recommendations

<u>We recommend</u> that management exercise more care to ensure that: (1) the District's reported ridership is in agreement with the supporting records; and (2) the distance from home to school, for students classified in Two Miles or More, is verified prior to those students being reported for State transportation funding.

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

Regulatory Citations

Chapter 1006, Part I, E., F.S.Transportation of Public K-12 Students Section 1011.68, F.S.Funds for Student Transportation
Chapter 6A-3, F.A.C.Transportation
Student Transportation General Instructions

JULY 2006

SCHEDULE D

Union County District School Board STUDENTS TRANSPORTATION SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

Management agreed with our findings and recommendations.

A copy of management's response may be found beginning on page 27 of this report.

-24-

Union County District School Board STUDENT TRANSPORTATION NOTES TO SCHEDULES

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

NOTE A - SUMMARY

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

1. Student Eligibility

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

2. <u>Transportation in Union County</u>

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005, the District received approximately \$463,116 in State transportation funding. The District's transportation reporting by survey was as follows:

Survey Period	No. of <u>Vehicles</u>	No. of <u>Students</u>
July 2004 October 2004 February 2005 June 2005	0 22 22 <u>0</u>	0 1,166 1,173 <u>0</u>
Total	<u>44</u>	<u>2,339</u>

3. Statutes and Rules

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

Chapter 1006, Part I, E., F.S.Transportation of Public K-12 Students

Section 1011.68, F.S.Funds for Student Transportation

Chapter 6A-3, F.A.C.Transportation

Union County District School Board STUDENT TRANSPORTATION NOTES TO SCHEDULES

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

NOTE B - SAMPLING

Our examination procedures provided for the selection of samples of buses and students, using statistical and judgmental methods, for testing the number of students transported as reported to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005. Our sampling process was designed to facilitate the performance of appropriate examination procedures to test the District's compliance with State requirements governing students transported.

MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE



THE SCHOOL BOARD OF UNION COUNTY

The Future Is Ours 55 SW Sixth Street Lake Butler, Florida 32054 (386) 496-2045

FAX (386) 496-2580

SUNCOM 823-2045

July 10, 2006

CARLTON FAULK Superintendent Mr. William O. Monroe Auditor General State of Florida Room, 412C, Claude Pepper Building 111 West Main Madison Street Tallahassee, FL 32399-1450

Dear Mr. Monroe:

ALLEN PARRISH District 1 I am writing this letter on behalf of the Union County School Board. It is our official response to the Report on the Examination of Full-time Equivalent (FTE) Students and Student Ttransportation, as reported by the Union County District School Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005.

ALVIN GRIFFIS District 2 SCHEDULE F - PAGE 13 - FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE.

The district will hold follow-up meetings with each facility to go over their findings. Individualized in-service will be held in the fall of 2006 to cover corrective actions needed by each facility.

MARSAN CARR District 3 2. SCHEDULE D – PAGE 24 – STUDENTS TRANSPORTATION SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

The district will exercise greater care when reporting student rider ship, thus guaranteeing accuracy when recording and reporting data.

SANDRA FLOYD District 4

3. MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE - PAGE 27

It was a pleasure to work with Mr. Alex Riggins, representing your office. Mr. Riggins was informative, helpful, kind, and knowledgeable. We were able to discuss matters with him and gain clarification when necessary. Mr. Riggins is a credit to his profession. We thank you for the service provided to our district by your office.

SUE WHITEHEAD District 5

ALL SCHOOLS FULLY ACCREDITED BY THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

Affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

July 10, 2006 Mr. William O. Monroe

Page 2 Re: Response to Audit

Sincerely,

Carlton Faulk

Superintendent of Schools

CFda

cc: file