

# PALM BEACH COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

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

AND

STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

	District	
	No.	
Dr. Monroe Benaim, M.D., Vice-Chair from 1		
Paulette Burdick	2	
William G. Graham, Vice-Chair to 11-20-06,		
Chair from 11-21-06	3	
Thomas E. Lynch to 11-20-06, Chair	4	
Robert J. Kanjian from 11-21-06	4	
Mark Hansen	5	
Dr. Sandra S. Richmond	6	
Dr. Debra L. Robinson	7	

This examination was conducted by Pamela Kelly, CPA, Richard J. Miller, Christopher Tynes, and Eric Seldomridge, CPA, and was supervised by J. David Hughes, CPA. Please address inquiries regarding this report to Joseph L. 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 (<u>http://www.myflorida.com/audgen</u>); by telephone at (850) 487-9024; or by mail at G74 Claude Pepper Building, 111 West Madison Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1450.

PAGE NO.

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students and Student Transportation **TABLE OF CONTENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

# FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS

Independent Auditor's Report	1
Schedule A - Populations, Samples, and Test Results	4
Schedule B - Effect of Audit Adjustments on Weighted FTE	6
Schedule C - Audit Adjustments by School	7
Schedule D - Findings and Audit Adjustments	
Schedule E – Recommendations and Regulatory Citations	
Schedule F – Summary of Management's Response	
Notes to Schedules	
STUDENT TRANSPORTATION	
Independent Auditor's Report	
Schedule A - Populations, Samples, and Test Results	
Schedule B - Findings and Audit Adjustments	
Schedule C – Recommendations and Regulatory Citations	
Schedule D – Summary of Management's Response	
Notes to Schedules	
MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE	

Palm Beach County District School Board Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students and Student Transportation LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

- IEP Individual Educational Plan
- IFSP Individual Family Support Plan
- **EP** Educational Plan
- **ESE** Exceptional Student Education
- LEP Limited English Proficient
- $\ensuremath{\textbf{FES}}\xspace$  Fluent English Speaking
- ESOL English for Speakers of Other Languages
- $\mathbf{PK}$  Prekindergarten
- OJT On-the-Job Training
- IDEA Individuals with Disabilities Education Act



DAVID W. MARTIN, CPA AUDITOR GENERAL AUDITOR GENERAL

STATE OF FLORIDA G74 Claude Pepper Building 111 West Madison Street

Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1450



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

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

We have examined management's assertion, included in its representation letter dated July 9, 2007, that the Palm Beach County District School Board complied with State requirements governing the determination and reporting of the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2007. 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 (AICPA) and the standards applicable to attestation engagements contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and, accordingly, included examining, on a test basis, evidence about the District's compliance with the aforementioned State requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our examination provides a reasonable basis for our opinion. The legal determination of the District's compliance with these requirements is, however, ultimately the responsibility of the Department of Education.

#### **Compliance**

Our examination procedures disclosed the following material noncompliance:

#### 1. Teachers

One hundred and eleven of the 643 teachers in our sample did not meet State requirements governing certification; School Board approval of out-of-field teacher assignments; notification of parents regarding out-of-field teachers; or the earning of college credits or in-service points in ESOL.<sup>1</sup>

#### 2. Students

We noted exceptions involving 105 of the 632 students in our sample for ESE Support Levels 4 and 5<sup>2</sup>; and 334 of the 474 students in our sample for Career Education 9-12 (OJT)<sup>3</sup>. These exceptions involved reporting errors or records that were not properly and accurately prepared or were missing and could not be located.

In our opinion, except for the material noncompliance mentioned above involving teachers and the reporting of, and preparation and maintenance of supporting documentation for, students in ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, and Career Education 9-12 (OJT), the Palm Beach 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, 2007.

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For teachers, see SCHEDULE D, finding Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 32, 33, 34, 39, 40, 45, 46, 47, 49, 51, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 65, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 77, 78, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 93, 97, 108, 111, 116, 117, 120, 121, 127, 128, 135, 138, 139, 140, 145, 146, 147, 152, 153, 154, 155, 159, 162, 164, 167, 169, 174, 178, 194, and 195.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> For ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, see SCHEDULE D, finding Nos. 13, 16, 20, 26, 38, 43, 54, 55, 56, 80, 82, 91, 92, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 106, 107, 109, 110, 114, 115, 134, 137, 148, 149, 150, 156, 157, 158, 161, 163, 168, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 205, 206, 207, and 208.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> For Career Education 9-12 (OJT), see SCHEDULE D, finding Nos. 44, 59, 67, 68, 69, 75, 118, 119, 125, 126, 129, 130, 131, 132, 151, 179, 180, 181, and 182.

#### Internal Control Over Compliance

In accordance with attestation standards established by the AICPA and *Government Auditing Standards*, we are required to report significant deficiencies in internal control detected during our examination and identify those considered to be material weaknesses. The purpose of our examination was to express an opinion on the District's compliance with State requirements and did not include expressing an opinion on the District's related internal controls. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. Due to its limited purpose, our examination would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses.<sup>4</sup> However, the material noncompliance mentioned above is indicative of significant deficiencie; the reporting of, and the preparation and maintenance of supporting documentation for, students in ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, and Career Education 9-12 (OJT). Other noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is indicative of control deficiencies<sup>4</sup>, and is also presented herein. The findings, populations, samples, and exception totals that pertain to material and other noncompliance are presented in SCHEDULE A and SCHEDULE 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.

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 Palm Beach 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,

1) No

David W. Martin, CPA June 12, 2008

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

# SCHEDULE A

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND TEST RESULTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

	Number of	% of	Number of Students	% of Pop.	Number of <u>Un</u> weighted	% of Pop.
Description <sup>1</sup>	<u>Schools</u>		w/Exceptions)	<u>(Sample)</u>	<u>FTE</u> <sup>2</sup>	<u>(Sample)</u>
1. <u>Basic</u>						
Population <sup>3</sup>	221	100.00%	38,124	100.00%	115,510.6800	100.00%
Sample Size <sup>4</sup>	45	20.36%	520	1.36%	436.6644	0.38%
Students w/Exce	ptions -	-	(20)	(3.85%)	-	-
Net Audit Adjust	ments <sup>5</sup> -	-	_	-	489.1028	-
2. Basic with ESE S	Services					
Population <sup>3</sup>	229	100.00%	9,566	100.00%	31,347.2900	100.00%
Sample Size <sup>4</sup>	46	20.09%	416	4.35%	349.6022	1.12%
Students w/Exce	ptions -	-	(27)	(6.49%)	-	-
Net Audit Adjust	ments <sup>5</sup> -	-	_	-	190.0737	-
3. <u>ESOL</u>						
Population <sup>3</sup>	200	100.00%	5,492	100.00%	15,503.1200	100.00%
Sample Size <sup>4</sup>	43	21.50%	2,094	38.13%	1,766.1338	11.39%
Students w/Exce		-	(100)	(4.78%)	-	-
Net Audit Adjust	rments <sup>5</sup> -	-	-	-	(443.7332)	-
4. <u>ESE Support Le</u>						
Population <sup>3</sup>	105	100.00%	1,112	100.00%	1,478.5700	100.00%
Sample Size <sup>4</sup>	36	34.29%	632	56.83%	464.3262	31.40%
Students w/Exce		-	(105)	(16.61%)	-	-
Net Audit Adjust	rments <sup>5</sup> -	-	-	-	(196.8581)	-
5. <u>Career Education</u>	n 9-12					
Population <sup>3</sup>	44	100.00%	1,181	100.00%	5,637.4100	100.00%
Sample Size <sup>4</sup>	9	20.45%	474	40.14%	118.8701	2.11%
Students w/Exce		-	(334)	(70.46%)	-	-
Net Audit Adjust	ments <sup>5</sup> -	-	-	-	(62.0703)	-
<u>All Programs</u>						
Population <sup>3</sup>	234	100.00%	55,475	100.00%	169,477.0700	100.00%
Sample Size <sup>4</sup>	48	20.51%	4,136	7.46%	3,135.5967	1.85%
Students w/Exce	ptions -	-	(586)	(14.174%)	-	-
Net Audit Adjust	ments <sup>5</sup> -	-	_	-	(23.4851)	-

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND TEST RESULTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Description <sup>1</sup>	Number	%	Number	% of
	of	of	of Teachers	Pop.
	<u>Schools</u>	<u>Pop.</u>	<u>(w/Exceptions)</u>	<u>(Sample)</u>
<u>Teachers</u> Population <sup>3</sup> Sample Size <sup>4</sup> Teachers w/Exceptions	234 48	100.00% 20.51%	2,296 643 (111)	100.00% 28.01% (17.26%)

<sup>1</sup> See NOTE A6.

<sup>4</sup> See NOTE B.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 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.)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> 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 Career Education). The population shown for the number of students is the total number of students in each program at the schools in our sample. Our Career Education sample was limited to 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, 2007. The population shown for teachers is the total number of teachers at schools in our sample who taught courses in ESE or Career Education or taught courses to LEP students. (See NOTE A5.)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Our audit adjustments present the net effect of noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures, including those related to our tests of teacher certification. Our audit adjustments generally reclassify reported FTE to Basic education, except for noncompliance involving a student's enrollment or attendance, in which case the reported FTE is taken to zero.

### SCHEDULE B

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students EFFECT OF AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS ON WEIGHTED FTE (For Illustrative Purposes Only)

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

No. Program <sup>1</sup>	Net Audit <u>Adjustment</u> <sup>2</sup>	Cost <u>Factor</u>	Weighted <u>FTE</u> <sup>3</sup>
101 Basic K-3	325.1859	1.035	336.5674
102 Basic 4-8	87.7292	1.000	87.7292
103 Basic 9-12	76.1877	1.088	82.8922
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	175.3800	1.035	181.5183
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	14.9302	1.000	14.9302
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(.2365)	1.088	(.2573)
130 ESOL	(443.7332)	1.275	(565.7598)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(137.5645)	3.734	(513.6658)
255 ESE Support Level 5	(59.2936)	5.201	(308.3860)
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(62.0703</u> )	1.159	<u>(71.9395</u> )
Total	<u>(23.4851</u> )		<u>(756.3711</u> )

<sup>1</sup> See NOTE A6.

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> 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

Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Audit Adjustments1 **District-**Balance Wide No. Program #0131 #0141 Forward 101 Basic K-3 156.8933 (.2000)7.0000 163.6933 102 Basic 4-8 31.1469 2.5000 33.6469 ..... 103 Basic 9-12 .9306 1.0000 1.9306 . . . . . 111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services 166.2500 166.2500 ..... ..... 112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services .0000 ..... ..... ..... 113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services .0000 ..... ..... ..... 130 ESOL (188.9708)(.8000)(9.5000)(199.2708)254 ESE Support Level 4 (113.5905)(113.5905)..... ..... 255 ESE Support Level 5 (41.3250)(41.3250)..... ..... 300 Career Education 9-12 .0000 <u>....</u> ..... <u>....</u> Total 11.3345 .0000 .0000 11.3345

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

Program <u>No.</u>	Brought <u>Forward</u>	<u>#0191</u>	<u>#0291</u>	<u>#0361</u>	<u>#0481</u>	Balance <u>Forward</u>
101	163.6933	2.3000	12.5000	.8000	33.6000	212.8933
102	33.6469	.4500	1.0000	2.0000	2.0000	39.0969
103	1.9306					1.9306
111	166.2500			.5000	.5000	167.2500
112	.0000					.0000
113	.0000					.0000
130	(199.2708)	(2.7500)	(13.5000)	(2.8000)	(35.6000)	(253.9208)
254	(113.5905)			(.5000)	(.5000)	(114.5905)
255	(41.3250)					(41.3250)
300	.0000	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u>.0000</u>
Total	<u>11.3345</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>11.3345</u>

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

Program <u>No.</u>	Brought <u>Forward</u>	<u>#0561</u>	<u>#0591</u>	<u>#0601</u>	<u>#0621</u>	Balance <u>Forward</u>
101	212.8933	6.5000	1.6250	2.5000	13.0000	236.5183
102	39.0969				4.0000	43.0969
103	1.9306					1.9306
111	167.2500				1.0000	168.2500
112	.0000					.0000
113	.0000					.0000
130	(253.9208)	(6.5000)	(1.6250)	(2.5000)	(17.0000)	(281.5458)
254	(114.5905)		(.2500)		(1.0000)	(115.8405)
255	(41.3250)					(41.3250)
300	.0000	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u>.0000</u>
Total	<u>11.3345</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(.2500</u> )	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>11.0845</u>

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

		Audit Adjustments <sup>1</sup>					
Program <u>No.</u>	Brought <u>Forward</u>	<u>#0651</u>	<u>#0691</u>	<u>#0751</u>	<u>#0831</u>	Balance <u>Forward</u>	
101	236.5183	42.5000		3.0000	1.0000	283.0183	
102	43.0969	1.0000			2.0000	46.0969	
103	1.9306		2.8496			4.7802	
111	168.2500					168.2500	
112	.0000	.0000				.0000	
113	.0000					.0000	
130	(281.5458)	(44.0000)	(2.9330)	(3.0000)	(3.0000)	(334.4788)	
254	(115.8405)		(.5000)			(116.3405)	
255	(41.3250)	(.5000)				(41.8250)	
300	.0000	<u></u>	<u>(.3358</u> )	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u>(.3358</u> )	
Total	<u>11.0845</u>	<u>(1.0000</u> )	<u>(.9192</u> )	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>9.1653</u>	

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

		Audit Adjustments <sup>1</sup>						
Program <u>No.</u>	Brought <u>Forward</u>	<u>#0931</u>	<u>#1241</u>	<u>#1371</u>	<u>#1491</u>	Balance <u>Forward</u>		
101	283.0183	3.8500	10.5000			297.3683		
102	46.0969	.5000	7.0000		5.1901	58.7870		
103	4.7802			5.9394		10.7196		
111	168.2500		.5000			168.7500		
112	.0000		.0000			.0000		
113	.0000					.0000		
130	(334.4788)	(4.3500)	(16.0000)	(1.5846)	(5.1901)	(361.6035)		
254	(116.3405)		(1.5000)			(117.8405)		
255	(41.8250)		(.5000)			(42.3250)		
300	<u>(.3358</u> )	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u>(6.6156</u> )	<u></u>	<u>(6.9514</u> )		
Total	<u>9.1653</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(2.2608</u> )	<u>.0000</u>	<u>6.9045</u>		

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

_						
Program <u>No.</u>	Brought <u>Forward</u>	<u>#1571</u>	<u>#1611</u>	<u>#1691</u>	<u>#1711</u>	Balance <u>Forward</u>
101	297.3683				4.9976	302.3659
102	58.7870			1.9319	2.9976	63.7165
103	10.7196	12.4973	11.8570			35.0739
111	168.7500					168.7500
112	.0000			(.5000)		(.5000)
113	.0000					.0000
130	(361.6035)	(3.3491)	(7.5052)	(.9319)	(5.0000)	(378.3897)
254	(117.8405)			(.5000)	(1.9956)	(120.3361)
255	(42.3250)				(.9996)	(43.3246)
300	<u>(6.9514</u> )	<u>(13.4538</u> )	<u>(5.6000</u> )	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u>(26.0052</u> )
Total	<u>6.9045</u>	<u>(4.3056</u> )	<u>(1.2482</u> )	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>1.3507</u>

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

D	D 1/		<u>Audit Adjı</u>	<u>ıstments</u> 1		D 1
Program <u>No.</u>	Brought <u>Forward</u>	<u>#1731</u>	<u>#1761</u>	<u>#1781</u>	<u>#1801</u>	Balance <u>Forward</u>
101	302.3659		4.0000	5.5000		311.8659
102	63.7165	9.3507				73.0672
103	35.0739					35.0739
111	168.7500		.5000		.4500	169.7000
112	(.5000)	(1.0000)	1.0000			(.5000)
113	.0000					.0000
130	(378.3897)	(8.3507)	(4.0000)	(3.5000)		(394.2404)
254	(120.3361)		(1.0000)	(2.0000)	(.9750)	(124.3111)
255	(43.3246)		(.5000)		.0500	(43.7746)
300	<u>(26.0052</u> )	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u>(26.0052</u> )
Total	<u>1.3507</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(.4750</u> )	<u>.8757</u>

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

		Audit Adjustments <sup>1</sup>					
Program <u>No.</u>	Brought <u>Forward</u>	<u>#1891</u>	<u>#1901</u>	<u>#1971</u>	<u>#1981</u>	Balance <u>Forward</u>	
101	311.8659	1.4000				313.2659	
102	73.0672	3.9500	1.5000	2.5300	1.1004	82.1476	
103	35.0739					35.0739	
111	169.7000	.5000	.9500			171.1500	
112	(.5000)			12.5000		12.0000	
113	.0000					.0000	
130	(394.2404)	(4.8500)	(1.5000)	(2.0300)	(1.1004)	(403.7208)	
254	(124.3111)	(1.0000)	(.9500)	(12.0000)		(138.2611)	
255	(43.7746)			(1.0000)		(44.7746)	
300	<u>(26.0052</u> )	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u>(26.0052</u> )	
Total	<u>.8757</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.8757</u>	

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

D	Audit Adjustments <sup>1</sup>				<b>D</b> 1	
Program <u>No.</u>	Brought <u>Forward</u>	<u>#2001</u>	<u>#2181</u>	<u>#2191</u>	<u>#2301</u>	Balance <u>Forward</u>
101	313.2659					313.2659
102	82.1476					82.1476
103	35.0739	1.5842	6.0088	2.4550	2.2428	47.3647
111	171.1500					171.1500
112	12.0000					12.0000
113	.0000		(.5000)	.0000	.5000	.0000
130	(403.7208)	(1.5842)	(1.3344)	(1.9550)	(2.2428)	(410.8372)
254	(138.2611)				.0000	(138.2611)
255	(44.7746)			(.5000)	(.5000)	(45.7746)
300	<u>(26.0052</u> )	<u>(.7486</u> )	<u>(5.1720</u> )	<u>(1.7350</u> )	<u></u>	<u>(33.6608</u> )
Total	<u>.8757</u>	<u>(.7486</u> )	<u>(.9976</u> )	<u>(1.7350</u> )	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(2.6055</u> )

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

			Audit Ad	ustments <sup>1</sup>		
Program <u>No.</u>	Brought <u>Forward</u>	<u>#2361</u>	<u>#2411</u>	<u>#2631</u>	<u>#2671</u>	Balance <u>Forward</u>
101	313.2659				.7500	314.0159
102	82.1476				.3500	82.4976
103	47.3647	3.7850		9.1170		60.2667
111	171.1500					171.1500
112	12.0000					12.0000
113	.0000	(.5000)		.8336		.3336
130	(410.8372)	(3.7850)		(3.6696)	(1.1000)	(419.3918)
254	(138.2611)		(.5000)	(.5834)		(139.3445)
255	(45.7746)		.5000	(.3336)		(45.6082)
300	<u>(33.6608</u> )	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u>(11.3362</u> )	<u></u>	<u>(44.9970</u> )
Total	<u>(2.6055</u> )	<u>(.5000</u> )	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(5.9722</u> )	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(9.0777</u> )

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

D	D 1.		Audit Adjustments <sup>1</sup>			
Program <u>No.</u>	Brought <u>Forward</u>	<u>#2721</u>	<u>#2741</u>	<u>#2861</u>	<u>#2921</u>	Balance <u>Forward</u>
101	314.0159	3.5000	3.0000	2.0000		322.5159
102	82.4976		.6000			83.0976
103	60.2667				(16.3924)	43.8743
111	171.1500	3.5000				174.6500
112	12.0000					12.0000
113	.3336				(1.6482)	(1.3146)
130	(419.3918)	(3.5000)	(3.6000)	(2.0000)		(428.4918)
254	(139.3445)	(2.0000)	1.0000	(.2500)		(140.5945)
255	(45.6082)	(1.5000)	(1.0000)			(48.1082)
300	<u>(44.9970</u> )	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u>(9.3494</u> )	<u>(54.3464</u> )
Total	<u>(9.0777</u> )	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(.2500</u> )	<u>(27.3900</u> )	<u>(36.7177</u> )

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

_			Audit Adjustments <sup>1</sup>			
Program <u>No.</u>	Brought <u>Forward</u>	<u>#2941</u>	<u>#3005</u>	<u>#3006</u>	<u>#3251</u>	Balance <u>Forward</u>
101	322.5159					322.5159
102	83.0976		.4830	4.1486		87.7292
103	43.8743		1.6796	7.3356	22.7982	75.6877
111	174.6500	.4000				175.0500
112	12.0000		.3161	2.5141		14.8302
113	(1.3146)		.3916	3.3832	(2.5000)	(.0398)
130	(428.4918)		(.4336)	(.7915)	(12.5163)	(442.2332)
254	(140.5945)	7.2000			(3.0000)	(136.3945)
255	(48.1082)	(7.6000)			(1.5000)	(57.2082)
300	<u>(54.3464</u> )	<u></u>	<u>(.7740</u> )	<u>(.1080</u> )	<u>(6.8419</u> )	<u>(62.0703</u> )
Total	<u>(36.7177</u> )	.0000	<u>1.6627</u>	<u>16.4820</u>	<u>(3.5600</u> )	<u>(22.1330</u> )

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

Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Audit Adjustments1 Program Brought Forward Total <u>No.</u> #3351 #9034 101 Basic K-3 322.5159 1.5000 1.1700 325.1859 102 Basic 4-8 87.7292 87.7292 ..... ..... 103 Basic 9-12 75.6877 .5000 76.1877 ..... 111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services 175.0500 175.3800 .3300 . . . . . 112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services 14.8302 .1000 14.9302 ..... 113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services (.0398)(.1967)(.2365)..... 130 ESOL (442.2332)(1.5000)(443.7332)..... 254 ESE Support Level 4 (136.3945)(1.1700)(137.5645)..... 255 ESE Support Level 5 (59.2936) (57.2082)(2.0854)..... 300 Career Education 9-12 <u>(62.0703</u>) (62.0703) <u>....</u> <u>....</u> Total (22.1330) .0000 (1.3521)(23.4851)

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

#### SCHEDULE D

Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

#### **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. Except for material noncompliance involving teachers and the reporting of, and the preparation and maintenance of supporting documentation for students in ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, and Career Education OJT, the Palm Beach 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, 2007. All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed below and requires management's attention and action, as recommended on page 88.

### <u>Findings</u>

Our examination included the July and October 2006 surveys and the February and June 2007 surveys (see NOTE A5). Unless otherwise specifically stated, the findings and audit adjustments presented herein are for the October 2006 survey or the February 2007 survey or both. Accordingly, our findings do not mention specific surveys unless necessary for a complete understanding of the noncompliance involved.

#### District-Wide -- Ineligible ESOL Courses

1. [Ref. 149] <u>Our examination procedures included an automated test that</u> compared the course numbers reported in ESOL by the District to the courses that have been designated for that program by the Department of Education. The results of this test disclosed that the District's schools incorrectly reported 16 Basic subject area courses in ESOL that were ineligible for such reporting. The courses were taught at 32 schools during the school terms covered by the October and February surveys. We made the following audit adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	156.8933
102 Basic 4-8	31.1469
103 Basic 9-12	.9306
130 ESOL	<u>(188.9708</u> )

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

Net Audit Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

.0000

Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS** For the Finant Var Ended June 30, 2007

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

#### **Findings**

#### Net Audit Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

#### District-Wide -- Full-Time PK, ESE Students Reported as Part-Time

2. [Ref. 150] <u>The District incorrectly reported 239 full-time PK, ESE students as</u> part-time students. Classifying the students as part-time made them eligible for the three Special Consideration points designated for PK students earning less than .5000 FTE; and, in each student's case, the addition of these three Special Consideration points qualified the student to be reported in the ESE-weighted program Nos. 254 (ESE Support Level 4) or 255 (ESE Support Level 5), rather than in the Basic-weighted program No. 111 (Grades K-3 with ESE Services). In response to our inquiries, management advised us that the District operated several instructional programs for its PK, ESE students, each of which provided less than full-time instruction (i.e., less than 1,500 weekly instructional minutes) after taking into account non-instructional time such as lunch and naps. However, we noted that:

- a. Several PK, ESE students who had sufficient points for program Nos. 254 or 255 were not re-classified by the District from full-time to part-time status as described above. In response to our inquiries, management verbally advised us that the District had re-classified only those PK, ESE students who needed the three Special Consideration points to qualify for program Nos. 254 or 255.
- b. <u>All of the cited PK, ESE students were enrolled full-time in schools that</u> <u>had bell schedules and calendars documenting more than 1,500 instructional</u> <u>minutes per week in a 900-hour instructional school year</u>.
- c. <u>PK students are considered full-time if their instructional schedule provides</u> <u>720 hours or more of documented annual instruction, pursuant to Section</u> <u>1011.61(1)(a)1.</u>, Florida Statutes None of the schools in which the cited <u>PK, ESE students were enrolled had a separate bell schedule documenting a</u> <u>part-time instructional schedule (i.e., less than a 720-hour instructional year).</u>

### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS**

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
District-Wide Full-Time PK, ESE Students Reported as Part-Time (Continued)	
We made the following audit adjustment to re-classify the 239 PK, ESE students in	
question to full-time status in program No. 111:	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services       166.2500         254 ESE Support Level 4       (113.5905)         255 ESE Support Level 5       (41.3250)	<u>11.3345</u> <u>11.3345</u>
North Palm Beach Elementary School (#0131)	
3. [Ref. 13101] <u>The course schedule for one LEP student incorrectly included a</u> portion of the student's instructional time in program No. 101 (Basic K-3) rather than in program No. 130 (ESOL). We made the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       (.2000)         130 ESOL       .2000	.0000
4. [Ref. 13102] The file for one LEP student did not contain documentation	
justifying the student's continued placement in ESOL for a fourth year. We made the	
following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	<u>.0000</u> .0000
Lake Park Elementary School (#0141)	
5. [Ref. 14101] The files for three LEP students did not contain documentation	
that the students' parents had been notified of the students' ESOL-placement. We made	
the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       1.5000         130 ESOL       (1.5000)	.0000

### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

**Findings** Lake Park Elementary School (#0141) (Continued) [Ref. 14170/71/72] Three teachers were appropriately approved by the School 6. Board to teach LEP students out-of-field; however, the teachers had earned none of the in-service training points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teachers' inservice training timelines. One teacher (Ref. 14170) needed 180 points and two teachers

(Ref. 14171/72) needed 60 points. We made the following audit adjustments:

<u>Ref. 14170</u> 101 Basic K-3 130 ESOL	5.5000 <u>(5.5000</u> )	.0000
<u>Ref. 14171</u> 102 Basic 4-8 130 ESOL	1.5000 <u>(1.5000</u> )	.0000
<u>Ref. 14172</u> 102 Basic 4-8 130 ESOL	1.0000 <u>(1.0000</u> )	<u>.0000</u> .0000

#### Washington Elementary School (#0191)

[Ref. 19170] One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to 7. teach LEP students out-of-field; however, the letter used to notify the parents of the teacher's out-of-field status was dated October 14, 2006, one day after the October survey; consequently, the notification was not valid for that survey. We made the following audit adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.9500	
130 ESOL	<u>(.9500</u> )	.0000

8. [Ref. 19171] One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to teach LEP students out-of-field; however, the teacher had earned none of the 60 inservice training points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. (Finding continues on next page.)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

Net Audit Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS**

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Washington Elementary School (#0191) (Continued)	
We also noted that the parents of the students concerned were not notified of the	
teacher's out-of-field status. We made the following audit adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       .4500         130 ESOL       (.4500)	.0000
9. [Ref. 19172/73/74] Three teachers taught Science and Social Studies to classes	
that included LEP students, but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points	
required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teachers' in-service training timelines. We	
made the following audit adjustments:	
Ref. 19172         101 Basic K-3       .6000         130 ESOL       (.6000)	.0000
Ref. 19173       .3000         101 Basic K-3       .3000         130 ESOL       (.3000)	.0000
Ref. 19174       .2000         101 Basic K-3       .2000         130 ESOL       (.2000)	.0000
10. [Ref. 19175] One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to	
teach LEP students out-of-field; however, the letter used to notify the parents of the	
teacher's out-of-field status was dated October 14, 2006, one day after the October	
survey; consequently, the notification was not valid for the October survey. We made	
the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .2500         130 ESOL       (.2500)	<u>.0000</u> .0000

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

**Findings** 

Net Audit Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

#### Northboro Elementary School (#0291)

11. [Ref. 29170/71/72] Three teachers were appropriately approved by the School Board to teach LEP students out-of-field; however, the teachers had earned none of the 60 in-service training points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teachers' inservice training timelines. We made the following audit adjustments:

	Ref. 29170		
	101 Basic K-3	2.5000	
	130 ESOL	<u>(2.5000)</u>	.0000
		<b>,</b>	
	<u>Ref. 29171</u>		
	101 Basic K-3	6.0000	
	130 ESOL	<u>(6.0000</u> )	.0000
	<u>Ref. 29172</u>		
	101 Basic K-3	4.0000	
	130 ESOL	<u>(4.0000)</u>	.0000
12.	[Ref. 29173] One teacher taught Primary Language Art	s to classes that included	
LEP s	students; however, the teacher was not properly certified	to teach LEP students	
and m	as not approved by the School Deard to teach such at	udants out of field Wa	
and w	ras not approved by the School Board to teach such st	udents out-of-neid. we	
made	the following audit adjustment:		
	102 Pasia 4.9	1 0000	

102 Basic 4-8	1.0000	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.0000)</u>	.0000
		.0000

#### U. B. Kinsey/Palmview Elementary School (#0361)

[Ref. 36101] One ESE student was not reported in accordance with the 13. student's Matrix of Services form. We made the following audit adjustment:

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

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS** For the Finand Year Ended June 20, 2007

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>		Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
U. B. Kinsey/Palmview Elementary School (#0361) (Continued)		
14. [Ref. 36170/72/73] Three teachers were appropriately approve	d by the School	
Board to teach LEP students out-of-field; however, the teachers had ear	med none of the	
in-service training points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to t	he teachers' in-	
service training timelines. Two teachers (Ref. 36170/73) needed 120	points and one	
teacher (Ref. 36172) needed 180 points. We made the following audit ad	justments:	
<u>Ref. 36170</u>		
101 Basic K-3	.8000	
130 ESOL	<u>(.8000</u> )	.0000
<u>Ref. 36172</u>		
102 Basic 4-8 130 ESOL	.5000 <u>(.5000</u> )	.0000
150 1501	<u>()</u>	.0000
<u>Ref. 36173</u> 102 Basic 4-8	1.0000	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.0000</u> )	.0000
15. [Ref. 36171] One teacher who taught Elementary Education	did not hold a	
Florida teaching certificate, and was not otherwise qualified to teach		
following audit adjustment:		
102 Basic 4-8 130 ESOL	.5000 <u>(.5000</u> )	.0000
	(	.0000
West Gate Elementary School (#0481)		
16. [Ref. 48101] The file for one ESE student did not contain ev	vidence that the	
student's General Education teacher had participated in the development	t of the student's	
IEP. We also noted that the file did not contain a Matrix of Services form	m that was valid	
for the reporting survey. We made the following audit adjustment:		
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.5000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(.5000</u> )	.0000

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

**Findings** 

Net Audit Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

#### West Gate Elementary School (#0481) (Continued)

101 Basic K-3

17. [Ref. 48170/71/72/73] Four teachers taught Primary Lan	guage Arts to classes	
that included LEP students, but were not properly certified to tead	ch LEP students and	
were not approved by the School Board to teach such students of	out-of-field. We also	
noted that the teachers had not earned the required number of in-s	ervice training points	
in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teachers' in-service training tim	elines. Two teachers	
(Ref. 48171/72) needed 120 points, one teacher (Ref. 48170) needed	d 180 points, and one	
teacher (Ref. 48173) needed 240 points. We made the following au	<u>dit adjustments</u> :	
Ref. 48170		
101 Basic K-3	9.9500	
130 ESOL	<u>(9.9500</u> )	.0000
<u>Ref. 48171</u>		
101 Basic K-3	14.7000	
130 ESOL	<u>(14.7000</u> )	.0000
<u>Ref. 48172</u>		

130 ESOL	<u>(6.8000</u> )	.0000
<u>Ref. 48173</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	2.0000	
130 ESOL	(2.0000)	.0000

6.8000

18. [Ref. 48174] One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to teach LEP students out-of-field; however, the teacher had earned none of the 300 inservice training points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. We made the following audit adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	2.1500	
130 ESOL	<u>(2.1500</u> )	.0000

.0000

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Palmetto Elementary School (#0561)	
19. [Ref. 56170] <u>One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to</u> teach LEP students out-of-field, but the teacher had earned none of the 300 in-service	
training points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training	
timeline. We made the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       6.5000         130 ESOL       (6.5000)	<u>.0000</u> .0000
Meadow Park Elementary School (#0591)	
20.       [Ref. 59101] The file for one ESE PK student did not contain an IEP or Matrix         of Services form that was valid for the reporting survey. We made the following audit         adjustment:         254 ESE Support Level 4       (.2500)	(.2500)
21. [Ref. 59170] <u>One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to</u> teach LEP students out-of-field, but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. We made the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       1.6250         130 ESOL       (1.6250)	<u>.0000</u> (.2500)
Berkshire Elementary School (#0601)	
22. Ref. 601021 The letter used to notify the parents of one LEP student of the	

22. [Ref. 60102] The letter used to notify the parents of one LEP student of the student's ESOL-placement was undated, and we could not otherwise determine whether the notification was made on a timely basis. We made the following audit adjustment:

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Berkshire Elementary School (#0601) (Continued)	
101 Basic K-3       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	.0000
23. [Ref. 60104] The file for one LEP student did not contain documentation	
supporting the student's continued ESOL-placement for a fifth year. We made the	
following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	.0000
24. [Ref. 60105] The file for one LEP student did not contain documentation that	
the student's parents had been notified of the student's ESOL-placement. We made the	
following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .5000         130 ESOL       (.5000)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>.0000</u>
Forest Hill Elementary School (#0621)	
25. [Ref. 62170] One teacher was hired as a long-term substitute for the school	
terms covered by the October and February surveys. Since there are no specific	
limitations placed on substitute teaching by law or rule, we made no audit adjustments.	
	.0000
26. [Ref. 62101] The Matrix of Services form for one ESE student incorrectly	
included three Special Considerations points for which the student was not eligible. The	
points were designated for PK students earning less than .5000 FTE. The student was a	
kindergarten student and earned .5000 FTE during the FTE survey period. We made	
the following audit adjustment:	

### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS**

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Forest Hill Elementary School (#0621) (Continued)	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services1.0000254 ESE Support Level 4(1.0000)	.0000
27. [Ref. 62102] The files for four LEP students did not contain documentation	
justifying the students' continued ESOL-placement for a fourth year. We made the	
following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       3.5000         130 ESOL       (3.5000)	.0000
28. [Ref. 62103] The LEP Student Plan for one student was not reviewed and	
updated for the 2006-07 school year. We also noted the student's file did not contain	
documentation justifying the student's continued ESOL-placement for a fifth year. We	
made the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .5000         130 ESOL       (.5000)	.0000
29. [Ref. 62104] The LEP Committees for two FES students did not consider at	
least two of the five criteria specified in Rule 6A-6.0902(2)(a)3., Florida Administrative	
Code, prior to recommending the students' continued placement in ESOL. We also	
noted that the LEP Committees did not consist of the required number of District	
personnel and there was no documentation that the students' parents had been invited to	
attend the Committee meetings. We made the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       2.0000         130 ESOL       (2.0000)	.0000
30. [Ref. 62105] The file for one LEP student did not contain documentation that	
the student's parents had been notified of the student's ESOL-placement. We made the	
following audit adjustment:	

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Forest Hill Elementary School (#0621) (Continued)	
102 Basic 4-8       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	.0000
31. [Ref. 62106] The parental notification letter for one LEP student was dated after	
the reporting survey had ended; consequently, the notification was not timely. We made	
the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .5000         130 ESOL       (.5000)	.0000
32. [Ref. 62171] One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to	
teach LEP students out-of-field, but had earned none of the 120 in-service training	
points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline.	
We made the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .5000         130 ESOL       (.5000)	.0000
33. [Ref. 62172] One teacher taught Primary Language Arts to classes that included	
LEP students, but was not properly certified to teach LEP students and was not	
approved by the School Board to teach such students out-of-field. We also noted that	
the teacher had earned only 60 of the 240 in-service training points required in ESOL	
strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. We made the following	
audit adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       3.0000         130 ESOL       (3.0000)	.0000

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Forest Hill Elementary School (#0621) (Continued)	
34. [Ref. 62173] <u>One teacher taught Primary Language Arts to a class that included</u> LEP students, but was not properly certified to teach LEP students and was not	
approved by the School Board to teach such students out-of-field. We also noted the teacher had earned none of the in-service training points required in ESOL strategies,	
pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. The teacher needed 180 points by the October survey and 240 points by the February survey. We made the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       6.0000         130 ESOL       (6.0000)	<u>.0000</u> .0000
Palm Springs Elementary School (#0651)	
35. [Ref. 65101] <u>One ESE student and one LEP student were absent from school</u> during the 11-day window of the reporting survey and should not have been included with the survey's results. We made the following audit adjustment:	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services       (.5000)         130 ESOL       (.5000)	(1.0000)
<ul><li>36. [Ref. 65102] <u>The file for one LEP student was missing and could not be located.</u></li><li>We made the following audit adjustment:</li></ul>	
102 Basic 4-8       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	.0000
37. [Ref. 65103] <u>The files for two LEP students did not contain documentation</u> justifying the students' continued ESOL-placement for a fourth year (one student) or had documentation dated after the October survey (one student). We made the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       1.5000         130 ESOL       (1.5000)	.0000

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>			
Palm Springs Elementary School (#0651) (Continued)				
38. [Ref. 65105] One ESE student was not reported in accordance with the				
student's Matrix of Services form. We made the following audit adjustment:				
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services.5000255 ESE Support Level 5(.5000)	.0000			
39. [Ref. 65170] One Elementary Education teacher taught Primary Language Arts				
to classes that included LEP students, but was not properly certified to teach Elementary				
Education or LEP students and was not approved by the School Board to teach				
Elementary Education or ESOL out-of-field. We also noted that the parents of the				
students concerned were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status in Elementary				
Education or ESOL. We further noted that the teacher had earned none of the 300 in-				
service training points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service				
training timeline. We made the following audit adjustment:				
101 Basic K-3       3.5000         130 ESOL       (3.5000)	.0000			
40. [Ref. 65171/72/73/74/75/76] Six teachers taught Primary Language Arts to				
classes which included LEP students, but were not properly certified to teach LEP				
students and were not approved by the School Board to teach such students out-of-field.				
We also noted that one teacher (Ref. 65176) had earned none of the 120 in-service				
training points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training				
timeline. We made the following audit adjustments:				
Ref. 65171         101 Basic K-3       8.5000         130 ESOL       (8.5000)	.0000			
Ref. 65172         101 Basic K-3       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	.0000			

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings Palm Springs Elementary School (#0651) (Continued)		Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>		
Tain spings Elementary school (#0051) (Continued)				
<u>Ref. 65173</u> 101 Basic K-3 130 ESOL	7.0000 <u>(7.0000</u> )	.0000		
<u>Ref. 65174</u> 101 Basic K-3 130 ESOL	8.5000 <u>(8.5000</u> )	.0000		
<u>Ref. 65175</u> 101 Basic K-3 130 ESOL	7.0000 <u>(7.0000</u> )	.0000		
<u>Ref. 65176</u> 101 Basic K-3 130 ESOL	5.5000 (5.5000)	.0000		
		<u>(1.0000</u> )		
Lake Worth High School (#0691)				
41. [Ref. 69101] We noted the following exceptions for three students in ESOL: (a) the files for two students did not contain documentation justifying the students'				
continued ESOL-placement for a fourth and sixth year, respectively; and (b) the file for				
one student indicated that the student was FES and ineligible for	•			
made the following audit adjustment:	L.			
103 Basic 9-12 130 ESOL	1.0890 <u>(1.0890</u> )	.0000		
42. [Ref. 69102] The reported course schedules for three LEI				

We made the following audit adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	(.1684)	
130 ESOL	.0850	
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>.0834</u> .0000	)
The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.		
-34-		

using an incorrect priority. Courses in program No. 103 (Basic 9-12) were funded prior to courses in program No. 130 (ESOL) and program No. 300 (Career Education 9-12).

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Lake Worth High School (#0691) (Continued)	
43. [Ref. 69103] One ESE student was absent from school during the 11-day	
window of the reporting survey and should not have been included with the survey's	
results. We made the following audit adjustment:	
254 ESE Support Level 4 (.5000)	(.5000)
44. [Ref. 69104/05] The timecards for two Career Education students in OJT were	
missing and could not be located for the October survey (Ref. 69104/05). We also	
noted that one of the two students (Ref. 69104) was reported in the February survey for	
more hours than his timecard supported. The student was reported for 8.34 hours, but	
the student's timecard supported only 4 hours. We made the following audit	
adjustments:	
<u>Ref. 69104</u> 300 Career Education 9-12 (.1694)	(.1694)
<u>Ref. 69105</u> 300 Career Education 9-12 (.2498)	(.2498)
45. [Ref. 69170/72] Two teachers were appropriately approved by the School Board	
to teach LEP students out-of-field, but had not earned the number of in-service training	
points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teachers' in-service training timeline.	
One teacher (Ref. 69170) had earned none of 120 required points and the other (Ref.	
69172) had earned only 60 of 180 required points. We made the following audit	
adjustments:	
Ref. 69170103 Basic 9-12.5068130 ESOL(.5068)	.0000
Ref. 69172103 Basic 9-12.5048130 ESOL(.5048)	.0000

Net Audit

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

## Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)	
Lake Worth High School (#0691) (Continued)		
46. [Ref. 69171/73/75] Three teachers taught Basic subject areas to classes that		
included LEP students, but had not earned the number of in-service training points		
required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teachers' in-service training timelines. Two		
of the three teachers taught Mathematics (Ref. 69171/75), and one had earned only 35		
points and the other had earned none. The third teacher taught Biology (Ref. 69173)		
and had earned only 12 points. We made the following audit adjustments:		
<u>Ref. 69171</u>		
103 Basic 9-12 .1668		
130 ESOL (.1668)	.0000	
<u>Ref. 69173</u>		
103 Basic 9-12 .1668		
130 ESOL (.1668)	.0000	
<u>Ref. 69175</u>		
103 Basic 9-12 .5838		
130 ESOL (.5838)	<u>.0000</u>	
	<u>(.9192</u> )	
Lantana Elementary School (#0751)		
47. [Ref. 75170] One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to		
teach LEP students out-of-field, but had earned none of the 180 in-service training		

points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline.

We made the following audit adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	3.0000	
130 ESOL	<u>(3.0000</u> )	<u>.0000</u>

.0000

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Forest Park Elementary School (#0831)	
48. [Ref. 83101] The file for one LEP student did not contain documentation	
justifying the student's continued ESOL-placement for a fourth year. We made the	
following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	.0000
49. [Ref. 83170] One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to	
teach LEP students out-of-field, but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points	
required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. We	
made the following audit adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       2.0000         130 ESOL       (2.0000)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>.0000</u>
J. C. Mitchell Elementary School (#0931)	
50. [Ref. 93101] The files for two students in ESOL indicated that the students	
were FES and ineligible for ESOL-placement. We made the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .5000         102 Basic 4-8       .5000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	.0000
51. [Ref. 93170] One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to	
teach LEP students out-of-field, but had earned none of the 300 in-service training	
points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline.	
We made the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       3.3500         130 ESOL       (3.3500)	<u>.0000</u> .0000

## Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>	
Gove Elementary School (#1241)		
52. [Ref. 124101] The file for one ESE student did not contain an IEP that covered		
the reporting survey. We made the following audit adjustment:		
102 Basic 4-8       .5000         112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services       (.5000)	.0000	
53. [Ref. 124102] The file for one ESE student did not contain evidence that the		
student's parents had been notified of the student's IEP meeting. We made the		
following adjustment:		
101 Basic K-3       .5000         111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services       (.5000)	.0000	
54. [Ref. 124103] The file for one ESE student did not contain evidence that one of		
the District's ESE specialists had participated in the development of the student's IEP.		
We made the following audit adjustment:		
102 Basic 4-8       .5000         254 ESE Support Level 4       (.5000)	.0000	
55. [Ref. 124104] One ESE student was not reported in accordance with the		
student's Matrix of Services form. We made the following audit adjustment:		
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services.5000255 ESE Support Level 5(.5000)	.0000	
56. [Ref. 124105] The Matrix of Services forms for two ESE students were more than		
three years old and had expired. We made the following audit adjustment:		
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services.5000112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services.5000254 ESE Support Level 4(1.0000)	.0000	

## Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>		
Gove Elementary School (#1241) (Continued)			
57. [Ref. 124170] One Primary Language Arts teacher in the October and February			
surveys had earned none of the in-service training points required in ESOL strategies,			
pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. The teacher needed 120 points by			
the October survey and 180 points by the February survey. We made the following			
audit adjustment:			
101 Basic K-3       10.0000         130 ESOL       (10.0000)	.0000		
58. [Ref. 124171] One teacher taught Primary Language Arts to classes that			
included LEP students, but was not properly certified to teach LEP students and was			
not approved by the School Board to teach such students out-of-field. We made the			
following audit adjustment:			
102 Basic 4-8       6.0000         130 ESOL       (6.0000)	<u>.0000</u>		
	<u>.0000</u>		

#### Palm Beach Gardens High School (#1371)

59. [Ref. 137102/03/04/05] The course schedules for 54 students (53 in our Career Education sample and one in our Basic sample) were funded using an incorrect priority. The students' off-campus OJT courses were funded prior to the students' on-campus courses (Ref. 137102). We also noted the following additional exceptions involving 20 of these students:

- The timecards for 14 students were missing and could not be located (Ref. a. <u>137103)</u>.
- The timecards for three students indicated that they did not work during the b. reporting survey (Ref. 137104).

Net Audit Adjustments

(Unweighted FTE)

# SCHEDULE D (Continued)

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS** For the Finand Year Ended June 20, 2007

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Palm BeachGardens High School (#1371) (Continued)			
c.	c. Three students were reported for more hours than their timecards supported		
	<u>(Ref. 137105)</u> .		
<u>We ma</u>	ade the following audit adjustments:		
	<u>Ref. 137102</u> 103 Basic 9-12 300 Career Education 9-12	4.3548 <u>(4.3548</u> )	.0000
	<u>Ref. 137103</u> 300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(1.7458</u> )	(1.7458)
	<u>Ref. 137104</u> 300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.4158</u> )	(.4158)
	<u>Ref. 137105</u> 300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.0992</u> )	(.0992)
60. [Ref. 137170] <u>One teacher taught Mathematics to classes that included LEP</u> students, but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. We made the following <u>audit adjustment</u> :			
	103 Basic 9-12 130 ESOL	.2502 (.2502)	.0000
61. [Ref. 137171/73] <u>Two teachers were appropriately approved by the School</u> <u>Board to teach LEP students out-of-field, but had earned none of the in-service training</u> <u>points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teachers' in-service training</u> <u>timelines. One teacher (Ref. 137171) needed 60 points and the other (Ref. 137173)</u> <u>needed 300. We made the following audit adjustments:</u>			
	<u>Ref. 137171</u> 103 Basic 9-12 130 ESOL	.5004 <u>(.5004</u> )	.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

**Findings** 

#### **SCHEDULE D** (Continued)

## Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Net Audit Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

#### Palm Beach Gardens High School (#1371) (Continued)

<u>Ref. 137173</u>			
103 Basic 9-12	.1668		
130 ESOL	<u>(.1668</u> )	<u>.0000</u>	
62. [Ref. 137172] One teacher taught Intensive Reading to class	ses that included		
LEP students, but was not properly certified to teach Intensive F	Reading or LEP		
students. We noted that the teacher was approved by the School Board	to teach Reading		
and LEP students out-of-field; however, the teacher had earned nor	ne of the 60 in-		
service training points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service			
training timeline and had not earned the required six hours of college credit towards			
certification in Reading, the teacher's out-of-field subject area. We may	de the following		
<u>audit adjustment</u> :			
103 Basic 9-12	.6672		
130 ESOL	<u>(.6672</u> )	.0000	

130 ESOL	<u>(.6672</u> )

(2.2608)

#### Boca Raton Middle School (#1491)

63. [Ref. 149101] The course schedules for five LEP students incorrectly included a portion of the student's instructional time in program No. 102 (Basic 4-8) rather than in program No. 130 (ESOL). We made the following audit adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	(.9767)	
130 ESOL	<u>.9767</u>	.0000

[Ref. 149102] The LEP Student Plans for six students were incomplete. The 64. students' Plans did not show their instructional programs and related course schedules, nor were these items attached to, or referenced in, the students' Plans; consequently, the students' ESOL-reporting was not adequately supported. We made the following audit adjustment:

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

-41-

# **Findings**

# SCHEDULE D (Continued)

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS**

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Boca Raton Middle School (#1491) (Continued)	
102 Basic 4-8       4.9068         130 ESOL       (4.9068)	.0000
65. [Ref. 149170] One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to	
teach LEP students, but had earned only 3 of the 300 in-service training points required	
in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. We made the	
following audit adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       1.2600         130 ESOL       (1.2600)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>.0000</u>
South Technical Education Center (#1571)	
66. [Ref. 157101] The English language assessment tests for three LEP students in	
their fourth, fifth, or sixth year of ESOL-placement were missing and could not be	
located; consequently, their ESOL-placement was not adequately supported. We made	
the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .6151         130 ESOL       (.6151)	.0000
67. [Ref. 157102] The course schedules for 16 Career Education students in OJT	
were funded using an incorrect priority. The students' off-campus OJT courses were	
funded prior to the students' on-campus courses. We made the following audit	
adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-121.8357300 Career Education 9-12(1.8357)	.0000
68. [Ref. 157103] The timecards for 11 Career Education students in OJT were	

missing and could not be located. We made the following audit adjustment:

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
South Technical Education Center (#1571) (Continued)	
300 Career Education 9-12 (1.4356)	(1.4356)
69. [Ref. 157104] The course schedules for 22 Career Education students in OJT	
were funded using an incorrect priority. The students' off-campus OJT courses were	
funded prior to the students' on-campus courses. We also noted the following	
exceptions for 21 of the 22 students:	
a. The timecards for 18 students were missing and could not be located.	
b. The timecards for three students were not signed by the students' employers.	
We also noted the timecard for one of these students supported less time (.75	
hours) than was reported for the student (4.5 hours) and the timecard	
covering the February survey for one of the students was missing and could	
not be located.	
We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       2.2783         300 Career Education 9-12       (5.1483)	(2.8700)
$\frac{1}{100}$	(2.0700)
70. [Ref. 157170/74] Two teachers were appropriately approved by the School	
Board to teach LEP students out-of-field, but had earned none of the in-service training	
points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teachers' in-service training	
timelines. One teacher (Ref. 15174) needed 60 points and the other (Ref. 15170) needed	
120. We made the following audit adjustments:	
<u>Ref. 15170</u>	
103 Basic 9-12 .2734	
130 ESOL (.2734)	.0000
<u>Ref. 15174</u>	
103 Basic 9-12       .1367         130 ESOL       (.1367)	.0000
(.1007)	.0000

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
South Technical Education Center (#1571) (Continued)	
71. [Ref. 157171/76] Two teachers who taught Mathematics (Ref. 157171) and	
English (Ref. 157176), respectively, did not hold Florida teaching certificates, and were	
not otherwise qualified to teach. We made the following audit adjustments:	
Ref. 157171       .4101         103 Basic 9-12       .4101         130 ESOL       (.4101)	.0000
Ref. 157176         103 Basic 9-12       .2734         130 ESOL       (.2734)	.0000
72. [Ref. 157172] One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to	
teach LEP students out-of-field, but the parents of the students concerned were not	
notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .4101         130 ESOL       (.4101)	.0000
73. [Ref. 157173/75] Two teachers taught Chemistry (Ref. 157173) and Social	
Science (Ref. 157175), respectively, to classes that included LEP students, but had	
earned none of the 60 in-service training points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to	
the teachers' in-service training timelines. We made the following audit adjustments:	
Ref. 157173       .4101         103 Basic 9-12       .4101         130 ESOL       (.4101)	.0000
Ref. 157175         103 Basic 9-12       .8202         130 ESOL       (.8202)	.0000

#### **SCHEDULE D** (Continued)

## Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

#### **Findings**

#### Net Audit Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

#### South Technical Education Center (#1571) (Continued)

74. [Ref. 157177] One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by the School Board to teach out-of-field. The teacher held certification in Business Education, but taught courses which required certification as a Teacher Coordinator of Work Experience. We also noted that the parents of the students concerned were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We made the following audit adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	5.0342	
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(5.0342</u> )	.0000
		(4.3056)

#### Santaluces High School (#1611)

75. [Ref. 161101/02/03/04] We noted the following exceptions involving 33 Career Education students in OJT:

- The course schedules for 30 students were funded using an incorrect priority. a. The students' off-campus OIT courses were funded prior to the students' oncampus courses (Ref. 161101). We also noted the following additional exceptions for 4 of these 30 students: the timecards for two students were missing and could not be located, and the timecards for two students indicated that the students did not work during the survey.
- One student enrolled in school after the end of the reporting survey, and should b. not have been included with that survey's results (Ref. 161102).
- The timecards for one student were missing and could not be located (Ref. c. 161103).
- The timecard for one student indicated that the student was not employed d. during the reporting survey and should not have been reported for OIT time (Ref. 161104).

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>		Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Santaluces High School (#1611) (Continued)		
We made the following audit adjustments:		
<u>Ref. 161101</u> 103 Basic 9-12 300 Career Education 9-12	4.4100 (4.4100)	.0000
<u>Ref. 161102</u> 103 Basic 9-12 300 Career Education 9-12	(.0582) <u>(.4418</u> )	(.5000)
<u>Ref. 161103</u> 300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.4158</u> )	(.4158)
<u>Ref. 161104</u> 300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.3324</u> )	(.3324)
76. [Ref. 161105] The file for one student in ESOL indicated	d that the student was	
FES, a competent English reader and writer, and ineligible for I	ESOL-placement. We	
made the following audit adjustment:		
103 Basic 9-12 130 ESOL	.4170 <u>(.4170</u> )	.0000
77. [Ref. 161170/75/78/79] Four teachers taught Basic st	ubject areas (three in	
Science (Ref. 161170/78/79) and one in Mathematics (Ref. 16	1175)) to classes that	
included LEP students, but the teachers had not earned the 60 in-	service training points	
required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teachers' in-service t	raining timelines. The	
teachers had earned only 20 (Ref. 161170), zero (Ref. 161178/79)	, and 33 (Ref. 161175)	
in-service training points. We made the following audit adjustmen	<u>ts</u> :	
<u>Ref. 161170</u> 103 Basic 9-12 130 ESOL	.5838 <u>(.5838</u> )	.0000

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>		Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Santaluces High School (#1611) (Continued)		
<u>Ref. 161175</u> 103 Basic 9-12 130 ESOL	3.3360 <u>(3.3360</u> )	.0000
<u>Ref. 161178</u> 103 Basic 9-12 130 ESOL	1.0842 <u>(1.0842</u> )	.0000
<u>Ref. 161179</u> 103 Basic 9-12 130 ESOL	1.2510 ( <u>1.2510</u> )	.0000
78. [Ref. 161171] One teacher was appropriately approved b	y the School Board to	
teach LEP students out-of-field, but had earned none of the	120 in-service training	
points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-se	ervice training timeline.	
We made the following audit adjustment:		
103 Basic 9-12 130 ESOL	.8332 <u>(.8332</u> )	<u>.0000</u> (1.2482)
Crestwood Community Middle School (#1691)		
79. [Ref. 169101] <u>The file for one ESE student did not constudent's General Education teacher had participated in the develop IEP.</u> We made the following audit adjustment:		
<ul><li>102 Basic 4-8</li><li>112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services</li></ul>	1.0000 <u>(1.0000</u> )	.0000
80. [Ref. 169102] <u>The <i>Matrix of Services</i> form for one ESE student was more that</u> three years old and had expired. We made the following audit adjustment:		
<ul><li>112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services</li><li>254 ESE Support Level 4</li></ul>	.5000 <u>(.5000</u> )	.0000

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS**

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Crestwood Community Middle School (#1691) (Continued)	
81. [Ref. 169103] The files for two LEP students did not contain documentation	
justifying the students' continued ESOL-placement for a fourth year. We made the	
following audit adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       .9319         130 ESOL       (.9319)	<u>.0000</u> .0000
Seminole Trails Elementary School (#1711)	.0000
82. [Ref. 171101] One ESE student was not reported in accordance with the	
student's Matrix of Services form. We made the following audit adjustment:	
254       ESE Support Level 4       .5000         255       ESE Support Level 5       (.5000)	.0000
83. [Ref. 171170] One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to	
teach LEP students out-of-field, but had earned none of the 120 in-service training	
points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline.	
We made the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       4.0000         130 ESOL       (4.0000)	.0000
84. [Ref. 171171] One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to	
teach ESE out-of-field, but the parents of the students concerned were not notified of	
the teacher's out-of-field status. We made the following audit adjustment:	
101Basic K-3.9976102Basic 4-81.9976254ESE Support Level 4(2.4956)255ESE Support Level 5(.4996)	.0000

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Seminole Trails Elementary School (#1711) (Continued)	
85. [Ref. 171172] <u>One teacher taught Primary Language Arts to classes that</u> included LEP students; however, the teacher was not properly certified to teach LEP	
students and was not approved by the School Board to teach such students out-of-field.	
We made the following audit adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	<u>.0000</u> .0000
Jupiter Middle School (#1731)	
86. [Ref. 173101] <u>The file for one ESE student did not contain evidence that the student's General Education teacher had participated in the development of the student's IEP. We made the following audit adjustment:</u>	
102 Basic 4-8       1.0000         112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services       (1.0000)	.0000
87. [Ref. 173171] One teacher taught Social Science to classes that included LEP	
students, but had earned only 31 of the 60 in-service training points required in ESOL	
strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. We made the following	
<u>audit adjustment</u> :	
102 Basic 4-8       .5168         130 ESOL       (.5168)	.0000
88. [Ref. 173172] <u>One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to</u> teach LEP students out-of-field, but had earned none of the in-service training points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. The teacher needed 120 points by the October survey, and 180 points by the February survey. We made the following audit adjustment:	

# SCHEDULE D (Continued)

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS**

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Jupiter Middle School (#1731) (Continued)	
102 Basic 4-8       7.8339         130 ESOL       (7.8339)	<u>.0000</u> .0000
H. L. Johnson Elementary School (#1761)	
89. [Ref. 176101/02] <u>The files for four LEP students did not contain</u> <u>documentation justifying the students' continued ESOL-placement for a fourth year.</u> <u>We made the following audit adjustments</u> :	
Ref. 176101         101 Basic K-3       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	.0000
Ref. 176102         101 Basic K-3       2.0000         130 ESOL       (2.0000)	.0000
90. [Ref. 176103] The LEP Student Plan for one student was dated after the end of	
the reporting survey; consequently, the student's ESOL-reporting was not adequately	
supported. We made the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .5000         130 ESOL       (.5000)	.0000
91. [Ref. 176104] <u>Two ESE students were not reported in accordance with the</u> students' <i>Matrix of Services</i> forms. We made the following audit adjustment:	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services.5000112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services.5000254 ESE Support Level 4(1.0000)	.0000
92. [Ref. 176105] <u>The <i>Matrix of Services</i> form for one ESE student was not reviewed</u> when the student's IEP was reviewed and updated. We made the following audit adjustment:	
aujustinent.	

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
H. L. Johnson Elementary School (#1761) (Continued)	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services       .5000         255 ESE Support Level 5       (.5000)	.0000
93. [Ref. 176170] One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to	
teach LEP students out-of-field, but the parents of the students concerned were not	
notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We made the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .5000         130 ESOL       (.5000)	<u>.0000</u>
	.0000
Whispering Pines Elementary School (#1781)	
94. [Ref. 178101] The LEP Committees for two FES students did not consider at	
least two of the five criteria specified in Rule 6A-6.0902(2)(a)3., Florida Administrative	
Code, prior to recommending the students' continued placement in ESOL. We made	
the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       1.5000         130 ESOL       (1.5000)	.0000
95. [Ref. 178102] The file for one student in ESOL did not contain adequate	
documentation to support the student's LEP classification and reporting in ESOL. We	
also noted that the file did not contain documentation that the student's parents had	
been notified of the student's ESOL-placement. We made the following audit	
adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	.0000

Net Audit

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

## Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)
Whispering Pines Elementary School (#1781) (Continued)	
96. [Ref. 178103] <u>The IEPs for three ESE students did not indicate that the</u> required District personnel had participated in the students' IEP meetings. Two of the IEPs did not show that the District's Local Education Agent Specialist had participated and one did not show that the student's ESE teacher had participated. We made the	
following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       2.0000         254 ESE Support Level 4       (2.0000)	.0000
97. [Ref. 178170] <u>One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to</u> teach LEP students out-of-field, but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points	
required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. We	
made the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	<u>.0000</u> .0000
Royal Palm School (#1801)	
98. [Ref. 180102] One PK student had withdrawn from school prior to the	
reporting survey and should not have been included with that survey's results. We made the following audit adjustment:	
254 ESE Support Level 4 (.4750)	(.4750)
99. [Ref. 180104] <u>The Matrix of Services forms for two ESE students incorrectly</u> included one Special Considerations point for which the students were not eligible. This point was designated for students with a <i>Matrix</i> score of 21 points and a Level 5 rating in four Domains. The students cited had a Level 5 rating in only three Domains. We made the following audit adjustment:	

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Royal Palm School (#1801) (Continued)	
254       ESE Support Level 4       1.0000         255       ESE Support Level 5       (1.0000)	.0000
100. [Ref. 180105] The Matrix of Services form for one ESE student incorrectly	
included 13 Special Considerations points for which the student was not eligible. The 13	
points were designated for students who were served in the home or hospital on a one-	
to-one basis. The student cited was not served under those circumstances. We made	
the following audit adjustment:	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services.4500255 ESE Support Level 5(.4500)	.0000
101. [Ref. 180106] Five ESE students were not reported in accordance with the	
students' Matrix of Services forms. We made the following audit adjustment:	
254ESE Support Level 4(2.5000)254ESE Support Level 41.0000255ESE Support Level 5(1.0000)255ESE Support Level 52.5000	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>(.4750</u> )
Banyan Creek Elementary School (#1891)	
102. [Ref. 189101] The file for one LEP student did not contain documentation	
justifying the student's continued ESOL-placement for a fifth year. We made the	
following audit adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       .4500         130 ESOL       (.4500)	.0000
103. [Ref. 189102] The parental notification letter for three LEP students was dated	
after the October survey; consequently, the notification was not timely. We made the	
following audit adjustment:	

# SCHEDULE D (Continued)

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS**

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Banyan Creek Elementary School (#1891) (Continued)	
101 Basic K-3       .9000         102 Basic 4-8       .4500         130 ESOL       (1.3500)	.0000
104. [Ref. 189103] The files for three LEP students did not contain documentation	
that the students' parents had been notified of the students' ESOL-placement. We made	
the following audit adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       2.2500         130 ESOL       (2.2500)	.0000
105. [Ref. 189104] The file for one student in ESOL indicated that the student was	
FES and ineligible for ESOL-placement. We made the following audit adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       .4500         130 ESOL       (.4500)	.0000
106. [Ref. 189105] The file for one ESE student (who was in our ESE Support	
Levels 4 and 5 sample) did not contain evidence that the student's General Education	
teacher had participated in the development of the student's IEP. We made the	
following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .5000         111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services       (.5000)	.0000
107. [Ref. 189106] One ESE student was not reported in accordance with the	
student's Matrix of Services form. We made the following audit adjustment:	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services1.0000254 ESE Support Level 4(1.0000)	.0000

Net Audit

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)
C C	(Onweighted TTE)
Banyan Creek Elementary School (#1891) (Continued)	
108. [Ref. 189170] One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to	
teach LEP students out-of-field, but had earned none of the in-service training points	
required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. The	
teacher needed 120 points for Primary Language Arts course instruction and 60 points	
for Basic subject area course instruction. We made the following audit adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8 .3500	
130 ESOL (.3500)	<u>.0000</u> .0000
	<u></u>
Loxahatchee Groves Elementary School (#1901)	
109. [Ref. 190101] The Matrix of Services form for one ESE student was missing and	
could not be located. We made the following audit adjustment:	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services.4750254 ESE Support Level 4(.4750)	.0000
110. [Ref. 190102] The Matrix of Services form for one ESE student in program No.	
254 (ESE Support Level 4) was not properly scored. The Matrix form showed a total of	
18 points rather than the correct 16 points. We made the following audit adjustment:	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services.4750254 ESE Support Level 4(.4750)	.0000
111. [Ref. 190170] One teacher taught Primary Language Arts to classes that	
included LEP students, but was not properly certified to teach LEP students and was	
not approved by the School Board to teach such students out-of-field. We also noted	
that the teacher had earned only 60 of the 120 in-service training points required in	
ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. We made the	
following audit adjustment:	

# SCHEDULE D (Continued)

## Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS**

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Loxahatchee Groves Elementary School (#1901) (Continued)	
102 Basic 4-8 1.5000	
130 ESOL $(1.5000)$	.0000
	<u>.0000</u>
Watson B. Duncan Middle School (#1971)	
112. [Ref. 197101] The reported course schedules for one LEP student was funded	
using an incorrect priority. A course in program No. 102 (Basic 4-8) was funded prior to	
a course in program No. 130 (ESOL). We made the following audit adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8 (.0100)	0000
130 ESOL <u>.0100</u>	.0000
113. [Ref. 197102] The IEP for one ESE student did not indicate that the student's	
ESE teacher had participated in the development of the student's IEP. We made the	
following audit adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       .5000         112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services       (.5000)	.0000
114. [Ref. 197103] We noted the following regarding the <i>Matrix of Services</i> forms for	
<u>12 ESE students: the <i>Matrix</i> forms for 11 students were not reviewed and updated</u> when the students' IEPs had been revised and the <i>Matrix</i> form for one student was not	
dated. We made the following audit adjustment:	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services12.0000254 ESE Support Level 4(11.0000)	
255 ESE Support Level 5 (1.0000)	.0000
115. [Ref. 197104] The Matrix of Services form for one ESE student was missing and	
could not be located. We made the following audit adjustment:	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services       1.0000         254 ESE Support Level 4       (1.0000)	.0000
<i>The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule</i> -56-	

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Watson B. Duncan Middle School (#1971) (Continued)	
116. [Ref. 197170/71] Two teachers taught Social Science (Ref. 197170) and	
Mathematics (Ref. 197171), respectively, to classes that included LEP students, but had	
not earned the required number of in-service training points required in ESOL	
strategies, pursuant to the teachers' in-service training timelines. One teacher (Ref.	
197170) had earned no points and the other teacher (Ref. 197171) had earned only 22 of	
60 required points. We made the following audit adjustments:	
Ref. 197170102 Basic 4-81.1900130 ESOL(1.1900)	.0000
Ref. 197171         102 Basic 4-8       .8500         130 ESOL       (.8500)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>.0000</u>
Bear Lakes Middle School (#1981)	
117. [Ref. 198170/71] Two teachers taught Mathematics (Ref. 198170) and Science	
(Ref. 198171), respectively, to classes that included LEP students, but the teachers had	
earned none of the 60 in-service training points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to	
the teachers' in-service training timelines. We made the following audit adjustments:	
Ref. 198170       .1834         102 Basic 4-8       .1834         130 ESOL       (.1834)	.0000
Ref. 198171       .9170         102 Basic 4-8       .9170         130 ESOL       (.9170)	<u>.0000</u> .0000

## Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Park Vista Community High School (#2001)	
118. [Ref. 200101] The timecards for four Career Education students in OJT were	
missing and could not be located. We made the following audit adjustment:	
300 Career Education 9-12 (.4988)	(.4988)
119. [Ref. 200102] The timecard for one Career Education student in OJT indicated	
that the student was not employed during the survey week and should not have been	
reported for OJT time. We made the following audit adjustment:	
300 Career Education 9-12 (.2498)	(.2498)
120. [Ref. 200170/71/73/74] Four teachers taught Science (Ref. 200170),	
Mathematics (Ref. 200171/74), and History (Ref. 200173) to classes that included LEP	
students, but the teachers had earned none of the 60 in-service training points required	
in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teachers' in-service training timelines. We made the	
following audit adjustments:	
Ref. 200170	
103 Basic 9-12 .9174	0000
130 ESOL ( <u>.9174</u> )	.0000
<u>Ref. 200171</u> 103 Basic 9-12 .1668	
130 ESOL (.1668)	.0000
Ref. 200173	
103 Basic 9-12       .0834         130 ESOL       (.0834)	.0000
130 ESOL (.0834)	.0000
<u>Ref. 200174</u> 103 Basic 9-12 .0834	
130 ESOL (.0834)	.0000

Net Audit

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)
Park Vista Community High School (#2001) (Continued)	
121. [Ref. 200172] One Reading teacher was appropriately approved by the School	
Board to teach Reading (in a prior year) and LEP students out-of-field, but the teacher	
had earned none of the 240 in-service training points required in ESOL strategies,	
pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline and had not earned the required six	
hours of college credit towards certification in Reading, the teacher's out-of-field subject	
area. We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12 .3332	
130 ESOL (.3332)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>(.7486</u> )
Olympic Heights Community High School (#2181)	
122. [Ref. 218101] The course schedule for one student (who was in our Basic	
sample) was funded using an incorrect priority. The student's off-campus OJT courses	
were funded prior to the student's on-campus courses. We made the following audit	
adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12 .0620	
300 Career Education 9-12 (.0620)	.0000
123. [Ref. 218102] The file for one ESE student did not contain an IEP that was	
valid for the reporting survey. We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12 .5000	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services $(.5000)$	.0000
124. [Ref. 218103] The file for one LEP student did not contain documentation that	
the student's parents had been notified of the student's ESOL-placement. We made the	
following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12 .3336	
130 ESOL (.3336)	.0000
<i>The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.</i> -59-	

Net Audit

# SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS** For the Finand Yoar Ended June 30, 2007

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)
Olympic Heights Community High School (#2181) (Continued)	
125. [Ref. 218104/05/06] The course schedules for 37 Career Education students in	
OJT were funded using an incorrect priority. The students' off-campus OJT courses	
were funded prior to the students' on-campus courses (Ref. 218104). We also noted the	
following additional exceptions involving seven of these students: the timecards for six	
students indicated that the students did not work any hours during the reporting survey	
periods (Ref. 218105); and the timecard for one student was missing and could not be	
located (Ref. 218106). We made the following audit adjustments:	
<u>Ref. 218104</u>	
103 Basic 9-12       3.4568         300 Career Education 9-12       (3.4568)	.0000
	.0000
<u>Ref. 218105</u> 103 Basic 9-12	
300 Career Education 9-12     (1.4868)	(.8316)
<u>Ref. 218106</u>	
103 Basic 9-12 .0004	(
300 Career Education 9-12 (.0834)	(.0830)
126. [Ref. 218107] The timecard for one Career Education student in OJT was not	
signed by the student's employer. We made the following audit adjustment:	
300 Career Education 9-12 (.0830)	(.0830)
127. [Ref. 218171] One teacher taught Social Science to classes that included LEP	
students, but had earned only 15 of the 60 in-service training points required in ESOL	
strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. We made the following	
<u>audit adjustment</u> :	
103 Basic 9-12 .3336	
130 ESOL (.3336)	.0000

# SCHEDULE D (Continued)

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS**

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Olympic Heights Community High School (#2181) (Continued)	
128. [Ref. 218172] One teacher had been appropriately approved by the School	
Board in the prior year to teach Reading out-of-field, but had not earned the required six	
hours of college credit towards certification in that out-of-field subject area. We made	
the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .6672         130 ESOL       (.6672)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>(.9976</u> )
Wellington High School (#2191)	
129. [Ref. 219101] Five Career Education students in OJT were reported for more	
hours than their timecards supported. We made the following audit adjustment:	
300 Career Education 9-12 (.2950)	(.2950)
130. [Ref. 219102] The timecards for four Career Education students in OJT	
indicated that the students were not employed and should not have been reported for	
OJT time. We made the following audit adjustment:	
300 Career Education 9-12 (.5550)	(.5550)
131. [Ref. 219103/04] The timecards for four Career Education students in OJT	
were missing and could not be located (Ref. 219103). We also noted that the timecard	
for one of the students was not signed by the student's employer (Ref. 219104). We	
made the following audit adjustments:	
<u>Ref. 219013</u>	
300 Career Education 9-12 (.7350)	(.7350)
<u>Ref. 219104</u>	
300 Career Education 9-12 (.0750)	(.0750)

## Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Wellington High School (#2191) (Continued)	
132. [Ref. 219105] The timecard for one Career Education student in OJT indicated	
that the student was not employed during the reporting survey and was not signed by the	
student's employer. We made the following audit adjustment:	
300 Career Education 9-12 (.0750)	(.0750)
133. [Ref. 219106] The file for one ESE student did not contain evidence that the	
student's General Education teacher had participated in the development of the student's	
IEP. We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .5000         113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services       (.5000)	.0000
134. [Ref. 219107] One ESE student was reported incorrectly for Hospital and	
Homebound instruction. The student had been dismissed from the Hospital and	
Homebound program prior to the reporting survey and should have been reported in	
program No. 113 (Grades 9-12 with ESE Services). We made the following audit	
<u>adjustment</u> :	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services       .5000         255 ESE Support Level 5       (.5000)	.0000
135. [Ref. 219170/71/72] Three teachers taught Mathematics (Ref. 219170/71) and	
Biology (Ref. 219172) to classes that included LEP students, but the teachers had not	
earned the 60 in-service training points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the	
teachers' in-service training timelines. Two of the teachers had earned 30 and 20 points,	
respectively, (Ref. 219170/71) and the third teacher (Ref. 219172) had not earned any	
points. We made the following audit adjustments:	
Ref. 219170         103 Basic 9-12       .1700         130 ESOL       (.1700)	.0000
The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule	

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS** For the Finand Year Ended June 20, 2007

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>		Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Wellington High School (#2191) (Continued)		
<u>Ref. 219171</u> 103 Basic 9-12 130 ESOL	.7650 <u>(.7650</u> )	.0000
<u>Ref. 219172</u> 103 Basic 9-12 130 ESOL	1.0200 <u>(1.0200</u> )	<u>.0000</u> (1.7250)
Glades Central High School (#2301)		<u>(1.7350</u> )
136. [Ref. 230101] The English language proficiency of one LE	P student was not	
assessed on a timely basis prior to the student's continued placeme	ent in ESOL for a	
fourth year. The assessment was not completed until after the 2006-0	07 school year. We	
made the following audit adjustment:		
103 Basic 9-12 130 ESOL	.5000 <u>(.5000</u> )	.0000
137. [Ref. 230102] Two ESE students were not reported in accordance with the		
students' Matrix of Services forms. We made the following audit adjustr	ment:	
<ul> <li>113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services</li> <li>254 ESE Support Level 4</li> <li>254 ESE Support Level 4</li> <li>255 ESE Support Level 5</li> </ul>	.5000 (.5000) .5000 <u>(.5000</u> )	.0000
138. [Ref. 230170] One teacher taught English to classes that inclu	ided LEP students,	
but was not properly certified to teach LEP students and was no	t approved by the	
School Board to teach such students out-of-field. We also noted that	t the parents of the	
students concerned were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field state	<u>us</u> .	

(Finding continues on next page.)

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Glades Central High School (#2301) (Continued)	
We further noted the teacher had earned none of the 120 in-service training points	
required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. We	
made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .5124         130 ESOL       (.5124)	.0000
139. [Ref. 230171/72] Two teachers taught Mathematics and Biology, respectively,	
but did not hold a Florida teaching certificate, and were not otherwise qualified to teach.	
We also noted that the teachers' classes included LEP students, but the teachers had	
earned none of the 60 in-service points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the	
teachers' in-service training timelines. We made the following audit adjustment:	
Ref. 230171         103 Basic 9-12       .3468         130 ESOL       (.3468)	.0000
Ref. 230172.5202103 Basic 9-12.5202130 ESOL(.5202)	.0000
140. [Ref. 230173] One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to	
teach LEP students out-of-field, but had not earned the in-service training points	
required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. The	
teacher had earned only 73 of the 240 points due by the October survey and 300 points	
due by the February survey. We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .3634         130 ESOL       (.3634)	<u>.0000</u> .0000

## Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Boynton Beach Community High School (#2361)	
141. [Ref. 236101] The course schedule for one LEP student incorrectly included	<u>a</u>
portion of the student's instructional time in program No. 103 (Basic 9-12) rather than	in
program No. 130 (ESOL). We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       (.040         130 ESOL       .040	/
142. [Ref. 236102] The timecard for one ESE student in OJT was missing and cou	<u>ld</u>
not be located. We made the following audit adjustment:	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services (.500	<u>0</u> ) (.5000)
143. [Ref. 236103] The English language assessments needed to justify the continue	ed
ESOL-placement of three LEP students for a fourth year were administered 12-month	<u>ns</u>
prior to the start of their fourth year. Assessments for continued ESOL-placeme	<u>nt</u>
should be made just prior to the start of a student's fourth, fifth, or six year. We made	le
the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       1.360         130 ESOL       (1.360)	
144. [Ref. 236104] The files for two students in ESOL indicated that the student	ts
were FES and ineligible for ESOL-placement. We made the following audit adjustmen	<u>t</u> :
103 Basic 9-12       .680         130 ESOL       (.680)	

Net Audit

# SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS** For the Finand Yoar Ended June 30, 2007

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)
Boynton Beach Community High School (#2361) (Continued)	( <u></u> ,
145. [Ref. 236170] One teacher taught English to classes that included LEP students,	
but the teacher was not properly certified to teach LEP students and was not approved	
by the School Board to teach such students out-of-field. We also noted that the parents	
of the students concerned were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status until	
October 14, 2006; consequently the notification was not valid for the October survey.	
We further noted that the teacher had earned none of the 60 in-service training points	
required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. We	
made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .3400         130 ESOL       (.3400)	.0000
146. [Ref. 236171] One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to	
teach LEP students out-of-field, but had earned none of the in-service training points	
required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. The	
teacher needed 120 points by the October survey and 180 points by the February survey.	
We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .1700         130 ESOL       (.1700)	.0000
147. [Ref. 236172] One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by	
the School Board to teach out-of-field. The teacher held certification in Specific	
Learning Disabilities, but taught courses that required certification in Mathematics. We	
also noted that the parents of the students concerned were not notified of the teacher's	
out-of-field status. We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       1.2750         130 ESOL       (1.2750)	.0000
	<u>(.5000</u> )

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Indian Ridge School (#2411)	
148. [Ref. 241102] <u>One ESE student was not reported in accordance with the</u>	
student's Matrix of Services form. We made the following audit adjustment:	
254       ESE Support Level 4       (.5000)         255       ESE Support Level 5       .5000	<u>.0000</u> .0000
Palm Beach Central High School (#2631)	
149. [Ref. 263101] The Matrix of Services form for one ESE student was not reviewed,	
dated, or initialed by its preparer; consequently, we could not determine the validity of	
the Matrix form. We made the following audit adjustment:	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services.5000254 ESE Support Level 4(.5000)	.0000
150. [Ref. 263102] One ESE student was reported incorrectly in program No. 255	
(ESE Support Level 5) based on placement in the Hospital and Homebound program;	
No Hospital and Homebound services were provided to the student. Consequently, the	
student should have been reported in program No. 113 (Grades 9-12 with ESE	
Services). We made the following audit adjustment:	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services       .3336         255 ESE Support Level 5       (.3336)	.0000
151. [Ref. 263103/04/05/06/07] We noted the following exceptions involving 83	
Career Education students in OJT: the course schedules for 80 students were funded	
using an incorrect priority that funded the students' off-campus OJT courses prior to the	
students' on-campus courses (Ref. 263103); and the timecards for three students were	
missing and could not be located (Ref. 263104). We also noted the following additional	
exceptions involving 30 of the aforementioned 80 students:	

Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Net Audit Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

# **Findings**

#### Palm Beach Central High School (#2631) (Continued)

- The timecards for 21 students were missing and could not be located (Ref. a. 236104).
- b. The timecards for 3 students indicated that the students were unemployed and should not have been reported for OJT time (Ref. 236105).
- The timecards for 4 students were not signed by the students' employers (Ref. c. 236106).
- Two students were reported for more hours than their timecards supported d. (Ref. 263107).

We made the following audit adjustments:

<u>Ref. 236103</u> 103 Basic 9-12 300 Career Education 9-12	5.3640 <u>(5.3640</u> )	.0000
<u>Ref. 236104</u> 300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(4.2414</u> )	(4.2414)
<u>Ref. 236105</u> 300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.5826</u> )	(.5826)
<u>Ref. 236106</u> 300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.5822</u> )	(.5822)
<u>Ref. 236107</u> 300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.5660</u> )	(.5660)

152. [Ref. 263170] One Reading teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to teach Reading (in a prior year) and LEP students out-of-field, but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. (Finding continues on next page.)

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS** For the Finand Year Ended June 20, 2007

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Palm Beach Central High School (#2631) (Continued)	
We also noted that the teacher had not earned the required 12 hours of college credit	
towards certification in Reading, the teacher's out-of-field subject area. We made the	
following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .8340         130 ESOL       (.8340)	.0000
153. [Ref. 263171/73/74/75] Four teachers taught Basic subject area classes that	
included LEP students, but the teachers had not earned the number of in-service	
training points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teachers' in-service training	
timelines. Three of the teachers taught Mathematics and one taught Biology. Two (Ref.	
263173/75) had not earned any of 60 required points, and two (Ref. 263171/74) had	
earned only 30 of 60 required points. We made the following audit adjustments:	
Ref. 263171       .0834         103 Basic 9-12       .0834         130 ESOL       (.0834)	.0000
Ref. 263173         103 Basic 9-12       2.0016         130 ESOL       (2.0016)	.0000
Ref. 263174103 Basic 9-12.2502130 ESOL(.2502)	.0000
Ref. 263175         103 Basic 9-12       .5004         130 ESOL       (.5004)	.0000

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

## Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Palm Beach Central High School (#2631) (Continued)	
154. [Ref. 263172] One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by	
the School Board to teach ESE out-of-field. The teacher held certification in Speech	
Language Impaired, but taught a course which required certification in Varying	
Exceptionalities. We also noted that the parents of the students concerned were not	
notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12 .0834	
254 ESE Support Level 4 (.0834)	.0000
	<u>(5.9722</u> )
Freedom Shores Elementary School (#2671)	
155. [Ref. 267170] One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to	
teach LEP students out-of-field, but the parents of the students concerned were not	
notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We made the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3 .7500	
102 Basic 4-8 .3500	0000
130 ESOL $(1.1000)$	<u>.0000</u>
	.0000
Discovery Key Elementary School (#2721)	
156. [Ref. 272101] The Matrix of Services form for one ESE student incorrectly	
included one Special Considerations point for which the student was not eligible. The	
point was designated for students with a Matrix score of 17 points and a Level 5 rating in	
three Domains. This student had a Level 5 rating in only two Domains. We made the	
following audit adjustment:	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services1.0000254 ESE Support Level 4(1.0000)	.0000

Net Audit

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)
Discovery Key Elementary School (#2721) (Continued)	
157. [Ref. 272102] Three ESE students were not reported in accordance with the	
students' Matrix of Services forms. We also noted that the Matrix form for one of the	
students was not reviewed and updated when the student's IEP was revised. We made	
the following audit adjustment:	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services1.0000254 ESE Support Level 4.5000255 ESE Support Level 5(1.5000)	.0000
158. [Ref. 272103] The files for two ESE students did not contain a Matrix of Services	
form that was valid for the reporting surveys. We made the following audit adjustment:	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services1.5000254 ESE Support Level 4(1.5000)	.0000
159. [Ref. 272170/71] Two teachers were appropriately approved by the School	
Board to teach LEP students out-of-field, but had earned none of the in-service training	
points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teachers' in-service training	
timelines. One teacher (Ref. 272170) needed 120 points and the other (Ref. 272171)	
needed 60 points. We also noted that the parents of the students taught by one of the	
teachers (Ref. 272171) were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We made	
the following audit adjustments:	
Ref. 272170       2.0000         101 Basic K-3       2.0000         130 ESOL       (2.0000)         Ref. 272171       2.0000	.0000
101 Basic K-3       1.5000         130 ESOL       (1.5000)	0000
130 ESOL (1.5000)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>.0000</u>

Net Audit

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)
Royal Palm Beach Elementary School (#2741)	<b>↓ 0 →</b>
160. [Ref. 274101] The LEP Committees for one FES student did not consider at	
least two of the five criteria specified in Rule 6A-6.0902(2)(a)3., Florida Administrative	
Code, prior to recommending the student's continued placement in ESOL. We also	
noted that the student's reading and writing proficiency was not assessed. We made the	
following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .9000         130 ESOL       (.9000)	.0000
161. [Ref. 274103] The Matrix of Services form for one ESE student in program No.	
255 (ESE Support Level 5) erroneously included three Special Considerations points in	
the calculation of the student's Matrix score. The student should have had a total score	
of 20 points, and been reported in program No. 254 (ESE Support Level 4). We made	
the following audit adjustment:	
254       ESE Support Level 4       1.0000         255       ESE Support Level 5       (1.0000)	.0000
162. [Ref. 274170/71] The parents of students taught by two out-of-field teachers in	
the October survey were not notified of the teachers' out-of-field status until October	
14, 2006; consequently the notification was not effective for that survey. We also noted	
that one teacher (Ref. 274071) had earned only 240 of the 300 in-service training points	
required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. We	
made the following audit adjustments:	

<u>Ref. 274170</u>		
101 Basic K-3	2.1000	
130 ESOL	<u>(2.1000)</u>	.0000

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS** For the Finant Van Ended June 30, 2007

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Royal Palm Beach Elementary School (#2741) (Continued)	
Ref. 274171       .6000         102 Basic 4-8       .6000         130 ESOL       (.6000)	<u>.0000</u> .0000
Pierce Hammock Elementary School (#2861)	
163. [Ref. 286101] <u>One PK student had withdrawn from school prior to the</u> reporting survey and should not have been included with that survey's results. We made	
the following audit adjustment: 254 ESE Support Level 4 (.2500)	(.2500)
164. [Ref. 286170] <u>One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to</u> <u>teach LEP students out-of-field, but had earned only 120 of the 240 in-service training</u> points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. We made the following audit adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       2.0000         130 ESOL       (2.0000)	<u>.0000</u> (.2500)
	<u> </u>

### Survivors Charter School Boynton (#2921)

165. [Ref. 292101] <u>The course schedules for 249 full-time students in the October</u> survey were reported incorrectly as consisting of five on-campus courses and two OJT courses (off-campus) of 50 minutes each, for a total of 350 minutes per day or .5000 FTE. However, the bell schedule for the 2006-07 school year showed an instructional day of four classes of 47 minutes each, and one class of 46 minutes, for a total of 234 minutes per day or .3900 FTE. (*Finding continues on next page.*)

Net Audit A 1º

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Survivors Charter School Boynton (#2921) (Continued)	
We also noted the following additional exceptions: (a) the OJT folders for 171 students	
were missing and could not be located; (b) the timecards for 75 students were missing	
and could not be located; (c) the timecards for two students were not signed by their	
supervisor; and (d) the timecard for one student did not indicate the days and hours	
worked.	
We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12(24.3718)113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services(1.2582)300 Career Education 9-12(1.7600)	(27.3900)
166. [Ref. 292103] The IEP for one ESE student was missing and could not be	
located. We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .3900         113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services       (.3900)	.0000
167. [Ref. 292170] One teacher in the October survey taught Career Education, but	
did not hold a Florida teaching certificate, and was not otherwise qualified to teach. We	
noted that the needed certificate was issued to the teacher on December 8, 2006;	
consequently, the certificate was effective only for the February survey, not the October	
survey. We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12 7.5894	
300 Career Education 9-12 (7.5894)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>(27.3900</u> )
Palm Beach School for Autism (#2941)	

168. [Ref. 294101] Twelve ESE students were not reported in accordance with the students' Matrix of Services forms. We made the following audit adjustment:

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Palm Beach School for Autism (#2941) (Continued)	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services.4000254 ESE Support Level 47.2000255 ESE Support Level 5(7.6000)	<u>.0000</u> .0000
Palm Beach Marine Institute (#3005)	
169. [Ref. 300570] <u>One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to</u> teach LEP students out-of-field, but had earned none of the 180 in-service training points required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. Since the student in question is cited in finding No. 172 (Ref. 300503), no audit adjustment is made here.	
	.0000
170. [Ref. 300501] <u>One student had withdrawn from school prior to the reporting</u> survey and should not have been included with that survey's results. We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12 (.1833)	(.1833)
171. [Ref. 300502] <u>One student was absent from school during the 11-day window of</u> <u>the reporting survey and should not have been included with the survey's results. We</u> <u>made the following audit adjustment</u> :	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services (.1833)	(.1833)
172. [Ref. 300503] <u>The file for one LEP student did not contain documentation</u> justifying the student's continued ESOL-placement for a fourth year. We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .4336         130 ESOL       (.4336)	.0000
<i>The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.</i> -75-	

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

### **Findings**

Net Audit Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

## Palm Beach Marine Institute (#3005) (Continued)

173. [Ref. 300504] The FTE for 93 students in the July and June surveys (4 of whom		
were in our Basic sample and 3 of whom were in our Basic with ESE Services sample)		
was incorrectly reported based on a days-in-term number that varied from student to		
student. We determined from the Institute's instructional calendar that there were 27		
days-in-term for the July survey (.1500 FTE per student) and 33 days-in-term for the		
June survey (.1833 FTE per student). We also noted that the reported course schedules		
for 16 of the 93 students incorrectly listed some Basic courses in program No. 300		
(Career Education). We made the following audit adjustment:		
102Basic 4-8.4830103Basic 9-12.8625112Grades 4-8 with ESE Services.3161113Grades 9-12 with ESE Services.5749300Career Education 9-12(.2072)	2.0293	
174. [Ref. 300571] One teacher did not hold a Florida teaching certificate, and was		
not otherwise qualified to teach. We made the following audit adjustment:		
103 Basic 9-12       .5668         300 Career Education 9-12       (.5668)	.0000	
	1.6627	

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS** For the Finant Var Ended June 30, 2007

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

**Findings** 

Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>

(.5159)

### Palm Beach Regional Detention Center (#3006)

175. [Ref. 300601] Four students had withdrawn from school prior to the June survey and should not have been included with that survey's results. We also noted the following exceptions involving two of those students who were in ESOL: the file for one student was missing and could not be located; and the file for the other student did not contain evidence of parental notification or documentation justifying the student's ESOL-placement for a fourth year. We made the following audit adjustment:

112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	(.3328)
130 ESOL	(.1711)
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.0120</u> )

176. [Ref. 300602] <u>The reported number of days-in-term and instructional minutes</u> for 213 students in the June survey (3 of whom were in our Basic sample, 3 in our Basic with ESE Services sample, and one in our ESOL sample) did not agree with the Center's instructional calendar and varied by student. Each student should have been reported for a 34-day term having five instructional hours per day or .1889 FTE. The students were reported for various amounts ranging from .0126 FTE to .1818 FTE. We made the following audit adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	4.1486	
103 Basic 9-12	6.7872	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	2.8469	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	3.5496	
130 ESOL	(.0720)	
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.0960</u> )	17.1643

## Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS**

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Palm Beach Regional Detention Center (#3006) (Continued)	
177. [Ref. 300603] One ESE student was absent from school during the 11-day	
window of the reporting survey and should not have been included with the survey's	
results. We made the following audit adjustment:	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services (.1664)	(.1664)
178. [Ref. 300670/71] Two teachers were not properly certified and were not	
approved by the School Board to teach out-of-field. We also noted that the parents of	
the students concerned were not notified of the teachers' out-of-field status. We made	
the following audit adjustments:	
Ref. 300670       .1908         103 Basic 9-12       .1908         130 ESOL       (.1908)	.0000
Ref. 300671       .3576         103 Basic 9-12       .3576         130 ESOL       (.3576)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>16.4820</u>

### West Boca Raton High School (#3251)

179. [Ref. 325101/02/03/04/05/09/10] <u>The course schedules for 54 Career</u> Education students in OJT were funded using an incorrect priority. The students' offcampus OJT courses were funded prior to the students' on-campus courses (Ref. 325101). We also noted the following exceptions for 16 of these students:

a. <u>The timecards for six students were missing and could not be located (Ref.</u> <u>325102)</u>.

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Net Audit Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

## **Findings**

## West Boca Raton High School (#3251) (Continued)

- The timecards for four students were not signed by the student's employer (Ref. b. 325103).
- The timecards for three students were missing and could not be located or were c. not signed by the students' employers (Ref. 325104).
- d. One student was reported for more hours than were supported by their timecards (Ref. 325105).
- One student had withdrawn from school prior to the reporting survey and e. should not have been included with that survey's results (Ref. 325109).
- f. One student was absent from school during the entire 11-day window of the reporting survey and should not have been included with that survey's results (Ref. 325110).

## We made the following audit adjustments:

<u>Ref. 325101</u> 103 Basic 9-12 300 Career Education 9-12	2.5347 (2.5347)	.0000
<u>Ref. 325102</u> 103 Basic 9-12 300 Career Education 9-12	.6628 <u>(1.7434</u> )	(1.0806)
<u>Ref. 325103</u> 103 Basic 9-12 300 Career Education 9-12	.4028 <u>(.8182</u> )	(.4154)
<u>Ref. 325104</u> 103 Basic 9-12 300 Career Education 9-12	.2694 <u>(1.0176</u> )	(.7482)
<u>Ref. 325105</u> 103 Basic 9-12 300 Career Education 9-12	.0620 <u>(.1284</u> )	(.0664)

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
West Boca Raton High School (#3251) (Continued)	
<u>Ref. 325109</u>	
103 Basic 9-12       (.3249)         300 Career Education 9-12       (.1751)	(.5000)
<u>Ref. 325110</u>	
103 Basic 9-12 (.3249)	( = 0.00)
300 Career Education 9-12 (.1751)	(.5000)
180. [Ref. 325106] The timecard for one Career Education student in OJT was	
missing and could not be located. We made the following audit adjustment:	
300 Career Education 9-12 (.0834)	(.0834)
181. [Ref. 325107] The timecard for one Career Education student in OJT indicated	
that the student had not worked any hours during the reporting survey and should not	
have been reported for OJT time. We made the following audit adjustment:	
300 Career Education 9-12 (.0830)	(.0830)
182. [Ref. 325108] The timecard for one Career Education student in OJT was not	
signed by the student's employer. We made the following audit adjustment:	
300 Career Education 9-12 (.0830)	(.0830)
183. [Ref. 325111] The files for three ESE students did not contain evidence that the	
students' parents had been notified of, and invited to, the students' IEP meetings. We	
made the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       2.5000         113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services       (2.5000)	.0000
184. [Ref. 325112] The file for one LEP student was missing and could not be	
located; consequently, we could not determine the student's ESOL-eligibility. We made	
the following audit adjustment:	
<i>The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule</i> -80-	

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
West Boca Raton High School (#3251) (Continued)	
103 Basic 9-12       .2502         130 ESOL       (.2502)	.0000
185. [Ref. 325113] The LEP Student Plans for 15 students were not reviewed and	
updated for the 2006-07 school year. We noted that the students' Plans did not show	
their instructional programs and related course schedules, nor were these items attached	
to, or referenced in, the students' Plans; consequently, the students' ESOL-reporting was	
not adequately supported. We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       10.6400         130 ESOL       (10.6400)	.0000
186. [Ref. 325114] We noted exceptions involving the parental notification letters for	
two LEP students in ESOL, as follows: (a) the notification letter for one student was not	
dated, and we could not otherwise determine if the notification had been made on a	
timely basis; and (b) the notification letter for the second student was not sent to the	
student's parents until after the reporting survey. We made the following audit	
adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .8506         130 ESOL       (.8506)	.0000
187. [Ref. 325115] One student's English language proficiency should have been, but	
was not, re-assessed following the student's return from a two-year, out-of-country	
absence. We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .2502         130 ESOL       (.2502)	.0000

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

## Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
West Boca Raton High School (#3251) (Continued)	
188. [Ref. 325116] <u>One ESE student was not reported in accordance with the</u> student's <i>Matrix of Services</i> form in the October survey. We also noted that the student's	
file did not contain evidence that the student's parents had been notified of, and invited	
to, the student's IEP meeting for the February survey. We made the following	
adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .5000         254 ESE Support Level 4       .5000         255 ESE Support Level 5       (1.0000)	.0000
189. [Ref. 325117] The Matrix of Services form for one ESE student was more than	
three years old and had expired. We made the following audit adjustment:	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services       .5000         255 ESE Support Level 5       (.5000)	.0000
190. [Ref. 325118] The file for one ESE student did not contain evidence that the	
student's parents had been notified of, and invited to, the student's IEP meeting. We	
made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       1.0000         254 ESE Support Level 4       (1.0000)	.0000
191. [Ref. 325119] The file for one ESE student did not contain an IEP that was	
valid for the reporting survey. We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .5000         254 ESE Support Level 4       (.5000)	.0000
192. [Ref. 325120] The IEP for one ESE student (who was in our ESE Support	
Levels 4 and 5 sample) was missing and could not be located. We made the following	
<u>audit adjustment</u> :	

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS** For the Finand Year Ended June 20, 2007

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
West Boca Raton High School (#3251) (Continued)	
103 Basic 9-12       .5000         113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services       (.5000)	.0000
193. [Ref. 325121] The files for two ESE students were missing and could not be	
located. We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       2.0000         254 ESE Support Level 4       (2.0000)	.0000
194. [Ref. 325170] One teacher was appropriately approved by the School Board to	
teach LEP students out-of-field, but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points	
required in ESOL strategies, pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. We	
also noted that the parents of the students concerned were not notified of the teacher's	
out-of-field status. We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .0834         130 ESOL       (.0834)	.0000
195. [Ref. 325171] One teacher taught Biology to classes that included LEP students,	
but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points required in ESOL strategies,	
pursuant to the teacher's in-service training timeline. We made the following audit	
<u>adjustment</u> :	
103 Basic 9-12       .4419         130 ESOL       (.4419)	<u>.0000</u>
	(3.5600)
Grassy Waters Elementary School (#3351)	
196. [Ref. 335101] The files for two LEP students did not contain documentation	

196. [Ket. 335101] The files for two LEP students did not contain documentation that the students' parents had been notified of, and invited to, the LEP Committee meeting for their child. We made the following audit adjustment:

## Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS**

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Grassy Waters Elementary School (#3351) (Continued)	
101 Basic K-3       1.5000         130 ESOL       (1.5000)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>.0000</u>
Exceptional Student Programs Pre-K (#9034)	
197. [Ref. 903402] The IEP and Matrix of Services form for one ESE student were	
missing and could not be located. We made the following audit adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .5000         255 ESE Support Level 5       (.5000)	.0000
198. [Ref. 903403/07] Two ESE students were not reported in accordance with the	
students' Matrix of Services forms. We made the following audit adjustments:	
Ref. 903403         .3900           254         ESE Support Level 4         .3900           255         ESE Support Level 5         (.3900)	.0000
Ref. 903407           111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services         .3900           254 ESE Support Level 4         (.3900)	.0000
199. [Ref. 903404/05] The files for two ESE students did not contain evidence that	
one of the District's Local Exceptional Agent specialists had participated in the	
development of the students' IEPs for the October survey. We also noted that one of	
the students was not reported in accordance with that student's Matrix of Services form in	
the February survey. We made the following audit adjustments:	
Ref. 903404       .7800         101 Basic K-3       .7800         254 ESE Support Level 4       (.7800)	.0000

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>	
Exceptional Student Programs Pre-K (#9034) (Continued)		
Ref. 903405       .3900         101 Basic K-3       .3900         254 ESE Support Level 4       (.3900)	.0000	
200. [Ref. 903406/08/09] The instructional time reported for seven ESE students		
(four in our sample for ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 (Ref. 903406/09) and three in our		
sample for Basic with ESE Services (Ref. 903408)) did not agree with either the		
instructional time authorized on the students' IFSPs (three students) and IEP (one		
student) or the instructional time shown on the teachers' instructional logs. We made		
the following audit adjustments:		
Ref. 903406           255         ESE Support Level 5         (.0600)	(.0600)	
<u>Ref. 903408</u> 111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services (.0600)	(.0600)	
Ref, 903409           255         ESE Support Level 5	(.0500)	
201. [Ref. 903410] One student's placement and reporting in the Hospital and		
Homebound program was not supported by the physician's statement. We noted that		
the physician's statement was not dated, and did not indicate that the student would		
need to be out of school for the required 15 days. We made the following audit		
adjustment:		
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services       .0400         255 ESE Support Level 5       (.0400)	.0000	

Net Audit

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

## Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>	Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)
Exceptional Student Programs Pre-K (#9034) (Continued)	
202. [Ref. 903412/13] The homebound instructional logs needed to support the	
reported homebound instruction of two students were missing and could not be located	
(Ref. 903412/13). We also noted that the Matrix of Services form for one of the students	
was missing and could not be located (Ref. 903413). We made the following audit	
<u>adjustments</u> :	
<u>Ref. 903412</u> 255 ESE Support Level 5 (.0600)	(.0600)
Ref. 903413           255         ESE Support Level 5         (.0900)	(.0900)
203. [Ref. 903414] The physician's statement for one student in the Hospital and	
Homebound program was dated after the reporting survey. We made the following	
<u>audit adjustment</u> :	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services       .1000         255 ESE Support Level 5       (.1000)	.0000
204. [Ref. 903415] The reported FTE for one student in the Hospital and	
Homebound program was overstated. The student was reported for 1,480 minutes of	
instruction, but only 1,230 minutes were documented by the supporting log. We made	
the following audit adjustment:	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services (.0700)	(.0700)
205. [Ref. 903416] The reported amount of instructional time for one student in the	
Hospital and Homebound program did not agree with the time documented by the	
student's instructional log. The student was reported for nine hours or .1800 FTE, but	
should have been reported for only six hours or .1200 FTE. We made the following	
<u>audit adjustment</u> :	
255 ESE Support Level 5 (.0600)	(.0600)

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

## Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS**

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Net Audit Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Exceptional Student Programs Pre-K (#9034) (Continued)	
206. [Ref. 903417] <u>The IEP and <i>Matrix of Services</i> form for one ESE student in the Hospital and Homebound program were missing and could not be located. We also noted that the log needed to support the reported homebound instruction of this student was missing and could not be located. We made the following audit adjustment:</u>	
255 ESE Support Level 5 (.1000)	(.1000)
<ul> <li>207. [Ref. 903418] <u>The homebound instructional log for one ESE student in the Hospital and Homebound program indicated that the student did not receive instruction during the 11-day window of the reporting survey and should not have been included with the survey's results. This student was in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 sample.</u></li> <li>We made the following audit adjustment: <ul> <li>113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services</li> <li>(.1667)</li> </ul> </li> <li>208. [Ref. 903419] <u>The homebound instructional logs needed to support the reported homebound instruction of 12 students were missing and could not be located.</u></li> </ul>	
We made the following audit adjustment:	((254)
255 ESE Support Level 5 (.6354)	<u>(.6354</u> )
	<u>(1.3521</u> )
	<u>(23.4851</u> )

## SCHEDULE E

Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

### Recommendations

We recommend that management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) only eligible courses are reported for ESOL-funding; (2) FTE is correctly calculated for all reported students, particularly for students in ESE PK programs and the Hospital and Homebound program; (3) only eligible students who are in attendance and membership for a particular survey are reported for FEFP funding; (4) students are reported in the proper funding categories and have adequate documentation to support that reporting, particularly with regard to students in ESOL and ESE; (5) the FTE for students enrolled in juvenile justice-related facilities is accurately calculated and reported based on the documented instructional day; (6) timecards for students in OJT programs are properly completed and retained in readily accessible files; (7) ESE students in ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 are reported in accordance with their *Matrix of Services* forms; (8) teachers are either properly certified or, if out-of-field, are approved by the School Board to teach out-of-field; (9) out-of-field teachers earn required college credits in their out-of-field subject areas and in-service training points in ESOL strategies on a timely basis; and (10) parents are appropriately notified when their children are assigned to out-of-field teachers.

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

## **Regulatory Citations**

#### Reporting

ection 1011.60, F.S
ection 1011.61, F.SDefinitions
ection 1011.62, F.SFunds for Operation of Schools
ule 6A-1.0451, F.A.C
ule 6A-1.04513, F.A.C
TE General Instructions 2006-2007

## <u>SCHEDULE E</u> (Continued)

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS** For the Finand Year Ended June 30, 2007

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

### Regulatory Citations (Continued)

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 2006-2007

Comprehensive Management Information System: Automated Student Attendance Recordkeeping System

#### English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)

Section 1003.56, F.S. ......English Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient Students

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

Rule 6A-6.0901, F.A.C. .....Definitions Which Apply to Programs for Limited English Proficient Students

Rule 6A-6.0902, F.A.C. ......Requirements for Identification, Assessment, and Programmatic Assessment of Limited English Proficient Students

Rule 6A-6.0904, F.A.C. .....Equal Access to Appropriate Programming for Limited English Proficient Students

Career Education On-the-Job Attendance

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

Exceptional Education

Section 1003.57, F.S. .....Exceptional Students Instruction

Section 1011.62, F.S. .....Funds for Operation of Schools

Section 1011.62(1)(e), F.S. .....Funding Model for Exceptional Student Education Programs

Rule 6A-6.03028, F.A.C. .....Development of Individual Educational Plans for Students with Disabilities

Rule 6A-6.03029, F.A.C. ......Development of Family Support Plans for Children with Disabilities Ages Birth through Five Years

Rule 6A-6.0312, F.A.C. .....Course Modification for Exceptional Students

Rule 6A-6.0331, F.A.C. .....Identification and Determination of Eligibility of Exceptional Students for Specially Designed Instruction

Rule 6A-6.0334, F.A.C. ......Temporary Assignment of Transferring Exceptional Students

Rule 6A-6.03411, F.A.C. ......Policies and Procedures for the Provision of Specially Designed Instruction and Related Services for Exceptional Students

## **<u>SCHEDULE E</u>** (Continued)

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS**

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

## Regulatory Citations (Continued)

Career Education On-the-Job Funding Hours

Rule 6A-6.055(3), F.A.C. ..... Definitions of Terms Used in Vocational Education and Adult Programs FTE General Instructions 2006-2007

## Teacher Certification

Section 1003.56, F.S English Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient Students
Section 1011.62(1)(g), F.S Education for Speakers of Other Languages
Section 1012.42(2), F.S
Section 1012.55, F.SPositions for Which Certificates Required
Rule 6A-1.0502, F.A.CNon-certificated Instructional Personnel
Rule 6A-1.0503, F.A.CDefinition of Qualified Instructional Personnel
Rule 6A-4.001, F.A.CInstructional Personnel Certification
Rule 6A-6.0907, F.A.CInservice Requirements for Personnel of Limited English Proficient Students

## <u>SCHEDULE F</u>

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Management agreed with our findings and recommendations, except for finding Nos. 1, 2, 36, and 185 as discussed below.

A copy of management's response may be found beginning on page 122 of this report.

#### Finding No. 1 (Ref. 149)

Our examination procedures included an automated test that compared the course numbers reported in ESOL by the District to the courses that have been designated for that program by the Department of Education. The results of this test disclosed that the District's schools incorrectly reported 16 Basic subject area courses in ESOL that were ineligible for such reporting. The courses were taught at 32 schools during the school terms covered by the October and February surveys.

<u>Management's Response</u> – Management indicates that one of the courses cited in our finding was inadvertently omitted from the ESOL-eligible course list for 2006-07 by the Department of Education.

<u>Auditor's Resolution</u> – The Department of Education advised us that the course in question was not approved for reporting in ESOL for 2006-07. Accordingly, our finding stands as presented herein.

### Finding No. 2 (Ref. 150)

The District incorrectly reported 239 full-time PK, ESE students as part-time students. Classifying the students as part-time made them eligible for the three Special Consideration points designated for PK students earning less than .5000 FTE; and, in each student's case, the addition of these three Special Consideration points qualified the student to be reported in the ESE-weighted program Nos. 254 (ESE Support Level 4) or 255 (ESE Support Level 5), rather than in the Basic-weighted program No. 111 (Grades K-3 with ESE Services).

<u>Management's Response</u> – Management indicates that its PK students were properly adjusted to, and reported as, part-time because they were provided less than full-time instruction (i.e., less than 1,500 weekly instructional minutes) after taking into account non-instructional time such as lunch and naps. Also, management indicates that this issue was reviewed in the prior audit, but was not cited as an exception.

<u>Auditor's Resolution</u> – Management did not address three key points made by our finding regarding the District's contention that its PK students were part-time and which seem inconsistent with its position. These key points are:

 Several PK, ESE students who had sufficient points for program Nos. 254 or 255 were not re-classified by the District from full-time to part-time status as described above. In response to our inquiries, management verbally advised us that the District had re-classified only those PK, ESE students who needed the three Special Consideration points to qualify for program Nos. 254 or 255.

# Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

## Finding No. 2 (Ref. 150) (Continued)

- All of the cited PK, ESE students were enrolled full-time in schools that had bell schedules and calendars 2. documenting more than 1,500 instructional minutes per week in a 900-hour instructional school year.
- PK students are considered full-time if their instructional schedule provides 720 hours or more of 3. documented annual instruction, pursuant to Section 1011.61(1)(a)1., Florida Statutes. None of the schools in which the cited PK, ESE students were enrolled had a separate bell schedule documenting a part-time instructional schedule (i.e., less than a 720-hour instructional year).

Regarding this issue and the prior audit, we make a standard disclosure in each of our reports that the absence of statements in those reports 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 our reports does not limit or lessen the District's obligation to comply with all State requirements governing FTE and FEFP. Our finding stands as presented herein.

#### Finding No. 36 (Ref. 65102)

### The file for one LEP student was missing and could not be located. We made the following audit adjustment:

Management's Response – Management indicates that the student's file was located and provided to the auditor.

Auditor's Resolution – The auditor originally cited two students. The student for whom the file was located was cleared by the auditor and is not cited in our finding. Accordingly, our finding stands as presented herein.

#### Finding No. 185 (Ref. 325113)

The LEP Student Plans for 15 students were not reviewed and updated for the 2006-07 school year. We noted that the students' Plans did not show their instructional programs and related course schedules, nor were these items attached to, or referenced in, the students' Plans; consequently, the students' ESOL-reporting was not adequately supported.

Management's Response - Management indicates that the LEP Student Plans cited in our finding were updated prior to each survey, but concedes that the Plans did not include hard copies of the students' schedules, which were maintained in an electronic format.

Auditor's Resolution – Management provided nothing of record to evidence that the *Plans* were appropriately updated. Our finding stands as presented herein.

NOTE A - SUMMARY

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

#### 1. <u>School District of Palm Beach County</u>

The District was established pursuant to Section 1001.30, Florida Statutes, to provide public educational services for the residents of Palm Beach County, Florida. Those services are provided primarily to students attending kindergarten through high school, but also to adults seeking career education-type training. The District is part of the State system of public education under the general direction and control of the State Board of Education. The geographic boundaries of the District are those of Palm Beach County. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2007, the District operated 234 schools, reported 169,477.07 unweighted FTE students, and received approximately \$127 million in State funding 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 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, 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.

NOTE A - SUMMARY (Continued)

#### 3. Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students

The funding provided by FEFP is based upon the numbers of individual students participating in particular educational programs. A numerical value is assigned to each student according to the student's hours and days of attendance in those programs. The individual student thus becomes equated to a numerical value known as an FTE. For example, for 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 20 hours per week for 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 FTE in each educational program by the specific cost factor of each program to obtain weighted FTEs. Weighted FTEs are multiplied by the base student allocation amount and that product is multiplied by the appropriate cost differential factor. Various adjustments are then added to this product to obtain the total State and local FEFP dollars. All cost factors, the base student allocation amount, cost differential factors, and various adjustment figures are established by the Florida Legislature.

#### 5. <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 2006-2007 school year were conducted during and for the following weeks: survey one was performed for July 10-14, 2006; survey two was performed for October 9-13, 2006; survey three was performed for February 5-9, 2007; and survey four was performed for June 11-15, 2007.

NOTE A - SUMMARY (Continued)

#### 6. Educational Programs

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

#### 7. <u>Statutes and Rules</u>

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

Chapter 1000, F.S.	K-20 General Provisions
Chapter 1001, F.S.	K-20 Governance
Chapter 1002, F.S.	Student and Parental Rights and Educational Choices
Chapter 1003, F.S.	Public K-12 Education
Chapter 1006, F.S.	Support for Learning
Chapter 1007, F.S.	Articulation and Access
Chapter 1010, F.S.	Financial Matters
Chapter 1011, F.S.	Planning and Budgeting
Chapter 1012, F.S.	Personnel
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, 2007. Our sampling process was designed to facilitate the performance of appropriate examination procedures to test the District's compliance with State requirements governing FTE and FEFP.

NOTE B - SAMPLING (Continued)

The following schools were in our sample:

Salas al Nama / Description	Finding Number(a)		
School Name/Description	<u>Finding Number(s)</u> 1		
- Ineligible ESOL Courses	2		
- Reporting of PK students 1 North Palm Basch Flamantary School	3 and 4		
1. North Palm Beach Elementary School	5 and 6		
2. Lake Park Elementary School			
3. Washington Elementary School	7 through 10 11 and 12		
4. Northboro Elementary School 5. U. B. Kinsey / Palmyiew Elementary School			
5. U. B. Kinsey/Palmview Elementary School	13 through 15 16 through 18		
6. West Gate Elementary School 7. Delmotto Elementary School	16 through 18 19		
7. Palmetto Elementary School 8. Meadow Park Elementary School	20 and 21		
8. Meadow Park Elementary School	20 and 21 22 through 24		
<ol> <li>9. Berkshire Elementary School</li> <li>10. Forest Hill Elementary School</li> </ol>	25 through 34		
•	35 through 40		
<ol> <li>Palm Springs Elementary School</li> <li>Lake Worth High School</li> </ol>	41 through 46		
	41 unougn 40 47		
<ol> <li>Lantana Elementary School</li> <li>Forest Park Elementary School</li> </ol>	48 and 49		
15. J. C. Mitchell Elementary School	50 and 51		
16. Gove Elementary School	52 through 58		
17. Palm Beach Gardens High School	59 through 62		
18. Boca Raton Middle School	63 through 65		
19. South Technical Education Center	66 through 74		
20. Santaluces High School	75 through 78		
20. Santances Figh School 21. Crestwood Community Middle School	79 through 81		
22. Seminole Trails Elementary School	82 through 85		
23. Jupiter Middle School	86 through 88		
24. H. L. Johnson Elementary School	89 through 93		
25. Whispering Pines Elementary School	94 through 97		
26. Royal Palm School	98 through 101		
27. Banyan Creek Elementary School	102 through 108		
28. Loxahatchee Groves Elementary School	109 through 111		
29. Watson B. Duncan Middle School	112 through 116		
30. Bear Lakes Middle School	117		
31. Park Vista Community High School	118 through 121		
32. Olympic Heights Community High School	122 through 128		
33. Wellington High School	129 through 135		
34. Glades Central High School	136 through 140		
35. Boynton Beach Community High School	141 through 147		
36. Indian Ridge School	148		
37. Palm Beach Central High School	149 through 154		
38. Freedom Shores Elementary School	155		
39. Discovery Key Elementary School	156 through 159		
	0		

## Palm Beach County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **NOTES TO SCHEDULES**

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

197 through 208

## NOTE B - SAMPLING (Continued)

School Name/Description (Continued)	<u>Finding Number(s)</u> (Continued)
40. Royal Palm Beach Elementary School	160 through 162
41. Pierce Hammock Elementary School	163 and 164
42. Survivors Charter School Boynton	165 through 167
43. Palm Beach School for Autism	168
44. Palm Beach Marine Institute	169 through 174
45. Palm Beach Regional Detention Center	175 through 178
46. West Boca Raton High School	179 through 195
47. Grassy Waters Elementary School	196

48. Exceptional Student Programs Pre-K



DAVID W. MARTIN, CPA AUDITOR GENERAL AUDITOR GENERAL STATE OF FLORIDA

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



850/488-5534 Fax: 488-6975

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

## INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT PALM BEACH COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

We have examined management's assertion, included in its representation letter dated July 9, 2007, that the Palm Beach 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, 2007. 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 (AICPA) and the standards applicable to attestation engagements contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and, accordingly, included examining, on a test basis, evidence about the District's compliance with the aforementioned State requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our examination provides a reasonable basis for our opinion. The legal determination of the District's compliance with these requirements is, however, ultimately the responsibility of the Department of Education.

#### **Compliance**

Our examination procedures, which included general and detailed tests, disclosed material noncompliance involving the District's reported student ridership. Our general tests resulted in the disallowance of 5,694 reported students because of exceptions involving inadequate or missing documentation, and the incorrect reporting of PK students. Our detailed tests found that 200 of the 449 students in our sample had exceptions involving their reported ridership category or eligibility for State transportation funding.<sup>1</sup>

In our opinion, except for the material noncompliance mentioned above involving inadequate or missing documentation and the classification and reporting of transported students, the Palm Beach 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, 2007.

All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed in SCHEDULE B. The impact of this noncompliance on the District's reported number of transported students is presented in SCHEDULE A and SCHEDULE B.

#### Internal Control Over Compliance

In accordance with attestation standards established by the AICPA and *Government Auditing Standards*, we are required to report significant deficiencies in internal control detected during our examination and identify those considered to be material weaknesses. The purpose of our examination was to express an opinion on the District's compliance with State requirements and did not include expressing an opinion on the District's related internal controls. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. Due to its limited purpose, our examination would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses.<sup>2</sup> However, the material noncompliance mentioned above is indicative of significant deficiencies considered to be material weaknesses in the District's internal controls related to the classification and reporting of transported students. The findings, populations, samples, and exception totals that pertain to this material noncompliance are presented in SCHEDULE A and SCHEDULE B.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>See SCHEDULE B, finding Nos. 1 through 14.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup><u>A control deficiency</u> in the entity's internal control over compliance exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect noncompliance on a timely basis. <u>A significant deficiency</u> is a control deficiency, or combination of control deficiencies, that adversely affects the entity's ability to comply with the aforementioned State requirements such that there is more than a remote likelihood that noncompliance that is more than inconsequential will not be prevented or detected by the entity's internal control. <u>A material weakness</u> is a significant deficiency, or combination of significant deficiencies, that results in a more than remote likelihood that material noncompliance will not be prevented or detected by the entity's internal control.

#### AUGUST 2008

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

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 Palm Beach 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,

W. Martin

David W. Martin, CPA June 11, 2008

## **SCHEDULE A**

# Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND TEST RESULTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Description	Number of <u>Vehicles</u>	% of <u>Pop.</u>	No. of Students <u>Transp.</u>	% of Pop. <u>(Sample)</u>
Population <sup>1</sup> Sample <sup>2</sup>	1,656	100.00%	129,658 449	100.00% 0.35%
<u>General Test Results</u> Net Audit Adjustments	-	-	(5,694)	4.39%
<u>Detailed Test Results</u> Sample Students w/ Exceptions <sup>3</sup> Net Audit Adjustments	-	- -	200 (104)	(44.54%) (23.16%)
<u>Combined Test Results</u> Net Audit Adjustments	_	_	(5,798)	4.47%

<sup>2</sup> See NOTE B.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The population figures for students are the totals of the figures reported for each survey conducted for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2007. The District reported 129,658 students in the following ridership categories: 3,998 in IDEA (K-12), Weighted; 2,370 in IDEA (K-12), Unweighted; 1,308 in IDEA (PK), Weighted; 35 in IDEA (PK), Unweighted; 2 in Hazardous Walking; and 121,945 in Two Miles or More. The District also reported operating a total of 1,656 buses and an indeterminable number of passenger cars. (IDEA stands for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Students with exceptions are those students who had exceptions affecting their ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding. Students cited only for incorrect reporting of days-in-term, if any, are not included.

## SCHEDULE B

Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

## <u>Overview</u>

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. Except for material noncompliance involving the classification and reporting of transported students, as discussed below, the Palm Beach 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, 2007. All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed below and requires management's attention and action, as recommended on page 117.

Students Transported Net Audit <u>Adjustments</u>

### **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. Our detailed tests involved verification of the specific ridership categories reported for students sampled from the July, October, February, and June surveys. Adjusted students who were in more than one survey are accounted for by survey. For example, a student sampled twice (i.e., once for the October survey and once for the February survey) will be presented in our findings as two sample students.

#### General Tests/Non-Sampled Students

1. [Ref. 64] <u>Our examination procedures disclosed noncompliance indicative of</u> significant deficiencies in the District's internal controls related to the classification and reporting of transported students. We noted the following:

a. <u>The District did not consistently and accurately determine and report</u> <u>student ridership based on the individual bus driver's report, the source</u> <u>record of student transportation.</u> Instead, the District frequently used <u>student demographic information and school attendance records to</u> <u>supplement or replace the use of bus drivers' reports</u>. (*Finding continues on next page.*)

Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings

Students Transported Net Audit Adjustments

## General Tests/Non-Sampled Students (Continued)

We noted that many students, who were not listed on a bus driver's report, were reported for State transportation funding based on their bus assignment history and school attendance record during survey week. We also noted that many reports were dated prior to or after a particular survey, and many showed no evidence of review by route coordinators.

- b. <u>The District did not adequately document the number of general</u>, <u>contracted</u>, or private vehicles that were used to transport students, and we were otherwise unable to verify the reported number of such vehicles.
- c. <u>The District did not have clearly defined and documented policies and</u> procedures for conducting transportation surveys, particularly with regards to Charter Schools. We noted that transportation reporting by Charter Schools did not include the preparation of bus drivers' reports, and was not adequately supervised or reviewed by the District.

The aforementioned circumstances resulted in, or contributed to, the exceptions noted in finding Nos. 2 through 14 below:

2. [Ref. 60] <u>The bus drivers' reports for 28 buses (3 in the July survey, 16 in the</u> <u>October survey and 9 in the February survey) did not adequately support the ridership of</u> <u>1,802 students.</u> We noted that students were reported who either were not listed on these reports or were not shown on the reports as having being been transported during the survey period concerned. We made the following audit adjustments:

July 2006 Survey	
<u>8 Days-in-Term</u>	
Two Miles or More	(40)
11 Days-in-Term	
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(6)
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(1)
Two Miles or More	(34)

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

		Students Transported Net Audit
<u>Findings</u>		<u>Adjustments</u>
General Tests/Non-Sampled Students (Continued)		
July 2006 Survey (Continued)		
<u>23 Days-in-Term</u> Two Miles or More	(1)	
October 2006 Survey		
<u>90 Days-in-Term</u>	(4)	
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(1)	
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted Two Miles or More	(28) (1,240)	
<u>February 2007 Survey</u>		
<u>90 Days-in-Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(1)	
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted Two Miles or More	(3)	(1.000)
I wo Miles of More	<u>(447</u> )	(1,802)
3. [Ref. 61] The District reported transporting 4,740 studen	ts using vehicles other	
than school buses (i.e., General Transportation-"G", District C	Dperated vehicles-"E",	
and Privately Owned Passenger vehicles-"P"), and submitted a va	ariety of records to us	

and Privately Owned Passenger vehicles-"P"), and submitted a variety of records to us to support the transportation and ridership classifications of those students. We examined these records and concluded that the reported ridership of 2,680 students and the IDEA-classifications of 56 students were incorrect due to deficiencies in the supporting records and reporting errors, respectively. For example:

a. <u>To support the ridership of students transported on the public</u> transportation systems known as Palm Tran and Tri-Rail, the District submitted request forms for bus and rail passes, and a computerized roster showing each rider's name and school, the type of pass, and its issuance date. However, we noted that many of the pass requests were undated, the duration of the pass (30-day or annual) was not indicated, and the dates of issuance were after the particular 2006-07 survey concerned. (Finding continues on next page.)

Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

**Findings** 

### General Tests/Non-Sampled Students (Continued)

We also noted that some students did not attend the schools for which passes had been requested, and many students who were reported did not have a pass request form and were not listed on the roster.

- b. For documentation of students utilizing contracted transportation, the District submitted monthly invoices from the two contracted companies showing student riders by name and date of transport. However, we noted that there were reported students who were not listed on the invoices, and invoices that listed students who were not reported.
- c. <u>The District incorrectly reported various ESE students in IDEA-weighted</u> <u>categories who were transported by private passenger cars.</u> <u>Only ESE</u> <u>students who are transported by school buses and meet IDEA-weighted</u> <u>criteria are eligible to be reported in an IDEA-weighted ridership category</u>.

We made the following audit adjustments:

<u>July 2006 Survey</u>	
<u>11 Days-in-Term</u>	
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(1)
October 2006 Survey	
<u>90 Days-in-Term</u>	
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(45)
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(5)
IDEA (PK), Weighted	(15)
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	(35)
Two Miles or More	(1,363)
<u>February 2007 Survey</u>	
<u>90 Days-in-Term</u>	
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(6)
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(30)
IDEA (PK), Weighted	(1)
Two Miles or More	(1,155)

Students Transported Net Audit Adjustments

## Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>		Students Transported Net Audit <u>Adjustments</u>
General Tests/Non-Sampled Students (Continued)		
June 2007 Survey		
<u>3 Days-in-Term</u>		
Two Miles or More	(1)	
<u>11 Davs-in-Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(6)	
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(1)	
IDEA (PK), Weighted	(1)	
Two Miles or More	(2)	
<u>12 Days-in-Term</u>		
Two Miles or More	(9)	
29 Davs-in-Term		
Two Miles or More	(1)	
<u>31 Days-in-Term</u>		
Two Miles or More	<u>(3)</u>	(2,680)
July 2006 Survey		
<u>11 Days-in-Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(1)	
IDEA (PK), Weighted	(1)	
india (inc), weighted	1	
<u>February 2007 Survey</u>		
90 Days-in-Term	(22)	
IDEA (K-12), Weighted IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(32) (4)	
IDEA (PK), Weighted	(19)	
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	19	
Two Miles or More	<u>36</u>	0
4. [Ref. 62] Our examination procedures disclosed that 597 PK studen	<u>nts (107 in</u>	
the July survey, 207 in the October survey and 283 in the February survey) were	re reported	
incorrectly in Two Miles or More. Pursuant to the Student Transportate	ion General	
Instructions, PK students are eligible for State transportation funding only	if they are	
IDEA or if they are the children of a student parent enrolled in a teenage par	ent-related	
program. (Finding continues on next page.)		

## **<u>SCHEDULE B</u>** (Continued)

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

**Findings Adjustments** General Tests/Non-Sampled Students (Continued) The District subsequently provided us with records supporting the eligibility of 210 of these students for IDEA ridership categories. We made the following audit adjustments: July 2006 Survey 11 Days-in-Term Two Miles or More (28)12 Days-in-Term Two Miles or More (1)16 Days-in-Term Two Miles or More (72)23 Days-in-Term Two Miles or More (6)October 2006 Survey 90 Days-in-Term IDEA (K-12), Unweighted (4)Two Miles or More (203)February 2007 Survey 90 Days-in-Term IDEA (K-12), Unweighted (5) Two Miles or More (597)<u>(278</u>)

# July 2006 Survey

<u>11 Days-in-Term</u>	
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	8
October 2006 Survey	
<u>36 Days-in-Term</u>	
IDEA (PK), Weighted	1
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	19
72 Days-in-Term	
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	1

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

Students Transported Net Audit

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

		Students Transported Net Audit
<u>Findings</u>		<u>Adjustments</u>
General Tests/Non-Sampled Students (Continued)		
October 2006 Survey (Continued)		
<u>90 Days-in-Term</u>		
IDEA (PK), Weighted	10	
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	37	
February 2007 Survey		
<u>18 Days-in-Term</u>		
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	2	
<u>36 Days-in-Term</u>	24	
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	24	
54 Days-in-Term		
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	1	
72 Days-in-Term		
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	2	
<u>90 Days-in-Term</u>		
IDEA (PK), Weighted	6	
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	<u>99</u>	210

5. [Ref. 63] We noted the following exceptions involving 24 buses with a reported ridership of 825 students: (a) the bus drivers' reports for 23 buses (13 in the October survey, 9 in the February survey and 1 in the June survey) were missing and could not be located; and (b) the bus driver's report for one bus did not show any of its assigned students as having been transported during the reporting survey. We made the following audit adjustments:

## October 2006 Survey

<u>90 Days-in-Term</u>	
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(7)
Two Miles or More	(343)

### Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findings</u>		Students Transported Net Audit <u>Adjustments</u>
General Tests/Non-Sampled Students (Continued)		
<u>February 2007 Survey</u> <u>90 Days-in-Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Unweighted Two Miles or More	(9) (460)	
June 2007 Survey <u>11 Days-in-Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Weighted Two Miles or More	(1) ( <u>5</u> )	<u>(825</u> )
Net Audit Adjustments – General Tests/Non-Sample Students		<u>(5,694</u> )

## **Detailed Tests/Sample Students**

6. [Ref. 51] <u>We noted exceptions involving seven of our sampled students (two in</u> <u>the July survey, four in the October survey, and one in the February survey), as follows</u>:

- a. <u>The reported ridership of six students (one in IDEA (K-12), Weighted, one in IDEA (PK), Weighted, two in Hazardous Walking, and two in Two Miles or More) was not supported by the available documentation. We concluded that these students were not transported during the reporting surveys. We also noted that three of the six students were not eligible for the ridership category in which they were reported.</u>
- Dne student in IDEA (K-12), Weighted was not eligible for that ridership category. We noted that this student lived more than two miles from school and should have been reported in Two Miles or More.

We made the following audit adjustments:

## Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Findin</u>	<u>28</u>		Students Transported Net Audit <u>Adjustments</u>
Detaile	ed Tests/Sample Students (Continued)		
<u>2 000000</u>			
	<u>July 2006 Survey</u> <u>11 Days-in-Term</u>		
	IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(2)	
	Two Miles or More	1	
	October 2006 Survey		
	<u>90 Days-in-Term</u> IDEA (PK), Weighted	(1)	
	Hazardous Walking	(2)	
	Two Miles or More	(1)	
	February 2007 Survey		
	<u>90 Days-in-Term</u> Two Miles or More	(1)	(6)
	I wo miles of more	<u>(1</u> )	(6)
7.	[Ref. 52] We noted exceptions involving 24 students, as follows:		
a.	The names of 22 reported students (11 in the October survey, 9 in the		
	February survey, and 2 in the June survey) were not listed on the supporting		
	bus drivers' reports. We also noted that 11 of these 22 students were		
	ineligible for the ridership categories in which they were reported.		
b.	One student in the February survey was not shown on the supporting bus		
	driver's report as having been transported during that survey period.		
c.	The IEP for one student IDEA (K-12), Weighted in the October survey did		
	not indicate that the student met one of the five eligibility criteria for		
	classification in an IDEA-weighted ridership category. However, the		
	student lived more than two miles from school and was eligible to be		
	reported in Two Miles or More.		
<u>We ma</u>	de the following audit adjustments:		
a.	October 2006 Survey		
	90 Days-in-Term		
	IDEA (K-12), Unweighted Two Miles or More	(8) (3)	
	The accompanying notes are an integral part of this sch		

## Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings		Students Transported Net Audit <u>Adjustments</u>
Detailed Tests/Sample Students (Continued)		
February 2007 Survey		
<u>90 Days-in-Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Weighted Two Miles or More	(4) (5)	
June 2007 Survey <u>12 Days-in-Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(1)	
Two Miles or More	(1) ( <u>1</u> )	(22)
b. <u>February 2006 Survey</u> <u>90 Days-in-Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted		(1)
c. <u>October 2006 Survey</u> <u>90 Days-in-Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted Two Miles or More	(1) <u>1</u>	0
8. [Ref. 53] Fourteen students (6 in the July survey, 4 in the October survey, an	<u>ud 4</u>	
in the February survey) were reported incorrectly in Two Miles or More. The stude	ents	
lived less than two miles from school and should not have been reported for St	<u>tate</u>	
transportation funding. We made the following audit adjustments:		
July 2006 Survey <u>11 Days-in-Term</u> Two Miles or More	(6)	
October 2006 Survey 90 Days-in-Term Two Miles or More	(4)	
<u>February 2007 Survey</u> <u>90 Days-in-Term</u> Two Miles or More	<u>(4</u> )	(14)

### Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Students Transported Net Audit <u>Adjustments</u>

0

(19) 19

(14) 14

(15) 15

# <u>Findings</u>

## Detailed Tests/Sample Students (Continued)

9. [Ref. 54] <u>Fifty-three students (19 in the July survey, 14 in the October survey, 15</u>
in the February survey, and 5 in the June survey) were reported in IDEA (K-12),
Unweighted; however, the students lived more than two miles from their assigned
school and should have been reported in Two Miles or More. We made the following
audit adjustments:

<u>11 Days-in-Term</u>	
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	
Two Miles or More	
October 2006 Survey	
90 Days-in-Term	
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	
Two Miles or More	
February 2007 Survey	
<u>90 Days-in-Term</u>	
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	
Two Miles or More	

## June 2007 Survey

July 2006 Survey

<u>12 Days-in-Term</u>	
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(5)
Two Miles or More	<u>5</u>

10. [Ref. 55] <u>Seventeen students in our sample were reported incorrectly in IDEA-</u>weighted ridership categories (3 in the July survey, 11 in the October survey, and 3 in the February survey). The students' IEPs did not indicate that the students met at least one of the five eligibility criteria required for IDEA-weighted classification. We noted that all of the students were eligible to be reported in other ridership categories (8 in IDEA (PK), Unweighted, 2 in IDEA (K-12), Unweighted, and 7 in Two Miles or More). We made the following audit adjustments:

### Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings		Students Transported Net Audit
<u>Findings</u>		<u>Adjustments</u>
Detailed Tests/Sample Students (Continued)		
July 2006 Survey		
<u>3 Days-in-Term</u>	(4)	
IDEA (K-12), Weighted Two Miles or More	(1)	
Two miles of more	1	
<u>11 Davs-in-Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(2)	
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	1	
Two Miles or More	1	
October 2006 Survey		
<u>90 Days-in-Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(A)	
IDEA (K-12), Weighted IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(4) 1	
IDEA (PK), Weighted	(7)	
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	7	
Two Miles or More	3	
<u>February 2007 Survey</u>		
<u>90 Days-in-Term</u>	(-)	
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(2)	
IDEA (PK), Weighted	(1)	
IDEA (PK), Unweighted Two Miles or More	1	0
I wo miles of more	<u>2</u>	0

11. [Ref. 56] Thirty-eight students were reported incorrectly in IDEA (K-12), Unweighted (4 in the July survey, 15 in the October survey, and 19 in the February survey). We noted that 36 of the 38 students lived less than two miles from school; were in programs for the Specific Learning Disabled, Language Impaired, or Speech Impaired; and had IEPs that did not authorize transportation services; consequently, these 36 students were not eligible for State transportation funding. The remaining two students were eligible for reporting in Two Miles or More. We made the following audit adjustments:

### Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings		Students Transported Net Audit <u>Adjustments</u>
<u>rmangs</u>		Adjustments
Detailed Tests/Sample Students (Continued)		
July 2006 Survey <u>11 Days-in-Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(4)	
October 2006 Survey		
<u>90 Days-in-Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(15)	
<u>February 2007 Survey</u> <u>90 Days-in-Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted Two Miles or More	(19) <u>2</u>	(36)
12. [Ref. 57] <u>Eight students (1 in the February survey, and 7 in the June</u> were not enrolled in school during the reporting survey. We also noted that two	of these	
students were not eligible for the ridership category in which they were reported made the following audit adjustments:	<u>ed. We</u>	
<u>February 2007 Survey</u>		
<u>90 Days-in-Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(1)	
June 2007 Survey <u>11 Days-in-Term</u>	(1)	
Two Miles or More	(1)	
<u>12 Days-in-Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Weighted Two Miles or More	(1) (5)	(8)
13. [Ref. 58] We noted exceptions involving 36 students in IDEA ri	dership	
categories (14 in IDEA (K-12), Weighted, 13 in IDEA (PK), Weighted, and 9 in	<u>IDEA</u>	

a. <u>The IEP for one student was missing and could not be located</u>.

(K-12), Unweighted):

Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

**Findings** 

Students Transported Net Audit Adjustments

## Detailed Tests/Sample Students (Continued)

- b. <u>Nine students were not eligible for IDEA-classification</u>.
- c. <u>The IEPs for 13 students who were Specific Learning Disabled, Language</u> <u>Impaired, or Speech Impaired, did not authorize transportation services</u>.
- d. The IEPs for three students were not valid for the reporting survey.
- e. <u>The IEPs for 10 students either did not indicate that the students met one of</u> <u>the five eligibility criteria required for IDEA-weighted classification or did not</u> <u>document that transportation services were needed due to a specific ESE-</u> <u>related need of the student.</u>

We determined that 21 of the 36 students were eligible to be reported in other ridership categories (13 in Two Miles or More and 8 in IDEA (PK), Unweighted). We made the following audit adjustments:

#### July 2006 Survey

<u>11 Days-in-Term</u>	
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(2)
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(2)
IDEA (PK), Weighted	(4)
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	3
October 2006 Survey	
<u>90 Days-in-Term</u>	
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(5)
IDEA (PK), Weighted	(2)
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	2
February 2007 Survey	
<u>90 Days-in-Term</u>	
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(2)
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(5)
IDEA (PK), Weighted	(3)
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	3
Two Miles or More	2

## Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Findings	Students Transported Net Audit <u>Adjustments</u>
Detailed Tests/Sample Students (Continued)	
June 2007 Survey12 Days-in-TermIDEA (K-12), WeightedIDEA (K-12), UnweightedIDEA (K-12), UnweightedTwo Miles or More11	(15)
14. [Ref. 59] Three PK students in the July survey were reported incorrectly in Two	
Miles or More. Prekindergarten students are eligible for State transportation funding	
only if they are enrolled in an IDEA program or if they are the child of a student parent	
enrolled in a teenage parent-related program. We were provided an IEP for one student	
that supported the student's eligibility for IDEA (PK), Unweighted. We made the	
following audit adjustment:	
July 2006 Survey12 Days-in-TermIDEA (PK), Unweighted1Two Miles or More(1)	
<u>16 Days-in-Term</u> Two Miles or More (2)	<u>(2</u> )
Net Audit Adjustments – Detailed Tests/Sample Students	<u>(104</u> )
Summary	
General and Detailed Tests	
Net Audit Adjustments – General Tests/Non-Sample StudentsNet Audit Adjustments – Detailed Tests/Sample StudentsSample Students w/ Exceptions200	(5694) (104) ==
Net Audit Adjustments – Combined Tests	<u>(5,798</u> )

## SCHEDULE C

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

### Recommendations

We recommend that management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) all transported students are reported in accordance with *Student Transportation General Instructions*; (2) adequate documentation is maintained to identify students who rode school buses or were transported by means other than a school bus (i.e., general public transportation or privately owned passenger cars); (3) only those students who were in membership and were transported during a survey period are reported with a survey's results; (4) the number of students to be reported in each ridership category is in agreement with the supporting records for that survey; (5) only ESE students who are properly classified and documented as disabled are reported in IDEA ridership categories, especially with regards to PK students; (6) ESE students who received special transportation services have their needs for such services clearly specified on their IEPs; (7) the distance from home to school, for students classified in the Two Miles or More ridership category, is verified prior to those students being reported; and (8) Charter School reporting is appropriately supervised and reviewed by the District.

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

## SCHEDULE D

### Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

Management agreed with our findings and recommendations, except for finding Nos. 2 and 3, as discussed below.

A copy of management's response may be found beginning on page 122 of this report.

## Finding No. 2 (Ref. 60)

The bus drivers' reports for 28 buses (3 in the July survey, 16 in the October survey and 9 in the February survey) did not adequately support the ridership of 1,802 students. We noted that students were reported who either were not listed on these reports or were not shown on the reports as having being been transported during the survey period concerned.

<u>Management's Response</u> – Management indicates that the students cited in our finding were transported during a survey period, were eligible for State transportation funding, and were properly reported. Management also indicates that: (1) students on 23 buses cited by the auditor were transported on other buses and were listed on the reports for those buses; for example, management specifically contends that the auditor failed to recognize that 100 students reported on Bus Route #R032 who were not listed on the report for that bus, were transported on, and listed on the report for, Bus Route #R028; and (2) the auditor inappropriately disallowed some reports because of the methods used by the drivers to indicate they verified ridership.

<u>Auditor's Resolution</u> – We examined all of the documentation submitted to us by the District during our examination's fieldwork. We accepted those students who were reported for one bus, but not listed on the report for that bus, if the submitted documentation indicated that they had been transported on another bus (including the specific cases of Bus Route #R032 and #R028). We also accepted various methods used by drivers to indicate they verified student ridership if those methods appeared to us to represent a reasonable and systematic process of taking student bus attendance. For example, we accepted check marks, X-marks, and dash marks in the cases of various drivers' reports. Our finding stands as presented herein.

#### Finding No. 3 (Ref. 61)

To support the ridership of students transported on the public transportation systems known as Palm Tran and Tri-Rail, the District submitted request forms for bus and rail passes, and a computerized roster showing each rider's name and school, the type of pass, and its issuance date. However, we noted that many of the pass requests were undated, the duration of the pass (30-day or annual) was not indicated, and the dates of issuance were after the particular 2006-07 survey concerned. We also noted that some students did not attend the schools for which passes had been requested, and many students who were reported did not have a pass request form and were not listed on the roster.

For documentation of students utilizing contracted transportation, the District submitted monthly invoices from the two contracted companies showing student riders by name and date of transport. However, we noted that there were reported students who were not listed on the invoices, and invoices that listed students who were not reported.

Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

<u>Management's Response</u> – Management indicates that the District's reporting of students transported by public and contracted means was adequately supported. Management also indicates that the auditor inappropriately used an examination criterion that the District must have physically checked the ridership of students transported on Palm Tran and Tri-Rail, and inappropriately used bus pass dates to determine the eligibility of such students for transportation reporting.

<u>Auditor's Resolution</u> – Contrary to management's indication, we did not require the District to have physically checked (or counted) the students transported on Palm Tran and Tri-Rail, and our finding does not reflect such a requirement. We realize, as does the Department of Education, the impracticality of physically counting these students, and the necessity of allowing the District some leeway in developing evidence to support their ridership. Accordingly, we examined the documentation provided to us by the District to determine if the District's reported number of students transported on Palm Tran and Tri-Rail was reasonably supported, and did not require the District to provide evidence those students were physically counted. We concluded, based on our examination, that the District's documentation was deficient in the areas cited in our finding, and note here that these deficient areas are not addressed in any specificity by management's response. Accordingly, our finding stands as presented herein.

#### Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation **NOTES TO SCHEDULES** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

### NOTE A - SUMMARY

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

### 1. <u>Student Eligibility</u>

Any student who is transported by bus must meet one or more of the following conditions in order to be eligible for State transportation funding: live two or more miles from school, be physically handicapped, be a Career Education 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. Transportation in Palm Beach County

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2007, the District received approximately \$30 million in State transportation funding. The District's transportation reporting by survey was as follows:

Survey	No. of	No. of
<u>Period</u>	<u>Vehicles</u>	<u>Students</u>
July 2006	255	4,541
October 2006	646	60,453
February 2007	641	63,735
June 2007	<u>114</u>	<u>929</u>
Total	<u>1,656</u>	<u>129,658</u>

#### 3. <u>Statutes and Rules</u>

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

### Palm Beach County District School Board Student Transportation **NOTES TO SCHEDULES** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2007

## 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, 2007. 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 DISTRICT OF PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA

SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE

3340 FOREST HILL BOULEVARD, C-316 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33406-5869 (561) 434-8200 FAX (561) 434-8571 ARTHUR C JOHNSON, Ph D. SUPERINTENDENT WILLIAM G, GRAHAM CHAIRMAN

PAULETTE BURDICK

MONROE BENAIM, M.D. MARK HANSEN CARRIE P HILL DR. SANDRA S. RICHMOND DEBRA L. ROBINSON, M D

August 4, 2008

David W. Martin, CPA Auditor General Room 412C Claude Pepper Building 111 West Madison Street Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1450

Attention: Joe Williams, Section 321

Dear Mr. Martin,

We have reviewed the preliminary and tentative report of the examination of full-time equivalent (FTE) students and student transportation, as reported by the School District of Palm Beach County, under the Florida Education Finance Program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2007.

After thoroughly reviewing the draft Audit report the District will not contest findings in student school by school FTE reporting or teacher certification findings. The individual ESE and ESOL FTE findings have been reviewed by the appropriate central and school based staff members. On-going training efforts will be reinforced to avoid recurrence. A corrective action plan for the certification findings is attached. The District will continue to contest the District-wide ineligible ESOL course, Pre-K ESE schedules, and several student transportation findings.

We do not agree with the following audit findings and request that the adjustment for these findings be eliminated. For ease of reading, the findings have been referenced by the original AG-424 number.

## Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students:

<u>AG424#</u>	Description	Unwtd FTE Adj.	Wtd FTE Adj.
149	Ineligible ESOL Courses	0.000	(46.3938)
150	Pre-K ESE schedules	11.3345	(467.0094)
325113	LEP Plan not reviewed	0.000	(1.9897)
65102	ESOL missing file	0.000	(0.2750)

PALM BEACH COUNTY SCHOOLS - RATED "A" BY THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION - 2005, 2006 AND 2007 EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER Page 2 of 5 August 4, 2008

## **Student Transportation:**

<u>AG424#</u>	<b>Description</b>	Net Adjustment
60	Missing Bus Driver Reports	(1,802)
61	General Purpose (Palm Tran & Tri-Rail)	(2,680)

### Response to Audit Finding 424 #149:

The District implemented a subject-based scheduling program in 18 elementary schools for the 2006/07 School Year. As part of the implementation, the district limited the use of the ESOL "pullout" course (5010010P - ESOL) and used academic subjects that correspond with the subjects reported on the elementary report card for the School District of Palm Beach County. The District began using the following elementary courses for funding:

5010030	Functional Basic Skills Communication
5010050	Reading
5010090	Writing
5012000	Math
5020000	Science
5021000	Social Studies

The district reported ESOL eligible students (LY) under FEFP 130 for each of these courses.

For the 2006/2007 SY, the FDOE inadvertently left course 5010030 off the eligible courses for FEFP Program 130 funding. The FDOE added this course as Program 130 eligible for 2007/08.

Since this is a basic communication course, this course should be eligible for funding under FEFP Program 130 during 2006/07, as all other communication courses are eligible for FEFP Program 130 funding for LY students. Therefore, finding #149 should be reversed and the FTE reinstated into FEFP Program 130. The other courses in finding #149 were incorrectly reported.

The District has implemented a program that codes students for funding in FEFP Program 130 using the eligible course table. Future courses will be coded correctly.

Page 3 of 5 August 4, 2008

### Response to Audit Finding 424 #150:

The District operates several program models to serve the disabled PK students. The models range from 60 minutes per week for drop in services to programs for the most severely disabled students (cognitive impairments, autism, and developmental delay). The students in the program that serves the most severe students were reported for 1425 minutes of funding. This program model took into consideration that the total school week for an elementary school is 1825 minutes (8:00 a.m. to 2:05 p.m., 5 days per week). The students in this model are expected to have a 30 minute lunch period (non instructional) and quiet (nap) time of 45 minutes daily. This represents 150 and 225 minutes, respectfully. In no instance in the district are students funded from the FEFP for lunch or guiet/nap periods. Therefore, subtracting the total nap and lunch time from the entire school week, the district could have actually reported students for 1450 minutes per week of instruction. This assumes that the instruction occurs from beginning bell (8:00 a.m.) to final dismissal (2:05 p.m.). Since instructional time is less than 1500 minutes, the FTE generated per Survey period is less than .5000, allowing the district to claim the additional 3 points as provided by the Matrix. The student's IEP indicates that the instructional time will be greater than 900 minutes per week.

These programs have been in operation for several years. This issue was reviewed during the FTE audit completed on the 2003/04 SY. Mr. Richard Miller, a member of the current audit team, was the lead auditor during that audit. There was not a finding regarding the counting of the additional 3 points. Therefore, the District had no reason to adjust the program model or how the Matrices were to be completed.

In regard to the Bell Schedule, this again was not an issue during the previous audit. The elementary schools scheduled students into courses that encompass the entire day (i.e.  $5100090 - 3^{rd}$  grade). During the 2006/07 school year, the District piloted (18 schools) a subject based approach to scheduling at the elementary level, dividing the day into 12 30-minute periods. This has been expanded to ALL elementary schools for the 2007/08 school year. In hindsight, the school centers utilizing the pilot schedule approach should have adjusted the periods accordingly. However, considering the complete paradigm shift, it was a major task to adjust the scheduling for the K-5 population. Elementary schools were directed to schedule their PK disabled students in the same manner as previous years. The District requests finding #150 be reversed and the FTE reinstated.

#### Response to Audit Finding 424 #325113:

LEP Student Plans were reviewed, updated and included in the folders. Student schedules were entered into TERMS prior to FTE; however, hard copies were not printed and included in the student LEP folders.

Page 4 of 5 August 4, 2008

### Response to Audit Finding 424 #65102:

The missing file was located and hand delivered to the auditor while he was at another school site. The auditor later returned the file to the school.

### Response to Audit Finding Transportation Ref. 60:

Twenty-eight reports were cited for being deficient. However, the auditors were provided with 23 reports that indicated the students were transported during survey week but were on a different bus. The names of the students did not appear on the bus routes that were initially sent to DOE. Because of driver shortages during survey week, these students were transported by other buses. For example, 100 students were reported as having rode Bus Code R032; however, during survey week the students rode R028 and were reported on that Code. The Auditor failed to recognize the adjustment. Some of the reports the Auditor failed to accept because of objections to the methods in which the drivers verified ridership. For example, some of the drivers drew a line through the box while others made a check. All of the students in *Ref. 60* were in membership during survey week, rode the bus one of the eligibility category criteria in Section 1011.68, Florida Statute. Proper documentation was provided to the Auditor to substantiate the findings. Additional copies are available on request due to the voluminous nature of this documentation.

Requested Restoration: 1,802

## Response to Audit Finding Transportation Ref. 61:

General purpose transportation utilized by the District consists of the use of public buses (Palm Tran) and trains (Tri-Rail). The Palm Beach County School District is the only district in the State utilizing these modes of transportation. Prior to the 2004-2005 Survey instructions, districts were required to keep a list of the names of the students included in the count for audit purposes. This requirement was deleted by the Department of Education from the 2005-2006, 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 instructions. However, the District continued to keep the list of students who used general purpose transportation. There were no specific instructions provided for verifying students who were transported via general purpose transportation. In fact, the District developed its own procedures. These procedures were utilized from 1999 until the 2003-2004 school year. In the 2003-2004 Audit, the District was cited for having the schools maintain the list of students instead of the Transportation Department (Department). The Department, since that time, has issued the passes and kept a list of students. The current audit cited a new criterion--requiring the District to physically check student ridership. It is physically impossible for attendance to be taken for 1300 students who

Page 5 of 5 August 4, 208

ride several different Tri-Rail schedules and multiple Palm Tran routes. The District submitted invoices for payment to the Auditor. The Auditor emphasized the date when the pass was issued which could have been before or after the survey period. Because of the number of students requiring passes, an agreement was made with Palm Tran and Tri-Rail, for grace periods, to permit students to ride without the District-issued pass. The District paid \$280 for each annual pass for Palm Tran and \$400 for Tri-Rail. The District was allocated approximately \$400 per student for the 2006-2007 school year. The expenditure for these passes was incurred by the District. If deducted, then the District is being penalized twice for providing general purpose transportation for students. All of the students, whose names appeared on the list provided to the Auditor were in membership during survey week, rode a general purpose mode of transportation one of the days of survey week or one of the six days prior to the survey week and met one of the eligibility category criteria in Section 1011.68, Florida Statute, The Auditor gave the District the opportunity to find the missing documents. All requested documents substantiating these findings were presented to the Auditor but do not appear to have been recognized in your draft report. Additional copies are available on request due to the voluminous nature of this documentation.

Requested Restoration: 2,680

Total Requested Restoration for Transportation: 4,482

The District has developed additional measures to address the other issues not being contested.

As always, we appreciate your review of our management procedures in FTE reporting and compliance. We do, however, request further review of selected items as listed in this letter and attachments. We also reserve the right to appeal the final audit report, as we deem appropriate.

If you have any questions please contact Michael Burke, Chief Financial Officer, at phone (561) 434-8584 or email <u>burkem@palmbeach.k12.fl.us</u>.

Sipeerely

Arthur'C. Johnson, Ph.D. Superintendent

ACJ/JMM/MJB:ac Attachments

Corrective Action	Solutions	Action Steps	Dept/Person Responsible	Due Date
ESOL Endorsement	Remind new teachers of ESOL	Create a flyer for TeacherFest that explains the ESOL requirement	Certification	8/1/08
COUNDING	ESOL teachers out- of- compliance	Develop a program that identifies category 1 teachers out-of-compliance for ESOL.	Certification Gerre Wood Gene Monaco	12/1/08
	-	<ul> <li>Track by 5 course option</li> <li>Track by test and 2 course option</li> <li>Track by start date</li> </ul>		
		<ul> <li>Update each semester</li> </ul>		
	Notify category 1	Send electronic notification to category 1	Certification	1/1/09
	of- compliance	September & January		
School Center	Investigate	Link ESOL compliance to principal	Certification/Area	FY09
Accountability for		evaluation (Achievement & Development	Superintendents	
Parent	through principal	Orientation)		
Notification			•	
Tracking ESOL	L	Require official college transcript or other	Multicultural	7/1/08
Compliance	documentation of	official/stamped college document, or	Certification	
	completion of	official inservice printout as		
	courses/classes	demonstration of course completion.		
Coursework	Offer ESOL courses	Develop or recreate all coursework on	Multicultural	1/1/09
Options	online	Blackboard/5 courses at 60 points per		
		course.		
		<ul> <li>Offer courses multiple times</li> </ul>		
		through out the year		