REPORT NO. 2009-084 JANUARY 2009

FRANKLIN COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students

and

Student Transportation

For the Fiscal Year Ended

June 30, 2008





BOARD MEMBERS AND SUPERINTENDENT

Franklin County District School Board members and the Superintendent of Schools who served during the 2007-08 fiscal year are listed below:

	District
	<u>No.</u>
Denise Butler	1
David Hinton	2
Teresa Martin, Vice-Chair	3
Jimmy Gander, Chairman	4
John Richards	5

Jo Ann Gander, Superintendent

The examination team leader was Alice Pounds, CPA, and the examination 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 and other audit reports prepared by the Auditor General can be obtained on our Web site www.myflorida.com/audgen; by telephone at (850) 487-9024; or by mail at G74 Claude Pepper Building, 111 West Madison Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1450.

Franklin County District School Board Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students and Student Transportation **TABLE OF CONTENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008

PAGE NO.

FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS

Independent Auditor's Report	1
Schedule A – Populations, Samples, and Test Results	3
Schedule B – Effect of Audit Adjustments on Weighted FTE	5
Schedule C – Audit Adjustments by School	6
Schedule D – Findings and Audit Adjustments	7
Schedule E – Recommendations and Regulatory Citations 1	10
Notes to Schedules	13

STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

Independent Auditor's Report	17
Schedule F – Populations, Samples, and Test Results	20
Schedule G – Findings and Audit Adjustments	21
Schedule H – Recommendations and Regulatory Citations	26
Notes to Schedules	27

MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

Exhibit A – Management's Response

Franklin County District School Board Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students and Student Transportation **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008

ESE – Exceptional Student Education

LEP – Limited English Proficient

ESOL – English for Speakers of Other Languages

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



PHONE: 850-488-5534 Fax: 850-488-6975

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

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

We have examined management's assertion, included in its representation letter dated September 10, 2008, that the Franklin 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, 2008. 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

In our opinion, the Franklin 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, 2008.

The results of our examination disclosed instances of noncompliance with the State requirements mentioned above. We considered this 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 is presented in SCHEDULE A, SCHEDULE B, SCHEDULE C, and SCHEDULE D.

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.¹ The noncompliance mentioned above, while indicative of certain control deficiencies¹, is not considered indicative of material weaknesses in the District's internal controls related to the determination and reporting of FTE. The findings, populations, samples, and exception totals that pertain to 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.

Pursuant to Section 11.45(4), Florida Statutes, this report is a public record and its distribution is not limited. Attestation standards established by the AICPA require us to indicate that this report is intended solely for the information and use 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 applicable District management and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Respectfully submitted,

David W. Martin, CPA December 5, 2008

¹ 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

Franklin 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, 2008

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008

	Number of Schools		Number of Students v/Exceptions)	% of Pop. <u>(Sample)</u>	Number of <u>Un</u> weighted <u>FTE</u> ²	% of Pop. <u>(Sample)</u>
1. <u>Basic</u>						
Population ³	5	100.00%	779	100.00%	913.5000	100.00%
Sample Size ⁴	3	60.00%	31	3.98%	27.0743	2.96%
Students w/Exception	ons -	-	(0)	(0.00%)	-	-
Net Audit Adjustmer		-	-	-	5.3020	-
2. Basic with ESE Serv	rices					
Population ³	5	100.00%	194	100.00%	210.7300	100.00%
Sample Size ⁴	3	60.00%	12	6.19%	10.5000	4.98%
Students w/Exception		-	(0)	(0.00%)	-	-
Net Audit Adjustmer	nts ⁵ -	-	-	-	.9800	-
3. <u>ESOL</u>						
Population ³	1	100.00%	1	100.00%	.1668	100.00%
Sample Size ⁴	1	100.00%	1	100.00%	.1668	100.00%
Students w/Exception		-	(1)	(100.00%)	-	-
Net Audit Adjustmer	nts ⁵ -	-	-	-	(.1668)	-
4. ESE Support Levels	4 and 5					
Population ³	5	100.00%	12	100.00%	14.5000	100.00%
Sample Size ⁴	3	60.00%	12	100.00%	10.0000	68.97%
Students w/Exception	ons -	-	(2)	(16.67%)	-	-
Net Audit Adjustmer	nts ⁵ -	-	-	-	(1.8400)	-
5. <u>Career Education 9-</u>	<u>12</u>					
Population ³	1	100.00%	15	100.00%	54.1900	100.00%
Sample Size ⁴	1	100.00%	15	100.00%	5.1352	9.48%
Students w/Exception	ons -	-	(3)	(20.00%)	-	-
Net Audit Adjustmer	nts ⁵ -	-	-	-	(5.3103)	-
<u>All Programs</u>						
Population ³	3	100.00%	1,001	100.00%	1,193.0868	100.00%
Sample Size ⁴	3	100.00%	71	7.09%	52.8763	4.43%
Students w/Exception		-	(6)	(8.45%)	-	-
Net Audit Adjustmer	nts ⁵ -	-	-	-	(1.0351)	-

Franklin 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, 2008

Description ¹	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 ³ Sample Size ⁴ Teachers w/Exceptions	5 3	100.00% 60.00%	32 13 (3)	100.00% 40.63% (23.08%)

¹ See NOTE A6.

³ The population shown for the number of schools is the total number of schools in the District which offered the courses in the program specified (i.e., Basic, ESOL, ESE, and 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, 2008. 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.)

⁴ See NOTE B.

⁵ Our audit adjustments present the net effects 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.

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

SCHEDULE B

Franklin 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, 2008

No. Program ¹	Net Audit <u>Adjustment</u> ²	Cost <u>Factor</u>	Weighted <u>FTE³</u>
102 Basic 4-8	.1668	1.000	.1668
103 Basic 9-12	5.1352	1.066	5.4741
130 ESOL	(.1668)	1.200	(.2002)
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.9800	1.048	1.0270
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.9800)	3.625	(3.5525)
255 ESE Support Level 5	(.8600)	5.062	(4.3533)
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(5.3103</u>)	1.119	<u>(5.9422</u>)
Total	<u>(1.0351</u>)		<u>(7.3803</u>)

¹ See NOTE A6.

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

³ Weighted FTE adjustments are presented for illustrative purposes only; they do not take special program caps or allocation factors into consideration and are not intended to indicate the FTE used to compute the dollar value of audit adjustments. That computation is the responsibility of the Department of Education. (See NOTE A4.)

SCHEDULE C

Franklin 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, 2008

Audit Adjustments1

No. Program	<u>#0021</u>	<u>#0091</u>	<u>#0101</u>	<u>Total</u>
102 Basic 4-8	.1668			.1668
103 Basic 9-12		5.1352		5.1352
130 ESOL	(.1668)			(.1668)
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services			.9800	.9800
254 ESE Support Level 4			(.9800)	(.9800)
255 ESE Support Level 5	(.4000)	(.4600)		(.8600)
300 Career Education 9-12	<u></u>	<u>(5.3103</u>)	<u></u>	<u>(5.3103</u>)
Total	<u>(.4000</u>)	<u>(.6351</u>)	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(1.0351</u>)

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

SCHEDULE D

Franklin County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS** For the Figure Very Ended June 30, 2008

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008

Overview

Management is responsible for determining and reporting the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) in compliance with State requirements. These requirements are found primarily in Sections 1011.60, 1011.61, and 1011.62, Florida Statutes; State Board of Education Rules, Chapter 6A-1, Florida Administrative Code; and the *FTE General Instructions* issued by the Department of Education. The Franklin 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, 2008. All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed below and requires management's attention and action, as recommended on page 10.

Findings

Our examination included the July and October 2007 surveys and the February and June 2008 surveys (see NOTE A5). Unless otherwise specifically stated, the findings and audit adjustments presented herein are for the October 2007 survey or the February 2008 survey or both. Accordingly, our findings do not mention specific surveys unless necessary for a complete understanding of the instances of noncompliance being disclosed.

Chapman Elementary School (#0021)

1.	[Ref. 2101] The LEP Student Plan for one student was not reviewed	<u>l and updated</u>	
for the	2007-08 school year. We made the following audit adjustment:		
	102 Basic 4-8 130 ESOL	.1668 <u>(.1668</u>)	.0000
2.	[Ref. 2102] One student in Hospital and Homebound was report	rted for more	
home	bound instruction than was provided. The student was reported for	or 1,500 Class	
Minute	es Weekly, or .5000 FTE, but was only provided 300 Class Minut	es Weekly or	
.1000	FTE. We made the following audit adjustment:		
	255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.4000</u>)	<u>(.4000</u>)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

Net Audit Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

(.4000)

Franklin 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, 2008

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

Findings

Carrabelle School (#0091)

3.	[Ref. 9103] The course schedules for 15 Career Education students in O	T were	
<u>reporte</u>	ed using an incorrect priority order. The students' off-campus work hou	rs were	
funded	prior to the students' on campus instruction. No audit adjustme	ent was	
conside	ered necessary.		
			.0000
4.	[Ref. 9101] We noted the following exceptions for three Career Ed	ucation	
student	ts in OJT:		
a.	The timecard for one student was missing and could not be located.		
b.	The timecard for one student indicated that the student did not work due	ring the	
	reporting survey week.		
c.	The timecard for one student supported less time worked than was repor	ted.	
<u>We ma</u>	de the following audit adjustment:		
	300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.4502</u>)	(.4502)
5.	[Ref. 9102] The schedule for one Hospital and Homebound student in p	orogram	
<u>No. 25</u>	5 (ESE Support Level 5) was incorrectly reported. The student was reported	rted for	
<u>1,500 r</u>	ninutes (.5000 FTE) of homebound instruction but was actually provid	led 120	
minute	s (.0400 FTE) of homebound instruction and 825 minutes (.2751 FTE)	of on-	
<u>campus</u>	s instruction. We made the following audit adjustment:		
	103 Basic 9-12	.2751	
	255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.4600)</u>	(.1849)

Franklin 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, 2008

Findings

Net Audit Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

Carrabelle School (#0091) (Continued)

6. [Ref. 9171/72] <u>Two teachers were not properly certified and were not approved</u>	
by the School Board to teach out-of-field. The teachers held certification in Varying	
Exceptionalities and Art, respectively, but taught courses which required certification in	
Carpentry and Commercial Art, respectively. 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:	
<u>Ref. 9171</u> 103 Basic 9-12 .1834	
300 Career Education 9-12 (.1834)	.0000
Ref. 9172 103 Basic 9-12 4.6767 300 Career Education 9-12 (4.6767)	0000
300 Career Education 9-12 (4.6767)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>(.6351</u>)
H. G. Brown Elementary School (#0101)	
7. [Ref. 10171] One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by	
the School Board to teach out-of-field. The teacher held certification in Elementary	
Education, but taught a course which required certification in Pre-school Education.	
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:	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services.9800254 ESE Support Level 4(.9800)	<u>.0000</u>
	.0000
	<u>(1.0351</u>)

SCHEDULE E

Franklin 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, 2008

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008

Recommendations

We recommend that management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) FTE is correctly calculated for all reported students, particularly those who are in the Hospital and Homebound program; (2) students in OJT are reported in accordance with priority guidelines and their supporting timecards; (3) *LEP Student Plans* are appropriately reviewed and updated; (4) teachers are properly certified or, if out-of-field, are approved by the School Board to teach out-of-field; and (5) the parents of students taught by out-of-field teachers are properly notified of the teachers' out-of-field status.

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

Section 1011.60, F.S Minimum Requirements of the Florida Education Finance Program
Section 1011.61, F.S Definitions
Section 1011.62, F.SFunds for Operation of Schools
Rule 6A-1.0451, F.A.C
Rule 6A-1.04513, F.A.C
FTE General Instructions 2007-2008

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 2007-2008

Comprehensive Management Information System: Automated Student Attendance Recordkeeping System

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

Franklin 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, 2008

Regulatory Citations (Continued)

English for Speakers of Other Lang	uages (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 tudents
Rule 6A-6.0904, F.A.C Students	Equal Access to Appropriate Programming for Limited English Proficient
Career Education On-the-Job Atten	<u>idance</u>
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 Birth through Five Years	Development of Family Support Plans for Children with Disabilities Ages
Rule 6A-6.0312, F.A.C	Course Modifications for Exceptional Students
Rule 6A-6.0331, F.A.C Specially Designed Instruction	Identification and Determination of Eligibility of Exceptional Students for
Rule 6A-6.0334, F.A.C	Temporary Assignment of Transferring Exceptional Students
Rule 6A-6.03411, F.A.C and Related Services for Except	Policies and Procedures for the Provision of Specially Designed Instruction tional Students

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 2007-2008

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

Franklin 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, 2008

Regulatory Citations (Continued)

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.C Definition of Qualified Instructional Personnel
Rule 6A-4.001, F.A.C Instructional Personnel Certification
Rule 6A-6.0907, F.A.CInservice Requirements for Personnel of Limited English Proficient Students

NOTE A - SUMMARY

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

1. <u>School District of Franklin County</u>

The District was established pursuant to Section 1001.30, Florida Statutes, to provide public educational services for the residents of Franklin County, Florida. Those services are provided primarily to 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 Franklin County. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2008, the District operated five schools, reported 1,193.0868 unweighted FTE, and received approximately \$554,000 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, the FEFP formula recognizes (1) varying local property tax bases, (2) varying program cost factors, (3) district cost differentials, and (4) differences in per student cost for equivalent educational programs due to sparsity and dispersion of student population.

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 2007-2008 school year were conducted during and for the following weeks: survey one was performed for July 9-13, 2007; survey two was performed for October 8-12, 2007; survey three was performed for February 4-8, 2008; and survey four was performed for June 9-13, 2008.

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: (1) Basic; (2) ESOL;(3) ESE; 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.C.Finance and Administration Chapter 6A-4, F.A.C.Certification Chapter 6A-6, F.A.C.Special 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, 2008. 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. The following schools were in our sample:

School Name/Description

1. Chapman Elementary School

2. Carrabelle School

3. H. G. Brown Elementary School

<u>Finding Number(s)</u> 1 and 2 3 through 6 7



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

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



PHONE: 850-488-5534 Fax: 850-488-6975

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

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

We have examined management's assertion, included in its representation letter dated September 10, 2008, that the Franklin 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, 2008. 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 disclosed material noncompliance with the District's reported student ridership data as follows: 37 of the 102 students in our sample had exceptions involving their reported ridership categories or eligibility for State transportation funding. (See SCHEDULE G, finding Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9.)

In our opinion, except for the material noncompliance mentioned above involving the classification and reporting of transported students, the Franklin 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, 2008.

The results of our examination disclosed other noncompliance with the State requirements mentioned above. (See SCHEDULE G, finding Nos. 1 and 7.) 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 G. The impact of this noncompliance on the District's reported number of transported students is presented in SCHEDULE F and SCHEDULE G.

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.¹ 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. Other noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is indicative of control deficiencies¹, and is also presented herein. The findings, populations, samples, and exception totals that pertain to material and other noncompliance are presented in SCHEDULE F and SCHEDULE G.

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

¹<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 control likelihood that material noncompliance will not be prevented or detected by the entity's internal control.

Pursuant to Section 11.45(4), Florida Statutes, this report is a public record and its distribution is not limited. Attestation standards established by the AICPA require us to indicate that this report is intended solely for the information and use 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 applicable District management and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Respectfully submitted,

W. Martes

David W. Martin, CPA December 5, 2008

SCHEDULE F

Franklin County District School Board Student Transportation POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND TEST RESULTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008

Description	Number of <u>Vehicles</u>	% of <u>Pop.</u>	No. of Students <u>Transp.</u>	% of Pop. <u>(Sample)</u>
Population ¹ Sample ²	52	- 100.00%	930 102	100.00% 10.97%
<u>Sample Students</u> With Exceptions ³ Net Audit Adjustments	- -	-	37 (26)	(36.27%) (25.49%)
<u>Non-Sample Students</u> With Exceptions Net Audit Adjustments	- -	- -	10 (10)	1.08% 1.08%
<u>Sample and Non-Sample Students</u> Net Audit Adjustments	-	-	(36)	3.87%

¹ The population figures for students are the totals of the figures reported for each survey conducted for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2008. The District reported 930 students in the following ridership categories: 29 in IDEA (K-12), Weighted; 14 in IDEA (PK), Weighted; 17 in IDEA (PK), Unweighted; and 870 in Two Miles or More. The District also reported operating a total of 52 vehicles (37 buses and 15 passenger cars). (IDEA stands for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.)

² See NOTE B.

³ Students with exceptions are sample students with exceptions affecting their ridership classification. Students cited only for incorrect reporting of days-in-term, if any, are not included.

SCHEDULE G

Franklin County District School Board Student Transportation FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008

Overview

Management is responsible for determining and reporting the number of students transported in compliance with State requirements. These requirements are found primarily in Chapter 1006 Part I, E., and Section 1011.68, Florida Statutes; State Board of Education Rules, Chapter 6A-3, Florida Administrative Code; and the *Student Transportation General Instructions* issued by the Department of Education. Except for material noncompliance involving the classification and reporting of transported students, the Franklin 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, 2008. All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed below and requires management's attention and action, as recommended on page 26.

Students Transported Net Audit Adjustments

Findings

Our examination procedures included both general tests and detailed tests. Our general tests included inquiries concerning the District's transportation of students and verification that a bus driver's report existed for each bus reported in a survey. 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.

1. [Ref. 51] <u>The number of buses was overstated by one bus in the July survey, two</u> buses in the October survey, three buses in the February survey and five buses in the June survey. We also noted that the number of days-in-term was incorrectly reported for three students at Gretchen Everhart School in the July survey. The school was in session for 8 days-in-term, but 12 days-in-term was reported. We made the following audit adjustment:

July 2007 Survey	
<u>8 Days-in-Term</u>	
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	3
<u>12 Days-in-Term</u>	
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	<u>(3</u>)

0

Franklin County District School Board Student Transportation FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008

<u>Findings</u>			Students Transported Net Audit <u>Adjustments</u>
July 2007 Survey Buses in Operation	(1)		
October 2007 Survey Buses in Operation	(2)		
<u>February 2008 Survey</u> Buses in Operation	(3)		
June 2008 Survey Buses in Operation	(5)		
2. [Ref. 52] <u>Eleven students were repo</u> students lived less than two miles from transportation funding. We made the follow <u>October 2007 Survey</u> <u>90 Days-in-Term</u> Two Miles or More	n school and were not eligi		(11)
3. [Ref. 53] <u>Three students were n</u> <u>concerned and should not have been repor</u> <u>following audit adjustments</u> :	· ·		
July 2007 Survey <u>12 Days-in-Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Weighted <u>February 2008 Survey</u> <u>90 Days-in-Term</u> Two Miles or More		(1) (<u>2</u>)	(3)
4. [Ref. 54] <u>Five ESE students were trained and the students were transhould have been reported in an IDEA-ure</u>	ansported by private passenge	er vehicle and	

following audit adjustments:

Franklin County District School Board Student Transportation FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008

<u>Findings</u>	Students Transported Net Audit <u>Adjustments</u>
July 2007 Survey	
<u>8 Days-in-Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Weighted (1 IDEA (K-12), Unweighted 1	
12 Days-in-TermIDEA (K-12), Weighted(1IDEA (K-12), Unweighted1	
October 2007 Survey90 Days-in-TermIDEA (K-12), WeightedIDEA (K-12), Unweighted	
February 2008 Survey90 Days-in-TermIDEA (K-12), WeightedIDEA (K-12), Unweighted2	2) 2 0
5. [Ref. 55] <u>Six ESE students were reported incorrectly in an IDEA-weighter</u> ridership category (two in IDEA (K-12) and four in IDEA (PK)). The IEPs for the	
students did not indicate that they met at least one of the five criteria required for	
IDEA-weighted classification. We noted, however, that four of the students wer	
eligible for IDEA-unweighted ridership categories. We made the following aud	
adjustments:	<u></u>
October 2007 Survey90 Days-in-TermIDEA (K-12), WeightedIDEA (PK), WeightedIDEA (PK), Unweighted2	2) 2) 2
February 2008 Survey90 Days-in-TermIDEA (PK), WeightedIDEA (PK), Unweighted12	2) 2 (2)

Franklin County District School Board Student Transportation FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008

<u>Findings</u>	Students Transported Net Audit <u>Adjustments</u>
6. [Ref. 56] Seventeen Pre-K students were reported incorrectly in an IDEA-	
unweighted ridership category. The students were not IDEA-students and were not	
eligible for State transportation funding. We made the following audit adjustment:	
October 2007 Survey 90 Days-in-Term IDEA (PK), Unweighted (7) IDEA (PK), Unweighted (Non-sample Students) (10)	(17)
7. [Ref. 57] The number of days-in-term in the June survey was incorrectly	
reported as 90 days-in-term for one student and 12 days-in-term for eight students. The	
schools were in session for 8 days-in-term. We made the following audit adjustment:	
June 2008 Survey <u>8 Days-in-Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Weighted <i>(Non-sample Students)</i> 8	
Two Miles or More (Non-sample Student) 1	
<u>12 Days-in-Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Weighted <i>(Non-sample Students)</i> (8)	
<u>90 Days-in-Term</u> Two Miles or More <i>(Non-sample Student)</i> (1)	0
8. [Ref. 58] <u>A bus driver's report for the one bus operated during the June survey</u>	
was not prepared and maintained to support the June reporting of three transported	
students. We also noted that the IEP for one of these students did not indicate that the	
student met at least one of the five criteria required for IDEA-weighted classification.	
We made the following audit adjustment:	

June 2008 Survey <u>8 Days-in-Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Weighted

(3)

<u>(3</u>)

Franklin County District School Board Student Transportation FINDINGS AND AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008

<u>Findings</u>		Students Transported Net Audit <u>Adjustments</u>
9. [Ref. 59] Two ESE students were reported incorrectly in IDEA-	weighted	
ridership categories. The students were transported by private passenger vel	nicle and	
were not eligible for reporting in an IDEA weighted ridership category. We not	made the	
following audit adjustment:		
June 2008 Survey <u>8 Days-in-Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Weighted IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(2) <u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Net Audit Adjustments		<u>(36</u>)
Summary		
Sample Students w/Exceptions Sample Students - Net Audit Adjustments	<u>37</u> 	(26)
Non-Sample Students w/Exceptions Non-Sample Students - Net Audit Adjustments	<u>10</u> 	<u>(10</u>)
Net Audit Adjustments		<u>(36</u>)

SCHEDULE H

Franklin County District School Board Student Transportation **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS**

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008

Recommendations

We recommend that management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) transported students are reported in the correct ridership category for the correct number of days-in-term; (2) only students who were enrolled in school and transported during a survey period are included with that survey's results; (3) the distance from home to school, for students classified in Two Miles or More, is verified prior to those students being reported; and (4) ESE students who receive special transportation services have their need for such services specified on their IEPs.

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

Franklin County District School Board Student Transportation **NOTES TO SCHEDULES** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008

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. <u>Transportation in Franklin County</u>

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2008, the District received approximately \$211,000 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 2007	4	5
October 2007	20	437
February 2008	23	479
June 2008	<u>5</u>	<u>9</u>
Total	<u>52</u>	<u>930</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

Franklin County District School Board Student Transportation **NOTES TO SCHEDULES** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008

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, 2008. 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.

EXHIBIT – A Management's Response

FRANKLIG SMOVY SEARTONS:

> Nina M. Marks Superintendent

Administrative Offices 155 Avenue E Apalachicola, Florida 32320 Phone (850) 653-8831 Fax (850) 653-8984 www.franklincountyschools.org

Franklin County Schools



Striving for Excellence

Board Meets First Thursday After First Monday on Each Month

January 5, 2009

Mr. David Martin, CPA Auditor General Room 476A, Claude Pepper Building 111 West Madison Street Tallahassee, FL 32399-1450

Dear Mr. Martin:

Presented herewith is my response to the findings presented in your report on the examination of the full-time equivalent (FTE) students and student transportation, as reported by the Franklin County District School Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2008.

Findings 1-7, Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students:

Ms. Alice Pounds of your staff, met with my staff and went over these findings in detail. The findings were distributed to appropriate staff for follow-up and resolution. We determined the findings to be correct, and can offer no rebuttal to them. It is readily apparent that these deficiencies occurred due to an absence of, or breakdown in applicable procedures and staff training.

We have reviewed your five (5) recommendations for correcting the cited deficiencies. We will evaluate related procedures and staff training needs, develop and implement improved procedures where needed, and train staff in areas of weakness. We hope to make these corrections before the next FTE reporting dates.

Findings 1-9, Student Transportation:

We agree with these findings. Again, the deficiencies occurred due to inadequate procedures and training. Your 4 recommendations are duly noted. We will endeavor to enhance our procedures and staff training to prevent the recurrence of the deficiencies. We hope to have this done before the next student transportation reporting date.

Sincerely

Jarke

Nina M. Marks Superintendent

George Thompson District 1 David Hinton District 2 Teresa Ann Martin District 3 Vice Chair Jimmy Gander District 4 Chair Carlton Whaley District 5