

**LAKE COUNTY
DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD**

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

and

Student Transportation

For the Fiscal Year Ended
June 30, 2012



BOARD MEMBERS AND SUPERINTENDENT

Lake County District School Board members and the Superintendent of Schools who served during the 2011-12 fiscal year are listed below:

<u>Member</u>	<u>District No.</u>
Jim L. Miller	1
Rosanne Brandeburg, Vice Chair to 11-21-11, Chair from 11-22-11	2
Tod Howard	3
Debbie Stivender, Chair to 11-21-11	4
Kyleen Fischer, Vice Chair from 11-22-11	5

Dr. Susan Moxley, Superintendent

The examination team leader was Bernice Rivas and the examination was supervised by Aileen B. Peterson, CPA. Please address inquiries regarding this report to J. David Hughes, CPA, Audit Manager, by e-mail at davidhughes@aud.state.fl.us or by telephone at (850) 412-2971.

This report and other reports prepared by the Auditor General can be obtained on our Web site at www.myflorida.com/audgen; by telephone at (850) 412-2722; or by mail at G74 Claude Pepper Building, 111 West Madison Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1450.

Lake County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students and Student Transportation
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

CELLA	Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment
CTE	Career and Technical Education
ELL	English Language Learner
EP	Educational Plan
ESE	Exceptional Student Education
ESOL	English for Speakers of Other Languages
FAC	Florida Administrative Code
FES	Fluent English Speaker
FS	Florida Statutes
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IEP	Individual Educational Plan
OJT	On-the-Job Training
PK	Prekindergarten

Lake County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students and Student Transportation
TABLE OF CONTENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

	PAGE NO.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS	
INDEPENDENT AUDITOR’S REPORT	1
SCHEDULE A – POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND TEST RESULTS	4
SCHEDULE B – EFFECT OF PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS ON WEIGHTED FTE.....	6
SCHEDULE C – PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL.....	7
SCHEDULE D – FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS.....	12
SCHEDULE E – RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS.....	34
NOTES TO SCHEDULES.....	37
STUDENT TRANSPORTATION	
INDEPENDENT AUDITOR’S REPORT.....	41
SCHEDULE F – POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND TEST RESULTS.....	44
SCHEDULE G – FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS.....	46
SCHEDULE H – RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS	53
NOTES TO SCHEDULES.....	54
MANAGEMENT’S RESPONSE	
EXHIBIT A – MANAGEMENT’S RESPONSE.....	56

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SUMMARY OF ATTESTATION EXAMINATION

Except for the material noncompliance described below involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were missing and could not be located for students in Basic with ESE Services, ESOL, ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, Career Education 9-12 (OJT), and student transportation, the Lake County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements regarding the determination and reporting of full-time equivalent (FTE) students under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) and the number of students transported for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012:

- Twenty-three of the 139 students in our Basic with ESE Services sample, 50 of the 153 students in our ESOL sample, 19 of the 117 students in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 sample, and 55 of the 67 students in our Career Education 9-12 (OJT) sample had exceptions involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were missing and could not be located.
- Sixty-eight of the 446 students in our student transportation sample had exceptions involving their reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding.

Noncompliance related to reported FTE resulted in 64 findings. The resulting proposed net adjustment to the District's reported, unweighted FTE totaled a negative 290.9793 but has a potential impact on the District's weighted FTE of a negative 326.7357. Noncompliance related to student transportation resulted in 10 findings and a proposed net adjustment of a negative 43 students.

Weighted adjustments to FTE are presented in our report for illustrative purposes only. The weighted adjustments to FTE do not take special program caps and allocation factors into account and are not intended to indicate the weighted FTE used to compute the dollar value of adjustments. That computation is the responsibility of the Department of Education. However, the gross dollar effect of our proposed adjustments to FTE may be estimated by multiplying the proposed net weighted adjustment to FTE by the base student allocation amount. For the Lake County District School Board, the estimated gross dollar effect of our proposed adjustments to reported FTE is a negative \$1,136,785 (negative 326.7357 times \$3,479.22).

We have not presented an estimate of the potential dollar effect of our proposed adjustments to student transportation because there is no equivalent method for making such an estimate.

The ultimate resolution of our proposed adjustments to FTE and student transportation and the computation of their financial impact is the responsibility of the Department of Education.

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF LAKE COUNTY

The District was established pursuant to Section 1001.30, Florida Statutes, to provide public educational services for the residents of Lake County. Those services are provided primarily to prekindergarten through twelfth grade students and to adults seeking career education-type training. The District is part of the State system of public education under the general direction and control of the State Board of Education. The geographic boundaries of the District are those of Lake County.

The governing body of the District is the District School Board that is composed of five elected members. The executive officer of the Board is the appointed Superintendent of Schools. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012, the District operated 55 schools serving prekindergarten through twelfth grade students, reported 40,563.12 unweighted FTE for those students, and received approximately \$99 million in State funding through FEFP.

FLORIDA EDUCATION FINANCE PROGRAM (FEFP)

Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students

Florida school districts receive State funding through FEFP to serve prekindergarten through twelfth grade students (adult education is not funded by FEFP). FEFP was established by the Florida Legislature in 1973 to guarantee to each student in the Florida public school system the availability of programs and services appropriate to the student's 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. 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 unweighted FTE (full-time equivalent) student. For example, one student would be reported as one FTE if the student was enrolled in six classes per day at 50 minutes per class for the full 180-day school year (i.e., six classes at 50 minutes each per day is 5 hours of class a day or 25 hours per week that equals one FTE).

Student Transportation

Any student who is transported by the District must meet one or more of the following conditions in order to be eligible for State transportation funding: live two or more miles from school, be physically handicapped, be a Career Education 9-12 or an ESE student who is transported from one school center to another where appropriate programs are provided, or be on a route that meets the criteria for hazardous walking conditions specified in Section 1006.23(4), Florida Statutes. The District received approximately \$7.7 million for student transportation as part of the State funding through FEFP.



DAVID W. MARTIN, CPA
AUDITOR GENERAL

AUDITOR GENERAL STATE OF FLORIDA

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



PHONE: 850-412-2722
FAX: 850-488-6975

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

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT LAKE COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD FLORIDA EDUCATION FINANCE PROGRAM (FEFP) FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS

We have examined management's assertion, included in its representation letter dated February 15, 2013, that the Lake 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, 2012. 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 2011-12* 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: 23 of the 139 students in our Basic with ESE Services sample,¹ 50 of the 153 students in our ESOL sample,² 19 of the 117 students in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 sample,³ and 55 of the 67 students in our Career Education 9-12 (OJT) sample⁴ had exceptions involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were missing and could not be located.

In our opinion, except for the material noncompliance mentioned above involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were missing and could not be located for students in Basic with ESE Services, ESOL, ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, and Career Education 9-12 (OJT), the Lake 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, 2012.

The results of our examination disclosed other noncompliance with the State requirements mentioned above. We considered this other noncompliance in forming our opinion regarding the District's compliance 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 SCHEDULES A, B, C, and D.

¹For Basic with ESE Services, see SCHEDULE D, Finding Nos. 5, 9, 10, 14, 15, 31, 34, 38, 47, 48, 49, and 63.

²For ESOL, see SCHEDULE D, Finding Nos. 2, 3, 6, 16, 18, 19, 20, 26, 27, 32, 36, 39, 40, 41, 42, 46, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, and 59.

³For ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, see SCHEDULE D, Finding Nos. 7, 11, 12, 13, 17, 22, 28, 29, 35, 43, 45, 60, and 61.

⁴For Career Education 9-12 (OJT), see SCHEDULE D, Finding Nos. 21, 23, 24, 25, 56, and 63.

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.⁵ However, the material noncompliance mentioned above is indicative of significant deficiencies considered to be material weaknesses in the District's internal controls related to reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were missing and could not be located for students in Basic with ESE Services, ESOL, ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, and Career Education 9-12 (OJT). Other noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is indicative of control deficiencies⁵ and is also presented herein. The findings, populations, samples, and exception totals that pertain to material and other noncompliance are presented in SCHEDULES A and D.

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

Pursuant to Section 11.45(4)(c), Florida Statutes, this report is a public record and its distribution is not limited. Attestation standards established by the 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
October 16, 2013

⁵ A control deficiency 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 significant deficiency 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 material weakness 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

Lake 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, 2012

REPORTED FTE

The funding provided by FEFP is based upon the numbers of individual students participating in particular educational programs. FEFP funds ten specific programs that are grouped under the following four general program titles: Basic, ESOL, ESE, and Career Education 9-12. Unweighted FTE represents FTE prior to the application of the specific cost factor for each program. (See SCHEDULE B and NOTES A3, A4, and A6.) The District reported 40,563.12 unweighted FTE at 55 schools to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012.

SCHOOLS AND STUDENTS

As part of our examination procedures, we sampled schools and students for testing FTE reported to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012. (See NOTE B.) The population of schools (55) consisted of the total number of schools in the District that offered courses in FEFP-funded programs. The population of students (17,702) consisted of the total number of students in each program at the schools in our samples. Our Career Education 9-12 data includes only those students who participated in OJT. Our populations and samples of schools and students are summarized as follows:

<u>Programs</u>	<u>Number of Schools</u>		<u>Number of Students</u>		<u>Students with Exceptions</u>	<u>Unweighted FTE</u>		<u>Proposed Adjustments</u>
	<u>Population</u>	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Sample</u>		<u>Population</u>	<u>Sample</u>	
Basic	53	19	14,406	219	11	31,918.1300	193.2259	(151.1867)
Basic with ESE Services	53	20	2,504	139	23	5,726.7300	124.4509	(65.3548)
ESOL	42	16	475	153	50	1,130.5600	113.8404	(43.0685)
ESE Support Levels 4 and 5	37	13	224	117	19	268.7200	86.9596	(9.7414)
Career Education 9-12	9	4	<u>93</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>1,518.9800</u>	<u>14.4318</u>	<u>(21.6279)</u>
All Programs	55	20	<u>17,702</u>	<u>695</u>	<u>158</u>	<u>40,563.1200</u>	<u>532.9086</u>	<u>(290.9793)</u>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE A (Continued)

Lake 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, 2012

TEACHERS

We also sampled teachers as part of our examination procedures. (See NOTE B.) Specifically, the population of teachers (519) consisted of the total number of teachers at schools in our sample who taught courses in ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 or Career Education 9-12 or taught courses to ELL students. From the population of teachers, we sampled 192 and found exceptions for 13 of those teachers.

PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS

Our proposed adjustments present the net effects of noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures, including those related to our tests of teacher certification. Our proposed 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. (See SCHEDULES B, C, and D.)

Section 2 of the General Appropriations Act for the 2011-12 fiscal year (Chapter 2011-69, Laws of Florida) established the cost factors for that fiscal year as shown on SCHEDULE B. Generally, the cost factors are greater than or equal to 1.000, with Basic education cost factors being the lowest. However, for the 2011-12 fiscal year, the cost factor for Career Education 9-12 was 0.999. Chapter 2012-133, Laws of Florida, in part, amended Section 1011.62(13)(b), Florida Statutes, to add language providing that, beginning with the 2011-12 fiscal year, an audit adjustment may not result in the reclassification of special program FTE to basic program FTE if the special program cost factor is less than the basic program cost factor. Accordingly, for instances of noncompliance involving teachers not being properly certified and teaching Career Education 9-12 students out of field or parents of the students not being notified of the teachers' out-of-field status, we have presented disclosure Findings with no proposed adjustments. (See SCHEDULE D, Finding Nos. 58 and 62.)

The ultimate resolution of our proposed adjustments to FTE and the computation of their financial impact is the responsibility of the Department of Education.

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE B

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
EFFECT OF PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS ON WEIGHTED FTE
(For Illustrative Purposes Only)
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

<u>No. Program</u> ¹	<u>Proposed Net Adjustment</u> ²	<u>Cost Factor</u>	<u>Weighted FTE</u> ³
101 Basic K-3	21.3864	1.102	23.5678
102 Basic 4-8	20.9646	1.000	20.9646
103 Basic 9-12	(193.5377)	1.019	(197.2149)
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	(3.0000)	1.102	(3.3060)
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	(3.9198)	1.000	(3.9198)
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(58.4350)	1.019	(59.5453)
130 ESOL	(43.0685)	1.161	(50.0025)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(9.0000)	3.550	(31.9500)
255 ESE Support Level 5	(.7414)	5.022	(3.7233)
300 Career Education 9-12	(21.6279)	.999	(21.6063)
Total	(290.9793)		(326.7357)

¹ See NOTE A6.

² These proposed net adjustments are for unweighted FTE. (See SCHEDULE C.)

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

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE C

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

<u>No. Program</u>	<u>Proposed Adjustments¹</u>			<u>Balance Forward</u>
	<u>#0031</u>	<u>#0041</u>	<u>#0068</u>	
101 Basic K-3	2.5447	.4696	.6792	3.6935
102 Basic 4-8	.58524380	1.0232
103 Basic 9-120000
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	(.4696)	(.4696)
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	1.0000	1.0000
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services0000
130 ESOL	(3.1299)	(1.1172)	(4.2471)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(1.0000)	(1.0000)
255 ESE Support Level 50000
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>.0000</u>
Total	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>

¹ These proposed adjustments are for unweighted FTE. (See NOTE A4.)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE C (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

<u>No.</u>	<u>Brought Forward</u>	<u>Proposed Adjustments¹</u>				<u>Balance Forward</u>
		<u>#0080</u>	<u>#0113</u>	<u>#0149</u>	<u>#0181</u>	
101	3.6935	2.0000	5.6935
102	1.0232	3.0100	3.6956	.5000	8.2288
103	.00000000
111	(.4696)	(.4696)
112	1.0000	.0802	(3.0000)	(1.9198)
113	.00000000
130	(4.2471)	(.6956)	(2.5000)	(7.4427)
254	(1.0000)	(3.0000)	(4.0000)
255	.0000	(.0902)	(.0402)	(.0360)	(.1664)
300	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>(2.2278)</u>	<u>(2.2278)</u>
Total	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(.0402)</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(2.2638)</u>	<u>(2.3040)</u>

¹ These proposed adjustments are for unweighted FTE. (See NOTE A4.)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE C (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

<u>No.</u>	<u>Brought Forward</u>	<u>Proposed Adjustments¹</u>				<u>Balance Forward</u>
		<u>#0231</u>	<u>#0251</u>	<u>#0281</u>	<u>#0382</u>	
101	5.6935	5.0124	10.9553	21.6612
102	8.2288	1.2442	.2412	.2634	9.9776
103	.00000000
111	(.4696)	(1.7652)	.0000	(2.2348)
112	(1.9198)	1.0000	(.9198)
113	.00000000
130	(7.4427)	(1.2442)	(3.4884)	(10.7187)	(22.8940)
254	(4.0000)	(.5000)	(.5000)	(5.0000)
255	(.1664)	(.5300)	(.6964)
300	<u>(2.2278)</u>	<u>(4.7103)</u>	<u>(6.9381)</u>
Total	<u>(2.3040)</u>	<u>(4.7103)</u>	<u>(.0300)</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(7.0443)</u>

¹ These proposed adjustments are for unweighted FTE. (See NOTE A4.)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE C (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

<u>No.</u>	<u>Brought Forward</u>	<u>Proposed Adjustments¹</u>				<u>Balance Forward</u>
		<u>#0481</u>	<u>#0533</u>	<u>#0561</u>	<u>#0597</u>	
101	21.66129600	.7652	23.3864
102	9.9776	10.9870	2.0000	22.9646
103	.00000000
111	(2.2348)	(.7652)	(3.0000)
112	(.9198)	(.5000)	(2.0000)	(3.4198)
113	.00000000
130	(22.8940)	(7.9870)	(.9600)	(31.8410)
254	(5.0000)	(2.5000)	(7.5000)
255	(.6964)	(.0450)	(.7414)
300	<u>(6.9381)</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>(6.9381)</u>
Total	<u>(7.0443)</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(.0450)</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(7.0893)</u>

¹ These proposed adjustments are for unweighted FTE. (See NOTE A4.)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE C (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

<u>No.</u>	<u>Brought Forward</u>	<u>Proposed Adjustments¹</u>				<u>Total</u>
		<u>#0801</u>	<u>#0901</u>	<u>#9018</u>	<u>#9029</u>	
101	23.3864	(2.0000)	21.3864
102	22.9646	(2.0000)	20.9646
103	.0000	10.7775	1.8850	(206.2002)	(193.5377)
111	(3.0000)	(3.0000)
112	(3.4198)	(.5000)	(3.9198)
113	.0000	(1.4350)	1.0000	(58.0000)	(58.4350)
130	(31.8410)	(9.3425)	(1.8850)	(43.0685)
254	(7.5000)	(1.5000)	(9.0000)
255	(.7414)	(.7414)
300	<u>(6.9381)</u>	<u>(.3900)</u>	<u>(14.2998)</u>	<u>(21.6279)</u>
Total	<u>(7.0893)</u>	<u>(.3900)</u>	<u>(.5000)</u>	<u>(278.5000)</u>	<u>(4.5000)</u>	<u>(290.9793)</u>

¹ These proposed adjustments are for unweighted FTE. (See NOTE A4.)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

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 2011-12* issued by the Department of Education. Except for the material noncompliance involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were missing and could not be located for students in Basic with ESE Services, ESOL, ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, and Career Education 9-12 (OJT), the Lake 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, 2012. All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed below and requires management's attention and action, as recommended on page 34.

Findings

Our examination included the July and October 2011 surveys and the February and June 2012 surveys (see NOTE A5). Unless otherwise specifically stated, the Findings and Proposed Adjustments presented herein are for the October 2011 survey or the February 2012 survey or both. Accordingly, our Findings do not mention specific surveys unless necessary for a complete understanding of the instances of noncompliance being disclosed.

District-Wide – Attendance Policies and Procedures

1. [Ref. 1] Our examination disclosed that the Lake County District School Board had not established written policies and procedures for the recording and monitoring of student attendance. Schools that record attendance electronically should regularly (each day for self-contained classrooms or period by period) monitor this attendance to ensure that all teachers submit the class attendance timely and should retain this monitoring documentation. For four of the schools in our sample, we noted that attendance was monitored only weekly or periodically.

(Finding Continues on Next Page)

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

**Proposed Net
 Adjustments
 (Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

District-Wide – Attendance Policies and Procedures (Continued)

Because student attendance defaults to “present” when attendance is not taken, the lack of proper monitoring could result in students being reported for FEFP funding who were not in attendance during the survey period. Additionally, we noted that five schools did not retain supporting records, such as student sign-in and sign-out logs or substitute teacher attendance records, contrary to State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.04513, FAC.

Despite the lack of regular monitoring of student attendance or the lack of certain supporting documentation as noted above, we were able to verify the membership and attendance of our sample students.

Additionally, two charter schools in our sample are not included in this District-wide finding; however, there were attendance exceptions that are specifically addressed in Finding Nos. 63 and 64.

We present this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustments.

.0000

Beverly Shores Elementary School (#0031)

2. [Ref. 3101] The English language proficiency of three ELL students was not assessed within 30 school days prior to the students’ ESOL anniversary dates. We also noted an ELL Committee was not convened to consider two of the students’ extended ESOL placements for a fourth or fifth year. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	1.7116	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.7116)</u>	.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

**Proposed Net
 Adjustments
 (Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Beverly Shores Elementary School (#0031) (Continued)

3. [Ref. 3102] The ELL Student Plan for one student was not reviewed and updated until March 16, 2012, which was after the reporting surveys. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.8331	
130 ESOL	<u>(.8331)</u>	.0000

4. [Ref. 3171/72] Two teachers were not approved by the School Board to teach ESOL out of field. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teachers' out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustments:

<u>Ref. 3171</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	.2958	
130 ESOL	<u>(.2958)</u>	.0000

<u>Ref. 3172</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	.2894	
130 ESOL	<u>(.2894)</u>	.0000

.0000

Clermont Elementary School (#0041)

5. [Ref. 4101] The EPs for two ESE students were not signed by at least one of the students' General Education teachers to indicate their participation in the development of the students' EPs. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.4696	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	<u>(.4696)</u>	.0000

.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

**Proposed Net
 Adjustments
 (Unweighted FTE)**

Findings**Grassy Lake Elementary School (#0068)**

6. [Ref. 6802] We noted the following exceptions involving two ELL students: (a) the file for one student did not contain any English language assessment documentation to support the student's ESOL placement, and (b) there was no evidence that the parents of one student were notified of their child's ESOL placement. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.4380	
102 Basic 4-8	.4380	
130 ESOL	<u>(.8760)</u>	.0000

7. [Ref. 6804] There was no evidence that the *Matrix of Services* forms for one ESE student were reviewed when the student's new IEPs were prepared. We propose the following adjustment:

112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	1.0000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(1.0000)</u>	.0000

8. [Ref. 6871] One teacher was not approved by the School Board to teach ESOL out of field. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.2412	
130 ESOL	<u>(.2412)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>.0000</u>

East Ridge Middle School (#0080)

9. [Ref. 8001] The EPs for two ESE students were not signed by at least one of the students' General Education teachers to indicate their participation in the development of the students' EPs. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	2.0000	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	<u>(2.0000)</u>	.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

**Proposed Net
 Adjustments
 (Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

East Ridge Middle School (#0080) (Continued)

10. [Ref. 8002] The EP for one ESE student was not signed. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	1.0000	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	(1.0000)	.0000

11. [Ref. 8003] We noted the following exceptions involving the Matrix of Services forms for two ESE students: (a) the Matrix of Services form for one student was missing and could not be located, and (b) there was no evidence that the Matrix of Services form for one student was reviewed when the student’s new IEP was prepared. We propose the following adjustment:

112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	2.0000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(2.0000)	.0000

12. [Ref. 8004] There was no evidence that the Matrix of Services forms for two ESE students were reviewed when the students’ new IEPs were prepared. We propose the following adjustment:

112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	1.0802	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(1.0000)	
255 ESE Support Level 5	(.0802)	.0000

13. [Ref. 8005] The course schedule for one student, who had intermittent instruction in the Hospital and Homebound Program as well as on-campus instruction, incorrectly included a course reported in Program No. 255 (ESE Support Level 5) for .0100 FTE. The homebound instructor’s contact log indicated that the student did not receive any homebound instruction during the survey period; therefore, the student should have been reported entirely for the student’s on-campus schedule. We propose the following adjustment:

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

<u>Findings</u>			<u>Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)</u>
<u>East Ridge Middle School (#0080)</u> (Continued)			
102 Basic 4-8		.0100	
255 ESE Support Level 5		<u>(.0100)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
			<u>.0000</u>
<u>Cecil E. Gray Middle School (#0113)</u>			
14. [Ref. 11301] <u>The EPs for two ESE students were not signed by at least one of the students' General Education teachers to indicate their participation in the development of the students' EPs. We propose the following adjustment:</u>			
102 Basic 4-8		2.0000	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services		<u>(2.0000)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
15. [Ref. 11302] <u>The EP for one ESE student was not signed. We propose the following adjustment:</u>			
102 Basic 4-8		1.0000	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services		<u>(1.0000)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
16. [Ref. 11303] <u>The file for one ELL student did not contain an <i>ELL Student Plan</i> covering the 2011-12 school year. We propose the following adjustment:</u>			
102 Basic 4-8		.6956	
130 ESOL		<u>(.6956)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
17. [Ref. 11304] <u>The contact log for one ESE student receiving both Hospital and Homebound instruction and on-campus instruction disclosed that no Hospital and Homebound instruction was provided to the student during the survey week. We propose the following adjustment:</u>			
255 ESE Support Level 5		<u>(.0402)</u>	<u>(.0402)</u>
			<u>(.0402)</u>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

**Proposed Net
 Adjustments
 (Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Round Lake Elementary School (#0149)

18. [Ref. 14901] One ELL student was beyond the maximum six-year period allowed for State funding of ESOL. We also noted the student’s ELL Student Plan was not updated for the 2011-12 school year. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.5000	
130 ESOL	(.5000)	.0000

19. [Ref. 14902] The file for one ELL student was missing the student’s ELL Student Plan and the parental notification of the student’s ESOL placement. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.5000	
130 ESOL	(.5000)	.0000

20. [Ref. 14903] Two ELL students scored English proficient on all parts of the March 2011 CELLA test. We noted that ELL Committees convened and recommended the students’ extended ESOL placements; however, the criteria considered when recommending the students’ extended placements were not adequately documented. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	1.5000	
130 ESOL	(1.5000)	.0000
		<u>.0000</u>

Mount Dora High School (#0181)

21. [Ref. 18101] We noted the following exceptions for 15 Career Education 9-12 (OJT) students: (a) the timecards for 12 students were missing and could not be located, and (b) the timecards for 3 students were not signed by the students’ employers and did not indicate the hours worked. We propose the following adjustment:

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

<u>Findings</u>		Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)
<u>Mount Dora High School (#0181)</u> (Continued)		
300 Career Education 9-12	(2.2278)	(2.2278)
22. [Ref. 18102] <u>One ESE student in the Hospital and Homebound Program was reported for more homebound instruction than was provided. We propose the following adjustment:</u>		
255 ESE Support Level 5	(.0360)	(.0360)
		(2.2638)
<u>Umatilla High School (#0231)</u>		
23. [Ref. 23101] <u>The timecards for seven Career Education 9-12 (OJT) students were not signed by the students' employers. Additionally, we noted that the timecard for one of the students was missing for the February 2012 survey. We propose the following adjustment:</u>		
300 Career Education 9-12	(2.1330)	(2.1330)
24. [Ref. 23102] <u>The timecards for seven Career Education 9-12 (OJT) students were missing and could not be located. We propose the following adjustment:</u>		
300 Career Education 9-12	(2.0356)	(2.0356)
25. [Ref. 23103] <u>Four Career Education 9-12 (OJT) students were reported for more work hours than were supported by the students' timecards. We propose the following adjustment:</u>		
300 Career Education 9-12	(.5417)	(.5417)
		(4.7103)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

**Proposed Net
 Adjustments
 (Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Oak Park Middle School (#0251)

26. [Ref. 25101] An ELL Committee did not convene to consider one student’s extended ESOL placement for a fourth year. We also noted that the student’s English proficiency was not assessed within 30 school days prior to the student’s fourth year ESOL anniversary date. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.3704	
130 ESOL	<u>(.3704)</u>	.0000

27. [Ref. 25102] The letter notifying parents of one ELL student’s placement in the ESOL Program was not dated and we could not otherwise determine whether the notification was made on a timely basis (i.e., prior to the reporting survey). We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.4810	
130 ESOL	<u>(.4810)</u>	.0000

28. [Ref. 25103] There was no evidence that the *Matrix of Services* forms for two ESE students were reviewed when the students' new IEPs were prepared. We propose the following adjustment:

112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	1.0000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(.5000)</u>	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.5000)</u>	.0000

29. [Ref. 25104] The reported number of homebound instructional minutes for one ESE student in the Hospital and Homebound Program was overstated. The student was reported for 270 instructional minutes but was provided only 180. We propose the following adjustment:

255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.0300)</u>	(.0300)
-------------------------	----------------	---------

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

<u>Findings</u>	<u>Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)</u>	
<u>Oak Park Middle School (#0251)</u> (Continued)		
30. [Ref. 25171] <u>One teacher was not approved by the School Board to teach ESOL out of field. We also noted that the parents of the ELL students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustment:</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	.3928	
130 ESOL	(.3928)	.0000
		(.0300)
<u>Lost Lake Elementary School (#0281)</u>		
31. [Ref. 28101] <u>The IEP or EP for two ESE students was not signed by at least one of the students' General Education teachers to indicate their participation in the development of the students' IEP or EP. We propose the following adjustment:</u>		
101 Basic K-3	1.7652	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	(1.7652)	.0000
32. [Ref. 28102] <u>The ELL Student Plans for two ESOL students did not include the students' instructional schedules. We also noted that one of the student's English language proficiency was not assessed within 30 school days prior to the student's fourth year ESOL anniversary date. We propose the following adjustment:</u>		
101 Basic K-3	1.8000	
130 ESOL	(1.8000)	.0000
33. [Ref. 28171/72] <u>Two teachers were not approved by the School Board to teach ESOL out of field. We also noted that the parents of the ELL students were not notified of the teachers' out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustments:</u>		

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

<u>Findings</u>		Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)
<u>Lost Lake Elementary School (#0281)</u> (Continued)		
<u>Ref. 28171</u>		
101 Basic K-3	1.4472	
130 ESOL	(1.4472)	.0000
 <u>Ref. 28172</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	.2412	
130 ESOL	(.2412)	.0000
		<u>.0000</u>
 <u>Groveland Elementary School (#0382)</u>		
34.	<u>[Ref. 38201] The IEP for one ESE student was not signed by at least one of the student's General Education teachers to indicate their participation in the development of the student's IEP. We propose the following adjustment:</u>	
101 Basic K-3	.5000	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	(.5000)	.0000
35.	<u>[Ref. 38202] There was no evidence that the Matrix of Services form for one ESE student was reviewed when the student's new IEP was prepared. We propose the following adjustment:</u>	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.5000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.5000)	.0000
36.	<u>[Ref. 38203/04] The ELL Student Plans for 12 ESOL students did not include the students' instructional schedules. We propose the following adjustment:</u>	
<u>Ref. 38203</u>		
101 Basic K-3	10.0002	
130 ESOL	(10.0002)	.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

<u>Findings</u>	<u>Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)</u>
<u>Groveland Elementary School (#0382)</u> (Continued)	
Ref. 38204	
101 Basic K-3	.4551
130 ESOL	(.4551)
	.0000
37. [Ref. 38271] <u>The newsletter that notified parents of one teacher's out-of-field status was dated November 2011, which was after the October 2011 survey. We propose the following adjustment:</u>	
102 Basic 4-8	.2634
130 ESOL	(.2634)
	.0000
	.0000
<u>Windy Hill Middle School (#0481)</u>	
38. [Ref. 48101] <u>The EPs for three ESE students were not signed by at least one of the students' General Education teachers to indicate their participation in the development of the students' EPs. We propose the following adjustment:</u>	
102 Basic 4-8	3.0000
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	(3.0000)
	.0000
39. [Ref. 48102] <u>The file for one ELL student did not contain any assessment documentation to support the student's placement in the ESOL Program. We propose the following adjustment:</u>	
102 Basic 4-8	.7268
130 ESOL	(.7268)
	.0000
40. [Ref. 48103] <u>The ELL Student Plan for one ESOL student was incomplete as the Plan did not include the student's instructional schedule. We propose the following adjustment:</u>	

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)	
Windy Hill Middle School (#0481) (Continued)		
102 Basic 4-8	.7000	
130 ESOL	(.7000)	.0000
41. [Ref. 48104] <u>The files for two ELL students were missing and could not be located. We propose the following adjustment:</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	1.2068	
130 ESOL	(1.2068)	.0000
42. [Ref. 48105] <u>An ELL Committee did not convene to consider one student's extended ESOL placement for a sixth year. We also noted that the student's English proficiency was not assessed within 30 school days prior to the student's ESOL anniversary date. We propose the following adjustment:</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	.4034	
130 ESOL	(.4034)	.0000
43. [Ref. 48106] <u>We noted the following exceptions involving the Matrix of Services forms for three ESE students:</u>		
a. <u>There was no evidence that the Matrix of Services forms for two ESE students were reviewed when the students' new IEPs were prepared.</u>		
b. <u>The August 27, 2008, Matrix of Services form for one student had expired prior to the October 2011 survey. Another Matrix of Services form was prepared on November 29, 2011, which was after the October 2011 survey, and did not have any evidence of review when the student's December 6, 2011, IEP was prepared. Additionally, this Matrix of Services form supported reporting in Program No. 112 (Grades 4-8 with ESE Services); however, the student was reported in Program No. 254 (ESE Support Level 4) in the February 2012 survey.</u>		

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)	
<u>Windy Hill Middle School (#0481)</u> (Continued)		
We propose the following adjustment:		
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	2.5000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(2.5000)</u>	.0000
44. [Ref. 48171] <u>One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by the School Board to teach out of field. The teacher held certification in Spanish and Business Education but taught a course which required certification in Reading. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustment:</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	4.9500	
130 ESOL	<u>(4.9500)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>.0000</u>
<u>Lake Hills School (#0533)</u>		
45. [Ref. 53301] <u>The reported number of homebound instructional minutes for one ESE student in the Hospital and Homebound Program was overstated. The student was reported for 150 homebound instructional minutes; however, the student was only provided 15 minutes of such instruction. We propose the following adjustment:</u>		
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.0450)</u>	<u>(.0450)</u>
		<u>(.0450)</u>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

**Proposed Net
 Adjustments
 (Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Umatilla Elementary School (#0561)

46. [Ref. 56101] The file for one ELL student did not contain adequate documentation to support the student's initial ESOL placement. The second-grade student was assessed as FES. We noted that an ELL Committee convened but did not document at least two of the five ESOL placement criteria specified in State Board of Education Rule 6A-6.0902(2)(a)3., FAC, when recommending the student's ESOL placement. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.9600	
130 ESOL	(.9600)	.0000
		<u>.0000</u>

Cypress Ridge Elementary School (#0597)

47. [Ref. 59701] The EPs for three ESE students were not signed by at least one of the students' General Education teachers (1 student) or Gifted teacher (2 students) to indicate their participation in the development of the students' EPs. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.7652	
102 Basic 4-8	2.0000	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	(.7652)	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	(2.0000)	.0000
		<u>.0000</u>

East Ridge High School (#0801)

48. [Ref. 80101] The file for one ESE student did not contain an EP covering the 2011-12 school year. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.4350	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(.4350)	.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

<u>Findings</u>	<u>Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)</u>
East Ridge High School (#0801) (Continued)	
49. [Ref. 80102] <u>The EP for one ESE student was not signed by at least one of the student's General Education teachers to indicate their participation in the development of the student's EP. We propose the following adjustment:</u>	
103 Basic 9-12	1.0000
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(1.0000)
	.0000
50. [Ref. 80103] <u>The ELL Student Plans for two ESOL students were not reviewed and updated prior to the October 2011 survey. Additionally, the file for one of these students did not contain English language assessment documentation to support the student's extended ESOL placement for a fifth year or written parental notification of the student's ESOL placement. We propose the following adjustment:</u>	
103 Basic 9-12	.8700
130 ESOL	(.8700)
	.0000
51. [Ref. 80104] <u>The ELL Student Plans for three ESOL students were not reviewed and updated until after the October 2011 survey. We propose the following adjustment:</u>	
103 Basic 9-12	1.3700
130 ESOL	(1.3700)
	.0000
52. [Ref. 80105] <u>An ELL Committee did not convene to consider one student's extended ESOL placement for a fourth year. We also noted that the student's English proficiency was not assessed within 30 school days prior to the student's ESOL anniversary date. We propose the following adjustment:</u>	
103 Basic 9-12	.4350
130 ESOL	(.4350)
	.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

**Proposed Net
 Adjustments
 (Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

East Ridge High School (#0801) (Continued)

53. [Ref. 80106] Two ELL students were beyond the maximum six-year period allowed for State funding of ESOL. We also noted that the ELL Student Plan for one student was not prepared until after the October 2011 survey. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	1.3700	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.3700)</u>	.0000

54. [Ref. 80107] An ELL Committee was not convened to consider one student's extended ESOL placement for a sixth year. We also noted that the student's file did not contain an ELL Student Plan covering the 2011-12 school year. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.8700	
130 ESOL	<u>(.8700)</u>	.0000

55. [Ref. 80108] The files for three ELL students did not contain ELL Student Plans covering the 2011-12 school year. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	2.4350	
130 ESOL	<u>(2.4350)</u>	.0000

56. [Ref. 80111] The files for six Career Education 9-12 (OJT) students did not contain timecards to support the students' reported work time in OJT. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.3900)</u>	(.3900)
---------------------------	----------------	---------

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

**Proposed Net
 Adjustments
 (Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

East Ridge High School (#0801) (Continued)

57. [Ref. 80172/73] Two teachers were not approved by the School Board to teach ESOL out of field. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teachers' out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustments:

<u>Ref. 80172</u>		
103 Basic 9-12	.3550	
130 ESOL	<u>(.3550)</u>	.0000
<u>Ref. 80173</u>		
103 Basic 9-12	1.6375	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.6375)</u>	.0000
		<u>(.3900)</u>

Lake Minneola High School (#0901)

58. [Ref. 90171] One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by the School Board to teach out of field. The teacher held a District-issued certificate in Industrial Arts Technology Education but taught a course that required a State-issued certificate in Technology Education. We present this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustment.

.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

**Proposed Net
 Adjustments
 (Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Lake Minneola High School (#0901) (Continued)

59. [Ref. 90101] The files for five ELL students did not contain *ELL Student Plans* covering the 2011-12 school year. We also noted that ELL Committees were not convened to consider four of the students' extended ESOL placements for a fourth or fifth year. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	1.8850	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.8850)</u>	.0000

60. [Ref. 90102] There was no evidence that the *Matrix of Services* forms for two ESE students had been reviewed when the students' new IEPs were prepared. We propose the following adjustment:

113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	1.0000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(1.0000)</u>	.0000

61. [Ref. 90105] One ESE student was not in attendance during the 11-day window of the reporting survey and should not have been included with the survey's results. We also noted that there was no evidence that the *Matrix of Services* form for this student had been reviewed when the student's new IEP was prepared in May 2011. We propose the following adjustment:

254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(.5000)</u>	<u>(.5000)</u>
		<u>(.5000)</u>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

**Proposed Net
 Adjustments
 (Unweighted FTE)**

Findings**Alee Academy Charter School (#9018)**

62. [Ref. 901871/72] Two teachers were not properly certified and were not approved by the School Board to teach out of field. The teachers held certification in Math and Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum (Ref. 901871) or Educational Leadership (Ref. 901872) but taught courses which also required a Teacher Cooperative Work Experience Endorsement. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teachers' out-of-field status. We present this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustments.

.0000

63. [Ref. 901801] We were unable to verify the attendance of the students reported at this school (11 were in our Basic sample, 4 were in our Basic with ESE Services sample and 16 were in our Career Education 9-12 [OJT] sample). We noted that an attendance Excel spreadsheet was prepared by the Director. The school contends that the Excel spreadsheet was its electronic attendance recordkeeping system; however, an electronic attendance recordkeeping system requires teachers to enter their attendance directly into the computer. This was not the case at the school as the attendance was entered by one person at the school. Additionally, attendance recordkeeping via an Excel spreadsheet does not comply with the electronic recordkeeping procedures outlined in the Department of Education's *Automated Student Attendance Recordkeeping System Handbook*. The *Handbook* states that the system shall include a sign-on indicator to assure that attendance is being taken regularly and a daily log shall be generated and maintained that will include sufficient information to ascertain when and by whom attendance data was entered, changed, or deleted. In addition, the attendance is required to be taken period by period. We determined that the school was recording attendance manually and subsequently entering this information into an Excel spreadsheet.

(Finding Continues on Next Page)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Alee Academy Charter School (#9018) (Continued)

Whether an electronic or manual attendance recordkeeping system is used, documentation should include information as to when and by whom attendance was entered, changed, or deleted. In a manual attendance recordkeeping system, the teachers' actual signed manual attendance records meet this documentation requirement; however, the school could not provide, upon audit inquiry, any of the teachers' manual attendance records. The only support for student attendance provided to us was one grade book for one teacher that did not indicate the dates of any of the assignments. We noted that the course schedules of the students also included an on-line course component that could document the students' attendance activity for a given period or day (on-line coursework using the A+ Learning System). We inquired and requested data from the A+ Learning System (courses taken on the computer); however, the school was unable to provide any documentation of the on-line coursework, such as student assignment history, grades, or transcripts. We also noted that there were no student timecards to support the instructional time reported in Career Education 9-12 (OJT).

As a result, we were unable to validate any source record of attendance to corroborate what was included in the aforementioned Excel spreadsheet. Accordingly, we propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	(206.2002)	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(58.0000)	
300 Career Education 9-12	(14.2998)	(278.5000)
		(278.5000)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE D (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

**Proposed Net
 Adjustments
 (Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Milestones Community Charter School (#9029)

64. [Ref. 902901] During the review of our sample students, we noted the following exceptions involving the attendance or membership of seven students that were reported but were not in our sample:

- a. The enrollment records for four students indicated that the students were enrolled during the entire school year; however, the students' original attendance cards were missing. In their absence, we reviewed the teachers' grade books and determined that the last date for which the students were graded was before the October 2011 survey for two students and before the February 2012 survey for two students.
- b. One student was not enrolled during the school year.
- c. One student was not officially withdrawn until January 4, 2012; however, the student's records were requested by another school district on October 4, 2011, before the October 2011 survey.
- d. The teacher's grade book for one student indicated that the student was withdrawn by January 5, 2012, which was prior to the February 2012 survey.

We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	(2.0000)	
102 Basic 4-8	(2.0000)	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	(.5000)	(4.5000)
		(4.5000)

Proposed Net Adjustment (290.9793)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE E

Lake 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, 2012

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) written policies and procedures are established for the daily inputting of student attendance activity via an electronic or manual system and the retention of all supporting records (specifically those records that document the attendance activity taken by substitutes and the individual student sign in and sign out of students coming in late and leaving early); (2) there is proper monitoring of the attendance data to ensure that all teachers have taken attendance and in a timely manner; (3) only students who are in membership and attendance at least 1 of the 11 days of a survey window are reported with the survey's results and attendance records are retained to support that reporting; (4) ELL students are not reported for more than the six-year period allowed for State funding of ESOL; (5) *ELL Student Plans* are reviewed, timely updated, and properly maintained in the students' files; (6) parents are timely notified of their child's ESOL placement; (7) English language proficiency of students being considered for extension of their ESOL placements (beyond the initial three-year base period) is assessed within the 30 school days prior to the individual student's ESOL anniversary date and ELL Committees are convened subsequent to these assessments but no later than the individual student's ESOL anniversary date; (8) ELL Committees adequately document the criteria considered when recommending students for extended ESOL placements in accordance with Rule 6A-6.09022, FAC; (9) *ELL Student Plans* are complete, including the students' instructional schedules; (10) students in Career Education 9-12 (OJT) are reported in accordance with timecards that are accurately completed, signed, and retained in readily-accessible files; (11) IEPs and EPs are complete and timely prepared, (12) students are reported in accordance with the students' *Matrix of Services* forms that are timely prepared; (13) there is evidence of review of the *Matrix of Services* forms to ensure that the forms accurately and currently reflect the IEP services in effect during the reporting survey; (14) all required participants are involved in the development of students' IEPs and EPs and documentation of this participation is maintained in the students' files; (15) reported FTE for students in the Hospital and Homebound Program is based on the homebound instructors' contact logs; (16) teachers are either properly certified, or if out of field, are timely approved to teach out of field by the School Board; (17) parents are appropriately notified of the teachers' out-of-field status; (18) students' files contain proper assessment documentation to support each student's placement in the ESOL Program; and (19) files, including grade and attendance documentation, are retained and placed in secure locations.

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE E (Continued)

Lake 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, 2012

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, FS Minimum Requirements of the Florida Education Finance Program
 Section 1011.61, FS Definitions
 Section 1011.62, FS Funds for Operation of Schools
 Rule 6A-1.0451, FAC Florida Education Finance Program Student Membership Surveys
 Rule 6A-1.04513, FAC Maintaining Auditable FTE Records

FTE General Instructions 2011-12

Attendance

- Section 1003.23, FS Attendance Records and Reports
 Rules 6A-1.044(3) and (6)(c), FAC Pupil Attendance Records
 Rule 6A-1.04513, FAC Maintaining Auditable FTE Records

FTE General Instructions 2011-12

Comprehensive Management Information System: Automated Student Attendance Recordkeeping System

English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)

- Section 1003.56, FS English Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient Students
 Section 1011.62(1)(g), FS Education for Speakers of Other Languages
 Rule 6A-6.0901, FAC Definitions Which Apply to Programs for English Language Learners
 Rule 6A-6.0902, FAC Requirements for Identification, Eligibility Programmatic and Annual Assessments of English Language Learners
 Rule 6A-6.0903, FAC Requirement for Classification, Reclassification, and Post Reclassification of English Language Learners
 Rule 6A-6.0904, FAC Equal Access to Appropriate Instruction for English Language Learners
 Rule 6A-6.09022, FAC Extension of Services in English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Program

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE E (Continued)

Lake 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, 2012

REGULATORY CITATIONS (Continued)

Career Education On-the-Job Attendance

Rule 6A-1.044(6)(c), FAC Pupil Attendance Records

Career Education On-the-Job Funding Hours

Rule 6A-6.055(3), FAC Definitions of Terms Used in Vocational Education and Adult Programs
FTE General Instructions 2011-12

Exceptional Education

Section 1003.57, FS Exceptional Students Instruction

Section 1011.62, FS Funds for Operation of Schools

Section 1011.62(1)(e), FS Funding Model for Exceptional Student Education Programs

Rule 6A-6.03028, FAC Provision of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) and
Development of Individual Educational Plans for Students with
Disabilities

Rule 6A-6.03029, FAC Development of Family Support Plans for Children with Disabilities
Ages Birth Through Five Years

Rule 6A-6.0312, FAC Course Modifications for Exceptional Students

Rule 6A-6.0331, FAC General Education Intervention Procedures, Identification, Evaluation,
Reevaluation and the Initial Provision of Exceptional Education Services

Rule 6A-6.0334, FAC Individual Educational Plans (IEPs) and Educational Plans (EPs) for
Transferring Exceptional Students

Rule 6A-6.03411, FAC Definitions, ESE Policies and Procedures, and ESE Administrators
Matrix of Services Handbook (2004 Revised Edition)

Teacher Certification

Section 1012.42(2), FS Teacher Teaching Out-of-Field; Notification Requirements

Section 1012.55, FS Positions for Which Certificates Required

Rule 6A-1.0502, FAC Non-certificated Instructional Personnel

Rule 6A-1.0503, FAC Definition of Qualified Instructional Personnel

Rule 6A-4.001, FAC Instructional Personnel Certification

Rule 6A-6.0907, FAC Inservice Requirements for Personnel of Limited English Proficient
Students

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

Lake County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
NOTES TO SCHEDULES
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

NOTE A – SUMMARY

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

1. School District of Lake County

The District was established pursuant to Section 1001.30, Florida Statutes, to provide public educational services for the residents of Lake County, Florida. Those services are provided primarily to prekindergarten through twelfth grade students and to adults seeking career education-type training. The District is part of the State system of public education under the general direction and control of the State Board of Education. The geographic boundaries of the District are those of Lake County.

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012, the District operated 55 schools serving prekindergarten through twelfth grade students, reported 40,563.12 unweighted FTE, and received approximately \$99 million in State funding through FEFP. 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 to serve prekindergarten through twelfth grade students (adult education is not funded by FEFP). FEFP was established by the Florida Legislature in 1973 to guarantee to each student in the Florida public school system the availability of programs and services appropriate to the student's 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.

Lake County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
NOTES TO SCHEDULES
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

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 prekindergarten through third grade, one FTE is defined as one student in membership in a program or a group of programs for 20 hours per week for 180 days; for grade levels four through twelve, one FTE is defined as one student in membership in a program or a group of programs for 25 hours per week for 180 days.

4. Calculation of FEFP Funds

The amount of State and local FEFP funds is calculated by the Department of Education by multiplying the number of unweighted FTE in each educational program by the specific cost factor of each program to obtain weighted FTEs. Weighted FTEs are multiplied by the base student allocation amount and that product is multiplied by the appropriate cost differential factor. Various adjustments are then added to 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. FTE Surveys

FTE is determined and reported during the school year by means of four FTE membership surveys that 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 2011-12 school year were conducted during and for the following weeks: survey one was performed for July 11 through 15, 2011; survey two was performed for October 10 through 14, 2011; survey three was performed for February 13 through 17, 2012; and survey four was performed for June 11 through 15, 2012.

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
NOTES TO SCHEDULES
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

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) ESOL, (3) ESE, and (4) Career Education 9-12.

7. Statutes and Rules

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

Chapter 1000, FSK-20 General Provisions
Chapter 1001, FSK-20 Governance
Chapter 1002, FSStudent and Parental Rights and Educational Choices
Chapter 1003, FSPublic K-12 Education
Chapter 1006, FSSupport for Learning
Chapter 1007, FSArticulation and Access
Chapter 1010, FSFinancial Matters
Chapter 1011, FSPlanning and Budgeting
Chapter 1012, FSPersonnel
Chapter 6A-1, FACFinance and Administration
Chapter 6A-4, FACCertification
Chapter 6A-6, FACSpecial Programs I

NOTE B - SAMPLING

Our examination procedures provided for the selection of samples of schools, students, and teachers using judgmental methods for testing FTE reported to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012. 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:

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
NOTES TO SCHEDULES
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

NOTE B - SAMPLING (Continued)

<u>School Name/Description</u>	<u>Finding Number(s)</u>
District-Wide – Attendance Policies and Procedures	1
1. Beverly Shores Elementary School	2 through 4
2. Clermont Elementary School	5
3. Grassy Lake Elementary School	6 through 8
4. East Ridge Middle School	9 through 13
5. Cecil A. Gray Middle School	14 through 17
6. Round Lake Elementary School*	18 through 20
7. Mount Dora High School	21 and 22
8. Umatilla High School	23 through 25
9. Oak Park Middle School	26 through 30
10. Lost Lake Elementary School	31 through 33
11. Groveland Elementary School	34 through 37
12. Windy Hill Middle School	38 through 44
13. Lake Hills School	45
14. Lake Academy Eustis	NA
15. Umatilla Elementary School	46
16. Cypress Ridge Elementary School	47
17. East Ridge High School	48 through 57
18. Lake Minneola High School	58 through 61
19. Alee Academy Charter School*	62 and 63
20. Milestones Community Charter School*	64

* Charter School



DAVID W. MARTIN, CPA
AUDITOR GENERAL

AUDITOR GENERAL STATE OF FLORIDA

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



PHONE: 850-412-2722
FAX: 850-488-6975

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

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT LAKE COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD FLORIDA EDUCATION FINANCE PROGRAM (FEFP) STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

We have examined management's assertion, included in its representation letter dated February 15, 2013, that the Lake 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, 2012. 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 2011-2012* 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: 68 of the 446 students in our sample had exceptions involving their reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding. (See SCHEDULE G, Finding Nos. 4 through 10.)

In our opinion, except for the material noncompliance mentioned above involving their reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding, the Lake 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, 2012.

The results of our examination disclosed other noncompliance with the State requirements mentioned above. We considered this other noncompliance in forming our opinion regarding the District's compliance 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 SCHEDULES F and 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 their reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding. 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 SCHEDULES F and G.

¹ *A control deficiency 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 significant deficiency 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 material weakness 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.*

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)(c), 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
October 16, 2013

SCHEDULE F

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Student Transportation
POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND TEST RESULTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Any student who is transported by the District must meet one or more of the following conditions in order to be eligible for State transportation funding: live two or more miles from school, be physically handicapped, be a Career Education 9-12 or an ESE student who is transported from one school center to another where appropriate programs are provided, or be on a route that meets the criteria for hazardous walking conditions specified in Section 1006.23(4), Florida Statutes. (See NOTE A1.)

As part of our examination procedures, we sampled students for testing the number of students transported as reported to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012. (See NOTE B.) The population of vehicles (679) consisted of the total of the numbers of vehicles reported by the District for each survey. For example, a vehicle that transported students during the July and October 2011 and February and June 2012 surveys would be counted in the population as four vehicles. Similarly, the population of students (36,931) consisted of the total numbers of students reported by the District as having been transported for each survey. (See NOTE A2.) The District reported students in the following ridership categories:

<u>Ridership Category</u>	<u>Number of Students Transported</u>
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	1,976
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	81
IDEA (PK), Weighted	338
Teenage Parents and Infants	75
Hazardous Walking	272
Two Miles or More	33,692
Center to Center (CTE and Dual Enrollment)	<u>497</u>
Total	<u>36,931</u>

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

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE F (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Student Transportation
POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND TEST RESULTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Our examination results are summarized below:

<u>Description</u>	<u>Buses</u>	<u>Students</u>	
	Proposed Net <u>Adjustment</u>	With Exceptions	Proposed Net <u>Adjustment</u>
We noted that the reported number of buses in operation was overstated.	(10)		
We sampled 446 of the 36,931 students reported as being transported by the District.		68	(37)
We also noted certain issues in conjunction with our general tests of student transportation that resulted in the addition of 7 students.	—	<u>7</u>	<u>(6)</u>
Total	<u>(10)</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>(43)</u>

Our proposed net adjustment presents the net effect of noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures. (See SCHEDULE G.)

The ultimate resolution of our proposed net adjustment and the computation of its financial impact is the responsibility of the Department of Education.

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE G

Lake County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Student Transportation
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

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 2011-2012 issued by the Department of Education. Except for the material noncompliance involving their reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding, the Lake 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, 2012. All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed below and requires management's attention and action, as recommended on page 53.

Students
Transported
Proposed Net
Adjustments

Findings

Our examination procedures included both general tests and detailed tests. Our general tests included inquiries concerning the District's transportation of students and verification that a bus driver's report existed for each bus reported in a survey. Our detailed tests involved verification of the specific ridership categories reported for students sampled from the July and October 2011 surveys and the February and June 2012 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 2011 survey and once for the February 2012 survey) will be presented in our Findings as two sample students.

- 1. [Ref. 51] The District's reported number of buses in operation was overstated by ten buses. We propose the following adjustments:

Table with 3 columns: Survey Name, Current Value, Proposed Value. Rows include July 2011 Survey (1), October 2011 Survey (2), and February 2012 Survey (7, 10).

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE G (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Student Transportation
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

**Students
 Transported
 Proposed Net
 Adjustments**

Findings

2. [Ref. 58] Our general tests disclosed that seven students were reported in ridership categories that were not appropriate for the students' grade levels. Six PK students were reported in the Two Miles or More ridership category; however, the students were enrolled in a Voluntary PK Program and should not have been reported for State transportation funding. One fourth grade student was reported in the IDEA (PK), Weighted ridership category, but should have been reported in the IDEA (K-12), Weighted ridership category. We propose the following adjustments:

July 2011 Survey

12 Days in Term

IDEA (K-12), Weighted	1	
IDEA (PK), Weighted	(1)	

October 2011 Survey

90 Days in Term

Two Miles or More	(1)	
-------------------	-----	--

February 2012 Survey

90 Days in Term

Two Miles or More	(5)	(6)
-------------------	-----	-----

3. [Ref. 60] The number of days in term reported for 39 students were understated. We noted that 37 students were reported for 72 days in term and 2 students were reported for 7 days in term but should have been reported for 90 or 8 days in term, respectively. We propose the following adjustment:

October 2011 Survey

90 Days in Term

Two Miles or More	5	
-------------------	---	--

72 Days in Term

Two Miles or More	(5)	
-------------------	-----	--

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE G (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Student Transportation
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

<u>Findings</u>	<u>Students Transported</u>	<u>Proposed Net Adjustments</u>
<u>February 2012 Survey</u>		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	3	
Two Miles or More	29	
<u>72 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(3)	
Two Miles or More	(29)	
<u>June 2012 Survey</u>		
<u>8 Days in Term</u>		
Two Miles or More	2	
<u>7 Days in Term</u>		
Two Miles or More	(2)	0
4. <u>[Ref. 52] The bus drivers' reports for 18 of our sampled students indicated that the students were not transported during the 11-day survey window. We also noted 9 of these students were reported in the Center to Center (CTE and Dual Enrollment) ridership category; however, we found no documentation supporting that the students were enrolled in another center. We propose the following adjustments:</u>		
<u>July 2011 Survey</u>		
<u>12 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(2)	
IDEA (PK), Weighted	(1)	
Two Miles or More	(1)	
<u>October 2011 Survey</u>		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
Center to Center (CTE and Dual Enrollment)	(1)	
<u>February 2012 Survey</u>		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(1)	
Two Miles or More	(1)	
Center to Center (CTE and Dual Enrollment)	(11)	(18)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE G (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Student Transportation
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

<u>Findings</u>	<u>Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments</u>
5. [Ref. 53] <u>Two students in our sample were not enrolled in school during the reporting survey and should not have been reported for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustments:</u>	
<u>October 2011 Survey</u>	
<u>90 Days in Term</u>	
Hazardous Walking	(1)
<u>February 2012 Survey</u>	
<u>90 Days in Term</u>	
Two Miles or More	(1) (2)
6. [Ref. 54] <u>Seven students in our sample were incorrectly reported in the Two Miles or More ridership category. The students lived less than two miles from their assigned schools and were not otherwise eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustments:</u>	
<u>July 2011 Survey</u>	
<u>12 Days in Term</u>	
Two Miles or More	(2)
<u>February 2012 Survey</u>	
<u>90 Days in Term</u>	
Two Miles or More	(1)
<u>June 2012 Survey</u>	
<u>8 Days in Term</u>	
Two Miles or More	(4) (7)
7. [Ref. 55] <u>Sixteen students in our sample were incorrectly reported in the IDEA (K-12), Unweighted (15 students) or Teenage Parents and Infants (1 student) ridership category. The students lived two miles or more from their assigned schools and should have been reported in the Two Miles or More ridership category. We propose the following adjustments:</u>	

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE G (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Student Transportation
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

<u>Findings</u>	<u>Students Transported</u>	<u>Proposed Net Adjustments</u>
<u>October 2011 Survey</u>		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(8)	
Teenage Parents and Infants	(1)	
Two Miles or More	9	
<u>February 2012 Survey</u>		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(6)	
Two Miles or More	6	
<u>June 2012 Survey</u>		
<u>8 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(1)	
Two Miles or More	<u>1</u>	0

8. [Ref. 56] Four students in our sample were incorrectly reported in the IDEA (K-12), Unweighted ridership category. The students were enrolled in a Speech Impaired or Specific Learning Disabilities ESE Program and their IEPs did not authorize transportation services. Consequently, the students should not have been reported in that ridership category and were not otherwise eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustments:

<u>October 2011 Survey</u>		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(2)	
<u>February 2012 Survey</u>		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	<u>(2)</u>	(4)

9. [Ref. 57] Six students in our sample were incorrectly reported in the Center to Center (CTE and Dual Enrollment) ridership category. The students were not enrolled in another center and were not otherwise eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustment:

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE G (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Student Transportation
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

<u>Findings</u>	<u>Students Transported</u>	<u>Proposed Net Adjustments</u>
<u>October 2011 Survey</u>		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
Center to Center (CTE and Dual Enrollment)	(6)	(6)
<p>10. [Ref. 59] <u>Fifteen students in our sample were incorrectly reported in the IDEA (K-12), Weighted ridership category. The students' IEPs did not indicate that the students met at least one of the five criteria required for reporting in an IDEA-Weighted ridership category. We determined that 12 of the students were eligible for reporting in the Two Miles or More ridership category and 3 students were eligible for reporting in the IDEA (K-12), Unweighted ridership category. We propose the following adjustments:</u></p>		
<u>July 2011 Survey</u>		
<u>12 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(1)	
Two Miles or More	1	
<u>4 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(1)	
Two Miles or More	1	
<u>October 2011 Survey</u>		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(7)	
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	2	
Two Miles or More	5	
<u>February 2012 Survey</u>		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(4)	
Two Miles or More	4	

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE G (Continued)

Lake County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Student Transportation
FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

<u>Findings</u>	<u>Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments</u>
<u>June 2012 Survey</u>	
<u>8 Days in Term</u>	
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(2)
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	1
Two Miles or More	<u>1</u>
Proposed Net Adjustment	<u>(4)</u>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

SCHEDULE H

Lake County District School Board
 Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
 Student Transportation

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) the number of buses in operation and the number of days in term are accurately reported; (2) students are reported in the correct ridership category and have documentation to support that reporting; (3) students are reported only if they were enrolled in school during the survey week and were transported at least 1 day during the 11-day survey window as evidenced by the supporting bus drivers' reports; (4) 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; (5) students reported in IDEA-Weighted ridership categories are appropriately documented as meeting one of the five criteria as noted on the students' IEPs; (6) only PK students with disabilities or PK children of students enrolled in a Teenage Parents and Infants Program are reported for State transportation funding; and (7) IEPs are verified for students in the Speech Impaired, Language Impaired, or Specific Learning Disabled to ensure that transportation services are authorized prior to reporting those students in the IDEA-Unweighted ridership category.

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

REGULATORY CITATIONS

Chapter 1006, Part I, E., FSTransportation of Public K-12 Students

Section 1011.68, FSFunds for Student Transportation

Chapter 6A-3, FACTransportation

Student Transportation General Instructions 2011-2012

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

Lake County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Student Transportation
NOTES TO SCHEDULES
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

NOTE A – SUMMARY

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

1. Student Eligibility

Any student who is transported by bus must meet one or more of the following conditions in order to be eligible for State transportation funding: live two or more miles from school, be physically handicapped, be a Career Education 9-12 or an ESE student who is transported from one school center to another where appropriate programs are provided, or be on a route that meets the criteria for hazardous walking conditions specified in Section 1006.23(4), Florida Statutes.

2. Transportation in Lake County

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012, the District received approximately \$7.7 million for student transportation as part of the State funding through FEFP. The District’s transportation reporting by survey was as follows:

<u>Survey Period</u>	<u>Number of Vehicles</u>	<u>Number of Students</u>
July 2011	48	455
October 2011	290	17,870
February 2012	297	18,166
June 2012	<u>44</u>	<u>440</u>
Total	<u>679</u>	<u>36,931</u>

3. Statutes and Rules

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

- Chapter 1006, Part I, E., FS Transportation of Public K-12 Students
- Section 1011.68, FS Funds for Student Transportation
- Chapter 6A-3, FAC Transportation

Lake County District School Board
Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)
Student Transportation
NOTES TO SCHEDULES
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

NOTE B – SAMPLING

Our examination procedures provided for the selection of samples of buses and students using judgmental methods for testing the number of students transported as reported to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012. 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



Leading our Students to Success

201 West Burleigh Boulevard • Tavares • FL 32778-2496
(352) 253-6500 • Fax: (352) 253-6503 • www.lake.k12.fl.us

<i>Superintendent:</i>	<i>School Board Members:</i>
Susan Moxley, Ed.D	<i>District 1</i>
	Bill Mathias
	<i>District 2</i>
	Rosanne Brandenburg
	<i>District 3</i>
	Tod Howard
	<i>District 4</i>
	Debbie Stivender
	<i>District 5</i>
	Kyleen Fischer

October 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Martin:

The preliminary and tentative findings for the Examination of the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students and Student transportation for the fiscal year ended June 20, 2012 for Lake County Schools have been reviewed. The District concurs in general with the findings.

Management continues to review our processes and procedures to ensure that full-time equivalent (FTE) student reporting is complete and accurate. Corrective action to address deficiencies noted in the reporting of and preparation and maintenance of supporting documentation for students in English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Support levels 4 and 5, and Career Education (9-12) On The Job (OJT) programs will continue to be implemented and evaluated.

Transportation reporting has improved significantly from the prior audit. However, we continue to recognize the important of reporting accuracy in; (1) the ridership category for the number of days in the term, (2) verification of the distance from home to school for students classified as Two Miles or More, and (3) support for the additional ESE transportation funding in the student’s Individual Education Plan (IEP).

Based on prior audit findings, we acknowledge that our most significant area of weakness has been the need to standardize procedures. As a result, the District requested and secured a process audit of the FTE recording reporting procedures from a CPA Firm. Based upon that review, the District then contracted to have our FTE policy and procedures manual reviewed and updated. We believe that this will assist the District in maintaining a more accurate and standardized FTE reporting procedure.

The Alee Academy Charter School does not concur with the specific findings related to their school’s questioned 278.50 unweighted FTE and plans to appeal the finding. As the sponsor for Alee Academy Charter School, the District is not responsible for the management or

**EXHIBIT A (CONTINUED)
MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE**

October 16, 2013
Page 2 of 2

recordkeeping of the Charter School. The District will work to facilitate the Charter School's request to appeal the findings in accordance with State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.0453(5). We would like to thank your staff for the manner in which the audit was conducted. We look to the audit process as a valuable tool in our continuous improvement of all areas of the school district.

Sincerely,



Dr. Susan Moxley, Superintendent
Lake County Schools



Carol J MacLeod, Chief Financial Officer
Lake County Schools