

**MARION COUNTY
DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD**

Florida Education Finance Program
Full-Time Equivalent Student Enrollment
and
Student Transportation

For the Fiscal Year Ended
June 30, 2017



Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Auditor General

Board Members and Superintendent

During the 2016-17 fiscal year, Dr. Heidi Maier served as Superintendent of Schools from 11-22-16, George D. Tomy served as Superintendent before that date, and the following individuals served as Board members:

	District No.
Nancy Stacy	1
Beth McCall, Vice Chair from 11-22-16	2
Carol Ely through 11-21-16	2
Bobby L. James, Chair through 11-21-16	3
Angie Boynton	4
Kelly King, Chair from 11-22-16, Vice Chair through 11-21-16	5

The team leader was Jennifer Taylor, CPA, and the examination was supervised by Aileen B. Peterson, CPA, CPM.

Please address inquiries regarding this report to J. David Hughes, CPA, Audit Manager, by e-mail at davidhughes@aud.state.fl.us or by telephone at (850) 412-2971.

This report and other reports prepared by the Auditor General are available at:

FLAuditor.gov

Printed copies of our reports may be requested by contacting us at:

State of Florida Auditor General

Claude Pepper Building, Suite G74 • 111 West Madison Street • Tallahassee, FL 32399-1450 • (850) 412-2722

MARION COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page
No.

SUMMARY i

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR’S REPORT ON FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT 1

SCHEDULE A – POPULATIONS, TEST SELECTION, AND TEST RESULTS

 Reported Full-Time Equivalent Student Enrollment 4

 Schools and Students..... 4

 Teachers..... 5

 Proposed Adjustments 5

SCHEDULE B – EFFECT OF PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS ON WEIGHTED FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT 6

SCHEDULE C – PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL 7

SCHEDULE D – FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS

 Overview..... 13

 Findings..... 13

SCHEDULE E – RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS 28

NOTES TO SCHEDULES..... 31

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR’S REPORT ON STUDENT TRANSPORTATION 35

SCHEDULE F – POPULATIONS, TEST SELECTION, AND TEST RESULTS..... 38

SCHEDULE G – FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS

 Overview..... 40

 Findings..... 40

SCHEDULE H – RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS..... 43

NOTES TO SCHEDULES..... 44

MANAGEMENT’S RESPONSE 45

MARION COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CMW	Class Minutes, Weekly
DEUSS	Date Entered United States School
DIT	Days in Term
DOE	Department of Education
ELL	English Language Learner
EP	Educational Plan
ESE	Exceptional Student Education
ESOL	English for Speakers of Other Languages
ESY	Extended School Year
FAC	Florida Administrative Code
FEFP	Florida Education Finance Program
FTE	Full-Time Equivalent
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IEP	Individual Educational Plan
OJT	On-the-Job Training
PK	Prekindergarten
SBE	State Board of Education

SUMMARY

SUMMARY OF ATTESTATION EXAMINATION

Except for the material noncompliance described below involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located for students in Basic, Basic with ESE Services, ESOL, ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 and Career Education 9-12, the Marion County District School Board (District) complied, in all material respects, with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of the full-time equivalent (FTE) student enrollment and student transportation as reported under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017. Specifically, we noted exceptions involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. The table below shows the total number of students included in each of our tests, as well as the number and percentage of students who attended charter schools who were included in our tests. The table also shows the number of students with exceptions in each of our tests, as well as the number and percentage of student with exceptions who attended charter schools.

Program Tested	Number of Students			Number of Students		
	Included in Test	Included in Test Who Attended Charter Schools	Percentage	With Exceptions	With Exceptions Who Attended Charter Schools	Percentage
Basic	223	25	11%	40	-	NA
Basic with ESE Services	187	10	5%	41	-	NA
ESOL	232	9	4%	54	1	2%
ESE Support Levels 4 and 5	117	-	NA	33	-	NA
Career Education 9-12	154	6	4%	92	6	7%
Totals	<u>913</u>	<u>50</u>		<u>260</u>	<u>7</u>	

Noncompliance related to the reported FTE student enrollment resulted in 60 findings. The resulting proposed net adjustment to the District's reported, unweighted FTE totaled negative 77.8903 (76.9959 applicable to District schools other than charter schools and .8944 applicable to charter schools) but has a potential impact on the District's weighted FTE of negative 105.4671 (104.4609 applicable to District schools other than charter schools and 1.0062 applicable to charter schools). Noncompliance related to student transportation resulted in 5 findings and a proposed net adjustment of negative 30 students.

The weighted adjustments to the FTE student enrollment are presented in our report for illustrative purposes only. The weighted adjustments to the FTE student enrollment do not take special program caps and allocation factors into account and are not intended to indicate the weighted FTE used to compute the dollar value of adjustments. That computation is the responsibility of the Department of Education (DOE). However, the gross dollar effect of our proposed adjustments to the FTE may be estimated by multiplying the proposed net weighted adjustments to the FTE student enrollment by the base student allocation amount. The base student allocation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017,

was \$4,160.71 per FTE. For the District, the estimated gross dollar effect of our proposed adjustments to the reported FTE student enrollment is negative \$438,818 (negative 105.4671 times \$4,160.71), of which \$434,632 is applicable to District schools other than charter schools and \$4,186 is applicable to charter schools.

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

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

THE DISTRICT

The District was established pursuant to Section 1001.30, Florida Statutes, to provide public educational services for the residents of Marion County, Florida. Those services are provided primarily to PK through 12th-grade students and to adults seeking career education-type training. The District is part of the State system of public education under the general direction and control of the SBE. The geographic boundaries of the District are those of Marion 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 elected Superintendent of Schools. The District had 56 schools other than charter schools, 4 charter schools, 5 District cost centers, and 2 virtual education cost centers serving PK through 12th-grade students.

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017, State funding totaling \$157.9 million was provided through the FEFP to the District for the District-reported 42,605.65 unweighted FTE as recalibrated, which included 567.65 unweighted FTE as recalibrated for charter schools. The primary sources of funding for the District are funds from the FEFP, local ad valorem taxes, and Federal grants and donations.

FEFP

FTE Student Enrollment

Florida school districts receive State funding through the FEFP to serve PK through 12th-grade students (adult education is not funded by the FEFP). The FEFP was established by the Florida Legislature in 1973 to guarantee to each student in the Florida public school system, including charter schools, the availability of programs and services appropriate to the student's educational needs that are substantially equal to those available to any similar student notwithstanding geographic differences and varying local economic factors. To provide equalization of educational opportunity in Florida, the FEFP formula recognizes: (1) varying local property tax bases, (2) varying program cost factors, (3) district cost differentials, and (4) differences in per-student costs for equivalent educational programs due to sparsity and dispersion of student population.

The funding provided by the FEFP is based on the numbers of individual students participating in particular educational programs. A numerical value is assigned to each student according to the student's hours and days of attendance in those programs. The individual student thus becomes equated to a numerical value known as an unweighted FTE student enrollment. For brick and mortar school students, one student would be reported as 1.0 FTE if the student was enrolled in six courses per day at 50 minutes

per course for the full 180-day school year (i.e., six courses at 50 minutes each per day is 5 hours of class a day or 25 hours per week, which equates to 1.0 FTE). For virtual education students, one student would be reported as 1.0 FTE if the student has successfully completed six courses or credits or the prescribed level of content that counts toward promotion to the next grade. A student who completes less than six credits will be reported as a fraction of an FTE. Half-credit completions will be included in determining an FTE student enrollment. Credits completed by a student in excess of the minimum required for that student for graduation are not eligible for funding.

School districts report all FTE student enrollment regardless of the 1.0 FTE cap. The DOE combines all FTE student enrollment reported for the student by all school districts, including the Florida Virtual School. The DOE then recalibrates all reported FTE student enrollment for each student to 1.0 FTE, if the total reported FTE for the student exceeds 1.0 FTE. The FTE student enrollment reported by the Department of Juvenile Justice for FTE student enrollment earned beyond the 180-day school year is not included in the recalibration to 1.0 FTE.

All FTE student enrollment is capped at 1.0 FTE except for the FTE student enrollment reported by the Department of Juvenile Justice for students beyond the 180-day school year. However, if a student only has FTE student enrollment reported in one survey of the 180-day school year (Survey 2 or Survey 3), the FTE student enrollment reported will be capped at .5000 FTE, even if FTE student enrollment is reported in Survey 1 or Survey 4, with the exception of FTE student enrollment reported by the Department of Juvenile Justice for students beyond the 180-day school year.

Student Transportation

Any student who is transported by the District must meet one or more of the following conditions in order to be eligible for State transportation funding: live 2 or more miles from school, be classified as a student with a disability under the IDEA, be a Career Education 9-12 or an ESE student who is transported from one school center to another where appropriate programs are provided, or be on a route that meets the criteria for hazardous walking conditions specified in Section 1006.23, Florida Statutes. Additionally, Section 1002.33(20)(c), Florida Statutes, provides that the governing board of the charter school may provide transportation through an agreement or contract with the district school board, a private provider, or parents. The charter school and the sponsor shall cooperate in making arrangements that ensure that transportation is not a barrier to equal access for all students residing within a reasonable distance of the charter school as determined in its charter. The District received \$10.2 million for student transportation as part of the State funding through the FEFP.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Auditor General

AUDITOR GENERAL STATE OF FLORIDA

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



Phone: (850) 412-2722
Fax: (850) 488-6975

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

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT

Report on Full-Time Equivalent Student Enrollment

We have examined the Marion County District School Board's (District's) compliance with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of the full-time equivalent (FTE) student enrollment reported under the Florida Education Finance Program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017. 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 2016-17* issued by the Department of Education.

Management's Responsibility for Compliance

District management is responsible for the District's compliance with the aforementioned State requirements, including the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control to prevent, or detect and correct, noncompliance due to fraud or error.

Auditor's Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the District's compliance with State requirements based on our examination. Our examination was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and the standards applicable to attestation engagements contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the examination to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the classification, assignment, and verification of the full-time equivalent student enrollment reported by the District under the Florida Education Finance Program complied with State requirements in all material respects.

An examination involves performing procedures to obtain evidence about whether the District complied with State requirements. The nature, timing, and extent of the procedures selected depend on our judgment, including an assessment of the risks of material noncompliance, whether due to fraud or error. We believe that the evidence we obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a reasonable basis for

our opinion. Our examination does not provide a legal determination on the District's compliance with State requirements. The legal determination of the District's compliance with these requirements is the responsibility of the Department of Education.

An examination by its nature does not include a review of all records and actions of District management and staff and, as a consequence cannot be relied upon to identify all instances of noncompliance, fraud, abuse, or inefficiency. Because of these limitations and the inherent limitations of internal control, an unavoidable risk exists that some material misstatements may not be detected, even though the examination is properly planned and performed in accordance with attestation standards.

Opinion

Our examination disclosed material noncompliance with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of full-time equivalent student enrollment as reported under the Florida Education Finance Program for students in our Basic, Basic with Exceptional Student Education Services, English for Speakers of Other Languages, Exceptional Student Education Support Levels 4 and 5, and Career Education 9-12 tests involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located.

In our opinion, except for the material noncompliance with State requirements described in the preceding paragraph involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located for students in Basic, Basic with Exceptional Student Education Services, English for Speakers of Other Languages, Exceptional Student Education Support Levels 4 and 5, and Career Education 9-12, the Marion County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of the full-time equivalent student enrollment reported under the Florida Education Finance Program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017.

Other Reporting Required by Government Auditing Standards

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we are required to report all deficiencies that are considered to be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses¹ in internal control; fraud and noncompliance with provisions of laws or regulations that have a material effect on the District's compliance with State requirements; and any other instances that warrant the attention of those charged with governance; noncompliance with provisions of contracts or grant agreements, and abuse that has a material effect on the District's compliance with State requirements. We are also required to obtain and report the views of responsible officials concerning the findings, conclusions, and recommendations, as well as any planned corrective actions.

We performed our examination to express an opinion on the District's compliance with State requirements and not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the District's related internal control over compliance with State requirements; accordingly, we express no such opinion. Because of its limited purpose, our

¹ A significant deficiency is a deficiency or a combination of deficiencies in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance. A material weakness is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis.

examination would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. However, the material noncompliance mentioned above is indicative of significant deficiencies considered to be material weaknesses in the District's internal controls related to reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located for students in Basic, Basic with Exceptional Student Education Services, English for Speakers of Other Languages, Exceptional Student Education Support Levels 4 and 5, and Career Education 9-12. Our examination disclosed certain findings that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards* and all findings, along with the views of responsible officials, are described in *SCHEDULE D* and *MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE*, respectively. The impact of this noncompliance with State requirements on the District's reported full-time equivalent student enrollment is presented in *SCHEDULES A, B, C, and D*.

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

Purpose of this Report

Pursuant to Section 11.45(4)(c), Florida Statutes, this report is a public record and its distribution is not limited. Attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants require us to indicate that the purpose of this report is to provide an opinion on the District's compliance with State requirements. Accordingly, this communication is not suitable for any other purpose.

Respectfully submitted,



Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Tallahassee, Florida
November 13, 2018

SCHEDULE A

POPULATIONS, TEST SELECTION, AND TEST RESULTS FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Reported FTE Student Enrollment

The funding provided by the FEFP is based on the numbers of individual students participating in particular educational programs. The FEFP funds ten specific programs that are grouped under the following four general program titles: Basic, ESOL, ESE, and Career Education 9-12. The unweighted FTE represents the FTE prior to the application of the specific cost factor for each program. (See *SCHEDULE B* and NOTE A3., A4., and A5.) For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017, the Marion County District School Board (District) reported to the DOE 42,605.65 unweighted FTE as recalibrated, which included 567.65 unweighted FTE as recalibrated for charter schools, at 56 District schools other than charter schools, 4 charter schools, 5 District cost centers, and 2 virtual education cost centers.

Schools and Students

As part of our examination procedures, we tested the FTE student enrollment reported to the DOE for schools and students for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017. (See NOTE B.) The population of schools (67) consisted of the total number of brick and mortar schools and cost centers in the District that offered courses, including charter schools, as well as the virtual education cost centers in the District that offered virtual instruction in the FEFP-funded programs. The population of students (21,445) consisted of the total number of students in each program at the schools and cost centers in our tests. Our Career Education 9-12 student test data includes only those students who participated in OJT.

We noted the following material noncompliance: exceptions involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located for 40 of the 223 students in our Basic test,² 41 of the 187 students in our Basic with ESE Services test,³ 54 of the 232 students in our ESOL test,⁴ 33 of the 117 students in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 test,⁵ and 92 of the 154 students in our Career Education 9-12 test.⁶ Twenty-five (11 percent) of the students in our Basic test attended charter schools and none of the 40 students with exceptions attended charter schools. Ten (5 percent) of the students in our Basic with ESE Services test attended charter schools and none of the 41 students with exceptions attended charter schools. Nine (4 percent) of the 232 students in our ESOL test attended charter schools and 1 (2 percent) of the 54 students with exceptions attended a charter school. Six (4 percent) of the 154 students in our

² For Basic, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 1, 2, 50, 52, and 53 on *SCHEDULE D*.

³ For Basic with ESE Services, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 1, 3, 4, 6, 25, 33, 35, 46, 51, and 54 on *SCHEDULE D*.

⁴ For ESOL, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 1, 10, 11, 14, 16, 20, 26, 32, 39, 42, 43, 45, and 60 on *SCHEDULE D*.

⁵ For ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 1, 7, 8, 9, 21, 23, 24, 27, 34, 36, 37, 44, 47, 48, 52, 53, 55, and 56 on *SCHEDULE D*.

⁶ For Career Education 9-12, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 1, 12, 13, 17, 18, 28, 29, 30, 38, 40, 41, and 58 on *SCHEDULE D*.

Career Education 9-12 test attended charter schools and all were included in the 92 students with exceptions. None of the students in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 test attended charter schools.

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

<u>Programs</u>	<u>Number of Schools</u>		<u>Number of Students at Schools Tested</u>		<u>Students With Exceptions</u>	<u>Recalibrated Unweighted FTE</u>		<u>Proposed Adjustments</u>
	<u>Population</u>	<u>Test</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Test</u>		<u>Population</u>	<u>Test</u>	
Basic	64	20	15,936	223	40	30,827.0700	172.9748	(31.7339)
Basic with ESE Services	67	21	4,193	187	41	8,752.2700	142.0143	(9.0938)
ESOL	53	17	857	232	54	1,573.6600	164.8085	(13.9181)
ESE Support Levels 4 and 5	30	13	180	117	33	136.8500	69.5938	(8.1670)
Career Education 9-12	12	6	<u>279</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>1,315.8000</u>	<u>36.9546</u>	<u>(14.9775)</u>
All Programs	67	21	<u>21,445</u>	<u>913</u>	<u>260</u>	<u>42,605.6500</u>	<u>586.3460</u>	<u>(77.8903)</u>

Teachers

We also tested teacher qualifications as part of our examination procedures. (See NOTE B.) Specifically, the population of teachers (687, of which 666 are applicable to District schools other than charter schools and 21 are applicable to charter schools) consisted of the total number of teachers at schools in our test who taught courses in ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, Career Education 9-12, or taught courses to ELL students, and of the total number of teachers reported under virtual education cost centers in our test who taught courses in Basic, Basic with ESE Services, ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, Career Education 9-12, or taught courses to ELL students. From the population of teachers, we selected 220 and found exceptions for 9 teachers. Eleven (5 percent) of the 220 teachers in our test taught at charter schools and 1 (11 percent) of the 9 teachers with exceptions taught at charter schools.

Proposed Adjustments

Our proposed adjustments present the net effects of noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures, including those related to our test of teacher qualifications. Our proposed adjustments generally reclassify the reported FTE to Basic education, except for noncompliance involving a student's enrollment or attendance in which case the reported FTE is taken to zero. (See *SCHEDULES B, C, and D.*)

The ultimate resolution of our proposed adjustments to the FTE student enrollment and the computation of their financial impact is the responsibility of the DOE.

SCHEDULE B

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

District Schools Other Than Charter Schools			
No. Program (1)	Proposed Net Adjustment (2)	Cost Factor	Weighted FTE (3)
101 Basic K-3	4.1859	1.103	4.6170
102 Basic 4-8	3.3019	1.000	3.3019
103 Basic 9-12	(43.6072)	1.001	(43.6508)
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	3.7786	1.103	4.1678
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	.3598	1.000	.3598
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(13.2322)	1.001	(13.2454)
130 ESOL	(13.3465)	1.194	(15.9357)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(5.7150)	3.607	(20.6140)
255 ESE Support Level 5	(2.4520)	5.376	(13.1820)
300 Career Education 9-12	(10.2692)	1.001	(10.2795)
Subtotal	(76.9959)		(104.4609)

Charter Schools			
No. Program (1)	Proposed Net Adjustment (2)	Cost Factor	Weighted FTE (3)
102 Basic 4-8	.5716	1.000	.5716
103 Basic 9-12	3.8139	1.001	3.8177
130 ESOL	(.5716)	1.194	(.6825)
300 Career Education 9-12	(4.7083)	1.001	(4.7130)
Subtotal	(.8944)		(1.0062)

Total of Schools			
No. Program (1)	Proposed Net Adjustment (2)	Cost Factor	Weighted FTE (3)
101 Basic K-3	4.1859	1.103	4.6170
102 Basic 4-8	3.8735	1.000	3.8735
103 Basic 9-12	(39.7933)	1.001	(39.8331)
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	3.7786	1.103	4.1678
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	.3598	1.000	.3598
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(13.2322)	1.001	(13.2454)
130 ESOL	(13.9181)	1.194	(16.6182)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(5.7150)	3.607	(20.6140)
255 ESE Support Level 5	(2.4520)	5.376	(13.1820)
300 Career Education 9-12	(14.9775)	1.001	(14.9925)
Total	(77.8903)		(105.4671)

- Notes: (1) See NOTE A7.
 (2) These proposed net adjustments are for unweighted FTE. (See SCHEDULE C.)
 (3) Weighted adjustments to the FTE are presented for illustrative purposes only. The weighted adjustments to the FTE do not take special program caps or allocation factors into consideration and are not intended to indicate the FTE used to compute the dollar value of adjustments. That computation is the responsibility of the DOE. (See NOTE A5.)

SCHEDULE C

PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT

<u>No.</u> <u>Program</u>	<u>Districtwide</u>	<u>Proposed Adjustments (1)</u>		<u>Balance Forward</u>
		<u>#0172</u>	<u>#0251</u>	
101 Basic K-30000
102 Basic 4-8	1.0022	1.0022
103 Basic 9-12	(48.7141)	(48.7141)
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	2.5357	2.5357
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	(.5002)	(.1600)	(.6602)
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(13.1451)	(13.1451)
130 ESOL	(1.5853)	(1.0020)	(2.5873)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.0050)	(2.5357)	(2.5407)
255 ESE Support Level 50000
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(7.6366)</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>(7.6366)</u>
Total	<u>(71.0861)</u>	<u>(.5000)</u>	<u>(.1600)</u>	<u>(71.7461)</u>

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

<u>No.</u>	<u>Brought Forward</u>	<u>Proposed Adjustments (1)</u>				<u>Balance Forward</u>
		<u>#0331</u>	<u>#0341</u>	<u>#0351</u>	<u>#0431</u>	
101	.000042494249
102	1.00224625	1.5197	2.9844
103	(48.7141)	.4594	1.7247	(46.5300)
111	2.5357	2.5357
112	(.6602)	(.6602)
113	(13.1451)	(13.1451)
130	(2.5873)	(.4594)	(.8499)	(1.7247)	(1.5197)	(7.1410)
254	(2.5407)	(.0375)	(.3751)	(2.9533)
255	.00000000
300	<u>(7.6366)</u>	<u>(.5057)</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>(.7828)</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>(8.9251)</u>
Total	<u>(71.7461)</u>	<u>(.5057)</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(.7828)</u>	<u>(.3751)</u>	<u>(73.4097)</u>

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

Proposed Adjustments (1)

<u>No.</u>	<u>Brought Forward</u>	<u>#0471</u>	<u>#0491</u>	<u>#0501</u>	<u>#0591</u>	<u>Balance Forward</u>
101	.42493956	.8205
102	2.9844	(.1830)	2.8014
103	(46.5300)5008	(46.0292)
111	2.53575000	3.0357
112	(.6602)	.4999	.1830	(.1432)	(.1205)
113	(13.1451)	.50015000	(12.1450)
130	(7.1410)	(.5007)	(.3956)	(8.0373)
254	(2.9533)	(1.0000)	(.5000)	(4.4533)
255	.0000	(.4450)	(.5001)	(.9451)
300	<u>(8.9251)</u>	<u>(.7200)</u>	<u>(9.6451)</u>
Total	<u>(73.4097)</u>	<u>(.4450)</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(.7200)</u>	<u>(.1432)</u>	<u>(74.7179)</u>

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

Proposed Adjustments (1)

<u>No.</u>	<u>Brought Forward</u>	<u>#0651</u>	<u>#0661</u>	<u>#0701</u>	<u>#0711</u>	<u>Balance Forward</u>
101	.8205	.49988210	2.1413
102	2.80144105	3.2119
103	(46.0292)	1.0000	1.5331	(43.4961)
111	3.0357	.26184997	3.7972
112	(.1205)5001	.3796
113	(12.1450)	(12.1450)
130	(8.0373)	(1.5331)	(1.2315)	(10.8019)
254	(4.4533)	(.7616)	(.9998)	(6.2147)
255	(.9451)	(1.0000)	(1.9451)
300	<u>(9.6451)</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>(.2632)</u>	<u>(.3609)</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>(10.2692)</u>
Total	<u>(74.7179)</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(.2632)</u>	<u>(.3609)</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(75.3420)</u>

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

No.	Brought Forward	Proposed Adjustments (1)				Balance Forward
		#0731	#7004	#9346	#9690*	
101	2.1413	2.0446	4.1859
102	3.21190900	3.3019
103	(43.4961)4298	(.5409)	3.8139	(39.7933)
111	3.7972	.0003	(.0189)	3.7786
112	.3796	(.0198)3598
113	(12.1450)	(.6672)	(.4200)	(13.2322)
130	(10.8019)	(2.5446)	(13.3465)
254	(6.2147)	.4997	(5.7150)
255	(1.9451)	(.5069)	(2.4520)
300	<u>(10.2692)</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>(4.7083)</u>	<u>(14.9775)</u>
Total	<u>(75.3420)</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(.2374)</u>	<u>(1.4165)</u>	<u>(.8944)</u>	<u>(77.8903)</u>

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

*Charter School

<u>No. Program</u>	<u>Proposed Adjustments (1)</u>		
	<u>Brought Forward</u>	<u>#9695*</u>	<u>Total</u>
101 Basic K-3	4.1859	4.1859
102 Basic 4-8	3.3019	.5716	3.8735
103 Basic 9-12	(39.7933)	(39.7933)
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	3.7786	3.7786
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	.35983598
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(13.2322)	(13.2322)
130 ESOL	(13.3465)	(.5716)	(13.9181)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(5.7150)	(5.7150)
255 ESE Support Level 5	(2.4520)	(2.4520)
300 Career Education 9-12	(14.9775)	(14.9775)
Total	(77.8903)	.0000	(77.8903)

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

*Charter School

SCHEDULE D

FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Overview

Marion County District School Board (District) management is responsible for determining that the FTE student enrollment as reported under the FEFP is in compliance with State requirements. These requirements are found primarily in Sections 1011.60, 1011.61, and 1011.62, Florida Statutes; SBE Rules, Chapter 6A-1, FAC; and the *FTE General Instructions 2016-17* issued by the DOE. All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed below and requires management's attention and action as presented in *SCHEDULE E*.

Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

Findings

Our examination included the July and October 2016 reporting survey periods and the February and June 2017 reporting survey periods (See NOTE A6.). Unless otherwise specifically stated, the Findings and Proposed Adjustments presented herein are for the October 2016 reporting survey period, the February 2017 reporting survey period, or both. Accordingly, our Findings do not mention specific reporting survey periods unless necessary for a complete understanding of the instances of noncompliance being disclosed.

Districtwide - Reporting of FTE

1. [Ref. 101] Our examination of the District's instructional calendar and related school bell schedules disclosed that four schools (three schools were in our test) did not provide at least 900 hours of instruction as prescribed by the DOE *2016-17 FTE General Instructions*, pages 1 and 2; Section 1011.60(2), Florida Statutes; and SBE Rule 6A-1.045111, FAC. Specifically, the District scheduled 7 early release days in the school year, resulting in less than a full day of instruction for all schools on these days. The bell schedules for the four schools supported an instructional week at or near 1,500 CMW, the minimum required to report 1.0000 FTE when completing 180 full days of instruction. The early release of the students at the four schools resulted in the District overreporting the FTE for 6,480 students (34 students were in our Basic test, 27 students were in our Basic with ESE Services test, 39 students were in our ESOL test, 1 student was in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 test, and 66 students were in our Career Education 9-12 test).

The students' FTE should have been reported based on the actual hours of instruction provided for the number of days that the schools were in session. Our recalculation of the FTE and the actual hours of instruction provided disclosed that the course schedules for the 6,480 students supported 892 to 895.3 hours of the required 900 hours of
(*Finding Continues on Next Page*)

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Districtwide – Reporting of FTE (Continued)

instruction (or between .9684 to .9896 total FTE) rather than the 1.0000 FTE reported for the 2016-17 school year, resulting in 71.0861 FTE being overreported.

We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	(48.7141)	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(13.1451)	
130 ESOL	(1.5853)	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.0050)	
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(7.6366)</u>	<u>(71.0861)</u>
		<u>(71.0861)</u>

Dunnellon Middle School (#0172)

2. [Ref. 17201] One Basic student was not in attendance during the February 2017 reporting survey period and should not have been reported for FEPF funding. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	<u>(.5000)</u>	(.5000)
---------------	----------------	---------

3. [Ref. 17202] The course schedule for one ESE student was incorrectly reported in Program No. 102 (Basic 4-8) in the October 2016 reporting survey period. The student was enrolled in an ESE Program as supported by the student’s IEP prepared on September 20, 2016; consequently, the student should have been reported in Program No. 112 (Grades 4-8 with ESE Services). We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	(.4998)	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	<u>.4998</u>	.0000

4. [Ref. 17203] An EP meeting was held on October 12, 2016, for one ESE student; however, School records did not demonstrate that the parents were invited to participate in the EP meeting. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	1.0000	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	<u>(1.0000)</u>	.0000

5. [Ref. 17270] One teacher taught a Basic subject area class that included ELL students but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by SBE Rule 6A-6.0907, FAC, and the teacher’s in-service training timeline. We propose the following adjustment:

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Dunnellon Middle School (#0172) (Continued)

102 Basic 4-8	1.0020	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.0020)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>(.5000)</u>

Ward-Highlands Elementary School (#0251)

6. [Ref. 25101] School records did not evidence that one ESE student who was scheduled for gifted education services 1 day per week was in attendance during the reporting survey periods. We propose the following adjustment:

112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	<u>(.1600)</u>	<u>(.1600)</u>
----------------------------------	----------------	----------------

7. [Ref. 25102] One ESE student's February 12, 2016, *Matrix of Services* form incorrectly included three special considerations points designated for PK students earning less than .5000 FTE during a reporting survey period; consequently, the student was reported in Program No. 254 (ESE Support Level 4) in the October 2016 reporting survey period rather than Program No. 111 (Grades K-3 with ESE Services). In addition, the IEP prepared on December 6, 2016, was not accompanied by a *Matrix of Services* form and School records did not evidence that the prior *Matrix of Services* form had been reviewed when the student's new IEP was prepared. We propose the following adjustment:

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	1.0000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(1.0000)</u>	<u>.0000</u>

8. [Ref. 25103] The IEP and the corresponding *Matrix of Services* form covering the 2016-17 school year for one ESE student was not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. We propose the following adjustment:

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	1.0000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(1.0000)</u>	<u>.0000</u>

9. [Ref. 25104] Three ESE students were not reported in accordance with the students' *Matrix of Services* forms. We propose the following adjustment:

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.5357	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(.5357)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>(.1600)</u>

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

North Marion High School (#0331)

10. [Ref. 33101] An ELL Committee was not convened by October 1 to consider one ELL student's continued ESOL placement beyond 3 years from the student's DEUSS. In addition, an *ELL Student Plan* covering the October 2016 reporting survey period was not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.2976	
130 ESOL	<u>(.2976)</u>	.0000

11. [Ref. 33102] One ELL student was reported in the ESOL Program beyond the maximum 6-year period allowed for State funding of ESOL. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.1618	
130 ESOL	<u>(.1618)</u>	.0000

12. [Ref. 33103] The timecards for two Career Education 9-12 students who participated in OJT were signed by the students' employer prior to the start of the reporting survey period; consequently, School records did not evidence the validity of the work hours reported. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.2582)</u>	(.2582)
---------------------------	----------------	---------

13. [Ref. 33104] One Career Education 9-12 student who participated in OJT did not work during the reporting survey period and School records did not evidence that the student was otherwise engaged in a job search. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.2475)</u>	(.2475)
		<u>(.5057)</u>

Oakcrest Elementary School (#0341)

14. [Ref. 34101] One student was incorrectly reported in the ESOL Program. An ELL Committee determined that the student was ineligible for continued placement in the ESOL Program. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.4250	
130 ESOL	<u>(.4250)</u>	.0000

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Oakcrest Elementary School (#0341) (Continued)

15. [Ref. 34170/71] The parents of students taught by two out-of-field teachers were either not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status (Ref. 34171) or were not notified until April 3, 2017 (Ref. 34170), which was after the February 2017 reporting survey period. We propose the following adjustments:

<u>Ref. 34170</u>		
101 Basic K-3	.4249	
130 ESOL	<u>(.4249)</u>	.0000
<u>Ref. 34171</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	.0375	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(.0375)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>.0000</u>

Forest High School (#0351)

16. [Ref. 35101] The English language proficiency of one ELL student was not assessed and an ELL Committee was not convened within 30 school days prior to the student's DEUSS anniversary date to consider the student's continued ESOL placement beyond 3 years from the student's DEUSS. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.7886	
130 ESOL	<u>(.7886)</u>	.0000

17. [Ref. 35102] More work hours were reported than were supported by the timecards for four Career Education 9-12 students who participated in OJT. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.3904)</u>	(.3904)
---------------------------	----------------	---------

18. [Ref. 35103] The timecards for two Career Education 9-12 students who participated in OJT were either signed by the student's employer prior to the start of the reporting survey period (one student) or were not dated (one student); consequently, School records did not evidence the validity of the work time reported. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.3924)</u>	(.3924)
---------------------------	----------------	---------

Findings

Forest High School (#0351) (Continued)

19. [Ref. 35171] One teacher taught Basic subject area classes that included ELL students but had earned only 18 of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by SBE Rule 6A-6.0907, FAC, and the teacher’s in-service training timeline. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.9361	
130 ESOL	<u>(.9361)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>(.7828)</u>

Wyomina Park Elementary School (#0431)

20. [Ref. 43101] School records did not demonstrate that the parents of one ELL student had been invited to participate in the ELL Committee meeting to consider the student’s continued ESOL placement beyond 3 years from the student’s DEUSS. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.2660	
130 ESOL	<u>(.2660)</u>	<u>.0000</u>

21. [Ref. 43102] One ESE student was reported for 900 CMW of occupational therapy but was only scheduled to receive 60 CMW of such instruction during the October 2016 reporting survey period. We propose the following adjustment:

254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(.3751)</u>	<u>(.3751)</u>
-------------------------	----------------	----------------

22. [Ref. 43172] One teacher taught a Primary Language Arts class that included ELL students but had earned only 240 of the 300 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by SBE Rule 6A-1.0503, FAC, and the teacher’s in-service timeline. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	1.2537	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.2537)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>(.3751)</u>

Hillcrest School (#0471)

23. [Ref. 47101] The IEPs for two ESE students were not accompanied by *Matrix of Services* forms and School records did not demonstrate that prior *Matrix of Services* forms were reviewed and updated when the students’ new IEPs were prepared. We propose the following adjustment:

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Hillcrest School (#0471) (Continued)

112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	.4999	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	.5001	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(1.0000)</u>	.0000

24. [Ref. 47102] The number of homebound instructional minutes for one ESE student was incorrectly reported. The student was reported for 1,575 CMW of instruction but received only 240 CMW of such instruction during the October 2016 reporting survey period as supported by the homebound teacher’s contact logs and the student’s IEP. We propose the following adjustment:

255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.4450)</u>	<u>(.4450)</u>
		<u>(.4450)</u>

North Marion Middle School (#0491)

25. [Ref. 49101] The reported course schedule for one ESE student incorrectly included a portion of the student’s instructional time in Program No. 102 (Basic 4-8). The student’s course schedule should have been reported entirely in Program No. 112 (Grades 4-8 with ESE Services). We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	<u>(.1830)</u>	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	<u>.1830</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>.0000</u>

Lake Weir High School (#0501)

26. [Ref. 50101] One ESE student’s schedule (who was in our ESOL test) was incorrectly reported in Program Nos. 103 (Basic 9-12) and 130 (ESOL). The student’s entire schedule should have been reported in Program No. 113 (Grades 9-12 with ESE Services). We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	<u>(.0828)</u>	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	.5000	
130 ESOL	<u>(.4172)</u>	.0000

27. [Ref. 50102] One ESE student was incorrectly reported in Program No. 255 (ESE Support Level 5) based on the student’s previous placement in the Hospital and Homebound Program. The student was dismissed from the Program on May 4, 2016, and should have been reported in Program No. 103 (Basic 9-12). We propose the following adjustment:

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Lake Weir High School (#0501) (Continued)

103 Basic 9-12	.5001	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.5001)</u>	.0000

28. [Ref. 50103] The timecard for one Career Education 9-12 student who participated in OJT was not signed by the student’s employer; consequently, School records did not evidence the validity of the work time reported. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.0829)</u>	(.0829)
---------------------------	----------------	---------

29. [Ref. 50104] More work hours were reported than were supported by the timecard for one Career Education 9-12 student who participated in OJT. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.0534)</u>	(.0534)
---------------------------	----------------	---------

30. [Ref. 50105] The timecards for four Career Education 9-12 students who participated in OJT were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.5837)</u>	(.5837)
---------------------------	----------------	---------

31. [Ref. 50170] One teacher taught English to a class that included an ELL student but was not properly certified to teach ELL students and was not approved by the School Board to teach such students out of field. We also noted that the parents of the student were not notified of the teacher’s out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.0835	
130 ESOL	<u>(.0835)</u>	.0000
		<u>(.7200)</u>

Harbour View Elementary School (#0591)

32. [Ref. 59101] School records did not demonstrate that the parents of one ELL student was invited to participate in the student’s ELL Committee meeting. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.3956	
130 ESOL	<u>(.3956)</u>	.0000

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Harbour View Elementary School (#0591) (Continued)

33. [Ref. 59102] School records did not demonstrate that one student who was scheduled for gifted education services 1 day per week was in attendance during the reporting survey periods. We propose the following adjustment:

112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	(.1432)	(.1432)
----------------------------------	---------	---------

34. [Ref. 59103] One ESE student's February 12, 2016, *Matrix of Services* form incorrectly included three special considerations points designated for PK students earning less than .5000 FTE during a reporting survey period. Consequently, the student was reported in Program No. 254 (ESE Support Level 4) in the October 2016 reporting survey period rather than in Program No. 111 (Grades K-3 with ESE Services). We propose the following adjustment:

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.5000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.5000)	.0000
		<u>(.1432)</u>

College Park Elementary School (#0651)

35. [Ref. 65101] The file for one ESE student did not contain a valid IEP covering the October 2016 reporting survey period. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.4998	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	(.4998)	.0000

36. [Ref. 65102] We noted the following exceptions for two ESE students:

- a. The file for one student did not contain a *Matrix of Services* form to support the student's reporting in Program No. 254 (ESE Support Level 4).
- b. The IEP for one student was not accompanied by a *Matrix of Services* form and School records did not evidence that the prior *Matrix of Services* form had been reviewed when the student's new IEP was prepared.

We propose the following adjustment:

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.7616	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.7616)	.0000
		<u>.0000</u>

Findings

Belleview High School (#0661)

37. [Ref. 66101] One ESE student was incorrectly reported in Program No. 255 (ESE Support Level 5) based on the student’s previous placement in the Hospital and Homebound Program. School records evidenced that the student was dismissed from the Program at the end of the 2015-16 school year. The student was only provided on-campus instruction during the 2016-17 school year and should have been reported in Program No. 103 (Basic 9-12). We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	1.0000	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(1.0000)</u>	.0000

38. [Ref. 66102] More work hours were reported than were supported by the timecards for two Career Education 9-12 students who participated in OJT. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.2632)</u>	<u>(.2632)</u>
		<u>(.2632)</u>

West Port High School (#0701)

39. [Ref. 70101] School records did not demonstrate that the parents of four ELL students were invited to participate in the students’ ELL Committee meetings. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	1.5331	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.5331)</u>	.0000

40. [Ref. 70102] The timecard for one Career Education 9-12 student who participated in OJT was not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.1174)</u>	(.1174)
---------------------------	----------------	---------

41. [Ref. 70103] The timecards for two Career Education 9-12 students who participated in OJT indicated that the students did not work during the February 2017 reporting survey period and School records did not evidence that the students were otherwise engaged in a job search. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.2435)</u>	<u>(.2435)</u>
		<u>(.3609)</u>

Findings

Hammett Bowen, Jr. Elementary School (#0711)

42. [Ref. 71101] The *ELL Student Plan (Plan)* for one student enrolled in the ESOL Program was incomplete as the *Plan* did not include the student’s instructional schedule or the ESOL instructional delivery model. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.8210	
130 ESOL	<u>(.8210)</u>	.0000

43. [Ref. 71102] An ELL Committee was not convened by October 1 to consider one ELL student’s continued ESOL placement beyond 3 years from the student’s DEUSS. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.4105	
130 ESOL	<u>(.4105)</u>	.0000

44. [Ref. 71103] The IEPs for three ESE students reported in the February 2017 reporting survey period were not accompanied by *Matrix of Services* forms and School records did not evidence that the prior *Matrix of Services* forms were reviewed when the students’ new IEPs were prepared. We also noted that one of the students was not reported in accordance with the student’s *Matrix of Services* form during the October 2016 reporting survey period. We propose the following adjustment:

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.4997	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	.5001	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(.9998)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>.0000</u>

Marion Oaks Elementary School (#0731)

45. [Ref. 73101] School records did not demonstrate that the parents of one ELL student were invited to participate in the student’s ELL Committee meeting. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.8482	
130 ESOL	<u>(.8482)</u>	.0000

46. [Ref. 73102] The course schedule for one ESE student was incorrectly reported in Program No. 101 (Basic K-3) in the October 2016 reporting survey period. The student was enrolled in an ESE Program as supported by the student’s IEP; therefore, the student should have been reported in Program No. 111 (Grades K-3 with ESE Services). We propose the following adjustment:

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Marion Oaks Elementary School (#0731) (Continued)

101 Basic K-3	(.5000)	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	<u>.5000</u>	.0000

47. [Ref. 73103] One ESE student's *Matrix of Services* form that accompanied the February 6, 2017, IEP was dated March 8, 2017, which was after the February 2017 reporting survey period. In addition, School records did not demonstrate that the prior *Matrix of Services* form was reviewed when this IEP was prepared. We propose the following adjustment:

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.4386	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(.4386)</u>	.0000

48. [Ref. 73104] Two ESE students were not reported in accordance with the students' *Matrix of Services* forms. We propose the following adjustment:

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	(.9383)	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>.9383</u>	.0000

49. [Ref. 73171] The parents of students taught by one out-of-field teacher were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status in PK Primary Education. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	1.6964	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.6964)</u>	.0000
		<u>.0000</u>

Marion Virtual Franchise (#7004)

50. [Ref. 700401] Two Basic virtual education students did not enroll in three virtual courses until after the February 2017 reporting survey period and did not complete the courses until after the 180-day school year. Consequently, the courses were not eligible to be reported for FEFP funding. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	<u>(.1540)</u>	(.1540)
----------------	----------------	---------

51. [Ref. 700402] The course schedule was incorrectly reported for one ESE virtual education student. The student completed a full-credit course (or .1668 FTE) but the course was reported for three half-credit courses (or .2502 FTE). In addition, a valid EP covering the 2016-17 school year was not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. We propose the following adjustment:

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Marion Virtual Franchise (#7004) (Continued)

103 Basic 9-12	.5838	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(.6672)	(.0834)
		(.2374)

Student Services/ESE (#9346)

52. [Ref. 934601] School records did not demonstrate that seven ESE students (one student was in our Basic test and six students were in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 test) enrolled in the Hospital and Homebound Program received homebound instruction during the reporting survey periods. In addition, the IEP for one student was not completed until October 27, 2016, which was after the October 2016 reporting survey period and was not accompanied by a *Matrix of Services* form. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	(.4250)	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(.5000)	
255 ESE Support Level 5	(.5006)	(1.4256)

53. [Ref. 934602] The FTE for five students (two students were in our Basic test and three students were in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 test) enrolled in the Hospital and Homebound Program were incorrectly reported. The homebound instructional minutes for three of the students were not reported in accordance with the homebound instructors' contact logs and the students' IEPs. Additionally, one of the three students discussed above and the two remaining students were not reported in accordance with the students' *Matrix of Services* forms. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	(.0800)	
103 Basic 9-12	(.1473)	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	(.0800)	
255 ESE Support Level 5	.3453	.0380

54. [Ref. 934603] The course schedules for six ESE students were incorrectly reported. The students were reported for 30 CMW of speech therapy; however, five of the students' *Service Plans* indicated that the students were only scheduled for 60 minutes per month (or 15 CMW) of such instruction and a *Service Plan* for one student was not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. We propose the following adjustment:

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Student Services/ESE (#9346) (Continued)

102 Basic 4-8	.0100	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	(.0189)	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	<u>(.0200)</u>	(.0289)

55. [Ref. 934604] The *Matrix of Services* forms for two ESE students to support the students' reporting in Program No. 255 (ESE Support Level 5) were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. We propose the following adjustment:

112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	.0802	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	.0800	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.1602)</u>	.0000

56. [Ref. 934605] The IEP for one ESE student was not signed by those who participated in the development of the IEP. We also noted that the *Physician Referral for Hospitalized and Homebound Program* form (evidencing the physician's statement) to support the student's placement in the Hospital and Homebound Program had expired prior to the February 2017 reporting survey period. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.1600	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.1600)</u>	.0000

57. [Ref. 934670] One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by the School Board to teach out of field in Social Science. We also noted that the students' parents were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.0314	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.0314)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>(1.4165)</u>

Francis Marion Military Academy (#9690) Charter School

58. [Ref. 969001] The timecards for six Career Education 9-12 students who participated in OJT were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.8944)</u>	(.8944)
---------------------------	----------------	---------

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Francis Marion Military Academy (#9690) Charter School (Continued)

59. [Ref. 969070] One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by the Charter School Board to teach out of field in Business Education. In addition, the parents of the students were not notified of the teacher’s out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	3.8139	
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(3.8139)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>(.8944)</u>

Ocali Charter Middle School (#9695)

60. [Ref. 969501] The letter notifying the parents of one ELL student’s placement in the ESOL Program was not dated and School records did not otherwise evidence that the notification was timely made (i.e., prior to the reporting survey period). In addition, School records did not demonstrate that parents were invited to participate in the student’s September 20, 2016, ELL Committee meeting. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.5716	
130 ESOL	<u>(.5716)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>.0000</u>

Proposed Net Adjustment **(77.8903)**

SCHEDULE E

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that Marion County District School Board (District) management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) FTE is calculated and reported based on the scheduled hours of annual instruction as supported by the District's calendar and each school's bell schedule; (2) only students who are in membership and in attendance at least 1 day during the reporting survey periods are reported for FEFP funding and documentation is retained to support this reporting; (3) students are reported in the correct FEFP Program and for the correct number of minutes, particularly for ESE students receiving home instruction; (4) parents are notified of the opportunity to participate in their children's IEP development and ELL Committee meetings; (5) IEPs are timely prepared, evidence the required participants who are involved in the development of the students' IEPs, and documentation is maintained in the students' files; (6) ESE students are reported in accordance with the students' *Matrix of Services* forms that are timely completed, correctly scored, and maintained in the students' files; (7) there is evidence that the *Matrix of Services* forms have been reviewed and updated as necessary when students' IEPs are reviewed or updated to ensure that the *Matrix of Services* forms accurately reflect the IEP services in effect during the reporting survey period; (8) students who are dismissed from the Hospital and Homebound Program are reported in the correct FEFP Program based upon the change in services; (9) students are reported in the Hospital and Homebound Program for the scheduled instructional time as supported by the students' IEPs and homebound teachers' contact logs, and as supported by a timely dated *Physician Referral for Hospitalized and Homebound Program* form (including the physician's statement); (10) ELL students are not reported in the ESOL Program for more than the 6-year period allowed for State funding of ESOL; (11) students that are exited from the ESOL Program by recommendation of an ELL Committee are not reported in the ESOL Program; (12) the English language proficiency of students being considered for continuation of their ESOL placements beyond the 3-year base period is timely assessed and ELL Committees are timely convened subsequent to the assessments; (13) *ELL Student Plans* are timely prepared and identify all of the courses that are to employ ESOL strategies, and the students' records are retained in readily-accessible files; (14) parents are timely notified of their children's ESOL placements (15) Career Education 9-12 students who participate in OJT are reported in accordance with timecards that are accurately completed, signed, and retained in readily-accessible files; (16) virtual courses other than credit recovery courses, completed after the end of the 180-day school year are not reported for FEFP funding if the students were not enrolled in the courses during the October or February reporting survey periods; (17) the course schedules and associated FTE of students who are enrolled in virtual education programs are accurately reported; (18) teachers earn the in-service training points required by SBE Rules 6A-1.0503 or 6A-6.0907, FAC, and in accordance with the teachers' in-service training timelines; and (19) teachers are appropriately certified or, if teaching out of field, are timely approved by the School Board or Charter School Board to teach out of field, and parents are timely notified when their children are assigned to teachers teaching out of field.

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

REGULATORY CITATIONS

Reporting

Section 1007.271(21), Florida Statutes, *Dual Enrollment Programs*

Section 1011.60, Florida Statutes, *Minimum Requirements of the Florida Education Finance Program*

Section 1011.61, Florida Statutes, *Definitions*

Section 1011.62, Florida Statutes, *Funds for Operation of Schools*

SBE Rule 6A-1.0451, FAC, *Florida Education Finance Program Student Membership Surveys*

SBE Rule 6A-1.045111, FAC, *Hourly Equivalent to 180-Day School Year*

SBE Rule 6A-1.04513, FAC, *Maintaining Auditable FTE Records*

FTE General Instructions 2016-17

Attendance

Section 1003.23, Florida Statutes, *Attendance Records and Reports*

SBE Rule 6A-1.044(3) and (6)(c), FAC, *Pupil Attendance Records*

SBE Rule 6A-1.04513, FAC, *Maintaining Auditable FTE Records*

FTE General Instructions 2016-17

Comprehensive Management Information System: Automated Student Attendance Recordkeeping System Handbook

ESOL

Section 1003.56, Florida Statutes, *English Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient Students*

Section 1011.62(1)(g), Florida Statutes, *Education for Speakers of Other Languages*

SBE Rule 6A-6.0901, FAC, *Definitions Which Apply to Programs for English Language Learners*

SBE Rule 6A-6.0902, FAC, *Requirements for Identification, Eligibility, and Programmatic Assessments of English Language Learners*

SBE Rule 6A-6.09021, FAC, *Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment for English Language Learners (ELLs)*

SBE Rule 6A-6.09022, FAC, *Extension of Services in English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Program*

SBE Rule 6A-6.0903, FAC, *Requirements for Exiting English Language Learners from the English for Speakers of Other Languages Program*

SBE Rule 6A-6.09031, FAC, *Post Reclassification of English Language Learners (ELLs)*

SBE Rule 6A-6.0904, FAC, *Equal Access to Appropriate Instruction for English Language Learners*

Career Education On-The-Job Attendance

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

Career Education On-The-Job Funding Hours

FTE General Instructions 2016-17

Exceptional Education

Section 1003.57, Florida Statutes, *Exceptional Students Instruction*

Section 1011.62, Florida Statutes, *Funds for Operation of Schools*

Section 1011.62(1)(e), Florida Statutes, *Funding Model for Exceptional Student Education Programs*

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

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

SBE Rule 6A-6.0331, FAC, *General Education Intervention Procedures, Evaluation, Determination of Eligibility, Reevaluation and the Provision of Exceptional Student Education Services*

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

SBE Rule 6A-6.03411, FAC, *Definitions, ESE Policies and Procedures, and ESE Administrators*

SBE Rule 6A-6.0361, FAC, *Contractual Agreements with Nonpublic Schools and Residential Facilities Matrix of Services Handbook (2015 Edition)*

Teacher Certification

Section 1012.42(2), Florida Statutes, *Teacher Teaching Out-of-Field; Notification Requirements*

Section 1012.55, Florida Statutes, *Positions for Which Certificates Required*

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

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

SBE Rule 6A-4.001, FAC, *Instructional Personnel Certification*

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

Virtual Education

Section 1002.321, Florida Statutes, *Digital Learning*

Section 1002.37, Florida Statutes, *The Florida Virtual School*

Section 1002.45, Florida Statutes, *Virtual Instruction Programs*

Section 1002.455, Florida Statutes, *Student Eligibility for K-12 Virtual Instruction*

Section 1003.498, Florida Statutes, *School District Virtual Course Offerings*

Charter Schools

Section 1002.33, Florida Statutes, *Charter Schools*

NOTES TO SCHEDULES

<p style="text-align: center;">NOTE A – SUMMARY FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT</p>

A summary discussion of the significant features of the Marion County District School Board (District), the FEFP, the FTE, and related areas is provided below.

1. The District

The District was established pursuant to Section 1001.30, Florida Statutes, to provide public educational services for the residents of Marion County, Florida. Those services are provided primarily to PK through 12th-grade students and to adults seeking career education-type training. The District is part of the State system of public education under the general direction and control of the SBE. The geographic boundaries of the District are those of Marion 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 elected Superintendent of Schools. The District had 56 schools other than charter schools, 4 charter schools, 5 District cost centers, and 2 virtual education cost centers serving PK through 12th-grade students.

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017, State funding totaling \$157.9 million was provided through the FEFP to the District for the District-reported 42,605.65 unweighted FTE as recalibrated, which included 567.65 unweighted FTE as recalibrated for charter schools. The primary sources of funding for the District are funds from the FEFP, local ad valorem taxes, and Federal grants and donations.

2. FEFP

Florida school districts receive State funding through the FEFP to serve PK through 12th-grade students (adult education is not funded by the FEFP). The FEFP was established by the Florida Legislature in 1973 to guarantee to each student in the Florida public school system, including charter schools, the availability of programs and services appropriate to the student's educational needs that are substantially equal to those available to any similar student notwithstanding geographic differences and varying local economic factors. To provide equalization of educational opportunity in Florida, the FEFP formula recognizes: (1) varying local property tax bases, (2) varying program cost factors, (3) district cost differentials, and (4) differences in per-student cost for equivalent educational programs due to sparsity and dispersion of student population.

3. FTE Student Enrollment

The funding provided by the FEFP is based on the numbers of individual students participating in particular educational programs. A numerical value is assigned to each student according to the student's hours and days of attendance in those programs. The individual student thus becomes equated to a numerical value known as an unweighted FTE student enrollment. For example, for PK through 3rd grade, 1.0 FTE is defined as one student in membership in a program or a group of programs for 20 hours per week for 180 days; for grade levels 4 through 12, 1.0 FTE is defined as one student in membership in a program or a group of programs for 25 hours per week for 180 days. For brick and mortar school

students, one student would be reported as 1.0 FTE if the student was enrolled in six courses per day at 50 minutes per course for the full 180-day school year (i.e., six courses at 50 minutes each per day is 5 hours of class a day or 25 hours per week, which equates to 1.0 FTE). For virtual education students, one student would be reported as 1.0 FTE if the student has successfully completed six courses or credits or the prescribed level of content that counts toward promotion to the next grade. A student who completes less than six credits will be reported as a fraction of an FTE. Half-credit completions will be included in determining an FTE student enrollment. Credits completed by a student in excess of the minimum required for that student for graduation are not eligible for funding.

4. Recalibration of FTE to 1.0

School districts report all FTE student enrollment regardless of the 1.0 FTE cap. The DOE combines all FTE student enrollment reported for the student by all school districts, including the Florida Virtual School. If the combined reported FTE for the student exceeds 1.0 FTE, the DOE recalibrates the reported FTE student enrollment for each student to 1.0 FTE. The FTE student enrollment reported by the Department of Juvenile Justice for FTE student enrollment earned beyond the 180-day school year is not included in the recalibration to 1.0 FTE.

All FTE student enrollment is capped at 1.0 FTE except for the FTE student enrollment reported by the Department of Juvenile Justice for students beyond the 180-day school year. However, if a student only has FTE student enrollment reported in one survey of the 180-day school year (Survey 2 or Survey 3), the FTE student enrollment reported will be capped at .5000 FTE, even if FTE student enrollment is reported in Survey 1 or Survey 4, with the exception of FTE student enrollment reported by the Department of Juvenile Justice for students beyond the 180-day school year.

5. Calculation of FEFP Funds

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

6. FTE Reporting Survey Periods

The FTE is determined and reported during the school year by means of four FTE membership survey periods that are conducted under the direction of district and school management. Each survey period is a testing of the FTE membership for a period of 1 week. The survey periods for the 2016-17 school year were conducted during and for the following weeks: Survey 1 was performed July 11 through 15, 2016; Survey 2 was performed October 10 through 14, 2016; Survey 3 was performed February 6 through 10, 2017; and Survey 4 was performed June 12 through 16, 2017.

7. Educational Programs

The FEFP funds ten specific programs under which instruction may be provided as authorized by the Florida Legislature. The general program titles under which these specific programs fall are: (1) Basic, (2) ESOL, (3) ESE, and (4) Career Education 9-12.

8. Statutes and Rules

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

Chapter 1000, Florida Statutes, *K-20 General Provisions*

Chapter 1001, Florida Statutes, *K-20 Governance*

Chapter 1002, Florida Statutes, *Student and Parental Rights and Educational Choices*

Chapter 1003, Florida Statutes, *Public K-12 Education*

Chapter 1006, Florida Statutes, *Support for Learning*

Chapter 1007, Florida Statutes, *Articulation and Access*

Chapter 1010, Florida Statutes, *Financial Matters*

Chapter 1011, Florida Statutes, *Planning and Budgeting*

Chapter 1012, Florida Statutes, *Personnel*

SBE Rules, Chapter 6A-1, FAC, *Finance and Administration*

SBE Rules, Chapter 6A-4, FAC, *Certification*

SBE Rules, Chapter 6A-6, FAC, *Special Programs I*

<p>NOTE B – TESTING FTE STUDENT ENROLLMENT</p>

Our examination procedures for testing provided for the selection of schools, students, and teachers using judgmental methods for testing the FTE student enrollment as reported under the FEFP to the DOE for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017. Our testing process was designed to facilitate the performance of appropriate examination procedures to test the District’s compliance with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of the FTE student enrollment as reported under the FEFP. The following schools were selected for testing:

<u>School</u>	<u>Findings</u>
Districtwide – Reporting of FTE	1
1. Dunnellon Middle School	2 through 5
2. Ward-Highlands Elementary School	6 through 9
3. North Marion High School	10 through 13
4. Oakcrest Elementary School	14 and 15
5. Forest High School	16 through 19
6. Wyomina Park Elementary School	20 through 22
7. Hillcrest School	23 and 24
8. North Marion Middle School	25
9. Lake Weir High School	26 through 31
10. Harbour View Elementary School	32 through 34
11. College Park Elementary School	35 and 36
12. Belleview High School	37 and 38
13. West Port High School	39 through 41
14. Hammett Bowen, Jr. Elementary School	42 through 44
15. Marion Oaks Elementary School	45 through 49
16. Marion Virtual Franchise	50 and 51
17. Marion eLearning	NA
18. Student Services/ESE	52 through 57
19. Marion Charter School*	NA
20. Francis Marion Military Academy*	58 and 59
21. Ocali Charter Middle School*	60

* Charter School



Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Auditor General

AUDITOR GENERAL STATE OF FLORIDA

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



Phone: (850) 412-2722
Fax: (850) 488-6975

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

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT

Report on Student Transportation

We have examined the Marion County District School Board's (District's) compliance with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of student transportation as reported under the Florida Education Finance Program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017. 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 2016-17* issued by the Department of Education.

Management's Responsibility for Compliance

District management is responsible for the District's compliance with the aforementioned State requirements, including the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control to prevent, or detect and correct, noncompliance due to fraud or error.

Auditor's Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the District's compliance with State requirements based on our examination. Our examination was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and the standards applicable to attestation engagements contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the examination to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the classification, assignment, and verification of student transportation reported by the District under the Florida Education Finance Program complied with State requirements in all material respects.

An examination involves performing procedures to obtain evidence about whether the District complied with State requirements. The nature, timing, and extent of the procedures selected depend on our judgment, including an assessment of the risks of material noncompliance, whether due to fraud or error. We believe that the evidence we obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a reasonable basis for

our opinion. Our examination does not provide a legal determination on the District's compliance with State requirements. The legal determination of the District's compliance with these requirements is, however, ultimately the responsibility of the Department of Education.

An examination by its nature does not include a review of all records and actions of District management and staff and, as a consequence cannot be relied upon to identify all instances of noncompliance, fraud, abuse, or inefficiency. Because of these limitations and the inherent limitations of internal control, an unavoidable risk exists that some material misstatements may not be detected, even though the examination is properly planned and performed in accordance with attestation standards.

Opinion

In our opinion, the Marion County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of student transportation reported under the Florida Education Finance Program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017.

Other Reporting Required by Government Auditing Standards

In accordance with attestation standards established by *Government Auditing Standards*, we are required to report all deficiencies that are considered to be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses⁷ in internal control; fraud and noncompliance with provisions of laws or regulations that have a material effect on the District's compliance with State requirements; and any other instances that warrant the attention of those charged with governance; noncompliance with provisions of contracts or grant agreements, and abuse that has a material effect on the District's compliance with State requirements. We are also required to obtain and report the views of responsible officials concerning the findings, conclusions, and recommendations, as well as any planned corrective actions.

We performed our examination to express an opinion on the District's compliance with State requirements and not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the District's related internal control over compliance with State requirements; accordingly, we express no such opinion. Our examination disclosed certain findings that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards* and all findings, along with the views of responsible officials, are described in *SCHEDULE G* and *MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE*, respectively. Because of its limited purpose, our examination would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. The impact of this noncompliance with State requirements on the District's reported student transportation is presented in *SCHEDULES F* and *G*.

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

⁷ A significant deficiency is a deficiency or a combination of deficiencies in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance. A material weakness is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis.

Purpose of this Report

Pursuant to Section 11.45(4)(c), Florida Statutes, this report is a public record and its distribution is not limited. Attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants require us to indicate that the purpose of this report is to provide an opinion on the District's compliance with State requirements. Accordingly, this communication is not suitable for any other purpose.

Respectfully submitted,



Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Tallahassee, Florida
November 13, 2018

SCHEDULE F

POPULATIONS, TEST SELECTION, AND TEST RESULTS STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

Any student who is transported by the Marion County District School Board (District) must meet one or more of the following conditions in order to be eligible for State transportation funding: live 2 or more miles from school, be classified as a student with a disability under the IDEA, be a Career Education 9-12 or an ESE student who is transported from one school center to another where appropriate programs are provided, or be on a route that meets the criteria for hazardous walking conditions specified in Section 1006.23(2), Florida Statutes. (See NOTE A1.)

As part of our examination procedures, we tested student transportation as reported to the DOE for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017. (See NOTE B.) The population of vehicles (693) consisted of the total number of vehicles (buses, vans, or passenger cars) reported by the District for all reporting survey periods. For example, a vehicle that transported students during the July and October 2016 and February and June 2017 reporting survey periods would be counted in the population as four vehicles. Similarly, the population of students (41,979) consisted of the total number of funded students reported by the District as having been transported for all reporting survey periods. (See NOTE A2.) The District reported students in the following ridership categories:

<u>Ridership Category</u>	<u>Number of Funded Students Transported</u>
Teenage Parents and Infants	7
IDEA – PK through Grade 12, Weighted	2,723
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>39,249</u>
Total	<u>41,979</u>

Students with exceptions are students with exceptions affecting their ridership category. Students cited only for incorrect reporting of DIT, if any, are not included in our error-rate determination.

Our examination results are summarized below:

<u>Description</u>	<u>Students</u>	
	<u>With Exceptions</u>	<u>Proposed Net Adjustment</u>
Our tests included 307 of the 41,979 students reported as being transported by the District.	12	(5)
In conjunction with our general tests of student transportation we identified certain issues related to 26 additional students.	<u>26</u>	<u>(25)</u>
Total	<u>38</u>	<u>(30)</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 DOE.

SCHEDULE G

FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

Overview

Marion County District School Board (District) management is responsible for determining that student transportation as reported under the FEFP is in compliance with State requirements. These requirements are found primarily in Chapter 1006, Part I, E. and Section 1011.68, Florida Statutes; SBE Rules, Chapter 6A-3, FAC; and the *Student Transportation General Instructions 2016-17* issued by the DOE. All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed below and requires management's attention and action as presented in *SCHEDULE H*.

Findings

Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments

Our examination procedures included both general tests and detailed tests. Our general tests included inquiries concerning the District's transportation of students and verification that a bus driver's report existed for each bus reported in a survey period. Our detailed tests involved verification of the specific ridership categories reported for students in our tests from the July and October 2016 reporting survey periods and the February and June 2017 reporting survey periods. Adjusted students who were in more than one reporting survey period are accounted for by reporting survey period. For example, a student included in our tests twice (e.g., once for the October 2016 reporting survey period and once for the February 2017 reporting survey period) will be presented in our Findings as two test students.

1. [Ref. 51] Our general tests disclosed that the number of DIT for four students was incorrectly reported. The students were reported for 7 or 16 DIT rather than 4 or 8 DIT, in accordance with the District's summer instructional calendars. In addition, one of the students was incorrectly reported in the IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted ridership category. The student's IEP did not indicate that the student met at least one of the five criteria required for reporting in a weighted ridership category; however, we determined that the student was eligible to be reported in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category. We propose the following adjustments:

July 2016 Survey

7 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted (1)

4 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted 1

**Students
Transported
Proposed Net
Adjustments**

Findings

June 2017 Survey

16 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted (3)

8 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted 2

All Other FEFP Eligible Students 1 0

2. [Ref. 52] Our general test of reported ridership disclosed that two students were incorrectly reported for State transportation funding. The students were enrolled in a Home Education Program that did not require transportation services; consequently, the students were not eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustment:

February 2017 Survey

90 Days in Term

All Other FEFP Eligible Students (2) (2)

3. [Ref. 53] Our general tests disclosed that 27 students (4 students were in our test) were either not marked by the bus drivers as riding a bus (25 students) or were not listed on the bus driver reports (2 students). Consequently, the students were not eligible to be reported for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustments:

October 2016 Survey

90 Days in Term

All Other FEFP Eligible Students (11)

February 2017 Survey

90 Days in Term

Teenage Parents and Infants (1)

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted (1)

All Other FEFP Eligible Students (14) (27)

4. [Ref. 54] The IEP for one student in our test did not document the need for ESY services; consequently, the student was not eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustment:

July 2016 Survey

4 Days in Term

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

**Students
Transported
Proposed Net
Adjustments**

Findings

5. [Ref. 55] Seven students in our test were incorrectly reported in the IDEA - PK through Grade-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 a weighted ridership category; however, we determined that all of the students were eligible for reporting in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category. We propose the following adjustments:

February 2017 Survey

90 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(6)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	6	

June 2017 Survey

8 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(1)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

Proposed Net Adjustment

(30)

SCHEDULE H

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that Marion County District School Board (District) management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) students are reported for the correct number of DIT based on District instructional calendars; (2) only those students who are in membership and are documented as having been transported at least 1 day of the reporting survey period are reported for State transportation funding; (3) only ESE students whose IEPs authorize ESY services are reported for funding during the summer reporting survey periods; and (4) students reported in the IDEA – PK through Grade 12, Weighted ridership category are documented as having met at least one of the five criteria required for reporting in a weighted ridership category as noted on the students' IEPs.

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

REGULATORY CITATIONS

Section 1002.33, Florida Statutes, *Charter Schools*
Chapter 1006, Part I, E., Florida Statutes, *Transportation of Public K-12 Students*
Section 1011.68, Florida Statutes, *Funds for Student Transportation*
SBE Rules, Chapter 6A-3, FAC, *Transportation*
Student Transportation General Instructions 2016-17

NOTES TO SCHEDULES

NOTE A - SUMMARY STUDENT TRANSPORTATION
--

A summary discussion of the significant features of the Marion County District School Board (District) student transportation and related areas is provided below.

1. Student Eligibility

Any student who is transported by the District must meet one or more of the following conditions in order to be eligible for State transportation funding: live 2 or more miles from school, be classified as a student with a disability under the IDEA, be a Career Education 9-12 or an ESE student who is transported from one school center to another where appropriate programs are provided, or be on a route that meets the criteria for hazardous walking conditions specified in Section 1006.23(2), Florida Statutes.

2. Transportation in Marion County

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017, the District received \$10.2 million for student transportation as part of the State funding through the FEFP. The District's student transportation reported by survey period was as follows:

<u>Survey Period</u>	<u>Number of Vehicles</u>	<u>Number of Funded Students</u>	<u>Number of Courtesy Riders</u>
July 2016	48	70	320
October 2016	307	21,177	1,989
February 2017	299	20,656	2,022
June 2017	<u>39</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>234</u>
Totals	<u>693</u>	<u>41,979</u>	<u>4,565</u>

3. Statutes and Rules

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

Section 1002.33, Florida Statutes, *Charter Schools*

Chapter 1006, Part I, E., Florida Statutes, *Transportation of Public K-12 Students*

Section 1011.68, Florida Statutes, *Funds for Student Transportation*

SBE Rules, Chapter 6A-3, FAC, *Transportation*

NOTE B – TESTING STUDENT TRANSPORTATION
--

Our examination procedures for testing provided for the selection of students using judgmental methods for testing student transportation as reported to the DOE for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017. Our testing process was designed to facilitate the performance of appropriate examination procedures to test the District's compliance with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of student transportation as reported under the FEFP.

MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE



www.marionschools.net
512 SE Third Street • Ocala FL 34471-2212
PO Box 670 • Ocala FL 34478-0670
352.671.7700 • Fax 352.671.7788
FRS 800.955.8770 (voice) • 800.955.8771 (TTY)

November 13, 2018

Ms. Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Auditor General
Claude Pepper Building, Suite G74
111 West Madison Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1450

RE: Response – Preliminary and Tentative Report - Marion Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2017

Dear Auditor General Norman:

The School District of Marion County has reviewed the report and finds the results in alignment with those from our final discussion with the data examination's lead auditor, Jennifer Taylor. As a result, Marion County Public Schools accepts the findings as noted in the report.

The outcome of this audit highlighted, for our district, areas where enhancements to some internal procedures and enriching inter-departmental collaborations are necessary. All, with a goal to increase our compliance rate for future audits.

Please contact Vickye Vaughns, Supervisor of Student Information and State Reporting, at 352-671-7565, if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

Heidi Maier, Ed.D.
Superintendent

HM/vv

Dr. Heidi Maier
Superintendent

Nancy Stacy
District 1

Beth McCall
District 2

Bobby L. James
District 3

Angie Boynton
District 4

Kelly King
District 5



An Equal Opportunity School District
SPEAKUP Hotline 866.SPEAK.UP or Text SPEAKUP to 847411

