STATE OF FLORIDA AUDITOR GENERAL

Attestation Examination

Report No. 2017-049
November 2016

VOLUSIA COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

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

For the Fiscal Year Ended
June 30, 2015

Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Auditor General

Board Members and Superintendent

During the 2014-15 fiscal year, the following individuals served as Board members or Superintendent:

Board Member	District No.
Dr. John Hill from 11-18-14	1
Candace Lankford to 11-17-14, Chair	1
Ida D. Wright, Vice-Chair from 11-18-14	2
Linda Cuthbert from 11-17-14	3
Stan Schmidt to 11-17-14, Vice Chair	3
Linda Costello, Chair from 11-18-14	4
Melody Johnson from 11-18-14	5
Diane Smith to 11-17-14	5

James T. Russell, Superintendent from 6-23-15,
Interim Superintendent from 1-27-15 to 6-22-15

Dr. Margaret A. Smith, Superintendent to 1-26-15

The team leader was Bernice Rivas 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:

www.myflorida.com/audgen

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

VOLUSIA COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

SUMMARY i

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENT ENROLLMENT 1

SCHEDULE A – POPULATIONS, TEST SELECTION, AND TEST RESULTS

- Reported FTE 4
- Schools and Students 4
- Teachers 5
- Proposed Adjustments 5

SCHEDULE B – EFFECT OF PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS ON WEIGHTED FTE STUDENT ENROLLMENT 6

SCHEDULE C – PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL 7

SCHEDULE D – FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS

- Overview 11
- Findings 11

SCHEDULE E – RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS 29

NOTES TO SCHEDULES 32

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON STUDENT TRANSPORTATION 35

SCHEDULE F – POPULATIONS, TEST SELECTION, AND TEST RESULTS 37

SCHEDULE G – FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS

- Overview 39
- Findings 39

SCHEDULE H – RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS 44

NOTES TO SCHEDULES 45

MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE 46

SUMMARY

SUMMARY OF ATTESTATION EXAMINATION

Except for the material noncompliance described below involving teachers and 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 English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) and student transportation, the Volusia 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, 2015. Specifically:

- Of the 171 teachers in our test, 41 did not meet State requirements governing certification, School Board approval of out-of-field teacher assignments, notification to parents regarding teachers' out-of-field status, or the earning of required in-service training points in ESOL strategies. Thirteen of the 171 teachers in our test (8 percent) taught at charter schools and 7 of the 41 teachers with exceptions (17 percent) taught at charter schools.
- 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 for 51 of the 171 students in our ESOL test. Sixteen of the 171 students (9 percent) in our ESOL test attended charter schools and 10 of the 51 students with exceptions (20 percent) attended charter schools.
- We noted exceptions involving the reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding for 66 of the 505 students in our student transportation test.

Noncompliance related to the reported FTE student enrollment resulted in 63 findings. The resulting proposed net adjustment to the District's reported, unweighted FTE totaled to negative 3.2321 (negative 2.7321 is applicable to District schools other than charter schools and negative .5000 is applicable to charter schools) but has a potential impact on the District's weighted FTE of negative 20.3954 (negative 18.9778 is applicable to District schools other than charter schools and negative 1.4176 is applicable to charter schools). Noncompliance related to student transportation resulted in 12 findings and a proposed net adjustment of negative 1,314 students.

The weighted adjustments to the FTE student enrollment are presented in our report for illustrative purposes only. The weighted adjustments to the FTE do not take special program caps and allocation factors into account and are not intended to indicate the weighted FTE used to compute the dollar value of adjustments. That computation is the responsibility of the Department of Education. However, the gross dollar effect of our proposed adjustments to the FTE may be estimated by multiplying the proposed net weighted adjustment to the FTE student enrollment by the base student allocation amount. The base student allocation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015, was $4,031.77 per FTE. For the District, the estimated gross dollar effect of our proposed adjustments to the reported FTE student enrollment is negative $82,230 (negative 20.3954 times $4,031.77), of which negative $76,514 is applicable to District schools other than charter schools and negative $5,716 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 Department of Education.

THE DISTRICT

The District was established pursuant to Section 1001.30, Florida Statutes, to provide public educational services for the residents of Volusia County, Florida. Those services are provided primarily to prekindergarten 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 State Board of Education. The geographic boundaries of the District are those of Volusia County.

The governing body of the District is the District School Board that is composed of five elected members. The executive officer of the Board is the appointed Superintendent of Schools. The District had 79 District schools other than charter schools, 8 charter schools, 1 District cost center, and 2 virtual education cost centers serving prekindergarten through 12th-grade students. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015, State funding totaling $184 million was provided through the FEFP to the District for the District-reported 61,350.52 unweighted FTE as recalibrated, which included 1,924.13 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 prekindergarten 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 upon the numbers of individual students participating in particular educational programs. A numerical value is assigned to each student according to the student's hours and days of attendance in those programs. The individual student thus becomes equated to a numerical value known as an unweighted FTE student enrollment. For brick and mortar school students, one student would be reported as 1.0 FTE if the student was enrolled in six classes per day at 50 minutes per class for the full 180-day school year (i.e., six classes at 50 minutes each per day is 5 hours of class a day or 25 hours per week, 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.

For the 2013-14 school year and beyond, all FTE student enrollment is capped at 1.0 FTE except for the FTE student enrollment reported by the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) for students beyond the 180-day school year. School districts report all FTE student enrollment regardless of the 1.0 FTE cap. The Department of Education combines all FTE student enrollment reported for the student by all school districts, including the Florida Virtual School Part-Time Program, using a common student identifier. The Department of Education 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 for extended school year periods and the DJJ FTE student enrollment reported beyond the 180-day school year is not included in the recalibration to 1.0 FTE.

Student Transportation

Any student who is transported by the District must meet one or more of the following conditions in order to be eligible for State transportation funding: live 2 or more miles from school, be physically handicapped, be a Career Education 9-12 or an Exceptional Student Education student who is transported from one school center to another where appropriate programs are provided, or be on a route that meets the criteria for hazardous walking conditions specified in Section 1006.23(4), Florida Statutes. 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 $10.5 million for student transportation as part of the State funding through the FEFP.

AUDITOR GENERAL
STATE OF FLORIDA

Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Auditor General

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
ON FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENT ENROLLMENT

We have examined the Volusia County District School Board's (District's) compliance with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of the FTE student enrollment as reported under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015. These requirements are found primarily in Sections 1011.60, 1011.61, and 1011.62, Florida Statutes; State Board of Education (SBE) Rules, Chapter 6A-1, Florida Administrative Code; and the *FTE General Instructions 2014-15* issued by the Department of Education. As discussed in the representation letter, management is responsible for the District's compliance with State requirements. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the District's compliance 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 (AICPA) and the standards applicable to attestation engagements contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and, accordingly, included examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting management's assertion about the District's compliance with the aforementioned State requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our examination provides a reasonable basis for our opinion. The legal determination of the District's compliance with these requirements is, however, ultimately the responsibility of the Department of Education.

Our examination disclosed material noncompliance with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of FTE student enrollment as reported under the FEFP for teachers and students in our English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) 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 mentioned above involving teachers and 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 ESOL, the Volusia County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of the FTE student enrollment as reported under the FEFP for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015.

In accordance with attestation standards established by the AICPA and *Government Auditing Standards*, we are required to report all deficiencies that are considered to be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses[1] 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 that has a material effect on the District's compliance with State requirements; 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 or on compliance and other matters; accordingly, we express no such opinions. 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. However, the material noncompliance mentioned above is indicative of significant deficiencies considered to be material weaknesses in the District's internal controls related to teacher certification and 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 ESOL. 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 FTE 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.

[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.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Tallahassee, Florida
November 10, 2016

SCHEDULE A

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

Reported FTE

The funding provided by the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) is based upon 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, English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Exceptional Student Education (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, 2015, the Volusia County District School Board (District) reported to the Department of Education 61,350.52 unweighted FTE as recalibrated, which included 1,924.13 unweighted FTE as recalibrated for charter schools, at 79 District schools other than charter schools, 8 charter schools, 1 District cost center, and 2 virtual education cost centers.

Schools and Students

As part of our examination procedures, we tested the FTE student enrollment reported to the Department of Education for schools and students for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015. (See NOTE B.) The population of schools (90) consisted of the total number of brick and mortar schools in the District that offered courses, including charter schools, as well as the designated District virtual education cost centers in the District that offered virtual instruction in the FEFP-funded programs. The population of students (16,570) 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 on-the-job training.

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 51 of the 171 students in our ESOL test.[2] Sixteen of the 171 students (9 percent) in our ESOL test attended charter schools and 10 of the 51 students with exceptions (20 percent) attended charter schools.

[2] For ESOL, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 35, 38, 39, 43, 44, 46, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 57, 61, and 63 on *SCHEDULE D*.

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

Programs	Number of Schools		Number of Students at Schools Tested		Students with Exceptions	Recalibrated Unweighted FTE		Proposed Adjustments
	Population	Test	Population	Test		Population	Test	
Basic	88	15	12,808	175	5	43,944.9800	126.3626	68.3311
Basic with ESE Services	89	15	2,869	118	5	12,580.1600	90.2638	(1.5836)
ESOL	78	15	617	171	51	2,075.0400	120.9884	(47.9449)
ESE Support Levels 4 and 5	57	8	138	120	8	785.0900	97.0188	(4.6429)
Career Education 9-12	12	4	138	82	4	1,965.2500	22.3227	(17.3918)
All Programs	90	15	16,570	666	73	61,350.5200	456.9563	(3.2321)

Teachers

We also tested teacher qualifications as part of our examination procedures. (See NOTE B.) Specifically, the population of teachers (576, of which 549 are applicable to District schools other than charter schools and 27 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 English Language Learner (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.

We noted the following material noncompliance: 41 of the 171 teachers in our test did not meet State requirements governing certification, School Board approval of out-of-field teacher assignments, notification to parents regarding teachers' out-of-field status, or the earning of required in-service training points in ESOL strategies.[3] Thirteen of the 171 teachers (8 percent) in our test taught at charter schools and 7 of the 41 teachers with exceptions (17 percent) 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 Department of Education.

[3] For teachers, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 9, 10, 16, 21, 22, 31, 32, 33, 37, 42, 45, 47, 48, 53, 54, 56, 58, and 62 on *SCHEDULE D*.

SCHEDULE B

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

District Schools Other Than Charter Schools		Proposed Net	Cost	Weighted
No.	Program (1)	Adjustment (2)	Factor	FTE (3)
101	Basic K-3	16.8647	1.126	18.9897
102	Basic 4-8	7.4999	1.000	7.4999
103	Basic 9-12	33.7665	1.004	33.9016
111	Grades K-3 with Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Services	.5000	1.126	.5630
112	Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	(.1644)	1.000	(.1644)
113	Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(.9192)	1.004	(.9229)
130	English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)	(38.3163)	1.147	(43.9488)
254	ESE Support Level 4	(3.9789)	3.548	(14.1171)
255	ESE Support Level 5	(.6640)	5.104	(3.3891)
300	Career Education 9-12	(17.3204)	1.004	(17.3897)
	Subtotal	(2.7321)		(18.9778)

Charter Schools		Proposed Net	Cost	Weighted
No.	Program (1)	Adjustment (2)	Factor	FTE (3)
101	Basic K-3	3.8781	1.126	4.3667
102	Basic 4-8	2.9545	1.000	2.9545
103	Basic 9-12	3.3674	1.004	3.3809
113	Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(1.0000)	1.004	(1.0040)
130	ESOL	(9.6286)	1.147	(11.0440)
300	Career Education 9-12	(.0714)	1.004	(.0717)
	Subtotal	(.5000)		(1.4176)

Total of Schools		Proposed Net	Cost	Weighted
No.	Program (1)	Adjustment (2)	Factor	FTE (3)
101	Basic K-3	20.7428	1.126	23.3564
102	Basic 4-8	10.4544	1.000	10.4544
103	Basic 9-12	37.1339	1.004	37.2825
111	Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.5000	1.126	.5630
112	Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	(.1644)	1.000	(.1644)
113	Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(1.9192)	1.004	(1.9269)
130	ESOL	(47.9449)	1.147	(54.9928)
254	ESE Support Level 4	(3.9789)	3.548	(14.1171)
255	ESE Support Level 5	(.6640)	5.104	(3.3891)
300	Career Education 9-12	(17.3918)	1.004	(17.4614)
	Total	(3.2321)		(20.3954)

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 Department of Education. (See NOTE A5.)

SCHEDULE C

PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL
FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENT ENROLLMENT

		Proposed Adjustments (1)			
No.	Program	#1551	#1631	#1811	Balance Forward
101	Basic K-3	.....	9.1456	5.1336	14.2792
102	Basic 4-8	.....	.6682	3.9690	4.6372
103	Basic 9-12	6.2063	.....	.....	6.2063
111	Grades K-3 with Exceptional Student Education Services (ESE)	.....	.5000	.....	.5000
112	Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	.....	.....	.....	.0000
113	Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	.1723	.....	.....	.1723
130	English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)	(6.2063)	(9.8138)	(8.9026)	(24.9227)
254	ESE Support Level 4	.....	(.5000)	(.2000)	(.7000)
255	ESE Support Level 5	(.5740)	.....	(.0500)	(.6240)
300	Career Education 9-12	(.0721)	.....	.....	(.0721)
Total		(.4738)	.0000	(.0500)	(.5238)

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

No.	Brought Forward	Proposed Adjustments (1) #3436	#3839	#4436	#4951	Balance Forward
101	14.2792	.....	.....	.....	.....	14.2792
102	4.6372	.....	.....	.....	.8260	5.4632
103	6.2063	20.5301	1.9408	3.6716	.....	32.3488
111	.5000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.5000
112	.0000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.0000
113	.1723	1.0000	(1.0000)	.5001	.....	.6724
130	(24.9227)	(3.6245)	(.7144)	(2.7842)	(.8260)	(32.8718)
254	(.7000)	(2.4690)	(.3098)	(.5001)	.....	(3.9789)
255	(.6240)	.....	.....	(.0400)	.....	(.6640)
300	(.0721)	(16.2010)	.....	(1.0473)	.....	(17.3204)
Total	(.5238)	(.7644)	(.0834)	(.1999)	.0000	(1.5715)

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

No.	Brought Forward	Proposed Adjustments (1) #6751	#6781	#6891*	#7001	Balance Forward
101	14.2792	.9225	1.6630	3.8781	.....	20.7428
102	5.4632	2.1899	.2086	2.9545	.....	10.8162
103	32.3488	.....	.....	.....	.1668	32.5156
111	.5000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.5000
112	.0000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.0000
113	.6724	.....	.....	.....	.....	.6724
130	(32.8718)	(3.1124)	(1.8716)	(6.8326)	(.1668)	(44.8552)
254	(3.9789)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(3.9789)
255	(.6640)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(.6640)
300	(17.3204)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(17.3204)
Total	(1.5715)	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000	(1.5715)

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

*Charter School

No.	Program	Brought Forward	Proposed Adjustments (1) #7006	#7891*	#9801	Total
101	Basic K-3	20.7428	.....	.....	.....	20.7428
102	Basic 4-8	10.8162	.....	.....	(.3618)	10.4544
103	Basic 9-12	32.5156	1.7378	3.3674	(.4869)	37.1339
111	Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.5000	.....	.....	.....	.5000
112	Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	.0000	.....	.....	(.1644)	(.1644)
113	Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	.6724	(1.4441)	(1.0000)	(.1475)	(1.9192)
130	ESOL	(44.8552)	(.2937)	(2.7960)	.....	(47.9449)
254	ESE Support Level 4	(3.9789)	.....	.....	.....	(3.9789)
255	ESE Support Level 5	(.6640)	.....	.....	.....	(.6640)
300	Career Education 9-12	(17.3204)	.....	(.0714)	.....	(17.3918)
Total		(1.5715)	.0000	(.5000)	(1.1606)	(3.2321)

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

*Charter School

FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Overview

Management is responsible for determining that the FTE student enrollment as reported under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) is in compliance with State requirements. These requirements are found primarily in Sections 1011.60, 1011.61, and 1011.62, Florida Statutes; State Board of Education (SBE) Rules, Chapter 6A-1, Florida Administrative Code (FAC); and the *FTE General Instructions 2014-15* issued by the Department of Education. Except for the material noncompliance involving teachers and 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 English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), the Volusia County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of the FTE student enrollment as reported under the FEFP for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015. All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed below and requires management's attention and action as presented in *SCHEDULE E*.

Findings		**Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)**
Our examination included the July and October 2014 reporting survey periods and the February and June 2015 reporting survey periods (See NOTE A6.). Unless otherwise specifically stated, the Findings and Proposed Adjustments presented herein are for the October 2014 reporting survey period or the February 2015 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.		
University High School (#1551)		
1. [Ref. 155101] One Exceptional Student Education (ESE) student in our Basic with ESE Services test was not in attendance during the October 2014 reporting survey period and should not have been reported for FEFP funding. We propose the following adjustment:		
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(.4017)	(.4017)
2. [Ref. 155102] Five English Language Learner (ELL) students were 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	2.1169	
130 ESOL	(2.1169)	.0000

Findings		Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

University High School (#1551) (Continued)

3. [Ref. 155103] Two ELL students' English language proficiencies were not assessed and ELL Committees were not convened by October 1 to consider the students' continued ESOL placements beyond 3 years from the students' Date Entered United States School (DEUSS) anniversary date. Additionally, an *ELL Student Plan* for one of the students was not completed until after the October 2014 reporting survey period. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.9550	
130 ESOL	(.9550)	.0000

4. [Ref. 155104] 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:

103 Basic 9-12	.8588	
130 ESOL	(.8588)	.0000

5. [Ref. 155105] One ELL student's *ELL Student Plan* was not reviewed and updated until January 5, 2015, which was after the October 2014 reporting survey period. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.3545	
130 ESOL	(.3545)	.0000

6. [Ref. 155106] The file for one ELL student did not contain support for the student's continued placement in the ESOL Program. The student was assessed as English proficient in all areas of the Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment test and scored a Level 3 on the Reading portion of the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test. Although an ELL Committee convened on May 6, 2014, the Committee did not document any criteria to support the student's continued ESOL placement. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.4650	
130 ESOL	(.4650)	.0000

7. [Ref. 155108] The timecards for one Career Education 9-12 student who participated in on-the-job training (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	(.0721)	(.0721)

Findings		Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

University High School (#1551) (Continued)

8. [Ref. 155109] The file for one ESE student who was provided both on-campus and homebound instruction did not contain a *Matrix of Services* form to support the student's on-campus reporting in Program No. 255 (ESE Support Level 5). We propose the following adjustment:

113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	.5740	
255 ESE Support Level 5	(.5740)	.0000

9. [Ref. 155171/73/75/76] Four teachers taught Primary Language Arts to classes that included ELL students but were not properly certified to teach ELL students. The teachers were approved by the School Board to teach out of field; however, School Board minutes did not indicate the approved out-of-field subject area(s). We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teachers' out-of-field status, and two of the teachers had earned none of the 60 (Ref. 155171) and none of the 180 (Ref. 155175) in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by SBE Rule 6A-6.0907, FAC, and the teachers' in-service training timelines. We propose the following adjustments:

Ref. 155171		
103 Basic 9-12	.4344	
130 ESOL	(.4344)	.0000
Ref. 155173		
103 Basic 9-12	.1456	
130 ESOL	(.1456)	.0000
Ref. 155175		
103 Basic 9-12	.1412	
130 ESOL	(.1412)	.0000
Ref. 155176		
103 Basic 9-12	.5751	
130 ESOL	(.5751)	.0000

10. [Ref. 155174] One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by the School Board to teach out of field. The teacher held certification in Social Science but taught a course that required certification in Biology. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustment:

Findings		Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)
University High School (#1551) (Continued)		
103 Basic 9-12	.1598	
130 ESOL	(.1598)	.0000
		(.4738)

Louise S. McInnis Elementary School (#1631)

11. [Ref. 163101] The *Matrix of Services* form for one ESE student was incorrectly scored. The score included three Special Consideration points for which the student was not eligible. The points were for students earning less than .5000 FTE; however, the student had earned .5000 FTE. We propose the following adjustment:

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

12. [Ref. 163103] The *ELL Student Plans* for two ELL students in the ESOL Program were incomplete as the *ELL Student Plans* did not include the students' instructional schedules. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	1.7664	
130 ESOL	(1.7664)	.0000

13. [Ref. 163104] The *ELL Student Plans* for two ELL students in the ESOL Program were not timely completed as the students' instructional schedules were not included with the *ELL Student Plans* until after the October 2014 reporting survey period. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.8789	
130 ESOL	(.8789)	.0000

14. [Ref. 163105] One student was incorrectly reported in the ESOL Program. The student had been exited from the ESOL Program on May 8, 2013; therefore, the student should have been reported in Basic education. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.2345	
130 ESOL	(.2345)	.0000

15. [Ref. 163106] 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	.4337	
130 ESOL	(.4337)	.0000

Findings		Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

Louise S. McInnis Elementary School (#1631) (Continued)

16. [Ref. 163171/72/73] Three teachers taught Primary Language Arts to classes that included ELL students but were not properly certified to teach ELL students. One teacher (Ref. 163173) was not approved by the School Board to teach such students until December 9, 2014, which was after the October 2014 reporting survey period. Although the other two teachers (Ref. 163171/72) were also approved to teach out of field, School Board minutes did not indicate the approved out-of-field subject area(s). We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of two of the teachers' (Ref. 163171/72) out-of-field status and were not notified of the remaining teacher's (Ref. 163172) out-of-field status until October 30, 2014, which was after the October 2014 reporting survey period. Additionally, one of the teachers (Ref. 163171) had earned none of the 180 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 adjustments:

Ref. 163171		
101 Basic K-3	3.3788	
130 ESOL	(3.3788)	.0000
Ref. 163172		
101 Basic K-3	1.5270	
130 ESOL	(1.5270)	.0000
Ref. 163173		
101 Basic K-3	1.5945	
130 ESOL	(1.5945)	.0000
		.0000

Deltona Lakes Elementary School (#1811)

17. [Ref. 181101/03] ELL Committees were not convened by October 1 to consider three ELL students' continued ESOL placements beyond 3 years from the students' DEUSS. We noted that an ELL Committee for one of the students (Ref. 181101) convened on November 13, 2014; however, the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the student's behavior rather than to consider the student's continued ESOL placement. We propose the following adjustments:

Ref. 181101		
102 Basic 4-8	.4308	
130 ESOL	(.4308)	.0000

Findings		Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)
Deltona Lakes Elementary School (#1811) (Continued)		
Ref. 181103		
102 Basic 4-8	.8617	
130 ESOL	(.8617)	.0000

18. [Ref. 181102] The letter notifying the parents of one ELL student's ESOL placement was undated. We determined that the parents were subsequently notified as denoted on the *Selection of Testing Location for ELL Students Taking Statewide Tests* form; however, the form was dated January 8, 2015, which was after the October 2014 reporting survey period. Accordingly, we propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.4400	
130 ESOL	(.4400)	.0000

19. [Ref. 181104] One ELL student was incorrectly reported in the ESOL Program. The student had been exited from the ESOL Program on January 29, 2015; therefore, the student should have been reported in Basic education in the February 2015 reporting survey period. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.4400	
130 ESOL	(.4400)	.0000

20. [Ref. 181107] The homebound teacher's contact logs for one ESE student who was enrolled in the Hospital and Homebound Program were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located to support the reported instructional time. We propose the following adjustment:

255 ESE Support Level 5	(.0500)	(.0500)

21. [Ref. 181171/72/74/75/77] Five teachers taught Primary Language Arts to classes that included ELL students but were not properly certified to teach ELL students. Three of the teachers (Ref. 181171/72/74) were approved by the School Board to teach out of field but School Board minutes did not indicate the approved out-of-field subject area(s). The remaining two teachers (Ref. 181175/77) were not approved by the School Board to teach such students out of field until December 9, 2014, which was after the October 2014 reporting survey period. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teachers' out-of-field status and one of the teachers (Ref. 181174) earned only 180 of the 240 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 adjustments:

Findings		Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

Deltona Lakes Elementary School (#1811) (Continued)

Ref. 181171		
101 Basic K-3	1.8840	
130 ESOL	(1.8840)	.0000
Ref. 181172		
101 Basic K-3	1.5101	
130 ESOL	(1.5101)	.0000
Ref. 181174		
101 Basic K-3	.8595	
130 ESOL	(.8595)	.0000
Ref. 181175		
102 Basic 4-8	.9906	
130 ESOL	(.9906)	.0000
Ref. 181177		
102 Basic 4-8	1.4859	
130 ESOL	(1.4859)	.0000

22. [Ref. 181176] One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by the School Board to teach out of field. The teacher was certified in ESE but taught a course that required certification in Elementary Education. We also noted that the parents of the ESE student were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.2000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.2000)	.0000
		(.0500)

Mainland High School (#3436)

23. [Ref. 343601] One ELL student's English language proficiency was not assessed within 30 school days prior to the student's DEUSS anniversary date and the *ELL Committee Minutes* form only documented the participation of one individual and did not document any criteria to support the student's continued ESOL placement beyond 3 years of the student's DEUSS. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.2584	
130 ESOL	(.2584)	.0000

Findings		Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

Mainland High School (#3436) (Continued)

24. [Ref. 343602] The *ELL Student Plans* for three ELL students were not completed until after the October 2014 reporting survey period. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.9112	
130 ESOL	(.9112)	.0000

25. [Ref. 343603] 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	.5168	
130 ESOL	(.5168)	.0000

26. [Ref. 343604] The files for two ELL students did not contain *ELL Student Plans* covering the 2014-15 school year. We also noted that an ELL Committee for one of the students was not convened by October 1 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	1.4212	
130 ESOL	(1.4212)	.0000

27. [Ref. 343605] One ESE student was not in attendance during the October 2014 reporting survey period; therefore, the student should not have been reported for FEFP funding. We propose the following adjustment:

254 ESE Support Level 4	(.5000)	(.5000)

28. [Ref. 343606] Two ESE students were not reported in accordance with the students' *Matrix of Services* forms. We propose the following adjustment:

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

29. [Ref. 343607] The timecards for one Career Education 9-12 student 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	(.1130)	(.1130)

Findings		Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

Mainland High School (#3436) (Continued)

30. [Ref. 343608] The timecard for one Career Education 9-12 student who participated in OJT was not signed by the student's employer. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	(.1514)	(.1514)

31. [Ref. 343671] One teacher taught Primary Language Arts to classes that included ELL students but was not certified to teach ELL students and was not approved by the School Board to teach such students out of field until January 27, 2015, which was after the October 2014 reporting survey period. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.3876	
130 ESOL	(.3876)	.0000

32. [Ref. 343672/74/75] Three teachers were not properly certified and were not approved by the School Board to teach out of field. The teachers taught classes in Digital Media (Ref. 363672), Family Consumer Science (Ref. 343674), and Math (Ref. 343675), respectively. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teachers' out of field status. We propose the following adjustments:

Ref. 343672		
103 Basic 9-12	14.4881	
300 Career Education 9-12	(14.4881)	.0000
Ref. 343674		
103 Basic 9-12	1.4485	
300 Career Education 9-12	(1.4485)	.0000
Ref. 343675		
103 Basic 9-12	.9690	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.9690)	.0000

33. [Ref. 343676/77] Two teachers taught Basic subject areas to classes 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 teachers' in-service training timelines. We propose the following adjustments:

Ref. 343676		
103 Basic 9-12	.0647	
130 ESOL	(.0647)	.0000

Findings		Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)
Mainland High School (#3436) (Continued)		
Ref. 343677		
103 Basic 9-12	.0646	
130 ESOL	(.0646)	.0000
		(.7644)

New Smyrna Beach High School (#3839)

34. [Ref. 383901] School records did not demonstrate that the parents of one ESE student in our Basic with ESE Services test had been advised of, and invited to, the student's *Educational Plan* (*EP*) development meeting. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	1.0000	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(1.0000)	.0000

35. [Ref. 383902] 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:

103 Basic 9-12	.7144	
130 ESOL	(.7144)	.0000

36. [Ref. 383903] The course schedule for one ESE student incorrectly included one course twice in the same period. We propose the following adjustment:

254 ESE Support Level 4	(.0834)	(.0834)

37. [Ref. 383971/72] Two teachers were not properly certified and were not approved by the School Board to teach out of field. One teacher taught a class in Physical Education (Ref. 383971) and the other teacher taught a class in Math (Ref. 383972). We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of one of the teacher's (Ref. 383971) out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustments:

Ref. 383971		
103 Basic 9-12	.1550	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.1550)	.0000
Ref. 383972		
103 Basic 9-12	.0714	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.0714)	.0000
		(.0834)

Findings		Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

Spruce Creek High School (#4436)

38. [Ref. 443601] ELL Committees for four ELL students were not convened by October 1 (two students) or within 30 school days prior to the students' DEUSS anniversary dates (two students) to consider the students' continued ESOL placements beyond 3 years from the students' DEUSS. We also noted that the English language proficiencies of two of the students were not assessed within 30 days prior to the students' DEUSS, and one of the students 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	2.4272	
130 ESOL	(2.4272)	.0000

39. [Ref. 443603] The file for one ELL student did not contain an *ELL Student Plan* covering the 2014-15 school year. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.3570	
130 ESOL	(.3570)	.0000

40. [Ref. 443605] School records did not demonstrate that the *Matrix of Services* form for one ESE student had been reviewed and updated when the student's February 10, 2015, *Individual Educational Plan* (*IEP*) was prepared. We propose the following adjustment:

113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	.5001	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.5001)	.0000

41. [Ref. 443606] The timecard for one Career Education 9-12 student who participated in OJT was not signed by the student's employer. We propose the following adjustment:

300 Career Education 9-12	(.1999)	(.1999)

42. [Ref. 443671/72] Two teachers were not properly certified and were not approved by the School Board to teach out of field. One teacher held certification in Specific Learning Disabilities (Ref. 443671) and one teacher held certification in ESE (Ref. 443672) but taught courses that required certification in Reading (Ref. 443671) and Business Education (Ref. 443672), respectively. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teachers' out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustments:

Findings		Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)
Spruce Creek High School (#4436) (Continued)		
Ref. 443671		
103 Basic 9-12	.0400	
255 ESE Support Level 5	(.0400)	.0000
Ref. 443672		
103 Basic 9-12	.8474	
300 Career Education 9-12	(.8474)	.0000
		(.1999)

Sweetwater Elementary School (#4951)

43. [Ref. 495101] The file for one ELL student did not contain an *ELL Student Plan* covering the 2014-15 school year. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.8260	
130 ESOL	(.8260)	.0000
		.0000

Discovery Elementary School (#6751)

44. [Ref. 675101] 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	.8524	
130 ESOL	(.8524)	.0000

45. [Ref. 675172/73/74] Three teachers taught Primary Language Arts to classes that included ELL students but were not properly certified to teach ELL students. Two teachers (Ref. 675172/73) were approved by the School Board to teach out of field; however, School Board minutes did not indicate the approved out-of-field subject area(s). The third teacher (Ref. 675174) was not approved by School Board to teach such students out of field until January 27, 2015, which was after the October 2014 reporting survey period. We also noted the parents of the students were not notified of one of the teacher's (Ref. 675174) out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustments:

Ref. 675172		
101 Basic K-3	.9225	
130 ESOL	(.9225)	.0000

Findings		Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)
Discovery Elementary School (#6751) (Continued)		
Ref. 675173		
102 Basic 4-8	.8100	
130 ESOL	(.8100)	.0000
Ref. 675174		
102 Basic 4-8	.5275	
130 ESOL	(.5275)	.0000
		.0000

Timbercrest Elementary School (#6781)

46. [Ref. 678102] One student was incorrectly reported in the ESOL Program. The student's English language proficiency was assessed as a Fluent English Speaker and tested to be a competent English reader and writer and did not qualify for placement in the ESOL Program. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.2086	
130 ESOL	(.2086)	.0000

47. [Ref. 678171/72/73] Three teachers taught Primary Language Arts to classes that included ELL students but were not properly certified to teach ELL students. Two of the teachers (Ref. 678171/73) were approved by the School Board to teach out of field; however, School Board minutes did not indicate the approved out-of-field subject area(s). The School Board did not approve the third teacher (Ref. 678172) to teach such students out of field until November 12, 2014, which was after the October 2014 reporting survey period. We propose the following adjustments:

Ref. 678171		
101 Basic K-3	.6844	
130 ESOL	(.6844)	.0000
Ref. 678172		
101 Basic K-3	.6484	
130 ESOL	(.6484)	.0000
Ref. 678173		
101 Basic K-3	.3302	
130 ESOL	(.3302)	.0000
		.0000

Findings		Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

The Reading Edge Academy (#6891) Charter School

48. [Ref. 689172] One teacher taught Primary Language Arts to classes that included ELL students but had earned none of the 120 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by SBE Rule 6A-6.0907, FAC, and the teacher's in-service training timeline. Since the student is cited in Finding 52 (Ref. 689104), we present this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustment.

.0000

49. [Ref. 689101] ELL Committees were not convened by October 1 to consider four ELL students' continued ESOL placements beyond 3 years from the students' DEUSS. Additionally, the English language proficiency of one of the students was not assessed within 30 school days prior to the student's DEUSS anniversary date and the initial placement date in the ESOL Program for one of the students was not documented. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	1.7236	
102 Basic 4-8	1.2927	
130 ESOL	(3.0163)	.0000

50. [Ref. 689102] The file for one student did not contain documentation to support the student's ESOL placement and the *ELL Student Plan* was undated. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.4309	
130 ESOL	(.4309)	.0000

51. [Ref. 689103] The file for one ELL student did not contain an *ELL Student Plan* covering the 2014-15 school year. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.8618	
130 ESOL	(.8618)	.0000

52. [Ref. 689104] One ELL student had been exited from the ESOL Program prior to the reporting survey periods; therefore, the student should have been reported in Basic education. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.8618	
130 ESOL	(.8618)	.0000

Findings		Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

The Reading Edge Academy (#6891) Charter School (Continued)

53. [Ref. 689171/73] The parents of ELL students taught by two out-of-field teachers were not notified of the teachers' out-of-field status. We also noted that one of the teachers (Ref. 689173) had earned none of the 240 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 adjustments:

Ref. 689171		
102 Basic 4-8	.8000	
130 ESOL	(.8000)	.0000
Ref. 689173		
101 Basic K-3	.8618	
130 ESOL	(.8618)	.0000
		.0000

Volusia County Virtual Instruction Program (#7001)

54. [Ref. 700171/72] Two virtual education teachers were not properly certified and were not approved by the School Board to teach out of field. One teacher (Ref. 700171) taught an Intensive Reading class that included ELL students and one teacher (Ref. 700172) taught a Family Consumer Science class. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teachers' out-of-field status. Since the student of one teacher (Ref. 700171) is cited in Finding 55 (Ref. 700101) and the students of the other teacher (Ref. 700172) were only reported in Basic education, we present this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustments.

.0000

55. [Ref. 700101] The file for one virtual education student enrolled in the ESOL Program did not contain documentation to support the student's ESOL placement. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.1668	
130 ESOL	(.1668)	.0000
		.0000

Findings		Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

Volusia Virtual Instruction - Course Offerings (#7006)

56. [Ref. 700672] One virtual education teacher taught English to classes that included ELL students but was not properly certified to teach ELL students. The teacher was approved by the School Board to teach out of field; however, School Board minutes did not indicate the approved out-of-field subject area. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. Since the student is cited in Finding 57 (Ref.700601), we present this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustment.

		.0000

57. [Ref. 700601] Two ELL students were 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	.2937	
130 ESOL	(.2937)	.0000

58. [Ref. 700671] One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by the School Board to teach out of field. The teacher was certified in Biology and Math but taught courses that required certification in Earth-Space Science. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	1.4441	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(1.4441)	.0000
		.0000

Richard Milburn Academy (#7891) Charter School

59. [Ref. 789101] One Basic student was not in attendance during the October 2014 reporting survey period and should not have been reported for FEFP funding. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	(.5000)	(.5000)

60. [Ref. 789102] The *IEP* for one ESE student was not signed by those who participated in the development of the student's *IEP*. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	1.0000	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(1.0000)	.0000

Findings		Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

Richard Milburn Academy (#7891) Charter School (Continued)

61. [Ref. 789103] ELL Committees for three ELL students were not convened by October 1 (one student) or within 30 school days prior to the students' DEUSS anniversary dates (two students) to consider the students' continued ESOL placements beyond 3 years from the students' DEUSS, and the files for these students did not contain *ELL Student Plans*. We also noted that two of the students were reported in the ESOL Program beyond the maximum 6-year period allowed for State funding of ESOL. Additionally, two of the students' English language proficiencies were not assessed within 30 school days prior to the students' DEUSS anniversary dates. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	2.2138	
130 ESOL	(2.2138)	.0000

62. [Ref. 789171/72/73/74] Four teachers were not properly certified and were not approved by the Charter School Board to teach out of field. One teacher held certification in English (Ref. 789171) but taught a class that included ELL students and the ESOL coverage was not added to her certificate until after the reporting survey period. The second teacher (Ref. 789172) held certification in General Science but taught a class that required certification in Chemistry. The third teacher (Ref. 789173) held certification in ESE but taught classes that required certification in Math, History, and ESOL. The fourth teacher (Ref. 789174) held certification in Social Science but taught a class that required certification in Business Education (Ref. 789174). We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teachers' out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustments:

Ref. 789171		
103 Basic 9-12	.2911	
130 ESOL	(.2911)	.0000
Ref. 789172		
103 Basic 9-12	.0714	
130 ESOL	(.0714)	.0000
Ref. 789173		
103 Basic 9-12	.2197	
130 ESOL	(.2197)	.0000
Ref. 789174		
103 Basic 9-12	.0714	
300 Career Education 9-12	(.0714)	.0000
		(.5000)

Findings		Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

Volusia Regional Juvenile Detention Center (#9801)

63. [Ref. 980101/02] The number of days in term for 134 students (4 students were in our Basic test, 2 students were in our Basic with ESE Services test, and 1 student was in our ESOL test) reported in the July 2014 and the June 2015 reporting survey periods was incorrectly reported for 30 days in term for each of the reporting survey periods. The Center's calendar supported 29 days and 31 days, respectively. Additionally, the students' schedules were reported for more than the maximum 25 hours per week allowed per the *FTE General Instructions 2014-15*. We propose the following adjustments:

Ref. 980101		
102 Basic 4-8	(.3618)	
103 Basic 9-12	(.4869)	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	(.1616)	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(.1475)	(1.1578)
Ref. 980102		
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	(.0028)	(.0028)
		(1.1606)
Proposed Net Adjustment		**(3.2321)**

SCHEDULE E

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS
FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENT ENROLLMENT

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that Volusia County District School Board (District) management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) only students who are in membership and in attendance at least 1 day during the reporting survey period are reported for the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) funding; (2) students are reported in the proper FEFP funding categories for the correct amount of FTE student enrollment equated to only the course taken for a given period and adequate documentation is retained to support that reporting, particularly with regard to students reported in the English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Program; (3) English Language Learner (*ELL*) *Student Plans* are timely prepared, dated, reviewed, and retained in the students' files; (4) students' files contain proper documentation to support each ELL student's ESOL placement; (5) students' English language proficiencies are assessed and ELL Committees are convened timely to support the students' continued ESOL placements beyond 3 years from the students' Date Entered United States School (DEUSS) anniversary dates; (6) ELL students are not reported in the ESOL Program for more than the 6-year period allowed for State funding of ESOL; (7) parents are timely notified of their child's ESOL placement; (8) students who have been exited from the ESOL Program are no longer reported in the ESOL Program; (9) Career Education 9-12 students who participated in on-the-job training are reported in accordance with timecards that are accurately completed, signed, and retained in readily-accessible files; (10) homebound instructors' contact logs are retained to support the instructional time provided to students enrolled in the Hospital and Homebound Program; (11) Exceptional Student Education students are reported in accordance with the students' *Matrix of Services* forms that are properly scored; (12) there is evidence of review of the *Matrix of Services* forms when a student's new *Individual Educational Plan* (*IEP*) is prepared; (13) parents are invited to attend and all required participants are involved in the development of the students' *Educational Plans* or *IEPs* and documentation of this participation is maintained in the students' files; (14) FTE student enrollment for students attending Department of Juvenile Justice Programs does not exceed the maximum calculation based on 25 hours per week of instruction and for the correct number of days in term; (15) teachers are properly certified or, if out of field, are approved to teach out of field by the School Board or Charter School Governing Board and the approval clearly indicates the out-of-field subject area; (16) out-of-field teachers earn the in-service training points as required by State Board of Education (SBE) Rule 6A-6.0907, Florida Administrative Code, and the teachers' in-service training timelines; and (17) parents are appropriately notified of teachers' out-of-field status.

The absence of statements in this report regarding practices and procedures followed by the District should not be construed as acceptance, approval, or endorsement of those practices and procedures. Additionally, the specific nature of this report does not limit or lessen the District's obligation to comply with all State requirements 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, Florida Administrative Code, *Florida Education Finance Program Student Membership Surveys*
SBE Rule 6A-1.045111, Florida Administrative Code, *Hourly Equivalent to 180-Day School Year*
SBE Rule 6A-1.04513, Florida Administrative Code, *Maintaining Auditable FTE Records*
FTE General Instructions 2014-15

Attendance

Section 1003.23, Florida Statutes, *Attendance Records and Reports*
SBE Rule 6A-1.044(3) and (6)(c), Florida Administrative Code, *Pupil Attendance Records*
SBE Rule 6A-1.04513, Florida Administrative Code, *Maintaining Auditable FTE Records*
FTE General Instructions 2014-15
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, Florida Administrative Code, *Definitions Which Apply to Programs for English Language Learners*
SBE Rule 6A-6.0902, Florida Administrative Code, *Requirements for Identification, Eligibility, and Programmatic Assessments of English Language Learners*
SBE Rule 6A-6.09021, Florida Administrative Code, *Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment for English Language Learners (ELLs)*
SBE Rule 6A-6.09022, Florida Administrative Code, *Extension of Services in English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Program*
SBE Rule 6A-6.0903, Florida Administrative Code, *Requirements for Exiting English Language Learners from the English for Speakers of Other Languages Program*
SBE Rule 6A-6.09031, Florida Administrative Code, *Post Reclassification of English Language Learners (ELLs)*
SBE Rule 6A-6.0904, Florida Administrative Code, *Equal Access to Appropriate Instruction for English Language Learners*

Career Education On-The-Job Attendance

SBE Rule 6A-1.044(6)(c), Florida Administrative Code, *Pupil Attendance Records*

Career Education On-The-Job Funding Hours

SBE Rule 6A-6.055(3), Florida Administrative Code, *Definitions of Terms Used in Vocational Education and Adult Programs*

FTE General Instructions 2014-15

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, Florida Administrative Code, *Provision of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) and Development of Individual Educational Plans for Students with Disabilities*

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

SBE Rule 6A-6.0312, Florida Administrative Code, *Course Modifications for Exceptional Students*

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

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

SBE Rule 6A-6.03411, Florida Administrative Code, *Definitions, ESE Policies and Procedures, and ESE Administrators*

SBE Rule 6A-6.0361, Florida Administrative Code, *Contractual Agreement with Nonpublic Schools and Residential Facilities*

Matrix of Services Handbook (2012 Revised 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, Florida Administrative Code, *Non-certificated Instructional Personnel*

SBE Rule 6A-1.0503, Florida Administrative Code, *Definition of Qualified Instructional Personnel*

SBE Rule 6A-4.001, Florida Administrative Code, *Instructional Personnel Certification*

SBE Rule 6A-6.0907, Florida Administrative Code, *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

NOTE A – SUMMARY
FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENT ENROLLMENT

A summary discussion of the significant features of the Volusia County District School Board (District), the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP), the FTE, and related areas follows:

1. The District

The District was established pursuant to Section 1001.30, Florida Statutes, to provide public educational services for the residents of Volusia County, Florida. Those services are provided primarily to prekindergarten 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 State Board of Education (SBE). The geographic boundaries of the District are those of Volusia County.

The governing body of the District is the District School Board that is composed of nine elected members. The executive officer of the Board is the appointed Superintendent of Schools. The District had 79 District schools other than charter schools, 8 charter schools, 1 District cost center, and 2 virtual education cost centers serving prekindergarten through 12th-grade students. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015, State funding totaling $184 million was provided through the FEFP to the District for the District-reported 61,350.52 unweighted FTE as recalibrated, which included 1,924.13 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 prekindergarten 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 upon the numbers of individual students participating in particular educational programs. A numerical value is assigned to each student according to the student's hours and days of attendance in those programs. The individual student thus becomes equated to a numerical value known as an unweighted FTE student enrollment. For example, for prekindergarten 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

classes per day at 50 minutes per class for the full 180-day school year (i.e., six classes at 50 minutes each per day is 5 hours of class a day or 25 hours per week, 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

For the 2013-14 school year and beyond, all FTE student enrollment is capped at 1.0 FTE except for the FTE student enrollment reported by the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) for students beyond the 180-day school year. School districts report all FTE student enrollment regardless of the 1.0 FTE cap. The Department of Education combines all the FTE student enrollment reported for the student by all school districts, including the Florida Virtual School (FLVS) Part-Time Program, using a common student identifier. The Department of Education then recalibrates all the 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 for extended school year periods and the DJJ FTE student enrollment reported beyond the 180-day school year is not included in the recalibration to 1.0 FTE.

5. Calculation of FEFP Funds

The amount of State and local FEFP funds is calculated by the Department of Education by multiplying the number of unweighted FTE in each educational program by the specific cost factor of each program to obtain weighted FTEs. Weighted FTEs are multiplied by the base student allocation amount and that product is multiplied by the appropriate cost differential factor. Various adjustments are then added to 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 2014-15 school year were conducted during and for the following weeks: survey period one was performed for July 7 through 11, 2014; survey period two was performed for October 13 through 17, 2014; survey period three was performed for February 9 through 13, 2015; and survey period four was performed for June 15 through 19, 2015.

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) English for Speakers of Other Languages, (3) Exceptional Student Education, 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, Florida Administrative Code, *Finance and Administration*
SBE Rules, Chapter 6A-4, Florida Administrative Code, *Certification*
SBE Rules, Chapter 6A-6, Florida Administrative Code, *Special Programs I*

NOTE B – TESTING
FTE STUDENT ENROLLMENT

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 Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015. 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:

	School	Findings
1.	University High School	1 through 10
2.	Louise S. McInnis Elementary School	11 through 16
3.	Deltona Lakes Elementary School	17 through 22
4.	Mainland High School	23 through 33
5.	New Smyrna Beach High School	34 through 37
6.	Spruce Creek High School	38 through 42
7.	Sweetwater Elementary School	43
8.	Discovery Elementary School	44 and 45
9.	Timbercrest Elementary School	46 and 47
10.	The Reading Edge Academy*	48 through 53
11.	Volusia County Virtual Instruction Program	54 and 55
12.	Volusia Virtual Instruction - Course Offerings	56 through 58
13.	Ivy Hawn Charter School of the Arts*	NA
14.	Richard Milburn Academy*	59 through 62
15.	Volusia Regional Juvenile Detention Center	63

* Charter School

AUDITOR GENERAL
STATE OF FLORIDA

Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Auditor General

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
ON STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

We have examined the Volusia 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 (FEFP) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015. These requirements are found primarily in Chapter 1006, Part I, E. and Section 1011.68, Florida Statutes; State Board of Education (SBE) Rules, Chapter 6A-3, Florida Administrative Code; and the *Student Transportation General Instructions 2014-15* issued by the Department of Education. As discussed in the representation letter, management is responsible for the District's compliance with State requirements. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the District's compliance 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 (AICPA) and the standards applicable to attestation engagements contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and, accordingly, included examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting management's assertion about the District's compliance with the aforementioned State requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our examination provides a reasonable basis for our opinion. The legal determination of the District's compliance with these requirements is, however, ultimately the responsibility of the Department of Education.

Our examination disclosed material noncompliance with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of student transportation as reported under the FEFP involving the students' reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding.

In our opinion, except for the material noncompliance with State requirements mentioned above involving the students' reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding, the Volusia County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements relating to the

classification, assignment, and verification of student transportation as reported under the FEFP for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015.

In accordance with attestation standards established by the AICPA and *Government Auditing Standards*, we are required to report all deficiencies considered to be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses[4] 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 that has a material effect on the District's compliance with State requirements; 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 or on compliance and other matters, accordingly, we express no such opinions. 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. However, the material noncompliance mentioned above is indicative of significant deficiencies considered to be material weaknesses in the District's internal controls related to the students' reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding. 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. The impact of this noncompliance 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.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Sherrill F. Norman

Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Tallahassee, Florida
November 10, 2016

[4] 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.

POPULATIONS, TEST SELECTION, AND TEST RESULTS
STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

Any student who is transported by the Volusia 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 physically handicapped, be a Career Education 9-12 or an Exceptional Student Education student who is transported from one school center to another where appropriate programs are provided, or be on a route that meets the criteria for hazardous walking conditions specified in Section 1006.23(4), Florida Statutes. (See NOTE A1.)

As part of our examination procedures, we tested student transportation as reported to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015. (See NOTE B.) The population of vehicles (505) consisted of the total number of vehicles (buses, vans, or passenger cars) reported by the District for each reporting survey period. For example, a vehicle that transported students during the July and October 2014 and February and June 2015 reporting survey periods would be counted in the population as four vehicles. Similarly, the population of students (49,107) consisted of the total number of students reported by the District as having been transported for each reporting survey period. (See NOTE A2.) The District reported students in the following ridership categories:

Ridership Category	Number of Students Transported
Teenage Parents and Infants	226
Hazardous Walking	560
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act – Prekindergarten through Grade 12, Weighted	1,551
All Other Florida Education Finance Program Eligible Students	46,770
Total	49,107

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

We noted the following material noncompliance: exceptions involving the reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding for 66 of the 505 students in our student transportation test.[5]

[5] For student transportation, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 12 on *SCHEDULE G*.

Our examination results are summarized below:

Description	Students With Exceptions	Students Proposed Net Adjustment
Our tests included 505 of the 49,107 students reported as being transported by the District.	66	(47)
We also noted certain issues in conjunction with our general tests of student transportation that resulted in the addition of 1,269 students.	1,269	(1,267)
Total	1,335	(1,314)

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

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

SCHEDULE G

FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS
STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

Overview

Management is responsible for determining that student transportation as reported under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) is in compliance with State requirements. These requirements are found primarily in Chapter 1006, Part I, E., and Section 1011.68, Florida Statutes; State Board of Education Rules, Chapter 6A-3, Florida Administrative Code; and the *Student Transportation General Instructions 2014-15* issued by the Department of Education. Except for the material noncompliance involving the students' reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding, the Volusia County District School Board (District) complied, in all material respects, with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of student transportation as reported under the FEFP for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015. 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 2014 reporting survey periods and the February and June 2015 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 (i.e., once for the October 2014 reporting survey period and once for the February 2015 reporting survey period) will be presented in our Findings as two test students.		
1. [Ref. 51] Our general tests of student ridership disclosed that 1,264 students were incorrectly reported for State transportation funding. The students were not identified as Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) students and the students were not enrolled in a Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) Program during the July 2014 reporting survey period. We propose the following adjustment:		
July 2014 Survey		
25 Days in Term		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(1,264)	(1,264)

Findings		Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments

2. [Ref. 52] Our general tests disclosed that 93 students enrolled in DJJ Programs were incorrectly reported for 25 days in term (DIT) in the July 2014 and June 2015 reporting survey periods. The Schools' instructional calendars supported 30 and 20 DIT for students attending Amikids Volusia School (24 students) and 28 and 22 DIT for students attending the PACE Center for Girls (54 students) for the July 2014 and June 2015 reporting survey periods, respectively. We propose the following adjustments:

July 2014 Survey		
30 Days in Term		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	13	
28 Days in Term		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	33	
25 Days in Term		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(46)	
June 2015 Survey		
25 Days in Term		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(47)	
22 Days in Term		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	24	
20 Days in Term		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	23	0

3. [Ref. 53] Our general tests disclosed that 738 Exceptional Student Education (ESE) students were incorrectly reported for 25 DIT rather than the 16 DIT included in the District's instructional calendar. We propose the following adjustment:

July 2014 Survey		
25 Days in Term		
IDEA – Prekindergarten (PK) through Grade 12, Weighted	(178)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(560)	
16 Days in Term		
IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	178	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	560	0

Findings		Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments

4. [Ref. 54] Twenty-nine students in our test were incorrectly reported in the July 2014 reporting survey period. The *Individual Educational Plans* (*IEPs*) for 26 ESE students did not authorize extended school year services, the *IEP* for 1 student was not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located, and the other 2 students were reported in the Teenage Parents and Infants ridership category but were not IDEA students and were not enrolled in a DJJ Program. Consequently, the students were not eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustment:

July 2014 Survey		
25 Days in Term		
Teenage Parents and Infants	(2)	
IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(4)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(23)	(29)

5. [Ref. 55] Three students in our test were incorrectly reported in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category. The students lived less than 2 miles from their assigned schools and were not otherwise eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustments:

July 2014 Survey		
25 Days in Term		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(1)	
October 2014 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(1)	
June 2015 Survey		
25 Days in Term		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(1)	(3)

6. [Ref. 56] Nine students in our test were incorrectly reported in the Teenage Parents and Infants ridership category. The students were not enrolled in the Teenage Parent Program; however, we determined that the students lived 2 miles or more from their assigned schools and were eligible for reporting in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category. We propose the following adjustments:

October 2014 Survey	
90 Days in Term	
Teenage Parents and Infants	(7)
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	7

Findings		Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments
February 2015 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
Teenage Parents and Infants	(2)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	2	0

7. [Ref. 57] The reported ridership of five students in our test was not adequately supported. The bus drivers' reports indicated that the students were not transported during the reporting survey period and one of the students lived less than 2 miles from the student's assigned school. Consequently, the students were not eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustment:

February 2015 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
Teenage Parents and Infants	(1)	
Hazardous Walking	(1)	
IDEA – PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(1)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(2)	(5)

8. [Ref. 58] Two students in our test were reported as being transported to school on city buses; however, District records did not demonstrate that the students received bus passes. Consequently, the students' ridership could not be validated. We propose the following adjustment:

February 2015 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
Teenage Parents and Infants	(1)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(1)	(2)

9. [Ref. 60] School records did not demonstrate that eight PK students in our test who were reported in the Teenage Parent and Infants ridership category were eligible to be reported. The birth certificates indicating the PK students' parents were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. Consequently, we could not validate the students' eligibility for reporting in this ridership category. We propose the following adjustments:

October 2014 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
Teenage Parents and Infants	(6)	
February 2015 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
Teenage Parents and Infants	(2)	(8)

Findings		Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments

10. [Ref. 61] Our general tests disclosed that two students who were reported in the IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted ridership category were transported by private passenger vehicles; consequently, the students were not eligible to be reported in a weighted ridership category. We determined that the students lived 2 miles or more from their assigned school and were eligible for reporting in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category. We propose the following adjustment:

February 2015 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(2)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	2	0

11. [Ref. 62] Our general tests disclosed that three students did not have a matching demographic record in the full-time equivalent database; therefore, we were unable to validate the students' eligibility for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustment:

June 2015 Survey		
25 Days in Term		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(3)	(3)

12. [Ref. 63] Ten 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 the students were eligible for reporting in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category. We propose the following adjustments:

October 2014 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(3)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	3	
February 2015 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(7)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	7	0
Proposed Net Adjustment		**(1,314)**

SCHEDULE H

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS
STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that Volusia County District School Board (District) management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) only students who are documented as enrolled in school during the reporting survey week and are documented as provided transportation by an approved method at least 1 day during the reporting survey period are reported for State transportation funding; (2) documentation is retained to support the eligibility of students reported in the Teenage Parents and Infants ridership category; (3) transportation personnel review the student database for completeness to ensure that students that do not have matching demographics are not reported for State transportation funding; (4) students reported in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – Prekindergarten (PK) through Grade 12, Weighted ridership category are documented as having met one of the five criteria required for reporting in a weighted ridership category as supported on the students' *Individual Educational Plans* (*IEPs*); (5) students transported by vehicles other than buses are not reported in the IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted ridership category; (6) only ESE students whose *IEPs* authorize extended school year services or students attending Department of Juvenile Justice Programs are reported in the summer reporting survey periods; (7) the distance from home to the student's assigned school is verified prior to reporting students in the All Other Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Eligible Students ridership category; and (8) transported students are reported in the correct ridership category for the correct number of days in term as evidenced by appropriate supporting documentation.

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*
State Board of Education Rules, Chapter 6A-3, Florida Administrative Code, *Transportation*
Student Transportation General Instructions 2014-15

NOTE A - SUMMARY
STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

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

1. Student Eligibility

Any student who is transported by bus must meet one or more of the following conditions in order to be eligible for State transportation funding: live 2 or more miles from school, be physically handicapped, be a Career Education 9-12 or an Exceptional Student Education student who is transported from one school center to another where appropriate programs are provided, or be on a route that meets the criteria for hazardous walking conditions specified in Section 1006.23(4), Florida Statutes.

2. Transportation in Volusia County

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015, the District received $10.5 million for student transportation as part of the State funding through the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP). The District's student transportation reported by survey period was as follows:

Survey Period	Number of Vehicles	Number of Students
July 2014	60	2,079
October 2014	221	23,551
February 2015	224	23,426
June 2015	0	51
Total	505	49,107

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*
State Board of Education Rules, Chapter 6A-3, Florida Administrative Code, *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 Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015. 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.

Volusia County Schools

P.O. Box 2118
DeLand, Florida 32721-2118

200 North Clara Avenue
DeLand, Florida 32720

DeLand (386) 734-7190
Daytona Beach (386) 255-6475
New Smyrna Beach (386) 427-5223
Osteen (386) 860-3322

James T. Russell
Superintendent of Schools

School Board of Volusia County

Mrs. Ida D. Wright, Chairman
Mrs. Melody Johnson, Vice Chairman
Mrs. Linda Costello
Mrs. Linda Cuthbert
Dr. John Hill

November 10, 2016

Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Auditor General, State of Florida
G74 Claude Pepper Building
111 West Madison Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1450

Dear Ms. Norman:

This letter is in response to the draft report on the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students and Student Transportation for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015. The School District of Volusia County is in agreement with the findings of the Auditor General.

The findings have been reviewed and the corrective actions for each program/service area are as follows:

FTE Eligibility

Volusia County Schools Technology Services & Innovation department has implemented a cross-check following the transmission of each survey and prior to the amendment close to identify and correct student records that have been adjusted in a manner which impacts a student's eligibility to be reported in a given survey.

School year 2016-2017, annual trainings with various levels of staff included a greater emphasis on proper attendance recordkeeping procedures and the process for updating or amending survey data. Communication with school-based personnel leading up to and during each survey processing period reinforces proper procedures and expectations.

English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)

In order to improve accuracy in regards to students reported in the ESOL program, the district has implemented the following corrective actions:

Effective SY 2016-17:

1. The number of personnel training opportunities was increased from previous years. Trainings held in September 2016 included special emphasis on the topics of Student Plans, required audit documentation, Language Proficiency Assessments, ELL Committees for students beyond three years of services based on their Date Entered a United States School (DEUSS), Exit from the program and Parent Notifications.
2. Implementation of an automated notification system that is triggered by changes made to a student's schedule. The message is directed to the school-based ESOL compliance administrator and advises that updates to the schedule necessitate a review and update of the student's ELL Plan.
3. Improvements made to ESOL forms (Selection of Test Location, ELL Committee Notes, Data Input sheet, etc.) to clarify required documentation and streamline data input.
4. On-site compliance support will be provided upon school request.

Effective SY 2017-18:

1. Implementation of a notification system that is triggered by the student's DEUSS date that would notify school-based ESOL compliance administrators that an evaluation is due within 30 days.
2. Inactivate the ELL program record upon withdraw from the district. Re-entry would require a manual reactivation of the ELL program record which should occur after the student is evaluated for services.

ESE

The following changes will be implemented in response to the deficiencies identified in the areas of ESE and Hospital Homebound:

1. Hospital Homebound: Additional reminders will be provided via email and at meetings with staff that a sign-in sheet (or time sheet) will be maintained by each teacher, including both paid-on-bill and full time teachers. The sign-in sheet will require the parent or facility representative's signature each time the student receives services. The sign-in sheet is to be housed in the student's homebound folder. Upon discharge the sign-in sheet will be maintained in the payroll records at the homebound office.

2. Matrix: A new Matrix Handbook has been created, and training will be provided to those who facilitate the IEP process. This training will be provided to ESE Coordinators and District Placement Specialists who in turn will train the IEP Facilitators at the secondary level. This training will include when a matrix should be reviewed and how the matrix is properly calculated. Reminder emails will be sent annually and will highlight the key information from the training to ensure that the information is frequently reviewed.

3. Parent Participation: Training regarding the rules that govern parent participation will be provided to those who facilitate the IEP process. This training will be provided to ESE Coordinators and District Placement Specialists who in turn will train the IEP Facilitators at the secondary level. This training will include best practices for informing and encouraging meaningful parent participation, and the steps to take when a parent chooses not to participate. The District Placement Specialist and IEP Facilitator will document on the Notification of Conference form the parent's response when the parent is unable/unwilling to attend.

Career and Technical Education

Effective the 2014-15 school year, school-based data personnel worked closely with OJT teachers to remove students from reporting when the required hours worked were not met or could not be substantiated by audit approved documentation. In addition, OJT Student Applications were revised to include language detailing the obligations and expectations of students involved in the OJT program. The implemented revisions of the OJT process were initiated from findings of the previous FEFP audit (school year ending June 30, 2013), and a noticeable improvement was seen in the current FEFP audit for school year ending June 30, 2015. Volusia County Schools is confident that the progression in this area will continue as staff and students become more familiar with the expectations associated with the program.

Certification

In addition to our current practices, the certification office will change the frequency of pulling student enrollment reports to identify teachers who are potentially out of field in ESOL. Those individuals will be sent for board approval to the next regularly scheduled board meeting after the placement of the student occurs. Teachers that are out of field are also being noted on the District website for parent notification. Parents are being made aware of the ability to see teachers out of field through documentation in our annual Parent Guide. Schools are required to send a copy of the letter to the District Certification office. This has been in in place since the 2014-2015 school year.

The District will include Charter schools in training regarding out of field requirements and remind them of the requirements that the out of field instructors be approved by their governing board and parent notification letters are sent. The certification office will work with our Manager of Charter Schools to ensure she receives governing board minutes showing approval of out of field teachers.

Student Transportation

Volusia County School's Student Transportation Services has implemented corrective strategies in collaboration with our Finance, Exceptional Student Education (ESE) and school-based staff. We have updated our reporting procedures and program logic so that only Department of Juvenile Justice and ESY students are reported for July and June survey periods. We continue to work with our schools to ensure they are collecting and retaining the proper documentation that supports the eligibility for transportation including weighted categories. For Teen Parent Programs, we require the programs to send copies of Birth Certificates for infants to the transportation department prior to reporting for FTE. Additionally, we have and continue to train school staff on correct coding for Summer Programs to ensure only eligible students are reported for transportation. Student Transportation Services continues to work closely with ESE to ensure we capture and provide needed services and equipment but only report those which meet one of the criteria for reporting. In addition, we have updated our maps and verified the distance to school for the walk zones.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the draft Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Audit Report. Compliance with rules pertaining to the FEFP is important to the School District of Volusia County and every effort will be made to correct deficiencies.

We wish to express our appreciation to you and your staff for an audit that was conducted in a timely and professional manner.

Respectfully,

James T. Russell
Superintendent of Schools

cc: Ms. Susan Freeman, Area Superintendent
Mr. Gary Marks, Area Superintendent
Mr. Greg Akin, Chief Operating Officer
Ms. Debra Muller, Chief Financial Officer
Ms. Dana Paige-Pender, Chief Human Resources Officer
Dr. Melissa Carr, Director, Technology Services & Innovation
Mr. Al Chandler, Director, Transportation Services
Ms. Teresa Marcks, Chief Academic Officer
Ms. Kim Gilliland, Director, ESE
Ms. Leticia Roman, Director, Title I
Ms. Gianna Acevedo-Alamo, Coordinator
Ms. Robin King, Specialist, Certification
Ms. Tina Skipper, FTE Data Analyst