

**INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD**

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

For the Fiscal Year Ended
June 30, 2017



Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Auditor General

Board Members and Superintendent

During the 2016-17 fiscal year, Dr. Mark J. Rendell served as Superintendent and the following individuals served as Board members:

	<u>District No.</u>
Shawn Frost, Vice-Chair	1
Dale Simchick, Chair through 11-21-16	2
Laura Zorc from 11-22-16	3
Matthew McCain through 11-21-16	3
Charles G. Searcy, Chair from 11-22-16	4
Tiffany M. Justice from 11-22-16	5
Claudia Jimenez through 11-21-16	5

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:

FLAuditor.gov

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

State of Florida Auditor General

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

**INDIAN RIVER COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Page
No.

SUMMARY	i
INDEPENDENT AUDITOR’S REPORT ON FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT	1
SCHEDULE A – POPULATIONS, TEST SELECTION, AND TEST RESULTS	
Reported Full-Time Equivalent Student Enrollment	4
Schools and Students.....	4
Teachers.....	5
Proposed Adjustments	5
SCHEDULE B – EFFECT OF PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS ON WEIGHTED FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT	6
SCHEDULE C – PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL.....	7
SCHEDULE D – FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS	
Overview.....	10
Findings.....	10
SCHEDULE E – RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS	19
NOTES TO SCHEDULES.....	22
INDEPENDENT AUDITOR’S REPORT ON STUDENT TRANSPORTATION	25
SCHEDULE F – POPULATIONS, TEST SELECTION, AND TEST RESULTS.....	28
SCHEDULE G – FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS	
Overview.....	30
Findings.....	30
SCHEDULE H – RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS.....	38
NOTES TO SCHEDULES.....	39
MANAGEMENT’S RESPONSE	40

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

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

SUMMARY

SUMMARY OF ATTESTATION EXAMINATION

Except for the material noncompliance described below involving 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 Basic, Basic with ESE Services, ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, and student transportation, the Indian River County District School Board (District) complied, in all material respects, with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of the full-time equivalent (FTE) student enrollment and student transportation as reported under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017. Specifically, we noted:

- State requirements governing teacher certification, School Board or Charter 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 were not met for 9 of the 88 teachers in our test. Six (7 percent) of the 88 teachers in our test taught at charter schools and 1 (11 percent) of the 9 teachers with exceptions taught at charter schools.
- Exceptions involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. The table below shows the total number of students included in each of our tests, as well as the number and percentage of students who attended charter schools who were included in our tests. The table also shows the number of students with exceptions in each of our tests, as well as the number and percentage of students with exceptions who attended charter schools.

Program Tested	Number of Students			Number of Students		
	Included in Test	Included in Test Who Attended Charter Schools	Percentage	With Exceptions	With Exceptions Who Attended Charter Schools	Percentage
Basic	98	20	20%	11	11	100%
Basic with ESE Services	73	10	14%	8	5	63%
ESE Support Levels 4 and 5	65	1	2%	18	-	NA
Totals	<u>236</u>	<u>31</u>		<u>37</u>	<u>16</u>	

- Exceptions involving the reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding for 179 of the 381 students in our student transportation test in addition to 333 students identified in our general tests.

Noncompliance related to the reported FTE student enrollment resulted in 29 findings. The resulting proposed net adjustment to the District's reported, unweighted FTE totaled negative 51.1988 (1.6717 applicable to District schools other than charter schools and 49.5271 applicable to charter schools) but has a potential impact on the District's weighted FTE of negative 87.5622 (36.0064 applicable to District schools other than charter schools and 51.5558) applicable to charter schools). Noncompliance related to student transportation resulted in 8 findings and a proposed net adjustment of negative 475 students.

The weighted adjustments to the FTE student enrollment are presented in our report for illustrative purposes only. The weighted adjustments to the FTE student enrollment do not take special program caps and allocation factors into account and are not intended to indicate the weighted FTE used to compute the dollar value of adjustments. That computation is the responsibility of the Department of Education (DOE). However, the gross dollar effect of our proposed adjustments to the FTE may be estimated by multiplying the proposed net weighted adjustments to the FTE student enrollment by the base student allocation amount. The base student allocation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017, was \$4,160.71 per FTE. For the District, the estimated gross dollar effect of our proposed adjustments to the reported FTE student enrollment is negative \$364,321 (negative 87.5622 times \$4,160.71), of which \$149,812 is applicable to District schools other than charter schools and \$214,509 is applicable to charter schools.

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

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

THE DISTRICT

The District was established pursuant to Section 1001.30, Florida Statutes, to provide public educational services for the residents of Indian River County, Florida. Those services are provided primarily to PK through 12th-grade students and to adults seeking career education-type training. The District is part of the State system of public education under the general direction and control of the SBE. The geographic boundaries of the District are those of Indian River 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 21 schools other than charter schools, 5 charter schools, 1 cost center, and 1 virtual education cost center serving PK through 12th-grade students.

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017, State funding totaling \$23.3 million was provided through the FEFP to the District for the District-reported 17,534.43 unweighted FTE as recalibrated, which included 2,283.35 unweighted FTE as recalibrated for charter schools. The primary sources of funding for the District are funds from the FEFP, local ad valorem taxes, and Federal grants and donations.

FEFP

FTE Student Enrollment

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

differentials, and (4) differences in per-student costs for equivalent educational programs due to sparsity and dispersion of student population.

The funding provided by the FEFP is based on the numbers of individual students participating in particular educational programs. A numerical value is assigned to each student according to the student's hours and days of attendance in those programs. The individual student thus becomes equated to a numerical value known as an unweighted FTE student enrollment. For brick and mortar school students, one student would be reported as 1.0 FTE if the student was enrolled in six courses per day at 50 minutes per course for the full 180-day school year (i.e., six courses at 50 minutes each per day is 5 hours of class a day or 25 hours per week, which equates to 1.0 FTE). For virtual education students, one student would be reported as 1.0 FTE if the student has successfully completed six courses or credits or the prescribed level of content that counts toward promotion to the next grade. A student who completes less than six credits will be reported as a fraction of an FTE. Half-credit completions will be included in determining an FTE student enrollment. Credits completed by a student in excess of the minimum required for that student for graduation are not eligible for funding.

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

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

Student Transportation

Any student who is transported by the District must meet one or more of the following conditions in order to be eligible for State transportation funding: live 2 or more miles from school, be classified as a student with a disability under the IDEA, be a Career Education 9-12 or an ESE student who is transported from one school center to another where appropriate programs are provided, or be on a route that meets the criteria for hazardous walking conditions specified in Section 1006.23 Florida Statutes. Additionally, Section 1002.33(20)(c), Florida Statutes, provides that the governing board of the charter school may provide transportation through an agreement or contract with the district school board, a private provider, or parents. The charter school and the sponsor shall cooperate in making arrangements that ensure that transportation is not a barrier to equal access for all students residing within a reasonable distance of the charter school as determined in its charter. The District received \$3.7 million for student transportation as part of the State funding through the FEFP.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Auditor General

AUDITOR GENERAL STATE OF FLORIDA

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



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

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

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT

Report on Full-Time Equivalent Student Enrollment

We have examined the Indian River County District School Board's (District's) compliance with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of the full-time equivalent (FTE) student enrollment reported under the Florida Education Finance Program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017. These requirements are found primarily in Sections 1011.60, 1011.61, and 1011.62, Florida Statutes; State Board of Education Rules, Chapter 6A-1, Florida Administrative Code; and the *FTE General Instructions 2016-17* issued by the Department of Education.

Management's Responsibility for Compliance

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

Auditor's Responsibility

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

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

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

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

Opinion

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

In our opinion, except for the material noncompliance with State requirements described in the preceding paragraph involving 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 Basic, Basic with Exceptional Student Education Services, and Exceptional Student Education Support Levels 4 and 5, the Indian River County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of the full-time equivalent student enrollment reported under the Florida Education Finance Program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017.

Other Reporting Required by Government Auditing Standards

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we are required to report all deficiencies that are considered to be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses¹ in internal control; fraud and noncompliance with provisions of laws or regulations that have a material effect on the District's compliance with State requirements; and any other instances that warrant the attention of those charged with governance; noncompliance with provisions of contracts or grant agreements 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; accordingly, we express no such opinion. Because of its limited purpose, our

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

examination would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. However, the material noncompliance mentioned above is indicative of significant deficiencies considered to be material weaknesses in the District's internal controls related to 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 Basic, Basic with Exceptional Student Education Services, and Exceptional Student Education Support Levels 4 and 5. 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. As noted in *MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE*, charter school management did not provide a response to some of the findings. The impact of this noncompliance with State requirements on the District's reported full-time equivalent student enrollment is presented in *SCHEDULES A, B, C, and D*.

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

Purpose of this Report

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

Respectfully submitted,



Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Tallahassee, Florida
September 6, 2018

SCHEDULE A

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

Reported FTE Student Enrollment

The funding provided by the FEFP is based on the numbers of individual students participating in particular educational programs. The FEFP funds ten specific programs that are grouped under the following four general program titles: Basic, ESOL, ESE, and Career Education 9-12. The unweighted FTE represents the FTE prior to the application of the specific cost factor for each program. (See *SCHEDULE B* and NOTE A3., A4., and A5.) For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017, the Indian River County District School Board (District) reported to the DOE 17,534.43 unweighted FTE as recalibrated, which included 2,283.35 unweighted FTE as recalibrated for charter schools, at 21 District schools other than charter schools, 5 charter schools, 1 cost center, and 1 virtual education cost center.

Schools and Students

As part of our examination procedures, we tested the FTE student enrollment reported to the DOE for schools and students for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017. (See NOTE B.) The population of schools (28) consisted of the total number of brick and mortar schools and cost centers in the District that offered courses, including charter schools, as well as the virtual education cost centers in the District that offered virtual instruction in the FEFP-funded programs. The population of students (9,323) consisted of the total number of students in each program at the schools and cost centers in our tests. Our Career Education 9-12 student test data includes only those students who participated in OJT.

We noted the following material noncompliance: exceptions involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located for 11 of the 98 students in our Basic test,² 8 of the 73 students in our Basic with ESE Services test,³ and 18 of the 65 students in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 test.⁴ Twenty (20 percent) of the 98 students in our Basic test attended charter schools and all of the 11 students with exceptions attended charter schools. Ten (14 percent) of the 73 students in our Basic with ESE Services test attended charter schools and 5 (63 percent) of the 8 students with exceptions attended charter schools. Similarly, 1 (2 percent) of the 65 students in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 test attended charter schools and none of the 18 students with exceptions attended charter schools.

² For Basic, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 25, 26, and 27 on *SCHEDULE D*.

³ For Basic with ESE Services, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 2, 9, 22, 25, and 28 on *SCHEDULE D*.

⁴ For ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 4, 5, 6, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 23 on *SCHEDULE D*.

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

<u>Programs</u>	<u>Number of Schools</u>		<u>Number of Students at Schools Tested</u>		<u>Students With Exceptions</u>	<u>Recalibrated Unweighted FTE</u>		<u>Proposed Adjustments</u>
	<u>Population</u>	<u>Test</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Test</u>		<u>Population</u>	<u>Test</u>	
Basic	27	9	7,159	98	11	13,208.8300	77.2627	(31.5944)
Basic with ESE Services	26	9	1,642	73	8	3,087.5100	60.3538	.0504
ESOL	23	8	398	98	6	671.9800	75.3163	(7.8488)
ESE Support Levels 4 and 5	18	6	120	65	18	142.7000	43.7436	(11.4664)
Career Education 9-12	4	2	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>423.4100</u>	<u>.4810</u>	<u>(.3396)</u>
All Programs	28	10	<u>9,323</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>17,534.4300</u>	<u>257.1574</u>	<u>(51.1988)</u>

Teachers

We also tested teacher qualifications as part of our examination procedures. (See NOTE B.) Specifically, the population of teachers (295, of which 280 are applicable to District schools other than charter schools and 15 are applicable to charter schools) consisted of the total number of teachers at schools in our test who taught courses in ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, Career Education 9-12, or taught courses to ELL students, and of the total number of teachers reported under virtual education cost centers in our test who taught courses in Basic, Basic with ESE Services, ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, Career Education 9-12, or taught courses to ELL students.

We noted the following material noncompliance: State requirements governing teacher 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 were not met for 9 of the 88 teachers in our test.⁵ Six (7 percent) of the 88 teachers in our test taught at charter schools and 1 (11 percent) of the 9 teachers with exceptions taught at charter schools.

Proposed Adjustments

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

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

⁵ For teachers, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 21, 24, and 29 on *SCHEDULE D.*

SCHEDULE B

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

District Schools Other Than Charter Schools			
No. Program (1)	Proposed Net Adjustment (2)	Cost Factor	Weighted FTE (3)
101 Basic K-3	1.1206	1.103	1.2360
102 Basic 4-8	2.0725	1.000	2.0725
103 Basic 9-12	3.6080	1.001	3.6116
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.0250	1.103	.0276
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	2.4958	1.000	2.4958
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	3.8825	1.001	3.8864
130 ESOL	(3.4097)	1.194	(4.0712)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(9.2585)	3.607	(33.3954)
255 ESE Support Level 5	(2.2079)	5.376	(11.8697)
Subtotal	(1.6717)		(36.0064)
Charter Schools			
No. Program (1)	Proposed Net Adjustment (2)	Cost Factor	Weighted FTE (3)
101 Basic K-3	(9.0916)	1.103	(10.0280)
103 Basic 9-12	(29.3039)	1.001	(29.3332)
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	(1.9127)	1.103	(2.1097)
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(4.4402)	1.001	(4.4447)
130 ESOL	(4.4391)	1.194	(5.3003)
300 Career Education 9-12	(.3396)	1.001	(.3399)
Subtotal	(49.5271)		(51.5558)
Total of Schools			
No. Program (1)	Proposed Net Adjustment (2)	Cost Factor	Weighted FTE (3)
101 Basic K-3	(7.9710)	1.103	(8.7920)
102 Basic 4-8	2.0725	1.000	2.0725
103 Basic 9-12	(25.6959)	1.001	(25.7216)
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	(1.8877)	1.103	(2.0821)
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	2.4958	1.000	2.4958
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(.5577)	1.001	(.5583)
130 ESOL	(7.8488)	1.194	(9.3715)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(9.2585)	3.607	(33.3954)
255 ESE Support Level 5	(2.2079)	5.376	(11.8697)
300 Career Education 9-12	(.3396)	1.001	(.3399)
Total	(51.1988)		(87.5622)

Notes: (1) See NOTE A7.

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

(3) Weighted adjustments to the FTE are presented for illustrative purposes only. The weighted adjustments to the FTE do not take special program caps or allocation factors into consideration and are not intended to indicate the FTE used to compute the dollar value of adjustments. That computation is the responsibility of the DOE. (See NOTE A5.)

SCHEDULE C

PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT

<u>No.</u> <u>Program</u>	<u>Proposed Adjustments (1)</u>			<u>Balance Forward</u>
	<u>#0031</u>	<u>#0051</u>	<u>#0081</u>	
101 Basic K-3	1.1206	1.1206
102 Basic 4-8	1.6441	1.6441
103 Basic 9-12	2.0796	2.0796
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services0000
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	1.0000	(1.0000)	.0000
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	1.8158	1.8158
130 ESOL	(1.1452)	(1.1206)	(.6441)	(2.9099)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(3.7502)	(3.7502)
255 ESE Support Level 5	(.6342)	(.6342)
300 Career Education 9-120000
Total	<u>(.6342)</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(.6342)</u>

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

<u>No.</u>	<u>Brought Forward</u>	<u>Proposed Adjustments (1)</u>				<u>Balance Forward</u>
		<u>#0131</u>	<u>#0171</u>	<u>#0291</u>	<u>#5001*</u>	
101	1.1206	1.1206
102	1.64414284	2.0725
103	2.0796	1.5284	(29.3039)	(25.6959)
111	.0000	.02500250
112	.0000	1.0000	1.4958	2.4958
113	1.8158	3.0000	(.9333)	(4.4402)	(.5577)
130	(2.9099)	(.4284)	(.0714)	(.0367)	(3.4464)
254	(3.7502)	(4.0125)	(1.4958)	(9.2585)
255	(.6342)	(1.0500)	(.5237)	(2.2079)
300	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>.....</u>	<u>(.3396)</u>	<u>(.3396)</u>
Total	<u>(.6342)</u>	<u>(1.0375)</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(34.1204)</u>	<u>(35.7921)</u>

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

*Charter School

<u>No. Program</u>	<u>Proposed Adjustments (1)</u>		
	<u>Brought Forward</u>	<u>#5002*</u>	<u>Total</u>
101 Basic K-3	1.1206	(9.0916)	(7.9710)
102 Basic 4-8	2.0725	2.0725
103 Basic 9-12	(25.6959)	(25.6959)
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.0250	(1.9127)	(1.8877)
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	2.4958	2.4958
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(.5577)	(.5577)
130 ESOL	(3.4464)	(4.4024)	(7.8488)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(9.2585)	(9.2585)
255 ESE Support Level 5	(2.2079)	(2.2079)
300 Career Education 9-12	(.3396)	(.3396)
Total	<u>(35.7921)</u>	<u>(15.4067)</u>	<u>(51.1988)</u>

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

*Charter School

SCHEDULE D

FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Overview

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

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

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

Districtwide – Attendance Recordkeeping

1. [Ref. 3108/5101/8102/13106/17102/500105] Our examination of the District's procedures involving the use of an electronic attendance record keeping system (Focus) disclosed that the schools in our test did not retain exception reports (*Teacher Completion Reports*) identifying teachers who did not submit attendance during the reporting survey periods. The District generated the *Teacher Completion Reports* from Focus at the time of our examination and our review of the *Teacher Completion Reports* disclosed that all the test students' teachers had submitted attendance at least 1 day during each reporting survey period. In addition, we noted that the Principals did not certify the schools' attendance records or retain substitute teacher attendance rosters (three schools – Ref. 3108/13106/17102), contrary to the DOE *Comprehensive Management Information System: Automated Student Attendance Recordkeeping System Handbook*. Since we could validate that the attendance activity in Focus was reliable and supported that the test students were in attendance and membership, we present this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustment.

.0000

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Vero Beach High School (#0031)

2. [Ref. 3102] The EP for one ESE student enrolled in the Gifted Program lacked one of two professional signatures required by SBE Rule 6A-6.030191(3), FAC. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.9344	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	<u>(.9344)</u>	.0000

3. [Ref. 3103] ELL Committees for three students were not convened by October 1 (two students) or within 30 days (one student) prior to the students' DEUSS anniversary dates to consider the students' continued ESOL placements beyond 3 years from each student's DEUSS. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	1.1452	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.1452)</u>	.0000

4. [Ref. 3104] School records did not demonstrate that the *Matrix of Services* forms for four ESE students were reviewed and updated when the students' new IEPs were prepared. We propose the following adjustment:

112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	1.0000	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	1.7502	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(2.7502)</u>	.0000

5. [Ref. 3105] The course schedules for two ESE students enrolled in the Hospital and Homebound Program were incorrectly reported for both homebound instruction and on-campus instruction. The students were provided 316 CMW (or .1054 FTE) of homebound instruction but were reported for a total of 2,218 CMW (or .7396 FTE). We propose the following adjustment:

255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.6342)</u>	(.6342)
-------------------------	----------------	---------

6. [Ref. 3106] One ESE student was not reported in accordance with the *Matrix of Services* form. We propose the following adjustment:

113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	1.0000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(1.0000)</u>	.0000
		<u>(.6342)</u>

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Osceola Magnet School (#0051)

7. [Ref. 5171] One teacher taught a Primary Language Arts course that included ELL students but had earned only 120 of the 240 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by SBE Rule 6A-1.0503, FAC, and the teacher’s in-service training timeline. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.6896	
130 ESOL	<u>(.6896)</u>	.0000

8. [Ref. 5172] One teacher taught Primary Language Arts and Basic subject area courses that included an ELL student but had earned none of the in-service training points in ESOL strategies (120 in-service points for Primary Language Arts and 60 for Basic subject areas) required by SBE Rules 6A-1.0503 and 6A-6.0907, FAC, and the teacher’s in-service training timeline. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.4310	
130 ESOL	<u>(.4310)</u>	.0000
		<u>.0000</u>

Gifford Middle School (#0081)

9. [Ref. 8101] The EP for one ESE student enrolled in the Gifted Program was not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. We propose the following adjustment:

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

10. [Ref. 8171/72] Two teachers taught Reading courses that included ELL students but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by SBE Rule 6A-1.0503, FAC, and the teachers’ in-service training timelines. We further noted that one of the teachers (Ref. 8172) was not properly certified to teach ELL students and was not approved by the School Board to teach such students out of field. In addition, the parents of the students taught by the teachers were not notified of the teachers’ out-of-field status in ESOL (Ref. 8172), or not until February 1, 2017, which was after the October 2016 survey (Ref. 8171). We propose the following adjustments:

<u>Ref. 8171</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	.1428	
130 ESOL	<u>(.1428)</u>	.0000

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Gifford Middle School (#0081) (Continued)

<u>Ref. 8172</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	.2142	
130 ESOL	<u>(.2142)</u>	.0000

11. [Ref. 8173] The parents of ELL students taught by one out-of-field teacher were not notified of the teacher’s out-of-field status in ESOL. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.1443	
130 ESOL	<u>(.1443)</u>	.0000

12. [Ref. 8174] One teacher taught a Basic subject area class that included an ELL student but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by SBE Rule 6A-6.0907, FAC, and the teacher’s in-service training timeline. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.1428	
130 ESOL	<u>(.1428)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>.0000</u>

Fellsmere Elementary School (#0101)

13. [Ref. 10101] The instructional time reported for several students did not agree with the School’s daily instructional schedule. Our examination disclosed that the students were reported for class minutes ranging from 1,590 to 1,740 CMW; however, the School’s daily instructional schedule supported 1,775 CMW. Student course schedules, which are necessary for the recalibration process to work appropriately, should reflect the number of instructional minutes established in the School’s daily instructional schedule. Since most of the students were reported at only one school for the entire school year and the reported FTE was recalibrated to 1.0, this incorrect reporting did not affect their ultimate funding level. We present this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustments.

.0000

Wabasso School (#0131)

14. [Ref. 13101] The instructional time reported for several students did not agree with the School’s daily instructional schedule. Our examination disclosed that the students were reported for class minutes ranging from 1,490 CMW to 2,005 CMW; *(Finding Continues on Next Page)*

Findings

Wabasso School (#0131) (Continued)

however, the School’s daily instructional schedule supported 1,725 CMW. Student course schedules, which are necessary for the recalibration process to work appropriately, should reflect the number of instructional minutes established in the School’s daily instructional schedule. Since most of the students were reported at only one school for the entire school year and the reported FTE was recalibrated to 1.0, this incorrect reporting did not affect their ultimate funding level. We present this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustments.

.0000

15. [Ref. 13102] The IFSPs for two ESE PK students were not available at the time of our examination. In response to our inquiry, a document dated March 28, 2016, titled *Part C Eligibility and Special Instruction Plan and Matrix* was provided. The document outlined services for a duration of 1 year; however, pursuant to SBE Rule 6A-6.03029(4)(b), FAC, a review must be conducted at least every 6 months and School records did not demonstrate that a review was completed in September 2016. We propose the following adjustment:

254 ESE Support Level 4	(.0125)	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.0250)</u>	(.0375)

16. [Ref. 13103] The *Matrix of Services* forms for two ESE students were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. We propose the following adjustment:

112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	1.0000	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	1.0000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(2.0000)</u>	.0000

17. [Ref. 13104] The *Matrix of Services* forms for two ESE students were not dated and School records did not otherwise demonstrate that the forms were prepared on a timely basis (i.e., prior to the reporting survey). We propose the following adjustment:

113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	2.0000	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(2.0000)</u>	.0000

18. [Ref. 13105] One ESE student was reported for both homebound instruction and on-campus instruction. The student’s on-campus schedule was incorrectly reported in Program No. 255 (ESE Support Level 5) based on the student’s placement in the Hospital (*Finding Continues on Next Page*)

Findings

Wabasso School (#0131) (Continued)

and Homebound Program. However, the student was not in attendance for the on-campus instruction during the October 2016 and February 2017 reporting survey periods. In addition, School records did not support the student's homebound instruction. The homebound instructor's contact logs for the October 2016 and February 2017 reporting surveys were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located, and the *Matrix of Services* form was not dated and School records did not otherwise demonstrate that it was prepared on a timely basis (i.e., prior to the reporting survey period). We propose the following adjustment:

255 ESE Support Level 5	(1.0000)	(1.0000)
-------------------------	----------	----------

19. [Ref. 13107] School records did not demonstrate that the *Matrix of Services* form for one ESE student was reviewed and updated when the student's new IFSP was prepared. We propose the following adjustment:

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.0250	
255 ESE Support Level 5	(1.0250)	.0000
		<u>(1.0375)</u>

Sebastian River Middle School (#0171)

20. [Ref. 17101] School records did not demonstrate that the *Matrix of Services* forms for two ESE students were reviewed and updated when the students' new IEPs were prepared. We also noted that one student was not reported in accordance with the student's *Matrix of Services* form. We propose the following adjustment:

112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	1.4958	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(1.4958)	.0000

21. [Ref. 17171] The parents of ELL students taught by one out-of-field teacher were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status in ESOL. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	.4284	
130 ESOL	(1.4284)	.0000
		<u>.0000</u>

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Sebastian River High School (#0291)

22. [Ref. 29101] The EP for one ESE student did not indicate the services that were to be provided to the student. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.9333	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	<u>(.9333)</u>	.0000

23. [Ref. 29102] The IEP for one ESE student did not include the meeting participants signature page. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.5237	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.5237)</u>	.0000

24. [Ref. 29171] The parents of an ELL student taught by one out-of-field teacher were not notified of the teacher’s out-of-field status in ESOL. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.0714	
130 ESOL	<u>(.0714)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>.0000</u>

Indian River Charter High School (#5001)

25. [Ref. 500101/03] Our examination procedures disclosed that the instructional time reported for the on-campus instruction for 387 students (9 students were in our Basic test, 4 students were in our Basic with ESE Services test, and 1 student was in our ESOL test) did not agree with the students’ on-campus schedules. Specifically, the students were provided 55 minutes per course for the number of days per week scheduled for each student. There was no formal bell schedule to define the instructional day; rather, the on-campus schedule was set up like a college schedule offering courses for varying days per week for 55 minutes each scheduled day per course. The students were reported as if the on-campus courses were provided Monday through Friday (5 days per week) for 275 minutes per course. The scheduling resulted in the students not obtaining the minimum 1,500 minutes per week after including all other off-campus instruction (dual enrollment, OJT, and virtual) and recalibration. We also noted that the students were scheduled for project time but pertinent records were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. In addition, the timecards for 2 Career Education 9-12 students who participated in OJT (Ref. 500103) *(Finding Continues on Next Page)*

**Proposed Net
Adjustments
(Unweighted FTE)**

Findings

Indian River Charter High School (#5001) (Continued)

were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. We propose the following adjustments:

<u>Ref. 500101</u>		
103 Basic 9-12	(28.4798)	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	(4.4402)	
130 ESOL	(.0367)	
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.3396)</u>	(33.2963)
<u>Ref. 500103</u>		
103 Basic 9-12	<u>(.2583)</u>	(.2583)

26. [Ref. 500102] One student was incorrectly reported for FEFP funding. The student was attending school as an international student under an F1 visa and had paid tuition to the School. Consequently, the student was not eligible for FEFP funding. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	<u>(.5000)</u>	(.5000)
----------------	----------------	---------

27. [Ref. 500104] School records demonstrating that one dual-enrolled student was enrolled in a college course were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	<u>(.0658)</u>	<u>(.0658)</u>
		<u>(34.1204)</u>

St. Peter's Academy (#5002) Charter School

28. [Ref. 500202/03] School records of student attendance did not evidence that student sign-in and sign-out records were retained for the 2016-17 school year or that the principal, at the end of the school year, certified the completeness and accuracy of the automated attendance records as prescribed in SBE Rule 6A-1.044, FAC, (Ref. 500202). The teachers marked attendance daily using manual records that were provided to the front office for entry into Focus (the District-utilized attendance software system). Our examination of the manual records indicated that three teachers did not sign the records attesting to the attendance activity recorded; consequently, the reported FTE for 31 students (1 student in our Basic with ESE Services test and 2 students in our ESOL test) was not adequately supported (Ref. 500203). We propose the following adjustments:

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)	
St. Peter's Academy (#5002) Charter School (Continued)		
Ref. 500202 – Administrative Only	.0000	
Ref. 500203		
101 Basic K-3	(9.8120)	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	(1.9127)	
130 ESOL	<u>(3.6820)</u>	(15.4067)
29. [Ref. 500271] The parents of ELL students taught by one out-of-field teacher were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status in ESOL until October 19, 2016, which was after the October 2016 reporting survey period. We propose the following adjustment:		
101 Basic K-3	.7204	
130 ESOL	<u>(.7204)</u>	<u>.0000</u>
		<u>(15.4067)</u>
Proposed Net Adjustment		<u>(51.1988)</u>

SCHEDULE E

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that Indian River County District School Board (District) management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) students' course schedules are reported in accordance with the schools' daily instructional and bell schedules; (2) ELL Committees are timely convened to consider students' continued ESOL placements; (3) IEPs, IFSPs, and *Matrix of Services* forms are timely prepared, and completed and are retained in the students' files; (4) ESE students are reported in accordance with the students' *Matrix of Services* forms that are dated, timely completed, and maintained in the students' files; (5) there is evidence that *Matrix of Services* forms have been reviewed and updated as necessary when students' IEPs are reviewed or updated to ensure that the *Matrix of Services* forms accurately reflect the IEP services in effect during the reporting survey period; (6) all required participants are involved in the development of students' EPs and documentation of this participation is maintained in the students' files; (7) students are reported in the Hospital and Homebound Program for the scheduled instructional time as supported by the students' IEPs and homebound instructors' contact logs; (8) students who participate in OJT are reported in accordance with timecards that are accurately completed, signed, and retained in readily accessible files; (9) teachers are properly certified or, if teaching out of field, are timely approved by the School Board to teach out of field; (10) parents are timely notified when their children are assigned to teachers teaching out of field; (11) out-of-field teachers earn the in-service training points required by SBE Rule 6A-1.0503 or 6A-6.0907, FAC, and in accordance with the teachers' in-service training timelines; (12) attendance procedures are properly followed and records are maintained in compliance with SBE rules, and the DOE *Comprehensive Management Information System: Automated Student Attendance Recordkeeping System Handbook*; (13) student attendance records are certified by the Principal for the school year; (14) dual-enrolled students reported for funding are enrolled in the courses and documentation is maintained in the students' files; (15) international students who paid tuition fees to the school are not reported for FEFP funding; and (16) EPs disclose all services provided to the student during the reporting survey periods.

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

REGULATORY CITATIONS

Reporting

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

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

Section 1011.61, Florida Statutes, *Definitions*
Section 1011.62, Florida Statutes, *Funds for Operation of Schools*
SBE Rule 6A-1.0451, FAC, *Florida Education Finance Program Student Membership Surveys*
SBE Rule 6A-1.045111, FAC, *Hourly Equivalent to 180-Day School Year*
SBE Rule 6A-1.04513, FAC, *Maintaining Auditable FTE Records*
FTE General Instructions 2016-17

Attendance

Section 1003.23, Florida Statutes, *Attendance Records and Reports*
SBE Rule 6A-1.044(3) and (6)(c), FAC, *Pupil Attendance Records*
SBE Rule 6A-1.04513, FAC, *Maintaining Auditable FTE Records*
FTE General Instructions 2016-17
Comprehensive Management Information System: Automated Student Attendance Recordkeeping System Handbook

ESOL

Section 1003.56, Florida Statutes, *English Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient Students*
Section 1011.62(1)(g), Florida Statutes, *Education for Speakers of Other Languages*
SBE Rule 6A-6.0901, FAC, *Definitions Which Apply to Programs for English Language Learners*
SBE Rule 6A-6.0902, FAC, *Requirements for Identification, Eligibility, and Programmatic Assessments of English Language Learners*
SBE Rule 6A-6.09021, FAC, *Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment for English Language Learners (ELLs)*
SBE Rule 6A-6.09022, FAC, *Extension of Services in English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Program*
SBE Rule 6A-6.0903, FAC, *Requirements for Exiting English Language Learners from the English for Speakers of Other Languages Program*
SBE Rule 6A-6.09031, FAC, *Post Reclassification of English Language Learners (ELLs)*
SBE Rule 6A-6.0904, FAC, *Equal Access to Appropriate Instruction for English Language Learners*

Career Education On-The-Job Attendance

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

Career Education On-The-Job Funding Hours

FTE General Instructions 2016-17

Exceptional Education

Section 1003.57, Florida Statutes, *Exceptional Students Instruction*
Section 1011.62, Florida Statutes, *Funds for Operation of Schools*
Section 1011.62(1)(e), Florida Statutes, *Funding Model for Exceptional Student Education Programs*
SBE Rule 6A-6.03028, FAC, *Provision of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) and Development of Individual Educational Plans for Students with Disabilities*
SBE Rule 6A-6.03029, FAC, *Development of Individualized Family Support Plans for Children with Disabilities Ages Birth Through Five Years*

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

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

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

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

Teacher Certification

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

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

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

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

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

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

Virtual Education

Section 1002.321, Florida Statutes, *Digital Learning*

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

Section 1002.45, Florida Statutes, *Virtual Instruction Programs*

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

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

Charter Schools

Section 1002.33, Florida Statutes, *Charter Schools*

NOTES TO SCHEDULES

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

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

1. The District

The District was established pursuant to Section 1001.30, Florida Statutes, to provide public educational services for the residents of Indian River County, Florida. Those services are provided primarily to PK through 12th-grade students and to adults seeking career education-type training. The District is part of the State system of public education under the general direction and control of the SBE. The geographic boundaries of the District are those of Indian River 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 21 schools other than charter schools, 5 charter schools, 1 cost center, and 1 virtual education cost center serving PK through 12th-grade students.

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017, State funding totaling \$23.3 million was provided through the FEFP to the District for the District-reported 17,534.43 unweighted FTE as recalibrated, which included 2,283.35 unweighted FTE as recalibrated for charter schools. The primary sources of funding for the District are funds from the FEFP, local ad valorem taxes, and Federal grants and donations.

2. FEFP

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

3. FTE Student Enrollment

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

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

4. Recalibration of FTE to 1.0

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

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

5. Calculation of FEFP Funds

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

6. FTE Reporting Survey Periods

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

7. Educational Programs

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

8. Statutes and Rules

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

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

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

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

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

Chapter 1006, Florida Statutes, *Support for Learning*

Chapter 1007, Florida Statutes, *Articulation and Access*

Chapter 1010, Florida Statutes, *Financial Matters*

Chapter 1011, Florida Statutes, *Planning and Budgeting*

Chapter 1012, Florida Statutes, *Personnel*

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

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

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

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

<u>School</u>	<u>Findings</u>
Districtwide – Attendance Recordkeeping	1
1. Vero Beach High School	2 through 6
2. Osceola Magnet School	7 and 8
3. Gifford Middle School	9 through 12
4. Fellsmere Elementary School	13
5. Wabasso School	14 through 19
6. Sebastian River Middle School	20 and 21
7. Sebastian River High School	22 through 24
8. Indian River Charter High School*	25 through 27
9. St. Peter's Academy*	28 and 29
10. Indian River Virtual Instruction Program	NA

* Charter School



Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Auditor General

AUDITOR GENERAL STATE OF FLORIDA

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



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

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

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT

Report on Student Transportation

We have examined the Indian River County District School Board's (District's) compliance with State requirements relating to the classification, assignment, and verification of student transportation as reported under the Florida Education Finance Program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017. These requirements are found primarily in Chapter 1006, Part I, E. and Section 1011.68, Florida Statutes; State Board of Education Rules, Chapter 6A-3, Florida Administrative Code; and the *Student Transportation General Instructions 2016-17* issued by the Department of Education.

Management's Responsibility for Compliance

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

Auditor's Responsibility

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

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

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

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

Opinion

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

In our opinion, except for the material noncompliance with State requirements described in the preceding paragraph involving the students' reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding, the Indian River 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 Florida Education Finance Program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017.

Other Reporting Required by *Government Auditing Standards*

In accordance with attestation standards established by *Government Auditing Standards*, we are required to report all deficiencies that are considered to be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses⁶ 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; accordingly, we express no such opinion. 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 students' reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding. Our examination disclosed certain findings that are required to be reported under *Government*

⁶ 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.

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 with State requirements on the District's reported student transportation is presented in *SCHEDULES F* and *G*.

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

Purpose of this Report

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

Respectfully submitted,



Sherrill F. Norman, CPA
Tallahassee, Florida
September 6, 2018

SCHEDULE F

POPULATIONS, TEST SELECTION, AND TEST RESULTS STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

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

As part of our examination procedures, we tested student transportation as reported to the DOE for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017. (See NOTE B.) The population of vehicles (209) consisted of the total number of vehicles (buses, vans, or passenger cars) reported by the District for all reporting survey periods. For example, a vehicle that transported students during the July and October 2016 and February and June 2017 reporting survey periods would be counted in the population as four vehicles. Similarly, the population of students (16,637) consisted of the total number of students reported by the District as having been transported for all reporting survey periods. (See NOTE A2.) The District reported students in the following ridership categories:

<u>Ridership Category</u>	<u>Number of Students Transported</u>
Teenage Parents and Infants	15
Hazardous Walking	1,556
IDEA – PK through Grade 12, Weighted	708
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>14,358</u>
Total	<u>16,637</u>

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

We noted the following material noncompliance: exceptions involving the reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding for 179 of 381 students in our student transportation test.⁷

⁷ For student transportation, the material noncompliance is composed of Findings 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 on *SCHEDULE G*.

Our examination results are summarized below:

<u>Description</u>	<u>Buses</u>	<u>Students</u>	
	<u>Proposed Net Adjustment</u>	<u>With Exceptions</u>	<u>Proposed Net Adjustment</u>
We noted that the reported number of buses in operation was overstated.	(24)	-	-
Our tests included 381 of the 16,637 students reported as being transported by the District.	-	179	(145)
In conjunction with our general tests of student transportation we identified certain issues related to 333 additional students.	-	<u>333</u>	<u>(330)</u>
Total	<u>(24)</u>	<u>512</u>	<u>(475)</u>

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

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

SCHEDULE G

FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

Overview

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

Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments

Findings

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

1. [Ref. 51/52/53] Our general tests disclosed the following regarding 223 students (2 students were in our test):
 - a. For 147 students, there were no matching student demographic records in the State FTE database for the July 2016 reporting survey period. District records did not evidence that transportation services were provided during the July 2016 reporting survey period (Ref. 51).
 - b. Bus driver reports for six buses (two in the October 2016 reporting survey period, one in February 2017 reporting survey period, and three in the June 2017 reporting survey period) were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located (Ref. 52) involving 74 students in reported ridership. We also noted that the number of DIT for 4 of the students in the June 2017 reporting survey period were incorrectly reported for 14 DIT rather than the 20 DIT indicated on the District's summer instructional calendar. The DIT are addressed in Finding No. 7 (Ref. 59).
 - c. Two students did not have matching student demographic records in the State FTE database for the October 2016 reporting survey period (Ref. 53).
(Finding Continues on Next Page)

**Students
Transported
Proposed Net
Adjustments**

Findings

We propose the following adjustments:

a. Ref. 51		
July 2016 Survey		
Number of Buses in Operation	(18)	
<u>14 Days in Term</u>		
Hazardous Walking	(5)	
IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(103)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>(39)</u>	(147)
b. Ref. 52		
October 2016 Survey		
Number of Buses in Operation	(2)	
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
Hazardous Walking	(21)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(12)	
February 2017 Survey		
Number of Buses in Operation	(1)	
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(37)	
June 2017 Survey		
Number of Buses in Operation	<u>(3)</u>	
	<u>(24)</u>	
<u>20 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(2)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>(2)</u>	(74)
c. Ref. 53		
October 2016 Survey		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>(2)</u>	(2)

2. [Ref. 54] Our general tests disclosed that 16 students were incorrectly reported in the Hazardous Walking ridership category as follows:

- a. Thirteen students were enrolled in middle schools, including 9 students who were either not marked as riding the bus assigned (5 students) or were not listed on the bus drivers' report (4 students), 3 students who lived more than *(Finding Continues Next Page)*

Findings

2 miles from their assigned school and should have been reported in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category, and 1 student lived less than 2 miles from school and was not otherwise eligible for State transportation funding.

- b. Three ESE students were enrolled in PK; however, the students were not marked as riding the bus assigned during the reporting survey periods.

We propose the following adjustments:

October 2016 Survey

90 Days in Term

Hazardous Walking	(9)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	2	

February 2017 Survey

90 Days in Term

Hazardous Walking	(7)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>1</u>	(13)

3. [Ref. 55] Sufficient documentation was not maintained to support the reporting of students in the Hazardous Walking ridership category. Section 1011.68(1)(e), Florida Statutes, authorizes funding for elementary school students who live less than 2 miles from their assigned school when subjected to the hazardous walking conditions described in Section 1006.23(2), Florida Statutes. Effective July 1, 2015, Chapter 2015-101, Laws of Florida (also cited as Gabby’s Law for Student Safety), among other things, amended Section 1006.23, Florida Statutes, revising the criteria used to determine a hazardous walking condition for public school students and the procedures for inspection and identification of hazardous walking locations. Further, the DOE issued guidance to the districts titled *Technical Assistance Note: Hazardous Walking Conditions Determination and Student Data Reporting Revisions for 2015-16, No. 2015-01* (Technical Assistance Note), dated November 5, 2015, which outlines many provisions of the law, cites the documentation that must be maintained on file by the school districts to support the hazardous walking locations, and includes a DOE Hazardous Walking Site Review Checklist that districts and governmental road jurisdictions may use when inspecting locations to determine whether a location meets the statutory criteria of hazardous walking conditions. Updated site checklists for each area were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located.

(Finding Continues on Next Page)

Findings

We noted that 65 students in our test were reported using a hazardous walking code that did not agree with the District’s most recent *Hazardous Walking Report*. Consequently, District records did not evidence which of the hazardous area locations the students would have encountered in route to their assigned schools.

In addition, we noted the following for 27 of the students: 18 students were not marked as riding the bus assigned during the reporting survey periods, 8 students were not listed on the bus drivers’ reports, and 1 student did not have a valid address at the time of the reporting survey period.

We propose the following adjustments:

October 2016 Survey

90 Days in Term

Hazardous Walking (35)

February 2017 Survey

90 Days in Term

Hazardous Walking (30) (65)

4. [Ref. 56] For 66 students in our test, we noted that the students were either not listed on the bus drivers’ report (25 students) or were not marked as riding the bus assigned (41 students) during the reporting survey periods. We also noted that the number of DIT for one of the students in the June 2017 reporting survey period was incorrectly reported for 14 rather than the 20 DIT indicated by the District’s summer instructional calendar. The DIT are addressed in Finding No. 7 (Ref. 59). We propose the following adjustments:

October 2016 Survey

90 Days in Term

Teenage Parents and Infants (2)

Hazardous Walking (4)

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted (4)

All Other FEFP Eligible Students (24)

February 2017 Survey

90 Days in Term

Hazardous Walking (4)

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted (1)

All Other FEFP Eligible Students (26)

Findings

June 2017 Survey

20 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted

(1)

(66)

5. [Ref. 57] For 27 students in our test, we noted that the students were incorrectly reported as follows:

- a. Four students in the Teenage Parent and Infants ridership category were not enrolled in a Teenage Parent Program for the 2016-17 school year; however, 3 students lived more than 2 miles from their assigned school and should have been reported in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category.
- b. Twelve students in the Hazardous Walking ridership category lived more than 2 miles from their assigned school and should have been reported in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category.
- c. The IEPs for 2 ESE students (1 student was reported in the IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted ridership category and 1 student was reported in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category) did not authorize ESY services; consequently, the students were not eligible for State transportation funding in the summer reporting survey periods. We also noted that the number of DIT for these students was incorrectly reported as 14 DIT rather than the 20 DIT indicated on the District's summer instructional calendar. The DIT are addressed in Finding No. 7 (Ref. 59).
- d. The IEP for 1 ESE student in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category was not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located. We also noted that the number of DIT for this student was incorrectly reported as 14 DIT rather than the 20 DIT indicated on the District's summer instructional calendar. The DIT are addressed in Finding No. 7 (Ref. 59).
- e. The IEPs for 3 ESE students reported in the All Other FEFP Eligible Student ridership category indicated that the students met at least one of the five criteria required for reporting in a weighted ridership category and should have been reported in the IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted ridership category. We also noted that the number of DIT for these students was incorrectly reported as 14 DIT rather than the 20 DIT indicated on the District's summer instructional calendar. The DIT are addressed in Finding No. 7 (Ref. 59).
- f. Five students reported in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category lived less than 2 miles from their assigned schools and were not otherwise eligible to be reported for State transportation funding.

We propose the following adjustments:

<u>Findings</u>		<u>Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments</u>
a. October 2016 Survey		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
Teenage Parents and Infants	(2)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	2	
February 2017 Survey		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
Teenage Parents and Infants	(2)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	1	(1)
b. October 2016 Survey		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
Hazardous Walking	(1)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	1	
February 2017 Survey		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
Hazardous Walking	(11)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>11</u>	0
c. June 2017 Survey		
<u>20 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(1)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>(1)</u>	(2)
d. June 2017 Survey		
<u>20 Days in Term</u>		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>(1)</u>	(1)
e. June 2017 Survey		
<u>20 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	3	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>(3)</u>	0
f. October 2016 Survey		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(4)	
February 2017 Survey		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>(1)</u>	(5)

**Students
Transported
Proposed Net
Adjustments**

Findings

6. [Ref. 58] Nineteen students in our test were incorrectly reported in the IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted ridership category. The IEPs for 8 students were not available at the time of our examination and could not be subsequently located; however, 5 students lived more than 2 miles from school and were eligible for reporting in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category. The IEPs for 11 students did not indicate that the students met at least one of the five criteria required for reporting in a weighted ridership category; however, 8 students lived more than 2 miles from school and the IEPs for 3 students authorized transportation services and were otherwise eligible for reporting in the All Other FEFP Eligible Students ridership category. We propose the following adjustments:

October 2016 Survey

90 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(7)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	6	

February 2017 Survey

90 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(11)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	9	

June 2017 Survey

20 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(1)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>1</u>	(3)

7. [Ref. 59] Our general tests disclosed that the number of DIT was incorrectly reported for 162 students in the June 2017 reporting survey period. The students were reported for 14 DIT rather than the 20 DIT indicated in the District's summer instructional calendar. We propose the following adjustment:

June 2017 Survey

20 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	125	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	37	

14 Days in Term

IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(125)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>(37)</u>	0

**Students
Transported
Proposed Net
Adjustments**

Findings

8. [Ref. 60] Our general tests disclosed that the reported student ridership did not agree with the bus drivers' reports for 96 students. Thirty-six students were not listed on the bus drivers' reports and 60 students were not marked as riding the bus assigned. We propose the following adjustments:

October 2016 Survey

90 Days in Term

Hazardous Walking	(3)	
IDEA - PK through Grade 12, Weighted	(1)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	(49)	

February 2017 Survey

90 Days in Term

Hazardous Walking	(17)	
All Other FEFP Eligible Students	<u>(26)</u>	<u>(96)</u>

Proposed Net Adjustment

(475)

SCHEDULE H

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that Indian River County District School Board (District) management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) the number of buses in operation and the number of DIT are accurately reported and documentation is maintained to support that reporting; (2) only those students who are in membership and are documented as having been transported at least 1 day during the reporting survey period are reported for State transportation funding; (3) only ESE students whose IEPs authorize ESY services are reported for State transportation funding in the summer reporting survey periods; (4) updated site checklists are maintained and current for all hazardous walking areas reported; (5) students reported in IDEA – 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 noted on the students' IEPs; and (6) transported students are reported in the correct ridership category 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*
SBE Rules, Chapter 6A-3, FAC, *Transportation*
Student Transportation General Instructions 2016-17

NOTES TO SCHEDULES

NOTE A - SUMMARY STUDENT TRANSPORTATION
--

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

1. Student Eligibility

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

2. Transportation in Indian River County

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017, the District received \$3.7 million for student transportation as part of the State funding through the FEFP. The District's student transportation reported by survey period was as follows:

<u>Survey Period</u>	<u>Number of Vehicles</u>	<u>Number of Students</u>
July 2016	18	147
October 2016	85	7,804
February 2017	87	8,524
June 2017	<u>19</u>	<u>162</u>
Totals	<u>209</u>	<u>16,637</u>

3. Statutes and Rules

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

Section 1002.33, Florida Statutes, *Charter Schools*

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

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

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

NOTE B – TESTING STUDENT TRANSPORTATION
--

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

MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE



School District of Indian River County

6500 57th Street • Vero Beach, Florida, 32967 • Telephone: 772-564-3000 • Fax: 772-564-3054

Mark J. Rendell, Ed.D. - Superintendent

September 6, 2018

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

Dear Ms. Norman:

I would like to respond to the preliminary and tentative report and list of examination findings conducted by the Auditor General's Office, dated August 6, 2018. The report is based on examination of select records on the District's full-time equivalent (FTE) student enrollment and student transportation, as reported under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP), for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017, and is being made for the purpose of rendering opinions concerning the District's compliance with applicable State requirements for the FEFP.

Full Time Equivalent Student Enrollment

Finding #1: Student Attendance Records. We acknowledge that the test schools did not retain exception reports. We have addressed that and do require *Teacher Completion Reports* to be on file at each traditional school. This is monitored by the district office staff.

Findings #2-24: ESE and ESOL Services at Traditional Schools. The majority of these findings involve discrepancies in records of services provided to ESE students. In the 2017-2018 School Year, we reorganized our staffing plan and dedicated a full-time employee at each school to document and verify that each and every ESE student was receiving appropriate services as warranted by their IEP (including hospital homebound services). The results of this change in practice have proven to be effective, I have attached a copy of a letter from the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services which lauds our district for "no findings of non-compliance" in an assessment of our compliance with IEP goals and appropriate transition services for students with disabilities. This assessment serves as an example of our improved practice. As for the ESOL discrepancies, our policies and procedures were sound. However, we have reviewed these policies and procedures with appropriate personnel to ensure that they are implemented with fidelity.

Finding #25: Indian River Charter High School – Instructional Time. The administration of Indian River Charter High School believe that they did provide the required minutes of instructional time. They will appeal this finding and have generated a letter indicating such.

"Educate and inspire every student to be successful"

Shawn R. Frost • Dale Simchick • Laura Zorc • Charles G. Searcy • Tiffany M. Justice
District 1 District 2 District 3 District 4 District 5

"To serve all students with excellence"
Equal Opportunity Educator and Employer

Finding #26: Indian River Charter High School – International Student Funding. The administration of Indian River Charter High School did not provide a response to this finding.

Finding #27: Indian River Charter High School – Dual Enrollment Discrepancy. The administration of Indian River Charter High School did not provide a response to this finding.

Finding #28: St. Peter’s Academy Charter School – Student Attendance. The administration of St. Peter’s Academy Charter School did not provide a response to this finding.

Finding #29: St. Peter’s Academy Charter School – ESOL Notification. The administration of St. Peter’s Academy Charter School did not provide a response to this finding.

Student Transportation

Finding #1: July and October Ridership Survey. The discrepancies noted by the sample survey appear to be a result of incorrect data on ridership reports. The ridership data did not match student enrollment data in FOCUS (our student management system). There were also examples of incomplete ridership data (missing reports). We have reviewed the procedures used to populate and record ridership logs and have trained the appropriate personnel to ensure that these records are accurate. We have also implemented new tracking mechanisms in the transportation department office.

Findings #2 and #3: Hazardous Walking Conditions Ridership. The findings indicate that a lack of supporting documentation, an up-to-date report of hazardous walking conditions, resulted in inaccurate reports of student ridership. We are in the process of updating our Hazardous Walking Conditions Report, which will ensure that the routes and membership are classified appropriately.

Findings #4 - #8: Ridership Survey Discrepancies. Each of these findings reflect inconsistencies in the record keeping and assignment practices in our Transportation Department. These range from student ridership discrepancies similar to finding #1, to misclassification of riders in various categories (Pre-K, ESE, etc.). We have updated some of our procedures and retrained personnel, as stated in the response to finding #1, and have implemented additional tracking mechanisms in the Transportation Department.

We appreciate the time and effort that was put into the generation of the preliminary and tentative report. We have already taken measures to correct deficiencies that were noted and will continue to address any other shortcomings.

Sincerely,



Mark J. Rendell, Ed.D.
Superintendent

pp



State Board of Education

Marva Johnson, *Chair*
Andy Tuck, *Vice Chair*
Members
Gary Chartrand
Tom Grady
Rebecca Fishman Lipsey
Michael Olenick

Pam Stewart
Commissioner of Education

April 06, 2018

Mr. Mark Rendell
Indian River County School District
6500 57th Street
Vero Beach, Florida 32967

Re: No Findings of Noncompliance

Dear Superintendent Rendell:

This letter verifies Indian River County School District's 2017-18 Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Compliance Self-Assessment monitoring process, including validation by the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services (bureau) staff and reassessment by the district. The self-assessment is designed to address the major areas of compliance related to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. The current SPP Indicator 13 measures the percent of youth aged 16 and older with individual educational plans (IEP) with measurable annual IEP goals and appropriate transition assessments, services and courses. SPP Indicator 13 also requires the state to identify and correct any areas of noncompliance during self-assessment as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification.

Results of districts' self-assessments are included in the state's APR and are used to inform general supervision activities, including the selection of districts for on-site monitoring and the local educational agency determinations required under section 300.603 of Title 34, Code of Federal Regulations. These determinations result in school districts being identified as "meets requirements," "needs assistance," "needs intervention" or "needs substantial intervention."

Monica Verra-Tirado, Ed.D., Chief
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services

www.fldoe.org
325 W. Gaines Street | Suite 614 | Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400 | 850-245-0475

Superintendent Rendell
April 06, 2018
Page Two

In the 2017-18 self-assessment, records were reviewed for secondary transition. We are pleased to report that no findings of identified in these records by the district or by the bureau during the validation process. The Indian River County School District is to be commended for this.

The bureau understands that the implementation of this self-assessment required a significant commitment of resources, and the time and attention your staff has devoted to the process is appreciated. It is our hope that the self-assessment process was helpful to you in identifying areas of strength in your ESE programs as well as areas that may warrant attention. If you have any questions regarding this process, please contact your district liaison or Ms. Leanne Grillot, senior program director, at 850-245-0475 or via email at Leanne.Grillot@fldoe.org.

Sincerely,



Monica Verra-Tirado, Ed.D., Chief
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services

MVT/lg

cc: Ms. Heather Standford-Clark
Ms. Leanne Grillot
Ms. Jacqueline Roumou
Ms. Jan Oberschlake



INDIAN RIVER
CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL

6055 COLLEGE LANE
VERO BEACH, FLORIDA 32966
T: 772.567.6600
F: 772.567.6338
www.IRCHS.org

CYNTHIA A. TREVINO-AVERSA
DIRECTOR

DR. RAY ADAMS
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

JOSEPH J. MEZZINA
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

SHENOECK BERRIOS
BUSINESS MANAGER

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

GENE WADDELL
CHAIRMAN

ROBERT A. BRACKETT
SECRETARY

KARL ZIMMERMANN
TREASURER

FAMELA K. BJORKMAN

JOAN L. JOHNSON

CASEY LUNCEFORD

DR. FRANK MEZZINA

RYAN C. SCARPA, ESQ.

BARBARA STRADER

August 31, 2018

Dr. Mark J. Rendell
Indian River County School District Superintendent
6500 57th Street
Vero Beach, FL 32967

Dear Dr. Rendell,

Indian River Charter High School is appealing the audit findings for the 2016-2017 school year issued by the Auditor General's office on June 25th, 2018. IRCHS is a high-performance organization with a unique, integrated, thematic curriculum. IRCHS has been an 'A' school for nine of the past ten years, was designated as a 'Florida School of Excellence' in 2017, and is ranked 129th in the State and 1st on the Treasure Coast by the U.S. News and World Report. Any student who attends IRCHS signs a contract which obligates him or her to positive behavior and involvement in the school and community. The school day begins at 7:30 AM and ends at 5:00 PM, with many students remaining well after that to participate in the school's award-winning Visual and Performing Arts Program and many clubs. It is an understatement to claim that the overwhelming majority of students are spending well beyond the 1500 instructional minutes per week that are required for FTE.

IRCHS was founded on the belief that freedom paired with accountability would produce results. That vision is affirmed when alumni return to share their story of the positive impact IRCHS has had on their lives. That vision is affirmed when, year after year, the school outperforms the State and District



INDIAN RIVER
CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL

6055 COLLEGE LANE
VERO BEACH, FLORIDA 32966
T: 772.567.6600
F: 772.567.6338
www.IRCHS.org

CYNTHIA A. TREVINO-AVERSA
DIRECTOR

DR. RAY ADAMS
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

JOSEPH J. MEZZINA
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

SHENOECK BERRIOS
BUSINESS MANAGER

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
GENE WADDELL
CHAIRMAN

ROBERT A. BRACKETT
SECRETARY

KARL ZIMMERMANN
TREASURER

PAMELA K. BJORKMAN

JOAN L. JOHNSON

CASEY LUNCEFORD

DR. FRANK MEZZINA

RYAN C. SCARPA, ESQ.

BARBARA STRADER

averages for standardized testing. Freedom is integral to the school's formula for success. Freedom allows teachers to collaborate and create thematic and integrated curriculum which engages students. Freedom empowers teachers to operate autonomously and work with students on an individual level.

Part of the school's unique curriculum is an interdisciplinary effort to explore different time periods each semester; engaging in a dialogue with history. All students participate in this integrated curriculum both inside and outside of the classroom. While the project hour initially appeared on students' schedules at night, a more accurate reflection of the time the project hour took place was during the day when students had 55-minute blocks of independent time. During that time, students often worked on interdisciplinary projects which explored the time period being studied that semester, or worked on projects for specific classes that were designated to be completed outside the classroom. Working on projects outside of a traditional classroom setting, but with guidance from instructors, is a regular occurrence at IRCHS.

All students participate in the school's Homebase program. When students enter Indian River Charter High School as freshman, they are assigned a Homebase teacher and Homebase classroom along with twenty-five other students in their cohort. There is a Homebase class once per week for 55 minutes, during which students complete team building activities, character lessons, topical discussions, and interdisciplinary projects related to



INDIAN RIVER
CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL

6055 COLLEGE LANE
VERO BEACH, FLORIDA 32966
T: 772.567.6600
F: 772.567.6338
www.IRCHS.org

CYNTHIA A. TREVINO-AVERSA
DIRECTOR

DR. RAY ADAMS
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

JOSEPH J. MEZZINA
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

SHENOECK BERRIOS
BUSINESS MANAGER

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
GENE WADDELL
CHAIRMAN

ROBERT A. BRACKETT
SECRETARY

KARL ZIMMERMANN
TREASURER

PAMELA K. BJORKMAN

JOAN L. JOHNSON

CASEY LUNCEFORD

DR. FRANK MEZZINA

RYAN C. SCARPA, ESQ.

BARBARA STRADER

the time period being studied that semester. This time is spent under the direct supervision of an instructor, attendance is taken for this class, and students complete projects as a part of this class. Homebase should be included as part of IRCHS' total instructional minutes towards FTE.

In addition, students would work during their 55-minute block of independent time in their Homebase room, sometimes working with their Homebase teacher. Part of the program also requires that students meet with their Homebase teacher individually on a regular basis to discuss grades, goals, and life in general. Through this process, teachers come to know their students on an individual level and help them navigate their high school careers successfully. This kind of mentorship produces tremendous benefit for teachers and students.

Another facet of the school's unique curriculum is a Senior Seminar class, a course requirement for all seniors. As a part of this class, each student explores different career options; shadowing a worker in the community in a field that interests the student. Students work diligently to fill out FAFSA forms, college applications, and scholarship applications. This effort pays huge dividends for our students down the road. Students explore their own drives and ambitions, write and edit college entrance essays, interview leaders in the community, and create a portfolio which is held to rigorous standards. This time is spent under the direct supervision of an instructor, attendance is taken for this class, and students complete projects as a part of



INDIAN RIVER
CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL

6055 COLLEGE LANE
VERO BEACH, FLORIDA 32966
T: 772.567.6600
F: 772.567.6338
www.IRCHS.org

CYNTHIA A. TREVINO-AVERSA
DIRECTOR

DR. RAY ADAMS
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

JOSEPH J. MEZZINA
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

SHENOECK BERRIOS
BUSINESS MANAGER

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
GENE WADDELL
CHAIRMAN

ROBERT A. BRACKETT
SECRETARY

KARL ZIMMERMANN
TREASURER

FAMELA K. BJORKMAN

JOAN L. JOHNSON

CASEY LUNCEFORD

DR. FRANK MEZZINA

RYAN C. SCARPA, ESQ.

BARBARA STRADER

this class. Senior Seminar should be included as part of IRCHS' total instructional minutes towards FTE.

Moving forward, IRCHS is committed to reporting FTE in a way that complies with all rules and regulations. We have changed our class schedule this year so that all students receive at least 250 minutes of supervised instruction per class per week. Looking back, we hope to demonstrate that instruction was taking place which went above and beyond any requirement. We believe the proof of this can be found in the tremendous demand for enrollment in the school and our ten-year status as a high-performance institution. In the future, we hope to come to a better mutual understanding, so that IRCHS can remain an institution with autonomy that strives for excellence. We believe that freedom is paramount to our success, and we will continue to innovate.

Sincerely,
Joseph Jeremy Mezzina

Assistant Director
(772) 567-6600 ext 239
joseph.mezina@irchs.org