

#### **BOARD MEMBERS AND SUPERINTENDENT**

Orange County District School Board members and the Superintendent of Schools who served during the 2010-11 fiscal year are listed below:

Member	District No.
Joie W. Cadle, Chair to 11-15-10	1
M. Daryl Flynn, Vice Chair	2
Judge Richardson Roach	3
Victoria Lynn Bell	4
Kathleen B. Gordon	5
Nancy W. Robbinson	6
Christine Moore Curtis	7
William E. Sublette, Chair from 11-16-10	*

Ronald Blocker, Superintendent

\* Board member Sublette was elected Countywide and served as Chair.

The examination team leader was Bernice Rivas and the examination was supervised by J. David Hughes, CPA. Please address inquiries regarding this report to Nancy M. Reeder, CPA, CISA, CFE, Audit Manager, by e-mail at nancyreeder@aud.state.fl.us or by telephone at (850) 414-9941.

This report and other reports prepared by the Auditor General can be obtained on our Web site at <u>www.myflorida.com/audgen</u>; by telephone at (850) 487-9175; or by mail at G74 Claude Pepper Building, 111 West Madison Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1450.

## Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students and Student Transportation **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

CELLA	Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment
ELL	English Language Learner
EP	Educational Plan
ESE	Exceptional Student Education
ESOL	English for Speakers of Other Languages
F.A.C.	Florida Administrative Code
FCAT	Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test
FES	Fluent English Speaker
<b>F.S.</b>	Florida Statutes
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IEP	Individual Educational Plan
IPT	Idea Oral Language Proficiency Test
LAB	Language Assessment Battery
MAT	Metropolitan Achievement Test
OJT	On-the-Job Training
РК	Prekindergarten
Pre-LAS	Pre-Language Assessment Scales
VPK	Voluntary Prekindergarten

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students and Student Transportation **TABLE OF CONTENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

# FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STUDENTS

Independent Auditor's Report	1
Schedule A – Populations, Samples, and Test Results	4
Schedule B – Effect of Proposed Adjustments on Weighted FTE	6
Schedule C – Proposed Adjustments by School	7
Schedule D – Findings and Proposed Adjustments	. 18
Schedule E – Recommendations and Regulatory Citations	. 95
Notes to Schedules	. 98

### STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

Independent Auditor's Report	
Schedule F – Populations, Samples, and Test Results	
Schedule G – Findings and Proposed Adjustments	
Schedule H – Recommendations and Regulatory Citations	
Notes to Schedules	
MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE	

# **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### Summary of Attestation Examination

Except for the material noncompliance mentioned below involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were missing and could not be located for students in ESOL, ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, Career Education 9-12 (OJT), and student transportation, the Orange County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements regarding the determination and reporting of full-time equivalent (FTE) students under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) and the number of students transported for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011.

- Four-hundred-thirty of the 1,109 students in our ESOL sample, 170 of the 704 students in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 sample, and 255 of the 326 students in our Career Education 9-12 (OJT) sample had exceptions involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were missing and could not be located.
- Of the 762 students in our student transportation sample, 170 had exceptions involving their reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding.

Noncompliance related to reported FTE resulted in 220 findings. The resulting proposed net adjustment to the District's reported, unweighted FTE totaled to a negative 76.4664 but has a potential impact on the District's weighted FTE of a negative 326.1217. Noncompliance related to student transportation resulted in 18 findings and a proposed net adjustment of a negative 2,604 students.

Weighted adjustments to FTE are presented in our report for illustrative purposes only. The weighted adjustments to FTE do not take special program caps and allocation factors into account and are not intended to indicate the weighted FTE used to compute the dollar value of adjustments. That computation is the responsibility of the Department of Education (DOE). However, the gross dollar effect of our proposed adjustments to FTE may be estimated by multiplying the proposed net weighted adjustment to FTE by the base student allocation amount. For the Orange County District School Board, the estimated gross dollar effect of our proposed adjustments to reported FTE is a negative \$1,181,787 (negative 326.1217 times \$3,623.76).

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

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

#### School District of Orange County

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

The governing body of the District is the District School Board that is composed of eight elected members. The executive officer of the Board is the appointed Superintendent of Schools. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011, the District operated 238 schools serving prekindergarten through twelfth grade students, reported 174,720.05 unweighted FTE for those students, and received approximately \$396 million in State funding through FEFP.

#### Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)

#### Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students

Florida school districts receive State funding through FEFP to serve prekindergarten through twelfth grade students (adult education is not funded by FEFP). FEFP was established by the Florida Legislature in 1973 to guarantee to each student in the Florida public school system the availability of programs and services appropriate to the student's educational needs which are substantially equal to those available to any similar student notwithstanding geographic differences and varying local economic factors. То provide equalization of educational opportunity in Florida, the FEFP formula recognizes: (1) varying local property tax bases, (2) varying program cost factors, (3) district cost differentials, and (4) differences in per-student cost for equivalent educational programs due to sparsity and dispersion of student population. The funding provided by FEFP is based upon the numbers of individual students participating in particular educational programs. A numerical value is assigned to each student according to the student's hours and days of attendance in those programs. The individual student thus becomes equated to a numerical value known as an unweighted FTE (full-time equivalent) student. For example, one student would be reported as one FTE if the student was enrolled in six classes per day at 50 minutes per class for the full 180-day school year (i.e., six classes at 50 minutes each per day is 5 hours of class a day or 25 hours per week that equals one FTE).

#### Student Transportation

Any student who is transported by the District must meet one or more of the following conditions in order to be eligible for State transportation funding: live two or more miles from school, be physically handicapped, be a Career Education 9-12 or an ESE student who is transported from one school center to another where appropriate programs are provided, or is on a route that meets the criteria for hazardous walking conditions specified in Section 1006.23(4), Florida Statutes. The District received approximately \$27 million for student transportation as part of the State funding through FEFP.



DAVID W. MARTIN, CPA AUDITOR GENERAL **AUDITOR GENERAL** 

**STATE OF FLORIDA** 

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



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

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

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

We have examined management's assertion, included in its representation letter dated August 23, 2011, that the Orange County District School Board complied with State requirements governing the determination and reporting of the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011. These requirements are found primarily in Sections 1011.60, 1011.61, and 1011.62, Florida Statutes; State Board of Education Rules, Chapter 6A-1, Florida Administrative Code; and the *FTE General Instructions* issued by the Department of Education. As discussed in the representation letter, management is responsible for the District's compliance with State requirements. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the District's compliance based on our examination.

Our examination was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) and the standards applicable to attestation engagements contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and, accordingly, included examining, on a test basis, evidence about the District's compliance with the aforementioned State requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our examination provides a reasonable basis for our opinion. The legal determination of the District's compliance with these requirements is, however, ultimately the responsibility of the Department of Education.

### **Compliance**

Our examination procedures disclosed material noncompliance involving 430 of the 1,109 students in our ESOL sample,<sup>1</sup> 170 of the 704 students in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 sample,<sup>2</sup> and 255 of the 326 students in our Career Education 9-12 (OJT) sample<sup>3</sup> who had exceptions involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were missing and could not be located.

In our opinion, except for the material noncompliance mentioned above involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were missing and could not be located for students in ESOL, ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, and Career Education 9-12 (OJT), the Orange County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements governing the determination and reporting of the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011.

The results of our examination disclosed other noncompliance with the State requirements mentioned above. We considered this other noncompliance in forming our opinion regarding the District's compliance and it did not affect our opinion as stated above. All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed in SCHEDULE D. The impact of this noncompliance on the District's reported FTE is presented in SCHEDULES A, B, C, and D.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For ESOL, see SCHEDULE D, Finding Nos. 4, 6, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 29, 33, 34, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 61, 65, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 103, 104, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 128, 129, 130, 131, 135, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 165, 166, 167, 168, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 185, 186, 187, 193, 194, 195, 204, 208, 209, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, and 218.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> For ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, see SCHEDULE D, Finding Nos. 9, 10, 11, 19, 20, 21, 35, 36, 37, 38, 45, 46, 60, 62, 63, 66, 67, 70, 80, 93, 94, 95, 96, 105, 108, 114, 123, 124, 125, 127, 140, 151, 152, 160, 161, 163, 164, 169, 179, 180, 182, 183, 184, 189, 190, 191, 201, 202, 205, 206, 207, and 220.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> For Career Education 9-12 (OJT), see SCHEDULE D, Finding Nos. 5, 7, 13, 21, 23, 24, 25, 28, 31, 102, 106, 134, 136, 196, 197, 198, 210, and 211.

#### Internal Control Over Compliance

In accordance with attestation standards established by the AICPA and *Government Auditing Standards*, we are required to report significant deficiencies in internal control detected during our examination and identify those considered to be material weaknesses. The purpose of our examination was to express an opinion on the District's compliance with State requirements and did not include expressing an opinion on the District's related internal controls. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. Due to its limited purpose, our examination would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses.<sup>4</sup> However, the material noncompliance mentioned above is indicative of significant deficiencies considered to be material weaknesses in the District's internal controls related to reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were missing and could not be located for students in ESOL, ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, and Career Education 9-12 (OJT). Other noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is indicative of control deficiencies<sup>4</sup> and is also presented herein. The findings, populations, samples, and exception totals that pertain to material and other noncompliance are presented in SCHEDULES A and D.

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

David W. Martin, CPA June 18, 2012

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> A <u>control deficiency</u> in the entity's internal control over compliance exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect noncompliance on a timely basis. A <u>significant deficiency</u> is a control deficiency, or combination of control deficiencies, that adversely affects the entity's ability to comply with the aforementioned State requirements such that there is more than a remote likelihood that noncompliance that is more than inconsequential will not be prevented or detected by the entity's internal control. A <u>material weakness</u> is a significant deficiency, or combination of significant deficiencies, that results in a more-than-remote likelihood that material noncompliance will not be prevented or detected by the entity's internal control.

### SCHEDULE A

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND TEST RESULTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

#### **Reported FTE**

The funding provided by FEFP is based upon the numbers of individual students participating in particular educational programs. FEFP funds ten specific programs that are grouped under the following four general program titles: Basic, ESOL, ESE, and Career Education 9-12. Unweighted FTE represents FTE prior to the application of the specific cost factor for each program. (See SCHEDULE B and NOTES A3, A4, and A6.) The District reported 174,720.05 unweighted FTE at 238 schools to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011.

#### Schools and Students

As part of our examination procedures, we sampled schools and students for testing FTE reported to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011. (See NOTE B.) The population of schools (238) consisted of the total number of schools in the District that offered courses in FEFP-funded programs. The population of students (45,150) consisted of the total number of students in each Program at the schools in our samples. Our Career Education 9-12 data includes only those students who participated in OJT. Our populations and samples of schools and students are summarized as follows:

					Students			
	Number of	Schools	Number of	Students	with	Unweight	ed FTE	Proposed
Programs	Population	<u>Sample</u>	Population	<u>Sample</u>	Exceptions	Population	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Adjustments</u>
Basic	232	37	28,718	402	8	118,912.2100	302.0479	961.9273
Basic with ESE Services	233	38	7,044	266	13	30,272.2700	229.7067	21.4770
ESOL	205	35	7,539	1,109	430	19,098.8000	926.2338	(475.0208)
ESE Support Levels 4 and 5	159	33	1,270	704	170	2,529.6500	575.0612	(71.1842)
Career Education 9-12	40	10	579	326	<u>255</u>	3,907.1200	95.6545	<u>(513.6657)</u>
All Programs	238	40	<u>45,150</u>	<u>2,807</u>	<u>876</u>	<u>174,720.0500</u>	<u>2,128.7041</u>	<u>(76.4664)</u>

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND TEST RESULTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

#### **Teachers**

We also sampled teachers as part of our examination procedures. (See NOTE B.) Specifically, the population of teachers (2,107) consisted of the total number of teachers at schools in our sample who taught courses in ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 or Career Education 9-12 (OJT) or taught courses to ELL students. From the population of teachers, we sampled 527 and found exceptions for 40 of those teachers.

### **Proposed Adjustments**

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

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

## SCHEDULE B

## Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students EFFECT OF PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS ON WEIGHTED FTE (For Illustrative Purposes Only)

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

No. Program <sup>1</sup>	Proposed Net Adjustment <sup>2</sup>	Cost <u>Factor</u>	Weighted <u>FTE<sup>3</sup></u>
101 Basic K-3	180.4891	1.089	196.5526
102 Basic 4-8	109.1875	1.000	109.1875
103 Basic 9-12	672.2507	1.031	693.0905
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	16.3499	1.089	17.8050
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	(.2190)	1.000	(.2190)
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	5.3461	1.031	5.5118
130 ESOL	(475.0208)	1.147	(544.8489)
254 ESE Support Level 4	(56.4708)	3.523	(198.9466)
255 ESE Support Level 5	(14.7134)	4.935	(72.6106)
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(513.6657</u> )	1.035	<u>(531.6440</u> )
Total	<u>(76.4664</u> )		<u>(326.1217</u> )

<sup>1</sup> See NOTE A6.

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

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

# SCHEDULE C

	Proposed Adjustments <sup>1</sup>				
No. Program	<u>#0031</u>	<u>#0040</u>	<u>#0041</u>	Balance <u>Forward</u>	
101 Basic K-3				.0000	
102 Basic 4-8	6.9492			6.9492	
103 Basic 9-12	11.9263	3.7370	(.0080)	15.6553	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services				.0000	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services				.0000	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services				.0000	
130 ESOL		(3.7370)	(.1585)	(3.8955)	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(18.8755)			(18.8755)	
255 ESE Support Level 5				.0000	
300 Career Education 9-12	<u></u>	<u>(1.2625</u> )	<u>(10.8696</u> )	<u>(12.1321</u> )	
Total	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(1.2625</u> )	<u>(11.0361</u> )	<u>(12.2986</u> )	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> These proposed adjustments are for <u>un</u>weighted FTE. (See NOTE A4.)

<u>No.</u>	Brought <u>Forward</u>	<u>#0055</u>	<u>#0074</u>	<u>#0111</u>	<u>#0125</u>	Balance <u>Forward</u>
101	.0000	.0126				.0126
102	6.9492					6.9492
103	15.6553	.1902	3.1005	22.2846	4.8278	46.0584
111	.0000	.5000				.5000
112	.0000	.5000				.5000
113	.0000		(1.0000)	(.2894)		(1.2894)
130	(3.8955)		(2.1005)	(18.9249)	(.4017)	(25.3226)
254	(18.8755)	1.4049		(1.6200)		(19.0906)
255	.0000	(2.6077)		(1.2103)		(3.8180)
300	<u>(12.1321</u> )	<u></u>	<u>(9.4047</u> )	<u>(4.1084</u> )	<u>(10.6336</u> )	<u>(36.2788</u> )
Total	<u>(12.2986</u> )	.0000	<u>(9.4047</u> )	<u>(3.8684</u> )	<u>(6.2075</u> )	<u>(31.7792</u> )

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> These proposed adjustments are for <u>unweighted FTE</u>. (See NOTE A4.)

<u>No.</u>	Brought <u>Forward</u>	<u>#0128</u>	<u>#0141</u>	<u>#0142</u>	<u>#0156</u>	Balance <u>Forward</u>
101	.0126		3.0000			3.0126
102	6.9492		.3870			7.3362
103	46.0584	6.8348				52.8932
111	.5000				3.3948	3.8948
112	.5000					.5000
113	(1.2894)					(1.2894)
130	(25.3226)		(3.3870)			(28.7096)
254	(19.0906)			(1.5000)	(3.9691)	(24.5597)
255	(3.8180)			.5000	(1.0000)	(4.3180)
300	<u>(36.2788</u> )	<u>(17.5891</u> )	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u>(53.8679</u> )
Total	<u>(31.7792</u> )	<u>(10.7543</u> )	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(1.0000</u> )	<u>(1.5743</u> )	<u>(45.1078</u> )

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> These proposed adjustments are for <u>un</u>weighted FTE. (See NOTE A4.)

Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Proposed Adjustments1 Brought Balance <u>No.</u> Forward #0212 #0213 <u>#0231</u> <u>#0241</u> Forward 101 3.0126 5.5000 39.3580 21.0392 8.8382 .9680 102 7.3362 4.4454 6.8540 1.00001.1380 20.7736 103 52.8932 52.8932 ..... ..... ..... ..... 111 3.8948 .7400 4.6348 ..... ..... ..... 112 .5000 .5000 ..... ..... ..... ••••• 113 (1.2894)(1.2894)..... ..... ..... ..... 130 (2.1060)(28.7096)(9.9454)(27.8932)(10.3382)(78.9924)254 (24.5597)(1.9002)(26.4599)..... ..... ..... 255 (4.3180)(4.3180)..... ..... ..... ..... 300 <u>(53.8679</u>) (53.8679) <u>....</u> <u>.....</u> <u>....</u> <u>....</u> Total (45.1078) .0000 (1.1602) (.5000) .0000 (46.7680)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> These proposed adjustments are for <u>un</u>weighted FTE. (See NOTE A4.)

	<b>D</b>		Proposed Ad	ljustments <sup>1</sup>		<b>D</b> 1
<u>No.</u>	Brought <u>Forward</u>	<u>#0521</u>	<u>#0531</u>	<u>#0541</u>	<u>#0571</u>	Balance <u>Forward</u>
101	39.3580	.7019	23.0126	.5000		63.5725
102	20.7736		1.6347	1.0000	33.7019	57.1102
103	52.8932					52.8932
111	4.6348	.9123	.4082	.5000		6.4553
112	.5000				(1.0000)	(.5000)
113	(1.2894)					(1.2894)
130	(78.9924)	(.7019)	(24.6473)	(1.5000)	(32.9966)	(138.8382)
254	(26.4599)	(4.2357)	(1.3769)	(1.0000)		(33.0725)
255	(4.3180)	(.1700)		.5000		(3.9880)
300	<u>(53.8679</u> )	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u>(53.8679</u> )
Total	<u>(46.7680</u> )	<u>(3.4934</u> )	<u>(.9687</u> )	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(.2947</u> )	<u>(51.5248</u> )

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> These proposed adjustments are for <u>un</u>weighted FTE. (See NOTE A4.)

			<b>D</b> 1			
<u>No.</u>	Brought <u>Forward</u>	<u>#0611</u>	<u>#0661</u>	<u>#0671</u>	<u>#0681</u>	Balance <u>Forward</u>
101	63.5725	1.5000			14.5000	79.5725
102	57.1102	6.3814			6.8197	70.3113
103	52.8932		590.2607	3.5907		646.7446
111	6.4553				(.1403)	6.3150
112	(.5000)					(.5000)
113	(1.2894)		3.5000	.5000		2.7106
130	(138.8382)	(7.8814)	(142.4625)	(4.0907)	(21.3197)	(314.5925)
254	(33.0725)	(.8663)	(2.5000)	(.5000)	(1.2856)	(38.2244)
255	(3.9880)		(2.4800)			(6.4680)
300	<u>(53.8679</u> )	<u></u>	<u>(446.8182</u> )	<u>(3.9223</u> )	<u></u>	<u>(504.6084</u> )
Total	<u>(51.5248</u> )	<u>(.8663</u> )	<u>(.5000</u> )	<u>(4.4223</u> )	<u>(1.4259</u> )	<u>(58.7393</u> )

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> These proposed adjustments are for <u>un</u>weighted FTE. (See NOTE A4.)

			<b>D</b> 1			
<u>No.</u>	Brought <u>Forward</u>	<u>#0771</u>	<u>#0801</u>	<u>#0851</u>	<u>#0891</u>	Balance <u>Forward</u>
101	79.5725	4.4600	2.0000	(.1002)	1.0000	86.9323
102	70.3113	2.4122			5.0000	77.7235
103	646.7446					646.7446
111	6.3150		.3998	.5000		7.2148
112	(.5000)					(.5000)
113	2.7106					2.7106
130	(314.5925)	(5.9122)	(2.0000)		(6.0000)	(328.5047)
254	(38.2244)		(1.6577)			(39.8821)
255	(6.4680)	(.9600)	(1.2548)	(.3998)		(9.0826)
300	<u>(504.6084</u> )	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u>(504.6084</u> )
Total	<u>(58.7393</u> )	<u>.0000</u>	<u>(2.5127</u> )	<u>.0000</u>	.0000	<u>(61.2520</u> )

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> These proposed adjustments are for <u>un</u>weighted FTE. (See NOTE A4.)

Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Proposed Adjustments1 Brought Balance <u>No.</u> Forward <u>#0931</u> <u>#0971</u> #1051 #1061 Forward 101 86.9323 7.8134 138.1934 36.9477 6.5000 ..... 102 77.7235 5.4655 3.6198 8.5295 95.3383 ..... 103 646.7446 4.8140 651.5586 ..... ..... ..... 111 7.2148 .9748 9.6874 .2850 1.2128 ..... 112 (.5000).6004 .1004 ..... ..... ..... 113 2.7106 2.2106 (.5000)..... ..... ..... 130 (328.5047)(4.3140)(42.4132)(10.1198)(16.3429)(401.6946)254 (39.8821)(1.1703)(.5882)(1.1379)(42.7785)..... 255 (9.0826)(.5000)(1.1753)(10.7579)..... ..... 300 (504.6084) (1.4385)(506.0469) <u>.....</u> <u>....</u> <u>.....</u> Total (61.2520) (1.4385) (.8853) (.1134) (.5000) <u>(64.1892</u>)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> These proposed adjustments are for <u>un</u>weighted FTE. (See NOTE A4.)

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS BY SCHOOL** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

	<b>D</b>		Proposed Ad	ljustments <sup>1</sup>		<b>D</b> 1
<u>No.</u>	Brought <u>Forward</u>	<u>#1081</u>	<u>#1261</u>	<u>#1441</u>	<u>#1491</u>	Balance <u>Forward</u>
101	138.1934	2.5251	29.9260	4.0000	4.3446	178.9891
102	95.3383	2.3194	7.1556	.5000	2.4030	107.7163
103	651.5586					651.5586
111	9.6874	3.1500		.5125	2.5000	15.8499
112	.1004	(.8194)				(.7190)
113	2.2106					2.2106
130	(401.6946)	(3.5000)	(37.0816)	(4.5000)	(6.7476)	(453.5238)
254	(42.7785)	(3.4784)		(.5125)	(4.0308)	(50.8002)
255	(10.7579)	(1.4063)				(12.1642)
300	<u>(506.0469</u> )	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u>(506.0469</u> )
Total	<u>(64.1892</u> )	<u>(1.2096</u> )	.0000	.0000	<u>(1.5308</u> )	<u>(66.9296</u> )

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

			Proposed Ad	justments <sup>1</sup>		D 1
<u>No.</u>	Brought <u>Forward</u>	<u>#1511</u>	<u>#1561</u>	<u>#1601</u>	<u>#1621</u>	Balance <u>Forward</u>
101	178.9891				1.5000	180.4891
102	107.7163			.5000	.9712	109.1875
103	651.5586	10.3649	.7064			662.6299
111	15.8499				.5000	16.3499
112	(.7190)		.5000			(.2190)
113	2.2106	1.1355	1.0000			4.3461
130	(453.5238)	(9.4050)		(.5000)	(1.9712)	(465.4000)
254	(50.8002)	(1.9687)	(2.7019)		(.5000)	(55.9708)
255	(12.1642)	(.5433)	(.0045)	(.5014)	(.5000)	(13.7134)
300	<u>(506.0469</u> )	<u>(5.2480</u> )	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u>(511.2949</u> )
Total	<u>(66.9296</u> )	<u>(5.6646</u> )	<u>(.5000</u> )	<u>(.5014</u> )	.0000	<u>(73.5956</u> )

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> These proposed adjustments are for <u>un</u>weighted FTE. (See NOTE A4.)

	-	Proposed Adjustments <sup>1</sup>		
No. Program	Brought <u>Forward</u>	<u>#1662</u>	<u>Total</u>	
101 Basic K-3	180.4891		180.4891	
102 Basic 4-8	109.1875		109.1875	
103 Basic 9-12	662.6299	9.6208	672.2507	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	16.3499		16.3499	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	(.2190)		(.2190)	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services	4.3461	1.0000	5.3461	
130 ESOL	(465.4000)	(9.6208)	(475.0208)	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(55.9708)	(.5000)	(56.4708)	
255 ESE Support Level 5	(13.7134)	(1.0000)	(14.7134)	
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(511.2949</u> )	<u>(2.3708</u> )	<u>(513.6657</u> )	
Total	<u>(73.5956</u> )	<u>(2.8708</u> )	<u>(76.4664</u> )	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> These proposed adjustments are for <u>un</u>weighted FTE. (See NOTE A4.)

### SCHEDULE D

Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

## **Overview**

Management is responsible for determining and reporting the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) in compliance with State requirements. These requirements are found primarily in Sections 1011.60, 1011.61, and 1011.62, Florida Statutes; State Board of Education Rules, Chapter 6A-1, Florida Administrative Code; and the *FTE General Instructions* issued by the Department of Education. Except for the material noncompliance involving reporting errors or records that were not properly or accurately prepared or were missing and could not be located for students in ESOL, ESE Support Levels 4 and 5, and Career Education 9-12 (OJT), the Orange County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements governing the determination and reporting of FTE for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011. All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed below and requires management's attention and action, as recommended on page 95.

### **Findings**

Our examination included the July and October 2010 surveys and the February and June 2011 surveys (see NOTE A5). Unless otherwise specifically stated, the Findings and proposed adjustments presented herein are for the October 2010 survey or the February 2011 survey or both. Accordingly, our Findings do not mention specific surveys unless necessary for a complete understanding of the instances of noncompliance being disclosed.

### District-Level

#### Student Management Solutions (SMS) System - Reporting Exceptions

 [Ref. 1/2/3] <u>Our examination of the District's Student Management Solutions</u> (SMS) system disclosed the following exceptions:

- a. <u>Survey forms (ESE 134s) were not readily accessible on the system as directed</u> by the *FTE General Instructions 2010-11* for instances when hard copy Survey forms are not maintained. (Ref. 1)
- b. <u>The student attendance records could not be printed and were not maintained</u> in DOE report formats required by the *Comprehensive Management Information* <u>System: Automated Student Attendance Recordkeeping System Handbook</u>. (Ref. 2)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u> <u>District-Level</u> (Continued)

<u>Student Management Solutions (SMS) System – Reporting Exceptions</u> (Continued)

c. The District was unable to provide evidence that the SMS system maintained a daily log for the 2010-11 school year as required by the *Comprehensive Management Information System: Automated Student Attendance Recordkeeping System Handbook* that provides that a daily log be generated and maintained with sufficient information to ascertain when and by whom attendance data was entered, changed, or deleted when electronic software systems are used. (Ref. 3)

However, since alternative attendance records were maintained and we were otherwise able to perform our normal examination procedures, we are presenting this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustments.

# .0000

### Reporting of PK-3 ESE Students

2. [Ref. --] <u>We noted the following exceptions involving the reporting of PK-3</u> ESE Students:

a. <u>The FTE earned and the instructional time for PK-3 ESE students were</u> incorrectly reported. The students' number of instructional minutes was reported once for the total of the students' base time and the students' pull-out time for therapy sessions and then also for their therapy sessions again as separate courses resulting in FTE being overstated overall. Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

**Findings** 

Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

District-Level (Continued)

### Reporting of PK-3 ESE Students (Continued)

b. We also noted that the reporting of FTE Earned, Course for students in grades PK-3 disclosed that the FTE calculation was incorrectly based upon 720 hours of instruction per 180-day school year. While the FTE General Instructions 2010-11 make provisions for the conversion of FTE Earned, Course for certain students, including grades PK-3 students who have Class Minutes, Weekly that are greater than or equal to 720 hours but less than or equal to 900 hours, this conversion is not applicable or necessary when the bell schedule and calendar support a 900-hour school year. Accordingly, the FTE Earned, Course should have been reported in accordance with Appendix A of the FTE General Instructions 2010-11.

We are presenting this disclosure Finding here and proposing adjustments in Finding Nos. 37 (Ref. 15602), 45 (Ref. 21302), 60 (Ref. 52101), 66 (Ref. 53102), 80 (Ref. 61106), 108 (Ref. 68101), 125 (Ref. 80105), 140 (Ref. 97101), 151 (Ref. 105103), 163 (Ref. 108101), 164 (Ref. 108102), 180 (Ref. 149101), and 205 (Ref. 160102).

### La Amistad (#0031)

3. [Ref. 3171/72] Two teachers were not properly certified and were not approved by the School Board to teach out of field. One teacher (Ref. 3171) held certification in History and one teacher (Ref. 3172) held certification in English but both teachers taught courses that required certification in ESE. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teachers' out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustments:

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>		Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
La Amistad (#0031) (Continued)		
<u>Ref. 3171</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	1.7764	
103 Basic 9-12	6.6245	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(8.4009</u> )	.0000
<u>Ref. 3172</u>		
102 Basic 4-8	5.1728	
103 Basic 9-12	5.3018	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(10.4746</u> )	.0000
		.0000

### Life Skills Center Charter School (#0040)

4. [Ref. 4002] <u>We noted 13 ELL students had one or more of the following</u> <u>exceptions</u>:

- Students were not assessed prior to their continued (or initial) ESOL placement.
- ELL Student Plans were simply dated "10/11"; thus, we could not determine if the ELL Student Plans were prepared prior to the reporting surveys.
- ELL Student Plans were incomplete for the 2010-11 school year (i.e. students' instructional time and course schedules were not attached to the ELL Student Plans).
- Written parental notification of their children's ESOL placements were missing and could not be located.
- Parental notification of their children's ESOL placements were not dated; thus, we could not determine if the parents had been notified prior to the reporting surveys.

Finding continues on next page.

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>		Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>		
Life Skills Charter School (#0040) (Continued)				
Students were assessed FES; however, th reading or writing test.	e students were not administered a			
We propose the following adjustment:				
103 Basic 9-12 130 ESOL	3.7370 ( <u>3.7370</u> )	.0000		
5. [Ref. 4003] The timecards for 19 Career I	Education 9-12 (OJT) students were			
missing and could not be located. We propose the	following adjustment:			
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(1.2625</u> )	<u>(1.2625</u> )		
		<u>(1.2625</u> )		
Florida Mall Education Center (#0041)				
6. [Ref. 4101] One ELL student was abse	ent from school during the 11-day			
window of the reporting survey and should not ha	ave been reported with that survey's			
results. We propose the following adjustment:				
<ul><li>103 Basic 9-12</li><li>130 ESOL</li><li>300 Career Education 9-12</li></ul>	(.0831) (.0834) <u>(.3335</u> )	(.5000)		
7. [Ref. 4102] We noted the following except	otions for 24 Career Education 9-12			
(OJT) students: (a) the timecards for 4 students	were not signed by the students and			
their employers; (b) the timecards for 20 students were missing and could not be				
located; and (c) 2 of the 20 students cited in (b) ab	oove had timecards reported in other			
surveys that were not signed by the students and	their employers. We propose the			
following adjustment:				
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(10.5361</u> )	(10.5361)		

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>				
Florida Mall Education Center (#0041) (Continued)					
8. [Ref. 4171] One teacher taught Reading to classes that included ELL students					
but was not properly certified to teach ELL students and was not approved by the					
School Board to teach such students out of field. We also noted that the parents of the					
students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status in Reading until after the					
October 2010 survey and were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status in ESOL.					
We propose the following adjustment:					
103 Basic 9-12       .0751         130 ESOL       (.0751)	<u>.0000</u>				
	<u>(11.0361</u> )				
Princeton House Charter School (#0055)					
9. [Ref. 5501] <u>The file for one ESE PK student did not contain an IEP covering</u> <u>the February 2011 survey. We propose the following adjustment</u> :					
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services.5000255 ESE Support Level 5(.5000)	.0000				
10. [Ref. 5502] The Matrix of Services forms for two ESE students incorrectly					
included one Special Considerations point for which the students were not eligible. The					
point was designated for students with a Matrix of Services score of 21 points and a					
Level 5 rating in four domains. This student had a Level 5 rating in only three domains.					
We propose the following adjustment:					
254       ESE Support Level 4       2.0000         255       ESE Support Level 5       (2.0000)	.0000				
11. [Ref. 5503] There was no evidence that the Matrix of Services form for one ESE					
student in the February 2011 survey was reviewed when the student's new IEP was	student in the February 2011 survey was reviewed when the student's new IEP was				
prepared on January 11, 2011. We propose the following adjustment:					
The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.					

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Findings	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Princeton House Charter School (#0055) (Continued)	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services.5000254 ESE Support Level 4(.5000)	.0000
12. [Ref. 5571/72] <u>Two teachers were not properly certified and were not approved</u>	
by the School Board to teach out of field. One teacher (Ref. 5571) was licensed as an	
Occupational Therapist but taught a course that required licensure or certification in	
Speech Language Therapy and one teacher (Ref. 5572) was certified in ESE but required	
certification in any Vocational field or coverage. We also noted that the parents of the	
ESE students were not notified of the teachers' out-of-field status. We propose the	
following adjustments:	
Ref. 5571       .0126         101 Basic K-3       .0126         255 ESE Support Level 5       (.0126)         Ref. 5572       .1902         103 Basic 9-12       .1902         254 ESE Support Level 4       (.0951)	.0000
255 ESE Support Level 5 (.0951)	.0000
	<u>.0000</u>
Workforce Advantage Academy Charter School (#0074)	
13. [Ref. 7402] The work hours reported for 80 Career Education 9-12 (OJT)	
students were not adequately supported. For example, no pay stubs were attached to	
the timecards, the timecards were not signed by the students' supervisors from the	
named companies, and the approval dates were from seven months to almost one year	
after the work dates reflected on the timecards. We propose the following adjustment:	
300 Career Education 9-12 (9.4047)	(9.4047)

Findings	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Workforce Advantage Academy Charter School (#0074) (Continued)	
14. [Ref. 7403] The file for one ESE student was missing and could not be locate	<u>.</u>
We propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       1.000         113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services       (1.000)	
15. [Ref. 7404] The files for five ELL students did not contain sufficie	nt
documentation to support the students' ESOL placement. We also noted that four	of
these students were over the maximum six-year period allowed for State funding	of
ESOL. We propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       2.100         130 ESOL       (2.100)	
	<u>(9.4047</u> )
Boone High School (#0111)	
16. [Ref. 11101] Five ELL students were beyond the maximum six-year period	<u>od</u>
allowed for State funding of ESOL. We propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       1.700         130 ESOL       (1.700)	
17. [Ref. 11102] The ELL Student Plans for nine students were not reviewed as	nd
updated for the 2010-11 school year. We also noted the following exceptions for fo	<u>ur</u>
of the students: (a) one student was not timely assessed prior to the start of his six	<u>th</u>
year; (b) one student who was placed in ESOL in August 2010 did not have an init	ial
assessment until December 2010 and there was no date on the parent notification letter	<u>er;</u>
and (c) the files for two students did not contain parent notification letters of the	ei <u>r</u>
children's ESOL placements. We propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       5.267         130 ESOL       (5.267)         The economic protection on an interval point of this economic	<u>.0000</u>
The accompanying notes are an integral part of this sched	uie.

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Boone High School (#0111) (Continued)	
18. [Ref. 11103] The files for three ELL students did not contain documentation to	
support that the parents were notified of their children's ESOL placements. We	
propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-122.8048130 ESOL(2.8048)	.0000
19. [Ref. 11104] Two ESE students were not reported in accordance with the	
students' Matrix of Services forms. We propose the following adjustment:	
113       Grades 9-12 with ESE Services       .5000         254       ESE Support Level 4       (1.5000)         255       ESE Support Level 5       1.0000	.0000
20. [Ref. 11105] The course schedules for five ESE students receiving both	
on-campus instruction and homebound instruction were reported incorrectly in	
Program No. 255 (ESE Support Level 5) for their on-campus instruction. The students'	
on-campus instruction should have been reported in Program No. 113 (Grades 9-12	
with ESE Services) [for three students] or Program No. 103 (Basic 9-12) [for two	
students]. We also noted that the instructional minutes for the fourth period were	
overstated by 180 minutes or .0600 FTE per student reporting (one student was in both	
the October 2010 and February 2011 surveys). We propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .6397         113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services       1.2106         255 ESE Support Level 5       (2.2103)	(.3600)

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

**Findings** 

Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

# Boone High School (#0111) (Continued)

21.	[Ref. 11106] The reporting of the instructional minutes for 15 studen	<u>nts' fourth</u>	
period	incorrectly included time for lunch causing the students' fourth per	riod to be	
overrep	ported by 180 minutes or .0600 FTE per student reporting. We also	noted the	
<u>followi</u>	ng exceptions for 4 of the students who were in the OJT Program	n: <u>(a) the</u>	
<u>timeca</u>	rds for 2 students were missing and could not be located; (b) 1 student's	s timecard	
<u>did no</u>	t support any hours worked during the reporting survey; and (c) 1 st	udent was	
<u>reporte</u>	ed for more work hours than were supported by the student's timeca	urd. <u>(One</u>	
studen	t was in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 sample, 5 students were in c	our ESOL	
<u>sample</u>	, 2 students were in our Basic with ESE Services sample, and 7 studen	its were in	
<u>our Ca</u>	reer Education 9-12 [OJT] sample.) We propose the following adjustme	ent:	
	<ul> <li>103 Basic 9-12</li> <li>130 ESOL</li> <li>254 ESE Support Level 4</li> <li>300 Career Education 9-12</li> </ul>	1.2600 (.5400) (.1200) (1.2556)	(.6556)
22.	[Ref. 11107] The files for two Gifted students did not contain an EF	<sup>o</sup> covering	
<u>the 201</u>	0-11 school year. We propose the following adjustment:		
	<ul><li>103 Basic 9-12</li><li>113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services</li></ul>	2.0000 (2.0000)	.0000
23.	[Ref. 11108] The timecards for two Career Education 9-12 (OJT) stud	lents were	
<u>not sig</u>	ned by the students' employers. We propose the following adjustment:		
	300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(.3168</u> )	(.3168)
24.	[Ref. 11109] The timecards for nine Career Education 9-12 (OJT) stud	lents were	
missing	g and could not be located. We propose the following adjustment:		
	300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(2.0394</u> )	(2.0394)

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Boone High School (#0111) (Continued)	
25. [Ref. 11110] We noted the following exceptions for three Career Education	
9-12 (OJT) students: (a) the timecards for two students indicated that the students	
worked fewer hours than were reported, and (b) the timecard for one student indicated	
the student did not work any hours. We propose the following adjustment:	
300 Career Education 9-12 (.4966)	(.4966)
26. [Ref. 11171] One teacher who taught Basic subject area classes that included	
ELL students had earned none of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL strategies	
required by rule and the teacher's in-service training timeline. We propose the following	
adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .3164         130 ESOL       (.3164)	.0000
27. [Ref. 11172] One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by	
the School Board to teach out of field. The teacher held certification in Elementary	
School Education with ESOL and Reading Endorsements but taught courses that	
required certification in English. We also noted that the parents of the students were	
not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       8.2956         130 ESOL       (8.2956)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>(3.8684</u> )

Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

**Findings** 

Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

### East Orlando Education Center (#0125)

28. [Ref. 12501] <u>The bell schedule for 20 Career Education 9-12 (OJT) students</u> was incorrectly calculated. Each course was for 245 instructional minutes; however, the number of reported minutes ranged from 295 minutes to 467 minutes. We also noted the following exceptions for 16 of the students: (a) the timecards for 10 students were missing and could not be located and 1 of these students was not enrolled in OJT until after the October 2010 reporting survey; (b) 4 students worked fewer hours than were reported; and (c) 2 students had both exceptions noted in (a) and (b) above. We propose the following adjustment:

103	Basic 9-12	1.3925	
300	Career Education 9-12	<u>(7.6000</u> )	(6.2075)

29. [Ref. 12502] <u>The ELL Student Plan for one student was not adequately dated</u> (indicating only "10/11") so that it could be determined that the ELL Student Plan was timely prepared (i.e., prior to the reporting survey). We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	.4017	
130 ESOL	<u>(.4017</u> )	.0000

30. [Ref. 12571] <u>One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by</u> the School Board to teach out of field. The teacher held certification in Elementary School Education but taught courses that required certification in Any Field with a Teacher Coordinator of Work Experience endorsement. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustment:

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>		Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
East Orlando Education Center (#0125) (Continued)		
<ul><li>103 Basic 9-12</li><li>300 Career Education 9-12</li></ul>	3.0336 ( <u>3.0336</u> )	.0000
		<u>(6.2075</u> )
Universal Education Center (#0128)		
31. [Ref. 12802] We noted the following exceptions for 24 Career (OJT) students: (a) the timecards for 20 students that were prepared 1 were determined to have been printed schedules of work time and were the students' supervisors to verify the work hours scheduled as bein (b) the work schedules for 4 students were missing and could ref. Consequently, we could not validate the reported time for these 24 propose the following adjustment: 300 Career Education 9-12	by the employer re not signed by ng worked, and not be located.	(10.7543)
32. [Ref. 12871] <u>One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by</u> the School Board to teach out of field. The teacher held certification in General Science with a Middle School Grades Endorsement but taught courses that required certification in Any Field with a Teacher Coordinator of Work Experience endorsement. We also noted that the parents of students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustment: 103 Basic 9-12 6.8348		
300 Career Education 9-12	<u>(6.8348</u> )	.0000
		<u>(10.7543</u> )

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

**Findings** 

Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

### Lakeville Elementary School (#0141)

33. [Ref. 14101] One ELL student scored English proficient on the student	<u>s</u>	
CELLA Composite and Reading portions of the test. However, we did not see evidence	<u>e</u>	
that the student was administered a second assessment test (LAB or IPT) or that a	<u>n</u>	
ELL Committee had convened to determine the student's ESOL placement status	<u>}.</u>	
Consequently, the student's ESOL placement was not adequately supported. W	<u>e</u>	
propose the following adjustment:		
101 Basic K-3       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)		
34. [Ref. 14102] We noted the following exceptions for three ELL students: (a) th	<u>e</u>	
files for two students were missing and could not be located, and (b) one student score	<u>d</u>	
English proficient on the CELLA Composite and Reading portions of the test. W	<u>e</u>	
propose the following adjustment:		
101 Basic K-3       2.0000         102 Basic 4-8       .3870         130 ESOL       (2.3870)	)	
<u>Cherokee School (#0142)</u>		
35. [Ref. 14201] We noted the following exceptions for two ESE students: (a) on	<u>e</u>	
student in the February 2011 survey withdrew prior to that reporting survey, and (b) on	<u>e</u>	
student in the October 2010 survey was absent during the entire 11-day survey period		
window. We propose the following adjustment:		

254 ESE Support Level 4	(.5000)	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.5000</u> )	(1.0000)

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

**Proposed Net** Adjustments **Findings** (Unweighted FTE) Cherokee School (#0142) (Continued) 36. [Ref. 14202/03] Four ESE students were not reported in accordance with their Matrix of Services forms. We propose the following adjustments: Ref 14202 254 ESE Support Level 4 (.5000)255 ESE Support Level 5 .0000 .5000 Ref. 14203 254 ESE Support Level 4 (.5000)255 ESE Support Level 5 .5000 .0000 (1.0000)

#### Cypress Springs Elementary School (#0156)

37. [Ref. 15602] The FTE earned and the instructional time for ten PK ESE students (one student was in our Basic with ESE Services sample and nine students were in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 sample) were incorrectly reported. The students should have been reported for 720 instructional minutes but were reported for varying numbers of instructional minutes depending on the students' individual therapy sessions that ranged from 750 to 840 minutes. We also noted that the reporting of FTE Earned, Course for students in grades PK-3 disclosed that the FTE calculation was incorrectly based upon 720 hours of instruction per 180-day school year. (See Finding No. 2.) We further noted that one student's Matrix of Services form was missing and could not be located. We propose the following adjustment:

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.3948	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(1.9691</u> )	(1.5743)

38. [Ref. 15603] Four ESE students were not reported in accordance with their Matrix of Services forms. We propose the following adjustment:

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Cypress Springs Elementary School (#0156) (Continued)	
111Grades K-3 with ESE Services3.0000254ESE Support Level 4(2.0000255ESE Support Level 5(1.0000)	)
Oakshire Elementary School (#0212)	<u>(</u> )
39. [Ref. 21202] One ELL student scored English proficient on the student's         CELLA Composite and Reading portions of the test. However, the student was no         administered a second assessment test (LAB) until after the October 2010 survey         Consequently, the student's ESOL placement was not adequately supported. We         propose the following adjustment:         101 Basic K-3       .5000         130 ESOL       (.5000)	<u>t</u> - 2
40. [Ref. 21203] Five ELL students scored English proficient on the students CELLA Composite and Reading portions of the test as well as on a second assessment test (LAB) that were completed prior to the reporting surveys. Additionally, we noted that the ELL Committees for these students did not convene to determine the students continued ESOL placements until after the reporting surveys. We also noted the following exceptions for two of the students: (a) the ELL Committee for one student did not consider at least two of the five ESOL placement criteria specified in State Board of Education Rule 6A-6.0902(2)(a)4., Florida Administrative Code, and (b) the file for one student did not contain written documentation to support that the student's parents had been notified of their child's initial ESOL placement. We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       3.5000         130 ESOL       (3.5000)	

Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

**Findings** 

### Oakshire Elementary School (#0212) (Continued)

41. [Ref. 21204] <u>Three ELL students scored English proficient on their second</u> assessment tests (Pre-LAS or LAB) prior to the reporting surveys. However, the ELL <u>Committee did not convene to determine the students' continued ESOL placements</u> <u>until after the reporting surveys had ended, and the ELL Committee for one of those</u> <u>students did not consider at least two of the five ESOL placement criteria specified in</u> <u>State Board of Education Rule 6A-6.0902(2)(a)4.</u>, Florida Administrative Code. We also <u>noted that the files for two of the students did not contain documentation to support</u> <u>that the students' parents had been notified of their children's ESOL placements. We</u> <u>propose the following adjustment:</u>

101 Basic K-3	1.0000
102 Basic 4-8	.4922
130 ESOL	<u>(1.4922</u> )

42. [Ref. 21205] Four ELL students scored English proficient on the CELLA Composite and Reading portions of the test as well as scoring a Level 3 on the FCAT. However, we did not see evidence that an ELL Committee had been convened to determine the students' continued ESOL placements for three of the four students. We noted the following for the remaining student: (a) the student had also scored English Proficient on a third measure (LAB) that was not completed until after the student's ESOL placement for a sixth year and also after the February 2011 survey, and (b) the ELL Committee meeting was not convened until after the February 2011 survey had ended. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	3.9532	
130 ESOL	<u>(3.9532</u> )	.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

.0000

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

### **Findings**

### Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

.0000

### Oakshire Elementary School (#0212) (Continued)

43. [Ref. 21206] <u>One ELL student in the February 2011 survey was not assessed on</u> a timely basis for continuation in ESOL for a fifth year. The student scored English proficient on the LAB test given in December 2010 and on the MAT test in February 2011. However, an ELL Committee was not convened to determine the student's continued ESOL placement until April 26, 2011, which was after the February 2011 survey. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	.5000	
130 ESOL	<u>(.5000</u> )	<u>.0000</u>

#### Lawton Chiles Elementary School (#0213)

44. [Ref. 21301] <u>The ELL Student Plans for 31 students were either not reviewed</u> and updated for the 2010-11 school year (8 students) or were not adequately dated (23 students) [indicating only "10/11"] such that it could be determined that the ELL <u>Student Plans were timely prepared (i.e., prior to the reporting survey). We also noted the</u> following exceptions for 9 of the 31 students:

- a. <u>Seven students scored English proficient on the CELLA Composite and Reading portions of the test and did not have a second assessment test (six students) or had earned a Level 3 on their FCAT reading test (one student).</u> <u>There was no documentation to support that an ELL Committee had been convened to consider the students' ESOL placements.</u>
- <u>The file for one student did not contain documentation that the student had</u> been assessed for initial ESOL placement or that the student's parents had been notified of their child's ESOL placement.

**Proposed Net** 

## **SCHEDULE D** (Continued)

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

## Adjustments **Findings** (Unweighted FTE) Lawton Chiles Elementary School (#0213) (Continued) The parental notification letter for one student was not dated; consequently, we c. could not determine that the parents had been notified of their child's ESOL placement in a timely manner (i.e., prior to the reporting survey). We propose the following adjustment: 101 Basic K-3 20.5392 102 Basic 4-8 6.8540 130 ESOL .0000 (27.3932) 45. [Ref. 21302] The FTE earned and the instructional time for seven PK ESE students were incorrectly reported. The students should have been reported for either 720 or 795 instructional minutes but were reported for varying numbers of instructional minutes depending on the students' individual therapy sessions ranging from 780 to 885 minutes. We also noted that the reporting of FTE Earned, Course for students in grades PK-3 disclosed that the FTE calculation was incorrectly based upon 720 hours of instruction per 180-day school year. (See Finding No. 2.) We further noted one student's Matrix of Services form was missing and could not be located. We propose the following adjustment: 111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services .2400 254 ESE Support Level 4 (1.4002)(1.1602)46. [Ref. 21303] The Matrix of Services form for one ESE student, who was reported for .5000 FTE, incorrectly included the three Special Considerations points designated for PK students who were reported for less than .5000 FTE. We propose the following adjustment: 111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services .5000 .0000 254 ESE Support Level 4 (.5000)

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Lawton Chiles Elementary School (#0213) (Continued)	
47. [Ref. 21304] <u>One ELL student was assessed FES and scored English proficient</u> on a second assessment (LAB) with no reading or writing assessment and no ELL	
<u>Committee meeting convened to determine the student's need for continued ESOL</u> <u>placement. We propose the following adjustment:</u>	
101 Basic K-3     .5000       130 ESOL     (.5000)	<u>.0000</u> (1.1602)
Pineloch Elementary School (#0231)	
48. [Ref. 23101] One ELL student scored English proficient on a test (LAB) prior         to the October 2010 reporting survey; however, the student was not exited from the         ESOL Program until after the October 2010 survey had ended. We propose the         following adjustment:         101 Basic K-3       .5000         130 ESOL       (.5000)	.0000
49. [Ref. 23102] <u>Three ELL students scored English proficient on CELLA</u> Composite and Reading portions of the test; however, we did not see evidence that the students were administered a second assessment test (LAB or IPT) nor did we see that an ELL Committee had been convened to support continued ESOL placement. Consequently, the students' ESOL placements were not adequately supported. We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       3.0000         130 ESOL       (3.0000)	.0000

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

### **Findings**

130 ESOL

## Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>

### Pineloch Elementary School (#0231) (Continued)

50. [Ref. 23103] We noted the following exceptions for eight ELL students: (a) the	<u>e</u>
files for seven students did not contain ELL Student Plans or evidence that the student	<u>3'</u>
parents were notified of their children's ESOL placements, and (b) the file for on	<u>e</u>
student was missing and could not be located. We also noted that one of seve	<u>n</u>
students, who had returned January 2011 after an extended absence from the District	<u>:t</u>
(April 2009), was not reassessed to determine if the student's continued ESO	<u>L</u>
placement was appropriate until after the February 2011 survey had ended. We propos	<u>e</u>
the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       3.4378         102 Basic 4-8       1.0000         130 ESOL       (4.4378)	)
51. [Ref. 23104] The ELL Student Plan for the 2010-11 school year for one studer	<u>ıt</u>
was not completed until November 1, 2010, which was after the October 2010 surve	<u>y</u>
had ended. We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .5000         130 ESOL       (.5000)	
52. [Ref. 23105] The file for one ELL student did not contain documentatio	<u>n</u>
justifying the student's continued ESOL placement for a fifth year. We propose th	<u>e</u>
following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3 .500	)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

<u>(.5000</u>)

.0000

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Findings	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Pineloch Elementary School (#0231) (Continued)	
53. [Ref. 23106] One ELL student scored English proficient on CELLA Composite	
and Reading portions of the test and also scored a Level 4 on the FCAT Reading	
assessment supporting exit from the Program; however, the student was not exited from	
the Program until after the October 2010 survey had ended. We propose the following	
adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       .5000         130 ESOL       (.5000)	.0000
54. [Ref. 23107] The file for one ELL student did not contain documentation to	
support that the student had been assessed eligible for initial ESOL placement and the	
documentation to support that the parents had been notified of their child's ESOL	
placement was not dated. Consequently, the student was not adequately documented	
for ESOL placement. We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .4004         130 ESOL       (.4004)	.0000
55. [Ref. 23109] One student withdrew from school prior to the reporting survey	
and should not have been included with the survey's results. We propose the following	
adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8 (.5000)	(.5000)
56. [Ref. 23110] One ELL student was reported incorrectly in ESOL. The student	
was FES and ineligible for reporting in ESOL. We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3 .5000	
130 ESOL (.5000)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>(.5000</u> )

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Findings	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Lake Gem Elementary School (#0241)	
57. [Ref. 24101] We noted the following exceptions for two ELL students: (a) one	
student was reported in the ESOL Program beyond the maximum six-year period	
allowed for State funding of ESOL, and (b) one student was assessed FES and was	
ineligible for continued ESOL placement. We propose the following adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       1.1380         130 ESOL       (1.1380)	.0000
58. [Ref. 24171] The parents of a student taught by one out-of-field teacher in	
ESOL were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We propose the following	
adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .2456         130 ESOL       (.2456)	.0000
59. [Ref. 24172] One teacher taught Primary Language Arts to classes that included	
ELL students but was not properly certified to teach ELL students and was not	
approved by the School Board to teach such students out of field. We propose the	
following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .7224         130 ESOL       (.7224)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>.0000</u>

Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

**Findings** 

Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

### Lake Silver Elementary School (#0521)

60. [Ref. 52101] The FTE earned and the instructional time for 14 PK ESE	
students (1 student was in our Basic with ESE Services sample and 13 students were in	
our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 sample) were incorrectly reported. The students	
should have been reported for either 750 or 990 instructional minutes but were reported	
for varying numbers of instructional minutes depending on their individual therapy	
sessions ranging from 780 to 1,500 minutes. We also noted that the reporting of FTE	
Earned, Course for students in grades PK-3 disclosed that the FTE calculation was	
incorrectly based upon 720 hours of instruction per 180-day school year. (See Finding	
No. 2.) We propose the following adjustment:	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services       (.0877)         254 ESE Support Level 4       (2.7357)         255 ESE Support Level 5       (.1700)	(2.9934)
61. [Ref. 52102] One ELL student was reported incorrectly in the ESOL Program.	
The student was FES and was recommended for exit by an ELL Committee prior to the	
reporting survey. We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .5000         130 ESOL       (.5000)	.0000
62. [Ref. 52103] Two ESE students were not reported in accordance with their	
Matrix of Services forms. We propose the following adjustment:	

 111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services
 1.0000

 254 ESE Support Level 4
 (1.0000)

 .0000

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Lake Silver Elementary School (#0521) (Continued)	
63. [Ref. 52104] <u>One ESE student in the October 2010 survey was not in</u> attendance during the entire 11-day survey period window and should not have been	
reported with the survey's results. We propose the following adjustment:	
254 ESE Support Level 4 (.5000)	(.5000)
64. [Ref. 52171] <u>One ESOL out-of-field teacher was not approved by the School</u>	
Board to teach ELL students out of field until October 26, 2010, after the reporting survey had ended. We also noted that the parents of the ELL students were not notified	
of the teacher's out-of-field status until November 2, 2010, also after the October 2010	
reporting survey. We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3     .2019       130 ESOL     (.2019)	.0000
	<u>(3.4934</u> )
Audubon Park Elementary School (#0531)	
65. [Ref. 53101] The ELL Student Plans for 24 students were not adequately dated	
(indicating only "10/11") such that it could be determined that the ELL Student Plans	
were timely prepared (i.e., prior to the reporting survey). We also noted that 5 of the 24	
students scored English proficient in the CELLA Composite and Reading portions of	
the test and did not have a second assessment test (3 students) or had scored English	
proficient on the LAB test (2 students) and an ELL Committee had not been convened	
to consider the students' continued ESOL placement. We propose the following	
<u>adjustment</u> :	
101 Basic K-3       23.0126         130 ESOL       (23.0126)	.0000

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

### **Findings**

### Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

### Audubon Park Elementary School (#0531) (Continued)

 66. [Ref. 53102] The FTE earned and the instructional time for eight PK ESE

 students were incorrectly reported. The students should have been reported for either

 790 or 800 instructional minutes but were reported for varying number of instructional

 minutes depending on their individual therapy sessions ranging from 850 to 890

 minutes. We also noted that the reporting of FTE Earned, Course for students in grades

 PK-3 disclosed that the FTE calculation was incorrectly based upon 720 hours of

 instruction per 180-day school year. (See Finding No. 2.) We propose the following

 adjustment:

 111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services
 (.0918)

 254 ESE Support Level 4
 (.9687)

67. [Ref. 53103] <u>One ESE student was not reported in accordance with the</u> student's *Matrix of Services* form. We propose the following adjustment:

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

68. [Ref. 53171] <u>The out-of-field status of one ESOL teacher was not approved by</u> the School Board until February 22, 2011, after that reporting survey. We also noted that the parents of the ELL students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status until February 14, 2011, also after the reporting survey. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	1.6347	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.6347</u> )	.0000

(.9687)

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

### Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

.0000

### Dream Lake Elementary School (#0541)

69.	[Ref. 54101] We noted the following exce	ptions for two ELL students: (a) one	
studer	t scored English proficient on CELLA Co	mposite and Reading portions of the	
<u>test</u> ar	nd also scored a Level 4 on the FCAT Rea	ding test prior to the 2010-11 school	
<u>year, a</u>	nd (b) the ELL Student Plan for one student	was not reviewed and updated for the	
<u>2010-</u> 2	1 school year and was not complete as the s	tudent's instructional time and course	
schedu	lle were not attached. We propose the follow	ving adjustment:	
	101 Basic K-3	.5000	
	102 Basic 4-8 130 ESOL	1.0000 <u>(1.5000</u> )	.0000
70		1	
70.	[Ref. 54102] Two ESE students were no	ot reported in accordance with their	
<u>Matrix</u>	of Services forms. We propose the following	<u>adjustment</u> :	
	111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.5000	

 254
 ESE Support Level 4
 (1.0000)

 255
 ESE Support Level 5
 .5000
 .0000

### Glenridge Middle School (#0571)

71. [Ref. 57101] <u>The FTE earned for 93 ELL students (4 students were in our ESOL sample) was calculated incorrectly.</u> The bell schedule supported 203 or 204 instructional minutes (.0677 to .0680 FTE) for each course; however, the students were actually reported for instructional minutes ranging from 524 to 532 minutes (.1747 to .1774 FTE) for each course. Consequently, the FTE earned was overstated in Program No. 130 (ESOL) and understated in Program No. 102 (Basic 4-8). (Three students were reported for less than .5000 FTE; consequently the overstated FTE went to zero.) We propose the following adjustment:

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>	
Glenridge Middle School (#0571) (Continued)		
102 Basic 4-8       23.2088         130 ESOL       (23.5035)	(.2947)	
72. [Ref. 57102] The ELL Student Plans for 11 students were not reviewed and		
updated for the 2010-11 school year. We also noted the following exceptions for 4 students: (a) the parents of one student were not notified of the student's ESOL		
placement; (b) the parent notice in one student's file was not dated; consequently, we		
could not determine whether it was timely sent; (c) the file for one student did not		
contain documentation justifying the student's continued ESOL placement for a fifth		
year; and (d) one student was reported incorrectly in ESOL in the October 2010 survey,		
as the student had passed the LAB and MAT tests, and the parents were not notified of		
the student's ESOL placement until the student had been exited from the Program in		
November 2010. We propose the following adjustment:		
102 Basic 4-8       6.3735         130 ESOL       (6.3735)	.0000	
73. [Ref. 57103] The ELL Student Plans for four students were not were adequately		
dated (indicating only "10/11") such that it could be determined that the ELL Student		
Plans were timely prepared (i.e., prior to the reporting survey). We also noted that the		
file for one of the four students did not contain documentation justifying the student's		
continued ESOL placement for a fifth year. We propose the following adjustment:		
102 Basic 4-8       2.8483         130 ESOL       (2.8483)	.0000	
74 Pof 571041 The file for one ELL student was missing and could not be		

74. [Ref. 57104] <u>The file for one ELL student was missing and could not be</u> located. We propose the following adjustment:

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Findings	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Glenridge Middle School (#0571) (Continued)	
102 Basic 4-8       .2711         130 ESOL       (.2711)	
75. [Ref. 57105] The file for one ESE student was missing and could not b	<u>e</u>
located. We propose the following adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       1.000         112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services       (1.000)	
	<u>(.2947</u> )
Azalea Park Elementary School (#0611)	
76. [Ref. 61101] The file for one ELL student did not contain documentation	<u>n</u>
justifying the student's continued ESOL placement for a fifth year. We noted that the	<u>e</u>
student did not have any results for the CELLA Composite or Reading portions of the	<u>e</u>
test and had scored a Level 4 on the FCAT Reading test. We propose the following	g
adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	
77. [Ref. 61102] Two ELL students who had been away from the District for more	<u>e</u>
than a year were not re-assessed for English proficiency upon their return to the	<u>e</u>
District. We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .500         102 Basic 4-8       .820         130 ESOL       (1.320)	3

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Findings	Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)
	<u> </u>
Azalea Park Elementary School (#0611) (Continued)	
78. [Ref. 61103] The ELL Student Plan for one student was not reviewed and	
updated for the 2010-11 school year and was not complete as the student's instructional	
time and course schedule were not attached. We propose the following adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	.0000
79. [Ref. 61104] The parental notification letters for two ELL students were not	
dated; consequently, we could not determine whether the parents were notified timely	
(i.e., prior to the reporting survey). We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	.0000
80. [Ref. 61106] The FTE earned and the instructional time for six PK ESE	
students were incorrectly reported. The students should have been reported for either	
825 or 840 instructional minutes but were reported for varying number of instructional	
minutes depending on their individual therapy sessions ranging from 885 to 960	
minutes. We also noted that the reporting of FTE Earned, Course for students in grades	
PK-3 disclosed that the FTE calculation was incorrectly based upon 720 hours of	
instruction per 180-day school year. (See Finding No. 2.) We propose the following	
adjustment:	
254 ESE Support Level 4 (.8663)	(.8663)

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Azalea Park Elementary School (#0611) (Continued)	
81. [Ref. 61171] <u>One teacher taught Primary Language Arts to classes that included</u> <u>ELL students but was not properly certified to teach ELL students and was not</u> <u>approved by the School Board to teach such students out of field. We also noted that</u> <u>the parents of the ELL students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status.</u> <u>We propose the following adjustment:</u>	
102 Basic 4-8         3.5606           130 ESOL         (3.5606)	<u>.0000</u> <u>(.8663</u> )
Colonial High School (#0661)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
82. [Ref. 66176] <u>One Reading teacher had earned only 60 of the 120 in-service</u> <u>training points in Reading required by rule and the teacher's in-service training timeline.</u> <u>Since the students are proposed for adjustment in Finding No. 91 (Ref. 66109), we are</u> <u>presenting this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustment here</u> .	
	.0000
83. [Ref. 66101] <u>The course schedules for all students were incorrectly reported.</u> <u>The bell schedule supported 239 instructional minutes for periods one through four, six,</u> <u>and seven and 236 instructional minutes for fifth period; however, the course schedules</u>	

and seven and 236 instructional minutes for fifth period; however, the course schedules were reported for varying amounts of instructional minutes ranging from 396 to 1,261 instructional minutes. Student schedules should reflect the correct amount of instructional minutes per the bell schedule for each period affected, resulting in excess FTE being reported in the Basic education program. We propose the following adjustment:

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Colonial High School (#0661) (Continued)	
103 Basic 9-12557.5282130 ESOL(110.7100)300 Career Education 9-12(446.8182)	.0000
84. [Ref. 66102] The files for five ELL students did not contain documentation	
justifying the students' continued ESOL placements for a four, fifth, or sixth year. We	
also noted that the ELL Student Plans were not were not adequately dated (indicating	
only "10/11") such that it could be determined that the ELL Student Plans were timely	
prepared (i.e., prior to the reporting survey) for four of the five students and was not	
reviewed and updated for the fifth student. We propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-122.5441130 ESOL(2.5441)	.0000
85. [Ref. 66103] One ELL student had withdrawn from school prior to the October	
2010 survey and should not have been included in the survey's results. We propose the	
following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       (.1812)         130 ESOL       (.3188)	(.5000)
86. [Ref. 66104] We noted the following exceptions for six ELL students: (a) the	
assessments for four students indicated the students were English proficient, and (b) the	
files for two students were missing and could not be located. We also noted the ELL	
Student Plans for four students were either not reviewed and updated for the 2010-11	
school year (two students), were missing and could not be located (one student), or not	
adequately dated (one student) [indicating only "10/11"] such that it could be	
determined that the ELL Student Plans were timely prepared (i.e., prior to the reporting	
survey). We propose the following adjustment:	

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Colonial High School (#0661) (Continued)	
103 Basic 9-122.1499130 ESOL(2.1499)	.0000
87. [Ref. 66105] Four ELL students were beyond the maximum six-year period	
allowed for State funding of ESOL. We also noted that the ELL Student Plans were	
either not reviewed and updated for the 2010-11 school year (three students) or not	
adequately dated (one student) [indicating only "10/11"] such that it could be	
determined that the ELL Student Plans were timely prepared (i.e., prior to the reporting	
survey). We propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-122.7853130 ESOL(2.7853)	.0000
88. [Ref. 66106] The files for three ELL students were missing and could not be	
located. We propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-121.1945130 ESOL(1.1945)	.0000
89. [Ref. 66107] One ELL student who had been away from the District for more	
than a year was not re-assessed for English proficiency upon the student's return to the	
District. We also noted that the student's ELL Student Plan was not adequately dated	
(indicating only "10/11") such that it could be determined that the ELL Student Plan was	
timely prepared (i.e., prior to the reporting survey). We propose the following	
adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .0797         130 ESOL       (.0797)	.0000

Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

**Findings** 

Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

### Colonial High School (#0661) (Continued)

90. [Ref. 66108] <u>The assessments to determine the ESOL placements of two</u> students were not completed until December 13, 2010, which was after the October 2010 reporting survey. We also noted the following exceptions:

- a. <u>The ELL Student Plan for one student was not reviewed and updated for the</u> 2010-11 school year and documentation to support that the student's parents had been notified of their child's ESOL placement was missing and could not <u>be located</u>.
- b. <u>The ELL Student Plan</u> for one student was not adequately dated (indicating only "10/11") such that it could be determined that the ELL Student Plan was timely prepared (i.e., prior to the reporting survey) and the parental notification letter was not completed until February 17, 2011, after the February 2011 reporting survey.

We propose the following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	1.1148	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.1148</u> )	.0000

91. [Ref. 66109] <u>The ELL Student Plans for 25 students were either not reviewed</u> and updated for the 2010-11 school year (4 students) or not adequately dated (21 students) [indicating only "10/11"] such that it could be determined that the ELL <u>Student Plans were timely prepared (i.e., prior to the reporting survey). We propose the</u> following adjustment:

103 Basic 9-12	17.0265	
130 ESOL	<u>(17.0265</u> )	.0000

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Colonial High School (#0661) (Continued)	
92. [Ref. 66110] The file for one ESE student in the October 2010 survey did not	
contain an IEP covering the reporting survey. We propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .5000         113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services       (.5000)	.0000
93. [Ref. 66111] Four ESE students were not reported in accordance with the	
students' Matrix of Services forms. We also noted no evidence that one of the student's	
Matrix of Services forms had been reviewed and updated when the student's new IEP had	
been prepared. We propose the following adjustment:	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services       2.5000         254 ESE Support Level 4       (2.0000)         255 ESE Support Level 5       (.5000)	.0000
94. [Ref. 66112] The course schedule for one ESE student receiving both	
on-campus instruction and homebound instruction was incorrectly reported in Program	
No. 255 (ESE Support Level 5) for the student's on-campus instruction. The student's	
on-campus instruction should have been reported in Program No. 103 (Basic 9-12). We	
propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .4800         255 ESE Support Level 5       (.4800)	.0000
95. [Ref. 66113] <u>Two ESE students were incorrectly reported in Program No. 255</u> (ESE Support Level 5) based on the students' placement in the Hospital and Homebound Program. The students were dismissed from the Hospital and	
Homebound Program prior to the reporting surveys and had returned to their regular	
schedules. We propose the following adjustment:	
seneauco. we propose the following adjustitient.	

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Colonial High School (#0661) (Continued)	
103       Basic 9-12       .5000         113       Grades 9-12 with ESE Services       1.0000         255       ESE Support Level 5       (1.5000)	.0000
96. [Ref. 66114] The Matrix of Services form for one ESE student was missing and	
could not be located. We propose the following adjustment:	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services.5000254 ESE Support Level 4(.5000)	.0000
97. [Ref. 66171/73/79] Three teachers taught Basic subject area classes that	
included ELL students but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL	
strategies required by rule and the teachers' in-service training timelines. We propose	
the following adjustments:	
Ref. 66171103 Basic 9-121.5113130 ESOL(1.5113)	.0000
Ref. 66173       .8767         103 Basic 9-12       .8767         130 ESOL       (.8767)	.0000
Ref. 66179       .7960         103 Basic 9-12       .7960         130 ESOL       (.7960)	.0000

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

**Findings** 

### Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

### Colonial High School (#0661) (Continued)

98. [Ref. 66172/75] Two teachers taught classes that included ELL students but	
were not properly certified to teach ELL students and were not approved by the School	
Board to teach such students out of field. We also noted that: (a) the parents of the	
ELL students were not notified of the teachers' out-of-field status, and (b) one teacher	
(Ref. 66172) had earned none of the 120 in-service training points and one teacher	
(Ref. 66175) had earned only 60 of the 180 in-service training points in ESOL strategies	
required by rule and the teachers' in-service training timelines. We propose the	
following adjustments:	
Ref. 66172         103 Basic 9-12       .3188         130 ESOL       (.3188)	.0000
Ref. 66175       .4782         103 Basic 9-12       .4782         130 ESOL       (.4782)	.0000
99. [Ref. 66174/77] Two teachers taught Reading to classes that included ELL	<u>.</u>
students but were not properly certified to teach ELL students and were not approved	
by the School Board to teach such students out of field. We also noted that the parents	
of the FLL students were not notified of the teachers' out of field status. We propose	

the following adjustments:

<u>Ref. 66174</u> 103 Basic 9-12 130 ESOL	.0797 <u>(.0797</u> )	.0000
<u>Ref. 66177</u> 103 Basic 9-12 130 ESOL	.2391 (.2391)	.0000

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Colonial High School (#0661) (Continued)	
100. [Ref. 66178] One teacher taught Primary Language Arts to a class that included	
an ELL student but was not properly certified to teach ELL students and was not	
approved by the School Board to teach such students out of field. We also noted that	
the parents of the ELL student were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We	
propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .0797         130 ESOL       (.0797)	.0000
101. [Ref. 66180] One teacher taught Reading classes that included ELL students but	
was not properly certified to teach Reading or ELL students and was not approved by	
the School Board to teach such students out of field. We also noted that: (a) the	
parents of the ELL students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status in	
ESOL, and (b) the teacher had earned none of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL	
strategies required by rule and the teacher's in-service training timeline. We propose the	
following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .1594         130 ESOL       (.1594)	<u>.0000</u>
Evans High School (#0671)	<u>(.5000</u> )
102. [Ref. 67101] The timecards for 15 Career Education 9-12 (OJT) students either	
were missing and could not be located (3 students) or indicated that the students	
(12 students) were unemployed with no work hours and had no documentation of job	
searches. We propose the following adjustment:	
300 Career Education 9-12 (3.7375)	(3.7375)

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Findings	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Evans High School (#0671) (Continued)	
103. [Ref. 67102] The files for three ELL students were incomplete. The files did	
not contain documentation of annual assessments, written parental notice of the	
students' ESOL placements, an ELL Student Plan, or historical records of their time in	
the ESOL Program. We propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       1.6666         130 ESOL       (1.6666)	.0000
104. [Ref. 67103] One ELL student withdrew from school prior to the February	
2011 survey and should not have been reported with the survey's results. We propose	
the following adjustment:	
130 ESOL (.5000)	(.5000)
105. [Ref. 67104] One ESE student was not reported in accordance with the	
student's Matrix of Services form. We propose the following adjustment:	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services.5000254 ESE Support Level 4(.5000)	.0000
106. [Ref. 67105] Three Career Education 9-12 (OJT) students were reported for	
more work hours than were supported by their timecards. (One of these students was	
also cited in Finding No. 102 for another survey period.) We propose the following	
adjustment:	
300 Career Education 9-12 (.1848)	(.1848)

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

**Findings** 

Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

### Evans High School (#0671) (Continued)

107. [Ref. 67171] <u>One teacher taught Basic subject area classes that included ELL</u> students but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by rule and the teacher's in-service training timeline. We propose the following <u>adjustment</u>:

103 Basic 9-12	1.9241	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.9241</u> )	.0000

(4.4223)

#### Engelwood Elementary School (#0681)

108. [Ref. 68101] <u>The FTE earned and the instructional time for ten PK ESE</u> students were incorrectly reported. The students should have been reported for either 690 or 975 instructional minutes but were reported for varying number of instructional minutes depending on their individual therapy sessions ranging from 750 to 1,035 minutes. We also noted that the reporting of *FTE Earned, Course* for students in grades PK-3 disclosed that the FTE calculation was incorrectly based upon 720 hours of instruction per 180-day school year. (See Finding No. 2.) We propose the following adjustment:

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	(.1403)	
254 ESE Support Level 4	<u>(1.2856</u> )	(1.4259)

109. [Ref. 68102] <u>The ELL Student Plans for 14 students were either not reviewed</u> and updated for the 2010-11 school year (2 students) or were not adequately dated (12 students) [indicating only "10/11"] such that it could be determined that the ELL <u>Student Plans were timely prepared (i.e., prior to the reporting survey). We propose the</u> following adjustment:

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Engelwood Elementary School (#0681) (Continued)	
101 Basic K-311.0000102 Basic 4-8.9576130 ESOL(11.9576)	.0000
110. [Ref. 68103] Six ELL students scored English proficient on the students'	
CELLA Composite and Reading portions of the test. One of the six students was not	
re-evaluated on the student's anniversary date in January 2011. We also noted the ELL	
Student Plans were either not reviewed and updated for the 2010-11 school year	
(one student) or were not adequately dated (five students) [indicating only "10/11"] such	
that it could be determined that the ELL Student Plans were timely prepared (i.e., prior to	
the reporting survey). We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-33.0000102 Basic 4-82.9561130 ESOL(5.9561)	.0000
111. [Ref. 68104] The file for one ELL student was missing and could not be	
located. We propose the following adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       .9908         130 ESOL       (.9908)	.0000
112. [Ref. 68105] Two ELL students were beyond the maximum six-year period	
allowed for State funding of ESOL. We also noted that an ELL Committee had	
recommended one of the students to be dismissed on September 1, 2010, and the ELL	
Student Plans for both students were not adequately dated (indicating only "10/11") such	
that it could be determined that the ELL Student Plans were timely prepared (i.e., prior to	
the reporting survey). We propose the following adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       1.9152         130 ESOL       (1.9152)	.0000

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

# **Proposed Net** Adjustments **Findings** (Unweighted FTE) Engelwood Elementary School (#0681) (Continued) 113. [Ref. 68106] One ELL student who had been away from the District for more than a year was not re-assessed for English proficiency upon the student's return to the District. We also noted that the student's ELL Student Plan was not adequately dated (indicating only "10/11") such that it could be determined that the ELL Student Plan was timely prepared (i.e., prior to the reporting survey). We propose the following adjustment: 101 Basic K-3 .5000 130 ESOL (.5000).0000 (1.4259)Northlake Park Community Elementary School (#0771) 114. [Ref. 77101] One ESE student was receiving both on-campus instruction and homebound instruction and was reported in Program No. 255 (ESE Support Level 5) for both. However, a separate and individual Matrix of Services form was not prepared for the student's on-campus instruction; consequently, the student should have been reported in Program No. 101 (Basic K-3) for the student's on-campus instruction. We propose the following adjustment: 101 Basic K-3 .9600 255 ESE Support Level 5 (.9600) .0000. 115. [Ref. 77103] One ELL student scored English proficient on the CELLA Composite and Reading portions of the test. However, we did not see evidence that the student was administered a second assessment test (LAB or IPT). Consequently, the student's continued ESOL placement was not adequately supported. We propose the

following adjustment:

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Northlake Park Community Elementary School (#0771) (Continued)	
101 Basic K-3       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	.0000
116. [Ref. 77104] Four ELL students scored English proficient on the CELLA	
Composite and Reading portions of the test as well as second assessment tests (LAB or	
MAT). However, we noted the ELL Committees for these students did not convene to	
determine the students' continued ESOL-placement status until after the reporting	
survey had ended and the recommendations from those ELL Committees all indicated	
to exit the students from the Program. We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-31.5000102 Basic 4-8.5000130 ESOL(2.0000)	.0000
117. [Ref. 77105] The file for one ELL student did not contain evidence that the	
ELL Student Plan for the 2010-11 school year existed in written format prior to the	
reporting survey. State Board of Education Rule 6A-6.0901(6), Florida Administrative	
Code, specifies that an ELL Student Plan should be a written (i.e., hard copy) document	
that is maintained in each student's file. We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-31.0000130 ESOL(1.0000)	.0000
118. [Ref. 77106] Two ELL students, who had returned after an extended absence	
from the District, were either not re-assessed to determine if the student's continued	
ESOL placement was appropriate (one student) or not until after the October 2010	
survey had ended (one student). We propose the following adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	.0000

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Northlake Park Community Elementary School (#0771) (Continued)	
119. [Ref. 77107] One ELL student scored English proficient on the assessment tests	
given (LAB and MAT). However, the student's file did not contain documentation to	
support the student's continued ESOL placement, written parental notification of their	
child's initial ESOL placement, and an ELL Student Plan. We propose the following	
adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       .5000         130 ESOL       (.5000)	.0000
120. [Ref. 77108] The file for one ELL student did not contain documentation	
justifying the student's continued ESOL placement for a fifth year. We propose the	
following adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       .4122         130 ESOL       (.4122)	<u>.0000</u>
	.0000
Durrance Elementary School (#0801)	
121. [Ref. 80101] Two ELL students scored English proficient on the CELLA	
Composite and Reading portions of the test. However, the students were not	
administered a second assessment test (LAB) and an ELL Committee was not convened	
to determine the students' continued ESOL-placement status until after the October	
2010 survey had ended and both recommendations from those ELL Committees	
indicated to exit the students from the Program. We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	.0000

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Durrance Elementary School (#0801) (Continued)	
122. [Ref. 80102] One ELL student scored English proficient on the CELLA	
Composite and Reading portions of the test. However, we did not see evidence that the	
student was administered a second assessment test (LAB or IPT) or that an ELL	
Committee had been convened to determine the student's continued ESOL placement	
status. We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	.0000
123. [Ref. 80103] The Matrix of Services form for one ESE student was incorrectly	
scored. The ratings total included three Special Considerations points for PK students	
reported for less than .5000 FTE; however, the student was not eligible for these points	
as the student was a kindergartner and reported for .5000 FTE. We propose the	
following adjustment:	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services.5000254 ESE Support Level 4(.5000)	.0000
124. [Ref. 80104] One ESE student receiving both on-campus instruction and	
homebound instruction was incorrectly reported in Program No. 255 (ESE Support	
Level 5) for the student's entire course schedule. The Matrix of Services form supported	
the on-campus instruction to be reported in Program No. 254 (ESE Support Level 4).	
We propose the following adjustment:	
254       ESE Support Level 4       .4130         255       ESE Support Level 5       (.4130)	.0000

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

### **Findings**

### Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

(2.5127)

### Durrance Elementary School (#0801) (Continued)

125. [Ref. 80105] <u>The FTE earned and the instructional time for 13 PK ESE</u> students were incorrectly reported. The students should have been reported for 840, 900, or 960 instructional minutes but were reported for varying number of instructional minutes depending on the students' individual therapy sessions ranging from 870 to 1,200 minutes. We also noted that the reporting of *FTE Earned, Course* for students in grades PK-3 disclosed that the FTE calculation was incorrectly based upon 720 hours of instruction per 180-day school year. (See Finding No. 2.) We propose the following adjustment:

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	(.1002)	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(1.5707)	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(.8418</u> )	<u>(2.5127</u> )

#### Lancaster Elementary School (#0851)

126. [Ref. 85101] One ESE student was enrolled in the Gifted Exceptional	
Education Program and had a valid EP in effect for the October 2010 survey. Thus the	
student's course schedule should have been more appropriately reported in Program	
No. 111 (Grades K-3 with ESE Services) rather than Program No. 101 (Basic K-3). We	
propose the following adjustment:	
101 $\operatorname{Borig} V$ 3 (5000)	

101	Basic K-3	(.5000)	
111	Grades K-3 with ESE Services	.5000	.0000

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Lancaster Elementary School (#0851) (Continued)	
127. [Ref. 85102] One ESE student receiving both on-campus instruction and	
homebound instruction was incorrectly reported in Program No. 255 (ESE Support	
Level 5) for the student's entire course schedule. However, the Matrix of Services form	
prepared for the student's on-campus instruction did not support this reporting in	
Program No. 255 and there was no evidence of review when the student's new IEP was	
prepared. We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .3998         255 ESE Support Level 5       (.3998)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>.0000</u>
McCoy Elementary School (#0891)	
128. [Ref. 89101] The files for three ELL students did not contain documentation	
justifying the student's continued ESOL placement for a fourth or sixth year. We	
propose the following adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       2.0000         130 ESOL       (2.0000)	.0000
129. [Ref. 89102] The file for one ELL student did not contain documentation	
justifying the student's continued ESOL placement for a fifth year. We also noted that	
the student had not completed the Writing portion of the test and, thus, did not have a	
Composite score on the 2010 CELLA and had earned a Level 3 on the FCAT Reading	
test. We propose the following adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	.0000

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
McCoy Elementary School (#0891) (Continued)	
130. [Ref. 89103] The ELL Student Plans for three students were not reviewed and	
updated for the 2010-11 school year. We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3.5000102 Basic 4-82.0000130 ESOL(2.5000)	.0000
131. [Ref. 89104] The file for one ELL student did not contain an ELL Student Plan	
or evidence that the student's parents were notified of the student's ESOL placement.	
We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .5000         130 ESOL       (.5000)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>.0000</u>
Dr. Phillips High School (#0931)	
132. [Ref. 93173] One teacher taught Primary Language Arts to a class that included	
an ELL student but was not properly certified to teach ELL students and was not	
approved by the School Board to teach such students out of field. We also noted that	
the parents of the ELL student were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status.	
Since the students are proposed for adjustment in Finding No. 135 (Ref. 93103), we are	
presenting this disclosure Finding with no proposed adjustment here.	
	.0000
133. [Ref. 93101] The EP for one student expired on June 30, 2010, and a new EP	
was not completed until November 4, 2010; consequently, there was no valid EP in	

effect during the October 2010 reporting survey. We propose the following adjustment:

### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findin</u>	<u>gs</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
<u>Dr. Ph</u>	illips High School (#0931) (Continued)	
	103 Basic 9-12       .5000         113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services       (.5000)	.0000
134.	[Ref. 93102] The timecards for seven Career Education 9-12 (OJT) students	
were m	issing and could not be located. We propose the following adjustment:	
	300 Career Education 9-12 (1.0126)	(1.0126)
135.	[Ref. 93103] We noted the following exceptions for six ELL students:	
a.	Two ELL students scored English proficient on their assessment tests (LAB)	
	and the students' files did not contain documentation to support continued	
	ESOL placements.	
b.	Two ELL students were reported beyond the maximum six-year period allowed	
	for State funding of ESOL.	
c.	The file for one student did not contain written notice to the parents of their	
	child's ESOL placement or documentation to support the student's ESOL	
	<u>placement</u> .	
d.	The file for one student was missing and could not be located. It was later	
	determined that the student had never been formally placed in the ESOL	
	Program.	
We pro	pose the following adjustment:	
	103 Basic 9-12       2.6784         130 ESOL       (2.6784)	.0000

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Dr. Phillips High School (#0931) (Continued)	
136. [Ref. 93104] Five Career Education 9-12 (OJT) students were reported for more	
work hours than were supported by the students' timecards. We propose the following	
<u>adjustment</u> :	
300 Career Education 9-12 (.4259)	(.4259)
137. [Ref. 93172/74/76] Three teachers taught Basic subject area classes that	
included ELL students but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL	
strategies required by rule and the teachers' in-service training timelines. We propose	
the following adjustments:	
D - 6 02172	
<u>Ref. 93172</u> 103 Basic 9-12 .1582	
130 ESOL (.1582)	.0000
<u>Ref. 93174</u>	
103 Basic 9-12 .2304	
130 ESOL (.2304)	.0000
Ref. 93176	
103 Basic 9-12 .9374	
130 ESOL ( <u>.9374</u> )	.0000
138. [Ref. 93175] The parents of a student taught by one out-of-field teacher in	
ESOL were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We propose the following	
adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .0774         130 ESOL       (.0774)	.0000

# **SCHEDULE D** (Continued)

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

**Proposed Net** Adjustments **Findings** (Unweighted FTE) Dr. Phillips High School (#0931) (Continued) 139. [Ref. 93177] One teacher taught Primary Language Arts to classes that included ELL students but was not properly certified to teach ELL students and was not approved by the School Board to teach such students out of field. We also noted that the parents of the ELL students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustment: 103 Basic 9-12 .2322 130 ESOL (.2322) .0000 (1.4385) Ventura Elementary School (#0971) 140. [Ref. 97101] The FTE earned and the instructional time for six PK ESE students were incorrectly reported. The students should have been reported for either 825 or 855 instructional minutes but were reported for varying number of instructional minutes depending on the students' individual therapy sessions ranging from 885 to 945 minutes. We also noted that the reporting of FTE Earned, Course for students in grades PK-3 disclosed that the FTE calculation was incorrectly based upon 720 hours of instruction per 180-day school year. (See Finding No. 2.) We propose the following adjustment: 111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services .2850 254 ESE Support Level 4 (1.1703)(.8853)

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

**Findings** 

Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

#### Ventura Elementary School (#0971) (Continued)

141. [Ref. 97102] Because of a redesign of the ESOL fold	ers in January 2011, the	
ELL Student Plans for ten ELL students were retroactively	updated for the period	
August 2010 through October 2010. We also noted that the	ELL Student Plans were	
incomplete as they did not include the students' instructional tir	me and course schedules.	
We further noted that the files for nine of the ten students	did not contain written	
notifications to parents of their children's placements in the	e ESOL Program. We	
propose the following adjustment:		
<ul><li>101 Basic K-3</li><li>102 Basic 4-8</li><li>130 ESOL</li></ul>	8.5000 1.0000 <u>(9.5000</u> )	.0000
142. [Ref. 97103] The ELL Student Plans for 16 students w	ere not adequately dated	
(indicating only "10/11") so that it could not be determined th	nat the ELL Student Plans	
were timely prepared (i.e., prior to the reporting survey). W	e propose the following	
adjustment:		
<ul><li>101 Basic K-3</li><li>102 Basic 4-8</li><li>130 ESOL</li></ul>	13.0000 1.5000 <u>(14.5000</u> )	.0000
143. [Ref. 97104] The files for three ELL students in	ESOL did not contain	
documentation justifying the students' continued ESOL place	ement beyond the initial	
three-year base period. We also noted the ELL Student Plans w	vere not adequately dated	
(indicating only "10/11") so that it could be determined that the	e ELL Student Plans were	
timely prepared (i.e., prior to the reporting survey). We	propose the following	
adjustment:		

101 Basic K-3	2.0000	
102 Basic 4-8	1.0000	
130 ESOL	(3.0000)	.0000

# **SCHEDULE D** (Continued)

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

**Proposed Net** Adjustments **Findings** (Unweighted FTE) Ventura Elementary School (#0971) (Continued) 144. [Ref. 97105] The parents of five ELL students were not appropriately notified of the students' ESOL placements until after the October 2010 reporting survey had ended. We also noted for two of the five students that the ELL Student Plans had not been updated until after the October 2010 reporting survey. We propose the following adjustment: 101 Basic K-3 1.5000 102 Basic 4-8 .9655 130 ESOL (2.4655).0000 145. [Ref. 97106] The files for two ELL students did not contain documentation justifying the students' continued ESOL placement for a fourth or sixth year. We also noted that the ELL Student Plans were not adequately dated (indicating only "10/11") so that it could be determined that the ELL Student Plans were timely prepared (i.e., prior to the reporting survey). We propose the following adjustment: 101 Basic K-3 1.0000 102 Basic 4-8 1.0000 130 ESOL (2.0000).0000 146. [Ref. 97107] The parental notification letter for one ELL student was not dated and we could not otherwise determine whether the notification was made on a timely basis (i.e., prior to survey). We propose the following adjustment: 101 Basic K-3 1.0000 130 ESOL (1.0000).0000 147. [Ref. 97108] The file for one ELL student was missing and could not be

located. We propose the following adjustment:

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Ventura Elementary School (#0971) (Continued)	
101 Basic K-3       .5000         130 ESOL       (.5000)	.0000
148. [Ref. 97171/72] Two Primary Language Arts teachers had not earned the	
in-service training points in ESOL strategies required by rule and the teachers' in-service	
training timelines. (One teacher [Ref. 97171] had earned only 60 of the 120 points and	
one teacher [Ref. 97172] had earned only 120 of the 180 points.) We propose the	
following adjustments:	
<u>Ref. 97171</u> 101 Basic K-3 5.1480 120 ESOL (5.1480)	.0000
130 ESOL $(5.1480)$	.0000
Ref. 97172101 Basic K-34.2997130 ESOL(4.2997)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>(.8853</u> )
Waterbridge Elementary School (#1051)	
149. [Ref. 105101] Seven ELL students scored English proficient on the CELLA	
Composite and Reading portions of the test. However, we did not see evidence that six	
of the students were administered a second assessment test (LAB). (The seventh	
student scored a Level 4 on the FCAT Reading test.) We also noted the ELL Student	
Plans for one of the students was missing and could not be located and the ELL Student	
Plans for two students were completed after the October 2010 reporting survey had	
ended. We propose the following adjustment:	
101Basic K-35.5000102Basic 4-8.4022130ESOL(5.9022)	.0000

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Waterbridge Elementary School (#1051) (Continued)	
150. [Ref. 105102] We noted the following exceptions for one ELL student: (a) the	
student scored English proficient on a second assessment test (LAB); (b) the student	
was exited from the ESOL Program on January 7, 2011, prior to the February 2011	
reporting survey; and (c) the written parental notification of their child's ESOL	
placement was missing and could not be located. We propose the following adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       .8044         130 ESOL       (.8044)	.0000
151. [Ref. 105103] The FTE earned and the instructional time for two PK ESE	
students were incorrectly reported. The students should have been reported for 825	
instructional minutes but were reported for 720 and 750 minutes, respectively. We also	
noted that the reporting of FTE Earned, Course for students in grades PK-3 disclosed	
that the FTE calculation was incorrectly based upon 720 hours of instruction per	
180-day school year. (See Finding No. 2.) We propose the following adjustment:	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services(.0252)254 ESE Support Level 4(.0882)	(.1134)
152. [Ref. 105104] The files for two ESE students had two separate Matrix of Services	
forms each supporting a different cost factor; consequently, we could not determine the	
appropriate reporting for either student. We propose the following adjustment:	
111       Grades K-3 with ESE Services       1.0000         254       ESE Support Level 4       (.5000)         255       ESE Support Level 5       (.5000)	.0000

# **SCHEDULE D** (Continued)

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

## **Findings**

# Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

# Waterbridge Elementary School (#1051) (Continued)

153.	[Ref. 105105] <u>'</u>	The files	for four ]	ELL stuc	dents did	not contain l	ELL Student Plans
valid for	r the 2010-11	school y	year and	written	parental	notification	of the students'
<u>ESOL p</u>	lacements. We	e propose	e the follo	wing ad	justment:		

101 Basic K-3	1.0000	
102 Basic 4-8	2.4132	
130 ESOL	<u>(3.4132</u> )	<u>.0000</u>

(.1134)

# Windy Ridge K-8 School (#1061)

154. [Ref. 106102] Seven ELL students scored English proficient on the CELLA Composite and Reading portions of the test and either scored proficient on a second assessment test or did not take a second assessment test. We also noted that two of the students' files did not contain documentation justifying the students' continued ESOL placement for a fourth or fifth year, and the ELL Student Plan for one student was not reviewed and updated for the 2010-11 school year. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	2.8134
102 Basic 4-8	2.9011
130 ESOL	<u>(5.7145)</u> .0000

155. [Ref. 106103] <u>The files for two ELL students did not contain documentation</u> justifying the students' continued ESOL placement for a fourth or fifth year. We also noted that the <u>ELL Student Plan</u> for one student was not reviewed and updated for the 2010-11 school year or complete as the student's instructional time and course schedule was not attached. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	1.0000		
102 Basic 4-8	.8108		
130 ESOL	<u>(1.8108</u> )	.0000	
The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.			

-73-

**Proposed Net** 

# **SCHEDULE D** (Continued)

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Adjustments **Findings** (Unweighted FTE) Windy Ridge K-8 School (#1061) (Continued) 156. [Ref. 106104] The ELL Student Plans for six students were not reviewed and updated for the 2010-11 school year or complete as the students' instructional time and course schedules were not attached. We propose the following adjustment: 101 Basic K-3 2.0000 102 Basic 4-8 3.8632 130 ESOL (5.8632).0000 157. [Ref. 106105] The parents of three ELL students were not notified of the students' ESOL placements until after the reporting survey in which they were placed. We also noted that the ELL Student Plan for one of the students was not reviewed and updated for the 2010-11 school year or complete as the student's instructional time and course schedule was not attached. We propose the following adjustment: 101 Basic K-3 1.0000 102 Basic 4-8 .4772 130 ESOL (1.4772).0000 158. [Ref. 106106] The parental notification letter for one student was not dated and we could not otherwise determine whether the notification was made on a timely basis (i.e., prior to the reporting survey). We also noted the ELL Student Plan was not updated until March 23, 2011, after the February 2011 reporting survey. We propose the following adjustment: 102 Basic 4-8 .4772 130 ESOL .0000 <u>(.4772</u>)

# **SCHEDULE D** (Continued)

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

## **Findings**

# Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

# Windy Ridge K-8 School (#1061) (Continued)

159. [Ref. 106107] <u>The ELL Student Plan for one student was not adequately dated</u> (indicating only "10/11") such that it could be determined that the ELL Student Plan was timely prepared (i.e., prior to the reporting survey). We also noted that the parents of the student were not notified of the student's ESOL placement. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3	1.0000	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.0000</u> )	.0000

# 160. [Ref. 106108] We noted the following exceptions for six ESE students:

- a. <u>The course schedules for five students incorrectly included portions of the students' instructional time in Program No. 111 (Grades K-3 with ESE Services) and Program No. 112 (Grades 4-8 with ESE Services) along with Program No. 254 (ESE Support Level 4) and Program No. 255 (ESE Support Level 5). However, the course schedules of ESE students should be reported entirely in the ESE program that is supported by their *Matrix of Services* forms.</u>
- b. <u>One student was not reported in accordance with the student's *Matrix of Services* form.</u>

# We propose the following adjustment:

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	1.1876	
112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services	.6004	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(.6379)	
255 ESE Support Level 5	<u>(1.1501</u> )	.0000

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Windy Ridge K-8 School (#1061) (Continued)	
161. [Ref. 106109] One ESE student withdrew from school prior to the October	
2010 reporting survey and should not have been included with the survey's results. We	
propose the following adjustment:	
254 ESE Support Level 4 (.5000)	(.5000)
162. [Ref. 106171] One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by	
the School Board to teach out of field. The teacher held certification in Hearing	
Impaired but taught courses that required certification in Visually Impaired. We also	
noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field	
status. We propose the following adjustment:	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services       .0252         255 ESE Support Level 5       (.0252)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>(.5000</u> )
John Young Elementary School (#1081)	
163. [Ref. 108101] The FTE earned and the instructional time for five PK ESE	
students were incorrectly reported. The students should have been reported for either	
840 or 975 instructional minutes but were reported for varying number of instructional	
minutes depending on the students' individual therapy sessions ranging from 900 to	
1,035 minutes. We also noted that the reporting of FTE Earned, Course for students in	
grades PK-3 disclosed that the FTE calculation was incorrectly based upon 720 hours of	
instruction per 180-day school year. (See Finding No. 2.) We propose the following	
<u>adjustment</u> :	
254 ESE Support Level 4 (.9155)	(.9155)

# **SCHEDULE D** (Continued)

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

**Findings** 

# Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

#### John Young Elementary School (#1081) (Continued)

164. [Ref. 108102] Eight ESE students were not reported in accordance with the students' *Matrix of Services* forms. We also noted that the FTE earned and the instructional time for two PK ESE students were incorrectly reported. The students should have been reported for 975 instructional minutes but were reported for 1,035 minutes. We also noted that the reporting of *FTE Earned, Course* for students in grades PK-3 disclosed that the FTE calculation was incorrectly based upon 720 hours of instruction per 180-day school year. (See Finding No. 2.) We propose the following adjustment:

111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services	3.1500	
254 ESE Support Level 4	(2.0378)	
255 ESE Support Level 5	(1.4063)	(.2941)

165. [Ref. 108103] We noted the following exceptions for one ELL student: (a) the student was not administered a second assessment test (LAB or MAT) until after the October 2010 reporting survey had ended and at that time had scored English Proficient; (b) the student was exited from the ESOL Program but not until March 1, 2011, after the February 2011 reporting survey had ended; and (c) the student's *ELL Student Plan* was not reviewed and updated for the 2010-11 school year or complete as the instructional time and course schedule were not attached. We propose the following adjustment:

102 Basic 4-8	1.0000	
130 ESOL	<u>(1.0000</u> )	.0000

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

John Young Elementary School (#1081) (Continued)
166. [Ref. 108104] We noted the following exceptions for two ELL students: (a) the
ELL Student Plan for one student was not completed until November 8, 2010, after the
October 2010 reporting survey had ended, and (b) the written parental notification of
their child's ESOL placement for the other student was not completed until
October 25, 2010, after the October 2010 reporting survey had ended. We propose the
following adjustment:
101 Basic K-31.0000130 ESOL(1.0000).0000
167. [Ref. 108105] We noted the following exceptions for one ELL student: (a) the
student scored English proficient on a second assessment test (LAB), and (b) the
student's ELL Student Plan was not reviewed and updated for the 2010-11 school year or
complete as the instructional time and course schedule were not attached. We propose
the following adjustment:
101 Basic K-3       .5000         130 ESOL       (.5000)       .0000
168. [Ref. 108106] One ELL student scored English proficient on the CELLA
Composite and Reading portions of the test. However, we did not see evidence that the
student was administered a second assessment test (LAB or IPT). Consequently, the
student's ESOL placement was not adequately supported. We propose the following
adjustment:
101 Basic K-3       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)       .0000
169. [Ref. 108107/08] The files for two ESE students (one who was in our Basic
with ESE Services sample and one in our ESE Support Levels 4 and 5 sample) were

missing and could not be located. We propose the following adjustments: *The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.* 

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
John Young Elementary School (#1081) (Continued)	
Ref. 108107102 Basic 4-8112 Grades 4-8 with ESE Services(.8194)	.0000
Ref. 108108       .5000         102 Basic 4-8       .5000         254 ESE Support Level 4       (.5000)	.0000
170. [Ref. 108171] <u>One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by</u> <u>the School Board to teach out of field. The teacher held certification in Specific</u> <u>Learning Disabilities but taught courses that required certification in Speech and</u>	
Language Impaired. We also noted that the parents of the students were not notified of	
the teacher's out-of-field status. We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .0251         254 ESE Support Level 4       (.0251)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>(1.2096</u> )
Sadler Elementary School (#1261)	
171. [Ref. 126101] We noted the following exceptions for two ELL students: (a) the	
students scored English proficient on the CELLA Composite and Reading portions of	
the test and there was no documentation of an ELL Committee intervention, and (b) the	
ELL Student Plans were not reviewed and updated for the 2010-11 school year and were	
incomplete as the students' instructional time and course schedules were not attached.	
We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-31.0000102 Basic 4-8.0784130 ESOL(1.0784)	.0000

## **SCHEDULE D** (Continued)

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

**Proposed Net** Adjustments **Findings** (Unweighted FTE) Sadler Elementary School (#1261) (Continued) 172. [Ref. 126102] The ELL Student Plans for 20 ELL students were not reviewed and updated for the 2010-11 school year and were incomplete as the students' instructional time and course schedules were not attached. We also noted the file for one of the students did not contain evidence that the student's parents were notified of their child's ESOL placement. We propose the following adjustment: 101 Basic K-3 12.0000 102 Basic 4-8 6.0930 130 ESOL (18.0930).0000 [Ref. 126103] The ELL Student Plans for two ELL students were incomplete as 173. the students' instructional time and course schedules were not attached. We propose the following adjustment: 101 Basic K-3 1.2439 130 ESOL .0000 (1.2439)174. [Ref. 126104] The ELL Student Plans for 14 students were incomplete as the students' instructional time and course schedules were not attached. We also noted that the written parental notifications of their children's ESOL placements were missing and could not be located. We propose the following adjustment: 101 Basic K-3 11.1567 102 Basic 4-8 .9842 130 ESOL .0000 (12.1409)

## **SCHEDULE D** (Continued)

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

#### **Findings**

# Proposed Net Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

.0000

#### Sadler Elementary School (#1261) (Continued)

175. [Ref. 126105] The files for four ELL students did not contain an ELL Student	
Plan or evidence that the students' parents were notified of the students' ESOL	
placements. We also noted one student scored English proficient on a second	
assessment test (Pre-LAS) and we did not see evidence that an ELL Committee had	
been convened to determine the student's initial ESOL placement. We propose the	
following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       3.5254         130 ESOL       (3.5254)	

176. [Ref. 126106] <u>One ELL student scored English proficient on the CELLA</u> Composite and Reading portions of the test. However, we did not see evidence that the student was administered a second assessment test (LAB or IPT) prior to the reporting surveys or that an ELL Committee had been convened to determine the student's ESOL-placement status. We also noted that the student's <u>ELL Student Plan</u> was not reviewed and updated for the 2010-11 school year and was incomplete as the student's instructional time and course schedule were not attached. We propose the following adjustment:

101 Basic K-3 130 ESOL	1.0000 <u>(1.0000</u> )	<u>.0000</u>
		.0000.

**Proposed Net** 

# **SCHEDULE D** (Continued)

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Adjustments **Findings** (Unweighted FTE) Shenandoah Elementary School (#1441) 177. [Ref. 144102] The parents of five ELL students were not notified of the students' ESOL placements until after the reporting survey in which they were placed. We also noted two of the students did not have their initial assessments done until after the February 2011 survey. We propose the following adjustment: 101 Basic K-3 2.0000 102 Basic 4-8 .5000 130 ESOL (2.5000).0000 178. [Ref. 144103] Two ELL students scored English proficient on the CELLA Composite and Reading portions of the test and the students did not have a second assessment test. We also noted one of the student's files did not contain documentation justifying the student's continued ESOL placement for a fifth year. We propose the following adjustment: 101 Basic K-3 2.0000 130 ESOL (2.0000).0000 179. [Ref. 144104/05] Three ESE students were not reported in accordance with the students' Matrix of Services forms. We propose the following adjustment: Ref. 144104 111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services .0125 254 ESE Support Level 4 .0000 (.0125)Ref. 144105 111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services .5000 254 ESE Support Level 4 (.5000).0000 .0000

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

# **Findings**

**Proposed Net** Adjustments (Unweighted FTE)

# Palmetto Elementary School (#1491)

180. [F	Ref. 149101] The FTE earned and the instructional time for nine P	YK ESE	
<u>students</u> v	vere incorrectly reported. The students should have been reported for	or either	
<u>840 or 900</u>	0 instructional minutes but were reported for varying number of instr	uctional	
minutes d	depending on their individual therapy sessions ranging from 840	<u>to 960</u>	
minutes.	We also noted that the reporting of FTE Earned, Course for students in	<u>n grades</u>	
PK-3 disc	closed that the FTE calculation was incorrectly based upon 720 h	ours of	
instruction	n per 180-day school year. (See Finding No. 2.) We propose the fo	ollowing	
<u>adjustmen</u>	<u>.t</u> :		
25	54 ESE Support Level 4	(1.5308)	(1.5308)
181. [F	Ref. 149102] <u>The course schedule for one student (who was in our Ba</u>	sic with	
ESE Servi	ices sample) incorrectly included the student's instructional time in I	Program	
<u>No. 130 (</u>	ESOL) but should have reported the student in Program No. 111 (Gra	<u>des K-3</u>	
with ESE	Services). We propose the following adjustment:		
	<ul><li>11 Grades K-3 with ESE Services</li><li>30 ESOL</li></ul>	.5000 <u>(.5000</u> )	.0000
182. [F	Ref. 149103] There was no evidence that the Matrix of Services form h	ad been	
reviewed	and updated when one student's new IEP had been prepa	red on	
January 25	5, 2011. We propose the following adjustment:		
	<ul><li>11 Grades K-3 with ESE Services</li><li>54 ESE Support Level 4</li></ul>	.5000 <u>(.5000</u> )	.0000
183 F	Ref 149104] Two ESE students were not reported in accordance y	with the	

[Ref. 149104] Two ESE students were not reported in accordance with the 183. students' Matrix of Services forms. We propose the following adjustment:

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>		
Palmetto Elementary School (#1491) (Continued)			
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services       1.5000         254 ESE Support Level 4       (1.5000)	.0000		
184. [Ref. 149105] The Matrix of Services form for one ESE student incorrectly			
included one Special Considerations point for which the student was not eligible. The			
point was designated for PK students reported for less than .5000 FTE. This student			
was reported for .5000 FTE. We also noted the IEP did not have all of the signatures of			
the required participants. We propose the following adjustment:			
101 Basic K-3       .5000         254 ESE Support Level 4       (.5000)	.0000		
185. [Ref. 149106] Two ELL students scored English proficient on the CELLA			
Composite and Reading portions of the test. However, we did not see evidence that the			
students were administered a second assessment test (LAB or IPT) or that an ELL			
Committee had been convened to determine the students' ESOL-placement status. We			
propose the following adjustment:			
101 Basic K-31.0000102 Basic 4-8.9612130 ESOL(1.9612)	.0000		
186. [Ref. 149107] One ELL student scored English proficient on the CELLA			
Composite and Reading portions of the test. However, we did not see evidence that the			
ELL Committee had convened to determine the student's continued ESOL-placement			
status. We propose the following adjustment:			
102 Basic 4-8       .9612         130 ESOL       (.9612)	.0000		

# **<u>SCHEDULE D</u>** (Continued)

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Palmetto Elementary School (#1491) (Continued)	
187. [Ref. 149108] One student was reported incorrectly in ESOL in the October	
2010 survey. The student had been exited from the ESOL Program on June 4, 2010,	
prior to the reporting survey. We propose the following adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       .4806         130 ESOL       (.4806)	.0000
188. [Ref. 149171] One teacher taught Primary Language Arts to classes that	
included ELL students but was not properly certified to teach ELL students and was not	
approved by the School Board to teach such students out of field. We also noted that	
the parents of the ELL students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status.	
We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       2.8446         130 ESOL       (2.8446)	.0000
	<u>(1.5308</u> )
West Orange High School (#1511)	
189. [Ref. 151101] We noted the following exceptions for two ESE students	
receiving both on-campus instruction and homebound instruction: (a) the Matrix of	
Services form for one student supported the student's on-campus instruction to be	
reported in Program No. 113 (Grades 9-12 with ESE Services), and (b) the IEP for one	
student had expired prior to the October 2010 reporting survey and the Matrix of Services	
forms were not completed. We propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .9599         113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services       .0834         255 ESE Support Level 5       (1.0433)	.0000

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Findings	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
West Orange High School (#1511) (Continued)	
190. [Ref. 151102] The Matrix of Services form for one ESE student did not include	
one Special Considerations point for which the student was eligible. The point was	
designated for students with a Matrix of Services score of 21 points and a Level 5 rating in	
four domains. This student met both criteria for this Special Considerations point. We	
propose the following adjustment:	
254       ESE Support Level 4       (.5000)         255       ESE Support Level 5       .5000	.0000
191. [Ref. 151103] Two ESE students were not reported in accordance with the	
students' Matrix of Services forms. We also noted the Matrix of Services form for one of the	
students also reported in the October 2010 survey was missing and could not be located.	
We propose the following adjustment:	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services       1.4687         254 ESE Support Level 4       (1.4687)	.0000
192. [Ref. 151104] One ESE student was absent from school during the entire	
11-day window of the reporting survey and should not have been included with the	
survey's results. We propose the following adjustment:	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services (.4166)	(.4166)
193. [Ref. 151105] Four ELL students were beyond the maximum six-year period	
allowed for State funding of ESOL. We also noted the written parental notification of	
one student's ESOL placement was missing and could not be located. We propose the	
following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       2.5787         130 ESOL       (2.5787)	.0000

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
West Orange High School (#1511) (Continued)	
194. [Ref. 151106] The files for two ELL students did not contain evidence that the	
students' parents were notified of their children's ESOL placements. We propose the	
following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       1.2293         130 ESOL       (1.2293)	.0000
195. [Ref. 151107] Two ELL students had returned after an extended absence from	
the District but were not re-assessed to determine if their continued ESOL placements	
were appropriate. We propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       1.0842         130 ESOL       (1.0842)	.0000
196. [Ref. 151108] The timecards for 20 Career Education 9-12 (OJT) students were	
missing and could not be located. We also noted the following exceptions for 2 of the	
students: (a) the timecard for 1 student reported in another reporting survey indicated	
that the student worked less hours than were reported (7 hours versus 8.5 hours), and	
(b) the timecard for 1 student indicated that no hours were worked during the other	
reporting survey. We propose the following adjustment:	
300 Career Education 9-12 (4.8178)	(4.8178)
197. [Ref. 151109] Two Career Education 9-12 (OJT) students were not employed	
until after the reporting surveys had ended. We propose the following adjustment:	
300 Career Education 9-12 (.2501)	(.2501)

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
West Orange High School (#1511) (Continued)	
198. [Ref. 151110] Three Career Education 9-12 (OJT) students were reported for	
more work hours than were supported by their timecards. We propose the following	
adjustment:	
300 Career Education 9-12 (.1801)	(.1801)
199. [Ref. 151171/73] Two teachers taught Basic subject area classes that included	
ELL students but had earned none of the 60 in-service training points in ESOL	
strategies required by rule and the teachers' in-service training timelines. We propose	
the following adjustments:	
Ref. 151171       .7285         103 Basic 9-12       .7285         130 ESOL       (.7285)         Ref. 151173	.0000
103 Basic 9-12       .5004         130 ESOL       (.5004)	.0000
200. [Ref. 151174] One teacher taught Primary Language Arts to classes that	
included ELL students but was not properly certified to teach ELL students and was not	
approved by the School Board to teach such students out of field. We also noted that	
the parents of the ELL students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field status.	
We propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       3.2839         130 ESOL       (3.2839)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>(5.6646</u> )

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Magnolia School (#1561)	
201. [Ref. 156101] <u>One ESE student reported in the October 2010 survey was not in</u>	
attendance during the entire 11-day reporting survey. We propose the following adjustment:	
254 ESE Support Level 4 (.5000)	(.5000)
202. [Ref. 156102] <u>Three ESE students were not reported in accordance with their</u> <u>Matrix of Services forms. We propose the following adjustment:</u>	
112       Grades 4-8 with ESE Services       .5000         113       Grades 9-12 with ESE Services       1.0000         254       ESE Support Level 4       (1.5000)	.0000
203. [Ref. 156172] <u>One teacher was not properly certified and was not approved by</u> the School Board to teach out of field. The teacher held certification in Varying	
Exceptionalities but taught a course that required a Reading Endorsement. We also	
noted that the parents of the students were not notified of the teacher's out-of-field	
status. We propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .7064         254 ESE Support Level 4       (.7019)         255 ESE Support Level 5       (.0045)	<u>.0000</u> <u>(.5000</u> )
Deerwood Elementary School (#1601)	
204. [Ref. 160101] <u>The file for one ELL student did not contain documentation</u> justifying the student's continued ESOL placement for a fifth year. We propose the following adjustment:	
102 Basic 4-8       .5000         130 ESOL       (.5000)	.0000

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Deerwood Elementary School (#1601) (Continued)	
205. [Ref. 160102] The FTE earned and the instructional time for two PK ESE	
students were incorrectly reported. The students should have been reported for 825	
instructional minutes but were reported for 885 to 1,035 minutes. We also noted that	
the reporting of FTE Earned, Course for students in grades PK-3 disclosed that the FTE	
calculation was incorrectly based upon 720 hours of instruction per 180-day school year.	
(See Finding No. 2.) We also noted one student's Matrix of Services form was missing and	
could not be located. We propose the following adjustment:	
255 ESE Support Level 5 (.5014)	<u>(.5014</u> )
	<u>(.5014</u> )
Shingle Creek Elementary School (#1621)	
206. [Ref. 162101] One ESE student was not reported in accordance with the	
student's Matrix of Services form. We propose the following adjustment:	
111 Grades K-3 with ESE Services.5000254 ESE Support Level 4(.5000)	.0000
207. [Ref. 162102] One ESE student was incorrectly reported in Program No. 255	
(ESE Support Level 5) based on the student's placement in the Hospital and	
Homebound Program. However, the student was dismissed from the Program prior to	
the February 2011 survey and should have been reported in Program No. 101	
(Basic K-3). We propose the following adjustment:	
101 Basic K-3       .5000         255 ESE Support Level 5       (.5000)	.0000

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>		
Shingle Creek Elementary School (#1621) (Continued)			
208. [Ref. 162103] One ELL student scored English proficient on the CELLA			
Composite and Reading portions of the test. However, we did not see evidence that an			
ELL Committee had been convened to determine the student's continued			
ESOL-placement status. We propose the following adjustment:			
102 Basic 4-8       .9712         130 ESOL       (.9712)	.0000		
209. [Ref. 162104] The parents of two ELL students were not notified of the			
students' ESOL placements until after the reporting survey had ended. We propose the			
following adjustment:			
101 Basic K-3       1.0000         130 ESOL       (1.0000)	.0000		
	.0000		
Freedom High School (#1662)			
210. [Ref. 166201] The timecards for nine Career Education 9-12 (OJT) students			
were missing and could not be located. We also noted the timecards for two of the			
students reported in other surveys indicated that the students worked less hours than			
were reported. We propose the following adjustment:			
300 Career Education 9-12 (1.6712)	(1.6712)		
211. [Ref. 166202] Four Career Education 9-12 (OJT) students were reported for			
more work hours than were supported by their timecards. We also noted the timecard			
for one of the students was not signed by the student's employer. We propose the			
following adjustment:			
300 Career Education 9-12 (.6996)	(.6996)		
The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.			

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Findings	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Freedom High School (#1662) (Continued)	
212. [Ref. 166203] <u>Nine ELL students were beyond the maximum six-year period</u> allowed for State funding of ESOL. We also noted the following exceptions for four of the students: (a) the ELL <i>Student Plans</i> for two of the students were not reviewed and updated until after the October 2010 reporting survey had ended, and (b) the ELL	
Student Plans for two students were incomplete as the students' instructional time and	
course schedules were not attached. We propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-121.3715130 ESOL(1.3715)	.0000
213. [Ref. 166204] <u>The file for one ELL student did not contain assessment</u> documentation to support the student's initial ESOL placement. We propose the	
following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .5707         130 ESOL       (.5707)	.0000
214. [Ref. 166205] The ELL Student Plans for three students were not completed	
until after the reporting surveys had ended. We did note that the students' instructional	
time and course schedules were attached; however, they were not printed until June	
2011, after the reported surveys. We propose the following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       1.9622         130 ESOL       (1.9622)	.0000

**Proposed Net** 

# **SCHEDULE D** (Continued)

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Adjustments **Findings** (Unweighted FTE) Freedom High School (#1662) (Continued) 215. [Ref. 166206] We noted the following exceptions involving five ELL students: The ELL Student Plan for one student was completed after the 2010-11 school a. <u>year</u>. b. The written parental notifications of the students' ESOL placements were missing and could not be located for four students. We also noted the ELL Student Plan was completed after the 2010-11 school year for one student and was incomplete for one student as the student's instructional time and course schedule were not attached. We propose the following adjustment: 103 Basic 9-12 3.3938 130 ESOL .0000. (3.3938)216. [Ref. 166207] The ELL Student Plans for three students were not reviewed and updated until November 2010, which was after the October 2010 reporting survey. We propose the following adjustment: 103 Basic 9-12 .9511 130 ESOL (.9511).0000 217. [Ref. 166208] One ELL student had returned after an extended absence from the District but was not re-assessed to determine if the student's continued ESOL

 103 Basic 9-12
 .9210

 130 ESOL
 (.9210)
 .0000

placement was appropriate. We also did not see evidence that the parents were notified

of their child's ESOL placement. We propose the following adjustment:

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments <u>(Unweighted FTE)</u>
Freedom High School (#1662) (Continued)	
218. [Ref. 166209] <u>The file for one ELL student did not contain documentation</u> justifying the student's continued ESOL placement for a fifth year. We propose the	
following adjustment:	
103 Basic 9-12       .4505         130 ESOL       (.4505)	.0000
219. [Ref. 166210] One ESE student was absent from school during the entire	
11-day window of the reporting survey and should not have been included with the	
survey's results. We propose the following adjustment:	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services (.5000)	(.5000)
220. [Ref. 166211] There was no evidence that the Matrix of Services forms for two	
students had been reviewed and updated when the students' new IEPs were prepared in	
May 2010. We propose the following adjustment:	
113 Grades 9-12 with ESE Services       1.5000         254 ESE Support Level 4       (.5000)         255 ESE Support Level 5       (1.0000)	<u>.0000</u>
	<u>(2.8708</u> )
Proposed Net Adjustment	<u>(76.4664</u> )

#### SCHEDULE E

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

#### Recommendations

We recommend that management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) only students who are in membership and in attendance at least 1 of the 11 days of a survey window are reported with that survey's results; (2) only students who have not exceeded the maximum six-year period of State funding of ESOL should be reported in the ESOL Program; (3) re-assessments should be made for all returning ELL students after an extended absence from the District; (4) ELL Student Plans should be reviewed and updated annually and properly maintained in the students' files; (5) ELL Student Plans should be properly dated such that it can be determined that the ELL Student Plans are timely prepared and should be complete with the students' instructional time and course schedules attached; (6) parents should be properly notified prior to the student's ESOL placement and those notification letters should be dated; (7) assessments for students entering their fourth, fifth, or sixth year of ESOL placement should be made prior to students' entry into that year based on the students' individual anniversary dates; (8) students are reported in the proper funding categories for the correct amount of FTE and have adequate documentation to support that reporting, particularly with regard to students in ESOL and ESE Support Levels 4 and 5; (9) ESE students are reported in accordance with their Matrix of Services forms and those forms are properly scored and maintained in the students' files; (10) there should be evidence of review of the *Matrix of Services* form to ensure that the IEP services are still properly represented by the Matrix of Services form; (11) students should be reported appropriately for their on-campus instruction based on the Matrix of Services form applicable to that placement and not based on the students' Hospital and Homebound placements; (12) PK ESE students should be reported for only instructional time and pull-out time for therapy sessions not to exceed what the instructional day permits and that the FTE reported for that time is accurately calculated per the FTE General Instructions; (13) students in Career Education 9-12 (OJT) are reported in accordance with timecards that are accurately completed, signed, and retained in readily-accessible files; (14) students in Career Education 9-12 (OJT) are reported in accordance with the students' time worked as documented on their timecards; (15) teachers are properly certified or, if out of field, are approved to teach out of field by the School Board; (16) parents are appropriately notified of teachers' out-of-field status; and (17) teachers earn in-service training points in ESOL strategies on a timely basis as required by rule and their in-service training timelines.

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

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

# **Regulatory Citations**

# Reporting Section 1011.60, F.S. ...... Minimum Requirements of the Florida Education Finance Program Section 1011.61, F.S. ..... Definitions Section 1011.62, F.S. ..... Funds for Operation of Schools Rule 6A-1.04513, F.A.C. ...... Maintaining Auditable FTE Records FTE General Instructions 2010-11 Attendance Section 1003.23, F.S. ..... Attendance Records and Reports Rules 6A-1.044(3) and (6)(c), F.A.C. .... Pupil Attendance Records Rule 6A-1.04513, F.A.C. ...... Maintaining Auditable FTE Records FTE General Instructions 2010-11 Comprehensive Management Information System: Automated Student Attendance Recordkeeping System Handbook English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Section 1003.56, F.S. ..... English Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient Students Section 1011.62(1)(g), F.S. ..... Education for Speakers of Other Languages Rule 6A-6.0901, F.A.C. ..... Definitions Which Apply to Programs for English Language Learners Rule 6A-6.0902, F.A.C. ..... Requirements for Identification, Eligibility Programmatic and Annual Assessments of English Language Learners of English Language Learners Rule 6A-6.0904, F.A.C. ...... Equal Access to Appropriate Instruction for English Language Learners

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

# Regulatory Citations (Continued)

Career Education On-the-Job Attenda	nce	
Rule 6A-1.044(6)(c), F.A.C.	Pupil Attendance Records	
Career Education On-the-Job Funding	<u>g Hours</u>	
Rule 6A-6.055(3), F.A.C.	Definitions of Terms Used in Vocational Education and Adult Programs	
FTE General Instructions 2010-11		
Exceptional Education		
Section 1003.57, F.S	Exceptional Students Instruction	
Section 1011.62, F.S	Funds for Operation of Schools	
Section 1011.62(1)(e), F.S	Funding Model for Exceptional Student Education Programs	
Rule 6A-6.03028, F.A.C	Provision of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) and Development of Individual Educational Plans for Students with Disabilities	
Rule 6A-6.03029, F.A.C.	Development of Family Support Plans for Children with Disabilities Ages Birth Through Five Years	
Rule 6A-6.0312, F.A.C.	Course Modifications for Exceptional Students	
Rule 6A-6.0331, F.A.C.	General Education Intervention Procedures, Identification, Evaluation, Reevaluation and the Initial Provision of Exceptional Education Services	
Rule 6A-6.0334, F.A.C.	Individual Educational Plans (IEPs) and Educational Plans (EPs) for Transferring Exceptional Students	
Rule 6A-6.03411, F.A.C	Definitions, ESE Policies and Procedures, and ESE Administrators	
Matrix of Services Handbook (2004 Revised Edition)		
Teacher Certification		
Section 1012.42(2), F.S	Teacher Teaching Out-of-Field; Notification Requirements	
Section 1012.55, F.S	Positions for Which Certificates Required	
Rule 6A-1.0502, F.A.C.	Non-certificated Instructional Personnel	
Rule 6A-1.0503, F.A.C.	Definition of Qualified Instructional Personnel	
Rule 6A-4.001, F.A.C.	Instructional Personnel Certification	
Rule 6A-6.0907, F.A.C	Inservice Requirements for Personnel of Limited English Proficient Students	

Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **NOTES TO SCHEDULES** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

# NOTE A – SUMMARY

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

# 1. <u>School District of Orange County</u>

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

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011, the District operated 238 schools serving prekindergarten through twelfth grade students, reported 174,720.05 unweighted FTE, and received approximately \$396 million in State funding through FEFP. The primary sources of funding for the District are funds from FEFP, local ad valorem taxes, and Federal grants and donations.

# 2. Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP)

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

Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **NOTES TO SCHEDULES** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

NOTE A - SUMMARY (Continued)

# 3. Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students

The funding provided by FEFP is based upon the numbers of individual students participating in particular educational programs. A numerical value is assigned to each student according to the student's hours and days of attendance in those programs. The individual student thus becomes equated to a numerical value known as an FTE. For example, for prekindergarten through third grade, one FTE is defined as one student in membership in a program or a group of programs for 20 hours per week for 180 days; for grade levels four through twelve, one FTE is defined as one student in membership in a program or a group of programs for 20 hours per week for a group of programs for 25 hours per week for 180 days.

# 4. <u>Calculation of FEFP Funds</u>

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

# 5. <u>FTE Surveys</u>

FTE is determined and reported during the school year by means of four FTE membership surveys that are conducted under the direction of district and school management. Each survey is a sampling of FTE membership for a period of one week. The surveys for the 2010-11 school year were conducted during and for the following weeks: survey one was performed for July 12 through 16, 2010; survey two was performed for October 11 through 15, 2010; survey three was performed for February 7 through 11, 2011; and survey four was performed for June 13 through 17, 2011

Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students **NOTES TO SCHEDULES** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

# **NOTE A - SUMMARY** (Continued)

## 6. Educational Programs

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

# 7. <u>Statutes and Rules</u>

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

Chapter 1000, F.S K-20 General Provisions
Chapter 1001, F.S K-20 Governance
Chapter 1002, F.S Student and Parental Rights and Educational Choices
Chapter 1003, F.S Public K-12 Education
Chapter 1006, F.S Support for Learning
Chapter 1007, F.S Articulation and Access
Chapter 1010, F.S Financial Matters
Chapter 1011, F.S Planning and Budgeting
Chapter 1012, F.S Personnel
Chapter 6A-1, F.A.C Finance and Administration
Chapter 6A-4, F.A.C Certification
Chapter 6A-6, F.A.C Special Programs I

# NOTE B - SAMPLING

Our examination procedures provided for the selection of samples of schools, students, and teachers using judgmental methods for testing FTE reported to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011. Our sampling process was designed to facilitate the performance of appropriate examination procedures to test the District's compliance with State requirements governing FTE and FEFP. The following schools were in our sample:

Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students NOTES TO SCHEDULES

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

#### NOTE B - SAMPLING (Continued)

District-Level:CStudent Management Solutions (SMS) System – Reporting Exceptions1Reporting of PK-3 ESE Students21. La Amistad32. Life Skills Center Charter School4 and 53. Florida Mall Education Center6 through 84. Princeton House Charter School13 through 125. Workforce Advantage Academy Charter School13 through 156. Boone High School16 through 277. East Orlando Education Center28 through 308. Universal Education Center31 and 329. Lakeville Elementary School35 and 3611. Cypress Springs Elementary School37 and 3812. Oakshire Elementary School39 through 4313. Lawton Chiles Elementary School39 through 4714. Pineloch Elementary School48 through 5615. Lake Gem Elementary School60 through 6417. Audubon Park Elementary School69 and 7019. Glenridge Middle School102 through 11321. Colonial High School108 through 1322. Northlake Park Community Elementary School124 through 1223. Durance Elementary School108 through 1324. Northlake Park Community Elementary School124 through 1325. Durance Elementary School124 through 1326. Aduetor Heigh School124 through 1327. Azalea Park Elementary School124 through 1328. Northlake Park Community Elementary School124 through 13129. Ventura Elementary School124 through 13129. Durance Elementary School126 and 127 <th></th> <th>School Name/Description</th> <th>Finding Number(s)</th>		School Name/Description	Finding Number(s)
Exceptions1Reporting of PK-3 ESE Students21. La Amistad32. Life Skills Center Charter School4 and 53. Florida Mall Education Center6 through 84. Princeton House Charter School9 through 125. Workforce Advantage Academy Charter School13 through 156. Boone High School16 through 277. East Orlando Education Center28 through 308. Universal Education Center31 and 329. Lakeville Elementary School33 and 3410. Cherokee School35 and 3611. Cypress Springs Elementary School39 through 4313. Lawton Chiles Elementary School44 through 4714. Pineloch Elementary School48 through 5615. Lake Gem Elementary School60 through 6417. Audubon Park Elementary School60 through 6417. Audubon Park Elementary School69 and 7019. Glenridge Middle School71 through 7520. Azalea Park Elementary School102 through 10121. Evans High School122 through 10122. Evans High School124 through 11324. Northlake Park Community Elementary School124 through 12525. Durrance Elementary School124 through 13124. Northlake Park Community Elementary School124 through 13225. Durrance Elementary School124 through 13326. Lancaster Elementary School124 through 13327. McCoy Elementary School124 through 13928. Vortura Elementary School124 through 13329. Ventura Elementary School12			0 (/
Exceptions1Reporting of PK-3 ESE Students21. La Amistad32. Life Skills Center Charter School4 and 53. Florida Mall Education Center6 through 84. Princeton House Charter School9 through 125. Workforce Advantage Academy Charter School13 through 156. Boone High School16 through 277. East Orlando Education Center28 through 308. Universal Education Center31 and 329. Lakeville Elementary School33 and 3410. Cherokee School35 and 3611. Cypress Springs Elementary School39 through 4313. Lawton Chiles Elementary School44 through 4714. Pineloch Elementary School48 through 5615. Lake Gem Elementary School60 through 6417. Audubon Park Elementary School60 through 6417. Audubon Park Elementary School69 and 7019. Glenridge Middle School71 through 7520. Azalea Park Elementary School102 through 10121. Evans High School122 through 10122. Evans High School124 through 11324. Northlake Park Community Elementary School124 through 12525. Durrance Elementary School124 through 13124. Northlake Park Community Elementary School124 through 13225. Durrance Elementary School124 through 13326. Lancaster Elementary School124 through 13327. McCoy Elementary School124 through 13928. Vortura Elementary School124 through 13329. Ventura Elementary School12		Student Management Solutions (SMS) System – Reporting	
Reporting of PK-3 ESE Students21. La Amistad32. Life Skills Center Charter School4 and 53. Florida Mall Education Center6 through 84. Princeton House Charter School9 through 125. Workforce Advantage Academy Charter School13 through 156. Boone High School16 through 277. East Orlando Education Center28 through 308. Universal Education Center31 and 329. Lakeville Elementary School35 and 3610. Cherokee School35 and 3611. Cypress Springs Elementary School37 and 3812. Oakshire Elementary School39 through 4313. Lawton Chiles Elementary School48 through 5615. Lake Gem Elementary School60 through 6417. Audubon Park Elementary School60 through 6417. Audubon Park Elementary School69 and 7019. Glenridge Middle School71 through 7520. Azalea Park Elementary School102 through 8111. Colonial High School102 through 11321. Colonial High School124 through 11322. Evans High School124 through 11323. Engelwood Elementary School124 through 11324. Northlake Park Community Elementary School124 through 13125. Durrance Elementary School124 through 12526. Lancaster Elementary School124 through 12727. McCoy Elementary School124 through 12728. Kool124 through 13129. Ventura Elementary School124 through 13129. Ventura Elementary School124 through 13			1
1.La Amistad32.Life Skills Center Charter School4 and 53.Florida Mall Education Center6 through 84.Princeton House Charter School9 through 125.Workforce Advantage Academy Charter School13 through 156.Boone High School16 through 277.East Orlando Education Center28 through 308.Universal Education Center31 and 329.Lakeville Elementary School33 and 3410.Cherokee School35 and 3611.Cyress Springs Elementary School37 and 3812.Oakshire Elementary School39 through 4313.Lawton Chiles Elementary School48 through 5615.Lake Gem Elementary School60 through 6417.Audubon Park Elementary School60 through 6818.Dream Lake Elementary School69 and 7019.Glenridge Middle School102 through 11321.Colonial High School102 through 11322.Lakes Elementary School108 through 11324.Northlake Park Community Elementary School104 through 10725.Durance Elementary School124 through 1226.Lancaster Elementary School124 through 1227.McCoy Elementary School124 through 13128.Northlake Park Community Elementary School124 through 11329.Lake Elementary School124 through 12520.Lancaster Elementary School126 and 12727.<		1	2
2.Life Skills Center Charter School4 and 53.Florida Mall Education Center6 through 84.Princeton House Charter School9 through 125.Workforce Advantage Academy Charter School13 through 156.Boone High School16 through 277.East Orlando Education Center28 through 308.Universal Education Center31 and 329.Lakeville Elementary School35 and 3611.Cypress Springs Elementary School39 through 4312.Oakshire Elementary School39 through 4313.Lawton Chiles Elementary School44 through 4714.Pineloch Elementary School60 through 6417.Audubon Park Elementary School60 through 6818.Dream Lake Elementary School69 and 7019.Glenridge Middle School70 through 7520.Azalea Park Elementary School102 through 10121.Evans High School102 through 11324.Northlake Park Community Elementary School108 through 11324.Northlake Park Community Elementary School126 and 12727.McCoy Elementary School126 and 12727.McCoy Elementary School126 through 13128.Dr. Phillips High School122 through 13129.Ventura Elementary School126 through 13120.Lake School124 through 15720.Azalea Park Elementary School126 and 12727.McCoy Elementary School126 and 127<	1.	1 U	
3.Florida Mall Education Center6 through 84.Princeton House Charter School9 through 125.Workforce Advantage Academy Charter School13 through 156.Boone High School16 through 277.East Orlando Education Center28 through 308.Universal Education Center31 and 329.Lakeville Elementary School35 and 3410.Cherokee School35 and 3611.Cypress Springs Elementary School37 and 3812.Oakshire Elementary School39 through 4313.Lawton Chiles Elementary School44 through 4714.Pineloch Elementary School57 through 5916.Lake Silver Elementary School60 through 6417.Audubon Park Elementary School69 and 7019.Glenridge Middle School76 through 8121.Colonial High School102 through 10723.Engelwood Elementary School102 through 11324.Northlake Park Community Elementary School104 through 11324.Northlake Park Community Elementary School124 through 12526.Lancaster Elementary School126 and 12727.McCoy Elementary School132 through 13128.Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13129.Ventura Elementary School126 and 12720.Zatae Elementary School126 and 12721.McCoy Elementary School126 and 12722.Evans High School122 through 131	2.	Life Skills Center Charter School	
4.Princeton House Charter School9 through 125.Workforce Advantage Academy Charter School13 through 156.Boone High School16 through 277.East Orlando Education Center28 through 308.Universal Education Center31 and 329.Lakeville Elementary School35 and 3410.Cherokee School35 and 3611.Cypress Springs Elementary School39 through 4313.Lawton Chiles Elementary School39 through 4313.Lawton Chiles Elementary School44 through 4714.Pineloch Elementary School60 through 6417.Audubon Park Elementary School60 through 6418.Dream Lake Elementary School65 through 6818.Dream Lake Elementary School69 and 7019.Glenridge Middle School71 through 7520.Azalea Park Elementary School102 through 10122.Evans High School102 through 11324.Northlake Park Community Elementary School104 through 12025.Durrance Elementary School124 through 12726.Lancaster Elementary School124 through 12526.Lancaster Elementary School132 through 13128.Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13129.Ventura Elementary School124 through 13120.Durrance Elementary School124 through 13321.McOrg Elementary School124 through 14822.Durrance Elementary School132			
5.Workforce Advantage Academy Charter School13 through 156.Boone High School16 through 277.East Orlando Education Center28 through 308.Universal Education Center31 and 329.Lakeville Elementary School33 and 3410.Cherokee School37 and 3821.Cypress Springs Elementary School37 and 3822.Oakshire Elementary School39 through 4333.Lawton Chiles Elementary School44 through 4714.Pineloch Elementary School48 through 5615.Lake Gem Elementary School60 through 6417.Audubon Park Elementary School60 through 6417.Audubon Park Elementary School69 and 7019.Glenridge Middle School71 through 7520.Azalea Park Elementary School82 through 10122.Evans High School102 through 10122.Evans High School102 through 10123.Engelwood Elementary School124 through 12025.Durrance Elementary School126 and 1277.McCoy Elementary School128 through 13128.Dr. Phillips High School128 through 13929.Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830.Waterbridge Elementary School140 through 14830.Waterbridge K-8 School149 through 16231.Jave School140 through 14832.Jurance Elementary School140 through 16233.Jurance Elementar			
6.Boone High School16 through 277.East Orlando Education Center28 through 308.Universal Education Center31 and 329.Lakeville Elementary School33 and 3410.Cherokee School35 and 3611.Cypress Springs Elementary School37 and 3812.Oakshire Elementary School39 through 4313.Lawton Chiles Elementary School44 through 4714.Pineloch Elementary School48 through 5615.Lake Gem Elementary School57 through 5916.Lake Silver Elementary School60 through 6417.Audubon Park Elementary School61 through 7520.Azalea Park Elementary School71 through 7520.Azalea Park Elementary School72 through 10122.Evans High School102 through 10123.Engelwood Elementary School108 through 11324.Northlake Park Community Elementary School124 through 12525.Durrance Elementary School124 through 13124.Northlake Park Community Elementary School122 through 13125.Durrance Elementary School126 and 12727.McCoy Elementary School132 through 13128.Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13129.Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830.Waterbridge Elementary School140 through 14830.Waterbridge Elementary School144 through 15331.Windy Ridge K-8 School154 t			0
7.East Orlando Education Center28 through 308.Universal Education Center31 and 329.Lakeville Elementary School33 and 3410.Cherokee School35 and 3611.Cypress Springs Elementary School37 and 3812.Oakshire Elementary School39 through 4313.Lawton Chiles Elementary School44 through 4714.Pineloch Elementary School48 through 5615.Lake Gem Elementary School57 through 5916.Lake Silver Elementary School60 through 6417.Audubon Park Elementary School69 and 7019.Glenridge Middle School71 through 7520.Azalea Park Elementary School82 through 10122.Evans High School102 through 10723.Engelwood Elementary School108 through 11324.Northlake Park Community Elementary School124 through 12525.Durrance Elementary School128 through 13126.Lancaster Elementary School128 through 13127.McCoy Elementary School128 through 13128.Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13129.Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830.Waterbridge Elementary School140 through 14831.Windy Ridge K-8 School140 through 14833.Sadler Elementary School163 through 13134.Durrance Elementary School140 through 14830.Waterbridge Elementary School140 through 148<		- · ·	0
8.Universal Education Center31 and 329.Lakeville Elementary School33 and 3410.Cherokee School35 and 3611.Cypress Springs Elementary School37 and 3812.Oakshire Elementary School39 through 4313.Lawton Chiles Elementary School44 through 4714.Pineloch Elementary School48 through 5615.Lake Gem Elementary School57 through 5916.Lake Silver Elementary School60 through 6417.Audubon Park Elementary School65 through 6818.Dream Lake Elementary School69 and 7019.Glenridge Middle School71 through 7520.Azalea Park Elementary School76 through 8121.Colonial High School102 through 10723.Engelwood Elementary School108 through 11324.Northlake Park Community Elementary School126 and 12725.Durrance Elementary School128 through 13128.Dr. Phillips High School128 through 13129.Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830.Waterbridge Elementary School140 through 14831.Windy Ridge K-8 School154 through 15331.Windy Ridge K-8 School163 through 17033.Sadler Elementary School163 through 170		8	
9.Lakeville Elementary School33 and 3410.Cherokee School35 and 3611.Cypress Springs Elementary School37 and 3812.Oakshire Elementary School39 through 4313.Lawton Chiles Elementary School44 through 4714.Pineloch Elementary School48 through 5615.Lake Gem Elementary School57 through 5916.Lake Silver Elementary School60 through 6417.Audubon Park Elementary School69 and 7019.Glenridge Middle School71 through 7520.Azalea Park Elementary School76 through 8121.Colonial High School102 through 10122.Evans High School102 through 10723.Engelwood Elementary School124 through 12524.Northlake Park Community Elementary School124 through 12525.Durrance Elementary School126 and 12727.McCoy Elementary School132 through 13128.Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13129.Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830.Waterbridge Elementary School140 through 14830.Waterbridge Elementary School140 through 14331.Windy Ridge K-8 School154 through 16232.John Young Elementary School163 through 17033.Sadler Elementary School163 through 170			0
10. Cherokee School35 and 3611. Cypress Springs Elementary School37 and 3812. Oakshire Elementary School39 through 4313. Lawton Chiles Elementary School44 through 4714. Pineloch Elementary School48 through 5615. Lake Gem Elementary School57 through 5916. Lake Silver Elementary School60 through 6417. Audubon Park Elementary School69 and 7019. Glenridge Middle School71 through 7520. Azalea Park Elementary School76 through 8121. Colonial High School102 through 10723. Engelwood Elementary School108 through 11324. Northlake Park Community Elementary School121 through 12525. Durrance Elementary School126 and 12727. McCoy Elementary School128 through 13128. Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13129. Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830. Waterbridge Elementary School149 through 15331. Windy Ridge K-8 School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176	9.	Lakeville Elementary School	
12. Oakshire Elementary School39 through 4313. Lawton Chiles Elementary School44 through 4714. Pineloch Elementary School48 through 5615. Lake Gem Elementary School57 through 5916. Lake Silver Elementary School60 through 6417. Audubon Park Elementary School65 through 6818. Dream Lake Elementary School69 and 7019. Glenridge Middle School71 through 7520. Azalea Park Elementary School76 through 8121. Colonial High School82 through 10122. Evans High School102 through 10723. Engelwood Elementary School108 through 11324. Northlake Park Community Elementary School126 and 12727. McCoy Elementary School128 through 13128. Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13929. Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830. Waterbridge Elementary School149 through 15331. Windy Ridge K-8 School163 through 16232. John Young Elementary School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176		•	35 and 36
12. Oakshire Elementary School39 through 4313. Lawton Chiles Elementary School44 through 4714. Pineloch Elementary School48 through 5615. Lake Gem Elementary School57 through 5916. Lake Silver Elementary School60 through 6417. Audubon Park Elementary School65 through 6818. Dream Lake Elementary School69 and 7019. Glenridge Middle School71 through 7520. Azalea Park Elementary School76 through 8121. Colonial High School82 through 10122. Evans High School102 through 10723. Engelwood Elementary School108 through 11324. Northlake Park Community Elementary School126 and 12727. McCoy Elementary School128 through 13128. Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13929. Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830. Waterbridge Elementary School149 through 15331. Windy Ridge K-8 School163 through 16232. John Young Elementary School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176	11.	Cypress Springs Elementary School	37 and 38
13. Lawton Chiles Elementary School44 through 4714. Pineloch Elementary School48 through 5615. Lake Gem Elementary School57 through 5916. Lake Silver Elementary School60 through 6417. Audubon Park Elementary School65 through 6818. Dream Lake Elementary School69 and 7019. Glenridge Middle School71 through 7520. Azalea Park Elementary School76 through 8121. Colonial High School102 through 10122. Evans High School102 through 10723. Engelwood Elementary School108 through 11324. Northlake Park Community Elementary School121 through 12526. Lancaster Elementary School126 and 12727. McCoy Elementary School132 through 13128. Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13929. Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830. Waterbridge Elementary School140 through 14831. Windy Ridge K-8 School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176			39 through 43
14. Pineloch Elementary School48 through 5615. Lake Gem Elementary School57 through 5916. Lake Silver Elementary School60 through 6417. Audubon Park Elementary School65 through 6818. Dream Lake Elementary School69 and 7019. Glenridge Middle School71 through 7520. Azalea Park Elementary School76 through 8121. Colonial High School82 through 10122. Evans High School102 through 10723. Engelwood Elementary School108 through 11324. Northlake Park Community Elementary School121 through 12526. Lancaster Elementary School126 and 12727. McCoy Elementary School128 through 13128. Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13929. Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830. Waterbridge Elementary School149 through 15331. Windy Ridge K-8 School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176			44 through 47
15. Lake Gem Elementary School57 through 5916. Lake Silver Elementary School60 through 6417. Audubon Park Elementary School65 through 6818. Dream Lake Elementary School69 and 7019. Glenridge Middle School71 through 7520. Azalea Park Elementary School76 through 8121. Colonial High School82 through 10122. Evans High School102 through 10723. Engelwood Elementary School108 through 11324. Northlake Park Community Elementary School114 through 12025. Durrance Elementary School126 and 12727. McCoy Elementary School128 through 13128. Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13929. Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830. Waterbridge Elementary School154 through 16231. Windy Ridge K-8 School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176			_
17. Audubon Park Elementary School65 through 6818. Dream Lake Elementary School69 and 7019. Glenridge Middle School71 through 7520. Azalea Park Elementary School76 through 8121. Colonial High School82 through 10122. Evans High School102 through 10723. Engelwood Elementary School108 through 11324. Northlake Park Community Elementary School114 through 12025. Durrance Elementary School126 and 12727. McCoy Elementary School128 through 13128. Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13929. Ventura Elementary School140 through 15331. Windy Ridge K-8 School154 through 16232. John Young Elementary School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176			57 through 59
18. Dream Lake Elementary School69 and 7019. Glenridge Middle School71 through 7520. Azalea Park Elementary School76 through 8121. Colonial High School82 through 10122. Evans High School102 through 10723. Engelwood Elementary School108 through 11324. Northlake Park Community Elementary School114 through 12025. Durrance Elementary School121 through 12526. Lancaster Elementary School126 and 12727. McCoy Elementary School132 through 13128. Dr. Phillips High School140 through 14830. Waterbridge Elementary School149 through 15331. Windy Ridge K-8 School154 through 16232. John Young Elementary School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176	16.	Lake Silver Elementary School	60 through 64
19. Glenridge Middle School71 through 7520. Azalea Park Elementary School76 through 8121. Colonial High School82 through 10122. Evans High School102 through 10723. Engelwood Elementary School108 through 11324. Northlake Park Community Elementary School114 through 12025. Durrance Elementary School121 through 12526. Lancaster Elementary School126 and 12727. McCoy Elementary School132 through 13128. Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13929. Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830. Waterbridge Elementary School149 through 15331. Windy Ridge K-8 School154 through 16232. John Young Elementary School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176	17.	Audubon Park Elementary School	65 through 68
20. Azalea Park Elementary School76 through 8121. Colonial High School82 through 10122. Evans High School102 through 10723. Engelwood Elementary School108 through 11324. Northlake Park Community Elementary School114 through 12025. Durrance Elementary School121 through 12526. Lancaster Elementary School126 and 12727. McCoy Elementary School128 through 13128. Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13929. Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830. Waterbridge Elementary School149 through 15331. Windy Ridge K-8 School154 through 16232. John Young Elementary School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176	18.	Dream Lake Elementary School	69 and 70
21. Colonial High School82 through 10122. Evans High School102 through 10723. Engelwood Elementary School108 through 11324. Northlake Park Community Elementary School114 through 12025. Durrance Elementary School121 through 12526. Lancaster Elementary School126 and 12727. McCoy Elementary School128 through 13128. Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13929. Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830. Waterbridge Elementary School149 through 15331. Windy Ridge K-8 School154 through 16232. John Young Elementary School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176	19.	Glenridge Middle School	71 through 75
22. Evans High School102 through 10723. Engelwood Elementary School108 through 11324. Northlake Park Community Elementary School114 through 12025. Durrance Elementary School121 through 12526. Lancaster Elementary School126 and 12727. McCoy Elementary School128 through 13128. Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13929. Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830. Waterbridge Elementary School149 through 15331. Windy Ridge K-8 School154 through 16232. John Young Elementary School171 through 170	20.	Azalea Park Elementary School	76 through 81
23. Engelwood Elementary School108 through 11324. Northlake Park Community Elementary School114 through 12025. Durrance Elementary School121 through 12526. Lancaster Elementary School126 and 12727. McCoy Elementary School128 through 13128. Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13929. Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830. Waterbridge Elementary School149 through 15331. Windy Ridge K-8 School154 through 16232. John Young Elementary School171 through 170	21.	Colonial High School	82 through 101
24. Northlake Park Community Elementary School114 through 12025. Durrance Elementary School121 through 12526. Lancaster Elementary School126 and 12727. McCoy Elementary School128 through 13128. Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13929. Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830. Waterbridge Elementary School149 through 15331. Windy Ridge K-8 School154 through 16232. John Young Elementary School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176	22.	Evans High School	102 through 107
25. Durrance Elementary School121 through 12526. Lancaster Elementary School126 and 12727. McCoy Elementary School128 through 13128. Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13929. Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830. Waterbridge Elementary School149 through 15331. Windy Ridge K-8 School154 through 16232. John Young Elementary School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176	23.	Engelwood Elementary School	108 through 113
26. Lancaster Elementary School126 and 12727. McCoy Elementary School128 through 13128. Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13929. Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830. Waterbridge Elementary School149 through 15331. Windy Ridge K-8 School154 through 16232. John Young Elementary School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176	24.	Northlake Park Community Elementary School	114 through 120
27. McCoy Elementary School128 through 13128. Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13929. Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830. Waterbridge Elementary School149 through 15331. Windy Ridge K-8 School154 through 16232. John Young Elementary School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176	25.	Durrance Elementary School	121 through 125
28. Dr. Phillips High School132 through 13929. Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830. Waterbridge Elementary School149 through 15331. Windy Ridge K-8 School154 through 16232. John Young Elementary School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176	26.	Lancaster Elementary School	126 and 127
29. Ventura Elementary School140 through 14830. Waterbridge Elementary School149 through 15331. Windy Ridge K-8 School154 through 16232. John Young Elementary School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176			128 through 131
30. Waterbridge Elementary School149 through 15331. Windy Ridge K-8 School154 through 16232. John Young Elementary School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176			132 through 139
31. Windy Ridge K-8 School154 through 16232. John Young Elementary School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176		•	140 through 148
32. John Young Elementary School163 through 17033. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176	30.	Waterbridge Elementary School	149 through 153
33. Sadler Elementary School171 through 176			154 through 162
			-
34. Shenandoah Elementary School 177 through 179			0
		•	0
35. Palmetto Elementary School180 through 188			e
36. West Orange High School189 through 200		0 0	e
37. Magnolia School201 through 203		0	e
38. Deerwood Elementary School204 and 205			
39. Shingle Creek Elementary School206 through 20910. English Creek Elementary School200 through 209			-
40. Freedom High School210 through 220	40.	Freedom High School	210 through 220



DAVID W. MARTIN, CPA AUDITOR GENERAL **AUDITOR GENERAL** 

**STATE OF FLORIDA** 

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



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

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

# INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ORANGE COUNTY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD FLORIDA EDUCATION FINANCE PROPRAM (FEFP) STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

We have examined management's assertion, included in its representation letter dated August 23, 2011, that the Orange County District School Board complied with State requirements governing the determination and reporting of the number of students transported for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011. These requirements are found primarily in Chapter 1006, Part I, E., and Section 1011.68, Florida Statutes; State Board of Education Rules, Chapter 6A-3, Florida Administrative Code; and the *Student Transportation General Instructions* issued by the Department of Education. As discussed in the representation letter, management is responsible for the District's compliance with State requirements. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the District's compliance based on our examination.

Our examination was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) and the standards applicable to attestation engagements contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and, accordingly, included examining, on a test basis, evidence about the District's compliance with the aforementioned State requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our examination provides a reasonable basis for our opinion. The legal determination of the District's compliance with these requirements is, however, ultimately the responsibility of the Department of Education.

## **Compliance**

Our examination procedures disclosed material noncompliance with the District's reported student ridership data as follows: 170 of the 762 students in our sample had exceptions involving their reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding. (See SCHEDULE G, Finding Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, and 17.)

In our opinion, except for the material noncompliance mentioned above involving their reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding, the Orange County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements governing the determination and reporting of the number of students transported for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011.

The results of our examination disclosed other noncompliance with the State requirements mentioned above. We considered this other noncompliance in forming our opinion regarding the District's compliance and it did not affect our opinion as stated above. All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed in SCHEDULE G. The impact of this noncompliance on the District's reported number of transported students is presented in SCHEDULES F and G.

## Internal Control Over Compliance

In accordance with attestation standards established by the AICPA and *Government Auditing Standards*, we are required to report significant deficiencies in internal control detected during our examination and identify those considered to be material weaknesses. The purpose of our examination was to express an opinion on the District's compliance with State requirements and did not include expressing an opinion on the District's related internal controls. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. Due to its limited purpose, our examination would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses.<sup>1</sup> However, the material noncompliance mentioned above is indicative of significant deficiencies considered to be material weaknesses in the District's internal controls related to their reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding. Other noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is indicative of control deficiencies<sup>1</sup> and is also presented herein. The findings, populations, samples, and exception totals that pertain to material and other noncompliance are presented in SCHEDULES F and G.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup><u>A control deficiency</u> in the entity's internal control over compliance exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect noncompliance on a timely basis. <u>A significant deficiency</u> is a control deficiency, or combination of control deficiencies, that adversely affects the entity's ability to comply with the aforementioned State requirements such that there is more than a remote likelihood that noncompliance that is more than inconsequential will not be prevented or detected by the entity's internal control. <u>A material weakness</u> is a significant deficiency, or combination of significant deficiencies, that results in a more-than-remote likelihood that material noncompliance will not be prevented or detected by the entity.

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

J. Marte

David W. Martin, CPA June 18, 2012

## SCHEDULE F

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation **POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND TEST RESULTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

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

As part of our examination procedures, we sampled students for testing the number of students transported as reported to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011. (See NOTE B.) The population of vehicles (2,505) consisted of the total of the numbers of vehicles reported by the District for each survey. For example, a vehicle that transported students during the July and October 2010 and February and June 2011 surveys would be counted in the population as four vehicles. Similarly, the population of students (146,340) consisted of the total numbers of students reported by the District as having been transported for each survey. (See NOTE A2.) The District reported students in the following ridership categories:

	Number of Students
<u>Ridership Category</u>	Transported
	-
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	2,872
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	733
IDEA (PK), Weighted	1,029
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	416
Teenage Parents and Infants	392
Hazardous Walking	887
Two Miles or More	139,371
Center to Center (IDEA), Weighted	30
Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted	349
Center to Center (Vocational and Dual Enrollme	ent) <u>261</u>
Total	<u>146,340</u>

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

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation **POPULATIONS, SAMPLES, AND TEST RESULTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Our examination results are summarized below:

	Buses	Buses Studen	
	Proposed		Proposed
	Net	With	Net
Description	<u>Adjustment</u>	<b>Exceptions</b>	<u>Adjustment</u>
We noted that the reported number of buses in operation was overstated.	(39)		
We sampled 762 of the 146,340 students reported as being transported by the District.		170	(118)
We also noted certain issues in conjunction with our general			
tests of student transportation that resulted in the addition of			
2,553 students.		<u>2,553</u>	<u>(2,486</u> )
Totals	<u>(39</u> )	<u>(2,723</u> )	<u>(2,604)</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 DOE.

## SCHEDULE G

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

## **Overview**

Management is responsible for determining and reporting the number of students transported in compliance with State requirements. These requirements are found primarily in Chapter 1006, Part I, E., and Section 1011.68, Florida Statutes; State Board of Education Rules, Chapter 6A-3, Florida Administrative Code; and the *Student Transportation General Instructions* issued by the Department of Education. Except for the material noncompliance involving their reported ridership classification or eligibility for State transportation funding, the Orange County District School Board complied, in all material respects, with State requirements governing the determination and reporting of students transported for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011. All noncompliance disclosed by our examination procedures is discussed below and requires management's attention and action, as recommended on page 127.

Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments

## **Findings**

Our examination procedures included both general tests and detailed tests. Our general tests included inquiries concerning the District's transportation of students and verification that a bus driver's report existed for each bus reported in a survey. Our detailed tests involved verification of the specific ridership categories reported for students sampled from the July and October 2010 surveys and the February and June 2011 surveys. Adjusted students who were in more than one survey are accounted for by survey. For example, a student sampled twice (i.e., once for the October 2010 survey and once for the February 2011 survey) will be presented in our Findings as two sample students.

1. [Ref. 51] <u>The number of days in term was incorrectly reported for 2,177</u> <u>students in the July 2010 survey. The students were reported for either 4 days in term</u> (2,174 students) or 44 days in term (3 students) but should have been reported for 5 <u>days in term. We propose the following adjustments</u>:

July 2010 Survey 44 Days in Term IDEA (K-12), Weighted

(3)

## Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

	Students Transported Proposed Net
Findings	Adjustments
July 2010 Survey(Continued)4 Days in TermIDEA (K-12), WeightedIDEA (K-12), Unweighted(463)IDEA (K-12), Unweighted(35)	
IDEA (PK), Weighted(93)IDEA (PK), Unweighted(29)Teenage Parents and Infants(30)Two Miles or More(1524)	
5 Days in TermIDEA (K-12), Weighted466IDEA (K-12), Unweighted35IDEA (PK), Weighted93IDEA (PK), Unweighted29Teenage Parents and Infants30Two Miles or More1,524	0
2. [Ref. 54] The number of days in term for 16 students in the October 2010 and	
February 2011 surveys who were enrolled in the District's Gifted Program was reported	
incorrectly for 90 days in term and should have been reported for only 18 days in term.	
We propose the following adjustments:	
<u>October 2010 Survey</u> <u>90 Days in Term</u> Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted (6)	
<u>18 Days in Term</u> Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted 6	
February 2011 Survey90 Days in TermCenter to Center (IDEA), Unweighted(10)	
18 Days in TermCenter to Center (IDEA), Unweighted10	0

Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

**Findings** 

Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments

3. [Ref. 59] <u>We noted the following exceptions regarding the number of days in</u> <u>term reported for 29 students</u>:

- a. <u>Twenty-one students were reported in the Center to Center (Vocational and</u> <u>Dual Enrollment) ridership category for a 90-day term; however, the students</u> <u>should have been reported for a 54-day term.</u>
- b. <u>A total of 6 students were incorrectly reported for days in term as follows:</u>
  - <u>Three students in the Center to Center (IDEA)</u>, <u>Unweighted ridership</u> category should have been reported for 72 days in term but were reported for 90 days in term (2 students) and 54 days in term (1 student).
  - Three students were reported for 90 days in term in the Center to Center (Vocational and Dual Enrollment), Unweighted ridership category but the students were actually IDEA students who should have been reported for 72 days in term (2 students) and 54 days in term (1 student) in the Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted ridership category.
- c. <u>Two students reported in the Center to Center (Vocational and Dual</u> <u>Enrollment) ridership category for 18-day and 89-day terms, respectively,</u> <u>should have been reported for a 90-day term</u>.

We propose the following adjustments:

a.	October 2010 Survey	
	<u>90 Days in Term</u>	
	Center to Center (Vocational and Dual Enrollment)	(12)
	<u>54 Days in Term</u>	
	Center to Center (Vocational and Dual Enrollment)	12

## Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Students Transported **Proposed Net Findings** Adjustments February 2011 Survey 90 Days in Term Center to Center (Vocational and Dual Enrollment) (9)54 Days in Term Center to Center (Vocational and Dual Enrollment) 9 0 b. October 2010 Survey 90 Days in Term Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted (2)54 Days in Term Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted (1) 72 Days in Term Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted 3 February 2011 Survey 90 Days in Term Center to Center (Vocational and Dual Enrollment) (3) 72 Days in Term Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted 2 54 Days in Term Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted 1 0 c. October 2010 Survey 18 Days in Term Center to Center (Vocational and Dual Enrollment) (1)90 Days in Term Center to Center (Vocational and Dual Enrollment) 1 February 2011 Survey 89 Days in Term Center to Center (Vocational and Dual Enrollment) (1) 90 Days in Term Center to Center (Vocational and Dual Enrollment) 0 1

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

**Findings** 

Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments

4. [Ref. 62] <u>We noted the following exceptions regarding the number of days in</u> term reported for 39 students enrolled in the Speech and Language Program:

- a. <u>Thirty-five PK students enrolled in the Speech and Language ESE Program in</u> <u>Center to Center (IDEA) ridership categories (Weighted – 14 students and</u> <u>Unweighted – 21 students) were reported for 90 days in term but should have</u> <u>been reported for 36 days in term.</u>
- b. <u>One PK student did not have a course schedule at the assigned school to</u> support the student's reporting in the Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted ridership category and was not otherwise eligible for State transportation funding.
- c. <u>One PK student in the Center to Center (IDEA)</u>, <u>Unweighted ridership</u> <u>category was reported for an 18-day term but should have been reported for a</u> <u>36-day term</u>.
- d. <u>Two PK students reported for a 90-day term (one in Center to Center [IDEA],</u> <u>Unweighted and one in the Center to Center [IDEA]</u>, Weighted) should have <u>been reported for an 18-day term and 54-day term, respectively</u>.

We propose the following adjustments:

a.	October 2010 Survey	
	90 Days in Term	
	Center to Center (IDEA), Weighted	(1)
	Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted	(4)
	<u>36 Days in Term</u>	
	Center to Center (IDEA), Weighted	1
	Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted	4

## Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Students Transported **Proposed Net Findings** Adjustments February 2011 Survey 90 Days in Term Center to Center (IDEA), Weighted (13)Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted (17)36 Days in Term Center to Center (IDEA), Weighted 13 Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted 0 17 b. February 2011 Survey 90 Days in Term Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted <u>(1</u>) (1)c. February 2011 Survey 18 Days in Term Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted (1)36 Days in Term Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted 1 0 d. February 2011 Survey 90 Days in Term Center to Center (IDEA), Weighted (1) Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted (1)18 Days in Term Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted 1 54 Days in Term Center to Center (IDEA), Weighted 0 1 5. [Ref. 65] The number of days in term for 19 students were incorrectly reported. The students were reported for varying numbers of days (90, 14, 13, or 2 days) but should have all been reported for a 12-day term. We propose the following adjustments: June 2011 Survey

<u>June 2011 Survey</u>	
<u>90 Days in Term</u>	
Two Miles or More	(1)

# Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>		Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments
<b>June 2011 Survey</b> (Continued) <u>14 Days in Term</u> Two Miles or More	(1)	
<u>13 Days in Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Unweighted IDEA (PK), Unweighted Two Miles or More	(1) (4) (11)	
<u>2 Days in Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(1)	
<u>12 Days in Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Unweighted IDEA (PK), Unweighted Two Miles or More	2 4 <u>13</u>	0

6. [Ref. 64] <u>Bus driver reports for 39 buses (affecting 43 students) were missing</u> and could not be located. This resulted in the reported number of buses in operation and students transported being overstated as follows:

- a. <u>The reported number of buses in operation was overstated by 3 buses in the</u> July 2010 survey, 8 buses in the October 2010 survey, 5 buses in the February 2011 survey, and 23 buses in the June 2011 survey for a total of 39 buses.
- b. <u>Forty-three students (4 of whom were in our sample) were reported as being</u> <u>transported on those buses; however, without the bus driver reports, the</u> <u>students could not be validated as being eligible for State transportation</u> <u>funding</u>.

We propose the following adjustments:

a.	July 2010 Survey Number of Buses in Operation		
	October 2010 Survey Number of Buses in Operation	(8)	

# Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findin</u>	<u>gs</u>				Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments
	February 2011 Survey				
	Number of Buses in Operation	(5)			
	June 2011 Survey Number of Buses in Operation	<u>(23</u> )	<u>(39</u> )		
b.	October 2010 Survey 90 Days in Term				
	Two Miles or More			(3)	
	Center to Center (Vocational and Dual I	Enrollme	ent)	(1)	
	<u>18 Days in Term</u> Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted			(1)	
	February 2011 Survey				
	<u>99 Days in Term</u>				
	Two Miles or More			(1)	
	<u>90 Days in Term</u>				
	Two Miles or More			(9)	
	<u>18 Days in Term</u>				
	Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted			(1)	
	June 2011 Survey				
	<u>13 Days in Term</u>				
	IDEA (PK), Unweighted			(2)	
	Two Miles or More			(7)	
	Center to Center (IDEA), Weighted			(8)	
	Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted			(9)	
	<u>12 Days in Term</u>				
	Two Miles or More			<u>(1</u> )	(43)
7.	[Ref. 52] We noted that 74 of our sampl				
drivers	reports as riding on the buses assigned of	<u>luring th</u>	e reporting	survey periods. We	
<u>also no</u>	ted the following for 16 of those students	<u>.</u>			

Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

## **Findings**

Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments

- a. <u>The IEPs for two students reported in the IDEA (K-12)</u>, Weighted ridership category did not authorize weighted services.
- <u>The IEP for one student reported in the IDEA (K-12), Unweighted ridership</u> category, who was enrolled in the Specific Learning Disabilities ESE Program, did not require specialized transportation services.
- c. <u>Seven students (one student reported in the IDEA (K-12), Unweighted</u> ridership category and six students reported in the Hazardous Walking ridership category) lived more than two miles from their assigned schools and should have been reported in the Two Miles or More ridership category.
- d. <u>Two students reported in the Two Miles or More ridership category actually</u> <u>lived less than two miles from their assigned school and were not eligible for</u> <u>State transportation funding.</u>
- e. <u>Three students reported in the Center to Center (IDEA)</u>, <u>Unweighted ridership</u> <u>category were not actually transported to another center and were not otherwise</u> <u>eligible for State transportation funding</u>.
- f. <u>One student reported in the Center to Center (IDEA)</u>, <u>Unweighted ridership</u> <u>category was reported for a 90-day term but actually was transported only for a</u> <u>54-day term.</u>

We propose the following adjustments:

July 2010 Survey

5 Days in Term	
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(1)
Two Miles or More	(1)

## Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Findings		Students Transported Proposed Net <u>Adjustments</u>
<u>r munigs</u>		<u>- Adjustitients</u>
October 2010 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(2)	
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(3)	
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	(1)	
Teenage Parents and Infants	(6)	
Hazardous Walking	(11)	
Two Miles or More	(8)	
72 Days in Term		
Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted	(1)	
<u>18 Days in Term</u>		
Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted	(1)	
February 2011 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(2)	
IDEA (PK), Weighted	(1)	
Teenage Parents and Infants	(2)	
Hazardous Walking	(15)	
Two Miles or More	(12)	
Center to Center (Vocational and Dual Enrollment)	(5)	
<u>18 Davs in Term</u>		
Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted	<u>(2</u> )	(74)
Senter to Senter (IDEA), Shweighted	<u>(</u> 2)	
8. [Ref. 53/66] Fifteen students [10 students were in our sample] (5 students	nts in the	
July 2010 survey and 10 students in the June 2011 survey) were not enrolled	<u>l in their</u>	
assigned schools during the reporting surveys. We propose the following adjust	ments:	
Def 52		
<u>Ref. 53</u> July 2010 Survey		
<u>5 Davs in Term</u>		
<u>5 Days in Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(1)	
$T = M^{2}$	(1)	

Two Miles or More (4)

## Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>		Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments
Ref. 53 (Continued)		
June 2011 Survey		
12 Days in Term		
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(1)	
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	(1)	
Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted	<u>(1</u> )	(8)
<u>Ref. 66</u>		
June 2011 Survey		
<u>13 Days in Term</u>		
Center to Center (IDEA), Weighted	(3)	
Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted	<u>(4</u> )	(7)
9. [Ref. 55] We determined that 34 students in our sample (24 students rep	orted in	
the IDEA [K-12], Unweighted ridership category and 10 students reported	in the	
Hazardous Walking ridership category) actually lived over two miles from sch	ool and	
should have been reported in the Two Miles or More ridership category. We		
	<u>510p000</u>	
the following adjustments:		
July 2010 Survey		
<u>5 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(2)	
Two Miles or More	2	
October 2010 Survey		
90 Days in Term		
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(5)	
Hazardous Walking	(8)	
Two Miles or More	13	
February 2011 Survey		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
	(0)	

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

(8)

(2)

10

IDEA (K-12), Unweighted

Hazardous Walking

Two Miles or More

## Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Findings	Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments		
June 2011 Survey			
<u>12 Days in Term</u>			
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted (9)			
Two Miles or More <u>9</u>	0		
10. [Ref. 56] Nine students in our sample reported in IDEA ridership categories			
were not enrolled in Exceptional education programs and were not otherwise eligible for			
State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustments:			
<u>October 2010 Survey</u> 90 Days in Term			
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted (2)			
<u>February 2011 Survey</u>			
<u>90 Days in Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Weighted (1)			
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted (5)			
IDEA (PK), Unweighted (1)	(9)		
11. [Ref. 57] We determined that 13 students in our sample reported in the Two	<u>.</u>		
Miles or More ridership category actually lived less than two miles from school and were			
not eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustments:			
not engible for state transportation rending. We propose the following adjustments.			
July 2010 Survey			
<u>5 Days in Term</u> Two Miles or More (8)			
Two Miles or More (8)			
October 2010 Survey			
<u>90 Days in Term</u>			
Two Miles or More (2)			
February 2011 Survey			
<u>12 Days in Term</u>			
Two Miles or More (3)	(13)		

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments

## **Findings**

12. [Ref. 58] <u>We noted the following exceptions for 92 students (one student was in our sample)</u>:

- a. <u>Thirty-five PK students were enrolled in the District's Voluntary</u> <u>Prekindergarten (VPK) Program and were not eligible for State transportation</u> <u>funding</u>.
- b. Fourteen students reported in PK student ridership categories were not actually in a PK grade-level but were eligible for other ridership categories, as follows: 6 students were eligible for reporting in the IDEA (K-12), Weighted ridership category and 8 students were eligible for reporting in the Two Miles or More ridership category.
- c. <u>Forty-three PK students were reported in non-PK grade-level ridership categories but were actually in the PK grade-level; thus, the students were eligible for reporting in other ridership categories as follows: 6 students in the IDEA (PK), Weighted ridership category, 36 students in the IDEA (PK), Unweighted ridership category, and 1 student in the Teenage Parents and Infants ridership category.</u>

We propose the following adjustments:

a.	October 2010 Survey		
	<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
	Hazardous Walking	(1)	
	Two Miles or More	(28)	
	<u>February 2011 Survey</u>		
	<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
	Two Miles or More	<u>(6</u> )	(35)

## Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Findings	Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments
b. July 2010 Survey5 Days in TermIDEA (K-12), WeightedIDEA (PK), WeightedIDEA (PK), UnweightedIDEA (PK), UnweightedTwo Miles or More2	
October 2010 Survey90 Days in TermIDEA (K-12), Weighted1DEA (PK), Weighted1DEA (PK), Weighted1DEA (PK), Unweighted1DEA (PK), Unweighted2	
February 2011 Survey90 Days in TermIDEA (K-12), Weighted1IDEA (PK), Weighted(2)IDEA (PK), Unweighted(1)Two Miles or More2	
June 2011 Survey12 Days in TermIDEA (K-12), UnweightedIDEA (PK), WeightedIDEA (PK), UnweightedIDEA (PK), UnweightedTwo Miles or More2	0
c. July 2010 Survey <u>5 Days in Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Weighted (1) IDEA (PK), Weighted 1	
October 2010 Survey90 Days in TermIDEA (K-12), WeightedIDEA (K-12), UnweightedIDEA (PK), WeightedIDEA (PK), Weighted3IDEA (PK), Unweighted22Teenage Parents and Infants1Two Miles or More(22)	

# Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Findings	Students Transported Proposed Net <u>Adjustments</u>		
<u>February 2011 Survey</u> <u>90 Davs in Term</u>			
IDEA (K-12), Weighted (1	)		
IDEA (PK), Weighted	-		
IDEA (PK), Unweighted 11			
Two Miles or More (11	)		
June 2011 Survey			
<u>12 Davs in Term</u>			
IDEA (K-12), Weighted (2	2)		
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted			
IDEA (PK), Weighted 1			
IDEA (PK), Unweighted			
Two Miles or More	<u>)</u> 0		
13. [Ref. 60] Eight students (one was in our sample) reported in Center to Center	<u>21</u>		
ridership categories were misclassified as follows: (a) seven ESE students were reporte	<u>d</u>		
in the Center to Center (Vocational and Dual Enrollment) ridership category but th	<u>e</u>		
students were IDEA students and should have been reported in the Center to Center	<u>er</u>		
(IDEA), Unweighted ridership category, and (b) one student was reported in the Center	er		
to Center (IDEA), Unweighted ridership category but was not an IDEA studen	<u>t;</u>		
however, the student was eligible to be reported in the Center to Center (Vocational an	<u>d</u>		
Dual Enrollment) ridership category. We propose the following adjustments:			
October 2010 Survey 90 Days in Term			
Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted			
Center to Center (Vocational and Dual Enrollment) (2	2)		
90 Days in Term			
Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted (1			
Center to Center (Vocational and Dual Enrollment) 1			

Students Transported Proposed Net

# **<u>SCHEDULE G</u>** (Continued)

## Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

<u>Findings</u>	Proposed Net Adjustments
February 2011 Survey90 Days in TermCenter to Center (IDEA), Unweighted5Center to Center (Vocational and Dual Enrollment)(5)	0
14. [Ref. 61] We determined for 29 students (3 were in our sample) reported in	
Center to Center ridership categories that the students were not being transported from	
one center to another center and were not otherwise eligible for State transportation	
funding. We propose the following adjustments:	
October 2010 Survey90 Days in TermCenter to Center (IDEA), Unweighted(1)Center to Center (Vocational and Dual Enrollment)(5)February 2011 Survey90 Days in TermCenter to Center (IDEA), Weighted(2)Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted(4)Center to Center (Vocational and Dual Enrollment)(4)18 Days in TermCenter to Center (IDEA), Unweighted(13)	(29)
15. [Ref. 63] We examined the reported ridership for all surveys as part of our	
general tests and noted that 2,380 students reported for State transportation funding did not have a matching demographic record in the State FTE database. We presented this information to transportation management who were unable to account for these student reportings. Accordingly, we propose the following adjustments:	

July 2010 Survey	
44 Days in Term	
Two Miles or More	

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this schedule.

(1)

## Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Findings		Students Transported Proposed Net <u>Adjustments</u>
July 2010 Survey (Continued)		
4 Days in Term		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(21)	
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(3)	
IDEA (PK), Weighted	(6)	
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	(2)	
Teenage Parents and Infants Two Miles or More	$\begin{pmatrix} 6 \\ (2(4)) \end{pmatrix}$	
I WO MILES OF MORE	(364)	
October 2010 Survey		
<u>90 Davs in Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(8)	
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted	(3)	
IDEA (PK), Weighted	(8)	
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	(4)	
Teenage Parents and Infants	(10)	
Hazardous Walking	(11)	
Two Miles or More	(917)	
February 2011 Survey		
<u>98 Davs in Term</u>		
Two Miles or More	(1)	
90 Days in Term		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(1)	
IDEA (PK), Weighted	(3)	
IDEA (PK), Unweighted	(1)	
Teenage Parents and Infants	(1)	
Two Miles or More	(245)	
Center to Center (IDEA), Unweighted	(1)	
Center to Center (Vocational and Dual Enrollment)	(5)	
June 2011 Survey		
<u>90 Days in Term</u>		
IDEA (K-12), Weighted	(2)	

#### Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Students Transported **Proposed Net Findings** Adjustments June 2011 Survey (Continued) 12 Days in Term IDEA (K-12), Weighted (94)IDEA (K-12), Unweighted (11)IDEA (PK), Weighted (39)IDEA (PK), Unweighted (15)Teenage Parents and Infants (8)Two Miles or More (589)(2,380)16. [Ref. 67] The District was unable to provide documentation to support the reporting of three students in our sample (two infants and one parent) in the Teenage Parents and Infants ridership category. However, we noted that the parent was eligible for reporting in the Two Miles or More ridership category and the infants were not otherwise eligible for State transportation funding. We propose the following adjustments: October 2010 Survey 90 Days in Term Teenage Parents and Infants (1) February 2011 Survey 90 Days in Term Teenage Parents and Infants (1) Two Miles or More June 2011 Survey 12 Days in Term Teenage Parents and Infants (2)<u>(1</u>) 17. [Ref. 68] We noted the following exceptions for 18 students in our sample involving their IEPs and reported ridership categories:

Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

**Findings** 

Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments

0

- a. <u>The IEPs for 15 students reported in the IDEA (K-12)</u>, Weighted ridership category did not indicate that the students met at least one of the five criteria for IDEA-weighted classification. However, we noted 14 of the 15 students were eligible for reporting in the Two Miles or More ridership category and 1 student was eligible for reporting in the IDEA (K-12), Unweighted ridership category.
- b. <u>The IEPs for 3 students enrolled in Speech and Language or Specific Learning</u> <u>Disabilities Programs and reported in the IDEA (K-12), Unweighted ridership</u> <u>category did not require specialized transportation services.</u> The students were <u>not otherwise eligible for State transportation funding</u>.

We propose the following adjustments:

a.	July 2010 Survey <u>5 Days in Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Weighted Two Miles or More	(2) 2
	October 2010 Survey 90 Days in Term IDEA (K-12), Weighted IDEA (K-12), Unweighted Two Miles or More	(6) 1 5
	<u>February 2011 Survey</u> <u>90 Days in Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Weighted Two Miles or More	(3) 3
	June 2011 Survey <u>12 Days in Term</u> IDEA (K-12), Weighted Two Miles or More	(4) <u>4</u>

## Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation **FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Findings	Students Transported Proposed Net Adjustments
b. October 2010 Survey	
90 Days in Term IDEA (K-12), Unweighted (2)	
<u>February 2011 Survey</u> 90 Days in Term	
IDEA (K-12), Unweighted (1)	(3)
18. [Ref. 69] One student reported in the IDEA (K-12), Weighted ridership	
category was transported using a private passenger vehicle; consequently, the student	
was ineligible to be reported in an IDEA-weighted ridership category but was eligible for	
reporting in the Two Miles or More ridership category. We propose the following	
<u>adjustment</u> :	
February 2011 Survey90 Days in TermIDEA (K-12), WeightedTwo Miles or More1	0
Proposed Net Adjustment	<u>(2,604</u> )

## SCHEDULE H

## Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REGULATORY CITATIONS**

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

## Recommendations

We recommend that management exercise more care and take corrective action, as appropriate, to ensure that: (1) the number of buses used to transport students is accurately reported; (2) only those students who are indicated as riding on the bus drivers' report of their assigned bus should be reported for State transportation funding; (3) transported students are reported for the correct ridership classification and for the correct number of days in term, particularly with regard for students attending other schools and being transported by shuttles to those schools for Gifted classes or dual enrolled courses; (4) bus driver reports are available, legible, and maintained in readily-accessible files; (5) only those students who are documented as enrolled in school during the survey week concerned and transported by the District at least one time during the 11-day survey window are reported for State transportation funding; (6) the distance from home to school is verified prior to students being reported and students are reported with the correct bus transporting them to their assigned school of enrollment; (7) students are appropriately classified as IDEA students in need of transportation as supported by the students' IEPs; (8) students reported in IDEA-weighted classifications are appropriately documented as meeting one of the five criteria and as noted on the student's IEP; (9) center-to-center students are properly reported based on their IDEA or non-IDEA status and are reported for only those number of days that the students were transported during the reporting survey; (10) students transported in private passenger cars are reported in the correct ridership category; (11) only PK students with disabilities or PK children of students enrolled in a Teenage Parents and Infants Program who are eligible for State transportation funding are reported and proper documentation is maintained to support this reporting; and (12) transportation personnel review the District database for completeness and verify that all students have matching demographics to support that the students are properly enrolled and otherwise eligible for State transportation.

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

## **Regulatory Citations**

Chapter 1006, Part I, E., F.S. .....Transportation of Public K-12 Students Section 1011.68, F.S. .....Funds for Student Transportation Chapter 6A-3, F.A.C. .....Transportation *Student Transportation General Instructions 2010-11* 

Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation **NOTES TO SCHEDULES** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

## NOTE A – SUMMARY

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

## 1. <u>Student Eligibility</u>

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

## 2. <u>Transportation in Orange County</u>

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011, the District received approximately \$27 million for student transportation as part of the State funding through FEFP. The District's transportation reporting by survey was as follows:

Survey	Number of	Number of
<u>Period</u>	Vehicles	<u>Students</u>
July 2010	276	2,580
October 2010	945	67,727
February 2011	936	72,446
June 2011	<u>348</u>	3,587
Total	<u>2,505</u>	<u>146,340</u>

## 3. <u>Statutes and Rules</u>

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

Orange County District School Board Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Student Transportation **NOTES TO SCHEDULES** For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

## NOTE B – SAMPLING

Our examination procedures provided for the selection of samples of buses and students using judgmental methods for testing the number of students transported as reported to the Department of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011. Our sampling process was designed to facilitate the performance of appropriate examination procedures to test the District's compliance with State requirements governing students transported.

#### EXHIBIT A MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE



# **Orange County Public Schools**

445 West Amelia Street • Orlando, FL 32801-1129 • Phone 407.317.3200 • www.ocps.net

June 4, 2012

Mr. David W. Martin, CPA Auditor General, State of Florida 111 West Madison Street Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1450

Dear Mr. Martin:

We have reviewed each of the findings reported in the audit draft of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students and Student Transportation for the Orange County Public Schools (OCPS) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011. This response is pursuant to the provisions of Section 11.45(7) (d), Florida Statutes.

Although each item is addressed briefly below, OCPS finds no basis for disagreement with the audit findings. District and school staff has been informed of the rules, regulations and record maintenance associated with the FTE process. OCPS will continue to work toward correction of all errors and deficiencies.

Item A: Teachers-The Certification Department will initiate additional procedures to monitor teachers who may be assigned to teach subjects for which they are not certified, specifically ESE, ELL, and OJT, and will notify parents of the teachers' out of field status.

Items B, C, D, and E: Students- Student Attendance Records will be maintained in DOE report formats; the FTE Calculator will be adjusted to correctly report the FTE earned and the instructional time for PK-3 students. Regarding record maintenance, OCPS believes these deficiencies to be isolated instances. OCPS does not believe that the problem is systemic, but rather individual student file errors. School personnel are routinely informed regarding required records and supporting documentation through training and district monitoring. OCPS will continue to stress the importance of this documentation to all parties.

Items F, G, and H: Transportation- OCPS will take corrective action to ensure that the correct number of buses is reported; only those students who are indicated as riding on the bus drivers' report are reported for State transportation funding; transported students are reported for the correct ridership classification and the correct number of days in term; bus driver reports are legible and accessible; and transportation personnel will review the District database for completeness and will verify all student data for students eligible for State transportation. OCPS has contracted for a review of the current process to identify weaknesses and determine possible solutions. The results of this process will enable OCPS to take corrective action.

OCPS would like to commend your staff for their professional manner during the audit. OCPS would also like to thank your staff for assisting and advising our staff on matters of compliance.

Barbara M. Jenkin Superintendent

"The Orange County School Board is an equal opportunity agency."