

## MINIMUM SCHOOL PROGRAM AUDIT FINDINGS



## Utah Constitutional Authority

### Article VII, Section 15

- Perform financial post audits of public accounts
  - Except as otherwise provided by the Utah Constitution
- Perform other duties as provided by statute



### Mission Statement

We provide Utah taxpayers and government officials with an <u>independent assessment</u> of financial operation, statutory compliance, and performance management for state and local government.

### Objectives

- Test the FY12 Minimum School Program (MSP) fund allocations for accuracy and compliance
- Determine whether the FY14 MSP budget projections were reasonable

### Audit Team

- Joe Christensen –Audit Director
- Janica Gines Audit Supervisor
- Jolene Cooley Audit Senior (In-Charge)
- Stacey Whipple
- Kimberlee Beck
- Nathan Harrison

### MSP Audit

We reviewed the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) MSP FY12 final report statutory distribution formulas and allocations to school districts and charter schools



## Programs Tested for Compliance

- Grades K-12
- Voted & Board Leeway
- Special Education
- Concurrent Enrollment
- Critical Languages & Dual Immersion

## Programs Tested for Compliance

- Educator Salary Adjustments
- Beverly Taylor Sorenson Elementary Arts
- Early Intervention
- Pilot Assessment

## Budget Projections Reviewed

- Grades K-12
- Voted & Board Leeway
- Special Education
- Career & Technical Education
- Class Size Reduction

### Audit Findings

- Noncompliance of Allocation to Charter Schools
- 2. Budget Projection Not Based on Preceding Year's Appropriation
- 3. Inadequate Guidance for Allocation and Unsupported Amount Used in Calculation
- 4. Inconsistency Between Data Used and Source Documents

Charter school allocations for the Grades K-12 program were not in compliance with *Utah Code* for either the FY12 actual final allocation or the FY14 budget projection

- Allocations to charter schools should use the same method as school districts
  - Prior year average daily membership plus growth
- Charter school allocations were based on the higher of prior year average daily membership or current year head count

#### Cause:

- Allocation method was originally used when prior year charter school data was unavailable
- Method was not changed when data became available

### **Results:**

- Sample schools recalculated received a 4.1% over allocation in FY12
- Projecting to all charter schools would estimate a \$4,991,097 over allocation
- Similar over allocation would be in the FY14 MSP budget projection

### Recommendations:

- USOE allocate funding to charter schools in accordance with the law
- USOE make recommendations to change the law, if they determine that an alternative funding formula is necessary or desired

# 2. Budget Projection Not Based on Preceding Year's Appropriation

Each year the USOE has used incomplete data in estimating the Career & Technical Education Add-On program Budget

# 2. Budget Projection Not Based on Preceding Year's Appropriation

#### **Result:**

 FY14 budget projection was understated by \$282,943 for the Career & Technical Education Add-On program

# 2. Budget Projection Not Based on Preceding Year's Appropriation

### Recommendation:

 USOE prepare the budget request for the Career & Technical Education Add-On program based on the actual amount appropriated for the program in the preceding fiscal year

## 3. Inadequate Guidance for Allocation

No formal USOE rules or guidance in law for allocating Special Education Self-Contained Program



## 3. Inadequate Guidance for Allocation

### Result:

- Unable to provide support for how some calculations were determined
- Unable to assure that the allocation was appropriate

## 3. Inadequate Guidance for Allocation

### Recommendation:

- USOE write and adopt a rule to govern how to allocate funds for the Special Education Self-Contained Program
- USOE include instructions on how to handle charter schools with no established history

## 4. Inconsistency Between Data Used and Source Documents

- Voted & Board Leeway FY14 Projection
  - Projections based on data that did not agree to the source data
  - While differences were minor, larger differences could have occurred

# 4. Inconsistency Between Data Used and Source Documents

#### Cause:

- Apparent misunderstanding of the source data being used
- Complicated manner used to compile estimated tax increment amounts
- Lack of documentation as to what source data is used

# 4. Inconsistency Between Data Used and Source Documents

### Recommendation:

- USOE ensure they understand the data being used in their calculation
- USOE document their data source so it can be re-referenced or updated as necessary

## auditor.utah.gov



