

TEHAMA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Report of Review

AUDIT RESOLUTION PROCESS

Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12 and FY 2012-13



BETTY T. YEE
California State Controller

February 2015



BETTY T. YEE
California State Controller

February 2, 2015

Larry P. Champion
County Superintendent of Schools
Tehama County Department of Education
1135 Lincoln Street
Red Bluff, CA 96080

Dear Mr. Champion:

The State Controller's Office reviewed the Tehama County Department of Education's (DOE) audit resolution process for local education agency exceptions noted in the annual audit reports. The review covered fiscal year (FY) 2011-12 and FY 2012-13.

Our review found that the Tehama DOE followed its audit resolution process for FY 2011-12 and FY 2012-13. As a result, the Tehama DOE was in compliance with California Education Code section 41020.

If you have any questions, please contact Carolyn Baez, Chief, Financial Audits Bureau, at (916) 322-7656.

Sincerely,

Original signed by

JEFFREY V. BROWNFIELD, CPA
Chief, Division of Audits

JVB/sk

cc: Debbie Towne, Director of Business Services
Tehama County Department of Education
Peter Foggiano, Director
School Fiscal Services Division
California Department of Education
Arlene Matsuura, Education Fiscal Services Consultant
School Fiscal Services Division
California Department of Education
Dan Troy, Principal Program Budget Analyst
Education Systems, California Department of Finance

Contents

Review Report

| | |
|--|---|
| Summary | 1 |
| Background | 1 |
| Objective, Scope, and Methodology | 2 |
| Conclusion | 3 |
| Views of Responsible Officials | 3 |
| Restricted Use | 3 |

Review Report

Summary

The State Controller's Office (SCO) reviewed the Tehama County Department of Education's (DOE) audit resolution process for local education agency (LEA) exceptions noted in the annual audit reports for fiscal year (FY) 2011-12 and FY 2012-13. Our review found that the Tehama DOE followed its audit resolution process for FY 2011-12 and FY 2012-13.

Background

California Education Code section 41020(n) requires the State Controller to annually select a sampling of county superintendents of schools to perform a follow-up review of the audit resolution process. Results of these reviews are reported to the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) and the county superintendents of the schools that were reviewed.

Furthermore, California Education Code section 41020(n) states that the State Controller shall require auditors to categorize audit exceptions in the audit report in such a manner that both the county superintendent of schools and the SPI can discern which exceptions they are responsible for ensuring that LEAs correct.

The Tehama DOE provides coordination of educational programs and professional and financial supervision for 17 LEAs under its direct jurisdiction. In addition, the county superintendent of schools maintains special schools and programs countywide independent of the local education agencies.

County superintendents of schools are required to do the following:

- Review, for each of their school districts, the audit exceptions relating to attendance, inventory of equipment, internal control, and any miscellaneous items, and determine whether the findings have been corrected or an acceptable plan of correction has been developed (California Education Code section 41020(i)(1));
- Review audit exceptions related to instructional materials program funds, teacher misassignments, and school accountability report cards. The county superintendents must also determine whether the exceptions have been corrected or an acceptable plan of correction has been developed (California Education Code section 41020(i)(2));
- Review audit exceptions related to attendance exceptions or issues that shall include, but are not limited to, those related to revenue limits, adult education, and independent study (California Education Code section 41020(j)(1));
- Notify the LEA and request the governing board of the LEA to provide to the county superintendent of schools a description of the correction or plan of correction by March 15 (California Education Code section 41020(j)(2));

- Review the description of the correction or plan of correction and determine its adequacy and, if its response was not adequate, require the LEA to resubmit a portion of its response (California Education Code section 41020(j)(3)); and
- By May 15, certify to the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) and the SCO that the county has reviewed all applicable exceptions, and state that all exceptions have been corrected or an acceptable plan for correction has been submitted by the LEA to the county superintendent, except as noted in the certification. In addition, identify by LEA any attendance-related exceptions or exceptions involving state funds, and require the LEA to submit the appropriate reporting forms to the SPI for processing (California Education Code section 41020(k));
- Review LEAs' unresolved prior year audit exceptions when the California Department of Education defers to the county (California Education Code section 41020(l)); and
- Adjust subsequent local property tax requirements to correct audit exceptions relating to LEA tax rates and tax revenues (California Education Code section 41020(o)).

Objective, Scope, and Methodology

Our review was conducted under the authority of California Education Code section 41020(n). Our review scope was limited to determining whether or not the Tehama DOE followed its audit resolution process in resolving audit exceptions. Our review did not include an evaluation of the sufficiency of the action taken by the LEA and the Tehama DOE to address each exception, nor did it assess the degree to which each exception was addressed. Specifically, our review was limited to the following procedures.

- Verifying that the Tehama DOE addressed all attendance, inventory of equipment, internal control, and miscellaneous exceptions. In addition, we verified whether the Tehama DOE addressed any findings on instructional materials program funds, teacher misassignments, and school accountability report cards. However, with respect to exceptions based on sample items, our review did not include a determination of whether or not the exception results were properly quantified and addressed at a districtwide or countywide level;
- Verifying whether the Tehama DOE notified LEAs that they must submit completed corrective action forms to the Tehama DOE by March 15, 2013, and March 15, 2014, for FY 2011-12 and FY 2012-13, respectively. Our review did not include an assessment of the LEAs' progress with respect to taking corrective action;
- Verifying whether the Tehama DOE required the LEAs to submit the appropriate reporting forms to the SPI for any attendance-related exceptions that affect state funding;

- Reviewing the letters of certification due on May 15, 2013, and May 15, 2014, that the Tehama DOE sent to the SPI and the SCO with respect to any resolved and unresolved audit exceptions;
- Verifying whether the Tehama DOE followed up with unresolved prior year audit exceptions the SPI required the Tehama DOE to conduct; and
- Verifying whether the Tehama DOE adjusted subsequent local property tax requirements to correct audit exceptions related to LEA tax rates and tax revenues.

Conclusion

Our review found that the Tehama DOE followed its audit resolution process for FY 2011-12 and FY 2012-13. As a result, the Tehama DOE was in compliance with California Education Code section 41020 for FY 2011-12 and FY 2012-13. We made no additional determination regarding the Tehama DOE's audit resolution process beyond the scope of the review outlined above.

**Views of
Responsible
Officials**

We discussed our conclusion with Debbie Towne, Director of Business Services, at an exit conference held on January 7, 2015. Ms. Towne generally agreed with the conclusion and authorized issuance of the final report.

Restricted Use

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Tehama DOE, the California Department of Education, the California Department of Finance, and the SCO; it is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties. This restriction is not meant to limit distribution of this report, which is a matter of public record.

Original signed by

JEFFREY V. BROWNFIELD, CPA
Chief, Division of Audits

February 2, 2015

**State Controller's Office
Division of Audits
Post Office Box 942850
Sacramento, CA 94250-5874**

<http://www.sco.ca.gov>