

**THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT** / THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK / ALBANY, NY12234

| то:               | Audits/Budget and Finance Committee                    |
|-------------------|--|
| FROM:             | Sharon Cates-Williams Noven Later-Williams             |
| SUBJECT:          | Board of Regents Oversight of Financial Accountability |
| DATE:             | February 3, 2014                                       |
| AUTHORIZATION(S): | Mr 75. 95 %.   |
|                   | SUMMARY  |

## **Issues for Discussion**

The following topics will be discussed with the Members of the Committee on Audits/Budget and Finance:

- 1. Completed Audits including the Report of the Internal Audit Workgroup. (Attachments I & II)
- 2. Report on Corrective Action Plans received from previously highlighted audits. (Attachment III)

## Reason(s) for Consideration

Update on Activities.

## **Proposed Handling**

Discussion and Guidance.

## Procedural History

The information is provided to assist the Committee in carrying out its oversight responsibilities.

## **Background Information**

1. <u>Completed Audits including the Report of the Internal Audit Workgroup</u> The Committee is being presented with 14 audits this month. (Attachments I & II) Audits are provided as follows:

Office of Audit Services

Rome City School District Utica City School District

## Office of the State Comptroller

Allegany-Limestone Central School District Andes Central School District Canton Central School District Cassadaga Valley Central School District Charlotte Valley Central School District Hampton Bays Union Free School District Harpursville Central School District Newfield Central School District Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School South Colonie Central School District Wainscott Common School District

New York City Office of the Comptroller

Final Audit Report on the New York City Department of Education's Payments to Navigant Consulting, Inc.

2. <u>Report on Corrective Action Plans Received from Previously Highlighted Audits</u> (Attachment III)

## **Recommendation**

No action required for audit initiatives and presentation of audits.

## **Timetable for Implementation**

N/A

The following materials are attached:

- Report of the Internal Audit Workgroup (Attachment I)
- Summary of Audit Findings Including Audit Abstracts (Attachment II)
- Report on Corrective Action Plans Received from Previously Highlighted Audits
  (Attachment III)

### Attachment I

#### Regents Committee on Audits/Budget and Finance February 2014 Review of Audits Presented Department's Internal Audit Workgroup

#### Newly Presented Audits

We reviewed the 14 audits that are being presented to the Committee this month. Two of the audits were issued by the Office of Audit Services (OAS), eleven were issued by the Office of the State Comptroller (OSC) and one by the New York City Office of the Comptroller. Twelve audits were of school districts, one was of a charter school and one of a contractor.

The findings were in the areas of budgeting, financial reporting, payroll, claims processing, procurement, Race to the Top Grant and capital assets.

The Department has issued letters to the school district auditees, reminding them of the requirement to submit corrective action plans to the Department and OSC within 90 days of their receipt of the audit report.

The Department's Internal Audit Workgroup reviewed all the audits and *do not believe there are any specific audits to bring to the Committee's attention*. However, of the eight school district audits that focused on financial condition/management and reserve funds, seven showed the districts are not properly managing fund balance or reserve funds resulting in unexpended surplus funds exceeding the statutory limit of four percent and/or maintaining excessive level of reserve funds. Such findings have become commonplace as districts endeavor to remain fiscally solvent.

The OSC recently released a public fiscal stress monitoring system that will identify school districts that are in fiscal stress as well as those showing susceptibility to fiscal stress. Such monitoring of the fiscal health of school districts should allow for early actions to prevent these entities from ending up in severe fiscal stress.

# February Regents Audits/Budget and Finance Committee Meeting Summary of Audit Findings

| Audit                                       | Procurement | Capital Assets | Claims<br>Processing | Payroll | Financial<br>Reporting | Budgeting | Other |
|---|-------------|----------------|----------------------|---------|------------------------|-----------|-------|
| Office of Audit Services                    |             |                |                      |         |                        |           |       |
| * Rome City School District (footnote 1)    |             |                |                      |         |                        |           |       |
| ** Utica City School District (footnote 1)  |             |                |                      |         |                        |           |       |
| Office of the State Comptroller             |             |                |                      |         |                        |           |       |
| Allegany-Limestone Central School District  |             |                |                      |         |                        |           |       |
| Andes Central School District               |             |                |                      |         |                        |           |       |
| Canton Central School District              |             |                |                      |         |                        |           |       |
| Cassadaga Valley Central School District    |             |                |                      |         |                        |           |       |
| Charlotte Valley Central School District    |             |                |                      |         |                        |           |       |
| Hampton Bays Union Free School District     |             |                |                      |         |                        |           |       |
| Harpursville Central School District        |             |                |                      |         |                        |           |       |
| Newfield Central School District            |             |                |                      |         |                        |           |       |
| Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School |             |                |                      |         |                        |           |       |
| South Colonie Central School District       |             |                |                      |         |                        |           |       |
| Wainscott Common School District            |             |                |                      |         |                        |           |       |
| New York City Office of the Comptroller     |             |                |                      |         |                        |           |       |
| ** New York City Department of Education    |             |                |                      |         |                        |           |       |
| (footnote 2)                                |             |                |                      |         |                        |           |       |

|               | r |   |   |   |   | r | r |
|---------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| February 2014 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 1 |

1 Race to the Top (RTTT) Grant

2 Contractor's adherence to agreement

\*\* No recommendations

The Department's Internal Audit Workgroup met to review each of the audits being presented this month. Letters will be sent to all of the school district auditees reminding them of the requirement to submit a corrective action plan.

| Office of Audit Services |   |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Audit                    | Major Finding(s)  | Recommendation/Response                                  |  |  |  |
| Rome City School         | \$1,918 adjustment  | 5 recommendations  |  |  |  |
| District                 |   |  |  |  |  |
| American Recovery and    | The audit found that the District paid stipends to employees to   | The recommendations focused on                           |  |  |  |
| Reinvestment Act         | attend a certain RTTT training event of which four were paid  | strengthening the policies and                           |  |  |  |
| (ARRA) Race to the Top   | but did not actually attend. One of the four did not attend any   | procedures pertaining to proper                          |  |  |  |
| (RTTT) Grant - July 1,   | training and three went to a non-RTTT training event. The   | reporting of expenditures, and                           |  |  |  |
| 2012 through June 30,    | total amount paid to these four individuals is \$1,918 and is   | timely reporting.  |  |  |  |
| 2013                     | disallowed.   |  |  |  |  |
| SD-1013-04               |   | The District agreed with the                             |  |  |  |
| 5th Judicial District    | The District submitted an FS-25 to request funds for reimbursement of expenditures incurred for the period ending March 31, 2013. However, the claim included an amount anticipated for the following month which is not allowable under RTTT awards. Department controls prevented the payment of anticipated costs and the District was only reimbursed for actual expenditures to date.<br>The District did not submit their 1512 Quarterly Reports for the periods ending December 31, 2012; March 31, 2013; and June 30, 2013. | recommendations and has<br>indicated they will implement |  |  |  |
|                          | The District reported having hired a distinguished educator to<br>work on its Network Team. However, the analysis of<br>professional salaries did not show the funding of this position.<br>Salaries were only claimed for substitutes to cover for<br>teachers attending training and for District staff to attend<br>training beyond their normal working hours.  |  |  |  |  |

| Utica City School<br>District<br>American Recovery and<br>Reinvestment Act<br>(ARRA) - Race to the<br>Top (RTTT) Grant - July<br>1, 2011 through June<br>30, 2012<br>SD-0813-02 | The District generally reported costs that are are allowable<br>and accurate in the final expenditure report. In addition, the<br>audit assessed that the District complied with pertinent federal<br>requirements. | There were no recommendations in the report.  |
|---|---|---|
| 5th Judicial District   |   |   |
|   | Office of the State Comptroller   |   |
| Audit   | Major Finding(s)  | Recommendation/Response                       |
| Allegany-Limestone  | Over the past five fiscal years, District officials added   | 6 recommendations                             |
| Central School District   | approximately \$1 million to reserves and increased the real  |   |
| Reserve Funds and   | property tax levy by approximately 26 percent. Additionally,  | The report's recommendations                  |
| Fixed Assets  | the Board failed to adopt a formalized plan for reserve funds   | focused primarily on strengthening            |
| 2013M-228<br>8th Judicial District  | that included the intent, funding levels, and use of such funds.  | policies and procedures regarding             |
| 8th Judicial District   | As of June 30, 2013, the District had more than \$2 million in a debt service reserve that District officials could not associate   | the use of reserves and movable fixed assets. |
|   | with any outstanding debt. Additionally, four of the District's   | lixeu asseis.                                 |
|   | six general fund reserves totaling approximately \$1.7 million  | District officials generally agreed           |
|   | were not supported by a plan or other documentation   | with the findings in the report, and          |
|   | validating the amount retained.   | they plan on implementing                     |
|   | 5   | corrective action.                            |
|   | While the Board adopted an asset policy, it has not updated it  |   |
|   | to reflect current District processes. The District engaged a   |   |
|   | third-party asset tracking company to account for the District's  |   |
|   | fixed assets without any formal control procedures in place for   |   |
|   | this process. The review of 50 movable assets disclosed   |   |
|   | discrepancies for 16 of them valued at more than \$11,000.  |   |
|   | The review of nine assets included on the disposed asset list   |   |
|   | disclosed that five of them valued at \$6,000 were still in use at  |   |
|   | the District.   |   |

| Andes Central School                        | District officials are not properly managing the District's fund                | 3 recommendations                    |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| District                                    | balance levels. They have appropriated funds they have not                      |                                      |
| Financial Management                        | used in four of the last five fiscal years (2008-09 to 2012-13),                | The report's recommendations         |
| 2013M-250                                   | because the District consistently spent less than what was                      | focused primarily on strengthening   |
| 6th Judicial District                       | budgeted. Although District officials used \$205,000 of                         | policies and procedures regarding    |
|   | appropriated fund balance in 2011-12, their unreserved fund                     | budgeting and the use of fund        |
|   | balance increased to almost 20 percent of the following year's                  | balance.                             |
|   | budgeted appropriations. While the 2012-13 unreserved fund                      |                                      |
|   | balance dropped slightly, it is still well above the amount                     | District officials generally agreed  |
|   | allowed by law. In addition, two reserves have excess                           | with the findings in the report, and |
|   | balances totaling \$415,000, based on their intended use.                       | they plan on implementing            |
|   | Also, during this time, real property taxes have increased from                 | corrective action.                   |
|   | \$2.5 million in 2009 to \$2.7 million in 2013, and the District                |                                      |
|   | has issued \$1.5 million in additional debt.                                    |                                      |
| Canton Central School                       | Budget-to-actual results were reviewed for fiscal years 2009-                   | 1 recommendation                     |
| District                                    | 10 through 2011-12 and found that District officials adopted                    |                                      |
| Financial Condition                         | realistic budgets and kept expenditures within budgeted                         | The report's recommendation          |
| 2013M-287                                   | appropriations. The Board reviewed budget-to-actual                             | focused primarily on strengthening   |
| 4th Judicial District                       | comparison reports throughout the year to monitor the budget                    | the policies and procedures          |
|   | and approved budget transfers at the monthly Board                              | regarding the use of fund balance    |
|   | meetings. However, the heavy reliance on appropriated fund                      | to fund operations.                  |
|   | balance as a financing source in the annual budgets has                         | District officials correct with the  |
|   | resulted in a significant reduction in the District's unexpended surplus funds. | District officials agreed with the   |
| Cassadaga Valley                            | District officials consistently overestimated expenditures in the               | findings.<br>4 recommendations       |
| Cassadaga Valley<br>Central School District | general fund by a total of \$6.3 million over the five-year period              |                                      |
| Financial Condition                         | ending June 30, 2013. Therefore, the District did not need to                   | The report's recommendations         |
| 2013M-249                                   | use the \$5.8 million of fund balance that the Board                            | focused primarily on strengthening   |
| 8th Judicial District                       | appropriated as a funding source in the general fund budgets                    | policies and procedures regarding    |
|   | for the same five-year period. Instead, the District has                        | budgeting and the use of fund        |
|   | experienced operating surpluses in the general fund for four                    | balance and reserves.                |
|   | of the last five years, totaling \$1,100,434, leading to                        |                                      |
|   | unexpended surplus fund balance exceeding the statutory                         | District officials generally agreed  |

| Charlotte Valley Central<br>School District<br>Financial Condition | limit of 4 percent of the ensuing year's operations for the last<br>two fiscal years. Also, District officials could not demonstrate<br>a planned need for more than \$876,000 in reserves.<br>District officials believed they were effectively managing the<br>District's finances. However, the Superintendent and the  | with the findings in the report, and<br>they plan on implementing<br>corrective action.<br><b>3 recommendations</b>   |
|--|--|---|
| 2013M-232<br>6th Judicial District                                 | Board did not develop reasonable budget estimates. For fiscal years ending 2007-08 through 2011-12, the Board adopted budgets that over-estimated expenditures by over \$2 million, with over-estimating the students with disabilities account comprising almost 68 percent of that variance. The District's revenue estimates were under-estimated by nearly \$723,000   | The report's recommendations<br>focused primarily on strengthening<br>policies and procedures regarding<br>budgeting and the use of fund<br>balance.                                    |
|  | for the same time period. These estimates ranged from as little as \$9,000 in 2010-11 to \$269,000 in 2011-12.<br>The Board's adopted budgets also included appropriating fund balance totaling more than \$2 million during the 2007-08 to 2011-12 fiscal years. However, only \$420,000 of this fund   | District officials stated that while<br>they did not agree with the findings<br>in the report as they are in dire<br>financial straits, they plan on<br>implementing corrective action. |
|  | balance was actually needed due to the operating surpluses<br>in 2008-09 and 2009-10 (totaling \$1,155,011). This resulted in<br>the unexpended surplus fund balance to be more than the 4<br>percent statutory limit, at 10.61 percent in 2007-08, 5.11<br>percent in 2008-09, 12.04 percent in 2009-10 and 4.05<br>percent in 2011-12. However, for the 2010-11 year, the fund<br>balance was under the threshold at 3.95 percent. |   |
| Hampton Bays Union<br>Free School District                         | Even though the claims auditor appeared to be properly auditing claims, the purchasing agent did not always formally   | 1 recommendation  |
| Claims Processing<br>2013M-333<br>10th Judicial District           | approve all purchases prior to ordering goods and services. A total of 25 claims, totaling \$154,909, were selected and reviewed to determine if purchase orders were issued prior to the ordering of the goods and services and if claims were for legitimate District purposes and audited prior to payment. Despite minor deficiencies that were discussed with District  | The report's recommendation<br>focused primarily on strengthening<br>policies and procedures regarding<br>confirming purchase orders.<br><i>District officials generally agreed</i>     |

|                         | officials, the claims tested did appear to be for proper District                                | with the recommendation and have                                  |
|-------------------------|--|---|
|                         | purposes and audited prior to payment. However, purchase   | indicated that they plan to initiate                              |
|                         | orders for 10 of the 25 claims, totaling \$50,859, were  | corrective action.  |
|                         | confirming purchase orders which were prepared after the   |   |
|                         | invoices were received from the vendor.  |   |
| Harpursville Central    | The Board and District officials did not ensure that fund  | 3 recommendations   |
| School District         | balances were reasonable. For the five-year period ending  |   |
| Financial Management    | June 30, 2013, District officials planned to use \$4.2 million of                                | The report's recommendations                                      |
| 2013M-261               | fund balance to finance District operations; however, they                                       | focused primarily on strengthening                                |
| 6th Judicial District   | only used \$1.27 million of appropriated fund balance during                                     | policies and procedures regarding                                 |
|                         | this period. As a result, the unexpended surplus funds   | budgeting and the use of fund                                     |
|                         | exceeded the statutory maximum of four percent of the  | balance.  |
|                         | ensuing year's budget during this period, ranging from 21  | The District officials gamerally                                  |
|                         | percent to 33 percent. In addition, the District has four reserve funds with excessive balances. | The District officials generally agreed with the recommendations, |
|                         |  | and have indicated that they plan to                              |
|                         |  | initiate corrective action.                                       |
| Newfield Central School | District officials did not ensure reasonable levels of fund                                      | 4 recommendations   |
| District                | balance were maintained. While their budgets included the  | 4 recommendations   |
| Financial Condition     | use of surplus and reserved fund balances to finance   | The report's recommendations                                      |
| 2013M-238               | operations, the positive variances between their budgets and                                     | focused primarily on strengthening                                |
| 6th Judicial District   | actual results never necessitated the full use of the surplus                                    | policies and procedures regarding                                 |
|                         | funds. Instead, the amount of surplus increased the District's                                   | budgeting, reporting of current                                   |
|                         | total fund balance by \$573,000 over a five-year period. Some                                    | liabilities, and the use of fund                                  |
|                         | of these surplus funds were transferred to various reserves                                      | balance.  |
|                         | resulting in three reserves having more money than is likely                                     |   |
|                         | necessary. Additionally, the District reported liabilities that                                  | District officials generally agreed                               |
|                         | were more than \$1.3 million over the actual obligations for the                                 | with the findings in the report. They                             |
|                         | same period. The adjustment of the overfunded reserves and                                       | plan on implementing corrective                                   |
|                         | correction of the overstated liabilities would increase the                                      | action, along with having   |
|                         | available fund balance by more than \$1.9 million. This would                                    | developed a five-year financial                                   |
|                         | cause the fund balance to be well over the amount allowed by                                     | plan.   |
|                         | law.   |   |

| Roosevelt Children's<br>Academy Charter<br>School<br>Selected Financial<br>Operations<br>2013M-254<br>10th Judicial District | The Board did not adopt realistic budgets or routinely monitor<br>financial operations. School officials created an expenditure<br>code entitled "building fund" and budgeted \$4.8 million in the<br>2010-11 fiscal year, \$5.2 million in 2011-12 and \$2.6 million in<br>2012-13, even though School officials had no expectation of<br>any outflow of cash for such expenses. This created the<br>appearance that there would be no net income for those<br>years. As a result, net income was understated in each of<br>those three years. Additionally, the Board is not monitoring<br>the annual budget and has not established a Budget and<br>Finance Committee as required by School by-laws. As a<br>result, the Board is unable to effectively monitor the School's<br>financial operations.   | 8 recommendations<br>The report's recommendations<br>focused primarily on strengthening<br>the policies and procedures<br>regarding budgeting,<br>reimbursement of Board<br>expenditures, and procurement.<br>School officials generally agreed<br>with the recommendations and<br>indicated they have taken, or plan<br>to take, corrective action. |
|--|--|--|
|  | The School also paid for Board member expenditures that<br>were not authorized by the School's by-laws or policy. Of<br>\$31,630 in Board expenditures, \$26,444 was not authorized.<br>These expenditures, which included undocumented credit<br>card charges as well as direct reimbursements, were for food,<br>transportation to attend regular Board meetings, lodging, and<br>charges for the Chairman's cell phone. Four Board members<br>who resided outside of New York State incurred<br>transportation costs. Additionally, the former Chairman was<br>directly reimbursed for an undocumented expenditure, and<br>alcohol was purchased at Board dinners. When Board<br>expenditures are not authorized, appropriate and/or<br>supported by itemized receipts, the School could be paying<br>unnecessary or excessive costs.<br>Finally, the Board did not always seek competition when<br>procuring goods and services, and its procurement policy<br>needs to be improved. The School paid four vendors a total of<br>\$521,197 for significant public work and purchase contracts |  |

| South Colonie Central<br>School District<br>Internal Controls over<br>Timekeeping<br>Procedures<br>2013M-298<br>3rd Judicial District | without fair competition, did not seek competitive price quotes<br>when procuring goods and services totaling \$16,028 and<br>engaged six professional service providers, paid a total of<br>\$478,264, without soliciting competition. When purchases are<br>made without using a competitive purchasing process there is<br>an increased risk that goods and services will not be<br>purchased prudently and at the best price. Further, the School<br>paid an information technology consultant \$118,182 more<br>than the agreement provided and did not have an applicable<br>agreement for paying \$25,713 for security services. Without<br>ensuring that proper agreements are in place and verifying<br>that compensation is correct, School officials are at risk of<br>paying providers more than the Board intended.<br>The District communicates payroll procedures by various<br>means, including a written payroll guide, periodic training and<br>occasional email messages. Although the District provides<br>useful information for clerks and supervisors involved in<br>reporting to the payroll office, it does not provide uniform<br>timekeeping procedures. Due to the lack of formal written<br>guidance, the school buildings and functional departments | <b>1 recommendation</b><br>The report's recommendation focused primarily on strengthening the policies and procedures regarding timekeeping. |
|---|--|--|
|   | have generally developed their own timekeeping procedures.<br>The result is a lack of uniformity in procedures which may<br>lead to confusion, errors or even timekeeping abuse.   | District officials generally agreed<br>with the recommendation and have<br>indicated that they plan to initiate<br>corrective action.        |
| Wainscott Common  | The Board needs to improve its oversight and management of   | 4 recommendations  |
| School District<br>Financial Condition  | the District's budget. Over the last five years, District officials<br>consistently underestimated revenues and over-estimated   | The report's recommendations   |
| 2013M-268   | expenditures in the Board-adopted budgets by a total of more   | focused primarily on strengthening   |
| 10th Judicial District  | than \$1.7 million. Although the Board appropriated  | the policies and procedures  |
|   | unexpended surplus funds each year, for a five-year total exceeding \$3.1 million, to help finance the ensuing year's operations, the District actually used less than \$1.9 million of  | regarding financial reporting and the use of fund balance.   |
|   | the appropriated fund balance during this period. As a result,   | District officials generally agreed  |

|                         | by the 2011-12 fiscal year, the District accumulated<br>unexpended surplus fund balance equivalent to 68 percent of<br>the ensuing year's budget, or 17 times the amount allowed by<br>statute. For the same time period, the District also increased<br>the real property tax levy by more than \$325,000. In addition,<br>the District has not developed a multiyear financial plan that<br>addresses the District's long-term operational needs or the<br>use of unexpended surplus fund balance in a manner that<br>benefits the District taxpayers. | with the recommendations and plan<br>on initiating corrective action. |   |
|-------------------------|--|---|---|
|                         | New York City Office of the Comptroller  |   |   |
| Audit                   | Major Finding(s)   | Recommendation/Response   |   |
| New York City           | Navigant Consulting, Inc. (Navigant) is a court appointed  | •   | 0 |
| Department of           | independent auditor whose assigned responsibility is to  |   |   |
| Education               | calculate the timely implemented court orders related to the   |   |   |
| Final Audit Report on   | New York City Department of Education's (DOE) provision of   |   |   |
| the New York City       | special education services. The objective of the audit is to   |   |   |
| Department of           | determine whether Navigant appropriately billed DOE and  |   |   |
| Education's Payments    | performed assigned responsibilities in accordance with the   |   |   |
| to Navigant Consulting, | Stipulation that was entered into on December 11, 2007   |   |   |
| Inc.                    | between DOE, Advocates for Children of New York, and a   |   |   |
| FM13-131AL              | group of parents attending New York City schools.  |   |   |
| 1st, 2nd, 11th, 12th,   | Nevinent engenistely killed the DOE for the consistent   |   |   |
| 13th Judicial District  | Navigant appropriately billed the DOE for the services<br>provided and performed its responsibilities as required by the<br>Stipulation  |   |   |
|                         | Stipulation.   |   |   |

## Regents Committee on Audits/Budget and Finance February 2014

## Summary of Corrective Action Plans Received from Previously Presented Audits

NOTE: The requirement for submission of the corrective action plan (CAP) as per Commissioner's Regulations 170.12 applies to school districts and BOCES.

| Auditor | Auditee-Scope  | Judicial<br>District# -<br>Regent | Month<br>Presented | Result of<br>CAP review |
|---------|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| OAS     | Roosevelt – Data Reliability   | 10 <sup>th</sup> -Tilles          | September          | Sufficient              |
| OSC     | East Ramapo – Financial<br>Condition   | 9 <sup>th</sup> -Phillips         | September          | Sufficient              |
| OSC     | Westchester School for Special<br>Children – Compliance with the<br>Reimbursable Cost Manual | 9 <sup>th</sup> -Phillips         | September          | Sufficient              |

#### East Ramapo's CAP

The corrective action plan indicated that District officials agreed with all the audit recommendations and procedures were put in place to address the fund balance deficit for 2013 and any additional unanticipated shortfall.

## **Roosevelt's CAP**

Roosevelt officials agreed with all the audit recommendations and established new procedures to ensure the accuracy of District's data. For example, a data team was created to periodically review accuracy of data and assignment of cohorts. In addition, student records will also be reviewed to ensure graduation requirements are met and student information in the system are corrected based on audit findings.

## Westchester School for Special Children's CAP

As a preschool special education services provider, the Westchester School for Special Children is not required by the Commissioner's Regulations to submit a CAP. However, as a matter of procedure related to the Office of the State Comptrollers (OSC) audits of special education services providers, the Department's special education workgroup reviews the OSC audit report and determines if the provider should be placed on Conditional program approval pending submission of an acceptable CAP. Upon such determination, a letter is sent to the provider requiring submission of the CAP. Westchester School was required to submit a CAP. Upon review of the CAP submitted, the special education workgroup decided that it addressed all the findings in the OSC audit and reinstated Westchester School from Conditional program approval to Full program approval.