Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs (SASA) Monitoring Plan for Formula Grant Programs

October 1, 2010 to September 30, 2011

August 31, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION---------- 3

II. MONITORING INDICATORS---------- 4

A. Monitoring Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies 5

B. Monitoring Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement 5

C. Monitoring Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (N/D) 6

D. Monitoring Title X, Part C: McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Act of 2001 6

III. THE MONITORING PROCESS---------- 7

A. Description of the Monitoring Process 8

B. Monitoring Team 8

C. Exit Conference 8

IV. MONTORING INDICATORS---------- 9

A. Overarching Requirement A: SEA Subrecipient Monitoring 9

B. Standards, Assessment and Accountability 10

C. Instructional Support 33

D. Fiduciary 48

E. Title I, Part D Neglected and Delinquent 70

F. McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Program 75

G. Title III 82

V. APPENDIX---------- 104

I. INTRODUCTION

Monitoring the implementation of Federal programs and the use of Federal program funds is an essential function of the U. S. Department of Education (ED). This document, designed for the 2009-2010 school year, describes the purpose, rationale, and process used by the Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs (SASA) office in monitoring the use of Title I, Parts A and D; Title III; and the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education program funds by State educational agencies, which are interchangeably referred to as "SEAs" or "States" throughout this document. As in previous years, the monitoring plan will be reviewed and revised periodically to reflect lessons learned and programmatic clarification.

Perhaps no funding has more potential for positively impacting the education of the nation's children than the $14.5 billion that is awarded to State and local educational agencies through Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies; and the $700 million that is awarded through Title III, Part A, English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement. SASA is also responsible for the administration of Title I, Part D, Prevention and Intervention Program for Children and Youth Who are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk of Dropping Out of school (N/D); and Title X, Part C, the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Act of 2001 (Homeless). These programs provide approximately $170 million to States, and support the Title I mission of improving teaching and learning for children attending high-poverty schools.

In addition to the regular funding described above, Public Law 111-5, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA), provides $10 billion in new funding for Title I, Part A and $3.5 billion for school improvement grants under section 1003(g) of Title I. ARRA also includes an additional $70 million for grants under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. The funds provided under ARRA provide an unprecedented opportunity for educators to implement innovative strategies to improve education for academically at-risk students and to close the achievement gap in Title I schools while stimulating the economy. With the unprecedented funding for education under ARRA comes more responsibility to provide meaningful transparency and accountability for investing wisely in ways that strengthen education, drive reforms, and improve results for students.

A. Definition and Purpose of Monitoring

Monitoring is the regular and systematic examination of a State's administration and implementation of a Federal education grant, contract, or cooperative agreement administered by ED. Monitoring the use of Federal funds has long been an essential function of ED. ED monitors programs under the general administrative authority of the U. S. Department of Education Organization Act. Section 80.40(e) of Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) also permits ED to make site visits as warranted by program needs.

Monitoring of programs administered by SASA is necessary to ensure that *all* children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education. Monitoring assesses the extent to which States provide leadership and guidance for local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools in

implementing policies and procedures that comply with the statutes and regulations of Title I, Part A; Title III, Part A; N/D; and Homeless.

Monitoring formalizes the integral relationship between ED and the States and emphasizes, first and foremost, accountability for using resources wisely in educating and preparing our nation's students. As a result of monitoring, ED is able to gather data about State and local needs and use that data to design technical assistance initiatives and national leadership activities. Thus, monitoring serves not only as a means for helping States achieve high-quality implementation of educational programs, it also helps ED to be a better advisor and partner with States in that effort. SASA's monitoring activities are designed to focus on the results of States' efforts to implement critical requirements of the ESEA using available resources and the flexibility provisions available to States and LEAs. Data from State monitoring also informs the programs' performance indicators under the Government Performance Results Act.

ED policy requires every program office overseeing discretionary or formula grant programs to prepare a monitoring plan for each of its programs. Beginning with the 2010 fiscal year, SASA's monitoring cycle will move to a two-year cycle. SASA's adapted monitoring process will include risk-based analysis and target areas of identified need, coordinated with technical assistance. There will also be additional focus given to States' administration and use of ARRA funds.

B. Monitoring and the Strategic Plan

The Education Department's 2007-2012 *Strategic Plan*[1] focuses on performance and outlines specific objectives, performance measures and targets in a coordinated effort to achieve measurable results for students. Regular monitoring of States' administration of Federal programs contributes to the accomplishment of the objectives and strategies outlined in the plan. It also supports the core principles of the ESEA as we help States leverage the law to improve academic performance for all students.

II. MONITORING INDICATORS

The content of SASA's monitoring is based on States' responsibilities to provide guidance and support to LEAs and schools based on the requirements of the ESEA. Monitoring States' implementation of programs administered by SASA means closely examining State policies, systems, and procedures to ensure LEA and school compliance with statutes and regulations.

ED uses monitoring indicators to determine the degree of implementation of Federal programs and activities administered by SEAs. For the four programs monitored, SASA staff have developed indicators in each of the three monitoring areas (Standards, Assessment and Accountability; Instructional Support; and Fiduciary). The use of such criteria ensures a consistent application of these standards across monitoring teams and across States. The published indicators provide guidance for all States regarding the purpose and intended outcomes of monitoring by describing what is being monitored and providing the criteria for judging the quality of implementation (acceptable evidence).

[1] The Department of Education's Strategic Plan 2007 – 2012 is available at www.ed.gov/about/reports/strat/ plan2007-12/2007-plan.pdf

The complete texts of the monitoring indicators for each program administered by SASA and monitored under this plan are contained in the Appendices. Please note that the indicators are written broadly to cover all the requirements of each topic. Examples of documentation and evidence that States and LEAs can provide to show compliance with these requirements are listed for each indicator.

A. Monitoring Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies

"The purpose of this title is to ensure that all children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on challenging State academic achievement standards and State academic assessments." (Title I, §1001)

Title I, Part A provides supplemental financial assistance through SEAs to LEAs and schools with high numbers or percentages of children from low-income families to help meet the educational needs of children who are most at risk of failing to meet challenging State academic achievement standards and State academic assessments. SEAs have significant and far-reaching responsibilities to LEAs that support the purpose of this title. Some of those major responsibilities include:

- Assuring that assessments, teacher preparation and training, and instruction are aligned with each State's academic standards;
- Meeting the educational needs of low-achieving children;
- Focusing on closing the achievement gap and targeting resources to those LEAs and schools with the greatest needs;
- Providing parents with opportunities to be involved in meaningful ways in the education of their children; and
- Holding schools and LEAs accountable for improving the academic achievement of all students. (See Appendix A for Title I, Part A Indicators.)

B. Monitoring Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement

" The purposes of this part are to help ensure that children who are limited English proficient, including immigrant children and youth, attain English proficiency, develop high levels of academic attainment in English, and meet the same challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards as all children are expected to meet." (Title III, §3102)

Title III, Part A provides supplemental financial assistance to States and eligible LEAs to develop and enhance their capacity to provide high-quality instructional programs designed to prepare limited English proficient children and immigrant children and youth to enter all-English instructional settings. Title III assists States in helping LEAs increase their capacity to establish, implement, and sustain language instructional educational programs for limited English proficient students. Some of the State's responsibilities include the following:

- Ensuring that Title III State Formula and Immigrant funds are distributed to eligible LEAs, according to Title III requirements.

- Establishing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards that are aligned with the achievement of the State's academic content standards.

- Identifying or developing measures of English proficiency and ensuring that the State's selected ELP assessment(s) is/are aligned to the State's ELP standards and that LEAs and schools are utilizing both ELP standards and the State's ELP assessment(s).

- Assuring that professional development activities lead to certification and licensing for staff of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students.

- Ensuring that planning, evaluation, administration, and interagency coordination related to subgrants to LEAs occurs when appropriate.

- Meeting the educational needs of LEP students by providing technical assistance to LEAs to ensure that implemented language instructional programs and curricula are scientifically-based; helping LEPs meet the same academic content standards as all children; and promoting parental and community participation.

- Holding all LEAs that receive Title III funds accountable for meeting the State's targets for improving English language proficiency and academic achievement of ELP students and providing recognition to LEAs that have exceeded the State's targets for participant achievement.

- Monitoring LEAs served by Title III to ensure that LEAs are fulfilling all requirements of Title III, including the annual assessment of all served LEP students and the development of the LEA's capacity to continue to offer high-quality language instructional programs. (Title III, § 3111, 3113)

C. Monitoring Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (N/D)

"It is the purpose of this part to improve educational services for children and youth in local and State institutions for neglected or delinquent children and youth so that such children and youth have the opportunity to meet the same challenging State academic achievement standards and State academic assessments that all children in the State are expected to meet." (Title I, Part D, § 1401)

A growing juvenile correctional system and the educational needs of students in that system established the need for the N/D program. SEAs provide financial assistance to State agencies and LEAs to promote educational programs for youth in State-operated institutions or community day programs to ensure that these students are provided a high-quality education.

While some States may receive onsite visits, others will be monitored through desk reviews, which could include video- or teleconferencing. Onsite visits will be based on allocation size and factors such as multiple or recurring findings. Additionally, fiduciary monitoring indicators have been added to Title I, Part D in part to focus on the administration of ARRA funds.

D. Monitoring Title X, Part C: McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Act of 2001

"Each State educational agency shall ensure that each child of a homeless individual and each homeless youth have equal access to the same free, appropriate public education, including a public preschool education, as provided to other children and youth." (Title X, Part C, § 721(1))

The McKinney-Vento program is designed to address the problems that homeless children and youth face in enrolling, attending, and succeeding in school. Homeless children and youth should have access to educational and other services that they need to meet the same State academic achievement standards and State academic assessments to which all students are held. States and LEAs are required to review and undertake steps to revise laws, regulations, practices, or policies that may act as barriers to the enrollment, attendance, or success in school of homeless children and youth. (See Appendix D for Title X, Part C Indicators.)

While some States may receive onsite visits, others will be monitored through desk reviews, which could include video- or teleconferencing. On-site visits will be based on allocation size and factors such as multiple or recurring findings. Monitoring priority will be given to ARRA subgrantees. Fiduciary monitoring indicators have been added to the McKinney-Vento program as well as a new indicator that focuses on State-level coordination activities.

III. THE MONITORING PROCESS

Monitoring States' implementation of programs administered by SASA provides an opportunity to examine how States have instituted policies, systems, and procedures to ensure LEA and school compliance with the statute and regulations. Monitoring serves many purposes:

- Formalizes the shared responsibility of SASA and the States to improve student achievement and close the achievement gap in order to have all students reach proficiency.
- Provides a vehicle to SASA's legal responsibility to monitor the implementation of Title I, Title III, and related programs it administers.
- Leverages support for broad scale implementation in all districts that receive these funds.
- Ensures that States and school districts provide critical information to parents that enable them to be full partners in their children's education.
- Provides data that inform technical assistance that supports States' and school districts' efforts to improve teaching and learning.
- Provides data to inform ED's policy and national leadership activities.

A. Description of the Monitoring Process

SASA's monitoring plan involves an onsite review that helps SEAs build capacity to improve student achievement and ensure program compliance. During the next two years, approximately 36 States will be monitored onsite. ED's current two-year monitoring cycle has been designed to align with the availability of ARRA funds and is in anticipation of the reauthorization of the ESEA during this time

span. The 36 States to be monitored during this cycle were selected on the basis of a risk analysis designed to help SASA focus its resources to the greatest advantage and better accomplish its programmatic goals. During the pre-site review, SASA staff will collect data specific to the monitoring indicators to determine compliance. As the monitoring process is a 'snapshot' of State implementation, approval of corrective actions required as a result of a monitoring activity are specific to compliance issues cited in monitoring reports and do not address emerging issues. SASA staff may monitor the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act remotely in some States. Monitoring outside of the scheduled cycle may be arranged as needed if a State has serious or chronic compliance problems or has unresolved issues identified during either the desk review or the monitoring process.

1. Desk Review

Each State has been assigned to a SASA staff member who functions as a State contact primarily responsible for information transmitted between the States and ED. One of the most important functions of the State contact is the preparation and maintenance of the ongoing desk review for each assigned State. In conducting the ongoing desk review, State contacts gather and analyze information related to the four formula programs that SASA administers. Desk reviews include an examination of specific program information. The State contact can follow major education events in the assigned State, overall trends in student and school performance data, unresolved issues, compliance problems, and problems with program implementation. Additionally, each State contact ensures that State policies and guidance to LEAs are consistent with ESEA. The desk reviews also assist SASA in providing timely information regarding States to other program offices in Education.

2. Preparation for Monitoring

Prior to the monitoring visit, SASA staff will request that the SEA submit specific documentation about eight weeks prior to scheduled onsite review. This information will assist SASA team members by providing background and context. A thorough analysis of relevant documents is crucial to conducting an effective and efficient monitoring review. Analysis of documents helps team members identify important issues and develop questions before the visit, ensuring focused and productive onsite interviews.

3. Onsite Monitoring

During the site visit, SASA staff will review additional documentation and will interview SEA and LEA staff, principals, teachers, parents, and other stakeholders. This multi-level interview strategy will allow the monitors to gather information from a variety of perspectives and better evaluate the impact of the State's administration on the implementation of the four programs at the LEA and school levels. This strategy will also allow the monitoring team to conduct a thorough review of the indicators, and acquire a more complete picture of the degree of program implementation across the State.

B. Monitoring Team

A team of five or more SASA staff members including trained consultants will be assigned to conduct the on-site reviews. The size of the team will vary depending on the issues identified, and in larger States, two teams may conduct onsite monitoring activities. A group leader is generally designated as the team leader.

C. Exit Conference

The Exit Conference is held at the conclusion of the onsite week for the purpose of reporting the preliminary results of the monitoring visit to staff from the SEA. Typically, the monitoring team meets with officials from the SEA to discuss potential findings and recommendations that the team will likely cite in the monitoring report. The team will summarize the week's activities, the potential findings and recommendations, and timelines for developing the monitoring report. The team also responds to questions posed by the SEA (both related to process and content). The team leader emphasizes that the information presented at the exit conference is preliminary, and explains that during the development of the monitoring report, the team will continue to review data and contact the SEA for additional information, as required.

Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part A
Overarching Requirement – SEA Subrecipient Monitoring

The SEA conducts monitoring of its subgrantees sufficient to ensure compliance with Title I program requirements. [§9304; §80.40 of EDGAR]

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
SEA ▪ What process does the SEA use to monitor implementation of Title I, Part A; Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 (Even Start), Title I, Part D, and the McKinney Vento Act? For each program: ➢ How frequently are these programs monitored? ➢ What findings have been made in the most recent monitoring year? ➢ How does the SEA ensure that findings are corrected? LEA ▪ When was the last time you were monitored by the SEA? ▪ What findings, if any, were made as a result of that monitoring visit? ▪ Was there any follow-up by the SEA to ensure that findings were corrected/addressed?	Documentation ▪ Established cycle of monitoring. ▪ Monitoring policies and procedures* ▪ Data collection instruments (interview guides, documents review checklists)* ▪ Sample of letters to LEAs, checklists, forms, etc. ▪ Process for identification of 'high risk' grantees. ▪ Process for follow-up/verification of implementation of required corrective actions. ▪ Monitoring reports, corrective actions from the LEAs visited as part of the on-site review. *Must include a method for monitoring all critical NCLB requirements. Interview ▪ Staff explains schedule of monitoring, including 'off cycle' monitoring. ▪ Staff describes monitoring process, including on-site procedures, data review, reporting and methods(s) for ensuring corrective action.	Documentation ▪ Copies of reports, corrective actions, results of technical assistance. ▪ Sample of letters to schools, checklists, forms, etc. ▪ Evidence of technical assistance provided by the SEA as a result of issues identified through the monitoring process. Interview ▪ Staff describes monitoring process, including on-site procedures, data review, and the reporting and corrective action processes, as pertains to most recent monitoring by the SEA. ▪ Staff discusses technical assistance provided by SEA during and as a result of monitoring process.

1.1: SEA has approved system of academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments (including alternate assessments) for all required subjects and grades, or has an approved timeline for developing them. §1111		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
1.1 Standards and Assessment Requirements **1.1 a** Has the State's system of standards and assessments, including alternate assessments, in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science been approved by ED?	Documentation ▪ List of assessments, including alternate assessments, the State the administering this school year in order to make AYP determinations. ▪ If the State has a letter approving the State's system of standards and assessments for reading, mathematics, and science for the required grades, then go to 1.1.X.	N/A
1.1 b Are any Statewide content standards or assessments implemented to meet ESEA requirements being revised/replaced?	▪ Timeline for any pending changes in standards and/or assessment with current schedule for completion, including plans for submissions for ED peer review~~,~~.	

1.1: SEA has approved system of academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments (including alternate assessments) for all required subjects and grades, or has an approved timeline for developing them. §1111		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
1.1 c What **guideline**s does the State have in place for **including all students with disabilities in the regular assessment system**? **1.1 d** If the State has approved/adopted alternate achievement standards, what **guideline**s does the State have in place for assessing only students with the most significant cognitive disabilities based on alternate achievement standards?	Documentation ▪ The State's **guidelines, as communicated to LEAs**, for the inclusion of all students with disabilities in the assessment system (e.g., instructions to IEP teams, accommodations manuals, test coordinator/administration manuals). ▪ Reports showing 100% of students with disabilities are participating in the assessment system. If the State has implemented alternate assessments, documentation that it has reported separately the number and percent of those students with disabilities assessed against alternate achievement standards, modified achievement standards and grade-level achievement standards, and those included in the regular assessments (including those administered with appropriate accommodations). ▪ State curriculum and/or test administration guides that inform educators about the inclusion of students with disabilities in regular assessments, with or without accommodations, or alternate assessments based on grade-level standards, or, if the State allows it, alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards.	Documentation ▪ LEA reports show that **100% of students** with disabilities are taking the regular assessment or an alternate assessment. Reported separately: the number and percent of those students with disabilities assessed on alternate assessments against alternate achievement standards, modified achievement standards, and those assessed on an alternate assessment against grade-level standards, and those included in the regular assessments (including those administered with appropriate accommodations). ▪ LEA curriculum and/or test administration **guides that inform educators about the inclusion of students with disabilities in regular assessments**, with or without accommodations, or alternate assessments based on grade-level standards, or, if the State allows it, alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards. ▪ Documentation on the **number of special education** children taking the various alternate assessments compared to the previous year's test takers. Interview ▪ If the LEA exceeds the 1% cap on the percentage of students proficient for AYP purposes on alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards, ▪ Discuss the basis for exceeding the 1% cap.

1.1: SEA has approved system of academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments (including alternate assessments) for all required subjects and grades, or has an approved timeline for developing them. §1111		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
	Interview: ▪ How does the State ensure that parents of those students are informed that their child's achievement will be based on alternate achievement standards?	▪ If the State has a alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards, does the State exceed the 3.0 percent cap of the number of proficient and advanced scores based on the modified and alternate academic achievement standards combined? ▪ How are parents of those students ~~are~~ informed that their child's achievement will be based on alternate achievement standards?

1.1: SEA has approved system of academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments (including alternate assessments) for all required subjects and grades, or has an approved timeline for developing them. §1111

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
1.1 e What guidelines does the State have in place for including all students with **limited English proficiency (LEP)** in the tested grades in the assessment system?	Documentation ▪ The State's guidelines, as communicated to LEAs, for the inclusion of all limited English proficient students in its assessment system. (e.g., instructions to IEP teams, accommodations manuals, test coordinator/administration manuals). Interview ▪ Does State have appropriate accommodations for LEP students? ▪ Discuss the State's definition of LEP. ▪ Discuss the State's criteria for student exit from the LEP accountability subgroup. Is this consistent with the Accountability workbook. ▪ Does the SEA report show that **100% of LEP students** are being assessed? ▪ How does the SEA identify formerly LEP students? ▪ How does the SEA define a recently arrived LEP student.? ▪ How many administrations of the State's reading/language arts assessments may a recently arrived LEP student be exempt?	Documentation ▪ Does the LEA report show that 100% of LEP students are being assessed? Interview ▪ Does the LEA know the State's definition of LEP and the State's LEP exit criteria? ▪ Does the LEP apply appropriate accommodations for LEP students? ▪ What actions does the LEA take to ensure that LEP accommodations are being applied on test day? ▪ Can the LEA identify the newly arrived LEP students? ▪ How many administrations of the State's reading/language arts assessments may a recently arrived LEP student be exempt?

1.1: SEA has approved system of academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments (including alternate assessments) for all required subjects and grades, or has an approved timeline for developing them. §1111

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
1.1 f What guidelines does the State have in place for including all students including migrant students in the tested grades in the assessment system?	Documentation ▪ Report show that **100% of migrant students** are being assessed.	Documentation ▪ Report show that **100% of migrant students** are being assessed.

1.1: SEA has approved system of academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments (including alternate assessments) for all required subjects and grades, or has an approved timeline for developing them. § 1111		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
1.1 g Does the SEA have a system for ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of assessment and accountability information disseminated by the agency? **1.1 h** Does the State have a system for monitoring and improving the on-going data quality of its assessment system?	Documentation ▪ The State's test security policy and consequences for violation are communicated to the public and to local educators. ▪ Existing written documentation of the State's plan for training and monitoring assessment administration conditions across the State, even when its assessment system is comprised of only local assessments. ▪ The State data management system includes data definitions that are disseminated to LEAs and procedures to maintain accurate student demographic data. ▪ State has committed appropriate resources for collecting appropriate data. ▪ Does the State have a plan and timeline for implementing the Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education that must be implement by the fall of 2010 in order to report data for the 2010-2011 school year? These seven racial and ethnic categories are: (1) Hispanic/Latino of any race; and, for individuals who are non-Hispanic/Latino, (2) American Indian or Alaska Native, (3) Asian, (4) Black or African American, (5) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, (6) White, and (7) Two or more races.	Documentation ▪ LEA has written procedures for ensuring data quality. ▪ LEA provides evidence indicating that written procedures for ensuring data quality were communicated to the LEA's by the State and implemented. ▪ Documentation provided on how any data quality issues related to assessment and accountability has been addressed, including security breaches. **Interviews:** ▪ Discuss how the State monitors test administration taking place in the LEA's and how the LEA monitors test administration in the schools. ▪ Have there been any data quality issues related to schools and the district and how have they been addressed? ▪ Has the LEA identified any errors in student demographic data or student achievement data?

1.1: SEA has approved system of academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments (including alternate assessments) for all required subjects and grades, or has an approved timeline for developing them. § 1111		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
	Interview: ▪ Discuss how the State monitors test administrations taking place in the LEAs. ▪ What type of data quality errors has the State encountered over the last three years with the test company vendor? ▪ How have those errors been dealt with? ▪ What type of data quality errors such as demographic or achievement data has the State encountered from schools and districts? ▪ How have those errors been dealt with? ▪ What steps have been taken to reduce the chance for the same type of errors to occur in the future?	

1.2: The SEA has implemented all required components as identified in its accountability workbook. §1111		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
1.2 a Does the State have an ESEA accountability workbook that has been approved by ED? **1.2 b** How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State **1.2 c** How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?	Documentation ▪ The State has an approval letter for its accountability system plan and an updated accountability workbook that reflects the areas approved in the letter. • The State has a definition of "public school" and "LEA" for AYP accountability purposes that account for all students enrolled in the public school district, regardless of program or type of public school, e.g. State school for the blind. ▪ The State Accountability System produces AYP decisions for all public schools (e.g., public schools with variant grade configurations, public schools that serve special populations, and public charter schools). It also holds accountable public schools with no grades assessed (e.g, K-2). ▪ All public schools and LEAs are systemically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination. ▪ The State has a definition of a "new" school with appropriate description of accountability rules that are consistently applied throughout the State. ▪ The State has a definition of a "small" school with appropriate description of accountability rules that are consistently applied throughout the State. ▪ Does every school get an AYP determination?	N/A

1.2: The SEA has implemented all required components as identified in its accountability workbook. §1111		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
1.2 d Does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?	▪ The State provides decisions about adequate yearly progress in time for LEAs to implement the required provisions 14 days before the beginning of the next academic year to notify parents about public school choice or supplemental educational services options. ▪ If the State received a one-year waiver of the 14-day public school choice notice requirement, what steps are being taken to comply with the 14-day requirement for next year? ▪ Provide the timeline for assessments and accountability designations including the test administration dates. LEA review of the accuracy of the achievement and demographic data, final results of the assessments available to LEA and schools, preliminary identification of LEAs and schools for improvement, final identification of LEAs and schools for improvement and notification of parents for choice and supplemental education services. **Interview:** ▪ Discuss the timeline used for assessments and accountability designations including the test administration dates. o LEA review of the accuracy of the achievement and demographic data, o final results of the assessments available to LEA and schools, o preliminary identification of LEAs and schools for improvement, o final identification of LEAs and schools for improvement and notification of parents for choice	<u>Documentation</u> ▪ LEA documents show that parental notification was provided in time to permit informed decisions regarding choice and supplemental educational services. ▪ Provide the timeline for assessments and accountability designations including the test administration dates. LEA review of the accuracy of the achievement and demographic data, final results of the assessments available to LEA and schools, preliminary identification of LEAs and schools for improvement, final identification of LEAs and schools for improvement and notification of parents for choice and supplemental education services. **Interview:** ▪ Discuss the timeline used for assessments and accountability designations including the test administration dates. o LEA review of the accuracy of the achievement and demographic data, o final results of the assessments available to LEA and schools, o preliminary identification of LEAs and schools for improvement, o final identification of LEAs and schools for improvement and notification of parents for choice and supplemental education services.

1.2: The SEA has implemented all required components as identified in its accountability workbook. §1111		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
	and supplemental education services.	
1.2 e How does the State define "full academic year" for identifying students in AYP decisions? **1.2 f** How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?	▪ The State definition of "full academic year" for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP is consistently applied statewide. ▪ The State documents a data management capability that results in accurate records of attendance for all students, including mobile students and how it holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year. ▪ The State explains how it holds LEAs accountable for students who transfer during the full academic year from one public school within the district to another public school within the district.	▪ The LEA correctly explains the definition of full academic year and can demonstrate that students are coded correctly for AYP calculations. ▪ Demonstrate with data that all students by subgroup have all been in the LEA for a FAY are included in the accountability system.

1.2: The SEA has implemented all required components as identified in its accountability workbook. §1111		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
1.2 g How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year? **1.2 h** How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA in the State made AYP?	Documentation ▪ The State has a timeline for ensuring that all students will meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014. ▪ The State has a method for calculating how each student subgroup, public school, and LEA makes AYP. ▪ The State identifies and defines subgroups for adequate yearly progress: economically disadvantaged, major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency and holds public schools and LEAs accountable for student subgroup achievement. ▪ AYP decisions for each public school and LEA are made annually. ▪ The procedures employed in the most recent AYP calculations are consistent with the description in the approved Accountability Workbook for school and LEAs. **Interview:** ▪ Describe how "safe harbor" is calculated into annual AYP determination? ▪ Did any schools make AYP using "safe harbor"?	**Interview:** ▪ Describe how "safe harbor" is calculated into annual AYP determination? ▪ Did any schools make AYP using "safe harbor"?

1.2: The SEA has implemented all required components as identified in its accountability workbook. §1111		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
	Interview: ▪ What are the procedures for identifying LEAs and schools for improvement and exiting from improvement?	**Interview:** ▪ What are the procedures for identifying LEAs and schools for improvement and exiting from improvement? ▪ Describe how "safe harbor" is calculated into annual AYP determination? ▪ Did any schools make AYP using "safe harbor"? ▪ What are the procedures for identifying LEAs and schools for improvement and exiting from improvement?
1.2 i How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress? **1.2 j** How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress? **1.2 k** What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?	<u>Documentation</u> ▪ State describes how "excess" proficient scores from an assessment based on alternate achievement standards are handled for AYP when the number of proficient scores exceeds 1%. ▪ State provides to all LEAs guidance on the assessment of new immigrant LEP students that is consistent with ESEA. ▪ The State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.	**Interview** ▪ LEA staff explains how LEP students are included in AYP calculations.

1.2 l What is the State definition of the public high school graduation rate? **1.2 m** What is the graduation rate target and annual goals?	<u>Documentation</u> ▪ The State has a defined graduation rate target and annual goals that is clearly stated in the approved Accountability Workbook. It: ➢ Calculates the percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or, ➢ Uses another more accurate definition that has been approved by the Secretary; and ➢ Does not count a dropout as a transfer. ▪ The State will calculate and report a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate on report cards providing assessment results for the 2010-11 school year. States, must use that rate, disaggregated by subgroups, in making AYP determinations for schools, LEAs, and the state beginning with the determinations that are based on 2011-12 assessment results. ▪ If the state currently has a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, what is the procedure for calculating and reporting the adjusted cohort graduation rate? ▪ If the state currently has an extended-year cohort graduation rate, what is the procedure for calculating and reporting the extended-year cohort graduation rate?	**Interview:** ▪ The LEA can articulate the State definition of graduation rate target and annual goals.

1.2: The SEA has implemented all required components as identified in its accountability workbook. §1111		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
1.2 n What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?	**Interview:** ▪ If the state does not have a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, what progress has been made toward meeting the 2010-11 requirements? ▪ The State defines the additional academic indicators and targets.	
1.2 o Does the State have a documented procedure for districts and schools to appeal AYP data and decisions?	**Interview:** ▪ Description of the appeals process and timeline with a record of the previous year's results. ▪ What appeals were granted to schools and LEAs and what appeals were rejected? ▪ State has published its plan to maintain continuity in AYP decisions necessary for validity through planned assessment changes, and other changes necessary to comply fully with ESEA.	Documentation ▪ The LEA has a procedure for reviewing preliminary AYP results and communicating corrections to the State. **Interview:** ▪ Did the LEA ask for any appeals for the LEA or schools, if so how many and for what purpose? ▪ What appeals were granted?

1.2: The SEA has implemented all required components as identified in its accountability workbook. §1111		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
1.2 p How has the State planned to incorporate anticipated changes in assessments into its definition of AYP? **See 1.1 b**	**Interview:** ▪ Discuss any flexibility program (growth/differentiated model) approved by ED. **Interviews:** ▪ What is the schedule for revisions to the state standards and assessment system and how will the changes in the assessment system be incorporated into the state's accountability system? ▪ What steps and procedures for determining AYP are the same or different from the prior year? (Changes in test, testing procedures, time of year)	▪ Staff can discuss how the State plans to incorporate anticipated changes in assessments into its definition of AYP.

1.2: The SEA has implemented all required components as identified in its accountability workbook. §1111		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
1.2 q What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations? **1.2 r** Do the State's participation data indicate that all students in the tested grade ranges are included in the assessment system (e.g., students with disabilities, students with limited English proficiency, economically disadvantaged students, race/ethnicity, and migrant)? **1.2 s** What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?	Documentation ▪ The State has a procedure to determine the number of absent or untested students by subgroup and aggregate. ▪ The State has a procedure to determine the denominator (total enrollment) for the 95% calculation (by subgroup and aggregate) that is described in detail in the approved Accountability Workbook. ▪ Reports that specify the participation rates and the method of calculation for all students and for each subgroup in the assessment system. ▪ Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for reaching the 95% assessed goal. **Interview:** ▪ Does the State publish the student count for each school by disaggregated groups prior to the assessment of students? ▪ What is the State's method of calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations? Documentation ▪ State has a policy that implements the regulation regarding the use of 95% allowance when the group is statistically significant according to the State rules.	Documentation ▪ LEA provides copies of guidance, memoranda, test administration manuals, etc., that document direction provided by the State for including required student subgroups in assessment administrations. ▪ LEA has documentation of information and/or guidance provided to schools regarding participation rates. ▪ LEA documents the participation of students by the required subgroups taking the required assessments for the district and by school (95% participation). ▪ LEA provides enrollment data against assessment participation for each required subgroup i.e. number enrolled and number assessed for each subgroup). ▪ LEA can document any exemptions from assessment that have been permitted for students by the required subgroups for the district and by school.

1.3: The SEA has published an annual report card as required and an annual Report to the Secretary. §1111(h)(1)		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
1.3.a The Annual State Report Card contains all of the following information? 1) Information in the aggregate, on student achievement at each proficiency level on the State academic assessments disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, and migrant status, English proficiency and status as economically disadvantaged (where the minimum "n" has been met); 2) comparison of the actual achievement levels of each group of students previously described to the State's annual measurable objectives for each required assessment; 3) the percentage of students not tested, disaggregated by the same categories noted above by subject; 4) the most recent two-year trend in student achievement in each subject at each grade-level, for grades in which assessment is required; 5) aggregate information on any other indicator used by the State to determine AYP; 6) graduation rates that are consistent with ED approved State definitions; 7) information on LEAs regarding whether they made AYP, including the number and names of schools identified for school improvement; and 8) the professional qualifications of teachers in the State, including percentage of such teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of classes not taught by highly qualified teachers, in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools. 9) the number of recently arrived LEP students who are not assessed on the State's reading/language arts test. 10) State data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) to provide parents and the public with additional important information about the performance of the students in their State.	Documentation ▪ Annual State Report Card as published on the SEA website or as distributed in print includes all required elements.	

1.3: The SEA has published an annual report card as required and an Annual Report to the Secretary. §1111		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
1.2 b Does the SEA have procedures to monitor annual Local Educational Agency (LEA) Report Cards to ensure that information in the reports cards is based on statistically valid and reliable data?	Documentation ▪ State conducts audit check of LEA data and has procedures to resolve errors.	Documentation ▪ LEA provides evidence indicating that written procedures for ensuring data quality were communicated to the LEA's by the State and implemented.
1.3 c Does the Annual State Report to the Secretary contain all of the required information? 1) on the State's progress in developing and implementing academic assessments as described in subsection (b)(3), 2) on the achievement of students on the academic assessments required under (b)(3), including the disaggregated results for the categories of students required in subsection (b)(2)(C)(v), 3) the acquisition of English proficiency by LEP students, 4) the number and names of all schools identified for school improvement under 1116(c), the reason why each school was identified, and the measures taken to address the achievement problems of such schools, 5) the number of students and schools that participated in public school choice and supplemental, educational service programs and activities under this title, and 6) information on the quality of teachers and the percentage of classes being taught by highly qualified teachers in the State, LEAs and schools.	▪ See most recent State Consolidated Report. Check for completeness. ▪ Data in the State Consolidated Report matches data in Report Card for the same year.	

1.4: The SEA has ensured that LEAs have published annual report cards as required §1111		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
1.4 a Do the annual LEA Report Cards contain all of the required information for the LEA and each school served, as follows? 1) information, in the aggregate, on student achievement at each proficiency level on the State academic assessments disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, and migrant status; English proficiency and status as economically disadvantaged (where the minimum "n" has been met); 2) comparison of the actual achievement levels of each group of students previously described in the State's annual measurable objectives for each required assessment; 3) information on how students served by the LEA achieved on the statewide academic achievement assessment compared to students in the State as a whole; 4) the percentage of students not tested, disaggregated by the same categories noted above by subject; 5) the most recent two-year trend in student achievement in each subject at each grade level, for grades in which assessment is required; 6) aggregate information on any other academic indicator used by the State to determine AYP; and aggregate information on any additional indicators used by the LEA to determine AYP; 7) graduation rates that are consistent with ED-approved State definitions; 8) information on the performance of the LEA regarding whether it made AYP and whether it has been identified for improvement, including the number and percent of schools identified for school improvement by name and how long the schools have been so identified; and	N/A	<u>Documentation</u> ▪ District Report Card samples or prototype with complete set of school report cards for that LEA.

1.4: The SEA has ensured that LEAs have published annual report cards as required §1111		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
9) the professional qualifications of teachers in the LEA, including percentage of such teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of classes not taught by highly qualified teachers, in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools. 10) The number of recently arrived LEP students who are not assessed on the State's reading/language arts test. 11) State data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) to provide parents and the public with additional important information about the performance of students in the State.		Documentation
1.4 b Within each LEA to do individual school reports include the following? 1) Whether the school has been identified for school improvement, and 2) Information that shows how the school's student's achievement on the statewide academic assessments and other indicators of AYP compared to students in the LEA and the State.		▪ Individual School Reports as published on the web or distributed to parents in print form.
1.4 c Has the LEA publicly disseminated the information contained in the Annual LEA Report Cards to all schools in the LEA and to all parents of children attending the LEA's schools in a form and to the extent practicable in the language that parents can understand?		▪ District Report Card samples; dissemination plan and timeline
1.4.d Has the LEA provided, to parent/guardian of each child attending any school, information on the level of achievement of the child in each of the State academic assessments?		▪ Student Assessment Report samples; dissemination plan and timeline.

1.5: The SEA indicates how funds received under Grants for State Assessments and related activities will be or have been used to meet the 2005-06 and 2007-08 assessment requirements of ESEA. §6111		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
1.5 a Has the State indicated how 6111 funds will be used to meet the SY 05-06 and 07-08 assessment requirements of ESEA?	Documentation ▪ State describes its uses of 6111 funds. ▪ State documents what part of 6111 funds is being spent on assessment development and what part is being spent on 6111 part B areas. (A) Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b). (B) Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7). (C) Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments. (D) Refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials. (E) Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems. (F) Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments.	N/A

1.5: The SEA indicates how funds received under Grants for State Assessments and related activities will be or have been used to meet the 2005-06 and 2007-08 assessment requirements of ESEA. §6111		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
	(G) Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments. (H) Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time.	N/A

1.6: SEA ensures that LEAs meet all requirements for identifying and assessing the English language proficiency of limited English proficient students. §1111

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
1.6 a Does the State conduct an annual language survey that identifies the following? **1.6 b** Languages other than English present in student population, and **1.6 c** Languages for which yearly academic assessments are needed.	Documentation • Summary of home language survey results, OELA report, or relevant consolidated application data that shows the number of languages present and relative incidence. • Documentation that 100% of eligible LEP students are tested on the State annual LEP assessment.	
1.6 d Does the SEA plan to select/develop English language proficiency (ELP) test(s) of oral language, reading and writing? (If multiple tests are permitted, the State will determine comparability sufficient to aggregate results at the State level.)	**Interview** ▪ State has established and disseminated an operational definition of English proficiency consistent with the test(s) adopted. ▪ Does the ELP test measure reading, writing, speaking and listening? If different test are permitted, has the State approved these tests? Has the State instructed the LEAs on interpreting the results across these assessments?	
1.6 e Do LEAs administer ELP tests annually in grades K-12 to all students with limited English proficiency in the schools served by the State?		Documentation ▪ LEA applies an ELP assessment that is approved by SEA to all LEP students as required by statute.

2.1: The SEA has developed procedures to ensure the hiring and retention of qualified paraprofessionals. §1112; §1119; 34 CFR Part 200 §200.58-200.60

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
SEA ▪ Do all instructional paraprofessionals meet the qualification requirements in Title I targeted assistance and schoolwide program schools? [§1112(c)(1)(I); §1119(c)-(f)] **LEA/School** ▪ How does the LEA ensure that instructional paraprofessionals in Title I schools work under the direct supervision of and in close and frequent proximity with a highly qualified teacher? What direction has been given to principals and teachers regarding this requirement? [§1112(c)(1)(I); §1119(g)]	**SEA Documentation** ▪ Written certification from the SEA, based on current documentation, that all instructional paraprofessionals in Title I schools meet the qualifications requirements.	**LEA/School Documentation** ▪ Samples of guidance, memoranda, training materials and/or agenda of meetings for principals and teachers in Title I schools regarding the duties and assignment of paraprofessionals.

2.2: The SEA has established a statewide system of intensive and sustained improvement and support that provides, or provides for, technical assistance to LEAs and schools as required. §1117; 34 CFR Part 200 §200.40

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
SEA ▪ How does the SEA provide, or provides for, a statewide system of support (SSOS) to LEAs and schools that includes, at a minimum: ➢ School support teams; ➢ Distinguished educators and principals; and ➢ Other approaches, such as higher education, education service agencies, and other private providers? [§1111(c)(3)-(4); §1117(a)] ▪ How does the SEA identify and prioritize support and assistance by the SSOS to LEAs and schools? [§1117(a)(2); §1117(a)(4)(B)] ▪ What training and professional development are provided to school support team members and other staff who provide assistance to LEAs and schools? [§1117(a)(4)(A)(ii)] ▪ How does the SEA monitor and/or review the ongoing quality of the SSOS? [§1111(f)(1)(B); §1117(a)(4)(1); §1117(a)(4)(B)(iv); §9304(a)(3)(B)]	**SEA Documentation** ▪ Current written documentation describing the SSOS, including the SEA's process for: ➢ Establishing and assigning school support teams. ➢ Designating and using distinguished educators. ➢ Identifying and prioritizing the services of the SSOS. ➢ Training and technical assistance to school support teams. ➢ Informing LEAs and schools about the SSOS. ▪ The SEA's criteria for identifying and rewarding distinguished schools and educators. ▪ Current written documentation that describes the SEA's process and criteria for monitoring and/or reviewing the assistance provided by the SSOS, including any actions the SEA has taken to improve the ongoing quality of the SSOS.	
LEA/Schools ▪ How has the SEA provided, or provided for, technical assistance and support to the LEA and schools as required? [§1117(a)] ▪ Has the LEA, with the schools and SEA, reviewed or evaluated the services of the SSOS/school support teams to determine if they are effective? What has been learned from that review? [§1117(a)(4)(C)]		**LEA/School Documentation** ▪ Listing of schools *currently* receiving technical assistance from the SSOS and a description of the assistance provided. ▪ Current written summary/analysis of the assistance provided by the SSOS/school support teams, which may include feedback from principal/teacher surveys, focus group discussions, or meetings with school and LEA staff.

2.3: The SEA ensures that LEAs and schools meet parental involvement and parental notification requirements. §§1111-1112; and §§1114 -1118**;** 34 CFR Part 200, §§200.37, 200.44, and 200.48

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
SEA ***I. Strategies to Implement Effective Parental Involvement*** ▪ What technical support or other assistance does the SEA provide to LEAs and schools to develop capacity to plan and carry-out effective parental involvement practices, LEA and school parental involvement policies, and school-parent compacts? [§1111(c)(4); §1111(d); §1118(g); §1118(h)] ▪ What guidance and support does the SEA provide to LEAs and schools about parental consultation and participation in school and LEA improvement the development of schoolwide programs? [§1115(b)(2)(B)(ii); §1116(b)(6); §1116(c)(6); §1118(c)(3)] ▪ What is the SEA's process to collect and review LEA parental involvement polices and practices to determine if the policies and practices meet the Title I requirements? How does the SEA use this information to improve parental involvement? [§1116(c)(1)(A); §1118(a)(2); §1118(h)] ▪ How does the SEA ensure that parents are involved in decisions about the use of the 1% reservation for parental involvement to schools? [§1118(a)(3)(b)]	**SEA Documentation** **I.** ***Strategies to Implement Effective Parental Involvement*** ▪ Current written documentation that includes: ➢ Copies of guidance and samples of communications to LEAs/schools on parental involvement requirements. ➢ Copies of communications to LEAs/schools that discuss and/or disseminate materials and resources on effective parental involvement practices. ➢ Sample of invitations/agenda of SEA meetings, conferences, or other professional development on effective parent involvement practices. ➢ Description of SEA's process to collect and review the effectiveness of LEA parental involvement policies and practices, including any actions the SEA has taken to improve the quality and effectiveness of parental involvement policies and practices as a result of that review.	

2.3: The SEA ensures that LEAs and schools meet parental involvement and parental notification requirements. §§1111-1112; and §§1114 -1118**;** 34 CFR Part 200, §§200.37, 200.44, and 200.48

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
SEA, Continued ***II. Parents Right to Know and Parental Notification*** ▪ What guidance and assistance does the SEA provide to LEAs and schools about the timeliness and required elements of parental notices for schools indentified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring? [§1116 (b)(6); 34 CFR §200.37; 34 CFR §200.44(a)(2)] ▪ How and when did the SEA notify LEAs on changes in the requirements for parental notifications for public school choice and SES specified in the Title I regulations issued in *October 2008*? [34 CFR §§200.22(b)(1); 200.37, 200.44, and 200.48] ▪ How and when does the SEA review/monitor LEA and school parental notices for timeliness and completeness of information as required by Title I statute and regulations? [§1116(b)(6); 34 CFR §§200.37 and 200.44(a)(2)] ▪ What guidance and assistance does the SEA provide to LEAs and schools about the "parent right to know" requirements? [§1111(h)(6)]	**SEA Documentation, Continued** ***II. Parents Right to Know and Parental Notification*** ▪ Current written documentation that includes: ➢ Copies of guidance or communications to LEAs/schools on parental notification requirements related to AYP determinations, school improvement status, public school choice, and SES, including evidence that the SEA has informed LEAs/schools about the parental notification requirements specified in the Title I regulations issued in *October 2008*. ➢ Copies of guidance or communications to LEAs/schools on "parents right to know" requirements, including templates of notifications that LEAs and schools may use. ➢ Description of SEA's process to review the content and format of LEA's parental notices for completeness of information required for school improvement status, pubic school choice, and SES, including actions the LEA has taken when letters were incomplete or not timely.	
LEA/Schools ***I. Strategies to Implement Effective Parental Involvement*** ▪ How does the LEA inform and involve parents in the in the development and review of the LEA's Title I plan and program/school improvement? [§1112(d)(1); §1118(a)(2)(A)] ▪ What technical assistance does the LEA provide to schools on including policy development and building capacity of parents for involvement? [§1112(b)(P); §1118(a)(1)		**LEA /School Documentation** ***I. Strategies to Implement Effective Parental Involvement*** ▪ *For LEAs and schools to be reviewed by ED:* ➢ Current written documentation that describes how the LEA is organized to coordinate and implement the parental involvement requirements to help schools and parents build capacity for effective parental involvement. ➢ Copy of LEA parent involvement policy.

2.3: The SEA ensures that LEAs and schools meet parental involvement and parental notification requirements. §§1111-1112; and §§1114 -1118**;** 34 CFR Part 200, §§200.37, 200.44, and 200.48

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
LEA/Schools, Continued ***I. Strategies to Implement Effective Parental Involvement*** ▪ Has the LEA conducted, with the involvement of parents, the required annual evaluation of the content and effectiveness of the LEA's parent involvement policy and parental involvement activities in improving the academic quality of Title I schools? [§1118(a)(2)(E)] ▪ How does the LEA and schools involve parents in planning, reviewing, and implementing parental involvement activities, school improvement plans, and schoolwide plans? [§1118(c)(3)] ▪ How does the LEA ensure schools convene an annual meeting to inform parents about the Title I program and to explain their right to be involved? [§1118(c)(1)] ▪ Does the LEA reserve at least 1% of its Title I allocation for parental involvement? How does the LEA ensure that parents are involved in making decisions about the use of these funds? [§1118(a)((3)] ▪ How does the LEA use the services of the Parent Information and Resource Center (PIRC)? How has the LEA informed schools, parents, and parent groups about the PIRC? [§1118(g)] ▪ How has the LEA encouraged schools to use Title I funds to support family literacy programs? [§1111(c)(14); §1118(E)(7); §1114(b)(1)(F); §1115(c)(1)(G)]		**LEA/Schools Documentation, Continued** ***I. Strategies to Implement Effective Parental Involvement*** ▪ *For LEAs and schools to be reviewed by ED:* ➢ Copy of school's parental involvement policy. ➢ Copy of school's school-parent compact. ➢ Copies of communications or materials disseminated by the SEA and the State's Parent Involvement and Resource Center (PIRC) on effective parental involvement practices that are based on the most current research and geared toward greater participation by parents in school planning, review, and improvement. ➢ Current written documentation that describes how parents are involved in the annual joint development/review of the written policy, e.g., meeting agenda, sign-in sheets, minutes of meetings, letters to parents. ➢ Summary of data analyzed or the LEA's process to collect information to determine the effectiveness of policies and practices, e.g.: LEA/school parent surveys; parent feedback from LEA/school parent meetings, workshops, conferences, and LEA/school parent advisory groups. ➢ Record of parent comments/input about use of funds for parental involvement, e.g., meeting agenda/minutes and results of parent surveys. ➢ Record that that schools conducted an annual parent meeting, e.g., meeting notices and copy of agenda/minutes.

2.3: The SEA ensures that LEAs and schools meet parental involvement and parental notification requirements. §§1111-1112; and §§1114 -1118**;** 34 CFR Part 200, §§200.37, 200.44, and 200.48

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
LEA/Schools, Continued ***II. Parents Right to Know and Parental Notification*** ▪ How and when does the LEA inform parents about schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring? [§1116(b)(6); §1116(c)(6); 34 CFR §200.37 and §200.44(a)(2)] ▪ How and when are parents notified about public school choice? About supplemental educational services? [§1116(b)(6)(F); §1116(e)(2)(A); 34 CFR §200.37(b)(4)(iv); §200.37(b)(5)(iii)] ▪ Are parental notifications and other communications easily understandable and in a language a parent can understand? [§1116(e)(2)(A); §1118(f); 34 CFR §200.36(b)] ▪ How and when does the LEA inform parents about the district's improvement status? [§1116(c)(6); §1116(c(10)(E)] ▪ How and when does the LEA/school notify parents they have the right to request information about teacher and paraprofessional qualifications? [§1111(h)(6)(A)] ▪ How and when does the LEA/school inform parents that their child has been assigned, or has been taught for four or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who is not highly qualified? [§1111(h)(6)(B)(ii)]		**LEA/Schools Documentation, Continued** ***II. Parents Right to Know and Parental Notification*** ▪ *For LEAs and schools to be reviewed by ED:* ➢ Current written documentation that describes the LEA's process and timelines for informing parents about school/LEA improvement determinations. ➢ LEA/school notifications in appropriate languages that contain information required for LEA/school improvement status, public school choice, and SES that are dated and signed. ➢ LEA/school communications to parents in multiple languages, as appropriate, regarding teacher and paraprofessional qualifications. ➢ Samples of LEA/school communications in multiple languages, as appropriate, informing parents about the placement or assignment of a teacher with their child for four or more weeks who is not highly qualified.

2.4: The SEA ensures that LEA and schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring have met the requirements of being so identified. §1116; 34 CFR Part 200, §§200.36-200.44

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
SEA ***I. LEA and School Improvement*** ▪ Does the SEA's AYP calendar allow enough time for LEAs/schools to notify parents about public school choice or supplemental educational services options, time for parents to make informed decisions, and time to implement public school choice and supplemental educational services? [§1111(b)(10); 1116(a)(2); 34.CFR §200.44(a)(2)] ▪ What guidance or notices has the SEA provided to LEAs regarding LEA and school improvement requirements? Does the guidance discuss: ➢ The LEA responsibilities for schools in improvement, corrective actions, and restructuring, including plan development and technical assistance as required? ➢ The SEA's responsibilities for LEA and school improvement, including corrective actions for LEAs as required? ➢ The requirements for LEA and school improvement specified in the Title I regulations issued in *October 2008*.[§1111(c)(6); 1111(b)(8); §1116(b)(1)(A)-(E); §1116(b)(14); §1116(c)(9); §1116(c); 34 CFR §§ 200.32, 200.43, 200.50] What "customized" technical support and other assistance has the SEA provided to LEAs and schools in curriculum alignment, instructional improvement, integrated school improvement plans, or other areas to help the LEA/schools to foster continuous improvement? [§1111(b)(8); §1111(c)(4); §1111(d); §1116(b)(14); §1116(c)(1)(A); §1116(c)(9)]	**SEA Documentation** ***I. LEA and School Improvement*** ▪ Current written documentation that shows that the SEA provides decisions about AYP in time for LEAs/schools to implement the required provisions according to required timelines. ▪ Current list of schools in improvement, corrective action, and restructuring and list of LEAs in improvement and corrective action. *For the LEAs to be reviewed by ED*, a description of the actions the LEA has taken for each school in corrective action and restructuring (see §§1116(b)(7)C) and 1116(b)(8)(B); 34 CFR §200.43] ▪ Copies of SEA guidance or notices to LEAs and schools about LEA and school improvement requirements that describe: ➢ The roles and responsibilities for the SEA and LEA in plan development, including the components of LEA and school improvement plans and timelines. ➢ LEA actions for schools in corrective action and restructuring, including actions specified for LEA and school improvement in the October 2009 Title I regulations. ➢ SEA actions for LEAs in corrective actions. ➢ SEA and LEA technical assistance as required. ▪ Current written documentation that describes the SEA's technical support to help schools and LEAs to foster continuous improvement, including approaches to measure and track school improvement results and to modify or discontinue strategies based on evidence.	

2.4: The SEA ensures that LEA and schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring have met the requirements of being so identified. §1116; 34 CFR Part 200, §§200.36-200.43

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
LEA/Schools ***I. LEA and School Improvement*** ▪ What written guidance and technical support does the LEA provide to schools in developing, revising and implementing school improvement plans? [§1112(b); §1116(b)(4)(A)] ▪ What assistance does the LEA provide to schools in analyzing data from the State assessment system and other examples of student work to identify and develop solutions to problems in: ➢ Instruction, ➢ Implementing the requirements for parental involvement and professional development, and ➢ Implementing the school plan, including LEA and school level responsibilities under the plan? [§1116(b)(4)(B)(i)] ▪ What assistance does the LEA provide to schools in: ➢ Analyzing school/student assessment data to make decisions in choosing the improvement action most appropriate for schools in corrective action and restructuring? [§1116(b)(4)(B)(i] ➢ Identifying and implementing professional development and instructional strategies that are scientifically research based and address the specific instructional needs that caused the school to enter into improvement? [§1116(b)(4)(B)(ii)] ➢ Analyzing and revising the school's budget so that the school allocates its resources more effectively? [§1116(b)(4)(B)(iii)]		**LEA/School Documentation** ***I. LEA and School Improvement*** ▪ *For LEAs and schools to be reviewed by ED:* ➢ Current written documentation that describes how the LEA is organized to oversee and monitor school improvement, review and approve school improvement plans, provide professional development, and provide technical support and other assistance to schools (.e.g., designated central office staff, local school support teams, and/or in conjunction with regional technical assistance center, a university/college, or other technical assistance provider). ➢ Copy of LEA's current approved Title I application, or selected sections from the application related to school improvement and professional development. ➢ Copies of current LEA and school improvement plans. ▪ Current written documentation that describes the content and format of communications and planning meetings with staff and parents of schools in improvement, corrective action and restructuring, including evidence that the LEA is making determinations about restructuring actions that have the greatest likelihood of success and reflect the requirements specified in §200.43 of the 2008 Title I regulations.

2.4: The SEA ensures that LEA and schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring have met the requirements of being so identified. §1116; 34 CFR Part 200, §§200.36-200.43

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
LEA and Schools, Continued ***I. LEA and School Improvement*** ▪ What assistance does the LEA provide to schools identified for corrective action and restructuring, including taking required actions? [§1112(c)(1)(D); §1116(b)(7)(C); §1116(b)(8)(B); 34 CFR §200.43] ▪ How has the LEA/school designed teacher professional development to ensure that teacher learning opportunities are sustained, job-embedded, collaborative, data-driven, and focused on student instructional needs. [§1116(b)((3)(A)(iii); §1116(c)(7)(c); §9101(34)]1 ▪ What process does the LEA/school use to develop/revise school plans and select school improvement practices or strategies based on research and has the greatest likelihood of strengthening the core academic subjects or academic issues that caused the school to be identified for improvement? [§1116(b)(3)(A)(i,ii] ▪ In cases where a school is both a schoolwide school and a school identified for improvement *and develops a single plan*, how does the LEA ensure that the single plan integrates the schoolwide requirements and the school improvement plan requirements? [§1114(b)(1); §1116(b)(3)(A)]		**LEA and School Documentation, Continued** ***I. LEA and School Improvement*** **NOTE: SEE ABOVE**

2.4: The SEA ensures that LEA and schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring have met the requirements of being so identified. [§1116; 34 CFR Part 200, §§200.36-200.43]

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
SEA **Section 1003(a) School Improvement Funds** ▪ What are the SEA's process and criteria for awarding section 1003(a) school improvement funds to LEAs? [§1003(b)-(c)] ▪ Does the SEA, with LEA approval, use the full amount or a portion of the 95% allocated to LEAs to directly provide 1003(a) funded services or arrange for those services through other entities that provide technical assistance? [§1003(b)(2)] ▪ What is the SEA's process for monitoring or reviewing how LEAs and schools are using section 1003(a) funds to ensure the on-going quality of school improvement activities in the lowest-achieving schools to meet goals under school improvement, corrective action, and restructuring plans to schools? [§1003(c); 34 CFR §80.40] **LEA and Schools** **Section 1003(a) School Improvement Funds** ▪ How does the LEA and schools use school level data to make decisions about the use of 1003(a) funds for school improvement? [§1003(a)] ▪ What is the LEA's process for monitoring or reviewing how schools are using section 1003(a) funds to ensure the on-going quality of school improvement activities? [§9306(a)(1)]	**SEA Documentation** **Section 1003(a) School Improvement Funds** ▪ SEA's process, criteria, and timeline for awarding 1003(a) funds. ▪ Current list of LEAs awarded section 1003(a) funds and the amount awarded. ▪ *In cases where the SEA reserves more than 5% of §1003(a) funds*, current written documentation that describes: ➢ The SEA's process to gain LEA approval for the SEA to provide direct or other assistance to LEAs and schools. ➢ The approaches the SEA uses to provide direct or other assistance, e.g., school support teams or arrangements with other assistance providers. ➢ List of LEAs and schools receiving assistance. Description of the SEA's process for reviewing LEA/school implementation of section 1003(a) funds and any assistance the SEA has provided to LEAs/schools as a result of that review.	**LEA and School Documentation** **Section 1003(a) School Improvement Funds** ▪ *For LEAs and schools to be reviewed by ED:* ➢ Copy of the LEA's current approved section 1003(a) application. ➢ Current list of schools receiving section 1003(a) funds and the amount awarded per school. Description of the LEA's process for reviewing school-level implementation of section 1003(a) funds and any assistance the LEA has provided to schools as a result of that review.

2.5: The SEA ensures that requirements for public school choice are met. §1112 and §1116; 34 CFR Part 200, §200.37, §200.44 and §200.48

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
SEA ▪ How and when did the SEA notify LEAs on the requirements for data collection, parent notification, and funding for choice-related transportation specified in the October 2008 Title I regulations? [34 CFR Part 200, §§ 200.37, 200.44, 200.48] What is the SEA's process for monitoring LEA implementation of public school choice, including examining participation rates, the adequacy of transfer options, and local practices to make determinations about potential problems and addressing those problems? [§1116(b)(1)(E)-(F); 34 CFR §200.44(a)(1)-(6); [34 CFR §80.40] **LEA/Schools** ▪ How does LEA identify the public choice options that are made available to parents? **Do public school options include only schools in your district?** [§116(b)(1)(E)-(F); §1116 (b)(11); 34 CFR §200.44)] ▪ What timelines and procedures does the LEA require parents to follow in selecting a different school for their child and communicating their selection to the LEA? [§1116(b)(1)(E)(ii); 34.CFR §200.44(a)(1)-(6)] ▪ How has the LEA met the requirement to post on its Website information about public school choice? [34 C.F.R. §§200.39(c)(1)(i); §200.39(c)(1)(iv); 200.42(b)(5); 200.43(b)(5); 200.43(c)(1)(iii)]	**SEA Documentation** ▪ Copies of guidance or notices to LEAs on the public school choice requirements, including evidence that LEAs have been notified about the public school choice requirements specified in the October 2008 Title I regulations. ▪ Current written documentation that describes the SEA's process for reviewing LEA implementing public school choice and any assistance the SEA has provided to LEAas a result of that monitoring or review.	**LEA/School Documentation** ▪ *For LEAs and schools to be reviewed by ED:* ➢ Current documentation that describes the LEA's process and timelines for receiving, processing, and implementing transfer options. ➢ Posting of the public school choice information on LEA's Website as follows: ▪ Beginning with data from the 2007-2008 school year, and for each subsequent school year, the number of students who were eligible for and who participated in the public school choice option, and ▪ For the current school year, a list of available schools to which students eligible to participate in public school choice may transfer.

2.6: The SEA ensures that requirements for the provision of supplemental educational services (SES) are met. §1116; 34 CFR Part 200, §§200.45–200.47]

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
SEA ▪ How and when did the SEA notify LEAs about the requirements for data collection, parent notification, and funding for SES specified in the October 2008 Title I regulations? [34 CFR, §§ 200.37, 200.44, 200.48] ▪ What are the SEA's criteria and timelines for approving SES providers? [§1116(e)(4)(A)-(B); §1116(e)(5)] ▪ How has the SEA met the requirement to maintain an update its list of approved providers? [§1116(e)(4)(C)] ▪ How has the SEA met the requirement to maintain an update its list of approved providers? [§1116(e)(4)(C)] ▪ What is the SEA's criteria and process for monitoring the quality and effective of providers? How does the SEA report any monitoring findings? [§1116(e)(4)(D); 34 CFR §200.47(c)] ▪ What is the SEA's process for monitoring LEA implementation of SES, including examining participation rates and local practices and taking actions to rectify situations where the LEA is out of compliance with the SES provisions? [§1116(b)(14)(B); 34 CFR §200.47(a)(4)(ii); 34 CFR §80.40]	**SEA Documentation** ▪ Current list of approved SES providers. ▪ Copies of guidance or notices to LEAs on the SES requirements, including evidence that LEAs have been notified about the SES requirements specified in the October 2008 Title I regulations. ▪ Current written documentation that describes the SEA's: ➢ Criteria and process for reviewing and approving SES providers. ➢ Criteria and process for monitoring the quality and effectiveness of SES providers, including reports of any findings and actions taken by the SEA to resolve the findings.	

2.6: The SEA ensures that requirements for the provision of supplemental educational services (SES) are met. §1116; 34 CFR Part 200, §§200.45–200.47

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
LEA/Schools – SES ▪ What timelines and procedures must parents follow in selecting an SES option for their child and communicating that selection to the LEA? [§1116(b)(1)(E)(ii); 34 CFR §200.46(a)(1)-(6)] ▪ How does the LEA ensure that students with disabilities, English-language learners, migrant students, and homeless students have access to SES? [§1116(e)(3)(A); 34 CFR Part 200, §§200.44(j) and 200.46(a)(3)(4)] ▪ How does the LEA apply "fair and equitable procedures" for serving students if the number of spaces with approved providers is not sufficient to serve all students who have requested services from the provider? [34 CFR Part 200, §200.46(a)(3)] ▪ What is the LEA's process for entering into an agreement/contract with an SES provider? [§1116(e)(3)] ▪ How has the LEA met the requirement to post on its Website information about SES? [34 C.F.R. §§200.39(c)(1)(ii); 200.39(c)(1)(iii); 200.42(b)(5); 200.43(b)(5); 200.43(c)(1)(iii)]		**LEA/Schools – SES Documentation** ▪ *For LEAs and schools to be reviewed by ED:* ➢ Current documentation that describes the LEA's process and timelines for notifying parents about SES options and for receiving and processing, SES enrollment forms. ➢ Samples of agreements/contracts between LEA and approved SES providers. ➢ Samples of student learning plans/achievement goals and student progress reports. ➢ Posting of the public school choice information on LEA's Website as follows: ▪ Beginning with data from the 2007-2008 school year, and for each subsequent school year, the number of students who were eligible for and the number of students who participated in SES, and ▪ For the current school year, a list of SES providers approved by the State to serve the LEA and the locations where services are provided.

2.7: The SEA ensures that LEAs and schools develop schoolwide programs that use the flexibility provided to them by the statute to improve the academic achievement of all students in the school. §1114, 34 CFR Part 200, §§200.25–200.28

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
SEA -- Schoolwide Programs ▪ What technical support or other assistance does the SEA provide to LEAs and schools to develop capacity to plan and implement schoolwide programs? [§1111(b)(8)(A); §1111(b)(8)(C); §1111(c)(10); §1114(b)(2)(A)] ▪ What support does the SEA provide to schools that have operated schoolwide programs for a significant period of time to ensure that these schools, through the LEAs, annually review and revise, with representatives of the school community, their schoolwide plans and that those plans address the required components. [§1111(b)(8)(A); §1111(b)(8)(C); §1111(c)(10)] ▪ How does the SEA encourage LEAs and schools to consolidate funds in schoolwide programs, and how have fiscal and accounting barriers to combining funds been modified or eliminated? [§1111(c)(10); §1111(a)(1); §1111(a)(3)]	**SEA -- Schoolwide Programs Documentation** ▪ Current written documentation that includes: ➢ Samples of guidance or communications to LEAs and schools on the schoolwide program requirements. ➢ Communications with LEAs and schools on consolidating and using funds with other Federal, State and local funds in schoolwide programs and eliminating fiscal and accounting barrier to combining funds. ➢ Samples of notices, agenda, or schedules of statewide, local, or school-specific professional development the SEA has provided to help LEAs and schools to build their capacity to plan and implement schoolwide programs. ➢ Examples of technical assistance provided by members of the State system of support to LEAs and schools in planning and implementing schoolwide programs.	
LEA and Schools – Schoolwide Programs ▪ What assistance or guidance does the LEA provide to schools to plan and develop their schoolwide plans? [§1112(c)(1)(A)-(C); §1114(b)(2)(B)] ▪ What assistance does the LEA provide to schools for improving the ongoing quality of their schoolwide programs and for ensuring that schools annually review and revise, with parents and representatives of the school community, their schoolwide plans? [§1112(c)(1)(C); §1112(f); §1114(b)(2)(B)]		**LEA and Schools -- Schoolwide Programs Documentation** ▪ *For LEAs and schools to be reviewed by ED:* ➢ List of schoolwide schools. ➢ Copies of schoolwide plans. ➢ Samples of LEA guidance or communications to schools and parents about schoolwide programs. ➢ Samples of training materials, agenda, or schedules of professional development to help schools plan, review, and implement schoolwide programs.

2.7: The SEA ensures that LEAs and schools develop schoolwide programs that use the flexibility provided to them by the statute to improve the academic achievement of all students in the school. §1114, 34 CFR Part 200, §§200.25–200.28

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
LEA and Schools -- Schoolwide, Continued ▪ How does the LEA and schools use student achievement and other school-level data to make decisions about the implementation of the schoolwide plan, including decisions about instructional changes, professional development, and the consolidation and use of Title I funds with other Federal, State, and local funds to support the schoolwide program plan. [§1112(c)(1)(A) and (C); §1114(b)] ▪ In cases where a school is both a schoolwide school and a school identified for improvement *and develops a single plan*, how does the LEA ensure that the single plan contains the the schoolwide requirements under section §1114 (b)(1) and the school improvement plan requirements under section §(b)(3)(A).		**LEA and Schools -- Schoolwide Documentation, Continued** **NOTE: SEE ABOVE**

2.8: The SEA ensures that LEA targeted assistance programs meet all requirements. §1115		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
SEA – Targeted Assistance Programs ▪ What technical support or other assistance does the SEA provide to LEAs and schools to develop capacity to plan and implement Title I targeted assistance programs? [§1111(b)(8)(A); §1111(b)(8)(C)]	**SEA – Targeted Assistance Documentation** ▪ Current written documentation that includes: ➢ Samples of guidance or communications to LEAs and schools on the targeted assistance program requirements. ➢ Samples of notices, agenda, or schedules of statewide, local, or school-specific professional development the SEA has provided to help LEAs and schools to build their capacity to plan and implement targeted assistance programs.	
LEA/Schools – Targeted Assistance Programs ▪ What guidance, assistance, and support does the LEA provide to schools for planning, implementing, and improving the ongoing quality of their targeted assistance programs? [§1112(c)(1)(C); §1112(f); §1112(b)(1)(H); §1115(c)(2)(B)] ▪ How does the LEA and schools use student achievement and other school-level data to make decisions about the implementation of the targeted assistance plan, including decisions about effective instructional methods and strategies, professional development, and coordination with the regular education programs? [§1112(c)(1)(C); §1112(f); 1112(b)(1)(H); §1115(c)-(d); §1115(e)]		**LEA and Schools – Targeted Assistance Programs Documentation** ▪ *For LEAs and schools to be reviewed by ED:* ➢ List of targeted assistance schools. ➢ Copies of targeted assistance plans. ➢ Samples of LEA guidance or communications to schools and parents about targeted assistance program requirement. ➢ Samples of training materials, agenda, or schedules of local or school-specific professional development to help schools to build their capacity to plan and implement targeted assistance programs.

3.1: Within State Allocations, Reallocations, and Carryover. The SEA complies with -

- The procedures for adjusting ED-determined allocations outlined in §§200.70 – 200.75 of the regulations.
- The procedures for reserving funds for school improvement, State administration, and (where applicable) the State Academic Achievement Awards program.
- The reallocation and carryover provisions in §§ 1126(c) and 1127 of the ESEA.

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
▪ When do LEAs receive their Title I allocation? ▪ Has the SEA granted any waivers to LEAs exceeding the 15% limit? Under what circumstances? What are the procedures for granting waivers? How has the SEA notified LEAs that waiver requests have been approved/denied? ▪ How does the SEA monitor budgets to ensure that LEAs do not exceed the 15% carryover limitation unless they have requested and been granted a waiver? ▪ How does the SEA provide technical assistance and written guidance to LEAs regarding allocations, reservation of funds and carryover? ▪ How are charter school LEAs included in the allocation process? ▪ From the 4% reservation for section 1003(a)-(e) school improvement activities, how has the SEA allocated 95% of the amount reserved to LEAs with schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring? Are all these funds being	Documentation ▪ Procedures showing how State adjusts ED allocations to account for the creation of new school districts and district boundary changes and to reserve funds for school improvement activities, State administration, and (where applicable) the State Academic Achievement Awards program. ▪ Evidence that carryover waivers approved by the SEA were reasonable and necessary or supplemental Title I, Part A appropriations became available. ▪ Procedures showing how the State adjusts ED allocations to account for existing, as well as new and expanding charter school LEAs. ▪ Evidence that the SEA has included charter schools in its allocation process. ▪ Evidence showing that the SEA has reserved 4% of the State's Title I, Part A allocation for section 1003(a)-(e) school improvement activities, and allocated 95% of the amount reserved to LEAs with schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.	Documentation ▪ Title I, Part A grant awards and notification of grant awards. ▪ Waiver requests, if applicable and SEA approval/denial. ▪ 1003 (a) – (e) grant awards ▪ Calculations of percentage of carryover.

3.1: Within State Allocations, Reallocations, and Carryover. The SEA complies with -

- The procedures for adjusting ED-determined allocations outlined in §§200.70 – 200.75 of the regulations.
- The procedures for reserving funds for school improvement, State administration, and (where applicable) the State Academic Achievement Awards program.

The reallocation and carryover provisions in §§1126(c) and 1127 of the ESEA.

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
	Documentation	Documentation
▪ spent? What is the SEA's process for working with LEAs that may not be spending all of these funds? ▪ How has the SEA awarded funds under 1003(a)? ▪ How much as the SEA retained from 1003(g) and 1003(a) for State-level activities? ▪ How has the SEA ensured that it has awarded at least 95% of its section 1003(g) and 1003(a) funds either separately or combined to its LEAs? ▪ Has the SEA reserved funds for the State Academic Achievement Awards program? If so, Is the amount reserved for this purpose less than 5% of the amount in excess of the Title I, Part A amount the State received in the preceding year? ▪ What is the SEA's balance of 1003 (a) and (g) funds for the most recent two years? ▪ Does the SEA consolidate their admin funds?	▪ Evidence that no LEA received a Title I amount less than the amount received in the prior year because of the school improvement reserve. ▪ For State administration, evidence showing that the SEA has reserved not more than 1% of its Title I, Part A allocation for this purpose. ▪ Evidence that the SEA has awarded funds under 1003(a) in accordance with its Accountability Workbook. ▪ If allocated separately from 1003(a) funds, evidence that the SEA has awarded funds under 1003(g) to ensure that each grant is not less than $50,000 or no more than $500,000 for each participating school? ▪ Record of the amount reserved for the Academic Achievement Awards program. Evidence that the amount reserved did not exceed more than 5% of the amount in excess of the Title I, Part A amount the State received in the preceding year. Record of awards made under this program. ▪ Evidence showing 1003 (a) and (g) fund balances and the LEAs/schools receiving funds.	▪ Evidence that schools receiving funds under 1003(g) are receiving a minimum of $50,000 to a maximum of $500,000. ▪ If applicable, evidence that the LEAs eligible to receive funds under 1003(g) whose schools are receiving direct services requested and approved direct services from the SEA or through other entities provided by the SEA,

3.1: Within State Allocations, Reallocations, and Carryover. The SEA complies with -

- The procedures for adjusting ED-determined allocations outlined in §§200.70 – 200.75 of the regulations.
- The procedures for reserving funds for school improvement, State administration, and (where applicable) the State Academic Achievement Awards program.

The reallocation and carryover provisions in §§1126(c) and1127 of the ESEA.

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
	Documentation ▪ Evidence showing what program admin funds are being consolidated and that over 50% of the consolidated funds are from state resources. ▪ Record of final basic, concentration, targeted, and education finance incentive grants to LEAs after SEA has adjusted ED allocations. ▪ Evidence that LEAs have full access to Title I funds for the full 27 month availability period (15 month initial availability plus 12 months). ▪ SEA written guidance and/or technical assistance to LEAs regarding allocations, reservation of funds, carryovers, and reallocation. ▪ Evidence that, if the SEA has made an exception to the 15 percent carryover limitation it has determined that the LEA request is reasonable and necessary or supplemental appropriations for Title I, Part A become available.	

3.2: LEA Plan. The SEA ensures that its LEAs comply with the provision for submitting an annual application to the SEA and revising LEA plans as necessary to reflect substantial changes in the direction of their program. [§1112]

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
SEA ▪ What is the process for review and approval of local applications? ▪ What type of technical assistance is provided to LEAs regarding the submission of their annual plan? ▪ What is the process for reviewing LEA plans to determine if the LEA has met requirements for required and allowable reservations? ▪ What is the process for submitting amendments? ▪ When are LEAs required to submit amendments? What type(s) of change(s) require a formal amendment?	Documentation ▪ Review and approval process for LEA plans, including procedures. (Review checklists, established schedule, and samples of correspondence with LEAs). ▪ Resolution procedures for unapproved plans. ▪ Guidance to LEAs on local application preparation and submission of plan amendments. ▪ Schedule/timeline regarding the process for submission, revisions, and final edits for LEA plans. ▪ Sample of amendment requests and SEA approval /denial. ▪ Evidence of technical assistance provided to LEAs on annual plan requirements. ▪ Evidence of timely plan approval and release of funds.	Documentation ▪ Most recently approved annual plan from the LEA, which includes: ➢ Needs Assessment ➢ Allocation amount, budget information and required set-asides ➢ A description of the poverty criteria used to select school attendance areas ➢ Record of schools' AYP. ▪ Amendment requests. ▪ Listing of schools with poverty criteria. ▪ Evidence that the plan included input from teachers, principals, administrators (including administrators of other programs described in Title I, Part A) and other appropriate school personnel, and parents of children in schools receiving Title I services.

3.3: Within District Allocation Procedures. LEA complies with the requirements with regard to: (1) Reserving funds for the various set-asides either required or allowed under the statute, & (2) Allocating funds to eligible school attendance areas or schools in rank order of poverty based on the number of children from low-income families who reside in an eligible attendance area. [§§1113, 1116, 1118 of the ESEA and §200.77 and §200.78 of the Title I regulations]

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
I. General LEA Selection and Allocation Requirements SEA ▪ What process has the SEA put in place to ensure that its LEAs comply with selection and allocation requirements? ▪ What guidance or instructions related to general selection and allocation requirements has the SEA provided to LEAs? LEA ▪ Are low-income and enrollment data available for all schools in the LEA? ▪ Has the LEA used the same measure of poverty for identifying eligible attendance areas and determining the allocation of each attendance area? ▪ Are all participating schools being funded based on low-income data from the same source? ▪ Are charter schools and alternative schools included in the ranking?	**I. General LEA Selection and Allocation Requirements** Documentation ▪ SEA guidance or instructions related to general selection and allocation requirements. ▪ SEA procedure(s) to ensure that LEAs comply with general selection and allocation requirements.	**I. General LEA Selection and Allocation Requirements** Documentation School Eligibility ▪ Documentation, if applicable, that the LEA has a waiver of requirements for the determination of eligible school attendance areas and allocations under a State-ordered or court-ordered desegregation plan. ▪ Evidence that the LEA has correctly calculated the district-wide poverty average. ▪ Evidence that the LEA is correctly applying the 125 percent rule if it serves any school below 35 percent. Enrollment Data ▪ Evidence that the LEA uses data that is consistent regarding the number of students residing in each of the school attendance areas. ▪ SEA or LEA policies for determining student count.

3.3: Within District Allocation Procedures. LEA complies with the requirements with regard to: (1) Reserving funds for the various set-asides either required or allowed under the statute, & (2) Allocating funds to eligible school attendance areas or schools in rank order of poverty based on the number of children from low-income families who reside in an eligible attendance area. [§§1113, 1116, 1118 of the ESEA and §§200.77 and 200.78 of the Title I regulations]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
		I. General LEA Selection and Allocation Requirements <u>Documentation</u> ▪ Measure of Poverty Used ▪ A list of schools and the poverty criterion that is used to determine eligibility and allocate funds. ▪ Evidence that the measure of poverty is used consistently across all school attendance areas.

3.3: Within District Allocation Procedures. LEA complies with the requirements with regard to: (1) Reserving funds for the various set-asides either required or allowed under the statute, & (2) Allocating funds to eligible school attendance areas or schools in rank order of poverty based on the number of children from low-income families who reside in an eligible attendance area. [§§1113, 1116, 1118 of the ESEA and §§200.77 and 200.78 of the Title I regulations]

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
II. Rank Ordering and Allocation Procedures SEA ▪ How does the SEA ensure that, when an LEA elects to "skip" an eligible school, that skipped school meets all the requirements related to "skipping?" ▪ Meets comparability requirements ▪ Receives supplemental State or local funds that are spent according to the requirements of Sec. 1114 (Schoolwide) or 1115 (Targeted Assistance) ▪ The funds provided from other sources equal or exceed the amount that would have been provided under Title I. ▪ How does the SEA ensure that LEAs have correctly applied the provision related to "grandfathering"? ▪ LEA ▪ Do low-income and enrollment data support the rank ordering of schools?	**II. Rank Ordering and Allocation Procedures** Documentation ▪ SEA guidance or instructions for rank ordering schools. ▪ SEA procedure(s) to ensure that LEAs meet requirements related to rank order.	**II. Rank Ordering and Allocation Procedures** Documentation ▪ Rank Order ▪ Evidence that, for each attendance area, the percentage of poverty is correctly calculated. ▪ Evidence that the feeder pattern, if applicable, is calculated correctly. ▪ Evidence that charter schools are included in the ranking. ▪ Evidence that, if funds are not available to serve all eligible schools within an eligible school attendance area, schools that have exceeded 75 percent poverty have been identified and ranked from highest percentage of poverty to lowest percentage of poverty. ▪ Evidence that, once schools with poverty rates above 75 percent have been served, if there are funds available to serve additional schools, the additional schools have been ranked from highest percentage of poverty to lowest percentage of poverty or have been ranked by grade span. ▪ Evidence that, in reserving Title I, Part A funds for choice-related transportation, SES, and parent outreach and assistance, the LEA has not reduced Title I allocations to schools identified for corrective action or restructuring by more than 15 percent. How should an LEA calculate this 15 percent limit?

3.3: Within District Allocation Procedures. LEA complies with the requirements with regard to: (1) Reserving funds for the various set-asides either required or allowed under the statute, & (2) Allocating funds to eligible school attendance areas or schools in rank order of poverty based on the number of children from low-income families who reside in an eligible attendance area. [§§1113, 1116, 1118 of the ESEA and §§200.77 and 200.78 of the Title I regulations]

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
II. Rank Ordering and Allocation Procedures SEA ▪ How does the SEA ensure that **all** schools in LEAs including charter schools, alternative schools, and special education schools are included in the rank order? LEA staff demonstrate an understanding of: ▪ The allocation formula including the procedures for rank ordering school attendance areas and schools and determining which attendance areas or schools are eligible for Title I. ▪ The ranking procedures without regard to grade spans for schools with a poverty rate above 75 percent. ▪ The requirement to exclude pre-kindergarten children from the poverty count of each school.	**II. Rank Ordering and Allocation Procedures**	**II. Rank Ordering and Allocation Procedures** Documentation ▪ Calculating Per Pupil Allocation (PPA) Amounts. ▪ Total Amount of Title I, Part A funds available for distribution to schools $_____ ▪ Evidence that the LEA has allocated funds to participating school attendance areas in rank order. ▪ Evidence that the LEA is correctly applying the 125 percent rule if they are serving schools below 35% poverty.

3.3: Within District Allocation Procedures. LEA complies with the requirements with regard to: (1) Reserving funds for the various set-asides either required or allowed under the statute, & (2) Allocating funds to eligible school attendance areas or schools in rank order of poverty based on the number of children from low-income families who reside in an eligible attendance area. [§§1113, 1116, 1118 of the ESEA and §§200.77 and 200.78 of the Title I regulations]

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
III. LEA Reservation of Funds SEA ▪ What procedure does the SEA have in place to ensure that, before an LEA may reallocate funds originally reserved for choice-related transportation and/or supplemental educational services to other activities, it has first met requirements described in 34 C.F.R. section 200.48? ▪ What procedures does the SEA have in place to ensure that, if an LEA has not met its 20 percent obligation and has not met criteria in 34 C.F.R. section 200.48 it must spend the unexpended amount in the subsequent school year? LEA ▪ Is the LEA considering variations in personnel costs, such as seniority pay differentials or fringe benefit differentials, as LEA-wide administrative costs rather than as part of the funds allocated to schools?	**III. LEA Reservation of Funds** Documentation ▪ SEA guidance or instructions to LEAs related to reserving funds for required or allowed reservations. ▪ SEA procedure(s) for ensuring that LEAs meet reservation requirements annually. ▪ SEA procedures to ensure that, before an LEA may reallocate funds originally reserved for choice-related transportation and/or supplemental educational services to other activities, it has first assured the SEA that eligible children and their families have had adequate time to avail themselves of the opportunity to transfer to other schools or to receive supplemental educational services. SEA guidance or instructions to LEAs related to calculating the per-pupil funding cap for supplemental educational services.	III. LEA Reservation of Funds Documentation ▪ Evidence that the LEA has reserved funds that are reasonable and necessary to provide services comparable to those provided to children in participating school attendance areas to serve: ➢ Homeless Children o Evidence that the LEA has reserved funds to serve homeless students who do not attend participating schools. ➢ Children in local institutions for neglected and delinquent children o Evidence that the LEA has reserved funds to serve children in local institutions for neglected children; and, if appropriate, children in local institutions for delinquent children; and, neglected and delinquent children in community-day programs. ▪ Evidence that the LEA has reserved funds to provide, where appropriate, financial incentives and rewards to teachers who serve students in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

3.3: Within District Allocation Procedures. LEA complies with the requirements with regard to: (1) Reserving funds for the various set-asides either required or allowed under the statute, & (2) Allocating funds to eligible school attendance areas or schools in rank order of poverty based on the number of children from low-income families who reside in an eligible attendance area. [§§ 1113, 1116, 1118 of the ESEA and §§200.77 and 200.78 of the Title I regulations]

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
III. LEA Reservation of Funds ▪ Is the LEA using a portion of the reservation for SES and Choice for parental outreach? Is this amount equal to or less than one percent of the total reserved? ▪ If the LEA has reserved less than 20 percent of its allocation for SES and Choice, can it provide documentation that it is able to provide SES and choice to all eligible students using less than that amount?	**III. LEA Reservation of Funds**	**III. LEA Reservation of Funds** <u>Documentation</u> ▪ Evidence that the LEA has reserved funds for: Choice-Related Transportation ▪ Evidence that the LEA, if appropriate, has reserved an amount equal to 20 percent of its Title I, Part A allocation for Choice, SES, and parent outreach unless the LEA meets these requirements with non-Title I funds. ▪ Evidence that, if the LEA has reserved less than 20 percent of its allocation for SES and Choice, it can provide documentation that it is able to provide SES and choice to all eligible students using less than that amount. ▪ Evidence that if demand from parents for transportation exceeds 5 percent, the LEA is spending at least 5 percent on transportation. ▪ Evidence that, if the LEA has reallocated funds reserved for choice-related transportation and/or supplemental educational services to other activities, it has first assured the SEA that eligible children and their families have had adequate time to avail themselves of the opportunity to transfer to other schools or to receive supplemental educational services.

3.3: Within District Allocation Procedures. LEA complies with the requirements with regard to: (1) Reserving funds for the various set-asides either required or allowed under the statute, & (2) Allocating funds to eligible school attendance areas or schools in rank order of poverty based on the number of children from low-income families who reside in an eligible attendance area. [§§1113, 1116, 1118 of the ESEA and §§200.77 and 200.78 of the Title I regulations]

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
III. LEA Reservation of Funds	**III. LEA Reservation of Funds**	**III. LEA Reservation of Funds** <u>Documentation</u> ▪ LEA staff can provide documentation related to the amount of funding that has been expended for choice-related transportation and supplemental educational services as of _____ (*Date to be determined by ED staff)* ▪ Professional Development Evidence that the LEA has reserved at least 5 percent of its allocation (unless a lesser amount is needed) to provide professional development activities to ensure that teachers who are not highly qualified become highly qualified. ▪ Parental Involvement Evidence that, if the LEA receives a Title I, Part A allocation greater than $500,000, it has reserved at least one percent of that allocation for parental involvement activities. **III. LEA Reservation of Funds** <u>Documentation</u> ▪ Evidence that, after the LEA has determined the private school portion, the LEA has distributed at least 95 percent of the remainder to schools.

3.3: Within District Allocation Procedures. LEA complies with the requirements with regard to: (1) Reserving funds for the various set-asides either required or allowed under the statute, & (2) Allocating funds to eligible school attendance areas or schools in rank order of poverty based on the number of children from low-income families who reside in an eligible attendance area. [§§1113, 1116, 1118 of the ESEA and §§200.77 and 200.78 of the Title I regulations]

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
IV. Equitable Services for Private School Participants SEA ▪ What procedures does the SEA use to ensure that LEAs have correctly calculated the amount of funds for equitable services to private school participants and their teachers and families?	**IV. Equitable Services for Private School Participants** Documentation ▪ Procedures that the SEA uses to ensure that LEAs have correctly calculated the amount of funds for equitable services to private school participants and their teachers and families.	**IV. Equitable Services for Private School Participants** Documentation ▪ Evidence that the LEA has correctly calculated the amount of funds for equitable services to private school participants and their teachers and families, including carryover as appropriate: ▪ Proportion of Reservation _____. 5% ▪ Amount reserved for Instructional Services – Private School Participants _____. ▪ Amount reserved for Parental Involvement – Families of Private School Participants _____. ▪ Amount reserved for Professional Development – Teachers of Private School Participants _____.

3.3: Within District Allocation Procedures. LEA complies with the requirements with regard to: (1) Reserving funds for the various set-asides either required or allowed under the statute, & (2) Allocating funds to eligible school attendance areas or schools in rank order of poverty based on the number of children from low-income families who reside in an eligible attendance area. [§§1113, 1116, 1118 of the ESEA and §§200.77 and 200.78 of the Title I regulations]

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
V. Additional Reservation of Funds for LEA and School Improvement SEA ▪ What guidance has the SEA provided to LEAs regarding reservations for requirements related to LEA and school improvement that are carried over into the next school year? ▪ SEA staff can describe the process that the SEA uses for ensuring that LEAs meet reservation requirements related to LEA and school improvement annually. ▪ SEA staff can describe the process that the SEA uses to inform them that the equitable services provision does not apply to reservations related to LEA and school improvement. LEA ▪ How does the LEA handle any reservations for requirements related to LEA and school improvement that are carried over into the next school year?	**V. Additional Reservation of Funds for LEA and School Improvement** Documentation ▪ SEA guidance or instructions to LEAs related to reservations for LEA and school improvement. ▪ SEA guidance or instructions to LEAs to inform them that the equitable services provision does not apply to reservations related to LEA and school improvement. ▪ SEA procedures for ensuring that LEAs meet reservation requirements related to LEA and school improvement annually.	**V. Additional Reservation of Funds for LEA and School Improvement** Documentation ▪ Evidence that, if the LEA has been identified for improvement, it has reserved at least 10 percent of its allocation for professional development activities (this may include funds reserved at the school level for those schools identified for improvement). ▪ Evidence that Title I schools that have been identified for improvement have reserved at least 10 percent of their allocation for professional development activities. ▪ Evidence that the LEA has not provided equitable services from reservations related to LEA and school improvement.

3.4: Fiscal Requirements: Maintenance of Effort, Comparability, Supplement not Supplant, and Internal Controls---The SEA ensures that the LEA complies with---

- The procedures for ensuring maintenance of effort (MOE) as outlined in §§1120A and 9021 of the ESEA.
- The procedures for meeting the comparability requirement as outlined in §1120A of the ESEA.
- The procedures for ensuring that Federal funds are supplementing and not supplanting non-Federal sources used for the education of participating children as outlined in §§1120A of the ESEA, 1114 of the ESEA, 1115 of the ESEA, and 1116 of the ESEA.

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
Maintenance of Effort <u>SEA</u> ▪ How does the SEA ensure that LEAs comply with the maintenance of effort fiscal requirement under Title I? ▪ How does the SEA provide technical guidance and support of its LEAs in the area of MOE?	**Maintenance of Effort** <u>Documentation</u> ▪ Procedures for determining maintenance of effort (MOE), including funds to be excluded from MOE calculations. ▪ MOE report comparing fiscal effort of first preceding year with second preceding year. ▪ For each LEA that does not maintain effort, the SEA calculations to determine how much the LEA's allocation for each covered program is reduced.	**Maintenance of Effort** <u>Documentation</u> *(Usually done at the SEA level. If maintenance of effort is calculated at the LEA, provide the same evidence as requested from the State, in addition to SEA guidance on procedures for calculating maintenance of effort.)*

3.4: Fiscal Requirements: Maintenance of Effort, Comparability, Supplement not Supplant, and Internal Controls--- The SEA ensures that the LEA complies with---

- The procedures for ensuring maintenance of effort (MOE) as outlined in §§1120A and 9021 of the ESEA.
- The procedures for meeting the comparability requirement as outlined in §1120A of the ESEA.
- The procedures for ensuring that Federal funds are supplementing and not supplanting non-Federal sources used for the education of participating children as outlined in §§1120A of the ESEA, 1114 of the ESEA, 1115 of the ESEA, and 1116 of the ESEA.

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
Comparability <u>SEA</u> ▪ How does the SEA ensure that LEAs comply annually with comparability requirements under Title I? ▪ How does the SEA provide technical guidance and support of its LEAs in the area of comparability? ▪ How does the SEA ensure that, in cases where Title I schools are not comparable, the LEA has made adjustments to the allocation of resources that LEA made to ensure that Title I and non-Title I schools are comparable?	**Comparability** <u>Documentation</u> ▪ Guidance provided to the LEAs describing the approved procedures for determining comparability. ▪ Sample comparability reports comparing Title I schools to non-Title I schools. ▪ Evidence that SEA is monitoring comparability at least every two years. ▪ Review within state allocations under indicator 3.1.	**Comparability** <u>Documentation</u> ▪ Annual comparability calculations for Title I schools and non-Title I schools showing that the resources Title I schools receive from local and State funds are comparable to those received by non-Title I schools. ▪ In cases where Title I schools are not comparable, documentation showing adjustments to the allocation of resources that LEA made to ensure that Title I and non-Title I schools are comparable.

3.4: Fiscal Requirements: Maintenance of Effort, Comparability, Supplement not Supplant and Internal Controls--- The SEA ensures that the LEA complies with---

- The procedures for ensuring maintenance of effort (MOE) as outlined in §§1120A and 9021 of the ESEA.
- The procedures for meeting the comparability requirement as outlined in §1120A of the ESEA.
- The procedures for ensuring that Federal funds are supplementing and not supplanting non-Federal sources used for the education of participating children as outlined in §§1120A of the ESEA, 1114 of the ESEA, 1115 of the ESEA, and 1116 of the ESEA.

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
Supplement Not Supplant SEA ▪ How does the SEA ensure that LEAs comply with the supplement not supplant requirements? ▪ How does the SEA ensure that LEAs understand the intent and purpose of schoolwide programs and targeted assistance programs and the distinction between them?	**Supplement Not Supplant** Documentation ▪ Written SEA guidance to LEAs on supplement not supplant requirements. ▪ Evidence that questions or inquiries from LEAs and schools regarding supplement not supplant issues have been adequately addressed. ▪ Evidence that the SEA has monitored expenditures of LEAs to ensure that funds are used to supplement, and not supplant State and local funds.	**Supplement Not Supplant** Documentation ▪ LEA approved budget and records of expenditures of Title I funds at the district level. ▪ Record of schoolwide expenditures that verifies that funds have not supplanted non-Federal funds. ▪ Record of targeted assistance program expenditures that verifies that funds have been used to meet the statutory requirements for such programs and not to supplant non-Federal resources.

3.4: Fiscal Requirements: Maintenance of Effort, Comparability, Supplement not Supplant, Internal Controls, and Reporting—The SEA ensures that the LEA complies with---

- The procedures for ensuring maintenance of effort (MOE) as outlined in §§1120A and 9021 of the ESEA.
- The procedures for meeting the comparability requirement as outlined in §1120A of the ESEA.
- The procedures for ensuring that Federal funds are supplementing and not supplanting non-Federal sources used for the education of participating children as outlined in §§1120A of the ESEA, 1114 of the ESEA, 1115 of the ESEA, and 1116 of the ESEA.

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
Internal Controls <u>SEA</u> ▪ How does the SEA ensure that its LEAs adhere to the proper accounting of time and attendance for Title I paid staff? ▪ How does the SEA ensure that LEAs adhere to the procedures for maintaining equipment and materials purchased with Title I funds? ▪ What is the process used to resolve audit issues? ▪ How does the SEA use audits to inform monitoring?	**Internal Controls** <u>Documentation</u> ▪ Record of personnel records for all Title I-funded positions. ▪ Record of inventory purchased within the last two years. ▪ Evidence from the SEA that audit findings referencing erroneous payments (overpayments and underpayments), if applicable, have been cleared.	**Internal Controls** <u>Documentation</u> ▪ Record of personnel records for all Title I-funded positions. ▪ Record of inventory purchased within the last two years. ▪ Evidence from the SEA that audit findings referencing erroneous payments (overpayments and underpayments), if applicable, have been cleared.

3.4: Fiscal Requirements: Maintenance of Effort, Comparability, Supplement not Supplant, Internal Controls, and Reporting—The SEA ensures that the LEA complies with---

- The procedures for ensuring maintenance of effort (MOE) as outlined in §§1120A and 9021 of the ESEA.
- The procedures for meeting the comparability requirement as outlined in §1120A of the ESEA.
- The procedures for ensuring that Federal funds are supplementing and not supplanting non-Federal sources used for the education of participating children as outlined in §§1120A of the ESEA, 1114 of the ESEA, 1115 of the ESEA, and 1116 of the ESEA.

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
Reporting ▪ Has your State submitted its prime-recipient (SEA) quarterly report(s) required by section 1512 of the ARRA to www.FederalReporting.gov? ▪ How is your State handling the sub-recipient (LEA) quarterly reporting requirements of section 1512 of the ARRA for LEAs that receive Title I ARRA funds? ▪ If the State is reporting for its LEAs, has it submitted the required sub-recipient data to www.FederalReporting.gov? ▪ If the State is having its LEAs report the sub-recipient data directly, how has the State ensured that the LEAs receiving Title I ARRA funds have reported this information to www.FederalReporting.gov?	**Reporting** Documentation ▪ Copy of quarterly reports for Title I ARRA funds,(The first report due October 10, 2009; January, April, July) ▪ Copy of guidance to LEAs regarding quarterly reporting requirements for Title I ARRA funds. *[Note: for the sub-recipient reporting, current OMB guidance gives States the choice of reporting for its LEAs or having the LEAs report themselves.]* ▪ Copy of required sub-recipient data submitted to www.FederalReporting.gov for Title I ARRA funding.	**Reporting** Documentation ▪ Copy of sub-recipient data reported to the State for Title I ARRA funds.

3.5: Services to Eligible Private School Children. The SEA ensures that the LEA complies with requirements with regard to services to eligible private school children, their teachers and their families**.** §§1120 and 9306 of the ESEA, §443 of GEPA, and §§200.62—200.67, §200.77 and §200.78 of the Title I Regulations

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
Services to Private School Children SEA ▪ What guidance/technical assistance has the SEA provided to its LEAs regarding the provision of services to eligible children attending private schools? ▪ How does the SEA ensure that its LEAs are meeting these requirements?	**Services to Private School Children** Documentation ▪ Procedures that the SEA uses to determine that the required consultation occurred. ▪ Evidence that LEAs have met the requirements for consultation, written affirmation and evaluation of the program. ▪ Copies of affirmation forms from LEAs that the SEA has collected. ▪ Evidence that LEAs have met the requirements for financial recordkeeping related to services to private school children that will facilitate an effective financial or programmatic audit. ▪ Evidence that the SEA has provided information to LEAs that are serving eligible private school children through contracts with a third party to ensure that the third party is providing Title I services to eligible private school children in accordance with all Title I requirements. ▪ Copy of monitoring protocols that the SEA uses to monitor the requirements of provision of services to eligible children attending private schools.	**Services to Private School Children** Documentation ▪ Evidence that consultation has occurred between LEA and private school officials or its representatives regarding services for private school children prior to the LEA making any decision. ▪ Copy of written affirmation from officials of private school or a representative. ▪ Evidence that private school children that have been selected for services reside in a participating public school attendance area and meet the multiple academic criteria established by the LEA in consultation with private school officials. ▪ Evidence that providers of services are employees of the LEA or employees of third party contractor. ▪ Documentation that all teachers and/or paraprofessionals employed by the LEA who provide services to private school children meet the Section 1119 requirements. ▪ Evidence that the LEA is evaluating the Title I program serving private school students and making modifications if necessary.

3.5: Services to Eligible Private School Children. The SEA ensures that the LEA complies with requirements with regard to services to eligible private school children, their teachers and their families**.** §§1120 and 9306 of the ESEA, §443 of GEPA, and §§200.62—200.67, §200.77 and §200.78 of the Title I Regulations

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
Services to Private School Children	**Services to Private School Children** <u>Documentation</u> ▪ SEA complaint procedures for private schools officials. ▪ Evidence that the SEA has provided guidance/technical assistance to its LEAs regarding the provision of services to eligible children attending private schools.	**Services to Private School Children** <u>Documentation</u> ▪ Copy of third party contract(s) and invoices from the third party contractor (If applicable). ▪ Evidence that the LEA regularly supervises the provision of Title I services to private school children. ▪ Evidence that the LEA maintains control of the Title I funds, materials, equipment and property that support services to private school children.

3.5: Services to Eligible Private School Children. The SEA ensures that the LEA complies with requirements with regard to services to eligible private school children, their teachers and their families**.** §§1120 and 9306 of the ESEA, §443 of GEPA, and §§200.62 – 200.67, §200.77 and §200.78 of the Title I Regulations

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
Services to Private School Children	**Services to Private School Children** <u>Documentation</u> ▪ Evidence that the SEA has provided technical assistance to LEAs that are serving eligible private school children through contracts with a third party to ensure that the third party is providing Title I services to eligible private school children in accordance with all Title I requirements. ▪ Evidence that, when LEAs contract with third party contractors to provide services to private school children, the administrative costs for the contractor are taken "off the top." ▪ Copy of SEA complaint procedures for private school officials.	**Services to Private School Children** <u>Documentation</u> ▪ Title I funded materials and equipment located at the private school are properly labeled.
▪ How has the SEA ensured that private school officials had an opportunity to have input regarding the provision of services to eligible private school children using ARRA funds?	▪ Evidence that the SEA has provided guidance/technical assistance to LEAs regarding the participation of private school officials in having services provided with the use of ARRA funds.	▪ Evidence that the LEA has consulted with private school officials regarding ARRA funds.

3.6: Committee of Practitioners (COP). The SEA establishes a Committee of Practitioners (COP) and involves the committee in decision making as required. [§§1903 and 1111 of the ESEA]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
SEA ▪ Is there a Committee of Practitioners in place? ▪ Can the SEA provide examples as to how the COP is regularly involved in advising the State on its Title I responsibilities?	Documentation ▪ Evidence that the COP has a membership comprised of representatives from LEAs, as a majority of its members; administrators; teachers, including vocational educators; parents; members of local school boards; representatives of private school children; and pupil services personnel. ▪ Evidence that the COP advises the State in carrying out its Title I responsibilities, including reviewing any proposed or final State Title I rule or regulation before its publication and developing and monitoring the implementation of the State's plan. ▪ Evidence that the COP has been involved in matters regarding the State administration of Title I programs.	This is a SEA Requirement

Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part D
Standards, Assessment and Accountability

1.1: The SEA conducts monitoring and evaluation of its subgrantees sufficient to ensure compliance with Title I, Part D program requirements and progress toward Federal and State program goals and objectives. [§§1426 and1431]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable SA/LEA Evidence**
Questions: ▪ How does the SEA ensure that students in Title I, Part D programs receive instruction that is aligned with state standards and accountability? ▪ What is the SEA process for monitoring Subpart 1 and 2 programs from selection and notification to reporting and corrective action follow-up? ▪ What is the process for data collection that the SEA uses to obtain demographic, academic and vocational outcome information on all Subpart 1 and 2 programs? ▪ How does the SEA evaluate statewide and subgrantee program performance and report the results of such evaluations?	Documentation: ▪ Written material describing statewide program performance for the last school year: reports, report cards, handouts, PowerPoint slides, agendas and notes, etc. ▪ Evidence SEA provided technical assistance to subgrantees on how to efficiently and effectively collect and use data, including training or conference agendas, presentation materials, activity descriptions, evaluations. ▪ A subgrantee monitoring schedule for the current fiscal year. ▪ A plan for monitoring all subgrantees through desk review and site visits ▪ Monitoring interview protocols for Subpart 1 and Subpart 2. ▪ Application review checklists or notes. ▪ The most recent monitoring reports for subgrantees. ▪ SEA documents tracking subgrantee responses to corrective actions.	Documentation: ▪ The most recent annual data report for the SA or LEA subgrantee. ▪ Any longitudinal tracking of annual outcome data for the SA or LEA subgrantee. ▪ The most recent agency or program-specific evaluation reports that include mention of the Title I, Part D program. ▪ Documents submitted to the SEA to address corrective actions required by the SEA.

Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part D
Instructional Support

2.1: The SEA ensures that State Agency (SA) programs for eligible students meet all requirements, including facilities that operate institutionwide projects. [§1412(A); §1414(a) and (c), 1416] {Formerly Indicators 1.2 and 2.1}		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable SA/LEA Evidence**
Questions: ▪ What are the SEA's goals and objectives for the Title 1, Part D Program? Have they been reviewed and updated recently? ▪ How does the SEA inform SAs about their eligibility and application requirements for a Title I, Part D subgrant? ▪ What technical assistance does the SEA provide the SAs on developing or revising their Subpart 1 applications? ▪ How does the SEA review and evaluate the Subpart 1 applications? ▪ Do institutionwide project plans include a comprehensive needs assessment across all education program services? ▪ How are the needs assessment, curriculum, plans for professional development and program evaluation aligned in institutionwide projects?	Documentation: ▪ Updated State plan tracking performance of Statewide goals and objectives. ▪ Documents concerning eligibility of SA facilities for Title I, Part D funds or institutionwide projects, including checking the Child Count, minimum hours of a regular program of instruction, age of students and average length of stay in institutions. ▪ Written SEA guidance to SAs on developing or revising Subpart 1 applications, including institutionwide projects for specific facilities or programs, such as written instructions, agenda, notes or minutes and handouts from meetings with prospective applicants. ▪ Checklists, notes or other written evidence that the SEA has a review process for awarding subgrants to State Agencies (SA) and approving institutionwide project plans. ▪ A list of subgrant awards to all State agencies and facilities served by Subpart 1 funds.	Documentation: ▪ State agency applications and supporting documents addressing the 19 application elements, including assurances and descriptions, from the current or past fiscal year, including the length of the school day, weekly hours of a regular program of instruction, and parental involvement activities. ▪ Documents related to the 8 institutionwide project application requirements for each facility conducting an institutionwide project, such as comprehensive needs assessment or program evaluation reports. ▪ Documents from professional development meetings and program evaluation meetings for institutionwide projects such as reports, agenda, notes or handouts.

2.2: The SEA ensures that Local Education Agency (LEA) programs for eligible students meet all requirements. [§1423 and §1425] {Formerly Indicator 1.3}		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
Questions: SEA Questions: ▪ How do you inform LEA's about the application requirements for a Title I, Part D subgrant? ▪ What criteria does the SEA use to determine Subpart 2 programs with "high numbers"? ▪ What technical assistance does SEA provide to LEAs and eligible institutions about operating Title I, Part D programs including developing or revising its Subpart 2 application? ▪ How does the SEA review and evaluate the Subpart 2 applications? LEA Questions: ▪ How does the LEA consult with each N or D facility in the program planning and evaluation process? ▪ Are formal agreements between the LEA and these facilities reviewed and updated annually?	Documentation: ▪ Written guidance to LEAs on developing or revising Subpart 2 applications such as written instructions, agenda, notes or minutes and handouts from meetings with prospective applicants. ▪ Checklists, notes, or other written evidence of the SEA review process for subgrants to LEAs that ensures that all funded facilities meet program goals and provide qualified instructional staff. ▪ Written information used by the SEA to identify eligible institutions, such as State agency licensing lists, and notifications to LEAs of their eligibility to submit child counts and apply for funds. ▪ A list of all LEA subgrant awards and N or D facilities served by these subgrants.	Documentation: ▪ LEA applications and supporting documents that address the 13 application elements, including assurances and descriptions, from the current or past fiscal year. ▪ Formal agreements between LEAs and neglected or delinquent facilities and programs outlining responsibilities for providing services mentioned in the 13 application elements. ▪ Qualifications of Title I, Part D staff when a facility is privately managed and served by the LEA.

Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part D
Fiduciary

3.1 The SEA ensures each State agency complies with the statutory and other regulatory requirements governing State administrative activities, providing fiscal oversight of the grants including reallocations and carryover, ensuring subgrantees reserve funds for transition services, demonstrating fiscal maintenance of effort and requirements to supplement, not supplant. [§1004, §1414 (c)(7), §1415(b) and §1418] **[**Also OMB Circular A-87, Part 80, Subpart C of EDGAR, and any other relevant standards, circulars, or legislative mandates] {Includes and exceeds Old Indicator 3.1}		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable SA Evidence**
▪ How much of the Subpart 1 allocation does the SEA reserve for State administration activities and for what activities? ▪ When do State agencies receive their Title I, Part D subgrants? If there was a delay of more than three months, why was that? ▪ How does the SEA ensure that 15% - 30% of funds are reserved and used for transition activities? ▪ What is the SEA's policy regarding carryover and reallocation of funds? ▪ What kind of internal fiscal controls does the SEA have in place to account for the use of Title I, Part D funds in a way that meets Federal requirements? ▪ What other technical assistance does the SEA provide to the SAs on uses of funds? <u>For the State agency:</u> ▪ For what transition-related activities are reserved funds used by the SA? ▪ How does the SA demonstrate fiscal maintenance of effort? ▪ How is the Title I, Part D program supplemental to the regular instructional program? ▪ What internal fiscal controls does the SA have in place to account for uses of funds in a way that meets Federal requirements?	<u>Documentation</u>: ▪ SEA budget detail on reserved funds for State administrative activities for the current fiscal year and use of funds for the last fiscal year. ▪ Written guidance sent to SAs outlining requirements for reserving funds for transition services under Subpart 1. ▪ Requirements on the State agency application to calculate the percentage and provide budget detail on transition services. ▪ Evidence that the SEA reviews fiscal maintenance of effort (MOE) for State agencies and any follow-up action when an SA fails to maintain effort. ▪ Any other fiscal reporting or oversight of Subpart 1 subgrantees, for example, quarterly reports, budget amendment requests and approvals, etc.	<u>Documentation</u>: ▪ Evidence that the SA reserves the appropriate amount of funds as required for transition services. ▪ Documentation of expenditures from the transition reservation for the current and prior fiscal years and/or documentation concerning the transition services provided at each of the funded facilities or programs. ▪ Evidence that the SA is implementing planned and approved activities, for example, budget reports at the end of a fiscal year, records of expenditures, carryover and other summary reports. ▪ A current list of all personnel (instructional and administrative staff) paid with Title I, Part D funds and the proportion of their salaries, benefits and duties that are funded by Title I, Part D.

3.2 The SEA ensures each LEA complies with the statutory and other regulatory requirements governing State administrative activities, providing fiscal oversight of the grants including reallocations and carryover, and allowable uses of funds. [§1424] [Also OMB Circulars A-87, Part 80, Subpart C of EDGAR and any other relevant standards, circulars, or legislative mandates] {New Indicator}

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
▪ How do the SEA and LEA ensure that the Title I, Part D program activities are within the uses of funds and purposes of the Title I, Part D program? What other technical assistance does the SEA provide to the LEAs on uses of funds? ▪ When do LEAs receive their Title I, Part D subgrants? If there was a delay of more than three months, why was that? ▪ What is the SEA's policy regarding carryover and reallocation of funds? ▪ What kind of internal fiscal controls do SEAs and LEAs have in place to ensure that they can account for the use of Title I, Part D funds in a way that meets Federal requirements? For the LEA: ▪ What kind of consultations does the LEA have with each N or D facility or program that will be served with Subpart 2 funds?	Documentation: ▪ SEA budget detail on reserved funds for State level activities for the current fiscal year and use of funds for the last fiscal year . ▪ Any other fiscal reporting or oversight of Subpart 2 subgrantees, for example, quarterly reports, budget amendment requests and approvals, etc.	Documentation: ▪ Formal agreements between an LEA, an N or D facility or alternative school program governing the use of Subpart 2 funds when they are subcontracted to a facility or program. ▪ Evidence that the LEA or facility is implementing planned and approved activities, including budget reports, records of expenditures, carryover and other summary reports. ▪ A current list of all personnel (instructional and administrative staff) paid with Title I, Part D funds.

Monitoring Indicators for McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Program
Standards, Assessment and Accountability

1.1: The SEA conducts monitoring and evaluation of LEAs with and without subgrants, sufficient to ensure compliance with McKinney-Vento program requirements. [§722(g)(2)(A) and (B)]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
▪ How does the SEA inform LEAs with and without subgrants about data collection responsibilities, and ensure complete, accurate and timely reports? ▪ How does the LEA collect local data and transmit information requested on homeless students to the SEA? ▪ How do the SEA & LEAs ensure that homeless students are included in statewide assessments? ▪ What emphasis do SEA and LEA place on student academic outcomes as part of the subgrant application? ▪ Does the SEA provide technical assistance and require LEAs with subgrants to conduct a program evaluation to determine the effectiveness of the program? ▪ What information has the LEA received from the SEA about its monitoring requirements for the McKinney-Vento program?	Documentation: ▪ Written guidance for data collection requirements for LEAs and how the SEA reviews the data. ▪ Written procedure for monitoring LEAs with and without subgrants to include: ▪ Recent copy of monitoring policies and procedures, schedules for current and previous school years. ▪ Sample notification letters to LEAs, preparation checklists, or other forms. ▪ A copy of the interview protocol for LEA reviews. ▪ Most recent copies of reports, recommendations and follow-up to corrective actions.	Documentation: ▪ The most recent copy of any evaluation reports of McKinney-Vento services or subgrant project. ▪ Written documentation or summaries of homeless students' primary nighttime residence. ▪ Most recent reports of statewide assessment performance of homeless students enrolled in the district for the last fiscal or school year.

Monitoring Indicators for McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Program
Instructional Support

2.1: The SEA implements procedures to address the identification, enrollment and retention of homeless students through coordinating and collaborating with other program offices and State agencies. [Title X, §722 (f) and (g)]	
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**
▪ How and from what sources does the State collect information to determine the ongoing needs of homeless students in the State? ▪ Since the State submitted its 2002 application, has it reviewed, revised, and developed policies, or issued policy briefs or memoranda to ensure removal of barriers for homeless students? ▪ How does the State coordinator collaborate with other State agency staff to address the needs of homeless children and youth? ▪ How do the SEA and State coordinator ensure coordination among SEA programs serving students experiencing homelessness including Title I, Part A, special education, early learning services, and at-risk youth programs? ▪ How does the State coordinator participate in Statewide activities that address the needs of homeless pre-school children and unaccompanied youth?	Documentation: ▪ Written communication to LEAs updating SEA policies and procedures that address the problems homeless children and youth face in school enrollment and retention since the last ED program review. ▪ Updates to the State Plan, including the completion of planned activities and proposals for new State-level activities. ▪ Data and summary reports from other program offices in the SEA and other State agencies concerning the educational needs of homeless children and youth in the State. ▪ Evidence that the SEA coordinates programs and services between the SEA, the State social services agency, and other agencies (including agencies providing mental health services), for example schedules, agendas, minutes, notes or handouts from attending such meetings. ▪ Evidence that the SEA ensures that eligible homeless students receive Title I, Part A services through its written guidance to LEAs, sections of the consolidated application and schoolwide program plans addressing the educational needs of homeless students, and description of the activities funded through the LEA reservation for comparable services for homeless students in non-Title I schools.

2.2: The SEA provides, or provides for, technical assistance to LEAs to ensure appropriate implementation of the statute. [§722(e) and (g)(3)(a)]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
▪ What ongoing professional development activities does the State Coordinator provide to LEAs with and without subgrants about the requirements of McKinney-Vento? ▪ How often does the SEA monitor changes in staffing of LEA liaisons? How does the SEA assist new liaisons with learning their responsibilities for implementing McKinney-Vento? ▪ What special activities are undertaken on behalf of homeless preschool children and homeless unaccompanied or out of school youth? ▪ How do the SEA and LEAs ensure enrollment in the school of origin, if feasible and in the best interest of the child, and transportation, when requested? ▪ What is the technical assistance that the State provides to LEAs to ensure that community agencies that serve homeless individuals are made aware of the rights of homeless students? ▪ How do the SEA and LEA ensure that homeless students are enrolled and assisted with basic school requirements (e.g., records transfer, health and immunization records, and residency)?	Documentation: ▪ Copies of written guidance to LEAs and/or information dissemination materials distributed electronically or by other means. ▪ The most recent liaison orientation, on-line trainings, conferences, and regional training agendas and technical assistant log. ▪ The most recent professional development schedule and agenda, handouts or other sample materials unique to the State. ▪ Documents related to activities associated with homeless preschool children, unaccompanied and out of school youth.	Documentation: ▪ Evidence that the LEA annually reviews and revises policies and practices to ensure they do not act as barriers to enrolling homeless students, such as agenda, minutes or notes from meeting where these reviews occur. ▪ Evidence that the LEA designates and allows for training of a liaison for homeless children and youth and this person provides training to other relevant district personnel. ▪ Examples of written notification to parents and youth regarding placement decisions when they are different from what was requested. ▪ Evidence that the LEA ensures that transportation to the school of origin is provided upon request and monitored by the LEA. ▪ Evidence that the LEA liaison or district staff conduct outreach to relevant community groups to inform them of McKinney-Vento rights and services for homeless children and youth, such as copies of agenda, minutes, handouts or notes.

Monitoring Indicators for McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Program
Fiduciary

3.1 The SEA ensures that Local Education Agency (LEA) subgrant plans for services to eligible homeless students meet all requirements. [§722(e)(1) and §723]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
Questions: ▪ What are the steps the State takes to organize a subgrant competition? How are reviewers chosen and trained? ▪ How does the SEA review grants for quality of application as well as local need? ▪ How does the SEA ensure subgrant funds are awarded in a timely manner and available throughout the grant period? If there was a delay of more than three months, why was that? ▪ What is the SEA's policy regarding carryover and reallocation of funds? ▪ What kind of internal fiscal controls do SEAs and LEAs have in place account for the use of subgrant funds in a way that meets Federal requirements?	Documentation: ▪ Evidence the SEA has an application and approval process to provide competitive subgrants to LEAs. ▪ Evidence that LEA subgrant applications are reviewed and awarded on a competitive basis for both need and quality of the project proposal. ▪ If the SEA awards any of its State-level coordination activity budget to LEAs for pilot projects, detail of those expenditures for the current fiscal year and any use of funds for the last fiscal year. ▪ Any other fiscal reporting or oversight of EHCY, for example, quarterly reports, budget amendment requests and approvals, etc.	Documentation: ▪ Evidence the LEA application/ plan includes assessment of the needs of homeless students and the supplemental services provided. ▪ Evidence that the subgrant expands or improves services provided as part of regular academic program. ▪ Written contracts when an LEA subcontracts any of its EHCY activities to a third-party organization. ▪ Evidence that the LEA is implementing required and authorized activities, for example, budget reports at the end of a fiscal year, records of expenditures, carryover and other summary reports. ▪ A current list of all personnel (instructional and administrative staff) paid with McKinney-Vento subgrant funds.

3.1 The SEA ensures that Local Education Agency (LEA) subgrant plans for services to eligible homeless students meet all requirements. [§722(e)(1) and §723]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
Reporting ▪ Has your State submitted its prime-recipient (SEA) quarterly report(s) required by section 1512 of the ARRA to www.FederalReporting.gov? ▪ How is your State handling the sub-recipient (LEA) quarterly reporting requirements of section 1512 of the ARRA for LEAs that receive Title I ARRA funds? ▪ If the State is reporting for its LEAs, has it submitted the required sub-recipient data to www.FederalReporting.gov? If the State is having its LEAs report the sub-recipient data directly, how has the State ensured that the LEAs receiving Title I ARRA funds have reported this information to www.FederalReporting.gov?	Documentation: ▪ Copy of quarterly reports for Title I ARRA funds,(The first report due October 10, 2009; January, April, July) ▪ Copy of guidance to LEAs regarding quarterly reporting requirements for Title I ARRA funds. *[Note: for the sub-recipient reporting, current OMB guidance gives States the choice of reporting for its LEAs or having the LEAs report themselves.]* ▪ Copy of required sub-recipient data submitted to www.FederalReporting.gov for Title I ARRA funding.	Documentation: ▪ Copy of sub-recipient data reported to the State for Title I ARRA funds.

3.2: The SEA complies with the statutory and other regulatory requirements governing the reservation of funds for State-level coordination activities. [§722 (c) – (g)] [Also OMB Circular A-87 and any other relevant standards, circulars, or legislative mandates] {New Indicator}	
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**
▪ How much of the McKinney-Vento EHCY allocation does the SEA reserve for State-level coordination activities and what are those activities? ▪ What is the SEA's policy regarding carryover of these funds? ▪ What kind of internal fiscal controls does the SEA have in place to ensure that it can account for the use of McKinney-Vento funds for State-level activities in a way that meets Federal requirements? ▪ What kinds of Statewide needs assessment and program evaluation is funded through State-level activities or conducted by the State coordinator?	Documentation: ▪ SEA budget detail on reserved funds for State-level coordination activities for the current fiscal year and use of funds for the last fiscal year . ▪ Any other fiscal documents such as contracts, invoices, etc. ▪ Needs assessment or evaluation reports for State-level coordination activities.

3.3: The SEA has a system for ensuring the prompt resolution of disputes. [§722(g)(C)]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
Questions: ▪ How does the State Coordinator ensure that liaisons are aware of the State's dispute resolution policy and that the LEA has adopted or adapted the policy? ▪ What is the State's process to review or investigate disputes brought by parents/youths? ▪ Do all districts have a written district dispute resolution process and track pre-dispute inquiries concerning barriers to enrollment? ▪ Do the SEA and LEAs conduct independent surveys of community groups determine if parents/youth are receiving their rights regarding school enrollment and enrollment disputes?	Documentation: ▪ Updated SEA dispute resolution policy and procedures including: ▪ -procedures for tracking disputes ▪ -documents indicating that dispute procedures have been implemented ▪ -records indicating that disputes are addressed, investigated and resolved in a timely manner ▪ Evidence that SEA tracks if LEAs have a dispute resolution policy in place. ▪ Survey results or records of inquiries and complaints made by community groups concerning barriers to enrollment for students experiencing homelessness.	Documentation: ▪ Written dispute resolution policy. ▪ Evidence that LEA implements a process for the prompt resolution of disputes, such as a phone log, notes, or e-mail messages. ▪ Records indicating that enrollment disputes are investigated and resolved in a timely manner. ▪ Evidence that students are enrolled and provided transportation during the dispute resolution process. ▪ Survey results or records of inquiries and complaints made by community groups concerning barriers to enrollment for students experiencing homelessness.

Monitoring Indicators for Title III
Overarching Requirement—SEA Subrecipient Monitoring

State Monitoring of Subgrantees. [§§3115—3116, and §3121; EDGAR 34 CFR 80.40]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
▪ What process does the SEA use to monitor subgrantees? ▪ How do the evaluation components of the monitoring plan address the requirements under Sections 3113, 3115, 3121, 3122 and 3302?	Documentation: ▪ Monitoring plan/process, including list of completed and planned on-site visits (monitoring cycle and schedule), data review, reporting and corrective action processes pertaining to most recent monitoring by the SEA. ▪ Copy of monitoring instrument(s) and criteria for selecting subgrantees for review, including on-site monitoring, desk reviews and/or subgrantee self-assessment tools. ▪ Copies of most recent monitoring reports issued to subgrantees and subgrantee responses to reports. ▪ Procedures for corrective actions required of subgrantees that fail to comply with Title III requirements.	Documentation: ▪ Monitoring process, including on-site visits, data review, reporting and corrective action processes pertaining to most recent monitoring by the SEA. ▪ Technical assistance provided by SEA during and as a result of monitoring process. Interview: ▪ Staff describes the SEA's monitoring processes and feedback received by subgrantee from the SEA.

Monitoring Indicators for Title III
Standards, Assessment and Accountability

1.1: English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards. [§3113]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
▪ Has the State established ELP standards and objectives that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing and cover grades K-12? ▪ Are the State ELP standards aligned with achievement of the State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in Section 1111(b)(1)? ▪ Has the State disseminated the ELP standards and provided training and technical assistance on implementation of the standards?	Documentation: ▪ Copy or link to State's current ELP standards. ▪ Evidence of a process for alignment of State ELP standards with the achievement of State academic content standards. ▪ Evidence that the State ELP standards were disseminated Statewide. ▪ Documentation of training and technical assistance provided to Title III subgrantees on implementation of the State's ELP standards. Interview: ▪ Staff outlines development of the ELP standards and objectives including any completed or planned activities. ▪ Staff describes professional development and technical assistance provided to subgrantees on Statewide ELP standards implementation.	Documentation: ▪ Evidence of ELP standards implementation. ▪ Evidence of participation in State training and/or technical assistance for implementation of State ELP standards. Interview: ▪ Staff describes how the State ELP standards have been implemented at the district level, including professional development provided to teachers and other staff, and curriculum development activities.

Monitoring Indicators for Title III
Standards, Assessment and Accountability

1.2: English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment. [§3113 and §3116]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
▪ Does the State ELP assessment address the four domains of speaking, listening, reading and writing? How does the State derive and report a score for comprehension? ▪ Has the State aligned the ELP assessment(s) to the ELP standards? ▪ How has the State ensured that the ELP assessment(s) are valid and reliable? ▪ How does the State ensure subgrantees annually assess the English proficiency of all Title III LEP students in grades K-12 consistent with Section 1111(b)(7)? ▪ How many ELP students were not assessed using the annual ELP assessment? What is the explanation for not assessing these students? ▪ What is the State's process for initial identification and placement of LEP students?	Documentation: ▪ Test administration manuals for ELP assessment(s) and/or other documents provided to test administrators on test administration policies and procedures, including policies on accommodations on ELP assessment(s) for students with disabilities. ▪ Evidence of a process for alignment such as an alignment study or other documentation demonstrating alignment of State ELP assessment to State ELP standards. ▪ Evidence that the ELP assessments address the four domains. ▪ If applicable, timeline and process for transition to new ELP assessment, and State plans to continue to make AMAO determinations during the transition. Interview ▪ Staff describes process for ensuring that all Title III LEP students in grades K-12 are annually assessed on the ELP assessment. ▪ Staff explains how the ELP assessment(s) addresses the four domains and enables the SEA to generate a score for the domain of comprehension. ▪ Staff explains the process that the SEA has followed to ensure that the State ELP assessment is aligned to the State standards.	Documentation: ▪ Process for verifying number and percentage of Title III LEP students tested on ELP assessment and method for reporting results to the State. • Technical assistance provided by the SEA regarding ELP assessment. ▪ Documentation of process for providing technical assistance to schools in their jurisdiction on how to administer the ELP assessment. ▪ Evidence of a diagnostic instrument used for initial placement. Interview ▪ Staff describes communications from the SEA regarding ELP assessment(s). Staff provides an overview of the process for identifying and placing LEP students.

Monitoring Indicators for Title III
Standards, Assessment and Accountability

1.3: Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs). [§3122(a)(1)(2)(3) and §1111(b)(2)(B)]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
▪ Has the State set AMAO targets for grades K-12 that address the four domains of ELP as required in Section 3122(a)(2)? ▪ Do the State's AMAO targets reflect annual increases in the number and percentage of children making progress in learning English and attaining ELP? ▪ Does the State include all Title III students in AMAO 1and AMAO 2? ▪ Does the State include Title III students who were not assessed in AMAO 1 and AMAO 2? ▪ What are the State's decision rules for making AMAO determinations for consortia? ▪ Has the State calculated all three AMAOs and made determinations for all subgrantees? ▪ Has the State notified all Title III subgrantees that have not met the AMAOs? ▪ How does the State hold subgrantees accountable for meeting the AMAOs, including subgrantees that do not meet AMAOs for two or four consecutive years? ▪ Does the State have a plan for providing technical assistance to Title III sub grantees that did not meet AMAOs?	Documentation: ▪ AMAO targets and methods for calculating AMAOs, including definitions of AMAO1, 2 and 3. ▪ Written State plan for making Title III AMAO determinations and timeline for notifying subgrantees of their AMAO status. ▪ Copy of the State notification to subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs. ▪ List of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs in each of the last four years and notification to these subgrantees. ▪ Copy of the State's accountability plan for subgrantees who fail to make AMAOs. ▪ State plans and current activities to assist Subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two and four consecutive years. ▪ If applicable, improvement plan samples or templates for subgrantees that do not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years. ▪ Decision rules for how the State makes AMAO determinations for consortia members. Interview ▪ Staff confirms current AMAO targets and explains the State's method for developing the targets. Staff discusses any changes to targets from previous years. ▪ Staff describes the State's plan and activities	Documentation: ▪ Title III improvement plan related to two-year accountability provisions and/or documents related to four-year accountability provisions, if applicable. ▪ State notification that indicates whether LEA met all three AMAOs. ▪ State notification letters to LEAs that have not met AMAOs, if applicable. Interview: ▪ Staff demonstrates knowledge of subgrantee's AMAO status, and any applicable sanctions for not meeting AMAOs for two or four consecutive years.

1.3: Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs). [§3122(a)(1)(2)(3) and §1111(b)(2)(B)]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
	conducted to assist subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two and four consecutive years.	

Monitoring Indicators for Title III
Standards, Assessment and Accountability

1.4: Data Collection and Reporting. [§3121 and §3123; EDGAR 34 CFR 76.731]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
▪ Has the State established and implemented data collection methods in order to provide complete and accurate data to meet all Title III reporting requirements? ▪ How does the State ensure that subgrantees track and report academic content performance of students for two years after they exit a Title III language instruction educational program?	Documentation: ▪ Complete and accurate Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data. ▪ Evidence that the State has provided technical assistance to subgrantees on procedures for reporting data. ▪ Procedures for data collection and means of verification of subgrantee data. Interview: ▪ Staff describes how it informs subgrantees regarding data collection requirements, collects data from subgrantees, and verifies that these data are accurate.	Documentation: ▪ Evidence that subgrantees have procedures in place to collect data on individual LEP students from schools and report these data to the SEA. Interview: ▪ Staff gives an overview of the process for collecting and reporting ELP assessment data to the SEA, including how staff has addressed any discrepancies in these data, such as any student records that cannot be matched or any partial scores due to child absences.

Monitoring Indicators for Title III
Instructional Support

2.1: State Level Activities. [§3111 (b)(2)]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
Does the State carry out one or more of the State level activities described in Section 3111(b)(2)?	Documentation: Evidence that the State is carrying out one or more of the following activities: ▪ Conducts or facilitates professional development activities and evaluates the effectiveness of those activities. ▪ Carries out planning, evaluations, administration, and interagency coordination. ▪ Provides technical assistance to subgrantees. ▪ Promotes parental and community participation. ▪ Provides recognition for subgrantees that have exceeded State AMAO targets.	Interview: Staff describes State level activities implemented at the LEA level.

2.2: State Oversight and Review of Local Plans[2]. [§3116(a) and §3115(c); EDGAR 34 CFR 76.770]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
▪ Does the State require eligible entities to submit a plan to the SEA that contains the information, assurances and certification required in Section 3116? ▪ Does the State review and approve procedures for local plans to ensure that subgrantees use funds for required activities described in Section 3115(c)? To increase the English proficiency levels of LEP students by providing high- quality language instruction educational programs that are based on scientifically based research (SBR). To provide high-quality professional development to classroom teachers (including teachers in classroom settings that are not in language instructional programs), principals, administrators, and other school personnel.	Documentation: ▪ Process used for subgrantee submission and SEA review of subgrantee local plan(s), and any plan amendments. ▪ Evidence of subgrantee plans containing all elements described in Section 3116. ▪ Evidence that the State ensures that local plans include a certification that all teachers in any language instruction educational program are fluent in English and any other language used for instruction (3116)(c). ▪ Copy of signed assurances from subgrantees as outlined in Section 3116(d) and 3116(c). ▪ Timeline for State review, approval, and notification of funding for Title III subgrants. ▪ Technical assistance provided to subgrantees on local plan requirements as described in Section 3116(b).	Documentation: ▪ Most recently approved local plan from the subgrantee. ▪ Notification of application instructions and guidance from SEA. ▪ Feedback from the SEA regarding their local plan. ▪ Subgrantee certification for ensuring teacher fluency in English and any other language used for instruction.

[2] Note, States can meet this requirement through a consolidated local plan, as provided for in Section 9305 of the ESEA.

2.3: Activities by Agencies Experiencing Substantial Increases in Immigrant Children and Youth. [§§3114—3115]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
▪ Does the State ensure subgrantees receiving funds for immigrant children and youth use the funds to pay for activities outlined under Section 3115(e)?	Documentation: ▪ List of subgrantees under the immigrant set aside. ▪ State guidance to eligible entities regarding application for the immigrant grant program and program requirements. Interview: ▪ Staff describes its process for informing eligible entities regarding the immigrant subgrants and its requirements, determining the funding formula and awarding grants, and ensuring that subgrantees utilize these funds to pay for the activities outlined under Section 3115(e).	Documentation: ▪ Records of the number of immigrant students being served by the subgrantee. ▪ Copy of subgrantee plan approved by SEA. ▪ Evidence that activities conducted by subgrantees are those outlined under Section 3115(e). Interview: ▪ Staff demonstrates an understanding that the immigrant grant program is distinct from the Title III formula grant program. ▪ If the LEA is the recipient of an immigrant grant, staff describes the guidance and oversight received from the SEA regarding this grant, as well as the types of activities offered and students served.

2.4: Private School Participation. [§9501]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
▪ Does the State ensure that its subgrantees comply with ESEA requirements regarding participation of LEP students, their teachers, or other educational personnel in private schools in areas served by the subgrantee?	Documentation: ▪ SEA policies and procedures addressing statutory requirements for the provision of services to eligible children attending private school. ▪ Evidence that the SEA monitors subgrantee compliance with the provision of equitable services to eligible children, their teachers, or other educational personnel. ▪ Evidence that the SEA monitors that the subgrantee conducts "timely and meaningful" consultation with appropriate private school officials during the design and development of the Title III program. ▪ SEA approved process available for filing of complaints by private school officials.	Documentation: ▪ Written subgrantee policies and procedures for provision of services on an equitable basis to eligible LEP children enrolled in participating private schools. ▪ Timeline of subgrantee-initiated contact with private schools to conduct consultation regarding equitable participation of LEP students, their teachers, or other educational personnel in Title III, and timeline when services began. ▪ Subgrantee assessment of services provided and how the results of the assessment are used to improve services. ▪ Documentation indicating that all private schools within the LEA intended to/did not intend to participate in Title III. The number of eligible students participating in each private school. ▪ Documentation of how students' and teachers' needs were identified. Evidence of how students were assessed. ▪ Documentation reflecting available funding amount. ▪ Documentation of consultation process for services provided. ▪ How does LEA monitor services to private school students and evaluate effectiveness of services?

2.5: Parental Notification and Outreach. [§3302]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
▪ How does the State ensure that subgrantees comply with parental notification requirements regarding initial and continuing placement of LEP students in language instruction educational programs as outlined in Section 3302(a)? ▪ How does the State ensure that subgrantees comply with the parental notification provisions for failure to meet Title III AMAOs in Section 3302(b)? ▪ How does the State ensure that the notifications are in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that the parent can understand? ▪ How does the State ensure that all subgrantees implement an effective means of outreach to parents of LEP children regarding their education as specified in Section 3302(e)?	Documentation: ▪ Sample subgrantee notification containing all the components required under Section 3302(a) (1-8). ▪ Guidance from SEA describing parental notification requirements and/or templates of parental notification letters. Interview: ▪ SEA discusses how it assists subgrantees to develop parental notifications.	Documentation: ▪ Sample subgrantee notification containing all components required under Section 3302(a) (1-8). ▪ Evidence of implementation of an effective means of outreach to parents of LEP children (sample notices). ▪ If applicable, samples of parental notifications regarding subgrantee failure to meet Title III AMAOs.

Monitoring Indicators for Title III
Fiduciary

3.1: State Allocations, Reallocations and Carryover. [§3111(b); 20 USC 6821(b)(3); §3114(a)-(d)]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
State Allocations: ▪ Has the SEA reserved not more than 5% for State level activities/administration? ▪ Has the SEA reserved not more than the maximum allowed for administration (60% of the State level reservation or $175,000, whichever is greater) for that State? ▪ Is the SEA using that portion of its State set aside funds not used for administration to carry out one or more of the following: ▪ Professional development activities and other activities that assist personnel in meeting State and local certification and licensing requirements for teaching LEP children. ▪ Planning, evaluation, administration, and interagency coordination related to the subgrants. ▪ Providing technical assistance and other forms of assistance to eligible entities that are receiving subgrants from the SEA. ▪ Providing recognition, which may include providing financial awards to subgrantees that have exceeded their AMAOs. Immigrant Set Aside: ▪ Of the funds available for subgrantees (at least 95 percent of an SEA's allocation, except for States where the minimum set-aside of $175,000 would exceed 5% of their Title III grant), has the SEA reserved an amount – not to exceed 15% of its Title III allocation, for subgrant(s) to eligible entities to serve	Documentation: ▪ Budget [including breakdown of funds reserved for State activities (SEA budget and personnel records) and subgrantee awards]. State Allocations: ▪ Documentation that the amount reserved for administrative expenses does not exceed the maximum allowed for that State. ▪ Documentation that any funds reserved and used to carry out one or more allowable activities other than administrative activities do not exceed the maximum allowed for that State. ▪ Documentation that the funds reserved for administrative costs are used to pay for the costs of planning and administering activities involved in awarding subgrants to eligible entities and carrying out State level activities. ▪ Record of the SEA's final awards to eligible entities. Immigrant Set Aside: ▪ List of eligible LEAs that have received Title III immigrant subgrants. Title III LEP Allocations: ▪ SEA calculations and final allocations to eligible entities. ▪ Record of LEA counts of LEP students	Documentation: ▪ Budget [including breakdown of funds] for Title III formula subgrants and Immigrant Children and Youth subgrants, if applicable. ▪ Grant award notification. ▪ Notification of LEA's Title III immigrant subgrant. ▪ Documentation of count of LEP students submitted to SEA. ▪ Documentation of reallocated funds, if applicable.

3.1: State Allocations, Reallocations and Carryover. [§3111(b); 20 USC 6821(b)(3); §3114(a)-(d)]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
immigrant children and youth as required by Section 3114(d)? ▪ Does the SEA have written policies/procedures for the allocation of funds to LEAs for Title III immigrant subgrants? ▪ Has the SEA made the Title III immigrant subgrants to LEAs? <u>Title III LEP Allocations:</u> ▪ Has the SEA allocated at least 95 percent of its allocation to eligible LEAs?[3] ▪ Has the SEA used the LEP counts provided by the LEAs to calculate the amount of each LEA's allocation? ▪ How has the SEA determined the allocation for each LEA? ▪ Are public charter school LEAs included in the application process and subsequent allocations under Title III? ▪ Does the SEA include counts of private school LEPstudents in the calculation of each LEA's allocation? ▪ Are all allocations for LEP subgrants at least $10,000? ▪ Are there any consortia that receive Title III funds? Is there a designated fiscal agent	provided by LEAs. ▪ Evidence that LEAs are eligible to receive subgrants. <u>Reallocation:</u> ▪ Written SEA policies and procedures for reallocating funds. ▪ Evidence that reallocations are in accordance with written policies and procedures.	

[3] Except in cases where the minimum reservation of $175,000 for administration is greater than 5% of the total grant.

3.1: State Allocations, Reallocations and Carryover. [§3111(b); 20 USC 6821(b)(3); §3114(a)-(d)]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
for each consortium? ▪ How does the SEA determine if a subgrant will not be used for the purpose for which it was made? <u>Reallocation:</u> ▪ What is the State's reallocation process? How does the State reallocate funds?		

3.2: District Allocations, Reallocations and Carryover. [§3115]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
▪ Has the LEA reserved not more than two percent of its allocation for the administration of the Title III program? Does the LEA include both direct and indirect costs in the two percent? ▪ What type of technical assistance has the SEA provided related to how LEAs may and must use funds? ▪ How does the SEA ensure that funds are used for required and authorized activities?	Documentation: ▪ SEA guidance or instructions about amount of funds with Title III administrative cost restrictions. ▪ SEA procedures to ensure that LEAs meet requirements related to amount with Title III administrative costs.	Documentation: ▪ Evidence that the LEA has reserved no more than two percent of its allocation for administration. ▪ Evidence that the LEA has included both direct and indirect costs in the two percent reservation. ▪ Evidence that the LEA is implementing required activities (budget reports, records of expenditures). ▪ Evidence that the LEA is implementing activities that are authorized (budget reports, records of expenditures).

3.3: Maintenance of Effort. [§1120A and §9021]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
▪ How does the SEA ensure that LEAs comply with the maintenance of effort fiscal requirement that applies to Title III and other covered programs under the ESEA? ▪ How does the SEA provide technical guidance and support of its LEAs in the area of MOE?	▪ Documentation: ▪ Procedures for determining maintenance of effort (MOE), including funds to be excluded from MOE calculations. ▪ MOE report comparing fiscal effort of the preceding fiscal year with the second preceding fiscal year as defined by §299.5 of the Department's MOE regulation. ▪ For each LEA that does not maintain effort, the SEA calculations to determine how much of the LEA's allocation for each covered program is reduced. ▪ Interview: ▪ Staff understands which types of funds are to be included and excluded when determining maintenance of effort. ▪ Staff understands that an LEA's allocations under Title III and the other covered programs must be reduced by the exact proportion its education expenditures from State and local sources in the preceding fiscal year fell below 90 percent of its expenditures in the second preceding fiscal year. Interview: ▪ Staff understands maintenance of effort can be determined by using either fiscal effort per student or aggregate expenditures.	Documentation *(Usually done at the SEA level. If maintenance of effort is calculated at the LEA, provide the same evidence as requested from the State, in addition to SEA guidance on procedures for calculating maintenance of effort.)*

3.4: Supplement, Not Supplant – General. [§3115(g)]

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
SEA ▪ How has the SEA demonstrated that it has met the supplement, not supplant provision for funds retained for State level activities? ▪ Is there a State law or policy that provides for a reduction in the amount of State aid available to LEAs for implementing language instruction education programs for LEP students based on the amount of Title III funds that LEAs receive? ▪ How does the SEA ensure that its LEAs comply with the supplement, not supplant requirements? ▪ How does the SEA provide technical assistance to LEAs in the area of supplement, not supplant? LEA ▪ What is the instructional program/service provided to all students (eg. to meet *Lau* requirements)? How are Title III funds providing activities/services that are supplemental? ▪ What funds is the LEA using to provide the core language instruction educational program for LEP students? ▪ How has the LEA demonstrated that services provided with Title III funds are in addition to services that students would otherwise receive from State, local or other Federal funds? ▪ What services is the LEA required by other Federal, State, local laws or regulations to provide? ▪ How has the LEA demonstrated that it is not using Title III funds to provide services that it is	Documentation: ▪ Budget records ▪ Personnel records ▪ Inventory records ▪ Written SEA process for ensuring that LEAs meet supplement, not supplant requirements. ▪ Evidence that questions or inquiries from LEAs regarding supplement, not supplant issues have been adequately addressed. ▪ Evidence that the SEA has monitored expenditures of LEAs to ensure that funds are used to supplement, and not supplant other Federal, State and local funds. ▪ Record of how programs/services were funded in previous year. Interview: ▪ Staff describes technical assistance provided to LEAs regarding this requirement. ▪ Staff describes the process for ensuring compliance with this requirement.	Documentation: ▪ Budget records ▪ Personnel records ▪ Inventory records ▪ LEA approved budget and records of expenditures of Title III funds at the district level. ▪ Record of expenditures that verify that funds have not supplanted other Federal, State, and local funds. ▪ Evidence that the LEA has not reduced State or local funds expended to implement language instruction programs serving LEP students based on the amount of Title III funds the LEA receives. ▪ LEA and school staff demonstrate an understanding of statutory requirement. ▪ LEA staff describes technical assistance provided by the SEA.

3.3: Maintenance of Effort. [§1120A and §9021]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
required to make available under State or local laws or other Federal laws? ▪ How has the LEA demonstrated that it is not using Title III funds to provide services that it provided in the prior year with State, local or other Federal funds? ▪ If not, can the LEA provide evidence that would rebut the presumption that supplanting took place.		

3.4A: Supplement, Not Supplant – Assessment. [§1111(b)(7) and §3113(b)(2)]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
Use of Funds to Develop ELP Assessments ▪ What funds were used to develop ELP assessments required under Section 1111(b)(7)? ▪ What funds were used to develop an ELP assessment that meets the requirements of Section 3113 or to enhance an ELP assessment already meeting the Section 1111(b)(7) requirements so that it meets Section 3113 requirements? Use of Funds to Administer ELP Assessments ▪ What funds has the SEA or LEA used to identify LEP students who may need language services, including the development of ELP screening or placement assessments? ▪ What funds do the SEA and/or LEA use to pay for the costs of administration, scoring or reporting of ELP assessment, and materials or equipment related to the administration of annual ELP assessments? ▪ What guidance has the SEA provided to LEAs on paying for the administration of ELP assessments?	Documentation ▪ Budget records ▪ Purchase orders ▪ Personnel runs ▪ Letters ▪ Memos ▪ Agendas	Documentation ▪ Budget records ▪ Purchase orders ▪ Personnel runs ▪ Letters ▪ Memos ▪ Agendas

3.4A: Supplement, Not Supplant – Assessment. [§1111(b)(7) and §3113(b)(2)]		
Guiding Questions	**Acceptable SEA Evidence**	**Acceptable LEA Evidence**
Screening and Placement Assessments for LEP Students ▪ What funds does an LEA use to develop and administer assessments to identify LEP students and place them in core language programs? ▪ What kind of guidance has the SEA provided to LEAs about paying for the development and administration of ELP screening and placement assessments?		

APPENDIX

State Monitoring Schedule for 2010-2011

State	Onsite Week	Programs to be Monitored
Maine	*October 4-8, 2010*	*Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless*
BIE (Florida)	*October 18-22, 2010*	*Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless*
Mississippi	*November 1-5, 2010*	*Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless*
Washington	*November 8-12, 2010*	*Title III*
BIE (Oklahoma)	*November 15-19, 2010*	*Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless*
New Mexico	*December 6-12, 2010*	*Title I, Parts A and D; Homeless; and Title III*
BIE (Arizona)	*December 13-17, 2010*	*Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless*
New York	*December 13-17, 2010*	*Title III*
Nevada	*February 14-18, 2011*	*Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless*
Pennsylvania	*February 28-March 4, 2011*	*Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless*
Indiana	*March 14-18, 2011*	*Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless*
Wyoming	*March 21-25, 2011*	*Title III*
Maryland	*March 28-April 1, 2011*	*Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless*
North Carolina	*April 11-15, 2011*	*Title III*
Tennessee	*April 11-15, 2011*	*Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless*
Nebraska	*May 2-6, 2011*	*Title I, Parts A and D; Homeless; and Title III*
Connecticut	*May 16-20, 2011*	*Title III*
South Dakota	*May 16-20, 2011*	*Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless*
Montana	*June 6-10, 2011*	*Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless*
North Dakota	*August 30 – September 3, 2011*	*Title III*
Oklahoma	*September 26-30, 2011*	*Title III*
Puerto Rico	*October 18-22, 2011*	*Title III*
Delaware	*To Be Determined*	*Title III*
Massachusetts	*To Be Determined*	*Title III*