



**Student Achievement and
School Accountability Programs (SASA)
Monitoring Plan for
Formula Grant Programs
October 1, 2011 to September 30, 2012**

August 31, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION-----	2
A. Definition and Purpose of Monitoring	2
B. Monitoring and the Strategic Plan	3
II. MONITORING INDICATORS-----	3
A. Monitoring Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants	4
B. Monitoring Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies	5
C. Monitoring Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement	5
D. Monitoring Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (N/D)	6
E. Monitoring Title X, Part C: McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Act of 2001	6
III. THE MONITORING PROCESS-----	7
A. Description of the 2011-2012 Monitoring Process	7
1. Preparing for Monitoring	8
2. Desk Review	7
3. Onsite Monitoring	7
B. Monitoring Team	8
C. Exit Conference	8
IV. MONITORING INDICATORS-----	9
A. School Improvement Grants (SIG)	9
B. Overarching Requirement: SEA Subrecipient Monitoring	47; 53; 83
C. Title I, Part A Fiduciary	54
D. Title I, Part D Neglected and Delinquent	72
E. McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Program	77
F. Title III	84
V. APPENDICES-----	103

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 2011-2012 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 \$115 million to States, and support the Title I mission of improving teaching and learning for children attending high-poverty schools.

School Improvement Grants (SIG) authorized under section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended, provides grants to SEAs that States use to make competitive sub-grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) that demonstrate the greatest need and the strongest commitment to raise substantially the achievement of students in their lowest-performing schools. Beginning in the fall of 2011 the SIG program will be administered by the new Office of School Turnaround (OST) within the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE). Turning around persistently low achieving schools is a major ED priority and as such SASA together with the OST will jointly monitor SEA SIG programs.

The SIG program provides unprecedented resources for turning around our nation’s persistently low achieving schools emphasizing changes in school governance, structure, human capital and teaching practices. For fiscal year (FY) 2009, \$3.5 billion was appropriated or available to States for SIG, and \$545 million was provided for FY 2010.

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 and the OST 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, section 1003(g); Title I, Part A; Title I, Part D; Title III, Part A; and Homeless. ED intends to identify areas where additional technical assistance may be needed by and can be provided to the SEA and LEAs.

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 (GPRA).

ED policy requires every program office overseeing discretionary or formula grant programs to prepare a monitoring plan for each of its programs. The monitoring process will include risk-based analysis and target areas of identified need, coordinated with technical assistance.

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 ED helps States leverage the law to improve academic performance for all students.

II. MONITORING INDICATORS

The content of 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 fidelity and quality of implementation of Federal programs and activities administered by SEAs. 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

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

evidence). For 2011-2012 ED monitoring indicators will focus on Title I, Part A Fiduciary, SIG, Title I, Part D, Homeless Education and Title III, Part A.

The complete texts of the monitoring indicators for each program administered and monitored under this plan are contained in the Monitoring Indicators section of this document. 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 Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

“In conjunction with Title I funds for school improvement reserved under section 1003(a) of the ESEA, School Improvement Grants under section 1003(g) of the ESEA are used to improve student achievement in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring so as to enable those schools to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) and exit improvement status.”

Under the final requirements published in the *Federal Register* in October 2010, SIG funds are to be focused on each State’s “Tier I,” “Tier II,” and “Tier III” schools.

- Tier I schools are the lowest-achieving five percent of a State’s Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years; and, if a State so chooses, certain Title I eligible (and participating) elementary schools that are as low achieving as the State’s other Tier I schools (“newly eligible” Tier I schools).
- Tier II schools are the lowest-achieving five percent of a State’s secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds; secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years; and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) secondary schools that are as low achieving as the State’s other Tier II schools (“newly eligible” Tier II schools).
- Tier III schools are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as Tier I or Tier II schools and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) schools (“newly eligible” Tier III schools).

B. 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:

- 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; and
- Holding schools and LEAs accountable for improving the academic achievement of all students.

C. 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)

D. 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.

E. Monitoring Title VII, Subtitle B McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as Amended

“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.

III. THE MONITORING PROCESS

Monitoring States' implementation of programs 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 ED and the States to improve student achievement and close the achievement gap in order to have all students reach proficiency.
- Provides a vehicle for 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 2011-2012 Monitoring Process

The monitoring plan involves onsite reviews that help SEAs build capacity to improve student achievement and ensure program compliance. SASA will work together with the Office of School Turnaround (OST) for the purposes of monitoring SIG. The States to be monitored during this cycle were selected on the basis of a risk analysis designed to help ED focus resources to the greatest advantage and better accomplish programmatic goals. During the pre-site review, ED 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. 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 onsite monitoring process.

1. Preparation for Monitoring

Prior to the monitoring visit, ED staff will request that the SEA submit specific documentation about eight weeks prior to scheduled onsite review. This information will assist the monitoring 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.

2. Desk Review

Desk reviews of requested documents will occur prior to onsite monitoring for SIG, Title I, Part A Fiduciary, Title I, Part D, McKinney-Vento Homeless Education and Title III, Part A.

3. Onsite Monitoring

During the site visit, ED 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. A description of the SIG onsite monitoring review process can be found in Appendix I.

SASA staff monitoring Title I, Part A Fiduciary, Title I, Part D, McKinney-Vento Homeless Education and Title III, Part A will interview SEA and LEA staff, as well as private school staff in receipt of equitable services, as appropriate.

B. Monitoring Team

A team of four or more ED staff members including trained consultants will be assigned to conduct the onsite 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 for SIG, Title I, Parts A and D, Homeless Education and Title III 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 School Improvement Grant
APPLICATION PROCESS**

I. APPLICATION PROCESS: The SEA ensures that its application process was carried out consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Sections I and II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]	
Guiding Questions	Acceptable Evidence
A. <u>SEA-Level Questions</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe generally your process for developing and submitting the State’s SIG application to ED. 	A. <u>SEA-Level Evidence</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA describes and gives background on its application process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was your process for developing your definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools”? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA describes its process for developing its PLA definition
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe generally your process for running the LEA competition. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA describes and gives background on its process for running the LEA competition
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did the SEA notify LEAs about the SIG application process? • What information did the SEA provide LEAs about the application process? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letters, emails, templates, or announcements outlining the SIG application process or soliciting applications from LEAs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many LEA/school applications did the SEA receive for each Tier (i.e. Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • URL indicating where on the SEA’s website copies of applications from all LEAs who applied for SIG grants are posted

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
APPLICATION PROCESS**

SEA-Level Questions, Continued

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did the SEA carry out its LEA application process and review with respect to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Conducting a rigorous review of applications? ○ Determining that LEAs had the capacity to implement the intervention models in selected schools? ○ Determining the amount of funds each LEA would receive? ○ Reviewing LEA budgets for allowable activities? • Did the SEA make any modifications in carrying out the LEA competition compared to the plan that the SEA described in its LEA application? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA provides sample copies of rubrics or feedback provided to LEAs on their SIG application • SEA describes its process for reviewing LEA applications, with particular attention to its rigor, its method for determining capacity, and its analysis of the LEA’s budget • SEA describes any changes it made from its application to ED when executing the LEA competition
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the SEA complete the LEA application approval process consistent within its approved timeline? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA explains timeline and process for approving LEA applications • Dated copies of approval notification letters to LEAs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many LEAs/schools did the SEA approve to fund in each Tier? • Which schools are implementing each of the following models: turnaround, transformation, restart, and closure? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • URL indicating where on the SEA’s website the following is posted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Name of each LEA awarded grant and schools being served ○ Amount of grant award over 3 years ○ Type of intervention being implemented in Tier I and Tier II schools

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
APPLICATION PROCESS**

SEA-Level Questions, Continued

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How has the SEA ensured that an LEA with nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools is not implementing the transformation model in fewer than 50 percent of its Tier I and Tier II schools? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the SEA has not met the requirement to post LEA awards on its website, please provide a current list of LEA awards including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Date of grant award, if different from awarding date; ○ Names of schools being served (by LEA), whether the school is Tier I, Tier II or Tier III and models each Tier I and Tier II (and Tier III if appropriate) school is implementing; and ○ Amount awarded for each LEA and school over three years.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the SEA post the required information on its website: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The State’s list of persistently lowest-achieving schools? ○ All LEA applications the SEA received (including those not funded) within 30 days of awards being granted or amended applications? ○ Summaries of LEA grants including: LEA names and NCES numbers, school names and NCES numbers, and types of interventions implemented in Tier I and Tier II schools? ○ The list of schools impacted by an n-size waiver (if applicable)? ○ The State’s request for a waiver of the 25% carryover requirement if not all of a State’s Tier I schools were funded (if applicable)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • URL, with date of posting, indicating where each of the following can be found on the SEA website: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ List of PLAs ○ LEA applications ○ Summaries of LEA grants including: LEA names and NCES numbers, school names and NCES numbers, amount of grant award, and types of interventions implemented in Tier I and Tier II schools ○ List of schools that are excluded from a state’s PLA list under the n-size waiver (if applicable)

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
APPLICATION PROCESS**

SEA-Level Questions, Continued

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have any LEAs submitted amendments to their application? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA provides copies of amendments submitted by LEAs to SEAs and letters responding to request
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were there any issues identified in the process of writing the SIG application for ED where the SEA could have used additional technical assistance? • Are there aspects of the LEA competition in which the SEA could have used more technical assistance to run a smoother competition and get stronger applications? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA describes areas of need in writing its SIG application for ED • SEA describes areas of need in running its LEA competition

<p>I. APPLICATION PROCESS: The SEA ensures that its application process was carried out consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Sections I and II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]</p>	
<p>Guiding Questions</p>	<p>Acceptable Evidence</p>
<p>B. <u><i>LEA-Level Questions</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe generally your experience, process, and timeline for writing the SIG application. 	<p>B. <u><i>LEA-Level Evidence</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA describes its experience and process for writing the SIG application
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What information did the LEA receive from the SEA regarding the submission of its application? • What was the process the LEA used to develop and submit its application? • In developing its application, how did the LEA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Conduct a needs assessment? ○ Select a model? ○ Construct its budget? ○ Use disaggregated student data to determine its intervention strategies? For example with regard to LEP students or students with disabilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA describes the information/guidance it received regarding the application • LEA describes how it prepared its application including conducting a needs assessment, selecting a model based on its needs assessment, and constructing a budget • Copy of the LEA’s needs assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many schools does the LEA have in each Tier? • Did the LEA apply to serve all of its Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA indicates number of schools in each Tier • LEA describes its process for determining for which schools it applied for SIG funding

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
APPLICATION PROCESS**

LEA-Level Questions, Continued

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did the LEA determine that it had the capacity to serve the Tier I and Tier II schools for which it applied for funding? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA describes how it determined its capacity or lack of capacity to serve the Tier I and Tier II schools for which it applied/or did not apply for funding
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many schools is the LEA serving with SIG funds in each Tier? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA indicates number of schools it is serving with SIG funds
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did you receive any feedback from the SEA regarding your application? If so, what types of feedback did you receive and how did you address those issues? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA describes feedback received from SEA on application
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you made any changes to or submitted any amendments to your LEA application? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA provides copies of amendments submitted to the SEA

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
IMPLEMENTATION**

II. IMPLEMENTATION: The SEA ensures that the SIG intervention models are being implemented consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Sections I and II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]	
Guiding Questions	Acceptable Evidence
<p>A. <u>SEA-Level Questions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe generally, what you have seen regarding the implementation of SIG in LEAs across the State. 	<p>A. <u>SEA-Level Evidence</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA describes its observations regarding implementation in LEAs, with examples of the following SIG model components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New governance structures within the LEA; ○ Recruiting and Retain new principals and staff; ○ Teacher Evaluation Systems; ○ Extended Time; ○ Promotion of use of student data ○ Parent Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the SEA made any organizational changes to support the implementation of the SIG intervention models? For example, reorganization, addition of staff, redefining of duties, creation of new offices? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA describes any organizational changes made to support the implementation of SIG • SEA organizational charts • Current written documentation that assigns or describes duties or responsibilities related to SIG, such as a job description, department memorandum, etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have there been any changes in the authority of the State to take over schools since your application was submitted to ED? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA describes any changes in the authority of the State to take over schools
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the SEA provide any services directly to a school receiving SIG funds, but not take over the school? If so, what services were provided? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA describes any services it is providing to a school

II. IMPLEMENTATION: The SEA ensures that the SIG intervention models are being implemented consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program [Sections I and II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]	
Guiding Questions	Acceptable Evidence
<p><i>B. <u>LEA-Level Questions</u></i>² <i>General Questions for all Intervention Models</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe what this school was like before implementing reform efforts as part of the school intervention model. • Describe generally your process for implementing the SIG models at the school level. 	<p><i>B. <u>LEA-Level Evidence</u></i> <i>Evidence for All Intervention Models</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA describes the school prior to SIG and before any reform efforts were implemented • LEA describes its process for implementing the SIG models in its schools
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the LEA made any structural changes to support the implementation of the SIG intervention models? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA describes structural changes made, such as reassignment of duties, creation of turnaround offices, addition of staff • Current documentation that describes how the LEA is organized to support/implement SIG, such as organizational charts or job descriptions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the LEA made any contractual changes or agreements with the labor union to ensure full and effective implementation of the intervention models (if applicable)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA describes contractual changes or agreements, their relationship to SIG, and the timing of the changes • Copies of MOUs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How has the LEA addressed the following requirements: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current documentation that describes the LEA's process and criteria for approving external providers

² Questions on implementation include both general questions that apply to all intervention models and model specific questions that focus on the model components. Some questions about specific model components are asked at the school level rather than the LEA level.

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
IMPLEMENTATION**

LEA-Level Questions, Continued

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recruited, screened, and selected external partners, if applicable, to ensure their quality? ○ Modified its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement interventions fully and effectively? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contracts/Agreements the LEA has entered into with external providers ● LEA describes how it has modified its policies and practices
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Has the LEA established annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics for each Tier I and Tier II school that it is serving? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LEA provides copies of LEA’s annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics for each Tier I and Tier II school that it is serving ● LEA provides any data it may have on progress toward those goals

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
IMPLEMENTATION**

LEA-Level Questions, Continued

<i>Turnaround Model Specific Questions</i>	<i>Turnaround Model Specific Evidence</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What process did you use to replace the principal? When did this occur? • Was no more than 50 percent of the school’s staff from the previous year rehired for this year or within the past two school years as part of a school reform effort? • What procedures and processes were used to screen school staff for hiring/rehiring? • What procedures and processes has the LEA implemented to recruit, place, and retain staff with the necessary skills to implement the intervention model selected? • What new authority has the principal been given with regards to model implementation? For example, specifically relating to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Staffing? ○ Calendars? ○ Scheduling? ○ Budgeting? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA describes its process and timeline for replacing the principal • List of staff (including hiring dates) who were hired or rehired as part of the turnaround model and those who did not return as part of the turnaround model • Current written documentation outlining the evaluation criteria and screening processes for hiring new and returning staff • LEA describes its process for screening and rehiring staff • LEA describes its procedures and processes for recruiting, placing and retaining staff with skills necessary to implement the intervention model selected • LEA describes new authority that the principal has with regards to SIG and specifically staffing, calendars, scheduling, and budgeting

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
IMPLEMENTATION**

LEA-Level Questions, Continued

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What types of professional development have been provided to support the implementation of school-reform strategies? For example, specifically regarding implementing new instructional programs or strategies, analyzing data, or teaching LEP students? • What instructional programs or new instructional strategies are being used? What process did the LEA use to identify the instructional programs or strategies being used?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Documentation of professional development activities for the 2010-2011 school year• LEA memorandum, announcements, or agendas for professional development meetings• Professional Development resources and materials provided by LEA to SIG school staff relating to the school reform models and effective instruction• Documentation, research, or data used to determine the types of professional development to be provided • Current written documentation outlining the LEA's criteria and evaluation process for screening and selecting new instructional programs
--	--

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
IMPLEMENTATION**

LEA-Level Questions, Continued

<i>Transformation Model Specific Questions</i>	<i>Transformation Model Specific Evidence</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What process did you use to replace the principal? When did this occur? • What procedures and processes has the LEA implemented to recruit, place, and retain staff with the necessary skills to implement the intervention model selected? • Where are you in the process of implementing a new teacher evaluation system? • What new flexibility has the school been given with regards to model implementation? For example, specifically relating to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Staffing? ○ Calendars? ○ Scheduling? ○ Budgeting? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA describes its process and timeline for replacing the principal • LEA describes its procedures and processes for recruiting, placing and retaining staff with skills necessary to implement the intervention model selected • Job announcements for positions with SIG school • LEA describes where it is in the process of developing its new staff evaluation system and who is involved • LEA memorandum, announcements, or rubrics outlining the evaluation criteria for staff • LEA describes new authority it has relating to SIG

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
IMPLEMENTATION**

LEA-Level Questions, Continued

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What systems of rewards are in place for staff that are having a positive impact on student achievement and graduation rates? What systems of support are in place for staff members who may be struggling? • What types of professional development are being provided to support the implementation of school reform strategies? For example, specifically regarding implementing new instructional programs or strategies, analyzing data, or teaching LEP students? • What instructional programs or instructional strategies are being used in schools? What process did the LEA use to identify the instructional programs or strategies being implemented?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faculty Handbook, memorandum, or staff contract that lays out system of reward for staff who are raising student achievement and remediation and consequences for staff who are not raising student achievement • Documentation of professional development activities for the 2010-2011 school year • LEA memorandum, announcements, or agendas for professional development meetings • Professional Development resources and materials provided by LEA to SIG school staff relating to the school reform models and effective instruction • Current written documentation outlining the LEA's criteria and evaluation process for screening and selecting new instructional programs or strategies
---	---

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
IMPLEMENTATION**

LEA-Level Questions, Continued

<p><i>Restart Model Specific Questions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What process and timeline was used to screen and select the charter school operator, charter management (CMO), or the education management organization? • Has the LEA included terms and provisions to hold the charter school operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable in the contract or agreement, for schools implementing the restart model? • What is the relationship between the LEA and the CMO, EMO, and charter school operator? • What is the LEA’s current assessment of the CMO, EMO, or charter school operator and their work? 	<p><i>Restart Model Specific Evidence</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memorandum, announcements, RFPs, and other documentation outlining the criteria and process for screening and selecting a CMO or EMO • Copy of service agreement/contract with CMO or EMO
<p><i>Closure Model Specific Questions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe generally why you implemented the closure model and how you closed the school 	<p><i>Closure Model Specific Evidence</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA describes its efforts to close its schools
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where are students who previously attended the closed school enrolled? How far away are these schools from the school that was closed? • How did you ensure that these schools are higher performing than the school which was closed with respect to student achievement data and how was this determined? • How did the LEA support families and students in their transition to the new school? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule for completing the closure process • Achievement data for the schools in which students are now enrolled • Letter to parents, press releases, or announcements providing information on the closure of the school and new school where the student will be enrolled

<p>II. IMPLEMENTATION: The SEA ensures that the SIG intervention models are being implemented consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Sections I and II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]</p>	
<p>Guiding Questions</p>	<p>Acceptable Evidence</p>
<p><i>C. <u>School-Level Questions</u></i> <i>1. School Leadership Team</i></p> <p><i>General Questions for All Intervention Models</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe what this school was like before implementing reform efforts as part of the school intervention models. • Describe generally what the plan or vision is for implementing the school intervention models to turn around this school and where you are in the process. 	<p><i>C. <u>School-Level Evidence</u></i> <i>1. School Leadership Team</i></p> <p><i>General Evidence for All Intervention Models</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School describes the school prior to the implementation of the SIG model and shares data from the school’s needs assessment • School describes its efforts to implement its particular model in response to the school’s needs assessment • Implementation timeline submitted as part of the LEA’s approved SIG application • School describes any reform efforts that were previously in place • School describes any changes made to its implementation timeline

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
IMPLEMENTATION**

School-Level Questions, School Leadership Team, Continued

<i>Turnaround Model Specific Questions</i>	<i>Turnaround Model Specific Evidence</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Questions specifically for the principal</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How long have you been principal at this school? ○ Have you been given any new authority with regards to the implementation of your school reform effort? For example with regards to staffing, calendars, scheduling, budgeting? • Was no more than 50 percent of the school’s staff from the previous year rehired for this year or within the past two school years as part of implementing an intervention? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What process was used to determine which staff would be rehired? • What types of professional development and professional support systems have been provided to support the implementation of school reform strategies and improve instruction? For example, specifically regarding implementing new instructional programs or strategies, analyzing data, or teaching LEP students? • What instructional programs or strategies are being used? Which of these are new? What process did you use to screen and select the instructional programs or strategies being used? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal provides timeframe of hiring • Principal describes new authority been granted • School provides information on staff rehiring • LEA memorandum, announcements, or agendas for professional development meetings • Professional Development resources and materials provided by LEA to SIG school staff relating to the school reform model and effective instruction • Current written documentation outlining the criteria and evaluation process for screening and selecting new instructional programs

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
IMPLEMENTATION**

School-Level Questions, School Leadership Team, Continued

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What annual goals have been set for your school? What types of benchmarks have you set to measure progress toward these goals? What types of data are you collecting to measure these benchmarks? • How have you increased the learning time for students? • What additional social-emotional services and supports are being made available to students (i.e. health services, nutrition services, social services, family literacy programs)? • What other efforts is the school implementing to raise student achievement? • How do you know the changes you are making are having an impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• School describes and/or provides copy of annual goals • School describes examples of data collected by the school, subject areas, or individual teachers, analysis of data, and how data was used to inform school decisions • School provides copies of most recent data collected • Current year's and previous year's school schedule • School describes how it is using additional learning time, its rationale for using time in that way, and its process for deciding on that use of time • Current written documentation outlining social-emotional services and supports available to students • School describes other efforts being made to raise student achievement • School describes its progress and provides evidence of progress, for example interim data
--	---

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
IMPLEMENTATION**

School-Level Questions, School Leadership Team, Continued

<i>Transformation Model Specific Questions</i>	<i>Transformation Model Specific Evidence</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Questions specifically for the principal</i><ul style="list-style-type: none">○ How long have you been principal at this school?○ How are you and your staff evaluated? How was that system developed?○ Have you been given any new authority you have been given with regards to the implementation of your school reform effort? For example with regards to staffing, calendars, scheduling, budgeting? • What systems of rewards are in place for staff that are having a positive impact on student achievement and graduation rates? How does the school support teachers who may be struggling? • What types of professional development or professional support system have been provided to support the implementation of school reform strategies? For example, specifically regarding implementing new instructional programs, analyzing data, or teaching LEP students?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Principal describes how s/he came to the school and new authority granted • Faculty Handbook, memorandum, or other documentation outlining the criteria and process for teacher evaluation • Faculty Handbook, memorandum, or staff contract that lays out system of reward for staff who are raising student achievement and remediation and consequences for staff who are not raising student achievement • School describes rewards and consequence system for staff, process for developing system, and rationale for system in place • LEA memorandum, announcements, or agendas for professional development meetings • Professional Development resources and materials provided by LEA to SIG school staff relating to the school reform models and effective instruction

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
IMPLEMENTATION**

School-Level Questions, School Leadership Team, Continued

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What instructional programs or strategies are being used? Which of these are new? What process did you use to screen and select the instructional programs or strategies being used? • What types of benchmarks have you set to measure progress? What types of data are you collecting to measure these benchmarks? • How have you increased the learning time for students? • How were parents and the community engaged in planning to implement the school intervention model? • What efforts have been made this year to engage families and the community in the school? How is that different from last year? • Do you think a different type of parent involvement is necessary to successfully engage parents and implement the model? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current written documentation outlining the criteria and evaluation process for screening and selecting new instructional programs • School describes process for selecting instructional programs and criteria used • School describes examples of data collected by the school, subject areas, or individual teachers, analysis of data, and how data was used to inform school decisions • School shares any benchmark or interim data collected thus far • Current year's and previous year's school schedule • Letters to parents, fliers, announcements, and agendas and/or minutes from parent/community meetings about the implementation of the transformation model • School describes its efforts to engage parents and the community
--	--

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
IMPLEMENTATION**

School-Level Questions, School Leadership Team, Continued

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the school implementing other efforts to raise student achievement? • How do you know the changes you and the school have made this year are working? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School describes additional efforts being made to raise student achievement • School describes its progress and provides evidence of progress, for example interim data
<p><i>Restart Model Specific Questions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What role does the EMO, CMO, or charter organization play in the school? • What strategies are being implemented as part of the restart model? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Curriculum? ○ Professional Development? ○ Extended learning time? ○ Parental Involvement? • <i>Additional questions may be asked similar to those posed for schools implementing the transformation and turnaround model</i> 	<p><i>Restart Model Specific Evidence</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Leadership Team describes role of EMO, CMO or charter organization • CMO or EMO describes strategies being implemented

<p>II. IMPLEMENTATION: The SEA ensures that the SIG intervention models are being implemented consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Sections I and II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]</p>	
<p>Guiding Questions</p>	<p>Acceptable LEA Evidence</p>
<p>C. <u>School-Level</u> 2. <i>Teacher Group Interview</i></p> <p><i>General Questions for all Intervention Models</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe generally what you know about the School Improvement Grant program and what that means for your school. • Generally, what was the school like in previous years or before the reforms? How has it changed, particularly with respect to school culture, expectations of you, and expectations of the students? 	<p>C. <u>School-Level</u> 2. <i>Teacher Group Interview</i></p> <p><i>Evidence for all Intervention Models</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers describe what they know about SIG and/or school-level reforms that have taken place, and their role in those reforms • Teachers describe own observations and impressions of the impact of reforms in school

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
IMPLEMENTATION**

School-Level Questions, Teacher Group Interview, Continued

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• How has your schedule changed from the previous year? • How do you know the changes you and the school have made this year are working?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Teachers describe how the school has increased learning time, how they use that time, and the impact of increased learning time on student learning • Teachers describe and provide evidence of how they know the reform efforts are working
---	--

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
IMPLEMENTATION**

School-Level Questions, Teacher Group Interview, Continued

<i>Transformation Model Specific Questions</i>	<i>Transformation Model Specific Evidence</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Were any of you new hires? What process did you go through in applying for your position, being screened, and hired? • Describe the [new] evaluation system that is being developed or in place for teachers or being developed • Are rewards available to staff for gains in student achievement levels? • What opportunities are teachers given to make improvements in their practice? • Give an example or two of how you have used what you learned through professional development or instructional supports in your classroom. • What new instructional programs or strategies are you using in your class this year?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Teachers describe hiring process they went through • Teacher describe new evaluation process and their role in developing the evaluation • Teachers describe reward systems that are in place • Teachers describe systems in place to support improvements • Teachers describe the various types of professional development and supports they have received including subject, format • Teachers describe any new instructional programs or strategies they are using in their classes, how they are being used, and how those programs are impacting student learning

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
IMPLEMENTATION**

School-Level Questions, Teacher Group Interview, Continued

- Give an example of how you are using data to inform your instruction.

- How has your schedule changed from the previous year?

- What efforts have been made this year to engage families and the community in the school? How is this different from previous years?

- How do you know the changes you and the school have made this year are working?

- Teachers describe what data they are collecting about their students and how they are using the data to inform instruction

- Teachers describe how the school has increased learning time, how they use that time, and the impact of increased learning time on student learning

- Teachers describe interactions with parents and community

- Teachers describe and provide evidence of how they know the reform efforts are working

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
IMPLEMENTATION**

School-Level Questions, Teacher Group Interview, Continued

<p><i>Restart Model Specific Questions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What changes or reforms has the hiring of the [insert name of CMO/EMO] brought to the school?• <i>Depending on the types of reforms implemented, it might make sense to ask some of the questions regarding Hiring, Professional Development, Additional Learning Time, Instructional programs, and Data that are posed under the Turnaround/Transformation Models</i>	<p><i>Restart Model Specific Evidence</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Teachers describe the changes they have seen implemented by the CMO/EMO
--	--

<p>II. IMPLEMENTATION: The SEA ensures that the SIG intervention models are being implemented consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Sections I and II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]</p>	
<p>Guiding Questions</p>	<p>Acceptable Evidence</p>
<p><i>C. School-Level Questions</i> 3. Parent Interviews <i>General Questions for all Intervention Models</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are you new to the [school name] community? • Describe generally, what you know about the School Improvement Grant program or changes and reforms that have taken place in the school this year. • What was the school like last year? How does that compare to the school this year? • What do your students say about the school? • How did the district or school inform you about the changes that would take place? • Did you have any opportunity to make suggestions on the changes that should be made or give feedback on the changes that would be made? • What programs and supports are provided by the school or school district that help you and your family? 	<p><i>C. School-Level Evidence</i> 3. Parent Interviews <i>General Evidence for all Intervention Models</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents describe the changes they have seen in the school, as well as their impressions of school culture and academic expectations • Parents describe their involvement in the reform planning efforts

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
IMPLEMENTATION**

School-Level Questions, Parent Interviews, Continued

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What programs for parents at your school make a positive difference in your child’s education (e.g. programs that assist with helping with homework or math and reading nights, etc.)?• How have you been involved in the school this year? For example, volunteering, PTA/PTO membership, school improvement team member, tutoring, mentoring, etc.)• Does your school and/or the school district have a parent center and/or parent liaison?• How does the school communicate with you? (E.g. newsletters, conference, phone class, e-mails, flyers, websites, etc.)? What information do they provide? How frequently do you have communication from the school? In what format?• How often do you communicate with your student’s teacher(s) about your child’s progress in school? In what format?• What would you suggest to improve communication and information sharing that would make things easier for parents and students?• How are you and other parents encouraged to attend parent meetings and other parent activities?• How could the school be more welcoming and open to families and the community? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Parents describe the ways the school and teacher communicates with them, how they are involved in the school itself, and how they support their child’s education |
|--|---|

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
IMPLEMENTATION**

II. IMPLEMENTATION: The SEA ensures that the SIG intervention models are being implemented consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Sections I and II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]	
Guiding Questions	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<p><i>C. School-Level Questions</i> 4. Student Interviews <i>Questions for All Intervention Models</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the three best things about your school? • Are there any things you don't like about your school? If so, what are they? Why? • What was your school like last year? What is your school like this year? How does that compare to what the school is like this year? • Do your teachers have high expectations for you? How do you know? • Do find your classes interesting and engaging? Give examples of how or how not. • Do you feel safe at school? Why or why not? 	<p><i>C. School-Level Evidence</i> 4. Student Interviews <i>Evidence for ALL Intervention Models</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students describe their overall impressions of the school, including expectations of their performance, levels of engagement, and impressions of safety • Students describe changes they have noticed between last year and the previous year

III. FISCAL: The SEA ensures LEAs and schools are using funds consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Section II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010)) ; §1114 of the ESEA; and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-87]

Guiding Questions	Acceptable Evidence
<p>A. <u>SEA-Level Questions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe your process and efforts for ensuring that SIG funds are spent on allowable activities and aligned with the school’s approved plan. 	<p>A. <u>SEA-Level Evidence</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA describes its internal accounting and budget review process • SEA provides copies of LEA and school level budgets for review with narratives as appropriate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the SEA’s reservation no more than 5% of the State’s SIG allocation? How is the SEA using its reservation? • Did the SEA fund all of its Tier I schools? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the SEA did not fund its entire list of Tier I schools, did it carry over 25% of the FY 2009 funds to be added to its FY 2010 funds, or did it receive a waiver to carry over less? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA budget for FY 2009 SIG funds including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SEA reservation amount and how those funds were used ○ Payroll records, invoices, etc. that document how the reservation was used. ○ LEA awards ○ Amount of FY 09 funds being carried over
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the SEA reserved sufficient FY 2009 funds to fund fully those schools that have had their applications approved for 3 years of implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA describes its priorities for reviewing LEA applications and ranking of LEAs/schools based on the SEAs priorities • SEA documentation that it used its process for ranking applications based on SEA priorities.

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
FISCAL**

LEA-Level Questions, Continued

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• How does the SEA ensure that its LEAs adhere to the proper accounting of time and attendance for SIG paid staff? • How does the SEA ensure that the LEAs adhere to the procedures for maintaining equipment and materials purchased with SIG funds?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SEA describes its process for ensuring that LEAs adhere to proper accounting of time and attendance for SIG paid staff • SEA describes its process for ensuring that LEAs adhere to the procedures for maintaining equipment and materials purchased with SIG funds • Monitoring reports, etc. that document that the SEA has implemented its process.
--	--

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
FISCAL**

LEA-Level Questions, Continued

<p>III. FISCAL: The SEA ensures LEAs and schools are using funds consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Section II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010)); §1114 of the ESEA; and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-87.]</p>	
Guiding Questions	Acceptable Evidence
<p><i>B. <u>LEA-Level Questions</u></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe your process and efforts for accounting for the spending of SIG funds 	<p><i>B. <u>LEA-Level Evidence</u></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA describes its internal accounting and budget review process and the steps it takes to make sure expenditures are allowable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the SEA adjust your proposed budget or did you have to adjust your budget as part of your application? • Has the LEA submitted any amendments to its application? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA describes any adjustments made to budgets or to programs based on budget adjustments • LEA provides copies of any amendments.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How much of the LEA’s SIG award is being used at the district-level to support implementation of the selected school intervention models? • How is the LEA using these funds? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA budget • LEA describes how funds are being used at the district-level • Copies of invoices, personnel “runs,” etc. that document expenditures of SIG funds.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is the LEA ensuring that district-level activities conducted with SIG funds are specifically supporting SIG schools? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA describes its process for ensuring district-level activities are directed toward SIG schools

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
FISCAL**

LEA-Level Questions, Continued

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• How is the LEA ensuring that a school being served with SIG funds is still receiving all the funds that it would have received without the SIG award?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• LEA describes its process for ensuring that SIG funds do not supplant other funds• Comparability reports• Documentation of Title I ranking and allocation
---	---

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
FISCAL**

<p>III. FISCAL: The SEA ensures LEAs and schools are using funds consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Section II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as Amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010)); §1114 of the ESEA; and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-87.]</p>	
<p>Guiding Questions</p>	<p>Acceptable Evidence</p>
<p>C. <u>School-Level Questions</u> 1. <u>School Leadership Team</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are you using SIG funds to support implementation of the SIG model in your school? • In addition to SIG funds, what are the other sources of funds do you receive? 	<p>C. <u>School-Level Evidence</u> 1. <u>School Leadership Team</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools describes how they are using SIG and other funds to support implementation • School-level SIG budgets

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

<p>IV. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE: The SEA ensures that technical assistance is provided to its LEAs consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Section II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]</p>	
<p>Guiding Questions</p>	<p>Acceptable Evidence</p>
<p>A. <u>SEA-Level Questions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe generally how you previously provided and continue to provide support to LEAs in preparing to apply for SIG funding, applying for SIG funding, and implementing the SIG models. 	<p>A. <u>SEA-Level Evidence</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA describes its past and present technical assistance efforts to help LEAs and schools use SIG funds and implement the intervention models, including types, to whom, and how often
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What types of technical assistance is the SEA providing to LEAs in preparing to and applying for SIG funding, particularly with respect to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Conducting the needs-assessment ○ Preparing and amending LEA applications? ○ Preparing and amending budgets? ○ Selecting the intervention model for each school? • What types of technical assistance is the SEA providing or planning to provide regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implementation? ○ Compliance? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA describes the technical assistance it has provided to the LEA with regards to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Conducting the needs-assessment ○ Preparing and amending LEA applications? ○ Preparing and amending budgets? ○ Selecting the intervention model for each school? ○ Its past and present technical assistance efforts to help LEAs and schools use SIG funds and implement the intervention models, including types, to whom, and how often • SEA guidance documents, letters, and memoranda related to the LEA’s SIG application, budgeting, selection of the intervention model, and selection of external providers

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

SEA-Level Questions, Continued

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is the SEA determining what types of technical assistance to provide and to whom? How frequently is the SEA providing technical assistance? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of statewide/regional meetings on SIG, such as announcements, invitations, agendas, and presentation materials • SEA informational resources and tool kits, including Web-based resources and materials, related to SIG
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is the SEA supporting LEAs with regards to the recruitment, screening, and selection of external providers to ensure quality? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA describes its process for ensuring that LEAs are recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers to ensure quality • SEA approved list of external providers, if applicable, and describes process for how LEAs may propose other providers, as applicable • Current written documentation or guidance describing the processes and criteria for approving external providers

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

<p>IV. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE: The SEA ensures that technical assistance is provided to its LEAs consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Section II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]</p>	
Guiding Questions	Acceptable Evidence
<p><i>B. <u>LEA-Level Questions</u></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are you receiving support or guidance with regard to SIG implementation? If so, describe generally any support or guidance you are receiving regarding SIG? 	<p><i>B. <u>LEA-Level Evidence</u></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA describes any technical assistance it has received from the SEA or other providers • Samples of guidance, memoranda, training materials and/or agenda of meetings about SIG that have been provided or been conducted by the SEA particularly relating to the application, budget, intervention model selection, and selection of external providers • Informational resources and tool kits, including Web-based resources and materials, provided by the LEA to schools related to the implementation of the SIG models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regards to technical assistance, how has the LEA supported, how does it currently support, and how does it plan to support schools in implementing the SIG program? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In what areas does the LEA feel it needs to develop its capacity to provide better technical assistance to its schools? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA describes any technical assistance it has provided to the schools, including the types, to whom, and how often • LEA describes any assistance it is currently providing or plans it has to provide additional technical assistance, including the types, to whom, and how often
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there other areas where the LEA or its schools implementing SIG models could use additional support or technical assistance? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA describes any areas where it could use additional technical assistance

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

<p>IV. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE: The SEA ensures that technical assistance is provided to its LEAs consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Section II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]</p>	
Guiding Questions	Acceptable Evidence
<p>C. <u>School-Level Questions</u> <i>School Leadership Team</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are the LEA and/or the SEA supporting your implementation of the model? • Are there areas where you could use additional technical assistance? 	<p>C. <u>School-Level Evidence</u> <i>School Leadership Team</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School describes any support it is receiving from the LEA • School describes areas where it needs more technical assistance

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
MONITORING**

<p>V. MONITORING: The SEA ensures that monitoring of LEAs and schools is being conducted consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Section II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]</p>	
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence
<p>A. <u>SEA-Level Questions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe your general plan for monitoring the implementation of the SIG program including the steps you have already taken and your upcoming plans. 	<p>A. <u>SEA-Level Evidence</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA describes process for monitoring LEAs, changes to monitoring plan, and upcoming plans • Current written documentation that describe the SEA’s process and criteria for monitoring the LEAs that are implementing the SIG program • Schedule for SEA monitoring of LEAs implementing the SIG program • Protocol to be used in monitoring, including any desktop or other off-site monitoring protocols
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you begun monitoring the LEA for its implementation of the SIG program? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>If so, what, if any, findings or technical assistance needs have you identified?</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA describes where it is in the monitoring process and any findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How have you conveyed your observations to the LEA or school? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA describes how it follows up with the LEA or district on monitoring findings

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
MONITORING**

<p>V. MONITORING: The SEA ensures that monitoring of LEAs and schools is being conducted consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Section II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]</p>	
Guiding Questions	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<p><i>B. <u>LEA-Level Questions</u></i> <i>General Questions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the SEA monitored or scheduled a monitoring visit to review the LEA’s SIG implementation? 	<p><i>B. <u>LEA-Level Evidence</u></i> <i>General</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA memorandums or letters relating to the monitoring of SIG
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is the LEA ensuring that each SIG school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is fully implementing the selected intervention model in the 2010 school year? ○ Is meeting the requirements of the school’s intervention model? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA describes its process for ensuring that schools are implementing in accordance with the final requirements

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
MONITORING**

<p>V. MONITORING: The SEA ensures that monitoring of LEAs and schools is being conducted consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Section II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]</p>	
Guiding Questions	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<p>C. <u>School-Level Questions</u> <i>School Leadership Team</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has anyone from the SEA or LEA visited to see how you are implementing your intervention model? 	<p>C. <u>School-Level Evidence</u> <i>School Leadership Team</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School describes any monitoring of their intervention that has been or they expect to be conducted by the LEA or SEA

**Monitoring Indicators for School Improvement Grant
DATA COLLECTION**

<p>VI. DATA COLLECTION: The SEA ensures that data is being collected consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Sections II and III of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]</p>	
Guiding Questions	Acceptable Evidence
<p>A. <u>SEA-Level Guiding Questions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What process is the SEA using to collect data on the leading indicators? • How is the SEA keeping track of or managing this data? • Does the SEA have SIG baseline data on the leading indicators? Has the SEA submitted its SIG baseline data to ED's EDFacts Partner Support Center? • Is the SEA collecting any additional data beyond that required by the SIG program? 	<p>A. <u>SEA-Level Evidence</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA describes the data it is collecting, its process for collecting the data, and its protocols for managing data on the leading indicators • Copies of any baseline or benchmark data that the SEA has thus far collected on the leading indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beyond the reporting requirements, does the SEA have any plans for how it will use the data it gathers? If so, please describe those plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA describes its plans for analyzing data and how it is using the data to inform policy decisions and its role in supporting LEAs/schools

<p>VI. DATA COLLECTION: The SEA ensures that data is being collected consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program [Sections II and III of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]</p>	
Guiding Questions	Acceptable Evidence
<p><i>B. LEA-Level Questions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What process is the LEA using to collect data on the leading indicators? • How is the LEA keeping track of or managing this data? • How is the LEA using this data to inform its decision-making and reform efforts? • Is the LEA collecting any additional data beyond that required by the SEA and the SIG program? 	<p><i>B. LEA-Level Evidence</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA describes the data it is collecting, its process for collecting the data, and its protocols for managing data on the leading indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beyond the reporting requirements, does the LEA have any plans for how it will use the data it gathers? If so, please describe those plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA describes its plans for analyzing data and how it is using the data to inform policy decisions and its role in supporting schools
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you begun collecting any benchmark or interim data on the leading indicators? If so, what does the data show thus far? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA provides copies of and explains any benchmark or interim data it has collected, if available

VI. DATA COLLECTION: The SEA ensures that data is being collected consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Sections II and III of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]

Guiding Questions

Acceptable Evidence

C. School-Level Questions

School Leadership Team

- Have you begun collecting any benchmark or interim data on the leading indicators? If so, what does the data show?

C. School-Level Evidence

School Leadership Team

- School provides copies of and explains any benchmark or interim data it has collected, if available

**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
<p><u>SEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What process does the SEA use to monitor implementation of Title I, Part A; Title I, Part D, and the McKinney Vento Act? <p><u>For each program:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 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? <p><u>LEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. <p>*Must include a method for monitoring <u>all</u> critical NCLB requirements.</p> <p><u>Interview</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. <p><u>Interview</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part A
Fiduciary**

<p>3.1: Within State Allocations, Reallocations, and Carryover. The SEA complies with -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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
<p><u>LEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ When do LEAs receive their Title I allocation? ▪ Has the SEA granted any waivers to LEAs exceeding the 15% limit. 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 are charter school LEAs included in the allocation process? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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) school improvement activities, and allocated 95% of the amount reserved to LEAs with schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. 	<p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Title I, Part A grant awards and notification of grant awards. ▪ Waiver requests, if applicable and SEA approval/denial. ▪ 1003(a) ▪ Calculations of percentage of carryover.

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part A
Fiduciary**

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
<p><u>LEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How has the SEA awarded funds under 1003(a)? ▪ How much as the SEA retained from 1003(a) for State-level activities? ▪ 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? ▪ Does the SEA consolidate their admin funds? 	<p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ 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. 	<p><u>Documentation</u></p>

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part A
Fiduciary**

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
	<p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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). ▪ 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. 	

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part A
Fiduciary**

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
<p><u>SEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the process for review and approval of local applications? ▪ 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? 	<p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 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 timely plan approval and release of funds. 	<p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most recently approved annual plan from the LEA, which includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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.

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part A
Fiduciary**

<p>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]</p>		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<p>I. General LEA Selection and Allocation Requirements <u>SEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? <p><u>LEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p>I. General LEA Selection and Allocation Requirements <u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SEA procedure(s) to ensure that LEAs comply with general selection and allocation requirements. 	<p>I. General LEA Selection and Allocation Requirements <u>Documentation/ School Eligibility</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. <p><u>Enrollment Data</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part A
Fiduciary**

<p>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]</p>		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<p>II. Rank Ordering and Allocation Procedures <u>SEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 ▪ How does the SEA ensure that LEAs have correctly applied the provision related to “grandfathering”? ▪ <u>LEA</u> ▪ Do low-income and enrollment data support the rank ordering of schools? 	<p>II. Rank Ordering and Allocation Procedures <u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SEA procedure(s) to ensure that LEAs meet requirements related to rank order. 	<p>II. Rank Ordering and Allocation Procedures <u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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?

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part A
Fiduciary**

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
<p>II. Rank Ordering and Allocation Procedures</p> <p><u>SEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p>II. Rank Ordering and Allocation Procedures</p>	<p>II. Rank Ordering and Allocation Procedures</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part A
Fiduciary**

<p>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]</p>		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<p>III. LEA Reservation of Funds</p> <p><u>LEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p>III. LEA Reservation of Funds</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SEA procedure(s) for ensuring that LEAs meet reservation requirements annually. 	<p><u>III. LEA Reservation of Funds</u></p> <p>Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Homeless Children <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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.

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part A
Fiduciary**

<p>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]</p>		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<p>III. LEA Reservation of Funds</p>	<p>III. LEA Reservation of Funds</p>	<p>III. LEA Reservation of Funds</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. <p>III. LEA Reservation of Funds</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that, after the LEA has determined the private school portion, the LEA has distributed at least 95 percent of the remainder to schools.

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part A
Fiduciary**

<p>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]</p>		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<p>IV. Equitable Services for Private School Participants <u>SEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p>IV. Equitable Services for Private School Participants <u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<p>IV. Equitable Services for Private School Participants <u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 _____.

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part A
Fiduciary**

<p>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]</p>		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<p>V. Additional Reservation of Funds for LEA and School Improvement</p> <p><u>SEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. <p><u>LEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How does the LEA handle any reservations for requirements related to LEA and school improvement that are carried over into the next school year? 	<p>V. Additional Reservation of Funds for LEA and School Improvement</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SEA procedures for ensuring that LEAs meet reservation requirements related to LEA and school improvement annually. 	<p>V. Additional Reservation of Funds for LEA and School Improvement</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part A
Fiduciary**

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
<p>Maintenance of Effort</p> <p><u>SEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How does the SEA ensure that LEAs comply with the maintenance of effort fiscal requirement under Title I? 	<p>Maintenance of Effort</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<p>Maintenance of Effort</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p><i>(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.)</i></p>

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part A
Fiduciary**

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
<p>Comparability</p> <p><u>SEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How does the SEA ensure that LEAs comply annually with comparability requirements under Title I? ▪ 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? 	<p>Comparability</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<p>Comparability</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part A
Fiduciary**

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
<p>Supplement Not Supplant</p> <p><u>SEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How does the SEA ensure that LEAs comply with the supplement not supplant requirements? ▪ How does the SEA ensure that its LEAs have provided its Title I schools all the State and local funds it would otherwise need to operate in the absence of federal funds? 	<p>Supplement Not Supplant</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<p>Supplement Not Supplant</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LEA approved budget and records of expenditures of Title I funds at the district level. ▪ Evidence that documents that Title I schools have received all the State and local funds they would need to operate in the absence of federal funds

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part A
Fiduciary**

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
<p>Internal Controls</p> <p><u>SEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p>Internal Controls</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<p>Internal Controls</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part A
Fiduciary**

<p>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</p>		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<p>Services to Private School Children</p> <p><u>SEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How does the SEA ensure that its LEAs provide services to eligible children attending private schools in accordance with requirements 	<p>Services to Private School Children</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<p>Services to Private School Children</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part A
Fiduciary**

<p>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</p>		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<p>Services to Private School Children</p>	<p>Services to Private School Children</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<p>Services to Private School Children</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part A
Fiduciary**

<p>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</p>		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<p>Services to Private School Children</p>	<p>Services to Private School Children</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<p>Services to Private School Children</p> <p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Title I funded materials and equipment located at the private school are properly labeled.

**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 and 1431]		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable SA/LEA Evidence
<p><u>Questions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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
Standards, Assessment and Accountability**

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]		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable SA/LEA Evidence
<p><u>Questions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What are the SEA’s goals and objectives for the Title I, 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? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Updated State plan tracking performance of SEA 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. 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part D
Instructional Support**

2.2: The SEA ensures that Local Education Agency (LEA) programs for eligible students meet all requirements. [§1423 and §1425]		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<p><u>Questions:</u> <u>SEA Questions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 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? <p><u>LEA Questions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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]		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable SA Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 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? <p><u>For the State agency:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.

**Monitoring Indicators for Title I, Part D
Fiduciary**

**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]**

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? <p><u>For the LEA:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What consultations does the LEA have with each N or D facility or program that will be served with Subpart 2 funds? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The most recent copy of 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.

**Monitoring Indicators for McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Program
Instructional Support**

**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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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)? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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
<p><u>Questions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 internal fiscal controls do SEAs and LEAs have in place account for the use of subgrant funds in a way that meets Federal requirements? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 <u>and</u> quality of the project proposal. ▪ If the SEA awards any of its State-level coordination activity funds 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. 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.

**Monitoring Indicators for McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Program
Fiduciary**

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]

Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 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 Statewide needs assessment and program evaluation is funded through State-level activities or conducted by the State coordinator? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.

**Monitoring Indicators for McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Program
Fiduciary**

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
<p><u>Questions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Updated SEA dispute resolution policy and procedures including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ -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. 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. <p><u>Interview:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. <p><u>Interview:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 implementation of the ELP standards. 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of ELP standards implementation. ▪ Evidence of participation in State training and/or technical assistance activities for implementation of State ELP standards. <p><u>Interview:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 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 <u>all</u> Title III LEP students in grades K-12 consistent with Section 1111(b)(7)? ▪ How many LEP 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? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Test administration manuals for ELP assessment 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 assessment addresses 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. <p><u>Interview</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 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. 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. <p><u>Interview</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff describes communications from the SEA regarding the ELP assessment. 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 1 and 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? ▪ 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 subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 meet 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. 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. <p><u>Interview:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff demonstrates knowledge of subgrantee’s AMAO status, and any applicable sanctions for not meeting AMAOs for two or four consecutive years.

**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
	<p><u>Interview</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 methods for verifying subgrantee data. <p><u>Interview:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff describes how it informs subgrantees regarding data collection requirements, collects data from subgrantees, and verifies that these data are accurate. 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that subgrantees have procedures in place to collect data on individual LEP students from schools and report these data to the SEA. <p><u>Interview:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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
<p>Does the State carry out one or more of the State level activities described in Section 3111(b)(2)?</p>	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <p>Evidence that the State is carrying out one or more of the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conducts or facilitates professional development activities and evaluates the effectiveness of those activities. ▪ Carries out planning, evaluation, administration, and interagency coordination. ▪ Provides technical assistance to subgrantees. ▪ Promotes parental and community participation. ▪ Provides recognition for subgrantees that have exceeded State AMAO targets. <p><u>Interview:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff describes how the State identifies effective practices at the LEA and school levels. ▪ Staff provides examples of effective practices at the State, LEA and school levels. 	<p><u>Interview:</u></p> <p>Staff describes State level activities implemented at the LEA level.</p>

**Monitoring Indicators for Title III
Instructional Support**

2.2: State Oversight and Review of Local Plans³. [§3116(a) and §3115(c); EDGAR 34 CFR 76.770]		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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’s review and approval procedures for local plans ensure that subgrantees use funds for required activities described in Section 3115(c)? <p style="margin-left: 40px;">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).</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">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.</p>	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 and approval of local plans and award notification to subgrantees. ▪ Technical assistance provided to subgrantees on local plan requirements as described in Section 3116(b). 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most recently approved local plan from the subgrantee. ▪ Notification of application instructions and guidance from SEA. ▪ Feedback from the SEA regarding the local plan. ▪ Subgrantee certification for ensuring teacher fluency in English and any other language used for instruction.

³ Note, States can meet this requirement through a consolidated local plan, as provided for in Section 9305 of the ESEA.

**Monitoring Indicators for Title III
Instructional Support**

2.3: Activities by Agencies Experiencing Substantial Increases in Immigrant Children and Youth. [§§3114—3115]		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the State ensure subgrantees awarded funds for immigrant children and youth use the funds to pay for activities outlined under Section 3115(e)? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ List of subgrantees under the immigrant program. ▪ State guidance to eligible entities regarding application for the immigrant grant program and program requirements. <p><u>Interview:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff describes the process for informing eligible entities regarding the immigrant program and 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). 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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). <p><u>Interview:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 the grant, as well as the types of activities implemented and students served.

**Monitoring Indicators for Title III
Instructional Support**

2.4: Private School Participation. [§9501]		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SEA policies and procedures addressing statutory requirements for the provision of services to eligible children attending private schools. ▪ Evidence that the SEA monitors for subgrantee compliance with the provision of equitable services to eligible children, their teachers, or other educational personnel. ▪ Evidence that the SEA monitors for subgrantee compliance with the requirements for “timely and meaningful” consultation with appropriate private school officials during the design and development of the Title III program. ▪ SEA approved process for filing of complaints by private school officials. 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 school officials for consultation regarding equitable participation of LEP students, their teachers, or other educational personnel in Title III, and timeline when services began. ▪ 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, including assessment of students’ English proficiency. ▪ Documentation reflecting the amount of funds available for services to private school students and their teachers.. ▪ Documentation of consultation during the design and implementation of services. ▪ Subgrantee assessment of services provided and how the results of the assessment are used to improve services. ▪ How does LEA monitor services to private school students and evaluate effectiveness of services?

**Monitoring Indicators for Title III
Instructional Support**

2.5: Parental Notification and Outreach. [§3302]		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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)? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Samples of signed and dated subgrantee notifications 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. <p><u>Interview:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SEA discusses how it assists subgrantees to develop parental notifications. 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Samples of signed and dated notifications 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 the LEA’s 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
<p><u>State Allocations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. <p><u>Immigrant Set Aside:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 immigrant children and youth as required by 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget [including breakdown of funds reserved for State activities (SEA budget and personnel records) and subgrantee awards]. <p><u>State Allocations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 planning, administrative and interagency coordination activities related to awarding subgrants to eligible entities and carrying out State level activities. ▪ Record of the SEA’s final awards to eligible entities. <p><u>Immigrant Set Aside:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ List of subgrantees under the immigrant programs. ▪ SEA definition of “significant increase”. ▪ SEA calculations and final allocations for immigrant subgrants. 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.

**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
<p>Section 3114(d)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? <p><u>Title III LEP Allocations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has the SEA allocated at least 95 percent of its allocation to eligible LEAs?⁴ ▪ 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 LEP students in the calculation of each LEA’s allocation? ▪ Are all allocations for LEP subgrants at least \$10,000? 	<p><u>Title III LEP Allocations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SEA calculations and final allocations to eligible entities. ▪ Record of LEA counts of LEP students provided by LEAs. ▪ Evidence that LEAs are eligible to receive subgrants. 	

⁴ Except in cases where the minimum reservation of \$175,000 for administration is greater than 5% of the total grant.

**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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are there any consortia that receive Title III funds? Is there a designated fiscal agent for each consortium? ▪ How does the SEA determine if a subgrant will not be used for the purpose for which it was made? <p><u>Reallocation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the State’s reallocation process? How does the State reallocate funds? 	<p><u>Reallocation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Written SEA policies and procedures for reallocating funds. ▪ Evidence that reallocations are in accordance with written policies and procedures. 	

**Monitoring Indicators for Title III
Fiduciary**

3.2: District Allocations, Reallocations and Carryover. [§3115]		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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).

**Monitoring Indicators for Title III
Fiduciary**

3.3: Maintenance of Effort. [§1120A and §9021]		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. <p><u>Interview:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. <p><u>Interview:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff understands maintenance of effort can be determined by using either fiscal effort per student or aggregate expenditures. 	<p><u>Documentation</u></p> <p><i>(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.)</i></p>

Monitoring Indicators for Title III Fiduciary

3.4: Supplement, Not Supplant – General. [§3115(g)]		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<p><u>SEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? <p><u>LEA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the instructional program/service provided to all students (e.g., to meet <i>Lau</i> 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? 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. <p><u>Interview:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff describes technical assistance provided to LEAs regarding this requirement. ▪ Staff describes the process for ensuring compliance with this requirement. 	<p><u>Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget records ▪ Personnel records ▪ Inventory records ▪ LEA approved budget and records of expenditures of Title III funds at the district level. ▪ <u>Record of expenditures that verify that funds have not supplanted other Federal, State, and local funds.</u> ▪ 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.

**Monitoring Indicators for Title III
Fiduciary**

3.3: Maintenance of Effort. [§1120A and §9021]		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How has the LEA demonstrated that it is not using Title III funds to provide services that it is 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. 		

**Monitoring Indicators for Title III
Fiduciary**

3.4A: Supplement, Not Supplant – Assessment. [§1111(b)(7) and §3113(b)(2)]		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<p><u>Use of Funds to Develop ELP Assessments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? <p><u>Use of Funds to Administer ELP Assessments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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? 	<p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget records ▪ Purchase orders ▪ Personnel runs ▪ Letters ▪ Memos ▪ Agendas 	<p><u>Documentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget records ▪ Purchase orders ▪ Personnel runs ▪ Letters ▪ Memos ▪ Agendas

**Monitoring Indicators for Title III
Fiduciary**

3.4A: Supplement, Not Supplant – Assessment. [§1111(b)(7) and §3113(b)(2)]		
Guiding Questions	Acceptable SEA Evidence	Acceptable LEA Evidence
<p><u>Screening and Placement Assessments for LEP Students</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 I: SIG Onsite Reviews

The SIG on-site reviews will include the following components: an SEA interview, two LEA interviews, and two school site visits (one per LEA). A sample schedule of the SASA team’s monitoring visit is provided below:

Day 1: School #1 Site Visit	Day 2: LEA #1 Interview	Day 3: School # 2 Site Visit	Day 4: LEA #2 Interview	Day 5: SEA Interview
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •School Leadership Team Interview •Teacher Interview •Parent Interview •Guided Classroom Observations with Conversation with Students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Interview with LEA staff responsible for SIG 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •School Leadership Team Interview •Teacher Interview •Parent Interview •Guided Classroom Observations with Conversation with Students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Interview with LEA staff responsible for SIG 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Interview with SEA staff responsible for SIG

SIG MONITORING ACTIVITIES

An overview of each of the interviews or site visits is provided below:

- **SEA Interview.** The SASA team will conduct a single, group interview with the SEA on the SIG program that will take approximately three to four hours. SEA staff that are responsible for the SIG program and can address the guiding interview questions should be present for the interview. This should include the Federal Programs or Title I Director, and may also include individuals from a State Turnaround Office or those responsible for the SIG application, budget, data collection, or implementation.
- **LEA Interview.** The SASA team will visit two LEAs. For each LEA, the team will conduct a single, group interview with LEA staff responsible for SIG implementation that will take approximately three hours. The LEA should ensure that individuals who can address the guiding interview questions are present for the interview. This should include the individual responsible for Federal or Title I programs, and may include other individuals responsible for aspects of the SIG program relating to the application, the budget, data collection, and implementation of the school model.
- **School Site Visit.** The SASA team will also conduct a site visits a school in the LEA that is receiving SIG funds to implement a school intervention model. During this

visit, the SASA team will meet with the school's SIG leadership team, teachers, parents, and students, as well as visit several classrooms. A sample schedule for the school site visit is also included below.

- **Leadership Team Interview.** The SASA team collectively interviews the members of the school's leadership team. In particular, this should include the principal and any individuals who have been responsible for the decision-making process with regards to planning and implementing the intervention model. Although some leadership teams may include parents, it is not necessary to include them in this interview as a separate interview with parents also will be conducted. For schools that are implementing the restart model, a representative from the CMO or EMO that is serving the SIG school to be visited as part of monitoring should be present.
- **Teacher Group Interview.** The SASA team interviews a group of 3-5 pre-selected teachers. The group should include the following: (1) at least one teacher from a grade and subject that is tested through statewide assessments; (2) at least one returning teacher; and (3) at least one new teacher for schools implementing the turnaround model. The group should not include any teachers who also serve on the leadership team, nor should members of the school's leadership team or the district be present for this interview.
- **Parent Group Interviews.** The SASA team interviews a pre-selected group of 8-10 parents of students currently enrolled in the school. The group should include at least one parent of a student who was enrolled at the school the previous year. Parent interviews may be scheduled during lunch, after school or in the evening to ensure high levels of participation.
- **Classroom Observations & Student Interviews.** A member of the school leadership team provides a tour to the SASA team of the school and classrooms to show the implementation of various components of the school intervention models (e.g. efforts to improve school culture, data usage, instructional programs/strategies, increased learning time, use of professional development strategies, etc.). The school leadership team provides an explanation of what the monitoring team should expect to see in the classroom from teachers, students, and in the classroom environment, as well as a list of the classrooms to be visited. The school leadership team escorts the SASA team to 3-4 pre-selected classrooms to observe for a period of time (at least 5 minutes per room) and provides pre/post-observation commentary to show various model components in action. Additionally, fifteen minutes should be set aside in one of the classes for the SASA team to interview the entire class of students.
- **Sample School Site Visit Schedule.** During its school site visit, the SASA team would like to get an accurate picture of a typical day in the school and aims to be minimally disruptive to the schedules of school staff and the learning of students.

A sample schedule is provided below. While the entrance conference and leadership team interview should be scheduled first so that the SASA team can gain context for its later interviews, the order of the classroom observations and student interviews; teacher interviews, and parent interviews remains flexible.

Sample School Visit Schedule

8:00-8:30	Entrance Meeting
8:30-10:30	Leadership Team Interview
10:30-11:30	Classroom Observations & Student Interviews
11:30-12:30	Parent Interviews over Lunch
12:30-1:30	Monitoring Team Lunch
1:30- 2:15	Teacher Interviews
2:15- 2:45	Wrap Up with School Administration

APPENDIX II

Draft Onsite State Monitoring Schedule for 2011-2012

State	Onsite Week	Programs to be Monitored
<i>Florida</i>	<i>Oct 3-7, 2011</i>	<i>SIG; Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless</i>
<i>Iowa</i>	<i>Oct 31 –Nov 4 2011</i>	<i>SIG; Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless</i>
<i>Hawaii</i>	<i>Dec 5-9 2011</i>	<i>SIG; Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless; Title III</i>
<i>Illinois</i>	<i>Dec 12-16 2011</i>	<i>SIG; Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless</i>
<i>Georgia</i>	<i>Jan 9-13 2012</i>	<i>SIG; Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless</i>
<i>Texas</i>	<i>Jan 30—Feb 3 2012</i>	<i>SIG; Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless; Title III</i>
<i>New York</i>	<i>Feb 13-17 2012</i>	<i>SIG; Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless</i>
<i>Oregon</i>	<i>March 5-9 2012</i>	<i>SIG; Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless</i>
<i>Puerto Rico</i>	<i>March 26-30 2012</i>	<i>SIG; Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless; Title III</i>
<i>Missouri</i>	<i>April 16-20 2012</i>	<i>SIG; Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless</i>
<i>Rhode Island</i>	<i>April 30-May 4 2012</i>	<i>SIG; Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless</i>
<i>Wisconsin</i>	<i>May 7-11 2012</i>	<i>SIG; Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless; Title III</i>
<i>BIE</i>	<i>May 7-11 2012</i>	<i>SIG; Title I, Parts A and D; and Homeless</i>
<i>District of Columbia</i>	<i>Sept 10-14 2012</i>	<i>SIG</i>
<i>Wyoming</i>	<i>Oct 3-7, 2011</i>	<i>Title III</i>
<i>North Carolina</i>	<i>Oct 24-28 2011</i>	<i>Title III</i>
<i>Alabama</i>	<i>Feb 13-17 2012</i>	<i>Title III</i>
<i>Mississippi</i>	<i>Feb 27-March 2 2012</i>	<i>Title III</i>
<i>Indiana</i>	<i>March 19-24 2012</i>	<i>Title III</i>
<i>Virginia</i>	<i>April 23-27 2012</i>	<i>Title III</i>
<i>Maine</i>	<i>Sept 10-14 2012</i>	<i>Title III</i>
<i>Vermont</i>	<i>TBD</i>	<i>Title III</i>