

Hawaii
 Targeted Monitoring Review of
 School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
 Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
 December 3-7, 2011

BACKGROUND

Overview of SIG Schools in Hawaii FY 2009			Implementation of SIG School Intervention Models	
Tier	Number of FY 2009 Eligible SIG Schools	Number of FY 2009 Served SIG Schools	Models	Number of Schools Implementing the Model
Tier I	6	3	Turnaround	0
Tier II	0	0	Transformation	3
Tier III	109	4	Restart	0
			Closure	0

MONITORING TRIP INFORMATION

Monitoring Visits	
Complex Visited	<i>Kau-Keaau- Paho Complex</i>
School Visited	<i>Naalehu Elementary School</i>
Model Implemented	<i>Transformation</i>
FY 2009 Funding Awarded (over two years)	<i>Complex¹ Award: \$3,603,374 School-level funding: \$1,396,212</i>
Charter Managing Agent Visited	<i>Ho'okāko'o Corporation Local School Board²</i>
School Visited	<i>Kamaile Elementary</i>
Model Implemented	<i>Transformation</i>
FY 2009 Funding Awarded (over two	<i>Complex Award: \$1,400,000 School-level funding: \$1,400,0000</i>

¹ Hawaii is a single, statewide school system that operates as both the State Education Agency (SEA) and the only Local Education Agency (LEA). Hawaii is the only State with this single SEA/LEA structure directed by a Superintendent of Education and a single Board of Education. Therefore, HIDOE's grantees are referred to as complexes. A complex is composed of a high school and the intermediate/middle and elementary schools that feed into it for a particular geographical location.

² While Kamaile Academy is located geographically within Waianae complex, the school is managed by Ho'okāko'o Corporation Local School Board (HC). HC staff members were responsible for facilitating the SIG application process and were interviewed during ED's monitoring visit.

Hawaii
 Targeted Monitoring Review of
 School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
 Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
 December 3-7, 2011

years)	
SEA Visited	<i>Hawaii Department of Education</i>
FY 2009 SIG Award	<i>\$11,006,857</i>
Staff Interviewed	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>SEA Staff: Bruce Naguwa, Constance Hassell, Sharon Nakagawa Geri Ann Hong</i> ➤ <i>Kau-Keaau-Pahoa Complex Staff: Complex Area Superintendent</i> ➤ <i>Naalehu Elementary Staff: Principal, vice principals, Leadership Team, 5 teachers, 3 parents, students, and 3 classroom visits</i> ➤ <i>Ho'okāko'o Corporation Local School Board Staff: Director of Ho'okāko'o Corporation and assistant staff</i> ➤ <i>Kamaile Academy Staff: Principal, Leadership Team, 5 teachers, 4 parents, students, and 3 classroom visits</i> 	
U.S. Department of Education Staff	
Team Leader	<i>Carlas McCauley</i>
Staff Onsite	<i>Carlas McCauley & Molly Scotch</i>

OVERVIEW OF MONITORING REPORT

The following report is based on the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department's) onsite monitoring visit to Hawaii from December 3 to December 7, 2011 and review of documentation provided by the State educational agency (SEA), complexes, and schools. The report consists of three sections: *Summary and Observations*, *Technical Assistance Recommendations*, and *Monitoring Findings*. The *Summary and Observations* section describes the implementation of the SIG program by the SEA, complexes, and schools visited; initial indicators of success; and any outstanding challenges being faced in implementation. This section focuses on how the SEA, complexes, and schools visited are implementing the SIG program with respect to the following five areas: school climate, teachers and leaders, instructional strategies and time, use of data, and technical assistance. The *Technical Assistance Recommendations* section identifies strategies and resources for addressing technical assistance needs. The *Monitoring Findings* section identifies areas where the SEA is not in compliance with the final requirements of the SIG program and indicates required actions that the SEA must take to resolve the findings. Please note that the observations and descriptions included in this report reflect the specific context of the limited number of classrooms visited and interviews conducted at a small number of schools and complexes within the State. As such, they offer a snapshot of what was occurring at the complex and school levels, and are not meant to represent a schools, Complexes, or State's

Hawaii
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 3-7, 2011

entire SIG program. Nor are we approving or endorsing any particular practices or approaches by citing them.

SUMMARY AND OBSERVATIONS

School Climate

Naalehu Elementary (Kau-Keaau-Pahoa Complex):

According to Kau-Keaau-Pahoa Complex (KPPC) and Naalehu Elementary School's (NES's) needs assessment, which was compiled in school year (SY) 2009-2010 by the Hawaii Department of Education (HIDOE) and the KPPC Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) response team, the school's focus was scattered and its vision and mission were undefined. The needs assessment indicated that if wholesale change did not occur in a timely manner, the school would continue to miss AYP targets. The assessment indicated a need for collaboration between teachers, leadership staff, and the school in order to effectively educate its students, especially its nearly 200 (1/3 of the school population) English Language Learner (ELL) population and community. During onsite interviews, the school leadership confirmed that poor communication and collaboration adversely affected the culture. Moreover, NES staff indicated that students believed that teachers had low expectations for them, in part, because of the negative culture and lack of structure.

To change the culture, school leadership implemented structures that could withstand the school's constant staffing and leadership changes. For example, the school contracted with Edison Learning to establish a structure through which leadership and the teaching staff can communicate and make decisions based on data. During interviews, school leadership and staff explained that the school uses this structure to set school goals and to assess student performance. The school also revamped its professional learning communities (PLCs), which the needs assessment found lacked structure and focus. School leadership and staff indicated that new structure for assessing data and the revamped PLCs, along with new instructional coaches, has improved school culture and spear-headed a school-wide focus on collaboration.

NES is also trying to improve the school's culture by increasing outreach to families and the community. The NES's needs assessment identified that the vast geographic area is a barrier to family and community engagement. To address this geographic challenge, the school has expanded parent involvement opportunities to the Ocean View community where many of the Marshallese families live. During school interviews, parents expressed gratitude in the school's decision to organize events in the new location, and it appears that parent involvement at family reading nights and other meetings has increased because of the changes.

Kamaile Academy (Ho'okāko'o Corporation Local School Board):

Kamaile Academy's (KA) vision is to be a college- and career-focused K-12 school that is project based and connected to Hawaiian culture. According to its 2010-2011 needs assessment,

Hawaii
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 3-7, 2011

which was compiled by KA and Ho'okāko'o Corporation Local School Board (HC) staff, the school had not been faithful to that mission before the implementation of SIG. It lacked a universal culture of rigor and college readiness, a defined behavior management structure, constant and data-driven professional development or collaboration, and a strategy for parental and community involvement.

During onsite interviews, teachers indicated that the school was beginning to develop a culture of rigor and improve its behavior management structure. As part of SIG implementation, staff created a Navigator Center that promotes college and provides assistance in the college application process. The new project based learning (PBL) curriculum, discussed further in the Teaching and Learning Section of this report, also helps student see high school as a beginning rather than an end to their education. Leadership explained they have also attempted to improve the school's culture by increasing student accountability for their actions through a positive behavior support system. With the change in school leadership, teachers explained that there is an increased focus on positive behavior support and that the school is developing a clear system of accountability for behavior.

Leadership and staff also explained that there have been positive changes in school culture because of increased collaboration among teaching staff. KA's needs assessment indicated that past efforts to establish a PLC and provide effective professional development (PD) were disorganized. This year, teachers have begun to assess themselves as part of their teacher evaluation model and now indicate areas where they need growth. Teachers indicated that the leadership team uses teachers' self-assessments to select PD topics. After attending a PD session teachers meet in PLCs and discuss how they plan to use what they have learned to improve their instruction. The focus during the PLCs is on using data to identify students' needs and how to fill in their learning gaps.

With the help of SIG funds, the school created the Navigator Center and a Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) to help increase parent and community member participation in school programs and services. The KA needs assessment had found that increased parental and community involvement was necessary to support school improvements. Teachers explained that the school now sends out monthly newsletters and will begin to forward text messages and emails to inform parents of school happenings. During interviews, parents explained that they spend more time at the school because it has been more welcoming to everyone. Parents also mentioned that KA's open-door policy allows people in the community to feel more comfortable about school changes.

Teachers and Leaders

Naalehu Elementary (Kau-Keaau-Pahoa Complex):

The principal was replaced at the beginning of the 2011-12 school year after leaving voluntarily. The current principal was originally hired as an assistant principal and was promoted at the beginning of the 2011-12 school year. Following a recommendation in the needs assessment,

Hawaii
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 3-7, 2011

NES hired two instructional coaches as part of the leadership team so that the principal has time to focus on improving the curriculum and other responsibilities. Both coaches and administrators serve on the school's Train Implement Perfect Sustain (TIPS) team that is responsible for observing and providing feedback to teachers. Teachers indicated that the coaches help with classroom observations and facilitate the communication between leadership staff and teaching staff. According to NES staff, the school is still in the process of hiring another vice principal to assist the principal and coaches in staff observations and assessments. KPPC used a significant portion of its SIG funds to hire new staff to support NES's growing EL population and preschool program. The NES needs assessment indicated that the school's geographic isolation created challenges with staff transiency and that it caused difficulty with maintaining highly qualified teachers, especially in those two areas. KKPC staff indicated that new hires are chosen from a list of all available teachers in Hawaii and then are interviewed by KKPC and NES staff individually. Parents commented that teachers are more experienced and that they challenge their students more than they did in past years.

Kamaile Academy (Ho'okāko'o Corporation Local School Board):

HC replaced the principal in spite of community concerns, not only because of SIG requirements, but because it believed leadership change would serve as the foundation for turnaround success. HC held several community meetings prior to replacing the principal to inform the parents and community members of the pending change. Through its hiring announcement, HC made clear that it was seeking a candidate who could support the growth of the school and teachers, improve support to all students (including ELL and special education students), strengthen the alignment of curricula between all grade levels, and develop a curriculum and accountability system that would promote student success. The selected principal, who had marked success in turnaround schools, began in the 2011-2012 school year. KA also shifted two positions within the school to create leadership roles and hired three additional leadership staff. HC staff explained that its biggest success in the first year was working with a diligent and focused leadership team that is committed to turn around KA. Parents explained that while the overhaul of the leadership team was controversial in the community, they feel more welcome and included in school activities because of the new leadership representatives.

KA leadership indicated that the school hired 30 new teachers for the 2011-2012 school year, including those teachers who work with the newly developed 10th grade. KA will continue to focus on efforts to improve recruitment because it is adding a grade level each year, has an extremely high teacher turnover rate, and is located in a rural community.

Instructional Strategies and Time

Naalehu Elementary (Kau-Keaau-Pahoa Complex):

To improve instruction, NES is focusing on coaching teachers, improving its professional development, and aligning its instruction to state standards. The school both hired academic coaches in reading, math, and data use and improved its professional development offerings to help build staff capacity. The needs assessment identified the need for more differentiated

Hawaii
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 3-7, 2011

instruction and strategies for certain subgroups, like English learners, so the school introduced professional programs, like Project GLAD (guided language acquisition design) through which teachers must meet monthly with their colleagues to discuss implementation of the language-acquisition strategies. Several staff explained that they are now able to differentiate their instruction for their students who need more help or consistent reinforcement. The newly hired reading and math coaches are also helping teachers develop a more standards-based teaching approach. With the increase in professional development and focused standards-based learning, parents, teachers, leadership, and students indicated that the school's academics had become more rigorous.

There was no evidence that Naalehu increased learning time.

Kamaile Academy (Ho'okako'o Corporation Local School Board):

To increase expectations for students across the school, KA adopted an improved project-based curriculum with performance assessments and an advisory program. Through the advisory program, for example, a teacher advisor develops in-depth knowledge about individual students and communicates regularly with parents. Parents indicated that this has built relationships between teachers and students.

In an effort to improve professional development for teachers, KA used the teachers' self-assessment data to choose topics and built in time (10 extra full days a year) to share these strategies with their peers and the leadership team. Last Spring KA also expanded the in-school collaboration time for teachers by four additional hours per week.

KA also increased the instructional time for students, adding one and a half hours to each school day starting in 2009. The school expanded instruction for core subjects as well as incorporating 60 minutes for response to intervention (RtI).

Use of Data

Naalehu Elementary (Kau-Keaau-Pahoa Complex)

Teachers now use monthly benchmark assessments to help identify content that requires additional instructional time and to differentiate instruction. KPPC also indicated that the complex tracks student attendance, achievement, and behavior.

Kamaile Academy (Ho'okako'o Corporation Local School Board):

HC established a Data Dashboard to help leadership and teachers set literacy and math targets based on several assessments. The system also tracks student behavior, attendance, and parent involvement. During their professional learning community sessions, teachers evaluate placement of students and develop tools and resources to improve instruction based on data.

Hawaii
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 3-7, 2011

Technical Assistance

Naalehu Elementary (Kau-Keaau-Pahoa Complex)

According to NES staff, the school does not receive sufficient technical assistance or other forms of support from the HIDOE. School leadership explained that KKPC staff, however, has provided support on how to hire new teachers as well as strategies for improving struggling staff.

Kamaile Academy (Ho'okako'o Corporation Local School Board):

HC staff explained that while the HIDOE has not provided technical assistance, HC staff members work directly with KA to implement the intervention models. HC staff meets weekly with KA leadership to discuss targets in their school improvement plan and monthly with Envision representatives to discuss how the external providers work.

Hawaii
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 3-7, 2011

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE RECOMMENDATION

This section addresses areas where additional technical assistance may be needed to improve the quality of implementation of the SIG program.

Issue (1): The SEA did not have full-time staff dedicate to the SIG program.

Technical Assistance Strategies:

We recommend that the HDOE dedicate staff to work with schools receiving SIG funds. The Department encourages SEAs to develop an overall strategy to support the turnaround work and provide sufficient state-level capacity to support that strategy. The HDOE could take proactive steps to learn from the support and oversight strategies of other SEAs and adopt appropriate strategies for supporting its turnaround schools.

Hawaii
 Targeted Monitoring Review of
 School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
 Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
 December 3-7, 2011

MONITORING FINDINGS

Summary of Monitoring Indicators

Critical Element	Requirement	Status	Page
1. 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 the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]	Finding	10-11
2. 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))]	Finding	12
3. 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]	Finding	11
4. 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))]	Finding	13
5. 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	Finding	13

Hawaii
 Targeted Monitoring Review of
 School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
 Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
 December 3-7, 2011

	Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]		
6. Data Collection	The SEA ensures that data are 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))]	N/A	

Critical Element 1: The SEA ensures that its application process was carried out consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program.

Finding (1): The SEA did not ensure that the complex application process was carried out consistent with its approved SIG application and the SIG requirements. The complexes submitted a budget in order to receive SIG funds but did not submit an entire application. The SIG requirements state that before approving a complex’s application, the SEA must ensure that the application meets requirements, particularly with respect to — (i) whether the complex has agreed to implement one of the four interventions identified in section I.A.2 of these requirements in each Tier I and Tier II school included in its application; (ii) the extent to which the complex’s application shows the complex’s strong commitment to use school improvement funds to implement the four interventions by addressing the factors in section I.A.4(a) of these requirements; (iii) whether the complex has the capacity to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in its application; and (iv) whether the complex has submitted a budget that includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school it identifies in its application and whether the budget covers the period of availability of the funds, taking into account any waiver extending the period of availability.

Citation: Sections II.B. of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010)), requires a State to submit to the Department for approval an application that contains such information as the Secretary may reasonably require. The FY 2009 SIG application required States to describe their process for reviewing LEA applications.

Further action required: Prior to making awards with the FY 2010 SIG funds, the HIDOE must provide to the Department evidence that it administered its competition consistent with its approved FY 2010 SIG application. The evidence must include a copy of the complex application used to make a determination on the award and the specific criteria used to determine that SIG requirements will be carried out to ensure that funded schools are implementing one of the models fully and effectively.

Hawaii
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 3-7, 2011

Finding (2): The HIDOE did not post the required documentation on its Web site within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants to complexes.

Citation: 75 C.F.R. § II.B.3 requires an SEA to post on its website, within 30 days of awarding school improvement grants to LEAs, all final LEA applications (75 C.F.R. [October 28, 2010]).

Further action required: The HIDOE must post on its website within 30 days of receipt of this report all final complex applications, as well as a summary of those grants that includes the following information: (a) name and National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) identification number of each complex awarded a grant; (b) amount of each complex's grant; (c) name and NCES identification number of each school being served; and (d) type of intervention being implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.

Critical Element 2: The SEA ensures that the SIG intervention models are being implemented consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program.

Finding (1). The HIDOE did not ensure that Kau-Keaau-Pahoa Complex implemented increased learning time in Naalehu Elementary School, as required for the transformation model. The complex told Naalehu Elementary that it could not increase time, despite the school's willingness to do so.

Citation: Section I.A.2(a)(viii) of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010)), requires an LEA implementing the turnaround model to establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in the final requirements.)

Further action required: The HIDOE must submit evidence to the Department that it has reviewed each complex that received FY 2009 SIG funds to implement the transformation model to determine if increased learning time is being provided consistent with the SIG final requirements. Additionally, the HIDOE must submit to the Department a timeline for implementation of increased learning for any school it determines is not currently doing so. Additionally, prior to making awards with the FY 2010 funds the HIDOE must submit evidence that the schools it has selected to award have the capacity to implement increased learning time and have provided a timeline for implementing increased learning time in the complex application for the school year 2012-2013.

Finding (2): The HIDOE has not ensured that Kamaile Academy and Naalehu Elementary School have established a system of rewards for school leaders, teachers, and other staff as required by the transformation model.

Citation: 75 C.F.R. § I.A.2. (d)(1)(i)(c) requires that an LEA must identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who in implementing this model, have increased student

Hawaii
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 3-7, 2011

achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities, have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so.

Further action required: The HIDOE must provide a timeline to the Department for implementation of a system of rewards at Kamaile Academy. Before awarding the FY 2010 funds, the HIDOE must also submit to the Department a timeline for implementation of the systems of rewards in the schools it would like to fund with the FY 2010 SIG funds.

Critical Element 3: The SEA ensures complexes 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].

Finding: The HIDOE did not ensure that complexes received awards that were of sufficient size and scope to support the activities outlined in the complex applications to fully and effectively implement the intervention models in SIG schools. During the FY 2009 SIG application process, the HIDOE placed a cap on the amount of funds a school could apply to receive based on the model (closure= \$50,000; transformation model = \$700,000; turnaround model \$400,000; restart=\$50,000).

Citation: Section II.B.5 of the final requirements for the SIG program states that “[a]n SEA must award a School Improvement Grant to an LEA in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to support the activities required under section 1116 of the ESEA and these requirements. The LEA’s total grant may not be less than \$50,000 or more than \$2,000,000 per year for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school that the LEA commits to serve.” (75 FR 66363, 66369 (October 28, 2010))

Further action required: The HIDOE must: (1) provide the managing agent (Ho’okako’ Corporation Local School Board) that received a SIG grant through the FY 2009 competition an opportunity to submit an amended application demonstrating the amount of funds the managing agent complex needs to continue full and effective implementation of the school intervention model in the school it is serving with FY 2009 SIG funds; (2) the HIDOE must submit the process to address this corrective action to the Department within 30 days of receipt of this report. This submission must include: (a) the information that HIDOE plans to provide its complexes regarding the amendment process; (b) a description of the process it will use to review the complex’s amended application, including the process it will use to determine the amount of funds the complex needs to continue full and effective implementation of the school intervention models during the remaining years of the grant; and (c) an assurance that moving forward, the HIDOE will continue to make awards decisions by reviewing the amount of funds each complex needs to fully and effectively implement school intervention models.

Hawaii
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 3-7, 2011

In addition, HIDOE must award its FY 2010 prior to the beginning the 2012-2013 school year, and submit a written report to the Department demonstrating that it used those funds to make awards as it described it would do pursuant to this corrective action. Upon review of that report and confirmation that, in fact, HIDOE made its FY 2010 SIG awards in compliance with the final requirements for the SIG program, this finding will be resolved.

Critical Element 4: The SEA ensures that technical assistance is provided to its complexes consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program.

Finding: The HIDOE has not provided technical assistance to ensure that complexes have knowledge of SIG requirements and support to implement the SIG reforms. The SEA did not have a strategy to support SIG implementation.

Citation: 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))].

Further action required: The HIDOE must submit to the Department a strategy for providing technical assistance for the FY 2009 and FY 2010 SIG recipients. The strategy must include a timeline for when the technical assistance strategy will begin.

Critical Element 5: The SEA ensures that monitoring of complexes and schools is being conducted consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program.

Finding: The HIDOE has not monitored SIG implementation as outlined in its approved application.

Citation: Section 80.40 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) states that grantees must monitor grant and subgrant activities to ensure compliance with applicable Federal requirements. Section 9304(a) of the ESEA requires that the SEA must ensure that (1) programs authorized under the ESEA are administered in accordance with all applicable statutes, regulations, program plans, and applications; and (2) the State will use fiscal control and funds accounting procedures that will ensure the proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds.

Further action required: The HIDOE must submit to the Department a timeline and monitoring protocol for its future monitoring efforts for FY 2009 and FY 2010 SIG recipients.