

**Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 U.S. Department of Education
Office of Safe and Healthy Students' Monitoring Report on the
Washington Office of the Superintendent for Public Instruction's
Title I, Part D Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk Program and
Title VII-B Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program**

Scope of Review: During June 8-10, 2015, a review team from the U.S. Department of Education (ED) Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Safe and Healthy Students (OSHS) monitored the Washington Office of the Superintendent for Public Instruction (OSPI) administration of the Title I, Part D program authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended and the Education for Homeless Children and Youth (EHCY) program authorized under Title VII, Subtitle B, of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.

Previous Monitoring: ED reviewed OSPI's Title I, Part D and EHCY programs during the week of February 12-15, 2007. Both programs met requirements under all indicators at that time.

General State Educational Agency (SEA) Monitoring Requirement

A State's ability to fully and effectively implement program requirements under Title I, Part D and the EHCY program is directly related to the extent to which it is able to regularly monitor its subgrantees and provide quality technical assistance based on identified needs.

Federal law does not specify the particular method or frequency with which States must monitor their grantees, and States have a great deal of flexibility in designing their monitoring systems. Whatever process is used, it is expected that States have mechanisms in place sufficient to ensure that they are able to collect and review critical implementation data with the frequency and intensity required to ensure effective and fully compliant programs under both Title I, Part D and the EHCY programs.

Under 34 C.F.R. § 80.40¹, grantees must monitor grant and subgrant supported activities to assure compliance with applicable Federal requirements. Additionally, section 9304(a) of the ESEA requires that the SEA provide assurances, including assurances 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 such fiscal control and funds accounting procedures as will ensure the proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the state.

Status: OSPI has met the monitoring requirements under 34 C.F.R. § 80.40 for both programs.

¹ A commensurate requirement is contained in the Office of Management and Budget's new Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance) at 2 C.F.R. § 200.328, which applies to the Title I, Part D and EHCY programs beginning with the grant awards made on or after July 1, 2015.

Emerging Practices: OSHS considers emerging practices to be operational activities or initiatives that contribute to successful outcomes or enhance agency performance capabilities. Emerging practices are those that have been successfully implemented and demonstrate the potential for replication by other agencies.

Typically, emerging practices have not been evaluated as rigorously as "promising," "effective," "evidence-based," or "best" practices but still offer ideas that work in specific situations. As a result of its monitoring activities, OSHS identified the following emerging practices for OSPI:

- Neglected or delinquent children and youth require services from various public agencies, and coordination across these agencies is essential to ensuring smooth and sustainable transitions for youth. The OSPI Title I, Part D State Coordinator has participated on many interagency initiatives, including: serving as a Governor-appointed member representing Education on the Washington Partnership Council on Juvenile Justice (Washington's State Advisory Group); co-chairing the Transition and Reentry Committee; serving as a member of the Washington State Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative's Steering Committee, the Washington State Supportive School Discipline Community of Practice, and the State Management Team for the Advancing Wellness & Resilience in Education Project grant; and representing OSPI on ad hoc committees addressing issues such as juvenile sex offenders and Children and Families of Incarcerated Parents for Washington public schools. These interagency activities have helped bring added attention and resources to OSPI's Title I, Part D programs.
- For many years, the Title I, Part D program has funded Educational Advocates in regional Educational Service Districts (ESDs) who use a multi-tiered system of support approach to facilitating the transition of youth from correctional facilities back to the community, including enrollment and retention in public school programs. As noted above, supporting effective transition outcomes for these youth is one of the most complex and challenging, as well as supplemental, aspects of the Title I, Part D program, and this approach is a creative and allowable use of funds that other States could replicate.²
- During the local education agency (LEA) interview for the EHCY program, three out of four local liaisons mentioned a promising recent collaboration with housing programs in their community to support families first identified as homeless by LEAs. The semi-rural Central Valley consortia of LEAs provided an example of creative networking and coalition-building to bring together housing and other community resources that less urban regions and school districts often struggle to obtain for their students.

² A program profile on the educational advocate program in Washington State is available at <http://www.neglected-delinquent.org/resource/program-highlights-education-advocate-program-washington-state>

Monitoring Area: Title I, Part D

In its review of the Title I, Part D program, the ED team examined:

- the SEA’s application for funding, procedures and guidance for State agency (SA) applications under Subpart 1, including institution-wide project plans, and LEA applications under Subpart 2;
- SEA technical assistance provided to SAs and LEAs;
- the SEA’s oversight and monitoring plan and activities; and
- SA and LEA subgrant plans and local evaluations for projects in the Spokane Public Schools, and Education Service Districts 101 and 113 as well as Seattle (community day program), Chehalis (Green Hills Academy School), and Issaquah (Echo Glen School) Public School districts.

The ED team interviewed LEA and facility staff of Part D, Subpart 2 programs in Spokane Public Schools and ESDs 101 and 113. The ED team also interviewed Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, SA program representatives from Seattle, Chehalis and Issaquah Public Schools, which provide services to youth in SA facilities. The Title I, Part D State coordinator was also interviewed to confirm information obtained at the local sites and discuss administration of the program.

Based on their review, ED has the following observations and recommendations:

Indicator 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.

Recommendation 1.1.1

Observation: There was relatively low program performance among the LEA programs compared to national performance measures as revealed by analysis of:

- (1) OSPI’s 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) section 2.4.2.3.2 which includes data on Academic and Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit; and
- (2) CSPR section 2.4.2.6, which includes data on Academic Performance of Long-term Students in Reading and Math.

While monitoring interviews with LEAs revealed that some low performance may be attributed to the short length of stay for many youth in OSPI’s detention programs, and because many students in at-risk programs are struggling with additional mental health issues and other challenging life circumstances, the fact that students in LEA programs

are not performing as well as the SA programs where youth share similar characteristics may signal the need for different approaches.

The SEA acknowledged that there is room for improvement in the area of analysis of Title I, Part D performance data at the LEA and program level as a means to improve student and program outcomes and stated that they have already received funding to update some of their data systems to assist with this. Further analysis of the LEA programs by the SEA and LEA facilities is necessary to determine the reasons for low performance and to plan program modifications that will result in improved performance.

Recommendation: ED recommends that OSPI consider carrying out further analyses and activities in order to identify and address factors contributing to low LEA program performance. These activities and analyses could include, but are not limited to, the following recommended activities:

- Providing additional technical assistance to subgrantees on how to evaluate Title I, Part D-funded programming and activities by using Title I, Part D specific performance data to evaluate the effectiveness of those activities in improving performance on Title I, Part D outcome measures required for the CSPR.
- Asking subgrantees for an annual program evaluation that accounts for any change in performance of the previous two year's Part D program performance data to be included in the annual grant application from each SA and LEA that receives a subgrant or in a final grantee report for the performance period.
- Modifying the Title I, Part D Midyear Report Form to include data on program outcomes and academic performance, conduct an analysis of the data submitted, and provide feedback and technical assistance to LEAs on how they can improve their programs.
- Conducting analyses of class attendance while students are in facilities to determine whether this is a factor in low performance.
- Piloting earlier post-tests (for example, after 20 days or 45 days, depending on average length of stay) or more frequent academic assessments to help identify problem areas of student progress that may require adjustments to the educational program.

Recommendation 1.1.2

Observation: The SEA uses a formula for awarding Subpart 2 grants to eligible LEAs as opposed to a discretionary process. The SEA has an informal process for determining award amounts and does not have clear procedures for notifying LEAs that they are eligible to receive Subpart 2 funds.

The Non-Regulatory Guidance for Title I, Part D programs states that if an SEA distributes funds through a formula, it may allocate funds proportionately among the eligible LEAs based on each LEA's proportionate share of children in correctional facilities or delinquent institutions and that the SEA must develop procedures for determining and notifying LEAs within the State that they are eligible to receive Subpart 2 funds.

Recommendation: ED recommends that the SEA:

- establish formal procedures to determine the size of Subpart 2 grants to eligible LEAs as outlined in the Non-Regulatory Guidance and notify LEAs within the State when they are eligible to receive subgrants;
- share the formula component of those procedures with LEAs so that they can estimate how much they can expect to receive as an aid in their planning of program activities; and
- present a session about this topic at annual statewide Title I, Part D training session or discuss it in a webinar or conference call.

Indicator 2.2 - The SEA ensures that LEA programs for eligible students meet all requirements.

Recommendation 2.2.1

Observation: The SSD LEA application included both the Juvenile Detention Center (JDC) program as well as the at-risk program. As a result, it is challenging to gain a clear understanding of all of the services provided at the various facilities served by SSD for both programs.

Recommendation: ED recommends that OSPI ask SSD to submit separate narratives and budgets for the JDC and at-risk programs so that all programs and facilities served by SSD are clearly delineated in the application.

**Table 1. Summary of Monitoring Results for the Title I, Part D
Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk Program**

Indicator Number	Description	Status	Page
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.	Met Requirements 2 Recommendations	3-5
2.1	The SEA ensures that SA programs for eligible students meet all requirements, including facilities that operate institution-wide projects.	Met Requirements	N/A
2.2	The SEA ensures that LEA programs for eligible students meet all requirements.	Met Requirements 1 Recommendation	5
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.	Met Requirements	N/A
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.	Met Requirements	N/A

Monitoring Area: McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Program

In its review of the EHCY program, the ED team examined:

- the SEA’s procedures and guidance for the identification, enrollment, and retention of homeless students;
- SEA technical assistance provided to LEAs with and without subgrants;
- the SEA’s McKinney-Vento State plan; and
- LEA applications for subgrants and local evaluations for projects in Spokane Public Schools and the Central Valley consortia, as well as the local liaisons from Bellevue and Snohomish Public Schools, non-subgrantee school districts.

The ED team also interviewed the EHCY State coordinator to confirm information obtained at the local site and discuss administration of the program.

Based on their review, ED has determined that the SEA has met the requirements under all of the EHCY program indicators at this time.

Table 2. Summary of Monitoring Results for the Title VII-B Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program

Indicator Number	Description	Status	Page
Indicator 1.1	The SEA conducts monitoring and evaluation of LEAs with and without subgrants, sufficient to ensure compliance with McKinney-Vento program requirements.	Met Requirements	N/A
Indicator 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.	Met Requirements	N/A
Indicator 2.2	The SEA provides, or provides for, technical assistance to LEAs to ensure appropriate implementation of the statute.	Met Requirements	N/A
Indicator 3.1	The SEA ensures that LEA subgrant plans for services to eligible homeless students meet all requirements.	Met Requirements	N/A
Indicator 3.2	The SEA complies with the statutory and other regulatory requirements governing the reservation of funds for State-level coordination activities.	Met Requirements	N/A
Indicator 3.3	The SEA has a system for ensuring the prompt resolution of disputes.	Met Requirements	N/A