

2013-2014 NCLB Compliance Report and Initial Compliance Review (ICR) Indicators



CURRICULUM DIVISION
© 2014 TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

Copyright and Terms of Service

Copyright © Texas Education Agency, 2014. These materials are copyrighted © and trademarked ™ as the property of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and may not be reproduced without the express written permission of TEA, except under the following conditions:

- 1) Texas public school districts, charter schools, and Education Service Centers may reproduce and use copies of the Materials and Related Materials for the districts' and schools' educational use without obtaining permission from TEA.
- 2) Residents of the state of Texas may reproduce and use copies of the Materials and Related Materials for individual personal use only, without obtaining written permission of TEA.
- 3) Any portion reproduced must be reproduced in its entirety and remain unedited, unaltered and unchanged in any way.
- 4) No monetary charge can be made for the reproduced materials or any document containing them; however, a reasonable charge to cover only the cost of reproduction and distribution may be charged.

Private entities or persons located in Texas that are **not** Texas public school districts, Texas Education Service Centers, or Texas charter schools or any entity, whether public or private, educational or non-educational, located **outside the state of Texas** *MUST* obtain written approval from TEA and will be required to enter into a license agreement that may involve the payment of a licensing fee or a royalty.

Contact **TEA Copyrights** with any questions you may have.

NCLB Compliance Report: PR3002



SAMPLE

Report Status:	< Selection Process >	Report ID:
SAS#: NCLBAAXX	Organization: Campus/Site: Vendor ID:	County District: ESC Region: School Year:
Name of Grant Program		
Printable Version	Compliance Report	Save
Exit	PR3002 - Title III, Part A	Instructions
Part 1: Private Nonprofit School Participation - Limited English Proficiency (LEP)		
Did private nonprofit schools participate in LEP activities?		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Consultation		Number
1.	Participating Private Nonprofit Schools That Received Equitable Services	
2.	Months the LEA Had Ongoing Consultation with the Private Nonprofit Schools <input type="checkbox"/> January <input type="checkbox"/> February <input type="checkbox"/> March <input type="checkbox"/> April <input type="checkbox"/> May <input type="checkbox"/> June <input type="checkbox"/> July <input type="checkbox"/> August <input type="checkbox"/> September <input type="checkbox"/> October <input type="checkbox"/> November <input type="checkbox"/> December	
Inventory		<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
3.	Position of the LEA Person Responsible for Maintaining Auditable Records and Labeling the LEA Material and Equipment Housed at the Participating Private Nonprofit Schools	
4.	Dates Inventory Was Conducted at the Private Nonprofit Schools (At least one date is required)	

NCLB Compliance Report: PR3002



SAMPLE

Report Status:	< Selection Process >	Report ID:
SAS#: NCLBAAXX	Organization: Campus/Site: Vendor ID:	County District: ESC Region: School Year:
Name of Grant Program		
Printable Version	Compliance Report	Save
Exit	PR3002 - Title III, Part A	Instructions
Part 1: Private Nonprofit School Participation - Limited English Proficiency (LEP)		
Did private nonprofit schools participate in LEP activities?		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Consultation		Number
1.	Participating Private Nonprofit Schools That Received Equitable Services	
2.	Months the LEA Had Ongoing Consultation with the Private Nonprofit Schools <input type="checkbox"/> January <input type="checkbox"/> February <input type="checkbox"/> March <input type="checkbox"/> April <input type="checkbox"/> May <input type="checkbox"/> June <input type="checkbox"/> July <input type="checkbox"/> August <input type="checkbox"/> September <input type="checkbox"/> October <input type="checkbox"/> November <input type="checkbox"/> December	
Inventory		<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
3.	Position of the LEA Person Responsible for Maintaining Auditable Records and Labeling the LEA Material and Equipment Housed at the Participating Private Nonprofit Schools	
4.	Dates Inventory Was Conducted at the Private Nonprofit Schools (At least one date is required)	

PR3002 Report Instructions



PR3002 REPORT INSTRUCTIONS

REVISION 1.4

PR3002—Title III, Part A

Use this schedule to report on use of Title III, Part A, funds. Use zeros when questions do not apply. Report only those expenditures and activities paid with Title III, Part A, funding during the compliance report grant year.

Several of the parts in this form are collapsed or available based upon whether you applied for limited English proficiency (LEP) or Immigrant funds on the Applicant Designation and Certification form.

PR3002 Instructions (Part 11)



Part 11: Program Implementation

Review the [Program Implementation Guide](#).

Complete this section to indicate your compliance with the program requirements:

1. For each program requirement listed, click **Yes**, **No**, or **N/A** to indicate whether you complied with the requirement.
2. Type an explanation of your answer in the **Explanation of Compliance Status** box.
 - If you clicked **Yes**, list the sources of documentation you have readily available to document compliance with the requirement. If a date box is provided, type the date of compliance with the requirement.
 - If you clicked **No**, explain the reason for noncompliance. Do not select No if the requirement is not applicable.
 - If you clicked **N/A**, explain why the requirement is not applicable.

2013-2014 Guide to Answering Program Implementation Questions



Guide to Answering Program Implementation Questions In Compliance Reports for 2013-2014

Guide to Program Implementation Questions—Title III, Part A

Title III, Part A

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
Needs Assessment	
1. The district has determined the needs for instruction in languages other than English and ensures that all teachers in Title III language	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include: • Documentation showing that teachers who are providing bilingual

Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk



2014-2015 Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk Department of Standards and Programs

Compliance Item				
44	45	46	47	48
LEA operate a program of support for students returning to school facility for the delinquent school operated by the LEA. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1422(b)]	Did the LEA determine the needs for instruction in languages other than English and ensure that all teachers in Title III language instructional programs for LEP children are fluent in both English and any other language used for instruction, including having written and oral communication skills? [P.L. 107-110, Section 3116(c)]	Did the LEA implement an effective means of outreach to parents of LEP/immigrant students to inform the parents of how they can be involved in the education of their children and be active participants in assisting their children to attain English proficiency, achieve at high levels in core academic subjects, and meet challenging State standards expected of all students? [P.L. 107-110, Section 3302(e)]	Was the LEA's consultation with participating private nonprofit school officials regarding the development and implementation of the Title III, Part A program timely and meaningful? Did the consultation occur before the LEA made any decision that affected the opportunities of eligible private school children, teachers, and other educational personnel to participate in the program, and did the consultation continue throughout the implementation and assessment of program activities? [P.L. 107-110, Section 9501]	Did the LEA adhere to the statutory 2% limitation on administrative costs related to the implementation of the Title III, Part A—LEP program? [P.L. 107-110, Section 3115(b)]
Part D, Subpart 1	Title III, Part A	Title III, Part A	Title III, Part A	Title III, Part A
PR3000 – Title I, Part D Part 11.2 – Program Implementation	PR3002 – Title III, Part A Part 11.1 – Program Implementation	PR3002 – Title III, Part A Part 11.2 – Program Implementation	PR3002 – Title III, Part A Part 11.3 – Program Implementation	PR3002 – Title III, Part A Part 11.4 – Program Implementation
LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.

**Title III, Part A
(LEP and Immigrant)
has 12 indicators.**

Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk



2014-2015 Initial Compliance Review Crosswalk Department of Standards and Programs

Compliance Item				
44	45	46	47	48
LEA operate a program for students returning to school for the delinquent school operated by the school district. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1422(b)]	Did the LEA determine the needs for instruction in languages other than English and ensure that all teachers in Title III language instructional programs for LEP children are fluent in both English and any other language used for instruction, including having written and oral communication skills? [P.L. 107-110, Section 3116(c)]	Did the LEA implement an effective means of outreach to parents of LEP/immigrant students to inform the parents of how they can be involved in the education of their children and be active participants in assisting their children to attain English proficiency, achieve at high levels in core academic subjects, and meet challenging State standards expected of all students? [P.L. 107-110, Section 3302(e)]	Was the LEA's consultation with participating private nonprofit school officials regarding the development and implementation of the Title III, Part A program timely and meaningful? Did the consultation occur before the LEA made any decision that affected the opportunities of eligible private school children, teachers, and other educational personnel to participate in the program, and did the consultation continue throughout the implementation and assessment of program activities? [P.L. 107-110, Section 9501]	Did the LEA adhere to the statutory 2% limitation on administrative costs related to the implementation of the Title III, Part A—LEP program? [P.L. 107-110, Section 3115(b)]
Part D, Subpart 1	Title III, Part A	Title III, Part A	Title III, Part A	Title III, Part A
PR3002 – Title I, Part D Part 11.2 – Program Implementation	PR3002 – Title III, Part A Part 11.1 – Program Implementation	PR3002 – Title III, Part A Part 11.2 – Program Implementation	PR3002 – Title III, Part A Part 11.3 – Program Implementation	PR3002 – Title III, Part A Part 11.4 – Program Implementation
LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.	LEA indicated compliance with this indicator.

Indicates where in the NCLB Compliance Report (PR3002) the compliance item is located.

LEA Responses



The following slides will provide the questions and responses in which most LEAs missed the indicator.

The response with the  is an appropriate response.

Indicator 48



Program Implementation Question #4

Compliance Status Response

Indicator 48:

Did the LEA adhere to the statutory 2% limitation on administrative costs related to the implementation of the Title III, Part A—LEP Program?

To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have Title III, Part A—LEP budget documents detailing program and administrative costs.

The only reason an LEA could just a compliance status of “N/A” would be that the LEA did not expend Title III, Part A—LEP program funds for any administrative costs.


In this case, the LEA should write the following: *“LEA did not use Title III, Part A—LEP funds for administrative costs.”*

Indicator 48:

Did the LEA adhere to the statutory 2% limitation on administrative costs related to the implementation of the Title III, Part A—LEP Program?



LEA Responses:

- No administrative costs were charged to the program.
 - Yes, the LEA adhered to the statutory 2% limitation.
 - Yes, the LEA did adhere to the 2% limitation on administrative costs requirement. We do not use any Title III, Part A—LEP funds for administrative costs to implement the program. We do have budget documents that detail the fact that we don't spend Title III, Part A—LEP funds for any administrative costs.
 - Our business office makes sure only the allowable amounts of administrative costs are utilized.
 - As documented on account code 263 budget finance reports, there were no administrative costs for the Title III Part A—LEP program.
-  We adhered to the statutory 2% limitation of administrative costs. Detailed 263 budget documentation of our 2013-2014 administrative funding is maintained at our Business Office.

Indicator 49

Program Implementation Question #5

Compliance Status Response

Indicator 49:

Did the LEA ensure that all appropriate administrative costs for the Title III, Part A—LEP program, including both direct and indirect costs and direct costs such as administrative salaries, were included with calculating administrative costs?

To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have Title III, Part A—LEP budget documents detailing program and administrative costs.


The only reason an LEA could justify a compliance status on “NA” would be that the LEA did not expend any Title III, Part A—LEP program funds for any administrative costs.

In this case, the LEA should write the following: *“LEA did not use Title III, Part A—LEP funds for administrative costs.”*

Indicator 49:

Did the LEA ensure that all appropriate administrative costs for the Title III, Part A—LEP program, including both direct and indirect costs and direct costs such as administrative salaries, were included with calculating administrative costs?

LEA Responses:

- The district did not use any Title III, Part A—LEP program funds to pay for administrative costs, including both direct or indirect costs. Budget sheets are available.
 - Yes, the LEA did not expend any 263 funds on administrative costs.
 - Yes, the district and director of bilingual/ESL services collaborated to write and implement grant application, care is taken to ensure that no administrative costs or salaries are charged to the grant.
 - The LEA ensure that all appropriate administrative costs for the Title III Part A—LEP program, including both indirect and direct costs such as administrative salaries were included with calculating administrative costs as mandated by 34CFR 80.3; and P.L. 107-110, Section 9201
 - All the above costs if any adhered to the limited administrative cost.
-  The district maintains Title III, Part A—LEP budget documents detailing program and administrative costs (purchase orders, requisitions, expenditure reports, etc.).

Indicator 50

Program Implementation Question #6

Compliance Status Response

Indicator 50:

Did the LEA ensure that any third-party contracts associated with the Title III, Part A—LEP program required the contractor to break out administrative costs, which were included in the 2% limit?

To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have copies of any third-party contracts, requiring the break-out of administrative costs; the LEA should also have Title III, Part A—LEP budget documents detailing program and administrative costs, including the administrative costs from any third-party contracts.


The LEA may answer “NA” if the LEA has no third-party contracts associated with the Title III, Part A—LEP program.

Indicator 50:

Did the LEA ensure that any third-party contracts associated with the Title III, Part A—LEP program required the contractor to break out administrative costs, which were included in the 2% limit?



LEA Responses:

- There were no administrative costs budgeted for these Title III funds as evidence by all expenditure reports. (N/A)
 - Not applicable (N/A)
 - No administrative costs were expended from Title III LEP. (N/A)
 - The LEA ensures that any third-party contracts were not paid with Title III funds.
 - No third-party contracts were used within the Title III program
 - We service students through ESL and Sheltered Instruction and used no 3rd party contractor.
 - District ensured that any third-party contracts required the contractor to break out administrative costs and were included in the 2% limit; but district did not have third-party contractor.
-  All third party contracts were required to have the contracts break out administrative costs. Documentation includes contracts and budget expenditures.

Indicator 51

Program Implementation Question #7

Compliance Status Response

Indicator 51:

Did the LEA ensure that appropriate time and effort records were maintained for staff who were split-funded with Title III, Part A—LEP and other funds?

To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have the following:

- A list of staff paid with Title III, Part A—LEP funds, including percentage of time spent working in program and sufficient information to indicate the work or duties carried out, as appropriate;
- Documentation for charges to payroll, as required in the applicable OMB circular.

The LEA could just a response of “NA” only if the LEA had no staff who were split-funded with Title III, Part A—LEP funds and other funds.


In this case, the LEA should write the following: *“LEA had not staff were split-funded with Title III, Part A—LEP and other funds.”*

Indicator 51:

Did the LEA ensure that appropriate time and effort records were maintained for staff who were split-funded with Title III, Part A—LEP and other funds?



LEA Responses:

- Documentation for charges to payroll, as required in the applicable OMB circular (N/A)
 - No staff were split funded with Title III funds.
 - Title III staff 100% funded in grant. Semi-annual certification is maintained and kept on file.
 - No employees were split funded out of Title III, Part A. If they were, appropriate time and effort documentation were kept.
 - The district assures that no full-time staff were hired with Title III A funds, so no time and effort records were required.
 - No time and effort records were maintained because there were not employees funded from Title III, Part A funds.
-  All time and effort records are required to be completed by staff and submitted to their supervisor for review. Final signed reports were submitted to the BE/ESL director.



Suggestions for Indicator #48

Did the LEA adhere to the statutory 2% limitation on administrative costs related to the implementation of the Title III, Part A—LEP Program?

To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have Title III, Part A—LEP budget documents detailing program and administrative costs.

The only reason an LEA could just a compliance status of “N/A” would be that the LEA did not expend Title III, Part A—LEP program funds for any administrative costs.

In this case, the LEA should write the following:
“LEA did not use Title III, Part A—LEP funds for administrative costs.”



Suggestions for Indicator #49

Did the LEA ensure that all appropriate administrative costs for the Title III, Part A—LEP program, including both direct and indirect costs and direct costs such as administrative salaries, were included with calculating administrative costs?

To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have Title III, Part A—LEP budget documents detailing program and administrative costs.

The only reason an LEA could justify a compliance status on “NA” would be that the LEA did not expend any Title III, Part A—LEP program funds for any administrative costs.

In this case, the LEA should write the following:
“LEA did not use Title III, Part A—LEP funds for administrative costs.”



Suggestions for Indicator #50

Did the LEA ensure that any third-party contracts associated with the Title III, Part A—LEP program required the contractor to break out administrative costs, which were included in the 2% limit?

To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have copies of any third-party contracts, requiring the break-out of administrative costs; the LEA should also have Title III, Part A—LEP budget documents detailing program and administrative costs, including the administrative costs from any third-party contracts.

The LEA may answer “NA” if the LEA has no third-party contracts associated with the Title III, Part A—LEP program.



Suggestions for Indicator #51

Did the LEA ensure that appropriate time and effort records were maintained for staff who were split-funded with Title III, Part A—LEP and other funds?

To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have the following:

- A list of staff paid with Title III, Part A—LEP funds, including percentage of time spent working in program and sufficient information to indicate the work or duties carried out, as appropriate;
- Documentation for charges to payroll, as required in the applicable OMB circular.

The LEA could just a response of “NA” only if the LEA had no staff who were split-funded with Title III, Part A—LEP funds and other funds.

In this case, the LEA should write the following:
“LEA had not staff were split-funded with Title III, Part A—LEP and other funds.”

Considerations for next year...



- Change the wording of the question
- Add specific information to the *PR3002 Instructions*
- Add specific information to the *Guide to Answering Program Implementation Questions*
- Any suggestions?