

## Guide to Answering Program Implementation Questions in Compliance Reports for 2012-2013

### Title I, Part A

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>1. The LEA coordinates and integrates Title I, Part A, services with other educational services in the LEA or individual school, such as Head Start, Even Start, Reading First, Early Reading First, and other preschool programs, and services for children with limited English proficiency or with disabilities, migratory children, neglected or delinquent youth, Indian children served under Part A of Title VII, homeless children, and immigrant children in order to increase program effectiveness, to eliminate duplication, and to reduce fragmentation of the instructional program. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1112(b)(1)(E)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting agendas, sign-in sheets, and meeting notes from LEA planning process</li> <li>• District plan showing program descriptions and outlining use of funds</li> </ul> <p>Given that most LEAs operate one or more other educational services or programs in addition to Title I, Part A and have one or more of the student populations described, it is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.</p>
<p>2. The LEA coordinates Title I, Part A, services with Title I, Part C, services in order to increase program effectiveness, to eliminate duplication, and to reduce fragmentation of the instructional program. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1112(b)(1)(E)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting agendas and meeting notes from LEA planning process;</li> <li>• LEA plan showing program descriptions and outlining use of funds.</li> </ul> <p>The only reason for this question to be marked "NA" would be that the LEA does not receive Title I, Part C funds.</p>
<p>3. For Title I, Part A, schoolwide program, the campus conducts a comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1114(b)(1)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the campus's comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) process;</li> <li>• Meeting agendas, meeting notes, sign-in sheets documenting the campus's CNA process;</li> </ul>

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campus Improvement Plan includes summary of CNA results and uses those results to determine program activities;</li> <li>• Program evaluations from prior years are part of CNA process to determine effectiveness and to inform decisions concerning program implementation.</li> </ul> <p>The only reason this question would be marked “NA” would be that the LEA only operates Targeted Assistance programs under Title I, Part A.</p>
<p>4. For a Title I, Part A, targeted assistance program, the LEA identifies students not older than age 21 who have the greatest need for special assistance and who are failing or most at risk of failing to meet the State's student academic achievement standards. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1115(b)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the LEA’s selection criteria, which must be multiple, educationally related, objective criteria, except that children in preschool through grade 2 shall be selected solely on the basis of such criteria as teacher judgment, interviews with parents, and developmentally appropriate measures.</li> <li>• Description of how the campus has supplemented the LEA’s criteria, if applicable.</li> </ul> <p>The only reason this question would be marked “NA” would be that the LEA only operates Schoolwide programs under Title I, Part A.</p>
<p>5. The LEA conducts a comprehensive needs assessment that includes an assessment of local needs for professional development and hiring. This assessment includes the participation of teachers, including Title I, Part A teachers, and takes into account the activities that need to be conducted in order to give teachers the means, including subject matter knowledge and teaching skills, and to give principals the instructional leadership skills to help teachers, to provide students with the opportunity to meet challenging state and local student academic achievement standards. [P.L. 107-110, Section 2122(c)(2)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the campus’s comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) process, including an assessment of local needs related to professional development and hiring;</li> <li>• Meeting agendas, meeting notes, sign-in sheets documenting participation of teachers (including Title I, Part A teachers) in the campus’s CNA process.</li> </ul> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p>

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>6. The LEA has a written parent involvement policy that is developed jointly with, agreed upon by, and distributed to, parents of participating students. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1118(a)(2)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copy of LEA’s written parent involvement policy;</li> <li>• Meeting agendas, meeting notes, sign-in sheets documenting participation of parents in the development of the policy;</li> <li>• Correspondence, newsletters, handbook used to distribute policy to parents;</li> <li>• Documents signed by parents acknowledging receipt of policy.</li> </ul> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p>
<p>7. Each Title I, Part A campus has a written parent involvement policy that is developed jointly with, agreed upon by, and distributed to parents of participating students. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1118(b)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copy of written parent involvement policy for <u>each Title I, Part A campus</u>;</li> <li>• Meeting agendas, meeting notes, sign-in sheet documenting participation of parents in the development of the policies;</li> <li>• Correspondence, newsletters, handbook used to distribute policy to parents;</li> <li>• Documents signed by parents acknowledging receipt of policy.</li> </ul> <p>In order to answer “Yes,” <u>all</u> Title I, Part A campuses must have such a written parent involvement policy in place.</p> <p>If <u>any</u> Title I, Part A campus does not have such a policy, the response must be “No.”</p> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p>

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>8. Each Title I, Part A, campus convenes an annual meeting to notify parents of their school's participation in the Title I program, to explain the program requirements, and to inform parents of their right to be involved. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1118(c)(1)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For each Title I, Part A campus—Meeting invitations, agendas, meeting notes that document what was share at the meeting, sign-in sheets documenting attendance of parents.</li> </ul> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.</p>
<p>9. The LEA has School-Parent compacts at each Title I, Part A, campus that outline how the parents, the entire school staff, and the students share the responsibility for improved student achievement and by what means the school and parents will build and develop a partnership to help children achieve the State's high standards. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1118(d)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copy of signed school-parent compacts for each Title I, Part A campus;</li> <li>• Meeting agendas, meeting notes, sign-in sheets documenting participation of parents in the development of the compacts;</li> </ul> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.</p>
<p>10. The Title I, Part A, LEA and campuses educate teachers, pupil services personnel, principals, and other staff members, with the assistance of parents, in the value and utility of the contributions of parents. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1118(e)(3)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training/meeting agendas, meeting notes that document content of training, sign-in sheets that show involvement of teachers, pupil services personnel, principals, and parents.</li> </ul> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.</p>
<p>11. The LEA provides communications about the Title I, Part A, program in a format, and to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand. [P.L. 107-110, Sections 1111, 1118(e)(5), and 1118(f)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correspondence, newsletters, handbooks in languages used by parents at home;</li> <li>• Documentation that translation/interpretive services provided at annual Title I, Part A meetings;</li> </ul>

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples of information offered in multiple formats (i.e., hard copy, web-based, face-to-face meetings, etc.)</li> </ul> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p>
<p>12. Each Title I, Part A, campus provides, to each individual parent, information on the level of achievement of the parent's child in each of the required state academic assessments. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1111(h)(6)(A-B)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of process by which each Title I, Part A campus distributes to individual parents information concerning the achievement level of their child(ren) on the required state assessments;</li> <li>• Correspondence to parents distributing information concerning the achievement level of their child(ren).</li> </ul> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p>
<p>13. Each Title I, Part A, campus provides timely notice, to each individual parent, if the child has been assigned to or taught by a teacher who is not highly qualified for four or more consecutive weeks. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1111(h)(6)(A-B)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of monitoring and notification process that is triggered when a non-HQ teacher is assigned to teach a core academic class;</li> <li>• List of non-HQ teachers who were assigned to teach core academic subjects, number of days they taught those classes, list of students affected, and copies of letters sent in cases where number of days equals 4 or more consecutive weeks.</li> </ul> <p>An LEA could justify a compliance status of “N/A” in response to this question if the LEA did not assign a teacher for four or more weeks who did not meet the highly qualified requirements.</p>

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>14. The LEA ensures that parents of students in Title I schools are informed of their right to request and receive information on the qualifications of their children's teachers. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1111(h)(6)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correspondence, newsletters, handbook used to distribute information on right to request.</li> </ul> <p>This is an LEA responsibility, although it may be that the LEA requires each Title I, Part A campus to notify the parents concerning their right to request information. It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.</p>
<p>15. The LEA has a written parent involvement policy and conducts, with the involvement of parents, an annual evaluation of the content and effectiveness of the parental involvement policy toward improving the academic quality of Title I, Part A, schools. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1118(a)(2)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copy of written parent involvement policy for the LEA;</li> <li>• Meeting agendas, meeting notes, sign-in sheet documenting participation of parents in the annual evaluation of the content and effectiveness of the policy;</li> <li>• Copy of annual evaluation.</li> </ul> <p>In order to answer "Yes," the LEA must have a written parent involvement policy in place <u>AND</u> must have evidence that it conducts an annual evaluation of that policy's content and effectiveness.</p> <p>If the LEA is missing either of these elements, the response must be "No."</p> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.</p>
<p>16. The LEA academically assessed Title I, Part A, services provided to participating private schools as agreed upon during consultation, and these results were used to improve services to private schools. [P.L. 107-110, Sections 1120(b)(1)(D) and 9501(c)(1)(D)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of consultation process showing that the LEA discussed the assessment process with the private school officials</li> <li>• Documentation that the results of the</li> </ul>

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
	<p>assessment were used to improve services to private schools.</p> <p>The only reason an LEA could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question would be that the LEA has no participating private non-profit schools.</p>
<p>17. The LEA's consultation with participating private nonprofit school officials regarding the development and implementation of the Title I, Part A, program was timely and meaningful. It occurred 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 continued throughout the implementation and assessment of program activities. [P.L. 107-110, Sections 1120(a), 1120(b)(2)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Documentation of consultation process showing that it occurred before the LEA made any decisions that affected participation opportunities of eligible private school children or teachers.</b></li> <li>• <b>Meeting notes showing that all required topics were included in the consultation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How the LEA will identify the needs of eligible private school children.</li> <li>○ What services the LEA will offer to eligible private school children.</li> <li>○ How and when the LEA will make decisions about the delivery of services.</li> <li>○ How, where, and by whom the LEA will provide services to eligible private school children.</li> <li>○ How the LEA will assess academically the services to private school children in accordance with §200.10 of the Title I regulations, and how the LEA will use the results of that assessment to improve Title I services.</li> <li>○ The size and scope of the equitable services that the LEA will provide to eligible private school children and, consistent with §200.64 of the Title I regulations, the proportion of its Title I funds that the LEA will allocate for these services and the amount of funds that the LEA reserves from its Title I allocation for the purposes listed in §200.77 of the Title I regulations.</li> <li>○ The method, or the sources of data, that the LEA will use (under §200.78 of the Title I regulations) to determine the number of private school children from low-income families residing in participating public school attendance areas, including whether the LEA will extrapolate data if a survey is used.</li> <li>○ The services the LEA will provide to teachers and families of participating private school children.</li> <li>○ Discussion of service delivery mechanisms the LEA will use to provide services; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Thorough consideration and analysis of the views of the private school officials on whether the LEA should contract with a third-party provider. If the LEA disagrees with the views of the private school officials on that issue, the LEA must provide in writing to those officials the reasons why the LEA has chosen not to use a third-party contractor.</li> <li>● Documentation showing that consultation continued throughout the implementation and assessment of the program activities.</li> </ul> <p>The only reason an LEA could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question would be that the LEA has no participating private non-profit schools.</p>
<p>18. The LEA publicly reported the annual progress of the LEA as a whole and of each of its campuses in meeting the highly qualified teachers requirements. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1119 (b)(1)(A)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Documentation showing the date the required information was posted on the LEA’s website and dated copy of the posting of the supporting documents.</li> <li>● Documentation showing the date the required information was published in local media (i.e., newspaper, public information broadcast, etc.) and a copy of supporting documents.</li> <li>● Documentation showing the date the required information was reported at an open meeting of the local school board and a copy of the supporting documents.</li> </ul> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p>
<p>19. The LEA has ensured that each campus has a highly qualified teacher plan that includes strategies to ensure that teachers who are not highly qualified in all core academic subject areas taught become highly qualified within a reasonable timeframe. [P.L. 107-110, Section 2122 (b)(10)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Copy of HQ plan for each campus, including strategies to ensure that all core academic subject teachers become HQ within a reasonable timeframe.</li> </ul>



Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
	<p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question. Even if the LEA reports 100% HQ for all of its campuses, these plans still need to be in place so that they can be implemented in the event a campus must place a non-HQ teacher in a core academic classroom.</p>
<p>20. Does the LEA have on file for each Title I, Part A campus a written attestation signed by the principal stating that the principal understands the requirements of Section 1119 and the current status of his/her campus with respect to meeting those requirements? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1119(i)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copy of signed attestation for each Title I, Part A campus. Must be dated. Must be based on HQ data for current school year.</li> </ul> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p>
<p>21. Did the LEA ensure that its campuses that are Stage 3 or higher received at least 85% of the Title I, Part A campus allocations that they received the prior year?</p>	<p>This question only applies to LEAs that 1) have one or more campuses in Stage 3 of School Improvement AND 2) reserve Title I, Part A funds to meet the 20% requirement for school choice-related transportation or supplemental educational service. If BOTH conditions are true, the LEA must answer “Yes” or “No.” The question will be grayed out if either of the conditions does not apply.</p> <p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include its Title I, Part A campus allocation determinations for the past two years.</p> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question, if BOTH conditions are true.</p>

Title I, Part C

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>1. The LEA has made adequate provision for serving the unmet educational needs of preschool migrant children. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1304 (b)(1) and (c)(4)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enrollment report from NGS showing number of preschool-aged migrant children;</li> <li>• Documentation showing number of children served by early childhood program (district-based program, home-based program, Teaching and Mentoring Communities (TMC), Head Start, etc.);</li> <li>• Documentation of efforts to provide services to preschool-aged migrant children not being served through other sources.</li> </ul> <p>The only reason an LEA could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question would be that the LEA has no preschool-aged migrant children identified in the New Generation System (NGS).</p>
<p>2. The LEA gives service priority to migrant children who are failing or most at risk of failing to meet the State’s content and performance standards and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year. [P.L. 107-110, Sections 1301(2), §1304(d)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priority for Services (PFS) Report from NGS;</li> <li>• List of services being provided to PFS students;</li> <li>• PFS student progress records;</li> <li>• Documentation that MEP-funded services are provided to the PFS students first.</li> </ul> <p>If the PFS students are already being served appropriately by other programs, such as Title I, Part A, the migrant service requirement may be met by providing migrant services coordination. In this case, the LEA should answer “Yes” and be prepared to provide appropriate documentation.</p> <p>The only reason that an LEA could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question would be that it has no PFS children.</p>

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>3. The LEA identifies and addresses the special educational needs of migrant children through a comprehensive plan for needs assessment and service delivery. [P.L. 107-110, Sections 1306(a)(1)(A)-(G)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A completed version of the Texas MEP local needs assessment tool;</li> <li>• A copy of the LEA’s Comprehensive Needs Assessment, if it includes a migrant-specific component;</li> <li>• A copy of the District Improvement Plan with a migrant-specific component;</li> <li>• Copy of PFS Action Plan;</li> <li>• Documentation showing that the LEA is conducting the activities approved on the PS3103 of the Consolidated Application for Funding.</li> </ul> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p>
<p>4. The LEA has established a parent advisory council (PAC) for the migrant program and has provided for appropriate consultation in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the LEA’s migrant program. [P.L. 107-110, Sections 1304(c)(3); 1306(a)(1)(B)(ii); and 1118]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agendas, meeting notes or minutes, sign-in sheets for migrant parent advisory council meetings;</li> <li>• Documentation that meetings were offered at times that migrant parents could attend, and that the meetings were conducted in a language that the parents could understand, or that translation was provided as needed.</li> <li>• Documentation that the meetings allowed for meaningful consultation with and input from migrant parents concerning the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the program.</li> </ul> <p>One reason that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question is if it has documentation to show that efforts were made to establish a PAC, but due to factors such</p>

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
	as extreme geographical distance, low numbers of identified migrant families within the LEA, etc., a PAC was not established.
<p>5. The LEA evaluates and improves the effectiveness of the migrant program, where feasible, using the same approaches and standards that are used to assess the performance of students under Title I, Part C, specifically, to enable all migrant students to meet the same challenging State content and performance standards that all Texas children are expected to meet. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1204 (b)(1), (b)(2), and (c)(5)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copy of evaluation of program activities conducted under PS3103, based on student performance.</li> </ul> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p>
<p>6. The LEA academically assessed Title I, Part C services provided to participating private schools as agreed upon during consultation, and these results were used to improve services to private schools. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1120(b)(1)(D); 9501(c)(1)(D)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of consultation process showing that the LEA discussed the assessment process with the private school officials;</li> <li>• Documentation that the results of the assessment were used to improve services to private schools.</li> </ul> <p>The only reason an LEA could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question would be that the LEA has no participating private non-profit schools.</p>
<p>7. The LEA’s consultation with participating private nonprofit school officials regarding the development and implementation of the Migrant program was timely and meaningful. It occurred 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 continued throughout the implementation and assessment of program activities. [P.L. 107-110, Section 9501]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of consultation process showing that it occurred before the LEA made any decisions that affected participation opportunities of eligible private school children or teachers;</li> <li>• Meeting notes showing that all required topics were included in the consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ how the needs of children and teachers will be identified;</li> <li>○ what services will be offered;</li> <li>○ how, where, and by whom the services will</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
	<p>be provided;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ how the services will be assessed and how the results of the assessment will be used to improve those services;</li> <li>○ the size and scope of the equitable services;</li> <li>○ the amount of funds available for those services;</li> <li>○ how and when the LEA will make decisions about the delivery of services; and</li> <li>○ a thorough consideration and analysis of the views of the private school officials on the provision of contract services through potential third-party providers.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Documentation showing that consultation continued throughout the implementation and assessment of the program activities.</li> </ul> <p>The only reason an LEA could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question would be that the LEA has <u>no</u> participating private non-profit schools.</p>
<p>8. Did the LEA ensure that MEP funds not consolidated in a schoolwide program were only used to carry out activities authorized under the MEP? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1304(c)(1)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation the LEA might be able to list to support a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● LEA and campus plans showing description of Migrant program;</li> <li>● Job descriptions of MEP-funded personnel;</li> <li>● Time and effort documentation for staff who were split-funded with MEP and other fund sources.</li> <li>● Accounting records documenting expenditures of MEP funds.</li> </ul> <p>The only way that an LEA could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question would be if the LEA consolidated <u>all</u> of its MEP funds in Title I, Part A schoolwide campus budgets. To be eligible to consolidate MEP funds in this manner, the LEA would have had to obtain special permission from TEA. For the 2012-2013 school year, <u>no LEAs obtained this permission</u>.</p>

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>9 Did the LEA ensure that all MEP-funded services and activities were supplemental? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1304(c)(2)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation the LEA might be able to list to support a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LEA and campus plans showing description of Migrant program;</li> <li>• Job descriptions for MEP-funded personnel.</li> </ul> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p>
<p>10. Did the LEA ensure that MEP-funded supplies, materials, and equipment were used only for MEP activities and to the benefit of MEP students? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1304(c)(1)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation the LEA might be able to list to support a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LEA and campus plans showing description of Migrant program;</li> <li>• Purchase requisitions;</li> <li>• Inventories;</li> <li>• Logs on use of equipment;</li> <li>• List of participants.</li> </ul> <p>The LEA could justify a response of “NA” if MEP funds were used <u>only</u> for personnel performing MEP-related duties, and the LEA had <u>no</u> MEP-funded supplies, materials, or equipment.</p>
<p>11. Did the LEA ensure that appropriate time and effort records were maintained for staff who were split-funded with Title I, Part C and other funds? [OMB Circular A-87, A-122, or A-21, as appropriate]</p>	<p>To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have documentation for charges to payroll, as required in the applicable OMB Circular (A-87, A-122, or A-21), such as a list of split-funded personnel and copies of their time and effort sheets.</p> <p>The LEA could justify a response of “NA” only if the LEA had <u>no</u> staff who were split-funded with Title I, Part C and other funds. The LEA should write the following: “LEA had no staff who were split-funded with Title I, Part C and other funds.”</p>
<p>12. Did the LEA ensure that it maintained control of Title I, Part C program funds being used to provide equitable services to private school migrant students and their teachers? [P.L. 107-110, Section 9501; and 34 CFR 299.6]</p>	<p>To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have written procedures for approving and processing expenditures related to services to private schools, as well as accounting records showing approval and disbursement of Title I, Part C according to procedures.</p> <p>The only reason an LEA could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question would be that the LEA has no participating private non-profit schools.</p>

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>13. Did the LEA ensure that migrant student records were requested and transferred in a timely manner? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1304(b)(3)]</p>	<p><b>To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should be able to provide documentation that demonstrates that the LEA met the timelines to request and enter migrant student data in NGS, as outlined in the <i>Texas Manual for NGS Data Management Requirements</i>, as well as written LEA procedures to share migrant student records with schools in non-NGS states via MSIX, email, and/or fax.</b></p> <p>The only case in which an LEA could justify a response of “NA” to this question would be if the LEA served no migrant students during the 2012-2013 school year and had no request for records from another LEA. This would be a VERY rare response for an LEA that receives MEP funds.</p>

Guide to Program Implementation Questions—Title I, Part D

Title I, Part D

Questions 1-2 and Questions 9-12 are for LEAs that receive Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds.

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>1. The district has on file a current written agreement between the LEA and applicable correctional facilities and alternative school programs serving children and youth involved in the juvenile justice system, which details the Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 program. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1423(2).]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copy of current written agreement</li> </ul> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p> <p>NOTE: This question is a duplicate of question 11 in this section. Both must be answered in order to complete the compliance report for Title I, Part D, Subpart 2; however, of these two questions, only the response to question 11 will be used for purposes of the Initial Compliance Review.</p>
<p>2. Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 data are collected, disaggregated, and evaluated to show the program’s impact on the ability of participants to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• maintain and improve educational achievement;</li> <li>• accrue school credits that meet State requirements for grade promotion and secondary school graduation;</li> <li>• make the transition to a regular program or other educational program operated by a district;</li> <li>• complete secondary school (or secondary school equivalency requirements) and obtain employment after leaving the facility; and,</li> <li>• as appropriate, to participate in postsecondary education and job training programs.</li> </ul> <p>[P.L. 107-110, Section 1431(a)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copy of evaluation of Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 program showing program’s impact in these areas.</li> </ul> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p>

Note that Questions 3-8 of this section are only applicable to State Agencies that receive funding under Title I, Part D, Subpart 1. In Texas, these Agencies are the Texas Youth Commission and the Windham School System. LEAs will not see these questions on their PR 2000 form.

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>3. Was the State Agency’s use of Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds supplemental to the regular education program?</p> <p>According to statute, a Title I, Part D, Subpart 1</p>	<p>To justify a “Yes” response to this question, the State Agency should have documentation showing the number of hours added to educational program through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.</p>



Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>program that supplements the number of hours of instruction students receive from State and local sources shall be considered to comply with the supplement, not supplant requirement of section 1120A without regard to the subject areas in which instruction is given during those hours. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1415(b)]</p>	<p>It is highly unlikely that the State Agency can justify a response of “NA” to this question.</p>
<p>4. In making Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services available to children and youth in adult correctional institutions, did the State Agency give priority to children and youth who were likely to complete incarceration within a 2-year period? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1414(c)(2)]</p>	<p>To justify a “Yes” response to this question, the State Agency should have documentation related to selection of program participants, including an explanation of how priority was given to children and youth who were likely to complete incarceration within a 2-year period.</p> <p>The only instance in which the State Agency could justify a response of “NA” would be if the State Agency operated <u>no</u> adult correctional institutions.</p>
<p>5. Did the State Agency maintain appropriate time and effort records for staff who were paid in whole or in part with Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds? [OMB Circular A-87]</p>	<p>To support a “Yes” response, the State Agency should have the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a list of staff paid with Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds, including percentage of time spent working in program;</li> <li>• Documentation for charges to payroll, as required in the applicable OMB Circular</li> </ul> <p>The State Agency could justify a response of “NA” only if it had <u>no</u> staff paid with Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds.</p>
<p>6. Does the State Agency have, for each campus that operates an Institution-wide Program under §1416, a comprehensive plan that meets the requirements of §1416? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1416]</p>	<p>To support a “Yes” response, the State Agency should have an Institution-wide Program Plan for each campus operating such a program.</p> <p>The State Agency could justify a response of “NA” to this question only if the State Agency had <u>no</u> campus that operated an Institution-wide Program under Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.</p>
<p>7. Did the State Agency reserve not less than 15% and not more than 30% of its Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 entitlement for Transition Services, as described in §1418? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1418]</p>	<p>To support a “Yes” response, the State Agency should have documentation supporting appropriate reservation of funds, as well as expenditure records related to transition services.</p> <p>It is highly unlikely that the State Agency could justify a response of “NA” to this question.</p>

Guide to Program Implementation Questions—Title I, Part D

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>8. Did the State Agency evaluate the effectiveness of its Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 program at least annually and use the evaluation results, as well as longitudinal studies to make improvements to the program? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1431]</p>	<p>To support a “Yes” response, the State Agency should have program effectiveness and longitudinal studies of its Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 program, as well as documentation of their use in the comprehensive needs assessment process and program planning.</p> <p>It is highly unlikely that the State Agency could justify a response of “NA” to this question.</p>

Questions 1-2 and Questions 9-12 are for LEAs that receive Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds.

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>9. Did the LEA use Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds only for authorized purposes:</p> <p>To support the operation of local educational agency programs that involve collaboration with locally operated correctional facilities—</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) to carry out high-quality education programs to prepare children and youth for secondary school completion, training, employment, or further education;</li> <li>(2) to provide activities to facilitate the transition of such children and youth from the correctional program to further education or employment; and</li> <li>(3) to operate programs in local schools for children and youth returning from correctional facilities, and programs which may serve at-risk children and youth.</li> </ol> <p>[P.L. 107-110, Section 1421]</p>	<p>To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LEA and/or campus plans that provide a description of the Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 program;</li> <li>• A description and list of Program beneficiaries;</li> <li>• Accounting records documenting Program expenditures.</li> </ul> <p>It is highly unlikely that the LEA could justify a response of “NA” to this question.</p>
<p>10. Did the LEA maintain appropriate time and effort records for staff who were paid in whole or in part with Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds? [OMB Circular A-87]</p>	<p>To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a list of staff paid with Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds, including percentage of time spent working in program;</li> <li>• Documentation for charges to payroll, as required in the applicable OMB Circular</li> </ul> <p>The LEA could justify a response of “NA” only if it had <u>no</u> staff paid with Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds.</p>

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>11. Did the LEA has a formal, written agreement with each local facility it served under Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, and did the agreement address the program that was provided by the LEA, as well as the responsibilities of the facility as described in §1425? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1425]</p>	<p>To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have a copy of the written agreement between the LEA and each facility, <u>AND</u> that plan should describe the services provided by the LEA, as well as the responsibilities of the facility.</p> <p>It is highly unlikely that the LEA could justify a response of “NA” to this question.</p> <p>NOTE: This question is a duplicate of question 1 in this section. Both must be answered in order to complete the compliance report for Title I, Part D, Subpart 2; however, of these two questions, only the response to question 11 will be used for purposes of the Initial Compliance Review.</p>
<p>12. Did the LEA operate a program of support for students returning from a facility for the delinquent to a school operated by the LEA? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1422(b)]</p>	<p>To justify a “Yes” response, the LEA should have a description of this program of support as part of the LEA plan or in its written agreement with the facility.</p> <p>The only instance in which the LEA could justify an “NA” response would be if more than 30% of students attending the school operated at the facility will reside outside the area served by the LEA when they leave the facility.</p>

Title II, Part A

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>1. The LEA coordinated the use of Title II, Part A, with Title I, Part A, funding to provide professional development for teachers and principals and other appropriate staff, for parental involvement and teacher/paraprofessional qualifications. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1112(b)(1)(D)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description in LEA plan that includes training in parental involvement strategies and activities to help teachers and paraprofessionals meet HQ requirements, showing coordination between fund sources.</li> </ul> <p>Please note that “coordination” includes <u>planning</u> in order to ensure that the professional development needs of teachers principals, and other staff are met—not necessarily that Title II, Part A funds were used to provide that professional development. The coordination among fund sources (i.e., planning—not necessarily funding) must occur if the LEA receives Title II, Part A funds. Do not mark “No” or “NA” simply because the LEA used all of its Title II, Part A funds for class-size reduction. Answer the question based on the <u>coordination</u> that can be documented by the LEA.</p> <p>The only reason an LEA could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question would be that the LEA does not receive one of these fund sources.</p>
<p>2. The LEA coordinated with teachers, paraprofessionals, principals, other relevant school personnel, and parents in planning Title II, Part A, program activities and preparing the LEA application for funding. [P.L. 107-110, Section 2122(b)(7)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agendas, meeting notes or minutes, sign-in sheets for planning activities related to the development of the Title II, Part A program and application for funding, showing the participation of teachers, paraprofessionals, principals, other relevant school personnel, and parents.</li> </ul> <p>Please note that “coordinating” with the identified groups of staff in planning Title II, Part A program activities is required. It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p>
<p>3. The LEA coordinated professional-development activities funded under Title II, Part A, with professional development activities funded under other Federal, State, and local programs. [P.L. 107-110, Section 2122(b)(4)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of professional development activities in LEA plan, showing coordination between fund sources.</li> </ul> <p>Again, please note that “coordination” includes <u>planning</u></p>

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
	<p>in order to ensure that the professional development needs of teachers principals, and other staff are met—not necessarily that Title II, Part A funds were used to provide that professional development. The coordination among fund sources (i.e., planning—not necessarily funding) must occur if the LEA receives Title II, Part A funds. Do not mark “No” or “NA” simply because the LEA used all of its Title II, Part A funds for class-size reduction. Answer the question based on the <u>coordination</u> that can be documented by the LEA.</p> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p>
<p>4. Based on an assessment of local needs for professional development and hiring, the LEA targeted Title II, Part A, funds to schools within the LEA that:</p> <p>(a) have the lowest proportion of highly qualified teachers,</p> <p>(b) have the largest average class size, or</p> <p>(c) are identified for school improvement under Title I, Part A.</p> <p>[P.L. 107-110, Section 2122(b)(3) and (c)]</p>	<p>To support a “yes,” an LEA should have documentation that shows how Title II, Part A funds were distributed to campuses using one or more of the required criteria.</p> <p>The <u>only</u> acceptable “NA” reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA is a one-campus LEA (such as some charter schools and other small one-campus LEAs that are K-8 or K-12 LEAs all in one campus).</li> <li>• LEA has no schools in Title I SIP, all teachers are HQT on all campuses, <u>AND</u> all campuses have equal class sizes or all campuses have no significant differences in class-size. If this is the situation in the LEA, the LEA must report all three statements to support the response of “NA”.</li> </ul> <p>Note that simply being a single attendance area does NOT exempt an LEA from this requirement.</p>
<p>5. The LEA’s consultation with participating private nonprofit school officials regarding the development and implementation of the Title II, Part A program was timely and meaningful. It occurred before the LEA made any decision that affected the opportunities of eligible private school teachers and other educational personnel to participate in the program, and continued throughout the implementation and assessment of program activities.</p> <p>[P.L. 107-110, Section 9501]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of consultation process showing that it occurred before the LEA made any decisions that affected participation opportunities of eligible private school children or teachers.</li> <li>• Meeting notes showing that all required topics were included in the consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ how the needs of children and teachers will be identified;</li> <li>○ what services will be offered;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ how, where, and by whom the services will be provided;</li> <li>○ how the services will be assessed and how the results of the assessment will be used to improve those services;</li> <li>○ the size and scope of the equitable services;</li> <li>○ the amount of funds available for those services; and</li> <li>○ how and when the LEA will make decisions about the delivery of services.</li> <li>○ a thorough consideration and analysis of the views of the private school officials on the provision of contract services through potential third-party providers</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Documentation showing that consultation continued throughout the implementation and assessment of the program activities.</li> </ul> <p>The only reason an LEA could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question would be that the LEA has no participating private non-profit schools.</p>
<p>6. Teachers paid with Title II, Part A funds for class-size reduction meet the HQ teacher requirements. [P.L. 107-110, Section 2123(a)(2)(B)]</p>	<p>If the LEA or campus used Title II, Part A funds to pay teachers that were hired to reduce class size, or if the LEA has a Title I, Part A schoolwide campus that combined its Title II, Part A funds in its schoolwide campus budget, this question does apply. In order to answer "Yes," the LEA must be able to list the following items as available documentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● HQ documentation for all teachers on a Title I schoolwide campus;</li> <li>● HQ documentation for all teachers hired for class-size reduction purposes who were paid with Title II, Part A funds.</li> </ul> <p>An LEA would mark "NA" only if the LEA used no Title II, Part A funds to hire teachers for class-size reduction, <u>AND</u> the LEA had no Title I, Part A schoolwide campuses that combined Title II, Part A funds in the campus budget.</p>

Title III, Part A

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>1. The district has determined the needs for instruction in languages other than English and ensures 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)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of languages other than English in which the LEA has determined instruction is needed for LEP students (as per statewide requirements for bilingual instruction).</li> <li>• Documentation showing that teachers who are providing bilingual instruction are fluent in English and the other language used for instruction. [See Title III Teacher Fluency section of Application Instructions for 2012-2013 for examples of methods for ensuring fluency.]</li> </ul> <p>The only reasons why an LEA should mark “NA” for this question are if the LEA was not required to provide a bilingual program (as per statewide requirements for bilingual instruction) or if it was required to provide one but had a TEA Bilingual Exception in effect for the 2012-2013 school year.</p>
<p>2. The district implements 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)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of activities conducted for parents of LEP/immigrant students that include the dissemination of information or discussion of at-home activities or strategies specifically related to how the parents can be involved in their children’s education and how they can support their children’s efforts to attain fluency in English.</li> </ul> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p>
<p>3. The LEA’s consultation with participating private nonprofit school officials regarding the development and implementation of the Title III, Part A program was timely and meaningful. It occurred before the LEA made any decision that affected the opportunities of the eligible private school children, teachers, and other educational personnel to participate in the program, and continued throughout the implementation and assessment of program</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of consultation process showing that it occurred before the LEA made any decisions that affected participation opportunities of eligible private school children or teachers.</li> <li>• Meeting notes showing that all required topics were included in the consultation:</li> </ul>

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>activities. [P.L. 107-110, Section 9501]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ how children will be identified as limited English proficient (LEP) and by whom;</li> <li>○ how the needs of children and teachers will be identified;</li> <li>○ what services will be offered;</li> <li>○ how, where, and by whom the services will be provided;</li> <li>○ how the services will be assessed and how the results of the assessment will be used to improve those services;</li> <li>○ the size and scope of the equitable services;</li> <li>○ the amount of funds available for those services; and</li> <li>○ how and when the LEA will make decisions about the delivery of services.</li> <li>○ a thorough consideration and analysis of the views of the private school officials on the provision of contract services through potential third-party providers</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Documentation showing that consultation continued throughout the implementation and assessment of the program activities.</b></li> </ul> <p>The only reason an LEA could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question would be that the LEA has no participating private non-profit schools.</p>
<p>4. Did the LEA ensure that it met 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)]</p>	<p>To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have Title III, Part A—LEP budget documents detailing program and administrative costs.</p> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p>
<p>5. Did the LEA ensure that all appropriate administrative costs for the Title III, Part A—LEP program, including both indirect costs and direct costs such as administrative salaries, were included when calculating administrative costs? [34 CFR 80.3; and P.L. 107-110, Section 9201]</p>	<p>To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have Title III, Part A—LEP budget documents detailing program and administrative costs.</p> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p>
<p>6. Did the LEA ensure that any third-party contracts associated with the Title III, Part A—</p>	<p>To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have copies of any third-party contracts, requiring the break-out of</p>



Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>LEP program required the contractor to break out administrative costs, which were included in the 2% limit? [34 CFR 80.3; and P.L. 107-110, Section 9201]</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The LEA may answer “NA” if the LEA has <u>no</u> third-party contracts associated with the Title III, Part A—LEP program.</p>
<p>7. 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? [OMB Circular A-87]</p>	<p>To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Documentation for charges to payroll, as required in the applicable OMB Circular.</li> </ul> <p>The LEA could justify a response of “NA” only if it had <u>no</u> staff paid with Title III, Part A—LEP funds.</p>
<p>8. Did the LEA ensure that it maintained control of Title III, Part A—LEP program funds being used to provide equitable services to private school ELL students and their teachers? [P.L. 107-110, Section 9501(d)]</p>	<p>To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have written procedures for approving and processing expenditures related to services to private schools, as well as accounting records showing approval and disbursement of Title III, Part A—LEP funds according to procedures.</p> <p>The only reason an LEA could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question would be that the LEA has no participating private non-profit schools.</p>
<p>9. Did the LEA ensure that it met the statutory 2% limitation on administrative costs related to the implementation of the Title III, Part A—Immigrant program? [P.L. 107-110, Section 3115(b)]</p>	<p>To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have Title III, Part A—Immigrant budget documents detailing program and administrative costs.</p> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p>
<p>10. Did the LEA ensure that all appropriate administrative costs for the Title III, Part A—Immigrant program, including both indirect costs and direct costs such as administrative salaries, were included when calculating administrative costs? [34 CFR 80.3; and P.L. 107-110, Section 9201]</p>	<p>To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have Title III, Part A—Immigrant budget documents detailing program and administrative costs.</p> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p>

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>11. Did the LEA ensure that any third-party contracts associated with the Title III, Part A—Immigrant program required the contractor to break out administrative costs, which were included in the 2% limit? [34 CFR 80.3; and P.L. 107-110, Section 9201]</p>	<p>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—Immigrant budget documents detailing program and administrative costs, including the administrative costs from any third-party contracts.</p> <p>The LEA may answer “NA” if the LEA has <u>no</u> third-party contracts associated with the Title III, Part A—Immigrant program.</p>
<p>12. Did the LEA ensure that appropriate time and effort records were maintained for staff who were split-funded with Title III, Part A—Immigrant and other funds? [OMB Circular A-87]</p>	<p>To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a list of staff paid with Title III, Part A—Immigrant funds, including percentage of time spent working in program and sufficient information to indicate the work or duties carried out, as appropriate;</li> <li>• Documentation for charges to payroll, as required in the applicable OMB Circular.</li> </ul> <p>The LEA could justify a response of “NA” only if it had <u>no</u> staff paid with Title III, Part A—Immigrant funds.</p>
<p>13. Did the LEA ensure that it maintained control of Title III, Part A—Immigrant program funds being used to provide equitable services to private school ELL students and their teachers? [P.L. 107-110, Section 9501(d)]</p>	<p>To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have written procedures for approving and processing expenditures related to services to private schools, as well as accounting records showing approval and disbursement of Title III, Part A—Immigrant funds according to procedures.</p> <p>The only reason an LEA could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question would be that the LEA has no participating private non-profit schools.</p>
<p>14. Did the LEA ensure that Title III, Part A—Immigrant-funded programs provide enhanced instructional opportunities for immigrant children and youth?</p>	<p>To support a “Yes” response, the LEA should have a description in the LEA and/or campus plans that shows how the Title III, Part A—Immigrant program enhances instructional opportunities for immigrant children and youth. The LEA should also have documentation that program beneficiaries are immigrant children and youth.</p> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question.</p>

School Choice Option (Title IX, Sec. 9532)

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
<p>1. The district, as a condition of receiving funds under the No Child Left Behind Act, established and implements a policy requiring that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a student attending a persistently dangerous public elementary school or secondary school (as determined by the Texas Education Agency), or</li> <li>• a student who becomes a victim of a violent criminal offense, while in or on the grounds of a public elementary or secondary school that the student attends,</li> </ul> <p>is offered and allowed to attend a safe public elementary or secondary school within the local educational agency, including a public charter school.</p> <p>Note: If another campus is not available within the LEA, the policy should provide for other types of services to ensure the safety of the student. In addition, the LEA is encouraged to attempt to secure a cooperative agreement with another LEA to accept transfers when reasonable and appropriate. [P.L. 107-110, Section 9532]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copy of policy approved by the local board;</li> <li>• Documentation that any student who has been affected by either of these circumstances has been offered the opportunity to transfer.</li> </ul> <p>The LEA is required to have the policy regardless of whether it has any campuses identified as Persistently Dangerous or whether it has any students who have been a victim of a violent criminal offense at school.</p> <p>It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question. The LEA is required to have policies in place that address BOTH of these contingencies. It is NOT sufficient to say that the LEA has no persistently dangerous campuses, or that the LEA had no students who were victims of a violent criminal offense.</p>
<p>2. The LEA notified parents that their students may transfer to a safe public school—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• at least within 14 calendar days of the start of the school year for students enrolled in a persistently dangerous school, or</li> <li>• generally, within 14 calendar days of the incident for students who are victims of a violent criminal act.</li> </ul> <p>[P.L. 107-110, Section 9532]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copy of written notification procedure;</li> <li>• List of campuses identified as Persistently Dangerous Schools. The PDS list is posted on TEA’s web site under No Child Left Behind and Title IX, Unsafe School Choice Option. [If LEA has no campuses on PDS list, this serves as documentation that the LEA has met the part of this requirement related to PDS.]</li> <li>• Violent Criminal Acts are those reported under Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) 425 Record Action Reason codes 17, 18, 19, 28, 30, 32, and 46. The LEA can access Discipline Reports available through the following link: <a href="http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/adhocrpt/index.html">http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/adhocrpt/index.html</a></li> </ul>

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
	<p>[Select “Discipline Data Products” in the left-hand menu. On the next screen, select “Discipline Reports.” On the next screen, select “Click here for District Summary Reports,” and follow prompts to select district. Once the report is open, scroll down to “W—Reason Incident Counts.”] For any Reason Incident Count for 17, 18, 19, 28, 30, 32, or 46, where the victim was a student, the LEA would need to provide notification to the student’s parent concerning the right to transfer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letters to parents of any student who has been affected by either of these circumstances, documenting the offer of the opportunity to transfer.</li> </ul> <p>An LEA could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question only if BOTH of the following conditions apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA has no campuses identified as Persistently Dangerous Schools, AND</li> <li>• The LEA had no students who were victims of a violent crime on campus. [See Discipline Reports, referenced above.]</li> </ul>
<p>3. If the district consolidates administrative funds for NCLB programs, the district does not use any other funds under the NCLB programs included in the consolidation for administration for the fiscal year of the consolidation. [P.L. 107-110, Section 9203(c)]</p>	<p>Examples of documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of “Yes” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Records showing consolidation of administrative funds, including names of programs included and amount of funds contributed by each program;</li> <li>• Records showing that no other NCLB program funds were used for administrative costs during that grant year.</li> </ul> <p>The only reason an LEA could justify a compliance status of “NA” in response to this question would be that the LEA does not consolidate administrative funds for NCLB programs.</p> <p>NOTE: The Agency will check the Consolidated Application for Federal Funding to determine whether the LEA chose to consolidate administrative funds.</p>