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

Title I, Part A

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
Program Coordination/Integration	
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)]	 Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include: Meeting agendas, sign-in sheets, and meeting notes from LEA planning process; District plan showing program descriptions and outlining use of funds 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
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)]	 status of "NA" in response to this question. Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include: Meeting agendas and meeting notes from LEA planning process; LEA plan showing program descriptions and outlining use of funds. The only reason for this question to be marked "NA" would be that the LEA does not receive Title I, Part C funds. In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA does not receive Title I, Part C funds."
Needs Assessment	
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)]	 Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include: Description of the campus's comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) process; Meeting agendas, meeting notes, sign-in sheets documenting the campus's CNA process; Campus Improvement Plan includes summary of CNA results and uses those results to determine program activities; Program evaluations from prior years are part of CNA process to determine effectiveness and to inform decisions concerning program implementation.
	The only reason this question would be marked "NA" would be that the LEA only operates Targeted Assistance programs under

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
	Title I, Part A.
	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA only operates Targeted Assistance programs."
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)]	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
	 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;
	 Description of how the campus has supplemented the LEA's criteria, if applicable.
	The only reason this question would be marked "NA" would be that the LEA only operates Schoolwide programs under Title I, Part A.
	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA only operates Schoolwide programs."
The LEA conducts a comprehensive needs assessment that includes an assessment of local	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
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)]	 Description of the campus's comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) process, including an assessment of local needs related to professional development and hiring;
	 Meeting agendas, meeting notes, sign-in sheets documenting participation of teachers (including Title I, Part A teachers) in the campus's CNA process.
	It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.
Parental Involvement	
 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)] 	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
	Copy of LEA's written parent involvement policy;
	 Meeting agendas, meeting notes, sign-in sheets documenting participation of parents in the development of the policy;
	 Correspondence, newsletters, handbook used to distribute policy to parents;
	Documents signed by parents acknowledging receipt of policy.
	It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
	a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.
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.	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
	 Copy of written parent involvement policy for <u>each Title I, Part A campus</u>;
[P.L. 107-110, Section 1118(b)]	 Meeting agendas, meeting notes, sign-in sheet documenting participation of parents in the development of the policies;
	 Correspondence, newsletters, handbook used to distribute policy to parents;
	Documents signed by parents acknowledging receipt of policy.
	In order to answer "Yes," <u>all</u> Title I, Part A campuses must have such a written parent involvement policy in place.
	If <u>any</u> Title I, Part A campus does not have such a policy, the response must be "No."
	It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.
Each Title I, Part A, campus convenes an annual meeting to notify parents of their school's participation	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
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)]	For each Title I, Part A campus—Meeting invitations, agendas, meeting notes that document what was share at the meeting, signin sheets documenting attendance of parents.
[1.2. 107-110, Section 1110(6)(1)]	It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.
9. The LEA has School-Parent compacts at each Title I, Part A, campus that outline how the parents, the entire	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
school staff, and the students share the responsibility for improved student achievement and by what means	Copy of signed school-parent compacts for each Title I, Part A campus;
the school and parents will build and develop a partnership to help children achieve the State's high standards.	Meeting agendas, meeting notes, sign-in sheets documenting participation of parents in the development of the compacts.
[P.L. 107-110, Section 1118(d)]	It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.
10. The Title I, Part A, LEA and campuses educate teachers, pupil services personnel, principals, and	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
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)]	Training/meeting agendas, meeting notes that document content of training, sign-in sheets that show involvement of teachers, pupil services personnel, principals, and parents.

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
	It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.
11. The LEA provides communications about the Title I, Part A, program in a format, and to the extent	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
practicable, in a language that parents can understand.	Correspondence, newsletters, handbooks in languages used by parents at home;
[P.L. 107-110, Sections 1111, 1118(e)(5), and 1118 (f)]	Documentation that translation/interpretive services provided at annual Title I, Part A meetings;
	Examples of information offered in multiple formats (i.e., hard copy, web-based, face-to-face meetings, etc.)
	It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.
12. Each Title I, Part A, campus provides, to each individual parent, information on the level of	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
achievement of the parent's child in each of the required state academic assessments. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1111(h)(6)(A-B)]	 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;
	Correspondence to parents distributing information concerning the achievement level of their child(ren).
	It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.
13. Each Title I, Part A, campus provides timely notice, to each individual parent, if the child has been assigned	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
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)]	Description of monitoring and notification process that is triggered when a non-HQ teacher is assigned to teach a core academic class;
	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.
	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.
	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA did not assign a teacher for four or more weeks who did not meet the highly qualified requirements."
14. The LEA ensures that parents of students in Title I	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
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)]	compliance status of "Yes" include:
	Correspondence, newsletters, handbook used to distribute information on right to request.
	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.
Program Evaluation	
15. The LEA has a written parent involvement policy and conducts, with the involvement of parents, an annual	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
evaluation of the content and effectiveness of the	Copy of written parent involvement policy for the LEA;
parental involvement policy toward improving the academic quality of Title I, Part A, schools. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1118(a)(2)]	 Meeting agendas, meeting notes, sign-in sheet documenting participation of parents in the annual evaluation of the content and effectiveness of the policy;
	Copy of annual evaluation.
	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.
	If the LEA is missing either of these elements, the response must be "No."
	It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.
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)]	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
	Documentation of consultation process showing that the LEA discussed the assessment process with the private school officials;
	Documentation that the results of the assessment were used to improve services to private schools.
	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.
	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA does not have participating private non-profit schools."
Private Nonprofit Services	

Program Implementation Question

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)]

Compliance Status Response

Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:

- 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;
- Meeting notes showing that all required topics were included in the consultation:
 - o How the LEA will identify the needs of eligible private school children.
 - \circ $\,$ What services the LEA will offer to eligible private school children.
 - How and when the LEA will make decisions about the delivery of services.
 - How, where, and by whom the LEA will provide services to eligible private school children.
 - 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.
 - o 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.
 - 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.
 - The services the LEA will provide to teachers and families of participating private school children.
 - Discussion of service delivery mechanisms the LEA will use to provide services; and
 - 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;
- Documentation showing that consultation continued throughout the implementation and assessment of the program activities.

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.

In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA does not have participating private non-profit schools."

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
Highly Qualified Plan	
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 teacher's requirements. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1119 (b)(1)(A)]	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
	Documentation showing the date the required information was posted on the LEA's website and dated copy of the posting of the supporting documents;
	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;
	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.
	It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.
19. The LEA has ensured that each campus has a highly qualified teacher plan that includes strategies to	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
ensure that teachers who are not highly qualified in all core academic subject areas taught become highly qualified within a reasonable timeframe.	Copy of HQ plan for each campus, including strategies to ensure that all core academic subject teachers become HQ within a reasonable timeframe.
[P.L. 107-110, Section 2122 (b)(10)]	
	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.
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?	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
	Copy of signed attestation for each Title I, Part A campus. Must be dated. Must be based on HQ data for current school year.
[P.L. 107-110, Section 1119(i)]	It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.

Title I, Part C

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
Program Coordination/Integration	·
The LEA has made adequate provision for serving the unmet educational needs of preschool migrant children.	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
[P.L. 107-110, Section 1304 (b)(1) and (c)(4)]	Enrollment report from NGS (e.g., district or campus report) showing number of preschool-aged migrant children;
	Documentation showing number of preschool migrant children served by early childhood program (district-based program, home-based program, Teaching and Mentoring Communities (TMC), Head Start, etc.);
	Documentation of efforts to provide services to preschool-aged migrant children not being served through other sources.
	The only reason an LEA could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question would be that the LEA had no preschool-aged migrant children identified in the New Generation System (NGS).
	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA had <u>no</u> preschool-aged migrant children identified in the New Generation System (NGS)."
Needs Assessment	
The LEA gives service priority to migrant children who are failing or most at risk of failing to meet the State's	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
content and performance standards and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year. [P.L. 107-110, Sections 1301(2), §1304(d)]	Priority for Service (PFS) Report and an Individual Supplemental Programs Report from NGS which lists supplemental services being provided to students (Note: If the Supplemental Programs Report is submitted, the district must highlight the names of the PFS students);
	PFS student progress records;
	Individual PFS Student Education Plan, PFS Student Action Plan, PFS Reporting Form, etc.;
	Documentation that MEP-funded services are provided to the PFS students first.
	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.
	The only reason that an LEA could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question would be that the district had

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
	no PFS children identified in NGS during the school year.
	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA had <u>no</u> PFS children identified in NGS during the school year."
The LEA identifies and addresses the special educational needs of migrant children through a	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
comprehensive plan for needs assessment and service delivery.	 A completed version of the Texas MEP local needs assessment (LNA) tool;
[P.L. 107-110, Sections 1306(a)(1)(A)-(G)]	 A copy of the LEA's Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA), if it includes a migrant-specific component;
	 A copy of the District Improvement Plan showing the migrant- specific section;
	 Documentation showing how the LEA is conducting the activities approved on the PS3103 of the Consolidated Application for Funding.
	It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.
Parental Involvement	
The LEA has established a parent advisory council (PAC) for the migrant program and has provided for	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
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]	 Agendas, meeting notes or minutes, sign-in sheets for migrant parent advisory council meetings;
	 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;
	Documentation that the meetings allowed for meaningful consultation with and input from migrant parents concerning the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the program.
	One reason that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question is if it had documentation to show that efforts were made to establish a PAC, but due to factors such as extreme geographical distance, low numbers of identified migrant families within the LEA, etc., a PAC was not established.
Program Evaluation	
5. The LEA evaluates and improves the effectiveness of the migrant program, where feasible, using the same	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
approaches and standards that are used to assess the performance of students under Title I, Part A,	 Student, parent and/or staff surveys, student progress reports; A copy of the migrant program evaluation conducted for activities
specifically, to enable all migrant students to meet the	- A copy of the migrant program evaluation conducted for activities

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
same challenging State content and performance standards that all Texas children are expected to meet.	approved on the PS3103.
[P.L. 107-110, Section 1304 (b)(1), (b)(2), and (c)(5)]	It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.
6. The LEA academically assessed Title I, Part C services provided to participating private schools as agreed upon	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
during consultation, and these results were used to improve services to private schools.	 Documentation of consultation process showing that the LEA discussed the assessment process with the private school officials;
[P.L. 107-110, Section 1120(b)(1)(D); 9501(c)(1)(D)]	Documentation that the results of the assessment were used to improve services to private schools.
	The only reason an LEA could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question would be that the LEA had <u>no</u> participating private non-profit schools.
Private Nonprofit Schools	
7. The LEA's consultation with participating private nonprofit school officials regarding the development	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
and implementation of the Migrant program was timely and meaningful. It occurred before the LEA made any decision that affected the opportunities of eligible	 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;
private school children, teachers, and other educational personnel to participate in the program, and continued throughout the implementation and assessment of	Meeting notes showing that all required topics were included in the consultation:
program activities.	o how the needs of children and teachers will be identified;
[P.L. 107-110, Section 9501]	o what services will be offered;
	o how, where, and by whom the services will be provided;
	 how the services will be assessed and how the results of the assessment will be used to improve those services;
	o the size and scope of the equitable services;
	o the amount of funds available for those services; and
	 how and when the LEA will make decisions about the delivery of services;
	 a thorough consideration and analysis of the views of the private school officials on the provision of contract services through potential third-party providers.
	Documentation showing that consultation continued throughout the implementation and assessment of the program activities.
	The only reason an LEA could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question would be that the LEA had <u>no</u> participating private non-profit schools.

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
Use of Funds	
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)]	Documentation the LEA might be able to list to support a compliance status of "Yes" include:
	District and campus improvement plans showing the migrant- specific section;
	Job descriptions of MEP-funded personnel;
	Time and effort documentation for staff who were split-funded with MEP and other fund sources;
	Accounting records documenting expenditures of MEP funds.
	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 2013-2014 school year, no LEAs obtained this permission.
Did the LEA ensure that all MEP-funded services and activities were supplemental?	Documentation the LEA might be able to list to support a compliance status of "Yes" include:
[P.L. 107-110, Section 1304(c)(2)]	District and campus improvement plans showing the migrant- specific section;
	Job descriptions for MEP-funded personnel.
	It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.
Did the LEA ensure that MEP-funded supplies, materials, and equipment were used only for MEP	Documentation the LEA might be able to list to support a compliance status of "Yes" include:
activities and to the benefit of MEP students? [P.L. 107-110, Section 1304(c)(1)]	District and campus improvement plans showing the migrant- specific section;
	Purchase requisitions;
	Inventories;
	Logs on use of equipment;
	List of participants.
	The LEA could justify a response of "NA" if MEP funds were used only for personnel performing MEP-related duties, and the LEA had no MEP-funded supplies, materials, and equipment.
	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "MEP funds were

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
	used <u>only</u> for personnel performing MEP-related duties and the LEA had <u>no</u> MEP-funded supplies, materials, and equipment."
Did the LEA ensure that appropriate time and effort records were maintained for staff who were splitfunded with Title I, Part C and other funds? [OMB Circular A-87, A-122, or A-21, as appropriate]	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.
	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.
	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA had <u>no</u> staff who were split-funded with Title I, Part C and other funds."
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?	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.L. 107-110, Section 9501; and 34 CFR 299.6]	
	The only reason an LEA could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question would be that the LEA had <u>no</u> participating private non-profit schools.
Did the LEA ensure that migrant student records were requested and transferred in a timely manner?	Documentation the LEA might be able to list to support a compliance status of "Yes" include:
[P.L. 107-110, Section 1304(b)(3)]	Written district procedures for sharing and/or obtaining migrant student records with/from other districts and states;
	Transfer of Student Records Request Log;
	Records Request Form;
	Copies of e-mails and faxes concerning the sharing of student records, etc.
	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 2013-2014 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.

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	
Program Coordination/Integration – Subpart 2		
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)]	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include: • Copy of current written agreement It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question. 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.	
 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: maintain and improve educational achievement; accrue school credits that meet State requirements for grade promotion and secondary school graduation; make the transition to a regular program or other educational program operated by a district; complete secondary school (or secondary school equivalency requirements) and obtain employment after leaving the facility; as appropriate, to participate in postsecondary education and job training programs. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1431(a)] 	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include: • Copy of evaluation of Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 program showing program's impact in these areas. It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.	

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 Juvenile Justice Department and the Windham School District. LEAs will not see these questions on their PR 2000 form.

Compliance Status Response
To justify a "Yes" response to this question, the State Agency should ave documentation showing the number of hours added to educational rogram through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1. It is highly unlikely that the State Agency can justify a response of NA" to this question.
To justify a "Yes" response to this question, the State Agency should ave 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. The only instance in which the State Agency could justify a esponse of "NA" would be if the State Agency operated no adult correctional institutions. In this case, the State Agency should write the following: "The State Agency does not operate any adult correctional institutions."
To support a "Yes" response, the State Agency should have the billowing: a list of staff paid with Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds, including percentage of time spent working in program; Documentation for charges to payroll, as required in the applicable OMB Circular The State Agency could justify a response of "NA" only if it had no taff paid with Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds. In this case, the State Agency should write the following: "The State Agency has no staff paid out of Title I, Part D, Subpart 1."
To support a "Yes" response, the State Agency should have an institution-wide Program Plan for each campus operating such a rogram. The State Agency could justify a response of "NA" to this question only if the State Agency had no campus that operated an Institution-
nst ro(' h e

	Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
		In this case, the State Agency should write the following: "The State Agency has no campus that operates an Institution-wide program under Title I, Part D, Subpart 1."
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?	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.L	107-110, Section 1418]	It is highly unlikely that the State Agency could justify a response of "NA" to this question.
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?	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.l	107-110, Section 1431]	
		It is highly unlikely that the State Agency could justify a response of "NA" to this question.

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
Us	e of Funds – Subpart 2	
9. [P.	Did the LEA use Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds only for authorized purposes: To support the operation of local educational agency programs that involve collaboration with locally operated correctional facilities— (1) to carry out high-quality education programs to prepare children and youth for secondary school completion, training, employment, or further education; (2) to provide activities to facilitate the transition of such children and youth from the correctional program to further education or employment; and (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.	 To support a "Yes" response, the LEA should have the following: LEA and/or campus plans that provide a description of the Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 program; A description and list of Program beneficiaries; Accounting records documenting Program expenditures. It is highly unlikely that the LEA could justify a response of "NA" to this question.

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
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]	To support a "Yes" response, the LEA should have the following: • a list of staff paid with Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds, including percentage of time spent working in program;
[OIVID CITCUIAL A-8/]	Documentation for charges to payroll, as required in the applicable OMB Circular
	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.
	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA has no staff paid out of Title I, Part D, Subpart 2."
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?	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.L. 107-110, Section 1425]	It is highly unlikely that the LEA could justify a response of "NA" to this question.
	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.
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?	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.L. 107-110, Section 1422(b)]	
	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.
	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA had more than 30% of students attending the school operated at the facility resided outside the area served by the LEA when they left the facility."

Title II, Part A

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response	
Program Coordination/Integration		
	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:	
	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.	
[P.L. 107-110, Section 1112(b)(1)(D)]		
	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.	
	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.	
	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA does not receive Title I, Part A funding."	
The LEA coordinated with teachers, paraprofessionals, principals, other relevant school	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:	
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)]	 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. 	
	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.	
The LEA coordinated professional-development activities funded under Title II, Part A, with	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:	
professional development activities funded under other Federal, State, and local programs. [P.L. 107-110, Section 2122(b)(4)]	Description of professional development activities in LEA plan, showing coordination between fund sources.	
	Again, please note that "coordination" includes <u>planning</u> in order to ensure that the professional development needs of teachers principals, and other	

	Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
		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 coordination that can be documented by the LEA.
		It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.
Ne	eds Assessment	
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:	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.
	(a) have the lowest proportion of highly qualified	The only acceptable "NA" reasons are:
	teachers, (b) have the largest average class size, or (c) an idealify of for a backing state of the same and the Title	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
[P.l	(c) are identified for school improvement under Title I, Part A. [P.L. 107-110, Section 2122(b)(3) and (c)]	 campus); 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".
		In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA has no Title I SIP campuses, all teachers are HQT on all campuses and all campuses have equal class sizes or all campuses have no significant differences in class size."
		Note that simply being a single attendance area does NOT exempt an LEA from this requirement.
Pri	vate Nonprofit Services	
5.	nonprofit school officials regarding the development	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
was timely and meaning LEA made any decision	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	 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;
	other educational personnel to participate in the program, and continued throughout the	Meeting notes showing that all required topics were included in the consultation:
ו סן	implementation and assessment of program activities. 107-110, Section 9501]	how the needs of children and teachers will be identified;what services will be offered;
[1 .1	107 110 ₁ 000tion 7001]	

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
	o how, where, and by whom the services will be provided;
	 how the services will be assessed and how the results of the assessment will be used to improve those services;
	 the size and scope of the equitable services;
	 the amount of funds available for those services; and
	o how and when the LEA will make decisions about the delivery of services.
	 a thorough consideration and analysis of the views of the private school officials on the provision of contract services through potential third-party providers;
	Documentation showing that consultation continued throughout the implementation and assessment of the program activities.
	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.
	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA does not have participating private non-profit schools."
Use of Funds	
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)]	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:
	HQ documentation for all teachers on a Title I schoolwide campus;
	HQ documentation for all teachers hired for class-size reduction purposes who were paid with Title II, Part A funds.
	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.
	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA did not pay to hire teachers for class size reduction with Title II, Part A and LEA did not combine Title I, Part A schoolwide campuses budgets with Title II, Part A."

Title III, Part A

Program Implementation Question Compliance Status Response Needs Assessment The district has determined the needs for Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance instruction in languages other than English and status of "Yes" include: ensures that all teachers in Title III language Documentation showing that teachers who are providing bilingual instruction educational programs for LEP children instruction are fluent in English and the other language used for are fluent in both English and any other language instruction. [See Title III Teacher Fluency section of Application used for instruction, including having written and Instructions for 2013-2014 for examples of methods for ensuring oral communication skills. fluency.] [P.L. 107-110, Section 3116(c)] The only reasons why an LEA should mark "NA" for this guestion 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 2013-2014 school year. Parental Involvement 2. The district implements an effective means of Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance outreach to parents of LEP/immigrant students to status of "Yes" include: inform the parents of how they can be involved in Documentation of activities conducted for parents of LEP/immigrant the education of their children and be active students that include the dissemination of information or discussion of atparticipants in assisting their children to attain home activities or strategies specifically related to how the parents can English proficiency, achieve at high levels in core be involved in their children's education and how they can support their academic subjects, and meet challenging State children's efforts to attain fluency in English. standards expected of all students. [P.L. 107-110, Section 3302(e)] It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question. **Private Nonprofit School Services** 3. The LEA's consultation with participating private Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include: nonprofit school officials regarding the development and implementation of the Title III, Documentation of consultation process showing that it occurred before Part A program was timely and meaningful. It the LEA made any decisions that affected participation opportunities of occurred before the LEA made any decision that eligible private school children or teachers; affected the opportunities of the eligible private Meeting notes showing that all required topics were included in the school children, teachers, and other educational consultation: personnel to participate in the program, and continued throughout the implementation and o how children will be identified as limited English proficient (LEP) and by assessment of program activities. whom; [P.L. 107-110, Section 9501] o how the needs of children and teachers will be identified; what services will be offered;

o how, where, and by whom the services will be provided;

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
	 how the services will be assessed and how the results of the assessment will be used to improve those services;
	o the size and scope of the equitable services;
	 the amount of funds available for those services; and
	o how and when the LEA will make decisions about the delivery of services;
	 a thorough consideration and analysis of the views of the private school officials on the provision of contract services through potential third-party providers.
	Documentation showing that consultation continued throughout the implementation and assessment of the program activities.
	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.
	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA does not have participating private non-profit schools."
Administrative Costs – LEP Program	
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?	To support a "Yes" response, the LEA should have Title III, Part A—LEP budget documents detailing program and administrative costs.
[P.L. 107-110, Section 3115(b)]	The only reason an LEA could just justify a compliance status of "NA" 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."
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	To support a "Yes" response, the LEA should have Title III, Part A—LEP budget documents detailing program and administrative costs.
included when calculating administrative costs? [34 CFR 80.3; and P.L. 107-110, Section 9201]	The only reason an LEA could just justify a compliance status of "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."
6. 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? [34 CFR 80.3; and P.L. 107-110, Section 9201]	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.
[54 Of IX 60.3, and 1 .L. 107-110, Section 7201]	The LEA may answer "NA" if the LEA has <u>no</u> third-party contracts

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
	associated with the Title III, Part A—LEP program.
Use of Funds – LEP Program	
Did the LEA ensure that appropriate time and effort	To support a "Yes" response, the LEA should have the following:
records were maintained for staff who were split- funded with Title III, Part A—LEP and other funds? [OMB Circular A-87]	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 justify a response of "NA" only if the LEA had <u>no</u> 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 no staff who were split-funded with Title III, Part A—LEP and other funds."
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)]	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.
	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.
	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA does not have participating private non-profit schools."
Administrative Costs – Immigrant Program	
9. question removed	Question will either be disabled or deleted.
Did the LEA ensure that all appropriate administrative costs for the Title III, Part A— Immigrant program, including both indirect costs	To support a "Yes" response, the LEA should have Title III, Part A— Immigrant budget documents detailing program and administrative costs.
and direct costs such as administrative salaries, were included when calculating administrative costs?	The only reason an LEA could just justify a compliance status of "NA" would be that the LEA did not expend any Title III, Part A—Immigrant program funds for any administrative costs.
[34 CFR 80.3; and P.L. 107-110, Section 9201]	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "LEA did not use Title III, Part A—Immigrant funds for administrative costs."
11. question removed	Question will either be disabled or deleted.
Use of Funds – Immigrant Program	
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	To support a "Yes" response, the LEA should have the following: • a list of staff paid with Title III, Part A—Immigrant funds, including

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
funds? [OMB Circular A-87]	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 justify a response of "NA" only if the LEA had <u>no</u> staff who were split-funded with Title III, Part A—Immigrant funds and other funds.
	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "LEA had no staff who were split-funded with Title III, Part A—Immigrant and other funds."
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?	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.L. 107-110, Section 9501(d)]	
	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.
	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA does not have participating private non-profit schools."
14. Did the LEA ensure that Title III, Part A— Immigrant-funded programs provide enhanced instructional opportunities for immigrant children and youth? [P.L. 107-110, Section 3551(e)]	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.
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	It is highly unlikely that an LEA receiving these funds could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question.

School Choice Option (Title IX, Sec. 9532)

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
Program Coordination/Integration	
The district, as a condition of receiving funds under the No Child Left Behind Act, established and	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
implements a policy requiring that:	Copy of policy approved by the local board;
 a student attending a persistently dangerous public elementary school or secondary school (as determined by the Texas Education Agency), or 	Documentation that any student who has been affected by either of these circumstances has been offered the opportunity to transfer. The LEA is required to have the policy regardless of whether it has any appropriate of the policy regardless.
 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, 	campuses identified as Persistently Dangerous or whether it has any students who have been a victim of a violent criminal offense at school.
is offered and allowed to attend a safe public elementary or secondary school within the local educational agency, including a public charter school.	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.
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]	
The LEA notified parents that their students may	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance
transfer to a safe public school—	status of "Yes" include:
at least within 14 calendar days of the start of	Copy of written notification procedure;
 at least within 14 calendar days of the start of the school year for students enrolled in a persistently dangerous school, or 	 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
 generally, within 14 calendar days of the incident for students who are victims of a violent criminal 	PDS list, this serves as documentation that the LEA has met the part of this requirement related to PDS.];
act. [P.L. 107-110, Section 9532]	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:
	http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/adhocrpt/index.html

Program Implementation Question	Compliance Status Response
	[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;
	Letters to parents of any student who has been affected by either of these circumstances, documenting the offer of the opportunity to transfer.
	An LEA could justify a compliance status of "NA" in response to this question only if BOTH of the following conditions apply:
	The LEA has no campuses identified as Persistently Dangerous Schools;
	AND
	The LEA had no students who were victims of a violent crime on campus. [See Discipline Reports, referenced above.]
	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA had no campuses identified as Persistently Dangerous schools and the LEA had no students who were victims of a violent crime."
If the district consolidates administrative funds for NCLB programs, the district does not use any other	Documentation that an LEA might be able to list in support of a compliance status of "Yes" include:
funds under the NCLB programs included in the consolidation for administration for the fiscal year of the consolidation.	Records showing consolidation of administrative funds, including names of programs included and amount of funds contributed by each program;
[P.L. 107-110, Section 9203(c)]	Records showing that no other NCLB program funds were used for administrative costs during that grant year.
	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.
	In this case, the LEA should write the following: "The LEA does not consolidate administrative funds for NCLB programs."
	NOTE: The Agency will check the Consolidated Application for Federal Funding BS6001 to determine whether the LEA chose to consolidate administrative funds.