MONITORING AND COMPLIANCE
DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING CORRECTIVE ACTION PLANS

Overview

Session Description

This session will begin with a group discussion about the corrective action planning process, including (1) how development of technical assistance plans can contribute to this process, (2) the indicators for which States commonly receive Federal monitoring findings, and (3) common questions State Education Agencies (SEA) have concerning these indicators. Participants will work mostly in small groups to review sample Federal monitoring report findings for three indicators—State Agency (SA) and Local Education Agency (LEA) Applications, Institutionwide Projects (IWPs), and Subgrantee Monitoring. In response to one of the findings, each group will use a planning tool to brainstorm and draft components of a comprehensive technical assistance plan to support subgrantee efforts to meet compliance. To close the session, participants will come together as a large group to share their small group conversations, to discuss strategies and resources States have used to meet compliance in these areas, and to discuss appropriate next steps to fully develop (e.g., set benchmarks to monitor subgrantee progress) and implement a technical assistance plan.

Common Federal Monitoring Findings and Recommendations

State Plan (former Indicator 1.1). Findings and recommendations concerned whether the content of the State Plan adhered to Federal guidelines (e.g., insufficient or improper identification of State goals; insufficient descriptions of State activities and/or services); and the extent to which States implemented their State Plan, including inappropriate allocation of Part D funds or lack of alignment between the content of the plan and how program activities were being conducted.

SA Application (former Indicator 1.2). Findings and recommendations concerned the extent to which SA Applications addressed all statutory requirements (i.e., the 19 required elements); using an inappropriate application; insufficient evidence that an application had been approved by the SEA; and not using an application to allocate funds.

LEA Application (former Indicator 1.3). Findings and recommendations concerned administering an application that did not meet all statutory requirements (i.e., the 13 required elements); insufficient evidence that an application had been approved by the SEA; and not using an application to allocate funds—that is, not sufficiently identifying and inviting LEAs that serve students with the greatest needs to

1

complete an application. SASA suggested that SEAs communicate better with their subgrantees so that they are aware of SEA and SASA requirements.

IWPs (former Indicator 2.1). Findings and recommendations concerned insufficient monitoring of existing IWPs; SEAs not providing subgrantees an opportunity to submit information related to IWPs on grant applications or for ensuring that each IWP submitted a plan; and insufficient training and technical assistance to SAs.

Transition Reservation (former Indicator 3.1). Findings and recommendations concerned the following four issues: (1) insufficient evidence of reserving funds for transition; (2) not enforcing requirements to reserve funds or reserving insufficient funds for transition; (3) questionable use of the transition reservation; and (4) inappropriate oversight of transition reservations.

Subgrantee Monitoring (former Indicator 3.2). Five main issues led to findings: (1) no evidence of subgrantee monitoring; (2) insufficient subgrantee monitoring; (3) use of informal and unsystematic monitoring protocols; (4) faulty data collection processes; and (5) insufficient use of program evaluation information. Recommendations focused on how States could improve specific aspects of their monitoring systems, including using additional tools—such as an annual evaluation form and/or data from Consolidated State Performance Reports; strengthening monitoring processes (e.g., tracking students after they exit a facility, providing more technical assistance); and planning for the future (e.g., focus on awarding more high school diplomas).

Common Questions

1. Concerning the LEA application formal agreement requirement referenced in Section 1423, what must this agreement include and who should sign it?

2. Are SAs and LEAs required to include a service delivery plan (or some other assurance that the plan would be implemented) in their applications to the SEA?

3. Should an SA submit an application that addresses all the requirements as well as a separate institution-wide application (if applicable)? A lot of the data appears redundant.

4. One of the sections of the law requires that SAs describe how the SA will carry out the evaluation requirements of section 9601 and how the results of the most recent evaluation will be used to plan and improve the program. How do I review this section of their application to ensure that State agencies are completing this section correctly?

5. Does an SEA have the authority to combine the Part D, Subpart 2, application—including the formal agreement—with a Title I consolidated application?

6. If SAs carry over their funds, are they allowed to use the transition set-aside money for other purposes in the next year, or is the use of those funds restricted?

7. Can Part D funds be used to pay for a transition coordinator who works outside of the facility (e.g., for a community-based organization) to reintegrate kids into school and/or work?

8. Section 1418(a) states that 15 percent to 30 percent of the SA's allocation will be used for transition services. Should the percentage of transition funds be calculated at the SA or facility level (i.e., should each facility be using 15 percent to 30 percent of its funds for transition)?

Session Agenda

A. *Whole Group Discussion:* The Corrective Action Planning Process (10 minutes)

B. *Overview:* Common Federal Monitoring Findings and Recommendations and Discussion of Related Technical Assistance Requests (15 minutes)

C. *Small Group Activity:* Developing a Technical Assistance Plan To Help Subgrantees Meet Compliance (30 minutes)

D. *Report Out and Next Steps* (20 minutes)

Related NDTAC Resources

- A Guide to Meeting Compliance Requirements for the Title I, Part D, Program (http://www.neglected-delinquent.org/nd/docs/monitoring_guide_20091111.pdf)

- Planning and Implementing Institutionwide Projects (http://www.neglected-delinquent.org/nd/resources/spotlight/iwpBrief200908.asp)

- Title I, Part D, Program Administration Planning Toolkit (http://www.neglected-delinquent.org/nd/docs/programAdminPlanningToolkit.pdf)