

## **Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)**

**April 11-15, 2005**

**Scope of Review:** A team from the U.S. Department of Education's (ED) Office of English Language Acquisition, State Consolidated Grant Division conducted an on-site review of the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) and St. Louis Public Schools (SLPS) the week of **April 11-15, 2005**. This was a comprehensive review of DESE's administration of Title III, Part A of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).

In conducting this comprehensive review, the ED team carried out a number of major activities. In its review of the Title III, Part A program, the ED team reviewed the seven elements addressed in the Title III monitoring guide. The review included analysis of implementation of English language proficiency standards, assessment, and accountability requirements, a review of State activities under Title III, and other essential components of the Title III State Formula Grant Program. During the on-site review, the ED team visited St. Louis Public Schools (SLPS), and interviewed administrative staff and teaching staff from the district and two schools.

**MO DESE participants:** Randy Rook (Director, Federal Grants Management), Shawn Cockrum (Director, Missouri Migrant & English Language Learner-MELL), Yaya Badji (Supervisor, Discretionary Grants), Bette Morff (Director, Financial Management), Craig Rector (Director, Federal Discretionary Grants), Dr. Dee Beck (Coordinator, Federal Programs), Dawn Maddox (Director, Data Analysis and Reporting), Susan Hanan (MELL Instructional Specialist) Sandra Anderson (MELL Instructional Specialist)

**ED Participants:** Harpreet Sandhu (Director, State Consolidated Grant Division), Dr. Marilyn Rahilly (Education Program Specialist), Dr. Millie Bentley-Memon (Senior Education Program Specialist)

**Previous Audit Findings:** None.

**Previous Monitoring Findings:** None. This is the first Title III on-site monitoring review.

## Summary of Title III, Part A Monitoring Indicators

<b>Title III, Part A: Submission Indicators</b>			
<b>Element Number</b>	<b>Critical element</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Page</b>
Element 1.1	State Submissions: Follow-up on areas identified through desk audit and document reviews.	Finding: Further Action Required	6
<b>Title III, Part A: Fiduciary Indicators</b>			
Element 2.1	Audits: The SEA ensures that its LEA/Subgrantees are audited annually in accordance with the Single Audit Act, and that all corrective actions required through this process are fully implemented.	Reviewed: No further action required at this time	6
Element 2.2	<p>Allocations, Reallocations, and Carryover The SEA complies with—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The procedures for Title III allocations outlined in Sec. 3114.</li> <li>• The procedures for allocating funds for immigrant children and youth programs as outlined in Sec. 3114(d).</li> </ul> <p>The reallocation provisions in Sec. 3114(c).</p>	Commendation	6
Element 2.3	<p>Reservation of funds: The SEA has a system in place that enables it to account for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) funds reserved for State administration,</li> <li>(2) funds reserved to provide technical assistance and other State level activities</li> <li>(3) the reservation of funds for immigrant activities, and</li> <li>(4) funds that become available for reallocation.</li> </ol>	Finding: Further Action Required	7
Element 2.4	Supplement not Supplant: The SEA ensures that Title III funds are used only to supplement or increase non-Federal sources used for the education of participating children and not to supplant funds from non-Federal sources.	Reviewed: No further action required at this time	7
Element 2.5	Equipment and Real Property: The SEA ensures that equipment and real property is procured at a cost that is recognized as ordinary and the equipment and real property is necessary for the performance of the Federal award.	Reviewed: No further action required at this time	7

**Title III, Part A: ELP Standards, Assessments and Accountability Indicators**

<b>Element Number</b>	<b>Critical element</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Page</b>
Element 3.1	English language proficiency standards: State English language proficiency standards have been developed, adopted, disseminated, and implemented.	Finding: Further Action Required, Recommendation	7-8
Element 3.2	ELP assessments: ELP assessments have been administered to all LEP students in the State in grades K-12. Accountability through data collection has been implemented.	Finding: Further Action Required	8
Element 3.3	Data Collection: The State has established and implemented clear criteria for the administration, scoring, analysis, and reporting components of its ELP assessments, and has a system for monitoring and improving the on-going quality of its ELP assessment system.	Reviewed: No further action required at this time	8
Element 3.4	New English language proficiency assessment: Transition to new ELP assessment or revising the current State ELP assessment.	Reviewed: No further action required at this time	9
Element 3.5	Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives: (AMAOs) AMAOs have been developed and AMAO determinations have been made for Title III-served LEAs.	Finding: Further Action Required	9
Element 3.6	Data system in place to meet all Title III data requirements including capacity to follow Title III served students for two years after exiting; State approach to follow ELP progress and attainment over time, using cohort model.	Reviewed: No further action required at this time	9

**Title III, Part A: State Level Activities; LEA Authorized and Required Activities, Immigrant Children and Youth Indicators**

<b>Element Number</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Page</b>
Element 4.1	<p>State Level Activities: Using administrative funds the State carries out one or more activities that may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional development</li> <li>• Planning, evaluation, administration and interagency coordination</li> <li>• Promote parental and community participation</li> <li>• Provide recognition.</li> </ul>	Reviewed: No further action required at this time	10
Element 4.2	<p>Required subgrantee activities: The LEA/Subgrantee is responsible to increase the English proficiency of LEP students by providing high quality language instructional programs and to provide high-quality professional development to classroom teachers (including teachers in classroom settings that are not the settings of language instructional programs), principals, administrators, and other school or CBO personnel.</p>	Commendation	10
Element 4.3	<p>Authorized subgrantee activities: The LEA may use the funds by undertaking one or more authorized activities.</p>	Reviewed: No further action required at this time	11
Element 4.4	<p>Activities by agencies experiencing substantial increases in immigrant children and youth: The subgrantee receiving funds under Section 3114(d)(1) shall use the funds to pay for activities that provide enhanced instructional opportunities for immigrant children and youth</p>	Reviewed: No further action required at this time	11

<b>Title III, Part A: State Review of Local Plans</b>			
<b>Element Number</b>	<b>Critical element</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Page</b>
Element 5.1	The SEA ensures that its LEAs comply with the provision for submitting an annual application to the SEA (Section 3116 (a)).	Finding: Further Action Required, Commendation	11
Element 5.2	Private School Participation: LEAs are complying with NCLB requirements regarding participation of LEP students and teachers in private schools under Title III.	Reviewed: No further action required at this time	12
Element 5.3	Teacher English fluency: Certification of teacher fluency requirement in English and any other language used for instruction (Section 3116(c)).	Reviewed: No further action required at this time	12
<b>Title III, Part A: State Monitoring of Subgrantees</b>			
Element 6.1	Monitoring: The SEA conducts monitoring of its subgrantees sufficient to ensure compliance with Title III program requirements.	Reviewed: No further action required at this time	12
Element 6.2	Consortia: Any governance issues in the State; policy of fiscal agents.	Not applicable	13
<b>Title III, Part A: Parental Notification</b>			
Element 7.1	Parental Notification: Provisions for identification and placement and for not meeting the AMAOs; notification in an understandable format (Section 3302).	Finding: Further Action Required, Commendation (LEA)	13

**Title III, Part A  
State Submission Indicators**

**Element 1.1- State Submissions**

Reviewed: DESE has submitted all reports required under Title III, Part A, and the Consolidated State Application to the US Department of Education.

Finding: Accurate targets for and calculations of the State's Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOS) have not been made to date.

Citation: Section 3123, 34 CFR 80.40, Section 3122 (a)(3)(A)

Further action required: A plan to accurately determine Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) must be developed and submitted to the US Dept of Education. The State must submit an addendum to the Dec 1, 2004 State Biennial Evaluation Report reflecting these changes.

**Title III, Part A  
Fiduciary Indicators**

**Element 2.1 - Audits**

Reviewed: Missouri demonstrated that it has a multiparty review process in place for reviewing audits and audit findings. This process appears to be functioning satisfactorily.

Citation: Circular A-133

**Element 2.2 – Allocations, Reallocations, and Carryover**

Commendation: Fiduciary indicators and State accounting system for funding and expenditures appear to be functioning well. The State's on-line system for accessing and reviewing LEA budgets permits easy reference to and review of LEA expenditures. The State provided adequate information regarding the fiduciary indicators and its monitoring of LEA budgets and allocations.

Citation: OMB A-87, 34 CFR 76.720

**Element 2.3 – Reservation of funds**

Finding: The State provided adequate evidence for expenditures for State administration, funds for technical assistance, other State activities and the reservation of funds for the immigrant children and youth program. The total Title III grant award to MO for FY 2004 was \$3,130,233. The State reported that \$175,000 was reserved for State-level activities.

Further Action Required: Missouri must consult with OELA regarding its method of allocating Title III funds to LEAs for FY 2005. The State is currently allocating varying amounts of funds to LEAs depending on the number of LEP students within the school district, with a minimum grant size of \$10,000 awarded to LEAs with 10 or more LEP students.

Citation: Sections 3111, 3115, 3116

#### **Element 2.4 – Supplement Not Supplant**

Reviewed: The State indicated that it informed LEAs that they must provide basic services to LEP students. Nine State-funded instructional specialists monitor LEAs to ensure that these services are being provided to LEP students. The State provided a copy of its administrative manual (Feb 2005), which documents on page 10 State and federal requirements regarding supplementing vs. supplanting.

Citation: Section 3115(g)

#### **Element 2.5 – Equipment and Real Property**

Reviewed: The State described its processes for ensuring that equipment and real property are accounted for, funded and managed properly. The State provided a copy of its administrative manual (Feb 2005) which documents on page 15 the State and federal requirements regarding inventory control and disposition of capital outlay.

Citation: OMB A-87; 34 CFR 76.533, 34 CFR 80.32

### **Title III, Part A ELP Standards, Assessments, and Accountability Indicators**

#### **Element 3.1 - ELP Standards**

Finding: Missouri has not yet demonstrated how its State English language proficiency standards are linked/aligned with the State academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science, as required under Section 3113 (b)(2). During the on-site review, the State indicated that it was planning to revise the current State ELP standards to align with the MAC II. The ED team advised the State that the ELP assessment should be aligned to the State ELP standards, and that that State should develop clear and appropriate ELP standards and a definition of proficient in English, and then base its ELP assessment upon these elements to form an integrated system of English language proficiency standards, assessments, and accountability.

Citation: Section 3113(b)(2)

Further action required: Missouri must submit evidence of having developed and implemented English language proficiency standards (ELP) that are linked/aligned with State academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science.

Recommendation: Missouri may wish to consult with St. Louis Public Schools or other districts in the State that have already developed ELP standards-based curriculum through work with external experts.

### **Element 3.2 - ELP Assessments**

Finding: Missouri did not submit sufficient evidence in the State Biennial Evaluation Report or the Consolidated State Performance Report for when and how a State English language proficiency assessment aligned to State English language proficiency standards will be fully implemented, as required under Section 3113(b)(3)(D).

The MAC II is currently being used as the Statewide ELP assessment in Missouri for all LEP students in the State, grades K-12. This assessment is adequate for identification and placement of LEP students, but the State has not demonstrated how this assessment is aligned with State ELP standards.

Citation: Section 3113(b)(3)(D)

Further action required: The State must submit a plan to address the implementation of an English language proficiency (ELP) assessment that is aligned to State ELP standards.

### **Element 3.3 – Data Collection (Reporting components of ELP assessments)**

Reviewed: The State provided evidence to indicate that the State ELP assessment, the MAC II, is administered Statewide using uniform and standardized procedures. Evidence included the 2005 MELL Test Coordinator’s Manual, distribution tables for the MAC II, a School Test Coordinator’s Checklist, a Test Administrator’s Checklist, training materials required for assessment administrators, and other documents. The State also provided evidence that appropriate procedures for scoring and reporting ELP assessment results are in place, including a Score Interpretation guide.

MO conducts an LEP student Census on an annual basis and results are available on-line at the DESE website. MO reported that there were 18,745 LEP students in the State in grades K-12 enrolled in MO public schools in 2004. This was a 26% increase from 2003.

Citation: Section 1111(b)(7), Section 3113(b)(3)(D)

### **Element 3.4 – Transition to new ELP assessment**

Reviewed: Not applicable. Missouri is not planning to develop or implement a new ELP assessment. Missouri plans to continue using the MAC II as its Statewide ELP assessment.

Citation: Section 1111(b)(7), Section 3113(b)(3)(D)

### **Element 3.5 – Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOS)**

Finding: MO has not submitted accurate targets for and calculations of the Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOS). During the on-site review, DESE reported that Missouri did not have a mechanism in place to make valid AMAO determinations. There are discrepancies in the reports previously submitted to the USDE in terms of the number of LEAs that met Title III AMAOS.

Citation: Section 3122(a)(3)(A)(i-iii)

Further action required: Missouri must make accurate Title III AMAO determinations for Title III-served LEAs throughout the State, and report accurate numbers of LEAs that meet or do not meet these AMAOS. A plan to accurately determine Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOS) must be developed and submitted to the US Dept of Education. The State must submit an addendum to the Dec 1, 2004 State Biennial Evaluation Report and the Consolidated State Performance Report reflecting these changes.

### **Element 3.6 – Data Collection (Data collection system)**

Reviewed: MO submitted data in its December 1, 2004 State Biennial Evaluation Report on the number and percentage of former Title III-served LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels in reading/language arts and mathematics Statewide for 2003-04.

MO presented its definition of cohort in the January 31, 2005 Consolidated State Performance Report. The State defines cohort as a grouping of grade levels that fit both the MAC II and the MAP testing spans, specified as grade levels K-3, 4-5, 6-8, and 9-12.

Citation: Section 3121(a)(4), Performance Indicator 2.1 of the Consolidated State Application

**Title III, Part A**  
**State Level Activities; LEA Authorized and Required Activities; Immigrant Children and Youth**

**Element 4.1 – State Level Activities**

Reviewed: MO reported that Title III and Migrant Education funds are used to support salaries for 9 regional MELL instructional specialists who provide technical assistance and professional development at the school and district levels throughout the State.

In its State Biennial Evaluation Report, MO indicated that the MELL (Migrant Education and English Language Learner) program, in conjunction with Southeast MO State University (SEMO), provides instructors and materials to conduct courses in methods and techniques that lead to ESOL certification. A total of 14 courses were offered at 4 different locations across the State.

In its State Biennial Evaluation Report, MO indicated that it provides technical assistance to subgrantees in identifying and implementing English language instructional programs and curricula, helping LEP students to meet State standards, identifying or developing measures of ELP, and promoting parental and community participation in programs that serve LEP children. The MELL program also provides paraprofessional training across the State as well as administrative workshops for superintendents and building principals on curriculum design, SIOP, and other topics.

Citation: Section 3111(b)(2)

**Element 4.2 – Required Subgrantee Activities**

Commendation: St. Louis Public Schools is exemplary in its development of English language proficiency standards, assessments and programs and in its compliance with Title III requirements. The district has done outstanding work in helping English language learners acquire English and succeed academically. The district's developing newcomer center for LEP students, especially refugees, provides a high quality English language instruction educational program.

Reviewed: St. Louis Public Schools provided adequate documentation on all required elements, including records and numbers of LEP students served under Title III, procedures for tracking LEP students' progress in English, curriculum and other areas. The district offers professional development and instructional training opportunities for teachers and administrators and provides tuition assistance for instructional staff to pursue ESL/bilingual teacher certification at institutions of higher education.

Citation: Section 3115(c)

### **Element 4.3 – Authorized Subgrantee Activities**

Reviewed: A copy of St. Louis Public Schools' local plan was provided to the monitoring team. The on-site team observed the implementation of subgrantee activities firsthand in the district office, and at two schools: Soldan International High School and Bunche International Middle School. The district also provided a count of their Title III ESOL student served and a list of the ESOL/bilingual migrant centers. The ESOL/Bilingual Migrant Program in the St. Louis Public Schools indicated that it planned to use carryover funds from FY2004 to further expand the current newcomer program. The monitoring team concurred that this initiative was appropriate and worthwhile.

Citation: Section 3115(d)

### **Element 4.4 – Activities by Agencies experiencing substantial increases in immigrant children and youth**

Reviewed: The St. Louis and Kansas City School Districts have experienced the greatest increases in immigrant children and youth Statewide in recent years. In St. Louis Public Schools, the total number of LEP students served was 2,895. The total allocation for FY 2004 was \$496,087, the immigrant allocation was \$74,864 and the formula allocation was \$421,223.

Citation: 3114(d)(1)

## **Title III, Part A State Review of Local Plans**

### **Element 5.1 – State Review of Local Plans**

Commendation: The State makes good use of technology by way of a centralized online application for federal funds, and an informational MELL website on programs and assistance for LEP students. The State uses the online system for receiving, reviewing, and approving LEA applications for federal funds. The State reviewed this consolidated system with the on-site monitoring team prior to and during the visit. This system is commendable for its efficacy and accessibility for both the State and LEAs throughout the State.

Finding: The State has not yet informed LEAs regarding Title III AMAO determinations.

Citation: Section 3116(a)

Further action required: Missouri must make accurate Title III AMAO determinations for Title III-served LEAs throughout the State, and report accurate numbers of LEAs that meet or do not meet these AMAOS. The State must also inform LEAs of this requirement. A plan to accurately determine Title III Annual Measurable Achievement

Objectives (AMAOs) must be developed and submitted to the US Dept of Education. The State must submit an addendum to the Dec 1, 2004 State Biennial Evaluation Report and the Consolidated State Performance Report reflecting these changes.

### **Element 5.2 – Private School Participation**

Reviewed: The Missouri State Constitution has some restrictions concerning serving private school students. Under State law, private school teachers can receive professional development and private school students can receive some supplemental instruction. DESE’s financial division conducts an annual census for non-public schools to inquire whether or not they wish to participate in federal funding. DESE provides information to LEAs regarding serving private school students under Title III, but many have chosen not to participate. DESE has a brochure entitled “Migrant and English Language Acquisition” which provides guidance to private schools.

Citation: 34 CFR 76.650 – 76.662

### **Element 5.3 – Teacher English Fluency**

Reviewed: Currently, State teacher certification is the one of the principal criteria used to determine and evaluate teacher English fluency in oral and written communication. The State indicated in its Biennial Evaluation Report that since the majority of the ESOL programs in the State use English as the language of instruction, the SEA requires LEAs to assure as part of their Title III application that all instructional personnel are fluent in English. The St. Louis Public School district provided information regarding the certification of its teachers supported by Title III.

Citation: Section 3116(c)

## **Title III, Part A State Monitoring of Subgrantees**

### **Element 6.1 – State Monitoring of Subgrantees**

Reviewed: The on-site visit indicated that DESE has a five-year plan to visit all LEAs and a consolidated federal programs self-monitoring checklist that the State uses to evaluate LEAs. This checklist was provided to the on-site team during the visit.

Citation: Section 3116, 34 CFR 80.40

Recommendation: DESE should evaluate whether the information received by way of online and on-site monitoring is sufficient to ensure that LEAs are in compliance with Title III requirements and determine whether more frequent on-site monitoring visits are merited.

## **Element 6.2 – Consortia**

Reviewed: Not applicable. There are no consortia in Missouri.

Citation: Section 3114(b)

## **Title III, Part A Parental Notification**

### **Element 7.1– Parental Notification**

Finding: Because the State did not effectively make AMAO determinations, LEA parental notification letters for failure to meet AMAOs were not issued.

Further action required: After the State has made AMAO determinations for Title III-served LEAs and informed the LEAs of these AMAOs, it must ensure that all Title III-served LEAs issue parental notification as required under Section 3302(b).

Finding: The State-provided parental notification form for identification and placement of LEP students did not include all required elements under Section 3302(a). DESE has attempted to revise this form since the monitoring visit.

Further action required: DESE must consult with OELA to ensure that this parental notification form includes all required elements under Section 3302(a).

Citation: Sections 3302(a), 3302(b)

Commendation: The St. Louis Public School District provided copies of parental notifications and parent handbooks that were translated in Bosnian, Somali, Spanish and other languages.