

State of New Jersey Department of Education PO Box 500 Trenton, NJ 08625-0500

CHRIS CHRISTIE Governor

KIM GUADAGNO Lt. Governor

April 20, 2012

CHRISTOPHER D. CERF Acting Commissioner

Dr. Mark Silverstein, Superintendent Glassboro Public Schools 560 Joseph Bowe Memorial Boulevard Glassboro, NJ 08028

Dear Dr. Silverstein:

The New Jersey Department of Education has completed a review of funds received and disbursed from one or more federal programs by the <u>Glassboro Board of Education</u>. The funding sources reviewed include titled programs for the Education Jobs Act of 2010 (Ed Jobs) in particular, and/or Elementary and Secondary Education (ESEA) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The review covered the period July 1, 2010 through January 20, 2012. The resulting report is enclosed. Please provide a copy of the report to each board member. All issued Ed Jobs monitoring reports will be posted on the department's website at http://www.state.nj.us/education/finance/jobs/monitor/.

Utilizing the process outlined in the attached "Procedures for LEA/Agency Response, Corrective Action Plan and Appeal Process," the Glassboro Board of Education is required, pursuant to <u>N.J.A.C.</u> 6A:23A-5.6, to publicly review and discuss the findings in this report at a public board meeting no later than 30 days after receipt of the report. Within 30 days of the public meeting, the board must adopt a resolution certifying that the findings were discussed in a public meeting and approving a corrective action plan which addresses the issues raised in the undisputed findings and/or an appeal of any **monetary** findings in dispute (emphasis added). A copy of the resolution and the approved corrective action plan and/or appeal must be sent to this office within 10 days of adoption by the board. Direct your response to my attention.

Also, pursuant to <u>N.J.A.C.</u> 6A:23A-5.6(c), you must post the findings of the report and the board's corrective action plan on your district's website.

By copy of this report, your auditor is requested to comment on all areas of noncompliance and recommendations in the next certified audit submitted to the New Jersey Department of Education. If you have any questions, please contact Anthony Hearn at (609) 633-2492.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Cicchino, Director Office of Fiscal Accountability and Compliance

RJC/AH/dk:Glassboro BOE Cover Letter/ Ed Jobs Enclosures

Distribution List

Christopher D. Cerf Bari Erlichson David Corso Barbara Gantwerk Justin Barra Karen Campbell Peggy McDonald Anthony Hearn Robert Bumpus Stephen M. Eells

STATE OF NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PO BOX 500 TRENTON, NJ 08625-0500

GLASSBORO PUBLIC SCHOOLS 560 JOSEPH BOWE MEMORIAL BOULEVARD GLASSBORO, NJ 08028 PHONE: (856) 652-2700



EDUCATION JOBS CONSOLIDATED MONITORING REPORT APRIL 2011

District:	Glassboro Public Schools
County:	Gloucester
Dates On-Site:	January 23 and 24, 2012
Case #:	Ed Jobs-029-11

FUNDING SOURCES

Program			Funding Award	
Ed Jobs			\$	564,293
Title I				539,408
IDEA Basic				618,903
IDEA Preschool				25,246
Title IIA				161,851
Title III				21,714
Carl D. Perkins				21,278
		Total Funds	\$	1,952,693

BACKGROUND

The *Education Jobs Act of 2010 (Ed Jobs)* and other federal laws require local education agencies (LEAs) to provide programs and services to their districts based on the requirements specified in each of the authorizing statutes (ESEA, IDEA and Ed Jobs). The laws further require that state education agencies such as the New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) monitor the implementation of federal programs by sub recipients and determine whether the funds are being used by the district for their intended purpose and achieving the overall objectives of the funding initiatives.

INTRODUCTION

The NJDOE visited the Glassboro Public Schools to monitor the district's use of *Ed Jobs* funds and the related program plans, where applicable, to determine whether the district's programs are meeting the intended purposes and objectives, as specified in the current year applications and authorizing statutes, and to determine whether the funds were spent in accordance with the program requirements, federal and state laws, and applicable regulations. The on-site visit included staff interviews and documentation reviews related to the requirements of the following programs: Ed Jobs, Title I; Title IIA; Title III; IDEA and Carl D. Perkins for the period July 1, 2010 through January 20, 2012.

The scope of work performed included the review of documentation including grant applications, program plans and needs assessments, grant awards, annual audits, board minutes, payroll records, accounting records, purchase orders, a review of student records, classroom visitations and interviews with instructional staff to verify implementation of Individualized Education Program (IEP), a review of student class and related service schedules, interviews of child study team members and speech-language specialist and an interview of the program administrator regarding IDEA grant, as well as current district policies and procedures. The monitoring team members also conducted interviews with district personnel, reviewed the supporting documentation for a sample of expenditures and conducted internal control reviews.

EXPENDITURES REVIEWED

The grants that were reviewed included Educational Jobs Act, Title I, Title IIA, Title III, IDEA and Carl d. Perkins from July 1, 2010 through January 20, 2012. A sampling of purchase orders was taken from the entire population and later identified as to the grant that was charged.

GENERAL DISTRICT OVERVIEW OF USES OF TITLE I AND IDEA FUNDS

Title I Projects

The district is using its FY 2011-2012 Title I, Part A funds to implement targeted assistance programs in the district. Primarily, the district provides tutoring services through in-class support and extensive professional development.

IDEA Projects (Special Education)

IDEA Basic funds for FY 2012 are being used to reduce tuition costs for students with disabilities receiving educational services in out of district programs approved by the NJDOE, and fund instructional and administrative staff assigned to the Extended School Year Program. The grant also funds child study team staff and teachers required to attend meetings during the summer months. Professional development and instructional and non-instructional supplies are also funded through the grant. Preschool funding is dedicated to tuition payments.

Nonpublic schools receive funding to support contracted services including classroom assistants and speech therapy and the purchase of instructional supplies.

DETAILED FINDINGS AND RECOMMEDATIONS

Ed Jobs Act Funding

There were no findings in Ed Jobs.

<u>Title I</u>

Finding 1: The district does not have the required supporting documents to verify the activity of Title I staff as required by federal law, including schedules that show activity and funding percentage.

Citation: OMB Circular A-87, Attachment B, Section 8(h): *Cost Principles for State, Local and Indian Tribal Governments (Compensation for personal services).*

Required Action: The district must verify the time and activity of staff charged to the grant. The district must submit a list of FY 2012 Title I funded staff, salaries, funding percentages and time sheets that match funding percentage to the NJDOE for review (including administrative staffing).

Finding 2: On several occasions the district failed to issue a purchase order prior to services being rendered (confirming order). The district's policy and state regulations require that a properly executed purchase order be issued prior to services being rendered.

Citation: N.J.S.A 18A:18A(2)(v) Public School Contracts Law.

Required Action: The district must implement a process to ensure that purchase orders are issued prior to receiving goods and services from vendors.

Finding 3: The district contracted with Gloucester County Special Services School District (GCSSSD) to provide services to students in facilities for neglected children, but the district could not produce a detailed contract and invoices for actual services provided.

Citation: EDGAR, PART 80--Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments, Section 20, Standards for financial management systems.

Required Action: The district must provide supporting documentation for payments rendered to GCSSSD in the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years. The documentation must detail the services performed and the costs for each of these services and must be sent to the NJDOE for review.

Finding 4: The Title I school-parent compacts did not include the required components, specifically outlining how parents, the entire school staff, and students will share the responsibility for improved student academic achievement and the means by which the school and parents will build and develop a partnership to help children achieve the state's high standards.

Citation: NCLB §1118(b) School Parental Involvement Policy.

Required Action: Each school receiving funds under Title I, Part A must develop a written school-parent compact jointly with parents for all children participating in Title I, Part A activities, services and programs. The compact must outline how parents, the entire school staff, and students will share the responsibility for improved student academic achievement and the means by which the school and parents will build and develop a partnership to help children achieve the state's high standards. The compact must be distributed to parents, posted on the district's parent web page, and submitted to the NJDOE for review. (The Non-Regulatory Guidance on Parental Involvement - Title I, Part A can be found at this link: <u>http://www.state.nj.us/education/title1/program/parent/</u>. A School-Parent Compact sample is included at the end of the guidance document.)

Finding 5: For the 2011-2012 school year, there is no evidence that the district distributed the "opt-out" form to parents and adult students regarding Title IX: Access to High School Students and Information on Students by Military Recruiters. There is no evidence the district maintains a record of parents and students that requested to "opt-out" of complying with requests from military recruiters, college recruiters and employers, or that the district provided students' names, addresses, and telephone listings to military recruiters, college recruiters and employers if requested.

Citation: NCLB §9528: Access to High School Students and Information on Students by *Military Recruiters.*

Required Action: The district must distribute an "opt-out" letter and form to parents of high school students as well as adult students for FY 2011-2012 and a copy of the revised letter must be submitted to the NJDOE for review. (A sample "opt-out" letter and guidance regarding Access to High School Students and Information on Students by Military Recruiters can be found at this link: http://www.state.nj.us/education/grants/nclb/guidance/info/).

<u>Title IIA</u>

There were no findings in Title IIA.

Carl D. Perkins

There were no findings in Carl D. Perkins.

IDEA (Special Education)

Finding 6: The district did not consistently include the required components in notice of eligibility, reevaluation and IEP meetings conducted for students eligible for special education and related services and eligible for speech–language services. Noncompliance was due to lack of consistent implementation of district procedures.

Citation: N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.3(k)3,5; 20 U.S.C. §1414(b)(1); and 34 CFR §300.304(a).

Required Action: The district must ensure that parents are provided notice of a meeting in writing, that contains all required components, early enough to ensure that the parent has an opportunity to attend. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the district must conduct training for child study team members and speech-language specialists regarding the procedures for implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. Additionally, the district must submit to NJDOE copies of notices of eligibility, reevaluation planning and IEP meetings conducted between May 2012 and September 2012 for students eligible for special education and related services and students eligible for speech–language services.

Finding 7: The district did not consistently provide copies of evaluation report(s) to parents at least 10 days prior to the determination of eligibility for students eligible for special education and related services and students eligible for speech–language services. Noncompliance was due to lack of consistent implementation of district procedures.

Citation: N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.5(a); 20 U.S.C. §1414(b)(4); and 34 CFR §300.306(a).

Required Action: The district must ensure that parents are provided copies of evaluation report(s) not less than 10 days prior to the determination of eligibility. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the district must conduct training for child study team members and speech-language specialists regarding procedures for implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. Additionally, the district

must submit documentation of provision of evaluation report(s) to parents for students evaluated for special education and related services and students evaluated for speechlanguage services between May 2012 and September 2012 to the NJDOE for review.

Finding 8: The district did not consistently include required considerations and statements in each IEP for students eligible for special education and related services and eligible for speech-language services.

The IEPs of students eligible for special education and related services and students eligible for speech-language services did not consistently include:

- consideration of extended school year;
- the group size for the provision of related services; and
- documentation of consideration of special factors in the Present Levels of Academic and Functional Performance statement.

Noncompliance was due to lack of consistent implementation of district procedures.

Citation: N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.7(c)1-11, (e) 1-17, and (f); 20 U.S.C. §1414(d)(3)(A)(B); and 34 CFR §300.324(a)(1)(2).

Required Action: The district must ensure that each IEP contains the required considerations and statements. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the district must conduct training for child study team members and speech-language specialists regarding the procedures for implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. The district must conduct annual review meetings and revise IEPs for the specific students whose IEPs were identified as noncompliant during monitoring and submit them to the NJDOE for review, along with IEPs for students whose annual review meetings were conducted between May 2012 and September 2012. Names of the students whose IEPs were identified as noncompliant will be provided to the school by the special education monitor. For assistance with correction of noncompliance, the district is referred to the state IEP sample form at www.statenj.us/education/specialed/forms.

Finding 9: The district did not consistently document in the IEPs of students removed from the general education setting for more than 20 percent of the day, including students placed in separate settings, consideration of placement in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). Specifically, IEPs did not consistently document:

- the supplemental aids and services considered and why they were rejected;
- district activities to transition students placed in separate programs to a less restrictive placement; and
- the potentially beneficial or harmful effects which a placement in general education, and, may have on the student with disabilities or other students in the general education class.

Additionally, documentation of the rational for removal from general education was not individualized based on the needs of the student. Noncompliance was due <u>a</u>-to<u>a</u> lack of consistent implementation of district procedures.

Citation: (*LRE*) N.J.A.C. 6A:14-4.2 (a)8(i),(ii) and (iii).

Required Action: The district must ensure that when discussing educational placement, the general education class is considered first and that supplementary aids and services are considered and documented in the IEPs of students removed from general education for more than 20% of the day. The district must ensure that all required decisions regarding placement are made by the IEP team and are documented in the IEP. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the district must conduct training for child study team members regarding the procedures for implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. The district must conduct annual review meetings and revise IEPs for the students whose IEPs were identified as noncompliant during monitoring and submit the revised IEPs as well as copies of IEPs for students removed from the general education setting for more than 20% of the day whose annual review meetings were conducted between May 2012 and September 2012 to the NJDOE for review. Names of the students whose IEPs were identified as noncompliant will be provided to the school by the special education monitor.

Finding 10: The district did not consistently provide to students beginning at age 14, written invitations to meetings where post-school transition was being discussed. Noncompliance was due to a lack of consistent implementation of the district procedures.

Citation: N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.3(k)2x and 3.7(e)13, 3.7(h); 20 U.S.C. §1414 (d)(1)(A)(i)(1)(VIII); and 34 CFR §300.322.b(2).

Required Action: The district must ensure that each student with an IEP age 14 or above is provided with a written invitation to any IEP meeting where transition to adult life will be discussed. Additionally, the district must submit copies of invitations to IEP meetings to students age 14 and above for meetings conducted between May 2012 and September 2012 to the NJDOE for review.

Finding 11: The district did not consistently maintain documentation of the description, frequency, duration and effectiveness of the interventions provided in the general education setting through the Intervention and Referral Service (I&RS). Noncompliance was due to lack of consistent implementation of district procedures.

Citation: N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.3(c).

Required Action: The district must ensure that I&RS documentation includes the description, frequency, duration and effectiveness of the interventions provided in the general education setting. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the district must conduct training for child study team members regarding the procedures for

implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. Additionally, the district must submit documentation for students referred to the child study team who were provided interventions in general education between May 2012 and September 2012 to the NJODE for review.

Finding 12: The district did not consistently conduct vision/hearing screenings and health/medical summaries for every student referred to the child study team for evaluation. Noncompliance was due to lack of consistent implementation of district procedures.

Citation: N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.4(j).

Corrective Action: The district must ensure that vision and audiometric screenings are conducted for every student referred to the child study team with a copy of the results maintained in students' files, along with available health/medical summaries. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the district must conduct training for child study team members regarding the procedures for implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. To demonstrate implementation of the procedures, the district must submit documentation verifying receipt of the health summary, including the vision and hearing screening, for students referred to the child study team between May 2012 and September 2012 to the NJDOE for review.

Finding 13: The district did not consistently conduct multidisciplinary initial evaluations for students referred for speech-language services by obtaining an educational impact statement from the general education teacher. Noncompliance was due to lack of consistent implementation of district procedures.

Citation: N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.5(b)6 and 3.6(b).

Required Action: The district must ensure that a multidisciplinary evaluation is conducted for students referred for speech-language services by obtaining the education impact statement from the general education teacher that details the educational impact of the speech problem on the student's progress in general education. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the district must conduct training for speech-language specialists regarding the procedures for implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. Additionally, initial evaluation reports for students referred for speech-language services between May 2012 and September 2012 must be submitted to the NJDOE for review.

Finding 14: The district did not consistently conduct all required sections of the functional assessment as a component of an initial evaluation for students referred for special education and related services and students referred for speech-language services. Noncompliance was due to lack of consistent implementation of district procedures.

Citation: N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.4(f)4(i-vi); 20 U.S.C. §1414(b)(4) and (5); and 34 CFR §300.306(c)(i).

Required Action: The district must ensure that all components of the functional assessment are conducted as part of the initial evaluations process. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the district must conduct training for child study team members and speech-language specialists regarding the district's procedures for implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. In addition, the district must submit evaluation reports developed between March 2012 and September 2012 for students referred for special education and related services and speech-language services to the NJDOE for review. For assistance with correction of noncompliance, the district is referred to the sample report form for speech-language evaluations at www.state.nj.us/education/speced/forms.

Administrative

<u>**Recommendation 1:**</u> The district does not have internal control policies and procedures to prevent contracting with disbarred vendors.

Citation: EDGAR, PART 80--Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments, Section 36, Procurement.

Recommended Action: The district should update internal control policies to prevent potential errors from occurring.

<u>Recommendation 2</u>: The district does not have formal written policies for requesting reimbursement from the Electronic Web Enabled Grant system; however, the district's practice for requesting reimbursement was verified through questions concerning the district's internal controls.

Citation: EDGAR, PART 80--Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments, Section 20, Standards for financial management systems.

Recommended Action: The district must have a formal board policy concerning the reimbursement of grant funds and should submit this to the NJDOE for review.

Recommendation 3: Under the New Jersey's Public School Contracts Law (PSCL), districts are not required to advertise for bids or competitively contract the provision of goods and services by vendors on the state contract list. In accordance with the PSCL [N.J.S.A. 18A:18A:10(a)], a board of education may place its order with a vendor offering the lowest price, including delivery charges, that best meets the requirements of the board of education. However, for all federal funds, districts need to review 34 CFR Part 80.36 on procurement requirements. The federal procurement regulations under this section do not include all the exemptions allowed under the PSCL and therefore, it is our understanding these federal regulations require districts to competitively contract or bid all goods and services over the bid

threshold, whether exempt under PSCL or not. The federal rules do include provisions for procurement by "noncompetitive proposals," but only under certain circumstances.

The NJDOE has requested clarification from the federal government regarding vendors on the state contract list and we are still waiting for a definitive response. It is the department's position and recommendation to the federal government that such contracts do not need any additional documentation beyond the statutory requirement under N.J.S.A. 18A:18A:10(c) that prior to placing orders, the board of education shall document with specificity that the goods and services selected best meet the requirements of the board of education. LFN 2010-3 issued January 15, 2010 for more information on competitive contracting for districts and professional development services.

Citation: EDGAR, PART 80--Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments, Section 36, Procurement.

Recommended Action: The district should review 34 CFR Part 80.36 and use open and competitive procedures where at all possible. The district should also analyze and include documentation in its files that demonstrates the district ensured the costs were reasonable.

The NJDOE thanks you for your time and cooperation during the monitoring visit and looks forward to a successful resolution of all findings and implementation of all recommendations contained in this report.

If you have any questions, please contact Anthony Hearn via phone at (609) 633-2492 or via email at anthony.hearn@doe.state.nj.us.