

State of New Jersey DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PO BOX 500 TRENTON, NJ 08625-0500

CHRIS CHRISTIE Governor KIM GUADAGNO

Lt Governor

August 28, 2012

CHRISTOPHER D. CERF Commissioner

Dr. David Healy, Superintendent Matawan-Aberdeen Regional School District 1 Crest Way Aberdeen, NJ 07747

Dear Dr. Healy:

The New Jersey Department of Education has completed a review of funds received and disbursed from one or more federal programs by <u>Matawan-Aberdeen Regional 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 May 8, 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," Matawan-Aberdeen Regional 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 Patricia Lagarenne at (609) 633-3643.

Sincerely,

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

RJC/PL/dk:Matawan-Aberdeen Reg. BOE Cover Letter/ Ed Jobs Enclosures

Distribution List

Christopher D. Cerf Bari Erlichson David Corso Barbara Gantwerk Justin Barra Karen Campbell Peggy McDonald Kimberly Murray Patricia Lagarenne Joseph Passiment Stephen M. Eells

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

MATAWAN-ABERDEEN REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

1 CREST WAY ABERDEEN, NJ 07747 PHONE: (732) 705-4000



EDUCATION JOBS CONSOLIDATED MONITORING REPORT AUGUST 2012

District:Matawan-Aberdeen Regional School DistrictCounty:MonmouthDates On-Site:May 9, 10 and 11, 2012Case #:Ed Jobs-051-11

FUNDING SOURCES

Program		Funding Award
Ed Jobs		\$ 443,803
Title I		356,656
Title IIA		93,629
Title III		20,704
IDEA Basic		830,969
IDEA Preschool		22,575
	Total Funds:	<u>\$ 1,768,336</u>

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 Matawan-Aberdeen Regional School District 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; and IDEA for the period July 1, 2010 through May 8, 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 Programs (IEP), a review of student class and related service schedules, interviews of child study team members, speech-language specialist and an interview of the program administrator regarding the 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 and IDEA from July 1, 2010 through May 8, 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 funding its programs in its Title I and non-Title schools and will revamp their programs to provide supplemental instructional programs that do not supplant federal funds.

IDEA Projects

The majority of funds are being used for one to one and instructional aides. Funds are also being used for professional development, child study team supplies, teaching supplies for special education staff and independent evaluations. Although the grant included funds for consultation services for nonpublic school students, there was no evidence that funds were used for this purpose.

DETAILED FINDINGS AND RECOMMEDATIONS

Ed Jobs

There were no findings for Ed Jobs.

<u>Title I</u>

Finding 1: Time and activity sheets for employees charged to the NCLB and the IDEA grants should include the signature of the immediate supervisor and contact information that includes what staff is doing, when they are doing it and where they are doing it.

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 administration must verify the time and activity of staff charged to the grants.

Finding 2: The district used its Title I, Part A funds to pay for the salaries of autism/special education aides. Since these aides may service non-Title I students and are mandated under other programs, the use of federal funds for these salaries supplants state/local funds. The district must use state/local funds for mandated programs.

Citation: OMB Circular A-87, Attachment B, Section 8(h): *Cost Principles for State, Local and Indian Tribal Governments*. NCLB §1120A(b): *Fiscal Requirements (Federal Funds to Supplement, Not Supplant, Non-Federal Funds)*.

Required Action: The district must reverse the charges for these unallowable activities and allocate state/local funds, rather than Title I funds, to support these expenditures. The district must submit a revised list of staff being funded and grants funding the positions (and reserves if they are being used) to the NJDOE for review.

Finding 3: The district used its Title I, Part A funds to pay for Mentoring Our Students Together, community teacher program salaries, Child Assault Prevention program, Reading Eggs and Study Island which are not just for Title I students/schools but benefit other students. The district must use state/local funds for expenses that benefit the entire student population.

Citation: NCLB §1120A(b): *Fiscal Requirements (Federal Funds to Supplement, Not Supplant, Non-Federal Funds).*

Required Action: The district must reverse the charges for these unallowable activities and allocate state/local funds, rather than Title I funds, to support these expenditures. The district must provide a list of items that it has identified as supplanting to the NJDOE for review.

Finding 4: The district did not inform parents of its Title I program selection criteria, why the child met the selection criteria and the course of action that the school has determined to remediate the child. All of these elements must be included in the notification letter to parents about their child's participation in the Title I program. The letter referred to the basic skills program rather than a distinguishable, supplemental Title I program.

Citation: ESEA §1118(c): Parental Involvement (Policy Involvement).

Required Action: The district must include in its parental notification letters the multiple measures used to identify the students and the reason for identification, as well as clearly defined exit criteria. The district notification letters must be revised to include more specificity regarding entrance and exit criteria. It is recommended the letter also include the Title I Annual meeting date.

Finding 5: The district could not provide evidence of convening its annual Title I parent meeting for Cliffwood Elementary School.

Citation: *NCLB* §1118(c)(1): *Parental Involvement (Policy Involvement).*

Required Action: The district must convene its FY 2012-2013 annual Title I meeting for the parents/guardians of its identified Title I students and submit evidence of said meeting to the NJDOE for review (invitational letter/flyer, agenda, meeting minutes, and sign in sheets must be obtained).

Finding 6: The district could not provide evidence of a mechanism used to distribute its written parental involvement policy.

Citation: NCLB §1118 (a)(2) and (b)(1): *Parental Involvement (Local Educational Agency Policy).*

Required Action: The distribution date of the parental involvement policy must be consistent with the distribution date reflected in the NCLB Consolidated Application on

the Electronic Web Enabled Grant (EWEG) system. The district must submit documented evidence to the NJDOE as to how and when its written parental involvement policy was distributed. The Parental Involvement Title I, Part A Non-Regulatory Guidance which is located at: http://www2.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/parentinvguid.pdf.

Finding 7: The school did not develop a school-level Title I parental involvement policy in conjunction with parents. (It is noted the district-level parental involvement policy was already developed.)

Citation: NCLB §1118(b): *School Parental Involvement Policy*, United States Department of Education's Title I, Part A Parental Involvement Non-Regulatory Guidance (Item D-1).

Required Action: The district should provide technical assistance to its schools in the development of school-level parental involvement policies and ensure that its schools work with their stakeholder groups to develop a school-level parental involvement policy. For FY 2012-2013, each Title I school must distribute a school-level parental involvement policy to parents of students and send a copy to the NJDOE for review. The distribution date must be consistent with the dates reflected in the NCLB Consolidated Application on the EWEG system. The school-level parental involvement policies must be posted to the district's website. The Parental Involvement Title I, Part A Non-Regulatory Guidance which located at: is http://www2.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/parentinvguid.pdf.

Finding 8: For the 2011-2012 school year, there is no evidence that the Title I parent compact was distributed to all Title I parents. (It is noted the compact was posted on the district website and distributed at back-to-school night). A school-level compact was not developed as required.

Citation: NCLB §1118(d): Parental Involvement (Shared Responsibilities for High Student Academic Achievement).

Required Action: The administration of the schools must work with its stakeholder group to develop a school-level parent compact for each of its Title I schools. The school must distribute the compact to parents of all students and submit a copy of the school-parent compact to the NJDOE for review

Finding 9: Supplemental Educational Services (SES) funds were used for transportation for SES students. This is not an allowable Title I expense. Parents were not given the option to choose an SES provider. The SES parent letter, enrollment form, list of approved SES providers and SES historical data were not posted on the district website.

Citation: NCLB §1116(e): Academic Assessment and Local Educational Agency and School Improvement (Supplemental Educational Services).

Required Action: The district must ensure that, if the district is required to offer SES in the 2012-13 school year, or if there are additional SES funds available in the 2011-2012

school year, the SES notification letter will be revised to meet the statutory and regulatory requirements. The district must submit a copy of the revised letter to the NJDOE for review prior to distribution. The district's website must be updated to include the required SES information including SES district data and available providers. The district must reverse the SES transportation charges and allocate state/local funds, rather than Title I funds, to support these expenditures.

Finding 10: The district could not provide evidence that it notified all nonpublic schools of students whose residence of record is in the public school attendance area of equitable Title I services.

Citation: ESEA §1120 Participation of Children Enrolled In Private School.

Required Action: The district must notify nonpublic schools, located both within and outside the district's boundaries that enroll resident students of the opportunity for their eligible students to receive equitable services. The district must submit a copy of the letters and documentation of mailings, refusal forms and affirmation of consultations to the NJDOE. Information on equitable participation of nonpublic students for Title I can NJDOE website which located be found on the is at: http://www.state.nj.us/education/title1/leg/policy/equitable.shtml.

<u>Title II</u>

Finding 11: A review of the district's general ledger records disclosed that the district incorrectly used program code 265 to record Title IIA expenditures. The Uniform Chart of Accounts for New Jersey School Districts (Chart of Accounts), as required by N.J.A.C. 6A:23-2.2(g) designates program codes 270-279 to record Title IIA expenditures. The use of distinct fund/program codes provides an audit trail of amounts expended for each project.

Citation: N.J.A.C. 6A:23-2.2(g).

Required Action: To facilitate an effective audit, the district must (1) revise its coding system to conform to the department's prescribed Chart of Accounts to ensure the proper recording of all financial transactions and (2) ensure compliance with EDGAR 34 CAFR, Part §80.20(b)(2) and §76.730(e).

Finding 12: The district employed a professional who has a teacher's aide certificate from New York. There is no reciprocity in New Jersey. The person does not have 60 credits nor has she been certified in New Jersey.

Citation: NCLB §1119: Qualifications for Teachers and Paraprofessionals.

Required Action: The district must verify the highly qualified status of the staff teaching in the after school program and/or define their roles in conjunction with section 1119(g) for duties as a paraprofessional.

Finding 13: On August 22, 2011, the district held professional development for bullying and paid for the consultant out of the FY 2011-2012 Title IIA funds which was before the project period started on September 1, 2011. There is no evidence of carryover or if the district used carryover funds. The purchase orders for stipends for this professional development were not supplied. Therefore, this expense cannot be allowed and the district should make appropriate fiscal corrections.

Citation: EDGAR 34 CAFR, Part §76.730(e).

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

Title III

Finding 14: A review of the district's general ledger disclosed that the district incorrectly used program code 275 to record Title III expenditures. The Chart of Accounts, as required by N.J.A.C. 6A:23-2.2(g) designates program codes 241-245 to record Title III expenditures. The use of distinct fund/program codes provides an audit trail of amounts expended for each project.

Citation: N.J.A.C. 6A:23-2.2(g).

Required Action: To facilitate an effective audit, the district must (1) revise its coding system to conform to the department's prescribed Chart of Accounts to ensure the proper recording of all financial transactions and (2) ensure compliance with EDGAR 34 CAFR, Part §80.20(b)(2) and §76.730(e).

IDEA

Finding 15: A review of the purchase order to Dell Marketing for iPads in the amount of \$1,881.60, revealed the invoice was charged to the incorrect account number. According to the Chart of Accounts, the function code 100 is reserved for instructional activities and function code 200 is reserved for activities which facilitate and enhance instruction. The purchase of the iPads was for the use of the child study team members to assist with development of curriculum for the IDEA program, and thus, should be charged to account number 20-250-200-600-000.

Citation: 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 ensure that each expenditure is posted according to the nature and use of the product purchased.

Finding 16: The district did not demonstrate that it met the standards of Maintenance of Effort figures as shown in the IDEA grant in the EWEG system.

Citation: Maintenance of Effort - Funds provided to an LEA under Part B of the Act must not be used to reduce the level of expenditures for the education of children with disabilities made by the LEA from local funds below the level of those expenditures for the preceding fiscal year. 34 CFR §300.203 (a-b).

Required Action: The school must provide all the information on the EWEG system and provide all supporting information to the NJDOE for review.

Finding 17: 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 18: The amount appropriated for the IDEA grant in the district's accounting records did not match the amount which was budgeted in EWEG. Additionally, the amount allocated in EWEG for the nonpublic funding was not reflected in the district appropriation.

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 implement a process to ensure that amounts awarded through a grant are recorded appropriately in the financial records.

Finding 19: The district did not consistently provide parents of students referred for and/or eligible for speech-language services notice of a meeting for eligibility and IEP team meetings. Additionally, the district's notices of meetings for students evaluated for and/or eligible for special education and related services and referred and/or eligible for speech-language services did not consistently inform the parent of all intended purposes of the meeting when a meeting was conducted for more than one purpose. Noncompliance was due to a lack of 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 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 speech-language specialists and child study team members regarding the procedures for implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. Additionally, a monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to review copies of notices of eligibility and IEP meetings that occurred between June 2012 and September 2012.

Finding 20: The district did not consistently provide parents written notice that contains all required components within 15 calendar days following the eligibility determination meeting for speech-language services. Noncompliance was due to a lack of implementation of district procedures.

Citation: 20 U.S.C. §1414(b)(1)(c)(4)(A); 34 CFR §300.304(a)(4); and 34 CFR §300.305(a) and N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.3(f) and 2.3(g)1-7.

Required Action: The district must ensure parents are provided written notice of a meeting that contains all required components within 15 calendar days of the meeting. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the district must provide training for speech-language specialists regarding the procedures for implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. In addition, a monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to review copies of notices of eligibility meetings that occurred between June 2012 and September 2012.

Finding 21: The district did not consistently provide copies of evaluation report(s) to parents at least 10 days prior to meeting(s) for determination of initial eligibility or determination of continued eligibility for speech-language services. Noncompliance was due to a 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 the provision of copies of evaluation report(s) to parents not less than 10 days prior to the determination of eligibility. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the district must provide training for speech-language specialists regarding the procedures for implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. In addition, a monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to review documentation of provision of evaluation report(s) to parents for students evaluated for speech-language services between June 2012 and September 2012.

Finding 22: The district did not consistently ensure that the required participants were in attendance at reevaluation planning and eligibility/IEP meetings for students eligible for special education and related services. Noncompliance was due to a lack of implementation of district procedures.

Citation: N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.3(k)1(i-vii); 20 U.S.C. §1414(d)(1)(B); and 34 CFR §300.321(a).

Required Action: The district must ensure that IEP team meetings are conducted with required participants and that documentation of attendance, or documentation of parental consent to excuse a team member from participation, is maintained in students' files. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the district must conduct training for child study team members regarding the procedures. To demonstrate implementation of the procedures, a monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to review the IEP participants' signature page, or documentation of parental consent to excuse a team

member from participation, from reevaluation and annual review meetings for students eligible for special education and related services, including students in out-of-district placements, whose IEP team meetings were conducted between September 2012 and December 2012.

Finding 23: The district did not consistently document in the IEPs of students removed from the general education setting for more than 20 percent of the school day, including students placed in separate settings, consideration of placement in the least restrictive environment. Specifically, IEPs did not consistently include the supplementary aids and services considered and for those students placed in separate settings, the activities to transition the student to a less restrictive environment. Noncompliance was due to a lack of implementation of district procedures.

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

Required Action: The district must ensure that when determining the educational placement of a child with a disability, the IEP team considers the general education class first and that all required decisions regarding the placement are documented in the IEP for each student removed from general education for more than 20 percent of the school day. The district must also ensure that for students placed in separate settings, the IEP team identifies activities to transition the student to a less restrictive environment and document them in each IEP. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the district must conduct training for child study team members regarding the district's procedures. To demonstrate that the district has corrected the individual instances of noncompliance, the district must conduct annual review meetings and revise the IEPs for specific students with IEPs that were identified as noncompliant. A monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to review the revised IEPs and IEPs for students whose annual review meetings were conducted between June 2012 and September 2012. Names of the students whose IEPs were identified as noncompliant will be provided to the district by the monitor.

Finding 24: The district did not consistently conduct meetings within 20 calendar days of receipt of a written request for a child study team or speech-language evaluation to determine if an evaluation was warranted. Additionally, when meetings did occur, all required participants did not attend. Noncompliance was due to a lack of implementation of district procedures.

Citation: N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.5(b)6; 3.3(e) and 3.6(b).

Required Action: The district must ensure identification meetings are conducted within 20 calendar days of receipt of a written request for evaluation and required participants are in attendance. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the district must conduct training for speech-language specialists and child study team members regarding the district's procedures. To demonstrate implementation of the procedures, a monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to review the dated initial request for evaluation for students referred for special education and related services and for students referred for special education and related services from the resulting meetings conducted between June 2012 and September 2012.

Finding 25: The district did not consistently conduct vision/hearing screenings and health/medical summaries for every preschool and school-age student referred to the child study team for evaluation. Noncompliance was due to a lack of consistent implementation of district procedures.

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

Required 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, a monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to review the health summaries, including the vision and hearing screenings, for students referred to the child study team between June 2012 and September 2012.

Finding 26: The district did not consistently conduct multidisciplinary initial evaluations for students referred for speech-language services by obtaining an educational impact statement from the classroom teacher. Noncompliance was due to a 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 a 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, a monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to review initial evaluation reports for students referred for speech-language services whose eligibility meetings were held between June 2012 and October 2012 to the NJDOE for review.

Finding 27: 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. Specifically, informal measures were not consistently conducted. Noncompliance was due to a 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 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 regarding the district's procedures for implementing the requirements in the

citation listed above. In addition, a monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to review evaluation reports developed between June 2012 and September 2012 for students referred for special education and related services. For assistance with correction of noncompliance, the district is referred to the sample report form for speech-language evaluations which is located at: <u>www.state.nj.us/education/speced/forms</u>.

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 errors from potentially occurring.

Recommendation 2: 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. See 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 Patricia Lagarenne at (609) 633-3643 or via email at patricia.lagarenne@doe.state.nj.us.