### NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RISK ASSESSMENT PLAN

**Introduction**

The law requires the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) to monitor the activities of sub-recipients to ensure that Local Education Agencies (LEAs) federal grant awards are being used for authorized purposes, in compliance with federal statues, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the sub-award; and that the sub-award performance goals are achieved.

In addition, the Uniform Grant Guidance describes the **requirements** of a state pass-through entity to complete a ***risk assessment*** on all of their LEAs. This guidance allows NDE the authority to develop a risk assessment process and methodology to meet the state’s needs, expectations, and

NDE’s *comfort levels.* In addition, it allows NDE the flexibility to develop grant specific risk assessments to meet the needs of our various grants. Uniform Grant Guidance does not require NDE to publish its methodology; however, ***we are required to annually publish the process and the results* of such assessments for each LEA.**

## The Process

NDE utilizes a series of data sets that are either provided to LEAs directly, such as the Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBAC) scores and other data sets that are already of public knowledge, and through the Nevada Accountability Portal, such as graduation rates, school index scores, chronic absenteeism, audit results…

NDE created the specific risk indicators and criteria for the risk assessment, and annually performs the risk assessment that provides a reasonable basis for the results based on our assessment objectives and federal requirements. NDE believes that the evidence obtained from the data and

indicators provide reasonable conclusions to determine LEA risk assessments levels.

## Understanding the Risk Indicators

Five categories consisting of 24 indictors of risk were identified that may adversely affect the ability and capacity of an LEA to achieve its objectives. The categories include, (1) Audit Performance, (2) Academic Achievement,

1. Reporting Timeliness and Accuracy, (4) Grant Management and (5) District and School Strategic Planning.

 **Category 1: Audit/Monitoring Performance**

**1. Outcomes of Federal and State Fiscal Audits (as available) -** In conjunction with the results of monitoring activities, this indicator collectively identifies both fiscal, programmatic, and documented deficiencies which could result in an increase or decrease in the level of risk.

**2. Single Audit Submissions, Evaluation and Findings (OMB Super Circular) results (as appropriate) A. Submittal B. Evaluation C. Findings**

 - An LEA that expends $750,000 or more in federal funds in one year is required to provide an organizational-wide financial statement through a Single Audit. This indicator identifies the LEA’s internal controls adequacy and appropriate spending of federal funds

**3. Title I Comparability Audits-** Title I comparability audits are conducted to ensure that LEAs are either exempt from Title I comparability requirements or are meeting Title I goals as outlined by federal reporting standards. LEA compliance issues can be an indicator of elevated risk.

**Category 2: Academic Achievement**

**4. CSI/TSI/ATSI Schools –** Schools that are designated as the lowest performing schools in the state, (lowest 5%) and/or schools with a 67% or less graduation rate. This indicator measures an LEA’s capacity and/or ability to effectively address the urgent needs of schools and students that are performing significantly below standards.

**5. WIDA Access AGP (English Language Assessment) -** The percentage of English Learners meeting their adequate growth percentile targets on the WIDA assessment is the ELPA measure in the NSPF. The federal law does not require this measure to be disaggregated; however, schools achieving in the lowest point earning category on the point attribution table for this indicator will be flagged for the EL subgroup only.

**6. Index Scores -** An index score range of 50 or above identifies an

adequate school that has met or exceeded the state’s standard for performance (3, 4, or 5 star rated school). The all-students group has, at a minimum, met expectations for academic achievement or growth. Subgroups meet expectations for academic achievement or growth with little exception; however, no group is far below

standard. This indicator measures an LEA’s risk to effectively address the urgent needs of schools and students that are performing significantly below standards.

**7. College and Career Readiness-** This indicator measures the LEAs success in increasing the student participation in Advanced Placement (AP) courses leading to the number and percentage of students receiving an advanced or CCR diploma.

**8. Chronic Absenteeism –** Chronic absenteeism is defined as students missing 10% or more of a school year or students at least 10 days. This indicator identifies the LEA and/or school capacity and abilities to implement successful interventions to sustain student populations. Research shows that for student achievement, what matters is the number of days a student misses, not the reason. It has strong relationships with achievement and graduation rates and is a key indicator for student success.

**9. Graduation Rates –** This indicator measures the percentage of students in an adjusted cohort who graduate within 4 or 5 years with a state recognized regular high school diploma. This indicates the LEAs implementation of differentiated supports and resources to meet the needs of all students. This factor serves as a key indicator of a LEA’s success in advancing their student population and helping those students receive their high school diploma within a specified time.

**10. Equitable Service/Consultation Process-** Stakeholders and Private Schools/Equitable Service - During the design and development of an LEA Federal grant applications, the LEA must engage in consultation with stakeholders in the area served by the LEA. LEAs must also consult with private school officials to identify the needs of eligible private school students, teachers and administrators consistent with the requirements in ESSA. The lack of a well-coordinated consultation process can be an indicator of risk that the districts highest priorities are not aligned with the community or private schools in the LEA service area.

**Category 3: Reporting Timeliness and Accuracy**

**11. Grant Closeout Reports-** Pursuant to the OMB Uniform Grants Guidance 200.343, the grant recipient must submit all financial, performance, and other reports required under the grant within 90 days after the grant award expires or is terminated. The lack of timely and accurate submissions of these reports may be an indicator of elevated risk.

**12. Grant Funding Application Submissions-**LEAs are required by Uniform Grant Guidance to have their Funding Applications approved (e-Page) prior to obligating and spending federal funds. The lack of timely and accurate submissions of the funding application, to include acknowledgment or acceptance of the assurances may be an indicator of risk. Unclear or vague objectives, resources that are not clearly aligned to prioritized needs or grant objectives can be risk factors that interfere with the effective implementation of the grant project. If ambiguity exists within the project objectives or how effectiveness of funds will be measured, the risk for using grant funds for expenditures outside the scope of the project may increase.

**13. General Statement of Assurance (GSA)-** The GSA is required to provide assurances annually to guarantee that recipients will abide by regulations and that recipients will implement certain policies, procedures, and practices to avoid risk to significant audit findings, investigations, and determinations of non-compliance.

**14. Stale Claims – Number of stale claims at the end of the previous State Fiscal Year (SFY) and percent of active awards with stale claims for each LEA-**The end of the previous State Fiscal Year (SFY) and percent of active awards with stale claims for each LEA-Stale claims are those whereby an LEA did not meet the established deadline for SFY reporting reimbursement for all expenditures that occurred on, or before, June 30 for each open sub-award. Stale claims risk reimbursements being delayed and/or unable to be reimbursed through the original funding source, if the funding has expired and is no longer available. This could result in federal or state funds being reverted. In addition, adhering to the SFY closure requirements is necessary to keep NDE in compliance with state regulations.

**15. Grant Programmatic Desktop Monitoring Submissions. Percentage of non-compliance monitoring items-**Desktop programmatic monitoring submissions, required of LEA sub-recipients, need to be abided by as outlined in ESSA. Compliance indicators within the report submissions help to demonstrate evidence and compliance with Federal law. Late submissions, and/or submissions that do not meet the compliance indicators for the particular item; can be elevated risk factors that interfere with effective implementation of the grant.

**Category 4: Grant Management**

**16. Carryover of Grant Funds-**Higher amounts of carryover indicate an elevated potential for risk for reasons including lack of planning, spending, inexperienced grant managers, and commitment to follow through with grant funded goals and objectives.

**17. Timeliness and Accuracy of Reimbursement Request Submissions (Per program)-** Due dates for approved reimbursement requests, as outlined in the General Statement of Assurances (GSA), should be submitted in a timely manner, and the information contained within should be accurate, complete, and based on verifiable documentation. Per Uniform Grant Guidance, LEAs and subrecipients must assure proper cash management. High carryover levels are considered elevated risks.

**18. Amendment Requests-**A higher number of LEA or subrecipient initiated amendments submitted late or during throughout the performance period may be an indicator of a LEA’s or subrecipient’s lack of ability to plan and align its grant funding with well-established high priority needs. A higher number of amendment requests indicate an elevated potential risk.

**19. New Personnel and New or Substantially Changed Systems-**Per Uniform Grant (2 CFR 200.331(b)), there is an elevated risk associated with LEAs or subrecipients who have new personnel in key positions and new or substantially changed systems. These changes can be an indicator for elevated risk. A LEAs District Performance Plan (DPP) should be directly aligned with specific evidence-based interventions needed to implement meaningful actions targeted to improve the lowest- performing schools and schools with underperforming student populations. The adequacy of the DPP and use of federal funds for activities that do not address the greatest plan prioritized needs is an indicator of elevated risk.

**Category 5: District and School Strategic Planning**

**20. LEA Approved District Performance Plan (DPP) Submission-**Each LEA receiving formula funds under ESSA (e.g. Title 1, Title II, Title III and Title IV) must develop an LEA plan that outlines intervention strategies and priorities for the use of those funds in improving education, particularly in schools serving low-income and underserved students. LEAs must develop these plans in consultation with stakeholders (see ESSA 1112(a) (1) (A), and plans must be approved by SEA (see ESSA 1112(a) (3). A LEAs DPP must align to SEA ESSA plan and strategies and with their LEA’s vison and mission. The adequacy of the DPP and use of federal funds for activities that do not address the greatest plan prioritized needs is an indicator of elevated risk.

**21. LEA Approved School Performance Plan (SPP) submissions-**Each school receiving formula funds under ESSA (e.g. Title I, Title II, Title III and Title IV) operating a Schoolwide Program (SWP) with the involvement of stakeholders, must develop a comprehensive written SPP to address student needs and improve teaching and learning throughout the school for LEA approval and SEA monitoring. See ESSA 1114 (b) (6), 1114 (b) (7) (A) (i), (iii) and NRS 385A.650). SPP submissions must include plan requirements as prescribed by Chapter 501, of State regulation Assembly Bill-AB7. SPPs should align with their LEA’s strategic vision/mission and to SEA ESSA plan priorities and strategies. LEAs who receive SEA notification that SPP submissions do not meet requirements are out of compliance, which is an elevated indicator or risk.

**22. Evidence-Based Levels – DPP-**There are four evidence-based levels. The higher the level, the higher the potential for statistically significant causal impacts for student improvements. Level 1 – Strong evidence, experimental studies; Level 2 – moderate evidence, quasi-experimental designs; Level 3 – promising evidence, correlational studies; Level 4 – demonstrates rationale. Based on the LEAs DPP and comprehensive needs assessment, this risk indicator evaluates the interventions, student improvement outcomes and percent of interventions by evidence-based levels. LEAs using all or mostly Level 4 interventions may be a potential risk.

**23. Evidence-Based Levels – SPP-**There are four evidence-based levels. The higher the level, the higher the potential for statistically significant causal impacts for student improvements. Level 1 – Strong evidence, experimental studies; Level 2 – moderate evidence, quasi-experimental designs; Level 3 – promising evidence, correlational studies; Level 4 – demonstrates rationale. Based on the LEAs SPP and comprehensive needs assessment, this risk indicator evaluates the interventions, student improvement outcomes and percent of interventions by evidence-based levels. LEAs using all or mostly Level 4 interventions may be a potential risk.

**24. Equitable Distribution of Teachers (EDT): Plan to Address Equity Gaps-**LEAs are responsible for providing evidence that the LEA ensures that low income and minority students are not taught at higher rates when compared to other students by inexperienced, ineffective, or out-of-field teachers [ESEA: Sec. 1111(g)(1)(B), 1112(b)(2), 2101(d)(2)(E)]

ESSA also requires LEAs accepting Title I-A funds submit plans to address any such disparities. The EDT Plan should provide/describe evidence that the LEA has developed and implemented an Equity Action Plan to monitor and continually improve implementation of equity interventions.

LEAs without an effective Equitable Distribution of Teachers Plan in place to address equity gaps are, either directly or indirectly, not addressing achievement gaps. The absence of an effective EDT Plan may indicate risk as follows:

• The lack of evidence to indicate that funds are prioritized, per the purpose of the Title programs, to build instructional excellence in schools.

• The lack of evidence to indicate the use of effective strategies to ensure that all students meet proficiency on the State academic achievement standards and state academic assessments.

**NDE Risk Assessment Scoring System**

*Note: The NDE scoring system is designed after the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) Grants Management Division 2018 fully implemented Risk Assessment process.*

NDE developed 24 risk indicators grouped into the five categories listed below. Based on these indicators, NDE prepared a comprehensive annual Risk Assessment which evaluates and ***scores*** the programmatic performance and financial stability of all LEAs. *Composite scores* for each of the five categories are *combined into a single score and percentage*.

## Weighted Risk Indicator Scoring System

## Scoring Rubrics were developed for each individual risk indicator. Seventeen (17) of the risk indicators are scored using 0 (least risk) to 3 (high risk).

Nine (9) of the risk indicators are scored “double”, 0 to 6 points. This combination of fiscal and programmatic indicators represents the most pivotal components which must be addressed to eliminate federal reversions, substantially reduce carryover funds and improve academic achievement.

## Scoring Methodology

* 1. An overall Risk Level and Risk Score are given in percentage and points for each LEA. Points are awarded from a *maximum of 99*. It is

important to note that all risk indicators are scored “as applicable”. The indicators that do not apply to a particular LEA are subtracted from the total. The *lower* number of points assigned to each LEA per category, *the lower the risk percentage score*.

* 1. Example, if an LEA had a score of 25, their Risk Score would be 25% (25/99), resulting in being designated as a **“Low Risk”.**
	2. These Risk calculations generate a Risk Percentage and a designated Risk Level of ***Low*, *Medium*,** or ***High***.
	3. Each category of risk indicators also includes a rubric with the methodology and metrics NDE used in scoring by indicators and category.

## Risk Assessment Results Example

**Risk Level** **Risk Score**

 Low Risk Scores between 1-29%

 Medium Risk Scores between 30-46%

 *High Risk* Scores above *47%*

**YOUR RISK ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

**Points: 25 Max points: 99 Risk level: Low Risk score: 25%**

**Risk Indicators weighted scoring by category**

**Category** **1 – Audit Performance – 18 points (18%)**

* 1. Outcomes of Federal and State Fiscal Audits (as available).

*Findings, Evaluation and Material Findings-* ***6 points***

* 1. *Single Audit (OMB Super Circular) Results -* ***6 points***
	2. *Title I Comparability Audits -* ***6 points***

##  Category 2 – Academic Achievement – 27 points (27%)

1. CSI/TSI/ATSI Schools – 3 points
2. WIDA Access AGP (English Language Assessment) – 3 points
3. *Index Scores –* ***6 points***
4. College and Career Readiness – 3 points
5. *Chronic Absenteeism –* ***6 points***
6. Graduation Rate – 3 points
7. Equitable Service/Consultation Process – 3 points

##  Category 3 – Reporting Timeliness and Accuracy - 18 points (18%)

1. Federal Grant Closeout Reports – 3 points
2. Federal Grant Funding Applications Submissions – 3 points
3. General Statement of Assurance (GSA) – 3 points
4. *Stale Claims –* ***6 points***
5. Federal Grant Desktop Monitoring – 3 points

##

##  Category 4 – Grant Management – 18 points (18%)

1. *Carryover of Federal Grant Funds –* ***6 points***
2. Timeliness and Accuracy of Reimbursement Request Submissions

– 3 points

1. Amendment Requests – 3 points
2. New Personnel and New or substantially Changed Systems – 3 points
3. Equitable Distribution of Teachers Plan – 3 points
4. Timeliness and Accuracy of Reimbursement Request Submissions

– 3 points

1. Amendment Requests – 3 points
2. New Personnel and New or substantially Changed Systems – 3 points
3. Equitable Distribution of Teachers Plan – 3 points

##  LEAs District Performance Plan (DPP)/ School Performance Plan (SPP)– 18 points (18%)

1. *LEAs DPP –* ***6 points***
2. *LEAs SPP –* ***6 points***
3. Evidence-based – DDP – 3 points
4. Evidence-based – SPP – 3 points

## Action Steps

**Tiered Monitoring Process and Procedures**

NDE’s monitoring process will leverage a collaborative, cross-program approach to provide support to districts. These supports will be designed to integrate programmatic and fiscal data to address areas in need of improvement. The monitoring process is designed to assess the degree to which program requirements are being fulfilled so the NDE can make recommendations when appropriate. In addition, it provides an opportunity for the NDE to provide technical assistance and guidance to LEAs in order to strengthen their program administration and improve the quality of programs and projects being implemented. As a pass- through agency for federal funds, NDE is required to conduct compliance reviews to ensure that subgrants of federal program funds to LEAs are used in accordance with the purposes of the authorizing statute (2 C.F.R.

 200.331). NDE will complete a yearly risk analysis for each LEA to determine their level of risk. LEAs will have an opportunity to receive guidance and technical assistance through the tiered monitoring process. From this process, the LEA will be informed of the risk score by notice of substantial compliance, request for clarification of information, or additional data as needed for review.

## Low Risk

* Desktop monitoring only on a 3-year cycle
* LEAs will have an opportunity to receive guidance and technical assistance.

## Medium Risk

* Letter from NDE specifically informing the LEA of indicators which do not meet the necessary standards to achieve substantial compliance
* LEA may receive targeted technical assistance
* Additional monitoring as deemed

## High Risk

* + Strategic, on-site monitoring (more than once if deemed necessary)
	+ High-level technical assistance
	+ Collaboratively designed and monitored Corrective Action Plan

**Appendix A**

### NDE Monitoring

***Title program specific* LEA *Monitoring programmatic* at-risk results should be included as risk indicators in the Risk Assessment process. Below are the *overarching* Title program programmatic requirements.**

**Overarching *Programmatic* Requirements.**

## Title I, Part A; Title I, Part D; Title II, Part A: Title III, Part A; Title IV, Part A; Title V, Part B.

**Monitoring Indicators**

**Acceptable LEA Evidences**

**LEA completes an annual comprehensive needs assessment.**

Provide evidence that each school completed an annual comprehensive needs assessment and evidence that the district considered these needs when prioritizing how funds will be

utilized.

**LEA maintains security that ensures all applicable technology, networks, passwords and student data is safe, secure and password protected.**

*On-site inspection* and verification of the LEA’s information technology security plan and/or Disaster Recovery Plan includes protection for

student privacy.

**Equitable Private School Consultation process exists and meetings between the LEA and private school officials occur:**

a. **Prior to the LEA making any decisions regarding the involvement in participating Title programs of eligible private school students,**

**teachers and families.**

b. **Throughout the implementation and assessment of the participating Title programs and services for private school students.**

Affirmation of Private School Consultation along with evidence of letters, phone logs, meeting agendas…to private schools documenting contact efforts. Also, interviews districts private schools.

**The LEA ensures that inventory controls are in place.**

**The LEA also ensures that private schools are offered the same monitoring and inventory controls for Federally owned property as public school sites.**

Provide up-to-date equipment inventory listing and *on-site inspections* for any equipment held at the public schools and private schools.

**LEAs maintains and retains all required records that fully show the amount of federal funds, how the LEA used the funds, the total costs of Federally supported projects, the share of costs provided from other sources, records to show compliance with program requirements, and any other records needed to facilitate an effective audit. The LEA must also take reasonable measures to safeguard and protect Personally Identifiable Information (PII).**

Provide evidence of a district records retention policy which states that all Federal Program records will be maintained for a minimum of three years from the expiration of the grant funds.

Provide evidence that required records are retained and easily accessible.

**LEA must ensure that site allocations are made in accordance with applicable statutory requirements. Federal notices are in place. Property and equipment are inventoried and monitored.**

Provide written policies and procedures for the following in accordance with Uniform Grant Guidance:

1. Financial Management System

**Personnel are verified.**

1. Cash Management System
2. Allowability of Costs
3. Procurement.
4. Conflict of Interest.
5. Method of Conducting Technical Evaluations of Proposals.
6. Travel
7. Property

**Maintenance of Effort and Comparability: Each LEA shall have either the combined fiscal effort per student or the aggregate expenditures of the LEA and the State with respect to the provision of free public education by the agency for the preceding fiscal year was not less than 90 percent of the combined fiscal year effort or aggregate expenditures for the second preceding fiscal year.**

**Each LEA shall use State and local funds in schools served under this part to provide services that, taken as a whole, are at least comparable to services in school that are not receiving funds under this part.**

Provide a written policy or procedure. In cases where Title I schools are not comparable, documentation showing adjustments to the allocation of resources that LEA made to ensure that Title I and non-Title I schools are comparable is required.

**Supplement not Supplant: The LEA must ensure that Federal program funds are not to supplement, not supplant State and local funds.**

Title I, Part A (only) provide written methodology documenting distribution of State and local funds showing evidence that methodology was implemented as submitted. All Federal programs provide evidence that funds were used to supplement only.

**Appendix B**

***Individual* Title Programs Programmatic Requirements.** There are additional risk indicators that may be unique to each Title program. Below is a breakout of each.

**Title 1, Part A – Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged Parent and Family engagement Plan was developed jointly with parents, agreed upon and disseminated to parents.**

**The LEA Parent and Family Engagement Plan that includes strategies for the inclusion of parents of private school children.**

Provide Parent and Family Engagement committee meeting sign-in sheets that clearly identify parents in attendance, to verify that their parent and Family Engagement Plans were developed jointly with and agreed on with parents. Provide Examples of how plans were disseminated. Provide evidence of Parent and Family Engagement Plan for the inclusion of parents of private school children. Provide strategies that were used to support private school parents and children.

**At the beginning of each school year, the LEA notifies the parents of *each student* about the right to request information regarding the professional qualifications of the student’s classroom teachers and professionals.**

**At the beginning of each school year, *parents* of participating students are informed that they have a right to request regular**

**meetings to help formulate suggestions and participate in the decisions made relating to the education of their children.**

Provide evidence of parents Right to Know letter verifying that they were informed and received timely notification if student has been assigned to or has been taught four or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who does not meet applicable state certification or licensure requirements at the grade level and subject area in which the teacher has been assigned.

Provide evidence verifying that Title I school informed parents of students receiving Title I services that they had a right to ask for regular meetings to help formulate suggestions and participate in the decisions made about the education of their children.

**LEA Title I committee selects a diverse group of members.**

Provide a list of names of committee members and their titles.

**Title I Targeted Assistance Programs Student Eligibility Criteria.**

Provide evidence that LEA has followed criteria for Targeted Assistance Program Student Eligibility.

**Application has been approved by NDE and includes budget, activities, equity plan, schoolwide programs and/or targeted assistance programs, services for homeless students, and collaboration to ensure foster care for the educational stability of children in foster care.**

Provide evidence that the LEA application has been implemented and covers each of these criteria.

 **Title I, Part A – Parent and Family Engagement**

**LEA ensures the Title I school Parent and Family Engagement Plan has been implemented and that each school has carried out the six requirements to build capacity for involvement.**

Provide agendas, sign-in sheets, minutes, notification of parent meetings and signed documents that verify implementation of Parent and Family Engagement.

**LEA ensures that an annual evaluation of the effectiveness of the parent and family Engagement Policy/Plan and activities have been completed for participating schools.**

**LEA should use the annual evaluation findings to help improve the Parent and family Engagement efforts.**

Provide evidence of the most recent evaluation form for the parent and family Engagement policy/Plan for each school in the district.

The evaluation *must* include the following:

1. Identifies barriers to greater participation, with particular attention to parents who are economically disadvantaged, are limited English proficiency, have limited literacy, or are of any racial or ethnic minority background.
2. Identifies the needs of parents and family members to assist with the learning of their children, including engaging with school personnel and teachers;
3. Identifies strategies to support successful school and family interactions.

Provide evidence of written documentation of how the

findings of the annual evaluation are used to design evidence-based strategies for more effective parent involvement, and to revise, if necessary, the parent and family engagement policies described in this section.

**Parents of students receiving Title I services receive information**

**about the schools’ Title I Program.**

**Parent notifications and information to the parents in a language that is understandable to the parents.**

**Title I school School-Parent Compact to be discussed and agree upon by the school, parent and the student. It should 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 and is jointly developed with parents for all children receiving Title I services.**

Provide evidence of School Annual Title I meeting agendas, sign-in sheets and minutes to verify that each Title I School does the following:

1. Conduct a School Annual Title I Meeting to inform parents of participating students about the school’s Title I program.
2. Provide a description and explanation of the curriculum in the use at the school.
3. Provide information about the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress.
4. Provide information about the achievement levels of the challenging State academic standards.

Provide examples of translated documents. Examples may include Parent Right to Know letter, timely notice letter, school parent compact, School Annual Title I meeting invitation, all correspondence to EL parents.

Provide evidence of the School- parent Compact that has been discussed and agreed upon by all stakeholders, to verify that each Title I school has developed a School-parent compact.

Provide documents that verify that parent provided input into how the funds set-aside for parent and Family Engagement were spent. (Meeting agenda, meeting minutes, sign-up sheets, surveys…).

**Title I, Part A – Paraprofessionals**

**LEA ensures that paraprofessionals are highly qualified.**

 Provide highly qualified documentation.

**The LEA provides professional development and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments.**

Provide professional Development Plan. Provide sign-in sheets, agendas, Individualized professional development plans, etc.

**Title I, Part A – Neglected**

**LEA provides evaluation for Neglected, Title I, Part D.**

Provide evidence of a process for ongoing monitoring of the program effectiveness using evaluation results from the curriculum model or instructional program in use. Examples may include assessments which are aligned to the curriculum and disaggregated data used to guide

instruction (charts, graphs, etc.)

 **LEA provides professional development opportunities for**

 **staff on Neglected, specific to Title I, Part A.**

 Provide sign-in sheets, agendas, and minutes of professional development

 opportunities specific to Title I, Part A.

 **Title I, Part A- 1003(a) School Improvement Grant**

 **Application has been approved by NDE to include budget, activities, and evaluation of all components.**

Provide evidence that the LEA application has been implemented

**Title I, Part C- Education of Migratory Children**

**Application has been approved by NDE to include budget, activities, inventory, required reports and evaluation of all components.**

Provide evidence that the LEA application has been implemented

**Title I, Part D – Delinquent Children and Youth**

**LEA provides instruction that is aligned with NDE academic standards and accountability system to delinquent children and youth.**

Provide the job description of the transition coordinator (if applicable). Provide policies and procedures, and samples of instruction materials that indicate students are held to the same standards and accountability system required of all students.

**Services provided to assist in the transition of delinquent children and youth back to the school or workforce environment.**

Provide policies and procedures that the transition of students to regular public-school programming or workforce situations is being conducted. Verify the appropriate use of 15%- 30% fund reservation. Examples may include a list of transition programs, students under age 20 receiving a diploma, and partnerships facilitating technical education and career education.

**LEA has a dropout prevention program that targets at-risk or delinquent children and youth back to the school or workforce.**

Provide documentation that the dropout prevention program has been shared with parents/guardians. Provide sign-in sheets and agendas of professional development regarding dropout prevention. Provide samples of the instructional materials used to facilitate dropout prevention.

**LEA has procedures for monitoring delinquent program funds.**

Provide job descriptions and list of employees paid with Part D Funds. Provide time records for all employees paid with Part D Funds. Provide a list of all equipment inventoried. Provide invoices, purchased orders, etc.

**LEA collects data on children and youth after they are released.**

Provide written procedures for student data collection which *must* include;

1. The number of children and youth returning to school.
2. A list of those students obtaining a regular HS diploma or its recognized equivalent.
3. A list of students that have attained employment after such children and youth are released.

**Procedures utilized to meet the needs of the delinquent students that have a disability, in order to meet an existing individualized Educational Program (IEP).**

Provide sample documentation of evidence of modifications. Provide records related to parent meetings regarding modifications. Provide evidence that the LEA application has been implemented.

**Application has been approved by NDE to include budget, activities, transitional plan, third party contracts/agreements, and evaluation of all components.**

Provide evidence that the LEA application has been implemented.

**Title II – Part A – Preparing, Training, and Recruiting High-Quality Teachers, Principals, and Other School Leader.**

**If applicable, describe how Class- Size Reduction needs are**

**determined.**

Provide the written methodology used to determine Class-Size

reduction.

**Professional development activities the LEA selects meet the purpose of Title II, Part A, by containing the following:**

1. **Increases student achievement consistent with the challenging NDE academic standards.**
2. **Improves the quality and effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other school leaders;**
3. **Increases the number of teachers, principals, and other school leaders who are effective in improving**

**student academic**

d) **Provides low-income and minority students greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders. Professional development activities meet the purpose of Title II, Part A by addressing the learning needs of all students, including children with disabilities, English learners and gifted and talented students.**

Provide documentation of professional development needs based on evidenced-based best practices.

Provide evidence of how data driven professional development is used to decrease the achievement gap between low and higher performing students.

Provide a list of teachers receiving incentives and type of incentives.

Provide evidence of how data driven professional development is used to meet the learning needs of children achievement in schools; and with disabilities, English learners, and gifted and talented students.

**The LEA provides meaningful consultation with teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, support personnel, parents, family, community partners and stakeholders.**

**The LEA consults with private schools within district boundaries to provide resources for professional development to the private school teachers if the private school chooses to participate.**

Provide documentation of specific Title II, Part A consultation criteria.

Provide sign-in sheets, agendas, and minutes of consultation including stakeholder representation.

**Application has been approved by NDE to include budget, activities, private school consolation, and evaluation of all components.**

Provide evidence that LEA application has been implemented.

**Title III, Part A – Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students**

**Title III funds are used as a supplement for programs for English Learners and immigrant children and youth and in no case to supplant.**

Provide expenditure reports, classroom schedules/rosters, invoices, purchase orders. Provide documentation that supports that Title III activities were used for supplemental activities and not to support a district’s general operating budget or program previously funded with local or other operating funds.

**LEA has identified English Learners for participation as required.**

Provide evidence of completed Home Language Usage Surveys and assistance to parents, who are completing the Home Language Usage Surveys have an understanding of the purpose of the Home Language usage Surveys.

Provide a verified list of eligible English Learners (EL).

Provide evidence of administering EL Screener to appropriate students (Language Minority Students, newly enrolled, etc.)

Provide a list of all K-12 students with student’s home language indicated.

**LEA annually assesses the English proficiency of all ELs.**

Provide:

1. Documentation of how many EL students were not assessed and the reason for not testing.
2. Evidence that all EL students, including those in other programs such as Special Education, are annually assessed.
3. Documentation that all EL parents are informed of the assessment testing requirements and results for all EL students.

**LEA ensures that the required language instruction educational program and the supplemental language instruction education programs focus on the development of English language proficiency and student academic attainment of NDE content standards.**

Provide:

1. District plan for implementation of NDE academic standards including the ELP standards.
2. The process of developing English Language Proficiency (ELP) content curriculum that integrates components of ELP standards.
3. Evidence of ELP standards being available to staff (Examples may include sign-in sheets from ELP training standards training).
4. Documentation of professional development related specifically to ELs that equipped educators with the skills necessary to implement the

required and supplemental LIEP.

5. Documentation of classroom observation feedback, from an administrator trained on ELP concepts, on how teachers

meet the needs of EL students.

**LEA ensures they provide effective professional development to classroom teachers (including teachers in classroom settings that are not the settings of language instruction educational programs), principals and other school leaders, administrators, and other school or community-based organizational personnel.**

Provide a professional development plan indicating how varying audiences are trained and sign-in sheets/agendas from the trainings.

**The LEA ensures that ELs are included in all NDE content and**

**ELP assessments.**

Provide evidence that all English Learners were tested

**Individual Learning Plans by the Language Proficiency and Assessment Committee have been created for all English Learners. All teachers serving English learners have received a copy of the student’s ILP and it is being implemented on a daily basis to increase English Proficiency.**

Provide:

1. Student ILP/LPAC Forms.
2. Signatures of Administrators, Classroom Teachers, ESOL Coordinator and others on the LPAC, if applicable.

**LEAs monitor students that meet the exit criteria.**

Provide:

1. List of former EL students currently being monitored.

Monitoring forms/documentation of students in monitoring.

**LEA has an effective means of parent outreach to EL parents (programs, activities, training, and family literacy). The district has evidence that EL parents are involved stakeholders.**

Provide evidence of how the LEA promotes parent, family, and community engagement in education of English Learners. Examples could include calendar of events, topics, and sign-in sheets.

**Application has been approved by NDE to include budget, activities, programs, parent and community engagement, and evaluation of all**

**components.**

Provide evidence that the LEA application has been implemented.

**Immigrant Children and Youth Grant**

**LEA shall use funds to pay for activities that provide enhanced instructional opportunities for immigrant children and youth.**

Provide documentation of chosen activities such as schedules, sign-in sheets, purchase orders (when applicable) from the list below:

1. Family literacy, parent and family outreach, and training activities designed to assist parents and families to become active participants in the education of their children.
2. Recruitment of, and support for, personnel, including teachers and paraprofessionals who have been specifically trained, or are being trained, to provide services to immigrant children and youth;
3. Provisions for tutorials, mentoring, and academic or career counseling for immigrant children and youth;
4. Identification, development and acquisition of curriculum materials, educational software, and technologies to be used in the program carried out with awarded funds;
5. Basic instructional services that are directly attributable to the presence of immigrant children and youth in the local education agency involved, including the payment of costs providing additional classroom supplies, costs of transportation, or such costs as are directly attributable to such additional basic instructional services;
6. Other instructional services that are designated to assist immigrant children and youth to achieve in elementary schools in the United States, such as programs of introduction to the educational system and civics education;

Activities, coordinated with community-based organizations, institutions of higher education, private sector entities with expertise in working with immigrants, to assist parents and families of immigrant children and youth by offering comprehensive community services.

**Title IV, Part A – Student Support and Enrichment**

**LEA shall develop its application through consultation with parents, teachers, private schools and other stakeholders with demonstrated expertise in programs and activities designed to meet the purpose of improving academic achievement and safety conditions of underperforming student and school populations.**

Provide evidence of dated meeting agendas, minutes, sign-in sheets, documentation of consultation with parents, teachers, principals, private schools, other school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel, students, community- based organizations, and local government representatives.

**LEA shall conduct a needs assessment plan that meets at a minimum, the three content areas of the Title IV, Part A program.**

Ensure the LEA has a needs assessment plan and that activities were selected from this plan that meet the targeted student populations.

**Application has been approved by NDE to include budget, activities, programs, consultation, stakeholder engagement and evaluation of the evidence-based measures of effectiveness.**

Provide evidence that the LEA application has been implemented.

**Supplement not supplant.**

Provide documentation that supports that Title I VA, Part A activities were used for supplemental activities and not to support a district’s general operating budget or program previously funded with local or other

operating funds

**Title V, Part B**

**Application has been approved by NDE to include budget, activities,**

**and evaluation of all components.**

Provide evidence that the LEA application has been implemented.

**Title IX, Part A – Education for Homeless Children and Youths**

**The LEA implements procedures to address the identification of homeless children and youth according to statutory definitions.**

Provide enrollment, intake, and tracking forms for all identified homeless students. Provide notes/logs/documentation of community contacts.

**The LEA implements procedures to address the immediate enrollment of homeless children and youth according to statutory requirements.**

Provide evidence of written procedures for enrolling homeless children.

Provide agendas, memos, and handbooks for training sessions.

Provide evidence of posters, brochures, and flyers available in each building.

**The LEA implements procedures to address the retention of homeless students in the school of origin.**

Provide the following:

1. Memos and other information explaining the rights of parents for their children to attend the school of origin.
2. Needs assessment documents.
3. District policies.
4. Tracking of transportation to school of origin.

**The LEA disseminates information both internally and externally to ensure appropriate implementation of the statue.**

Provide communication tools for internal and external stakeholders. Provide agendas, sign-in sheets, and handbooks for training sessions. Provide evidence of posters, brochures, and flyers available in each building.

**The LEA ensures that there is coordination of programs and services to homeless students and families.**

Provide completed collaboration forms for community and district coordination**.**

**The LEA has a system for ensuring prompt resolution of dispute.**

Provide dispute resolution form and log.

**The liaison participated in professional development in the current year.**

Provide certificates of attendance for district liaison from the following:

1. State Conference
2. Trainings at Educational Cooperatives.
3. 3. Other trainings

**Application has been approved by NDE to include budget, activities, and enrollment residency questionnaire, policies, training, phone and email logs, and distributed information, records of transportation, agendas, agreements, required reports and evaluation of all components.**

Provide evidence that the LEA application has been implemented.

 **Appendix C**

 **Category 1- Audit**

**1. Federal Fiscal and State Audits (as available)**

**Least Risk (0)- None Performed**

 **Low Risk (1-2)-** Fiscal Audit was performed. Entity had 3 low risk findings or less or had no findings or only minor findings (i.e. the entity is too small to properly segregate internal controls).

**Medium Risk (2-3)-** Entity had findings in internal controls or grants, but the entity had a corrective action plan to deal with these issues. Findings did not exceed 5 of a minor nature.

**High Risk (4-6)-** Entity was unauditable. Major deficiencies in internal controls were found in the audit. Entity had major findings relating to grants and internal controls.

**2. Single Audits (OMB Super Circular Results (as appropriate)**

1. **Submittal**
2. **Evaluation**

 **c. Findings**

**Least Risk (0)- none performed/entity was exempt**

**Low Risk (1-2)-** Entity received an unmodified opinion on certified annual financial report.

Audit contained no findings or less than 3 findings (minor in nature) that entity responded to with a corrective action plan.

**Medium Risk (2-3)-** Entity received a modified opinion on their certified annual financial report. 3-5 minor findings in annual certified financial report. However, entity did have corrective action plan for findings.

**High Risk (4-6)-** Audit contained an adverse opinion or a disclaimer of opinion on the complete financial statements (not just a certain component). Material findings were found, and the auditee did not have a corrective action plan for findings. Audit contained notes that the entity was a “going concern.”

**3. Title I**

**Least Risk** (0)- none

**Low Risk (1-2)-** Entity was in

**Medium Risk (2-3)-** Entity eventually

**High Risk (4-6)-** Auditee was not in

**4. Title I Comparability Audits**

**Least Risk** (0)- None performed/Entity Exempt

**Low Risk (1-2)-** Entity was incompliance with Title I Comparability requirements.

**Medium Risk (2-3)-** Entity eventuallywas in compliance, but required several formal letters from the Department to get into compliance

**High Risk (4-6)-** Auditee was not incompliance with Title I Comparability requirements

**Category 2 – Academic Achievement**

**4. CSI/TSI/ATSI Schools**

**Least Risk (0)-** There is no Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) or Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) designated schools identified in the District

**Low Risk (1)-** 1% to 25% of schools in the district are designated CSI/TSI/or ATSI

**Moderate Risk (2)-** 26% and 49% of schools in the district are designated CSI/TSI/or ATSI

**High Risk (3)-** 50% or more of schools in the district are designated CSI/TSI/or ATSI

**5. WIDA Access AGP (EL Assessment)**

**Least Risk (0)- Sophia/Kul**

**Low Risk (1)-**

**Moderate Risk (2)-**

**High Risk (3)-**

**6. Index Scores Double Score – 6**

**Least Risk (0)-** The District’s average index score was at or above 50

**Low Risk (1)-** The District’s average index score was between 51 and 67

**Moderate Risk (2)-** The District’s average index score was between 34 and 50

**High Risk (3)-** The District’s index score was lower than 33

**7. College and Career Readiness**

**Least Risk (0)-** The Districts rate of students obtaining their Advanced or CCR Diploma is less than 2% below or above the statewide average

**Low Risk (1)-** The Districts rate of students obtaining their Advanced or CCR Diploma is

between 3% to 5% below the statewide average

**Moderate Risk (2)-** The Districts rate of students obtaining their Advanced or CCR Diploma is between 6 to 9% below the statewide average

**High Risk (3)-** The Districts rate of students obtaining their Advanced or CCR Diploma is greater than10% below the statewide average

**8. Chronic Absenteeism**

**Least Risk (0)-** The Districts chronic absenteeism rate is below 4.9%

**Low Risk (1)-** The Districts chronic absenteeism rate is between 5% and 8%

**Moderate Risk (2)-** The Districts absenteeism rate is between 8.1% and 9.9%

**High Risk (3)-** The Districts chronic absenteeism rate is 10% or greater**. Note – If greater than 20% - double score**

**9. Graduation Rate**

**Least Risk (0)-** The District’s graduation rate is between 2% below or at the statewide average

**Low Risk (1)-** The District’s graduation rate is between 3% below to 5% below the statewide average

**Moderate Risk (2)-** The District’s graduation rate is 6 to 9% below the statewide average

**High Risk (3)-** The District’s graduation rate is greater than 10% below the statewide average

**10. Equitable Service/Consultation Process**

**Least Risk (0)-** The District had no carryover of their equitable services set-aside, no filed complaints, and signed annual affirmations of consultation were submitted on time

**Low Risk (1)-** The District had 15% or less carryover of their equitable services funds, no filed complaints, and signed annual affirmations of consultation were on time

**Moderate Risk (2)-** The District had greater than 15% but less than 25% carryover of their equitable services set-aside, or one- two filed complaints, or signed annual affirmations of consultation were late by two weeks or less

**High Risk (3)-** The District had greater than 25% carryover of their equitable services set-aside, or three or more filed complaints, or signed annual affirmations of consultation were late by three or more weeks

**Category 3: Reporting Timeliness and Accuracy**

**11. Federal Grant Closeout Reports**

**Least Risk (0)- ALL** financial, performance, and other LEA sub- recipient reports required under the grant pursuant to the OMB Uniform Grants Guidance 200.343 were completed and accurately submitted by the due date identified

**Low Risk (1)- ONE** financial, performance or other LEA sub- recipient reports, required under the grant (pursuant to the OMB Uniform Grants Guidance 200.343), was EITHER incomplete or inaccurate AND/OR submitted after the due date identified

**Moderate Risk (2)- TWO-THREE** financial, performance or other LEA sub- recipient reports required under the grant (pursuant to the OMB Uniform Grants Guidance200.343) were INCOMPLETE orinaccurate AND/OR SUBMITTED after the due date identified

**High Risk (3)- FOUR OR MORE** financial, performance or other LEA sub-recipient required reports required under the grant (pursuant to the OMB Uniform Grants Guidance200.343) were INCOMPLETE orinaccurate, AND/OR submitted after the due date identified

**12. Federal Grant Funding Application Submissions**

**Least Risk (0)- ALL** Federal Grant Funding Application Submissions are received by the due date **AND ALL** application components are complete in the first submission of R0, as communicated through the SEA review and approval status.

**Low Risk (1)- ALL** Federal Grant Funding Application Submissions are received by the due date, **AND** Between **95% -99%** of application components **were completed correctly** in the first submission of R0 for SEA review andapproval.

**Moderate Risk (2)- ALL** Federal Grant Funding Application Submissions were received by the due date, **AND** between **85%-95%** of application components **were completed correctly** in the first submission of R0 for SEA review andapproval.

**High Risk (3)-** Federal Grant Funding Application Submissions were **NOT** received by the due date, **AND/OR less than 85%** of application components **were completed correctly** in the first submission of R0 for SEA review and approval.

**13. General Statement of Assurance (GSA)**

**Least Risk (0)- ALL** provisions established by the NDE (which governs the funds and program) are accepted by the LEA sub-grantee through certification and acknowledgement of the federal General Statement of Assurances.

**Low Risk (1)- N/A**

**Moderate Risk (2)- N/A**

**High Risk (3)-** The LEA did **NOT** accept the sub-grantee certification and acknowledgement of the federal General Statement of Assurances.

**14. Stale Claims – Number of stale claims at the end of the previous State Fiscal Year (SFY) and percent of active awards with stale claims for each LEA**

**DOUBLE Points – 6**

**Least Risk (0)- NO** stale claims were submitted on behalf of the LEA at the end of the previous State Fiscal Year.

**Low Risk (1)- N/A**

**Moderate Risk (2)- ONE** stale claim was submitted on behalf of the LEA at the end of the previous State Fiscal Year due to circumstances that were preventable by the LEA.

**High Risk (3)- TWO OR MORE** stale claims were submitted on behalf of the LEA at the end of the previous State Fiscal Year due to circumstances that were preventable by the LEA.

**15. Federal Grant Programmatic Desktop Monitoring Submissions**

**Least Risk (0)-**

**Low Risk (1)-**

**Moderate Risk (2)-**

**High Risk (3)-**

**Risk Category 4 – Grant Management - Revised**

**16. Carryover of Federal Grant Funds/Reversions Back to the Feds or State DOUBLE POINTS – 6**

**Least Risk (0)- No carryover $0 Reversions back to Fed or State**

**Low Risk (1)-** Federal Funds carryover of .01% to 4.99% and $0 Reversions back to Feds or State.

**Moderate Risk (2)-** Federal funds carryover in range of 5% to 14.99 and $0 Reversions back to Feds or State.

**High Risk (3)-** Federal funds carryover in excess of 15% and/or any amount greater than $0 reverted back to Feds or State.

**17. Timeliness and Accuracy of Reimbursement Request Submissions (Per program).**

**Least Risk (0)- No reimbursement request submissions that were late or inaccurate**

**Low Risk (1)-** One reimbursement request submission late or inaccurate

**Moderate Risk (2)-** Two reimbursement request submissions late or inaccurate

**High Risk (3)-** Three or more reimbursement request submissions late or inaccurate

**18. Amendment Requests Initiated by Subrecipient (per program).**

**Least Risk (0)- No amendment requests in past fiscal year**

**Low Risk (1)-** One or two amendment requests in past fiscal year

**Moderate Risk (2)-** Three or four amendment requests in past fiscal year

**High Risk (3)-** Five or more amendment requests in past fiscal year

**19. New Personnel and New or Substantially Changed Systems**

**Least Risk (0)-** The District had no turnover of Superintendent, or key fiscal or programmatic grant management personnel in the past three years prior to the federal grant award year being monitored

**Low Risk (1)-** The District had greater than 0 and less than 20% turnover of Superintendent, or key fiscal or programmatic grant management personnel in the past three years prior to the federal grant award year being monitored

**Moderate Risk (2)-** The District had greater than 21% but less than 50% turnover of Superintendent, or key fiscal or programmatic grant management personnel in the past three years prior to the federal grant award year being monitored

**High Risk (3)-** The District had greater than 51% turnover of Superintendent, or key fiscal or programmatic grant management personnel in the past three years prior to the federal grant award year being monitored

**20. Equitable Distribution of Teachers Plan**

**Least Risk (0)-** The LEA submitted EDT plans that prioritized funds to build instructional excellence in schools and employed effective strategies to ensure students met NDE academic achievement standards

**Low Risk (1)-**

**Moderate Risk (2)-**

**High Risk (3)-** No evidence was provided by the LEA to indicate that that funds were prioritized to build instructional excellence in schools or strategies employed to ensure students meet NDE academic achievement standards

**Risk Category 5: District and School Planning**

**21. LEA District Performance Plan (DPP) Submission**

**Least Risk (0)- LEA’S DPP submission MEETS ALL Federal requirements** per ESSA 1112(a)(1)(A) and 1112(a)(3), 1112(6) Plan Provisions(6)(b) (A- D and 1111(g)(1)(B) (i.e. connecting applicable additional plans within the LEA plan, such has the LEAs and associated practices). DPP was “Accepted” by the SEA for meeting all Federal compliance indicators

**Low Risk (1)- N/A**

**Moderate Risk (2)- N/A**

**High Risk (3)- LEA’S DPP DOES NOT MEET ALL Federal requirements** per ESSA 1112(a)(1)(A)and 1112(a)(3) 1112(6) Plan Provisions(6)(b) (A-D and 1111(g)(1)(B) (i.e. connecting applicable additional plans within the LEA plan, such has the LEAs Equitable Distribution Plan and associated practices). DPP was marked as “Does Not Meet Compliance” by the SEA for not meeting all Federal compliance indicators

**22. LEA Approved School Performance Plan (SPP) Submission(s)**

**Least Risk (0)- ALL APPROVED LEA SPP submissions MEETS ALL Federal and State requirements** and all SPP submissions were accepted by the SEA in meeting the compliance indicators outlined in ESSA1114(b)(6)], 1114(b)(7)(A)(I) (iii), (IV), NRS 385A.650 andChapter 501 of State regulation AB7

**Low Risk (1)- N/A**

**Moderate Risk (2)- N/A**

**High Risk (3)- ONE OR MORE APPROVED LEA SPP submissions DOES NOT MEET ALL Federal and State requirements** and was not accepted by the SEA in meeting all compliance indicators, as outlined in ESSA 1114(b)(6)], 1114(b)(7)(A)(I), (iii)), NRS 385A.650 andChapter 501 of State regulation AB7

**23. Evidence- Based Levels- DPP**

**Least Risk (0)-** For the LEAs allocation of federal grant funds, specific, prioritized Level 1, 2 and 3 (90% or greater) evidence-based interventions were implemented in low- performing schools that resulted in outcomes with measurable effectiveness related directly to the targeted intervention and is aligned to Nevada’s Academic Content Standards (NACS) and/or other State outcomes

**Low Risk (1)-** For the LEAs allocation of federal grant funds, specific, prioritized Level 1, 2 and 3 (80% to 89%) evidence-based interventions were implemented in low- performing schools that resulted in outcomes with measurable effectiveness related directly to the targeted intervention and is aligned to Nevada’s Academic Content Standards (NACS) and/or other State outcomes

**Moderate Risk (2)-** For the LEAs allocation of federal grant funds, specific, prioritized Level 1, 2 and 3 (70% to 79%) evidence-based interventions were implemented in low-performing schools that resulted in outcomes with measurable effectiveness related directly to the targeted intervention and is aligned to Nevada’s Academic Content Standards (NACS) and/or other State outcomes

**High Risk (3)-** For the LEAs allocation of federal grant funds, specific, prioritized Level 1, 2 and 3 (less than 69%) evidence-based interventions were implemented in low-performing schools that resulted in outcomes with measurable effectiveness related directly to the targeted intervention and is aligned to Nevada’s Academic Content Standards (NACS) and/or other State outcomes

**24. Evidence- Based Levels- SPPs**

**Least Risk (0)-** For the SPPs allocation of federal grant funds, specific, prioritized Level 1, 2 and 3 (90% or greater) evidence-based interventions were implemented in low- performing schools that resulted in outcomes with measurable effectiveness related directly to the targeted intervention and is aligned to Nevada’s Academic Content Standards (NACS) and/or other State outcomes

**Low Risk (1)-** For the SPPs allocation of federal grant funds, specific, prioritized Level 1, 2 and 3 (80% to 89%) evidence-based interventions were implemented in low- performing schools that resulted in outcomes with measurable effectiveness related directly to the targeted intervention and is aligned to Nevada’s Academic Content Standards (NACS) and/or other State outcomes

**Moderate Risk (2)-** For the SPPs allocation of federal grant funds, specific, prioritized Level 1, 2 and 3 (70% to 79%) evidence-based interventions were implemented in low-performing schools that resulted in outcomes with measurable effectiveness related directly to the targeted intervention and is aligned to Nevada’s Academic Content Standards (NACS) and/or other State outcomes

**High Risk (3)-** For the SPPs allocation of federal grant funds, specific, prioritized Level 1, 2 and 3 (less than 69%) evidence-based interventions were implemented in low-performing schools that resulted in outcomes with measurable effectiveness related directly to the targeted intervention and is aligned to Nevada’s Academic Content Standards (NACS) and/or other State outcome.