Speaker 0   00:00:00   Welcome and thank you for joining today's grantee learning series for c Ovid 19 relief programs. Please note this conference is being recorded and all audio connections are muted at this time. If you require technical assistance, please open chat with the associated icon at the bottom of your screen and send a message to the event producer. You may also submit written questions throughout the conference by selecting all panelists from the dropdown menu in the chat panel. With that, I'll turn the conference over to Melissa Schrader, technical assistance lead.

Speaker 1   00:00:34   Thanks, Candace, and good afternoon everyone, and thanks for setting aside time to join us today for the Grantee Learning Series Monitoring Webinar. I'm Melissa Schrader, and I'm a program officer and the technical assistance lead in the Office of State and Grantee relations. The Grantee Learning series is comprised of five webinars held each Wednesday afternoon, beginning last Wednesday, and going through August 23rd. These webinars are designed to provide a forum for the department to share important information and resources with our grantees to support your implementation of the Esser gear and S programs. These webinars serve to orient grantee staff that may be new to these programs, while also refreshing the knowledge grantee staff who've been working on these programs over the last few years. This afternoon, we're joined by my colleagues Christopher Tate, who's a group leader in the Office of State and Grantee relations, and oversees Grants administration and monitoring, and we're also joined by Chris Fenton, who's a program officer that leads our monitoring work. They've prepared a presentation to provide an overview of monitoring for the Esser gear and EAMS programs. If you have questions during the presentation, please feel free to submit them using the chat feature. We'll also have time at the end of the presentation to take questions both in the chat, and we invite you to come off mute to ask any questions you may have at that time. Without further delay, I'll turn it over to Christopher. Christopher.

Speaker 2   00:01:59   Thank you, Melissa. Good afternoon. I'm Christopher Tate, the group leader responsible for managing program monitoring with the OFF Within the Office of State and Grantee Relations, or SS G R, the office that, as you know, manages the US Department of Education's PK through 12 Pandemic Relief programs. I'm joined today by my colleague Chris Fenton. Chris, a former state education agency, program administrator, and federal Monitor for E S D A programs. Comes to this work with a significant amount of federal grant implementation experience and is a key resource to your state's program officer when facilitating a review.

Speaker 2   00:02:44   During our session today, we want to accomplish two objectives. First, we will situate SGS monitoring within our office's performance review framework and point to the broad regulations that guide our oversight of the work you do and administering your programs. Then we will review the different types of monitoring conducted by our office and touch upon our expectations for grantees as partners in this work. Finally, we will close with a few reminders about our fiscal year 20 23, 20 24 monitoring activities. Today's presentation, as I mentioned, is shaped around sdr, R'S implementation of its performance review framework, and both the routine and more formal monitoring activities that S G R conducts of each of the three pandemic relief programs, eser Gear and EENs. As with our prior presentation focused on grants administration, we won't go into depth on all of the components of this framework. As other webinars in our series, we'll dive into the specific requirements and activities associated with those areas. For example, we have upcoming sessions focused on reporting maintenance of effort and maintenance of equity. While we certainly provide oversight in

these different areas, our office is structured in a way that allows teams that manage that work to develop deep expertise in those subjects and provided the breadth of the work, they're able to provide deeper support during implementation. It requires a different, more specific structure for providing oversight to those requirements and their support to you as our grantees.

Speaker 2   00:04:37   Before we dive into SDRs monitoring activities, I want to take a moment and revisit the requirements that broadly guide the responsibilities for the awarding of funds and provision of oversight by pass through entities such as state educational agencies and governor's offices. I do this because, as you will see through today's session, our monitoring practices are first designed to monitor for compliance with these requirements, and so we scaffold our review in a way that allows us to independently assess each of these requirements as well as other associated federal requirements. And secondly, our monitoring is structured quite similar similarly to your monitoring practices, but this structure also allows for less formal opportunities to review implementation of grant programs and provide more timely technical assistance aimed at ensuring each of you has resources to address issues as they arise before issues result in non-compliance. Our award making and oversight work in SS G R largely mirrors the work that you do as a result of these requirements. While we will focus specifically on monitoring today, the department does use other mechanisms, which will we touch, which we will touch on later to ensure compliance, again, such as reporting, but also audits. Though we like you endeavor to provide support before taking enforcement action. We do find it necessary sometimes to take action when a grantee is deemed to be non-compliant in any given area, or to provide technical assistance when an area reviewed is compliant. But there are existing weaknesses that can be improved upon by utilizing different resources available to us at the department.

Speaker 2   00:06:37   The SS G R Performance Review framework is designed to address SGS responsibilities for fiscal and programmatic oversight of the elementary and secondary Emerge School Emergency Relief Fund, the Governor's Emergency Education Relief Fund, and the emergency assistance to non-public schools program. Its implementation is also intended to help us identify areas in which grantees need assistance and support to meet their goals and obligations. The S G R Performance Review framework includes a set of activities that are intended to assist grantees in meeting performance standards and complying with grant requirements such as, but not limited to communication with grantees review of grantee performance data review of G five, fiscal data monitoring and audit resolution, the performance review framework provides an integrated approach to compliance assistance and our oversight. During this session, though, we will be focusing on SDRs monitoring activities. We view monitoring as a part of this whole, as often isolated activities implemented to allow for an unbiased compliance review aimed at addressing a single question, is the grantee compliant with the review requirement?

Speaker 2   00:08:03   While the quality of implementation of a particular program or requirement is sometimes addressed, given the historic nature of this investment in education and the capacity of our team in conducting singular monitoring visits, we focus on compliance, but also offer recommendations in areas where program implementation might be improved based on what we know from other monitoring events. This is to say that first and foremost, we aim to provide a critical eye to compliance with the implementation of the program and federal requirements, while offering up observations where a particular aspect of programming might be improved and that those who are deep in the work might not have seen the expertise to solve. Those problems may already exist within a grantees organization, organization, but resources are also available at the department to support grantees with improving

implementation as needed. We try to ensure that you as grantees are then aware that the, those resources exist and are available to you to further assess and improve implementation of your programs program.

Speaker 2   00:09:14   As you see fit to this end, technical assistance will be addressed in a future webinar that focuses just on that topic. As I mentioned earlier, reporting and the unique oversight we provide for the implementation of maintenance of effort and maintenance of equity will be addressed in future webinars. We have in the past also hosted webinars focused on late liquidation, and while we have specific mechanisms in place to provide oversight for those requests, we'll only briefly touch on the monitoring of those requests toward the end of today's presentation. My final point here before moving forward is that S G R is involved with the resolution of audits. Though we won't touch upon that work much during today's webinar, audits play a critical role in preventing waste fraud and abuse and our critical component to the work we do in ensuring that our programs are implemented in compliance, and that we Azure partners are preventing waste, fraud, and abuse. The office of Elementary and Secondary Education works with grantees to resolve single audit findings and the office of the Inspector general audit findings. Audits identify problems with the management, control and use of federal funds and grantees to expend at least $750,000 in federal funds during their fiscal year are required to complete those audits.

Speaker 2   00:10:45   The department works to help our grantees resolve these findings in the same way that it ensures grantees resolve any findings or correct corrective actions resulting from our monitoring. And so with that, I want to turn our attention now specifically to monitoring SDRs. Monitoring is broken into two clear parts, routine monitoring and formal monitoring. Routine monitoring of grantees starts with ongoing reviews of fiscal activities program staff using the department's grants management system as the primary tool for fiscal oversight, conduct regular drawdown analysis. Additionally, as a part of the department's ongoing reviews, the department holds a monthly call monthly with each grantee. Each monthly call is organized to address timely fiscal and programmatic topics that are central to the management of pandemic relief programs. And we do this for all grantees, and we use it as an opportunity to monitor a grantee's performance, but also to assist with the resolution of implementation issues.

Speaker 2   00:11:53   Formal monitoring, which we will explore at depth later in our presentation, include singular events where a grantee and sometimes a grantee's sub-recipients are reviewed for compliance in either a single area or across multiple fiscal and programmatic domains within SS G R grantees are identified for monitoring based on risk, the scoring of grantees based on a variety of fiscal, fiscal, and program indicators. Then grantees are selected for review based on the facts and circumstances of a grantee's work as it is known to us. Some grantees might be invited for targeted monitoring where a small number of requirements are reviewed, or for comprehensive and consolidated monitoring where the grantee is reviewed across multiple fiscal and programmatic domains. A critical point that I want to make is that, as most grantees are aware, in early 2022 S G R implemented quarterly reviews. These are reviews of a limited targeted scope.

Speaker 2   00:13:02   These review themselves, the type of our targeted monitoring were changed to biannual reviews. Last year, when our office moved forward with implementing check-in calls, first, we wanted to be responsive to the field's desire for more frequent communication, and also create opportunities to collaborate on resolving program issues before the possibility of a grantee being in a

position of non-compliance. Second, the combination of monthly check-in and biannual targeted review. Um, targeted reviews, we felt achieved one of achieved three objectives. The first objective was that the approach struck a balance between ensuring oversight for this unprecedented federal investment and education. Second, we were better meeting the needs of grantees by improving access to federal thought partners and ensuring that we were managing the timely completion of different grant implementation activities. Finally, we were creating a structure that tried to honor the limited capacities of our grantees. Given the multiple hats we know you wear as both a grantee and also as a grantor, we will get into formal monitoring in a bit. But for now, let's turn our attention to routine monitoring and specifically monthly check-ins with grantees.

Speaker 2   00:14:30   In the fall of 2022, S G R launched monthly check-in calls with grantees as a direct result of the feedback that we were receiving about the timeliness of communication around policies and available supports to grantees. Many grantees indicated that regular touchpoints would improve the exchange of critical grant information and allow for the creation of a space where program officers could more easily assist grantees with emerging concerns. The implementation of this monitoring approach became feasible for our office, when over the course of a year, we were able to increase the number of our program officers and ensure that each program officer, as a result, had a fewer number, uh, number of grantees to support. These calls are intended to be less formal monitoring activities and are more focused on the provision of technical assistance. The calls are intended to be a place to follow up on outstanding requests, highlight a upcoming grant milestones and feature relevant topics such as review of drawdowns, late liquidation requests, and the, and reporting to name a few.

Speaker 2   00:15:46   They're also intended to create a space to inform grantees of technical assistance and ensure adequate grant oversight. Our monthly check-in calls are designed in this way to be a space aimed at reducing the burden on grantees in the long run by establishing a regular cadence for collaboration in this work. As a matter of process program officers share an agenda ahead of the call with the grantee and the grantee might add, uh, to that agenda in advance of the call, the objective being that to conduct follow up on topics in real time or to establish commitments for follow up on either's part during the call. These meetings are then documented and notes shared out as a way of establishing mutual accountability for each of us in delivering on our commitments internally, it sets an expectation that our responses to grantees questions and concerns are a priority, and in working with our partners here at the department, we're better able to advocate on our grantees behalf because we have a clear understanding of the issues that you are facing. Now, I'm going to turn the session over to my colleague, Chris, to walk us through formal monitoring. Chris,

Speaker 3   00:17:08   You, uh, so as Christopher mentioned, part of our ecosystem of monitoring involves formal monitoring as well as the, uh, less formal monthly check-ins and day-to-day work. Um, as he mentioned, um, the targeted monitoring is focused on a specific topic or set of topics such as cash management or, you know, internal controls, something along those lines. And the targeted monitoring is conducted as issues are identified and through the day-to-day activities and oversight occurring, um, for all states during the, um, biannual reviews that you mentioned as well. So when ident when issues are identified for targeted monitoring, we put together a specific set of questions and we reach out to the state, and it's like a miniature more formal monitoring. Um, like some of your states have probably been through already. To date, seven states have received the targeted monitoring, Iowa, Montana, Nevada, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and West Virginia.

Speaker 3   00:18:11   And that was during the beginning phase of the, um, pandemic and the grants. Um, and it was a good chance to get in early with some of the grantees and work on some specific issues. And as we have moved through the implementation of these grants, uh, with subsequent, uh, grant funding, we have implemented the other, um, types of monitoring that Christopher mentioned that are types of, um, targeted monitoring. Um, we monitor the specific maintenance of effort and maintenance of equity requirements, um, as well as, um, working with the FADA reporting requirements and other, um, regular requirements of grantees. Um, the department, um, provides, you know, individualized assistance, um, during these calls. And the calls are, um, these biannual monitoring, um, review calls are for all, uh, all states during the cycle. And again, we, um, moved toward biannual, biannual rather than the quarterly reviews when we implemented the, um, less formal monthly, um, reviews.

Speaker 3   00:19:16   So beginning in spring of 2022, um, these biannual reviews got started and they were, again, for all grantees, and they focus on the timely or high priority aspects of program implementation, um, such as the l e a use of funds requirements for our ser, um, stakeholder engagement, ss e a, reservations, et cetera. Um, SS d R may require an s e a to provide documentation in advance of these reviews, uh, and, you know, responses to, uh, an agenda or a sort of a smaller protocol. Um, any findings or corrective actions from the biannual reviews will, um, be treated as formal findings, and they will be recorded in the grant file. Um, biannual reviews are less formal than targeted comprehensive or consolidated monitoring, but they still do involve, um, you know, the compliance and, um, follow up and corrective actions as needed. Um, S G R continuously analyzes grantee data and uses these biannual reviews to address high priority needs and trends as they're discovered.

Speaker 3   00:20:24   Um, and again, you know, the monthly check-ins are less formal, um, and the, and the biannual reviews are more formal, but again, they're not as, uh, intensive as the comprehensive and consolidated reviews that we're going to get into in a, in a few minutes. And to date, we have conducted two UAL reviews of all grantees, um, that includes all 50 states, DC and Puerto Rico. Um, their first review conducted in the spring and summer of 2022 focused on the ARP Esser awards to LEAs, uh, and the required 20% set aside to address the academic impact of lost instructional time. And the second review, which we have concluded fairly recently, was in the winter of 2023, and it focused on the awarding of gear funds and the sub-recipient grantee, uh, oversight, moving into the more, uh, commonly understood, I guess, types of monitoring the comprehensive and consolidated monitoring.

Speaker 3   00:21:24   These are the full-on, um, programmatic and fiscal reviews, and they're focused on grantees implementation of the pandemic relief programs. Um, this type of monitoring evaluates systems and processes a grantee uses to implement its programs. Uh, these include such things as a grantee's, accounting systems and fiscal controls, internal controls, personnel allocations, budgeting, and sub-recipient monitoring. In addition to other, um, program focused areas, um, thus far, four states have received comprehensive monitoring. Um, three states, California, Indiana, and Maine were required to take corrective actions to address findings of non-compliance with federal requirements. And, um, no findings were identified for Wisconsin during its review. Um, the department will conduct comprehensive monitoring of New Jersey's, esser and E'S programs in the fall of 2023. Um, similar to the con comprehensive monitoring in terms of content is the consolidated monitoring. And again, it essentially, it's, it's a very similar type process where there's a cross-cutting fiscal, um, component, and that primarily covers uniform guidance requirements for federal funds.

Speaker 3   00:22:39   And then there are program specific requirements, um, that are rooted in statute and regulation primarily. Um, S D R leads the comprehensive monitoring for its grantees and the M S O or the, um, uh, management support office in O E S E leads, the consolidated monitoring across several O E S E programs. Um, selection of grantees for monitoring is rooted in a risk analysis for grantees. S D R uses its own risk assessment, which includes award amount reporting, um, G five remaining balance, improper payments. Um, we're going to start doing that, um, in f y 2024 and ED wide, um, e r R scores, which is the, the department wide risk ratings. And those, um, we use the areas of internal controls and administrative risk from that risk assessment in our S G R internal risk assessment. And so we, you know, have categories based on the risk assessment and we, you know, make determinations of who will get monitoring based on that and any other applicable factors.

Speaker 3   00:23:46   Um, and again, consolidated monitoring is very similar. It just is a cross program monitoring activity involving other programs outside of SS G r, um, commonly it'll be Title one, part a, title two, um, title three, and SDRs participated in in several of these as well. And again, um, the, um, programs, the other programs are going to be the programs authorized to be by the, uh, E SS E A and they are the formula grant programs that are administered by O E S C and consolidated monitoring also reviews the grantee systems and grants management processes to involve, uh, to ensure compliance with the federal requirements, just like our comprehensive monitoring does. Thus far, six states have received consolidated monitoring. Four of these states, uh, Florida, Kentucky, Nebraska, and Tennessee, were required to take corrective actions to address findings of non-compliance with federal requirements. And two states, Washington and Maine have, uh, monitoring determinations pending, um, that will be finalized soon. And those, um, the Florida, Kentucky, Nebraska, and Tennessee had, um, mainly the, some of the, the fiscal and cross-cutting, um, elements that required corrective action. And we are, um, participating in the consolidated monitoring of New Mexico in the fall of 2023.

Speaker 3   00:25:21   And again, these formal the big monitoring activities, comprehensive and consolidated, um, monitoring have pretty extended timelines, and the expectations are more intense than the biannual or, um, other reviews, monthly calls, et cetera, targeted reviews. Um, these next couple of slides go into some of the timelines, um, um, chunks and expectations for grantees around, uh, 90 days, you know, prior to the review is when things kick off. And that would be, you know, your typical notice, um, from the department, your basic, here we come letter that's, you know, letting you know that this SS e has been identified for, uh, monitoring review. And then the dates are, are, you know, nailed down from that process, um, in the next few weeks after that. So essentially, there's some back and forth between the department and grantees trying to work out the logistics. Um, but once those logistics get worked out, the grantee will be working on their, um, self-assessment and supporting documentation.

Speaker 3   00:26:25   And essentially that is, um, like a questionnaire that covers the basic topics that we mentioned previously. Um, you know, for the programmatic, uh, there's a state context element. There's, um, you know, elements of, you know, budgeting and allocations and, um, sub-recipient monitoring and internal risk and things like that, that, you know, our expectations of all federal grantees and specific expectations of the S G R programs that are found in the various funding statutes and regulations that have come on the heels of those legislations. Uh, 15 days prior to review is when all of the final agenda gets, starts getting nailed down, um, 30, I should have mentioned 30 days prior to the review. S G R should have received by then the responses and documentation before the review. There

may be some, you know, back and forth trying to get clarity on responses, et cetera, but, um, really it's just, it's a, you know, a chance to just nail down logistics prior to the, the interview portion of the review.

Speaker 3   00:27:29   And once that interview hap those interviews happen. It's basically with the SS e a, it'll cover whichever programs are indicated, um, and it will involve, you know, the applicable staff there. Um, sometimes the interviews can be relatively brief depending on how thorough the responses were, um, on the self-assessment and how thorough the documentation was. Other times, um, a, a more broad discussion may be in order depending on, you know, the circumstances of the review. Um, the, uh, there's also a, a, an interview segment with LEAs. Um, it's important to talk to the sub-recipients during these comprehensive and col consolidated reviews in order to sort of triangulate the information we are receiving from the s e a. And whenever we do the reviews, we always emphasize that we are not reviewing the LEAs, but we are reviewing the grantee, the s e a generally, um, in, in these reviews.

Speaker 3   00:28:27   And the information the LEAs provide is merely meant to help support our determinations for the grantee. And the reviews happen over the course of about a week or two, depending on logistics and how easy it's to coordinate with the LEAs. Um, and then after that, we begin the work internally in S G R of putting together the, um, the report. And we may reach out to, you know, the grantee to get additional information to make sure that we have our, uh, ducks in a row as far as information goes, and we begin the internal analysis and drafting the segments of the report. Um, 25 days after the review, uh, the grantee should receive a draft of the monitoring report for review, and that's mainly to provide technical edits and any factual corrections. Uh, and there may be a conference call held to review determinations made as the result, uh, uh, of that. And once we receive those technical edits as well, um, we finalize the report making any adjustments as needed, and the report gets published online, and then within 30 days after that report is received by the grantee, um, the corrective actions are due. And we understand that, you know, some corrective actions may involve a little bit of a different timeline, but those are decided on a case by case basis. Generally speaking, it's 30 business days, um, for most of those corrective actions, and I will hand it off. Back to Christopher now.

Speaker 2   00:30:02   Thanks, Chris. I want to touch for a moment here on our monitoring protocols and reports. The department updated its monitoring program protocols in FY 2023, and each protocol is posted on our website, and the links are being provided, uh, in the chat. The protocols were updated to reflect the subsequent awarding of funds under the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act, and the American Rescue Plan updates to the protocols assess compliance with new program requirements, including the required uses of funds to address loss, instructional time, and the additional required state set-asides. Additionally, these revised protocols help the department better identify areas of need for technical assistance. SDR r's formal monitoring of the esser ins and gear programs are guide guided by protocols that have domains determined by the cluster of requirements to be reviewed in any given, uh, section. For example, in both the Esser and Gear monitoring protocols, we had the Equitable Services domain because equitable services were permissible use of CARES Act funds for these programs.

Speaker 2   00:31:18   Each program's monitoring protocol reviews the systems and processes a grantee implemented to provide oversight for the provision of services and supports to non-public schools by grantee sub-recipients in Meet if meeting with a grant sub-recipient. As a part of our monitoring, we use a parallel program protocol that is used for assessing these sub-recipients implementation of equitable services to students who are in non-public schools. The information we gather from the sub-recipient, as

Chris noted, such as with Equitable Services, helps us triangulate the grantees information with data from our documentation review, and also information from the sub-recipients review to make a determination of the grantee's compliance with the requirements in the reviewed area. The protocols for our monitoring of each of the three programs is additionally a provided in the chat below and is linked in today's presentation, which will be shared at a later time. Additionally, when we're conducting comprehensive monitoring, we use the fiscal elements protocol that is used for consolidated monitoring. This protocol guides our review of the different fiscal requirements grantees must implement to ensure that their organizations have the necessary internal controls and processes in place for ensuring compliant implementation of its award making management of its pass through funds and fiscal oversight of sub-recipient awards. Please note that, as Chris mentioned, all of our reports are also posted online once finalized and shared with the grantee. All of our re reports can be accessed at the hyperlink embedded in today's presentation at the bottom of our slide, and is also going to be put in today's chat.

Speaker 2   00:33:13   Finally, I want to take a moment and just revisit our schedule for, um, FFY 2023 and FY 2024, uh, monitoring. And I want to note a couple of things. As Chris said, we conducted our first biannual review, um, or I'm sorry, our second biannual review of fiscal year 2023 in the fall, and its focus was on dear grantees and their awarding of funds and, uh, oversight of sub-recipients. Our first, uh, review of fiscal year 2024 will occur starting in October. Um, our, uh, program officers will share the self-assessment and provide, um, reminders about the process for the biannual review with grantees as a part of their September check-in call. The reviews will occur in October, and we anticipate running through, um, November just given, um, the, the additional documentation that must be provided and the work that the grantee might need to go into to, to the additional work, rather, to complete the self-assessment. So we like to be respectful of that, and we know that program officers will work with you to reschedule your monthly check-in calls as needed. I do want to add, though, that we aim to always use those monthly check-in calls, um, as a space to conduct the biannual review, only because we don't want to create additional expectations of grantees, um, particularly during parts of the school of the, uh, academic school year, where we know our grantees are, um, conducting their own monitoring reporting, and also dealing, uh, with providing technical assistance to their various sub-recipients.

Speaker 2   00:35:01   The specific topic of the, um, next biannual review has not been determined. We know and have determined that the review will actually center on Arp Ser, but the subtopic within sort of that broad, uh, broad topic, uh, will be determined sometime in the next, uh, within the next month, and shared with you again in September. With regard to consolidated and comprehensive monitoring, as Chris said, we, um, identified Florida, Washington, Maine, and New Mexico for consolidated monitoring. New Mexico has not been monitored, but will be monitored in September. And in terms of comprehensive monitoring, we identified New Jersey, um, and that state will additionally be monitored in September of this year. We are currently running our risk assessment and refining our, our processes and aim to, um, identify grantees for comprehensive monitoring, uh, starting in August. Now, as Chris, uh, laid out in the timeline that he shared with you, we don't, uh, reach out to states to notify them of our intent to monitor until approximately 90 days before a monitoring event, uh, would occur.

Speaker 2   00:36:16   And we do that for two reasons. First, obviously, we partner to implement consolidated monitoring with multiple other offices, and the management support office that runs that activity is currently going through their own state identification process. Um, and so we, we amend our process based on the states that collectively the office of elementary and secondary education identifies for consolidated monitoring. Um, so more to come, but if your state were to be monitored, bill assure

that a, we will work with you, um, to identify the best possible date for conducting that monitoring event, but you'll also start to receive it. Um, notice from us, well in advance of any monitoring activities begin, because again, we understand that oftentimes these activities occur, um, at rather busy times and each of the two quarters of the academic school year. So with that, I want to go ahead and open it up to any questions that folks might have, and I invite Chris to join me back on the screen

Speaker 0   00:37:26   As we move to q and a. Please click the raise hand icon located at the bottom of your screen. We hear a tone when your line is unmuted, at which time please state your name and ask your question. You may continue to submit written questions through chat by selecting all panelists from the dropdown menu, typing your message in the box provided and hitting enter to send. So

Speaker 2   00:37:48   I'm going to take a moment, um, while we wait for additional questions to come into the chat to answer a couple of questions that have already come in. Um, the first being, we had a question come in that on the SSR monitoring protocol, um, page 14, there's an indicator asking, um, how the S e A monitors compliance with the requirements that an l e a record, the notice of federal interest in the official real property records for the jurisdiction in which the facility is located as soon as possible. Um, how, and the question is, how are other s e a monitor other SS e's monitoring compliance, um, with this indicator? And I'm going to ask if there are other state, uh, education agency folks, um, on the line who can speak to how you are monitoring that particular requirement. I'm going to ask you to drop that in the chat.

Speaker 2   00:38:46   Um, what I will say from our perspective is that we are just now implementing this, um, our review of this requirement as a part of our protocol. So we are still in the process of, um, gathering different ss e a practices. So what I might ask is that you, um, the person who submitted this question, if you will email your state mailbox, we will work with your program officer to get, um, a series of examples that we can then share with you since we don't have those, uh, readily available at this, at this moment. And I would ask, uh, Sandy, if you don't mind, if you'll please just as a reminder, drop the, uh, state mailbox, uh, addresses address in the chat. That would be helpful. Chris, I'm going to punt the next question to you since you do you have much more experience with regard to our consolidated monitoring? And it, it's the question about our monitoring protocols for, for the title programs, those that are included in the consolidated monitoring available in much the same way, um, SDRs,

Speaker 3   00:40:06   Yes, they should be. And they're online. And I dropped a link in the chat. Um, I tagged it, consolidated, well, not tagged it. It's consolidated monitoring, uh, colon, and then the link to the, um, MSOs performance, uh, reporting, um, website. It has a link to their various protocols that they use, including the Title one and Title two and, and possibly others, as well as, uh, links to the reporting from the monitoring of events, uh, events in the past five or six years or so at least.

Speaker 2   00:40:42   And taking a step, step

Speaker 3   00:40:43   Back and if anything looks like it's not updated there, you can reach out through your state mailbox and we'll reach out to our front office and, and track it down the accurate info.

Speaker 2   00:40:53   And we had a recommendation, Chris, that came in, um, from Mr. Parsley that if the, um, examples that, uh, one, one person ask us to share could be shared with all SCAs, um, that would be incredible. Luckily, the person who's running this, um, this session is in charge of our technical assistance. So perhaps we can work together to come up with a small package of examples that we

might be able to share, uh, with S c a. So thank you Mr. Parsley for that recommendation. It is something that we will certainly look into,

Speaker 3   00:41:25   And I will say that's something that we've tried to do, um, as, as needs rise up. Uh, it's, it's been really good to see SES and grantees collaborate with each other, um, on implementation and, and sharing success stories and challenges as well. And, uh, we definitely seek to make those connections when we can.

Speaker 2   00:41:48   Any final questions for us? I see not many additional, uh, questions in the chat. I

Speaker 3   00:41:59   Mean, as always, you can reach out to your program officer through your state mailbox and we'll hit the ground running.

Speaker 4   00:42:12   Melissa,

Speaker 0   00:42:12   You're muted.

Speaker 1   00:42:20   Thank you for joining us today.

Speaker 3   00:42:36   I'm still having a hard time hearing Melissa. I'm not sure if that's universal.

Speaker 0   00:42:42   Yeah, the audio was very quiet just then.

Speaker 1   00:42:49   Apologies, I'll put some information into the chat.

Speaker 3   00:42:58   I see a question in the chat, chat about, um, sharing find trends and findings. We do publish the, uh, the reports online, and that's a great way to check in really quickly. Um, again, we do send out newsletters and things, uh, you know, through the S D R and, uh, we'll, you know, try and highlight things as we can there. I'm sure

Speaker 0   00:43:38   I don't see any further questions in chat, and there are no hands raised at this time.

Speaker 3   00:43:47   Thanks for participating everybody.

Speaker 2   00:43:54   Thank you for participating. Please. Um, we hope that you'll be able to join us for our future webinars.

Speaker 0   00:44:02   That concludes our conference. Thank you for using event services. You may now disconnect. <silence>.