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What is Consolidation?

GaDOE allocates funding streams to LEAs.

Fund 150

School District

LEAs determine school level allocations.

Each month schools use Fund 150 to carry out their SWP.

Expenditures are then attributed to programs by percentage.

Each school’s program total is combined to determine LEA total for drawdowns.

Funds are consolidated at schools in Fund 150.
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Cohorts

Want to know how it’s going? Ask one of our cohort LEAs

Cohort 1:
Calhoun City, Cartersville City, Foothills Charter, Madison

Cohort 2:
APS, Dougherty, Long, Marietta City, Mitchell

Cohort 3:
Berrien, Bryan, Clarke, Coweta, Effingham, Fulton, Gainesville City, Lamar, Richmond, Scintilla Charter, Tattnall, Walker

Cohort 4:
Atkinson, Barrow, Ben Hill, Du Bois Charter, Griffin-Spalding, Miller, Montgomery, Muscogee, Oglethorpe, Stephens, Terrell
Consolidating Title I, Part C MEP Criteria

The following criteria apply to all LEAs involved in the Initiative:

• Only Title I schoolwide schools can participate in the Consolidation of Funds Initiative.

• At least one federal program must be combined with state and local funds in order to participate.

• LEAs agree to abide by the guidelines set forth in the Consolidation of Funds Manual.

• LEAs that are designated by the GaDOE as high risk for FY20 are ineligible to participate in the Program.
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Do you still have to serve subgroups?

This authority affords a schoolwide program school significant flexibility to better serve all students by improving the entire instructional program, rather than only providing separate services to specific target populations.

The Secretary emphasizes that a school operating a schoolwide program must address the needs of all students in the school, particularly the needs of the lowest-achieving students who are members of the target population of any program that is included in the schoolwide program.

2004 Federal Register
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Needs, Planning, Evaluation

- Needs Assessment
- Plan for Implementation
- Monitoring for Effectiveness
The principal of each consolidating school, in conjunction with LEA central office staff, has the discretion to

- **Identify the unique needs** of the students, faculty, leadership & community
- **Develop a targeted & tailored schoolwide plan** to implement & enhance the school’s instructional program
  - Customize the instructional program of the school to address identified needs
  - Highlight how the SWP meets the **Intent & Purpose** of federal funding
  - Streamline budgeting & purchasing through the Fund 150 budget
- **Evaluate the success** of the schoolwide plan
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Resources - Guidance

- GaDOE Consolidation of Funds Website
- USDE Non-Regulatory Guidance
- Consolidation of Funds Manual

Richard Woods, Georgia’s School Superintendent | Georgia Department of Education | Educating Georgia’s Future
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ESSA – Statutory Restrictions

A school must meet the following requirements if the school consolidates and uses funds from the Title I Part C, Education of Migratory Children program in its schoolwide program: (1) Migrant education. Before the school chooses to consolidate in its schoolwide program funds received under part C of Title I of the ESEA, the school must –

(i) Use these funds, in consultation with parents of migratory children or organizations representing those parents, or both, first to meet the unique educational needs of migratory students that result from the effects of their migratory lifestyle, and those other needs that are necessary to permit these students to participate effectively in school, as identified through the comprehensive Statewide needs assessment under § 200.83 and

(ii) Document that these needs have been met.

(ESEA section 1306(b)(4); 34 C.F.R. § 200.29(c)(1)) as amended by ESSA
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Application for the Consolidation of Funds

DUE with CLIP

Why do consolidating LEAs submit an annual Title I, Part C CoF Application?

GA’s request to USDE on allowing LEAs to consolidate Title I, Part C includes annual submission of MEP application to SEA

How is this different from the CLIP?

This application is very thorough and program specific
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What is new this year?

• Combined Title I, Part C CoF Application Guidance document into the Application.

• Streamlined and further clarified application questions.

• Added the option to request flexibility in K-12 funding available to consolidate based on local justification to be reviewed by GaDOE staff.
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Benefits and Misconceptions

Benefits

• Allow more consistency and flexibility in the structuring of tutor schedules.
• Strengthen the IDR component.
• Streamline funds for pre-school and OSY/DO instructional services.
• Potentially increases tutoring segments for PFS and Non-PFS students.
• Leverages all consolidated funds to increase services to migrant students.
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Benefits and Misconceptions

Common Misconceptions

• The program implementation model can’t change.
  MEP Model must fit needs of students.
• There will be less academic support for migrant students.
  Often LEAs who consolidate are able to leverage more funds to serve Migrant students.
• Migrant staff will be limited to serving only migrant students.
  Staff, not just migrant staff, may be used flexibly, often leading to more support from more staff, not just migrant staff.
• The LEA will not need to contact migrant parents.
  Migrant parents must be contacted annually to ensure student needs are being met.
• The LEA is not required to participate in GAMEP trainings and workshops.
  IDR trainings are required for LEAs who received Title I, Part C funding. GAMEP trainings and workshops paired with IDR trainings provide rich resources that will assist with support for preschool, k-12, and OSY/DO. Training addresses areas of need across the state.
• The LEA is not required to collect and report any MEP student data.
  While K-12 Implementation plans do not need to be submitted, LEAs must monitor the implementation and effectiveness of schoolwide plans. LEAs must also continue to report data relative to preschool and OSY/DO. This includes implementation plans and supplemental services.
A. Meeting Statute Requirements for Academic Support and Mobility Support

- Explain how Title I, Part C funds have been used first:
  - to meet the unique educational needs of migratory students that result from the effects of their migratory lifestyle,
  - and those other needs that are necessary to permit these students to participate effectively in school, as identified through the Comprehensive Statewide Needs Assessment/Service Delivery Plan, and the district’s FY20 comprehensive needs assessment and improvement plans. The State Service Delivery plan defines successful performance as scoring proficient or higher on the Milestones End of Course (EOC) or End of Grade (EOG). The performance of children in non-EOC or EOG grades is measured by meeting or exceeding the district’s grade level assessment expectations.
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Question A

Upon request, GaDOE staff can provide a file of Migrant PFS and Non-PFS students and GTID that can be used to help sort assessment files for this information.

- **Tier 1 Performance Review:** Did migrant students score proficient or higher on **End of Course and End of Grade Assessments** on grade level assessments?

- **Tier 2 Performance Review:** Did migrant students score proficient or higher on **local grade level assessments**? [If all students scored at proficient or higher on Tier 1 review, this does not need to be completed.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 1 Performance Review: Did migrant students score proficient or higher on End of Course and End of Grade Assessments on grade level assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Priority for Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Priority for Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Priority for Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Migrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 2 Performance Review: Did migrant students score proficient or higher on local grade level assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Priority for Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Priority for Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Priority for Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Migrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Question A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explain how participation in the GaDOE Consolidation of Funds Initiative will meet these children’s academic and non-academic needs during the 2020-2021 school year and how these supports will be measured.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Academic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What, if anything, will the LEA do differently to support incoming migratory children <strong>during the summer</strong> to ensure new students’ unique academic and non-academic needs are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain how the LEA will monitor the mobility of outgoing migratory children during the year to ensure student’s unique needs are met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Question A – Excerpt of Tattnall Response (Sample)

• Tutors work with migratory students during the school day and after school. Priority for Service (PFS) students’ academic needs are targeted for tutorials first. Migrant Family Outreach Coordinator (MFOC) assists with scheduling and monitoring. Progress is charted through digital learning platforms.

• Migrant students who did not meet proficiency on the previous year’s EOC or EOG assessment in ELA or Math are treated as PFS students and are served in a small group setting.

• SSPs participate in BOE PD and utilize PDNow for specific needs. Teachers provide feedback on the impact of SSP support.

• Data is collected on statewide assessments, digital learning platform performance, report card data, grade level retention data.
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Question A – Excerpt of Tattnall Response (Sample)

- Schedules the dental/medical services
- Post secondary option/information
- Ear, eye, dental screening for students
- High school counselor referrals
- Facility school communication
- Translation/interpretation
- Emergency medical
- Connect parents to school resources

Non-Academic
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Question A – Excerpt of Tattnall Response (Sample)

• Support Incoming Migrant Children During Summer
  • Upon a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) being received, each student’s academic needs are assessed via the PFS form, checking MSIX for previous school records.
  • If students are enrolled for a short duration, the LEA will immediately serve them academically and assess for academic growth.

• Monitor Outgoing Migrant Children During Year
  • Each SSP is required to complete information change form, MSIX is updated, parent contact is made to find out about the move, departure form is completed, grades and records forwarded if next school location is known.
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Questions B & C

B. Priority for Service Students (SEC. 1302(d))

a. Did the LEA participate in the Consolidation of Funds Initiative in FY20? Did the LEA meet the statutory requirements of priority for service (PFS) students in the prior year?

b. How will the LEA meet the statutory requirements of priority for service (PFS) students in the current year 2020-2021?

C. Use of K-12 Consolidated Funds (Not set-asides Preschool, Out of School Youth and Dropouts)

The LEA assures the Georgia Department of Education Migrant Education Program that the academic and non-academic needs of K-12 migrant students are explicitly addressed in the Consolidation of Funds Schoolwide Plan to include summer and school year supports and which may include school-based and home-based supports.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Sec. 1304(d) of the ESSA gives priority to migratory children who have made a qualifying move within the previous 1-year period and who—(1) are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet the challenging State academic standards; or (2) have dropped out of school.
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Question B – Excerpt of Tattnall Response (Sample)

• B.a - PFS Prior Year
  • Yes, the LEA participated in the Consolidation of Funds Initiative in FY20.
  • Yes, the LEA met the statutory requirements of PFS in prior year.

• B.b – PFS Current Year
  • The LEA will use the PFS notification/report to serve the PFS K-12 and drop-out students/out of school youth.
  • The LEA will serve non-PFS students once the needs of PFS students have been served and schedule allows it.
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Question B – Excerpt of Tattnall Response (Sample)

• The LEA will monitor PFS and Non PFS performance every 4.5 weeks via progress reports and report cards.
• The migrant tutor assigned to the PFS students or school will monitor grades and consult with teachers on a weekly basis.
• PFS and Non-PFS students needing academic support will be invited to attend the after-school.
• Summer school is available for PFS and non-PFS students in grades K-8th.
• Summer school credit recovery is available to migrant students in grades 9-12.
D. Parent and Stakeholder Consultation

Explain and provide documentation of how consultation with migrant parents, or organizations representing those parents, or both, was carried out in an organized, on-going, and timely way that involved parents in the planning/review of this schoolwide consolidation initiative.

Attach a list with the names of migrant parents and/or other participants in the creation of this plan.

**Agendas and other supporting documentation must be kept on file for Cross-Functional or Programmatic Monitoring.**

E. Monitoring the Migrant Education Program (MEP) under Consolidation for Effectiveness

In order to ensure that the MEP supported by Consolidated Funds is successful, how will the LEA monitor migrant participant’s needs.

In the event that, through monitoring, the LEA determines the MEP is not effective under Consolidation, what steps will be taken to transition the program out of consolidation.
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Question D – Excerpt of Tattnall Response (Sample)

- Parent Advisory Council (PAC) Meetings (3 Times a Year)
  - Update on Consolidation
  - Parent meeting agenda, sign in sheet, and minutes
  - Survey distributed for Feedback
- Comprehensive Needs Assessment Meeting (May)
  - Phone calls, Invitation letters
  - Results of Migrant Parent and Migrant Student Surveys
  - Academic Results and Program Effectiveness

**Be sure to develop a plan to obtain parent feedback when parents typically do not attend in-person meetings.**
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Question E – Excerpt of Tattnall Response (Sample)

• Monitoring Participant Needs:
  • Parent Advisory Council: Parent surveys, PAC Officer Input
  • Migrant Stakeholders: Spring Migrant Parent and Migrant Student Surveys
  • Statewide Assessments: GMAS EOG, GMAS EOC
  • Digital Learning Platforms: iReady, Lexile
  • Local Achievement Results: ELA progress monitoring scores, report cards
  • Implementation Monitoring: SSP Schedules, Teacher Feedback on SSPs
• In the event monitoring oversight shows that migrant participant’s academic needs are not met under the schoolwide programs or other components of the program are not being addressed, an exit strategy has been developed to prevent the consolidation of MEP funds for the 21-22 school year: the LEA will conduct mid-semester academic reviews to monitor students academic progress. In the spring of 2021, the CLIP stakeholder team and migrant parents will meet to review performance data and determine if all needs of migrant students have or have not been met. If needs have not been met at a specific school, Tattnall County will discontinue the consolidation of funds initiative at that specific school.
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Questions F & G

F. [ ] Assurance: Our LEA meets the requirements above as described in (ESEA section 1306(b)(4); 34 C.F.R. § 200.29(c)(1)) as amended by ESSA.

G. OPTIONAL Request for Flexibility: Based on a thorough review of migrant participant needs and enrollment trends by month, a LEA may seek flexibility in funding available to K-12 under consolidation. However, all commitments of supporting preschool children, K-12 students, and Out-of-School Youth must be met. For example, a LEA could seek flexibility to prorate the salary of a staff member who serves K-12 for 7 months (Aug–Feb) and serves out-of-school youth for 5 months (Mar–Jul). Please note that in this example, an individual would be responsible for completing time and effort documentation to include Fund 150 (state and local) and Title I, Part C (federal).

Is the LEA seeking flexibility? [ ] Yes [ ] No

If yes, provide a detailed explanation of what flexibility is sought and how the LEA will be able to meet commitments to preschool children, K-12 students and out-of-school youth, including verifying that there is no reduction in services to preschool children and out-of-school youth.
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ESSA – Statutory Restrictions

A school must meet the following requirements if the school consolidates and uses funds from the Title I Part C Education of Migratory Children Program in its schoolwide program: (1) Migrant education.

Before the school chooses to consolidate in its schoolwide program funds received under part C of Title I of the ESEA, the school must—

(i) Use these funds, in consultation with parents of migratory children or organizations representing those parents, or both, first to meet the unique educational needs of migratory students that result from the effects of their migratory lifestyle, and those other needs that are necessary to permit these students to participate effectively in school, as identified through the comprehensive Statewide needs assessment under § 200.83 and

(ii) Document that these needs have been met.

(ESEA section 1306(b)(4); 34 C.F.R. § 200.29(c)(1)) as amended by ESSA

Richard Woods, Georgia’s School Superintendent | Georgia Department of Education | Educating Georgia’s Future
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Feedback - consolidation@doe.k12.ga.us

Please provide us with feedback by completing our short survey. The survey can be accessed by QR code or the abbreviated link below.

OR

Open your phone’s camera and hold up until you can see QR code. Your phone will prompt you to access a website – allow access.