

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

CHRIS CHRISTIE Governor

KIM GUADAGNO Lt. Governor

July 15, 2013

Mr. John Gamble, School Lead Marion P. Thomas Charter School 370 South 7th Street Newark, NJ 07103-2047

Dear Mr. Gamble:

The New Jersey Department of Education has completed a review of funds received and disbursed from one or more federal programs by the <u>Marion P. Thomas Charter School</u>. The funding sources reviewed include titled programs for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The review covered the period July 1, 2011 through December 31, 2012. The resulting report is enclosed. Please provide a copy of the report to each board member. All issued Consolidated Monitoring Reports will be posted on the department's website at http://www.state.nj.us/education/finance/jobs/monitor/consolidated.

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

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

By copy of this report, your auditor is requested to comment on all areas of noncompliance and recommendations in the next certified audit submitted to the New Jersey Department of Education. If you have any questions, please contact Steven Hoffmann at (973) 621-2750.

Sincerely,

. Cerchino

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

RJC/SH/dk:Marion P. Thomas Charter School Cover Letter/consolidated monitoring Enclosures

CHRISTOPHER D. CERF Commissioner

www.nj.gov/education

Distribution List

Christopher D. Cerf David Corso Justin Barra Susan Martz Karen Campbell Peggy McDonald Kimberly Murray Steven Hoffmann Joseph Zarra Stephen M. Eells

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

MARION P. THOMAS CHARTER SCHOOL 370 SOUTH 7th STREET

370 SOUTH 7th STREET NEWARK, NJ 07103 PHONE: (973) 621-0060



CONSOLIDATED MONITORING REPORT JULY 2013

District: County: Dates On-Site: Case #: Marion P. Thomas Charter School Essex February 12 and 13, 2013 CM-053-12

FUNDING SOURCES

Program

Funding Award

Title I		\$ 500,580
IDEA Basic		136,430
Title IIA		24,977
	Total Funds	\$ 661,987

BACKGROUND

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

INTRODUCTION

The NJDOE visited the Marion P. Thomas Charter School to monitor the school's use of federal funds and the related program plans, where applicable, to determine whether the school's programs are meeting the intended purposes and objectives, as specified in the current year applications and authorizing statutes, and to determine whether the funds were spent in accordance with the program requirements, federal and state laws, and applicable regulations. The on-site visit included staff interviews and documentation reviews related to the requirements of the following programs: Title I; Title IIA and IDEA Basic for the period July 1, 2011 through December 31, 2012.

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

EXPENDITURES REVIEWED

The grants that were reviewed included Title I, Title IIA and IDEA Basic from July 1, 2011 through December 31, 2012. A sampling of purchase orders and/or salaries was taken from each program reviewed.

GENERAL DISTRICT OVERVIEW OF USES OF TITLE I AND IDEA FUNDS

Title I Projects

Title I funds were expended to support instructional assistants' salaries, professional development, an after school enrichment program, and parental involvement activities.

Title IIA Projects

The school used its FY 2011-2012 and currently in FY 2012-2013 (as of monitoring visit February 12-13, 2013) Title II, Part A funds primarily for purchases of professional development services and in-class support for language arts and mathematics, team teaching, coaching and/or modeling; collection of student response data for teachers in its targeted assistance programs. Activities also included providing mentors for "targeted" teachers who teach core subject areas in the targeted assistance program.

IDEA Projects (Special Education)

The school plans to use the grant to supplement the cost of instruction and purchase professional services for students with disabilities. The IDEA funds will address services for students with IEPs and provide related services by approved providers, purchase supplies, assistive and augmentative devices in accordance with IEPs, and professional development for special education teachers. The grant will also fund textbooks and instructional software and supplies for special education students, as well as transition services.

DETAILED FINDINGS AND RECOMMEDATIONS

<u>Title I</u>

Finding 1:

Condition: The school did not provide evidence that multiple measures were consistently applied to determine which students were eligible to receive Title I services. In addition, the district incorrectly included free and reduced lunch as one of the measures. As such, the monitors were unable to verify if the district is actually serving its lowest performing students and that all students receiving services actually met the eligibility criteria.

Citation: ESEA §1115: Targeted Assistance Schools.

Required Action: The school must revise its criteria for the Title I program to include multiple, educationally related objective criteria for both entrance into and exit from the program. Poverty measures are not acceptable entrance criteria for Title I services. Acceptable criteria include student performance on state assessments, benchmark assessments, local assessments, end-of-unit tests, portfolio assessments and grades. In addition, the school must establish a system to ensure that students receiving Title I services meet each of the established entrance criteria.

Finding 2:

Condition: The school's FY 2012-2013 Title I eligibility participation letter did not clearly state the multiple measures, including both entrance and exit criteria, used to identify Title I eligible students. Without this information, parents are unable to understand the reasons their child was selected to participate in the Title I program, and what is needed for their child to exit the program.

Citation: ESEA §1115: *Targeted Assistance Schools*; ESEA §1118(c): *Parental Involvement (Policy Involvement).*

Required Actions: In its Title I participation letter, the school must include the multiple measures used to identify the students, as well as clearly defined exit criteria. The school must provide a copy of its revised FY 2012-2013 Title I participation letter to the NJDOE for review.

Finding 3:

Condition: The school does not have supporting documents to verify the activity of Title I teachers as required by federal law. The documentation must reflect what the staff is doing, when and where and it must match their funded percentage. This documentation is necessary to verify that funded staff members are actually performing allowable grant activities.

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

Required Action: The school must verify the time and activity of staff charged to the grant. The school must submit a list of FY 2012-2013 Title I funded staff, salaries, funding percentages and time sheets to date to the NJDOE for review.

Finding 4:

Condition: The school did not provide evidence of convening its annual Title I parent meeting. Not conducting an annual meeting to explain the Title I legislation and the school's Title I programs in the beginning of the year does not allow parents of identified Title I students to be informed and vested in the Title I process from the start.

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

Required Actions: The school must convene its FY 2013-2014 annual Title I meeting for the parents/guardians of its identified Title I students in the beginning of the year and submit evidence of said meeting to the NJDOE for review (invitational letter/flyer, agenda, meeting minutes, and sign in sheets must be obtained).

Finding 5:

Condition: The school does not have a parental involvement program that reflects the requirements of Title I. In FY 2012-2013, there is no evidence the school's parental involvement policy and the school's school-parent compact were reviewed annually and developed in conjunction with Title I parents. The exclusion of parents in the development of these documents does not offer them the opportunity for full participation in their child's educational program.

Citation: ESEA §1118: Parental Involvement.

Required Action: The school must include the associated stakeholder groups in the development of the parental involvement policy and school-parent compact. The school must provide evidence of development with parents of the Title I students for the 2012-2013 school year to the NJDOE for review.

Title IIA

Finding 6:

Condition: During FY 2011–2012, the school used Title IIA funds on June 27, 2012, for two staff professional development activities: *"Team Building Activity/Marion P. Thomas Charter School Performing the Highest Level"* and *"Leadership Group Activity: What? Really? Are you sure?*" during a one-day Annual Staff Retreat/Picnic at Forest Lodge. The school provided no evidence these activities were "high quality professional development." Additionally, no supporting documentation (i.e. sign in sheet of attendees, evaluation and summary report of the outcome of the professional development activities) was available at the time of the monitoring visit.

The school is non-compliant for the two professional development activities that occurred at the Staff Annual Retreat/Picnic, which took place on June 27, 2012, specifically because the two professional development activities do not meet the criteria of "High-Quality" Professional Development.

Citation: NCLB §1112, §1119, §2122-§2123. *The NCLB Improvement Teacher Quality State Grants ESEA Title II, Part A Non-Regulatory Guidance, Revised October 5, 2006. Section A: Professional Development. (A-1, pgs 1-2).*

Required Action: The school must reverse the charges for the non-compliant professional development activities, and allocate state/local funds, rather than Title IIA funds that may support these activities.

The team leaders at the school should review *The NCLB Improvement Teacher Quality State Grants ESEA Title II, Part A Non-Regulatory Guidance, Revised October 5, 2006* which is located at: <u>http://www2.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.pdf</u>

Finding 7:

Condition: During FY 2011-2012, the school's use of Title IIA funds for staff professional development activities included: round trip bus transportation, meals, facility (Forest Lodge), and staff monetary awards specifically for the June 27, 2012, one-day Annual Staff Professional Development Retreat/Picnic, at Forest Lodge. The use of the grant for this purpose supplants state and local funds. Whereas, Title IIA funds must be used to supplement, and not supplant, any non-federal funds that would otherwise be used for authorized Title II activities.

Citation: Section 2123(b): Supplement not Supplant. The NCLB Improvement Teacher Quality State Grants ESEA Title II, Part A Non-Regulatory Guidance, Revised October 5, 2006. Section A: Professional Development. (pg 35. Sections E-15, E-16.).

Required Action: The school must reverse the activities funded under Title IIA funds. Whereas, the school must be able to reasonably document that the activities funded under Title IIA are, in fact supplemental.

Finding 8:

Condition: For FY 2012-2013 (monitoring visit February 12 and 13, 2013), the school's Certificated Staff Report, and other available documentation, showed inconsistencies concerning the status of some teachers who may or may not be highly qualified in any subject area they currently teach. Specifically, a review of the FY 2012-2013 Certificated Staff Report did not have an approved, authorized signature, and the report had missing information (i.e missing status of certification, subject area, etc.). Therefore, the "highly qualified" status of some teachers is unknown.

Additionally, the position/title and certification status of staff person "Catena" is questionable. This person is posted on a separate document: Provisional staff FY 2012-2013, as a mentor for teacher "Gonzales." However, the document does not show the type of mentor that Catena is, or the subject area. This same person is not on the district's FY 2012-2013 Certified Staff Report. Therefore, the official status of "Catena" is unknown.

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

Required Action: The school must continue to verify the highly qualified certification status of all mentors for teachers in all "targeted assistance" programs. All required information in the Certificated Staff Report must be complete, and have an approved, authorized signature.

Title IID

A review of the expenditures for the Title IID grant yielded no findings.

IDEA (Special Education)

Finding 9:

Condition: In the FY 2011-2012 and FY 2012-2013 grant years, the school's contracts with consultants did not specify that payments must be tied to specific services, nor did the contracts include a standard rate for services provided. Additionally, the school should not enter into open-ended contracts; the school should ensure that contracts either include a fixed standard rate for services or a not to exceed amount.

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

Required Action: The school must revise its contracts with all providers to ensure that a standard rate is established and that payments are based on specific services provided.

Special Education

Finding 10:

Condition: The school did not consistently provide parents of students referred and/or eligible for special education and related services and students referred and/or eligible for speech-language services notice of a meeting for identification, and IEP team meetings. Additionally, the school's notices of meetings did not consistently inform the parent of all intended purposes of the meeting, the right to invite others to the meetings and the provision of Parental Rights in Special Education. Noncompliance was due to a lack of consistent implementation of school procedures.

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

Required Action: The school must provide parents notice of a meeting in writing that contains all required components early enough to ensure they have an opportunity to attend. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the school must conduct training for child study team members and speech-language specialists regarding the procedures for implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. A monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to interview staff and review documentation of the provision and content of notice of a meeting for meetings conducted between May 2013 and September 2013.

Finding 11:

Condition: The school did not consistently provide parents written notice that contains all required components, within 15 calendar days following identification, initial eligibility, initial IEP, and reevaluation planning meetings for students eligible for special education and related services and for students eligible for speech-language services. Noncompliance was due to a lack of consistent implementation of school procedures.

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

Required Action: The school must ensure parents are provided written notice following a meeting that contains all required components within 15 calendar days of the meeting. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the school must provide training for child study team members and speech-language specialists regarding the procedures for implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. In addition, a monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to review copies of written notice sent to parents following meetings conducted between May 2013 and September 2013.

Finding 12:

Condition: The school did not consistently provide parents with copies of special education rules and due process hearing rules when a determination was made to conduct or not to conduct an initial evaluation for students referred for special education and related services. Noncompliance was due to a lack of implementation of school procedures.

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

Required Action: The school must ensure parents are provided with copies of special education rules and due process hearing rules when a determination is made to conduct or not to conduct an initial evaluation. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the school must provide training for child study team members regarding the procedures for implementing the requirements in the citations listed above. A monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to interview staff and review documentation of the provision of special education rules and due process rules at identification meetings conducted between May 2013 and September 2013.

Finding 13:

Condition: The school did not consistently provide copies of evaluation reports to parents at least 10 days prior to the determination of initial eligibility or redetermination of eligibility for students referred and/or eligible for special education and related services. Noncompliance was due to a lack of implementation of school procedures.

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

Required Action: The school must ensure parents are provided copies of evaluation reports not less than 10 days prior to the determination of eligibility. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the school must conduct training for child study team members regarding procedures for implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. A monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to interview staff and review documentation of the provision of copies of evaluation reports

provided 10 days prior to eligibility meetings conducted between May 2013 and September 2013.

Finding 14:

Condition: The school did not consistently convene identification, eligibility IEP, and reevaluation meetings with required participants for students eligible for special education and related services and speech-language services. Noncompliance was due to a lack of implementation of school procedures.

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

Required Action: The school must ensure identification, eligibility IEP, and reevaluation meetings are conducted with required participants and that documentation of attendance or written parental consent to excuse a member of the team are maintained in student record. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the school must conduct training for child study team members and speech-language specialists regarding the procedures for implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. A monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to interview staff and review documentation of participants at meetings conducted between May 2013 and September 2013.

Finding 15:

Condition: The school did not consistently document in the IEPs of students placed in separate settings, activities to move the student to a less restrictive environment. Noncompliance was due to a lack of implementation of the school procedures.

Citation: N.J.A.C. 6A:14-4.2 (a)4.

Required Action: The school must ensure when determining the educational placement of a child with a disability, the IEP team considers the general education class first and all required decisions regarding the placement are documented in the IEP for each student removed from general education for more than 20 percent of the school day. The school must also ensure for students placed in separate settings, the IEP team identifies activities to transition the student to a less restrictive environment and document them in each IEP. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the school must conduct training for child study team members regarding the school's procedures. To demonstrate the school has corrected the individual instances of noncompliance, the school must conduct annual review meetings and revise the IEPs for specific students with IEPs that were identified as noncompliant. Additionally, at the next IEP meeting for each student placed in a separate setting, the school must ensure the procedures are implemented. A monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to interview staff and review the revised IEPs, along with the IEPs for students whose annual review meetings were conducted between May 2013 and September 2013. Names of the students with IEPs that were identified as noncompliant will be provided to the school by the monitor.

Finding 16:

Condition: The school did not include required considerations and statements in each IEP for students eligible for speech-language services. Specifically, IEPs did not include:

- Present levels of academic achievement and functional performance; and
- Consideration of the need for extended school year.

Noncompliance was due to a lack of school procedures.

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

Required Action: The school must ensure each IEP contains the required considerations and statements. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the school must conduct training for speech-language specialists regarding the procedures for implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. At the next IEP meeting for each student eligible for speech-language services, the school must ensure all required components for the IEP are discussed and documented. A monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to interview staff and review documentation of the considerations and required statements in IEPs at IEP meetings conducted between May 2013 and September 2013.

Finding 17:

Condition: The school did not conduct meetings within 20 calendar days of receipt of a written request for evaluation for students referred for special education and related services or speech-language services. Noncompliance was due to a lack of implementation of school procedures.

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

Required Action: The school must ensure identification meetings are conducted within 20 calendar days of receipt of a written request for evaluation. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the school must conduct training for child study team members and speech-language specialists regarding the school's procedures. To demonstrate implementation of the procedures, a monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to interview staff and review the dated initial request for evaluation for students referred for special education and related services and for students referred for special education pages from the resulting meetings conducted between May 2013 and September 2013.

Finding 18:

Condition: The school did not conduct vision/hearing screenings for every student referred to the child study team for evaluation. Noncompliance was due to a lack of implementation of school procedures.

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

Required Action: The school must ensure a vision and audiometric screening is conducted for every student referred to the child study team with a copy of the results maintained in students' files. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the school must conduct training for child study team members regarding the procedures for implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. A monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to interview staff and review documentation of vision and hearing screenings following referral to the child study team between May 2013 and September 2013.

Finding 19:

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

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

Required Action: The school must ensure all components of the functional assessment are conducted as part of all initial evaluations. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the school must conduct training for child study team members and speech-language specialists regarding the school's procedures for implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. The school is referred to the sample report form speech-language evaluations located for which is at: www.state.nj.us/education/speced/forms. A monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to interview staff and review evaluation reports for students evaluated for special education and related services or speech-language services between May 2013 and September 2013.

Finding 20:

Condition: The school did not consistently ensure that students found eligible for speech-language services met the eligibility criteria. Noncompliance was due to a lack of implementation of school procedures.

Citation: N.J.A.C. 6A:14- 3.6(b)1-3; 20 U.S.C. §1401(3); and 34 CFR §300.306(b).

Required Action: The school must ensure the criteria set forth in N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.6(b) are used to determine eligibility for speech-language services. In order to demonstrate

correction of noncompliance, the school must conduct training for speech-language specialists regarding the procedures for implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. A monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to interview staff and review documentation of eligibility meetings conducted between May 2013 and September 2013.

Finding 21:

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

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

Required Action: The school must ensure interventions are provided in the general education setting for students exhibiting academic and/or behavioral difficulties prior to referring the student for an evaluation. In addition, the school must ensure when the I&RS team identifies interventions to meet the needs of a struggling learner, the team identifies and maintains documentation of the nature, description, frequency, and duration of the interventions and measure the effectiveness. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the school must conduct training for administrators and I&RS staff regarding the procedures for implementing the requirements in the citations listed above. Additionally, a monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to interview I&RS team members and teachers and review documentation for students who were provided interventions in general education between May 2013 and September 2013.

Finding 22:

Condition: The school does not have a policy for the provision of accommodations and modifications or, when appropriate, an alternate assessment for students with disabilities participating in schoolwide assessments. In addition, the school did not consistently document in IEPs for students eligible for special education and related services or speech-language services, how each student with a disability will participate in schoolwide assessment: general education assessments for the student's grade or an alternate assessment. An interview with school administration indicated the school conducts schoolwide assessments for all students in kindergarten and grades two through eight.

Citation: 34 CFR §300.160.

Required Action: The school must revise policies and procedures to ensure students with disabilities participate in school wide assessments and each IEP contains a statement of any individual modifications to be provided the student in the administration of school wide assessments. The policy must include the provision of accommodations and modifications and the provision of alternate assessments for those children who cannot

participate in the regular assessment. If the school reports publicly on the school wide assessment, the school must also report with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children. In order to demonstrate correction of noncompliance, the school must conduct training for child study team members regarding the procedures for implementing the requirements in the citation listed above. In addition, a monitor from the NJDOE will conduct an on-site visit to review the policy and IEPs developed between May 2013 and September 2013.

Administrative

Finding 23:

Condition: The school does not comply with required timekeeping standards for federally funded grants. Employees with 100 percent of their salary paid with Title I funds must complete a semi-annual certification attesting to their performance of Title I related duties, and employees with less than 100 percent of their salary paid with Title I funds must complete monthly personal activity reports.

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

Required Action: The school must ensure employees submit personal activity reports that have been verified by supervisors, as required.

Finding 24:

Condition: On several occasions, the school failed to issue a purchase order prior to goods being purchased or services being rendered (confirming order). School policy and state regulations require that a properly executed purchase order be issued prior to the purchase of goods or the rendering of services.

Citation: EDGAR, PART 80-Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments, Section 20, Standards for financial management systems. N.J.S.A. 18A:18A(2)(v) Public School Contracts Law.

Required Action: Purchase orders should be issued to all vendors prior to goods or services being provided.

Finding 25:

Condition: The school charged several expenditures to the incorrect general ledger accounts.

Citation: Uniform Minimum Chart of Accounts (Handbook 2R2). EDGAR, PART 80-Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments, Section 20, Standards for financial management systems.

Required Action: The school should ensure expenditures are charged to the appropriate general ledger account in accordance with the Uniform Minimum Chart of Accounts.

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

If you have any questions, please contact Steven Hoffmann via phone at (973) 621-2750 or via email at steven.hoffmann@doe.state.nj.us.