

Race to the Top

Progress Update – On-site Review

State: **Hawaii**

Part B: *In preparation for the on-site program review and stocktakes, the State must update and provide appropriate documentation to substantiate its responses for each application criterion.*¹

Assurance area: **B – Standards and Assessments**

Application criterion: **B3 – Supporting the transitions to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments**

Relevant projects: **1) Common Core Standards Implementation, 2) Assessment Literacy, 3) End-of-course Assessments, and 4) Continuum of Proactive Student Supports for Early Intervention and Prevention**

1. What methods, tools, and processes is the State using to determine the progress toward goals and the quality of implementation of the activities described in this application criterion?
2. Provide a narrative that demonstrates the extent of the State's progress toward its goals and alignment to the scope of work.
3. What is the State's assessment of the quality of implementation to date?
4. If the State is not on track with the goals, timelines and quality of implementation outlined in the scope of work, why not, and what strategies is the State employing in order to meet its goals?
5. What are the potential obstacles and/or risks that could impact the State's ability to achieve its goals?

Evaluation: Performance and progress to date (choose one)

Problematic (1) Weak (2) Adequate (3) Strong (4) Advanced (5)

¹ Note that States will only be required to submit documentation for the on-site program review, not for monthly calls.

Part C: *In preparation for the on-site program review and stocktakes, States must answer the following questions and complete the evaluation for each assurance area (e.g. assurance area B) and for Priority 2 (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math, STEM).*

Assurance area: **B- Standards and Assessments**

1. How has the State's progress to date directly or indirectly impacted student achievement?
2. Identify 2 to 3 key deliverables that are essential for meeting the State's goals in this assurance area/Priority 2: STEM.

*Evaluation:*² *Likelihood of reaching performance measures in this assurance area (choose one)*

Red (1) Orange (2) Yellow (3) Green (4)

² Red – requires urgent and decisive action; Orange – requires substantial attention, some aspects need urgent attention; Yellow – aspect(s) require substantial attention, some aspects good; Green – good, requires refinement and systematic implementation.

Race to the Top Accountability and Oversight

<p style="text-align: center;">Allocation of Funds</p>	<p>funding under Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.</p> <p>Documentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation and disbursement information • LEA budgets for scope of work activities
<p style="text-align: center;">Fiscal Management EDGAR 80.20, 80.21, and ARRA Sections 14002(b), 14003, 14004, 1604, 1605, and 1606</p>	<p>Requirement: The State is practicing fiscal responsibility and administering the use of Race to the Top funds (both internally and externally with LEAs and contractors) to ensure compliance with Federal regulations and prevent fraud, waste, and abuse.</p> <p>Documentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State Chart of Accounts identifying all Race to the Top related fund, program, and account codes. • A summary report of the Race to the Top revenues evidencing that the revenues have been tracked with unique fund codes. • Expenditure reports to demonstrate tracking of Race to the Top funds to allowable (project-based and approved) costs. • Expenditure reports that demonstrate compliance with cash management principles. • Alignment of spending to proposed and approved budget. • Evidence of use of funds only during the period of allowability. ▪ For the account that the RTT funds are residing in at the State level, provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation (i.e. monthly or quarterly bank statement, report from State Treasury account) evidencing whether or not the account is an interest bearing account. • An example of evidence of receipt of RTT funds drawn down from G5 (e.g. wire transfer, cash receipt form, bank statement) into a non-interest bearing account. • Evidence of corresponding outlay of RTT funds from the State’s account to allowable expenditures, including subrecipient accounts (e.g. journal entry).
<p style="text-align: center;">Subrecipient Monitoring (EDGAR §80.40)</p>	<p>Requirement: The State’s monitoring strategy includes all components (detailed in first bullet below).</p> <p>Documentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Race to the Top-specific monitoring plan, protocols, and schedule for all subrecipients, vendors, and contractors. • Evidence that the State’s monitoring strategy outlines its ability to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assess LEA progress and alignment to their scopes of work, determine the quality of LEA implementation through established methods, tools, and processes, and identify and work to mitigate potential obstacles and/or risks that could impact the LEAs’ ability to achieve its goals. ▪ Monitor grant and subgrant activities to assure compliance with applicable Federal requirements; and • Sample monitoring reports and corrective action follow-up
<p style="text-align: center;">Quarterly ARRA Section 1512 Reporting (ARRA Sections 14008 and 1512)</p>	<p>Requirement: The State is ensuring compliance with ARRA Section 1512 quarterly reporting regulations.</p> <p>Documentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An explanation of/example for section 1512 reporting process. • Sample of documentation supporting the data in Section 1512 quarterly report. <p>Evidence of State ensuring the validity of LEA-reported numbers.</p>