2010 - 2011 TITLE I COMPARABILITY REPORT CHECKLIST

NO

-	_	-
	E,	٨·
_	_	٦.

REVIEWER:

Source documentation required YES Data Entry Contact/Email:

Title I Coordinator/Email:

Date Source	Prelir		eview	E-ma	il LEA	Report Complete	To Program Director/ Bureau Chief	Comments
Rec'd/	Initial Review complete	TO PD	RET'D To REV'R	ТО	FROM	DATE	DATE	
	Source Docs	Source Docs Initial Rec'd/ Review	Source Docs Initial TO PD Rec'd/ Review	SourceDocsInitialRec'd/ReviewTo	SourceTO PDRET'DTODocsInitialTO PDRET'DTORec'd/ReviewToTo	SourceTO PDRET'DTOFROMDocsInitialTO PDRET'DTOFROMRec'd/ReviewToToFROM	SourceCompleteDocsInitialTO PDRET'DTOFROMDATERec'd/ReviewToToFROMDATE	Source Docs Initial Rec'd/ TO PD RET'D To TO FROM DATE Bureau Chief

Documents

NA	Assurances	Pupil-Teacher Ratio	Average Per-Pupil Exp 🗌
 Comparability Checklist LEA's Written Comparability Procedures SIGNED/DATED Comparability Option Selection Form SIGNED/DATED Form C 2010-11 PSES 	 Comparability Checklist LEA's Written Comparability Procedures LEA-wide Policies (3) along with documentation of implementation Charter Schools Spreadsheets, if applicable SIGNED/DATED Comparability Option Selection Form SIGNED/DATED Form C 2010-11 PSES 	 Comparability Checklist LEA's Written Comparability Procedures Form A and Forms A-1 Form A-2 – Worksheet Printout Form A-2 View Calculations Charter Schools Spreadsheets, if applicable SIGNED/DATED Comparability Option Selection Form SIGNED/DATED Form C 2010-11 PSES 	 Comparability Checklist LEA's Written Comparability Procedures Form A and Forms A-1 Form A-3- Worksheet Printout Form A-3 View Calculations Form A-4 – School Data Worksheet Charter Schools Spreadsheets, if applicable SIGNED/DATED Comparability Option Selection Form SIGNED/DATED Form C 2010-11 PSES
Additional documentation to be submitted:	• Source documentation and calculations, if applicable	• Source documentation and calculations, if applicable	• Source documentation and calculations, if applicable

2010 – 2011 TITLE I COMPARABILITY REPORT CHECKLIST

REPORT	DATE	REVIEW	Reason(s) for Revisions:	REPORT STATUS			
TYPE	RECEIVED:	COMPLETE		In	Action		
				Compliance	Required		
ORIGINAL:							
1 st Revision:							
2 nd Revision:							
Source Documents:							

COMPARABILITY OPTION SELECTION FORM

(Check all that apply)

The Comparability Option Selection Form	Only 1 of the following options has been indicated:
received on:	NOT APPLICABLE If checked go to SECTION 1
 is signed by Superintendent (verify) OR if signed by a designee, the LEA has provided 	ASSURANCES – If checked go to SECTION 2
appropriate documentation that the designee is not paid wholly or in part with Title I funds and	PUPIL-TEACHER RATIO – If checked go to SECTION 3
has provided appropriate authorization for the signee.	AVERAGE PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES
Form C, received by FLDOE, was signed by staff other than LEA Title I staff.	If checked go to SECTION 4
	NOTE: The requirements for this option have
	changed. Please refer to the Comparability TAP.)

The LEA has submitted all required forms/documents to demonstrate comparability by the chosen method and each form is completed correctly.						
All schools meet comparability requirements.						
□ The LEA has submitted all required forms/documents to demonstrate comparability by the chosen method but each form is not completed correctly. The following clarification, verification or revision is required: □ Form A □ Form A-1 □ Form A-2 □ Form A-3 □ Form A-4 □ Form C						
Form C - If checked, the LEA has identified non-comparable schools and has indicated the corrective action(s) to be taken and has included a deadline for making corrections.						

2010 – 2011 TITLE I COMPARABILITY REPORT CHECKLIST

SECTION 1 -NOT APPLICABLE

The LEA has submitted the following:

The LEA has submitted **written procedures** demonstrating how it complies with comparability requirements. The procedures address each of the following components:

- Timeline for demonstrating comparability
- Identification of the office responsible for making comparability calculations
- Measure/option used to determine whether Title I schools are comparable
- Source of Data
- Date certain
- Manner and timelines for making adjustments in schools that are not comparable (including charter schools, if applicable)
- Procedures that specify or define non-federal instructional staff
- Procedures that specify or define Instructional materials/supplies
- Use of State Fiscal and State Stabilization Funds (SFSF)

COMPARABILITY OPTION SELECTION FORM

Signed and dated by Superintendent.

☐ If, signed by Superintendent's designee, the LEA has provided appropriate documentation that the designee is not paid wholly or in part with Title I funds and has provided appropriate authorization for the signee and document is dated.

FORM C

On the Printed Copy Sent to DOE:

The name and signature of the certifying official are provided.

The LEA has provided appropriate documentation to support that the certifying official is not paid wholly or in part with Title I funds.

Date Certain Certifying Official's Name/Date	Certifying Official's Title
--	-----------------------------

2010 - 2011 TITLE I COMPARABILITY REPORT CHECKLIST

SECTION 2 - ASSURANCES

The LEA provided the following required documentation to demonstrate comparability. All documents should reflect policies for the most current school year.

	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED	COMMENTS						
	LEA-wide salary schedules							
	Policy on equivalence among schools in teachers, administrators, and other staff							
	Policy on Equivalence among schools in the provision of curriculum/instructional materials and instructional supplies							
	 The LEA has submitted written procedures dem comparability requirements. The procedures address of the for demonstrating comparability Identification of the office responsible for make Measure/option used to determine whether Tites Source of Data Date certain Manner and timelines for making adjustments (including charter schools, if applicable) Procedures that specify or define non-federal is Procedures that specify or define Instructional Use of State Fiscal and State Stabilization Fundaments 	ress each of the following components: ing comparability calculations the I schools are comparable in schools that are not comparable nstructional staff materials/supplies						
FORM	1 C - The LEA has provided:							
	Date Certain Certifying Official's Nat	me/Date Certifying Official's Title						
	I C reflects: Imm 1 The names of all project schools determined selected by the LEA.	not to be comparable under the method						
Colu	mn 2 The grade span(s) of the school(s) that are	•						
Colu	Column 3 The reason(s) why the school is not comparable (e.g., the personnel ratio is too low, curriculum materials and other supplies expenditure were too low); and							
	The corrective action(s) the LEA will take to make the school comparable and the timeline in which corrective action will be made.							
On t	he Printed Copy Sent to DOE:							
П 1	he name and signature of the certifying official are provide	ded.						
	The LEA has provided appropriate documentation to support with Title I funds.	ort that the certifying official is not paid wholly						
FOR	M C - Overall Comment(s):							

2010 – 2011 TITLE I COMPARABILITY REPORT CHECKLIST

SECTION 3 – PUPIL-TEACHER RATIO

The LEA has submitted **written procedures** demonstrating how it complies with comparability requirements. The procedures address each of the following components:

- Timeline for demonstrating comparability
- Identification of the office responsible for making comparability calculations
- Measure/option used to determine whether Title I schools are comparable
- Source of Data
- Date certain
- Manner and timelines for making adjustments in schools that are not comparable (including charter schools, if applicable)
- Procedures that specify or define non-federal instructional staff
- Procedures that specify or define Instructional materials/supplies
- Use of State Fiscal and State Stabilization Funds (SFSF)

GRADE SPAN SERVED	Title I/Project Schools					Non-Title I/Non-Project Schools					COMMENTS
Grade Span(s) Served - The correct number of schools	GRADE	SPAN	s	YES	NO	GRADE SF	PANS	YES	5 N	ю	
for each grade span served is indicated for Title I and Non- Title I schools.	A – Elem B – Middle C – High <u>D - Combir</u>					A – Elem B – Middle C – High <u>D - Combina</u>					
Range Option has been indicated for:	All grade s Some grad		าร			All grade Spa Some grade					
	El	NROL	LME	NT SIZ	E RAI	NGE					
If selected, the correct enrollment	GRADE	LAF	RGE	SM	ALL	GRADE	LA	RGE	SMA	LL	
size range for schools within a	SPANS	Y	Ν	Y	N	SPANS	Y	N	Υ	N	
grade span has been divided into groups of smaller or larger schools and the size range meets the definition of significant difference in the enrollments of schools.	A – Elem B – Middle C – High D - Combo					A – Elem B – Middle C – High D - Combo					

FORMS A and A-1 – The LEA has indicated:

2010 – 2011 TITLE I COMPARABILITY REPORT CHECKLIST

SECTION 3 – PUPIL-TEACHER RATIO (continued)

FORM A-2

Step 1: For each grade span served, the LEA has:

	Title I/Project Schools	Non-Title I/Non-Project Schools
Student FTE Type	Indicated the type of full-time equivalent used.	Indicated the type of full-time equivalent used.
New School	☐ If checked, verify that school opened after the start of the school year.	If checked, verify that school opened after the start of the school year.
Range	Indicated the appropriate enrollment size range, if applicable.	Indicated the appropriate enrollment size range, if applicable.
Title I?	Included all of the TITLE I/PROJECT schools within the LEA in the indicated grade span.	Included all of the NON-TITLE I/NON- PROJECT schools within the LEA in the indicated grade span.
	□ Identified under the column entitled "Title I?" heading if new school is added.	 Identified under the column entitled "Title I?" heading if new school is added.
Virtual	☐ Indicated if schools are Virtual.	Indicated if schools are Virtual.
Charter	Indicated if schools are Charter.	Indicated if schools are Charter.

Step 2: For schools listed under School Number/School Name, verify the following for each grade span served:

Title I/Project Schools	Non-Title I/Non-Project Schools
All schools listed receive Title I funds	All non-Title I schools within grade spans/size of Title I schools are listed
Charter schools are listed, if applicable	Charter schools are listed, if applicable
"Skipped" schools are identified as Title I Schools (Schools on PSES with Selection Code "E."	Skipped Schools are non-applicable to non-Title I schools
Are correctly divided into "larger" and "smaller," if applicable	Are correctly divided into "larger" and "smaller," if applicable
Schools that overlap grade spans being served (i.e., K-12; K-8, etc.) are listed, if applicable	Schools that overlap grade spans being served (i.e., K-12; K-8, etc.) are listed, if applicable

Note: LEA has the option of excluding schools with fewer than 100 students.

Step 3: For each grade span served, the LEA:

Grade Span	Indicated the correct grade span for each school.
Student FTE	Provided the school's count of full-time equivalent (FTE) students.
Staff FTE	Provided the number of FTE staff paid with state and local funds who are regularly assigned to the school, excluding staff time devoted to English language educational programs and additional staff funded to meet the specific needs of students with disabilities. Staff included in this calculation are school-level staff , paid for from state and local funds, who provide direct instruction, instructional support, or administrative support; in addition to the time noted above, staff excluded are custodial staff, food service staff, health aides, and federally paid employees.
Not Applicable	Indicated NA for Pre-K Centers, schools reflected as Superintendent's Office, schools that have closed or have less than 100 students. Any Title I schools for which NA has been applied must still be included in the total count of Title I schools for the appropriate grade span.

2010 – 2011 TITLE I COMPARABILITY REPORT CHECKLIST

SECTION 3 – PUPIL-TEACHER RATIO (continued)

Step 4: Check the "View Calculations" to determine if all schools are comparable.							
All Schools are Comparable?	Yes	Form A-2 Comments:					
	🗌 No						

Form C -	The L	EA has	provided:				
Dat	te Cert	ain	Certifying Official's Name/Date	Certifying Official's Title			
FORM C ref	lects:						
Column 1			es of all project schools determined not to be by the LEA.	e comparable under the method			
Column 2		The grad	e span(s) of the school(s) that are not comp	arable.			
Column 3		The reason(s) why the school is not comparable (e.g., the personnel ratio is too low; curriculum materials and other supplies expenditure were too low, etc.)					
		The corrective action(s) the LEA will take to make the school comparable and the timeline in which corrective action will be made.					
On the Pri	nted C	opy Sent	to DOE:				
The nan	ne and	signature	of the certifying official are provided.				
☐ The LEA has provided appropriate documentation to support that the certifying official is not paid wholly or in part by Title I funds.							
FORM C –	Over a	all Comme	nt(s):				

Page 7 Rev 10.25.10

2010 – 2011 TITLE I COMPARABILITY REPORT CHECKLIST

SECTION 4 - AVERAGE PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES (NOTE: the requirements for this option has changed)

The LEA has submitted **written procedures** demonstrating how it complies with comparability requirements. The procedures address each of the following components:

- Timeline for demonstrating comparability
- Identification of the office responsible for making comparability calculations
- Measure/option used to determine whether Title I schools are comparable
- Source of Data
- Date certain
- Manner and timelines for making adjustments in schools that are not comparable (including charter schools, if applicable)
- Procedures that specify or define non-federal instructional staff
- Procedures that specify or define Instructional materials/supplies
- Use of State Fiscal and State Stabilization Funds (SFSF)

FORMS A and A-1 – The LEA has indicated:

GRADE SPAN SERVED	Title I/Project Schools				Non-Title I/Non-Project Schools				COMMENTS		
Grade Span(s) Served - The correct number of	GRADE SPANS		Y	YES NO		GRADE SPANS		YES	i N	ю	
correct number of schools for each grade span served is indicated for Title I and Non- Title I schools. Enrollment Size Range Option has been indicated for:	A – Elem B – Middle C – High D - Combination All grade spans Some grade spans					A – Elem B – Middle C – High D - Combination All grade Spans Some grade spans					
	ENROLLMENT SIZE RANGE										
If selected, the correct	GRADE LARG		RGE SMALL		GRADE	LARGE		SMA	LL		
enrollment size range for schools	SPANS	Y	Ν	Υ	Ν	SPANS	Y	N	Y	Ν	
within a grade span has been divided into groups of smaller or larger schools and the size range meets the definition of significant difference in the enrollments of schools.	A – Elem B – Middle C – High D - Combo					A – Elem B – Middle C – High D - Combo					

2010 – 2011 TITLE I COMPARABILITY REPORT CHECKLIST

SECTION 4 - AVERAGE PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES (continued)

Form A-3

Step 1: For each grade span served, the LEA has:

	Title I/Project Schools	Non-Title I/Non-Project Schools
Student FTE/Type	Indicated the type of full-time equivalent used.	Indicated the type of full-time equivalent used.
New School	☐ If checked, verify that school opened after the start of the school year.	If checked, verify that school opened after the start of the school year.
Range	Indicated the appropriate enrollment size range, if applicable.	Indicated the appropriate enrollment size range, if applicable.
Title I?	Included all of the TITLE I/PROJECT schools within the LEA in the indicated grade span, and	Included all of the NON-TITLE I/NON- PROJECT schools within the LEA in the indicated grade span, and
	Identified under the column entitled "Title I?" heading if new school is added.	 Identified under the column entitled "Title I?" heading if new school is added.
Virtual	Indicated if schools are Virtual.	Indicated if schools are Virtual.
Charter	Indicated if schools are Charter.	Indicated if schools are Charter.

Step 2: For schools listed under School Number/School Name, verify the following for each grade span served:

Title I/Project Schools	Non-Title I/Non-Project Schools
All schools listed receive Title I funds	All non-Title I schools within grade spans/size of Title I schools are listed
Charter schools are listed, if applicable	Charter schools are listed, if applicable
" Skipped" schools are identified as Title I Schools (Schools on PSES with Selection Code "E."	Skipped Schools are non-applicable to non- Title I schools
Are correctly divided into "larger" and "smaller," if applicable	Are correctly divided into "larger" and "smaller," if applicable
Schools that overlap grade spans being served (i.e., K-12; K-8, etc.) are listed, if applicable	Schools that overlap grade spans being served (i.e., K-12; K-8, etc.) are listed, if applicable

Note: LEA has the option of excluding schools with fewer than 100 students.

Step 3: Verify that the LEA has provided:

Grade Span	The correct grade span for each school.
Student FTE	The weighted or unweighted full-time equivalent student count for the date certain of the current year.
LEA Allocation	The current LEA allocation per FTE according to LEA school board policy or administrative directive has been recorded.
Grade Span Allocation	The total grade-span allocation.
Total State/ Local Allocation	Total State and Local Funds Allocated as displayed on Form A-4 is displayed in the school's budget. (See Form A-4)
Not Applicable	NA for Pre-K Centers, schools reflected as Superintendent's Office, schools that have closed or have less than 100 students and has provided <u>narrative justifying this option.</u>

2010 – 2011 TITLE I COMPARABILITY REPORT CHECKLIST

SECTION 4 - AVERAGE PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES (continued)

Step 4: Check the "View Calculations" to determine if all schools are Comparable.						
All Schools	🗌 Yes	Form-A-3: Comment(s):				
are						
Comparable?	🗌 No					

Form A-4 – Schools Allocation Data

For each gra	ide spa	an served, the LEA has:
Total State and Local Funds Allocation		Completed Form A-4 to determine the school's total allocation of state and local funds for instructional services. The LEA should use budget function/object codes under which state and local funds are allocated to schools to purchase resources necessary to provide appropriate instructional services to students. The data used should include the amount budgeted to each school for salaries of instructional personnel; instructional materials, and contracted services for providing instruction to students. (See Comparability TAP)
		All Title I schools (including skipped schools) within the grade span served are included.
		All non-Title I schools within the grade spans served are included.
		Each school's total as indicated on Form A-4 is being reflected on Form A-3.

FORM C - The LEA has provided:

Date Certain			Certifying Official's Name/Date	Certifying Official's Title					
FORM C re	FORM C reflects:								
Column	Column 1 The names of all project schools determined not to be comparable under the method selected by the LEA.								
Column	2 [The gra	ade span(s) of the school(s) that are not com	parable.					
Column	The reason(s) why the school is not comparable (e.g., the personnel ratio is too low, curriculum materials and other supplies expenditure were too low).								
		The co	rrective action(s) the LEA will take to make th	ne school comparable.					
On the P	On the Printed Copy Sent to DOE:								
The name and signature of the certifying official are provided.									
The LEA has provided appropriate documentation to support that the certifying official is not paid wholly or in part by Title I funds.									

FORM C – Overall Comment(s):