

Steven's answer justification:

Here are the presentation. Also, someone asked if I could provide Answers and reasoning for the pop quiz questions on the allowability slides, so here they are:

Question 1 (slide 37): Yes this is allowable, so long as it is covered in the school's school-wide plan. It is not supplanting because it is a school-level expenditure, and Title I-A no longer looks at school-level expenditures to determine if supplanting occurred.

Question 2 (slide 38): This is not allowable because it would be a presumption of unlawful supplanting for Title IV-A. The LEA would have to rebut the presumption by showing that there was no other funding available and this was a necessary part of its Title IV-A program.

Question 3 (slide 39): This is not allowable. Since the school is a targeted assistance school, it could only use Title I funds to pay for its Title I students to use the software.

Question 4 (slide 40): Not an allowable use of Title I funds, even in a schoolwide school.

Question 5 (slide 41): Not allowable is the district implements the initiative in non-Title I schools using non-federal funds. This would violate Title I-A's methodology test. If, however, the schools decided to use the funds they already receive to implement this at the school-level, that might not violate supplement, not supplant.

Question 6 (slide 42): If all 20% of the Title I student use the workbooks, then this could be an allocable use of Title I funds.

Question 7 (slide 43): If the LEA uses non-federal funds to provide the camps for non-Title I schools, this would violate the methodology test and would be considered supplanting. Therefore, not allowable.