

Webinar Transcript
ESSA, Title IV, Part A: Changes to the Title IV, Part A, Student Support and Academic Enrichment
(SSAE) Grants Resulting from the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2017
May 24, 2017

Greta Colombi: Welcome to the Title IV, Part A, Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grant resulting from the Fiscal Year 2017 Department Of Education Appropriations Act. Before we get started today, I'm going to share a few details with you. First, throughout the presentation today, please note we will be using the acronym SSAE or SSAE Program to refer to the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grant program. Second, we have logistical details for you. We are very pleased so many of you have joined us. Since there are so many of us, to prevent background noise which could be disruptive, you should be participating in listen-only mode as described in the confirmation email. If you did not click listen-only mode when you entered the webinar, please be sure to mute your lines. Please note you're welcome to enter questions within the chat box here throughout the course of the webinar.

After today's events on the webinar event page, we will post the recording and slides within a week. Then we will post a Q&A document with responses to all questions you asked today via the chat box once it is available on that same webpage. In the meantime, you can access a copy of the slides and the provisions in the Appropriations Act that's related to the subject of the webinar within the Documents for Download file pod on the bottom right-hand corner of the screen. Next, with big webinars like this, technical issues sometimes occur. Should you have any audio problems or technical issues, please email ncssle@air.org or call 1(800)258-8413. We have staff standing by to help you. [Pause]

Before I hand off the webinar to our speakers, I would like to ask a quick polling question. What is your role? We have a broad range of stakeholders here as option. Please check all that apply. So we're moving the polling question over. It'll be up on your screen in just a moment. Hopefully, that gives you some time to think about what category works best for you. [Pause] There we go. Please take your time and let us know who was on today. So far, it looks like we have a large proportion of state educational agency staff people. We're just going to wait a couple of moments. It looks like we have got folks from nearly every single category so it is really wonderful to see such a diverse group on our webinar today. It looks like we also have a number of community-based organization staff and district administrators,

some advocates. The overall majority appears to be state educational agency directors and staff. Thank you very much for participating in today's poll. [Pause]

We are now all set. Without further ado, we are going to get started. I would like to now introduce you to David Esquith.

David Esquith: Thank you. Hi, this is David Esquith. I'm the director of the Office of Safe and Healthy Students at the Department of Education and I want to welcome everyone to today's webinar. This is the fourth webinar that we have done on Title IV, Part A and I think we have kind of record participation. [Audio Gap] and I want to give a particular shout out to the Girl Scouts and individuals who are affiliated with the Girl Scouts who are very much in attendance today. So we are thrilled to have the Girl Scouts and all of our partners at kind of the state educational agencies and school districts and all of our stakeholders. Without further ado, I'm going to turn it over to my colleague Eve Birge who's going to go over today's agenda. Eve?

Eve Birge: Thank you, David. Good afternoon. I'm Eve and I'm joined by Bryan Williams. We work with Dave in the Office of Safe and Healthy Students. Today, we are going to cover a new option for states under Title IV, Part A related to state subgrants [Audio Gap]. First, I'm going to provide a little background on the Every Student Succeeds Act or ESSA, then I will talk about the new provisions in the Appropriations Law, provisions that give states more flexibility in how they award Title IV, Part A subgrants. Bryan will answer some questions we have received. I will review the key takeaways and toward the end of the presentation, we will open it up for additional questions. We are fortunate today to be joined by our colleagues from Office of the General Counsel, Rachel and Lisa, who we hope will chime in during the Q&A portion of the webinar. It is my hope that first, by carefully reviewing the language in the appropriations about the new provision than addressing the questions we received from the field, summarizing the key takeaways and finally opening it up to you for any questions that remain will support you and will support your forward momentum.

Let's start with a little background. The Every Student Succeeds Act or ESSA was signed into law in December 2015. ESSA creates opportunity for [Audio Gap] well-rounded education, one that prepares every student regardless of their background to succeed in college and in their careers. Soon after it was signed, the Department of Education released non-regulatory guidance on one part of ESSA, a new grant called the student support and academic enrichment program. This program provides

SEAs, LEAs, and schools with flexibility to tailor your investments based on the needs of your unique student population.

Let's focus on the purpose of the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grant program. This SSAE program is intended to increase the capacity of SEAs, LEAs and local communities to provide all communities to a well-rounded education, to improve conditions for student learning, and to improve the use of technology. Where it is possible, we encourage coordination and integration of the SSAE program with activities authorized and funded under other sections of the ESEA.

Now let's move on to the SSAE funding requirement. The Department allocates the SSAE program funds to states by formula based on each state's share of funds under Title I, Part A of the ESEA. An SEA must reserve at least 95% of its SSAE allocation for subgrants to LEA. SEAs may use up to 5% of their allocation for state level activities, including up to 1% for administrative costs.

So that's a little background. Now we'll get into the changes that provided the impetus for us all to get together today. You might be wondering, I hope you're wondering what changes were made to Title IV, Part A and the Department of Education Appropriations Act. Well, let's get into it.

The Department of Education Appropriations Act includes 400 million for the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Program. It also made important changes to the SSAE program. The new provision that we are reviewing today applies to Fiscal Year 2017 funds.

Here is the change. The Appropriations Act provides states with the new option of awarding the Title IV, Part A subgrant to LEAs competitively instead of by formula. The key takeaway from this slide is that states now have a new option. They can make competitive awards or make grants or make awards by formula. We anticipate that this additional flexibility may be appealing to states whose available funding is insufficient to provide each eligible LEA with a \$10,000.00 minimum allocation.

There is an important point you don't want to miss about minimum expenditure requirements. The FY 2017 appropriations language adds provisions which are only applicable to competitive subgrants that move the minimum expenditure requirements up to the state level. So if an SEA decides to award the funds competitively, the requirements for percentage minimums across the three content

areas listed on this slide would only apply to the SEA distribution. LEAs would not be held to these requirements. If a state awards by formula, the LEAs are subject to the minimum expenditure requirements across the three content areas.

There is also a minimum award amount. SEAs that choose to make competitive subgrants can't make grants were less than \$10,000.00 and the grants they meet can only be for one year. This is also key. If an SEA distributes funds competitively, it must meet certain priorities. If a state is going to make competitive awards, it must give priority to the LEAs with the greatest need based on the Title I count and in a way that ensures geographic diversity.

This information I'm about to cover only place to funds awarded to an LEA solely for education technology. If a state decides to hold a competition and an LEA is awarded a subgrant to carry out only activities under the education technology content area, there is a new prohibition that bumps the ceiling for funds spent on technology infrastructure from 15% to 25%. This bump from 15% to 25% for technology infrastructure only applies to states that decide to hold the competition and only applies to LEAs that propose to focus solely on activities under the effective use of technology content area.

With regard to the timeline, amounts made available to states awarding subgrants on a competitive basis can be obligated by SEAs until September 30, 2018 and by LEA until September 30, 2019. States that decide to distribute funds competitively might want to consider the amount of time LEAs will need to implement their programs and structure their competition timelines to help make sure funds are awarded promptly so the LEAs have enough time to obligate the funds.

As you can see, there's obviously a big impact on the student support and academic enrichment program. State agencies now have an option they didn't have before. The 2017 Department of Education Appropriations Act didn't make any other changes that would affect programs that are covered by the consolidated state plan.

I'm now going to pass the mic to Bryan Williams and Bryan is going to review some of the questions we received. These questions relate to the changes and you will see that they build and expand on the information that we have reviewed so far.

Bryan Williams: Thanks, Eve. We've covered some important changes to SSAE for Fiscal Year 2017 and I'm sure many of you are thinking about how these changes may apply to you. We

have developed a few Q&As that will hopefully address some of your questions. So why don't we jump right in?

Our first question is "As a result of the 2017 Department of Education Appropriations Act, are states that required to distribute funds competitively?" The answer here is no. This year, states have the option to distribute Title IV, Part A funds using a competitive process or by formula in accordance with the program statute. You are not required to distribute funds competitively.

Question two is "What if a state has already submitted its plan to the Department of Education? Is it required to revise and resubmit this plan as a result of these changes?" The answer here is no. You are one of the seven states that have submitted a plan to the department and you do not wish to award subgrants competitively. No further action is necessary.

"What if a state has submitted its plan which stated that it would distribute funds by formula but now wants to distribute funds competitively?" In this case, the department will be in communication with states that have submitted their ESSA plans and we will provide the option of revising their submissions including their SSAE responses if necessary.

Question 4, "How much flexibility do states have in developing a competitive grant program?" States have discretion with respect to administering the competition. Of course, you could decide to hold a separate competition for each of the three content areas under SSAE or you could decide to require LEAs to address all three content areas in their proposal. Eve mentioned earlier two important points: one, that under a competitive process, LEAs are not subject to the statutory minimum expenditure requirements for the three content areas under SSAE and two, if a state decides to hold separate competitions for each of the three areas, an LEA that receives funds solely for technology and no other content area can now spend up to 25% of its funding technology infrastructure which is an increase from the 15% that exists under [Audio Gap].

Question 5 asks, "Do the minimum expenditure requirements apply to LEAs that are funded under a competitive process?" Again, the answer is no. If a state distributes funds competitively, the minimum expenditure requirements do not apply at the LEA level. In fact, LEAs do not even have to use funds for each of the three content areas if they are funded under a competitive process unless the state designs its

competition to require LEAs to address all three content areas. In that event, the statutory minimum expenditure requirements still would not apply at the LEA level. However, the minimum expenditure requirements do apply to the SEA allocation on a statewide basis in the event that the state distributes funds competitively. The important thing to remember is that under a competitive process, the minimum expenditure requirements for the three content areas move from the LEA level to the SEA level.

Our final question is “When distributing funds competitively, how are states to determine priority for LEAs with the greatest need?” The answer is that states must make awards with priority given to LEAs with the greatest need based on the number or percentage of children counted under Title I, Part A in a manner that ensures geographic diversity among grant recipients representing rural, suburban, and urban areas. However, states have flexibility to implement this priority in a number of ways. For example, you may consider providing additional points or weight to an application from an LEA that is identified as having the greatest need or if necessary, you can decide to go outside of the rank-ordered list of potential grant recipients to fund such an LEA. Similarly, a state may decide to go outside of rank order to achieve geographic diversity or meet the expenditure requirements in each of the content areas on a statewide basis. These are just a few examples to meet this requirement and I'm sure that many states already have administrative systems in place for competitive grants as well as others.

Okay. We have covered a few key questions related to some of the important changes this year and now I'm going to turn it back over to Eve who's going to summarize what we have covered today.

Eve Birge:

Thanks, Bryan. So I will briefly go over the information we have reviewed and highlight some key takeaways. I hope that this will give you also an opportunity to submit any additional questions that you might have.

If a state decides to award SSAE program funds competitively, the following information applies. The state must make awards so that at least 20% of available funds are distributed for well-rounded educational opportunities, at least 20% for safe and healthy students, and a portion for effective use of technology. LEAs receiving competitive subgrants are not subject to the minimum expenditure requirements described above. An LEA that receives a competitive subgrant only for

activities under the effective use of technology content area may use up to 25% of funds for technology infrastructure.

Again, here are a few more key takeaways for states that decide they want to hold a competition. Each subgrant awarded will have a one-year term. A subgrant cannot be less than \$10,000. Funds will be distributed to SEAs in July 2017. Three more takeaways. For SEAs making competitive subgrants, funds will remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018. Competitive subgrant funds will remain available for application by LEAs until September 30, 2019. This new provision applies only to FY 2017 funds.

Now, Bryan covered some important points. If the state submitted its plan and now wants to distribute funds competitively, they will have a chance to revise their submissions. Also, states have discretion and flexibility in how they administer a competition. He also reminded us states must make awards with priority given to LEAs with the greatest need and in a manner that ensures geographic diversity.

Okay. Now let's get to your questions. David Esquith will facilitate this portion of our webinar. David?

David Esquith: Thanks, Eve, and again thanks to everyone for participating today. Folks have been good about sending questions during the webinar and we're going to try to get to some of those at this point. We are also going to give people a little more time while we are answering these questions and at the end to put up their questions because one of the things that we have learned over time is we have taken a look at this new appropriations language is while it is short, there are lots of kind of dimensions to it and implications for state agencies and local agency stakeholders. We want to make sure that we have got as many questions as people might have about this as you're kind of working through some of the implications for the language.

So working with my colleagues Lisa and Rachel, I'm going to read the questions and then turn to them for some of our answers. Our first question is "There appears to be no prohibition on states allowing technology purchases in competitions focused on health and safety and well-rounded programs. Is that correct?"

Rachel Peternith: Yes, we believe that is correct.

David Esquith: All right. We are seeing a number of questions related to kind of the state allocations. The first one I think is an important one and one that we are well aware of. The

question is “The budget tables on the United States Department of Education website shows zero dollars for our State for Fiscal Year 2017. Is this an error?” The answer is yes and that we will be providing the correct data shortly. I think that a number of folks were wondering about kind of what is our state allocation is and is the information on the department’s website incorrect. We apologize for the error. It is incorrect. The correct information should be up there shortly. You will need to look on the Department of Education website for the budget tables and that is where you will find that information. Lisa or Rachel, is there anything you want to add?

Okay. The next question has to do with the equitable participation. The question is “Is there a nonpublic schools equitable participations requirement?” We know that there is a requirement related to the formula grants allocation. I’m assuming that this question is does that same requirement apply if grants are awarded competitively.

Rachel Peternith: Yes, LEAs must comply with Sections 8501 through 8504 of the SEA as amended by ESSA regarding equitable participation of private school students. We know that whether a state chooses to make subgrants via formula or via competition, other than the specific sort of terms that have been changed by the Appropriations Act, subgrants have to have all of the same terms and conditions as a appear in the Title IV formula in the ESEA which means subgrantees have to apply with equitable participation and they will also still have to complete a needs assessment.

David Esquith: Very good. I kind of want to reinforce that point that Rachel just made at the end about the needs assessment. Whereas the central piece on this new appropriations language has to do with giving state agencies the option to award grants competitively, the basic requirements whether it is formula or competitive apply to those funds. Right, Rachel, Lisa?

Rachel Peternith: Yes.

David Esquith: Okay. Next question, “Can a nonprofit apply directly? Are there restrictions?” I'm assuming this is just for the sake of kind of this question, if the state agency were to hold a grant competition, can nonprofits apply directly to the SEA competition is what I’m assuming this question is getting at as opposed to whether it would apply to a formula-based distribution. What do you all think?

Lisa Harris: No, the eligible agencies who receive subgrants under SSAE even in the competitive arena remains to LEA. So states will still be making subgrants to LEAs or a consortia of LEAs but not to nonprofits directly.

David Esquith: Thank you, Lisa. The next question has to do with public and nonpublic schools. "Are allocations different for public and nonpublic schools? If so, where can I obtain this information?" I'm again kind of reading into this question that we're kind of talking about the equitable participation issues. So Lisa and Rachel, what do you think?

Lisa Harris: This appears to also relate to equitable participation. Again, allocations for services to students and nonpublic schools would be provided through the equitable participation or equitable services requirements that were just discussed by Rachel a moment ago and LEAs continue to be required to comply with those provisions. The SEAs and the LEAs essentially are required to comply with those provisions to ensure that services are provided consistent with those sections, which again are Sections 8501 to 8504 of the ESEA.

Rachel Peternith: If anybody wants more information on that, you can find our SSAE non-regulatory program guidance on the department's website. It's also on the NCSSLE website and this is covered on Page 13 that has a footnote that provides a link to additional guidance on equitable services. There is also guidance on this in the ESSA fiscal guidance, also on the NCSSLE website I believe. Hopefully, you can find more information about equitable services there that will be helpful.

David Esquith: Okay. Let me see about further questions. I think while we are kind of waiting for you to put in additional questions and as we consider the ones that have been submitted to whether we can give you kind of a reliable answer at this point, I think one of the things to remember about this kind of new appropriations language is that while it is giving state educational agencies kind of an additional option on allocating funds to the school districts, it doesn't change kind of the basic structure and purpose and intent of Title IV, Part A. I think the questions that we're getting on equitable participation are good ones but they seem to suggest that something has changed around equitable participation because of this new option on holding a grant competition and the answer that I think you are hearing from us is those basic requirements are the same. This is simply another method that states have to distribute funds to their school districts.

A lot of the questions that we got in kind of the first three webinars that we held on Title IV, Part A were questions about how different state agencies will distribute their funds and their application and this kind of reinforces the notion states have an option. They have different ways that they can exercise that option of holding a grant competition and each state may be different and will kind of approach whether they exercise this option and how they exercise the option. There is a great deal of flexibility given to states in regards to doing that.

Let's see if there are other questions that we are able to answer at this point. Rachel or Lisa, are you kind of scrolling through the questions that we're getting?

Lisa Harris: There are quite a few and we are scrolling and trying to [Laughter] provide answers.

David Esquith: Well, while you're doing that, I see one that is kind of easily answered which is "What are kind of the three content areas?" If you look at the slide Eve covered earlier in the webinar, we have kind of three content areas, three buckets. One is well-rounded, one is safe and healthy, and the third is educational technology. Again, I would refer you to back to our Title IV, Part A guidance for further details. We also have our first three webinars archived at the NCSSE website so you can go to that website and learn more about the three content areas.

Rachel Peternith: We received a question that said "If we award LEAs by formula, could the districts use all of their funds for a needs assessment this year and use their funds for implementation next year?" The answer is no. Section 4106 A2 regarding LEA eligibility requires LEAs to complete a needs assessment prior to receiving an SSAE subgrant.

David Esquith: Another process kind of question on the webinar is "Will these slides be distributed to the webinar participants?" The answer is yes and they will also be available on the website.

Greta Colombi: That's right. Right In the bottom right-hand corner of your screen, you will see a box that's called Documents for Download and by clicking on a file, you can indicate to upload it so you can access it right away. [Pause]

David Esquith: We are giving people a little more time to ask questions. We're taking a look at those questions. I see one in regard to kind of the formula for calculating the equitable distribution. One of the things that you will also be seeing on the NCSSE website relatively soon is that we received a number of questions for the first three webinars

and we are looking to have those posted on the NCSSE website shortly, and we will definitely kind of push that out to make sure everyone knows that they are there, but a lot of the questions that we are getting on kind of the basic program will be answered in the Q&A that we will be posting shortly on the website resulting from the first three webinars. [Pause]

Lisa Harris: I'll talk about a follow-up on one of the questions about nonprofits.

David Esquith: Okay.

Lisa Harris: This seems to be a follow-up to an earlier question about whether nonprofits are eligible to apply directly and it asks whether partnerships are allowed in the subgranting process and whether an LEA in partnership with a local nonprofit would be able to apply for this grant. To clarify again, and this is simply based on the language of the law which tells us who is eligible to receive the funds, again it is LEAs or consortia of LEAs that are the subgrantees whether formula or competitive. Of course, the way that the program is designed, the way that the statute is written, stakeholders such as nonprofits and other entities play a very critical role with respect to SSAE. So we expect nonprofits to be involved with LEAs in providing services, in providing input into applications and in other ways but LEAs or consortia of LEAs are the recipients of funds and also would be the fiscal agent. The nonprofit cannot receive funds. The nonprofit cannot be the fiscal agent. [Pause]

David Esquith: I'm seeing a little bit kind of the chat discussion, I want to kind of clarify that 5- this is Dave - when I referred to the NCSSE website, that is the National Center on Safe and Supportive Learning Environments. That is the acronym that we use and how we pronounce it and I want to make sure that people are clear on which website to go to. Again, that's the National Center on Safe and Supportive Learning Environments. [Pause]

Question, "Can states allocate on a formula basis initially and then transition to a competitive allocation in future years?"

Rachel Peternith: The option to states to have a competitive option for their subgrant is only in this FY 2017 Appropriations Act authority and specifically only applies to funds that have been appropriated in this year FY 2017. So we can't anticipate what will happen with future years of appropriation, whether Congress would assert the same flexibility, whether there will be additional funding for this program, etcetera. So the only thing

we can comment on is the flexibility that appears for this year which is the option of competitive or formula. [Pause]

David Esquith: Okay, questions are still coming in. we will give it a minute to look at those questions. [Pause] We are still taking a look at the questions that are coming in. [Pause]

Lisa Harris: There is a question about whether a state is prohibited from weighting certain activities in running its competition. For example, safety, health, and AP exams, programs were folded into Title IV. "May a state add weight to those activities in their competition if the state sees a need for it?" The Appropriations Law provides a couple of priorities. One is prioritizing based on greatest needs and that is based on the Title I formula. The other is geographic diversity. A state has to incorporate those into its competition. Beyond that, a state could in fact create other priorities consistent with its own requirements for running competitions. However, we want to caution that the state also has to meet the expenditure requirements that in a formula instance are usually imposed on the LEA but are imposed on the state in the case of a competition. So yes is the bottom line answer that of these other priorities that the state wants to create are possibly but the state has to meet the expenditure requirements of 20% of the funds for well-rounded education, 20% for safe and healthy students, and some portion for effective use of technology.

David Esquith: Thank you, Lisa. This really kind of I think reinforces a point that we have made over on Title IV, Part A, that there are basic requirements that must be met by both SEAs and LEAs and that once those requirements are met, that there is a great deal of flexibility here both at the state level as well as at the district level or both kind of the allocation of the funds as well as the use of those funds. So it is a kind of fundamental, I think very attractive part of this program with the flexibility as long as the basic requirements are met. Would you agree?

Lisa Harris: Yes. That's right.

Rachel Peternith: I'll just answer a question. There's a question that says "Is the competitive option only available for FY 17?" I think I answered this before but I'll answer it again because it came up again. Yes. At this time, all we have is the FY 17 appropriation authority. We can't anticipate what will happen in the future so just assume that right now, you can do formula or competitive and don't make any assumptions about what future appropriations will be.

David Esquith: To kind of reinforce that point, that is simply because the provision was in the continuing resolution related to Fiscal Year 2017 funds and it will be up to Congress to decide what to do in future years. At this point, we have a change that applies to only 2017 funds. [Pause]

One of the questions that we have gotten is “Will the department track which states opt to allocate the funds competitively and which states opt to allocate by formula? If so, would this information be made available to the public?” I will look to Lisa and Rachel but my thought on this is that in order for a state to kind of award the grants competitively or by formula, it must be in their state plan. State plans are available and public in each state and so that is where one would look to determine if your state or other states have decided to exercise the option of awarding grants competitively.

As Bryan mentioned earlier, to kind of reinforce kind of a point that was made earlier is states that have submitted, we have had 17 states submit their state plan for kind of the first cohort or review. If they now wish to exercise this competitive grant option, they will be given an opportunity to revise those plans. Then once those plans are revised and approved, they will be made public so that certainly the information about whether a state decides to award the Title IV, Part A grants competitively or by formula will be available publicly through the issuance and publication of the state plans in each state. [Pause] Any others?

Rachel Peternith: There are a couple of others.

David Esquith: Okay.

Rachel Peternith: Yes. So I can answer one. There is a question asking “What was the reason this change was made? Won’t competitive methods deny all schools access?” We believe the additional flexibility offered to states by Congress to allow states to make subgrants by formula or through competition was to allow states to sort of make the most of the appropriation that they are going to be receiving, the allocation that they will be receiving under Title IV, Part A and give them the option of rather than giving all LEAs a very small allocation, to make a larger, competitive awards to fewer LEAs, those noted in the slides earlier, that have the need as well as address the geographic and diversity as well to allow them to sort of make a bigger investment in fewer LEAs so that they can make more of an impact based on the overall appropriation amount. The second part of that question about - I lost the question but won’t that impact

access to all schools. There was never a requirement that all schools receive Title IV, Part A funds, just sort of overall eligibility of all LEAs. So I don't know that that is relevant.

David Esquith: It could impact school districts.

Rachel Peternith: Yes, absolutely.

David Esquith: If a state agency decides to award the grants competitively, there may be school districts that would not receive funds through the competitive process. I see one of the questions while we are looking at others has to do with the issue of kind of deadlines to release funds at both the state and local level. This was one of the slides that Eve covered so I would encourage you all to go back through the slide deck. We do have that information on a slide. Eve, can you kind of access that readily and kind of go over that information again for someone who is asking that question?

Eve Birge: This is about the...?

David Esquith: The deadlines for obligation.

Eve Birge: I think it is Slide 17, that funds will be distributed to the SEAs in July 2017. They'll remain available for obligation by the SEAs until September 30, 2018 and by LEAs until September 30, 2019.

David Esquith: Okay. If we could put Slide 17 on the screen just as a reminder to folks while we continue to go through the other questions.

Lisa Harris: There is another one about "If a state has more LEAs that make it possible to allocate more than \$10,000.00," per LEA I assume is the question, "then that would mean the SEA has to award via competitive process." We want to emphasize again there is no requirement to award competitively. The Appropriations Law provides that as a possibility, something that the state may consider but there is no requirement. A state can still award by formula regardless of the amount of the allocation.

David Esquith: Right, and that there are provisions in kind of using the formula which addressed the issue of what a state educational agency should do if there are LEAs that would get less than \$10,000.00.

Lisa Harris: Right. Yes.

David Esquith: Again, that guidance is in the earlier Title IV, Part A guidance that we issued and further information will be coming out in the Qs & As on those webinars. Right?

Lisa Harris: That's right.

David Esquith: Okay.

Rachel Peternith: There was a question in general about whether we would be trying to respond to questions that we don't get to in this webinar, and I think our intention is we will do that. I'm not sure if it will be in writing or by another webinar but we will be in touch.

David Esquith: Definitely. What we will do is go through all of the questions that we haven't gotten to today, take a look at the ones where there are answers already in kind of the first set of Qs & As that we have kind of teed up to issue. If there are new questions, we will add to that body of Q&A and again, it will be available on the National Center on Safe and Supportive Learning Environments website. [Pause] Any others at this point?

Lisa Harris: There are a couple of questions about carryover also known as the Tydings Amendment. It's asked in a couple of different ways. This was probably addressed during the presentation, a little bit maybe, but we will emphasize it again which is that for competitive funds, the Appropriations Law says that states must award these FY 2017 funds or states must obligate these FY 2017 by September 30, 2018. Under the carryover provisions or the Tydings Amendment, LEAs will have until September 30, 2019 to obligate those funds. Under the formula provisions however, in the statute itself, the Tydings Amendment would apply as it always does to both the state and the LEAs so that both states and LEAs would have until September 30, 2019 to obligate funds.

David Esquith: Okay. We are continuing to get some questions so we are just going to give it a minute for people to submit their questions and for us to take a look at them. [Pause] We're still looking at the questions. We want to try to get to as many of these as we can today but also be sure that we are giving you kind of reliable answers. That is why we are kind of going through the questions carefully, to make sure that the ones that we answer are the ones where we are confident that we both understand the question and can give you a reliable answer, so please be patient. [Pause]

Okay. I think at this point we are going to kind of end this portion of the webinar. Questions that you have posed that we did not get to today, you will find answers to those questions either in the first cohort of Qs & As we will be publishing soon or we will add them to the second cohort. Now, I'm going to turn it back over to Greta to wrap up today's webinar.

Greta Colombi: Thank you, David. I just have a few final thoughts for you before we sign off. As a reminder, if you have SSAE program questions after the conclusion of today's webinar, please submit them to the email address on the screen. All resources from today's webinar including the slides, archive recording, and later the Q&A will be posted on the webpage for this event which I have included within the participant chat. We will also send a follow-up email with the resources to those who registered. If you have any questions about this webinar or future ones or about the National Center on Safe and Supportive Learning Environments, feel free to reach out to us at ncssle@air.org. Last but not least, we would greatly appreciate it if you could provide us with your feedback about today's webinar by responding to four quick questions that are being pulled up onto your screen in a moment. Your feedback will help us make improvements. [Pause] Thank you so very much again and we all hope you have a wonderful day and we will be in touch. [Audio Gap]

- End of Recording -