



**The National  
Evaluation and  
Technical  
Assistance Center**

for the  
Education of Children and Youth  
Who Are Neglected, Delinquent  
or At-Risk (NDTAC)

## **ND Topical Call**

**Innovative Uses of Title I, Part D, Funds: Blending and Braiding (Call 3)**

**September 22, 2014**

[www.neglected-delinquent.org](http://www.neglected-delinquent.org)

# Agenda

1. Overview of the Innovative Uses of Funds Topical Call Series
2. The Difference Between Blending and Braiding Funds
3. Constraints on Braiding and Blending Federal Funding
4. Efforts to Blend or Braid TIPD funds in Montana, Washington State, and Utah
5. Whole Group Discussion
6. Technical Assistance Resources

# Series Overview

- **How can TIPD grantees and subgrantees maximize service delivery for children and youth who are neglected and delinquent with strained state and local budgets?**
  - Call 1: Cost-Benefit Analysis to Drive Decisionmaking
  - Call 2: Transitions
  - Call 3: Blending and Braiding Funds

# Call 2 Recap

1. Promising Practices and Model Programs:
  - Wraparound services
  - Pre-release training
  - Professional development
  - Public-private partnership
2. Funding Mechanisms Available to Title I, Part D Subgrantees
3. Resources

# The Difference Between Blending and Braiding Funds

- **Blending of funds:** Two or more sources of funds are put together for a specific purpose and track expenditures as if they were one (i.e., cannot discern how each fund source is allocated)
- **Braiding of funds:** Two or more sources of funds are put together for a specific purpose in such a way that the funds can still be accounted for separately

# Constraints on Braiding and Blending Federal Funding

- Historically both practices have been discouraged
- Presently, practice of braiding funds has been allowed, even encouraged, in at least the last three reauthorizations of the Elementary & Secondary Education Act (ESEA)
- **Above all, NCLB requires all funds spent to have an impact on student learning and must be planned to be spent according to a needs assessment that is based on hard data, not opinion or perception.**

# Constraints on Braiding and Blending Federal Funding

- Only certain programs may be blended.
  - The four programs from which you may move funds are Title II, Part A (Teacher Quality Program), Title II, Part D (Ed. Technology), Title IV, Part D (Safe & Drug Free Schools), and Title V, (Innovative Programs).
  - Funds may be transferred to the same four Title programs plus Title I, Part A.
  - Funds may **not** be transferred from Title I.

# Constraints on Braiding and Blending Federal Funding

- There is a limit on the amount of funding which may be blended
  - A school system can move up to 50% of funds from any of four NCLB Titles to any of five Titles
  - The 50% limit is further restricted to 30% when a school system is "identified for improvement", and is eliminated (0%) when a school system is identified for "corrective action"
  - Moving funds from one program to another is accomplished using an Inter fund transfer request
- Title I and Title II allow funds to be used to provide professional development (as defined in NCLB)



# Constraints on Braiding and Blending Federal Funding

- Braiding funds might lead a school system close to the "supplement vs supplant" issue
  - Funds from NCLB Title programs are to be supplemental in nature.
  - If these funds are **used to provide something that is required by local, state law or polity or other federal law** then supplanting occurs and a district may have to pay the funds back to the program if discovered in an audit.
  - Supplanting also occurs when a school system **uses federal funds to pay for something that has previously been paid from local funds.**

# Efforts to Blend or Braid TIPD funds in Utah

- State TIPD Coordinator, Murray Meszaros
- Training local educators and Department of Juvenile Justice Services (DJJS) staff in O&A and Secure Care sites with the goal to increase local-level collaboration and empowerment.
  - Initially, funded using Subpart 1 administrative set-aside money as a pilot.
  - OJJDP also gave the state a small amount of seed money.
  - Given overwhelming positive response, state dollars now pay the lions share but are blended with Subpart 1 administrative set aside and DJJS dollars

# Efforts to Blend or Braid TIPD funds in Utah

- State statutory guidelines are being altered to allow for transition-like services so transition services are going to be a braided in the future with state and Subpart 1 funds.
  - Currently, transition is paid for solely by ND funds, but the TIPD program has successfully demonstrated the need for and power of transition.
  - The TIPD program is being very careful to not create supplanting situations as this rolls forward.
- All academic services are “braided”: State dollars pay for educational services during the regular school year and ND funds pay for “summer school” where state dollars are non-existent.

# Efforts to Blend or Braid TIPD funds in Utah

- CTE and other related rigorous educational services are currently being paid for by Subpart 1 funds.
  - State dollars may be blended with Subpart 1 funds in the future to support CTE programs
  - The proposed transition to blended funding is being closely planned out and monitored in their evolving strategic plan

# Efforts to Blend or Braid TIPD funds in Utah

- Developing a strong collaborative relationship with Department of Juvenile Justice Services (DJJS) integral
- Director and Deputy Director of DJJS are key players; their willingness to respond positively to the TIPD program invitation has:
  - Facilitated faster implementation
  - Saturated their entire agency culture. Now receiving calls from formerly resistant mid-level staff to come and learn what the TIPD program is up to

# Efforts to Blend or Braid TIPD funds in Utah

- Utah State Office of Education now has a joint mission statement and plans with DJJS -- from the state director all the way down to the local staff of DJJS and Education.
  - Developing similar statements with other state agencies and expect to see potential joint projects (including potential appropriate funding matters) in the future.

# Efforts to Blend or Braid TIPD funds in Washington State

- State TIPD Coordinator, Kathleen Sande
- In 2006, only served youth incarcerated inside detention centers due to limited Subpart 2 Title 1 D funds
- In 2007, corrected their method of counting youth in October, thereby substantially increasing our funding from \$885,000 to \$3.4 million
- Blend/braid Subpart 2 funds to support transition services

# 2008 COMPLETED THE MULTI-SYSTEM INTEGRATION CERTIFICATE PROGRAM AT GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY'S CENTER FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM

## \* CAPSTONE PROJECT:

- \* Place Education Advocates in middle and high schools
- \* Providing a continuum of transition services for  
Youth leaving juvenile justice and at-risk youth
- \* Early intervention and prevention services for
  - \* Middle – transition into high school students
- \* Transition/Intervention wrap-around services in alternative schools

<http://cjr.georgetown.edu/certprogs/public/certificatepublic.html>



# Characteristics of Effective Transition Systems (per NDTAC)

- Coordinated service offerings
- A transition coordinator or specialist
- Transition plans created at first contact
- High levels of youth and family involvement
- Culturally sensitive practices
- High levels of agency involvement
- Strong court involvement
- Agencies and schools work together
- Knowledgeable and well-trained staff
- Sufficient funding
- Well-designed tracking and monitoring system

# Determinations on Using Title I D funding

- \* Large funding increase (\$885,000 to \$3.4 million)
- \* Loss of Safe/Drug Free funds
- \* Data analysis = gap in re-engaging youth in school
- \* Need for:
  - \* continuum of services after incarceration
  - \* Coordinated services with transition specialists in Detention, in high schools and in middle schools
  - \* Statewide coordination, tracking and monitoring
  - \* High levels of coordination with schools, Courts, ESDs, long-term and short-term facility admin & staff

# Washington State Education Advocate (EA) Program

## **Vision:**

- Increase Title I D services statewide
- Address the needs of both incarcerated and at-risk youth
- Assist youth in overcoming barriers returning to school and work
- Improve school coordination when the return to school

## **Result:**

- Provided youth across WA with Education Advocate positions
- Developed a relationship with 9 Regional Educational Service Districts (as LEAs)
- Serve youth releasing from County Detention & State Facilities
- Serve middle & high school youth at risk of dropping out

# Stakeholders and Partners

- \* Program Supervisor for Institution Education & Title I D
- \* Student Support Director, OSPI
- \* Prevention/Intervention Director, OSPI
- \* Secondary Education Assistant Superintendent, OSPI
- \* Neglected-Delinquent Technical Assistance Center (NDTAC)
- \* Federal Program Specialist, US Department of Education
- \* Local County Juvenile Court Administrators
- \* Regional Superintendents of Educational Service Districts
- \* Prevention/Intervention Directors, each of the 9 ESDs

# Collaboration and Joint Planning between ESDs and local school districts

- \* Conduct a local needs assessment of the area
- \* Selected target group to serve
- \* Develop referral criteria and plan with detention school staff
- \* Develop youth-driven plan for those returning to school or choosing a vocation
- \* Determine how the program will be integrated with other school-based efforts

- \* Target primary site (schools, education institution and/or county with greatest need of services)
- \* Target certain student groups or areas with highest need (ethnic group, school or community)
- \* Coordinate how to meet the needs of the targeted students and not duplicate efforts

# Three-Tiered Case Management

Advocacy, support and guidance to youth:

- \* High need = Daily monitoring & support, contact with youth and an adult support, monitor attendance, grades, peer involvement
- \* Moderate need = Weekly or bi-weekly monitoring and support, contact with youth and adult
- \* Low need = Monthly or quarterly contact and support to maintain good practices

# What Education Advocates do..

## PROVIDE 1-1 SERVICES

- \* Assess with a strength-based instrument
- \* Develop a student-driven success plan
- \* 3-Tiered Case Management
- \* Refer to community services (social health, drug, alcohol)
- \* Monitor attendance
- \* Tutoring
- \* GED testing
- \* Career coaching
- \* Academic Testing
- \* Mentoring

## ASSIST YOUTH TO

- \* Overcome barriers
- \* Stay in school
- \* Connect to vocation/careers
- \* Improve attendance
- \* Improve school coordination
- \* Re-engage in school
- \* Engage with their community
- \* Locate viable employment

# ESDs Gather Data to Identify & Prioritize Students

## \* Re-entry Youth

- \* Previous School information
- \* Current status and risk of failing
- \* Criminal history & risk of offending
- \* Soft Skills – social, work, peer relationships and communication
- \* History of Behavioral Health concerns/issues
- \* Living arrangements

**INTERVENTION**

## \* Middle /High School Youth

- \* persistent low grades
- \* failing grades in one or more classes
- \* falling behind in course work
- \* being held back one grade level
- \* lack of educational engagement
- \* Health risk

**PREVENTION**



# Individualized Student Needs Assessment (intake)

- \* Strength-based assessment (intake form) collecting:
  - \* Demographics
  - \* School/Education History
  - \* History of Juvenile Justice Involvement
  - \* Community Resources/Linkages needs
  - \* Personal History (mental health, abuse, peer involvement sexual history, extracurricular activities
  - \* Substance Abuse History (for those qualified)
- \* Screening tool for vocational interests and skills
- \* Refer out for mental health, drug & alcohol

# Paperwork

\* To receive a federal grant, each ESD completes our application with assurances and the following narratives annually:

1. Needs assessment
2. Targeted population
3. Projected number to serve
4. How to rank for services
5. Lessons Learned (after each year)
6. Services to be provided
7. Program evaluation methods
8. Parent involvement
9. Sustainability
10. Budget

# Youth Served 2009-date

YEAR	Facility Youth	Middle/High Youth	TOTAL SERVED	Funding
2009-10	819	193	1012	\$1,220,000
2010-11	763	815	1578	\$1,980,000
2011-12	837	566	1403	\$1,712,492
2012-13	933	411	1344	\$1,588,080

# Outcomes 2009-13

## Youth Out of Detention:

- Enrolled in School 26%
- Enrolled in GED 13%
- Completed GED 11%
- Completed Diploma 4%
- Enrolled in Job Training 25%
- Employed 21%

## At-Risk Youth in Middle/High School:

- Enrolled in School 23%
- High School Credits 55%
- Tested above grade-level
  - in Math 14%
  - In Reading 30%

# Efforts to Blend or Braid TIPD funds in Montana

- State TIPD Coordinator, Heather Denny
- Considering braiding:
  - Title I, Part A, Part D
  - Title X (homeless)
  - Title III (LEP)
  - Title VII (Indian Ed.)
- Program implementation in local settings may give more bang for the buck

# Whole Group Discussion

- Have you or your subgrantees blended or braided TIPD funds?
  - If not, why not?
  - If so,
    - Subpart 1 or Subpart 2?
    - What student needs were/are served?
    - What funding sources?
- If you have not or are planning to, how might you blend or braid TIPD funds?

# Resources

- [A Self-Assessment and Planning Guide: Developing a Comprehensive Financing Plan to Support Effective Systems of Care](#)
- [Blending and Braiding Funds to Support a System of Care](#)
- [Critical Financing Strategies with System-Level Outcomes, Indicators, Data Sources, and Data Analysis Plan \(Table\)](#)
- [Blending And Braiding Funds And Resources: The Intermediary As Facilitator](#)
- [Collaborative Funding Strategies](#)

# Resources

- [Mix and Match: Using Federal Programs to Support Interagency Systems of Care for Children with Mental Health Care Needs](#)
- [Blending and Braiding Funding Strategies: What are they and how do you make them work?](#)
- [Cross-Systems Financing Project Report](#)



# Resources

## ■ Spark Institute Fiscal Guides

- [Guide to Blending & Braiding](#)
- [Colorado Guide 1: Blending & Braiding](#)
- [Colorado Guide 2: TANF for Local Communities: Over 50 Ways to Use Your TANF!](#)
- [Colorado Guide 3: Partnering with Funders: A Guide for Communities, Advocates, and Non-Profits](#)
- [Cross-System Financing Strategies: Strategies for Innovative Financing of Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment Services for Children and Youth](#)
- [Successful Principles and Strategies for Integrated Funding to Support Models like High Fidelity Wraparound](#)

# Registrants

Email	First Name	Last Name	Job Title	Organization	City	State txt	Attendees
monica.johnson@doe.state.nj.us	Monica	Johnson	NJ Title I Part D Coordinator	NJDOE	Trenton	NJ	1
jackie.godbout@roadrunner.com	Jackie	Godbout	Title IA/ID Consultant	Maine Dept. of Education	Augusta	ME	1
karl.koenig@education.ohio.gov	Karl	Koenig	Assistant Director- Office of Federal Programs	Ohio Department of Education	Columbus	OH	1
mrussman@mail.nysed.gov	Mary	Russman	Education Program Assistant	New York State Education Department	Albany	NY	1
jmclendon@mde.k12.ms.us	Jerry	McClendon	Title I N & D Coordinator	MS Dept. of Ed	Jackson	MS	1
elizabeth.roper@tn.gov	Liz	Roper	Neglected & Delinquent Director	Tennessee Dept. of Education	Nashville	TN	1
Martha.Slemp@ky.gov	Martha	Slemp	DOC Education Branch Manager	Department of Corrections Kentucky		KY	2
jackie.godbout@maine.gov	Jackie	Godbout	Title IA/ID	Maine Dept. of Education	Augusta	ME	1
chandra.martin@arkansas.gov	Chandra	Martin	Public School Program Advisor	Arkansas Department of Education	Little Rock	AR	1
mbaune@nd.gov	Margaret	Baune	State Coordinator	North Dakota Department of Public Instruction	Bismarck	ND	1
Stephanie.Enos@ride.ri.gov	Stephanie	Enos	Education Specialist, Title I	RI Department of Education		RI	1
lynda.thistle Elliott@doe.nh.gov	Lynda	Thistle Elliott	Dir Office of Homeless Ed/Coord	NH Department of Education	Concord	NH	1
lseiter@air.org	Liann	Seiter	Title I Part D	NDTAC	Washington	DC	1
pat.frost@nebraska.gov	Pat	frost	Title I Part D State Coordinator, Title IA Consultant	NE Dept of ED		NE	1
richard.bartosh@iowa.gov	Rick	Bartosh	Title I Consultant	Iowa Dept. of Education	Des Moines	IA	1
bharris@ed.sc.gov	Basil	Harris	State N&D Coordinator	SC Department of Education	Columbia	SC	1
marsha.ruetters@dese.mo.gov	Marsha	Ruetters	Supervisor	DESE	Jefferson City	MO	1
pmonarch@mail.nysed.gov	Paula	Monarch-Palmieri	Associate	NYSED	Albany	NY	2
hdenny@mt.gov	Heather	Denny	State Coordinator	OPI	Helena	MT	1
cbradley@isbe.net	Cheryl	Bradley	Consultant	Illinois State Board of Education		IL	1