# ESEA Office Hours on 8.27.2020

Q: Would this childcare just be for teachers or could it extend to parents that are not teachers?

A: CDE will follow-up with an answer to this.

Q: So currently with the injunction and the unknowns we still do not have the option to use ESSER for all students at the public schools, but for non-publics use the FRL student calculation? Asking because if we do all and consult that way & then the injunction holds, wouldn't we have that option to do only FRL for the non-publics, but all for the district schools? Then we are in a bind with non-publics if we move forward. What if we have the NPS spend the money that is allocated to them? How would we handle this if the injunction holds?

A: We do not have an answer to this question currently. There is not clear guidance yet. Work with superintendents and legal counsel when allocating funding to NPS. This is up in the air so we cannot give guidance on this interim rule either way. The interim final rule is around the equitable services and the calculation not on how districts are to allocate funds to their schools.

Q: Would it help to see what Adams County created for their CRF reporting (on the funds they allocated to Adams county schools?)

A: Yes!

Q: This is a CRF question on allowability -- I don't want to forget to ask -- this is from a charter of ours - right now with the new READ Act rules for them of no longer allowing DIBELS deep testing so that K-2 students are going straight to a READ Act plan, they are having trouble managing the caseload. The tie to COVID is the instructional time lost last spring. They want to hire a part-time employee to manage this with READ & also to service e-learners in a more in-depth way. Note: they do get READ Act dollars, but my take from them is they have more need than what these funds can provide due to READ Act changes and instructional lost time for READ students. Would this be allowable with CRF?

A: Laura, extra staff to help students recover lost instructional time is allowable under CRF. If you can make this tie, to COVID response, you should be good to go. What would not be allowable is using CRF to hire staff narrowly to meet your READ Act requirements, which you would have to also do in a non-pandemic context. Make sense?

Comment on EDT: Thank you for recognizing that districts/schools are doing their best to fill teacher positions and struggling with remote, in person, hybrid situations. Reassignments may cause impacts on infield category.

Q: In-field in EDT does not include interventionists (215 coding) is that correct? Asking because I could see different levels needing to reallocate interventionists -- e.g. reallocating someone as an interventionist who is secondary licensed but using them at an elementary level in reassignment.

A: If an interventionist is filling the role of teacher for a significant length of time, it would be wise to document that staff member as a teacher. It depends on their ability to demonstrate in-field status.

Follow-up: Sorry -- I mean they stay interventionist, but support elementary instead of secondary, but don't hold an elementary license

A: We do not look at interventionists, just the teacher of record in an EDT analysis.

Q: This is a CRF use of funds question - is the purchase of touchless time clocks for employees to clock in and out on and touchless POS systems for Food Service use by students allowed with CRF funds? Each item would be under $5,000.

A: If you can tie this to pandemic response and health and safety then these are allowable purchases.