

Grant Title	IDEA B Formula		
NOGA ID	236600011088076600		
Request #	1	Request Amount	\$1,912,460.71

Based on the review of documentation provided, the TEA has approved and processed a reimbursement of \$57,297.03, based on the transactions tested. The details are noted in the table below. A partial payment has been previously paid in the amount of \$1,855,163.68.

TN	Employee Name	Reimbursement Requested	Costs to be reimbursed	Attributes Failed	Findings/ Observations
01.	Pedro Alvarado	\$4,520.83	\$4,520.83	None	None
02.	Hilda Briones	\$5,141.67	\$5,141.67	None	None
03.	Stephanie Canales	\$5,235.00	\$5,235.00	None	None
04.	Victor Chapa	\$4,625.00	\$4,625.00	None	None
05.	Vanessa Davis	\$5,458.33	\$5,458.33	None	None
06.	Mikayla Gonzales	\$10,264.54	\$10,264.54	None	None
07.	William Pierce	\$5,108.33	\$5,108.33	None	None
08.	Marisela Perez	\$6,575.00	\$6,575.00	None	None
09.	Penelope Silva	\$5,293.33	\$5,293.33	None	None
10.	Daniel Ybarra	\$5,075.00	\$5,075.00	None	None
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$57,297.03</b>	<b>\$57,297.03</b>		

### Payroll Attributes Tested

- a. Was the position approved/listed in the grant application budget?
- b. Was the job description signed, did it describe activities that are allowed in the grant, and did it align with the job title approved in the grant application?
- c. Was the position allowable per applicable laws, rules, and regulations?
- d. Is the program/activity/strategy that is being funded described in the DIP/CIP, if applicable?
- e. Was the payroll cost incurred within the allowable grant period? If expenditure was prior to grant start date, was the position included as an approved pre-award or activity cost?
- f. Was the employee appropriately certified/licensed for the position?
- g. Did the payroll authorization form, personnel action form, or other record identify all of the sources of funding from which the employee was authorized to be paid? Did the payroll records match the source(s) of funding?

### Time and Effort Documentation

- h. If the employee worked on a single cost objective or was 100% funded by the grant, was appropriate documentation provided?
- i. If the employee was split-funded or worked on multiple cost objectives, was appropriate documentation provided?

- j. Was the time and effort documentation certified after-the-fact by the employee or school official having first-hand knowledge of the work performed?
- k. Did the documentation account for the total activity for which the employee was compensated?
- l. Did the time allocation agree to the payroll cost allocation?

#### TEA Substitute System of Time and Effort Reporting

- m. Was a management certification on file?
- n. Was a predetermined schedule submitted for the semi-annual certification?
- o. Was the periodic certification (semi-annual) signed and dated by both employee and supervisor?
- p. Did the time allocation agree to the cost allocation?

#### Additional Time and Effort Attributes Tested

- q. Was a signed and dated job description with the source of funding provided in-lieu of periodic certification per the Ed-Flex Waiver?
- r. Was a timesheet or comparable record provided to support the payment for extra-duty or supplemental pay?
- s. Was a signed and dated supplemental contract/agreement provided that stipulates allowable program work activities performed by the employee for extra-duty or supplemental pay?
- t. Was the expenditure properly coded according to FASRG?