Adult Education Competitive Grant Application Process

Question and Answers Set 4 (Questions 72 – 84)
February 16, 2017

The questions and answers pertaining to the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) competitive grant funding have been compiled; combining duplicate questions received, and grouped in sets by date. Q & As will be numbered sequentially. Additional sets of questions will be posted once a week, or more often, if needed.

BUDGET

72. Q. Since the funding has been cut, are we expected to maintain the maintenance of effort, or will the match amounts be the 15% of the new grant?

72. A. Eligible applicants are required to provide a minimum regional match of 15 percent of their federal allocation.

73. Q. Am I understanding correctly the Professional Development goes under Admin Budget Code 1000 for AEFLA? Is this for the hours worked during the professional development and all other expenses would go under the 5000 budget code or does this also include the mileage, food, and hotel?

73. A. Professional Development costs are treated as all other costs under Admin Budget. Therefore, salaries would be listed under Object Code 1000; benefits under Object Code 2000; and mileage, food, and hotel under Object Code 5000.

74. Q. Am I still able to use mileage for local travel under budget code 5000 for teachers who travel to different locations to teach?

74. A. Yes, mileage would be listed under administrative budget, Object Code 5000.

75. Q. Also, we usually deduct C&I from the AEFLA, now since it is a separate grant this year does that mean we have more money to spend in AEFLA? Normally we would have to deduct the $31,297 from AEFLA.

75. A. Refer to question and answer 41 in Set 2 located at
http://www.doe.virginia.gov/instruction/adulted/grants_funding/2017-18/adult-ed-17-18-competitive-grant-application-q-a-2.pdf

76. Q. **Also, how do I calculate match. When entering the information on the spreadsheet under VDOE it states that Match has not been entered. I usually use match on salaries. My AEFLA grant is for $422,663 – so is my match as follows: 422,663/.85 = 497,251-422,663= 74,588**

76. A. An eligible provider's match is calculated by taking 15 percent of the federal AEFLA allocation, so the region's match will be $63,399.45. Page 19 of the *Adult Education 2017-2018 Competitive Grant Application Package* states, "No matching funds are required for the GAE or State Lead Coordinating Agency funds awarded within the AEFLA grant."

77. Q. **We plan to apply for IELCE funds as well as additional IET funds. Should the budget worksheets reflect the total of the two or is there a need to provide separate budgets for each?**

77. A. IELCE applicants will combine the IELCE and IET funds in the IELCE budget workbook. The budget narrative should provide a detailed breakdown of how the funds will be used.

78. Q. **Concerning students who can be educated under the IEL/Civics Grant, do they have to be from a country whose native language is not English or do they just have to test at such a level using the accepted assessments that their English language skills fall below Advanced level on acceptable ESOL assessments? I'm asking for a more specific definition of who technically qualifies for services.**

78. A. IELCE funding must be used to provide education services to English language learners, defined in WIOA as an eligible individual who has limited ability in reading, writing, speaking, or comprehending the English language; and whose native language is other than English; or who lives in a family or community environment where a language other than English is the dominant language.

79. Q. **Can the IELCE budget narrative be an attachment or does it need to fit in the 30 page narrative template?**

79. A. The question must be answered within the template's textbox for Section 3.6.1 and is included in the 30 page limit.

80. Q. **Following the guidelines on page 17 of the RFP, the administrative cost limit is "not more than five percent of a local grant." Using this calculation, one region only has $1,310.10 remaining after subtracting the One-Stop allocation. This is a minimal amount when there is the necessity to also include professional development for an entire region. Should a "written justification of the need for a larger percentage request" be submitted (page 17 of the RFP) or "Request an exemption (question 37 from February 1)? If so, who should this be submitted to, and what is the turnaround for the reply in light of budget preparation and grant deadline? Is**

there any other way to fund professional development? In this region's budget, there is not sufficient money.

80. A. Request for additional administrative funding over the five percent cap (if applicable) should be included in the application appendices, as instructed on Page 25 of the *Adult Education 2017-2018 Competitive Grant Application Package.*

81. Q. When will the Race to GED grant be posted?

81. A. Typically, the Race to GED grant funding is announced in May following the General Assembly's approval of Virginia's state biennial budget.

82. Q. We see that our region's target is 4,764. Are we able to serve a smaller subset of that population or must our grant serve the needs of the full 4,764 ? Is the cost per participant based on actual costs in that region (i.e., we are a higher cost of living area, but receive less funding than smaller regions, per client)? In reference to 1.31.1. As an existing post-secondary program, we are seeking to extend our model to those individuals with a lower level of education by creating strong partnerships with adult basic education offices. Can we use data from our current program to demonstrate efficacy with a similar population to address grant question 1.31.1 ?

82. A. The region's target refers to the enrollment target; therefore, at a minimum a program design must address serving the total enrollment target population. Regional allocations are not based on actual costs for each region. In Section 1.3.1, eligible applicants should provide information and supportive quantitative data that clearly demonstrates the program's past three years' effectiveness in improving the literacy skills of individuals, especially with respect to eligible individuals who have low levels of literacy or who are English language learners regardless of whether or not the instruction took place at the postsecondary level.

OTHER (MISCELLANEOUS)

83. Q. Should the question and additional details that need to be included in the written response in the textbox be left in the textbox or deleted?

83. A. Yes, the text should be left in the textbox. The eligible applicant should key in the response directly below the existing statement in the textbox.

84. Q. There is the understanding that a MOU with the LWDB is necessary. This MOU is not listed on page 25 of the RFP as part of the application components. Is it correct to assume that the LWDB MOU is not included in the application's components?

84. A. The inclusion of MOUs is addressed on Page 25 under Application Components as "All regional memoranda of agreement/understanding (if applicable)".