

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT  
DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICES  
OFFICE OF PROGRAM AND PROVIDER MONITORING**

**FINAL MONITORING REPORT**

<<ENTITY NAME>>

<<date submitted>>

Note: Keep the body of the report consistent with the initial submission - this is merely an update to capture follow up activities.

Property of the District of Columbia Government



## Contents

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
A. Background .....	1
B. Engagement.....	1
II. MONITORING SCOPE AND PROCESS .....	1
III. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW .....	1
A. Program Desk Review .....	2
B. Interviews .....	2
C. Onsite Review .....	2
1. Observations .....	3
2. Findings .....	3
3. Areas of Concern .....	3
IV. FISCAL REVIEW .....	4
A. Fiscal Desk Review.....	4
1. Observations .....	4
V. <<entity abbreviation>> PROMISING PRACTICES .....	4
VI. <<entity abbreviation>> FOLLOW-UP.....	4
APPENDIX I.....	i

Property of the District of Columbia Government

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The District of Columbia Department of Employment Services (DOES) Office of Program and Provider Monitoring (OPPM) conducts program reviews of the District of Columbia Workforce and Job Training programs in accordance with D.C. Municipal regulations 717.29 Action ED-4.2.F: Training Program Tracking and 717.30 Action ED-4.2.G: Best Practices Analysis; Job Training and Adult Education Programs Quarterly Reports, D.C. Code § 32-771 (2016); District of Columbia Code §32-241; United States Department of Labor Training and Employment Guidance Letters (TEGL) as mandated, and under the guidance of the Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to Local and State Government (OMB Circular A-102). OPPM is also responsible for conducting monitoring and data validation for grantees throughout DOES.

### A. Background

Provide a summary of the entity's background with DOES and WIOA.

### B. Engagement

Provide a summary of the DOES award (NOGA or HCA) to include contract number, date of the award, the award amount and general details, such as the number of customers to be served.

Per Section Five of the grant agreement (update if this is an HCA), DOES is required to monitor and evaluate the grantee's compliance with grant guidelines as well as agency and local requirements. This report will be submitted to DOES leadership who will disseminate to program staff to address any staff related matters raised by the report.

## II. MONITORING SCOPE AND PROCESS

To facilitate the execution of the review, OPPM requested programmatic correspondence from <<Entity abbreviation>> on <<date>> (with a deliverable date of <<date>>), in preparation for a site visit scheduled for <<date>>. Provide a summary of if, when, and under what conditions the required deliverables were submitted.

The scheduled monitoring was conducted to ensure <<Entity abbreviation>> compliance with local and agency regulations, as well as policies governed by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). Monitoring included an administrative review with <<Entity abbreviation>> administrative staff and a review of participant case files.

## III. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

Administrative reviews require the administrative program staff to participate in a monitoring interview to discuss service to clients, program management, program policies, workflow, key programmatic staff, internal controls, training performance/outcomes, and standard operating procedures. On <<date>>, OPPM Program Analysts <<enter OPPM monitor names>>, henceforth collectively referred to as "OPPM monitors," conducted an onsite review of the <<grantee/provider>>. During the visit, OPPM monitors made several observations which are

detailed below. The following section is a comprehensive account of all observations noted.

### A. Program Desk Review

<<Entity abbreviation>> provided the following documents requested by OPPM:  
(Input all that apply and annotate what was requested but not received)

- Notice of Grant Award (NOGA);
- CT WIOA Provider Partner Agreements;
- CT Written Accounting Policies;
- CT WIOA Youth Policies and Procedures;
- CT WIOA Youth Program Staffing Roster;
- CT Enrollee Roster;
- WIOA Program Elements;
- CT WIOA Youth Participant Timesheets;
- CT WIOA Youth Program Monthly Reports (April 2018, May 2018, and June 2018);
- CT Clean Hands Certificate;
- CT Current Business License;
- CT Certificate of Liability Insurance;
- CT WIOA Youth Program Service Location;
- CT WIOA Youth Program Expenditures (not inclusive); and
- CT WIOA Youth Program Participants (with contact information included).

### B. Interviews

Provide a summary of interviews conducted to include staff and participants.

#### *Interview No. 1 – Staff Interview*

Summary 1 – provide as much detail as possible

#### *Interview No. 2 – Participant A*

Summary 2 – provide as much detail as possible. **When documenting participant interviews, do not use their names.**

### C. Onsite Review

Onsite monitoring is conducted to assess programmatic promising practices, service gaps, and regulatory compliance. On <<enter the date>>, OPPM monitors conducted onsite reviews at the <<entity abbreviation>> site as follows:

#### <<Entity Address>>

Currently, <<entity abbreviation>> serves <<###>> participants via the <<enter the name of the contract and program>>. The following is a comprehensive account of all observations, findings, and areas of concern:

## 1. Observations

In assessing <<entity abbreviation>> programmatic processes, OPPM monitors observed the following:

Note any general observations here.

## 2. Findings

The monitoring revealed the following findings:

**No. 1 – Facility is Inaccessible to Persons Using Wheelchairs for Mobility** (example)

Condition: Describe the finding in detail

Required Action: Cite the statute and what is required by law to remedy the finding.

Close-Out Remarks: Describe what the follow up activity revealed and state whether the finding is abated or confirmed.

**No. 2 – Failure to Safeguard Personally Identifiable Information (PII)** (example)

Condition: Describe the finding in detail

Required Action: Cite the statute and what is required by law to remedy the finding.

Close-Out Remarks: Describe what the follow up activity revealed and state whether the finding is abated or confirmed.

**No. 3 – Improper Use of Incentives** (example)

Condition: Describe the finding in detail

Required Action: Cite the statute and what is required by law to remedy the finding.

Close-Out Remarks: Describe what the follow up activity revealed and state whether the finding is abated or confirmed.

## 3. Areas of Concern

The monitoring revealed the following areas of concern:

**No. 1 – Eligibility Documents Kept in Separate Unmarked File** (example)

Condition: Describe the finding in detail

Recommendation: Cite the statute (if applicable) and what OPPM recommends to remedy the concern.

Close-Out Remarks: Describe what the follow up activity revealed and state whether the concern is abated or confirmed.

#### IV. FISCAL REVIEW

The <<entity abbreviation>> fiscal monitoring was conducted after the site visit to verify that submitted, invoiced expenditures agree with both: 1) the proposed budget detail; and 2) the provided supporting documentation. OPPM monitors made several observations which are detailed below. The following section is a comprehensive account of all observations noted.

##### A. Fiscal Desk Review

Desk reviews require the review of necessary documents to accurately assess and identify any fiscal compliance concerns and best practices. The following fiscal information was collected by <<internal DOES entity per the requirement>>:

- <<entity abbreviation>> Proposal Budget Detail (example); and
- <<entity abbreviation>> Invoices to date (example) (<<month/year>>).

##### 1. Observations

While auditing <<entity abbreviation>> fiscal documents and processes, the following was observed:

- <<entity abbreviation>> is behind in the submission of invoices (example);
- <<entity abbreviation>> has submitted expenditure reports (example).

There are no fiscal findings or areas of concern to report at this time. Once subsequent invoices and policies and procedures are received, tests will be run to determine if corrective measures are warranted.

#### V. <<entity abbreviation>> PROMISING PRACTICES

OPPM monitors noted the following promising practices:

##### *No. 1 – Personal Commitment to Participant Success (example)*

Provide positive feedback here to delineate things that are done well which should be continued and supported.

#### VI. <<entity abbreviation>> FOLLOW-UP

Provide a summary of the follow up visit, to include date, monitors who attended, a very brief description of abatements or failures to remedy. Reference the entity's formal response by stating when it was received and that it can be found below in Appendix I.

## APPENDIX I

<<ENTITY NAME>>  
FORMAL RESPONSE  
SUBMITTED <<DATE>>  
(Copy and paste PDF submission below)

Attachments may contain Personally Identifiable Information (PII) and therefore will be excluded; however, they may be provided upon request.

Property of the District of Columbia Government