

2024-2025 Title II, Part A Statewide Data for Public Reporting

As per the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA), as amended by the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA), Title II, Part A, section 2104(a-c), each LEA receiving Title II, Part A funds shall submit to TEA such information as the State requires, which shall include the following information:

- (1) a description of how the school system is using Title II, Part A funds received to meet the purpose of this title, and how such chosen activities improved teacher, principal, or other school leader effectiveness; and
- (2) if Title II, Part A funds are used to improve equitable access to teachers for low-income and minority students, consistent with section 1111(g)(1)(B), a description of how funds have been used to improve such access.

Background

This requirement was previously met through a national survey conducted by the US Department of Education (USDE). However, in May 2025, TEA was notified that the USDE would not administer the national survey for the 2024-2025 grant year. Under section 2104(b), the ESEA requires school systems to report to State Education Agencies (SEAs) how they spend Title II, Part A funds each year.

In the absence of the USDE survey, TEA is responsible for collecting this information from school systems as outlined in ESEA 2104(b). Although TEA is not required to report this information to USDE, it must make the results publicly available under ESEA 2104(c).

To comply, TEA created a Title II, Part A special data collection survey. All school systems that applied for Title II, Part A program funds in 2024-2025 and did not redirect 100% of their Title II, Part A funds via Funding Transferability and/or the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) were required to report the requested information. School systems that redirected 100% of their Title II, Part A funds via Funding Transferability and/or Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) were exempt because they did not operate a Title II, Part A program in the 2024-2025 grant year.

All requested data was for the 2024-2025 school year.

Public Reporting

This report fulfills the requirements of Title II, Part A, Section 2104(a–c). The structure mirrors the reporting worksheet provided to school systems to ensure consistency and transparency.

Responses in this report are bold and italicized for clarity.

Contact Information

For information and guidance on the Title II, Part A program and/or the special data collection, contact the Federal Program Compliance Division via email at ESSASupport@tea.texas.gov.

SY 2024-2025 Title II, Part A Program, Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP, and Funding Transferability Data

of school systems that applied for Title II, Part A funds: **1105**

of school systems that utilized the REAP Alternative Funds Use Authority (AFUA) and/or Funding Transferability for 100% of their Title II, Part A funds and thus were not required to submit the requested data: **578**

of school systems that implemented a Title II, Part A program and were required to submit the data requested: **527**

of school systems that were part of a Shared Services Agreement (SSA) and did not report data individually: **88**

of fiscal agents of SSAs that responded with aggregate data for their members: **2**

of school systems that closed and thus provided no data: **6**

of school systems that did not provide data: **1**

Section 1: School System & Staff Contact Information

In this section, school systems provided contact information. This section is not part of the report, as results are meant to be aggregated. Instead, we are providing data on how many school systems responded with overall percentages and rounded up to the nearest whole number.

Number of school system responses received: **522**

Section 2: Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs)

Number of FTE Teachers: **369,800.47**

Number of FTE Principals and Other School Leaders: **21,325.54**

Section 3: Percent of Title II-A Funds Budgeted

Note: Percentages may not total 100%, as some activities support both teachers and school leaders.

3.a. Percent of Title II, Part A Funds Budgeted to Support Teachers: This is an estimate of the percentage of all Title II, Part A (Title II-A) funds budgeted in school systems in SY 2024–2025 to support teachers.

% of Title II, Part A Funds Budgeted to Support Teachers: **71%**

3.b. Percent of Title II, Part A Funds Budgeted to Support Principals and Other School Leaders:

This is an estimate of the percentage of all Title II, Part A funds budgeted in school systems in SY 2024–2025 to support principals and other school leaders.

% of Title II, Part A Funds Budgeted to Support Principals and Other School Leaders:

88%

Allocation of Title II, Part A Funds

For the following Sections (4-10), school systems were asked to provide the amount of Title II, Part A funds they budgeted in SY 2024-2025, after transfers, for the following activities. These amounts do not include carryover funds, and the school systems could have provided estimates.

Notes for Sections 4-10:

- *The amounts include funds used for equitable services in private nonprofit schools, if applicable.*
- *The school systems may have provided estimates if they did not have the exact amount.*
- *The amounts reported do not include carryover funds from the prior year.*

Section 4: Use of Title II, Part A funds for Class-Size Reduction

4.a. In SY 2024-2025, how many school systems used Title II, Part A funds, after transfers, for Class-Size Reduction to a level that is evidence-based to improve student achievement through the recruiting and hiring of additional effective teachers?

- Yes **[n=34; 7%]**
- No **[n=488; 93%]**

4.b. Amount Budgeted for Class-Size Reduction: **\$ 7,303,730.00**

4.c. During SY 2024–2025, in total, how many full-time equivalents (FTEs) were funded by Title II, Part A for the purpose of class-size reduction to an evidence-based level to improve student achievement through the recruiting and hiring of additional effective teachers?

Total Funded FTEs: **214.6**

Section 5: Use of Title II-A funds for Evaluation Systems

5.a. In SY 2024-2025, how many school systems used Title II, Part A funds, after transfers, for Evaluation Systems? (such as designing or revising systems, helping teachers and leaders to understand the system, helping with using the results to inform decision making about professional development, improvement strategies, and personnel decisions)?

- Yes **[n=81; 16%]**
- No **[n=441; 84%]**

5.b. Amount Budgeted for Evaluation Systems: **\$ 5,797,560.66**

Section 6: Use of Title II-A funds for hiring, recruiting, and retaining staff referenced below

6.a. In SY 2024-2025, how many school systems used Title II, Part A funds, after transfers, for hiring, recruiting, and retaining effective teachers, principals, and other leaders (such as support with screening candidates and early hiring, recruiting individuals from other fields, differential and

incentive pay, leadership opportunities and multiple pathways for teachers, induction or new educator mentoring programs, or improving school working conditions)?

- Yes **[n=325; 62%]**
- No **[n=197; 38%]**

6.b. Amount Budgeted for hiring, recruiting, and retaining effective teachers, principals, and other leaders: \$ 51,310,767.27

6.c. What strategies did school systems implement to hire, recruit, and retain effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders with the use of Title II, Part A funds?

- Support with screening candidates and early hiring of teachers **[n=118, aggregate percentage is 12%]**
- Recruiting individuals from other fields to become teachers or leaders **[n=53, aggregate percentage is 6%]**
- Recruiting new potential educators from the communities served by a school or school system (e.g., through “grow your own” programs or Registered Apprenticeships in education) **[n=70, aggregate percentage is 7%]**
- Differential and incentive pay for teachers and leaders **[n=153, aggregate percentage is 16%]**
- Providing additional time for collaborative planning with peers **[n=87, aggregate percentage is 9%]**
- Emphasis on leadership opportunities and multiple career pathways for teachers **[n=65, aggregate percentage is 7%]**
- Induction or new teacher and leader mentoring programs, including training for mentor teachers **[n=177, aggregate percentage is 19%]**
- Targeting and tailoring professional development to individual teacher or leader needs **[n=172, aggregate percentage is 18%]**
- Feedback mechanisms to improve school working conditions **[n=36, aggregate percentage is 4%]**
- Other **[n=18, aggregate percentage is 2%]**

6.d. Of the strategies selected for 6.c., the two selected with the highest Title II, Part A funding amounts are listed below:

- Induction or new teacher and leader mentoring programs, including training for mentor teachers **[n=136, 26%]**
- Targeting and tailoring professional development to individual teacher or leader needs **[n=127, 24%]**

Section 7: Use of Title II-A funds for Professional Development (PD)

7.a. In SY 2024-2025, did school systems use Title II, Part A funds, after transfers, for professional development (such as in-service seminars, coaching, university courses, or support for professional learning communities)? *If “no” was selected, sections 8-9 were disabled.*

- Yes **[n=423; 81%]**
- No **[n=99; 19%]**

7.b. Amount Budgeted for Professional Development: **\$ 91,821,026.13**

7.c. Who participated in Title II, Part A-funded professional development activities in SY 2024-2025?

Available selections:

- Teachers **[Selected alone n=92; 22%]**
- Principals and other school leaders **[Selected alone n=12; 3%]**
- **[Both options selected; n=319, 75%]**

Section 8: Use of Title II-A funds for Professional Development to Support Teachers

8.a. This is an estimated percentage of teachers in school systems that participated in Title II, Part A-funded professional development activities during SY 2024–2025. Teachers include all staff members who teach, even if they also hold leadership roles.

Percentage of all teachers who participated in Title II, Part A-funded professional development activities in SY 2024-2025: **71%**

8.b. Which of the following types of professional development and support to teachers did the school system provide during SY 2024–2025, funded at least in part by Title II, Part A (*at least one option was required to be selected, and multiple selections were allowed*)?

- Single-session professional development **[n=304, aggregate percentage is 22%]**
- Multi-session professional development **[n=353, aggregate percentage is 25%]**
- Multi-session one-on-one support from teacher leaders or coaches **[n=201, aggregate percentage is 14%]**
- Multi-session Internet-based professional development (e.g., video library, skill-building modules, online coaching) **[n=133, aggregate percentage is 10%]**
- Multi-session group support (e.g., lesson study, peer-to-peer communities of practice) **[n=158, aggregate percentage is 11%]**
- Professional conferences or membership fees for organizations **[n=182, aggregate percentage is 13%]**
- University or college courses; traditional, course-based curriculum **[n=14, aggregate percentage is 1%]**
- Alternative (non-traditional) preparation pathways to certification (e.g., microcredentials or job-embedded), either university or non-university-based **[n=21, aggregate percentage is 2%]**
- Professional certifications (e.g. National Board certification, state-level credentials or endorsements) **[n=24, aggregate percentage is 2%]**
- Other: **[n=5, aggregate percentage is 0%]**

8.c. Of the types of professional development selected in 8.b., the two selected with the highest Title II, Part A funding amounts.

- Single-session professional development **[n=185, aggregate percentage is 25%]**
- Multi-session professional development **[n=275, aggregate percentage is 37%]**

8.d. Which of the following topics were covered by teacher professional development in school systems in SY 2024–2025, funded at least in part by Title II, Part A (*at least one option was required to be selected, and multiple selections were allowed*)?

- Teacher content knowledge in ELA **[n=296, aggregate percentage is 11%]**
- Teacher content knowledge in STEM (science, technology, engineering, mathematics, or computer science) **[n=252, aggregate percentage is 9%]**
- Teacher content knowledge in subjects other than ELA or STEM **[n=201, aggregate percentage is 7%]**
- Instructional strategies for academic subjects **[n=359, aggregate percentage is 13%]**
- Instructional strategies for classroom management or student behavior management **[n=220, aggregate percentage is 8%]**
- Using data and assessments to guide instruction **[n=277, aggregate percentage is 10%]**
- Providing instruction and academic support to English learners **[n=153, aggregate percentage is 6%]**
- Providing instruction and academic support to students with disabilities or developmental delays **[n=122, aggregate percentage is 5%]**
- Identifying gifted and talented students **[n=42, aggregate percentage is 2%]**
- Understanding state content standards and instructional strategies to meet them **[n=70, aggregate percentage is 3%]**
- Understanding teacher evaluation systems and resulting feedback **[n=243, aggregate percentage is 9%]**
- Engaging parents and families **[n=59, 11%, aggregate percentage is 2%]**
- Using technology **[n=128, aggregate percentage is 5%]**
- Integrating academic content, career and technical education, and work-based learning **[n=61, aggregate percentage is 2%]**
- Training for educators of early learners **[n=129, aggregate percentage is 5%]**
- Offering joint professional learning and planning activities that address transition from early childhood to elementary school **[n=29, aggregate percentage is 1%]**
- Identifying students with referral needs (such as sexual abuse, mental health issues, homelessness, drug or alcohol abuse) **[n=32, aggregate percentage is 1%]**
- Other **[n=9, aggregate percentage is 0%]**

8.e. Of the professional development topics selected in 8.d., the two selected with the highest Title II, Part A funding amounts reported were:

- Instructional strategies for academic subjects **[n=140, aggregate percentage is 18%]**
- Understanding teacher evaluation systems and resulting feedback **[n=228, aggregate percentage is 29%]**

Section 9: Use of Title II-A funds for PD to Support Principals and Other School Leaders

9.a. Estimated percentage of principals or other school leaders in school systems that participated in Title II, Part A-funded professional development activities during SY 2024–2025. Note: Other school leaders may include assistant principals or other staff responsible for instructional leadership and management in an elementary or secondary school building.

Percentage of all principals and other school leaders who participated in Title II–A funded professional development activities in SY 2024-2025: **88%**

9.b. Which of the following types of professional development and support to principals and other school leaders did school systems provide during SY 2024-2025, funded at least in part by Title II-A (*at least one option was required to be selected, and multiple selections were allowed*)?

- Single-session professional development [**n=184, aggregate percentage is 21%**]
- Multi-session professional development [**n=257, aggregate percentage is 29%**]
- Multi-session one-on-one professional development [**n=130, aggregate percentage is 15%**]
- Multi-session group support (e.g., learning communities, school system monthly or quarterly principals' meetings) [**n=91, aggregate percentage is 10%**]
- Professional conferences or organizations [**n=144, aggregate percentage is 16%**]
- University or college courses, traditional, course-based curriculum [**n=2, aggregate percentage is 0%**]
- Alternative (non-traditional) preparation pathways to certification (e.g., job-embedded leadership preparation or support for teacher candidates), either university or non-university-based [**n=3, aggregate percentage is 0%**]
- State leadership conferences or trainings [**n=63, aggregate percentage is 7%**]
- Leadership certifications (e.g., state-level credentials or endorsements) [**n=5, aggregate percentage is 1%**]
- Other [**n=8, aggregate percentage is 1%**]

9.c. Of the types of professional development selected in 9.b., the two selected with the highest Title II, Part A funding amounts reported were:

- Single-session professional development [**n=120, aggregate percentage is 21%**]
- Multi-session professional development [**n=203, aggregate percentage is 35%**]

9.d. Which of the following topics were covered by principal and other school leader professional development in school systems in SY 2024–2025, funded at least in part by Title II, Part A (*at least one option was required to be selected, and multiple selections were allowed*):

- School improvement planning or identifying interventions to support academic improvement [**n=229, aggregate percentage is 27%**]

- Strategies and practices to advance school climate, e.g., supporting students' social and emotional development and positive and inclusive school culture, including through multi-tiered systems of support; collaborating with other local partners to meet school and community needs that support student academic success (e.g., becoming a full-service community school); strategies for meeting students basic needs and health needs so they can be academically successful (e.g., learning strategies for effective school meal program **[n=174, aggregate percentage is 21%]**)
- Training on recruiting and supporting a diverse educator workforce **[n=30, aggregate percentage is 4%]**
- Strategies and practices to help teachers improve instruction, e.g., performance data use, teacher evaluation, feedback and coaching on instruction, instructional planning support, curriculum materials selection, and curriculum alignment with state standards **[n=283, aggregate percentage is 33%]**
- Strategies and practices to develop and manage the school's workforce, e.g., a focus on recruiting, hiring, and retaining diverse and effective teachers; selecting professional development tailored to teachers' needs; effectively assigning teachers to students; and establishing pathways for developing teacher leaders and assistant principals as instructional leaders **[n=83, aggregate percentage is 10%]**
- Strategies to engage parents and the community **[n=40, aggregate percentage is 5%]**
- Other **[n=7, aggregate percentage is 1%]**

9.e. Of the professional development topics selected in 9.d., the two selected with the highest Title II, Part A funding amounts reported were:

- School improvement planning or identifying interventions to support academic improvement **[n=229, 27%]**
- Strategies and practices to help teachers improve instruction, e.g., performance data use, teacher evaluation, feedback and coaching on instruction, instructional planning support, curriculum materials selection, and curriculum alignment with state standards **[n=283, 33%]**

Section 10: Use of Title II-A funds for Other Activities

10.a. In SY 2024-2025, did school systems use Title II, Part A funds, after transfers, for other activities that have not already been noted in Sections 4-9?

- Yes **[n=42, 8%]**
- No **[n=480, 92%]**

10.b. Description of the “Other” activities provided:

- Recruitment and Retention
- Electronic systems for Professional Development
- Alignment with academic standards
- Suite for teacher development
- Evaluation and training for teachers
- Other Professional Development not covered in the different topics of this report
- Salary
- Certification assistance
- Supplies for Professional Development
- Administrative costs
- Stipends

10.c. Amount Budgeted for Other Activities: **\$ 2,675,539.00**

Section 11: Teacher Quality/Effectiveness

11.a. During the most recent school year, did school systems examine information about the distribution of teacher quality or effectiveness to assess whether low-income or minority students in Title I, Part A schools were served at disproportionate rates by inexperienced, ineffective, or out-of-field teachers?

- Yes, and issues were found. **[n=79, 15%]**
- Yes, but no issues were found. **[n=257, 49%]**
- No **[n=186, 36%]**

11.b. Which of the following types of information was used to define teacher quality or effectiveness in the examination of the distribution of teachers *(at least one option was required to be selected, and multiple selections were allowed)*?

- Teacher evaluation ratings **[n=245, aggregate percentage 20%]**
- Teacher effectiveness, as measured by value-added measures or student growth percentiles **[n=205, aggregate percentage 17%]**
- Teacher effectiveness, as measured by student learning objectives or student growth objectives **[n=168, aggregate percentage 14%]**
- Teacher experience **[n=177, aggregate percentage 15%]**
- Teacher certification **[n=189, aggregate percentage 16%]**
- Teacher education **[n=66, aggregate percentage 6%]**
- Assignment of teachers to a grade or classes consistent with their field of certification **[n=144, aggregate percentage 12%]**
- Other **[n=4, aggregate percentage 0%]**

Section 12: Strategies used to Improve Equitable Access

12.a. During SY 2024-2025, did school systems use Title II, Part A funds to improve within-school system equitable access to effective teachers?

- Yes **[n=149,29%]**
- No **[n=373,71%]**

12.b. What strategies did school systems use to address any substantial issues found in access to effective teachers for low-income and minority students (*at least one option was required to be selected, and multiple selections were allowed*)?

- Offering more compensation for qualified or effective teachers who move to or stay in schools with more low-income or minority students compared to other schools **[n=29, aggregate percentage 9%]**
- Developing career ladders or teacher leadership roles to attract and retain teachers in schools with more low-income or minority students compared to other schools **[n=31, aggregate percentage 10%]**
- Beginning the hiring process earlier for vacancies at schools with more low-income or minority students compared to other schools **[n=42, aggregate percentage 14%]**
- Increasing external recruitment activities, such as hosting open houses and job fairs for schools with more low-income or minority students compared to other schools **[n=41, aggregate percentage 13%]**
- Improving teaching and learning environments (e.g., lower teaching loads, more resources, or improved facility quality) at schools with more low-income or minority students compared to other schools **[n=65, aggregate percentage 21%]**
- Offering more professional development for teachers in schools with more low-income or minority students compared to other schools **[n=90, aggregate percentage 29%]**
- Limiting the ability of teachers who are inexperienced or low-performing to transfer to or be placed in schools with more low-income or minority students compared to other schools **[n=7, aggregate percentage 2%]**
- Making exceptions in contracts or regulations to protect the most qualified or effective teachers from layoff in schools with more low-income or minority students compared to other schools **[n=0, aggregate percentage 0%]**
- Other **[n=6, aggregate percentage 2%]**

--End of Data Collection Report --