

Title II, Part A Frequently Asked Questions

This document provides the answers to program-related questions received by the Division. You can also navigate through the document using the Bookmarks in your PDF viewer. The newest questions that have been added will be noted by “*” and in blue font.

For questions or additional information, please contact us at ESSASupport@tea.texas.gov.

Questions and responses are organized by the following topic areas:

- [Alignment to Challenging State Academic Standards](#)
- [Carryover](#)
- [Compliance Monitoring](#)
- [Comprehensive Needs Assessment](#)
- [Consultation](#)
- [Coordination](#)
- [Parent and Family Engagement](#)
- [Prioritization of Funds](#)
- [Professional Development](#)
- [Recruitment and Retention of Teachers](#)
- [Supplement, Not Supplant](#)
- [Use of Funds](#)

Alignment to Challenging State Academic Standards

- Q1. When professional development evaluation results are referenced as supporting documentation, could you be more specific about what that is?**
- A1. When professional development evaluation results are referenced as acceptable supporting documentation, we are referring to the evaluation form/survey completed by meeting/professional development participants. When retaining an evaluation form as documentation, LEAs should also retain a synthesis or summary of the participant responses/results. It is considered best practice to use evaluation results as data for ongoing consultation and for continuous improvement. Such responses/results can be used as documentation of ongoing consultation with the required stakeholders.

Q2. For the requirement related to activities alignment with the challenging State academic standards, if an LEA is using Title II, Part A funds for contracted services of professional development, would the contract or the LEA's purchase order (PO) be retained as documentation?

A2. For the requirement related to activities alignment with the challenging State academic standards, an LEA should retain documentation that provides the information needed to show compliance with the requirement. In some cases, a PO may not have detailed information about the professional development being provided. Thus, if the contract has more information that would establish compliance, then it may be provided as documentation. In general, the documentation provided should be the one that has the most information related to meeting the compliance requirement in question.

Q3. How does an LEA document that a professional development activity meets the ESSA definition of professional development?

A3. All professional development activities noted in the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) are from the ESSA statute or the USDE Non-Regulatory guidance and would meet the ESSA definition of professional development. Thus, additional documentation for such activities would not be needed. For example, if STEM focused professional development is an activity noted on an invoice, then additional documentation would not be needed to establish compliance because it is a statutory referenced activity.

If the activity is not referenced in Statute or in the USDE Non-Regulatory Guidance, then additional information would be needed to show that it would meet the ESSA definition of professional development. In case of an audit and/or random validation monitoring, the LEA may be asked to provide documentation justifying that the professional activity meets the ESSA definition of professional development.

If an invoice does not have all the information, then additional documentation would need to be provided to establish compliance (i.e. presentation materials, agenda, minutes, evaluation/survey and summary of the responses/results, detailed statement of work, detailed contract for services, etc).

Q4. If an LEA used all their Title II, Part A funds for class-size reduction, what do they retain as documentation?

A4. If an LEA used all their Title II, Part A funds for class-size reduction, they are still required to meet all Title II, Part A requirements. For the activities alignment with challenging State academic standards requirement, they can retain documentation referenced in the Documentation Reference Table in the Program Requirements section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#).

Carryover

Q1: Our district is likely to have higher than usual carryover in 2020-2021 because travel for training is much reduced because of the pandemic. What options do we have to avoid having excess carryover?

A1: The Title II, Part A statute does not specify a limitation on carryover funds; therefore, the LEA could choose to carryover the funds into 2021-2022.

Another option is to use [Title V, Part A — Funding Transferability](#). This allows LEAs the flexibility to target federal funds to programs that most effectively address their unique needs. Eligible LEAs may transfer all or any lesser amount of the funds allocated from Title II, Part A or Title IV, Part A into one or more of the following programs:

- Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Education Agencies
- Title I, Part C – Education of Migratory Children
- Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-risk
- Title II, Part A – Supporting Effective Instruction
- Title III, Part A – Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students
- Title IV, Part A – Student Support and Academic Enrichment
- Title V, Part B – Rural Education Initiative

Transferred funds are subject to the rules and requirements applicable to the funds under the provision to which the funds are transferred. If the LEA transfers funds from a program that provides for the participation of students, teachers, or other educational personnel from private nonprofit schools, LEA must conduct private school consultation in accordance with section 8501.

Contact your grant negotiator for assistance on the amendment process.

Q2: A lot of us have more unspent funding than in previous years in the ESSA grants. I know there's a waiver for the 85% rule on Title I, but what about the other ESSA funds? What if I have 50-60% left in my 20-21 T2 or T3 on 9/30/21? Those grants have been a little bit more difficult to spend this year, with the COVID restrictions (especially T2).

A2: This has been a concern for more LEAs than usual because of the effect the pandemic has had on travel and large gatherings. There is no statutory limitation on the amount of 2020-2021 Title II, Part A funds that can be carried forward into the 2021-2022 grant year. If this seems to create a situation where the LEA will have more funds than are expendable in 2021-2022, the LEA may want to consider using its Funding Transferability option in the Consolidated Federal Grant Application (Schedule PS3109).

Q3: Has there been any additional information released concerning the possibility of another waiver from the USDE to extend the grant period for 2019-2020 grant funds that are set to expire September 30, 2021?

A3: As noted in the [“To the Administrator Addressed” correspondence that was issued on September 16, 2021](#), the USDE has granted a waiver that will allow the Agency to extend the end date of the 2019-2020 ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant application to June 30, 2022. This means that LEAs will have two grant applications running concurrently: The 2019-2020 application will be open (the LEA may make budget amendments through April 1, 2022; no programmatic amendments will be accepted), and the 2021-2022 application (which will include any 2020-2021 carryover funds) will be open until June 30, 2022.

Q4: Do LEAs have to Prioritize its carryover when awarded?

A4: ESSA Section 2102(b)(2)(c) requires an LEA to prioritize Title II, Part A funds to schools identified for school improvement by TEA and that have the highest percentage of children counted under Title I, Part A. Thus, Title II, Part A funds that are carried over are required to be prioritized. The LEA should prioritize Title II, Part A funds carried over in accordance with the current year prioritization methodology. For example, funds carried over into the 2022-2023 year from the 2021-2022 year should be prioritized in accordance with the 2022-2023 prioritization methodology.

*Q5: [Can we confirm that the carryover limit for Title II, Part A is 15%?](#)

A5: [The Title II, Part A statute does not set limitations for carryover funds. In the past, the Agency has considered programs that carried over more than 25% to be at higher risk, but that practice was put on hold during the time that LEAs received pandemic-related stimulus funding. The Agency plans to reintroduce such an indicator to the risk assessment system beginning with the 2025-2026 school year. \[https://tea.texas.gov/finance-and-grants/24-25-tea-gca-ra-fsd-060324.pdf\]](#)

Compliance Monitoring

Q1. How does the state monitor Title II, Part A for program compliance?

A1. TEA monitors Title II, Part A for program compliance through a validation monitoring process. LEAs that are selected for participation are required to submit documentation for review. In instances where improvement is needed, the LEA is referred to its regional education service center for technical assistance in order to come into compliance. Additionally, the LEA may be referred to the TEA Federal Compliance Officer to engage in the [Non-Compliance Resolution Process](#).

Q2. Which year will be validated: prior or current?

A2. Prior to the 2024-2025 school year, the Title II, Part A validation monitored selected Title II, Part A program requirements in the current school year. However, for the 2024-2025 school year and beyond, the Title II, Part A validation will validate selected Title II, Part A program requirements implemented in the prior year, and compare the LEA's compliance to the self-reported compliance status on the Compliance Report submitted for the year being validated.

Q3. If a District transferred their Title II, Part A funds into another program area through funding transferability or the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP), will they be selected for a random validation?

A3. If an LEA transferred 100% of their Title II, Part A funds through the funding transferability option or REAP, they will not be in the pool of LEAs subject to random validation for Title II, Part A. However, if the LEA transferred less than 100% of their funds out of Title II, Part A, they are subject to random validation because they are required to meet all Title II, Part A requirements since they chose to keep a portion of their Title II, Part A funds.

Q4. If an LEA joined a Shared Services Arrangement (SSA) for Title II, Part A, will they be selected for a random validation?

A4. If an LEA joined a Shared Services Arrangement for Title II, Part A, they are still required to meet all the program requirements associated with Title II, Part A. Thus, the LEA will be in the pool of LEAs subject to random validation for Title II, Part A. Based on the agreement between the SSA and LEA, the SSA may be required to submit the documentation required for random validation.

Q5: On the PS3104, Part 1, Section C: When it comes to other allowable activities such as improving the capacity of campus leaders to coach teachers, should that statement be removed as it could potentially fall under option 2 "Professional Development/Educator Growth"?

A5: Because Title II, Part A runs into the 3 areas of focus, it might be best to stick to those areas. Make the LEA aware that such documentation should be kept locally and readily available upon request.

Q6: On the Program Compliance Self-Check Item 2, it states that "The LEA coordinates activities under Title II, Part A with other related strategies, programs, and activities being conducted in the community". If the LEA does coordinate with community organizations but does not spend Title II funds on the activity, can they still answer "Yes" to this compliance question? For example, if a district coordinates with its local Child Advocacy Center and has them come in and do a supplemental professional development regarding signs to watch for in their students to identify possible child abuse, but the services provided by the Child Advocacy Center are free, would they still be able to check "Yes" on this compliance question or "No."

A6: The main thing here is that the LEA is coordinating their activities with community organizations. In which case they would answer yes. If such activity does not use Title II, Part A funds but it is part of the LEA professional development program, then this activity will meet this compliance item.

Recommended documentation would encompass the coordination with the organization as well as documentation showcasing that such professional development is free of charge and part of the Title II, Part A Professional Development Plan.

Q7: I have an LEA that self-reported not in compliance because they weren't prioritizing. They spent all their money on professional development. The LEA needs to prioritize and make the necessary changes as soon as possible so they will be in compliance, correct? Once they do the prioritization, if there are funds left, are they able to serve non-Title I schools?

A7: You are correct. When they reported in compliance as part of the 21-22 ESSA Consolidated Compliance Report, they essentially agreed to plan to come into compliance for the 22-23 school year. The LEA must give priority to the campuses in School Improvement and to campuses with the highest percentages of low-income students. If the LEA has no campuses in school improvement, or can document that the professional development needs and teacher recruitment/retention needs of those campuses are met through the School Improvement grant, then the LEA may focus its Title II, Part A program on meeting other identified needs. The [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) gives some suggestions on how to retain documentation (page 19). Since every LEA is different, please note that they will need to have a description of their methodology/rationale of prioritization kept on file and readily available upon request by TEA and/or an auditor. In other words, the LEA must keep documentation demonstrating how the LEA determined the amount of Title II, Part A funds distributed to each campus. The main thing to remember about prioritization is that the funds first have to be allocated to Title I, Part A campuses identified for School Improvement and campuses with the highest numbers of low-income percentages students. Then, after that, the LEA may allocate its Title II, Part A funds based on other needs. The [Title II, Part A FAQ document](#) provides guidance on how best to document compliance (page 12).

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Q1. Should the needs assessment and improvement plan be completed at the end of an academic year, at the beginning of an academic year or after school starts?

A1. The comprehensive needs assessment and initial improvement planning processes should be completed upon submission of the ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application. By certifying and submitting the application, the LEA is agreeing to the Program-Specific Provisions and Assurances which include references to the comprehensive needs assessment and improvement planning processes. The improvement plan is a living document and may change based on the LEA's needs. Documentation noting the changes would need to be retained locally in case of an audit and/or random validation monitoring. Please note that there are meaningful consultation requirements that also must be followed as it relates to the comprehensive needs assessment and improvement planning.

Q2. Does the amount of federal funds budgeted per activity need to be noted in the District Improvement Plan (DIP)?

A2. For Title II, Part A compliance purposes, the exact dollar amounts do not need to be noted in the DIP as they are already noted in the ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application, ESSA Consolidated Compliance Report and ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application Expenditure Reporting processes. Activities in the DIP do need to reference the specific federal program that is funding each of the activities. It is best practice to include an estimated amount range in the CIP and DIP.

Q3. Could the compliance documentation for an activity be listed in the CIP or does it have to be in the DIP?

A3. If Title II, Part A funds are used at the campus level, the activity could be included in the Campus Improvement Plan and provided as supporting documentation to establish compliance.

Q4. Where in statute is a comprehensive needs assessment and/or district improvement plan referenced for Title II, Part A purposes?

A4. Historically, LEAs were required to conduct a needs assessment to engage key stakeholders under section 2122I of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. While Title II, Part A of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, does not require the same formal needs assessment (although a needs assessment is required under other sections of ESEA), such an assessment may help ensure that Title II, Part A funds are used strategically, to maximize educator effectiveness and student outcomes. (Source: [United States Department of Education Non-Regulatory Guidance for Title II, Part A: Building Systems of Support for Excellent Teaching and Learning \(September 27, 2016\)](#)). The professional development definition in ESSA also states that professional development activities “are an integral part of broad schoolwide and districtwide educational improvement plans.” Thus, the reason that compliance can be documented via improvement plans is that they are documents that are universally implemented across LEAs. Additionally, this provides LEAs the opportunity to include the Title II, Part A required information in a plan that is already developed rather than having to develop another document to establish compliance.

Q5. Does each specific training/PD session need to be stated in the I/CIP or can it be more general?

A5. The level of specificity to be included in the comprehensive needs assessment and campus improvement plan related to specific training and professional development activities is a local decision as long as the LEA is able to provide documentation that establishes compliance. LEAs are strongly recommended not to include vendor names and/or vendor-specific products. Instead, LEAs can include a general description of the service/activity.

Consultation

Q1: What stakeholders are required in order for LEAs to meet the Title II, Part A consultation requirement?

A1: ESSA, Section 2102(b)(3)(A), requires LEAs to meaningfully consult with the following nine groups of stakeholders as they plan for, implement, and evaluate their Title II, Part A program:

- Teachers
- Principals
- Other school leaders*
- Paraprofessionals (including organizations representing such individuals)
- Specialized instructional support personnel**
- Charter school leaders (in an independent school district (ISD) that has in-district charter schools)
- Parents
- Community partners
- Other organizations or partners with relevant and demonstrated expertise in programs and activities designed to meet the purpose of Title II, Part A

*“Other school leaders” are defined in Section 8101(44) as a principal, assistant principal, or other individual who is:

1. an employee or officer of an elementary school or secondary school, local educational agency, or other entity operating an elementary school or secondary school; **AND**
2. responsible for the daily instructional leadership and managerial operations in the elementary school or secondary school building.

**Specialized instructional support personnel are defined in Section 8101(47) as—

1. school counselors, school social workers, and school psychologists; and
2. other qualified professional personnel, such as school nurses, speech language pathologists, and school librarians, involved in providing assessment, diagnosis, counseling, educational, therapeutic, and other necessary services as part of a comprehensive program to meet student needs.

Q2: Should each campus have Title II, Part A stakeholder committee or is this a district-level committee?

A2: The statutory consultation requirement for Title II, Part A is at the district level.

Q3: What documentation is recommended to keep on file to show that stakeholder involvement occurred. Additionally, how many persons are recommended to be part of the process? Can the Site-based Decision-making (SBDM) committee meet the consultation requirement?

A3: Typically, documentation of stakeholder meetings includes sign-in sheets with the name of the meeting, the date, stakeholder names, and roles for the required stakeholders. Given the increased use of virtual meeting environments during the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school years, participant

rosters that include the meeting title, meeting date, and stakeholder names and roles would be acceptable substitutes for the more traditional sign-in sheets. This eliminates the need of a participant signature. In addition, meeting agendas and meeting notes should provide evidence of meaningful consultation with the required stakeholders in the development of the Title II, Part A program. It should be clear from the agendas and minutes that the stakeholders have a genuine opportunity to participate in the planning and decision-making; this should not be a “rubber stamp” approval.

As to the number of participants, in instances where the statute indicates that a required category of membership is plural (i.e., teachers, parents, etc.), there should be at least two representatives per category in order to ensure compliance.

It is possible that the SBDM committee could meet the consultation requirement, if all of the stakeholders required for Title II, Part A are participants on the SBDM committee and if the committee’s participation in the planning and decision-making for the Title II, Part A program is documented.

Q4: What is meant by “meaningful” consultation?

A4: “Meaningful consultation” refers to a genuine opportunity to participate and provide input into planning and decisions concerning the program. The required stakeholders must have a genuine opportunity to participate in the planning and decision-making; it should not be a “rubber stamp” approval.

Q5: Can the documentation provided for meaningful consultation reference DIP or CIP coordinated meetings or does there have to be a specific Title II, Part A meeting?

A5. Having a coordinated meeting with other programs that includes all the Title II, Part A required stakeholders for meaningful consultation and to seek advice for continuous improvement of the Title II, Part A program would meet the meaningful consultation requirements in Title II, Part A. The meeting(s) would also need to include the use of data and ongoing consultation requirements specific to Title II, Part A. It is not required that separate meetings be held for planning purposes related to the Title II, Part A program.

Q6. Some small LEAs do not have multiple people to meet the required stakeholder requirements. For example, there are small LEAs that only have 1 principal in their LEA and the requirement references “Principals.” How does the LEA document this type of exception?

A6. We understand that small LEAs may not have multiple people to meet the required stakeholder requirements for a group of stakeholders. For example, if an LEA only has 1 principal in their LEA, it can be noted on the sign in sheet retained as documentation. However, this does not mean that an LEA can exclude a group of stakeholders because they weren’t invited to participate and were an available group of stakeholders in the LEA.

Q7. Are the dates of meetings, surveys, etc. relevant when it comes to documentation retained to show compliance?

A7. Dates of meetings are relevant because they can justify compliance with the “ongoing consultation” requirements related to the academic year in question. A list of meeting dates would not be sufficient documentation to show compliance. Meeting agendas and minutes, sign-in sheets and/or surveys/results would need to be provided along with the specific dates as documentation of the meaningful consultation requirements. Surveys, as a form of documentation, are also relevant as long as a summary or synthesis of the survey responses/results accompany the survey provided as documentation.

Q8. Are the meaningful consultation requirements for Title II, Part A similar to the PNP consultation requirement in that it has to be timely (i.e. the beginning of the year)?

A8. The meaningful consultation requirements for Title II, Part A are not necessarily similar to the PNP consultation requirement about timely consultation at the beginning of the year. Although the beginning of the year is the natural time for the Title II, Part A meaningful consultation process to begin because that is the time when planning takes place, multiple meetings held throughout the year shows ongoing consultation. The CIP/DIP is a living document and may need to be revised at multiple points in the year and thus, ongoing consultation may be useful in that process of continuous improvement.

Q9. Are a school librarian and a school counselor considered “other school leaders”?

A9. In terms of stakeholder requirements related to the Title II, Part A LEA meaningful consultation process, a school librarian and school counselor would be considered specialized instructional support personnel. A school librarian or school counselor may be considered “other school leaders,” if they meet the definition of school leader.

Q10. What are examples of other organizations or partners with relevant and demonstrated expertise in programs and activities designed to meet the purpose of Title II, Part A?

A10. Individuals or organizations with relevant and demonstrated expertise in programs and activities designed to meet the purpose of Title II, Part A include, but are not limited to the following: professional development providers, Education Service Center federal programs personnel, and professional development consultants.

Q11. To meet the meaningful consultation requirements, are face to face meetings the only method to establish compliance?

A11. No. Although having meetings that include all the required stakeholder groups represented may be the simplest way of ensuring program compliance with the requirements associated with meaningful consultation, there are multiple methods of establishing compliance.

For example, an LEA may choose to seek advice from teachers regarding how best to improve the LEA's activities to meet the purpose of Title II, Part A by administering a survey or having a focus group. In turn, the LEA may use the data obtained to continually update and improve their Title II, Part A activities. The LEA would need to retain documentation showing the process and results associated with the advice sought.

Additionally, to meet the stakeholder group requirement of other organizations or partners with relevant and demonstrated expertise in programs and activities designed to meet the purpose of Title II, Part A, an LEA may choose to seek advice from their Education Service Center (ESC) federal programs staff regarding how best to improve the LEA's activities to meet the purpose of Title II, Part A by attending ESC offered Title II, Part A meetings and/or training opportunities. In turn, the LEA may use the data obtained to continually update and improve their Title II, Part A activities. The LEA would need to retain documentation showing the process and results associated with the advice sought.

Q12: For Title II, Part A program requirement documentation, could a survey take the place of a consultation meeting, or is a meeting required?

A12: Best practice would be to consider surveys as a tool that the LEA can use as part of its consultation process. For example, an LEA may choose to seek advice from teachers regarding how best to improve the LEA's activities to meet the purpose of Title II, Part A by administering a survey or having a focus group. In turn, the LEA may use the data obtained to continually update and improve its Title II, Part A activities. The LEA would need to retain documentation showing the process and results associated with the advice sought.

It might be difficult to justify using a survey to completely replace a stakeholder meeting, however. If there is no actual meeting, the give-and-take discussion is lost, and the consultation is less meaningful. It would be better to use a survey to broaden the scope of the input the LEA receives, and to use that data to inform the discussions and recommendations of the stakeholder group.

Coordination

Q1. What happens if an LEA does not include the local amounts for a professional development activity noted in the DIP? How would an LEA document that coordination of professional development activities is occurring?

A1. For Title II, Part A compliance purposes, the exact federal dollar amounts do not need to be noted in the DIP as they are already noted in the ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application, ESSA Consolidated Compliance Report and ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application Expenditure Reporting processes. Activities in the DIP do need to reference the specific federal program that is funding each of the activities. Making reference to other federal, state and/or local funds being

used for Title II, Part A related professional development activities can be used to document Title II, Part A coordination of professional development activities through other federal, state and local programs. It is best practice to include an estimated amount range in the CIP and DIP.

Q2. In reference to coordination of professional development activities, can Title II, Part A fully fund an activity that includes participation of other programs like Title III?

A2. In order to increase program effectiveness, eliminate duplication, and reduce fragmentation of the instructional program, coordination is a critical requirement of Title II, Part A. The example referenced can be considered coordination with another federal program. For allowability of the activity, please see the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#).

Q3. Can you give an example of coordinating with community examples?

A3. The Title II, Part A Non-Regulatory Guidance and/or ESEA provides the following examples of recommended strategies related to coordinating with the community.

Teacher Leadership — Participating in community of learning opportunities and other professional development opportunities with diverse stakeholder groups such as parents, civil rights groups, and administrators, to positively impact student outcomes; for example, through a forum to discuss the implication of a policy or practice on a school community, or organizing a community-wide service learning project, where teachers afterwards work together to imbed conclusions of these activities into their teaching.

Educator Cultural Competence — Improving the recruitment, placement, support, and retention of culturally competent and responsive educators, especially educators from underrepresented minority groups, to meet the needs of diverse student populations. These efforts may include, but are not limited to: Providing financial support to educator recruitment programs within the community to improve hiring and retention of a diverse workforce; Offering career advancement opportunities for current staff members, such as paraprofessionals, who have worked in the community for an extended period of time, to support their efforts to gain the requisite credentials to become classroom instructors; and Partnering with preparation providers including local community colleges, Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs), Minority Serving Institutions, and alternative route providers, to build a pipeline of diverse candidates.

Evidence-Based Professional Development — ESSA promotes the implementation of high-quality, personalized, evidence-based professional development for teachers, instructional leadership teams, principals, or other school leaders, that is focused on improving teaching and student learning. Under ESSA, professional development should be sustained, personalized, and job-embedded initiatives that address identified needs rather than stand-alone, one-day, or short-term professional development. ESSA states this professional development may include training teachers, principals, or other school leaders to: Effectively engage parents, families, and community partners and coordinate services between school and community; and develop policy with school, local educational agency, community, or State leaders.

Supporting Students Affected by Trauma and/or Mental Illness — ESSA supports the provision of in-service training for school personnel in techniques and support related to identifying and supporting students affected by trauma or mental illness, including the use of referral mechanisms, partnerships with outside organizations, or addressing school conditions for learning such as safety, peer interaction, drug and alcohol abuse, and chronic absenteeism.

Other activities include community partner involvement in the meaningful consultation process of planning for your LEA’s Title II, Part A program; and partnering with community partners for topic specific professional development opportunities (i.e. mental health, safety, health, nutrition, etc.).

Parent and Family Engagement

Q1. How and in what context would it be allowable to use Title II, Part A funds to provide training to parents?

A1. The intent and purpose of Title II focuses on professional development for teachers, principals and other school leaders. Although Title II, Part A does support parent engagement in various ways, it could be difficult to document that providing training to parents directly would align with the intent and purpose of Title II, Part A. You may consider inviting parents to a Title II, Part A professional development opportunity provided to teachers, principals and/or other school leaders in which the LEA has paid a set amount for the training rather than a per participant cost and ensure that by including parents it does not have an adverse effect on the training received by the teachers, principals and/or other school leaders.

Parent engagement in Title II, Part A would be allowable in the following ways. For example, parents are required stakeholders in the meaningful consultation and planning processes associated with the use of Title II, Part A funds. Additionally, Title II, Part A funds could be used to provide professional development to teachers, principals and other school leaders aimed at strategies for engaging parents, families, and community partners if the professional development meets the ESSA definition of professional development. Although funds used to pay for professional development activities associated with parent engagement or involvement strategies are considered allowable under Title II, Part A, there are several steps and requirements for using Title II, Part A funds. “Allowable” under Title II, Part A is only one part of the required steps. Please reference the Use of Funds section of [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) for additional information.

Prioritization of Funds

Q1: If the LEA has never done Title I, Part A in previous years, would we have to show prioritization of funds for Title II, Part A?

A1: If the LEA has not participated in Title I, Part A, the LEA would not be involved in the Title I School Improvement grant; therefore, that piece of the prioritization of funds requirement would not be applicable. However, all campuses would have a low-income percentage, which is what the second part of the prioritization of funds requirement refers to. The LEA should prioritize the campuses with the highest percentages of low-income students when planning for its Title II, Part A program.

Q2: What is the best way to document that the LEA is meeting the Prioritization of Funds requirement?

A2: The most straightforward way is for the LEA to include a written description in its District Improvement Plan, indicating how it considered the School Improvement status and low-income percentages in its prioritization. A chart showing each campus, its School Improvement status (yes/no), Low-income %, and amount of Title II, Part A funds would be helpful. If a campus is receiving supplemental funding from School Improvement (or other supplemental fund source) that meets all its Title II-related needs, the LEA could indicate that in the chart and in its rationale for prioritizing Title II, Part A funds to other campuses.

*Q3: If a LEA that is trying to shore up its compliance with Title II especially regarding Prioritization. For example, if the LEA has \$1,000,000 in funding, and it prioritizes \$700,000 to the schools with the highest % of low-income students then use the additional \$300,000 throughout the district with non-title and title campuses since the LEA feels the needs of the title campuses (or highest % of low-income students) would be met with the \$700,000. Is the LEA able to use the additional \$300,000 at the district level to provide all campuses necessary and allowable professional development?

A3: That could be one way of prioritizing the funds. The LEA could either allocate the \$700,000 in Title II, Part A funds to the high-need campuses and administer the remaining \$300,000 from the district level, or the LEA could administer the entire amount from the district level and give priority to the teachers at the high-need campuses. For example, if a professional development opportunity costs \$10,000 and the LEA has 10 seats available, one method of documenting compliance is how many “spots” are given to the campuses that have the highest % of low-income students and go from there. That is just one possible method. In the example provided, the LEA would have to keep a decision-making model that provides the rationale, or the “story” if you will, as to how the LEA determined that \$700,000 is enough to meet the needs at those campuses and identify how the rest (\$300,000) will be used. The LEA is reminded that Title II, Part A funds are intended to be supplemental and not to be used for any State required training.

Professional Development

Q1: What is a good way to keep track of professional development when teachers attend out-of-district training?

A1: One possibility is to collect copies of completion certificates from teachers who attend out-of-district training. This is a district decision, however, and should follow district procedures.

Q2: Can we pay to send district administrators to professional development using Title II, Part A?

A2: The intended beneficiaries of the Title II, Part A program are teachers, principals, and other school leaders. The term “other school leaders” is defined in Section 8101(44) as a principal, assistant principal, or other individual who is:

1. an employee or officer of an elementary school or secondary school, local educational agency, or other entity operating an elementary school or secondary school; **AND**
2. responsible for the daily instructional leadership and managerial operations in the elementary school or secondary school building.

In order for an LEA to send a district administrator to professional development using Title II, Part A funds, the LEA would need to document how such an expenditure meets the intent and purpose of Title II, Part A.

Q3: In regard to Title II, Part A, what is the best way to document that a practice/professional development is evidence-based according to the definition listed in the Title II, Part A Program Guide?

A3: The ESSA statute [Section 8101(21)(A)] defines “evidence-based” as meaning an activity, strategy, or intervention that—

(i) demonstrates a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes based on—

(I) strong evidence from at least 1 well-designed and well-implemented experimental study;

(II) moderate evidence from at least 1 well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study; or

(III) promising evidence from at least 1 well-designed and well-implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias; or (ii)(I) demonstrates a rationale based on high-quality research findings or positive evaluation that such activity, strategy, or intervention is likely to improve student outcomes or other relevant outcomes; and

(ii) includes ongoing efforts to examine the effects of such activity, strategy, or intervention.

For documentation, the LEA would need to be able to provide a copy of evidence from such a study, to show why the LEA believes that the activity or strategy will be effective in meeting the needs of its target population. The LEA would also need to show its own evaluation efforts to determine the effectiveness of the activity or strategy after implementation.

Q4: Would Central Office staff who are instructional leaders, example the instructional office over the math dept, not be allowed to attend Title II-funded training?

A4: It would not be a problem for additional staff to attend Title II-funded trainings, so long as it did not increase the cost of the training, and so long as the training is meeting the intent and purpose of Title II, Part A to improve educator quality and effectiveness.

Q5: Can funds be used for face-to-face professional development now?

A5: This has always been a district decision. The LEA would want to ensure it is following its local policies and procedures and responding in the best interest of its staff and students.

Q6: An LEA has conducted its needs assessment and has, as part of its plan, set aside a week of training that will begin this year and continue annually. This week will be at the end of July or first of August and it is outside of the teachers' contracted days. This is to be part of the LEA's ongoing PD development for teachers in the classroom. The LEA want to separate it from all the back-to-school training that occurs during in-service so that teachers will not be so overwhelmed with information.

The LEA plans to provide their teachers with stipends to attend that week since it is outside of their contract days and will also have to pay for some of the PD as well. Assuming the PD meets the criteria of T2A, would these be allowable costs for Title 2?

A6: It would be allowable to plan for Title II, Part A to cover some type of PD that the LEA wants to continue on an annual basis. However, they would need to be sure that none of the PD that Title II is paying for is to meet a state requirement. Any PD provided with Title II, Part A funds must be supplemental.

It would be permissible to use Title II, Part A funds to be used for stipends to pay teachers for their time to attend supplemental training that is scheduled outside their contracted days.

Q7: Based on the definition of school leader, if an LEA wants to send a cohort of leaders/administrators/teachers to work with the regional education service center, in TIL (Texas Instructional Leadership) and if the principal supervisor works on campuses to coach the principals (not working at the service center, but floats from campus to campus), would this activity be an allowable use of Title II, Part A funds?

A7: Such a professional development opportunity for teachers, principals, and principal supervisors could be an allowable activity, as long as the activity is supplemental (i.e., not to meet state requirements).

Q8: Professional development can't be a one-time training, correct? Example: a trainer that comes to provide training on techniques that can be used in classroom to enhance teaching. Is this allowable, since teachers would be implementing the techniques in classroom?

A8: One-time trainings or stand-alone seminars can be allowable only if they are part of a broader professional development program or plan for the teacher or school leader. It would be possible for an LEA to group several one-time trainings into a professional development plan for one or more of its teachers and/or principals.

Q9: Can we spend Title II funds for master's degree classes for a teacher needing those to teach AP classes?

A9: It can be allowable for Title II, Part A to pay for coursework that meets the ESSA definition of professional development, as well as the steps and requirements listed in the Use of Funds section of the Title II, Part A Program Guide.

Q10: We had a question regarding the use of Title II, Part A funds for professional development that is a district initiative. If the professional development activity is approved as an action item on a Board agenda, would it be an allowable cost for Title II, Part A?

A10: It depends on whether the Board is just approving the PD as an allowable activity, or whether they are requiring staff to participate in the PD. If they are just approving it as something that staff can participate in, then Title II, Part A might be able to fund it. However, if the Board is requiring staff to participate, then it would become an activity that is "required by state or local rule," and it would be considered supplanting for Title II, Part A to pay for it.

Q11: Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to purchase a book that is required for a professional development workshop?

A11: It is allowable for Title II, Part A funds to be used to purchase supplies and materials that are used for a specific professional development activity, so a book that is required for a training would be allowable, as long as the training itself was an allowable activity for Title II, Part A.

Q12. Could the FAQ include a specific statement that "core academic" PD is no longer a valid term? It would be extremely helpful to actually have it outlined what PD we can pay out of TIIA funds. For example, since PD is no longer restricted to ONLY "core academic" subjects to state that fine arts (band, choir, orchestra, arts, etc) can use TIIA funds for PD.

A12: The [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) does discuss other topics that professional development might include, in addition to improving or increasing the teachers’ knowledge of the academic subject they teach.

It isn’t that “core academic subjects” is not a valid term. It is just not specifically defined in the ESSA statute anymore. [Note that when NCLB did define the term, “core academic subjects” did include fine arts.]

In terms of what the state’s academic curriculum is, since the [Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills](#) establishes state standards for both the [foundation curriculum](#) (English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) and the enrichment curriculum (career and technical education, fine arts, health education, languages other than English, physical education, and technology applications), we can infer that it would be allowable for an LEA to use Title II, Part A funds to supplement teachers’ content knowledge in any of these subjects that they teach. The LEA would need to follow the [Use of Funds](#) guidance for Title II, Part A in making its determination of allowability for individual activities.

Q13: On the Region 14, Title IV School Safety State Initiative they provide a link to [mandated professional development](#) based on statute. Based on what I am reading in the Mentor Training requirements in this linked document, a mentor program is not required, but if the district decides to have a mentor program, then the mentor training is a state-required training. That would mean that Title II could not be used for the training required for the mentors. Is that correct?

A13: You are correct. If the LEA chooses to implement the program, the training is mandatory; therefore, Title II, Part A funds could not be used for the training required for this program. If, however, there is additional mentor training that is above and beyond the required training, and the LEA can document that the required training was provided with state or local (or ESSER) funds, then Title II, Part A could provide the additional training.

Q14: Does it affect the ability to pay for a PD if a district requires teachers to attend three trainings in the summer but does not specify what kind? For instance, if a teacher is required to attend three days and attends a supplemental STEM conference for three days (that meets PD definition). Would that impact the district being able to fund the conference out of Title II?

A14: Please keep in mind that the training topic to be provided needs to be supplemental to state requirements and meets the ESSA definition of professional development. If those criteria are met, the training would be considered a valid use of the Title II, Part A funds. If the professional development is required by state law or by local policy, then using Title II, Part A funds to pay for the training would be a supplant. Refer to question 10 on this section.

REAP/Funding Transferability

Q1: If I do transferability of funds from Title II to Title I what guidelines do I adhere to?

A1: Funds that are transferred into another program through REAP or Funding Transferability follow the guidelines of the receiving program. So, if Title II, Part A funds are transferred into Title I, Part A, those funds follow the guidelines of Title I, Part A.

Q2: Could Title II, Part A funds that are REAPed or transferred still be used for professional development?

A1: Title II, Part A funds that are REAPed or transferred to Title I, Part A are then used according to Title I, Part A rules. The funds may still be used for professional development, but this would be based on the Use of Funds requirements for Title I, Part A, and would have to meet the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program.

Recruitment and Retention of Teachers

Q1: Can Title II funds be used to recruit and train substitute teachers?

A1: This could certainly be a need at this time, given the teacher shortages and the health-related pandemic issues. There shouldn't be an issue with it, as long as the substitute training isn't state required.

The other thing to consider is how the LEA funded those activities in the prior year. If the LEA has not previously had a recruiting and training program for its substitute teachers, this would not be an issue. Likewise, if this is something the LEA has started with its ESSER funds, it would not be a supplant to start doing it with Title II, Part A, since the SNS requirement for Title II, Part A is only to supplement state and local funding.

Q2: Can LEAs use Title II, A funds to pay student teachers to complete student teaching in their district? This would be like a paid internship-type position with an aide-level salary. The thought is that this would be a recruitment tool. Colleges are sharing the idea of a paid student teaching position with LEAs since getting teachers begins with getting student teachers.

A2: This could be part of an LEA's recruitment and retention strategy. There could be several ways for such a payment to be made, depending on how the program is set up. It might be a stipend, or it might be done as a contracted service, if the payment is being made through the college.

Q3: Is there a specific definition of "ineffective teachers"? We know it relates to student achievement and T-TESS results, but is there a hard and fast definition? If not, would it be advisable for districts to create their local definition of "ineffective teachers" and document that?

A3: When it comes to teacher effectiveness, TEA uses the definition listed in the ESSA State Plan: on page 39, it states that "For the purposes of equity gaps, TEA calculates teacher effectiveness based

on student academic growth based on state assessments. 1) Comparison between actual student growth to expected student growth for minority and low-income students against expected student growth to actual student growth for nonminority and non-low-income students regardless of campus Title I designation. 2) Comparison between actual student growth to expected student growth for minority and low-income students against expected student growth to actual student growth for non-minority and non-low-income students within Title I schools.”

Q4: Can a PNP request that they receive equitable services from Title II, by requesting to pay for one of their teachers to obtain a certification?

A4: Professional development is the only Title II, Part A area of focus that is available for PNP equitable services. Activities that fall under the Teacher Recruitment and Retention area of focus are not allowed for PNP school.

Q5: What funds would be allowed to support paraprofessionals in getting their alternative certification?

A5: Initiatives that provide paraprofessionals with professional growth opportunities can be allowable with Title II, Part A funds, provided the other Use of Funds considerations are met (i.e., SNS, consultation requirements, EDGAR, local policies and procedures). The LEA can use its Title II, Part A funds to support a “Grow Your Own” program under the Teacher Recruitment/Retention area of focus.

Q6: Can the LEA go to another country to recruit on site through Title II funds, or does it need to be done through other means?

A6: The LEA’s process for recruiting effective teachers should note the rationale for the need to recruit from another country. More specifically, it should note all the avenues the LEA has pursued, leading them to recruit out of the country. In addition, the LEA should ensure compliance with the [Title II, Part A Use of Funds](#) one pager and look for any supplanting issues, as well as noting how these recruitment efforts align with the “recruiting effective teachers” part of the Title II, Part A Program. Travel expenses are an allowable expense. An LEA that is planning on using funds for travel outside of the state will need to fill out the form mentioned in the [Budgeting Costs Guidance Handbook](#) on page 7. That being said, please note that the statute does mention that costs need to be reasonable and necessary, and they must meet the intent and purpose of the Title II, Part A Program. Furthermore, documentation needs to be kept on file and readily available upon request by TEA and/or an auditor. An auditor may ask to see all the different avenues the LEA navigated through to recruit teachers, not only from Texas but also other states. TEA requires subgrantees to justify, and document, their intent to expend grant funds on certain activities. For additional guidance, please refer to [Forms for Prior Approval, Disclosure and Justification webpage](#).

Supplement, Not Supplant

Q1. Is it allowable for Title II, Part A funds to be used for the Reading Academies?

A1. Traditional SNS precludes Title II, Part A from being used for the Reading Academies in the instances where the academies are a state requirement. Therefore, the only instance where the academies may be considered allowable under Title II, Part A is if an LEA wants to provide the training to non-K-3 teachers. The HB3 state requirement is only for Principals and K-3 Teachers.

Q2. We have historically sent teachers to a conference with local funds. We would like to also send instructional coaches to that conference using Title II, Part A funds. Would this be considered a supplant?

A2. Title II, Part A funds must be used to supplement, not supplant, any non-federal funds that would otherwise be used to pay for the activity. To “supplement” would be to enhance, expand, increase, or extend the programs and services offered with state and local funds. So, it is not the number of staff sent to the training, but the activity paid with grant funds that is to be considered. By paying with federal funds, the LEA must be able to demonstrate that they would enhance, expand, increase, or extend the programs and services offered with state and local funds.

Q3. Would it be considered a supplant if an LEA utilized Title II, Part A funds to pay for state-required professional development (i.e. District Testing Coordinator Training, 30-hour G/T training for teachers meeting the needs of G/T identified students and LPAC training for members of the LPAC committee)?

A3. Use of Title II, Part A funds for state required professional development activities as referenced in the question would be considered supplanting as per the “Providing Services Required Under State or Local Law Presumption of Supplant” noted on Page 4 of the most recent version of the [Supplement, Not Supplant Handbook](#). In the event of a fiscal audit, the LEA must be prepared to provide documentation to rebut the presumption or work with their finance office to re-classify the funds.

Q4. Would it be considered a supplant if an LEA utilized Title II, Part A funds to pay for salary increases as required by HB3(2019)?

A4. Use of Title II, Part A funds for state required salary increases would be considered supplanting as per the “Providing Services Required Under State or Local Law Presumption of Supplant” noted on Page 4 of the most recent version of the [Supplement, Not Supplant Handbook](#). In the event of a fiscal audit, the LEA must be prepared to provide documentation to rebut the presumption or work with their finance office to re-classify the funds.

Q5: What is the Supplement, Not Supplant requirement for Title II, Part A?

A5: ESSA, Section 2301, states that Title II, Part A funds “shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, non-Federal funds that would otherwise be used for activities authorized under this title.” The traditional presumptions of supplant apply to Title II, Part A. (See [SNS Handbook](#).)

Q6: If a district requires certain professional development for every teacher to improve instruction, would using Title II, Part A funds be supplanting?

A6: It depends. If the professional development is required by state law or by local policy, then using Title II, Part A funds to pay for the training would be a supplant. However, if the training is required of teachers as part of the LEA’s districtwide plan or the teachers’ individual growth plan, rather than prescribed by state law or local policy, the training could be provided with Title II, Part A funds.

Q7: Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to pay an annual membership to a job application system that allows applicants to submit one common online application to all participating LEAs? This system provides employers with easy access to thousands of applicants seeking employment in the education industry. Members benefit by avoiding the costly advertising expenses for open positions, and they have easy access to web-based modules that facilitate the applicant screening and hiring process.

A7: An employment application system such as the one described is usually for all LEA employees, including employees that may not be considered intended beneficiaries of the Title II, Part A program (i.e. food service, custodial, transportation, etc.). This raises concerns for potential supplanting, as well as not meeting the intent and purpose of the program. Because of this, it is not a use of funds that is recommended.

Q8: We were granted the Mentor Allotment last year and were able to pay for mentor stipends. This year, we were not granted the allotment, so may we go back to paying the stipends with Title II funds as in previous years?

A8: This would be an example of where the LEA would want to keep documentation showing that the state fund source that had been used is no longer available. (This could be minutes from a board meeting, or from a budget report.) This would be what an auditor would want to see in order for the LEA to successfully rebut the presumption of supplanting.

Q9: We have been paying a teacher out of Title II for class-size reduction, but it does not truly satisfy that requirement so I will be moving it back into the local budget but would need to move some of the locally paid mentor stipends to Title II. We may have to look at doing away with some of our stipends if I cannot do this. What can I do?

A9: The answer to this depends on whether the LEA can rebut the presumption of supplanting. If the LEA can document that the stipends will end because of budget reductions, the LEA can rebut the presumption of supplanting. However, the LEA must be careful not to plan to use Title II, Part A funds for the stipends so that the state/local funds that were previously used for stipends are available for use elsewhere. That would be seen by auditors as a supplant. It all comes down to the documentation.

Q10: I have a district that utilizes Title IV, Part A funds for materials/resources utilized in its Makerspace (STEM) classes. The LEA’s student-to-teacher ratio is very high (40:1) for those classes and they were wondering if they could utilize Title II, Part A funds to fund salaries for additional teachers under the classroom reduction allowability. I wasn’t sure if that allowability is only for core content class-size reduction or if it is allowable for STEM classes as well.

A10: The Title II, Part A statute does not have core subject limitations. Please remember that in regard to class-size reduction, such an activity would need to be evidence-based with regard to the subject, grade, and number of students. Please refer to page 13 of the [Program Guide](#).

*Q11: There is a State mandate for districts to have a textbook adoption, I believe every 12 years. We have decided to have a textbook adoption several years early and all of the teachers are now needing professional development over the summer, off contract, to learn the new curriculum. Since we are not required by State law to do the textbook adoption at this point in time, it is okay to use Title II, Part A funds to pay for the extra duty pay for teacher Professional Development or because textbook adoptions are State mandated, at no point in time can we use Title II, Part A funds for the extra duty pay?

A11: From a “Supplement, Not Supplant” perspective, Title II, Part A funds cannot be used to meet a state requirement. If this is professional development on the required curriculum, Title II, Part A funds cannot be used. However, it is possible that Title II, Part A funds could be used for professional development on supplemental curriculum, provided that this was part of a larger PD plan for the teachers’ professional growth and development. The LEA would want to consider all the items in the [Title II, Part A Use of Funds document](#) when making that determination.

*Q12: We have an LEA that wants to pay for 10 teachers with Title II funds to attend a conference that they have never been to before. In addition, some of their campuses want to use their local funds from their campus budget to send additional teachers. Would this be considered allowable or supplanting?

A12: It would be considered an allowable use of Title II, Part A funds to pay for professional development that meets the definition in statute. Please remember that Title II, Part A funds are supplemental, thus the LEA would need to ensure that the use of Title II, Part A funds for professional development is in addition to what the LEA provides with state or local funds. Simply sending more teachers for the same purpose is not supplemental. If the LEA is sending the same category of staff to the conference for the same purpose, it would be considered supplanting to send some teachers with Title II, Part A funds and some teachers with state or local funds. However, if the LEA could send

another category of staff to the same conference to meet a different need. Please use the [Title II, Part A Use of Funds](#) document to better guide the decision-making process.

Here is an example to consider:

2021-2022 School Year:

Cascade ISD has determined that their Bilingual/ESL teachers need more training on instructional practices. The LEA decides to send a few of their Bilingual/ESL teachers to the 2022 Title III Symposium with state bilingual funds because this will help with strengthening instructional practices in their state-mandated program models. (Appropriate Use of Funds)

2022-2023 School Year:

Cascade ISD has determined that administrators need more training and guidance on how to enhance program implementation and monitor language development of Emerging Bilingual students. The LEA has determined the 2023 Title III Symposium would be a great PD opportunity and has decided to use its Title II, Part A funds to send their campus/LEA level administrators to the conference. (Appropriate Use of Funds)

This scenario would be allowable because Cascade ISD is targeting supports for 2 different groups of personnel while meeting 2 different targeted purposes.

It would not be allowable to use Title II, Part A funds to send the same type of personnel to meet the same purpose to the 2023 Title III Symposium since state funds were used last year, as this would be supplanting.

Use of Funds

Q1. Can Title II, Part A funds be used to provide teachers with stipends to attend professional development outside of their work schedule (for example, after hours, during the summer or on weekends)?

A1. It depends. LEAs must determine that the professional development meets the requirements noted in the ESSA definition for professional development. Additionally, LEAs should refer to the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) to ensure that all use-of-funds criteria are met.

Q2. Can Title II, Part A funds be used to provide new teachers with stipends to attend new teacher orientation which is considered outside of their contracted workdays?

A2. It depends. New teacher orientations are known for providing general information about campus/LEA policies and procedures and in part do not focus on improving student academic achievement related to the State’s challenging academic standards. Additionally, such orientations may not meet the ESSA definition for professional development activities. If an LEA determines that it meets the professional development requirements noted in the ESSA definition for professional development, it should refer to the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) to ensure that all use-of-funds criteria are met.

Q3. Are recruitment and retention initiatives for effective teachers such as signing bonuses, recruitment materials, salary differentials or incentive pay considered Title II, Part A allowable expenditures?

A3. It depends. Although funds for recruitment and retention initiatives for effective teachers such as signing bonuses, recruitment materials, salary differentials or incentive pay are considered allowable under Title II, Part A, there are several steps and requirements for using Title II, Part A funds. “Allowable” under Title II, Part A is only one part of the required steps. Please reference the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) for the steps required to determine whether an LEA can use Title II, Part A funds for a particular expense.

Q4. Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to pay stipends and/or substitute costs associated with educators participating in professional development or mentorship initiatives?

A4. It depends. Although funds used to pay for stipends and/or substitute costs associated with educators participating in professional development or mentorship initiatives are considered allowable under Title II, Part A, there are several steps and requirements for using Title II, Part A funds. “Allowable” under Title II, Part A is only one part of the required steps. Please reference the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) for the steps required to determine whether an LEA can use Title II, Part A funds for a particular expense.

Q5. Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to pay stipends and/or substitute costs associated with educators participating in collaborative educator work such as planning, peer observations, and/or analyzing student data to increase student achievement in relation to meeting the challenging State academic standards?

A5. It depends. Although funds used to pay for stipends and/or substitute costs associated with educators participating in collaborative educator work such as planning, peer observations, and analyzing student data to increase student achievement in relation to meeting the challenging State academic standards are considered allowable under Title II, Part A, there are several steps and requirements for using Title II, Part A funds. “Allowable” under Title II, Part A is only one part of the required steps. Please reference the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) for the steps required to determine whether an LEA can use Title II, Part A funds for a particular expense.

Q6. Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to pay for conference fees, travel and hotel costs, meal reimbursements, and mileage reimbursements associated with teacher, principal and/or other [school leader](#) travel to a conference?

A6. It depends. Conferences must meet the ESSA definition for professional development activities (for example, professional development activities that are sustained [not stand-alone, 1-day, or short-term workshops], intensive, collaborative, job-embedded, data-driven, and classroom-focused). If an LEA determines that the conference meets the professional development requirements noted in the ESSA definition for professional development, they will also need to refer to the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) to ensure that all use-of-funds criteria are met. Additional details on state and federal travel guidelines can be found on [TEA's Administering a Grant web page](#).

Q7. Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to pay for program development costs such as conducting a needs assessment, contracting with program developers, or administering and analyzing surveys?

A7. It depends. Although funds used to pay for program development costs such as conducting a needs assessment, contracting with program developers, or administering and analyzing surveys are considered allowable under Title II, Part A, there are several steps and requirements for using Title II, Part A funds. “Allowable” under Title II, Part A is only one part of the required steps. Please reference the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) for the steps required to determine whether an LEA can use Title II, Part A funds for a particular expense.

Q8. Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to pay for materials and supplies for use in PD sessions?

A8. It depends. Although funds used to pay for materials and supplies that are 100% dedicated for use in professional development sessions that meet the ESSA definition of professional development are considered allowable under Title II, Part A, there are several steps and requirements for using Title II, Part A funds. “Allowable” under Title II, Part A is only one part of the required steps. Please reference the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) for the steps required to determine whether an LEA can use Title II, Part A funds for a particular expense.

Q9. Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to pay for materials and supplies used for implementing collaborative educator work?

A9. It depends. Although funds used to pay for materials and supplies that are 100% dedicated for implementing collaborative educator work are considered allowable under Title II, Part A, there are several steps and requirements for using Title II, Part A funds. “Allowable” under Title II, Part A is only one part of the required steps. Please reference the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) for the steps required to determine whether an LEA can use Title II, Part A funds for a particular expense.

Q10. Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to pay for food and/or refreshments for professional development?

A10. See the [Using Federal Grant Funds to Pay for Food section](#). LEAs will also need to refer to the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) to ensure that all use-of-funds criteria are met. Additional details can be found on [TEA's Administering a Grant web page](#).

Q11. Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to pay for individual teacher electronic tablet devices?

A11. No. Materials and supplies that are not directly connected to professional development as defined in ESSA and/or used outside the scope of a professional development environment are considered unallowable expenditures.

Q12. Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to pay for electronic devices used by administrators to conduct classroom observations and/or provide feedback to teachers?

A12. It depends. Although funds used to pay for materials and supplies that are used directly for professional development and educator growth are considered allowable under Title II, Part A, there are several steps and requirements for using Title II, Part A funds. “Allowable” under Title II, Part A is only one part of the required steps. Please reference the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) for the steps required to determine whether an LEA can use Title II, Part A funds for a particular expense.

Q13. Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to pay for electronic white boards for classroom use?

A13. No. Materials and supplies that are not directly connected to professional development as defined in ESSA and/or used outside the scope of a professional development environment are considered unallowable expenditures.

Q14. Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to pay for a professional library book collection?

A14. No. Materials and supplies that are not directly connected to professional development as defined in ESSA and/or used outside the scope of a professional development environment are considered unallowable expenditures.

Q15. Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to pay for tuition and/or fees associated with a teacher, principal, and/or other school leader’s advanced degree?

A15. No. However, if the coursework meets the ESSA definition of professional development with the degree solely as a byproduct and the steps and requirements listed in the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#), it may be an allowable expenditure.

Q16. Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to pay for the State certification fees, certification exam fees and certification exam preparation course fees associated with a teacher adding a State certification?

A16. It depends. Although using Title II, Part A funds to pay for certification exam fees (for exams that are taken successfully) and certification exam preparation course fees associated with a teacher adding or obtaining a State certification may be allowable, there are several steps and requirements for using Title II, Part A funds. “Allowable” under Title II, Part A is only one part of the required steps. Please reference the Use of Funds section of the Title II, Part A Program Guide for the steps required to determine whether an LEA can use Title II, Part A funds for a particular expense.

Please note that it would be considered a supplant for Title II, Part A funds to pay the State certification fee because this would be to meet the state certification requirement. The LEA could consider using state or local funds, or if all the LEA’s campuses are schoolwide campuses, the LEA could consider using Title I, Part A funds for this purpose.

Q17. Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to pay for the State certification fees, certification exam fees and certification exam preparation course fees associated with a paraprofessional obtaining a State teacher certification?

A17. It depends. Although using Title II, Part A funds to pay for certification exam fees (for exams that are taken successfully) and certification exam preparation course fees associated with a paraprofessional obtaining a State teacher certification may be allowable, there are several steps and requirements for using Title II, Part A funds. “Allowable” under Title II, Part A is only one part of the required steps. Please reference the Use of Funds section of the Title II, Part A Program Guide for the steps required to determine whether an LEA can use Title II, Part A funds for a particular expense.

Please note that it would be considered a supplant for Title II, Part A funds to pay the State certification fee because this would be to meet the state certification requirement. The LEA could consider using state or local funds, or if all the LEA’s campuses are schoolwide campuses, the LEA could consider using Title I, Part A funds for this purpose.

Q18. Can Title II, Part A pay for professional development for an Instructional Officer at the District level that supports specialists/program coordinators (campus) since they don't work directly with teachers?

A18. The intent of Title II, Part A funding is to support educators in their work to improve the overall quality of instruction and ensure equity of educational opportunity for all students. Since the Instructional Officer in this scenario seems to be disconnected from working directly with educators, this would conflict with the intent and be hard to justify that it meets the Title II, Part A use of funds steps and requirements referenced in the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#).

However, if the Instructional Officer is a Principal Supervisor, the Title II, Part A Non-Regulatory Guidance provides the following guidance. "When developing strategies for supporting principals and other school leaders, SEAs and LEAs may use Title II, Part A funds to improve the effectiveness of principals, assistant principals, and other school leaders, which includes an employees or officers of an elementary or secondary school, LEA, or other entity operating a school who are "responsible for the daily instructional leadership and managerial operations in the elementary school or secondary school building." (ESEA section 8101(44)). By including principal supervisors who are responsible for the daily instructional leadership and managerial operations in the elementary school or secondary school building, the ESEA section 8101(44) definition of "school leader" acknowledges the importance of school leaders who are actively responsible for successful instruction and management in the school. This means that the ESEA considers those LEA staff, such as the principals' supervisors, who actively mentor and support principals and by doing so are themselves "responsible for the school's daily instructional leadership and managerial operations," to also be eligible for Title II, Part A funded support. (ESEA section 8101(44)). We encourage SEAs and LEAs to extend Title II, Part A-funded services to these principal supervisors to the extent that those individuals actively and frequently take responsibility for helping principals with instructional leadership and the school's managerial operations."

Q19. Can funds be used for a math coach to provide instructional coaching to teachers?

A19. The intent of Title II, Part A funding is to support educators in their work to improve the overall quality of instruction and ensure equity of educational opportunity for all students. Since a math coach in this scenario seems to be connected to working directly with educators, this would be aligned with the intent of Title II, Part A. Although funds used to pay for other school leaders supporting educator professional development and growth are considered allowable under Title II, Part A, there are several steps and requirements for using Title II, Part A funds. "Allowable" under Title II, Part A is only one part of the required steps. Please reference the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) for the steps required to determine whether an LEA can use Title II, Part A funds for a particular expense.

Q20. What would be allowable expenses related to "improving school working conditions"?

A20. The Title II, Part A Non-Regulatory Guidance provides the following examples of recommended strategies and additionally references ESEA sections 2103(b)(3)(B),(D) and (I).

From Title II, Part A Non-Regulatory Guidance: Improve working conditions for teachers through high-impact activities based on local needs, such as improving access to educational technology, reducing class size to a level that is evidence-based, to the extent the State determines that such evidence is reasonably available, or providing ongoing cultural proficiency training to support stronger school climate for educators and students.

From ESEA Section 2103(b)(3)(B): Developing and implementing initiatives to assist in recruiting, hiring, and retaining effective teachers (particularly in low-income schools with high percentages of ineffective teachers and high percentages of students who do not meet the challenging State academic standards) to improve within-district equity in the distribution of teachers, consistent with section 1111(g)(1)(B), such as initiatives that provide...

- expert help in screening candidates and enabling early hiring;
- differential and incentive pay for teachers, principals, or other school leaders in high-need academic subject areas and specialty areas, which may include performance-based pay systems;
- teacher, paraprofessional, principal, or other school leader advancement and professional growth, and an emphasis on leadership opportunities, multiple career paths, and pay differentiation; new teacher, principal, or other school leader induction and mentoring programs that are designed to
 - improve classroom instruction and student learning and achievement; and
 - increase the retention of effective teachers, principals, or other school leaders;
- the development and provision of training for school leaders, coaches, mentors, and evaluators on how accurately to differentiate performance, provide useful feedback, and use evaluation results to inform improvement strategies, and personnel decisions; and
- a system for auditing the quality of evaluation and support systems.

From ESEA Section 2103(b)(3)(D): Reducing class size to a level that is evidence based and used to improve student achievement through the recruiting and hiring of additional effective teachers.

From ESEA Section 2103(b)(3)(I): Providing high-quality, personalized professional development that is evidence-based for

- teachers, instructional leadership teams, principals, or other school leaders,
- that is focused on improving teaching and student learning and achievement, including
 - supporting efforts to train teachers, principals, or other school leaders to
 - effectively integrate technology into curricula and instruction (including education about the harms of copyright piracy);
 - use data to improve student achievement and understand how to ensure individual student privacy is protected,
 - as required under section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (commonly known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”) (20 U.S.C. 1232g) and State and local policies and laws in the use of such data;
 - effectively engage parents, families, and community partners, and coordinate services between school and community;
 - help all students develop the skills essential for learning readiness and academic success;

- develop policy with school, local educational agency, community, or State leaders; and
- participate in opportunities for experiential learning through observation.

Q21. For a STEM-focused professional development activity, is it a Title II, Part A allowable expense to procure supplies, consultants, etc. as related to the activity?

A21. Although funds used to pay for supplies and materials and/or contracted services related to Title II, Part A professional development activities are considered allowable under Title II, Part A, there are several steps and requirements for using Title II, Part A funds. “Allowable” under Title II, Part A is only one part of the required steps. Please reference the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) for the steps required to determine whether an LEA can use Title II, Part A funds for a particular expense.

Q22. Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to pay for the salary of an Assistant Principal?

A22. Use of Title II, Part A funds for the salary of an Assistant Principal generally would not meet the intent and purpose of Title II, Part A.

Q23: One of my districts wants to know if they can pay for the ESC Distance Learning Fee Service with Title II funds. Would this be an allowable use of funds?

A23: The LEA would have to be able to document that this is a supplemental activity that also meets the intent and purpose of Title II, Part A.

The difficulty might be in ensuring that the distance learning is for training that is supplemental and not training that is required by state law or local policy.

Q24: I have heard guidance that federal funds should not be used for substitute pay, and I have also heard that substitute pay should follow the funding stream of the staff that are being subbed for. What is the guidance for whether Title II, Part A funds can pay for substitutes?

A24: Title II, Part A funds may not be used to pay for substitutes to cover general absences; one exception would be if the LEA, according to its local policies and procedures, uses Title II, Part A funds to pay for substitutes for teachers who are paid with Title II, Part A funds. This would only apply to Title II, Part A teachers who are part of an evidence-based class-size reduction program.

Title II, Part A funds may be used to pay for substitutes to allow teachers to attend a Title II, Part A-funded training.

Substitute pay for private school teachers is not allowable under any circumstances.

Q25: Are we allowed to use Title II funds for membership fees for conference? Also, if it is a membership fee for a reduced conference fee, do we have to pay the higher registration fee?

A25: The LEA would need to ensure that it could justify such a cost as necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of its Title II, Part A program. Costs associated with membership dues or fees for business, technical, and professional organizations directly related to and necessary to carry out the objectives of the grant are generally allowable, as long as the LEA meets the requirements as noted in the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#).

LEAs must use the following steps and requirements to determine whether Title II, Part A funds can be used for any activity/resource.

- Apply the traditional presumptions of Supplant to determine if the use of funds is supplemental.
- Ensure that the LEA has prioritized Title II, Part A funds for use at Title I, Part A campuses identified for School Improvement and campuses serving Title I, Part A students.
- Ensure that activities and/or resources address the learning needs of all students, including children with disabilities, English learners, and gifted and talented students; and are:
 - Identified in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment [**Highly Recommended**];
 - Included in the District and/or Campus Improvement Plan;
 - The plan addresses how the activity/resource identified will be aligned with challenging State academic standards; and
 - The planning process for the Title II, Part A program meets the requirements for meaningful consultation of stakeholders and coordination
 - If a professional development activity, ensure that it meets the ESSA definition of Professional Development;
 - Reasonable;
 - Necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of the Title II, Part A program;
 - Allocable; and
 - Allowable under Title II, Part A.
- Ensure that the expenditure(s) meet all EDGAR requirements.
- Ensure that all LEA policies and procedures were followed.

The LEA would also want to be sure that, if this is being done under the professional development focus area, membership must be part of a districtwide or individual growth plan for educational staff.

Q26: Is teacher longevity pay an allowable Title II, Part A expense?

A26: It is allowable for Title II, Part A funds to pay for payroll costs, such as longevity pay, that are associated with a position that is paid with Title II, Part A funds, as long as that is in keeping with the districtwide policy.

Q27: In what circumstances could Title II, Part A funds pay for base salaries for positions?

A27: Base salaries could only be paid with Title II, Part A funds if the LEA is funding a position to provide the professional development activities identified by the LEA, or if the LEA has determined that it can fund a supplemental class-size reduction teacher with Title II, Part A funds as part of an evidence-based class-size reduction program.

Q28: Are Title II, Part A funds restricted to core content areas?

A28: There are no “core content” requirements related to Title II, Part A under ESSA. An LEA could institute a local practice, such as to focus on STEM subjects, but there is not a core content restriction in statute or guidance.

Q29: Would it be an allowable use of funds to have Title II, Part A funds pay the salary of an Assistant Superintendent who supervises principals?

A29: The LEA would have to be very careful to avoid a supplant here. If this is an existing position that has been paid with state/local funds, it would be a supplant to start paying it with Title II, Part A funds. Even if it is a new position, the job duties could also be problematic. Any general administrative duties for the LEA as a whole would likely be outside the intent and purpose of the Title II, Part A program. Coaching teachers and principals could be seen as allowable, but perhaps not normal supervisory duties.

Q30: Can Title II, Part A funding be used to pay tuition for aides going through a teacher certification program?

A30: It could be possible for this to be an allowable activity with Title II, Part A funds. However, each LEA would need to make its own determination as to whether the activity would be supplemental, as well as in line with the LEA’s policies and procedures.

Q31: Can you provide more specificity to evaluation and support systems? Is this evaluation of LEA programs? What do you mean by Support Systems?

A31: There is a bit more detail in the [Title II, Part A program guide](#) on pp. 10-11: “ESSA supports the development or improvement of a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation and support system for teachers, principals, or other school leaders that is based on evidence of student achievement and may include student growth. It should also include multiple measures of educator performance and provide clear, timely, and useful feedback to teachers, principals, or other school leaders.”

Q32: What would the documentation look like when the LEA is considering whether it can replicate the results of the study and appropriate context in implementing an evidenced-based activity.

A32: The LEA would want to be able to show that it would be implementing the activity in a similar context and with similar materials, so that there would be a reasonable expectation of being able to produce similar results. If the activity is contingent on having certain materials or set of circumstances that the LEA is not planning to use, the LEA might not be able to justify the expectation of success.

Q33: Can Title II Part A split-fund costs with Title I since Title funds can only cover the cost of Title schools? For example, substitutes for training or programs that are evidence based?

A33: It would not be a supplanting issue for Title II, Part A funds to replace Title I, Part A funds (or vice versa) because those statutes only require the federal funds to supplement state and local funds—not other federal funds. However, an LEA would want to ensure that it could document that Title II, Part A funds have been prioritized to meet the needs at campuses that have been identified for school improvement and campuses that have the highest percentage of low-income students. If Title II, Part A funds remain after that, then this could be an allowable activity if it meets with LEA policies and procedures.

Q34: The purpose of Title II is to improve Educator Quality & Effectiveness which includes teachers, principals, and school leaders. Can this include Paraprofessionals too?

A34: Initiatives that provide paraprofessionals with professional growth opportunities can be allowable with Title II, Part A funds, provided the other [Use of Funds](#) considerations are met (i.e., SNS, consultation requirements, EDGAR, local policies and procedures).

Q35: Can we use Title II money to create a teacher podcast? I would need to be able to purchase the equipment needed.

A35: This could be possible; however, the LEA would need to ensure that the equipment purchased with 100% Title II, Part A funds was used only for Title II, Part A activities. If the equipment is split-funded, the LEA would have to document its proportional use among those fund sources.

Q36: Can an LEA pay stipends (time for studying and time to take the test) for teachers adding ESL certification? Can we pay for the certification test? If so, will this be under Recruit, Support, and Retain?

A36: These could be allowable activities under Title II, Part A. However, the LEA would need to consider whether any state/local funds have previously been used for this purpose. If so, there may be a supplanting issue. If such state/local funds are no longer available because of budget reductions, the LEA might be able to rebut the presumption of supplanting with appropriate

documentation. The LEA would also need to ensure that these activities are in keeping with its policies and procedures. The activity, if allowable for the LEA, would fall under the “Recruit, Support, and Retain” area of focus.

Q37: Can a district use Title II funds to hire a mentor/coach to provide training (according to the Professional Development definition) and support for teachers on a high-need Title I campus?

A37: Because the mentor/coach in this case would be connected to working directly with educators, this would be aligned with the intent of Title II, Part A. The LEA would need to ensure that the other requirements in the [Use of Funds guidance](#) are met.

Q38: Can Title IIA funds be used toward a subscription to a service that would provide an LEA the opportunity to expand recruitment efforts and create more diverse teacher application pools?

A38: This could be problematic. It might be possible if the subscription is strictly for teachers and principals. However, if there are other LEA/campus personnel positions, such as maintenance workers, cafeteria staff, and/or clerical positions, that would be included in the service, it would not be possible to differentiate these from positions that are related to the provision of Title II, Part A services. Also, if the LEA has previously had such a service paid for with state/local funds, there would be a supplanting issue.

Q39: In the Title II, Part A provisions and assurances, it states: Title II program activities will address the learning needs of all students, including children with disabilities, English Learners, and gifted and talented students. This is also a question in the compliance report (pre-COVID). Is this a requirement?

A39: Section 2103(b) does state that an LEA receiving Title II, Part A funds “shall use the funds made available through the subgrant to develop, implement, and evaluate comprehensive programs and activities described in subsection (b), which ...shall address the learning needs of all students, including children with disabilities, English learners, and gifted and talented students...” It is a requirement that the LEA address the learning needs of all students in the planning and implementation of its Title II, Part A program. Not every activity has to address all students, but the totality of the program should ensure that the learning needs of all students are addressed.

Q40: Is there a list of state-mandated professional development activities?

A40: The Title IV, Part A School Safety State Initiative at ESC 14 has an extensive list of state-mandated training and professional development under its District/LEA Resources. It is important for the LEA to document the training that it conducts/obtains with state/local funds. When the required amount of training for a particular topic is met, additional training beyond that amount for that topic would be considered supplemental and could be allowable with Title II, Part A funds provided

that the other requirements in the Use of Funds section of the Title II, Part A Program Guide are met.

Q41: Can Title II, Part A funds be utilized for a stipend for paraprofessionals to administer and assist students who are English Learners and doing Summit K-12?

A41: Using Title II, Part A funds to pay paraprofessionals to provide direct services to students is not in keeping with the intent and purpose of the Title II, Part A program.

Q42: Can a district use Title II funds to hire a mentor/coach to provide training (PD according to the PD definition) and support for teachers on a high-needs Title I campus? This would be a new position so SNS wouldn't be an issue. I did explain that it had to meet all the requirements on the Title II Use of Funds One-Pager.

A42: Because the mentor/coach seems to be connected to working directly with educators, this would be aligned with the intent of Title II, Part A. You are also correct that the LEA would need to ensure that the other requirements in the [Use of Funds guidance](#) are met.

Q43: Can we use Title II, Part A funds for stipends for teachers adding ESL certification? Can we pay for the certification test? If so, will this be under Recruit, Support and Retain area of focus?

A43: These could be allowable activities under the Recruit, Support and Retain area of focus for Title II, Part A. However, the LEA would need to consider whether any state/local funds have previously been used for this purpose. If so, there may be a supplanting issue. If such state/local funds are no longer available because of budget reductions, the LEA might be able to rebut the presumption of supplanting with appropriate documentation. The LEA would also need to ensure that these activities are in keeping with its policies and procedures.

Q44: Can Title II, Part A be used to pay the legal fees to achieve work visas for international bilingual teachers?

A44: This could be allowable as part of recruitment. In Section 2103(b)(3)(B)(i), the statute mentions obtaining “expert help in screening candidates and enabling early hiring.” Arguably, “expert help” includes legal work on immigration paperwork and “early hiring” includes hiring them before they enter the country through another form of visa – essentially getting them right at the beginning of the pipeline and directing them to your district and high-need schools specifically, as applicable. Note, however, that federal funds cannot be spent outside the country unless authorized, so it would have to be US-based immigration attorneys.

Q45: One of our participating private nonprofit schools would like us to purchase supplies that they believe will help develop problem solving skills and tactile learning. Would this be allowable for the PNP?

A45: No, it would not be allowable. Title II, Part A funds can be used to purchase supplies and materials that will be used as part of an allowable professional development activity. However, they may not be used for supplies and materials for students. This is true for Title II, Part A programs at the school district and at PNP schools.

Q46: Can LEAs use Title II, A funds to pay student teachers as part of their plan to recruit qualified teachers?

A46: If the LEA is doing this as part of a teacher recruitment program to attract and retain qualified teachers, then this would be an allowable activity. The LEA would want to ensure that it is complying with all the items on the [Title II, Part A Use of Funds one-pager](#).

Q47: Can LEAs use Title II, A funds to pay student teachers to complete student teaching in their district? This would be like a paid internship-type position with an aide-level salary.

A47: Yes, although how this is done may vary, depending on how the program is structured. The LEA could either do this through a contract with the educator certification program, or however the LEA contracts or pays non-employees. If the LEA is actually hiring the student teacher as an LEA employee, there may also be other factors to consider, depending on the LEA's local policies and procedures.

Q48: The Program Guide mentions that Title II, Part A funds can be used to “improve school working conditions.” Can you provide examples of what that means?

A48: The USDE has provided the following examples in its non-regulatory guidance:

- Develop feedback mechanisms to improve working conditions, including through periodically and publicly reporting results of educator support and working conditions feedback which may leverage teacher leadership and community partners. (ESEA section 2103(b)(3)(N)).
- Carry out in-service training for school personnel in addressing issues related to school conditions for student learning, such as safety, peer interaction, drug and alcohol abuse, and chronic absenteeism. (ESEA section 2103(b)(3)(I)(iv)).
- Create teams of educators for teachers in high-need schools who convene regularly to learn, problem solve, and look over student work together, or provide time during the school day for educators to observe one another and reflect on new teaching and leading practices.

- Provide “teacher time banks” to allow effective teachers and school leaders in high-need schools to work together to identify and implement meaningful activities to support teaching and learning.

For example, when implementing teacher time banks, Title II, Part A funds may be used to pay the costs of additional responsibilities for teacher leaders, use of common planning time, use of teacher-led developmental experiences for other educators based on educators’ assessment of the highest leverage activities, and other professional learning opportunities. [ESEA sections 2101I(4)(B)(v)(I) and 2103(b)(3)I(iv) and reasonable and necessary cost principles in 2 CFR §200.403].

- Improve working conditions for teachers through high-impact activities based on local needs, such as improving access to educational technology, reducing class size to a level that is evidence-based, to the extent the State determines that such evidence is reasonably available, or providing ongoing cultural proficiency training to support stronger school climate for educators and students. [ESEA sections 2103(b)(3)(B), (D) and I]

Q49: Can TIIA funds be used to reimburse ESL Supplemental tests and practice tests? If so, only for tests or practice tests that have been passed?

A49: Title II, Part A funds can be used to reimburse tests that are not required by state or local law. Paying for practice tests could be considered allowable as part of a teacher’s Professional Development plan. It would be up to the district policy to determine whether reimbursement would only be made for tests that have been passed.

Q50: Can TIIA funds be used to purchase laptops/computers for our Instructional Coaches/Officers who provide PD services to teachers, principals, and other school leaders?

A50: The LEA should be cautious about this. If the LEA routinely provides laptops/computers for its other staff, then this could be a supplant to use Title II, Part A funds to do the same for the instructional coaches/officers. Even if this is not the case, the district would have to ensure that the instructional coaches/officers were assigned 100% to Title II, Part A duties and not to other duties. Having to account for split-time for the laptops is probably not something that the LEA wants to do.

Q51: I have a district with a question regarding Title II. A district had a mid-year change of personnel in the Federal Programs position. They are wondering if it would be allowable to use Title II funds to pay to contract with the former director for one-day to work on mentoring regarding the program (the hand-off)?

A51: It may depend on how the former director was paid. If the former director was paid with Title II, Part A funds, it might be ok (although if the new director is being trained on other federal programs

as well, it would not be an allowable use of Title II, Part A funds to train on the other programs.) If the former director was paid with state/local funds, this would be seen as a supplant.

A cleaner way to fund it would be to use ESSER funds, which have no SNS provision.

Q52: I have an LEA that is considering the use of Title II, Part A funds for a guest speaker for a convocation. They believe that the speaker will be able to set the mind-set of the district to refocus the culture of the whole district. They would like to have the speaker spend the second day working specifically with the campus leaders to continue and strengthen the impact of the mind-set shift. The LEA believes that they can tie it to this portion of the program guide on page 7:

Improving School Working Conditions

- Developing feedback mechanisms to improve working conditions, including through periodically and publicly reporting results of educator support and working conditions feedback which may leverage teacher leadership and community partners.
- Improve working conditions for teachers through high-impact activities based on local needs, such as improving access to educational technology, reducing class size to a level that is evidence-based, and providing ongoing cultural proficiency training to support stronger school climate for educators and students.
- Providing ongoing professional development aimed at cultural competency and responsiveness and equity coaching, designed to improve conditions for all educators and students, including educators and students from underrepresented minority groups, diverse national origins, English language competencies, and varying genders and sexual orientations.
- Carry out in-service training for school personnel in addressing issues related to school conditions for student learning, such as safety, peer interaction, drug and alcohol abuse, and chronic absenteeism.

A52: If this LEA has identified this as a need and have included it in the LEA plan, it is possible for such an event to be an allowable Title II, Part A activity. It should ultimately be tied to improving the effectiveness of teachers and improving student achievement. If the activity also meets the other items on the [Use of Funds](#) document for Title II, Part A, then it should be fine.

Q53: I had a school contact me that is having a significant gang problem and just recently had a shooting involving their students that is gang-related. Since this is a need for their district, they wondered if they could use Title II funds for educator training around gang violence prevention (identification, signs, etc.).

I found in the Program Guide under Supported Students Affected by Trauma and/or Mental Illness that says

“ESSA Supports the provision of in-service training for school personnel in techniques [...] addressing school conditions for learning such as safety, peer interaction, drug and alcohol abuse” but was not sure if that would cover what she is looking for.

What is your guidance on this question?

A53: The LEA would want to be sure that such training meets the statutory definition of professional development (Program Guide, pp. 8-9), and that all the Use of Funds items are met. This would be PD for teacher and principals, not direct services for students.

Title IV, Part A funds might also be a possibility that would have more flexibility, as might ESSER funding.

Q54: Our school requires that our teachers be trained as Montessori Teachers. They receive their training in Houston during the summer. The training is on all core subjects but within the Montessori philosophy. My question is would our Title II Part A funds be available to use for part of the training fees?

A54: One of the factors in determining whether this is an allowable use of Title II, Part A funds is the LEA’s own rules and regulations. If the LEA has made it a requirement that teachers be trained as Montessori Teachers, then this activity would be “required by state or local rule,” making it a supplant if Title II, Part A were to pay for it.

Q55: I have an LEA asking if the use of Title II funds to pay for professional development/travel for the Director of Literacy would be allowable. The position of Director of Literacy hires reading interventionists, supervises them daily, completes yearly evaluation, and is responsible for the managerial operations of the Reading Interventionist on campuses. Would this be an allowable expenditure?

A55: Whether Title II Part A (T2A) funds can be used to pay for professional development and associated travel for the Director of Literacy depends on how the LEA considers that position. The T2A program’s intended beneficiaries are teachers, principals, and other school leaders. The term “other school leaders” is defined in Section 8101(44) as a principal, assistant principal, or other individual who is:

1. an employee or officer of an elementary school or secondary school, local educational agency, or other entity operating an elementary school or secondary school; AND
2. responsible for the daily instructional leadership and managerial operations in the elementary school or secondary school building.

In order for an LEA to send a district administrator to professional development using Title II, Part A funds, the LEA would need to document that the administrator is one of the intended beneficiaries and that the expenditure meets the intent and purpose of Title II, Part A.

In addition, the professional development involved must meet the statutory definition. Please refer to page 8 of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) for the text of the definition.

Q56: Could you provide guidance on whether or not it is allowable to utilize Title II, Part A funds for lunch during a well-documented working lunch PD session?

A56: Instances where Title II, Part A funds can be used to provide working lunch are very rare. According to the Budgeting Costs Guidance Handbook, on page 18, it states that “there is a very high burden of proof to show that paying for food and beverages with federal funds is necessary to meet the goals and objectives of a federal grant” and that it might be best to “structure the agenda for the meeting so that there is time for participants to purchase their own food, beverages, and snacks”.

Another option is that LEA organizes an opportunity for participants to pay for their own boxed lunches.

Q57: Could a district use Title II, Part A funds to pay for an employee’s teacher prep program fees (because they are having trouble recruiting)?

A57: The Title II Part A Program Guide lists several allowable activities in the area of recruiting and retaining effective teachers, such as: providing financial support to educator recruitment programs within the community to improve hiring and retention of a diverse workforce. If this is a new initiative by the LEA, it would be advisable to have the supporting documentation and for such to be readily available for an auditor or TEA upon request.

Q58: I was visiting with a district this morning regarding a district plan involving supplemental training for their teachers on their evaluation system through conferences that are not required. I know that is a statutorily allowable activity for Title II. However, they also would like to allow their teachers the opportunity to visit a school district that is implementing a system they use in their district and view best practices in action (travel costs, subs). Would that be allowable to pay for those teachers to visit that school/district to see best practices in action if it aligns with their PD plan?

A58: When it comes to the allowable use of T2A funds to visit a school to see best practices in action as part of professional development for teachers, the professional development activity must meet the intended definition of the ESSA statute. Such definition is listed in page 8 of the Title II, Part A Program Guide. In this scenario, if the visit is not a stand-alone, or short-term workshop and meets the definition established, then it would be allowable use of funds. If that is not the case, however, then by definition this activity will not be an appropriate use of funds.

Q59: Could an LEA utilize Title II, Part A funds to fund salaries for additional teachers under the classroom allowability for classes that are not core content subjects?

A59: The Title II, Part A statute does not have core subject limitations. Please remember that class-size reduction activities would need to be evidence-based. Please refer to page 13 of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#).

Q60: Can we pay principals and teachers a stipend for being an A-rated campus using Title II, Part A funds?

A60: The Title II, Part A Statute does not mention campus rating as a limitation for use of funds. Rather, the prioritization of funds should be going towards the schools that are identified for school improvement by TEA [i.e., at campuses that are implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities and targeted support and improvement activities under section 1111(d)] and that have the highest percentage of children counted under Title I, Part A.

Now, when it comes to stipends, the LEA would have to make sure that it aligns with the intent and purpose of the program.

“The purpose of Title II, Part A is to increase student achievement consistent with the challenging State academic standards; improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other school leaders; increase the number of effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders who are effective in improving student academic achievement in schools; and provide low-income and minority students greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders. The intent of the funding is to support educators in their work to improve the overall quality of instruction and ensure equity of educational opportunity for all students”. That being said, some questions to ponder are: what activity are they engaging in that will entitle them to a stipend? Are they attending professional development (PD) outside their work schedule? Is the PD supplemental to what they are required to get? Does the PD meet the definition as stated in statute? Stipends may be allowable, but the LEA must be careful of supplement not supplant issues.

Q61: With sign-on stipends being paid out of Title II, Part A, is it allowable for a teacher who is not certified (or a bilingual teacher who is not bilingual certified) to receive the stipend? Is this against TEA or is it a local rule?

A61: The LEA would need to follow its local policies when deciding whether to give a stipend to an uncertified teacher.

Q62: We still have quite a bit remaining in our Title II, Part A funds that we use for sign-on stipends. We are still having a hard time finding enough teachers, but we have potential candidates that would

come if they didn't already sign a new lease on housing elsewhere. Would it be allowable to have a "moving expense" stipend of a set amount for anyone who lived XX miles from the district to be able to recruit teachers to join our district who live outside the area and do not have the funds to move without these funds?

A62: Title II, Part A funds may be used for recruitment. The LEA could define its recruitment to include "moving expenses" and as you mentioned, follow all the other steps and requirements for use of funds and any potential SNS issues.

Q63: Can a paraprofessional be hired using Title II funds if they are helping support/coteach/reduce group size in the classroom to make the teacher more effective?

A63: Using Title II, Part A funds to pay paraprofessionals to provide direct services to students is not keeping with the intent and purpose of the Title II, Part A program.

Q64: We have a district that wanted to know if it would be allowable to use Title II, Part A funds to pay for an Effective Schools Framework Diagnostic to be conducted on two of their campuses. The campuses are not in School Improvement, but the district wants to opt-in voluntarily for the Diagnostics to be conducted as a proactive measure based on current performance and needs. The ESF Diagnostic would be conducted by one of the ESC departments that works with schools in this area.

A64: After looking into the ESF, it seems this would align with the intent and purpose of the T2A program as long as they are not State-required activities. Please advise the LEA to maintain documentation at the local level and be readily available upon request by TEA and/or an auditor.

Q65: Are you familiar with Opportunity Culture? Could those OC stipends be paid for using Title II funds since it is teacher coaching, adding in more effective teachers in front of more kids, etc.?

A65: It would be considered allowable to provide stipends to their teachers to participate in programs such as Opportunity Culture under the realm of coaching and mentorship. That being said, please advise the LEA to go through the [use of funds one pager](#) as posted in the Title II, Part A webpage. In addition, please know that it will depend on the description (extra-duty pay, stipend, etc.), and advise the LEA to have a description of what it considers "stipends" and how they are distributed.

Q66: Can Title II, Part A funds be used for extra-duty pay to administrators (principals, assistant principals, counselors, etc.) for an allowable and supplemental professional development?

A66: In regards to extra-duty pay, please note that such costs (typically associated with code 6100) would be allowable for professional development that is not state-required and that occurs outside of the regular school day/week. In terms of who may qualify for Title II, Part A funds, please note that the

LEA will need to determine whether the recipients meet the definition of School Leader; page 4 of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) states:

The ESSA statute refers to teachers, principals and other school leaders as intended program beneficiaries of the Title II, Part A program. For purposes of the Title II, Part A program, other “school leader” refers to a principal, assistant principal, or other individual who is... 1) An employee or officer of an elementary school or secondary school, local education agency, or other entity operating an elementary or secondary school; and 2) Responsible for the daily instructional leadership and managerial operations in the elementary school or secondary school building. For example, LEA central office staff meet the first part of the definition but may not meet the second part. As a result, they are not identified as a ‘school leader.’

Q67: Can we pay salaries of curriculum coordinators who train our teachers to be more effective in their curriculum areas?

A67: It depends. It is an allowable use of Title II, Part A funds to pay for salaries; in question 27 of the [FAQ](#), it mentions that: “Base salaries could only be paid with Title II, Part A funds if the LEA is funding a position to provide the professional development activities identified by the LEA” The LEA would have to be careful of Supplement Not Supplant issues. The LEA would need to make sure that the position duties are not state-required and would need to make sure that their job description identifies what Title II, Part A activities, specifically, they are going to be responsible for. Especially if such position has provided training before. If the position is split-funded, Time and Effort applies.

Q68: Title II, Part A funds should be prioritized to campuses in school improvement and where the largest numbers of Title I, Part A students are attending. If a district is using Title II, Part A funds to send teachers to a conference, and they’re using the money for Title I, Part A campuses (they have none in school improvement), can they also use Title II, Part A funds to pay for the other campuses’ teachers to attend who are NOT Title I, Part A or in school improvement if the spending meets all the other requirements?

A68: When it comes to the allowable use of Title II, Part A funds, it is allowable to use such funds to send teachers for professional development as long as the professional development meets the requirements noted in the ESSA definition of professional development. Identification of teachers to send to such professional development is up to the LEA. It would be best to have such process written down in the event this is asked by TEA or/and an auditor. In this example, based on the information provided, the LEA does not have any campuses on school improvement. The LEA would need to have a methodology on how it prioritizes funds and have it listed in the DIP. Remember that prioritization also includes low-income student percentages; the LEA should prioritize the campuses with the highest percentages of low-income students when planning for its Title II, Part A program. As always, please advise the LEA about SNS issues, to use the [Use of Funds One Pager](#) to guide their decision making process, and to keep documentation locally and readily available upon request.

Q69: I have an LEA that is asking about a Title II Professional Development activity that involves split-funding with Title I funds. It's a new conference they want their teachers to attend. Regarding Title II Part A- the fine arts elementary school is asking that we use Title II, Part A funds to cover the cost of a professional development conference this summer. It just so happens that Title I schools are covering the cost of their teachers to attend the same conference with their campus Title I funds. Assuming we will make certain the goal is part of the CIP/DIP, would this be an allowable expense with Title II, Part A funds for the schools that do not have Title I funds?

A69: In regards paying for conference fees for professional development, it is considered an allowable use of funds to pay for professional development as long as such event meets the definition as stated on ESSA Section 8102(42). ESSA defines professional development (PD) as activities that are sustained, intensive, collaborative, job embedded, data-driven, personalized or based on information from an evaluation and support system, and classroom-focused rather than PD that stands alone and does not connect to a larger school-wide or individualized plan. The statutory definition for professional development can be found in the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) on page 8.

Regarding the use of funds based on historical situation. There is no supplanting issue between Title I, Part A and Title II, Part A because both of those programs are only required to supplement non-federal funds. However, if the LEA decides that this is a required training or that the activity was provided last year with state or local funds, then Title II, Part A funds could not be used to cover the training. If this is an additional training or sending more personnel thanks to the Title II, Part A funds, then it would be considered allowable. Lastly, please remember that Title II, Part A has a prioritization requirement. Thus, the LEA would have to have documentation of how it prioritizes the funds for its campuses. This will assist with determining how much of the Title II, Part A funds are available for what you refer to as schools that do not have Title I (TI) funds. The main thing about TI schools is the School Improvement grant and low-income percentages. LEAs are required to prioritize funds to those schools first and to schools that have the highest percentage of low-income children. Then, after that, the LEA may allocate their Title II, Part A funds based on other documented needs. The [Title II, Part A FAQ](#) document provides guidance on how best to document compliance (page 12).

Q70: Can we use Title II, Part A funds to pay for an evaluator of Title II programs? Do you think that would be a supplant in any way if it is a brand-new position for this program?

A70: The use of Title II, Part A funds for a position that will only evaluate Title II, Part A Program does not seem to be in alignment with the intent and purpose of the Title II, Part A Program.

Q71: May an LEA use T2PA funds to pay for the advertising costs (newspaper ad) in order to promote attendance at a teacher job fair?

A71: To use Title II, Part A funds strictly for advertising does not seem to align with the intent and purpose of the Title II, Part A Program. Now, if the LEA has a recruiting process of effective teachers, it should note the rationale for using Title II, Part A funds as a necessary component of its outreach. This process of recruitment effective teachers needs to be documented and kept on file locally and readily available upon request by TEA and/or an auditor. I would caution you about potential SNS issues especially if the LEA has advertised positions in the past. I would advise you to recommend the use of the Title II, Part A Use of funds one page document to help them guide their decision. You can find it here: [Title II, Part A Use of Funds One Pager](#)

Q72: We had a question from a district yesterday asking about purchasing iPads for their teachers with Title II funds. They do all the evaluation, data disaggregation, and PD online. They stated that these iPads would be crucial to their teachers' ability to receive access to their PD and work with student data in addition to housing their evaluation pieces. I told the district I would ask for guidance on whether this would be allowable since it is their PD delivery system. What are your thoughts on this?

A72: This could be a reason for concern because of the method of Professional Development delivery may fall under "required by state or local rule," and it may be considered supplanting. In terms of the use of Title II, Part A Funds for materials and supplies, the answer is: it depends. Although funds used to pay for materials and supplies that are 100% dedicated for use in professional development sessions that meet the ESSA definition of professional development are considered allowable under Title II, Part A, there are several steps and requirements for using Title II, Part A funds. "Allowable" under Title II, Part A is only one part of the required steps. Please reference the Use of Funds section of the Title II, Part A Program Guide for the steps required to determine whether an LEA can use Title II, Part A funds for a particular expense.

Q73: We currently use Title II, Part A funds to pay for a trainer at the District level, to develop and deliver training for our schools. Based on the definition of a school leader, since they are considered Central Office staff, this kind of position does not receive Title II, Part A services, correct?

A73: Based on the information provided, it seems that this trainer will be aligned with the intent and purpose of the Title II, Part A program and thus may receive Title II, Part A services such as independent training in order to gain further skill and be up to date with evidence-based practices on delivering training. In this example, the funded position is a central office staff member and would seem to not meet the definition of "other school leader." However, if the position is a district position that is responsible for developing and delivering supplemental training to teachers at all the schools, the LEA could justify that the position is providing instructional leadership to the campuses, and that person could also receive training with Title II, Part A funds. The LEA would need to make

sure that if Title II, Part A funds to aid in the further development of this position, such development is not a State required or mandated training in order to avoid any Supplement Not Supplant issues.

Q74: Counselors meet the definition of specialized instruction personnel, but they do not meet the definition of a school leader, can they still receive Title II, Part A Services?

A74: The argument can be made that counselors meet the definition of other school leaders, since typically, they play a key role in managing student schedules. Throughout the Title II, Part A Statute, there are references to provide training for school personnel for mental health, trauma, drug and alcohol abuse and prevention and recognition of child sexual abuse.

Q75: When registering for a training and there are “late fees” associated with the registration, is it allowable to pay for the “late” fees with federal funding? Are any “late” fees ever allowable to be paid with federal funds? Are fees related to changes in airfare allowable to be paid with federal funds?

A75: It is considered allowable use of Title II, Part A funds to pay for registration fees for professional development fees as long as the it meets the definition of professional development as stated in Page 8 of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#). The LEA should consider if allowing for late fees is considered reasonable and necessary and good stewardship of federal funds. Furthermore, the LEA should follow its local policies and procedures in regards to travel expenses and protocols such as changing airfare.

Q76: Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to purchase supplies for teachers to implement the instructional strategies learned in a training in their classroom? These would be instructional supplies they learned about in their Professional Development. Would that be allowable?

A76: It is allowable for Title II, Part A funds to be used to purchase supplies and materials that are used for a specific professional development activity, so a book that is required for a training would be allowable, as long as the training itself was an allowable activity for Title II, Part A.

That being said, materials and supplies that are not directly connected to professional development as defined in ESSA and/or used outside the scope of a professional development environment are considered unallowable expenditures. Supplies and materials that are purchased with Title II, Part A for professional development may not be used as instructional materials for students.

***Q77: In terms of “supplemental curriculum writing” activities funded by Title II, Part A funds. Would that be considered an allowable activity paid by Title II, Part A funds? If so, what category in the PS3104 (Recruit, support, and retain effective teachers and principals, professional development / educator growth, evidence-based activities or other allowable activities) will it fall under?**

A77: Based on the information provided, this may fall under the Evidence-Based Activities. As such please note, that in order for this category to be used, the LEA will need to identify educational research that aligns with the statute guidelines in Section 8101(21)(A). Please make sure that the research is seen from a contextual lens, is contemporaneous, and it is kept locally and readily available upon request by TEA and/or an auditor. Please refer to the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) for more information.

In terms of what the state's academic curriculum is, since the [Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills](#) establishes state standards for both the foundation curriculum (English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) and the enrichment curriculum (career and technical education, fine arts, health education, languages other than English, physical education, and technology applications), we can infer that it would be allowable for an LEA to use Title II, Part A funds to supplement teachers' content knowledge in any of these subjects that they teach. The LEA would need to follow the Use of Funds guidance for Title II, Part A in making its determination of allowability for individual activities.

Lastly, the LEA may decide to host a professional development targeting how to best write curriculum and in which participants engage in supplemental curriculum activities. At that point, this will fall under Professional Development / Educator Growth. Using this category, the LEA would need to ensure that the Professional Development meets the statutory definition and that activities are not State required activities. Documentation on this would need to be kept locally and be readily available upon request by TEA and/or and auditor. Please refer to the Title II, Part A Program Guide for more information.

***Q78: Can ESSA Title II, Part A funds pay for Zoom subscriptions?**

A78: It is allowable for Title II, Part A funds to be used to purchase supplies and materials that are used for a specific professional development activity, so a book that is required for a training would be allowable, as long as the training itself was an allowable activity for Title II, Part A. Funds used to pay for materials and supplies that are 100% dedicated for use in professional development sessions that meet the ESSA definition of professional development are considered allowable under Title II, Part A, there are several steps and requirements for using Title II, Part A funds. "Allowable" under Title II, Part A is only one part of the required steps. Please refer to the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) for the steps required to determine whether an LEA can use Title II, Part A funds for a particular expense.

In the example provided, it may be difficult to justify using Title II, Part A funds to pay for Zoom subscriptions for professional development because the account could be used for purposes other than professional development and by staff who are not teachers or principals. Materials and supplies that are not directly connected to professional development as defined in ESSA and/or used outside the scope of a professional development environment are considered unallowable expenditures.

***Q79: Could Title II Part A funds be used to host Spanish lessons for our teachers that are interested in being able to communicate better with families and students?**

A79: It would be considered an allowable use of Title II, Part A funds to pay for professional development for teachers in order to communicate better with families and students. Please note that such professional development would need to meet the definition stated on the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#). Keep in mind if the school board is requiring staff to participate, then it would become an activity that is “required by state or local rule,” and it would be considered supplanting for Title II, Part A to pay for it.

***Q80: Could an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to pay teachers a stipend to teach at tier 3 schools?**

A80: It depends. Although costs associated with recruitment and retention initiatives for effective teachers such as signing bonuses, recruitment materials, salary differentials or incentive pay are considered allowable under Title II, Part A, there are several steps and requirements for using Title II, Part A funds. “Allowable” under Title II, Part A is only one part of the required steps. Please reference the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) for the steps required to determine whether an LEA can use Title II, Part A funds for a particular expense.

Please note that Title II, Part A does not dictate specific school tiers. The LEA would need to follow its local policies and procedures and have this as a documented identified need.

***Q81: Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to pay for the superintendent of a partner charter school for coaching teachers in a district? The coaching is based on incentives and is paid to the superintendent if the school reaches specific performance goals.**

A81: It would be difficult to document and justify that such use of Title II, Part A funds is reasonable and allowable. Since the duties the Superintendent performed (coaching) would not be considered a single cost objective, the time and effort documentation required to be maintained is a personnel activity report (PAR) documenting the time spent coaching teachers on the campus in question. Additionally, since the Superintendent receives the compensation for coaching teachers in the Charter system that may include campuses that are not part of the LEA, it would be necessary to account for the amount spent only coaching teachers on the in-district charter campus. Another consideration is whether the compensation meets the Supplement, Not Supplant requirements for Title II, Part A. If the compensation has already been paid or previously been paid with state and/or local funds, it would be considered a supplant to use Title II, Part A funds for such activity and thus, not allowable.

***Q82: Is it allowable to pay Direct Costs from the ESSA Title II, Part A grant? Where can I find the answer to this question in the written guidance documents?**

A82: Written guidance is provided in the instructions for the application. As per the [2023-2024 ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application Instructions](#), Direct Administrative Costs would be considered allowable, as long as the amount is reasonable and necessary as per your local policies and procedures. See the table on page 4 of the instructions.

***Q83: Can the LEA use Title II, Part A funds to meet the matching requirement of another grant requirement?**

A83: Based on the [General Fiscal Guidelines](#) page 34, federal funds are not allowed to be used in order to fulfill the matching component.

***Q84: If an LEA is wanting to use Title II, Part A funds to pay for a consultant for the Teacher Incentive Allotment to help them establish student growth measures/teacher effectiveness as part of teacher retention, would that be an allowable use of funds?**

A84: In response to the question about the use of Title II, Part A funds to pay for a consultant for the Teacher Incentive Allotment, to aid with student growth measures teacher effectiveness as part of teacher retention. It would depend on whether the LEA has used state funds to pay for such a consultant last year. If not, the LEA could use Title II, Part A funds for such purpose under the teacher/retention area of focus. However, if the LEA used Teacher Incentive Allotment funds or other state funds for this purpose last year, it could mean a supplant to use Title II, Part A funds.

***Q85: The LEA has a Teacher Incentive Allotment, they currently pay teacher stipends for the extra work as noted in the grant. However, there are a number of principals that have been given the additional duty of completing walkthroughs at their own and at other campuses with the Teacher Incentive Allotment focus in hopes to use data to measure the effectiveness of the program. Would it be possible to create stipends for administrators who are given these additional observation/walkthrough tasks, to be paid with Title II, Part A funds next year with a local stipend description that entails how this supports the intent of the program (teacher growth and retention)?**

A85: In the case of incentives, the LEA's funds for recruitment and retention initiatives for effective teachers such as signing bonuses, recruitment materials, salary differentials or incentive pay are considered allowable under Title II, Part A. There are several steps and requirements for using Title II, Part A funds. "Allowable" under Title II, Part A is only one part of the required steps. Please refer to the Use of Funds section of the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) for the steps required to determine whether an LEA can use Title II, Part A funds for a particular expense.

If the state's Teacher Incentive Allotment has a requirement that it be evaluated for effectiveness, then Title II, Part A funds would not be able to be used for the evaluation as that would constitute a supplanting issue.

***Q86: We are wanting to create a better system for signing in at Elevate and Leadership Summit. I have a quote for \$11,600 for a program called Expo Pass that would allow us to print badges and collect attendance from each session. Could this be paid for through Title II?**

A86: Materials and supplies that are not directly connected to professional development as defined in ESSA and/or used outside the scope of a professional development are considered unallowable expenses.

In the example referenced, the LEA is reminded that Title II, Part A funds also need to be reasonable and necessary. A cost is reasonable if in its nature and amount, it does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time of the cost is incurred. To be necessary, a cost must be needed for the performance and procedure of the Title II, Part A program. Such cost must be consistent with policies and procedures that apply uniformly to both federally funded and other activities of an LEA and be accorded consistent treatment.

The LEA should also consider whether this equipment would be used for trainings that are outside the scope of Title II, Part A.

***Q87: Our district is working on developing a recruitment and retention administrator incentive program for school administrators. The Administrator Incentive Allotment Program will prioritize Title I schools with higher economically disadvantaged student populations by paying a stipend to the campus principal based on student performance and the percentage of economically disadvantaged students that are served at the school.**

The stipends range from \$11,000 to \$35,000 due to the range of the percentage of economically disadvantaged students at the school and the overall student enrollment at the school.

Can the program be implemented using Title II funds if it is in our CNA, CIP, and has been determined by the planning committee as necessary to recruit and retain highly effective principals?

A87: Based on the stipend amounts referenced above, it would be difficult to justify that the amounts are reasonable and necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of the Title II, Part A program. However, if the LEA chooses to use Title II, Part A funds for the activity, the LEA will need to document and justify such use of Title II, Part A funds with the following guidance in mind. A cost is reasonable if in its nature and amount, it does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time of the cost is incurred. To be necessary, a cost must be needed for the performance of the Title II, Part A program. Such cost must be consistent with policies and procedures that apply uniformly to both federally funded and other activities of an LEA and be accorded consistent treatment.

The LEA would need to determine and maintain documentation if the reason for the stipend aligns with the intent and purpose of the Title II, Part A Program. If this is part of the recruitment and retention strategy, the LEA would need to make sure that such strategy is identified in its District

Improvement Plan. The LEA would need to also review the items the [Title II, Part A Use of Funds](#) one page document to ensure that all the requirements are met.

Time and effort documentation is required for any type of compensation paid with federal funds, including stipends. A stipend should be paid based on policies and procedures adopted by the board or local authorities.

For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that demonstrates that the time and effort requirements are met and that funds being charged to Title II, Part A are related to time spent working directly on activities that meet the intent and purpose of the Title II, Part A program.

***Q88: If a teacher is asked to attend a training that requires overnight air travel, can we pay from federal for their service animal to go with them; and if so, what documentation do we need on file to show that the service animal is necessary.”**

A88: Due to the uniqueness of this question, we reached out to the Audit team for assistance with the response. Below, please find the guidance provided by an Auditor in the Federal Fiscal Monitoring Division.

A distinction would need to be made – is it a service animal or an emotional support animal? It’s my understanding that airlines are not allowed to charge for service animals. So technically, there should be no charge associated with transporting the employee’s service animal. Since the grantee is asking about a transportation charge, it sounds like their question is related to an emotional support animal.

The Department of Transportation issued a final rule on 1/11/2021 to amend the Air Carrier Access Act (14 CFR Part 382) to distinguish between service animals and emotional support animals and it allows airlines to treat emotional support animals as pets. Therefore, an airline can charge passengers to transport emotional support animals. Because the federal government went so far as to make this distinction, it can be inferred that the costs for transporting a service animal could be considered unreasonable and unnecessary, and therefore not be allowed.

However, 2 CFR 200.475 seems to give more flexibility to subrecipients to determine what is reasonable, and as long as the cost is in accordance with their local policy and treated the same as similar costs paid from nonfederal funds, then perhaps they could justify the cost as allowable. If that specific cost is not addressed in their local policy, they would have a more difficult time making their case that it is allowed. The best option is to pay for the cost out of local funds, should the LEA decide it is going to reimburse the employee for those costs.

***Q89: An LEA has identified a need in its DIP and has a strategy for looking at some non-traditional pathways for recruiting Hispanic and Latino teachers and leaders. The LEA is wondering about using Title II, Part A funds to have an outside vendor conduct degree audit of applicants international degree with the intention of getting them qualified to teach and lead in Texas. Would that be considered allowable?**

A89: Following guidance from question 44 of this section, it could be argued that contracted services for a review of an international degree could be considered “expert help in screening candidates and enabling early hiring.” Remember that spending federal funds outside the country is not allowable, thus it would need to be a US-based contractor.

***Q90: We are interested in purchasing PowerSchool Perform K-12 Teacher Evaluation Software with our Title II funds. This purchase will improve teacher support and retain effective educators, manage and conduct teacher evaluations and observations online or in person, and provide teachers with constructive feedback, tailored professional learning, and easy-to-use tools. While exploring the TEA’s TII website, I could not locate the information I needed within the program guidelines or FAQs. Is PowerSchool Perform eligible for Professional Development under Title II-Part A?**

A90: There seem to be two components in this scenario: the first is the training related to the software, and the second is what the software actually is intended to do and how it will be used.

In terms of professional development, the training on how to use the software will need to meet the definition of professional development as stated in the [Title II, Part A Program Guide](#) pg. 18. If the training provided meets such definition, then Title II, Part A funds may be used to pay for the training provided.

In terms of the planning of the use of the software, there are some concerns. Title II, Part A funds should not be used for any state-required/mandated actions. Teacher evaluation is part of such requirements and thus, would not be an unallowable use of funds.

***Q91: Can we use Title II, Part A funds to pay summer school teachers? This would be for teachers providing instruction.**

A91: In general, providing direct services to students is outside the intent and purpose of the Title II, Part A program. One allowable exception to this is to provide one or more additional teachers in order to accomplish an evidence-based class-size reduction program; however, the LEA must have evidence to show that reducing the class size for the grade level and subject involved has a significant impact on student achievement.

In terms of Supplement Not Supplant, Title II, Part A funds may not be used for activities that are conducted to meet the required state standards. The LEA is required to provide summer instruction for students who have not passed the grade level. Thus, use of Title II, Part A funds to meet this requirement will be considered unallowable.

If the LEA wants to use Title II, Part A funds to reduce the class size of its summer school, the LEA would have to have documentation that the required summer school instruction is provided with state or local funds and have evidence that further reducing the class size for the grade level and subject involved has a significant impact on student achievement.

***Q92: Are we able to use Title II, Part A funds to pay for Teacher Incentive Allotment Support? We would send our principals to training so they get calibrated on our appraisal instruments. In addition, we would like to send district and campus leaders for training.**

A92: It would be considered allowable use of Title II, Part A funds for professional development that meets the definition as intended in statute. The definition of Professional Development may be found in the [Title II, Part A Program Guide page 18](#).

Concerning the use of funds from the Teacher Incentive Allotment (TIA), the LEA is reminded to pay close attention to the requirements of such program. If TIA has a requirement that principals and leaders would need to get trained for appraisal instruments or other required training by such program, then Title II, Part A funds may not be used to meet such requirement.

If the LEA decides to use Title II, Part A funds for this purpose, the LEA will need to make the case that such training is not required of the program and/or is supplemental to the requirements of TIA. Such documentation should be kept locally on file and be readily available upon request by TEA and/or an auditor.