



Federal Program Compliance Division

ESSASupport@tea.texas.gov

Department of Grant Compliance and Administration

Statewide Training Series

Questions & Answers

Training Title: Title II, Part A, Program Compliance Requirements

Training Date: 5/11/2023

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

Q1: Will we have access to the power point?

A1: Yes, the presentation slides are posted for your convenience at the [Statewide Training series webpage](#).

Q2: Can Title II, Part A be used to fund Professional Development on Education Law for Principals?

A2: Title II, Part A funds may be used to pay for Professional Development that meets the definition as stated in law. Use of Title II, Part A for State-required training or professional development is unallowable.

Q3: So, if we have a Methodology in place, would SNS still apply?

A3: The Supplement, Not Supplant Methodology is documentation for Title I, Part A and Title I School Improvement. Title II, Part A follows the traditional SNS documentation. For additional guidance, please refer to the [Supplement, Not Supplant Handbook](#).

Q4: Can you also pay for signing bonuses for teachers to recruit teachers to Title I schools who meet the definition of high-need schools?

A4: 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 [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 we pay for teacher certification program or teacher certification exam fees for substitute teachers (who have a bachelor's degree) who are working at a school that meets the definition of a high-need school? This will support the recruitment strategy and it addresses the CNA and DIP that highlight staffing shortages. Is this allowable assuming that we are addressing the five

steps for the Use of funds? In the FAQ this is allowable for paraprofessionals but does not mention substitute teachers.

A5: Some LEAs have established a “Grow Your Own” program to help address the teacher shortage in high-needs areas. It is possible to design such a program that could be supported with Title II, Part A funds.

Q6: Slide 37 - Comprehensive Needs Assessment says, “highly recommended.” Does this mean it is not a requirement?

A6: Correct. The slides list the best, strongest documentation to show compliance. However, that is not the only way to do so. The LEA may have other documentation that potentially might show compliance. In the event of an audit, TEA or audit staff would make the final determination concerning whether the documentation is sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the program requirement.

Q7: Curriculum Director is housed in Central Office but responsible for daily instructional practices by leading the principal and teachers. Does that person qualify for services?

A7: It depends. Title II, Part A funds are meant to be supplemental, thus if the Curriculum Director is creating state-mandated curriculum, then it would not be an allowable use of Title II, Part A funds to provide this position.

Q8: How often must the LEA stakeholder group meet for “meaningful” consultation? Is one meeting sufficient?

A8: The statute refers to “meaningful consult” and engage in “ongoing consultation” while also providing guidance that such process should not interfere with the timely submission of the application. While there is no set number of meetings defined, it is important to point out that the statute does suggest ongoing consultation, and as such refers to more than one.

Q9: What if a district requires training for a certain population of teachers: content elementary teachers, etc. Would this still be allowed to be funded if the training is not required already?

A9: If the district 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.

Q10: Must the description of the consultation process be officially documented within the District Improvement plan? Or can we keep it on file separately?

A10: It is best practice and considered strong documentation to have such description in the District Improvement Plan. However, it is not a requirement. The LEA may have other documentation that potentially might show compliance. In the event of an audit, TEA or audit staff would make the final determination concerning whether the documentation is sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the program requirement.

Q11: Where should we document the “coordination” requirement? In the Improvement Plan?

A11: It is best practice and considered strong documentation to have such description in the District Improvement Plan.

Q12: Will this zoom presentation be posted on YouTube?

A12: This presentation will be available on the Statewide Training series webpage as a voiced-over PowerPoint presentation.

Q13: SNS question - we found that our mental health counselor, that we hired using ESSER funds, has been instrumental with our students both academically and mentally. Since ESSER is going away, would it be considered supplanting if we began paying that position with Title II. She services all campuses for both students AND staff.

A13: ESSER funds are federal funds. The SNS provision for Title II, Part A only applies to state and local funds. Instead of an SNS question, this would require the LEA to consider whether direct mental health services are allowable under Title II, Part A. Training related to mental health issues would be allowable, but the provision of direct mental health services would not be appropriate.

Q14: Must the description of the Prioritization of Funds be officially documented within the District Improvement plan? Or can we keep it on file separately?

A14: It is best practice and considered strong documentation to have such description in the District Improvement Plan. The LEA may have other documentation that potentially might show compliance. In the event of an audit, TEA or audit staff would make the final determination concerning whether the documentation is sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the program requirement.

Q:15 When the curriculum director needs to hold/attend instructional workshops to lead the principals and the principal in conjunction with the curriculum director are held responsible for the daily instructional practices, can the curriculum director's portion of the PD be paid with T2? There are times the PD will not be successful without the Curriculum Director attending with the group to implement with fidelity.

A:15 It depends. Title II, Part A funds are meant to be supplemental, thus if the Curriculum Director is creating or facilitating state-mandated curriculum, then it would not be an allowable use of funds to provide services to this position.

Q16: Our district has no campuses under SIP. For Prioritizing funds, as long as we rank and serve (high/low) based on low-income % is what TEA is looking for as it pertains to audit docs? In other words, the campus that has the highest low-income receives the most per-pupil funding from TIIA?

A16: If the LEA has no campuses in Title I School Improvement, the LEA should prioritize the campuses with the highest percentages of low-income students when planning for its Title II, Part A program. Please refer to the Title II, Part A Program Guide page 18-19 for strongest possible documentation.

Q17: We have multiple schools eligible for Title I School Improvement Grants, but only some of them are awarded the grants. Is it considered, then, coordination of funds to prioritize Title 2 funds for campuses that were eligible, but were not awarded the Title 1 SIG grants.

A17: In order to be compliant with the requirement of prioritization, the LEA should first show how it has prioritized Title II, Part A funds to the campuses under the Title I School Improvement Grant. The LEA is then to use the percentages of low-income students as its next step in the prioritization process. If funds remain, the LEA could consider the SIG eligibility as another factor in determining Title II, Part A services.

Q18: This was our first year implementing an Aspiring Leadership Academy. Our expenses this year were simply buying refreshments for our meetings. Our goal is to extend the program and include registration at state leadership conferences. Would this be allowed with SNS?

A18: This is a question with two different contents. First, food/refreshments. See the Using Federal Grant Funds to Pay for Food section. LEAs will also need to refer to the Use of Funds section of [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.

Next, registration fees for conferences: 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.

In determining whether a particular activity is supplement (according to the traditional presumptions of supplanting), please refer to Section A of the [Supplement, Not Supplant Handbook](#).

Q19: Can we use funds for teacher travel for PD?

A19: It would be considered an allowable use of Title II, Part A funds to aid in the development of teachers attending supplemental professional development. The LEA would need to ensure that the professional development in question meets the ESSA definition for professional development activities.

Q20: TEA FAQ says the dollar amounts for Title 2 do not have to be posted in the DIP - only that Title 2 must be indicated as a funding source. If we add dollar amounts only to show prioritization, is that sufficient?

A20: Including dollar amounts for each campus is one step in the direction of demonstrating compliance. The LEA may have other documentation that potentially might show compliance. In the event of an audit, TEA or audit staff would make the final determination concerning whether the documentation is sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the program requirement.

Q21: Referring to previously asked question about Education Law for Principals, the PD is informational, which is not necessarily state or local requirements?

A21: Professional Development for principals that meets the statutory definition and is for training that is not required by state or local law or policy, is considered an allowable use of funds.

Q22: We have Title 1 schoolwide programs at 11 elementary schools. We have not designated any middle schools as Title 1 campuses, though their % eco-dis is higher than some of the identified elementary schools. In our prioritization of funds, slide 27 seems to indicate we could/should consider our middle schools for prioritization before some elementary schools. Is this correct?

A22: The requirement of prioritization is meant to first acknowledge the schools identified under the Title I School Improvement grant, then the second piece of the prioritization of funds refers to the use of the low-income percentages for all campuses. For a list of the Title I School Improvement grant campuses, please visit the [Texas Schools Report Card](#) web page.

Q23: What is the difference between a Comprehensive Needs Assessment (not required) and Consultation (required)? I thought these were the same if we are meeting with stakeholders, using data, and getting their input.

A23: The process of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment may look similar to the Consultation requirement for the Title II, Part A program. However, the Title II, Part A program does mention a list of stakeholders that are required to be part of the consultation process; such a list may not be the same as those included in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment. An LEA may choose to meet the Consultation requirement for Title II, Part A by including the Title II-required stakeholders in the District Improvement Plan process.

Q24: How does it work if a district transfers Title II funds into Title I? Does the use of the funds requirement then shift to the Title I requirements or do the Title II remain in place?

A24: When transferring 100% of Title II, Part A funds into Title I, Part A, at that point the fiscal agent is no longer required to comply with the requirements for Title II, Part A. However, if the LEA does not transfer 100%, then the LEA is held responsible for meeting the requirements of the program. For questions about funding transferability, please contact Idalia Ibanez Program Director at idalia.ibanez@tea.texas.gov

Q25: Are the compliance reports (Gun Free and ESSA Consolidated Mock-ups) for 2022-2023?

A25: For questions about the Gun Free reports please reach out to Idalia Ibanez Program Director at idalia.ibanez@tea.texas.gov

Q26: The self-check guide is dated 21-22. Does it all still apply, or is a 22-23 Self-Check Guide coming soon?

A26: The 2022-2023 Program Self-Check Guide is currently being revised and will be posted on the [Federal Program Compliance Division](#) website under the [ESSA Consolidated Compliance Reports Resources](#) page.

Q27: I'm having trouble getting the slides from TEA's website. Could you provide a link here?

A27: Yes, the presentation slides are posted for your convenience at the [Statewide Training series webpage](#).

Q28: Can Title II pay Administrative Cost?

A28: Title II, Part A funds may be used for Administrative Costs. Please refer to the [General And Fiscal Guidelines](#) and any other applicable erratas.

Q29: Since we received our carryover funds later this year, is it possible for us to use those funds for 2023-24 beginning of the year professional development activities?

A29: It is considered an allowable use of Title II, Part A funds to pay for professional development that meets the statutory definition. For questions regarding carryover, please contact your grant negotiator.

Q30: Is there a resource that provides step-by-step instructions regarding transferability of unused Title II funds to another title program?

A30: For questions regarding funding transferability, please contact Idalia Ibanez, Program Director at idalia.ibanez@tea.texas.gov

Q31: When will the 23-24 School Improvement schools be identified? Since we are submitting our Title II application and getting our DIP approved, this is important if we are supposed to include the funding amounts for these campuses.

A31: The LEA may proceed with the planning and application for 2023-2024 based on current School Improvement data. For a list of the current Title I School Improvement grant campuses, please visit the [Texas Schools Report Card](#) web page and/or the [School Improvement Grants](#) web page.

Q32: Can you give us an example of how to write these statements on the DIP?

A32: The presentation used for this training contains a few examples of how these statements may be written. Please go to the [Statewide Training series webpage](#) to access the slides.

Q33: In order to use these funds, we must have the need in our CIP, therefore does that make it mandated for the school and now not allowable?

A33: Identification of needs is different than a mandated activity. The intent behind the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and the District Improvement Plan is to identify LEA individual needs and how they potentially may be addressed. If a training or activity is mandated by district policy, at that point it may address the need but the use of Title II, Part A funds would not be allowable.