

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 red 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](#)
- [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 – Fund 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.

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 random validation 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.

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

A2. The Title II, Part A random validation will validate selected Title II, Part A program requirements in the current year.

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.

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 2122(c) 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 Leading \(September 27, 2016\)](#)). 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 CNA/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, 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.

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.

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.

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. It would be possible for an LEA to group several onetime 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.

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.

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.”

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: 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?"**

***A10: If the LEA can document that the stipends end because of budget reductions, then it could rebut the presumption of supplanting. However, the LEA must avoid planning to use Title II, Part A funds for the stipends so that they can use the local funds elsewhere. That would be seen as a supplant.**

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 funds used to pay for the State certification fees associated with a teacher adding a State certification 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.

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 funds used to pay for the State certification fees associated with a paraprofessional obtaining a State teacher certification 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.

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 (E).

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)(E): 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.

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 the 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 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.