

State and District Use of Title II, Part A Funds in 2019-20

NCEE 2021-011a
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

A Publication of the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance



U.S. Department of Education

Miguel Cardona

Secretary

Institute of Education Sciences

Mark Schneider

Director

National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance

Matthew Soldner

Commissioner

Stephanie Stullich

Project Officer

JUNE 2021

The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) is the independent, non-partisan statistics, research, and evaluation arm of the U.S. Department of Education. The IES mission is to provide scientific evidence on which to ground education practice and policy and to share this information in formats that are useful and accessible to educators, parents, policymakers, researchers, and the public.

We strive to make our products available in a variety of formats and in language that is appropriate to a variety of audiences. You, as our customer, are the best judge of our success in communicating information effectively. If you have any comments or suggestions about this or any other IES product or report, we would like to hear from you. Please direct your comments to ncee.feedback@ed.gov.

This report was prepared for the Institute of Education Sciences under Contract No. ED-ESE-15-A0016/0003 by Westat. The content of the publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of IES or the U.S. Department of Education.

This report is in the public domain. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, the citation should read:

Isenberg, E. and Webber, A. (2021). *State and district use of Title II, Part A funds in 2019-20* (NCEE 2021-011a). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

This report also is available on the IES website at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee>.

Upon request, this report is available in alternate formats such as Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette. For more information, please contact the Department's Alternate Format Center at 202-260-9895 or 202-205-8113.



State and District Use of Title II, Part A Funds in 2019-20

June 2021

Eric Isenberg

Ann Webber

Westat

Contents

Appendix A. Study Purpose and Methodology	A-1
1. Study Purpose	A-2
2. District and State Surveys.....	A-2
3. Sample Design	A-3
4. Survey Response Rates and Weighting.....	A-6
5. Statistical Tests	A-8
Appendix B. Additional Report Exhibits	B-1
Overview.....	B-2
Appendix C. Supplementary Exhibits	C-1
Appendix D. State-by-State Exhibits	D-1
Overview.....	D-2
Appendix E. Survey Instruments	E-1
SEA Survey.....	E-2
LEA Survey	E-15

Appendix A Exhibits

Exhibit A.1. Frame size and sample allocation for traditional public school districts	A-5
Exhibit A.2. Sample size and response rates	A-6
Exhibit A.3. Sample size and response rates for district survey, by state	A-7

Appendix B Exhibits

Exhibit B.1. Amount of funds reserved and transferred at the state level	B-3
Exhibit B.2. States reserving additional funds for activities to support principals and other school leaders, by state	B-4
Exhibit B.3. Amount of funds that states transferred to Title II-A from other ESEA programs	B-4
Exhibit B.4. District use of ESEA funding transferability	B-5

Exhibit B.5.	Percentage of districts transferring funds from Title II-A to other programs and from other programs.....	B-5
Exhibit B.6.	Percentage of districts transferring funds between Title II-A and other ESEA programs, by state	B-6
Exhibit B.7.	District use of funding transferability, by district characteristics	B-7
Exhibit B.8.	Share of funds that districts transferred between Title II-A and other ESEA programs, in districts that transferred funds	B-8
Exhibit B.9.	District use of Title II-A funds	B-8
Exhibit B.10.	Percentage of teachers participating in professional development funded by Title II-A in districts that used Title II-A funds for this purpose, by district size	B-9
Exhibit B.11.	District-reported Title II-A funding for professional development	B-9
Exhibit B.12.	Percentage of districts that used Title II-A funds for various types of strategies, by state.....	B-10
Exhibit B.13.	Share of district-level Title II-A funds used for various types of strategies, by state	B-11
Exhibit B.14.	District use of Title II-A funds, by district size.....	B-12
Exhibit B.15.	District use of Title II-A funds, by urbanicity	B-12
Exhibit B.16.	District use of Title II-A funds, by traditional and charter school local education agencies (LEAs)	B-13
Exhibit B.17.	District professional development types for teachers	B-14
Exhibit B.18.	District professional development types for teachers, by district type and size	B-15
Exhibit B.19.	District professional development types for principals	B-16
Exhibit B.20.	Percentage of districts reporting that they used Title II-A funds for certain types of professional development for teachers, by state	B-17
Exhibit B.21.	Percentage of districts reporting that they used Title II-A funds for certain types of professional development for principals, by state	B-18
Exhibit B.22.	District professional development topics for teachers	B-19
Exhibit B.23.	Percentage of districts reporting that they used Title II-A funds for teacher professional development on certain topics, by state	B-20

Exhibit B.24.	District professional development topics for teachers, by district size.....	B-21
Exhibit B.25.	District professional development topics for teachers, by urbanicity	B-22
Exhibit B.26.	District professional development topics for principals	B-23
Exhibit B.27.	Percentage of districts reporting that they used Title II-A funds for principal professional development on certain topics, by state.....	B-24
Exhibit B.28.	State use of Title II-A funds	B-25
Exhibit B.29.	Percentage of Title II-A funds used to support teachers and principals and other leaders	B-26
Exhibit B.30.	District strategies to recruit, hire, and retain effective educators using Title II-A funds	B-26
Exhibit B.31.	Percentage of districts that used Title II-A funds for various strategies to recruit, hire, and retain effective educators, by state.....	B-27
Exhibit B.32.	State use of Title II-A funds for teachers, principal, or other school leader evaluation and support, by state	B-28

Appendix C Exhibits

Exhibit C.1.	District allocations, by district characteristics.....	C-2
Exhibit C.2.	District professional development (PD) types for principals, in traditional and charter school districts	C-3
Exhibit C.3.	District professional development topics for teachers, in traditional and charter school districts	C-4
Exhibit C.4.	District professional development topics for principals, in traditional and charter school districts	C-5
Exhibit C.5.	District professional development topics for principals, by district size	C-5
Exhibit C.6.	District professional development topics for principals, by urbanicity	C-6
Exhibit C.7.	District strategies to recruit, hire, and retain effective educators using Title II-A funds, in traditional and charter school districts	C-6
Exhibit C.8.	District strategies to recruit, hire, and retain effective educators using Title II-A funds, by district size.....	C-7
Exhibit C.9.	District strategies to recruit, hire, and retain effective educators using Title II-A funds, by urbanicity	C-8

Exhibit C.10.	District use of information to define teacher quality, among districts that examined distribution of teacher quality or effectiveness	C-8
---------------	---	-----

Appendix D Exhibits

Exhibit D.1.	Amount of funds reserved and transferred at the state level	D-3
Exhibit D.2.	States reserving additional funds for activities to support principals and other school leaders, by state	D-4
Exhibit D.3.	Amount of funds that states transferred to Title II-A from other ESEA programs	D-4
Exhibit D.4.	Percentage of districts transferring funds between Title II-A and other ESEA programs, by state	D-5
Exhibit D.5.	Amount of reserved funds that states have not yet obligated	D-6
Exhibit D.6.	SEA employees paid with Title II-A funds	D-7
Exhibit D.7.	Percentage of districts that used Title II-A funds for various types of strategies, by state.....	D-8
Exhibit D.8.	Share of district-level Title II-A funds used for various types of strategies, by state	D-9
Exhibit D.9.	Percentage of districts reporting that they used Title II-A funds for certain types of professional development for teachers, by state	D-10
Exhibit D.10.	Percentage of districts reporting that they used Title II-A funds for certain types of professional development for principals, by state	D-11
Exhibit D.11.	Percentage of districts reporting that they used Title II-A funds for teacher professional development on certain topics, by state	D-12
Exhibit D.12.	Percentage of districts reporting that they used Title II-A funds for principal professional development on certain topics, by state.....	D-13
Exhibit D.13.	State use of Title II-A funds for teachers, principal, or other school leader evaluation and support, by state	D-14
Exhibit D.14.	Percentage of districts that used Title II-A funds for various strategies to recruit, hire, and retain effective educators, by state.....	D-15

Appendix A.

Study Purpose and Methodology

1. Study Purpose

Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Title II, Part A provides grants to states and subgrants to local education agencies. The grants are a primary source of federal funding to improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other school leaders. A broad range of activities is permissible at both the state and district levels under this program. The funding is also intended to provide low-income and minority students greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders; the law does not specify teacher effectiveness but rather leaves it for each state to define.

This study is designed to provide information about how states and districts use Title II-A funds, in response to a statutory requirement to collect and publicly report this information annually. This report, for the 2019-20 school year, is based on surveys of all states and of a nationally representative sample of school districts, including a state representative sample of school districts and a nationally representative sample of charter school districts. Specific topics covered in the surveys include the types of activities supported with Title II-A funds and use of funding flexibility provided under the statute. Because districts of different sizes, types (regular and charter), and localities (urban, rural, and suburban) may use funds in different ways, the report discusses instances in which there are significant differences by these district characteristics.

2. District and State Surveys

District Survey

The U.S. Department of Education first administered an annual district survey on the use of Title II-A funding in 2002-03 to better understand how school districts spent these program funds in relation to the wide range of activities allowed under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). In addition to providing information on what funds districts receive and how districts use Title II-A funds, the Department has used this survey to collect information on the provision of professional development in districts.

In 2019, the study team developed a revised version of the survey to align with activities specified in the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA), which was organized around several categories of funding. The study team incorporated input from Department staff, survey instruments from a Department study of Title I and II, input from public comments in response to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) notice, and feedback from pilot tests of the instruments with several districts in 2018. Pilot results improved: 1) the clarity of survey items, 2) the information needed to complete the survey, and 3) ways to reduce respondent burden.

To improve data quality and get a better understanding of how states and districts are using their funds, the Department also expanded the sample of traditional school districts to be representative at the state level, and added a nationally representative sample of charter school districts.

State Education Agency (SEA) survey

The Department also administers an annual state survey to gain a better understanding of how states are using their Title II-A state activities funds. In 2020, the Department administered the Survey on the Use of Funds Under Title II-A to SEAs in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico through the *EDFacts* Metadata and Process System (EMAPS). Completion of the state survey meets reporting requirements under Section 2104(a)(1-4) of ESEA.

3. Sample Design

The respondent universe consisted of two subpopulations of local education agencies (LEAs): traditional school districts¹ and charter school districts.² A list sampling frame was generated from the 2018-19 NCES Common Core of Data (CCD) Public Elementary and Secondary Agency Universe File. The sample was drawn to produce estimates that are representative of traditional school districts at both the national and state levels, and to produce estimates that are representative of charter school districts at the national level. The sample included 4,941 traditional school districts, representing each of 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and a nationally representative sample of 574 charter school districts. Expecting a minimum response rate of 80 percent, the survey design aimed to achieve a target sample of 3,953 respondent traditional school districts and 459 charter school districts.

The Title II-A program is designed, among other things, to provide students from low-income families and minority students with greater access to effective educators. To permit statistical comparison of Title II-A implementation by poverty level and district size, the traditional school district sampling frame was stratified by state, and then within each state by size (number of students enrolled) and poverty level. The charter school district sampling frame was stratified by size and poverty level only. Stratification by poverty used the 2018 child poverty estimates from the Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program, the most recent available when the sample was drawn.³ Stratification by state and size was conducted using data from the 2018-19 NCES CCD Public Elementary and Secondary Agency Universe File.

¹ Traditional school districts are the local government administrative authority that governs the education system at a specified local level on behalf of the public and the state. Within the CCD, these are LEA types 1 and 2. However, in the case of New York City and Vermont, they are type 3. In New York City and Vermont, component districts under supervisory unions were originally selected but these entities could not provide financial data at the component level. Therefore, their supervisory unions were selected.

² Charter school districts are education units created under the state charter legislation; these districts operate only charter schools and are not under the administrative control of another LEA, and operate only charter schools. Within the CCD, these are LEA type 7.

³ SAIPE estimates were used for traditional school districts. For charter school districts, which generally were not included in the SAIPE poverty estimates, we used Census tract estimates.

For traditional public school districts, stratification by state was used to produce state-level estimates with the desired precision.⁴ Within each state, a minimum of four strata were created (two size strata crossed by two poverty strata)⁵. To prevent fragmentation of strata, each stratum included at least 15 sampled districts. For states with fewer than 60 traditional school districts, the sample included all districts to ensure adequate representation and minimize sampling error (even with some nonresponse). States with a large number of traditional school districts had eight strata (four size strata crossed by two poverty strata) instead of four.⁶

For stratification by size within each state, a sampling method was used to balance the importance of including large school districts for estimating size-related estimates more efficiently while also including a reasonable number of small districts to estimate proportions more efficiently. This method involved proportional allocation using the square root of the district size of student enrollment. After allocating the state sample to size strata proportionally to the sums of the size measures, an equal probability systematic sample using the zip code as the sort variable was selected from each stratum.

The state-level sample size for traditional school districts is presented in Exhibit A.1 along with the frame size based on the 2018-19 NCES CCD data.

For charter school districts, the sampling strategy was designed to allow national inferences on the basis of size and poverty. Thus, for the sample of charter school districts, the frame was stratified by size and poverty. Twenty strata were formed by crossing five size strata with four poverty strata.⁷ For the size strata, the same method used for the traditional school district sample was used for the charter school district sample, balancing the importance of including large districts while also including a reasonable number of small districts. The total sample of 574 charter school districts was allocated to the 20 strata using this sampling principle, and then an equal probability systematic sample of the allocated sample size using the zip code as the sort variable was selected from each stratum.

⁴ For consistency throughout the report, state-level analyses in this report include charter districts. In states with many charter schools (e.g., the District of Columbia) excluding them from the state-level averages could result in a misleading picture of how Title II-A funds were used.

⁵ Poverty strata were defined by the estimated percentage of children age 5 to 17 in the district who are in poverty. Each state's median poverty percentage was used to create two poverty strata (above and below the median).

⁶ States with a frame size of at least 120 districts had eight strata, states with a frame size of between 60 and 120 districts had four strata, states with a frame size of between 2 to 59 districts had two strata, and states with a frame size of one district had one stratum.

⁷ The four poverty strata were formed by the quartiles of the distribution of district-level estimates of the percentage of children age 5 to 17 in poverty across all charter school districts in the nation.

Exhibit A.1. Frame size and sample allocation for traditional public school districts

State	Frame size	Field sample size	Number of strata
Alabama	137	96	8
Alaska	53	53	2
Arizona	215	113	8
Arkansas	234	115	8
California	992	151	8
Colorado	178	106	8
Connecticut	169	104	8
Delaware	19	19	2
District of Columbia	1	1	1
Florida	67	67	4
Georgia	180	105	8
Hawaii	1	1	1
Idaho	115	83	4
Illinois	853	149	8
Indiana	293	124	8
Iowa	333	127	8
Kansas	285	124	8
Kentucky	173	104	8
Louisiana	69	69	4
Maine	213	113	8
Maryland	24	24	2
Massachusetts	326	129	8
Michigan	537	140	8
Minnesota	329	127	8
Mississippi	144	97	8
Missouri	517	142	8
Montana	399	133	8
Nebraska	244	117	8
Nevada	19	18	2
New Hampshire	166	103	8
New Jersey	544	141	8
New Mexico	89	78	4
New York	689	146	8
North Carolina	117	87	4
North Dakota	175	104	8
Ohio	617	143	8
Oklahoma	512	138	8
Oregon	178	107	8
Pennsylvania	499	139	8
Puerto Rico*	1	1	1
Rhode Island	32	32	2
South Carolina	84	75	4
South Dakota	149	98	8
Tennessee	147	98	8
Texas	1023	151	8
Utah	41	41	2
Vermont	57	52	2
Virginia	132	94	8
Washington	298	124	8
West Virginia	55	55	2
Wisconsin	421	135	8
Wyoming	48	48	2
Total	13,193	4,941	NA

NA = Not applicable

* Although Puerto Rico was the sample universe, they were later deemed ineligible for the survey as the result of a freeze on their FY 2019 funds.

4. Survey Response Rates and Weighting

Surveys were fielded in spring and summer of 2020. All states responded to the SEA survey. For the district survey, 93 percent of sampled traditional school districts (4,533) and 88 percent of sampled charter school districts (434) responded to the survey, for an overall response rate of 92 percent (4,967) (Exhibit A.2).⁸ Within each state, the response rate for districts ranged from 72 percent to 100 percent (Exhibit A.3).

Because not all districts responded to the survey, to report estimates that are representative at state and national levels, the study team created a set of survey weights to account for nonresponse. The weights are designed to account for the sample design and survey nonresponse so that the final sample is representative of the target populations. Weighting began with the calculation of a base weight (i.e., the inverse of the sampling probability) and then adjusted for unit nonresponse. The nonresponse weighting adjustment used the response propensity score method to accommodate the rich auxiliary information that is available in the CCD-based sampling frame.⁹

In analyzing the survey data, it is important to measure the precision of estimates. This requires estimation of the variance of an estimate, which can be achieved using various estimation methods. We chose the jackknife variance estimator.

Exhibit A.2. Sample size and response rates

Type of district	Sample size	Number eligible	Number of respondents	Response rate
Traditional school districts	4,941	4,898	4,533	93%
Charter school districts	574	495	434	88%
Total	5,515	5,393	4,967	92%

Note: Eligible districts are districts that received Title II-A funds.

⁸ Only districts that received Title II-A funds completed the survey. In calculating the reported response rate, districts that did not receive Title II-A funds were treated as ineligible.

⁹ The response propensity score of a sampled unit is the probability that the unit responds to the survey. This is unknown but can be estimated using a model, and then the estimated probability is used to calculate the adjustment factor.

Exhibit A.3. Sample size and response rates for district survey, by state

State	Sample size	Number eligible	Number of respondents	Response rate
All districts	5,515	5,393	4,967	92%
Alabama	97	97	94	97%
Alaska	53	52	46	88%
Arizona	188	150	134	89%
Arkansas	118	117	114	97%
California	157	156	136	87%
Colorado	106	106	95	90%
Connecticut	106	103	93	90%
Delaware	26	26	19	73%
District of Columbia	13	12	9	75%
Florida	69	69	66	96%
Georgia	110	108	102	94%
Hawaii	1	1	1	100%
Idaho	89	86	80	93%
Illinois	149	148	139	94%
Indiana	139	135	127	94%
Iowa	127	127	117	92%
Kansas	124	124	114	92%
Kentucky	104	103	99	96%
Louisiana	97	95	86	91%
Maine	115	108	86	80%
Maryland	24	24	23	96%
Massachusetts	146	143	124	87%
Michigan	200	197	194	98%
Minnesota	153	148	140	95%
Mississippi	98	96	95	99%
Missouri	151	150	138	92%
Montana	133	133	118	89%
Nebraska	117	116	110	95%
Nevada	22	20	19	95%
New Hampshire	105	104	90	87%
New Jersey	160	157	153	97%
New Mexico	85	84	78	93%
New York	202	200	181	91%
North Carolina	122	114	107	94%
North Dakota	104	101	95	94%
Ohio	192	189	180	95%
Oklahoma	143	142	130	92%
Oregon	111	110	99	90%
Pennsylvania	178	175	162	93%
Puerto Rico	1	0	0	.
Rhode Island	37	37	32	86%
South Carolina	75	73	70	96%
South Dakota	98	93	79	85%
Tennessee	98	98	93	95%
Texas	196	192	173	90%
Utah	65	64	55	86%
Vermont	52	52	49	94%
Virginia	94	94	88	94%
Washington	125	124	111	90%
West Virginia	55	55	51	93%
Wisconsin	137	137	129	94%
Wyoming	48	48	44	92%

Note: Eligible districts are districts that received Title II-A funds. Although Puerto Rico was the sample universe, they were later deemed ineligible for the survey as the result of a freeze on their FY 2019 funds.

5. Statistical Tests

Statistical tests were used to compare differences in proportions by district characteristics. To compare the differences between proportions among two groups (traditional public school districts and charter school districts), *t*-tests were used. To compare differences across three or more categories (by district size and urbanicity categories), chi-squared tests were used.

Appendix B.

Additional Report Exhibits

OVERVIEW

This appendix provides the supporting exhibits that are called out in the main body of the report. The exhibits are sequenced in the order they are referenced in the report. Additional tables providing related information, such as breakouts by type of district (traditional and charter, district enrollment size, and urbanicity), can be found in Appendix C.

Exhibit B.1. Amount of funds reserved and transferred at the state level

State	Total amount of funds reserved for state-level activities	Funds reserved for preparation academies	Additional funds for state activities to support school leaders	Funds transferred from other programs
All states	\$101,638,784		\$31,014,829	\$1,694,747
Alabama	\$1,681,396			
Alaska	\$492,854		\$280,927	
Arizona	\$1,860,020			
Arkansas	\$1,013,847		\$539,367	
California	\$11,904,487		\$6,540,458	\$430,000
Colorado	\$1,164,596			
Connecticut	\$896,498			
Delaware	\$492,854			
District of Columbia	\$492,854			
Florida	\$5,121,970			
Georgia	\$3,059,493			
Hawaii	\$492,854			
Idaho	\$492,854		\$280,927	
Illinois	\$3,951,704			
Indiana	\$1,809,992		\$997,306	
Iowa	\$754,387		\$430,001	
Kansas	\$795,320			
Kentucky	\$1,560,541			
Louisiana	\$2,362,410			\$600,000
Maine	\$492,854			
Maryland	\$1,425,452		\$758,341	
Massachusetts	\$1,715,482		\$977,825	
Michigan	\$3,635,369		\$207,216	
Minnesota	\$1,325,973		\$755,805	
Mississippi	\$871,789			
Missouri	\$1,764,982		\$1,006,040	
Montana	\$492,854			
Nebraska	\$500,764		\$275,921	
Nevada	\$656,811		\$349,423	
New Hampshire	\$492,854			
New Jersey	\$2,261,325			
New Mexico	\$821,564		\$468,292	
New York	\$7,422,654		\$4,230,913	
North Carolina	\$2,623,923			
North Dakota	\$611,854			\$119,000
Ohio	\$3,722,890		\$2,122,047	
Oklahoma	\$1,512,991			\$545,747
Oregon	\$993,450			
Pennsylvania	\$3,838,435		\$2,187,908	
Rhode Island	\$492,854			
South Carolina	\$1,431,976		\$816,227	
South Dakota	\$492,854			
Tennessee	\$1,893,969		\$1,043,577	
Texas	\$9,206,222		\$5,247,547	
Utah	\$709,754		\$377,590	
Vermont	\$492,854			
Virginia	\$1,891,866			
Washington	\$1,703,649			
West Virginia	\$772,959			
Wisconsin	\$1,579,408		\$840,246	
Wyoming	\$492,854		\$280,927	
Puerto Rico	\$2,892,364			

Source: 2019-20 SEA survey.

Exhibit B.2. States reserving additional funds for activities to support principals and other school leaders, by state

State	Amount	Percentage of state allocation (for states reserving funds)
All states	\$31,014,829	2.8%
Alaska	\$280,927	3.0%
Arkansas	\$539,367	2.8%
California	\$6,540,458	3.0%
Idaho	\$280,927	3.0%
Indiana	\$997,306	2.9%
Iowa	\$430,001	3.0%
Maryland	\$758,341	2.8%
Massachusetts	\$977,825	3.0%
Michigan	\$207,216	0.3%
Minnesota	\$755,805	3.0%
Missouri	\$1,006,040	3.0%
Nebraska	\$275,921	2.9%
Nevada	\$349,423	2.8%
New Mexico	\$468,292	3.0%
New York	\$4,230,913	3.0%
Ohio	\$2,122,047	3.0%
Pennsylvania	\$2,187,908	3.0%
South Carolina	\$816,227	3.0%
Tennessee	\$1,043,577	2.9%
Texas	\$5,247,547	3.0%
Utah	\$377,590	2.8%
Wisconsin	\$840,246	2.8%
Wyoming	\$280,927	3.0%

Source: 2019-20 SEA survey.

Exhibit B.3. Amount of funds that states transferred to Title II-A from other ESEA programs

State	Funds initially reserved from Title II-A	Funds transferred to Title II-A from other programs	Total amount available for state-level activities	Percentage increase in funding for state activities
California	\$11,474,487	\$430,000	\$11,904,487	4%
Louisiana	\$1,762,410	\$600,000	\$2,362,410	34%
North Dakota	\$492,854	\$119,000	\$611,854	24%
Oklahoma	\$967,244	\$545,747	\$1,512,991	56%

Note: The percentage of funds transferred is calculated as the amount of funds transferred to Title II-A divided by the amount of funds initially allocated to states.

Source: 2019-20 SEA survey.

Exhibit B.4. District use of ESEA funding transferability

Transfer of funds	Percentage of districts transferring funds	Amount of funds transferred	Funds transferred as a percentage of initial Title II-A allocations
Funds transferred from Title II-A to another program			
Title I, Part A	22.9%	\$129,100,641	7.1%
Title I, Part C	<0.0%	\$70,570	<0.0%
Title I, Part D	<0.0%	\$174,716	<0.0%
Title III, Part A	<0.0%	\$61,237	<0.0%
Title IV, Part A	1.3%	\$7,366,523	0.4%
Title V, Part B	1.0%	\$4,141,065	0.2%
Funds transferred from Title II-A to any other programs	24.9%	\$140,914,752	7.8%
Funds transferred to Title IIA from any other programs	6.8%	\$62,033,672	3.4%
Number of districts	15,728		
Number of districts (unweighted)	4967		

Note: For the amount and percentage of funds transferred, the denominator is the amount of Title II-A funding initially allocated to districts before any transfers were made. One percent of districts transferred funds both out of Title II-A to other programs and into Title II-A from other programs.

Source: 2019-20 District survey.

Exhibit B.5. Percentage of districts transferring funds from Title II-A to other programs and from other programs

Topic	Percentage of districts
Transferring funds from Title II, Part A to other programs only	24
Transferring funds to Title II, Part A from other programs only	6
Transferring funds both to Title II, Part A and from Title II, Part A	1
Not transferring funds	69
Number of districts	15,728
Number of districts (unweighted)	4967

Source: 2019-20 District survey.

Exhibit B.6. Percentage of districts transferring funds between Title II-A and other ESEA programs, by state

State	Percentage transferring funds from Title II-A to other programs	Percentage transferring funds to Title II-A from other programs
All states	25	7
Alabama	4	8
Alaska	32	15
Arizona	31	5
Arkansas	41	9
California	5	5
Colorado	28	8
Connecticut	12	2
Delaware	32	0
District of Columbia	29	0
Florida	3	0
Georgia	41	2
Hawaii	0	100
Idaho	11	0
Illinois	24	12
Indiana	4	0
Iowa	13	8
Kansas	13	8
Kentucky	26	1
Louisiana	19	5
Maine	58	13
Maryland	0	0
Massachusetts	12	6
Michigan	46	10
Minnesota	12	6
Mississippi	56	0
Missouri	51	6
Montana	57	4
Nebraska	31	10
Nevada	9	0
New Hampshire	3	4
New Jersey	11	8
New Mexico	18	0
New York	19	12
North Carolina	19	0
North Dakota	59	8
Ohio	17	3
Oklahoma	70	2
Oregon	33	3
Pennsylvania	24	10
Rhode Island	6	32
South Carolina	0	7
South Dakota	20	12
Tennessee	17	25
Texas	35	5
Utah	1	9
Vermont	10	14
Virginia	4	12
Washington	21	15
West Virginia	0	6
Wisconsin	1	0
Wyoming	11	11

Source: 2019-20 District survey (N = 15,728 districts, 4,967 unweighted).

Exhibit B.7. District use of funding transferability, by district characteristics

Characteristics	Percentage of districts transferring funds	Change in Title II-A funds after transfers (for districts with transfers)	Number of districts	Number of districts (unweighted)
Districts transferring funds from Title II-A to another program	24%	-67%	15,728	4,967
By district enrollment size				
Large districts (more than 10,000 students)	7%	-44%	893	554
Medium districts (2,500 to 10,000 students)	12%	-68%	3,120	1,581
Small districts (less than 2,500 students)	29%*	-78%*	11,715	2,832
By urbanicity				
Urban districts	22%	-65%	2,284	682
Suburban districts	13%	-51%	3,877	1,288
Town districts	20%	-72%	2,620	1,053
Rural districts	33%*	-79%*	6,947	1,944
By type of district				
Traditional districts	23%	-65%	13,187	4,533
Charter school districts	30%*	-75%*	2,541	434
Districts transferring funds to Title II-A from another program	6%	40%	15,728	4,967
By district enrollment size				
Large districts (more than 10,000 students)	11%	43%	893	554
Medium districts (2,500 to 10,000 students)	9%	33%	3,120	1,581
Small districts (less than 2,500 students)	5%*	45%*	11,715	2,832
By urbanicity				
Urban districts	8%	42%	2,284	682
Suburban districts	9%	40%	3,877	1,288
Town districts	4%	31%	2,620	1,053
Rural districts	4%*	43%*	6,947	1,944
By type of district				
Traditional districts	6%	40%	13,187	4,533
Charter school districts	6%	44%	2,541	434

* Percentage of districts differed significantly by size (chi-squared test, $p < 0.05$), urbanicity (chi-squared test, $p < 0.05$), or type (t-test, $p < 0.05$).

Note: For the decrease/increase in funds column, the numerator is the net transfers the district made (transfers out of Title II-A subtracted from transfers into Title II-A). The denominator is the amount of funding available to the relevant districts before any transfers were made.

Source: 2019-20 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2018-19.

Exhibit B.8. Share of funds that districts transferred between Title II-A and other ESEA programs, in districts that transferred funds

Type of district	Percentage
Districts with net transfers <u>from</u> Title II-A	
Net transfers amounted to 0-50% of Title II-A funds	16
Net transfers amounted to 51-99% of Title II-A funds	18
Net transfers amounted to 100% or more of Title II-A funds	66
Number of districts	3,812
Number of districts (unweighted)	992
Districts with net transfers <u>to</u> Title II-A	
Net transfers amounted to 0-50% of Title II-A funds	58
Net transfers amounted to 51-99% of Title II-A funds	28
Net transfers amounted to 100% or more of Title II-A funds	13
Number of districts	933
Number of districts (unweighted)	358

Note: Net transfers represent the amount the district transferred out of Title II-A minus the amount transferred into Title II-A. The denominator is the district's amount of Title II-A funding before any transfers were made.

Source: 2019-20 District survey.

Exhibit B.9. District use of Title II-A funds

Type	Total funding	Percentage of districts allocating funds to each area	Share of funds allocated to each area (for districts that allocated funds)
Professional development (PD)	\$1,017,861,864	81%	59%
Recruiting, hiring, retaining effective educators	\$254,035,184	34%	15%
Class size reduction	\$261,181,032	21%	15%
Evaluation systems	\$40,976,818	12%	2%
Other	\$138,882,980	28%	8%
Any purpose other than PD	\$695,076,014	64%	41%
Number of districts	13,114		
Number of districts (unweighted)	4,335		

Source: 2019-20 District survey.

Exhibit B.10. Percentage of teachers participating in professional development funded by Title II-A in districts that used Title II-A funds for this purpose, by district size

Title II-A funds used to support:	All districts	Large	Medium	Small
Participation in professional development	72	74	68	70*
Number of districts	10,612	852	2,693	7,066
Number of districts (unweighted)	3,637	527	1,378	1,732

* Percentage of districts differed significantly by size (chi-squared test, $p < 0.05$).

Source: 2019-20 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2018-19.

Exhibit B.11. District-reported Title II-A funding for professional development

Total amount of Title II-A funds that districts allocated for professional development	\$1,017,861,864
Total number of full-time equivalent (FTE) teachers in districts that reported using Title II-A funds for professional development	2,735,243
Average percentage of teachers participating in Title II-A funded professional development, in districts that reported using Title II-A funds for this purpose	72%
Total number of teachers participating in Title II-A funded professional development	1,955,905
Average amount per FTE teacher	\$372
Average amount per teacher participating in Title II-A funded professional development	\$520

Source: 2019-20 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2018-19.

Exhibit B.12. Percentage of districts that used Title II-A funds for various types of strategies, by state

State	Professional development	Recruiting, hiring, and retaining effective educators	Class size reduction	Evaluation systems	Other
All states	81	34	21	12	28
Alabama	90	40	68	10	52
Alaska	84	59	3	25	47
Arizona	93	35	2	13	29
Arkansas	73	40	20	10	27
California	90	40	20	19	45
Colorado	84	34	10	11	26
Connecticut	94	17	11	14	36
Delaware	100	49	15	15	33
District of Columbia	90	13	0	18	18
Florida	100	86	7	50	75
Georgia	91	77	5	18	66
Hawaii	100	100	0	100	0
Idaho	86	65	2	21	21
Illinois	87	28	29	8	22
Indiana	73	49	19	6	20
Iowa	33	14	73	2	2
Kansas	79	44	23	11	30
Kentucky	74	48	33	11	30
Louisiana	85	52	9	18	34
Maine	91	18	13	4	19
Maryland	100	86	14	18	77
Massachusetts	90	52	5	15	49
Michigan	92	24	1	10	25
Minnesota	66	9	44	4	10
Mississippi	100	41	3	14	44
Missouri	75	21	34	15	21
Montana	65	37	21	12	23
Nebraska	67	13	28	3	13
Nevada	84	50	0	16	32
New Hampshire	98	33	3	10	32
New Jersey	93	15	12	9	17
New Mexico	91	40	7	11	38
New York	81	27	16	12	20
North Carolina	88	63	21	16	29
North Dakota	65	34	41	8	9
Ohio	75	21	28	8	10
Oklahoma	76	39	9	19	19
Oregon	81	40	6	17	44
Pennsylvania	64	5	62	2	19
Rhode Island	100	25	17	11	11
South Carolina	88	53	55	13	62
South Dakota	27	24	35	3	54
Tennessee	97	54	11	9	56
Texas	76	56	3	21	42
Utah	79	38	9	6	13
Vermont	100	48	4	21	35
Virginia	80	57	51	21	51
Washington	91	40	5	10	25
West Virginia	100	62	13	33	66
Wisconsin	77	34	29	8	21
Wyoming	88	42	24	32	30

Source: 2019-20 District survey (N = 13,114 districts, 4,335 unweighted).

Exhibit B.13. Share of district-level Title II-A funds used for various types of strategies, by state

State	Professional development	Recruiting, hiring, and retaining effective educators	Class size reduction	Evaluation systems	Other
All states	59	15	15	2	8
Alabama	38	10	41	2	9
Alaska	78	13	1	1	7
Arizona	66	22	0	2	9
Arkansas	61	17	9	2	11
California	71	11	7	3	8
Colorado	73	18	1	3	4
Connecticut	43	26	18	2	12
Delaware	50	5	19	5	20
District of Columbia	40	58	0	2	0
Florida	60	17	11	3	9
Georgia	72	18	2	1	7
Hawaii	59	40	0	1	0
Idaho	72	18	1	5	5
Illinois	59	10	14	3	14
Indiana	70	12	13	2	3
Iowa	24	6	68	1	1
Kansas	70	11	12	1	6
Kentucky	54	11	22	1	13
Louisiana	55	21	7	4	12
Maine	72	2	23	1	3
Maryland	45	21	3	1	29
Massachusetts	53	25	3	3	17
Michigan	84	6	2	2	5
Minnesota	56	7	29	3	4
Mississippi	79	12	4	2	3
Missouri	49	9	37	3	3
Montana	31	9	50	3	6
Nebraska	59	18	20	0	2
Nevada	67	25	0	4	5
New Hampshire	66	18	11	2	3
New Jersey	71	5	14	2	8
New Mexico	63	18	5	3	11
New York	41	7	43	2	6
North Carolina	51	27	13	2	6
North Dakota	41	8	42	2	7
Ohio	63	7	23	2	5
Oklahoma	77	12	3	1	7
Oregon	70	15	1	3	11
Pennsylvania	36	21	37	1	5
Rhode Island	71	14	5	8	2
South Carolina	48	7	37	2	5
South Dakota	36	12	35	0	16
Tennessee	75	12	3	2	9
Texas	58	23	4	3	12
Utah	60	16	16	2	5
Vermont	76	10	3	1	10
Virginia	47	18	24	1	9
Washington	75	12	2	2	9
West Virginia	71	13	3	6	7
Wisconsin	52	17	21	5	6
Wyoming	66	7	11	5	12

Source: 2019-20 District survey (N = 13,114 districts, 4,335 unweighted).

Exhibit B.14. District use of Title II-A funds, by district size

Type	Percentage of districts allocating funds to each area			Share of funds allocated to each area		
	Large	Medium	Small	Large	Medium	Small
Professional development	98	91	76*	61	61	53*
Recruiting, hiring, retaining effective educators	61	41	29*	16	12	14*
Class size reduction	15	22	21*	12	17	22*
Evaluation systems	26	17	9*	2	3	3
Other	51	36	23*	9	7	7
Any purpose other than PD	82	71	61*	39	39	47*
Number of districts	870	2,948	9,295			
Number of districts (unweighted)	540	1,498	2,297			

* Percentage of districts differed significantly by size (chi-squared test, $p < 0.05$).

Source: 2019-20 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2018-19.

Exhibit B.15. District use of Title II-A funds, by urbanicity

Type	Percentage of districts allocating funds to each area				Share of funds allocated to each area			
	Urban	Suburban	Town	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Town	Rural
Professional development	89	90	80	72*	60	65	53	51*
Recruiting, hiring, retaining effective educators	41	36	38	27*	15	15	14	15
Class size reduction	8	16	30	25*	14	11	23	24*
Evaluation systems	16	15	13	8*	2	3	3	2*
Other	26	30	29	26	9	7	8	8
Any purpose other than PD	58	61	75	65*	40	36	47	49*
Number of districts	1,965	3,645	2,340	5,164				
Number of districts (unweighted)	615	1,222	949	1,549				

* Percentage of districts differed significantly by urbanicity (chi-squared test, $p < 0.05$).

Source: 2019-20 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2018-19.

Exhibit B.16. District use of Title II-A funds, by traditional and charter school local education agencies (LEAs)

Type	Percentage of districts allocating funds to each area		Share of funds allocated to each area	
	Traditional	Charter	Traditional	Charter
Professional development	80	84	59	63
Recruiting, hiring, retaining effective educators	33	34	14	24*
Class size reduction	25	2*	16	2*
Evaluation systems	13	7*	2	5
Other	30	13*	8	6
Any purpose other than PD	68	45*	41	37
Number of districts	11,033	2,081		
Number of districts (unweighted)	3,979	356		

* Percentage of charter school districts is significantly different from the percentage of traditional public school districts (p < 0.05).

Source: 2019-20 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2018-19.

Exhibit B.17. District professional development types for teachers

Type	Percentage of districts using Title II-A funds for this type of activity	Percentage of districts indicating the activity was one of the two largest expenditures in this area
Short-term trainings or conferences	93	72
Short-term training (3 days or less), single session	88	65
Conducted by external provider	79	49
Conducted by district or school-level staff	65	31
Professional conferences or organizations	70	27
Longer-term training or education	77	59
Longer-term training with connected content (4 or more days)	65	43
Conducted by external provider	50	26
Conducted by district or school-level staff	42	21
One-on-one support from teacher leaders or coaches	45	22
Group support (e.g., lesson study, peer-to-peer communities of practice)	33	8
University or college courses	18	4
Collaborative or job-embedded	52	28
One-on-one support from teacher leaders or coaches	45	22
Group support (e.g., lesson study, peer-to-peer communities of practice)	33	8
Other	38	10
Internet-based professional development (e.g., video library, skill-building modules, online coaching)	24	5
Professional certifications (e.g., national board certification, state-level credentials or endorsements)	18	3
Other	3	3
Number of districts	10,634	10,634
Number of districts (unweighted)	3,640	3,640

Note: Districts first indicated whether they used Title II-A funds for each activity, and then indicated which two areas had the largest amount of funding allocated.

Source: 2019-20 District survey.

Exhibit B.18. District professional development types for teachers, by district type and size

Type	Percentage of districts using Title II-A funds for this type of activity	Percentage of districts indicating the activity was one of the two largest expenditures in this area	Number of districts	Number of districts (unweighted)
Short-term trainings or conferences	93%	72%	10,634	3,640
Large districts (>10,000 students)	97%	61%	851	526
Medium districts (2,500-10,000 students)	94%	67%	2,692	1,378
Small districts (<2,500 students)	92%*	76%*	7,091	1,736
Traditional districts	93%	73%	8,893	3,344
Charter school districts	89%*	71%	1,742	296
Longer-term training or education	77%	59%	10,634	3,640
Large districts (>10,000 students)	96%	80%	851	526
Medium districts (2,500-10,000 students)	87%	68%	2,692	1,378
Small districts (<2,500 students)	72%*	53%*	7,091	1,736
Traditional districts	78%	58%	8,893	3,344
Charter school districts	77%	63%	1,742	296
Collaborative or job-embedded	52%	28%	10,634	3,640
Large districts (>10,000 students)	84%	44%	851	526
Medium districts (2,500-10,000 students)	64%	34%	2,692	1,378
Small districts (<2,500 students)	44%*	24%*	7,091	1,736
Traditional districts	52%	27%	8,893	3,344
Charter school districts	52%	32%	1,742	296

* Percentage of districts differed significantly by size (chi-squared test, $p < 0.05$).

Note: Districts first indicated whether they used Title II-A funds for each activity, then indicated which two areas were the “top two” based on the amount of funding allocated.

Source: 2019-20 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2018-19.

Exhibit B.19. District professional development types for principals

Type	Percentage of districts using Title II-A funds for this type of activity	Percentage of districts indicating the activity was one of the two largest expenditures in this area
Short-term trainings or conferences	84	74
Short-term training (3 days or less), conducted by external provider or district-level staff	73	59
Professional conferences or organizations, external to the district or state	56	36
Longer-term training or education	61	51
Longer-term group PD, conducted by an external provider	33	19
Longer-term group PD, conducted by district staff	25	15
Longer-term one-on-one PD, conducted by an external provider	15	6
Longer-term one-on-one PD, conducted by district staff	15	7
Group support (e.g., learning communities, district monthly, or quarterly principal meetings)	27	15
University or college courses	7	2
Collaborative or job-embedded	38	26
Longer-term one-on-one PD, conducted by an external provider	15	6
Longer-term one-on-one PD, conducted by district staff	15	7
Group support (e.g., learning communities, district monthly, or quarterly principal meetings)	27	15
Other	55	31
State leadership conferences or trainings	42	19
Leadership certifications (e.g., state-level credentials or endorsements)	10	3
Other	10	10
Number of districts	10,629	10,629
Number of districts (unweighted)	3,636	3,636

Note: Districts first indicated whether they used Title II-A funds for each activity, then indicated which two areas were the “top two” based on the amount of funding allocated.

Source: 2019-20 District survey.

Exhibit B.20. Percentage of districts reporting that they used Title II-A funds for certain types of professional development for teachers, by state

State	Short-term trainings or conferences	Longer-term trainings or education	Collaborative or job-embedded	Other
All states	93	77	52	38
Alabama	99	87	61	38
Alaska	93	74	52	41
Arizona	94	68	42	34
Arkansas	83	85	61	41
California	93	71	57	32
Colorado	68	86	64	49
Connecticut	86	77	44	40
Delaware	100	100	90	34
District of Columbia	100	100	76	70
Florida	100	96	87	87
Georgia	89	93	78	68
Hawaii	100	100	100	100
Idaho	92	86	57	40
Illinois	97	68	37	35
Indiana	93	81	57	50
Iowa	88	61	35	36
Kansas	95	82	39	38
Kentucky	94	80	70	38
Louisiana	87	83	67	49
Maine	91	84	50	36
Maryland	87	100	90	73
Massachusetts	89	86	58	31
Michigan	94	79	57	31
Minnesota	88	69	45	17
Mississippi	99	91	70	45
Missouri	93	70	35	47
Montana	90	69	17	25
Nebraska	98	54	31	16
Nevada	63	100	72	46
New Hampshire	92	81	47	38
New Jersey	96	80	42	45
New Mexico	90	76	64	37
New York	86	86	64	33
North Carolina	99	81	68	62
North Dakota	87	78	29	31
Ohio	92	80	51	38
Oklahoma	93	88	63	52
Oregon	83	90	70	17
Pennsylvania	96	66	35	25
Rhode Island	82	92	83	37
South Carolina	91	88	52	55
South Dakota	100	60	32	28
Tennessee	97	83	69	40
Texas	96	73	54	45
Utah	90	83	56	56
Vermont	83	98	83	27
Virginia	93	93	51	66
Washington	97	68	50	41
West Virginia	96	98	84	68
Wisconsin	97	65	43	32
Wyoming	95	77	50	39

Source: 2019-20 District survey (N = 10,634 districts, 3,640 unweighted).

Exhibit B.21. Percentage of districts reporting that they used Title II-A funds for certain types of professional development for principals, by state

State	Short-term trainings or conferences	Longer-term trainings or education	Collaborative or job-embedded	Other
All states	84	61	38	55
Alabama	98	78	51	66
Alaska	85	70	48	55
Arizona	91	52	30	54
Arkansas	83	68	55	67
California	90	55	38	43
Colorado	53	69	50	60
Connecticut	80	67	41	44
Delaware	87	85	48	40
District of Columbia	76	100	100	48
Florida	96	85	75	76
Georgia	79	84	57	54
Hawaii	100	100	100	100
Idaho	80	73	52	65
Illinois	90	42	24	61
Indiana	86	57	39	74
Iowa	65	46	31	53
Kansas	87	59	33	72
Kentucky	88	78	64	61
Louisiana	85	69	54	71
Maine	65	64	27	58
Maryland	77	60	23	60
Massachusetts	74	68	35	41
Michigan	84	58	32	55
Minnesota	85	54	37	47
Mississippi	92	75	58	78
Missouri	95	46	35	59
Montana	78	41	22	59
Nebraska	92	55	28	76
Nevada	58	80	52	45
New Hampshire	82	65	35	51
New Jersey	84	51	28	54
New Mexico	70	52	34	68
New York	77	66	41	31
North Carolina	95	68	45	73
North Dakota	78	49	23	72
Ohio	75	78	46	44
Oklahoma	89	78	56	72
Oregon	78	78	44	39
Pennsylvania	80	49	28	59
Rhode Island	78	85	64	66
South Carolina	83	73	40	73
South Dakota	85	36	25	53
Tennessee	96	71	50	73
Texas	94	62	44	52
Utah	71	56	34	65
Vermont	62	85	54	44
Virginia	85	68	36	70
Washington	89	56	33	41
West Virginia	94	86	73	71
Wisconsin	85	47	25	66
Wyoming	92	61	41	50

Source: 2019-20 District survey, N = 10,629 districts (3,636 unweighted).

Exhibit B.22. District professional development topics for teachers

Topic	Percentage of districts using Title II-A funds for this topic	Percentage of districts indicating the topic was one of the two largest expenditures in this area
Instructional practice	97	79
Instructional strategies for academic subjects	83	42
Using data and assessments to guide instruction	75	23
Understanding state content standards and instructional strategies to meet them	66	17
Instructional strategies for classroom management or student behavior management	66	18
Using technology	61	10
Providing instruction and academic support for students with disabilities or developmental delays	54	4
Providing instruction and academic support to English learners	43	3
Integrating academic content, career and technical education, and work-based learning	27	1
Identifying gifted and talented students	18	<1
Content knowledge	89	51
Teacher content knowledge in ELA	81	36
Teacher content knowledge in STEM or computer science	71	25
Teacher content knowledge in subjects other than ELA or STEM	59	6
School management, climate, improvement	50	5
Identifying students with referral needs	32	3
Understanding teacher evaluation systems and resulting feedback	28	1
Offering joint professional learning and planning activities that address transition from early childhood to elementary school	20	<1
Engaging parents and families	36	2
Other	8	6
Number of districts	10,631	10,631
Number of districts (unweighted)	3,637	3,637

Note: Districts first indicated whether they used Title II-A funds for each activity, then indicated which two areas were the “top two” based on the amount of funding allocated.

Source: 2019-20 District survey.

Exhibit B.23. Percentage of districts reporting that they used Title II-A funds for teacher professional development on certain topics, by state

State	Instructional practice	Content knowledge	School management, climate, and improvement	Parent and community engagement	Other
All states	97	89	50	36	8
Alabama	100	93	60	43	5
Alaska	96	82	52	41	22
Arizona	98	87	38	22	7
Arkansas	93	86	64	54	9
California	92	92	58	55	10
Colorado	95	86	39	23	14
Connecticut	98	83	34	19	6
Delaware	100	87	31	58	0
District of Columbia	100	100	76	76	0
Florida	100	98	76	45	7
Georgia	100	93	56	37	4
Hawaii	100	100	100	100	0
Idaho	100	86	58	39	8
Illinois	99	92	55	39	10
Indiana	97	97	53	23	8
Iowa	94	75	42	17	14
Kansas	98	90	69	49	3
Kentucky	97	94	59	35	5
Louisiana	96	95	74	51	4
Maine	98	87	39	31	4
Maryland	100	81	64	31	14
Massachusetts	100	83	38	34	11
Michigan	98	92	43	33	8
Minnesota	94	69	43	37	12
Mississippi	100	95	60	54	5
Missouri	95	88	59	34	9
Montana	98	73	47	28	0
Nebraska	100	96	53	25	6
Nevada	100	93	46	41	6
New Hampshire	95	86	37	22	15
New Jersey	99	93	41	22	11
New Mexico	96	86	58	26	2
New York	98	96	45	28	8
North Carolina	99	74	62	34	10
North Dakota	100	72	42	20	2
Ohio	98	76	44	29	4
Oklahoma	100	95	50	59	3
Oregon	99	84	55	30	11
Pennsylvania	100	83	41	48	9
Rhode Island	100	96	64	51	33
South Carolina	98	87	49	22	0
South Dakota	100	65	39	43	15
Tennessee	100	100	59	49	2
Texas	97	94	60	50	5
Utah	100	94	41	32	7
Vermont	100	98	35	17	13
Virginia	96	89	37	30	10
Washington	100	97	47	22	12
West Virginia	100	98	82	65	8
Wisconsin	94	97	37	21	3
Wyoming	97	86	47	25	14

Source: 2019-20 District survey (N = 10,631 districts, 3,637 unweighted).

Exhibit B.24. District professional development topics for teachers, by district size

Topic	Percentage of districts using Title II-A funds for this topic		
	Large	Medium	Small
Instructional practice	100	99	97*
Instructional strategies for academic subjects	95	89	80*
Using data and assessments to guide instruction	89	81	71*
Understanding state content standards and instructional strategies to meet them	90	78	59*
Instructional strategies for classroom management or student behavior management	79	66	64*
Using technology	78	66	57*
Instruction and academic support for students with disabilities or developmental delays	71	54	52*
Instruction and academic support for English learners	75	56	35*
Integrating academic content, career and technical education, and work-based learning (as appropriate)	47	27	25*
Identifying gifted and talented students	36	21	15*
Content knowledge	96	93	87*
Teacher content knowledge in ELA	90	84	78*
Teacher content knowledge in STEM or computer science	88	79	65*
Teacher content knowledge in subjects other than ELA or STEM	81	66	54*
School management, climate, improvement	62	47	49*
Identifying students with referral needs	38	29	32*
Understanding teacher evaluation systems and resulting feedback	44	28	25*
Offering joint professional learning and planning activities that address transition from early childhood to elementary school	33	19	19*
Engaging parents and families	43	34	36*
Other	8	8	8
Number of districts	851	2,690	7,090
Number of districts (unweighted)	526	1,376	1,735

* Percentage of districts differed significantly by size (chi-squared test, $p < 0.05$).

Source: 2019-20 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2018-19.

Exhibit B.25. District professional development topics for teachers, by urbanicity

Topic	Percentage of districts using funds for this topic			
	Urban	Suburban	Town	Rural
Instructional practice	100	98	98	95*
Instructional strategies for academic subjects	88	85	84	79*
Using data and assessments to guide instruction	83	76	74	72*
Understanding state content standards and instructional strategies to meet them	68	71	66	61*
Instructional strategies for classroom management or student behavior management	80	62	66	61*
Using technology	56	62	63	62
Instruction and academic support for students with disabilities or developmental delays	62	58	53	46*
Instruction and academic support for English learners	54	53	45	29*
Integrating academic content, career and technical education, and work-based learning (as appropriate)	29	27	29	26
Identifying gifted and talented students	19	18	19	17
Content knowledge	89	90	90	87
Teacher content knowledge in ELA	81	83	82	78
Teacher content knowledge in STEM or computer science	68	74	75	67*
Teacher content knowledge in subjects other than ELA or STEM	65	64	60	52*
School management, climate, improvement	52	46	53	50
Identifying students with referral needs	33	27	36	32*
Understanding teacher evaluation systems and resulting feedback	36	24	30	25*
Offering joint professional learning and planning activities that address transition from early childhood to elementary school	18	21	20	20
Engaging parents and families	44	32	38	34*
Other	7	8	7	8
Number of districts	1,745	3,285	1,861	3,739
Number of districts (unweighted)	560	1,129	781	1,167

* Percentage of districts differed significantly by urbanicity (chi-squared test, $p < 0.05$).

Source: 2019-20 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2018-19.

Exhibit B.26. District professional development topics for principals

Topic	Percentage of districts using Title II-A funds for this topic	Percentage of districts indicating the topic was one of the two largest expenditures in this area
Strategies and practices to help teachers improve instruction	85	72
School improvement planning or identifying interventions to support academic improvement	78	60
Strategies and practices to advance organizational development	66	38
Strategies to engage parents and the community	40	8
Strategies and practices to develop and manage the school's workforce	31	6
Other	10	8
Number of districts	10,631	10,631
Number of districts (unweighted)	3,637	3,637

Note: Districts first indicated whether they used Title II-A funds for each activity, then indicated which two areas were the “top two” based on the amount of funding allocated.

Source: 2019-20 District survey.

Exhibit B.27. Percentage of districts reporting that they used Title II-A funds for principal professional development on certain topics, by state

State	School management, climate, and improvement	Instructional practice	Parent and community engagement	Other
All states	91	85	40	10
Alabama	96	99	52	2
Alaska	96	89	52	11
Arizona	88	81	46	8
Arkansas	95	89	52	7
California	95	76	48	12
Colorado	84	86	35	15
Connecticut	89	89	31	5
Delaware	100	100	58	0
District of Columbia	76	100	76	24
Florida	100	96	46	3
Georgia	92	85	44	9
Hawaii	100	100	0	0
Idaho	91	90	54	2
Illinois	92	84	41	12
Indiana	95	95	37	6
Iowa	68	70	44	23
Kansas	94	79	51	4
Kentucky	99	93	39	2
Louisiana	92	84	58	8
Maine	92	79	39	8
Maryland	86	91	45	13
Massachusetts	82	84	40	17
Michigan	85	83	33	16
Minnesota	90	72	41	11
Mississippi	97	94	63	3
Missouri	100	91	40	2
Montana	55	58	25	37
Nebraska	98	94	56	3
Nevada	93	72	49	15
New Hampshire	88	78	34	13
New Jersey	85	82	27	17
New Mexico	83	83	31	17
New York	91	82	34	10
North Carolina	94	93	40	4
North Dakota	89	83	32	9
Ohio	96	91	32	6
Oklahoma	96	94	63	2
Oregon	89	89	30	11
Pennsylvania	81	73	33	23
Rhode Island	92	90	37	6
South Carolina	93	98	37	6
South Dakota	81	61	31	15
Tennessee	99	98	60	1
Texas	97	95	52	3
Utah	78	92	46	9
Vermont	96	81	23	15
Virginia	89	88	45	10
Washington	92	86	27	12
West Virginia	100	98	63	4
Wisconsin	86	85	29	15
Wyoming	97	92	28	8

Source: 2019-20 District survey (N = 10,631 districts, 3,637 unweighted).

Exhibit B.28. State use of Title II-A funds

Activity	Number of states allocating funds	Total amount of funds allocated
Administration, monitoring, and technical assistance	45	\$26,792,039
Administration and monitoring	44	\$19,565,556
Training, technical assistance, and capacity building for LEAs	22	\$7,226,483
Professional development	33	\$15,275,972
Professional development programs for principals	21	\$10,309,539
Promoting high-quality instruction and instructional leadership in STEM subjects, including computer science	21	\$2,610,909
Training to integrate technology into curricula and instruction	9	\$1,057,351
Training to integrate career and technical education into academic instruction	5	\$697,141
Training related to use of student data and privacy	3	\$241,032
Training to prevent and recognize child sexual abuse	2	\$30,000
Developing educator skills, credentials for supporting K-12 students in postsecondary education coursework	2	\$330,000
Recruiting, hiring, retaining effective educators	35	\$21,772,318
Opportunities for effective teachers to lead evidence-based professional development for their peers	16	\$5,925,763
Reforming certification, licensing, or tenure systems or preparation programs	19	\$5,173,492
Training and support for instructional leadership teams	11	\$3,366,545
Developing career paths that promote professional growth including instructional coaching and mentoring	9	\$3,793,248
Developing new teacher and principal induction and mentoring programs	19	\$2,209,733
Providing alternative routes for state certification of teachers, principals, or other school leaders	11	\$727,659
Establishing or expanding preparation academies for teachers, principals, or other school leaders	0	\$0
Reforming or improving preparation programs for teachers, principals, or other school leaders	5	\$423,925
Providing licensure/certification reciprocity with other states	2	\$36,821
Developing performance-based pay systems and other incentives to recruit and retain teachers and leaders in high-need subjects and schools	2	\$115,133
Evaluation systems	19	\$6,681,319
Teacher, principal, or other school leader evaluation and support systems	19	\$6,681,319
Equitable access	20	\$6,184,557
Improving equitable access to effective teachers	20	\$6,184,557
Other	29	\$8,766,310
Other activities	25	\$8,502,598
Library programs	6	\$190,626
Addressing transition to elementary school and school readiness	4	\$73,086

Note: The District of Columbia and Puerto Rico are included as states in these calculations.
Source: 2019-20 SEA survey.

Exhibit B.29. Percentage of Title II-A funds used to support teachers and principals and other leaders

Title II-A funds used to support:	Percentage of funds
Teachers	91
Principals and other leaders	9
Number of districts	13,109
Number of districts (unweighted)	4,333

Source: 2019-20 District survey.

Exhibit B.30. District strategies to recruit, hire, and retain effective educators using Title II-A funds

Strategy	Percentage of districts using this strategy	Percentage of districts indicating the strategy was one of the two largest expenditures in this area
Targeting and tailoring professional development to individual teacher or leader needs	86	71
Induction or new teacher and leader mentoring programs	75	60
Emphasis on leadership opportunities and multiple career pathways for teachers	45	15
Support with screening candidates and early hiring for teachers	36	12
Feedback mechanisms to improve school working conditions	34	6
Differential and incentive pay of teachers and leaders	33	19
Recruiting individuals from other fields to become teachers or leaders	29	7
Other	9	7
Number of districts	4,433	4,433
Number of districts (unweighted)	1,772	1,772

Note: Districts are included in this table only if they reported using Title II-A funds to recruit, hire, and retain effective teachers, principals, or other school leaders. Districts first indicated whether they used Title II-A funds for each strategy, then indicated which two areas were the “top two” based on the amount of funding allocated.

Source: 2019-20 District survey.

Exhibit B.31. Percentage of districts that used Title II-A funds for various strategies to recruit, hire, and retain effective educators, by state

State	Targeting and tailoring professional development	Induction or mentoring programs	Leadership opportunities and multiple career pathways	Support with screening candidates and early hiring	Feedback to improve school working conditions	Differential and incentive pay	Recruiting individuals from other fields	Other
All states	86	75	45	36	34	33	29	9
Alabama	84	66	40	43	32	23	57	4
Alaska	84	69	58	63	31	26	42	16
Arizona	93	73	34	43	56	47	36	4
Arkansas	75	58	45	54	30	46	51	7
California	92	90	46	39	35	14	15	3
Colorado	86	89	42	25	33	22	23	21
Connecticut	69	85	43	26	35	22	18	15
Delaware	100	100	51	31	51	68	31	0
District of Columbia	100	100	100	100	76	100	100	0
Florida	97	97	53	48	28	32	51	7
Georgia	78	87	48	42	34	23	55	7
Hawaii	100	100	100	100	0	100	100	0
Idaho	90	76	38	36	40	53	34	24
Illinois	94	84	53	37	23	10	17	17
Indiana	82	58	61	36	18	76	31	4
Iowa	70	17	32	41	12	29	9	23
Kansas	78	83	30	26	32	31	42	6
Kentucky	92	93	61	25	36	6	28	3
Louisiana	88	86	63	54	39	45	56	7
Maine	85	26	33	11	18	0	15	56
Maryland	89	89	52	48	16	11	21	11
Massachusetts	83	93	37	21	33	18	10	6
Michigan	68	52	32	21	29	53	25	14
Minnesota	98	79	53	16	38	32	14	2
Mississippi	94	69	43	47	39	29	56	24
Missouri	96	96	42	58	67	55	54	0
Montana	94	74	10	20	15	27	49	12
Nebraska	96	83	36	64	36	0	28	0
Nevada	81	81	47	34	34	34	59	22
New Hampshire	87	77	50	7	28	30	15	6
New Jersey	95	87	25	23	25	8	8	2
New Mexico	88	94	55	26	45	38	55	4
New York	89	72	49	28	28	24	6	6
North Carolina	93	88	56	53	48	42	50	9
North Dakota	61	92	30	36	30	15	60	4
Ohio	70	22	49	11	18	69	17	18
Oklahoma	90	78	35	51	47	29	39	3
Oregon	92	92	60	25	40	6	23	6
Pennsylvania	81	40	44	50	18	0	24	0
Rhode Island	100	92	70	23	47	39	38	8
South Carolina	84	75	45	57	21	19	49	9
South Dakota	70	68	42	42	14	48	38	25
Tennessee	93	71	59	34	40	44	40	6
Texas	86	64	44	45	40	42	26	13
Utah	92	77	35	43	39	54	31	2
Vermont	100	91	52	9	13	22	13	4
Virginia	92	82	56	28	38	29	41	14
Washington	92	92	38	36	46	12	41	7
West Virginia	94	94	67	38	56	9	51	13
Wisconsin	83	78	25	40	44	31	29	2
Wyoming	82	82	58	42	46	12	29	18

Note: Districts are included in this table only if they reported using Title II-A funds to recruit, hire, and retain effective teachers, principals, or other school leaders.

Source: 2019-20 District survey (N = 4,433 districts, 1,772 unweighted).

Exhibit B.32. State use of Title II-A funds for teachers, principal, or other school leader evaluation and support, by state

State	Total amount of funds reserved for state-level activities	Amount of reserved funds used for evaluation systems	Share of reserved funds used for evaluation systems
All states	\$101,638,784	\$6,681,319	7%
Alabama	\$1,681,396	\$0	0%
Alaska	\$492,854	\$0	0%
Arizona	\$1,860,020	\$186,002	10%
Arkansas	\$1,013,847	\$41,556	4%
California	\$11,904,487	\$0	0%
Colorado	\$1,164,596	\$0	0%
Connecticut	\$896,498	\$0	0%
Delaware	\$492,854	\$0	0%
District of Columbia	\$492,854	\$0	0%
Florida	\$5,121,970	\$655,000	13%
Georgia	\$3,059,493	\$372,700	12%
Hawaii	\$492,854	\$112,731	23%
Idaho	\$492,854	\$207,916	42%
Illinois	\$3,951,704	\$0	0%
Indiana	\$1,809,992	\$0	0%
Iowa	\$754,387	\$0	0%
Kansas	\$795,320	\$0	0%
Kentucky	\$1,560,541	\$358,743	23%
Louisiana	\$2,362,410	\$32,342	1%
Maine	\$492,854	\$0	0%
Maryland	\$1,425,452	\$44,000	3%
Massachusetts	\$1,715,482	\$157,317	9%
Michigan	\$3,635,369	\$237,694	7%
Minnesota	\$1,325,973	\$400,000	30%
Mississippi	\$871,789	\$0	0%
Missouri	\$1,764,982	\$342,188	19%
Montana	\$492,854	\$0	0%
Nebraska	\$500,764	\$0	0%
Nevada	\$656,811	\$10,000	2%
New Hampshire	\$492,854	\$0	0%
New Jersey	\$2,261,325	\$0	0%
New Mexico	\$821,564	\$0	0%
New York	\$7,422,654	\$1,444,572	19%
North Carolina	\$2,623,923	\$89,285	3%
North Dakota	\$611,854	\$0	0%
Ohio	\$3,722,890	\$863,192	23%
Oklahoma	\$1,512,991	\$0	0%
Oregon	\$993,450	\$0	0%
Pennsylvania	\$3,838,435	\$0	0%
Rhode Island	\$492,854	\$63,000	13%
South Carolina	\$1,431,976	\$1,063,081	74%
South Dakota	\$492,854	\$0	0%
Tennessee	\$1,893,969	\$0	0%
Texas	\$9,206,222	\$0	0%
Utah	\$709,754	\$0	0%
Vermont	\$492,854	\$0	0%
Virginia	\$1,891,866	\$0	0%
Washington	\$1,703,649	\$0	0%
West Virginia	\$772,959	\$0	0%
Wisconsin	\$1,579,408	\$0	0%
Wyoming	\$492,854	\$0	0%
Puerto Rico	\$2,892,364	\$0	0%

Source: 2019-20 SEA survey.

Appendix C.
Supplementary Exhibits

Exhibit C.1. District allocations, by district characteristics

Characteristic	Average total district allocation	Number of districts (weighted)	Total allocation
All districts	\$130,589	13,114	\$1,712,504,234
By type of district			
Traditional	\$149,428	11,033	\$1,648,643,204
Charter	\$30,692	2,081	\$63,861,030
By district enrollment size			
Large (>10,000 students)	\$1,076,122	870	\$936,352,057
Medium (2,500-10,000 students)	\$158,292	2,948	\$466,705,846
Small (<2,500 students)	\$33,291	9,295	\$309,446,331
By urbanicity			
Urban	\$333,447	1,965	\$655,164,517
Suburban	\$172,252	3,645	\$627,872,996
Town	\$83,316	2,340	\$194,934,966
Rural	\$45,416	5,164	\$234,531,754

Source: 2019-20 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2018-19.

Exhibit C.2. District professional development (PD) types for principals, in traditional and charter school districts

Type	Percentage of districts using Title II-A funds for this type of activity		Percentage of districts indicating the activity was one of the two largest expenditures in this area	
	Traditional	Charter	Traditional	Charter
Short-term trainings or conferences	85	78*	75	68*
Short-term training (3 days or less), conducted by external provider or district-level staff	73	70	59	58
Professional conferences or organizations, external to the district or state	58	46*	37	32
Longer-term training or education	60	63	50	55
Longer-term group PD, conducted by an external provider	34	27*	20	13*
Longer-term group PD, conducted by district staff	24	30	14	23*
Longer-term one-on-one PD, conducted by an external provider	15	12	6	7
Longer-term one-on-one PD, conducted by district staff	14	20*	5	14*
Group support (e.g., learning communities, district monthly or quarterly principal meetings)	28	21*	16	11*
University or college courses	7	9	2	3
Collaborative or job-embedded	39	36	25	29
Longer-term one-on-one PD, conducted by an external provider	15	12	6	7
Longer-term one-on-one PD, conducted by district staff	14	20*	5	14*
Group support (e.g., learning communities, district monthly or quarterly principal meetings)	28	21*	16	11*
Other	57	45*	32	29
State leadership conferences or trainings	45	30*	20	17
Leadership certifications (e.g., state-level credentials or endorsements)	10	13	3	4
Other	11	10	11	10
Number of districts	8,888	1,742	8,888	1,742
Number of districts (unweighted)	3,340	296	3,340	296

* Percentage of charter school districts is significantly different from the percentage of traditional districts ($p < .05$).

Note: Districts first indicated whether they used Title II-A funds for each activity, then indicated which two areas were the “top two” based on the amount of funding allocated.

Source: 2019-20 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2018-19.

Exhibit C.3. District professional development topics for teachers, in traditional and charter school districts

Topic	Percentage of districts using Title II-A funds for this topic		Percentage of districts indicating the topic was one of the two largest expenditures in this area	
	Traditional	Charter	Traditional	Charter
Instructional practice	97	98	79	81
Instructional strategies for academic subjects	84	81	42	46
Using data and assessments to guide instruction	76	71	24	22
Understanding state content standards and instructional strategies to meet them	69	52*	18	10*
Instructional strategies for classroom management or student behavior management	64	74*	15	32*
Using technology	64	47*	11	5*
Instruction and academic support for students with disabilities or developmental delays	53	56	3	7*
Instruction and academic support for English learners	45	36*	3	3
Integrating academic content, career and technical education, and work-based learning	29	20*	1	<1*
Identifying gifted and talented students	20	11*	<1	1
Content knowledge	91	81*	52	46*
Teacher content knowledge in ELA	82	74*	37	33
Teacher content knowledge in STEM or computer science	74	55*	26	20*
Teacher content knowledge in subjects other than ELA or STEM	61	52*	6	7
School management, climate, improvement	51	45	5	6
Identifying students with referral needs	32	31	3	4
Understanding teacher evaluation systems and resulting feedback	27	31	1	2
Offering joint professional learning and planning activities that address transition from early childhood to elementary school	22	11*	1	0
Engaging parents and families	35	37	2	3
Other	8	8	6	6
Number of districts	8,889	1,742	8,889	1,742
Number of districts (unweighted)	3,341	296	3,341	296

* Percentage of charter school districts is significantly different from the percentage of traditional districts (p < .05).

Note: Districts first indicated whether they used Title II-A funds for each activity, then indicated which two areas were the “top two” based on the amount of funding allocated.

Source: 2019-20 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2018-19.

Exhibit C.4. District professional development topics for principals, in traditional and charter school districts

Topic	Percentage of districts using Title II-A funds for this topic		Percentage of districts indicating the topic was one of the two largest expenditures in this area	
	Traditional	Charter	Traditional	Charter
Strategies and practices to help teachers improve instruction	86	81	72	72
School improvement planning or identifying interventions to support academic improvement	78	80	60	63
Strategies and practices to advance organizational development	67	62	38	36
Strategies to engage parents and the community	39	44	7	11
Strategies and practices to develop and manage the school's workforce	31	33	6	7
Other	11	8	9	6
Number of districts	8,889	1,742	8,889	1,742
Number of districts (unweighted)	3,341	296	3,341	296

Note: Districts first indicated whether they used Title II-A funds for each activity, then indicated which two areas were the “top two” based on the amount of funding allocated.

Source: 2019-20 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2018-19.

Exhibit C.5. District professional development topics for principals, by district size

Topic	Percentage of districts using Title II-A funds for this topic		
	Large	Medium	Small
Strategies and practices to help teachers improve instruction	92	89	82*
School improvement planning or identifying interventions to support academic improvement	86	79	77*
Strategies and practices to advance organizational development	78	68	64*
Strategies to engage parents and the community	43	37	41
Strategies and practices to develop and manage the school's workforce	55	34	27*
Other	6	10	11*
Number of districts	851	2,690	7,090
Number of districts (unweighted)	526	1,376	1,735

* Percentage of districts differed significantly by size (chi-squared test, $p < 0.05$).

Source: 2019-20 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2018-19.

Exhibit C.6. District professional development topics for principals, by urbanicity

Topic	Percentage of districts using Title II-A funds for this topic			
	Urban	Suburban	Town	Rural
Strategies and practices to help teachers improve instruction	85	86	87	82
School improvement planning or identifying interventions to support academic improvement	82	76	79	78
Strategies and practices to advance organizational development	69	65	69	64
Strategies to engage parents and the community	46	37	44	38*
Strategies and practices to develop and manage the school's workforce	41	29	34	27*
Other	8	13	7	11*
Number of districts	1,747	3,285	1,860	3,739
Number of districts (unweighted)	561	1,129	780	1,167

* Percentage of districts differed significantly by urbanicity (chi-squared test, $p < 0.05$).

Source: 2019-20 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2018-19.

Exhibit C.7. District strategies to recruit, hire, and retain effective educators using Title II-A funds, in traditional and charter school districts

Strategy	Percentage of districts indicating strategy was one of the two largest expenditures in this area			
	Percentage of districts using strategy		Percentage of districts indicating strategy was one of the two largest expenditures in this area	
	Traditional	Charter	Traditional	Charter
Targeting and tailoring professional development to individual teacher or leader needs	88	77*	74	59*
Induction or new teacher and leader mentoring programs	80	48*	64	34*
Emphasis on leadership opportunities and multiple career pathways for teachers	45	43	14	18
Support with screening candidates and early hiring for teachers	37	31	13	12
Feedback mechanisms to improve school working conditions	35	30	6	8
Recruiting individuals from other fields to become teachers or leaders	30	24	7	9
Differential and incentive pay of teachers and leaders	27	62*	14	47*
Other	9	12	6	11
Number of districts	3,724	709	3,724	709
Number of districts (unweighted)	1,636	136	1,636	136

* Percentage of charter school districts is significantly different from the percentage of traditional districts ($p < .05$).

Note: Districts are included in this table only if they reported using Title II-A funds to recruit, hire, and retain effective teachers, principals, or other school leaders. Districts first indicated whether they used Title II-A funds for each strategy, then indicated which two areas were the “top two” based on the amount of funding allocated.

Source: 2019-20 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2018-19.

Exhibit C.8. District strategies to recruit, hire, and retain effective educators using Title II-A funds, by district size

Strategy	Percentage of districts using strategy		
	Large	Medium	Small
Targeting and tailoring professional development to individual teacher or leader needs	93	90	84*
Induction or new teacher and leader mentoring programs	87	84	68*
Emphasis on leadership opportunities and multiple career pathways for teachers	58	44	42*
Support with screening candidates and early hiring for teachers	45	35	34*
Feedback mechanisms to improve school working conditions	41	34	33
Recruiting individuals from other fields to become teachers or leaders	41	28	28*
Differential and incentive pay of teachers and leaders	20	25	38*
Other	8	9	9
Number of districts	533	1,225	2,675
Number of districts (unweighted)	346	680	746

* Percentage of districts differed significantly by size (chi-squared test, $p < 0.05$).

Note: Districts are included in this table only if they reported using Title II-A funds to recruit, hire, and retain effective teachers, principals, or other school leaders.

Source: 2019-20 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2018-19.

Exhibit C.9. District strategies to recruit, hire, and retain effective educators using Title II-A funds, by urbanicity

Strategy	Percentage of districts using strategy			
	Urban	Suburban	Town	Rural
Targeting and tailoring professional development to individual teacher or leader needs	83	88	91	83*
Induction or new teacher and leader mentoring programs	64	82	79	72*
Emphasis on leadership opportunities and multiple career pathways for teachers	49	43	51	40
Support with screening candidates and early hiring for teachers	37	29	37	40
Feedback mechanisms to improve school working conditions	36	27	42	35*
Recruiting individuals from other fields to become teachers or leaders	31	19	33	35*
Differential and incentive pay of teachers and leaders	46	27	29	32*
Other	12	8	9	9
Number of districts	814	1,294	886	1,440
Number of districts (unweighted)	311	480	425	556

* Percentage of districts differed significantly by urbanicity (chi-squared test, $p < 0.05$).

Note: Districts are included in this table only if they reported using Title II-A funds to recruit, hire, and retain effective teachers, principals, or other school leaders.

Source: 2019-20 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2018-19.

Exhibit C.10. District use of information to define teacher quality, among districts that examined distribution of teacher quality or effectiveness

Type of information	Percentage of districts using the information to define teacher quality		
	All	Traditional	Charter
Teacher certification	78	79	76
Assignment of teachers to a grade or classes consistent with their field of certification	76	78	65*
Teacher evaluation ratings	76	75	78
Teacher experience	75	75	80
Teacher effectiveness, as measured by student learning objectives or student growth objectives	57	56	59
Teacher effectiveness, as measured by value added measures or student growth percentiles	56	54	66*
Teacher education	53	53	58
Other	3	3	5
Number of districts	10,067	8,528	1,540
Number of districts (unweighted)	3,190	2,923	267

* Percentage of charter school districts is significantly different from the percentage of traditional districts ($p < .05$).

Note: Districts are included in this table only if they reported using Title II-A funds to recruit, hire, and retain effective teachers, principals, or other school leaders.

Source: 2019-20 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2018-19.

Appendix D.
State-by-State Exhibits

OVERVIEW

This appendix provides easy access to all exhibits displaying state-level data. Some of these exhibits repeat data provided in Appendix B.

Exhibit D.1. Amount of funds reserved and transferred at the state level

State	Total amount of funds reserved for state-level activities	Funds reserved for preparation academies	Additional funds for state activities to support school leaders	Funds transferred from other programs
All states	\$101,638,784		\$31,014,829	\$1,694,747
Alabama	\$1,681,396			
Alaska	\$492,854		\$280,927	
Arizona	\$1,860,020			
Arkansas	\$1,013,847		\$539,367	
California	\$11,904,487		\$6,540,458	\$430,000
Colorado	\$1,164,596			
Connecticut	\$896,498			
Delaware	\$492,854			
District of Columbia	\$492,854			
Florida	\$5,121,970			
Georgia	\$3,059,493			
Hawaii	\$492,854			
Idaho	\$492,854		\$280,927	
Illinois	\$3,951,704			
Indiana	\$1,809,992		\$997,306	
Iowa	\$754,387		\$430,001	
Kansas	\$795,320			
Kentucky	\$1,560,541			
Louisiana	\$2,362,410			\$600,000
Maine	\$492,854			
Maryland	\$1,425,452		\$758,341	
Massachusetts	\$1,715,482		\$977,825	
Michigan	\$3,635,369		\$207,216	
Minnesota	\$1,325,973		\$755,805	
Mississippi	\$871,789			
Missouri	\$1,764,982		\$1,006,040	
Montana	\$492,854			
Nebraska	\$500,764		\$275,921	
Nevada	\$656,811		\$349,423	
New Hampshire	\$492,854			
New Jersey	\$2,261,325			
New Mexico	\$821,564		\$468,292	
New York	\$7,422,654		\$4,230,913	
North Carolina	\$2,623,923			
North Dakota	\$611,854			\$119,000
Ohio	\$3,722,890		\$2,122,047	
Oklahoma	\$1,512,991			\$545,747
Oregon	\$993,450			
Pennsylvania	\$3,838,435		\$2,187,908	
Rhode Island	\$492,854		\$0	
South Carolina	\$1,431,976		\$816,227	
South Dakota	\$492,854			
Tennessee	\$1,893,969		\$1,043,577	
Texas	\$9,206,222		\$5,247,547	
Utah	\$709,754		\$377,590	
Vermont	\$492,854			
Virginia	\$1,891,866			
Washington	\$1,703,649			
West Virginia	\$772,959			
Wisconsin	\$1,579,408		\$840,246	
Wyoming	\$492,854		\$280,927	
Puerto Rico	\$2,892,364			

Source: 2019-20 SEA survey.

Exhibit D.2. States reserving additional funds for activities to support principals and other school leaders, by state

State	Amount	Percentage of state allocation (for states reserving funds)
All states	\$31,014,829	2.8%
Alaska	\$280,927	3.0%
Arkansas	\$539,367	2.8%
California	\$6,540,458	3.0%
Idaho	\$280,927	3.0%
Indiana	\$997,306	2.9%
Iowa	\$430,001	3.0%
Maryland	\$758,341	2.8%
Massachusetts	\$977,825	3.0%
Michigan	\$207,216	0.3%
Minnesota	\$755,805	3.0%
Missouri	\$1,006,040	3.0%
Nebraska	\$275,921	2.9%
Nevada	\$349,423	2.8%
New Mexico	\$468,292	3.0%
New York	\$4,230,913	3.0%
Ohio	\$2,122,047	3.0%
Pennsylvania	\$2,187,908	3.0%
South Carolina	\$816,227	3.0%
Tennessee	\$1,043,577	2.9%
Texas	\$5,247,547	3.0%
Utah	\$377,590	2.8%
Wisconsin	\$840,246	2.8%
Wyoming	\$280,927	3.0%

Source: 2019-20 SEA survey.

Exhibit D.3. Amount of funds that states transferred to Title II-A from other ESEA programs

State	Funds initially reserved from Title II-A	Funds transferred to Title II-A from other programs	Total amount available for state-level activities	Percentage increase in funding for state activities
California	\$11,474,487	\$430,000	\$11,904,487	4%
Louisiana	\$1,762,410	\$600,000	\$2,362,410	34%
North Dakota	\$492,854	\$119,000	\$611,854	24%
Oklahoma	\$967,244	\$545,747	\$1,512,991	56%

Note: The percentage of funds transferred is calculated as the amount of funds transferred to Title II-A divided by the amount of funds initially allocated to states.

Source: 2019-20 SEA survey.

Exhibit D.4. Percentage of districts transferring funds between Title II-A and other ESEA programs, by state

State	Percentage transferring funds from Title II-A to other programs	Percentage transferring funds to Title II-A from other programs
All states	25	7
Alabama	4	8
Alaska	32	15
Arizona	31	5
Arkansas	41	9
California	5	5
Colorado	28	8
Connecticut	12	2
Delaware	32	0
District of Columbia	29	0
Florida	3	0
Georgia	41	2
Hawaii	0	100
Idaho	11	0
Illinois	24	12
Indiana	4	0
Iowa	13	8
Kansas	13	8
Kentucky	26	1
Louisiana	19	5
Maine	58	13
Maryland	0	0
Massachusetts	12	6
Michigan	46	10
Minnesota	12	6
Mississippi	56	0
Missouri	51	6
Montana	57	4
Nebraska	31	10
Nevada	9	0
New Hampshire	3	4
New Jersey	11	8
New Mexico	18	0
New York	19	12
North Carolina	19	0
North Dakota	59	8
Ohio	17	3
Oklahoma	70	2
Oregon	33	3
Pennsylvania	24	10
Rhode Island	6	32
South Carolina	0	7
South Dakota	20	12
Tennessee	17	25
Texas	35	5
Utah	1	9
Vermont	10	14
Virginia	4	12
Washington	21	15
West Virginia	0	6
Wisconsin	1	0
Wyoming	11	11

Source: 2019-20 District survey (N = 15,728 districts, 4,967 unweighted).

Exhibit D.5. Amount of reserved funds that states have not yet obligated

State	Total state allocation for Title II-A	Total amount of funds reserved	Reserved funds not yet obligated	Percentage of served funds not yet obligated
All states	2,025,095,342	101,638,784	15,465,450	15%
Alabama	33,627,937	1,681,396	150,000	9%
Alaska	9,857,080	492,854	0	0%
Arizona	37,200,413	1,860,020	0	0%
Arkansas	20,276,954	1,013,847	0	0%
California	229,489,744	11,904,487	0	0%
Colorado	23,291,927	1,164,596	0	0%
Connecticut	17,929,976	896,498	119,047	13%
Delaware	9,857,080	492,854	0	0%
District of Columbia	9,857,080	492,854	186,579	38%
Florida	102,439,415	5,121,970	405,109	8%
Georgia	61,189,877	3,059,493	0	0%
Hawaii	9,857,080	492,854	0	0%
Idaho	9,857,080	492,854	0	0%
Illinois	79,034,080	3,951,704	3,951,704	100%
Indiana	36,199,844	1,809,992	408,662	23%
Iowa	15,087,758	754,387	0	0%
Kansas	15,906,409	795,320	0	0%
Kentucky	31,210,836	1,560,541	262,395	17%
Louisiana	44,060,261	2,362,410	1,317,465	56%
Maine	9,857,080	492,854	246,156	50%
Maryland	28,509,050	1,425,452	0	0%
Massachusetts	34,309,648	1,715,482	466,808	27%
Michigan	72,707,384	3,635,369	0	0%
Minnesota	26,519,473	1,325,973	0	0%
Mississippi	29,059,637	871,789	871,789	100%
Missouri	35,299,643	1,764,982	0	0%
Montana	9,857,080	492,854	0	0%
Nebraska	10,015,297	500,764	0	0%
Nevada	13,136,221	656,811	0	0%
New Hampshire	9,857,080	492,854	202,512	41%
New Jersey	45,226,505	2,261,325	0	0%
New Mexico	16,431,291	821,564	234,046	28%
New York	148,453,080	7,422,654	0	0%
North Carolina	52,478,464	2,623,923	604,027	23%
North Dakota	9,857,080	611,854	73,281	12%
Ohio	74,457,801	3,722,890	37,835	1%
Oklahoma	25,123,227	1,512,991	611,085	40%
Oregon	19,869,007	993,450	993,450	100%
Pennsylvania	76,768,707	3,838,435	0	0%
Rhode Island	9,857,080	492,854	0	0%
South Carolina	28,639,528	1,431,976	0	0%
South Dakota	9,857,080	492,854	17,544	4%
Tennessee	37,879,390	1,893,969	124,563	7%
Texas	184,124,449	9,206,222	109,986	1%
Utah	14,195,094	709,754	342,304	48%
Vermont	9,857,080	492,854	492,854	100%
Virginia	37,837,332	1,891,866	0	0%
Washington	34,072,983	1,703,649	372,103	22%
West Virginia	15,459,185	772,959	550,254	71%
Wisconsin	31,588,176	1,579,408	0	0%
Wyoming	9,857,080	492,854	0	0%
Puerto Rico	57,847,299	2,892,364	2,313,892	80%

Note: The District of Columbia and Puerto Rico are included as states in these calculations. Reserved funds were not yet obligated when the state completed the SEA survey during the summer of 2020.

Source: 2019-20 SEA survey.

Exhibit D.6. SEA employees paid with Title II-A funds

State	Number of SEA employees fully funded	Number of SEA employees partially funded
All states	181	607
Alabama	1	0
Alaska	1	0
Arizona	3	33
Arkansas	0	0
California	12	42
Colorado	0	40
Connecticut	4	0
Delaware	0	4
District of Columbia	2	1
Florida	0	0
Georgia	10	2
Hawaii	6	0
Idaho	0	3
Illinois	0	20
Indiana	3	10
Iowa	2	11
Kansas	0	0
Kentucky	6	8
Louisiana	1	49
Maine	0	1
Maryland	7	2
Massachusetts	12	0
Michigan	3	69
Minnesota	3	18
Mississippi	0	0
Missouri	8	43
Montana	1	5
Nebraska	0	3
Nevada	1	1
New Hampshire	1	2
New Jersey	6	3
New Mexico	5	0
New York	24	0
North Carolina	3	24
North Dakota	0	1
Ohio	7	2
Oklahoma	8	5
Oregon	1	6
Pennsylvania	19	0
Rhode Island	0	5
South Carolina	1	0
South Dakota	1	0
Tennessee	0	11
Texas	0	140
Utah	0	3
Vermont	0	0
Virginia	3	3
Washington	8	1
West Virginia	0	5
Wisconsin	4	26
Wyoming	0	5
Puerto Rico	4	0

Note: The District of Columbia and Puerto Rico are included as states in these calculations.

Source: 2019-20 SEA survey.

Exhibit D.7. Percentage of districts that used Title II-A funds for various types of strategies, by state

State	Professional development	Recruiting, hiring, and retaining effective educators	Class size reduction	Evaluation systems	Other
All states	81	34	21	12	28
Alabama	90	40	68	10	52
Alaska	84	59	3	25	47
Arizona	93	35	2	13	29
Arkansas	73	40	20	10	27
California	90	40	20	19	45
Colorado	84	34	10	11	26
Connecticut	94	17	11	14	36
Delaware	100	49	15	15	33
District of Columbia	90	13	0	18	18
Florida	100	86	7	50	75
Georgia	91	77	5	18	66
Hawaii	100	100	0	100	0
Idaho	86	65	2	21	21
Illinois	87	28	29	8	22
Indiana	73	49	19	6	20
Iowa	33	14	73	2	2
Kansas	79	44	23	11	30
Kentucky	74	48	33	11	30
Louisiana	85	52	9	18	34
Maine	91	18	13	4	19
Maryland	100	86	14	18	77
Massachusetts	90	52	5	15	49
Michigan	92	24	1	10	25
Minnesota	66	9	44	4	10
Mississippi	100	41	3	14	44
Missouri	75	21	34	15	21
Montana	65	37	21	12	23
Nebraska	67	13	28	3	13
Nevada	84	50	0	16	32
New Hampshire	98	33	3	10	32
New Jersey	93	15	12	9	17
New Mexico	91	40	7	11	38
New York	81	27	16	12	20
North Carolina	88	63	21	16	29
North Dakota	65	34	41	8	9
Ohio	75	21	28	8	10
Oklahoma	76	39	9	19	19
Oregon	81	40	6	17	44
Pennsylvania	64	5	62	2	19
Rhode Island	100	25	17	11	11
South Carolina	88	53	55	13	62
South Dakota	27	24	35	3	54
Tennessee	97	54	11	9	56
Texas	76	56	3	21	42
Utah	79	38	9	6	13
Vermont	100	48	4	21	35
Virginia	80	57	51	21	51
Washington	91	40	5	10	25
West Virginia	100	62	13	33	66
Wisconsin	77	34	29	8	21
Wyoming	88	42	24	32	30

Source: 2019-20 District survey (N = 13,114 districts, 4,335 unweighted).

Exhibit D.8. Share of district-level Title II-A funds used for various types of strategies, by state

State	Professional development	Recruiting, hiring, and retaining effective educators	Class size reduction	Evaluation systems	Other
All states	59	15	15	2	8
Alabama	38	10	41	2	9
Alaska	78	13	1	1	7
Arizona	66	22	0	2	9
Arkansas	61	17	9	2	11
California	71	11	7	3	8
Colorado	73	18	1	3	4
Connecticut	43	26	18	2	12
Delaware	50	5	19	5	20
District of Columbia	40	58	0	2	0
Florida	60	17	11	3	9
Georgia	72	18	2	1	7
Hawaii	59	40	0	1	0
Idaho	72	18	1	5	5
Illinois	59	10	14	3	14
Indiana	70	12	13	2	3
Iowa	24	6	68	1	1
Kansas	70	11	12	1	6
Kentucky	54	11	22	1	13
Louisiana	55	21	7	4	12
Maine	72	2	23	1	3
Maryland	45	21	3	1	29
Massachusetts	53	25	3	3	17
Michigan	84	6	2	2	5
Minnesota	56	7	29	3	4
Mississippi	79	12	4	2	3
Missouri	49	9	37	3	3
Montana	31	9	50	3	6
Nebraska	59	18	20	0	2
Nevada	67	25	0	4	5
New Hampshire	66	18	11	2	3
New Jersey	71	5	14	2	8
New Mexico	63	18	5	3	11
New York	41	7	43	2	6
North Carolina	51	27	13	2	6
North Dakota	41	8	42	2	7
Ohio	63	7	23	2	5
Oklahoma	77	12	3	1	7
Oregon	70	15	1	3	11
Pennsylvania	36	21	37	1	5
Rhode Island	71	14	5	8	2
South Carolina	48	7	37	2	5
South Dakota	36	12	35	0	16
Tennessee	75	12	3	2	9
Texas	58	23	4	3	12
Utah	60	16	16	2	5
Vermont	76	10	3	1	10
Virginia	47	18	24	1	9
Washington	75	12	2	2	9
West Virginia	71	13	3	6	7
Wisconsin	52	17	21	5	6
Wyoming	66	7	11	5	12

Source: 2019-20 District survey (N = 13,114 districts, 4,335 unweighted).

Exhibit D.9. Percentage of districts reporting that they used Title II-A funds for certain types of professional development for teachers, by state

State	Short-term trainings or conferences	Longer-term trainings or education	Collaborative or job-embedded	Other
All states	93	77	52	38
Alabama	99	87	61	38
Alaska	93	74	52	41
Arizona	94	68	42	34
Arkansas	83	85	61	41
California	93	71	57	32
Colorado	68	86	64	49
Connecticut	86	77	44	40
Delaware	100	100	90	34
District of Columbia	100	100	76	70
Florida	100	96	87	87
Georgia	89	93	78	68
Hawaii	100	100	100	100
Idaho	92	86	57	40
Illinois	97	68	37	35
Indiana	93	81	57	50
Iowa	88	61	35	36
Kansas	95	82	39	38
Kentucky	94	80	70	38
Louisiana	87	83	67	49
Maine	91	84	50	36
Maryland	87	100	90	73
Massachusetts	89	86	58	31
Michigan	94	79	57	31
Minnesota	88	69	45	17
Mississippi	99	91	70	45
Missouri	93	70	35	47
Montana	90	69	17	25
Nebraska	98	54	31	16
Nevada	63	100	72	46
New Hampshire	92	81	47	38
New Jersey	96	80	42	45
New Mexico	90	76	64	37
New York	86	86	64	33
North Carolina	99	81	68	62
North Dakota	87	78	29	31
Ohio	92	80	51	38
Oklahoma	93	88	63	52
Oregon	83	90	70	17
Pennsylvania	96	66	35	25
Rhode Island	82	92	83	37
South Carolina	91	88	52	55
South Dakota	100	60	32	28
Tennessee	97	83	69	40
Texas	96	73	54	45
Utah	90	83	56	56
Vermont	83	98	83	27
Virginia	93	93	51	66
Washington	97	68	50	41
West Virginia	96	98	84	68
Wisconsin	97	65	43	32
Wyoming	95	77	50	39

Source: 2019-20 District survey (N = 10,634 districts, 3,640 unweighted).

Exhibit D.10. Percentage of districts reporting that they used Title II-A funds for certain types of professional development for principals, by state

State	Short-term trainings or conferences	Longer-term trainings or education	Collaborative or job-embedded	Other
All states	84	61	38	55
Alabama	98	78	51	66
Alaska	85	70	48	55
Arizona	91	52	30	54
Arkansas	83	68	55	67
California	90	55	38	43
Colorado	53	69	50	60
Connecticut	80	67	41	44
Delaware	87	85	48	40
District of Columbia	76	100	100	48
Florida	96	85	75	76
Georgia	79	84	57	54
Hawaii	100	100	100	100
Idaho	80	73	52	65
Illinois	90	42	24	61
Indiana	86	57	39	74
Iowa	65	46	31	53
Kansas	87	59	33	72
Kentucky	88	78	64	61
Louisiana	85	69	54	71
Maine	65	64	27	58
Maryland	77	60	23	60
Massachusetts	74	68	35	41
Michigan	84	58	32	55
Minnesota	85	54	37	47
Mississippi	92	75	58	78
Missouri	95	46	35	59
Montana	78	41	22	59
Nebraska	92	55	28	76
Nevada	58	80	52	45
New Hampshire	82	65	35	51
New Jersey	84	51	28	54
New Mexico	70	52	34	68
New York	77	66	41	31
North Carolina	95	68	45	73
North Dakota	78	49	23	72
Ohio	75	78	46	44
Oklahoma	89	78	56	72
Oregon	78	78	44	39
Pennsylvania	80	49	28	59
Rhode Island	78	85	64	66
South Carolina	83	73	40	73
South Dakota	85	36	25	53
Tennessee	96	71	50	73
Texas	94	62	44	52
Utah	71	56	34	65
Vermont	62	85	54	44
Virginia	85	68	36	70
Washington	89	56	33	41
West Virginia	94	86	73	71
Wisconsin	85	47	25	66
Wyoming	92	61	41	50

Source: 2019-20 District survey (N = 10,629 districts, 3,636 unweighted).

Exhibit D.11. Percentage of districts reporting that they used Title II-A funds for teacher professional development on certain topics, by state

State	Instructional practice	Content knowledge	School management, climate, and improvement	Parent and community engagement	Other
All states	97	89	50	36	8
Alabama	100	93	60	43	5
Alaska	96	82	52	41	22
Arizona	98	87	38	22	7
Arkansas	93	86	64	54	9
California	92	92	58	55	10
Colorado	95	86	39	23	14
Connecticut	98	83	34	19	6
Delaware	100	87	31	58	0
District of Columbia	100	100	76	76	0
Florida	100	98	76	45	7
Georgia	100	93	56	37	4
Hawaii	100	100	100	100	0
Idaho	100	86	58	39	8
Illinois	99	92	55	39	10
Indiana	97	97	53	23	8
Iowa	94	75	42	17	14
Kansas	98	90	69	49	3
Kentucky	97	94	59	35	5
Louisiana	96	95	74	51	4
Maine	98	87	39	31	4
Maryland	100	81	64	31	14
Massachusetts	100	83	38	34	11
Michigan	98	92	43	33	8
Minnesota	94	69	43	37	12
Mississippi	100	95	60	54	5
Missouri	95	88	59	34	9
Montana	98	73	47	28	0
Nebraska	100	96	53	25	6
Nevada	100	93	46	41	6
New Hampshire	95	86	37	22	15
New Jersey	99	93	41	22	11
New Mexico	96	86	58	26	2
New York	98	96	45	28	8
North Carolina	99	74	62	34	10
North Dakota	100	72	42	20	2
Ohio	98	76	44	29	4
Oklahoma	100	95	50	59	3
Oregon	99	84	55	30	11
Pennsylvania	100	83	41	48	9
Rhode Island	100	96	64	51	33
South Carolina	98	87	49	22	0
South Dakota	100	65	39	43	15
Tennessee	100	100	59	49	2
Texas	97	94	60	50	5
Utah	100	94	41	32	7
Vermont	100	98	35	17	13
Virginia	96	89	37	30	10
Washington	100	97	47	22	12
West Virginia	100	98	82	65	8
Wisconsin	94	97	37	21	3
Wyoming	97	86	47	25	14

Source: 2019-20 District survey (N = 10,631 districts, 3,637 unweighted).

Exhibit D.12. Percentage of districts reporting that they used Title II-A funds for principal professional development on certain topics, by state

State	School management, climate, and improvement	Instructional practice	Parent and community engagement	Other
All states	91	85	40	10
Alabama	96	99	52	2
Alaska	96	89	52	11
Arizona	88	81	46	8
Arkansas	95	89	52	7
California	95	76	48	12
Colorado	84	86	35	15
Connecticut	89	89	31	5
Delaware	100	100	58	0
District of Columbia	76	100	76	24
Florida	100	96	46	3
Georgia	92	85	44	9
Hawaii	100	100	0	0
Idaho	91	90	54	2
Illinois	92	84	41	12
Indiana	95	95	37	6
Iowa	68	70	44	23
Kansas	94	79	51	4
Kentucky	99	93	39	2
Louisiana	92	84	58	8
Maine	92	79	39	8
Maryland	86	91	45	13
Massachusetts	82	84	40	17
Michigan	85	83	33	16
Minnesota	90	72	41	11
Mississippi	97	94	63	3
Missouri	100	91	40	2
Montana	55	58	25	37
Nebraska	98	94	56	3
Nevada	93	72	49	15
New Hampshire	88	78	34	13
New Jersey	85	82	27	17
New Mexico	83	83	31	17
New York	91	82	34	10
North Carolina	94	93	40	4
North Dakota	89	83	32	9
Ohio	96	91	32	6
Oklahoma	96	94	63	2
Oregon	89	89	30	11
Pennsylvania	81	73	33	23
Rhode Island	92	90	37	6
South Carolina	93	98	37	6
South Dakota	81	61	31	15
Tennessee	99	98	60	1
Texas	97	95	52	3
Utah	78	92	46	9
Vermont	96	81	23	15
Virginia	89	88	45	10
Washington	92	86	27	12
West Virginia	100	98	63	4
Wisconsin	86	85	29	15
Wyoming	97	92	28	8

Source: 2019-20 District survey (N = 10,631 districts, 3,637 unweighted).

Exhibit D.13. State use of Title II-A funds for teachers, principal, or other school leader evaluation and support, by state

State	Total amount of funds reserved for state-level activities	Amount of reserved funds used for evaluation systems	Share of reserved funds used for evaluation systems
All states	\$101,638,784	\$6,681,319	7%
Alabama	\$1,681,396	\$0	0%
Alaska	\$492,854	\$0	0%
Arizona	\$1,860,020	\$186,002	10%
Arkansas	\$1,013,847	\$41,556	4%
California	\$11,904,487	\$0	0%
Colorado	\$1,164,596	\$0	0%
Connecticut	\$896,498	\$0	0%
Delaware	\$492,854	\$0	0%
District of Columbia	\$492,854	\$0	0%
Florida	\$5,121,970	\$655,000	13%
Georgia	\$3,059,493	\$372,700	12%
Hawaii	\$492,854	\$112,731	23%
Idaho	\$492,854	\$207,916	42%
Illinois	\$3,951,704	\$0	0%
Indiana	\$1,809,992	\$0	0%
Iowa	\$754,387	\$0	0%
Kansas	\$795,320	\$0	0%
Kentucky	\$1,560,541	\$358,743	23%
Louisiana	\$2,362,410	\$32,342	1%
Maine	\$492,854	\$0	0%
Maryland	\$1,425,452	\$44,000	3%
Massachusetts	\$1,715,482	\$157,317	9%
Michigan	\$3,635,369	\$237,694	7%
Minnesota	\$1,325,973	\$400,000	30%
Mississippi	\$871,789	\$0	0%
Missouri	\$1,764,982	\$342,188	19%
Montana	\$492,854	\$0	0%
Nebraska	\$500,764	\$0	0%
Nevada	\$656,811	\$10,000	2%
New Hampshire	\$492,854	\$0	0%
New Jersey	\$2,261,325	\$0	0%
New Mexico	\$821,564	\$0	0%
New York	\$7,422,654	\$1,444,572	19%
North Carolina	\$2,623,923	\$89,285	3%
North Dakota	\$611,854	\$0	0%
Ohio	\$3,722,890	\$863,192	23%
Oklahoma	\$1,512,991	\$0	0%
Oregon	\$993,450	\$0	0%
Pennsylvania	\$3,838,435	\$0	0%
Rhode Island	\$492,854	\$63,000	13%
South Carolina	\$1,431,976	\$1,063,081	74%
South Dakota	\$492,854	\$0	0%
Tennessee	\$1,893,969	\$0	0%
Texas	\$9,206,222	\$0	0%
Utah	\$709,754	\$0	0%
Vermont	\$492,854	\$0	0%
Virginia	\$1,891,866	\$0	0%
Washington	\$1,703,649	\$0	0%
West Virginia	\$772,959	\$0	0%
Wisconsin	\$1,579,408	\$0	0%
Wyoming	\$492,854	\$0	0%
Puerto Rico	\$2,892,364	\$0	0%

Source: 2019-20 SEA survey.

Exhibit D.14. Percentage of districts that used Title II-A funds for various strategies to recruit, hire, and retain effective educators, by state

State	Targeting and tailoring professional development	Induction or mentoring programs	Leadership opportunities and multiple career pathways	Support with screening candidates and early hiring	Feedback to improve school working conditions	Recruiting individuals from other fields	Differential and incentive pay	Other
All states	86	75	45	36	34	29	33	9
Alabama	84	66	40	43	32	57	23	4
Alaska	84	69	58	63	31	42	26	16
Arizona	93	73	34	43	56	36	47	4
Arkansas	75	58	45	54	30	51	46	7
California	92	90	46	39	35	15	14	3
Colorado	86	89	42	25	33	23	22	21
Connecticut	69	85	43	26	35	18	22	15
Delaware	100	100	51	31	51	31	68	0
District of Columbia	100	100	100	100	76	100	100	0
Florida	97	97	53	48	28	51	32	7
Georgia	78	87	48	42	34	55	23	7
Hawaii	100	100	100	100	0	100	100	0
Idaho	90	76	38	36	40	34	53	24
Illinois	94	84	53	37	23	17	10	17
Indiana	82	58	61	36	18	31	76	4
Iowa	70	17	32	41	12	9	29	23
Kansas	78	83	30	26	32	42	31	6
Kentucky	92	93	61	25	36	28	6	3
Louisiana	88	86	63	54	39	56	45	7
Maine	85	26	33	11	18	15	0	56
Maryland	89	89	52	48	16	21	11	11
Massachusetts	83	93	37	21	33	10	18	6
Michigan	68	52	32	21	29	25	53	14
Minnesota	98	79	53	16	38	14	32	2
Mississippi	94	69	43	47	39	56	29	24
Missouri	96	96	42	58	67	54	55	0
Montana	94	74	10	20	15	49	27	12
Nebraska	96	83	36	64	36	28	0	0
Nevada	81	81	47	34	34	59	34	22
New Hampshire	87	77	50	7	28	15	30	6
New Jersey	95	87	25	23	25	8	8	2
New Mexico	88	94	55	26	45	55	38	4
New York	89	72	49	28	28	6	24	6
North Carolina	93	88	56	53	48	50	42	9
North Dakota	61	92	30	36	30	60	15	4
Ohio	70	22	49	11	18	17	69	18
Oklahoma	90	78	35	51	47	39	29	3
Oregon	92	92	60	25	40	23	6	6
Pennsylvania	81	40	44	50	18	24	0	0
Rhode Island	100	92	70	23	47	38	39	8
South Carolina	84	75	45	57	21	49	19	9
South Dakota	70	68	42	42	14	38	48	25
Tennessee	93	71	59	34	40	40	44	6
Texas	86	64	44	45	40	26	42	13
Utah	92	77	35	43	39	31	54	2
Vermont	100	91	52	9	13	13	22	4
Virginia	92	82	56	28	38	41	29	14
Washington	92	92	38	36	46	41	12	7
West Virginia	94	94	67	38	56	51	9	13
Wisconsin	83	78	25	40	44	29	31	2
Wyoming	82	82	58	42	46	29	12	18

Note: Districts are included in this table only if they reported using Title II-A funds to recruit, hire, and retain effective teachers, principals, or other school leaders.

Source: 2019-20 District survey (N = 4,433 districts, 1,772 unweighted).

Appendix E.

Survey Instruments

SEA Survey

Survey on the Use of Funds Under Title II, Part A (Supporting Effective Instruction Grants – State Activities Funds)

State: _____

About the Survey

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), provides funds to States and LEAs to improve the quality of their teachers, principals, and other school leaders and raise student achievement. States and local educational agencies (LEAs) receive these funds under Title II, Part A of the ESEA (Supporting Effective Instruction Grants). The purpose of this survey is to enable policymakers and practitioners to gain a better understanding of how States are using their Title II, Part A State activities funds. Completion of this survey meets the reporting requirements under Section 2104(a)(1-4) of ESEA.

Instructions

Navigate through the survey by answering each question and clicking the "Save" button or the "Save and Mark as Complete" button. When you click the "Save" button, the responses you entered will be saved without navigating you away from the page. The "Save and Mark as Complete" button will navigate you back to the List of Survey Questions page. You may return to any section by clicking the List of Survey Questions tab on the navigation links at the top of the screen. You may enter or change answers to questions any time prior to submission, even if a question is marked as complete.

You do not have to complete the survey all at once. You may return at a later time to complete the survey. The completed survey is due on mm/dd/yyyy.

Once you have completed all sections, please be sure to click on the "Submit Completed Survey" button after the list of questions.

If you need assistance, please contact XXX at (301) XXX-XXXX or XXX@XXX.com.

Contact Information

Please provide the following contact information for the individual completing the survey.

First Name: _____
Last Name: _____
Position: _____
Phone: _____
E-mail: _____

Question 1: Provide the dollar amount of Federal FY 2019 Title II, Part A State activities funds allocated for the following activities. Do not include carryover funds. You can estimate if you do not have exact figures.

Maximum Title II, Part A funds available for State activities under Section 2101(c)(4)(A):	\$xxx,xxx,xxx
Actual amount reserved for State activities under Section 2101(c)(4)(A)	\$ _____
Total amount of Title II, Part A funds transferred <u>to</u> another program under ESEA funding transferability provisions (ESEA section 5103)	\$ _____
Amount of Title II, Part A funds transferred to Title I, Part A	\$ _____
Amount of Title II, Part A funds transferred to Title I, Part C	\$ _____
Amount of Title II, Part A funds transferred to Title I, Part D	\$ _____
Amount of Title II, Part A funds transferred to Title III, Part A	\$ _____
Amount of Title II, Part A funds transferred to Title IV, Part A	\$ _____
Amount of Title II, Part A funds transferred to Title IV, Part B	\$ _____
Amount of Title II, Part A funds transferred to Title V, Part B	\$ _____
Amount of funds transferred <u>from</u> other ESEA programs to Title II, Part A	\$ _____
Total Federal FY 2019 Title II, Part A State activities funds allocated	\$ _____
<i>State activities funds not yet obligated at the time of response</i>	\$ _____

<p style="text-align: center;">Activity</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Please note: States are not required to fund every activity listed</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Title II, Part A funds</p>
<p>(a) Reforming teacher, principal, or other school leader certification, recertification, licensing, or tenure systems or preparation program standards and approval processes to ensure that—</p> <p>(I) teachers have the necessary subject-matter knowledge and teaching skills, as demonstrated through measures determined by the State, which may include teacher performance assessments, in the academic subjects that the teachers teach to help students meet challenging State academic standards;</p> <p>(II) principals or other school leaders have the instructional leadership skills to help teachers teach and to help students meet such challenging State academic standards; and</p> <p>(III) teacher certification or licensing requirements are aligned with such challenging State academic standards.</p>	<p>(I): \$ _____</p> <p>(II): \$ _____</p> <p>(III): \$ _____</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Total:</p> <p>\$ _____</p>
<p>(b) Developing, improving, or providing assistance to local educational agencies to support the design and implementation of teacher, principal, or other school leader evaluation and support systems that are based in part on evidence of student academic achievement, which may include student growth, and shall include multiple measures of educator performance and provide clear, timely, and useful feedback to teachers, principals, or other school leaders, such as by—</p> <p>(I) developing and disseminating high-quality evaluation tools, such as classroom observation rubrics, and methods, including training and auditing, for ensuring inter-rater reliability of evaluation results;</p> <p>(II) developing and providing training to principals, other school leaders, coaches, mentors, and evaluators on how to accurately differentiate performance, provide useful and timely feedback, and use evaluation results to inform decision making about professional development, improvement strategies, and personnel decisions; and</p> <p>(III) developing a system for auditing the quality of evaluation and support systems.</p>	<p>(I): \$ _____</p> <p>(II): \$ _____</p> <p>(III): \$ _____</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Total:</p> <p>\$ _____</p>
<p>(c) Improving equitable access to effective teachers.</p>	<p>\$ _____</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Activity</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Please note: States are not required to fund every activity listed</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Title II, Part A funds</p>
<p>(d) Carrying out programs that establish, expand, or improve alternative routes for State certification of teachers (especially for teachers of children with disabilities, English learners, science, technology, engineering, mathematics, or other areas where the State experiences a shortage of educators), principals, or other school leaders, for—</p> <p>(I) individuals with a baccalaureate or master’s degree, or other advanced degree;</p> <p>(II) mid-career professionals from other occupations;</p> <p>(III) paraprofessionals;</p> <p>(IV) former military personnel; and</p> <p>(V) recent graduates of institutions of higher education with records of academic distinction who demonstrate the potential to become effective teachers, principals, or other school leaders.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$ _____</p>
<p>(e) Developing, improving, and implementing mechanisms to assist local educational agencies and schools in effectively recruiting and retaining teachers, principals, or other school leaders who are effective in improving student academic achievement, including effective teachers from underrepresented minority groups and teachers with disabilities, such as through—</p> <p>(I) opportunities for effective teachers to lead evidence-based (to the extent the State determines that such evidence is reasonably available) professional development for the peers of such effective teachers; and</p> <p>(II) providing training and support for teacher leaders and principals or other school leaders who are recruited as part of instructional leadership teams.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">(I): \$ _____</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(II): \$ _____</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(III): \$ _____</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Total:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">\$ _____</p>
<p>(f) Fulfilling the State educational agency’s (SEA’s) responsibilities concerning proper and efficient administration and monitoring of the programs carried out under this part, including provision of technical assistance to local educational agencies.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$ _____</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Activity</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Please note: States are not required to fund every activity listed</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Title II, Part A funds</p>
<p>(g) Developing, or assisting local educational agencies in developing—</p> <p>(I) career opportunities and advancement initiatives that promote professional growth and emphasize multiple career paths, such as instructional coaching and mentoring (including hybrid roles that allow instructional coaching and mentoring while remaining in the classroom), school leadership, and involvement with school improvement and support;</p> <p>(II) strategies that provide differential pay, or other incentives, to recruit and retain teachers in high-need academic subjects and teachers, principals, or other school leaders, in low-income schools and school districts, which may include performance-based pay systems; and</p> <p>(III) new teacher, principal, or other school leader induction and mentoring programs that are, to the extent the State determines that such evidence is reasonably available, evidence-based, and designed to—</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(aa) improve classroom instruction and student learning and achievement, including through improving school leadership programs; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(bb) increase the retention of effective teachers, principals, or other school leaders.</p>	<p>(I): \$ _____</p> <p>(II): \$ _____</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(III-aa): \$ _____</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(III-bb): \$ _____</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Total: \$ _____</p>
<p>(h) Providing assistance to local educational agencies for the development and implementation of high-quality professional development programs for principals that enable the principals to be effective and prepare all students to meet the challenging State academic standards.</p>	<p>\$ _____</p>
<p>(i) Supporting efforts to train teachers, principals, or other school leaders to effectively integrate technology into curricula and instruction, which may include training to assist teachers in implementing blended learning (as defined in section 4102(1) of the ESEA) projects.</p>	<p>\$ _____</p>
<p>(j) Providing training, technical assistance, and capacity building to local educational agencies that receive a subgrant under Title II, Part A.</p>	<p>\$ _____</p>
<p>(k) Reforming or improving teacher, principal, or other school leader preparation programs, such as through establishing teacher residency programs and school leader residency programs.</p>	<p>\$ _____</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Activity</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Please note: States are not required to fund every activity listed</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Title II, Part A funds</p>
<p>(l) Establishing or expanding teacher, principal, or other school leader preparation academies, with an amount of the funds reserved for State activities that is not more than 2 percent of the State’s allotment, if—</p> <p>(I) allowable under State law;</p> <p>(II) the State enables candidates attending a teacher, principal, or other school leader preparation academy to be eligible for State financial aid to the same extent as participants in other State approved teacher or principal preparation programs, including alternative certification, licensure, or credential programs; and</p> <p>(III) the State enables teachers, principals, or other school leaders who are teaching or working while on alternative certificates, licenses, or credentials to teach or work in the State while enrolled in a teacher, principal, or other school leader preparation academy.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">\$ _____</p>
<p>(m) Supporting the instructional services provided by effective school library programs.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">\$ _____</p>
<p>(n) Developing, or assisting local educational agencies in developing, strategies that provide teachers, principals, or other school leaders with the skills, credentials, or certifications needed to educate all students in postsecondary education coursework through early college high school or dual or concurrent enrollment programs.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">\$ _____</p>
<p>(o) Providing training for all school personnel, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel, and paraprofessionals, regarding how to prevent and recognize child sexual abuse.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">\$ _____</p>
<p>(p) Supporting opportunities for principals, other school leaders, teachers, paraprofessionals, early childhood education program directors, and other early childhood education program providers to participate in joint efforts to address the transition to elementary school, including issues related to school readiness.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">\$ _____</p>
<p>(q) Developing and providing professional development and other comprehensive systems of support for teachers, principals, or other school leaders to promote high-quality instruction and instructional leadership in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics subjects, including computer science.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">\$ _____</p>
<p>(r) Supporting the professional development and improving the instructional strategies of teachers, principals, or other school leaders to integrate career and technical education content into academic instructional practices, which may include training on best practices to understand State and regional workforce needs and transitions to postsecondary education and the workforce.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">\$ _____</p>

Activity Please note: States are not required to fund every activity listed	Title II, Part A funds
(s) Working with other States, as a consortium, to voluntarily develop a process that allows teachers who are licensed or certified in a participating State to teach in other participating States without completing additional licensure or certification requirements.	\$ _____
(t) Supporting and developing efforts to train teachers on the appropriate use of student data to ensure that individual student privacy is protected as required by 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 in accordance with State student privacy laws and local educational agency student privacy and technology use policies.	\$ _____
(u) Supporting other activities identified by the State that are, to the extent the State determines that such evidence is reasonably available, evidence-based and that meet the purpose of Title II of the ESEA.	\$ _____

Set aside question

Under Section 2101(c)(3), SEAs are allowed to reserve up to 3 percent of the amount reserved for subgrants to LEAs for activities for principals or other school leaders (in addition to the funds reserved for state activities under Section 2101(c)(4)(A)). Did your state reserve additional funds under Section 2101(c)(3) for activities for principals and other school leaders?

- Yes**
- No**

If you selected “Yes,” what percentage of those funds were reserved for those activities? ___ percent

In addition, please provide a description of the activities funded by the reserved funds: [Text answer]

Question 2: Please identify the areas in which your State allocated Federal FY 2019 Title II, Part A State activities funds.

Developing and supporting school principals and other school leaders

What amount of Title II, Part A State activities funds have been allocated towards the activities described above? \$ _____

Please provide a brief description of how Title II, Part A state activities funds were used for developing and supporting principals and school leaders:

Ensuring equitable access to teachers for low-income and minority students

What amount of Title II, Part A State activities funds have been allocated towards the activities described above? \$ _____

Please provide a brief description of how Title II, Part A state activities funds were used for ensuring equitable access to teachers for low-income and minority students:

Preparing, developing, and retaining teacher leaders

What amount of Title II, Part A State activities funds have been allocated towards the activities described above? \$ _____

Please provide a brief description of how Title II, Part A state activities funds were used for preparing, developing, and retaining teacher leaders:

Creating supportive school climates

What amount of Title II, Part A State activities funds have been allocated towards the activities described above? \$ _____

Please provide a brief description of how Title II, Part A state activities funds were used for creating supportive school climates:

Developing, implementing, or supporting educator evaluation systems

What amount of Title II, Part A State activities funds have been allocated towards the activities described above? \$ _____

Please provide a brief description of how Title II, Part A state activities funds were used for developing, implementing, or supporting educator evaluation systems:

Preparing educators to implement new college- and career-ready standards

What amount of Title II, Part A State activities funds have been allocated towards the activities described above? \$ _____

Please provide a brief description of how Title II, Part A state activities funds were used for preparing educators to implement new college- and career-ready standards:

Impact of Activities

Does your state evaluate the impact of some or all of activities supported with Title II, Part A funds?

Yes

No

If you selected "Yes," please provide a description of how you evaluate the impact of Title II, Part A funds below:

Upload study

If you selected "Yes," please upload any evaluation documents or reports that address the impact of Title II, Part A funds using the upload button below:

Question 3: SEA employees paid with Title II, Part A State activities and/or administrative funds

Provide the number of SEA employees whose salaries are fully funded by Title II, Part A State activities and/or administrative funds, and the number of SEA employees whose salaries are partially funded by Title II, Part A State activities funds and/or administrative funds. Please count numbers of **people** paid, not FTEs paid.

Fully funded	Partially funded
_____	_____

How many FTEs are accounted for in the previous chart?

Question 4: Did your State use Title II, Part A funds to implement a teacher, principal, or other school leader evaluation and support system consistent with Section 2101(c)(4)(B)(ii) in school year (SY) 2018-19?

Yes If you checked “yes,” please provide SY 2018-19 evaluation results for teachers, principals, or other school leaders in your State. Enter whole numbers, not percentages, of teachers, principals, or other school leaders in each category.

No

	Teachers	Principals	Other school leaders
Total			

Category	Teachers	Principals	Other school leaders
Not rated			
Ineffective			
[insert category]			
[insert category]			
[insert category]			

Question 5: Does your State collect data on the SY 2018-19 annual retention rate of effective and ineffective teachers, principals, and other school leaders, using any methods or criteria the State has or developed under Section 1111(g)(2)(A)?

Please note, nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require any SEA or LEA to collect and report any data the SEA or LEA was not collecting or reporting as of the day before the date of enactment of the ESSA.

Yes If you checked “yes,” please complete the table below by providing the number of teachers, principals, or other school leaders retained in each category in SY 2018-19.

No

	Teachers	Principals	Other school leaders
Total			

Category	Teachers	Principals	Other school leaders
Not rated			
Ineffective			
[insert category]			
[insert category]			
[insert category]			
[insert category]			

LEA Survey

Study of Title II-A Use of Funds:

District Survey

2019–20



The **Study of Title II-A Use of Funds** is examining how states and districts are using their Title II, Part A funds provided through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The study includes surveys of officials from all state education agencies and from a representative sample of school district officials from each state. The purpose of this survey is for the U.S. Department of Education to gain a better understanding of how school districts are using their Title II, Part A funds. The United States (U.S.) Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences (IES) is sponsoring this study.

The study, including this survey, is being conducted by Westat.

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 120 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit (Education Department General Administrative Regulations, Sections 75.591 and 75.592). Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0618. Note: Please do not return the completed survey to this address.

Notice of Confidentiality

Information collected for this study comes under the confidentiality and data protection requirements of the Institute of Education Sciences (The Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, Title I, Part E, Section 183). Responses to this data collection will be used only for statistical purposes. The reports prepared for the study will summarize findings across the sample and will not associate responses with a specific district or individual. We will not provide information that identifies you or your district to anyone outside the study team, except as required by law.

Survey on the Use of Funds Under Title II, Part A

Supporting Effective Instruction Grants – Subgrants to Districts

District: [DISTRICT NAME]
State: [ST]
NCES ID: [NCES ID]

Instructions

Answer each question and click the "Save" button or the "Save and Mark as Complete" button. When you click the "Save" button, the responses you entered will be saved without navigating you away from the page. The "Save and Mark as Complete" button will check your responses for potential errors, and, if there are none, navigate you back to the List of Survey Questions. You may return to any section by clicking "List of Survey Questions" at the top of the screen. You may enter or change answers to questions any time prior to submission, even if a question is marked as complete.

You do not have to complete the survey all at once. You may return at a later time to complete the survey.

To fill out this survey, it will be useful to access your district's Title II, Part A financial data. In addition, you will need access to the total amount spent on professional development across all funding sources.

Please refer to the table below to determine the questions you should complete. All districts should complete Question 1 before completing the remaining questions, as the applicability of Questions 2-12 depend on your response to Question 1.

Contact information	All districts
Section 1	All districts
Section 2	Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2019–20
Section 3	Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2019–20
Section 4	Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2019–20
Section 5	Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2019–20
Section 6	Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2019–20
Section 7	Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2019–20
Section 8	Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2019–20
Section 9	Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2019–20
Section 10	Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2019–20
Section 11	All districts

Section 12

Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2019–20
and that have used strategies to address inequities

Once you have completed and marked all sections as complete, please be sure to click on the “Submit Completed Survey” button.

For assistance, please call 1-855-817-1704 or send an e-mail to title2afunds@westat.com.

Contact information

Please provide the following contact information for the individual completing the survey.

First Name: _____
Last Name: _____
Position: _____
Phone: _____
E-mail: _____

Section 1: Title II, Part A funding in SY 2019–20

1. Did your district receive Title II, Part A funding in school year 2019–20?

- Yes** If you selected “yes,” **continue to Section 2.**
- No** If you selected “no,” you do not need to complete this survey. **[Ineligible for survey]**

Section 2: Transfers to and from Title II, Part A

2a. Your State Education Agency (SEA) provided the amount of Federal FY 2019 Title II, Part A funds made available to your district in SY (2019–20).

This does not include carryover funds. If this allocation is incorrect, please contact Westat at Title2afunds@westat.com.

2b. Please provide the amount of Federal FY 2019 funds transferred from Title II, Part A. **Do not include carryover funds.**

Title II, Part A funds transferred to Title I, Part A	\$ _____
Title II, Part A funds transferred to Title I, Part C	\$ _____
Title II, Part A funds transferred to Title I, Part D	\$ _____
Title II, Part A funds transferred to Title III, Part A	\$ _____
Title II, Part A funds transferred to Title IV, Part A	\$ _____
Title II, Part A funds transferred to Title V, Part B	\$ _____

Total amount of Title II, Part A funds transferred to another program under ESEA funding transferability provisions (ESEA section 5103)

\$ _____

2c. Provide the total amount of FY 2019 funds transferred to Title II, Part A from another Federal program. **Do not include carryover funds.**

\$ _____

Total amount of Title II, Part A funds available to your district in SY 2019-20 after transfers:

\$ _____

>> [If total funds available after transfers=0, then go to Section 11. Otherwise, continue to Section 3]

Section 3: Allocation of Title II, Part A funds

For reference, in Section 2 you answered that the total amount of Title II, Part A funds available to your district in SY 2019–20 AFTER TRANSFERS was: \$xxx,xxx.xx

3a. Please provide the amount of Title II, Part A funds available to your district in SY 2019–20, after transfers, allocated for the following activities. **Do not include carryover funds.** You can estimate if you do not have exact figures. *Note: Please include any funds used for services in private schools in the categories for which funds were allocated.*

Hiring, recruiting, and retaining effective teachers, principals, and other leaders (such as support with screening candidates and early hiring, recruiting individuals from other fields, differential and incentive pay, leadership opportunities and multiple pathways for teachers, induction or new educator mentoring programs, or improving school working conditions) \$ _____

Evaluation systems (such as designing or revising systems, helping teachers and leaders to understand the system, help with using the results for high stakes decisions, or guiding professional development planning) \$ _____

Class size reduction \$ _____

Professional development (such as in–service seminars, coaching, or support for professional learning communities) \$ _____

Other \$ _____

Total amount of SY 2019–20 Title II, Part A funds allocated: \$ _____

3b. In the table below, please provide the percentage of all Title II, Part A funds used in your district in SY 2019–20 to support teachers and the percentage of funds allocated to support principals and other leaders.

Teachers	Principals
_____ %	_____ %

>> [If no funds reported for “hiring, recruiting, and retaining,” skip Section 4.
 If no funds reported for “class size reduction,” skip Section 5.
 If no funds reported for “professional development,” skip Sections 6 through 10.]

Section 4: Strategies to hire, recruit, or retain effective teachers and leaders

4. Using Title II, Part A funds, what strategies has your district used or will your district use to hire, recruit, and retain effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders? Also, please check the top two strategies based on the amount of funding allocated.

[Question only applies if, at question 3, allocated Title II, Part A funds for Hiring, recruiting, and retaining effective teachers, principals, and other leaders.]

Strategy	Check all that apply	Check top two strategies
a) Support with screening candidates and early hiring for teachers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b) Recruiting individuals from other fields to become teachers or leaders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c) Differential and incentive pay of teachers and leaders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d) Emphasis on leadership opportunities and multiple career pathways for teachers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e) Induction or new teacher and leader mentoring programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f) Targeting and tailoring professional development to individual teacher or leader needs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g) Feedback mechanisms to improve school working conditions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h) Other (describe: _____)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section 5: Class size reduction

- 5a. During SY 2019–20, how many teachers have salaries funded, in part or in whole, by Title II, Part A funds for the purpose of class size reduction?

[Question only applies if, at question 3, allocated Title II, Part A funds for class size reduction.]

Type of teacher	Fully-funded (number)	Partially- funded (number)	Total funded (number)
Full-time teachers	_____	_____	_____
Part-time teachers	_____	_____	_____

- 5b. During SY 2019–20, in total, how many full-time equivalents (FTEs) are funded by Title II, Part A for the purpose of class size reduction?
For example, an FTE of 1.00 means that the person is equivalent to a full-time worker, while an FTE of 0.50 means that the worker is only half-time. Two teachers working half-time each would each be .50 FTE for a total of 1.0 FTE, but would be reported as two teachers for the total funded number.

Type of teacher	Total funded (FTEs)
Full-time teachers	_____
Part-time teachers	_____

Section 6: Teachers participating in professional development

6. Please provide the total count of teachers in your district in SY 2019-20, and the proportion of teachers in your district that you have or intend to use Title II, Part A funds to provide professional development activities in SY 2019–20.

[Question only applies if, at question 3, allocated Title II, Part A funds for professional development.]

Total number of teachers in your district in SY 2019–20 _____

Proportion of teachers that you have or intend to use Title II, Part A funds to provide professional development activities in SY 2019–20

- Almost all (75% or more)**
- Most (50% to less than 75%)**
- Some (25% to less than 50%)**
- Few (Less than 25%)**

Section 7: Types of professional development for teachers

7. Please complete the table below regarding all teacher professional development provided during SY 2019–20 (at least *in part* funded by Title II, Part A including planned professional development). Which of the following types of professional development and support to teachers is your district providing during SY 2019–20? Also, please check the top two types based on the amount of funding allocated to each method.

[Question only applies if, at question 3, allocated Title II, Part A funds for professional development.]

Types of teacher professional development (at least <i>in part</i> funded by Title II, Part A)	Check all that apply	Check top two types
a) Short-term (3 days or less) single-session professional development, conducted by an external provider	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b) Short-term (3 days or less) single-session professional development, conducted by district or school-level staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c) Longer-term (4 or more days) professional development with connected content, conducted by an external provider or coach	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d) Longer-term (4 or more days) professional development with connected content, conducted by district or school-level staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e) Longer-term (4 or more days) one-on-one support from teacher leaders or coaches	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f) Longer-term (4 or more days) Internet-based professional development (e.g., video library, skill-building modules, online coaching)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g) Longer-term (4 or more days) group support (e.g., lesson study, peer-to-peer communities of practice)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h) Professional conferences or organizations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i) University or college courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j) Professional certifications (e.g. NBPTS certification, state-level credentials or endorsements)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k) Other (describe: _____)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section 8: Topics of professional development for teachers

8. Please complete the table below regarding all teacher professional development provided during SY 2019–20 (at least *in part* funded by Title II, Part A including planned professional development). Which of the following topics are covered by teacher professional development in your district in SY 2019–20? Also, please check the top two topics based on the amount of funding allocated to each topic.

[Question only applies if, at question 3, allocated Title II, Part A funds for professional development.]

Teacher Professional Development Topic (at least <i>in part</i> funded by Title II, Part A)	Check all that apply	Check top two topics
a) Teacher content knowledge in ELA	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b) Teacher content knowledge in STEM (science, technology, engineering, mathematics, or computer science)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c) Teacher content knowledge in subjects other than ELA or STEM	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d) Instructional strategies for academic subjects	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e) Instructional strategies for classroom management or student behavior management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f) Using data and assessments to guide instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g) Providing instruction and academic support to English learners	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h) Providing instruction and academic support to students with disabilities or developmental delays	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i) Identifying gifted and talented students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j) Understanding state content standards and instructional strategies to meet them	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k) Understanding teacher evaluation systems and resulting feedback	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
l) Engaging parents and families	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
m) Using technology	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
n) Integrating academic content, career and technical education, and work-based learning (as appropriate)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
o) Offering joint professional learning and planning activities that address transition from early childhood to elementary school	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
p) Identifying students with referral needs (such as sexual abuse, mental health issues, drug or alcohol abuse)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
q) Other (describe: : _____)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section 9: Types of professional development for principals and other school leaders

9. Please complete the table below regarding all principal and other school leaders professional development provided during SY 2019–20 (at least in part funded by Title II, Part A including planned professional development). Which of the following types of professional development and support to principals and other school leaders is your district providing during SY 2019–20? Also, please check the top two types based on the amount of funding allocated to each method.

[Question only applies if, at question 3, allocated Title II, Part A funds for professional development.]

Types of principal and other school leaders professional development (at least <i>in part</i> funded by Title II, Part A)	Check all that apply	Check top two types
a) Short-term (3 or less days) professional development, conducted either by external provider or district-level staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b) Longer-term (4 or more days) group professional development, conducted by district-level staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c) Longer-term (4 or more days) group professional development, conducted by an external provider	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d) Longer-term (4 or more days) one-on-one professional development, conducted by district-level staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e) Longer-term (4 or more days) one-on-one professional development, conducted by an external provider	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f) Longer-term (4 or more days) group support (e.g., learning communities, district monthly or quarterly principal meetings)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g) Professional conferences or organizations, external to the district or state	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h) University or college courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i) State leadership conferences or trainings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j) Leadership certifications (e.g., state-level credentials or endorsements)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k) Other (describe: _____)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section 10: Topics of professional development for principals and other school leaders

10. Please complete the table below regarding all principal and other school leader professional development provided during SY 2019–20 (at least *in part* funded by Title II, Part A including planned professional development). Which of the following topics are covered by principal and other school leader professional development in your district in SY 2019–20? Please check the top two topics based on the amount of funding allocated to each topic.

[Question only applies if, at question, 3 allocated Title II, Part A funds for professional development.]

Principal and Other School Leader Professional Development Topic (at least <i>in part</i> funded by Title II, Part A)	Check all that apply	Check top two topics
a) School improvement planning or identifying interventions to support academic improvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b) Strategies and practices to advance organizational development (e.g., a focus on setting a shared school mission; creating a safe and respectful environment for learning; improving school climate and culture; fostering communication and collaboration among teachers and parents; distributing leadership responsibilities; ensuring efficient use of available funding and instructional time; and deploying resources aligned with strategic goals)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c) Strategies and practices to help teachers improve instruction (e.g., performance data use, teacher evaluation, feedback and coaching on instruction, instructional planning support, curriculum materials selection, and curriculum alignment with state standards)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d) Strategies and practices to develop and manage the school’s workforce (e.g., a focus on recruiting, hiring, and retaining effective teachers; selecting professional development tailored to teachers’ needs; effectively assigning teacher talent to students; and establishing pathways for developing teacher leaders and assistant principals as instructional leaders)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e) Strategies to engage parents and the community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f) Other (describe: _____)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section 11: Teacher Quality/Effectiveness and Equity

11a. Has your district examined information about the distribution of teacher quality or effectiveness to assess whether low-income or minority students were served at disproportionate rates by inexperienced, ineffective, or out-of-field teachers?

- Yes, and inequities were found**

If you selected “yes,” complete the remainder of this question below.
- Yes, but no inequities were found**

If you selected “yes,” complete the remainder of this question below.
- No**

If you selected “no,” click on “Save and Mark as Complete” and **continue to Section 12.**

11b. Which of the following types of information were used to define teacher quality or effectiveness in the examination of the distribution of teachers? Check all that apply.

Type of information used to define teacher quality	Check all that apply
a) Teacher evaluation ratings	<input type="radio"/>
b) Teacher effectiveness, as measured by value-added measures or student growth percentiles	<input type="radio"/>
c) Teacher effectiveness, as measured by student learning objectives or student growth objectives	<input type="radio"/>
d) Teacher experience	<input type="radio"/>
e) Teacher certification	<input type="radio"/>
f) Teacher education	<input type="radio"/>
g) Assignment of teachers to a grade or classes consistent with their field of certification	<input type="radio"/>
h) Other (describe: _____)	<input type="radio"/>

>> [If total funds available after transfers=0 in Section 2, skip Section 12]

Section 12: Strategies used to improve equitable access

12a. During SY 2019–20, has or will your district use Title II, Part A funds to improve within-district equity in the distribution of teachers?

- Yes** If you selected “yes,” complete the remainder of this question below.
- No** If you selected “no,” click on “Save and Mark as Complete”.

12b. What strategies has your district used or will your district use to address any substantial inequities found in equitable access to effective teachers for low-income and minority students? Check all that apply.

Strategy to address inequities	Check all that apply
a) Offering more compensation for qualified or effective teachers who move to or stay in schools with lower levels of teacher quality or effectiveness compared to other schools	<input type="radio"/>
b) Developing career ladders or teacher leadership roles to attract and retain teachers in schools with lower quality/less effective teachers	<input type="radio"/>
c) Beginning the hiring process earlier for vacancies at schools with lower levels of teacher quality or effectiveness compared to other schools	<input type="radio"/>
d) Increasing external recruitment activities such as hosting open houses and job fairs for schools with lower levels of teacher quality or effectiveness compared to other schools	<input type="radio"/>
e) Improving teaching and learning environments (e.g., lower teaching loads, more resources, or improved facility quality) at schools with lower levels of teacher quality or effectiveness compared to other schools	<input type="radio"/>
f) Offering more professional development for teachers in schools with lower levels of teacher quality or effectiveness compared to other schools	<input type="radio"/>
g) Limiting the ability of teachers who are inexperienced or low performing to transfer to or be placed in schools with lower levels of teacher quality or effectiveness compared to other schools	<input type="radio"/>
h) Making exceptions in contracts or regulations to protect the most qualified or effective teachers from layoff in schools with lower levels of teacher quality or effectiveness compared to other schools	<input type="radio"/>
i) Other (describe: _____)	<input type="radio"/>