

State and District Use of Title II, Part A Funds in 2018-19

2021-006a
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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



U.S. Department of Education

Philip Rosenfelt
Acting Secretary

Institute of Education Sciences

Mark Schneider
Director

National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance

Matthew Soldner
Commissioner

Stephanie Stullich
Project Officer

FEBRUARY 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 2018-19* (NCEE 2021-006a). 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 2018-19

February 2021

Eric Isenberg

Ann Webber

Westat

Contents

Appendix A. Methodology	A-1
1. District and State Surveys	A-2
2. Sample Design	A-2
3. Survey Response Rates and Weighting	A-5
4. Statistical Tests.....	A-7
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
District Survey	E-15

Appendix A Exhibits

Exhibit A.1. Frame size and sample allocation for traditional public school districts	A-4
Exhibit A.2. Sample size and response rates	A-5
Exhibit A.3. Sample size and response rates for district survey, by state	A-6

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.	Share of funds that districts transferred between Title II-A and other ESEA programs, in districts that transferred funds	B-7
Exhibit B.8.	District use of funding transferability, by district characteristics	B-8
Exhibit B.9.	District use of Title II-A funds	B-9
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.	Percentage 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-6
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-7
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

Methodology

1. 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 (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 2019, 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.

2. Sample Design

The respondent universe consisted of two subpopulations of LEAs: traditional school districts¹ and charter school districts.² A list sampling frame was generated from the 2016-17 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

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.

national and state levels, and to produce estimates that are representative of charter school districts at the national level. The sample included 4,921 traditional school districts, representing each of 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and a nationally representative sample of 568 charter school districts. Expecting a minimum response rate of 80 percent, the survey design aimed to achieve a target sample of 3,937 respondent traditional school districts and 454 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 2017 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 2016-17 NCES CCD Public Elementary and Secondary Agency Universe File.

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 strata⁵). 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 2016-17 NCES CCD data.

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.

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 target sample size of at least 120 districts had eight strata, and states with a target sample size of between 60 and 120 districts had four strata.

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

State	Frame size	Field sample size	Number of strata
Alabama	132	94	4
Alaska	53	53	1
Arizona	224	114	4
Arkansas	235	117	4
California	995	152	8
Colorado	178	105	4
Connecticut	169	105	4
Delaware	19	19	1
District of Columbia	1	1	1
Florida	70	67	4
Georgia	180	105	4
Hawaii	1	1	1
Idaho	114	88	4
Illinois	855	149	8
Indiana	291	123	8
Iowa	338	127	8
Kansas	286	124	8
Kentucky	173	105	4
Louisiana	69	69	4
Maine	239	117	4
Maryland	24	24	1
Massachusetts	238	117	4
Michigan	542	140	8
Minnesota	330	129	8
Mississippi	146	97	4
Missouri	520	138	8
Montana	408	133	8
Nebraska	245	117	4
Nevada	18	18	1
New Hampshire	177	104	4
New Jersey	546	141	8
New Mexico	89	76	4
New York	689	131	8
North Carolina	115	88	4
North Dakota	175	104	4
Ohio	614	143	8
Oklahoma	517	138	8
Oregon	181	105	4
Pennsylvania	500	138	8
Puerto Rico	1	1	1
Rhode Island	32	32	1
South Carolina	84	72	4
South Dakota	151	100	4
Tennessee	146	98	4
Texas	1,024	152	8
Utah	41	41	1
Vermont	56	56	1
Virginia	130	92	4
Washington	298	124	8
West Virginia	55	55	1
Wisconsin	422	134	8
Wyoming	48	48	1
Total	13,284	4,921	NA

NA = Not applicable

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 568 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.

3. Survey Response Rates and Weighting

Surveys were fielded in spring and summer of 2019. All states responded to the SEA survey. For the district survey, 93 percent of sampled traditional school districts (4,460) and 92 percent of sampled charter school districts (455) responded to the survey, for an overall response rate of 93 percent (4,915) (Exhibit A.2).⁸ Within each state, the response rate for districts ranged from 81 percent to 100 percent (Exhibit A.3).

Exhibit A.2. Sample size and response rates

Type of district	Sample size	Number eligible	Number of respondents	Response rate
Traditional school districts	4,921	4,810	4,460	93%
Charter school districts	568	495	455	92%
Total	5,489	5,305	4,915	93%

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

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.

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.

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	5,489	5,305	4,915	93%
Alabama	94	94	93	99%
Alaska	53	50	42	84%
Arizona	190	156	130	83%
Arkansas	121	121	118	98%
California	157	155	129	83%
Colorado	106	105	95	90%
Connecticut	108	104	94	90%
Delaware	26	25	24	96%
District of Columbia	12	11	9	82%
Florida	67	67	65	97%
Georgia	110	109	106	97%
Hawaii	1	1	1	100%
Idaho	96	94	86	91%
Illinois	151	149	138	93%
Indiana	139	137	131	96%
Iowa	127	127	119	94%
Kansas	124	122	108	89%
Kentucky	105	104	99	95%
Louisiana	89	84	83	99%
Maine	120	107	100	93%
Maryland	24	24	22	92%
Massachusetts	132	130	121	93%
Michigan	204	202	199	99%
Minnesota	151	150	143	95%
Mississippi	97	95	94	99%
Missouri	148	147	138	94%
Montana	133	122	110	90%
Nebraska	117	109	101	93%
Nevada	18	16	15	94%
New Hampshire	104	100	95	95%
New Jersey	157	153	142	93%
New Mexico	87	82	72	88%
New York	185	184	155	84%
North Carolina	123	115	100	87%
North Dakota	104	96	86	90%
Ohio	195	184	164	89%
Oklahoma	151	148	139	94%
Oregon	107	101	90	89%
Pennsylvania	180	177	168	95%
Puerto Rico	1	1	1	100%
Rhode Island	36	36	34	94%
South Carolina	72	71	69	97%
South Dakota	100	83	74	89%
Tennessee	98	98	95	97%
Texas	189	185	175	95%
Utah	67	67	66	99%
Vermont	56	52	42	81%
Virginia	92	92	89	97%
Washington	124	122	114	93%
West Virginia	55	55	53	96%
Wisconsin	138	138	134	97%
Wyoming	48	48	45	94%

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

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.

4. 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.

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.

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	\$101,608,882	\$222,235	\$21,353,724	\$2,303,652
Alabama	\$1,645,676			
Alaska	\$489,497		\$270,643	
Arizona	\$1,771,082			
Arkansas	\$998,928		\$515,487	
California	\$12,040,218			\$521,000
Colorado	\$1,168,015			
Connecticut	\$923,942			
Delaware	\$489,497			
District of Columbia	\$489,497			
Florida	\$4,843,670			
Georgia	\$2,886,883			
Hawaii	\$489,497			
Idaho	\$489,497		\$270,643	
Illinois	\$4,066,256			
Indiana	\$1,794,516		\$992,188	
Iowa	\$789,720	\$160,000	\$436,636	
Kansas	\$799,653			
Kentucky	\$1,594,806			
Louisiana	\$2,102,768			\$1,199,718
Maine	\$489,497			
Maryland	\$1,459,775		\$753,303	
Massachusetts	\$1,774,815		\$981,295	
Michigan	\$3,840,204		\$212,325	
Minnesota	\$1,366,280		\$755,416	
Mississippi	\$892,408		\$970,753	
Missouri	\$1,755,747			
Montana	\$489,497			
Nebraska	\$499,386			
Nevada	\$587,359		\$303,101	
New Hampshire	\$489,497			
New Jersey	\$2,302,295			
New Mexico	\$816,691		\$451,549	
New York	\$7,868,030		\$4,350,234	
North Carolina	\$2,432,333			
North Dakota	\$605,497			\$116,000
Ohio	\$3,757,091		\$2,077,296	
Oklahoma	\$1,687,176			\$466,934
Oregon	\$991,229			
Pennsylvania	\$4,022,373			
Rhode Island	\$489,497			
South Carolina	\$1,350,493		\$746,688	
South Dakota	\$489,497			
Tennessee	\$1,824,130		\$1,008,562	
Texas	\$8,843,884		\$4,889,784	
Utah	\$692,567		\$255,281	
Vermont	\$489,497			
Virginia	\$1,859,777			
Washington	\$1,664,431			
West Virginia	\$816,192	\$62,235		
Wisconsin	\$1,631,457		\$841,898	
Wyoming	\$489,497		\$270,643	
Puerto Rico	\$2,967,165			

Source: 2018-19 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	\$21,353,724	2.7%
Alaska	\$270,643	3.0%
Arkansas	\$515,487	2.8%
Idaho	\$270,643	3.0%
Indiana	\$992,188	3.0%
Iowa	\$436,636	3.0%
Maryland	\$753,303	2.8%
Massachusetts	\$981,295	3.0%
Michigan	\$212,325	0.3%
Minnesota	\$755,416	3.0%
Missouri	\$970,753	3.0%
Nevada	\$303,101	2.8%
New Mexico	\$451,549	3.0%
New York	\$4,350,234	3.0%
Ohio	\$2,077,296	3.0%
South Carolina	\$746,688	3.0%
Tennessee	\$1,008,562	3.0%
Texas	\$4,889,784	3.0%
Utah	\$255,281	2.0%
Wisconsin	\$841,898	2.8%
Wyoming	\$270,643	3.0%

Source: 2018-19 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	\$11,519,218	\$521,000	\$12,040,218	5%
Louisiana	\$903,050	\$1,199,718	\$2,102,768	133%
North Dakota	\$489,497	\$116,000	\$605,497	24%
Oklahoma	\$1,220,242	\$466,934	\$1,687,176	38%

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: 2018-19 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	21.5%	\$118,327,819	6.2%
Title I, Part C	<0.0%	\$157,429	<0.0%
Title I, Part D	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
Title III, Part A	0.1%	\$207,943	<0.0%
Title IV, Part A	1.0%	\$3,929,362	0.2%
Title V, Part B	1.1%	\$2,646,798	0.1%
Funds transferred from Title II-A to any other programs	23.4%	\$125,269,350	6.6%
Funds transferred to Title II-A from any other programs	6.3%	\$46,593,675	2.5%
Number of districts	15,688		
Number of districts (unweighted)	4,915		

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: 2018-19 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	22
Transferring funds to Title II, Part A from other programs only	5
Transferring funds both to Title II, Part A and from Title II, Part A	1
Not transferring funds	71
Number of districts	15,688
Number of districts (unweighted)	4,915

Source: 2018-19 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	23	6
Alabama	2	2
Alaska	31	7
Arizona	11	9
Arkansas	50	8
California	3	4
Colorado	16	6
Connecticut	9	0
Delaware	28	32
District of Columbia	40	0
Florida	1	0
Georgia	20	1
Hawaii	0	100
Idaho	13	1
Illinois	23	13
Indiana	2	0
Iowa	9	1
Kansas	21	7
Kentucky	24	1
Louisiana	19	1
Maine	33	20
Maryland	0	0
Massachusetts	7	10
Michigan	49	9
Minnesota	9	4
Mississippi	41	1
Missouri	51	12
Montana	64	6
Nebraska	30	6
Nevada	13	0
New Hampshire	5	3
New Jersey	10	7
New Mexico	19	1
New York	15	5
North Carolina	6	0
North Dakota	52	13
Ohio	19	2
Oklahoma	80	3
Oregon	27	4
Pennsylvania	26	10
Rhode Island	4	17
South Carolina	0	20
South Dakota	34	18
Tennessee	17	26
Texas	26	2
Utah	1	0
Vermont	20	15
Virginia	4	6
Washington	18	12
West Virginia	0	11
Wisconsin	1	0
Wyoming	15	7
Puerto Rico	0	0

Source: 2018-19 District survey (N = 15,688 districts, 4,915 unweighted).

Exhibit B.7. 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	17
Net transfers amounted to 51-99 of Title II-A funds	16
Net transfers amounted to 100 or more of Title II-A funds	67
Number of districts	3,555
Number of districts (unweighted)	912
Districts with net transfers <u>to</u> Title II-A	
Net transfers amounted to 0-50 of Title II-A funds	76
Net transfers amounted to 51-99 of Title II-A funds	20
Net transfers amounted to 100 or more of Title II-A funds	4
Number of districts	835
Number of districts (unweighted)	323

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: 2018-19 District survey.

Exhibit B.8. 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)	Estimated number of districts using transfer option	Number of districts (unweighted)
Districts transferring funds <u>from Title II-A to another program</u>	23%	-66%	15,688	4,915
By district enrollment size				
Large districts (more than 10,000 students)	5%	-43%	929	558
Medium districts (2,500 to 10,000 students)	11%	-66%	3,022	1,523
Small districts (less than 2,500 students)	27%*	-78%*	11,738	2,834
By urbanicity				
Urban districts	23%	-58%	2,294	706
Suburban districts	11%	-57%	3,524	1,179
Town districts	15%	-73%	2,605	1,104
Rural districts	31%*	-77%*	7,264	1,926
By type of district				
Traditional districts	22%	-64%	13,156	4,460
Charter school districts	28%*	-79%*	2,532	455
Districts transferring funds <u>to Title II-A from another program</u>	5%	36%	15,688	4,915
By district enrollment size				
Large districts (more than 10,000 students)	8%	37%	929	558
Medium districts (2,500 to 10,000 students)	8%	35%	3,022	1,523
Small districts (less than 2,500 students)	4%*	36%	11,738	2,834
By urbanicity				
Urban districts	6%	39%	2,294	706
Suburban districts	8%	34%	3,524	1,179
Town districts	5%	32%	2,605	1,104
Rural districts	4%*	37%*	7,264	1,926
By type of district				
Traditional districts	6%	36%	13,156	4,460
Charter school districts	4%	33%	2,532	455

* 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: 2018-19 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2016-17.

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)	\$1,043,206,409	80%	58%
Recruiting, hiring, retaining effective educators	\$235,914,316	32%	13%
Class size reduction	\$313,916,925	24%	18%
Evaluation systems	\$35,734,299	10%	2%
Other	\$169,666,910	30%	9%
Any purpose other than PD	\$755,232,449	66%	42%
Number of districts		13,187	
Number of districts (unweighted)		4,334	

Source: 2018-19 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

	All districts	Large	Medium	Small
Participated in professional development	68%	69%	66%	70%*
Number of districts	10,546	872	2,577	7,096
Number of districts (unweighted)	3,606	523	1,311	1,772

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

Source: 2018-19 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2016-17.

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	\$1,043,206,409
Total number of full-time equivalent (FTE) teachers in districts that reported using Title II-A funds for professional development	2,769,013
Average percentage of teachers participating in Title II-A-funded professional development, in districts that reported using Title II-A funds for this purpose	68%
Total number of teachers participating in Title II-A-funded professional development	1,882,929
Average amount per FTE teacher	\$377
Average amount per targeted teacher	\$551

Source: 2018-19 District survey.

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	80	32	24	10	30
Alabama	90	33	74	10	61
Alaska	84	72	12	19	50
Arizona	96	36	0	13	28
Arkansas	71	42	28	9	13
California	76	41	13	3	56
Colorado	85	34	5	4	28
Connecticut	96	25	13	11	35
Delaware	76	48	9	31	58
District of Columbia	78	26	0	0	0
Florida	100	83	8	49	74
Georgia	95	64	5	20	64
Hawaii	100	100	0	100	0
Idaho	94	55	7	23	19
Illinois	91	23	33	6	21
Indiana	72	45	27	4	23
Iowa	28	14	72	1	12
Kansas	73	50	34	3	30
Kentucky	77	55	34	12	30
Louisiana	86	58	12	19	42
Maine	86	10	22	14	27
Maryland	91	92	28	27	91
Massachusetts	91	53	8	15	38
Michigan	90	28	0	12	21
Minnesota	63	10	49	4	14
Mississippi	94	44	2	17	49
Missouri	78	29	32	12	25
Montana	72	33	28	7	14
Nebraska	71	16	26	5	14
Nevada	93	72	0	0	50
New Hampshire	97	24	5	13	29
New Jersey	94	14	11	9	17
New Mexico	88	49	10	13	44
New York	82	27	21	20	36
North Carolina	87	50	23	15	30
North Dakota	73	30	31	8	14
Ohio	65	19	41	5	17
Oklahoma	85	26	6	15	19
Oregon	97	43	4	11	31
Pennsylvania	62	5	53	5	24
Rhode Island	92	29	8	8	23
South Carolina	90	57	58	13	53
South Dakota	41	7	53	6	37
Tennessee	98	40	20	9	51
Texas	77	53	20	10	45
Utah	81	39	6	7	6
Vermont	95	32	5	9	42
Virginia	83	48	58	18	43
Washington	88	34	4	8	43
West Virginia	98	71	9	36	77
Wisconsin	78	24	29	7	17
Wyoming	90	34	25	15	32
Puerto Rico	100	0	100	0	100

Source: 2018-19 District survey (N = 13,187 districts, 4,334 unweighted).

Exhibit B.13. Percentage 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	58	13	17	2	9
Alabama	44	7	41	1	7
Alaska	68	15	5	1	12
Arizona	63	23	0	3	10
Arkansas	51	23	13	10	4
California	70	13	4	1	12
Colorado	79	12	1	1	7
Connecticut	42	20	21	3	14
Delaware	45	6	19	4	26
District of Columbia	54	46	0	0	0
Florida	58	12	10	4	16
Georgia	67	17	2	3	11
Hawaii	62	37	0	1	0
Idaho	74	17	1	4	4
Illinois	61	7	21	1	9
Indiana	65	11	19	1	4
Iowa	23	5	67	2	3
Kansas	59	16	21	0	3
Kentucky	56	15	20	0	9
Louisiana	55	23	9	4	9
Maine	63	4	28	1	3
Maryland	51	28	6	2	13
Massachusetts	51	22	7	3	18
Michigan	81	9	3	2	6
Minnesota	51	9	31	2	6
Mississippi	76	12	0	3	8
Missouri	44	11	33	1	11
Montana	22	3	73	0	2
Nebraska	41	29	23	2	5
Nevada	82	13	0	0	6
New Hampshire	73	9	9	2	8
New Jersey	68	9	13	2	9
New Mexico	36	28	3	1	32
New York	39	8	46	1	5
North Carolina	47	25	18	2	8
North Dakota	50	6	41	1	2
Ohio	52	10	32	1	5
Oklahoma	73	13	4	3	7
Oregon	70	17	1	3	9
Pennsylvania	33	2	58	1	6
Rhode Island	66	17	4	4	9
South Carolina	47	9	36	3	6
South Dakota	35	4	44	1	16
Tennessee	71	9	7	2	11
Texas	53	20	10	2	14
Utah	50	14	31	2	4
Vermont	78	7	2	0	13
Virginia	41	12	37	1	9
Washington	76	8	2	2	11
West Virginia	67	17	2	4	10
Wisconsin	56	17	19	6	3
Wyoming	65	13	10	7	5
Puerto Rico	71	0	19	0	9

Source: 2018-19 District survey (N = 13,187 districts, 4,334 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	96	89	76*	59	59	52*
Recruiting, hiring, retaining effective educators	60	38	28*	14	11	13*
Class size reduction	17	27	23*	14	20	27*
Evaluation systems	23	13	8*	2	2	2
Other	59	39	25*	11	7	6*
Any purpose other than PD	84	71	63*	41	41	48*
Number of districts	909	2,890	9,388			
Number of districts (unweighted)	545	1,457	2,332			

* Percentage of districts differed significantly by size (chi-squared test, $p < 0.05$).
Source: 2018-19 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2016-17.

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	88	88	79	73*	58	63	51	51*
Recruiting, hiring, retaining effective educators	43	31	38	26*	14	12	14	11*
Class size reduction	9	18	34	28*	15	13	26	29*
Evaluation systems	14	11	10	7*	2	2	2	2
Other	29	31	33	29	10	10	7	8*
Any purpose other than PD	60	61	76	68*	42	37	49	49*
Number of districts	1,960	3,354	2,359	5,514				
Number of districts (unweighted)	639	1,129	1,012	1,554				

* Percentage of districts differed significantly by urbanicity (chi-squared test, $p < 0.05$).
Source: 2018-19 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2016-17.

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	79	86*	58	68*
Recruiting, hiring, retaining effective educators	32	31	13	24*
Class size reduction	27	3*	18	3*
Evaluation systems	10	8	2	3
Other	34	12*	10	3*
Any purpose other than PD	70	44	42	32
Number of districts	11,119	2,068		
Number of districts (unweighted)	3,958	376		

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

Source: 2018-19 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2016-17.

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	83	69
Short-term training (3 days or less), single session	80	63
Conducted by external provider	71	47
Conducted by district or school-level staff	60	33
Professional conferences or organizations	59	22
Longer-term training or education	67	53
Longer-term training with connected content (4 or more days)	55	37
Conducted by external provider	41	23
Conducted by district or school-level staff	35	17
One-on-one support from teacher leaders or coaches	38	20
Group support (e.g., lesson study, peer-to-peer communities of practice)	28	8
University or college courses	18	4
Collaborative or job-embedded	46	26
One-on-one support from teacher leaders or coaches	38	20
Group support (e.g., lesson study, peer-to-peer communities of practice)	28	8
Other	34	10
Internet-based professional development (e.g., video library, skill-building modules, online coaching)	18	2
Professional certifications (e.g., national board certification, state-level credentials or endorsements)	17	3
Other	6	5
Number of districts	13,120	13,120
Number of districts (unweighted)	4,324	4,324

Note: Districts were asked to indicate all of the listed types of teacher professional development for which they used Title II-A funds. 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: 2018-19 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	83%	69%	13,120	4,324
Large districts (>10,000 students)	94%	59%	908	545
Medium districts (2,500-10,000 students)	87%	67%	2,882	1,451
Small districts (<2,500 students)	80%*	71%*	9,331	2,328
Traditional districts	82%	69%	11,061	3,950
Charter school districts	84%	69%	2,059	374
Longer-term training or education	67%	53%	13,120	4,324
Large districts (>10,000 students)	93%	78%	908	545
Medium districts (2,500-10,000 students)	82%	65%	2,882	1,451
Small districts (<2,500 students)	60%*	47%*	9,331	2,328
Traditional districts	67%	52%	11,061	3,950
Charter school districts	68%	59%	2,059	374
Collaborative or job-embedded	46%	26%	13,120	4,324
Large districts (>10,000 students)	77%	42%	908	545
Medium districts (2,500-10,000 students)	63%	34%	2,882	1,451
Small districts (<2,500 students)	38%*	21%*	9,331	2,328
Traditional districts	46%	25%	11,061	3,950
Charter school districts	47%	26%	2,059	374

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

Note: Districts were asked to indicate all of the listed types of teacher professional development for which they used Title II-A funds. 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: 2018-19 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2016-17.

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	70	64
Short-term training (3 days or less), conducted by external provider or district-level staff	62	52
Professional conferences or organizations, external to the district or state	48	32
Longer-term training or education	50	44
Longer-term group PD, conducted by an external provider	26	16
Longer-term group PD, conducted by district staff	22	14
Longer-term one-on-one PD, conducted by an external provider	12	5
Longer-term one-on-one PD, conducted by district staff	13	6
Group support (e.g., learning communities, district monthly, or quarterly principal meetings)	22	13
University or college courses	7	2
Collaborative or job-embedded	30	22
Longer-term one-on-one PD, conducted by an external provider	12	5
Longer-term one-on-one PD, conducted by district staff	13	6
Group support (e.g., learning communities, district monthly, or quarterly principal meetings)	22	13
Other	47	28
State leadership conferences or trainings	38	18
Leadership certifications (e.g., state-level credentials or endorsements)	8	3
Other	8	9
Number of districts	13,029	13,029
Number of districts (unweighted)	4,313	4,313

Note: Districts were asked to indicate all of the listed types of principal professional development for which they used Title II-A funds. 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: 2018-19 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	83	67	46	34
Alabama	94	82	60	35
Alaska	81	65	47	28
Arizona	91	76	56	28
Arkansas	83	74	47	44
California	90	67	49	30
Colorado	81	78	67	44
Connecticut	88	69	34	30
Delaware	100	68	59	20
District of Columbia	100	100	100	4
Florida	100	95	95	95
Georgia	90	93	80	67
Hawaii	100	100	100	100
Idaho	94	86	41	54
Illinois	87	63	34	20
Indiana	79	72	48	43
Iowa	52	41	32	16
Kansas	81	62	40	33
Kentucky	85	76	65	48
Louisiana	92	85	66	66
Maine	88	59	40	25
Maryland	87	96	78	47
Massachusetts	90	89	63	34
Michigan	90	72	57	36
Minnesota	67	47	39	26
Mississippi	94	89	73	39
Missouri	82	64	44	37
Montana	85	31	15	19
Nebraska	72	40	33	31
Nevada	92	92	56	29
New Hampshire	91	89	54	32
New Jersey	87	69	31	32
New Mexico	88	70	37	42
New York	73	70	51	33
North Carolina	89	64	48	60
North Dakota	90	62	42	30
Ohio	70	57	39	27
Oklahoma	90	53	37	47
Oregon	95	74	55	39
Pennsylvania	71	49	26	26
Rhode Island	78	78	51	25
South Carolina	88	78	51	41
South Dakota	67	40	16	26
Tennessee	98	68	59	39
Texas	79	69	43	33
Utah	85	81	51	37
Vermont	92	97	85	31
Virginia	83	80	54	60
Washington	85	86	74	44
West Virginia	98	93	81	58
Wisconsin	84	68	40	31
Wyoming	92	85	54	28
Puerto Rico	100	100	0	100

Source: 2018-19 District survey (N = 13,120 districts, 4,324 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	70	50	30	47
Alabama	87	76	55	79
Alaska	81	59	44	56
Arizona	62	45	28	44
Arkansas	73	68	44	63
California	78	63	33	35
Colorado	53	77	61	32
Connecticut	79	48	26	37
Delaware	77	44	21	61
District of Columbia	54	96	70	0
Florida	94	83	69	86
Georgia	78	70	50	61
Hawaii	100	100	100	100
Idaho	85	51	34	87
Illinois	78	45	22	48
Indiana	65	47	37	50
Iowa	51	24	17	44
Kansas	75	43	28	52
Kentucky	77	63	46	69
Louisiana	88	66	54	73
Maine	66	57	34	49
Maryland	63	59	32	45
Massachusetts	70	55	40	37
Michigan	77	56	35	50
Minnesota	56	35	21	39
Mississippi	84	72	58	73
Missouri	72	42	23	42
Montana	85	22	12	64
Nebraska	65	31	19	61
Nevada	79	71	65	49
New Hampshire	77	64	33	49
New Jersey	71	38	16	39
New Mexico	72	39	31	54
New York	55	49	38	27
North Carolina	67	50	28	45
North Dakota	80	49	22	77
Ohio	64	45	28	34
Oklahoma	90	49	26	74
Oregon	62	72	51	49
Pennsylvania	59	39	14	41
Rhode Island	74	68	42	29
South Carolina	79	71	37	55
South Dakota	48	26	9	38
Tennessee	96	65	42	80
Texas	74	48	24	41
Utah	65	62	43	53
Vermont	82	80	38	55
Virginia	70	58	34	58
Washington	67	45	26	57
West Virginia	92	85	83	81
Wisconsin	64	44	29	51
Wyoming	75	72	53	51
Puerto Rico	100	100	100	100

Source: 2018-19 District survey (N = 13,029 districts, 4,313 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	88	76
Instructional strategies for academic subjects	75	39
Using data and assessments to guide instruction	69	24
Understanding state content standards and instructional strategies to meet them	59	16
Instructional strategies for classroom management or student behavior management	58	17
Using technology	55	10
Providing instruction and academic support for students with disabilities or developmental delays	44	4
Providing instruction and academic support to English learners	36	3
Integrating academic content, career and technical education, and work-based learning	25	2
Identifying gifted and talented students	16	<1
Content knowledge	78	47
Teacher content knowledge in ELA	68	32
Teacher content knowledge in STEM or computer science	61	23
Teacher content knowledge in subjects other than ELA or STEM	52	6
School management, climate, improvement	44	5
Identifying students with referral needs	27	3
Understanding teacher evaluation systems and resulting feedback	27	2
Offering joint professional learning and planning activities that address transition from early childhood to elementary school	16	<1
Engaging parents and families	30	2
Other	8	6
Number of districts	13,061	13,061
Number of districts (unweighted)	4,318	4,318

Note: Districts were asked to indicate all of the listed topics of teacher professional development for which they used Title II-A funds. 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: 2018-19 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	88	78	44	30	8
Alabama	92	90	36	39	2
Alaska	91	75	66	40	16
Arizona	99	87	42	24	3
Arkansas	79	74	48	49	5
California	88	78	39	28	5
Colorado	95	71	41	18	15
Connecticut	92	89	43	18	11
Delaware	100	55	55	15	0
District of Columbia	100	100	54	84	0
Florida	100	100	84	50	5
Georgia	98	92	46	34	1
Hawaii	100	100	100	0	0
Idaho	96	74	70	46	10
Illinois	87	89	35	29	7
Indiana	83	79	42	23	10
Iowa	63	57	28	15	6
Kansas	83	77	53	40	7
Kentucky	89	85	57	31	6
Louisiana	98	90	67	51	4
Maine	88	77	57	32	7
Maryland	100	90	64	23	5
Massachusetts	99	77	56	29	6
Michigan	93	86	49	27	16
Minnesota	78	62	40	29	8
Mississippi	96	93	49	43	4
Missouri	86	74	53	39	5
Montana	86	81	29	33	4
Nebraska	87	73	48	19	7
Nevada	92	78	62	50	7
New Hampshire	96	88	48	34	9
New Jersey	93	86	33	16	12
New Mexico	93	74	60	41	7
New York	85	73	41	32	9
North Carolina	92	75	48	33	6
North Dakota	91	65	52	14	7
Ohio	78	69	37	19	4
Oklahoma	95	82	50	40	4
Oregon	99	72	41	30	8
Pennsylvania	73	69	36	35	12
Rhode Island	81	67	29	15	8
South Carolina	95	90	55	28	3
South Dakota	66	34	31	23	18
Tennessee	100	100	65	55	1
Texas	90	74	40	33	6
Utah	91	74	46	31	4
Vermont	97	92	46	24	8
Virginia	92	75	55	40	11
Washington	96	91	64	18	16
West Virginia	100	100	83	70	10
Wisconsin	88	83	37	29	6
Wyoming	95	82	41	21	15
Puerto Rico	100	100	100	0	0

Source: 2018-19 District survey (N = 13,061 districts, 4,318 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	98	93	85*
Instructional strategies for academic subjects	98	93	85*
Using data and assessments to guide instruction	86	77	64*
Understanding state content standards and instructional strategies to meet them	84	71	53*
Instructional strategies for classroom management or student behavior management	75	63	55*
Using technology	69	63	50*
Instruction and academic support for students with disabilities or developmental delays	60	49	41*
Instruction and academic support for English learners	67	52	27*
Integrating academic content, career and technical education, and work-based learning (as appropriate)	47	31	22*
Identifying gifted and talented students	31	20	13*
Content knowledge	94	87	74*
Teacher content knowledge in ELA	89	81	62*
Teacher content knowledge in STEM or computer science	84	73	55*
Teacher content knowledge in subjects other than ELA or STEM	75	63	46*
School management, climate, improvement	59	49	41*
Identifying students with referral needs	33	32	25*
Understanding teacher evaluation systems and resulting feedback	41	29	24*
Offering joint professional learning and planning activities that address transition from early childhood to elementary school	28	21	13*
Engaging parents and families	38	32	28*
Other	8	9	7
Number of districts	905	2,881	9,275
Number of districts (unweighted)	543	1,450	2,325

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

Source: 2018-19 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2016-17.

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	93	91	86	85*
Instructional strategies for academic subjects	81	81	77	68*
Using data and assessments to guide instruction	78	71	68	64*
Understanding state content standards and instructional strategies to meet them	65	65	60	53*
Instructional strategies for classroom management or student behavior management	71	60	60	51*
Using technology	57	56	55	52
Instruction and academic support for students with disabilities or developmental delays	53	49	43	39*
Instruction and academic support for English learners	47	48	36	24*
Integrating academic content, career and technical education, and work-based learning (as appropriate)	28	27	26	23*
Identifying gifted and talented students	18	18	15	14*
Content knowledge	84	83	77	73*
Teacher content knowledge in ELA	75	76	67	61*
Teacher content knowledge in STEM or computer science	63	68	61	56*
Teacher content knowledge in subjects other than ELA or STEM	57	58	52	46*
School management, climate, improvement	51	44	46	40*
Identifying students with referral needs	27	30	28	25
Understanding teacher evaluation systems and resulting feedback	39	26	29	22*
Offering joint professional learning and planning activities that address transition from early childhood to elementary school	17	15	20	15*
Engaging parents and families	37	28	29	28*
Other	7	9	8	7
Number of districts	1,945	3,350	2,357	5,409
Number of districts (unweighted)	634	1,126	1,010	1,548

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

Source: 2018-19 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2016-17.

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	71	63
School improvement planning or identifying interventions to support academic improvement	67	56
Strategies and practices to advance organizational development	53	32
Strategies to engage parents and the community	31	7
Strategies and practices to develop and manage the school's workforce	28	7
Other	7	7
Number of districts	13,013	13,013
Number of districts (unweighted)	4,311	4,311

Note: Districts were asked to indicate all of the listed topics of principal professional development for which they used Title II-A funds. 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: 2018-19 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	76	71	31	7
Alabama	90	80	46	4
Alaska	87	72	40	3
Arizona	77	69	21	6
Arkansas	79	69	42	12
California	82	66	45	4
Colorado	83	78	19	18
Connecticut	82	80	23	14
Delaware	97	75	55	0
District of Columbia	100	88	24	0
Florida	92	95	35	8
Georgia	88	83	38	4
Hawaii	100	100	0	0
Idaho	80	75	49	4
Illinois	78	74	32	10
Indiana	74	69	29	9
Iowa	50	46	18	7
Kansas	72	62	47	6
Kentucky	88	81	34	3
Louisiana	90	94	45	4
Maine	75	64	20	3
Maryland	82	73	32	4
Massachusetts	78	71	15	10
Michigan	84	83	29	10
Minnesota	59	56	30	6
Mississippi	94	90	43	3
Missouri	75	75	31	5
Montana	81	64	50	3
Nebraska	70	67	16	11
Nevada	93	93	50	0
New Hampshire	89	71	40	5
New Jersey	71	69	17	14
New Mexico	76	75	37	5
New York	67	67	27	7
North Carolina	74	68	27	3
North Dakota	87	70	28	7
Ohio	71	64	24	6
Oklahoma	90	83	48	2
Oregon	73	90	45	5
Pennsylvania	63	57	30	9
Rhode Island	78	59	15	0
South Carolina	84	79	33	4
South Dakota	37	41	11	12
Tennessee	93	95	54	5
Texas	83	77	39	6
Utah	85	82	41	1
Vermont	90	87	21	10
Virginia	77	79	39	14
Washington	82	75	20	14
West Virginia	98	98	64	4
Wisconsin	70	69	30	8
Wyoming	90	90	25	3
Puerto Rico	100	0	0	0

Source: 2018-19 District survey (N = 13,013 districts, 4,311 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	49	\$29,207,158
Administration and monitoring	49	\$21,768,595
Training, technical assistance, and capacity building for LEAs	23	\$7,438,563
Professional development	32	\$20,319,078
Professional development programs for principals	18	\$12,624,664
Promoting high-quality instruction and instructional leadership in STEM subjects, including computer science	17	\$5,093,763
Training to integrate technology into curricula and instruction	9	\$1,289,148
Training to integrate career and technical education into academic instruction	4	\$731,878
Training related to use of student data and privacy	2	\$519,625
Training to prevent and recognize child sexual abuse	2	\$30,000
Developing educator skills, credentials for supporting K-12 students in postsecondary education coursework	1	\$30,000
Recruiting, hiring, retaining effective educators	39	\$19,061,665
Opportunities for effective teachers to lead evidence-based professional development for their peers	15	\$5,260,018
Reforming certification, licensing, or tenure systems or preparation programs	24	\$5,246,620
Training and support for instructional leadership teams	14	\$3,148,853
Developing career paths that promote professional growth including instructional coaching and mentoring	12	\$2,769,559
Developing new teacher and principal induction and mentoring programs	17	\$1,693,906
Providing alternative routes for state certification of teachers, principals, or other school leaders	6	\$520,694
Establishing or expanding preparation academies for teachers, principals, or other school leaders	2	\$222,235
Reforming or improving preparation programs for teachers, principals, or other school leaders	4	\$160,222
Providing licensure/certification reciprocity with other states	2	\$28,932
Developing performance-based pay systems and other incentives to recruit and retain teachers and leaders in high-need subjects and schools	1	\$10,626
Evaluation systems	22	\$7,655,756
Teacher, principal, or other school leader evaluation and support systems	22	\$7,655,756
Equitable access	22	\$4,849,912
Improving equitable access to effective teachers	22	\$4,849,912
Other	28	\$8,699,235
Other activities	25	\$8,488,512
Library programs	4	\$132,516
Addressing transition to elementary school and school readiness	3	\$78,207

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

Source: 2018-19 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	89
Principals and other leaders	11
Number of districts	13,193
Number of districts (unweighted)	4,265

Source: 2018-19 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	80	68
Induction or new teacher and leader mentoring programs	71	59
Emphasis on leadership opportunities and multiple career pathways for teachers	36	15
Support with screening candidates and early hiring for teachers	30	12
Feedback mechanisms to improve school working conditions	29	6
Recruiting individuals from other fields to become teachers or leaders	26	9
Differential and incentive pay of teachers and leaders	26	19
Other	11	9
Number of districts	4,577	4,577
Number of districts (unweighted)	1,841	1,841

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 were asked to indicate all of the listed strategies for which they used Title II-A funds. 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: 2018-19 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	Recruiting individuals from other fields	Differential and incentive pay	Other
All states	80	71	36	30	29	26	26	11
Alabama	87	76	35	38	28	40	33	4
Alaska	68	45	36	41	32	14	32	23
Arizona	84	62	30	39	35	31	24	4
Arkansas	85	72	39	49	44	55	37	23
California	92	86	25	25	37	15	11	7
Colorado	73	58	37	25	29	25	16	29
Connecticut	94	47	38	20	20	11	10	16
Delaware	94	76	53	18	12	18	41	12
District of Columbia	100	15	15	15	100	100	15	85
Florida	91	88	50	41	34	53	29	7
Georgia	94	94	43	54	37	50	19	7
Hawaii	100	100	100	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho	67	64	25	39	34	28	42	4
Illinois	86	80	40	29	31	22	6	19
Indiana	66	56	40	23	29	27	54	11
Iowa	49	26	12	47	2	16	62	6
Kansas	73	84	32	28	31	30	31	8
Kentucky	85	96	38	35	25	21	17	1
Louisiana	92	72	69	33	30	46	32	13
Maine	97	83	14	19	26	12	3	17
Maryland	69	83	38	26	10	28	10	10
Massachusetts	83	92	24	12	24	3	9	8
Michigan	70	44	19	13	16	16	48	19
Minnesota	72	85	35	28	26	9	18	0
Mississippi	72	61	25	36	28	41	20	25
Missouri	81	85	61	54	47	33	31	18
Montana	50	30	5	21	16	71	54	0
Nebraska	71	55	27	3	14	3	11	0
Nevada	55	65	33	33	0	33	12	0
New Hampshire	70	95	46	10	15	5	27	24
New Jersey	86	63	13	28	20	5	9	6
New Mexico	76	69	61	18	36	34	35	5
New York	82	75	38	26	26	21	23	8
North Carolina	81	94	31	42	44	52	26	15
North Dakota	74	82	26	41	39	39	15	22
Ohio	75	52	50	34	29	18	25	10
His Oklahoma	75	48	29	24	32	17	32	3
Oregon	88	83	58	20	31	30	11	12
Pennsylvania	95	60	73	53	73	54	34	12
Rhode Island	81	81	34	38	19	14	10	0
South Carolina	72	74	23	51	19	34	15	13
South Dakota	81	100	20	20	20	30	10	10
Tennessee	72	85	49	27	31	28	40	13
Texas	84	56	41	40	28	36	40	11
Utah	72	77	26	28	24	17	45	3
Vermont	79	82	55	21	18	19	24	0
Virginia	83	68	49	23	14	32	27	10
Washington	70	88	37	23	30	25	7	22
West Virginia	92	84	52	33	38	30	3	19
Wisconsin	80	70	37	21	33	14	31	14
Wyoming	78	79	51	30	22	7	30	14

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: 2018-19 District survey (N = 4,577 districts, 1,841 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	\$101,608,882	\$7,655,756	8%
Alabama	\$1,645,676	\$0	0%
Alaska	\$489,497	\$0	0%
Arizona	\$1,771,082	\$177,107	10%
Arkansas	\$998,928	\$0	0%
California	\$12,040,218	\$0	0%
Colorado	\$1,168,015	\$0	0%
Connecticut	\$923,942	\$0	0%
Delaware	\$489,497	\$0	0%
District of Columbia	\$489,497	\$0	0%
Florida	\$4,843,670	\$560,000	12%
Georgia	\$2,886,883	\$651,912	23%
Hawaii	\$489,497	\$59,036	12%
Idaho	\$489,497	\$240,041	49%
Illinois	\$4,066,256	\$286,090	7%
Indiana	\$1,794,516	\$0	0%
Iowa	\$789,720	\$0	0%
Kansas	\$799,653	\$0	0%
Kentucky	\$1,594,806	\$704,606	44%
Louisiana	\$2,102,768	\$0	0%
Maine	\$489,497	\$0	0%
Maryland	\$1,459,775	\$0	0%
Massachusetts	\$1,774,815	\$0	0%
Michigan	\$3,840,204	\$251,087	7%
Minnesota	\$1,366,280	\$0	0%
Mississippi	\$892,408	\$30,000	3%
Missouri	\$1,755,747	\$346,796	20%
Montana	\$489,497	\$105,000	21%
Nebraska	\$499,386	\$0	0%
Nevada	\$587,359	\$11,000	2%
New Hampshire	\$489,497	\$0	0%
New Jersey	\$2,302,295	\$168,453	7%
New Mexico	\$816,691	\$574,681	70%
New York	\$7,868,030	\$1,712,450	22%
North Carolina	\$2,432,333	\$0	0%
North Dakota	\$605,497	\$0	0%
Ohio	\$3,757,091	\$334,859	9%
Oklahoma	\$1,687,176	\$0	0%
Oregon	\$991,229	\$0	0%
Pennsylvania	\$4,022,373	\$0	0%
Rhode Island	\$489,497	\$63,000	13%
South Carolina	\$1,350,493	\$1,010,395	75%
South Dakota	\$489,497	\$28,500	6%
Tennessee	\$1,824,130	\$65,000	4%
Texas	\$8,843,884	\$0	0%
Utah	\$692,567	\$0	0%
Vermont	\$489,497	\$0	0%
Virginia	\$1,859,777	\$0	0%
Washington	\$1,664,431	\$99,500	6%
West Virginia	\$816,192	\$0	0%
Wisconsin	\$1,631,457	\$176,243	11%
Wyoming	\$489,497	\$0	0%
Puerto Rico	\$2,967,165	\$0	0%

Source: 2018-19 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	\$136,382	13,187	\$1,798,440,044
By type of district			
Traditional	\$156,738	11,119	\$1,742,732,497
Charter	\$26,937	2,068	\$55,707,547
By district enrollment size			
Large (>10,000 students)	\$1,137,353	909	\$1,033,854,437
Medium (2,500-10,000 students)	\$159,929	2,890	\$462,144,764
Small (<2,500 students)	\$32,215	9,388	\$302,440,843
By urbanicity			
Urban	\$354,154	1,960	\$694,052,078
Suburban	\$195,216	3,354	\$654,796,945
Town	\$88,781	2,359	\$209,399,305
Rural	\$43,559	5,514	\$240,191,715

Source: 2018-19 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2016-17.

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	71	66	65	59
Short-term training (3 days or less), conducted by external provider or district-level staff	63	58	53	47*
Professional conferences or organizations, external to the district or state	50	38*	33	28*
Longer-term training or education	51	47	43	44
Longer-term group PD, conducted by an external provider	27	21*	17	15
Longer-term group PD, conducted by district staff	22	21	14	16
Longer-term one-on-one PD, conducted by an external provider	11	13	5	8
Longer-term one-on-one PD, conducted by district staff	13	12	5	8*
Group support (e.g., learning communities, district monthly or quarterly principal meetings)	23	18*	14	10
University or college courses	7	7	2	2
Collaborative or job-embedded	30	30	21	23
Longer-term one-on-one PD, conducted by an external provider	11	13	5	8
Longer-term one-on-one PD, conducted by district staff	13	12	5	8*
Group support (e.g., learning communities, district monthly or quarterly principal meetings)	23	18*	14	10
Other	48	42	27	33
State leadership conferences or trainings	39	30*	18	19
Leadership certifications (e.g., state-level credentials or endorsements)	9	7	3	3
Other	8	12*	8	13*
Number of districts	10,976	2,053	10,976	2,053
Number of districts (unweighted)	3,940	373	3,940	373

* Percentage of charter school districts is significantly different from the percentage of traditional districts ($p < .05$).
 Note: Districts were asked to indicate all of the listed types of principal professional development for which they used Title II-A funds. 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: 2018-19 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2016-17.

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	87	91	75	80
Instructional strategies for academic subjects	74	78	38	43
Using data and assessments to guide instruction	68	70	22	31*
Understanding state content standards and instructional strategies to meet them	60	54	17	11*
Instructional strategies for classroom management or student behavior management	57	65*	15	25*
Using technology	56	47*	11	5*
Instruction and academic support for students with disabilities or developmental delays	43	49	3	5
Instruction and academic support for English learners	36	34	3	2
Integrating academic content, career and technical education, and work-based learning	27	19*	2	1
Identifying gifted and talented students	17	9*	<1	0*
Content knowledge	79	75	48	42
Teacher content knowledge in ELA	69	65	32	30
Teacher content knowledge in STEM or computer science	63	51*	23	18*
Teacher content knowledge in subjects other than ELA or STEM	53	44*	6	5
School management, climate, improvement	43	46	5	6
Identifying students with referral needs	28	26	2	3
Understanding teacher evaluation systems and resulting feedback	25	35*	2	3
Offering joint professional learning and planning activities that address transition from early childhood to elementary school	17	8*	1	<1
Engaging parents and families	29	35*	2	2
Other	8	7	6	7
Number of districts	11,002	2,059	11,002	2,059
Number of districts (unweighted)	3,944	374	3,944	374

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

Note: Districts were asked to indicate all of the listed topics of teacher professional development for which they used Title II-A funds. 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: 2018-19 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2016-17.

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	71	70	63	62
School improvement planning or identifying interventions to support academic improvement	66	67	57	53
Strategies and practices to advance organizational development	54	51	32	31
Strategies to engage parents and the community	31	35	6	9
Strategies and practices to develop and manage the school's workforce	27	32	6	11*
Other	7	6	7	6
Number of districts	10,968	2,046	10,968	2,046
Number of districts (unweighted)	3,939	372	3,939	372

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

Note: Districts were asked to indicate all of the listed topics of principal professional development for which they used Title II-A funds. 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: 2018-19 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2016-17.

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	88	80	66*
School improvement planning or identifying interventions to support academic improvement	78	72	64*
Strategies and practices to advance organizational development	72	60	49*
Strategies and practices to develop and manage the school's workforce	47	30	25*
Strategies to engage parents and the community	39	33	30*
Other	6	6	8*
Number of districts	908	2,879	9,226
Number of districts (unweighted)	544	1,449	2,318

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

Source: 2018-19 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2016-17.

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	77	76	71	65*
School improvement planning or identifying interventions to support academic improvement	73	68	67	63*
Strategies and practices to advance organizational development	59	55	53	50*
Strategies and practices to develop and manage the school's workforce	36	27	29	24*
Strategies to engage parents and the community	34	30	32	31
Other	6	8	6	8
Number of districts	1,947	3,333	2,357	5,377
Number of districts (unweighted)	634	1,123	1,010	1,544

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

Source: 2018-19 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2016-17.

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 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	82	72*	70	58*
Induction or new teacher and leader mentoring programs	75	50*	64	31*
Emphasis on leadership opportunities and multiple career pathways for teachers	35	38	14	20
Support with screening candidates and early hiring for teachers	30	32	11	15
Feedback mechanisms to improve school working conditions	29	33	5	10
Recruiting individuals from other fields to become teachers or leaders	26	28	9	12
Differential and incentive pay of teachers and leaders	22	49*	15	42*
Other	11	14	8	14
Number of districts	3,834	744	3,834	744
Number of districts (unweighted)	1,693	148	1,693	148

* 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 were asked to indicate all of the listed strategies for which they used Title II-A funds. 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: 2018-19 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2016-17.

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	88	84	77*
Induction or new teacher and leader mentoring programs	82	81	64*
Emphasis on leadership opportunities and multiple career pathways for teachers	47	35	34*
Support with screening candidates and early hiring for teachers	40	26	30*
Feedback mechanisms to improve school working conditions	32	27	30
Recruiting individuals from other fields to become teachers or leaders	34	23	26*
Differential and incentive pay of teachers and leaders	26	19	29*
Other	8	9	13*
Number of districts	571	1,148	2,858
Number of districts (unweighted)	358	674	809

* 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: 2018-19 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2016-17.

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	77	84	80	79
Induction or new teacher and leader mentoring programs	65	75	76	68*
Emphasis on leadership opportunities and multiple career pathways for teachers	43	38	36	30*
Support with screening candidates and early hiring for teachers	37	26	31	29
Feedback mechanisms to improve school working conditions	36	27	29	27*
Recruiting individuals from other fields to become teachers or leaders	28	19	31	27*
Differential and incentive pay of teachers and leaders	40	21	24	24*
Other	14	10	10	11
Number of districts	893	1,111	994	1,580
Number of districts (unweighted)	339	78	455	569

* 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: 2018-19 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2016-17.

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	77	78	71*
Assignment of teachers to a grade or classes consistent with their field of certification	75	76	68*
Teacher experience	75	74	77
Teacher evaluation ratings	74	74	72
Teacher effectiveness, as measured by value-added measures or student growth percentiles	55	52	68*
Teacher effectiveness, as measured by student learning objectives or student growth objectives	54	52	63*
Teacher education	49	48	57*
Other	5	4	9*
Number of districts	9,298	7,858	1,440
Number of districts (unweighted)	2,926	2,666	260

* 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: 2018-19 District survey; Common Core of Data, 2016-17.

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 for academies	Additional funds for state activities to support school leaders	Funds transferred from other programs
All states	\$101,608,882	\$222,235	\$21,353,724	\$2,303,652
Alabama	\$1,645,676			
Alaska	\$489,497		\$270,643	
Arizona	\$1,771,082			
Arkansas	\$998,928		\$515,487	
California	\$12,040,218			\$521,000
Colorado	\$1,168,015			
Connecticut	\$923,942			
Delaware	\$489,497			
District of Columbia	\$489,497			
Florida	\$4,843,670			
Georgia	\$2,886,883			
Hawaii	\$489,497			
Idaho	\$489,497		\$270,643	
Illinois	\$4,066,256			
Indiana	\$1,794,516		\$992,188	
Iowa	\$789,720	\$160,000	\$436,636	
Kansas	\$799,653			
Kentucky	\$1,594,806			
Louisiana	\$2,102,768			\$1,199,718
Maine	\$489,497			
Maryland	\$1,459,775		\$753,303	
Massachusetts	\$1,774,815		\$981,295	
Michigan	\$3,840,204		\$212,325	
Minnesota	\$1,366,280		\$755,416	
Mississippi	\$892,408		\$970,753	
Missouri	\$1,755,747			
Montana	\$489,497			
Nebraska	\$499,386			
Nevada	\$587,359		\$303,101	
New Hampshire	\$489,497			
New Jersey	\$2,302,295			
New Mexico	\$816,691		\$451,549	
New York	\$7,868,030		\$4,350,234	
North Carolina	\$2,432,333			
North Dakota	\$605,497			\$116,000
Ohio	\$3,757,091		\$2,077,296	
Oklahoma	\$1,687,176			\$466,934
Oregon	\$991,229			
Pennsylvania	\$4,022,373			
Rhode Island	\$489,497			
South Carolina	\$1,350,493		\$746,688	
South Dakota	\$489,497			
Tennessee	\$1,824,130		\$1,008,562	
Texas	\$8,843,884		\$4,889,784	
Utah	\$692,567		\$255,281	
Vermont	\$489,497			
Virginia	\$1,859,777			
Washington	\$1,664,431			
West Virginia	\$816,192	\$62,235		
Wisconsin	\$1,631,457		\$841,898	
Wyoming	\$489,497		\$270,643	
Puerto Rico	\$2,967,165			

Source: 2018-19 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	\$21,353,724	2.7%
Alaska	\$270,643	3.0%
Arkansas	\$515,487	2.8%
Idaho	\$270,643	3.0%
Indiana	\$992,188	3.0%
Iowa	\$436,636	3.0%
Maryland	\$753,303	2.8%
Massachusetts	\$981,295	3.0%
Michigan	\$212,325	0.3%
Minnesota	\$755,416	3.0%
Missouri	\$970,753	3.0%
Nevada	\$303,101	2.8%
New Mexico	\$451,549	3.0%
New York	\$4,350,234	3.0%
Ohio	\$2,077,296	3.0%
South Carolina	\$746,688	3.0%
Tennessee	\$1,008,562	3.0%
Texas	\$4,889,784	3.0%
Utah	\$255,281	2.0%
Wisconsin	\$841,898	2.8%
Wyoming	\$270,643	3.0%

Source: 2018-19 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	\$11,519,218	\$521,000	\$12,040,218	5%
Louisiana	\$903,050	\$1,199,718	\$2,102,768	133%
North Dakota	\$489,497	\$116,000	\$605,497	24%
Oklahoma	\$1,220,242	\$466,934	\$1,687,176	38%

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: 2018-19 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	23	6
Alabama	2	2
Alaska	31	7
Arizona	11	9
Arkansas	50	8
California	3	4
Colorado	16	6
Connecticut	9	0
Delaware	28	32
District of Columbia	40	0
Florida	1	0
Georgia	20	1
Hawaii	0	100
Idaho	13	1
Illinois	23	13
Indiana	2	0
Iowa	9	1
Kansas	21	7
Kentucky	24	1
Louisiana	19	1
Maine	33	20
Maryland	0	0
Massachusetts	7	10
Michigan	49	9
Minnesota	9	4
Mississippi	41	1
Missouri	51	12
Montana	64	6
Nebraska	30	6
Nevada	13	0
New Hampshire	5	3
New Jersey	10	7
New Mexico	19	1
New York	15	5
North Carolina	6	0
North Dakota	52	13
Ohio	19	2
Oklahoma	80	3
Oregon	27	4
Pennsylvania	26	10
Rhode Island	4	17
South Carolina	0	20
South Dakota	34	18
Tennessee	17	26
Texas	26	2
Utah	1	0
Vermont	20	15
Virginia	4	6
Washington	18	12
West Virginia	0	11
Wisconsin	1	0
Wyoming	15	7
Puerto Rico	0	0

Source: 2018-19 District survey (N = 15,688 districts, 4,915 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 reserved funds not yet obligated
All states	\$2,025,095,342	\$101,608,882	\$11,788,414	12%
Alabama	\$32,913,526	\$1,645,676	\$0	0%
Alaska	\$9,789,945	\$489,497	\$0	0%
Arizona	\$35,421,651	\$1,771,082	\$0	0%
Arkansas	\$19,978,571	\$998,928	\$452,650	45%
California	\$230,384,365	\$12,040,218	\$0	0%
Colorado	\$23,360,309	\$1,168,015	\$0	0%
Connecticut	\$18,478,853	\$923,942	\$267,650	29%
Delaware	\$9,789,945	\$489,497	\$123,945	25%
District of Columbia	\$9,789,945	\$489,497	\$392,167	80%
Florida	\$96,873,400	\$4,843,670	\$0	0%
Georgia	\$57,737,660	\$2,886,883	\$0	0%
Hawaii	\$9,789,945	\$489,497	\$0	0%
Idaho	\$9,789,945	\$489,497	\$0	0%
Illinois	\$81,325,138	\$4,066,256	\$754,588	19%
Indiana	\$35,890,332	\$1,794,516	\$753,939	42%
Iowa	\$15,794,406	\$789,720	\$0	0%
Kansas	\$15,993,074	\$799,653	\$0	0%
Kentucky	\$31,896,136	\$1,594,806	\$255,424	16%
Louisiana	\$45,152,518	\$2,102,768	\$986,817	47%
Maine	\$9,789,945	\$489,497	\$155,411	32%
Maryland	\$29,195,507	\$1,459,775	\$0	0%
Massachusetts	\$35,496,301	\$1,774,815	\$676,122	38%
Michigan	\$76,804,084	\$3,840,204	\$0	0%
Minnesota	\$27,325,603	\$1,366,280	\$293,101	21%
Mississippi	\$29,746,976	\$892,408	\$0	0%
Missouri	\$35,114,945	\$1,755,747	\$78,922	4%
Montana	\$9,789,945	\$489,497	\$0	0%
Nebraska	\$9,987,738	\$499,386	\$218,428	44%
Nevada	\$11,747,199	\$587,359	\$0	0%
New Hampshire	\$9,789,945	\$489,497	\$102,782	21%
New Jersey	\$46,045,916	\$2,302,295	\$0	0%
New Mexico	\$16,333,827	\$816,691	\$0	0%
New York	\$157,360,601	\$7,868,030	\$0	0%
North Carolina	\$48,646,661	\$2,432,333	\$0	0%
North Dakota	\$9,789,945	\$605,497	\$137,059	23%
Ohio	\$75,141,835	\$3,757,091	\$1,574,382	42%
Oklahoma	\$24,404,849	\$1,687,176	\$1,511,357	90%
Oregon	\$19,824,594	\$991,229	\$988,217	100%
Pennsylvania	\$80,447,461	\$4,022,373	\$0	0%
Rhode Island	\$9,789,945	\$489,497	\$0	0%
South Carolina	\$27,009,861	\$1,350,493	\$0	0%
South Dakota	\$9,789,945	\$489,497	\$5,331	1%
Tennessee	\$36,482,619	\$1,824,130	\$300,376	16%
Texas	\$176,877,689	\$8,843,884	\$520,967	6%
Utah	\$13,851,357	\$692,567	\$0	0%
Vermont	\$9,789,945	\$489,497	\$274,164	56%
Virginia	\$37,195,548	\$1,859,777	\$477,937	26%
Washington	\$33,288,630	\$1,664,431	\$10,822	1%
West Virginia	\$16,323,858	\$816,192	\$264,780	32%
Wisconsin	\$32,629,157	\$1,631,457	\$0	0%
Wyoming	\$9,789,945	\$489,497	\$5,494	1%
Puerto Rico	\$59,343,302	\$2,967,165	\$205,582	7%

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 2019.

Source: 2018-19 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	157	592
Alabama	1	0
Alaska	1	0
Arizona	7	5
Arkansas	0	0
California	6	62
Colorado	0	31
Connecticut	4	0
Delaware	0	4
District of Columbia	2	1
Florida	0	0
Georgia	7	2
Hawaii	7	0
Idaho	1	0
Illinois	0	13
Indiana	3	15
Iowa	1	7
Kansas	0	0
Kentucky	1	3
Louisiana	1	32
Maine	0	1
Maryland	7	2
Massachusetts	13	0
Michigan	6	75
Minnesota	2	21
Mississippi	0	22
Missouri	7	35
Montana	2	6
Nebraska	0	2
Nevada	1	1
New Hampshire	1	3
New Jersey	7	2
New Mexico	5	0
New York	23	0
North Carolina	3	24
North Dakota	0	2
Ohio	2	1
Oklahoma	3	0
Oregon	0	9
Pennsylvania	15	0
Rhode Island	0	5
South Carolina	0	1
South Dakota	1	0
Tennessee	0	11
Texas	0	152
Utah	0	3
Vermont	1	4
Virginia	2	3
Washington	6	3
West Virginia	0	5
Wisconsin	4	21
Wyoming	0	3
Puerto Rico	4	0

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

Source: 2018-19 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	80	32	24	10	30
Alabama	90	33	74	10	61
Alaska	84	72	12	19	50
Arizona	96	36	0	13	28
Arkansas	71	42	28	9	13
California	76	41	13	3	56
Colorado	85	34	5	4	28
Connecticut	96	25	13	11	35
Delaware	76	48	9	31	58
District of Columbia	78	26	0	0	0
Florida	100	83	8	49	74
Georgia	95	64	5	20	64
Hawaii	100	100	0	100	0
Idaho	94	55	7	23	19
Illinois	91	23	33	6	21
Indiana	72	45	27	4	23
Iowa	28	14	72	1	12
Kansas	73	50	34	3	30
Kentucky	77	55	34	12	30
Louisiana	86	58	12	19	42
Maine	86	10	22	14	27
Maryland	91	92	28	27	91
Massachusetts	91	53	8	15	38
Michigan	90	28	0	12	21
Minnesota	63	10	49	4	14
Mississippi	94	44	2	17	49
Missouri	78	29	32	12	25
Montana	72	33	28	7	14
Nebraska	71	16	26	5	14
Nevada	93	72	0	0	50
New Hampshire	97	24	5	13	29
New Jersey	94	14	11	9	17
New Mexico	88	49	10	13	44
New York	82	27	21	20	36
North Carolina	87	50	23	15	30
North Dakota	73	30	31	8	14
Ohio	65	19	41	5	17
Oklahoma	85	26	6	15	19
Oregon	97	43	4	11	31
Pennsylvania	62	5	53	5	24
Rhode Island	92	29	8	8	23
South Carolina	90	57	58	13	53
South Dakota	41	7	53	6	37
Tennessee	98	40	20	9	51
Texas	77	53	20	10	45
Utah	81	39	6	7	6
Vermont	95	32	5	9	42
Virginia	83	48	58	18	43
Washington	88	34	4	8	43
West Virginia	98	71	9	36	77
Wisconsin	78	24	29	7	17
Wyoming	90	34	25	15	32
Puerto Rico	100	0	100	0	100

Source: 2018-19 District survey (N = 13,187 districts, 4,334 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	58	13	17	2	9
Alabama	44	7	41	1	7
Alaska	68	15	5	1	12
Arizona	63	23	0	3	10
Arkansas	51	23	13	10	4
California	70	13	4	1	12
Colorado	79	12	1	1	7
Connecticut	42	20	21	3	14
Delaware	45	6	19	4	26
District of Columbia	54	46	0	0	0
Florida	58	12	10	4	16
Georgia	67	17	2	3	11
Hawaii	62	37	0	1	0
Idaho	74	17	1	4	4
Illinois	61	7	21	1	9
Indiana	65	11	19	1	4
Iowa	23	5	67	2	3
Kansas	59	16	21	0	3
Kentucky	56	15	20	0	9
Louisiana	55	23	9	4	9
Maine	63	4	28	1	3
Maryland	51	28	6	2	13
Massachusetts	51	22	7	3	18
Michigan	81	9	3	2	6
Minnesota	51	9	31	2	6
Mississippi	76	12	0	3	8
Missouri	44	11	33	1	11
Montana	22	3	73	0	2
Nebraska	41	29	23	2	5
Nevada	82	13	0	0	6
New Hampshire	73	9	9	2	8
New Jersey	68	9	13	2	9
New Mexico	36	28	3	1	32
New York	39	8	46	1	5
North Carolina	47	25	18	2	8
North Dakota	50	6	41	1	2
Ohio	52	10	32	1	5
Oklahoma	73	13	4	3	7
Oregon	70	17	1	3	9
Pennsylvania	33	2	58	1	6
Rhode Island	66	17	4	4	9
South Carolina	47	9	36	3	6
South Dakota	35	4	44	1	16
Tennessee	71	9	7	2	11
Texas	53	20	10	2	14
Utah	50	14	31	2	4
Vermont	78	7	2	0	13
Virginia	41	12	37	1	9
Washington	76	8	2	2	11
West Virginia	67	17	2	4	10
Wisconsin	56	17	19	6	3
Wyoming	65	13	10	7	5
Puerto Rico	71	0	19	0	9

Source: 2018-19 District survey (N = 13,187 districts, 4,334 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	83	67	46	34
Alabama	94	82	60	35
Alaska	81	65	47	28
Arizona	91	76	56	28
Arkansas	83	74	47	44
California	90	67	49	30
Colorado	81	78	67	44
Connecticut	88	69	34	30
Delaware	100	68	59	20
District of Columbia	100	100	100	4
Florida	100	95	95	95
Georgia	90	93	80	67
Hawaii	100	100	100	100
Idaho	94	86	41	54
Illinois	87	63	34	20
Indiana	79	72	48	43
Iowa	52	41	32	16
Kansas	81	62	40	33
Kentucky	85	76	65	48
Louisiana	92	85	66	66
Maine	88	59	40	25
Maryland	87	96	78	47
Massachusetts	90	89	63	34
Michigan	90	72	57	36
Minnesota	67	47	39	26
Mississippi	94	89	73	39
Missouri	82	64	44	37
Montana	85	31	15	19
Nebraska	72	40	33	31
Nevada	92	92	56	29
New Hampshire	91	89	54	32
New Jersey	87	69	31	32
New Mexico	88	70	37	42
New York	73	70	51	33
North Carolina	89	64	48	60
North Dakota	90	62	42	30
Ohio	70	57	39	27
Oklahoma	90	53	37	47
Oregon	95	74	55	39
Pennsylvania	71	49	26	26
Rhode Island	78	78	51	25
South Carolina	88	78	51	41
South Dakota	67	40	16	26
Tennessee	98	68	59	39
Texas	79	69	43	33
Utah	85	81	51	37
Vermont	92	97	85	31
Virginia	83	80	54	60
Washington	85	86	74	44
West Virginia	98	93	81	58
Wisconsin	84	68	40	31
Wyoming	92	85	54	28
Puerto Rico	100	100	0	100

Source: 2018-19 District survey (N = 13,120 districts, 4,324 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	70	50	30	47
Alabama	87	76	55	79
Alaska	81	59	44	56
Arizona	62	45	28	44
Arkansas	73	68	44	63
California	78	63	33	35
Colorado	53	77	61	32
Connecticut	79	48	26	37
Delaware	77	44	21	61
District of Columbia	54	96	70	0
Florida	94	83	69	86
Georgia	78	70	50	61
Hawaii	100	100	100	100
Idaho	85	51	34	87
Illinois	78	45	22	48
Indiana	65	47	37	50
Iowa	51	24	17	44
Kansas	75	43	28	52
Kentucky	77	63	46	69
Louisiana	88	66	54	73
Maine	66	57	34	49
Maryland	63	59	32	45
Massachusetts	70	55	40	37
Michigan	77	56	35	50
Minnesota	56	35	21	39
Mississippi	84	72	58	73
Missouri	72	42	23	42
Montana	85	22	12	64
Nebraska	65	31	19	61
Nevada	79	71	65	49
New Hampshire	77	64	33	49
New Jersey	71	38	16	39
New Mexico	72	39	31	54
New York	55	49	38	27
North Carolina	67	50	28	45
North Dakota	80	49	22	77
Ohio	64	45	28	34
Oklahoma	90	49	26	74
Oregon	62	72	51	49
Pennsylvania	59	39	14	41
Rhode Island	74	68	42	29
South Carolina	79	71	37	55
South Dakota	48	26	9	38
Tennessee	96	65	42	80
Texas	74	48	24	41
Utah	65	62	43	53
Vermont	82	80	38	55
Virginia	70	58	34	58
Washington	67	45	26	57
West Virginia	92	85	83	81
Wisconsin	64	44	29	51
Wyoming	75	72	53	51
Puerto Rico	100	100	100	100

Source: 2018-19 District survey (N = 13,029 districts, 4,313 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	88	78	44	30	8
Alabama	92	90	36	39	2
Alaska	91	75	66	40	16
Arizona	99	87	42	24	3
Arkansas	79	74	48	49	5
California	88	78	39	28	5
Colorado	95	71	41	18	15
Connecticut	92	89	43	18	11
Delaware	100	55	55	15	0
District of Columbia	100	100	54	84	0
Florida	100	100	84	50	5
Georgia	98	92	46	34	1
Hawaii	100	100	100	0	0
Idaho	96	74	70	46	10
Illinois	87	89	35	29	7
Indiana	83	79	42	23	10
Iowa	63	57	28	15	6
Kansas	83	77	53	40	7
Kentucky	89	85	57	31	6
Louisiana	98	90	67	51	4
Maine	88	77	57	32	7
Maryland	100	90	64	23	5
Massachusetts	99	77	56	29	6
Michigan	93	86	49	27	16
Minnesota	78	62	40	29	8
Mississippi	96	93	49	43	4
Missouri	86	74	53	39	5
Montana	86	81	29	33	4
Nebraska	87	73	48	19	7
Nevada	92	78	62	50	7
New Hampshire	96	88	48	34	9
New Jersey	93	86	33	16	12
New Mexico	93	74	60	41	7
New York	85	73	41	32	9
North Carolina	92	75	48	33	6
North Dakota	91	65	52	14	7
Ohio	78	69	37	19	4
Oklahoma	95	82	50	40	4
Oregon	99	72	41	30	8
Pennsylvania	73	69	36	35	12
Rhode Island	81	67	29	15	8
South Carolina	95	90	55	28	3
South Dakota	66	34	31	23	18
Tennessee	100	100	65	55	1
Texas	90	74	40	33	6
Utah	91	74	46	31	4
Vermont	97	92	46	24	8
Virginia	92	75	55	40	11
Washington	96	91	64	18	16
West Virginia	100	100	83	70	10
Wisconsin	88	83	37	29	6
Wyoming	95	82	41	21	15
Puerto Rico	100	100	100	0	0

Source: 2018-19 District survey (N = 13,061 districts, 4,318 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	76	71	31	7
Alabama	90	80	46	4
Alaska	87	72	40	3
Arizona	77	69	21	6
Arkansas	79	69	42	12
California	82	66	45	4
Colorado	83	78	19	18
Connecticut	82	80	23	14
Delaware	97	75	55	0
District of Columbia	100	88	24	0
Florida	92	95	35	8
Georgia	88	83	38	4
Hawaii	100	100	0	0
Idaho	80	75	49	4
Illinois	78	74	32	10
Indiana	74	69	29	9
Iowa	50	46	18	7
Kansas	72	62	47	6
Kentucky	88	81	34	3
Louisiana	90	94	45	4
Maine	75	64	20	3
Maryland	82	73	32	4
Massachusetts	78	71	15	10
Michigan	84	83	29	10
Minnesota	59	56	30	6
Mississippi	94	90	43	3
Missouri	75	75	31	5
Montana	81	64	50	3
Nebraska	70	67	16	11
Nevada	93	93	50	0
New Hampshire	89	71	40	5
New Jersey	71	69	17	14
New Mexico	76	75	37	5
New York	67	67	27	7
North Carolina	74	68	27	3
North Dakota	87	70	28	7
Ohio	71	64	24	6
Oklahoma	90	83	48	2
Oregon	73	90	45	5
Pennsylvania	63	57	30	9
Rhode Island	78	59	15	0
South Carolina	84	79	33	4
South Dakota	37	41	11	12
Tennessee	93	95	54	5
Texas	83	77	39	6
Utah	85	82	41	1
Vermont	90	87	21	10
Virginia	77	79	39	14
Washington	82	75	20	14
West Virginia	98	98	64	4
Wisconsin	70	69	30	8
Wyoming	90	90	25	3
Puerto Rico	100	0	0	0

Source: 2018-19 District survey (N = 13,013 districts, 4,311 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	Funds reserved for evaluation systems
All states	\$101,608,882	\$7,655,756
Alabama	\$1,645,676	\$0
Alaska	\$489,497	\$0
Arizona	\$1,771,082	\$177,107
Arkansas	\$998,928	\$0
California	\$12,040,218	\$0
Colorado	\$1,168,015	\$0
Connecticut	\$923,942	\$0
Delaware	\$489,497	\$0
District of Columbia	\$489,497	\$0
Florida	\$4,843,670	\$560,000
Georgia	\$2,886,883	\$651,912
Hawaii	\$489,497	\$59,036
Idaho	\$489,497	\$240,041
Illinois	\$4,066,256	\$286,090
Indiana	\$1,794,516	\$0
Iowa	\$789,720	\$0
Kansas	\$799,653	\$0
Kentucky	\$1,594,806	\$704,606
Louisiana	\$2,102,768	\$0
Maine	\$489,497	\$0
Maryland	\$1,459,775	\$0
Massachusetts	\$1,774,815	\$0
Michigan	\$3,840,204	\$251,087
Minnesota	\$1,366,280	\$0
Mississippi	\$892,408	\$30,000
Missouri	\$1,755,747	\$346,796
Montana	\$489,497	\$105,000
Nebraska	\$499,386	\$0
Nevada	\$587,359	\$11,000
New Hampshire	\$489,497	\$0
New Jersey	\$2,302,295	\$168,453
New Mexico	\$816,691	\$574,681
New York	\$7,868,030	\$1,712,450
North Carolina	\$2,432,333	\$0
North Dakota	\$605,497	\$0
Ohio	\$3,757,091	\$334,859
Oklahoma	\$1,687,176	\$0
Oregon	\$991,229	\$0
Pennsylvania	\$4,022,373	\$0
Rhode Island	\$489,497	\$63,000
South Carolina	\$1,350,493	\$1,010,395
South Dakota	\$489,497	\$28,500
Tennessee	\$1,824,130	\$65,000
Texas	\$8,843,884	\$0
Utah	\$692,567	\$0
Vermont	\$489,497	\$0
Virginia	\$1,859,777	\$0
Washington	\$1,664,431	\$99,500
West Virginia	\$816,192	\$0
Wisconsin	\$1,631,457	\$176,243
Wyoming	\$489,497	\$0
Puerto Rico	\$2,967,165	\$0

Source: 2018-19 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	80	71	36	30	29	26	26	11
Alabama	87	76	35	38	28	40	33	4
Alaska	68	45	36	41	32	14	32	23
Arizona	84	62	30	39	35	31	24	4
Arkansas	85	72	39	49	44	55	37	23
California	92	86	25	25	37	15	11	7
Colorado	73	58	37	25	29	25	16	29
Connecticut	94	47	38	20	20	11	10	16
Delaware	94	76	53	18	12	18	41	12
District of Columbia	100	15	15	15	100	100	15	85
Florida	91	88	50	41	34	53	29	7
Georgia	94	94	43	54	37	50	19	7
Hawaii	100	100	100	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho	67	64	25	39	34	28	42	4
Illinois	86	80	40	29	31	22	6	19
Indiana	66	56	40	23	29	27	54	11
Iowa	49	26	12	47	2	16	62	6
Kansas	73	84	32	28	31	30	31	8
Kentucky	85	96	38	35	25	21	17	1
Louisiana	92	72	69	33	30	46	32	13
Maine	97	83	14	19	26	12	3	17
Maryland	69	83	38	26	10	28	10	10
Massachusetts	83	92	24	12	24	3	9	8
Michigan	70	44	19	13	16	16	48	19
Minnesota	72	85	35	28	26	9	18	0
Mississippi	72	61	25	36	28	41	20	25
Missouri	81	85	61	54	47	33	31	18
Montana	50	30	5	21	16	71	54	0
Nebraska	71	55	27	3	14	3	11	0
Nevada	55	65	33	33	0	33	12	0
New Hampshire	70	95	46	10	15	5	27	24
New Jersey	86	63	13	28	20	5	9	6
New Mexico	76	69	61	18	36	34	35	5
New York	82	75	38	26	26	21	23	8
North Carolina	81	94	31	42	44	52	26	15
North Dakota	74	82	26	41	39	39	15	22
Ohio	75	52	50	34	29	18	25	10
Oklahoma	75	48	29	24	32	17	32	3
Oregon	88	83	58	20	31	30	11	12
Pennsylvania	95	60	73	53	73	54	34	12
Rhode Island	81	81	34	38	19	14	10	0
South Carolina	72	74	23	51	19	34	15	13
South Dakota	81	100	20	20	20	30	10	10
Tennessee	72	85	49	27	31	28	40	13
Texas	84	56	41	40	28	36	40	11
Utah	72	77	26	28	24	17	45	3
Vermont	79	82	55	21	18	19	24	0
Virginia	83	68	49	23	14	32	27	10
Washington	70	88	37	23	30	25	7	22
West Virginia	92	84	52	33	38	30	3	19
Wisconsin	80	70	37	21	33	14	31	14
Wyoming	78	79	51	30	22	7	30	14

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: 2018-19 District survey (N = 4,577 districts, 1,841 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)

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

State: 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 for the U.S. Department of Education 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 NAME at (XXX) XXX-XXXX or NAME@westat.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 2018 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.

Total Federal FY 2018 Title II, Part A State activities funds allocation for State:	\$xxx,xxx,xxx
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 V, Part B	\$ _____
Total Amount of funds transferred <u>from</u> another program to Title II, Part A	\$ _____
Total Federal FY 2018 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 style="text-align: center;">\$ _____</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 style="text-align: center;">\$ _____</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;">\$ _____</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(III-bb):</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">\$ _____</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Total:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">\$ _____</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

In Federal FY 2018, a total of \$xxx,xxx,xxx.xx was made available for subgrants to LEAs in [State]. Under Section 2101(c)(3), SEAs are allowed to reserve not more than 3 percent of the amount reserved for subgrants to LEAs for activities for principals or other school leaders described in Section 2101(c)(4). Did your state reserve any of these funds for activities for principals and other school leaders described in Section 2101(c)(4)?

- 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 2018 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) 2017-18?

Yes If you checked “yes,” please provide school year (SY) 2017-18 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]			
[insert category]			

Question 5: Does your State collect data on the SY 2017-18 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 is 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 school year (SY) 2017-18.

No

	Teachers	Principals	Other school leaders
Total			

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

District Survey

Study of Title II-A Use of Funds:

District Survey 2018-2019



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. The completed survey is due on **xx/xx/xxxx**.

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 2018-19
Section 3	Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2018-19
Section 4	Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2018-19
Section 5	Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2018-19
Section 6	Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2018-19
Section 7	Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2018-19
Section 8	Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2018-19
Section 9	Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2018-19
Section 10	Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2018-19
Section 11	Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2018-19 and that have examined information about the distribution of teacher quality or effectiveness across schools in the district serving different student populations
Section 12	Districts that received Title II, Part A funds in SY 2018-19 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 2018-19

1. Did your district receive Title II, Part A funding in school year 2018-19?

- Yes** If you selected “yes,” **continue to Section 2.**
- No** If you selected “no,” you do not need to complete this survey. Click on “Save and Mark as Complete” then, on the List of Survey Questions, click “Submit Completed Survey.”

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

2a. Please provide the amount of Federal FY 2018 Title II, Part A funds made available to your district in SY (2018-19). **Do not include carryover funds.**

2b. Please provide the amount of Federal FY 2018 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 2018 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 2018-19 after transfers: \$ _____

>> **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 2018-19 AFTER TRANSFERS was:

\$xxx,xxx.xx

3a. Please provide the amount of Title II, Part A funds available to your district in SY 2018-19, after transfers, allocated for the following activities. **Do not include carryover funds.** You can estimate if you do not have exact figures.

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, 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 2018-19 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 2018-19 to support teachers and the percentage of funds allocated to support principals and other leaders.

Teachers	Principals
_____ %	_____ %

>> Continue to Section 4.

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

4a. During SY 2018-19, has or will your district use Title II, Part A funds to hire, recruit, and retain effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders?

- Yes** 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 5**.

4b. 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.

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

>> Continue to Section 5.

Section 5: Class size reduction

5.a. During SY 2018-19, has or will your district use Title II, Part A funds to fund, in whole or part, teacher salaries?

- Yes** 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 6**.

5.b. During SY 2018-19, how many teachers have salaries funded, in part or in whole, by Title II, Part A funds? In total, how many full-time equivalents (FTEs) are funded by Title II, Part A?

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

>> Continue to Section 6.

Section 6: Teacher professional development activities

6. Please provide the total amount of funds your district has allocated for professional development during SY 2018-19 (including planned professional development) across all funding sources.

Total amount of funds allocated for professional development across all funding sources

\$ _____

>> Continue to Section 7.

Section 7: Teachers participating in professional development

7. Please provide the total count of teachers in your district in SY 2018-19, 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 2018-19.

Total number of teachers in your district in SY 2018-19

Proportion of teachers that you have or intend to use Title II, Part A funds to provide professional development activities in SY 2018-19

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

>> Continue to Section 8.

Section 8: Types of professional development

8. Please complete the table below regarding all teacher professional development provided during SY 2018-19 (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 2018-19? Also, please check the top two types based on the amount of funding allocated to each method.

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
Short-term (3 days or less) single-session professional development, conducted by an external provider	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Short-term (3 days or less) single-session professional development, conducted by district or school-level staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Longer-term (4 or more days) professional development with connected content, conducted by an external provider or coach	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Longer-term (4 or more days) professional development with connected content, conducted by district or school-level staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Longer-term (4 or more days) one-on-one support from teacher leaders or coaches	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
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"/>
Longer-term (4 or more days) group support (e.g., lesson study, peer-to-peer communities of practice)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Professional conferences or organizations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
University or college courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Professional certifications (e.g. NBPTS certification, state-level credentials or endorsements)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (describe: _____)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

>> Continue to Section 9.

Section 9: Topics of professional development for teachers

9. Please complete the table below regarding all teacher professional development provided during SY 2018-19 (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 2018-19? Also, please check the top two topics based on the amount of funding allocated to each topic.

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

>> Continue to Section 10.

Section 10: Types of professional development for principal and other school leaders

10. Please complete the table below regarding all principal and other school leaders professional development provided during SY 2018-19 (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 principal and other school leaders is your district providing during SY 2018-19? Also, please check the top two types based on the amount of funding allocated to each method.

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
Short-term (3 or less days) professional development, conducted either by external provider or district-level staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Longer-term (4 or more days) group professional development, conducted by district-level staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Longer-term (4 or more days) group professional development, conducted by an external provider	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Longer-term (4 or more days) one-on-one professional development, conducted by district-level staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Longer-term (4 or more days) one-on-one professional development, conducted by an external provider	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Longer-term (4 or more days) group support (e.g., learning communities, district monthly or quarterly principal meetings)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Professional conferences or organizations, external to the district or state	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
University or college courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
State leadership conferences or trainings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Leadership certifications (e.g., state-level credentials or endorsements)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (describe: _____)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

>> Continue to Section 11.

Section 11: Topics of professional development for principal and other school leader professional development

11. Please complete the table below regarding all principal and other school leader professional development provided during SY 2018-19 (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 2018-19? Please check the top two topics based on the amount of funding allocated to each topic.

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
School improvement planning or identifying interventions to support academic improvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
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"/>
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"/>
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"/>
Strategies to engage parents and the community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (describe: _____)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

>> Continue to Section 12.

Section 12: Teacher Quality/Effectiveness and Equity

12a. 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?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p><input type="radio"/> Yes, and inequities were found</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes, but no inequities were found</p> <p><input type="radio"/> No</p> | <p>If you selected “yes,” complete the remainder of this question below.</p> <p>If you selected “yes,” complete the remainder of this question below.</p> <p>If you selected “no,” click on “Save and Mark as Complete” and</p> |
|---|--|

12b. 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
Teacher evaluation ratings	<input type="radio"/>
Teacher effectiveness, as measured by value added measures or student growth percentiles	<input type="radio"/>
Teacher effectiveness, as measured by student learning objectives or student growth objectives	<input type="radio"/>
Teacher experience	<input type="radio"/>
Teacher certification	<input type="radio"/>
Teacher education	<input type="radio"/>
Assignment of teachers to a grade or classes consistent with their field of certification	<input type="radio"/>
Other (describe: _____)	<input type="radio"/>

>> Continue to Section 13.

Section 13: Strategies used to improve equitable access

13a. During SY 2018-19, 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**”.

13b. 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
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"/>
Developing career ladders or teacher leadership roles to attract and retain teachers in schools with lower quality/less effective teachers	<input type="radio"/>
Beginning the hiring process earlier for vacancies at schools with lower levels of teacher quality or effectiveness compared to other schools	<input type="radio"/>
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"/>
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"/>
Offering more professional development for teachers in schools with lower levels of teacher quality or effectiveness compared to other schools	<input type="radio"/>
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"/>
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"/>
Other (describe: _____)	<input type="radio"/>