

Title I, Part A Frequently Asked Questions

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

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

Questions and responses are organized by the following topic areas:

- [Campus Improvement Plan \(CIP\)/District Improvement Plan \(DIP\)](#)
- [Campus Improvement Plan \(CIP\)/District Improvement Plan \(DIP\) Stakeholders](#)
- [Carryover](#)
- [Community Eligibility Provision \(CEP\)](#)
- [Compliance Documentation](#)
- [Compliance Report for LEAs – Title I, Part A \(PR1000\)](#)
- [Comprehensive Needs Assessment \(CNA\)](#)
- [Consolidated Administrative Costs](#)
- [District of Innovation](#)
- [Early Childhood Education](#)
- [Eligibility/Within-LEA Allocations/SC5000 Schedule](#)
- [ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application](#)
- [Federal Report Card Dissemination](#)
- [New Title I, Part A Campus Processes](#)
- [Paraprofessional Requirements – Title I, Part A](#)
- [Parent and Family Engagement \(PFE\) Requirements](#)
- [Procurement](#)
- [LEA Reservations](#)
- [Schoolwide Program](#)
- [Supplement, Not Supplant \(SNS\) – Title I, Part A](#)
- [Targeted Assistance Program](#)
- [Time and Effort Documentation](#)
- [Title I, Part A-Specific Training](#)
- [Use of Funds – Title I, Part A](#)
 - [Contracted Services](#)
 - [Equipment](#)
 - [Other](#)
 - [Payroll/Personnel](#)
 - [Professional Development](#)
 - [Supplies and Materials](#)

Campus Improvement Plan (CIP)/District Improvement Plan (DIP)

Q1: Our LEA is comprised of only three campuses: high school (not served), middle school (not served), and elementary (schoolwide). Can our CIP and DIP be one document? Are there any parameters?

A1: It is acceptable for a small LEA or single campus LEA to have a document that consolidates the CIP and DIP into one document, but they must identify goals/activities separately for the district and campuses. For audit and/or random validation monitoring purposes, an LEA may be asked to identify specific goals/activities listed in their DIP and CIP to support the activity. If the expense is charged at the campus level, an auditor will want to see that activity identified in the CIP. Similarly, if the expense is charged at the LEA level, an auditor will want to see the activity identified in the DIP.

Although a Campus Improvement Plan is required for Title I, Part A campuses, state law requires all campuses to have a CIP and all LEAs to have a DIP. TEC 11.252 lists the state requirements for the DIP. But the LEA should also review the Title I, Part A provisions and assurances to see what assurances and descriptions are required to be included in the plan. (Likewise, for other federal grant programs the LEA participates in.) TEC 11.253 lists the state requirements for each CIP. If the LEA is wanting a single document to serve for all its campuses, it should be very clear which campus needs, goals, and activities go with which campus. The LEA should also review the Title I, Part A provisions and assurances for schoolwide programs to be sure that all of the required descriptions and assurances are included for the campus that is schoolwide.

Q2: Do we document 2020-2021 Title I, Part A activities funded with 2019-2020 funds in the campus and district improvement plans for 2020-2021 or 2019-2020?

A2: If Title I, Part A funded activities are taking place in the 2020-2021 school year, they should be based on the comprehensive needs assessment conducted for the 2020-2021 school year and included in the 2020-2021 plans. If the activities took place in the 2019-2020 school year, they should be based on the comprehensive needs assessment conducted for the 2019-2020 school year and included in the 2019-2020 plans.

Q3: Is there a current timeline document or chart that shows when CIPs/DIPs are due for campuses/LEAs and a deadline for when they should be posted to their website?

A3: For purposes of the Title I, Part A program, the improvement plans should be completed prior to the certification and submission of the ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application. For purposes of the Title I, Part A program, improvement plans are not “due” to TEA. However, in the case of an audit or random validation monitoring, LEAs may be requested to submit their plans. For Title I, Part A purposes, it would be a local decision as to when and whether the improvement plans would be posted to their website. Best practice would be that the improvement plans be posted

on the LEA/campus websites and made widely available to stakeholders at the beginning of the school year.

Please note that there are also State requirements related to District and Campus Improvement Plans. For information related to the plan requirements for the State Compensatory Education program, please visit the [TEA State Compensatory Education web page](#).

Q4: Are charter schools with only one campus required to complete a District Needs Assessment or District Improvement Plan under ESSA?

A4: It is acceptable for a small LEA or single campus LEA to have a document that consolidates the CNA, CIP and DIP into one document, but they must identify needs and goals/activities separately for the district and campuses. For audit and/or random validation monitoring purposes, an LEA may be asked to identify specific needs and/or goals/activities listed in their DIP and CIP to support the activity. If the expense is charged at the campus level, an auditor will want to see that activity identified in the CIP. Similarly, if the expense is charged at the LEA level, an auditor will want to see the activity identified in the DIP.

Although a Campus Improvement Plan is required for Title I, Part A campuses, state law requires all campuses to have a CIP and all LEAs to have a DIP. TEC 11.252 lists the state requirements for the DIP. But the LEA should also review the Title I, Part A provisions and assurances to see what assurances and descriptions are required to be included in the plan. (Likewise, for other federal grant programs the LEA participates in.) TEC 11.253 lists the state requirements for each CIP. If the LEA is wanting a single document to serve for all its campuses, it should be very clear which campus needs, goals, and activities go with which campus. The LEA should also review the Title I, Part A provisions and assurances for schoolwide programs to be sure that all of the required descriptions and assurances are included for any campus that is schoolwide.

Q5: Are LEAs required to translate their CIP?

A5: LEAs are required to make their CIP available to parents and the public in an understandable and uniform format, and to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand. For audit and/or random validation purposes, if the LEA is not going to provide the document in a language that the parents can understand, the LEA would need to document why they did not translate the document and how the parents were able to obtain the information (i.e., oral translation).

The statutory language related to your question reads as follows.

ESSA Section 1114

(b) SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM PLAN.—An eligible school operating a schoolwide program shall develop a comprehensive plan (or amend a plan for such a program that was in existence on the day before the date of the enactment of the Every Student Succeeds Act) that—

(4) is available to the local educational agency, parents, and the public, and the information contained in such plan shall be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand;

Q6: If an LEA makes changes to its DIP or a campus makes changes to its CIP after the plan has already been approved by the school board, do they have to take the DIP or CIP back to the school board for approval?

A6: For the Title I, Part A program, this is a local decision that would depend on the LEA's policies and procedures associated with the board approval of documents.

Q7: Does the DIP need to be approved by the board of trustees?

A7: It depends. The Texas Education Code (TEC) §11.251(a) requires that the board of trustees annually approve the district and campus performance objectives. TEA School Improvement guidance requires districts to obtain board approval of their improvement plans if the district or campus is designated for certain levels of federal intervention. Such requirements can be referenced on the [TEA Division of School Improvement Campus Accountability Interventions and Guidance webpage](#).

Additionally, for any LEA, if the district and campus decision-making process that has been established by the LEA's local school board specifies that board approval of the DIP is required, then the plan would be subject to board approval.

Response Revised 11/30/2022

Q8: Does an LEA reservation of funds need to be documented in the DIP?

A8: Yes. It is important to note in the DIP what reservation of funds the LEA has made and to ensure that the reservation(s) correspond to an identified need as per the comprehensive needs assessment process. Please note that some reservations are required by statute, such as for Homeless children and youth; children in local institutions for neglected children; and if appropriate, children in local institutions for delinquent children, and neglected or delinquent children in community day programs. LEAs that provide equitable services to students attending private nonprofit schools would reserve funds to cover the administrative costs of the private school program, as well as for the equitable services. Depending on the size of the LEA entitlement, there may also be a required reservation of funds for Parent and Family Engagement. The LEA has the option to make additional reservations, such as for Title I, Part A preschool programs or Title I, Part A services to students in foster care. In all of these cases, in addition to documenting the reservations in the DIP, the LEA must indicate the amounts reserved for these activities on the PS6101 of the Consolidated Federal Grant Application on eGrants. For additional information, see the following sections of the [Title I, Part A Program Guide](#): Reservation of Funds, Parent and Family Engagement, Services to Homeless Students, Private Nonprofit Schools.

Q9: Do LEA activities funded by Title I, Part A need to be specified in the DIP?

A9: Yes. All LEA activities funded by Title I, Part A are required to be documented in the DIP. Additionally, it is important to ensure that such activities be carried out as a result of an identified need as per the comprehensive needs assessment process. Please note that solely having an activity specified in the DIP does not necessarily make it an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds. There are several steps and requirements for using Title I, Part A. funds. Inclusion in the DIP is only one part of the required steps. Please reference the Use of Funds section of [Title I, Part A Program Guide](#) and the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#) for the steps required to determine whether an LEA can use Title I, Part A funds for a particular expense.

Q10: How often should the LEA review the DIP?

A10: The LEA, in consultation with stakeholders, should review the DIP at least quarterly to ensure that the LEA is on track to meet the goals set through the activities noted in the plan related to providing opportunities to meet the challenging State academic standards.

Q11: How often should the LEA revise the DIP?

A11: The LEA, in consultation with stakeholders, should revise the DIP at any time deemed necessary based on student needs and especially when progress is not being made towards the goals and objectives of the plan. At a minimum the DIP should be revised annually in order to address new findings from the LEA's Comprehensive Needs Assessment and the LEA's evaluation of the plan's effectiveness in meeting its stated goals.

Q12: Does the DIP need to be translated into multiple languages?

A12: LEAs operating at least one schoolwide program must establish translation procedures related to ensuring that campus improvement plans are, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that parents can understand. USDE has not provided guidance or defined the term "to the extent practicable." However, not translating required documents is not an option. Although it is not a statutory requirement for LEAs to translate their DIP, please note that it is a requirement that LEAs follow their translation procedures to ensure that requirements are met as related to timely and meaningful stakeholder consultation which may include parents who are economically disadvantaged, are disabled, have limited English proficiency, have limited literacy, or are of any racial or ethnic minority background.

Q13: Can a Targeted Improvement Plan used to carry out school improvement activities be attached as an appendix to the DIP to satisfy the improvement activities requirement?

A13: Yes. A school that is identified for school improvement can add their required improvement plan as an appendix to the DIP to satisfy the improvement activities requirement under ESSA. Please note that there may be other requirements associated with being identified for school improvement. LEAs are to follow all state school improvement interventions and submission requirements as prescribed by the Division of School Improvement.

Q14: Is the DIP subject to random validation monitoring?

A14: Yes. The DIP and the processes associated with district improvement planning are subject to random validation monitoring. Various Title I, Part A program requirements are required to be included in the DIP and thus, applicable pages from the DIP may be requested as documentation if your LEA is selected for random validation monitoring.

Q15: Does including an activity in the DIP automatically allow my LEA to use Title I, Part A funds for that activity?

A15: No. There are several steps and requirements for using Title I, Part A. funds. Solely having an activity included in the DIP does not necessarily make it an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds. There are several steps and requirements for using Title I, Part A. funds. Inclusion in the DIP is only one part of the required steps. Please reference the [Title I, Part A Program Guide](#) and the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#) for the steps required to determine whether an LEA can use Title I, Part A funds for a particular expense.

Q16: Is the DIP required to be made available to the public?

A16: Yes. Please note that the information contained in the plan is required to be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand.

Q17: Is there a specific format that TEA recommends for the DIP?

A17: No. The requirement in statute is that the information contained in the plan be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand. We acknowledge that there are vendors that provide DIP-related products. TEA does not endorse any of the vendors nor require LEAs to use a vendor for this purpose.

Q18: What elements of the comprehensive needs assessment are required to be included in the DIP?

A18: It is beneficial for the DIP to include a summary of the comprehensive needs assessment process and identified areas of need and strengths as related to students meeting the challenging State academic standards.

Q19: When should the CNA and District Improvement Plan/Campus Improvement Plan processes be completed as it relates to the Title I, Part A program?

A19: The CNA, DIP and CIP processes should be completed prior to the certification and submission of the ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application. Each LEA shall periodically review and, as necessary, revise its plan per Sec. 1112(a)(5). Each schoolwide program campus shall regularly monitor and revise their plan as necessary based on student needs to ensure that all students are provided opportunities to meet the challenging State academic standards as per Sec. 1114(b)(3).

Q20: One of the Statutorily Required Descriptions for the Title I, Part A LEA Program Plan has to do with transitions for students from middle grades to high school and high school to postsecondary education. Is the description required to be in their plan if the LEA skips or doesn't serve any of the high school campuses with Title I, Part A funds?

A20: If an LEA applies for and receives Title I, Part A funds, they are required to meet all the statutory requirements for the LEA plan regardless of which campuses they choose to serve with their Title I, Part A funds.

Q21: What are the public posting requirements for District and Campus Improvement Plans?

A21: The Title I, Part A statutory requirement [Section 1114 (b)(4)] related to making the schoolwide program plan/campus improvement plan available states the following, “An eligible school operating a schoolwide program shall develop a comprehensive plan (or amend a plan for such a program that was in existence on the day before the date of the enactment of the Every Student Succeeds Act) that—is available to the local educational agency, parents, and the public, and the information contained in such plan shall be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand.” If posting the plan on the campus website is the method your LEA has selected to make it available to the LEA, parents, and the public, it is best practice to have it posted by the first day of school. The LEA would follow its local translation policies and procedures in determining whether the document is required to be translated into another language(s).

There are no Title I, Part A statutory requirements for posting the LEA Title I, Part A Program Plan/District Improvement Plan. However, if the LEA Title I, Part A Program Plan/District Improvement Plan includes specific information that is statutorily required to be made available to the local educational agency, parents, and the public, and the information contained in such plan shall be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand, the LEA would need to make the document available to said stakeholders (i.e. LEA Parent and Family Engagement Policy, Parents Right to Know, etc.). The LEA would follow its local translation policies and procedures in determining whether the document is required to be translated into another language(s).

Q22: Is there a specific deadline by which the campus improvement plan must be posted on the campus website?

A22: The Title I, Part A statutory requirement [Section 1114 (b)(4)] related to making the plan available states the following, “An eligible school operating a schoolwide program shall develop a comprehensive plan (or amend a plan for such a program that was in existence on the day before the date of the enactment of the Every Student Succeeds Act) that—is available to the local educational agency, parents, and the public, and the information contained in such plan shall be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand.” If posting them on the campus website is the method your LEA has selected to make them available to the LEA, parents, and the public, it is best practice to have it posted by the first day of school.

Q23: Do we still have the ten Schoolwide Program Components to include in our District Improvement Plans, or are there only three elements?

A23: The Ten Components of a Title I, Part A Schoolwide Program were a requirement in developing "a comprehensive reform strategy designed to upgrade the entire educational program in a Title I campus" under No Child Left Behind. Currently under the Every Students Succeeds Act (ESSA), these requirements are described much differently. According to the Supporting School Reform by Leveraging Federal Funds in a Schoolwide Program, non-regulatory guidance, September 2016, p.3, "There are three requirements of a schoolwide program that are essential to effective implementation: 1) conducting a comprehensive needs assessment, 2) preparing a comprehensive schoolwide plan, and 3) annually reviewing and revising, as necessary, the schoolwide plan." For a comprehensive listing of Title I, Part A Schoolwide Program requirements, please see the [Program-Specific and ESSA Provisions and Assurances](#).

There are also requirements for LEAs that have applied for Title I, Part A funds. Please see the [Program-Specific and ESSA Provisions and Assurances](#) for a comprehensive listing of what should be included in the LEA's Title I, Part A Program Plan that can be included in the District Improvement Plan.

Q24: If an LEA has 2 small schoolwide program campuses, can both campuses jointly develop one comprehensive needs assessment and one schoolwide program plan?

A24: Each schoolwide program campus must have its own schoolwide program comprehensive needs assessment and schoolwide program plan/campus improvement plan. The needs of the students attending each campus will need to be considered separately. It would not be acceptable for the needs of the students on both campuses to be generalized together. The comprehensive needs assessment process would need to take into account the needs of the students on each of the campuses separately. The same would apply to the schoolwide program plan/campus improvement plan for each campus.

Q25: How often does the LEA Title I, Part A Program Plan/District Improvement Plan and Schoolwide Program Plan/Campus Improvement Plan have to be reviewed and revised?

A25: Guidance Related to the LEA Title I, Part A Program Plan (LEA)

Section 1112(a)(5) states that each LEA shall periodically review and, as necessary, revise its plan.

The LEA shall annually review and, as necessary, revise its plan. For Title I, Part A purposes, we interpret periodic review as being reviewed at least once annually. It would be considered best practice to review the LEA Title I, Part A Plan quarterly. It is important for the LEA to keep in mind that the LEA Title I, Part A Program Plan should be a snapshot of the LEA's current Title I, Part A program. Thus, if the LEA determines that a change in the scope of its Title I, Part A program is necessary, its LEA Title I, Part A Program Plan will need to be revised. In the case of an audit and/or random validation monitoring, the LEA may be asked to make available its most current plan. If the plan has not been revised to reference the most current information about the Title I, Part A program being implemented, there could be an audit finding.

Guidance Related to the Schoolwide Program Plan (Schoolwide Program Campuses)

Section 1114(b)(3) states that the plan and its implementation shall be regularly monitored and revised as necessary based on student needs to ensure that all students are provided opportunities to meet the challenging State academic standards.

There are two evaluation related requirements embedded in the Schoolwide Program Plan statutory language: 1) regularly monitoring implementation and 2) evaluating the plan. Since the campus is required to regularly monitor implementation of the Schoolwide Program Plan, campuses operating a schoolwide program shall document that they reviewed implementation of the plan at least semi-annually with quarterly review as best practice. They are required to annually evaluate the Schoolwide Program Plan which includes the review and revision of the plan, as necessary.

As per the [USDE Non-Regulatory Guidance: Supporting School Reform by Leveraging Federal Funds in a Schoolwide Program](#) “There are three required components of a schoolwide program that are essential to effective implementation: conducting a comprehensive needs assessment, preparing a comprehensive schoolwide plan, and annually reviewing and revising, as necessary, the schoolwide plan.

- Conducting a comprehensive needs assessment. To ensure that a school’s comprehensive plan best serves the needs of those children who are failing, or are at-risk of failing, to meet the challenging State academic standards, the school must conduct a comprehensive needs assessment. (ESEA section 1114(b)(6)). Through the needs assessment, a school must consult with a broad range of stakeholders, including parents, school staff, and others in the community, and examine relevant academic achievement data to understand students’ most pressing needs and their root causes. (ESEA section 1114(b)(2); 34 C.F.R. § 200.26(a)). Where necessary, a school should attempt to engage in interviews, focus groups, or surveys, as well as review data on students, educators, and schools to gain a better understanding of the root causes of the identified needs.
- Preparing a comprehensive schoolwide plan that describes how the school will improve academic achievement throughout the school, but particularly for the lowest-achieving students, by addressing the needs identified in the comprehensive needs assessment. (ESEA section 1114(b)(7)). The schoolwide plan must include a description of how the strategies the school will be implementing will provide opportunities and address the learning needs of all students in the school, particularly the needs of the lowest-achieving students. (ESEA section 1114(b)(7)(A)(i), (iii)). The plan must also contain descriptions of how the methods and instructional strategies that the school intends to use will strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum, including programs and activities necessary to provide a well-rounded education. (ESEA section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)). To ensure that the plan results in progress toward addressing

- the needs of the school, the plan should include benchmarks for the evaluation of program results. This plan may be integrated into an existing improvement plan.
- Annually evaluating the schoolwide plan, using data from the State’s assessments, other student performance data, and perception data to determine if the schoolwide program has been effective in addressing the major problem areas and, in turn, increasing student achievement, particularly for the lowest-achieving students. Schools must annually revise the plan, as necessary, based on student needs and the results of the evaluation to ensure continuous improvement. (ESEA section 1114(b)(3); 34 C.F.R. § 200.26(c)).”

It is important for the LEA to keep in mind that a Schoolwide Program Plan on a schoolwide program campus should be a snapshot of the campus’s current Title I, Part A schoolwide program. Thus, if the campus determines that a change in the scope of its Title I, Part A schoolwide program is necessary and based on the identified needs of the campus, its campus Title I, Part A Schoolwide Program Plan will need to be revised. In the case of an audit and/or random validation monitoring, the LEA may be asked to make available the campus’s most current plan. If the plan has not been revised to reference the most current information about the Title I, Part A schoolwide program being implemented, there could be an audit finding.

Q26: For many years, our LEA has contracted with an outside vendor to provide us with an electronic template for the comprehensive needs assessment process and campus improvement plans. Is creating our own documents permissible?

A26: Yes, it is permissible for your LEA to create its own documents based on your LEA’s needs, as long as the LEA is able to document that all the requirements for the Title I, Part A comprehensive needs assessment process and the Title I, Part A Schoolwide Program Plan are included in the documents.

***Q27: Does an LEA posting the LEA and all campus plans only on the LEA web site (instead of also posting on the campus websites) meet the requirement for making the plans available to parents and the public and do each have to be provided in an understandable and uniform format, and to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand?**

*A27: It is the LEA’s decision how to design its web site. The plans should be easily accessible by the public and by parents, if required to be distributed to parents and the public. If a campus plan is required to be distributed to parents, it would make most sense for the plan to be posted on the campus website. If the sole method of distribution to parents is via website, the campus and LEA would be responsible for communicating such method to all parents and maintain documentation showing evidence of such communication. LEAs and campuses are required to ensure that the plans are in an understandable and uniform format.

The LEA should follow its local translation policy or procedures to determine the appropriate languages for translation.

***Q28: ESSA Section 1114(b)(4), when referring to the Schoolwide Program Plan/Campus Improvement Plan, it references that, "the information contained in such plan shall be in an understandable and uniform format, and to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand." Does this mean that the plan has to be translated into other language(s)?**

*A28: The LEA should follow its locally developed/adopted Translation Policy or Procedure when determining whether documents are to be translated into another language.

***Q29: ESSA Section 1112(b)(3) requires that the LEA Program Plan/District Improvement Plan include a description of how the local educational agency will carry out its responsibilities under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1111(d). Does this requirement only apply to LEAs that have a comprehensive or targeted support campus?**

*A29: This requirement only applies to LEAs that have schools identified under Section 1111(d)(1) and (2), which references campuses identified as comprehensive support and improvement campuses and targeted support and improvement campuses.

***Q30: ESSA Section 1112(b)(4) requires that the LEA Program Plan/District Improvement Plan include a description of the poverty criteria that will be used to select school attendance areas under section 1113. What exactly should an LEA include in its plan to meet this requirement?**

*A30: The requirement is referring to which measure(s) of poverty the LEA will use to establish Title I, Part A campus eligibility. The options in statute are as follows.

To determine the number of public school students from low-income families, the ESSA statute provides an LEA the option to use the number of public school children who are:

- Eligible for free or reduced-priced lunch (FRPL) under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (including children counted through the Community Eligibility Provision);
- In families receiving assistance under the State program funded under Title IV, Part A of the Social Security Act (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families);
- Eligible to receive medical assistance under the Medicaid program;
- Ages 5-17 in poverty as counted in the most recent LEA-level census poverty data approved by the Department; or
- Counted by the LEA using a composite of any of the above measures.

If an LEA chooses to use Ages 5-17 in poverty data, please be advised that because census data are generally not available at the school level, this measure would most likely be part of a composite with one or more of the additional measures noted here.

The LEA should also include additional information that may not be documented on the SC5000 as part of its process for allocating Title I, Part A funds to eligible campuses (i.e., if using the flexibility for high schools [above 50% poverty], if using grade span grouping/define grade spans, per-pupil amounts, etc.).

LEAs with an enrollment of fewer than 1,000 students or LEAs only operating one school are exempt in statute from having to use the poverty measures to determine which of its schools receive Title I funds. Such LEAs may use other criteria, such as academic performance or the grade span of its schools to determine which of its schools receive Title I funds, or the LEA may choose to allocate Title I funds to all its schools. Such LEAs will want to include the criteria that were used to allocate funds to Title I, Part A campuses.

***Q31: Is it a requirement for the LEA written parent and family engagement (PFE) policy to be included in the LEA Program Plan/District Improvement Plan as an addendum, or can the LEA state that it will follow the parent and family engagement strategies laid out in the plan and post the plan on the website or distribute it in the school handbook?**

*A31: There are 2 statutory references related to the LEA PFE written policy. Section 1112 (b)(7) references that the LEA Title I, Part A Program Plan shall describe, “the strategy the local educational agency will use to implement effective parent and family engagement under section 1116.” Section 1116(a)(2) references that, “Each local educational agency that receives funds under this part shall develop jointly with, agree on with, and distribute to, parents and family members of participating children a written parent and family engagement policy. The policy shall be incorporated into the local educational agency’s plan developed under section 1112.” Since statute states that the policy shall be “incorporated into the LEA’s plan,” to meet compliance requirements, the LEA should either include it in the LEA plan or as an addendum to the plan. Although there is no distribution requirement in the Title I, Part A statute for the LEA Title I, Part A program plan/DIP, there is a distribution requirement for the LEA PFE written policy. The LEA would decide how it will distribute the policy to parents and family members of participating children. The LEA could post the PFE policy on its website. However, the LEA would also need to notify parents that the PFE policy will be made available on the website. The LEA can also have copies available at Title I, Part A campuses and/or it can also publish the LEA PFE written policy in the student handbook that is distributed to all parents.

***Q32: What are the Title I, Part A translation requirements as they relate to LEA and campus plans?**

*A32: The following responses are related to the LEA Program Plan requirements that LEAs may include in their District Improvement Plans and the Schoolwide Program Plan requirements that Title I, Part A Schoolwide Program campuses may include in their Campus Improvement Plans.

General Translation Requirements

In instances where the Title I, Part A statute requires that information, to the extent practicable, be provided to parents in a language that parents can understand, the LEA would need to follow its written local translation policy/procedure to determine if the LEA would be providing the information in multiple languages in accordance with such policy/procedure.

Title I, Part A LEA Program Plan

The ESSA Title I, Part A statute does not require that the Title I, Part A LEA Program Plan be translated in its entirety; however, there are some requirements listed in statute that are either

required to be in the plan or are referenced in Section 1112 where the plan is referenced that do require such translation. All the Parents' Right to Know requirements referenced in Section 1112(e) require that the notices and information be provided to parents in an understandable and uniform format, and to the extent practicable, provided in a language that parents can understand [Section 1112(e)(4)]. Additionally, Section 1112(b)(7) makes reference to a description of the strategy the LEA will use to implement effective parent and family engagement under section 1116. Since the LEA Written Parent and Family Engagement Policy is required to be incorporated into the plan, such policy is required to be distributed to parents in an understandable and uniform format, and to the extent practicable, provided in a language that parents can understand [Section 1116(a)(2)].

Title I, Part A Schoolwide Program Plan

Section 1114(b)(4) requires that the Schoolwide Program Plan is made "available to the LEA, parents, and the public, and the information contained in such plan shall be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in language that the parents can understand."

Campus Improvement Plan (CIP)/District Improvement Plan (DIP) Stakeholders

Schoolwide Program Plan/Campus Improvement Plan Statutory Requirement for Stakeholders:

An eligible school operating a schoolwide program shall develop a comprehensive plan (or amend a plan for such a program that was in existence on the day before the date of the enactment of the Every Student Succeeds Act) that—is developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals present in the school, administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), the local educational agency, to the extent feasible, tribes and tribal organizations present in the community, and, if appropriate, specialized instructional support personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students, and other individuals determined by the school.

Q1: The ESSA Statute [Section 1114(b)(2)] references the following stakeholders that are required to be involved in the development of the Campus Improvement Plan: parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals present in the school, administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), the local educational agency, to the extent feasible, tribes and tribal organizations present in the community, and, if appropriate, specialized instructional support personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students, and other individuals determined by the school. When it references including students when the plan relates to a secondary school, is secondary school defined as a high school only?

A1: A secondary school would include high school and middle school/junior high school campuses.

Q2: To what degree are students required to be involved in the development of the Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) on a secondary school campus?

A2: Section 1114 of the ESSA statute provides a list of required stakeholders for the development of the Schoolwide Program Plan - Campus Improvement Plan (CIP). The statute states that if the plan relates to a secondary school, that students should be involved, if appropriate. The campus can determine what is appropriate.

If the campus does not feel that it is appropriate for the students to sit through the very intense or in-depth conversations, then they would not need to have students be involved for those conversations. The requirement for stakeholder involvement could vary based on what may be the most appropriate way to involve a particular group of stakeholders. For example, a campus may determine that the most appropriate way to involve students in the development of the CIP would be to seek input and feedback on the specific activities that directly affect students. This can be documented in a variety of ways which includes, but is not limited to, having a meeting that only includes students, conducting a student survey, or discussion of the item(s) at a Campus

Committee meeting and then excusing the students. The key is for the campus to maintain documentation locally that shows evidence of their involvement.

Q3: If a campus only has 1 administrator (Principal) how do they meet the requirement to include school leaders, principals, and administrators mentioned in statute? Our LEA has one campus with one principal and six teachers that make up their school community. If a campus does not have paraprofessionals, are they excused from having that role represented on their campus?

A3: We understand that small LEAs may not have multiple people to meet the required stakeholder requirements for a group of stakeholders or even at least 1 person to represent a particular group of required stakeholders. To justify that all of the required stakeholders were not part of the process because the roles did not exist within the LEA, it can be noted on the sign in sheet retained as documentation locally. However, this does not mean that an LEA can exclude a group of stakeholders because they weren't invited to participate and were an available group of stakeholders in the LEA. The LEA would not be required to have paraprofessionals represented on the committees if the LEA has no paraprofessional staff. The LEA would be expected to have more than one parent representative.

Q4: Statutory language for Title I, Part A, states “if appropriate, specialized instructional support personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff...” Does the “if appropriate” apply to all of the positions that follow? Or does it only apply to the specialized instructional staff?

A4: “If appropriate,” applies to all of the positions that follow.

Q5: Title I, Part A requires representation from LEA-level staff – that would mean any administrator of the LEA?

A5: The Schoolwide Program Plan is to be developed with the involvement of the LEA. This would include an LEA-level individual or individuals who have relevant knowledge of the campus needs and have been involved in the campus needs assessment process.

Q6: Does an LEA need to have one master sign-in sheet for Federal Programs meetings (i.e., Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA), CIP, DIP, etc.) or should the sign-in sheets be separate for each program (ex. Title I, Title II and Title IV)?

A6: If an LEA chose to use that option, one master sign-in-sheet would suffice for all programs administered in the Federal Program Compliance Division. To ensure compliance can be established in an audit or random validation, each sign in sheet should include the purpose, date, and time of the meeting; stakeholder name; stakeholder group represented on the committee; and the stakeholder's signature indicating that they were present at the meeting. It is also important to note that each program has their individual requirements for stakeholder groups that are required to be involved for different purposes. Thus, it is also important for LEAs to retain detailed agendas and minutes of meetings as documentation related to the specific program requirements.

Q7: What is considered timely and meaningful stakeholder consultation?

A7: Timely and meaningful stakeholder consultation is a critical requirement that can be found throughout the ESSA statute. It is important for LEAs to ensure that their processes and procedures include elements that document timely and meaningful stakeholder consultation. LEAs should use the following guiding questions when considering whether stakeholder consultation is timely and meaningful.

- ✓ Are stakeholders involved in the comprehensive needs assessment and district improvement planning processes on an ongoing basis?
- ✓ Are the comprehensive needs assessment and LEA improvement planning processes tailored to solicit meaningful input and feedback from all stakeholders?
- ✓ Do the engagement activities include goal setting and development of ideas and activities rather than just one-way communication for information sharing purposes?
- ✓ Is stakeholder engagement sustained with stakeholders having the opportunity to participate in discussions at the decision-making, implementation and evaluation stages of the processes?
- ✓ Are all the required stakeholders involved and in attendance at every step of the processes?
- ✓ Are there processes in place to solicit input from stakeholders from whom English is not their primary language?
- ✓ Does the process have enough time built in for meaningful consultation?
- ✓ Are the comprehensive needs assessment and LEA improvement planning activities part of a process rather than an event?
- ✓ Are there opportunities built into the process for stakeholders to share their feedback in a comfortable setting?
- ✓ Has the LEA considered the barriers to greater participation by parents in activities, with particular attention to parents who are economically disadvantaged, are disabled, have limited English proficiency, have limited literacy, or are of any racial or ethnic minority background?
- ✓ Are the activities associated with the comprehensive needs assessment and district improvement planning processes held at a variety of times to ensure maximum stakeholder attendance and engagement?
- ✓ Are parents of participating children aware that if the District Improvement Plan is not satisfactory to them, their comments shall be submitted by the LEA to the state via the ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application?

Q8: How does the LEA submit parent comments through the Consolidated Application?

A8: Inside the Consolidated Application on eGrants, there is an “Attach File” function that is accessible from the Table of Contents page. It is located above the blue bar that is labeled “Grant Resources.”

Q9: Can the same stakeholders who are consulted for the DIP be the same stakeholders utilized to develop the Parent and Family Engagement Policy?

A9: There could certainly be some overlap between the two groups. However, although, parents of children in schools served under Title I, Part A are required to be a part of the DIP stakeholder consultation process, they are only one of the stakeholder groups that are part of that process. The requirement for the Parent and Family Engagement (PFE) Policy is that it be jointly developed with parents and family members of participating children. Thus, the stakeholder group responsible for the development of the PFE Policy would likely need to include more parents so that the group could include a sufficient number and representative group of parents and family members served by the LEA to adequately represent the needs of the populations served for the purposes of developing, revising, and reviewing the parent and family engagement policy.

Q10: Does “Principals” refer to the 1 Campus Principal and any Assistant Principals in the list of stakeholders required to be involved in the development of the Schoolwide Program Plan/Campus Improvement Plan?

A10: “Principals” can refer to Principal and any Assistant Principals. It is customary that a campus would have only 1 Principal. Assistant Principals can be considered “other school leaders.”

Q11: Does there have to be at least 2 LEA Administrators on every campus improvement planning team?

A11: The plan must be developed with the involvement of at least 2 LEA Administrators since the administrator reference in statute is plural (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this Title [Title I, Part C; Title I, Part D]).

Q12: The statutory listing of stakeholders required to be involved in the development of the Schoolwide Program Plan/Campus Improvement Plan has “Administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title)” and “the LEA, to the extent feasible.” Are the “Administrators” serving in a dual capacity as LEA Administrators and LEA Representatives?

A12: The administrators are serving as LEA representatives so the language that references that “the LEA, to the extent feasible” is to be involved leaves it open for other LEA representatives that may not be administrators to serve as stakeholders.

Q13: Are students on a secondary campus required to be involved in the development of the campus improvement plan?

A13: If a secondary campus deems student involvement appropriate in the development of the plan, they can include students. If a secondary school does not have students as part of their stakeholder list, that would be acceptable.

Q14: Is it allowable for a parent who is an employee of the LEA to be one of the stakeholders representing parents to inform the comprehensive needs assessment and schoolwide program/LEA improvement planning processes? How does this requirement apply to a substitute who is a contractor instead of an employee?

A14: Texas Education Code §11.251 specifies that a parent who is an employee of the school district is not considered a parent representative on the district and campus improvement plan committees. The Title I, Part A statute does not include such a requirement. However, since state statute includes this requirement, the LEA should follow the state statutory requirement when selecting their parents that will be part of the comprehensive needs assessment and schoolwide program/LEA improvement planning processes.

If a substitute is not an employee of the district, then they, technically, could be considered a parent representative on the district and campus improvement plan committees.

Carryover

***Q1: ESSA allows an exception to the 15% limit on carryover for LEAs receiving less than \$50,000 in Title I, Part A funds. If an LEA with less than \$50,000 in Title I, Part A transfers Title II, Part A and/or Title IV, Part A funds into Title I, Part A and therefore has a total over \$50,000, does that exception still apply?**

***A1:** Any funds transferred into the Title I, Part A program through Funding Transferability will be included in the total amount used to calculate Title I, Part A carryover to determine if the LEA has exceeded the 15% statutory limitation. If the transferred in amounts cause the LEA to go over \$49,999, then the 15% limit will be applied, and the LEA will need to use a waiver if the LEA wants to carryover more than 15%.

REAP funds are not actually transferred, so they are not included in the carryover calculation when used for Title I, Part A purposes. [Response revised, June 2023]

Q2: Are there waivers available for the Title I, Part A 15% carryover requirement?

A2: There are two waivers available related to Title I, Part A carryover as referenced below.

- Statutory waiver under Section 1127: Once every three years the LEA may be granted a waiver of the 15% carryover limitation through Schedule WV4001 in the ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application. Staff in the Grants Administration Division will determine whether an LEA's carryover amount will exceed the limit allowed and will apply the statutory waiver, if it is available. If the LEA has used the statutory waiver in the past two years, staff will check to see if the LEA meets the requirements for the Ed-Flex Statewide Programmatic waiver related to the 15% carryover limitation. Any necessary documents will be initiated by the Grants Administration Division.
- If the statutory waiver is not available to the LEA, and if the LEA experienced an increase in Title I, Part A funding between the initial planning amount and the final allocation amount, the LEA may be granted an Ed-Flex waiver through Schedule WV4001 in the ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application. Any necessary documents will be initiated by the Grants Administration Division.

***Q3: How is the amount for the Title I, Part A 15% carryover limit calculated for LEAs and for SSA Fiscal Agents?**

***A3:** The Title I, Part A statute imposes a 15% carryover limit to the LEAs total Title I, Part A amount received in a given year. This is typically the LEA's Title I, Part A Final amount, and prior-year Carryover and Reallocation also received does not count. In order to prevent lapsing of funds though, Final/Revised Final expenditures processed during that grant closeout period will be applied first to any remaining prior-year project funds (carryover and reallocation) and then to the current year project. What remains in the current year project being closed out then becomes carryover on the LEA's new year project NOGA along with its new Final amount. This is true for grants like Title II, Part A and Title IV, Part A too.

When determining the total amount of Title I, Part A an LEA received, funding transfers from Title II, Part A and/or Title IV, Part A into Title I, Part A as reported on the eGrants PS3109 must be also taken into account. If the LEA reports that 100% of its Title II, Part A is being transferred and used as Title I, Part A funds locally, then those funds count as additional Title I, Part A funds received and after Final/Revised Final Title II, Part A expenditures are processed, 100% of remaining Title II, Part A is considered as additional Title I, Part A carryover when calculating if total Title I, Part A carryover exceeds the 15% of total Title I, Part A funding received and thus a waiver will be required in order to keep all the carryover funds.

For a Shared Services Arrangement (SSA), we have to consider all the member LEAs, determine a total Title I, Part A received by the Fiscal Agent, determine via the PS3109 which LEAs transferred Title II, Part A and/or Title IV, Part A into Title I, Part A, add those amounts to the Title I, Part A total, determine a total Title I, Part A carryover amount that includes proportionate shares of any Title II, Part A and/or Title IV, Part A carryover due to funding transfers, and then determine if the 15% threshold has been exceeded. If so, the Fiscal Agent would need a waiver; otherwise the SSA's Title I, Part A carryover (and potentially Title II, Part A and /or Title IV, Part A carryover) would have to be reduced to the calculated threshold amount.

As you can see, funding transfers add to the complexity and thus just looking at a prior-year Title I, Part A Final amount and multiplying to get a 15% carryover limit amount does not always work for LEAs and Fiscal Agents in particular.

Due to COVID, prior grants were extended to the full 27 months thus no carryover to process and last year (2021-2022) USDE granted Texas a one-time only waiver to waive the Title I, Part A requirement. This is the first year in a while that we have had to address Title I, Part A waivers and the impact of funding transfers into Title I, Part A may have.

Community Eligibility Provision (CEP)

Q1: Where can we find information related to PEIMS reporting for Economic-Disadvantage if we are an LEA participating in the CEP Program?

A1: The guidance that is published in the 2020-2021 Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS) can be found by accessing this link:
<https://tealprod.tea.state.tx.us/TWEDS/85/379/0/0/DataComponents/ComplexType/List/8262>.

2020-2021 Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS) Section DR40

ECONOMIC-DISADVANTAGE-CODE (E0785) indicates the student's economic disadvantage status.

Overview of Community Eligibility Provision (CEP)

- Review enrolled students against all direct certification lists for free or reduced-price lunch eligibility.
- Distribute a locally developed income survey form to each student that is not on a direct certification list at the beginning of the school year and each student that enrolls during the school year.

Although the CEP program allows all students enrolled on a CEP campus to receive free meals, students must be reported with the economic disadvantage code for which they actually qualify based upon the direct certification lists and the locally developed income survey form.

Q2: Our LEA has two campuses. The elementary/junior high is served with Title I, Part A funds. The high school is not. The district is moving to the CEP funding process for 20-21. Must the high school now receive Title I, Part A funding?

A2: As a single attendance area, the LEA has the option to choose which of its eligible campuses to serve.

Compliance Documentation

Q1: What are acceptable forms of documentation for sign-in sheets?

A1: Given the increased use of virtual meeting environments during the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school years, participant rosters that include the meeting title, meeting date, and stakeholder names and roles would be acceptable substitutes for the more traditional sign-in sheets. This eliminates the need of a participant signature.

Compliance Report for LEAs – Title I, Part A (PR1000)

Q1: My LEA has always presented the ESSA Consolidated Compliance Report submitted to TEA at the Annual Title I, Part A Meeting. Is it required to be presented or provided to the public?

A1: It is not a statutory requirement that the ESSA Compliance Report for Title I, Part A be shared at the Annual Title I, Part A Meeting nor provided to the public. The report is subject to the Public Information Act and could be requested by the public through that avenue.

Please note that there may be information that is reported in the report that may be of interest and/or require consultation. For example, LEA Reservation Amounts are reported. The reservation of funds by an LEA will reduce the amount of funds available for distribution to participating campuses; therefore, the LEA must determine what reservations are needed in consultation with teachers, pupil services personnel (where appropriate), principals, parents of children receiving services, and private school officials before any decisions are made by the LEA.

For a list of the statutory requirements associated with the Annual Title I, Part A Meeting, take a look at the recently updated [Title I, Part A Annual Meeting Toolkit](#).

Q2: When completing the PR1000, should expenditures reported for LEA reservations not exceed the totals that were approved in the ESSA Consolidated Application – PS3101 Title I, Part A Program Schedule?

A2: Some variance is acceptable, but the LEA should try to ensure that the application reflects its actual program. If there is a significant change in the amount of funds reserved, the LEA should amend its application within the amendment period; that is the case anytime the scope of the program changes from what was in the approved application.

Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)

Q1: An LEA has decided to combine all their campuses (elementary, middle, and high) into one campus with one campus ID number. Do they need to engage in the comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) process separately, or is it acceptable for the newly formed campus to engage in one comprehensive needs assessment process?

A1: The new consolidated campus would just need to have gone through the CNA process once taking into consideration the needs of the new students that are being added to the campus.

Please note the following since you mention that the LEA has combined all its campuses.

It is acceptable for a small LEA or single campus LEA to have a document that consolidates the Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) and District Improvement Plan (DIP) into one document, but they must identify goals/activities separately for the district and campuses. For audit and/or random validation monitoring purposes, an LEA may be asked to identify specific goals/activities listed in their DIP and CIP to support the activity. If the expense is charged at the campus level, an auditor will want to see that activity identified in the CIP. Similarly, if the expense is charged at the LEA level, an auditor will want to see the activity identified in the DIP.

Although a Campus Improvement Plan is required for Title I, Part A campuses, state law requires all campuses to have a CIP and all LEAs to have a DIP. TEC 11.252 lists the state requirements for the DIP, but the LEA should also review the Title I, Part A provisions and assurances to see what assurances and descriptions are required to be included in the plan. (Likewise, for other federal grant programs the LEA participates in.) TEC 11.253 lists the state requirements for each CIP. If the LEA is wanting a single document to serve for all its campuses, it should be very clear which campus needs, goals, and activities go with which campus. The LEA should also review the Title I, Part A provisions and assurances for schoolwide programs to be sure that all the required descriptions and assurances are included for the campus that is schoolwide.

Q2: Who is required to be on the campus-level CNA committee?

A2: For Title I, Part A purposes, the ESSA Statute provides a list of required stakeholders for the development of the Campus Improvement Plan (CIP). It would be best practice to include the same stakeholders that are required for the CIP in the CNA process to ensure that they are knowledgeable of the CNA results in their work to connect the CNA to the CIP. See additional information below on the importance of engaging a variety of stakeholders in the process.

A schoolwide campus should include a description of the campus's CNA process in the CNA or CIP. The description should include the date(s) that the CNA was developed (if a new campus) or the date(s) that the CNA was reviewed and revised for the current school year, list of stakeholders involved that includes the individuals by name and roles, areas examined, and list of multiple data sources analyzed. In the event that an LEA is selected for random validation, the LEA would need to submit documentation to show that the stakeholders listed in the description were involved in the CNA process.

The [Needs Assessment Guidebook](#), a resource that provides information as it relates to stakeholders involved in the CNA process, includes the following “A needs assessment is a process that should be undertaken with (or by) local stakeholders rather than completed entirely by a small group of leaders or an outside entity. Engaging school staff, parents, a diverse assortment of leaders and external support providers (even students, at the secondary level) during each phase of the needs assessment—not just in the delivery of results—ensures that the planning, data collection, identified needs, and consideration of underlying causes incorporate the input of a broad knowledge base, including diverse local perspectives.

The benefit of a needs assessment conducted with collaboratively engaged stakeholders is seen long after the needs assessment is complete. By developing trust in and through the process, participating stakeholders are more likely to be invested in the outcomes and actively engaged in the selection, development, and implementation of improvement plans and strategies that create lasting change. In addition, active participation increases the overall capacity of the group to sustain implementation and improvement efforts. Relational trust is a critical factor for implementing lasting changes in education settings, and active stakeholder engagement can help to build that trust (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).”

Q3: Are the Title I, Part A stakeholders required to be involved in the CNA process the same for the development of the Campus Improvement Plan?

A3: ESSA Sec. 1114(b)(2) provides a list of required stakeholders for the development of the Campus Improvement Plan (CIP). Including the same stakeholders required for the CIP in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) process will ensure that the same stakeholders are knowledgeable of the CNA results as they work to connect the CNA to the CIP development process. However, since a list of stakeholders for the CNA process are not listed in statute, the campus can determine which stakeholders to include in the CNA process.

A schoolwide campus should include a description of the campus’s CNA process in the CNA or CIP. The description should include a list of involved stakeholders’ names and roles. In the event that an LEA is selected for random validation, the LEA would need to submit documentation to show that the stakeholders listed in the description were involved in the CNA process.

Q4: Where in the ESSA Statute does it state that a Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) is required for LEAs receiving Title I, Part A funds?

A4: Although the ESSA Statute does not require a CNA for the components of the Title I, Part A LEA Plan, state statute (TEC 11.252) requires the District Improvement Plan be based on a comprehensive needs assessment. The ESSA Statute (Section 1114) does require a CNA for Title I, Part A campuses operating a schoolwide program.

- Q5: If an LEA has 2 small schoolwide program campuses, can both campuses jointly develop one comprehensive needs assessment and one schoolwide program plan?**
- A5: Each schoolwide program campus must have its own schoolwide program comprehensive needs assessment and schoolwide program plan/campus improvement plan. The needs of the students attending each campus will need to be considered separately. It would not be acceptable for the needs of the students on both campuses to be generalized together. The comprehensive needs assessment process would need to take into account the needs of the students on each of the campuses separately. The same would apply to the schoolwide program plan/campus improvement plan for each campus.
- Q6: For many years, our LEA has contracted with an outside vendor to provide us with an electronic template for the comprehensive needs assessment process and campus improvement plans. Is creating our own documents permissible?**
- A6: Yes, it is permissible for your LEA to create its own documents based on your LEA's needs as long as the LEA is able to document that all the requirements for the Title I, Part A comprehensive needs assessment process and the Title I, Part A Schoolwide Program Plan are included in the documents.

Consolidated Administrative Costs

Q1: Can you tell us more about Consolidated Administrative Costs?

A1: LEAs are allowed to consolidate federal grant funds from several federal grant programs in order to pay for the costs associated with the administration of those programs. The federal grant programs eligible for this consolidation are those awarded under the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA). The authorizing statute is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), Title VIII, Part B, Sec. 8201 and Sec. 8203. Please note that LEAs must receive approval from TEA to consolidate their administrative funds.

Consolidating administrative funds provides flexibility to LEAs by allowing them to charge administrative costs to an administrative cost pool instead of assigning specific costs to specific programs. As long as the cost is an allowable administrative activity under any of the programs that have been consolidated, it may be charged to any of the consolidated administrative funds.

In addition, the consolidated funds may be treated as one cost objective, so LEAs are not required to maintain personnel activity reports to document the time spent by employees on administrative activities performed exclusively for the programs that contribute to the pool. For these employees, LEAs must still maintain semi-annual certifications, or their equivalents, and identify the administrative cost pool as the cost objective.

If the LEA consolidates administrative funds, a [Consolidation of Administrative Costs form](#) must be completed, maintained locally, and submitted to TEA upon request.

For additional information related to Consolidated Administrative Costs, see the Budget Schedule Instructions for the ESSA Consolidated Application.

District of Innovation

- Q1: Is a District of Innovation exempt from any Title I, Part A statutory requirements (i.e., fiscal requirements [comparability; supplement, not supplant; and maintenance of effort]; Parents' Right to Know; Campus Improvement Plan; time and effort; LEA Plan/District Improvement Plan [DIP]).?**
- A1: LEAs that are operating as Districts of Innovation are not exempt from the Title I, Part A federal statutory requirements referenced (fiscal requirements [comparability; supplement, not supplant; and maintenance of effort]; Parents' Right to Know; Campus Improvement Plan; time and effort; LEA Plan/District Improvement Plan [DIP]). Please note that there are some parents' right-to-know requirements that relate to teacher and paraprofessional certification requirements that may not apply to a District of Innovation if the district is implementing its approved District of Innovation teacher certification policy where such requirements may be waived as per State statute.
- Q2: If a District has a District of Innovation Plan in place that allows the district to waive site-based activities at the campus level, are these activities still required for Title I, Part A?**
- A2: Stakeholder involvement is required in Title I, Part A statute. Although a meeting is one method a campus may use for stakeholder involvement, there are multiple methods for involving stakeholders (i.e., surveys, focus groups, correspondence, etc.). The campus would need to keep appropriate documentation for the methods the campus used.

Early Childhood Education

Q1: Are Title I campuses required to have a Pre-K program or is this optional?

A1: There is no requirement in ESSA that requires Title I campuses to provide a pre-kindergarten program. For questions related to state requirements associated with pre-kindergarten programs, please reach out to the [TEA Early Childhood Education Division](#).

Eligibility/Within-LEA Allocations/SC5000 Schedule

Q1: Do campuses identified as “skipped” on the SC5000 need to have a CIP in place?

A1: Since “skipped” campuses will not be receiving Title I, Part A funding to implement a Title I, Part A program, they are not obligated to meet the program requirements associated with receiving Title I, Part A funding, such as the Campus Improvement Plan. Please note that although the “skipped” campus is not required to have a CIP in place to meet the Title I, Part A requirements, Texas Education Code Section 11.253(c) requires the following, “Each school year, the principal of each school campus, with the assistance of the campus-level committee, shall develop, review, and revise the campus improvement plan for the purpose of improving student performance for all student populations, including students in special education programs under Subchapter A, Chapter 29, with respect to the student achievement indicators adopted under Section 39.053 and any other appropriate performance measures for special needs populations.”

As per the [Schedule SC5000 Title I, Part A Campus Selection Guidance](#) (Page 9), the LEA confirms by submission of its application that “skipped” campuses meet the following requirements: 1) The skipped campus meets the comparability of services requirement; 2) The skipped campus receives supplemental funds from other State or local sources that are expended per the requirements of a TA or a SW campus; and 3) The funds expended from such other sources equal or exceed the amount that would be provided on the campus under Title I, Part A. Additionally, if the LEA chooses to “skip” a campus, the LEA must provide the eligible private school children who reside within the boundaries of the “skipped” campus’s attendance area the opportunity to receive Title I, Part A services.

Q2: Is the LEA’s low-income percentage in part one of schedule SC5000 based only on students ages 5 to 17 as of the snapshot date (date we are using for enrollment)?

A2: The LEA Total Low-Income % is calculated by dividing the total number of students who meet the LEA’s selected poverty measure by the LEA’s total number of students (either residing or enrolled, as the LEA has determined).

The LEA has several options concerning the data it uses to calculate low-income percentages. Statute allows LEAs to select from the following measures of poverty:

- Children eligible for free and/or reduced-price lunches under the National School Lunch Act;
- Children in families receiving assistance under Title IV, Part A of the Social Security Act (Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, or TANF);
- Children eligible to receive medical assistance under the Medicaid program;
- Children, ages 5 through 17, inclusive, in poverty as counted in the most recent LEA-level census poverty data approved by the US Department of Education; or
 - Note: Because census data are generally not available at the school level, if an LEA uses this measure, it would most likely be part of a composite with one or more of the above measures
- A composite of any of the above measures.

The LEA would be restricted to ages 5 through 17 only if they were selecting the 4th bulleted item solely as their only measure of poverty. For all other data (bullets # 1, 2, 3 and 5), the low-income percentage would be based on student enrollment numbers regardless of student ages.

Q3: Are the campus numbers (enrollment and low-income percentage) based on our LEA procedures and may include students who are 18 years of age on the snapshot date?

A3: Whichever data option the LEA selects, the LEA must use the same measure of poverty as noted in Q1 above—

- To identify eligible campuses;
- To determine the campus rankings; and
- To determine Title I, Part A allocations to campuses.

For campuses, the LEA would be restricted to ages 5 through 17 only if they were selecting the 4th bulleted item solely as their only measure of poverty as noted in Q1 above. For all other data (bullets # 1, 2, 3 and 5), the low-income percentage would be based on student enrollment numbers regardless of student ages if the basis of eligibility being selected for the campuses is “enrollment.”

Q4: Based on US Department of Agriculture flexibility related to the Pandemic, students will not be required to complete and return a National School Lunch Program (NSLP) application. Thus, our LEA will not have data available for determining low-income percentages. Can the LEA create a low-income survey to determine low-income percentages?

A4: In a Fact Sheet released by the [US Department of Education \(USDE\)](#) on January 4, 2021, related to NSLP data, they stated that an LEA can use data from a poverty survey that replicate NSLP or other poverty data. If the form replicates NSLP or other poverty data, then it would be acceptable for use in reporting Title I, Part A Low-Income data. The poverty thresholds to be used would be the same ones used to calculate Free and Reduced Priced Lunch eligibility. Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) campuses use this method since they do not collect NSLP applications. Additionally, if the LEA does not have the best available poverty data from 20-21 because they did not collect a survey, they can use 19-20 data.

Q5: Based on the flexibility provided by the US Department Education (USDE) related to using school year (SY) 2019-2020 data for determining low-income percentages, what documentation would the LEA need to maintain if using this flexibility?

A5: The LEA would need to maintain the same documentation that was kept when the 2019-2020 poverty data were entered for the 2020-2021 SC5000. Each LEA is required to maintain auditable documentation locally supporting the poverty numbers provided on the SC5000 in the case of an audit and/or random validation monitoring. If the LEA uses SY 2019-2020 National School Lunch Program (NSLP) data as the LEA selected measure of poverty, the LEA will need to maintain auditable documentation that supports that the LEA used the same measure of poverty data for the LEA and all campuses and that the date used to determine low-income data and enrollment

numbers was the same for all campuses. Examples of the documentation would be NSLP student information system generated reports and the actual NSLP applications that support the numbers from reports generated by the NSLP student information system.

Q6: For LEAs who ordinarily use Direct Certification as their Basis of Eligibility but are providing meals to students using Summer Seamless Option, may we still enter their Direct Certification % on the SC5000? Or is there something else we should do?

A6: If an LEA is using direct certification as a basis of eligibility, for the low-income percentage, the LEA would enter the % of students on the campus that are considered low-income based on direct certification. Keep in mind that the number of students directly certified is a subset of the total number of students eligible for free and reduced-priced meals.

Q7: May LEAs choose to use 2019-2020 enrollment and National School Lunch Program (NSLP) numbers on the SC5000 for the 2021-2022 ESSA Consolidated Application?

A7: For enrollment, an LEA uses the most recently available data, which will be from the previous school year in most cases. Since enrollment data should be available for 2020-2021, the LEA would use enrollment data from 2020-2021. The as-of date is selected by the LEA. The date used to determine enrollment numbers must be the same for all campuses.

The [US Department of Education](#) released a Fact Sheet on January 4, 2021, with the following non-regulatory guidance related to low-income percentages for within-LEA allocations.

Due to the novel Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA's) Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) granted nationwide waivers (USDA waivers) through June 30, 2021, to support access to nutritious meals while minimizing potential exposure to COVID-19. The USDA waivers relate to the National School Lunch Program (NSLP), the School Breakfast Program (SBP), the Seamless Summer Option (SSO), and the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP).

For LEAs that choose to participate under the USDA waivers, complete NSLP data collected through household applications may not be available from school year (SY) 2020-2021. To the extent that SEAs and LEAs use NSLP data to help carry out the Title I, Part A program, they ordinarily would use NSLP data from SY 2020-2021 to implement their Title I, Part A program in SY 2021-2022 because the SY 2020-2021 data would be the best data available. The information that follows outlines options for LEAs to successfully implement their Title I, Part A program without complete NSLP data.

To the extent that NSLP data from SY 2020-2021 are not available, options available to an LEA for its within-LEA allocations in SY 2021-2022 include using:

- Medicaid or Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) data or a composite of data of these two sources from SY 2020- 2021;
- The best available NSLP data, **which may be from SY 2019-2020**;
- NSLP data from SY 2020-2021 that may be accessible (e.g., counts of children identified through direct certification);

- A composite of NSLP, Medicaid, and TANF data, which might include Medicaid or TANF counts from SY 2020-2021 and the best available FRPL data, **which may be from SY 2019-2020**; or
- Data from a poverty survey conducted by the SEA or LEA that replicate NSLP, Medicaid, or TANF data.

Q8: For LEAs implementing the CEP program, is it acceptable for the LEA to use a socio-economic survey to determine the LEA and campus low-income percentages utilized to determine within-LEA allocations?

A8: An LEA can use data from a poverty survey that replicates the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) survey or other poverty data. If the survey replicates the NSLP or other poverty data survey, then it would be acceptable for use in reporting Title I, Part A Low-Income data for the LEA and campuses.

Q9: An LEA has 2 Title I, Part A served campuses that are combining. They will be at a new physical location, with a new name, but will be keeping the PEIMS number of one of the campuses. For the application, would we average the two schools' snapshot (that is the date we use) free/reduced-price lunch information?

A9: The process would remain the same as with all campuses reported on the SC5000. To determine the campus low-income % for the combined campus, the LEA would divide the number of low-income students by the figure entered in the "Total Campus Enrollment" field and enter that result. The LEA would use the number of low-income students, multiplied by the per-pupil amount the LEA chooses, to determine a campus's Title I, Part A allocation.

Please note that LEAs that have a total enrollment of less than 1,000 students can determine per-pupil amounts without any regard to campus low-income percentages. The LEA may choose to serve any and/or all campuses without regards to the campus low-income percentages. Such an LEA may use other criteria, such as academic performance or the grade span of its schools to determine which of its schools receive Title I funds, or it may choose to allocate Title I funds to all of its schools.

Q10: For 2021-2022, I understand that LEAs may use their 2019-2020 National School Lunch Program (NSLP) data if that is the best available information. Which enrollment numbers do they use: 2019-2020 or 2020-2021?

A10: An LEA uses the most recently available data for enrollment, which will be from the previous school year in most cases. Since enrollment data should be available for 2020-2021, they would use enrollment data from 2020-2021. The as-of date is selected by the LEA. The date used to determine enrollment numbers must be the same for all campuses.

Q11: Is it allowable for an LEA to reduce the Title I, Part A allocation for a stand-alone Pre-Kindergarten campus due to other funds being available to the campus?

A11: If the LEA wants to serve the PK campus but wants to adjust the amount of Title I, Part A funds allocated to the campus, they can use the related exception. ESSA Section 1113(c)(2)(B) permits an LEA to reduce the amount of Title I, Part A funds allocated to a Title I, Part A campus by the

amount of supplemental funds from State or local sources that it spends on programs that meet the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A. The LEA would need to maintain documentation to that effect and ensure that the reduction of Title I, Part A funds is for State or local sources that meet the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A.

Under 34 C.F.R. 200.79(b), a program meets the intent and purposes of Title I, Part A if the program either—

1. Is implemented in a school in which the percentage of children from low-income families is at least 40 percent;
2. Is designed to promote schoolwide reform and upgrade the entire educational operation of the school to support students in their achievement toward meeting the challenging State academic standards that all students are expected to meet;
3. Is designed to meet the educational needs of all students in the school, particularly the needs of students who are failing, or are most at risk of failing, to meet the challenging State academic standards; and
4. Uses the State’s assessment system to review the effectiveness of the program;

OR

1. Serves only students who are failing, or are most at risk of failing, to meet the challenging State academic standards;
2. Provides supplementary services designed to meet the special educational needs of participating students to support their achievement toward meeting the State’s student academic achievement standards; and
3. Uses the State’s assessment system to review the effectiveness of the program.

It is important to note that if the LEA substitutes 100% of the Title I, Part A funds with supplemental state or local sources, it is essentially “skipping” the campus. A “skipped” campus is not considered a Title I, Part A campus.

Q12: I have a campus that is not Title I, Part A eligible. May I use the Ed-Flex Waiver to make it Schoolwide Program eligible?

A12: There are two types of Ed-Flex Waivers involved here. If the LEA wishes to serve a campus is not Title I, Part A eligible, the LEA must first apply and be approved for an Ed-Flex [Individual Programmatic Waiver](#). This is separate from the SW Ed-Flex Waiver that is part of the Consolidated Application. There are two application windows for the Individual Ed-Flex Programmatic Waiver: in May, for a July 1 start date, and in August for an October 1 start date. The specific dates are posted on the web site (linked above), along with the application forms.

Once the LEA has received approval for the waiver to establish the campus’s Title I, Part A eligibility, the LEA can apply for the SW Ed-Flex Waiver through the Consolidated Application.

Q13: I have a campus that is Title I, Part A eligible but not SW eligible, how can I make it SW eligible?

A13: The LEA may be able to use a Feeder Pattern, or, if the campus was previously a schoolwide program, the LEA may use "SW from a previous year." If neither of these options works, the LEA may request an Ed-Flex SW waiver through the ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application.

Q14: When applying the "35 percent rule," must all school attendance areas with at least 35 percent poverty be served?

A14: No. However, the school attendance areas to be served must be selected in rank order.

Q15: May an LEA allocate a greater per-pupil amount, for example, to schoolwide program schools than to targeted assistance schools since schoolwide programs serve all children in the school?

A15: The Title I statute requires allocations to be based on the total number of low-income children in a school attendance area or school. Therefore, poverty is the only factor on which an LEA may determine funding. In other words, an LEA may not allocate funds based on the instructional model, educational need, or any other non-poverty factor. In fact, now that Title I, Part A places the responsibility for selecting participants and designing programs on schools rather than on the LEA, the LEA will not necessarily be in a position to know in advance the instructional model or educational need when determining allocations.

Q16: Is there any flexibility in how an LEA may count children from low-income families in middle and high schools?

A16: Of the four measures of poverty the statute permits an LEA to use for identifying eligible school attendance areas and allocating funds to those areas, eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch is by far the measure most frequently used. Yet, we know from experience that high school and middle school students are less likely to participate in free and reduced-price lunch programs than are elementary school students. Hence, those schools often may not be identified as eligible for Title I services or, if eligible, may not receive as high an allocation as their actual poverty rate would require. In order to address the situation, an LEA may use comparable data collected through alternative means such as a survey. Also, an LEA may use the feeder pattern concept. This concept would allow the LEA to project the number of low-income children in a middle school or high school based on the average poverty rate of the elementary or middle school attendance areas that feed into that school.

Q17: Can an LEA have different per-pupil amounts within a grade span?

A17: Yes, if the campuses are **equal to or** below 75% low-income, campuses within the same grade span can have different amounts, provided the LEA follows the rank and serve rule within a grade span group. All campuses above 75% must follow the Rank and Serve rule regardless of grade span. Only single attendance areas do not have to follow these rules for per-pupil amounts.

Response Revised 06/30/2022

Q18: If an LEA uses PEIMS snapshot data to get their enrollment numbers and they want to pull their low-income numbers (economically disadvantaged) from there, which codes would they use? For example: 01- eligible for free meals under the NSLP, 02- eligible for reduced-price meals under the NSLP, and 99-other economically disadvantaged. Would they just use the number of students coded as 01 & 02 or would they also include 99 since some use 99 for students who qualify as economically disadvantaged but are not direct certified?

A18: If the LEA uses a composite of National School Lunch Program (NSLP), Medicaid, and Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) data as their selected poverty measure, the LEA can choose to use students coded with a 99, in addition to 01 and 02, for their low-income percentage. The LEA would maintain documentation for students coded 01, 02, and 99.

Q19: What is the difference between residing and enrollment?

A19: Enrollment is the total number of students enrolled on a campus, based on the as-of date selected by the LEA. Residing is the number of students residing in the attendance area.

Q20: For the number of targeted assistance program students served, would the LEA report previous year students served, or an anticipated number of students to be served for 21-22; or the number of students who qualify for services in 21-22 based on local criteria?

A20: The LEA would report the estimated number of students to be served on the Targeted Assistance campus.

Q21: If a campus is using direct certification as the basis of eligibility, is the percentage for low income 100% or the actual percentage?

A21: The actual percentage of low-income students should be used. Direct certification is selected only when the LEA is solely using direct certification data as a poverty measure. Keep in mind that the number of students directly certified is a subset of the total number of students eligible for free and reduced-priced meals.

Q22: Do you have to amend if the actual numbers change from the estimated number of Targeted Assistance students entered when submitting the application?

A22: The LEA may amend the SC5000 if the actual numbers change from the estimated number of Targeted Assistance students entered when submitted the application.

Q23: If campuses are closed in AskTED, how do we remove these campuses from the SC5000 Schedule?

A23: If the campuses are listed in AskTed, even if closed, they will always show up on the SC5000. For any closed campus, designate "0" for enrollment, "None" for the Basis of Eligibility, and "NS" for Campus Status.

Q24: Charter Schools are not required to set aside money for private school equitable services, correct?

A24: That is correct.

Q25: Can Title I, Part A funds that are reserved at the LEA level for foster care student transportation be used at non-Title I, Part A campuses?

A25: No. The only Title I, Part A LEA reserved funds that can be used for students at non-Title I, Part A campuses are those funds reserved at the LEA level for services to homeless students.

Q26: If the campus with the highest number and percentage of low-income students is a high school, can an LEA "skip" that campus and only serve the elementary schoolwide program-eligible campuses?

A26: Yes. For LEAs with a total enrollment of 1,000 or more students, a campus is identified as a skipped campus in the following situations: 1) A campus has a low-income percentage over 75% and is not served. 2) Another campus with the same grade span and a lower low-income percentage is served. The LEA confirms by submission of its application that skipped campus(es) meet the following requirements: 1) The skipped campus meets the comparability of services requirement; 2) The skipped campus receives supplemental funds from other State or local sources that are expended per the requirements of a TA or a SW campus; and 3) The funds expended from such other sources equal or exceed the amount that would be provided to the campus under Title I, Part A.

Q27: If an LEA redirects funds into Title I, Part A from Title II, Part A and Title IV, Part A through the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) which then makes its Title I, Part A allocation over \$500,000, does the LEA at that point need to make the required 1% parent and family engagement reservation?

A27: Redirected funds through REAP is not indicated on the PS3101 (only funds transferred through Funding Transferability). Thus, if the LEA redirects funds through REAP that will not affect the Parent and Family Engagement requirement if the amount is over \$500,000. However, if the LEA transfers funds into Title I, Part A from Title II, Part A and/or Title IV, Part A through Funding Transferability which causes the LEA Title I, Part A allocation to exceed \$500,000, they will be required to reserve at least 1% for parent and family engagement activities.

Q28: What percentage should be reserved for homeless and foster care transportation?

A28: The reservation for services to homeless students' reservation is required by all LEAs, regardless of the Title I status of their campuses. An amount must be reserved for this purpose (a minimum of \$100 is required). The reservation should be what the LEA deems to be reasonable and necessary, which may be determined based on a needs assessment. The LEA should maintain documentation to demonstrate how the LEA decided on the amount reserved. If an LEA chooses to reserve funds for foster care transportation, the LEA is required to reserve a minimum of \$100.

Q29: Please clarify what is meant by LEAs with less than 1,000 students being exempt from using poverty measures. What might that look like and how would it be reported on the SC5000?

A29: LEAs with less than 1,000 students are still required to complete the SC5000 and are to maintain documentation locally that shows how they chose to allocate funds to their campuses. Such an LEA may use other criteria, such as academic performance or the grade span of its schools to

determine which of its schools receive Title I funds, or it may choose to allocate Title I funds to all its schools.

Q30: What are some examples of allowable expenditures with Title I, Part A funds reserved at the LEA level for administration of Title I, Part A programs?

A30: Such costs may include payroll costs associated with the role of the person or persons that manage and administer the Title I, Part A program.

Q31: Is an LEA required to rank and serve campuses if there is only one campus per grade span with no overlapping grade levels?

A31: If the LEA has less than 1,000 students, the LEA is not required to rank campuses. Such an LEA may use other criteria, such as academic performance or the grade span of its schools to determine which of its schools receive Title I funds, or it may choose to allocate Title I funds to all its schools. If the LEA has 1,000 or more students, the LEA is required to follow the rank and serve process for allocating funds to their campuses.

Q32: In the ranking example, two of the campuses were Title I, Part A eligible because they had at least a 35% low-income percentage. Would those campuses implement a targeted assistance program since the schoolwide program eligibility threshold is 40%?

A32: Since the campuses do not meet schoolwide program eligibility, they could implement a targeted assistance program.

Q33: On the SC5000, do we use the schoolwide status for schools who have gone through the schoolwide transition process and will be schoolwide in 2021-22?

A33: If the campus has completed the one-year schoolwide transition planning process, they are eligible to be served as a schoolwide campus. If they have not completed this process, the campus must use another designation until the process is complete. The SC5000 may be amended to change that designation to SW upon completion of the planning process.

Q34: Is foster care transportation an allowable activity to be conducted with Title I, Part A funds that have been reserved at the LEA level?

A34: Yes, foster care transportation is listed on the PS3101 as one of the activities that can be conducted with reserved funds.

Q35: Please describe more about Direct Certification. What is required? Multiplier?

A35: Direct Certification can be a complex process for LEAs that have CEP and non-CEP campuses. That is when the multiplier is required. Appendix A of the following document provides additional information about the multiplier. <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/within-district-alloc-guid-draft-for-public-comment-3112020.pdf> Please reach out via email to ESSASupport@tea.texas.gov if you have questions related to the process.

Q36: If a district has less than 100 students, do they still have to determine per-pupil allocations?

A36: An LEA with an enrollment of fewer than 1,000 students is exempt in statute from having to use the poverty measures to determine which of its schools receive Title I funds. Such an LEA may use other criteria, such as academic performance or the grade span of its schools to determine which of its schools receive Title I funds, or it may choose to allocate Title I funds to all its schools. LEAs must maintain documentation of the per-pupil amounts used to determine Title I, Part A allocations.

***Q37: What are the pros and cons of using grade span grouping versus straight rank and serve?**

*A37: Using grade span grouping for Title I, Part A eligibility could allow campuses to be Title I, Part A eligible that otherwise would not be eligible on their own. The same is true for schoolwide program eligibility. For campuses with a low-income percentage **equal to or** below 75%, the flexibility in grade span grouping could also allow an LEA to allocate Title I funds by grade span within each grade span and not across grade spans. **Response Revised 06/30/2022**

Q38: May a served campus with 74% poverty receive the same amount per pupil as those equal to or greater than 75% poverty? Or must the 74% campus receive an amount that is less?

A38: The LEA must ensure that it allocates Title I, Part A funds to its campuses with a poverty percentage above 75 percent first. If the LEA has funds remaining, the LEA has the discretion to allocate the remaining funds using a variety of methods. An LEA is not required to allocate the same per-pupil amount to each participating school. If an LEA allocates different per-pupil amounts to participating campuses, the LEA must allocate a per-pupil amount that is equal to or higher to campuses with higher poverty rates than it allocates to campuses with lower poverty rates.

Q39: Please clarify how an LEA with only one campus per grade span with no campuses above 35% should approach allocations.

A39: If the LEA chooses to serve any campus below 35% low-income, the 125% rule comes into effect. The 125% rule requires an LEA to allocate an amount for each low-income child in each participating Title I school that is at least 125 percent of the LEA's allocation per low-income child.

Q40: We have always skipped a campus based on the local/state funding allocated each year to them. With enrollment changes and programming changes, this campus no longer qualifies based on this year's numbers. Do we take this next year to set up a schoolwide program for them, thus they are not receiving Title I programming/funding until 2022-2023?

A40: If the campus is engaged in the one-year schoolwide transition process, the campus can choose to implement a targeted assistance program and thus receive Title I, Part A funding in 2021-2022.

Q41: Could you give an example of state and local funds that would meet the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A for the purposes of skipping a campus?

A41: State compensatory education funding is an example of supplemental state funds that could meet the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A for the purposes of skipping a campus.

Q42: If all of our campuses are below 35%, how are we supposed to allocate 125% to all of them?

A42: If the LEA chooses to serve any campus below 35% low-income, the 125% rule comes into effect. The 125% rule requires an LEA to allocate an amount for each low-income child in each participating Title I school that is at least 125 percent of the LEA's allocation per low-income child. The LEA would need to use the rank and serve process and may not be able to serve all eligible campuses if there are not enough funds. The intent of the 125% rule is to concentrate the Title I, Part A funds in campuses that have higher poverty percentages; it is not necessarily the intent that all campuses be served.

Q43: How does an LEA determine the amount of funds a campus will receive for Title I, Part A funding?

A43: The campus allocation is determined by the number of low-income students multiplied by the per-pupil amount. For example, if the per-pupil amount that is determined by the LEA for the campus is \$1,500 and the campus has a total of 250 students and 78% of the students come from low-income families, the number of low-income students would be 195. The LEA would determine the campus's allocation by multiplying 195 times \$1,500. The campus allocation would be \$292,500.

Q44: Is there a specific requirement for the date used to pull low-income data for eligibility?

A44: LEAs are required to use the same date for all campuses in the LEA. TEA does not collect that date; the LEA must maintain auditable documentation in case it is requested. For the year of data used to determine poverty counts of public schools, an LEA uses the most recently available data, which will be from the previous school year in most cases.

Q45: Can an LEA serve a campus that only enrolls prekindergarten students as a schoolwide campus?

A45: If the campus meets overall Title I, Part A eligibility requirements and schoolwide program eligibility requirements, an LEA can choose to serve a campus that only enrolls prekindergarten students. In determining overall Title I, Part A eligibility please note that the LEA must use the same poverty measure(s) for all its campuses, both for eligibility and for determining allocations. For example, the LEA likely wouldn't have Census low-income data for students ages 5-17 that would apply to a campus that only has pre-K students. Such an LEA would need to use another poverty measure for all its campuses.

Q46: How many times can a campus use the "schoolwide previous year" provision for implementing a schoolwide program on a campus that does not currently meet the 40% threshold?

A46: A campus can use the "Schoolwide Previous Year" provision and remain a schoolwide program until the campus is either schoolwide eligible on its own or is no longer Title I, Part A eligible and cannot be served.

Q47: With Title I, Part A funds, are we able to not allocate funds to a campus and instead use them at the LEA-level to hire a campus interventionist to support the campus?

A47: The LEA reservations process occurs prior to allocation of funds to campuses. Funds reserved at the LEA level should be used for LEA-wide Title I, Part A activities to benefit students at Title I, Part A served campuses. The campus would still need to be allocated funds based on the rank and

serve process. If the campus in question did not receive a Title I, Part A campus allocation, the campus would not be considered a Title I, Part A served campus and thus, the LEA would not be able to use LEA reserved funds to provides services to the students on that campus.

Q48: Would it be accurate to say that if you choose to use "residing" numbers, you would have to remove students who are out-of-district transfers in order to get an accurate account of total students in LEA/campuses? Enrollment would account for ALL students regardless of whether they live within the LEA boundaries?

A48: That is correct.

Q49: What are the required Title I, Part A LEA reservations?

A49: An LEA that receives Title I funds must reserve a proportional share of those funds to provide equitable services to eligible children who attend a private school.

If the Title I, Part A LEA entitlement amount (includes funds transferred via Funding Transferability) is greater than \$500,000, the LEA must reserve at least 1% of funds for Districtwide Parent and Family Engagement Activities. The LEA must distribute at least 90% of its Districtwide Parent and Family Engagement reservation to its Title I schools, giving priority to high-need schools. For this purpose only, Texas defines 'high-need schools' as low-income schools with high percentages of students who do not meet the challenging State academic standards.

The Services to Homeless Students reservation is required by all LEAs, regardless of the Title I status of their campuses. An amount must be reserved for this purpose (a minimum of \$100 is required). The reservation should be what the LEA deems to be reasonable and necessary which may be determined based on a needs assessment. The LEA should maintain documentation to demonstrate how the LEA decided on the amount reserved.

ESSA also requires an LEA to reserve Title I, Part A funds to provide services comparable to those provided to children in Title I, Part A campuses to children in local institutions for neglected children.

Q50: Is staff development a required LEA reservation?

A50: Although an LEA can use Title I, Part A reserved funds for LEA-wide professional development activities, it is not a statutory required reservation.

Q51: Is it required that a campus be a targeted assistance program campus before transitioning to a schoolwide program campus?

A51: No. However, a campus implementing a schoolwide program must ensure that it has met all the statutory requirements for implementing a schoolwide program during the one-year planning process. If the LEA determines, in consultation with the school, that less time is needed to develop and implement the schoolwide program, the LEA will need to retain documentation to that effect. All documentation to demonstrate compliance for schoolwide planning must be maintained locally for audit and validation/monitoring purposes. Documentation of the planning process must include a comprehensive needs assessment, the inclusion of the required

stakeholders in the process, incorporation of the required descriptions into the Campus Improvement plan, documentation related to parent and family engagement (PFE) requirements (i.e., school-parent compact and PFE policy), and the provision for an evaluation of program effectiveness that will inform the next year's needs assessment and planning. If the LEA determines that ESC training/technical assistance was part of the reason that less time was needed to develop and implement the schoolwide program, then the LEA would need to keep such documentation in addition to the documentation noted above.

Q52: If an LEA has one prekindergarten campus serving only 3- and 4-year-old students, is the Title I, Part A campus eligibility based on the age of the students they serve, or their within-LEA ranking based on the percentage of low-income students on the campus?

A52: The campus' eligibility to receive Title I, Part A funds must be based on the low-income percent for the campus and in accordance with the statutory requirements for ranking and serving Title I, Part A eligible campuses.

The LEA has several options concerning the data it uses to calculate low-income percentages. Statute allows LEAs to select from the following measures of poverty:

- Children eligible for free and/or reduced-price lunches under the National School Lunch Act;
- Children in families receiving assistance under Title IV, Part A of the Social Security Act (Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, or TANF);
- Children eligible to receive medical assistance under the Medicaid program;
- Children, ages 5 through 17, inclusive, in poverty as counted in the most recent LEA-level census poverty data approved by the US Department of Education; or
 - Note: Because census data are generally not available at the school level, if an LEA uses this measure, it would most likely be part of a composite with one or more of the above measures
- A composite of any of the above measures.

The LEA would be restricted to ages 5 through 17 only if they were selecting the 4th bulleted item solely as their only measure of poverty. For all other data (bullets # 1, 2, 3 and 5), the low-income percentage would be based on student enrollment numbers regardless of student ages.

If the LEA wishes to qualify the preschool campus for Title I, Part A, the LEA will need to use a poverty measure other than the Census low-income data, or at least use a composite that included at least one additional measure from the list above. Otherwise, the LEA would not be able to consider students under the age of 5 in its determinations of the campus low-income percentages.

Q53: If the LEA only has three campuses with no grade levels that overlap, and all three campuses are eligible to implement a Title I, Part A schoolwide program, can the LEA still allocate a higher per-pupil amount for the elementary school if the middle school has a higher low-income percent?

A53: An LEA may determine eligibility within grade spans and choose which grade span(s) to serve. In doing so, the LEA may use its district-wide percentage of poverty or the percentage of poverty

data of the relevant grade span(s). If a grade-span poverty percentage is above 35 percent, the LEA may also identify as eligible any school with a poverty percentage of at least 35 percent. If there is only one school in a grade span, that school is eligible for Title I funds, provided that any school above 75 percent poverty has received a Title I, Part A allocation.

Consistent with statutory requirements, the LEA must ensure that its school above 75 percent poverty receives a per-pupil allocation that is at least as high as the per-pupil allocations of all its other campuses. When an LEA allocates Title I funds by grade span, the rule that the LEA must allocate a higher per-pupil amount to campuses with higher poverty rates than it allocates to campuses with lower poverty rates would apply within each grade span and not across grade spans for campuses grouped with a low-income percent of 75 and below.

Q54: Please explain more about preschool and Title I, Part A. We have a preschool campus where all students meet eligibility for free or reduced lunch, but they are not considered a Title I, Part A campus. Why?

A54: If the campus meets Title I, Part A eligibility criteria based on the poverty measure selected, it may be served. There are flexibilities provided in statute to LEAs that include not serving a campus or skipping a campus. Ultimately, the LEA would need to ensure that it is allocating funds to eligible Title I, Part A campuses in accordance with the statutory requirements for ranking and serving Title I, Part A eligible campuses.

The LEA has several options concerning the data it uses to calculate low-income percentages. Statute allows LEAs to select from the following measures of poverty:

- Children eligible for free and/or reduced-price lunches under the National School Lunch Act;
- Children in families receiving assistance under Title IV, Part A of the Social Security Act (Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, or TANF);
- Children eligible to receive medical assistance under the Medicaid program;
- Children, ages 5 through 17, inclusive, in poverty as counted in the most recent LEA-level census poverty data approved by the US Department of Education; or
 - Note: Because census data are generally not available at the school level, if an LEA uses this measure, it would most likely be part of a composite with one or more of the above measures
- A composite of any of the above measures.

The LEA would be restricted to ages 5 through 17 only if they were selecting the 4th bulleted item solely as their only measure of poverty. For all other data (bullets # 1, 2, 3 and 5), the low-income percentage would be based on student enrollment numbers regardless of student ages.

If the LEA wishes to qualify the preschool campus for Title I, Part A, the LEA will need to use a poverty measure other than the Census low-income data, or at least use a composite that included at least one additional measure from the list above. Otherwise, the LEA would not be able to consider students under the age of 5 in its determinations of the campus low-income percentages.

Q55: Can a campus use Schoolwide Program (SWP) Previous Year to meet SWP eligibility requirements if the campus used feeder pattern to establish its eligibility in the previous year?

A55: Yes, a campus can use SWP Previous Year to establish SWP eligibility in a future year if they were ever eligible to run a SWP through **feeder pattern** the feeder pattern option. The SWP Previous Year option does not apply to campuses who apply for an Ed-Flex Schoolwide Program Eligibility waiver. **Response Revised 06/30/2022**

Q56: If an LEA uses a locally developed income survey to gather data related to low-income students, can students who are coded in the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) with a code of 99 (other Economically Disadvantaged [ECD]) be included in the low-income numbers for the LEA and/or a campus?

A56: If the locally developed income survey replicates National School Lunch Program, Medicaid, or Temporary Assistance to Needy Families data, the LEA can include students coded 99 (other ECD) in its low-income calculations for Title I, Part A purposes. This process would be something that the LEA would document in the LEA's Title I, Part A Program Plan in the case of an audit and/or random validation monitoring.

Q57: If the LEA and/or campus low-income percentages have changed (based on current-year snapshot data) since the current-year ESSA Consolidated Application was submitted, does an LEA need to amend the SC5000?

A57: The LEA has the discretion to use the best available data at the time that the application is submitted and is not required to amend and update the data as additional data become available. TEA does not recommend that an LEA amend the SC5000 for this purpose. If the LEA decides to amend the SC5000 with the most recent data, the LEA needs to be extremely cautious since it has been operating its campus Title I, Part A programs based on the percentages originally submitted. Submitting new data could affect campus eligibility and allocations as they relate to the rank and serve statutory requirements.

Q58: If a campus meets overall Title I, Part A eligibility, but does not meet the 40% threshold to operate a schoolwide program, what options does the campus have to be able to implement a schoolwide program?

A58: If a Title I, Part A eligible campus does not meet the 40% threshold to operate a schoolwide program, the campus has three alternative options for establishing campus schoolwide program eligibility. Please note that the one-year schoolwide transition planning process applies to all campuses that will be implementing a schoolwide program for the first time.

1. Schoolwide Previous Year

The Schoolwide Previous Year option can be used for a campus that was SW eligible in a previous year and still meets the basic Title I, Part A eligibility criteria. This basis can be used each year until the campus is either Schoolwide program eligible on its own, using Residing, Enrollment, or Direct Certification, or is no longer Title I, Part A eligible and cannot be served. Please note that this option cannot be used to establish basic Title I

eligibility for a campus. The LEA is responsible for maintaining documentation locally that shows evidence of the campus being eligible to operate a Schoolwide program in a previous year. If the LEA does not have documentation, the LEA cannot use the Schoolwide Previous Year option.

If the campus meets the criteria for Schoolwide Previous Year, on the **SC5000 - Title I, Part A Campus Selection, Part B. Campus Selection Data** section under the “Additional Eligibility” column, the LEA would select the “SW Previous Year” checkbox.

If the campus in question has not ever operated a schoolwide program, then the feeder pattern option may be a viable option for establishing schoolwide program eligibility.

2. Feeder Pattern

The Feeder Pattern option can be used for a campus to establish schoolwide program eligibility by projection, based on the number of low-income students in the elementary school attendance area(s) that feed into that campus. The LEA must maintain the following documentation for any campus whose eligibility is established via feeder pattern: low-income numbers and enrollment from those campuses that comprise the feeder pattern for the campus in question.

If the campus meets the criteria for the feeder pattern option, on the **SC5000 - Title I, Part A Campus Selection, Part B. Campus Selection Data** section under the “Basis of Eligibility” column, the LEA would select “Feeder Pattern” from the drop-down listing.

If the campus in question does not meet the criteria for the feeder pattern option, then the Schoolwide Eligibility Ed-Flex Waiver option would be the only other viable option for establishing schoolwide program eligibility.

3. Schoolwide Eligibility Ed-Flex Waiver

The Schoolwide Eligibility Ed-Flex waiver allows any campus otherwise eligible to receive Title I, Part A funds to implement a Title I, Part A schoolwide program regardless of the percentage of students from low-income families. This Statewide Programmatic Waiver of Schoolwide Eligibility will be valid for one year. After the one-year waiver is implemented, the campus may continue to implement a schoolwide program for as long as the campus remains an eligible Title I, Part A attendance area. The LEA must maintain a completed [Supporting Documentation Form](#) on file locally. The Supporting Documentation form can be found on the TEA Ed-Flex Waivers Webpage under Statewide Programmatic Waivers. Although there is no evaluation of this Statewide Programmatic Waiver of Schoolwide Eligibility beyond the one-year waiver period, TEA will track and report to USDE the performance of all campuses granted this waiver until the point the campus has a low-income percentage of 40.00% or greater.

If this option is selected, previously the LEA was required to complete the WV4004–Ed-Flex Title I, Part A SW Eligibility schedule. The WV4004 schedule has been discontinued beginning in 2022-2023. If the campus chooses to apply for the Schoolwide Program Eligibility Statewide Programmatic Ed-Flex Waiver, on the **SC5000 - Title I, Part A Campus Selection, Part B. Campus Selection Data** section under the “Additional Eligibility” column, the LEA would select the “SW Ed-Flex Waiver” checkbox.

Note: If the campus selected “Individual Prog. Waiver” because a campus does not meet the low-income criteria to be a Title I campus at all, the LEA would need to apply for and receive an [Ed-Flex Individual Programmatic waiver](#) in order to qualify as a Title I campus before requesting a SW eligibility waiver. At the time that the LEA receives approval of an Ed-Flex Individual Programmatic waiver, an amendment to the SC5000 can be submitted requesting a SW Ed-Flex Waiver.

Q59: For how long can the Schoolwide Previous Year option be used to establish schoolwide program eligibility for a Title I, Part A eligible campus?

A59: If a Title I, Part A eligible campus does not meet the 40% threshold, and it was previously schoolwide program eligible on its own, the Schoolwide Previous Year option can be used to establish Schoolwide Program eligibility on a campus each year the campus is Title I, Part A eligible on its own (using Residing, Enrollment, or Direct Certification).

Q60: Does the eligibility threshold of 40% low-income that is required to operate a Schoolwide program apply to campuses within an LEA that has an enrollment of less than 1,000 students?

A60: Yes. Although LEAs with an enrollment of less than 1,000 is exempt from the rank and serve statutory requirements that govern overall Title I, Part A eligibility, campuses within an LEA that has an enrollment of less than 1,000 students are still required to follow the eligibility requirements as they relate to operating a schoolwide program.

Q61: Is it allowable to allocate Title I, Part A funds to a stand-alone Pre-Kindergarten campus?

A61: If the campus is Title I, Part A eligible, they can be served regardless of the grade levels offered. The campus would be treated like any other campus.

Q62: Is it allowable to allocate \$340 per pupil at the elementary level for high-poverty schools (over 75%) and \$370 per pupil to high-poverty secondary schools (over 75%) or does the LEA need to have the same per pupil allocation for all high poverty school regardless of the grade span?

A62: ESSA requires the LEA to first allocate, in rank order of poverty, Title I funds to its schools above 75% poverty, including any middle schools or high schools. An LEA is not required to allocate the same per-pupil amount to each participating school. However, if an LEA allocates different per-pupil amounts to participating campuses with a poverty percent above 75%, the LEA must allocate a per-pupil amount that is equal to or higher to campuses with higher poverty rates than it allocates to campuses with lower poverty rate regardless of grade span. The grade-span grouping

option can only be utilized to allocate funds to campuses with 75% poverty or below after high-poverty schools (over 75% poverty) have been allocated funds.

If the low-income percentages for the high-poverty secondary schools are all greater than the low-income percentages for all the high-poverty elementary schools, then it would be allowable to allocate \$340 per pupil at the elementary level for high-poverty schools (over 75%) and \$370 per pupil to high-poverty secondary schools (over 75%). However, if the low-income percentages for any of the high-poverty elementary schools are greater than the low-income percentages for any of the high-poverty secondary schools, then it would not be allowable to allocate \$340 per pupil at the elementary level for high-poverty schools (over 75%) and \$370 per pupil to high-poverty secondary schools (over 75%).

Q63: If a campus has a low-income percentage of 39.64%, is the campus eligible to operate a Title I, Part A Schoolwide program since 39.64 % can round up to 40%?

A63: The threshold for schoolwide program eligibility is 40%. Unless the campus has a low-income percentage of at least 40% (no rounding), they are not eligible on their own to implement a schoolwide program. If the campus was ever previously at 40%, it can maintain schoolwide status up until the campus is no longer Title I, Part A eligible. Additionally, the campus may be able to use the feeder pattern option, if applicable, or apply for an Ed-Flex Waiver for Schoolwide Eligibility.

***Q64: Does an LEA's entitlement change if a campus chooses to operate a targeted assistance program instead of a schoolwide program?**

*A64: An LEA's Title I, Part A entitlement is based on Census data updates, not on how many campuses the LEA serves as Schoolwide or Targeted Assistance.

In other words, the size of the LEA's funding amount does not increase with the number of campuses or students served. If the LEA decides to serve a new eligible campus, the level of Title I, Part A funding does not increase.

The Title I, Part A allocations an LEA makes to its eligible, served campuses are based on the number of low-income students at each campus, not on the number of students served or the total number of students enrolled.

Schoolwide campuses are allocated funds based on their number of low-income students, just like targeted assistance campuses. Schoolwide campuses do not get more because they are schoolwide.

ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application

Q1: It is my understanding that LEAs need to have a public hearing for the ESSA application. Can you tell me what information must be included or what that might look like? When does this public hearing need to take place? Before or after the submission of the ESSA Application?

A1: As per ESEA Section 8306(a)(7) and the ESSA section of the Program-Specific Provisions and Assurances, upon submission of the ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application, an LEA is to assure that “before the application was submitted, the applicant afforded a reasonable opportunity for public comment on the application and considered such comment.”

If an LEA chooses to meet this requirement via a public hearing, the LEA will follow their local policies and procedures related to public hearings. Additionally, the LEA would want to ensure that the public had time to review the ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application before the public hearing so that they are able to provide comments on the content of the application. As per statute, the opportunity for public comment on the application and consideration of such comment would need to take place before the application is submitted. Documentation of this requirement would be retained locally and could include the dates in which the public was provided with the opportunity to review the application prior to the public hearing, the public hearing notice, public hearing agenda and public hearing minutes.

Q2: When thinking about stamp-in dates for ESSA Consolidated Applications, what is the stamp-in date tied to (other than when the application was submitted)? How does the stamp-in date affect payroll and different positions paid from Title I, Part A and LEA positions, in particular?

A2: The funds are not effective for payroll positions until they have been entered on the application and that application has been certified and submitted. The stamp-in date is the date the LEA certified and submitted the application and is the date the funds are effective for a particular position. If an LEA submits an amendment and adds a position, that position has the same stamp-in date as when the amendment was submitted.

Q3: Can you provide clarification as to the PS3101 – Title I, Part A Program Schedule, Part 1B, Line 5: Administration of Title I, Part A reserved funds amount?

A3: An LEA reserves funds in this category for activities related to the administration of Title I, Part A Programs (including administration of Title I, Part A programs for students at facilities for neglected and delinquent). Such costs may include payroll costs associated with the role of the person or persons that manage the Title I, Part A program.

Q4: Are indirect costs included on the PS3101 – Title I, Part A Program Schedule?

A4: Since the reserved funds percentage is calculated based on the total LEA Title I, Part A funds available, if indirect costs are to be charged for any of the activities to be conducted with reserved funds, then they would be included in the amount noted on Part B of the PS3101. Although indirect costs are noted on the budget schedule, the program schedule is different. If some or all the indirect costs being noted in the budget schedule are being used at the LEA level, then the LEA

would need to include that amount in the PS3101 – Part 1B; Line 5. The Total Funding and Transfer Amount(s) noted on Part 1A; Line 4 includes all Title I, Part A funds (including any indirect costs that the LEA may classify as indirect costs on the budget schedule) so to accurately reflect funds being reserved at the LEA level, indirect costs would need to be considered when completing the PS3101.

Q5: On the PS3101 of the ESSA Consolidated Application, how does an LEA determine the amount of funds to set aside for Services to Eligible Private School Students and Homeless Students?

A5: For services to eligible private school students, there is a reservation calculation worksheet that the LEA completes in the ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application. It is referenced as the PS3099. For services to homeless students, an amount must be reserved for this purpose (a minimum of \$100 is required). The reservation should be what the LEA deems to be reasonable and necessary which may be determined based on a needs assessment. The LEA should maintain documentation to demonstrate how the LEA decided on the amount reserved.

Q6: What is the difference in lines 2 and 3 of section B of the PS3101 – Title I, Part A program schedule in the ESSA Consolidated Application? What does it mean by Administration of Title I, Part A Programs for Eligible Private School (PNP) Students?

A6: Line 2 references the total calculation of the private school reservation as noted on the PS3099. Line 3 references any funds reserved at the LEA level for the administration of PNP equitable services. Funds may be reserved at the LEA level for the costs associated with administering the Title I, Part A program. An example is the LEA using Title I, Part A funds reserved at the LEA for the salary of their Title I, Part A Director that administers and manages the program at the LEA level.

Federal Report Card Dissemination

Q1: Is an LEA required to post federal report cards for all campuses regardless of whether they receive Title I, Part A funds? If they must post for all campuses, are they required to notify parents at all campuses?

A1: Each LEA that receives Title I, Part A funding is responsible for disseminating the state, LEA and campus-level federal report cards for all campuses, regardless of whether they are Title I served. The LEA does need to notify the parents of enrolled students at all campuses.

***Q2: For how long must federal report card data be posted on an LEA's website?**

***A2:** An LEA shall keep at least 3 years of federal report card data on its website.

New Title I, Part A Campus Processes

Q1: When an LEA launches a new school, how does/what is the process for that campus to receive Title I, Part A funding?

A1: The process an LEA follows to launch a new campus that is eligible to receive Title I, Part A funding is generally a two-step process with many other processes embedded in each of the steps. We have provided general information for the two steps and references to resources that provide the detailed intricacies for each of the steps. Additionally, the LEA can reach out to its regional Education Service Center Title I, Part A contact for technical assistance and support related to the processes. The technical assistance and support for this process are provided under the ESC ESSA Basic Services Initiative and are free of charge to LEAs.

Step 1: Determine Title I Campus Eligibility

Campus eligibility for Title I, Part A is determined through the SC5000 schedule which the LEA completes as part of its ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application in eGrants.

Detailed information related to Title I, Part A campus eligibility can be found in the following documents: [Schedule SC5000 Title I, Part A Campus Selection – ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application Guidance Document](#) and Section II. C. Campus Eligibility of the [Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Program Guide](#).

Step 2: Determine the Title I program the school will implement

Once it is determined that a campus meets Title I eligibility requirements, the campus will need to determine which Title I program (Targeted Assistance Program or Schoolwide Program) the school will implement based on the eligibility requirements for each program.

Schoolwide Program

A schoolwide program permits a school to use funds from Title I, Part A and other federal programs to upgrade the entire education program in a Title I school to improve the achievement of the lowest achieving students. This contrasts with a Title I, Part A targeted assistance program, in which Title I, Part A funds are used only for programs that provide services to eligible children identified as failing or being most at risk of failing to meet the state’s challenging academic standards.

Generally, speaking, to be eligible for a Schoolwide Program, the campus must have a low-income percentage of at least 40%. (If the campus is eligible for Title I, Part A, but does not meet the 40% threshold, it is possible to request a SW Eligibility waiver in the ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application.)

ESSA Section 1114(b)(1)(A) states that an eligible school operating a schoolwide program shall develop a comprehensive plan that is developed during a 1-year period, unless—the local educational agency determines, in consultation with the school, that less time is needed to develop and implement the schoolwide program. The Schoolwide Program section of the [Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Program Guide](#) provides the requirements for the

comprehensive plan that is based on the comprehensive needs assessment.

If the LEA determines, in consultation with the school, that less time is needed to develop and implement the schoolwide program, the LEA would need to retain documentation to that effect. All documentation to demonstrate compliance for schoolwide planning must be maintained locally for audit and validation/monitoring purposes. Documentation of the planning process must include a comprehensive needs assessment, the inclusion of the required stakeholders in the process, incorporation of the required descriptions into the Campus Improvement plan, documentation related to parent and family engagement (PFE) requirements (i.e., school-parent compact and PFE policy), and the provision for an evaluation of program effectiveness that will inform the next year's needs assessment and planning. If the LEA determines that ESC training/technical assistance was part of the reason that less time was needed to develop and implement the schoolwide program, then the LEA would need to keep such documentation in addition to the documentation noted above.

Detailed information related to Title I, Part A Schoolwide Program Requirements can be found in the following document: Section II. E. Schoolwide Program Requirements of the [Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Program Guide](#).

Targeted Assistance Program

A Targeted Assistance (TA) Program provides services to eligible children identified as having the greatest need for special assistance. Targeted assistance program campuses are either ineligible for a schoolwide program or have chosen not to operate a schoolwide program. A campus may be served as a Targeted Assistance campus, provided the campus is Title I, Part A eligible (at least 35% low-income, or equal to or greater than the LEA low-income percentage). TA campuses may only serve students identified in greatest need of services. Students must be selected for services based on multiple, educationally related, objective criteria established by the LEA. The selection criteria may be supplemented by the campus. The criteria for determining student eligibility for students served on TA campuses must be included in the District and the Campus improvement plans.

Detailed information related to Title I, Part A Schoolwide Program Requirements can be found in the following document: Section II. F. Targeted Assistance Programs of the [Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Program Guide](#).

Paraprofessional Requirements – Title I, Part A

Q1: When should an LEA document compliance with the requirements?

A1: For audit and/or random validation purposes, we would advise your LEA to complete the forms for current-year instructional paraprofessionals that are funded by Title I, Part A funds.

Q2: Are LEAs required to report the number of paraprofessionals who meet the requirements?

A2: There is currently no annual ESSA report associated with the Title I, Part A Paraprofessional requirements.

Q3: If we have a paraprofessional that completed a similar paraprofessional assessment 10 years ago while in California, would it count and exempt her from taking another assessment to meet the requirements?

A3: Your LEA can accept the results of the assessment if you are able to document that the employee met a rigorous standard of quality and demonstrated through a local academic assessment: Knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics; or knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness, as appropriate. You would need official assessment documentation that includes the name of the assessment, date of assessment, assessment score, and passing standard.

Q4: Is the local assessment to be developed within the district, or is there a certified assessment through the local ESC?

A4: The assessment can be developed by the LEA, as long as the LEA is able to document the following:

- The assessment assesses knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics; or knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness, as appropriate.
- The passing standard of the assessment demonstrates that the individual met a rigorous standard of quality.

The LEA can utilize external assessment providers for an assessment, including your regional Education Service Center.

Q5: What changed in the requirements from the transition of NCLB to ESSA?

A5: The only changes from what was expected under NCLB vs. ESSA are as follows.

1. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), requires that LEAs ensure that paraprofessionals performing instructional duties whose salaries are paid in full or in part from Title I, Part A funds on a Schoolwide or Targeted Assistance campus, meet the Title I, Part A Paraprofessional requirements.

2. Additionally, within one year of being hired, Title I, Part A paraprofessionals must have the Educational Aide state certification. *Note: Charter school personnel are exempt from the state certification requirement unless it is required by local policies and procedures.*

For more information related to the Educational Aide state certification, visit the [Becoming an Educational Aide in Texas web page](#).

Q6: What is the timeframe for the paraprofessionals to complete their requirements?

A6: Prior to providing services, Title I, Part A paraprofessionals must have a high school diploma or its recognized equivalent and meet one of the following requirements:

1. Complete at least two years of study at an institution of higher education (defined as completion of 48 semester hours or equivalent trimester hours) of college coursework or an applicable number of semester hours as defined by the institution of higher education attended, whichever is less;
2. Possess an associate (or higher) degree; or
3. Meet a rigorous standard of quality and can demonstrate, through a local academic assessment—
 - Knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics; or
 - Knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness, as appropriate.

Additionally, within one year of being hired, Title I, Part A paraprofessionals must have the Educational Aide state certification. For more information related to the Educational Aide state certification, visit the [Becoming an Educational Aide in Texas web page](#).

Q7: What is a rigorous local academic assessment?

A7: The rigorous standard of quality would be determined by the assessment provider (LEA, ESC, external vendor).

Q8: Does the [Title I, Part A Paraprofessional LEA Documentation Form](#) need to be updated yearly?

A8: If the status of the employee's qualifications has not changed, the form would not need to be updated yearly.

Q9: Can college remedial courses count towards the completion of 48 semester hours requirement noted in the [requirements for Title I, Part A Paraprofessionals](#)?

A9: It is a local decision. If the LEA's policies and procedures allow for accepting remedial courses when hiring individuals, the LEA could accept the courses for this purpose. If the LEA does not accept remedial courses as per the LEA's hiring practices, then the LEA would not accept them for this purpose.

Q10: Should the “Determining Title I, Part A Paraprofessional Requirements” form be placed in the personnel file, and if an Instructional Assistant were to go to another district, should the form be accompanied with the service record?

A10: The documentation form must be maintained in the employee’s service record or personnel file. It would be a local decision as to which method the LEA chooses to use, or the LEA can use both methods (maintained in the personnel file and accompanied with the service record if the employee transitions to another LEA).

Q11: We understand that within one year of taking on the role of paraprofessional, to meet the Title I, Part A Paraprofessional Requirements, the paraprofessional must acquire state paraprofessional certification. Is this still true if the paraprofessional already holds a Texas teaching certification?

A11: If the paraprofessional already holds a Teaching certification, that would satisfy the state certification requirement for Title I, Part A paraprofessionals.

Q12: Charter school paraprofessionals being paid partially or in full with Title I, Part A funds are not required to have the state educational aid certification. However, they do need to have at least one of the three additional requirements?

A12: That is correct. If a charter school does not have a certification requirement in its local policies and procedures for paraprofessionals, then they are not required to obtain the state certification. However, they are required to have a high school diploma or its recognized equivalent and meet one of the three requirements noted below.

1. Complete at least two years of study at an institution of higher education (defined as completion of 48 semester hours or equivalent trimester hours) of college coursework or an applicable number of semester hours as defined by the institution of higher education attended, whichever is less;
2. Possess an associate (or higher) degree; or
3. Meet a rigorous standard of quality and can demonstrate, through a local academic assessment—
 - Knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics; or
 - Knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness, as appropriate.

Q13: When the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act requirements for highly qualified were implemented, the LEA went through a process of certifying those who did not have the college hours to meet the highly qualified requirement. Are those staff still considered highly qualified, or was there a time limit on those certifications?

A13: If the LEA has the documentation for that certification process referenced in item #3 below, and it meets the following requirements, then the certification process is still valid.

Prior to providing services, Title I, Part A paraprofessionals must have a high school diploma or its recognized equivalent and meet one of the following requirements:

1. Complete at least two years of study at an institution of higher education (defined as completion of 48 semester hours or equivalent trimester hours) of college coursework or an applicable number of semester hours as defined by the institution of higher education attended, whichever is less;
2. Possess an associate (or higher) degree; or
3. Meet a rigorous standard of quality and can demonstrate, through a local academic assessment—
 - Knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics; or
 - Knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness, as appropriate.

Additionally, within one year of being hired, Title I, Part A paraprofessionals must have the Educational Aide state certification.

Note: Charter school personnel are exempt from the state certification requirement unless it is required by local policies and procedures.

There are documentation form templates under the Resources section of [the TEA Title I, Part A Requirements for Paraprofessionals webpage](#).

Q14: Are college hours received from a college in a foreign country allowed to meet the Title I, Part A Paraprofessional requirements?

A14: The qualification requirement for paraprofessionals refers to at least two years of study at an institution of higher education. Foreign colleges and universities are institutions of higher education. The LEA would need to follow its policies and procedures for obtaining a translation of the transcript and determining whether the coursework meets the requirement.

Parent and Family Engagement (PFE) Requirements

Q1: Is there a deadline for the School-Parent Compact for campuses each year?

A1: Although the ESSA statute does not provide specific information related to a deadline for the school-parent compact for campuses each year, the intent of the statute as it relates to the distribution of the school-parent compact is that it be distributed at the beginning of the school year (within the first 4 to 6 weeks) annually. As referenced in ESSA Section 1116(d), the purpose of the school-parent compact is to “outline how parents, the entire school staff, and students will share the responsibility for improved student academic achievement and the means by which the school and parents will build and develop a partnership to help children achieve the State’s high standards.” For additional information and resources related to the requirements associated with the school-parent compact requirement, please visit the [Title I, Part A Parent and Family Engagement Statewide Initiative School Parent Compacts web page](#).

Q2: Are the ESSA requirements for Parent and Family Engagement activities primarily the responsibility of the campuses or the LEA?

A2: ESSA references parent and family engagement-related responsibilities for both LEAs and campuses. LEAs and campuses are both required to have a written parent and family engagement (PFE) policy. The delineated responsibilities that are referenced in the ESSA requirements that are specific to LEAs and campuses for the written PFE policies. For additional information and resources related to the requirements associated with the LEA and campus written parent and family engagement policies, please visit the [Title I, Part A Parent and Family Engagement Statewide Initiative Written Parent and Family Engagement Policies web page](#).

Q3: If the LEA originally had activities in the Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) or District Improvement Plan (DIP) for parent and family engagement, is the LEA out of compliance if they choose not to do those activities or can the LEA simply change the CIP or DIP to reflect the decision to change?

A3: In general, the CIP and DIP are living documents based on the needs identified as a result of the comprehensive needs assessment process. We understand that such needs may change mid-year or as a result of an extenuating circumstance (i.e. pandemic). It is important to keep the CIP and DIP as up to date as possible in the case of an audit and/or random validation monitoring. Thus, LEAs can amend their CIP and DIP at any time that they are able to document that needs have changed, as long as they follow the improvement planning process requirements, which includes the involvement of various stakeholder groups, including parents. For audit and/or random validation monitoring, it is important for LEAs and campuses to maintain all versions of the CIP and DIP with the dates the documents were updated being noted within the documents. The LEA should exercise caution when making decisions related to making changes to PFE-related activities since it is required to consult with parents and family members of participating children when such changes are to be initiated. The LEA should also verify to see if there are any implications related to the funds reserved at the LEA level for parent and family engagement activities. The

activities may have also been listed in the LEA and/or campus parent and family engagement written policies and thus, revisions to the policies would need to occur, as well, in consultation with parents and family members of participating children. Statute states that the written policies shall be jointly developed with, and distributed to, parents and family members of participating children, **and agreed on by such parents**. Additionally, the LEA shall involve parents and family members of children receiving Title I, Part A funds in the decisions regarding how Title I, Part A funds reserved under Section 1116(a)(3)(A) are allotted for parental involvement activities. [Section 1116(a)(3)(B)]

Q4: We are looking to add the following job duties to our parent liaison. Would this be allowable?

- 1. Work with individual and/or small groups of students in corrective or reinforcement activities assigned by the teacher except where certain programs may prohibit supervision of a given activity.**
- 2. Assist the teacher in implementing special strategies for reinforcing material or skills based on a sympathetic understanding of individual students, their needs, interests and abilities.**
- 3. Assist with supervision of students.**

A4: Assignment of job duties is a local decision. Although the duties you are wanting to add do seem to meet the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, they would not be considered parent and family engagement duties as they are tied to student instruction. You may consider revising the job title and function in the job description document to include instructional duties. This would ensure that your documentation maintained locally is as accurate as possible in the case of an audit. Additionally, you would want to ensure that the instructional duties referenced are tied to a need based on a comprehensive needs assessment and documented in the campus improvement plan.

Adding the instructional duties might also change some of the budget coding for the position. For example, if the LEA was using funds reserved for parental involvement activities to pay for the parent liaison, but then added the instructional duties, the LEA would want to be sure that only an appropriate percentage of the salary was coded to the parental involvement reservation.

Q5: When should the Parent Right to Know letters be sent out for any teacher teaching outside of their certification area?

A5: Campuses must provide to each individual parent timely notice that the parent's child has been assigned or taught for four or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who does not meet state certification or licensure requirements soon after the four weeks have passed. Sample Notification Letters can be found on the [Statewide Parent and Family Engagement Initiative Web Site for Parents' Right to Know](#). Additionally, another resource that you may find helpful is [An Administrator's Checklist to ESSA Parent and Family Engagement](#). It provides a comprehensive list of all the parental involvement requirements.

Q6: We have a teacher (teaching a core subject on a Title I campus) that is working through an ACP program but does not have an intern or probationary certification. After how many weeks, do we have to provide notification to parents of their children being taught by a non-certified teacher?

A6: ESSA Section 1112(e)(1)(B)(ii) states that schools that receive Title I, Part A funds shall provide to each individual parent of a child who is a student in such school with respect to such student, timely notice that the student has been assigned, or has been taught for 4 or more consecutive weeks by, a teacher who does not meet applicable State certification or licensure requirements at the grade level and subject area in which the teacher has been assigned.

To determine if a teacher meets State certification requirements based on the information provided by the LEA (teacher that is working through an ACP program but does not have an intern or probationary certification and he/she is teaching a core subject), please reach out to the Division of Educator Certification. They are available only via [helpdesk ticket](#). If it is determined that the teacher in this circumstance does not meet State certification requirements, then the notification requirement referenced above would need to be met.

Q7: Are LEAs required to send the Parents’ Right to Know notification for teachers who are currently in an Alternative Certification Program (ACP)?

A7: ESSA requires that campuses provide to each individual parent timely notice that the parent’s child has been assigned or taught for four or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who does not meet state certification or licensure requirements soon after the four weeks have passed. Sample Notification Letters can be found on the [Statewide Parent and Family Engagement Initiative Web Site for Parents’ Right to Know](#). Additionally, another resource that you may find helpful is [An Administrator’s Checklist to ESSA Parent and Family Engagement](#). It provides a comprehensive list of all the parental involvement requirements.

The notification is required if the teacher does not meet state certification or licensure requirements. In some cases, teachers enrolled in alternative certification programs may meet state certification requirements. However, in other cases, teachers enrolled in alternative certification programs may not meet state certification requirements. For specific questions related to state certification requirements, please reach out to the Division of Educator Certification by submitting a HelpDesk Ticket under the “Educator Certification and CPE” card on the [HelpDesk web page](#).

Q8: Are charter schools required to comply with the requirement related to parental notification of teachers who are not certified and have been teaching for 4 or more weeks?

A8: ESSA Section 1112(e)(1)(B) states, “ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—In addition to the information that parents may request under subparagraph (A), a school that receives funds under this part shall provide to each individual parent of a child who is a student in such school, with respect to such student—

(ii) timely notice that the student has been assigned, or has been taught for 4 or more consecutive weeks by, a teacher who does not meet applicable State certification or licensure requirements at the grade level and subject area in which the teacher has been assigned.”

Teachers employed by open enrollment charter schools in Texas are not required to be certified as per state certification or licensure requirements except in the case of teachers assigned to teach in special education or bilingual programs, in which case the appropriate state certification is required. Therefore, the parents right to know requirement referenced in ESSA statute (Section 1112[e][1][B][ii]) would only apply to special education and bilingual teachers employed by an open enrollment charter school.

Q9: Is it acceptable for campuses to host their Annual Title I Meeting in a virtual/remote setting?

A9: Yes, it is acceptable for LEAs to host their Annual Title I, Part A Meeting in a virtual/remote setting. Documentation is key. The LEA would need to document how all the requirements associated with the Annual Title I meeting were met (i.e., attendance, offered to all parents, translation, information provided, opportunity for feedback, etc.). Additionally, the LEA would need to consider alternative options to share the information from the meeting with parents that may not be able to attend the meeting being held in a remote setting. The updated [Annual Title I, Part A Annual Meeting Toolkit](#) has resources related to the Annual Title I, Part A Annual Meeting requirement and a section with suggestions for hosting the meeting in a virtual setting.

Q10: Does the LEA PFE Policy need to be approved by the board of trustees?

A10: It depends. Federal statute does not require the PFE policy to be approved by the board unless the LEA’s local policies and procedures require that all policies be approved by the board. The LEA should note, however, that federal statute does require the LEA’s PFE policy to be incorporated into the LEA plan. [Section 1116(a)(2)] If the LEA is required by either its district and campus decision-making process or by state law to obtain board approval of its improvement plan, the PFE policy would be subject to local board approval.

Q11: Can the Title I, Part A campus annual meeting be combined with other beginning of the year events?

A11: In some cases, yes. The meeting shall be set at a convenient time, to which all parents of participating children shall be invited and encouraged to attend, to inform parents of their school’s participation under Title I, Part A, and to explain the requirements of Title I, Part A, and the right of the parents to be involved. The Title I, Part A annual meeting can be part of a larger event, but it can’t be reduced to a 5–10-minute summary or a handout. The LEA must give parents more than one attendance option (different days and times) to participate in the annual meeting.

Q12: How do LEAs document the annual evaluation of the content and effectiveness of the PFE policy?

A12: Acceptable forms of documentation for the annual evaluation of the content and effectiveness of the PFE Policy includes, but is not limited to, evaluation meeting agenda, minutes, sign in sheets,

survey instruments, survey responses, focus groups, focus group responses and/or an evaluation report.

Q13: How often does the campus written PFE policy need to be updated?

A13: The campus written PFE policy shall be evaluated at least annually to ensure that it meets the changing needs of parents and the school. However, it should be updated as the needs change for the parents and the school which may be more frequently than annually.

Q14: Does the campus PFE policy need to be translated into other languages?

A14: LEAs operating at least one schoolwide or targeted assistance program must establish Translation procedures related to ensuring that the campus PFE Policy is, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that parents can understand. USDE has not provided guidance or defined the term to the extent practicable. However, it is a requirement that campuses follow their LEA's translation procedures in determining whether the policy needs to be translated into other languages.

Q15: Can a campus use an already established committee to review, evaluate and guide the decisions related to the PFE requirements including the creation/revision of the campus PFE policy?

A15: Yes. The campus can use an already established committee to review, evaluate and guide the decisions related to the PFE requirements including the creation/revision of the campus PFE policy as long as the already established committee is comprised of a sufficient number and representative group of parents and family members served by the campus to adequately represent the needs of the populations served for the purposes of developing, revising, and reviewing the parent and family engagement policy.

Q16: Can the same stakeholders who are consulted for the DIP be the same stakeholders utilized to develop the LEA Parent and Family Engagement Policy?

A16: There could certainly be some overlap between the two groups. However, although, parents of children in schools served under Title I, Part A are required to be a part of the DIP stakeholder consultation process, they are only one of the stakeholder groups that are part of that process. The requirement for the Parent and Family Engagement (PFE) Policy is that it be jointly developed with parents and family members of participating children. Thus, the stakeholder group responsible for the development of the PFE Policy would likely need to include more parents so that the group could include a sufficient number and representative group of parents and family members served by the LEA to adequately represent the needs of the populations served for the purposes of developing, revising, and reviewing the parent and family engagement policy.

Q17: Where can I find sample LEA and campus PFE policies?

A17: Sample templates that have been vetted for compliance and include all the PFE requirements can be accessed in the Additional Resources section of the [Title I, Part A Program Guide](#).

Q18: Is the school-parent compact required for all Title I, Part A campuses?

A18: Yes.

Q19: Where are the school-parent compacts required to be kept?

A19: Copies of school-parent compacts should be retained by the campus or LEA in accordance with the record retention policies and procedures of the LEA. Signatures are not required.

Q20: How does a campus make their PFE policy available to the local community?

A20: There are a variety of ways that a campus can make their PFE policy available to the local community. Campuses can post direct links to the PFE policy on its web site, make hard copies available to individuals in the local community upon request, make hard copies available for viewing in public locations and/or have the policy available at the front office of the campus.

Q21: Are all Title I, Part A campuses required to host annual parent-teacher conferences for parents of all children served under Title I, Part A?

A21: Only elementary Title I, Part A campuses are required to host annual parent-teacher conferences for parents of all children served under Title I, Part A. At the conference, the school-parent compact shall be discussed as the compact relates to the individual child's achievement.

Q22: Can the LEA and campus PFE policies be included in the Student Handbook/Code of Conduct publication provided to parents yearly to meet the requirements for distribution?

A22: It depends. The following requirements related to the distribution of the PFE policies would need to be met for the Student Handbook/Code of Conduct (SH/COC) to be an acceptable distribution method for the PFE policies. The LEA and campuses must ensure that the most current PFE policies are published in the SH/COC document. If the PFE policies are revised at any time before a new SH/COC is distributed, an addendum to the SH/COC providing the revised PFE policy must be distributed to all parents of participating students. The SH/COC meets the translation requirements as set out in the LEAs translation procedure. The PFE policy is noted separately in the table of contents and easily accessible and written in an understandable and uniform format within the SH/COC document. Parents may request a hard copy.

Q23: Can the LEA reserve more than 1 percent of its Title I, Part A entitlement to assist schools to carry out PFE activities?

A23: Yes. If the LEA's Title I, Part A entitlement is greater than \$500,000, the LEA is required to reserve **at least** 1 percent of its Title I, Part A entitlement to assist schools to carry out parent and family engagement activities. The LEA can reserve more than 1 percent. Please note that at least 90 percent of the funds reserved shall be distributed to Title I, Part A schools, with priority given to high-need schools. It is also required that the LEA involve parents and family members of children in Title I, Part A served campuses in the decisions regarding how reserved Title I, Part A funds are allotted for parent and family engagement activities.

Q24: Is a campus required to convene the Title I, Part A annual meeting and the parent policy development meetings at different times of the day?

A24: Yes. Parents should be offered multiple opportunities to receive the information. Each Title I, Part A campus shall offer at least two attendance options for its annual Title I meeting (at different times of the day and at different days of the week) to ensure maximum participation by parents and family members of participating students. Likewise, parents must have more than one meeting opportunity to provide input on the development, review, and evaluation of the PFE policy.

Q25: Does the parent and family engagement policy for LEA and/or campuses require school board approval or is it okay to include the policy in our administrative regulations and our department handbook/plan without the board voting to approve it as a board policy?

A25: The LEA would need to follow their local policies and procedures for policy adoption.

Q26: Is there a translation policy template?

A26: We currently do not have a template. We are looking to identify exemplars of translation policies that can be shared through the [Statewide Title I, Part A Parent and Family Engagement Initiative](#) when they are vetted and available for sharing.

Q27: Are non-traditional campuses (head start, credit recovery, dropout recovery, DAEPs, etc.) required to meet the parent and family engagement requirements (school-parent-student compact, annual Title I, Part A meeting, campus written PFE policy, etc.)?

A27: Every campus served with Title I, Part A funds is required to meet all parent and family engagement statutory requirements. Each campus is required to have its own School-Parent-Student Compact and a campus written PFE policy that is based on the needs of the parents served by the campus. Additionally, each campus is required to host the annual Title I, Part A meetings.

Q28: Is the family engagement plan required under TEC 29.168 for elementary schools the same as the campus parent and family engagement policy required under Title I, Part A?

A28: They each have separate statutory requirements. The two documents can be combined into one, as long as the requirements of each are addressed. The Family Engagement Plan referenced in TEC 29.168 is related to prekindergarten programs. The specific requirements for the high-quality prekindergarten program family engagement plan can be found in the following Commissioner’s Rules: <https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/ch102aa.pdf>.

The Title I, Part A written PFE policy requirements are noted in the [Title I, Part A Program Guide](#).

Q29: Do the Title I, Part A PFE statutory requirements apply to only Schoolwide Program Campuses, or do they also apply to campuses operating a Targeted Assistance Program?

A29: The PFE requirements noted in Section 1116 apply to any Title I, Part A served campus, regardless of the program being implemented on the campus.

Q30: Which parents would be involved in developing the required PFE statutory requirements on a Targeted Assistance Campus? All parents, or only the parents of students served by the targeted assistance program?

A30: On a targeted assistance campus, the parents and family members of participating children would be involved in developing the required PFE statutory requirements on the campus.

Q31: If a campus serves 5th and 6th grade students, does the parent-teacher conference Title I, Part A requirement apply to 6th grade since that grade level is usually not considered “elementary”?

A31: It would depend on how the LEA classifies the campus. If the LEA considers the campus an elementary school, the conferences would be required for both grade levels. If the LEA considers the campus a secondary school, the conferences would not be required for neither grade level. Statute specifically states the requirement is for elementary schools.

Q32: Are there specific qualifications for translators that are utilized by the LEAs to act as face-to-face interpreters or to translate documents?

A32: There is no statutory requirement that references qualifications for interpreters or individuals translating documents. It is a local decision. The LEA would refer to their local policies and procedures for interpreters and translation of documents.

Q33: If an LEA chooses to reserve an amount that is more than the 1% that is statutorily required for parent and family engagement, is the LEA required to comply with the 90% distribution to Title I, Part A campuses requirement for the amount reserved above the 1%?

A33: The ESSA Statute, Section 1116(a)(3)(C) states, “Not less than 90 percent of the funds reserved under subparagraph (A) [for parent and family engagement activities] shall be distributed to schools served under this part, with priority given to high-need schools.” Since the statutory requirement is 1%, the LEA would only need to meet the 90% distribution requirement for the statutory requirement amount of 1%. The LEA should maintain documentation that at least 90% of the 1% reservation was distributed to Title I, Part A campuses.

Q34: Can a campus and/or LEA coordinate their parent and family engagement activities across multiple federal programs?

A34: Section 1116(a)(2)(C) states that “(2) Each local educational agency that receives funds under Title I, Part A part shall develop jointly with, agree on with, and distribute to, parents and family members of participating children a written parent and family engagement policy. The policy shall be incorporated into the local educational agency’s plan developed under section 1112, establish the agency’s expectations and objectives for meaningful parent and family involvement, and describe how the agency will—(C) coordinate and integrate parent and family engagement strategies under this part with parent and family engagement strategies, to the extent feasible and appropriate, with other relevant Federal, State, and local laws and programs;” The keywords are “to the extent feasible and appropriate.” Coordination could look different based on the needs of the families being served. In a schoolwide program, for example, the Annual Title I Meeting requirement may not meet the coordination requirements for another program if the program has

requirements that are specific to the population being served. However, for example, if time is scheduled during the meeting that is tailored to meet the needs of another program and for parents/family members of students being served by the other program, it may become more conducive to meeting the requirements for another program. The LEA would need to see how best to coordinate to ensure they are meeting the needs and requirements of the different populations they are serving.

Q35: Can Title I, Part A funds be used to coordinate with Title III, Part A, to provide English classes for parents?

A35: Providing English classes/literacy training for parents would be allowable under Title I, Part A “if the LEA has exhausted all other reasonably available resources of funding for such training” [Section 1116 (e)(7)]. If it is determined that the LEA can document that it has exhausted all other reasonably available resources of funding for such training, it would be allowable to use Title I, Part A funds. The LEA would need to ensure that the steps and requirements for use of Title I, Part A funds are met as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#). The activity would need to have been identified through the comprehensive needs assessment process and documented in the appropriate improvement plan (DIP and/or CIP).

From a Supplement, Not Supplant perspective, Title III, Part A funds must be supplemental to other federal funds, but Title I, Part A funds are not required to be supplemental to other federal funds; therefore, it would be allowable for Title I, Part A funds to replace Title III, Part A funds, but not the reverse.

Q36: Is the Annual Title I Meeting required to be conducted by the campus or the LEA?

A36: The Annual Title I Meeting is required to be conducted by each Title I, Part A served campus.

Q37: Is it acceptable for the LEA Written Parent and Family Engagement (PFE) Policy to be distributed along with the Campus Written PFE Policy at each campus’ Annual Title I Meeting?

A37: Yes, a campus could use the Annual Title I Meeting as an opportunity to distribute both the LEA and Campus PFE policies since they are both required to be distributed.

Q38: Is the Parent and Family Engagement training that is required to be provided to school personnel with the assistance of parents required to be provided annually?

A38: The statute does not reference whether this requirement is to be completed annually. Thus, each of the stakeholders referenced in statute (teachers, specialized instructional support personnel, principals, and other school leaders, and other staff) would need to have completed the training at least once while working at the same campus or when parent needs may have changed as it relates to how to reach out to, communicate with, and work with parents as equal partners on a campus. The campus and LEA would need to maintain the documentation necessary to establish compliance with this requirement. Best practice would be that the training take place annually. Although this requirement is included in the LEA Title I, Part A Compliance Report Self-Check that is submitted annually, when the LEA is reporting “In Compliance,” for this particular item, they are affirming that all staff required to be trained have been trained.

Q39: ESSA Section 1116(2) states that the LEA written parent and family engagement (PFE) policy "shall be incorporated into the local educational agency's plan developed under ESSA Section 1112." Does the LEA written PFE policy required under ESSA Section 1116 have to be adopted and posted to the LEA website by a specific date each year?

A39: The LEA Written Parent and Family Engagement Policy is required to be included as part of the LEA Title I, Part A Program Plan/District Improvement Plan. Such plan should be completed prior to the certification and submission of the ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application. For Title I, Part A purposes, it would be a local decision as to when and whether the Plan and Policy would be posted to the LEA website as a means for making them available to the public. Best practice would be that the Plan and Policy be posted on the LEA/campus websites and made widely available to stakeholders at the beginning of the school year.

Q40: Is the Campus Written Parent and Family Engagement Policy required in ESSA Section 1116 required to be included in the Schoolwide Program Plan required under section 1114?

A40: The Campus Written Parent and Family Engagement Policy is not required to be included as part of the Schoolwide Program Plan/Campus Improvement Plan. However, such plan should be completed prior to the certification and submission of the ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application. For Title I, Part A purposes, it would be a local decision as to when and whether the Plan and Policy would be posted to the campus website as a means for making them available to the public. Best practice would be that the Plan and Policy be posted on the LEA/campus websites and made widely available to stakeholders at the beginning of the school year.

Q41: Section 1116(e)(3) requires that a training be provided to school staff on the value and utility of contributions of parents, and in how to reach out to, communicate with, and work with parents as equal partners, implement and coordinate parent programs, and build ties between parents and the school. Is the LEA or campus required to provide the training?

A41: Section 1116(e)(3), states "To ensure effective involvement of parents and to support a partnership among the school involved, parents, and the community to improve student academic achievement, **each school and local educational agency assisted under this part**— shall educate teachers, specialized instructional support personnel, principals, and other school leaders, and other staff, with the assistance of parents, in the value and utility of contributions of parents, and in how to reach out to, communicate with, and work with parents as equal partners, implement and coordinate parent programs, and build ties between parents and the school;" Since the statute refers to both a school and LEA, either one can provide the training as long as all the stakeholders referenced receive the training. For example, the LEA may provide the training to Principals and the school may provide the training to the other stakeholders referenced. Schools and the LEA must maintain documentation (agenda, training materials, and sign-in sheets/participant rosters) locally showing evidence that the training occurred.

Q42: If an LEA has multiple campuses, however, only one campus is served under Title I, Part A, does the LEA need a separate LEA and campus written Parent and Family Engagement Policy, or would one document be sufficient in this situation?

A42: One policy would be sufficient in this situation, as long as the PFE policy statutory requirements for the LEA and Title I, Part A campus are both included in the one policy document. The name of the campus would also need to be on the campus-specific portions of the policy, and the LEA and campus must meet the policy distribution requirements.

Q43: If an LEA does not expend the Title I, Part A funds required to be reserved for Parent and Family Engagement activities (1%) in a grant year, is the LEA required to reserve the funds in the following year when the funds are carried over?

A43: A local educational agency (LEA) that received a Title I allocation that exceeded \$500,000 and, as required, reserved 1% of its allocation for parent and family engagement, but did not obligate all of this amount by September 30, must use a portion of its Title I carryover funds equal to the unobligated amount for parent and family engagement in addition to its current year's reservation for this purpose provided that the LEA only reserved 1% of its allocation. (If an LEA reserved more than 1% for parent and family engagement and already obligated an amount equal to 1%, then it need not use any of its carryover funds for this purpose.)

For example, an LEA with School Year (SY) 2021-2022 Title I allocation of \$10,000,000 reserved \$100,000 to meet the requirement to reserve at least 1% of its allocation to carry out parent and family engagement activities under ESEA section 1116. If this LEA only obligated \$90,000 of the \$100,000 by September 30, 2022, in addition to reserving 1% of its SY 2022-2023 allocation for parent and family engagement activities under ESEA section 1116, the LEA must also assign \$10,000 of its SY 2021-2022 carryover funds to this activity. In other words, the \$10,000 in carryover from SY 2021-2022 would be in addition to the required SY 2022-2023 PFE reservation.

***Q44: Does an LEA posting the LEA and all campus parent and family engagement policies only on the LEA web site (instead of also posting on the campus websites) meet the requirement for making the policies available to parents and the public and do each have to be provided in an understandable and uniform format, and to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand?**

*A44: It is the LEA's decision how to design its web site. The policies should be easily accessible by the public and by parents, if required to be distributed to parents and the public. If a campus policy is required to be distributed to parents, it would make most sense for the policy to be posted on the campus website. If the sole method of distribution to parents is via website, the campus and LEA would be responsible for communicating such method to all parents and maintain documentation showing evidence of such communication. LEAs and campuses are required to ensure that the policies are in an understandable and uniform format.

The LEA should follow its local translation policy or procedures to determine the appropriate languages for translation.

***Q45: An ESSA Title I, Part A requirement states that an LEA must notify parents if a student has a non-certified teacher in the classroom. With the teacher shortage, the LEA is contracting with staffing agencies who offer teachers to the LEA. If the LEA uses the services of a staffing agency to employ a teacher who may not have all the certifications, is the LEA still required to send**

such notice to parents, even if the teacher is not an employee of the district, but is an employee of the staffing agency?

*A45: The Parents’ Right-to-Know requirement referenced below would apply to an individual that is fulfilling the role of teacher regardless of whether that person is performing such duties as an employee or a contractor.

Section 1112(e)(1)(B)(ii): A school that receives funds under Title I, Part A shall provide to each individual parent of a child who is a student in such school, with respect to such student— timely notice that the student has been assigned, or has been taught for 4 or more consecutive weeks by, a teacher who does not meet applicable State certification or licensure requirements at the grade level and subject area in which the teacher has been assigned.

***Q46: Do districts need to ensure they have a LOCAL POLICY outlining translation procedures, or can locally communicated translation PROCEDURES be linked, communicated, or referenced in the distribution communication such as in handbooks, online for required documents, etc.?**

*A46: The LEA needs auditable documentation ensuring that it has a process for translating documents that are required to be provided in a language that parents can understand. LEAs can achieve that through adoption and implementation of a translation procedure, policy, or documented process.

***Q47: Is it allowable for an LEA to develop an online module (with the input of parents) that staff could then push out to campuses to meet the requirement related to the training in the value and utility of parents? All LEA staff would take the online module (with self-checks throughout), and receive a certificate of completion. Is this allowable rather than a live training?**

*A47: The statute does not provide a specific method in which the training is to be provided. As long as the training includes the statutory requirements, the LEA and schools can determine the method of the training based on their local needs. The statutory requirement related to the training requirement is as follows:

ESSA Section 1116(e)(3): To ensure effective involvement of parents and to support a partnership among the school involved, parents, and the community to improve student academic achievement, each school and local educational agency assisted under this part— shall educate teachers, specialized instructional support personnel, principals, and other school leaders, and other staff, with the assistance of parents, in the value and utility of contributions of parents, and in how to reach out to, communicate with, and work with parents as equal partners, implement and coordinate parent programs, and build ties between parents and the school.

***Q48: Is it a requirement for the LEA written parent and family engagement (PFE) policy to be included in the LEA Program Plan/District Improvement Plan as an addendum or can the LEA state that they will follow the parent and family engagement strategies laid out in the plan and post it on the website or distribute it in the school handbook?**

*A48: There are 2 statutory references related to the LEA PFE written policy. Section 1112 (b)(7) references that the LEA Title I, Part A Program Plan shall describe, “the strategy the local

educational agency will use to implement effective parent and family engagement under section 1116.” Section 1116(a)(2) references that, “Each local educational agency that receives funds under this part shall develop jointly with, agree on with, and distribute to, parents and family members of participating children a written parent and family engagement policy. The policy shall be incorporated into the local educational agency’s plan developed under section 1112.” Since statute states that the policy shall be “incorporated into the LEA’s plan,” to meet compliance requirements, the LEA should either include it in the LEA plan or as an addendum to the plan. Although there is no distribution requirement in the Title I, Part A statute for the LEA Title I, Part A program plan/DIP, there is a distribution requirement for the LEA PFE written policy. The LEA would decide how it will distribute the policy to parents and family members of participating children. The LEA could post the PFE policy on its website. However, the LEA would also need to notify parents that the PFE policy will be made available on the website. The LEA can also have copies available at Title I, Part A campuses and/or the LEA can also publish the LEA PFE written policy in the student handbook that is distributed to all parents.

Procurement

Q1: May an LEA use federal funds to purchase items from large stores (i.e., Wal Mart, Target, H-E-B) if the large store is unwilling to sign a procurement form?

A1: There is no required procurement form. However, if the LEA requires that a form be signed as part of its local policy and the store is unwilling to sign the form, then the LEA cannot purchase from those stores because it would be violating its local procurement policy.

LEA Reservations

Q1: Is there a correlation between the 1% LEA reservation for Parent and Family Engagement (PFE) and the reservation for services to homeless students?

A1: Regardless of whether the LEA is a Single Attendance Area or a Multiple Attendance Area, the LEA shall reserve from the LEA's entitlement such Title I, Part A funds as are reasonable and necessary, prior to making allocations to eligible campuses, in order to accomplish the following purposes:

Districtwide Parent and Family Engagement Activities [Note: If the LEA's Title I, Part A entitlement is greater than \$500,000, the LEA is required to reserve at least 1 percent of its Title I, Part A entitlement to assist schools to carry out parent and family engagement activities. At least 90 percent of the funds reserved shall be distributed to Title I, Part A schools, with priority given to high-need schools.]

Services to Homeless Students [Note: The Homeless reservation is required by all LEAs, regardless of the Title I status of their campuses. Although an amount must be reserved for this purpose, there is no specific amount or percentage required. It is what the LEA deems to be reasonable and necessary. The LEA should maintain documentation to demonstrate how the LEA decided on the amount reserved.]

Q2: Are the reservations for PFE and services to homeless students related in any way?

A2: The two reservations are not necessarily related in any way. LEAs would make a determination as to which line item they would make an LEA reservation under and maintain documentation locally to justify the determination. The LEA would need to abide by the reserved funds amounts noted on Program Schedule 3101 – Title I, Part A of the ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application for each of the activities areas to be conducted with reserved funds. If the LEA determines that the needs of the LEA have changed, an amendment can be submitted to adjust the amounts noted. The LEA should maintain documentation to demonstrate how the LEA decided on the amount reserved.

Q3: Can funds reserved for PFE be used to support services to homeless students and vice versa?

A3: It depends. Funds reserved at the LEA level can be used for Districtwide PFE activities and MV/homeless students. There are some instances where the LEA can document that funds reserved for Districtwide PFE activities may be used to support homeless students and vice versa. It is what the LEA deems to be reasonable and necessary. The LEA would need to abide by the reserved amounts noted on Program Schedule 3101 – Title I, Part A of the ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application for each of the activities areas to be conducted with reserved funds. If the LEA determines that the needs of the LEA have changed, an amendment can be submitted to adjust the amounts noted. The LEA should maintain documentation to demonstrate how the LEA decided on the amount reserved.

Q4: Is there a limit on the total amount reserved at the LEA level and on personnel paid out of the LEA reservation for Title I, Part A?

A4: There is not a statutory limitation on the total amount reserved at the LEA level and on personnel paid out of the LEA reservation for Title I, Part A other than that the total reserved funds cannot exceed the LEA's entitlement amount. However, if the total reservation exceeds 30% of the entitlement, TEA will contact the LEA for a justification. The LEA would need to ensure that the funds reserved are for the statutory authorized activities which include the 10 items noted below. The LEA would need to ensure that the reserved funds are documented on the most current ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application – PS3101 Title I, Part A Program Schedule. Please note that there are additional requirements for some of the reservations noted below related to the amount reserved for such activities: Districtwide Parent and Family Engagement Activities and Services to Homeless Students.

1. Districtwide Parent and Family Engagement Activities (If the Entitlement Amount is greater than \$500,000, an LEA must reserve at least 1% of funds for Districtwide Parent and Family Engagement Activities.)
2. Title I, Part A Services to Eligible Private School Students, Not Including Administration
3. Administration of Title I, Part A Programs for Eligible Private School Students
4. Preschool Programs
5. Administration of Title I, Part A Programs (including administration of Title I, Part A programs for students at facilities for neglected and delinquent)
6. Districtwide Professional Development Activities
7. Services to Homeless Students (The Homeless reservation is required for all LEAs. Though the reservation amount should reflect the LEA's needs, a minimum of \$100 should be reserved and documentation should be maintained to demonstrate how this amount was determined.)
8. Services to Students Residing in Local Facilities for the Neglected
9. Services to Students Residing in Local Facilities for the Delinquent
10. Foster Care Transportation

Q5: Can an LEA serve skipped campuses with the parent and family engagement (PFE) LEA reservation?

A5: LEA reservation funds for Parent and Family Engagement (PFE) can only be used to support Title I, Part A served campuses. A skipped campus is not considered a Title I, Part A served campus. Thus, it would be unallowable to serve skipped campuses with the PFE LEA reservation.

Q6: All campuses in an LEA are Title I, Part A served campuses. The LEA reserves Title I, Part A funds each year for services to support homeless students and will continue to do so in the future. I just wanted to clarify the Title I, Part A requirement. What is the requirement if all campuses are Title I, Part A served campuses?

A6: The following reservation requirements apply to all LEAs receiving Title I, Part A funds. The Homeless reservation is required by all LEAs, regardless of the Title I status of their campuses. An amount must be reserved for this purpose at the LEA level (a minimum of \$100 is required at the

LEA level). The Homeless reservation should be what the LEA deems to be reasonable and necessary which may be determined based on a needs assessment. The LEA should maintain documentation to demonstrate how the LEA decided on the amount reserved.

Q7: If an LEA reserved the required 1% of their Title I, Part A funds for parent and family engagement but did not expend the full 1%, does the remaining amount carryover for the same purpose in the following year?

A7: LEAs are not required to allocate the amount remaining that is carried over for the same purpose in the following year unless it is required by their local policies and procedures related to carryover funds.

Q8: If an LEA has Title I, Part A served campuses and non-Title I, Part A campuses, may the LEA reserve funds for Districtwide Professional Development activities?

A8: The LEA may reserve funds for Districtwide Professional Development activities to support Title I, Part A served campuses only. Non-served campuses cannot benefit from LEA reserved funds for Districtwide Professional Development activities.

Q9: If an LEA has Title I, Part A served campuses and non-Title I, Part A campuses, may the LEA reserve funds for Districtwide Parent and Family Engagement (PFE) activities?

A9: If the LEA receives over \$500,000 in Title I, Part A funds, they are required to reserve funds for PFE activities. If the LEA receives \$500,000 or less in Title I, Part A funds, the LEA may reserve funds for Districtwide PFE activities. The PFE reserved funds can only be used to support Title I, Part A served campuses.

Q10: As we share the April campus estimates for Title I, Part A with our campus principals, I wanted to be sure to provide the most updated information on what is allowable with the PFE reservation. Can you please point me in the right direction? Are there any changes based on the CARES Act?

A10: At least 90% of the funds reserved at the LEA for Parent and Family Engagement shall be distributed to Title I, Part A schools, with priority given to high-need schools. The LEA shall involve parents and family members of children in Title I, Part A served campuses in the decisions regarding how reserved Title I, Part A funds are allotted for parent and family engagement activities. Funds reserved to carry out parent and family engagement activities shall be used to carry out activities and strategies that are consistent with the LEA's parent and family engagement policy, including at least one of the following:

- Supporting schools and nonprofit organizations in providing professional development for LEA and school personnel regarding parent and family engagement strategies, which may be provided jointly to teachers, principals, other school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, early childhood educators, parents and family members.
- Supporting programs that reach parents and family members at home, in the community, and at school.

- Disseminating information on best practices focused on parent and family engagement, especially best practices for increasing the engagement of economically disadvantaged parents and family members.
- Collaborating, or providing subgrants to schools to enable such schools to collaborate, with community-based or other organizations or employers with a record of success in improving and increasing parent and family engagement.
- Engaging in any other activities and strategies that the LEA determines are appropriate and consistent with the LEA's parent and family engagement policy.

For additional information related to the Parent and Family Engagement Requirements, you can also refer to the [Title I, Part A Program Guide](#).

The requirements associated with the Title I, Part A parent and family engagement reservation were not impacted by the CARES Act. For CARES Act information, please visit the [CARES Act Funding and COVID Expense Reimbursement FAQ](#).

Q11: If a district is required to provide 90% of their reservation for parent engagement back to the campuses, can the 90% be captured in time and effort for the parent liaison?

A11: If the employee is providing Campus-specific PFE responsibilities, the time the employee spends on such responsibilities would be considered at the campus level. Additionally, the LEA would need to ensure that it is following LEA policies and procedures related to the classification of employees (LEA vs. campus). The LEA would need to retain detailed documentation in case of an audit or random validation monitoring review.

Q12: Is there a maximum amount that an LEA may reserve?

A12: No. An LEA must bear in mind, however, that the goal of Part A is to enable participating children to make adequate progress toward meeting the challenging student performance standards that all children are expected to meet. Moreover, if the 125 Percent Special Allocation Rule applies, the LEA must calculate 125 percent of the LEA's allocation per low-income child before it reserves any funds.

Q13: How may an LEA reserve funds for activities such as parental involvement and professional development?

A13: An LEA may reserve funds at the LEA level for activities such as parental involvement and professional development or the LEA may require its Title I schools to carry out these activities from their allocations. For example, an LEA that is required to spend at least 1 percent of its allocation for parental involvement activities may reserve the full 1 percent from its Part A allocation, require each school to spend a requisite amount from its Part A allocation, or use a combination of these approaches. If the LEA does decide to reserve funds for parental involvement, at least 90% of that reservation must be allocated to campuses.

Q14: How may preschool children be served under Title I, Part A?

A14: There are several ways in which preschool children may be served under Part A. For example—

- A participating school may use part of its Part A funds to operate a preschool program.
- An LEA may reserve an amount from the LEA's total allocation to operate a Part A preschool program for eligible children in the district as a whole or for a portion of the district.
- An LEA may reserve an amount from the LEA's total allocation and distribute these funds to schools that wish to operate a Part A preschool program.

Q15: Is it correct that an LEA may not have total LEA reservations that exceed 10% of the total Title I, Part A allocation?

A15: Although Title I, Part A funds must be allocated to campuses as per the rank and serve statutory requirements, there is no statutory required percent of funds to be allocated to campuses. If the LEA total reservation exceeds 30%, TEA will contact the LEA for a justification.

Q16: Is an LEA obligated to provide services to the neglected/delinquent facilities using Title I, Part A funds?

A16: If the LEA applies for Title I, Part A funds, the LEA is required to reserve funds for children in local institutions for neglected children and if appropriate, children in local institutions for delinquent children, and neglected or delinquent children in community day programs. [Section 1113(c)(3)(A)(ii) & (iii)] The reservation amounts are required to be noted on the PS3101 in the ESSA Consolidated Grant Application. The amount would be based on the needs identified and no less than \$100.

***Q17: If an LEA has reserved Title I, Part A funds in the PS3101 for Preschool Programs, can those funds serve any Preschool student in the program, or only those meeting the low-income criteria?**

*A17: Table 1 (Page 10) of the [USDE Non-Regulatory Guidance on early learning](#) has a chart that references mechanisms by which schools and LEAs can use Title I, Part A funds to support preschool programs that may be useful. Specifically reference the orange section of the chart that is referenced below. Student eligibility will depend on the type of Title I program involved. If the child resides in the attendance area of a Schoolwide campus, the child could be served in the LEA's Title I preschool program; if the child resides in the attendance area of a Targeted Assistance campus, the child would need to meet the educationally related eligibility criteria established by the LEA/campus.

Table 1. Mechanisms by which schools and LEAs can use Title I, Part A funds to support preschool programs

District (LEA)-Operated: An LEA may reserve a portion of funds from its Title I allocation to operate a preschool program for eligible children in the LEA as a whole or in a portion of the LEA.

- **District (LEA) as a Whole:** An LEA may serve preschool children who reside throughout the LEA and whom the LEA identifies as eligible because they are at risk of failing to meet the State’s academic achievement standards when they reach school age. An LEA may not use Title I funds to implement a preschool program throughout the district to benefit all preschool students in the LEA unless all the schools in the LEA are Title I schools operating schoolwide programs.
- **Portion of the District (LEA):** An LEA may serve preschool children who reside in specific Title I school attendance areas (e.g., its highest-poverty school attendance areas) served by some or all of its Title I schools if, for example, an LEA does not have sufficient Title I funds to operate a preschool program for the district as a whole.

***Q18: The LEA is required to reserve at least 1% for Parent and Family Engagement (PFE) since the LEA’s entitlement is greater than \$500,000. All funds reserved meet the 1% requirement and are used for PFE Liaison salaries. How can the LEA ensure that it is meeting the statutory requirement that 90% of the 1% reservation be distributed to high-need schools?**

***A18:** If the all of the LEA’s required PFE reservation is used to pay PFE liaisons who are assigned to the Title I, Part A campuses and provide services on the campuses for parent and family engagement activities, it is acceptable to count those funds (PFE Campus Liaison Salaries) as meeting the 90% of the 1% LEA PFE reservation that is required to be distributed to Title I, Part A schools. In this case, all of the 1% PFE reservation is distributed to the campuses.

Schoolwide Program

Q1: The Board of Trustees approved a name change for an elementary school. They kept the same campus number. The only thing that changed was the name. Does the campus have to go through a schoolwide program transition process?

A1: Since the name of the campus is the only thing that changed, they would not be required to go through a schoolwide program transition process.

Q2: We have had several LEAs that are reconfiguring their campuses to combine different grade levels to create new campuses. There are a couple of scenarios that we have seen:

- **Multiple campuses that are Schoolwide where grade levels are being reconfigured.**
- **Multiple campuses that are a mixture of Schoolwide and Eligible, but Not Served that are being reorganized**
 - **It varies, but sometimes certain grade levels go up to an Intermediate or Middle School level from an existing elementary campus; or sometimes the LEA expands an Elementary School to include grades from Intermediate or Middle Schools. We have also seen where campuses are combined, and then multiple elementary schools are created.**
- **What is the best way to handle these situations? Do the “new” campuses need to go through the process to become Schoolwide?**

A2: The campuses would need to go through the process to some extent because there has been a change in the composition of the student body. However, the time that it would take for the planning process would all depend on the extent of the reorganization/reconfiguration and how the collective needs of the student body of the “new” school would be affected. If the LEA determines, in consultation with the school, that less time was needed to develop and implement the schoolwide program based on the collective needs of the “new” student body, the LEA will need to retain documentation to that effect. All documentation to demonstrate compliance for schoolwide planning must be maintained locally for audit and validation/monitoring purposes.

Documentation of the planning process must include a comprehensive needs assessment, the inclusion of the required stakeholders in the process, incorporation of the required descriptions into the Campus Improvement plan, documentation related to parent and family engagement (PFE) requirements (i.e., school-parent compact and PFE policy), and the provision for an evaluation of program effectiveness that will inform the next year’s needs assessment and planning. If the LEA determines that Education Service Center (ESC) training/technical assistance was part of the reason that less time was needed to develop and implement the schoolwide program, then the LEA would need to keep such documentation in addition to the documentation noted above.

Q3: We have also had questions about how the Education Service Center (ESC) is supposed to support those campuses who are going through the process of transitioning to Schoolwide. What are the recommended steps, trainings, etc. that we need to do in support of the LEA?

A3: The recommended steps and training would center around the comprehensive needs assessment, the inclusion of the required stakeholders in the process, incorporation of the required descriptions into the Campus Improvement plan, documentation related to parent and family engagement (PFE) requirements (i.e., school-parent compact and PFE policy), and the provision for an evaluation of program effectiveness that will inform the next year’s needs assessment and planning.

Q4: What is a Title I, Part A schoolwide program?

A4: A Title I, Part A schoolwide program permits a school to use funds from Title I, Part A and other federal education program funds and resources to upgrade the entire educational program of the school in order to raise academic achievement for all the students. This contrasts with a Title I, Part A targeted assistance program, in which Title I, Part A funds are used only for programs that provide services to eligible children identified as having the greatest need for special assistance.

Q5: What happens if a school that becomes a schoolwide program drops below the initial eligibility threshold in a subsequent year?

A5: To promote effective, long-term planning, a school can maintain its schoolwide program eligibility even if it drops below the initial poverty threshold. There is no required redetermination of schoolwide program status if the campus continues to operate a schoolwide program. Therefore, a school that becomes a schoolwide campus with 41% poverty can continue its schoolwide program even if its poverty level falls below 40% in following years, **if the campus continues to meet the general Title I eligibility requirements.**

Q6: How does a school become a schoolwide program?

A6: A campus can operate a SW program using Title I, Part A funds if it meets one of the following criteria:

- The campus has a low-income percentage of 40% or greater based on the school’s attendance area.
- The campus had a low-income percentage greater than or equal to 40% in a previous year.
- The campus can remain SW in the subsequent year provided the campus is still Title I, Part A eligible.
- The campus uses feeder pattern to become SW eligible.
- The campus is Title I, Part A eligible, and the LEA has requested and been approved for an Ed-Flex Waiver through the Consolidated Application to designate the campus SW.

- The campus was SW in a previous year but is no longer Title I, Part A eligible (This option is available if the LEA designates the campus for a One-Year Transition. Under this option, the campus can only be designated SW for **one additional year** if it does not re-establish an eligible low-income percentage. This option can only be used once per campus.).
- The campus is not (or no longer) Title I, Part A eligible, but the LEA applies and is approved for an [Ed-Flex Individual Programmatic Waiver](#) that covers Title I, Part A eligibility, as well as a SW eligibility waiver. Applications for an Ed-Flex Individual Programmatic Waiver are made **outside** the eGrants process. Information concerning the application form and the timeframe for obtaining approval for the waiver are available on the [Ed-Flex web site](#).

Q7: Does Title I have to pay for implementing the three elements in a schoolwide program?

A7: Even though a campus with a schoolwide program must include these elements in its school, it is not obligated to use solely Title I funds to pay for implementing them. For example, Campus A becomes a schoolwide program and decides to include most of its federal funds in the schoolwide program. The campus may design the schoolwide program it wants without worrying about which funding source will pay for it or even how the federal funds will be used. If the campus as a whole includes the three elements, it can spend the vast majority of its federal resources as it chooses.

Despite the seemingly equal weight of each of the three elements, schools should not forget the purpose of a schoolwide program. The comprehensive needs assessment process, campus improvement planning process, and active parent and family engagement are strategies that can help a schoolwide program meet its core purpose and should guide a campus towards the overall purpose—identifying and implementing those instructional strategies that can increase the quality and amount of learning time for all children to enable them to achieve the challenging State academic standards.

Q8: May a schoolwide program implement a pull-out approach or operate specific programs that focus on a particular grade?

A8: If the campus meets the requirements related to the three elements, it can implement any approach it chooses to meet the needs of its students. In most cases, enabling all children to master the challenging State academic standards will require comprehensive improvements in the instructional program that is provided to all students at the campus. But schoolwide program activities need not be uniform for the whole school. If the school's comprehensive needs assessment indicates that certain children can benefit from different types of activities or other pull-out services for some more intensive instruction, a school certainly should conduct those activities.

Q9: May a schoolwide program school combine funds it receives under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)?

A9: Yes. Under the 1997 reauthorization of IDEA, an LEA may use a per-child share of its IDEA, Part B funds in a schoolwide program school in which children with disabilities are participating.

Specifically, the amount of Part B funds that may be combined may not exceed an amount equal to the number of children with disabilities participating in the schoolwide program multiplied by the amount of Part B funds per child with disabilities the LEA received. Unlike other federal education programs whose funds are combined in a schoolwide program, the reauthorized IDEA only allows flexibility in the use of funds. All other requirements of the IDEA, such as those concerning the rights and services afforded to individual children with disabilities, must still be met for children in schoolwide program schools.

Example—

Step 1

Total IDEA, Part B LEA allocation, excluding indirect cost	Divided by Total number of children enrolled in Special Education in the LEA	Equals Per pupil amount
\$50,000	÷ 107	= \$467

Step 2

Per pupil amount	Multiplied by Number of children in Special Education enrolled on the SW campus	Equals Total IDEA, Part B contribution to the SW campus program
\$467	X 7	= \$3,269

Q10: If a schoolwide program campus combines funds from other federal education programs, how does the campus determine if the intent and purposes of those programs are met?

A10: A schoolwide program campus must meet the intent and purposes of the programs from which funds are combined in order to ensure that the needs of the intended beneficiaries of those programs are addressed. Therefore, the school must be able to demonstrate that its schoolwide program contains enough activities to reasonably address those needs and thus meet the intent and purposes of each program. However, the campus does not need to document that it used funds from a particular program to meet the specific intent and purposes of that program.

Consistent with 34 CFR 200.29(c)(1), a schoolwide program school seeking to consolidate its Migrant Education Program from Title I, Part C must receive prior approval from TEA.

Q11: What happens if a Schoolwide campus chooses to combine funds from some of its federal programs in its schoolwide program, but does not want to combine funds from other federal programs?

A11: If the campus, in consultation with the LEA, decides not to combine a specific federal fund source such as Migrant Education funds on its Schoolwide campus, the campus must then restrict the use of Migrant funds to Migrant program activities. The LEA must track the program activities and

expenditures to the Migrant program to show both program and fiscal compliance as it would on a Targeted Assistance campus.

Q12: If a schoolwide program campus is not required to identify particular children, how can the school determine whether it is meeting the needs of the intended beneficiaries of the federal education programs whose funds it has combined?

A12: A schoolwide program campus is not required to identify particular children as eligible to participate in a schoolwide program because it is not required to focus federal education funds on particular children. All children are eligible to participate in all aspects of the schoolwide program, as appropriate. However, in order to know how best to address the needs of all children in the school, particularly the needs of children who are members of the target population of any program whose funds are combined, the school by necessity needs to know which children have special needs because they are, for example, migrant, or limited English proficient, or at risk of failing to meet the state's academic standards. The school also must identify children by certain characteristics in order to disaggregate data on its final state assessment.

Supplement Not Supplant (SNS) – Title I, Part A

Q1: If an LEA has paid for transportation for homeless and foster care students out of local funds and now wants to reserve Title I, Part A funds at the LEA level for the same purposes, would it be considered supplanting?

A1: For Title I, Part A purposes, if the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place it would not be considered supplanting for the LEA to use Title I, Part A funds to pay for transportation costs for homeless and foster care students that were previously paid out of local or state funds.

Q2: Does an LEA apply the traditional presumptions of supplant to Title I, Part A campuses implementing a Targeted Assistance Program?

A2: No. The Title I, Part A Supplement Not Supplant (SNS) requirements (SNS Methodology or Statement of Exemption) apply to the Title I, Part A program in its entirety. There are not separate SNS documentation requirements that depend on whether an LEA has campuses implementing a Schoolwide Program or a Targeted Assistance Program. The traditional presumptions of supplant do not exist for the Title I, Part A program.

If an LEA has an SNS Methodology or Statement of Exemption, the LEA has met its SNS documentation requirement and can use Title I, Part A funds on a Targeted Assistance campus for students that have been identified to receive such services. As per the ESSA Statute, Section 1115(c)(1), “eligible children are children identified by the school as failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet the challenging State academic standards on the basis of multiple, educationally related, objective criteria established by the LEA and supplemented by the school, except that children from preschool through grade 2 shall be selected solely on the basis of criteria, including objective criteria, established by the LEA and supplemented by the school.”

Q3: Does Supplement, Not Supplant (SNS) only apply to use of general funds or does it relate to other grant funds too? For example, if the district uses ESSER funds for additional positions in 2021-2022, would it be supplanting to use Title I, Part A in 2022-2023 to continue paying that same position?

A3: The ESSER funds are federal funds. Title I, Part A is only required to supplement state and local funds. The LEA would only need to be concerned with supplanting ESSER funds when federal funds are included in the SNS provision, such as with Title III, Part A and Rural and Low-Income Schools.

Q4: How does having an Exemption for the Supplement, Not Supplant Methodology impact funds reserved at the LEA level?

A4: There is no difference in how reserved funds are viewed. Any State and local funds that are retained at the LEA level must be used in a Title I neutral manner; and Title I, Part A funds that are

reserved at the LEA level must be used only for Title I, Part A purposes, as indicated in the LEA's approved ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application.

Q5: What SNS methodology is used for Title I, Part A LEA reservations?

A5: The SNS Methodology for distributing state and local funds to campuses (or valid Statement of Exemption) meets the SNS requirement for Title I, Part A. For funds that are retained at the LEA level, the LEA makes the following assurances as part of its methodology or Statement of Exemption:

- any State and local funds that are retained at the LEA level will be used in a Title I neutral manner; and
- any Title I, Part A funds that are reserved at the LEA level will be used only for Title I, Part A purposes, as indicated in the LEA's approved ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application.

Q6: Is it true that the Supplement, Not Supplant rule is no longer in place for ESSA?

A6: No. The Supplement, Not Supplant requirement is still a statutory provision under many programs included in ESSA. However, the ESSA statute provides a new method of documenting compliance with the requirement for Title I, Part A. The SNS Methodology requirement for Title I, Part A states that the SNS requirement is met for Title I, Part A if the LEA has a written Title I-neutral method for distributing State and local funds to its campuses, or if the LEA has a valid Statement of Exemption from the Methodology requirement.

Other ESSA programs, such as Title II, Part A and Title IV, Part A, which have an SNS provision in statute, still follow the traditional way of demonstrating compliance with the SNS requirement. According to the traditional presumptions of supplanting, the LEA would be considered to be out of compliance under the following conditions, unless the LEA has documentation to rebut the presumption:

- Providing Services Required Under State or Local Law;
- Providing Same Services as Those Provided in Prior School Year with State or Local Funds; or
- Providing the Same Services in Federal and Non-Federal Programs

Q7: Are there exemplar SNS documents we can review?

A7: Section C of the [Supplement, Not Supplant Handbook](#) provides examples of SNS Methodologies and Section F provides templates for the Statement of Exemption and an SNS Methodology. An LEA is not required to use these templates, but the information and elements contained in the template must be present in the LEA's documentation.

Q8: When we place teachers that are funded out of Title I, Part A funds in a grade level to help with student academic success, do we need to make sure we are not supplanting? For example, do we need to make sure that in that grade level we are meeting the 22:1 ratio before placing a teacher funded out of Title I, Part A in that grade level?

A8: As per the [Supplement, Not Supplant Handbook](#), “The term “supplement, not supplant” has traditionally meant that federal funds cannot be used to perform a service that would normally be paid for with state or local funds. The new SNS methodology requirement for Title I, Part A represents a shift in mindset. For Title I, Part A, LEAs no longer look at whether an individual cost meets the traditional SNS requirement. Instead, the LEA’s allocation of State and local funds to campuses is examined as a whole to ensure that Title I, Part A funds are supplemental. The LEA demonstrates through its SNS Methodology that its distribution of State and local funds to campuses has been accomplished in a Title I-neutral manner. In other words, the LEA allocates State and local funds to its campuses without regard to their Title I status. Each campus receives all of the State and local funds it would otherwise receive if it were not receiving assistance under Title I. **Once that is accomplished, either through a Title I-neutral SNS Methodology or through a Statement of Exemption, the supplemental requirement for Title I, Part A funds at the campus level has been met.**” In other words, the LEA does not apply the traditional presumptions of supplanting to Title I, Part A funds and would make determinations about the use of Title I, Part A funds based on the Comprehensive Needs Assessments and the Campus Improvement Plans.

The Title I, Part A program is a campus-based program and funds should also be distributed to campuses as per the statutory requirements for ranking and serving Title I, Part A eligible campuses. Schoolwide program campuses should use their funds based on the results of a comprehensive needs assessment and what has been included in the campus improvement plan. As with any use of Title I, Part A funds, LEAs are required to follow the steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).

Q9: If a LEA has a Statement of Exemption for the Title I, Part A SNS compliance requirement, can the LEA pay for a Reading Interventionist out of Title I, Part A Funds that was paid with local funds in the previous year? (Assuming that it is in the LEA’s CNA, CIP, it's reasonable, necessary, and allocable etc.)

A9: When documenting compliance with SNS for Title I, Part A, we do not look at the individual activity level. If the LEA has a valid, written methodology for allocating its state and local funds to its campuses, or it has a valid Statement of Exemption, the LEA has met the SNS requirement for Title I, Part A. To determine the allowability of individual Title I, Part A activities, the LEA would then ensure that it has met the remaining items on the Use of Funds one-pager. The traditional SNS presumptions of supplanting do not apply to Title I, Part A.

Targeted Assistance Program

Q1: Can you assist in helping me understand the ESSA language below (Section 1115, Targeted Assistance campuses)? Does the highlighted language below mean that a district could use Title I, Part A funds to implement the program described below for all students?

Each targeted assistance program SHALL use methods and instructional strategies to strengthen the academic program of the school...

- ***Activities may include expanded learning time, before- and after-school programs, summer programs and opportunities, a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address behavior problems, and early intervening services.***

A1: The statutory language related to the bullet you referenced is as follows.

TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOL PROGRAM.—To assist targeted assistance schools and local educational agencies to meet their responsibility to provide for all their students served under this part the opportunity to meet the challenging State academic standards, each targeted assistance program under this section shall—

(2) serve participating students identified as eligible children under subsection (c), including by—

(B) using methods and instructional strategies to strengthen the academic program of the school through activities, which may include—

(i) expanded learning time, before- and afterschool programs, and summer programs and opportunities; and

(ii) a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address behavior problems, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.);

The “shall” refers to serving participating students identified as eligible children with activities which may include “a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address behavior problems, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.)”

Since the recommended (“may include”) activity refers to serving participating students identified as eligible children, it would not be allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to implement this activity schoolwide for all students in a Targeted Assistance campus.

- Q2: There has been some flexibility granted across federal programs given our current circumstances. Does any flexibility apply to Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance campuses in allowing materials purchased with Title I, Part A funds to be used for entire classrooms rather than the targeted student population that qualify based on pre-determined criteria?**
- A2: There has not been any flexibility applied to Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance campuses in allowing materials purchased with Title I, Part A funds to be used for entire classrooms rather than the targeted student population that qualify based on pre-determined criteria.
- Q3: May an LEA and school use Title I, Part A funds to identify at-risk students?**
- A3: No. It is the responsibility of the LEA and school to identify at-risk students from State or local sources. After eligible children are identified, Part A funds may be used to identify those most in need or to identify their specific educational needs. Please note that the definition of “at risk” for Title I, Part A purposes refers to students being at risk of academic failure and not necessarily to the “at risk” of dropping out criteria as defined for State Compensatory Education purposes.
- Q4: May a school provide services to particular children for less than a full school year?**
- A4: A school may serve students who are in greatest need of assistance for only a particular skill for the period of time it takes the student to master the skill. In other words, if not necessary, a student need not be a participant for an entire school year.
- Q5: May a Targeted Assistance Program choose to serve all the students in a particular grade within a school?**
- A5: No. In a Targeted Assistance Program, the school must identify students who are failing or most at risk of failing to meet the State’s academic achievement standards. This cannot be all of the students in a grade level.
- Q6: Are there any requirements for teachers that are fully funded by Title I, Part A funds on a targeted assistance campus?**
- A6: The ESSA Statute Section 1115(d) provides the following requirements related to teachers that are paid with Title I, Part A funds on a Targeted Assistance Campus, “To promote the integration of staff supported with funds under this part into the regular school program and overall school planning and improvement efforts, public school personnel who are paid with funds received under this part may— (1) participate in general professional development and school planning activities; and (2) assume limited duties that are assigned to similar personnel who are not so paid, including duties beyond classroom instruction or that do not benefit participating children, so long as the amount of time spent on such duties is the same proportion of total work time as prevails with respect to similar personnel at the same school.”

Q7: Can a Title I, Part A campus operating a targeted assistance program put on a family engagement night and invite all campus parents and families?

A7: If the campus is using its Title I, Part A funds for hosting the family engagement night, then it would only be acceptable for such services to be provided to the families of students identified as eligible to be served by the Targeted Assistance Program. You would also want to ensure that you are following your campus written Title I, Part A Parent and Family Engagement Policy.

Q8: Can a Title I, Part A campus operating a targeted assistance program provide the parent electronic newsletter to all campus parents and families?

A8: If the campus is using its Title I, Part A funds for creating the newsletter and/or sending out the newsletter, then it would only be acceptable for such services to be provided to the families of students identified as eligible to be served by the Targeted Assistance Program. You would also want to ensure that you are following your campus written Title I, Part A Parent and Family Engagement Policy.

Q9: How specific does a Targeted Assistance Program campus need to be in its campus improvement plan?

A9: For a targeted assistance campus, the campus will want to make sure that it includes all the parent and family engagement requirements (campus written parent and family engagement policy) and any information related to campus Title I, Part A expenditures in its campus improvement plan.

Q10: Does a Targeted Assistance Program campus need to address the specific services provided to eligible students in its campus improvement plan?

A10: For a targeted assistance campus, the campus will want to include all the specific services/activities that are funded by the Title I, Part A program.

Q11: Does a Targeted Assistance Program campus need to have Title I, Part A specifically stated in its campus improvement plan?

A11: For a targeted assistance campus, the campus will want to include Title I, Part A as a fund source for activities/services that are tied to the campus goals and needs that are being funded with Title I, Part A funds. LEAs and campuses should include anything and everything that is funded by Title I, Part A in the case of an audit. All the activities/services funded by Title I, Part A should be the result of a comprehensive needs assessment of the students eligible to receive Title I, Part A services.

***Q12: Who determines the criteria for determining which students are to be served in a Targeted Assistance Program?**

*A12: As per ESSA Section 1115(c)(1)(B), the LEA is required to establish the criteria for determining student eligibility for services on a Targeted Assistance Campus. A campus can supplement the LEA's criteria. Eligible children are children identified by the school as failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet the challenging State academic standards on the basis of multiple, educationally related, objective criteria, except that children from preschool through grade 2 shall be selected

solely on the basis of criteria, including objective criteria, established by the local educational agency and supplemented by the school.

The LEA should include the multiple, educationally related, objective criteria that it uses to determine eligibility in its LEA Title I, Part A Program Plan/District Improvement Plan. If the campus supplements the criteria, the campus should include a description of the supplemental criteria in its Campus Improvement Plan, or the LEA can include it in the LEA Title I, Part A Program Plan/District Improvement Plan.

The LEA and campus should be able to maintain documentation locally concerning how the students eligible for Title I, Part A services on a Targeted Assistance Campus met the LEA-established criteria and, if applicable, any supplemental criteria established by the campus in the case of an audit and/or random validation monitoring.

Time and Effort Documentation

Q1: Our LEA is considering using Title I funds to pay a stipend to a principal to be the Title I coordinator. Does time and effort have to be kept in the case of a stipend?

A1: Time and effort documentation is required for any type of compensation paid with federal funds, including stipends. A stipend should be paid based on policies and procedures adopted by the board or local authorities. A good example is a board approving a policy to pay a stipend in the amount of \$1000 for all teachers with graduate degrees. There is a good chance that this position's regular salary is paid with local funds, but the stipend will be paid out of federal funds.

The principal must maintain time and effort documentation that describes a policy/reason adopted by the appropriate authority or the board supporting the stipend for such activities. The document must be signed and dated by the supervisor authorizing the stipend.

If the principal was paid for extra duty pay outside of the normal working hours, the time and effort documentation would include a time sheet of extra duties performed and a supplemental pay agreement approved by the supervisor for provided specific services eligible under the federal program.

Either way, the time and effort documentation is required.

Q2: If an LEA federal programs director is split-funded from all ESSA programs (i.e., 50% Title I, Part A; 20% Title II, Part A; 10% Title III, Part A; and 20% Title IV, Part A), is a semi-annual certification alone acceptable documentation to satisfy time and effort requirements?

A2: **Yes, based on the programs listed. If they were also paid out of Title I, Part C then the answer would be "no," and they would need to fill out a PAR. No, a personnel activity report (PAR) is required. Response Revised 06/30/2022**

Q3: If you checked to pay for substitute teachers from Title I, Part A in the ESSA Consolidated Application budget schedule (BS6101 – Payroll Costs), does the LEA need to maintain time and effort documentation for substitute teachers paid with Title I, Part A funds?

A3: Selecting the checkbox on Part 3 of the BS6101 related to substitutes indicates that the LEA will use funds to pay for substitute teachers. LEA time and effort documentation is required for any type of compensation paid with federal funds.

Q4: Since the Title I, Part A program is part of the Ed-Flex program and any position fully funded by an Ed-Flex program does not require time and effort, do we need to keep time and effort documentation for the individuals that are 100% funded by the Title I, Part A program?

A4: The Ed-Flex Statewide Administrative Waiver that states the following, "This waiver eliminates the requirement that charges for salaries and wages be supported by a semi-annual certification that the employee worked solely on that program for the period covered by the certification. This waiver is allowable, as long as the employee's job description clearly states that the employee is assigned 100 percent to the program or single cost objective." The Ed-Flex waiver can be used

instead of time and effort if the employee is 100% funded from the Title I, Part A. The LEA would need to update job descriptions for its employees to state the position is 100% funded by Title I, Part A. While not required it is also good practice to list the Financial Accountability System Resource Guide (FASRG) coding for the employee in the job description and have the employee review sign and date the new job description.

Q5: Our LEA has reading and math specialists that are funded by 70% State Compensatory Education (SCE) and 30% Title I, Part A. They all work on a Title I, Part A Schoolwide campus. Although paid out of 2 separate funds, their duties align with a single cost objective. Can these employees complete a semi-annual certification, or do they need to complete the monthly time/effort forms?

A5: The employees can complete a semi-annual certification, certifying under a single cost objective.

Q6: What documentation is required for a teacher that is 100% funded by Title I, Part A on a campus?

A6: If a teacher is 100% funded by Title I, Part A, it is required that the employee have a job description for time and effort documentation purposes. It should clearly state that the employee is assigned 100% to the program or single cost objective. While not required, it is also good practice to list the Financial Accountability System Resource Guide (FASRG) coding for the employee in the job description and have the employee review sign and date the new job description.

The Ed-Flex Statewide Administrative Waiver states the following, “This waiver eliminates the requirement that charges for salaries and wages be supported by a semi-annual certification that the employee worked solely on that program for the period covered by the certification. This waiver is allowable as long as the employee’s job description clearly states that the employee is assigned 100 percent to the program or single cost objective.” The Ed-Flex waiver can be used instead of time and effort if the employee is 100% funded from the Title I, Part A. The LEA would need to update job descriptions for its employees to state the position is 100% funded by Title I, Part A. While not required, it is also good practice to list the Financial Accountability System Resource Guide (FASRG) coding for the employee in the job description and have the employee review sign and date the new job description.

***Q7: How should the LEA document time and effort for substitute teachers who are being paid with Title I, Part A funds?**

*A7: There are two source documents TEA auditors look for when evaluating substitute teacher pay from a federal grant:

1. Teacher of record – usually the LEAs keep documentation on who needed a sub and when; and
2. Timesheet or comparable record for the time worked.

TEA auditors would not ask for a contract or job description for a substitute teacher.

- *Q8: If an LEA redirects funds via REAP/Funding Transferability from Title II, Part A and/or Title IV, Part A into Title I, Part A, how should that be described on the job description for employees paid from Title II, Part A/Title IV, Part A and performing Title I, Part A duties? The job description is not being used as part of the Ed-Flex waiver for Time and Effort.**
- *A8: Specific to the job description, it does not need to list the grant the employee is being paid from. Rather, the description should be an updated list of job duties that align with the Title I, Part A cost objectives (the description may already provide for this).
- *Q9: The LEA has several Title I, Part A Instructional Aides who are funded 80% Title I, Part A and 20% local. What documentation is needed to satisfy the time and effort requirement?**
- *A9: Texas has approval from USDE to continue its Ed-Flex waiver authority through the 2023-2024 school year. One of the administrative waivers eliminates the requirement that charges for salaries and wages be supported by periodic certification if an employee works on a covered program or single cost objective.

The Ed-Flex covered programs are:

- Title I, Part A
- Title I, Part C
- Title I, Part D
- Title II, Part A
- Title IV, Part A
- Perkins

The employee job description must state the employee is assigned 100% to the program or single cost objective. One way to tell if the employee is working on a single cost objective is to review their activities and determine if they could be funded 100% by the federal grant (rather than just 80%). In this case, it does appear they could use the job description as documentation, even though the employees are split-funded because they are working on a single cost objective.

Title I, Part A-Specific Training

- Q1: We are training our new principals remotely on the Title I, Part A program. To whom will I send the attestation letters that they sign indicating that they have received the training? Is it an email or an upload to TEASE/TEAL?**
- A1:** The only “attestation” related to principals is the NCLB principal attestation that the principal was aware of the Highly Qualified teacher status and para status of all the Title I teachers and paras. The attestations were kept locally. However, the NCLB requirement for attestations is not in the ESSA statute and thus is no longer a requirement for LEAs.

Use of Funds – Title I, Part A

Contracted Services Use of Funds

When determining Title I, Part A use of funds allowability, an LEA/campus should always reference the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#).

Q1: The LEA is wanting to use Title I, Part A funds to contract with the Education Service Center (ESC) for Effective Schools Framework (ESF) support. Is this allowable if they have addressed it in their CNA and CIP?

A1: Professional and contracted services necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A would be an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds as long as the steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#) are met. The LEA would need to document how the support received by the ESC for the Effective Schools Framework meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program. Additionally, the campus/es benefitting from the services would have to be Schoolwide Program campuses.

Q2: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to repair Chromebooks purchased with local funds?

A2: If the LEA has a valid SNS methodology or Statement of Exemption, the use of Title I, Part A funds to pay for the repairs would be an allowable use of funds, as long as the student device repairs are for students being served by the Title I, Part A program. As with the use of any Title I, Part A funds, the campus would need to ensure that the LEA is able to document how the activity meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. The LEA will also need to ensure that the activity is identified as a need, noted in the CIP, and that the use of funds steps and requirements are followed as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).

The campus would also need to ensure that it is following the LEA's local policies and procedures as they relate to the EDGAR requirements.

Q3: Is it allowable for an LEA to use Title I, Part A funds for professional oral or written translation services?

A3: It is allowable for an LEA to use Title I, Part A funds for professional oral or written translation services on Title I, Part A campuses if they meet the steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).

Q4: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds for contracted services to provide technical assistance and support related to Title I Comparability requirements?

A4: If your LEA meets all the Title I, Part A use of funds requirements as noted on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#), it would be considered allowable to pay a consultant to assist in duties associated with program administration activities (Title I Comparability) taking into consideration the following guidance.

For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that supports the funds being charged to Title I, Part A are related to time spent working directly on Title I, Part A program administration activities and to meet the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. The work conducted by the consultant would be considered program administration activities which would need to be conducted with funds reserved at the LEA level. The LEA would also need to ensure that it is in compliance with the procurement threshold (2CFR 200.320) and obligation of funds (34CFR 76.707) requirements noted in EDGAR.

Q5: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to purchase online tutoring services for students?

A5: If the campuses are schoolwide campuses, the use of funds for online tutoring is allowable, as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. If one or more of the campuses is Targeted Assistance, the LEA would have to ensure that only students identified as most in need receive the Title I, Part A services. If one or more of the campuses is a non-Title I campus, this would not be an allowable use of funds for those campuses. Please refer to the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#) as well. The LEA needs to be able to document how the activity meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. The need for this particular use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan. The LEA would also need to ensure that it is in compliance with the procurement threshold (2CFR 200.320) and obligation of funds (34CFR 76.707) requirements noted in EDGAR.

Q6: After determining that all the Title I, Part A use-of-funds steps and requirements have been met as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#), can an LEA pay for a software program license at the beginning of the year?

A6: As per the [EDGAR FAQ document](#) (Question 7.10 – Page 24), “As long as the subgrantee receives the full benefit of the subscription (full access to the service) at the beginning of the grant year, the contract for that grant year may be paid at the beginning of the period of availability. If the subscription contains items that are not all available at the beginning of the service, such as completing one level of the software before the next level is available, then you may only pay for the service that has been invoiced and received during the period of the invoice. In this example, you could not pay for the entire year of the subscription at the beginning of the grant year because you have not received the full benefit (full access).”

Q7: May Title I, Part A funds be used to provide training/professional development for instructional and pupil services personnel not paid with Title I, Part A funds?

A7: The cost of training personnel not paid with Title I, Part A funds is an allowable charge if the training is specifically related to the Title I, Part A program and designed to meet the specific educational needs of Title I, Part A participants and supplements, rather than supplants, state and local training.

Q8: How would an LEA handle a multi-year contract as it relates to obligation of funds?

A8: The LEA cannot use federal funds to pay for services that have not been rendered. Although the LEA can obligate the funds for the current year, they cannot be expended until the services have been received/rendered and within the current grant year dates. If allowed in the LEA's policies and procedures, the LEA can prepay services that have not been rendered with other funds (local or state). When the services are completed, the LEA can then reimburse the local/state fund accounts with the federal funds.

Q9: Is it an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds for a schoolwide campus to purchase student electronic device monitoring software?

A9: If the LEA has a valid SNS methodology or Statement of Exemption, the use of Title I, Part A funds to pay for electronic device monitoring software would be an allowable use of funds, as long as the student devices are for students being served by the Title I, Part A program. As with the use of any Title I, Part A funds, the campus would need to ensure that the LEA is able to document how the activity meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program. The LEA will also need to ensure that the activity is identified as a need, noted in the CIP, and that the use of funds steps and requirements are followed as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).

Q10: In an LEA that has Title I, Part A served campuses and non-Title I, Part A served campuses, is it allowable use of Title I, Part A LEA reserved funds to purchase a district-wide curricular support program that will be used to help close the academic achievement gaps for Title I, Part A served campuses and use state/local resources to fund the program for non-Title I, Part A served campuses?

A10: USDE has provided the following guidance related to the issue of state/local funds that are retained for use at the district level:

ESEA section 1118(b)(2) requires an LEA to demonstrate compliance with the supplement, not supplant requirement by having a methodology that ensures that its allocation of State and local funds to schools is Title I neutral so that Title I, Part A funds used in Title I schools are supplemental. There is no similar compliance test for State and local funds reserved for districtwide activities. However, because the general supplement, not supplant requirement in ESEA section 1118(b)(1) applies to all State and local funds, an LEA must conduct districtwide activities supported by such funds in a manner that does not take into account a school's Title I status (e.g., by implementing a policy of conducting districtwide activities in a Title I-neutral manner).

They do give an exception in a case where the state/local funds are used to provide a "Title I-like" program at non-Title I campuses and Title I, Part A funds are used to provide such a program at Title I, Part A campuses.

In short, the LEA can't allocate Title I, Part A funds to non-Title I, Part A campuses; but it could use Title I, Part A funds reserved at the district level to provide a supplemental curricular support program (such as described in the question) at its Title I, Part A campuses, and supplemental

state/local funds that were reserved at the district level to provide a similar program for its non-Title I campuses.

As with any other Title I, Part A use of funds, the LEA would need to follow the steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#). The LEA could use LEA reserved funds for Targeted Assistance campuses since they are considered Title I, Part A served campuses. They would indicate on the PS3101 only the amount of Title I, Part A funds that are reserved for the activity.

Q11: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to contract with a community-based organization to provide academic and enrichment programming for students?

A11: The intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. If the activities/services being provided by the community-based organization meet the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program and such activities/services are based on the needs identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and documented in the campus improvement plan, the use of Title I, Part A funds would be allowable as long as the other steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A use of funds reference document](#) have been met.

If the LEA has a contract with the organization and/or rental agreement, it would need to adhere to the provisions of the contract/agreement and be sure to meet documentation and obligation of funds requirements if they are using Title I, Part A funds for those purposes.

Q12: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to contract with an entity to validate transcripts for students new to the LEA from other countries?

A12: In order for Title I, Part A funds to be used for this activity, the LEA would need to have a valid SNS Methodology for distributing its state and local funds (or have a valid Statement of Exemption), and the activity would have to be identified as a need in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, be part of the District and/or Campus improvement plan, and meet the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A. The LEA would also need to ensure that it is following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds, as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).

Equipment Use of Funds

When determining Title I, Part A use of funds allowability, an LEA/campus should always reference the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#).

Q1: May equipment be purchased with Title I, Part A funds?

A1: Yes. An LEA, however, must determine that—

- 1) the equipment is reasonable and necessary to effectively operate its Title I, Part A programs;
- 2) existing equipment it already has will not be sufficient; and
- 3) the costs are reasonable.

Q2: May Title I, Part A funds be used to pay the interest on lease-purchase agreements for the purchase of, for example, computer equipment?

A2: Interest paid or incurred during the grant period for equipment is allowable subject to the following conditions.

1. The financing is provided (from other than tax or user fee sources) by a bona fide third party external to the LEA;
2. The assets are used in support of federal awards;
3. Earnings on debt service reserve funds or interest earned on borrowed funds pending payment of the construction or acquisition costs are used to offset the current period's cost or the capitalized interest, as appropriate. Earnings subject to being reported to the Federal Internal Revenue Service under arbitrage requirements are excludable.
4. LEAs will negotiate the amount of allowable interest whenever cash payments (interest, depreciation, use allowance, and contributions) exceed the LEA's cash payments and other contributions attributable to that portion of real property used for federal awards. Interest paid in a prior grant period cannot be charged retroactively to the current grant period.

Q3: What procedures govern disposition of equipment purchased with Title I, Part A funds?

A3: The disposition of equipment purchased with Title I, Part A funds is governed by Chapter 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Section 80.32(e).

Q4: When an LEA recovers funds from the sale of equipment or real property purchased with Title I, Part A funds, may these funds be retained by the LEA or school?

A4: A state's procedures govern the disposition of Title I, Part A equipment and real property. Texas applies the provision in 34 CFR 80.32(e) as its state procedures:

When equipment purchased with federal program funds can no longer be used for the originally authorized purpose or for other activities currently or previously supported by the federal government, disposition of the equipment will be as follows:

- Unit cost less than \$5,000—Items of equipment with a current per-unit fair market value of less than \$5,000 may be retained, sold, or otherwise disposed of with no further obligation to TEA.
- Unit cost \$5,000 or more—Items of equipment with a current per-unit fair market value of \$5,000 or more may be retained or sold. If the LEA elects to retain the equipment, it shall purchase the equipment for its fair market value. Market value may be determined by an independent appraiser, e.g., a vendor for the equipment. If the LEA elects to sell the equipment, the equipment may be sold to the highest bidder through the competitive bidding procedure normally used by the LEA to dispose of surplus property. In either case, the proceeds from the purchase/sale may be credited to the appropriate federal program’s sub-fund and used to expand that program at the LEA. If the LEA does not wish to use the proceeds in that program, the proceeds will be refunded to TEA.

Q5: What options does an LEA have to make maximum use of equipment purchased, in whole or in part, with Title I, Part A funds.

A5: An LEA has several options to increase flexibility in using Title I, Part A equipment. When an LEA purchases equipment with Title I, Part A funds, for example, it may share the cost with other federal, state, or local programs that will also make use of the equipment on a proportional basis. Likewise, an LEA that wishes to use Title I, Part A equipment in non-Title I, Part A activities may pay a reasonable user fee to the Title I, Part A program for the portion of time the equipment is used in non-Title I, Part A activities. Further, an LEA may use Title I, Part A equipment in non-Title I, Part A activities without paying a user fee or sharing costs in accordance with the standards described in Q13, below. Additionally, an LEA may take into consideration when it decides its equipment needs under Title I, Part A whether other equipment—e.g., LEA-funded adult education equipment used at night—would be available for Title I, Part A use during the day.

Q6: Are there circumstances under which Title I, Part A equipment may be used in non-Title I, Part A activities without paying a user fee or sharing costs?

A6: Yes, subject to the standards described here. Any equipment purchased with Title I, Part A funds must be reasonable and necessary to implement a properly designed program for Title I, Part A participants. The USDE recognizes, however, that under some circumstances, equipment purchased as part of a properly designed Title I, Part A program may, without constituting an improper expenditure, be used on a less than full-time basis. If that equipment could be made available for other educational uses without interfering with its use in the Title I, Part A program or significantly shortening its useful life, the USDE would have no objection to the non-Title I, Part A use, given the fact that the equipment would otherwise be idle.

Other Use of Funds

When determining Title I, Part A use of funds allowability, an LEA/campus should always reference the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#).

Q1: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay for shipping and the distribution costs of the Texas Home Learning packets to parents of students most in need?

A1: If the campuses are schoolwide campuses, this would not be a problem, as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. If one or more of the campuses is Targeted Assistance, the LEA would have to ensure that only students identified as most in need receive the Title I, Part A services. If one or more of the campuses is a non-Title I campus, this would not be an allowable use of funds for those campuses. Please refer to the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#) as well.

Elements of this question are answered in the [Federal Funding & Grants COVID 19 FAQ Document \(5/7/2020\)](#) published on the TEA website referenced below.

Eligible Uses of Grant Funds Section

2. Can LEAs use federal grant funds to provide hotspots for students without home Internet access or other costs associated with Learning from Home programs? Updated April 14, 2020

Many school systems around the state are working to expand wireless hotspot locations in communities where free commercial Internet services are not otherwise available. Please document all costs associated with these expenditures, in anticipation that additional funding streams may become available as Congress continues to authorize financial support for COVID-19.

In the meantime, there are many sources of funds currently available to be redeployed for these types of purposes:

ESSA, Title I, Part A served Schoolwide campuses may use their Title I, Part A funds to provide internet hot spots, technology resources, and other at home learning costs as long as it is identified in the campus comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) as a need.

Note: *As long as the LEA has the required supplement, not supplant methodology documented and implemented, there is not a supplanting issue.*

ESSA, Title IV, Part A may also be a potential federal fund source. However, Title IV has the traditional rules of supplant so it is only allowable if the LEA has not previously spent state or local funds for the same costs this year or in the prior year.

Other state or local funds may also be used for these types of activities, but keep in mind it may cause a supplant issue for the use of ESSA, Title IV, Part A funds as described above.

Q2: Title I, Part A allowable use of funds allows for organizational memberships as long as the membership is in the name of the LEA. However, there are some organizations that do not offer organizational memberships. We have parent liaisons who want to join an organization for the purpose of obtaining information for sharing with parents. Would this be allowable under Title I, Part A?

A2: Costs associated with membership dues or fees for business, technical, and professional organizations directly related to and necessary to carry out the objectives of the grant are generally allowable under Title I, Part A as long as the LEA meets the requirements as noted on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).

Q3: Our LEA would like to host SAT college entrance exam camps throughout the year. We have local funds to host the first three camps. However, is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds for an additional boot camp or would this be considered supplanting?

A3: If the campuses are schoolwide campuses, this would not be a problem, as long as the LEA has a valid Supplement, Not Supplant Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. If one or more of the campuses are Targeted Assistance, the LEA would have to ensure that only students identified as most in need receive the Title I, Part A services. If one or more of the campuses is a non-Title I campus, this would not be an allowable use of funds for those campuses. Please refer to the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#) as well which includes the requirements of having this activity as an identified need in the comprehensive needs assessment and documented in the campus improvement plan.

Q4: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay for costs associated with the state-required Reading Academies?

A4: If the LEA has a valid SNS methodology or Statement of Exemption, the use of Title I, Part A funds to pay for the state required Reading Academies would be an allowable use of funds. Professional development is an allowable use of funds under Title I, Part A as long as it is being provided for schoolwide program/targeted assistance program teachers and the use of funds steps and requirements are followed as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).

Since the inception of ESSA, the method of determining compliance with the Supplement, Not Supplant requirements for Title I, Part A changed. For Title I, Part A, LEAs are no longer required to adhere to the traditional presumptions of supplant (of which one traditional presumption included state requirements). The requirement related to Supplement, Not Supplant for Title I, Part A is that the LEA must have a valid Supplement, Not Supplant Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. For more information related to the methodology or statement of exemption, [click here to access the most current version of the Supplement, Not Supplant Handbook](#).

Please note that the traditional presumptions of supplant are still in place for other federal programs (i.e., including but not limited to Title II, Part A and Title IV, Part A). For a complete list of federal programs that still take into account the traditional presumptions of supplant, [click here to access the most current version of the Supplement, Not Supplant Handbook](#).

Q5: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to purchase student meals during intersession?

A5: Title I is intended to address the academic needs of children who are not meeting, or most at-risk of not meeting, challenging State academic standards. Generally, given this purpose, Title I funds are used for instructional strategies that are designed to improve the academic achievement of low-achieving students, not for meals.

Having said this, however, the statute recognizes that students may have needs, such as hunger, that prevent them from being able to take full advantage of the educational program they are offered. Accordingly, section 1115(e)(2) authorizes a local educational agency (LEA) to use a portion of its Title I funds, as a last resort, to provide health, nutrition, and other social services not otherwise available to Title I participating students if the school, if appropriate, has engaged in a comprehensive needs assessment and established a collaborative partnership with local service providers and funds are not reasonably available from other public or private sources to provide such services. Thus, an LEA may use Title I funds to provide breakfast or lunch to those Title I students that it identifies as needing the meal, provided that this service is reasonable and necessary to the success of a school's Title I program; the activity is consistent with the school's comprehensive assessment of the academic needs of the Title I children served; and funds for this service are not otherwise available from other public or private sources for those purposes.

In these limited instances, an LEA would have to demonstrate that it has exhausted all other sources of funding before it pays for nutrition services with Title I funds. This might include, for example, checking whether any programs administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture can meet the needs of these students. If the LEA ultimately cannot identify another source of funding for breakfast or lunch for those Title I students in need of this service, then under section 1115(e)(2) it may use some of its Title I funds to address the need.

Q6: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay for the actual cost of insurance for technology equipment purchased through Operation Connectivity?

A6: The actual cost of insurance for equipment purchased through Operation Connectivity may be charged as a direct cost to Title I, Part A so long as the insurance costs are not contained in any other comprehensive casualty insurance that may be held by the LEA. As with any use of Title I, Part A funds, the LEA would also need to ensure to follow the steps and requirements noted on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).

Q7: Can Title I, Part A funds be used for students in a non-Title I, Part A campus?

A7: Title I, Part A funds can only be used to support Title I, Part A students at Title I, Part A served campuses (with only 1 exception referenced below). If a campus, based on their campus low-income percentage, does not meet Title I, Part A eligibility requirements to operate a Schoolwide Program or Targeted Assistance Program, they are not considered a Title I, Part A campus and thus students on the campus cannot be served by Title I, Part A funds. The LEA provides TEA with the campuses served with Title I, Part A funds on the ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application – SC5000 Title I, Part A Campus Selection. Title I, Part A funds can only be used for campuses noted as operating a Schoolwide Program or Targeted Assistance Program.

The only exception is related to the LEA reservation for services to homeless students. The ESSA statute allows for Title I, Part A funds reserved by the LEA for services to homeless students to be used to support homeless students on all campuses regardless of their Title I status.

Q8: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay for instructional activities for students during intersession?

A8: If the campuses are Schoolwide campuses, the use of Title I, Part A funds for intersession instructional activities is allowable as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. If one or more of the campuses is Targeted Assistance, the LEA would have to ensure that only students identified as most in need receive the Title I, Part A services. If one or more of the campuses is a non-Title I campus, this would not be an allowable use of funds for those campuses because Title I, Part A funds can only be used to serve Title I, Part A students. Please refer to the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The need for this particular use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan for the campuses. The LEA would also need to be able to document that the use of funds meets the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps.

Q9: The LEA is changing website companies and wanted to do a one-time purchase of a component that is an App. They would like to utilize Title I, Part A funds for this by splitting the cost between their Title I Schoolwide campuses. It will be used to share information with parents. Would this type of purchase be allowable if they are able to answer all of the items on the Title I, Part A Use of Funds document?

A9: The LEA would need to ensure that they are following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA would specifically need to be able to document how this use of funds is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. Additionally, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and included in the campus improvement plan. Title I, Part A funds can only be used to support Title I, Part A campuses.

If the funds being used for the purchase are from the LEA parent and family engagement (PFE) reservation, the LEA would also need to ensure that they are following the requirements for PFE reserved funds which are noted in ESSA Section 1116(a)(3)(D)(i-v) referenced below.

Funds reserved to carry out parent and family engagement activities shall be used to carry out activities and strategies that are consistent with the LEA's parent and family engagement policy, including at least one of the following:

- Supporting schools and nonprofit organizations in providing professional development for LEA and school personnel regarding parent and family engagement strategies, which may be

provided jointly to teachers, principals, other school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, early childhood educators, parents, and family members.

- Supporting programs that reach parents and family members at home, in the community, and at school.
- Disseminating information on best practices focused on parent and family engagement, especially best practices for increasing the engagement of economically disadvantaged parents and family members.
- Collaborating, or providing subgrants to schools to enable such schools to collaborate, with community-based or other organizations or employers with a record of success in improving and increasing parent and family engagement.
- Engaging in any other activities and strategies that the LEA determines are appropriate and consistent with the LEA's parent and family engagement policy.

Q10: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay for the Texas Success Initiative Assessment (TSIA) fees for students on Title I, Part A Schoolwide campuses?

A10: The use of Title I, Part A funds for the TSIA is allowable as long as the LEA follows the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA needs to be able to document how the activity meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. The use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan. Additionally, the services could only be provided for students attending schoolwide campuses as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. If a campus is a Targeted Assistance campus, the LEA would have to ensure that only students identified as most in need receive the Title I, Part A services. If the students attend non-Title I campuses, this would not be an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds for those campuses.

Q11: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to upgrade a culinary arts room to meet industry standards?

A11: Section 8526 of ESSA states that, no funds under this Act may be used for construction, renovation, or repair of any school facility. If an upgrade includes construction, renovation, or repair of any school facility, it would be an unallowable use of Title I, Part A funds.

Q12: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to upgrade and install stainless steel equipment in the culinary arts room to meet industry standards?

A12: When determining whether Title I, Part A funds can be used it is always important to ensure that the use of funds is reasonable and necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. An LEA would need to be able to document that the use of funds is reasonable and necessary to meet such intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program.

If the LEA can document that paying for the upgrading and installation of all stainless steel equipment for student use meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A, that they have followed the steps and requirements noted on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#), and that the need has been identified as a result of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process and listed in the Campus Improvement Plan, it would be considered an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds. Additionally, the use of funds would only be allowed on Title I, Part A Schoolwide campuses since Title I, Part A funds can only be used to serve Title I, Part A students. It would be difficult to justify and document such costs on a Targeted Assistance campus.

The LEA should also review any policies and procedures referencing construction, renovation, or repair of any school facility to ensure that their definitions of such activities do not include upgrading and installation of equipment because if the definitions do include such activities, it would be an unallowable use of Title I, Part A funds based on Section 8526 of ESSA.

Q13: We have Title I, Part A campuses that closed at the end of this school year, and they have funds that they left unspent. It would not be reasonable or necessary to spend these remaining funds to purchase items for campuses that are closing. May I redistribute these funds to purchase items for the remaining Title I campuses without violating the Title I, Part A campus allocations requirements?

A13: Under these circumstances, it would be acceptable to reallocate funds that were remaining from closed campuses to the remaining campuses. The LEA would need to make sure that they remain in compliance with the rank and serve requirements for the remaining campuses. If the LEA is not using within grade-span groupings, the LEA must allocate a per-pupil amount that is equal to or higher to campuses with higher poverty rates than it allocates to campuses with lower poverty rates. If the funds are evenly distributed as noted, this should not be a problem since the per-pupil amounts should have already met the requirements. The LEA would need to document the reasons for their deviation from the initial campus allocations as they noted in their explanation in the case of an audit and/or random validation monitoring.

Q14: May Title I, Part A funds be used to pay the cost of renting or leasing privately owned facilities for instructional purposes or office space?

A14: The cost to rent or lease space in privately owned buildings is allowable if the space is necessary for the success of the program and space in publicly owned buildings is not available to the grantee.

Q15: Are maintenance and operation costs such as janitorial services and utility costs allowable charges?

A15: Maintenance and operation costs are allowable charges to Title I, Part A to the extent that the costs are not otherwise included in rent or other charges for space, are reasonable and necessary for the success of the program and are distributed on an equitable basis.

Q16: May Title I, Part A funds be used to construct or acquire real property?

A16: No. The Title I, Part A statute does not authorize the use of Title I, Part A funds for construction or acquisition of real property.

Q17: Does this mean that Title I, Part A funds may not be used to buy mobile vans or portable building or to install wiring for vans or computers?

A17: No. These are permissible uses of Title I, Part A funds. A mobile van or portable building is a piece of equipment, not real property. Items such as wiring that, for example, make a van operational are part of the equipment.

Q18: Can Title I, Part A funds pay for student fees associated with the submission of Career and Technical Education (CTE) certification applications?

A18: Student fees associated with the submission of Career and Technical Education (CTE) certification applications are allowable under Title I, Part A, as long as the LEA meets the Title I, Part A Use of Funds requirements as noted on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan.

Q19: Can LEAs reserve Title I, Part A funds for services to homeless students for certification fees that a student will incur at the end of a certification course/program?

A19: It is an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds reserved at the LEA level for Services to Homeless Students to pay for certification fees a student experiencing homelessness will incur at the end of a certification course/program. As with any use of Title I, Part A funds, the LEA would need to follow the steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).

Two principles govern the use of Title I, Part A funds to provide such services to homeless students. First, the services must be reasonable and necessary to assist homeless students to take advantage of educational opportunities. (ESEA section 1113(c)(3)(A); 2 CFR § 200.403(a)). Second, Title I, Part A funds must be used only as a last resort when funds or services are not available from other public or private sources, such as the USDA's National School Lunch Program and Breakfast Program, public health clinics, or local discretionary funds (sometimes provided by the PTA) used to provide similar services for economically disadvantaged students generally. (See ESEA section 1115(e)(2)).

Q20: Our district has used a TEA Use of Funds Questionnaire in the past for purchases over \$1000 as a best practice. Is the use of this form still a requirement for Title I, Part A? I have not found it on your website. Please advise.

A20: TEA requires that an LEA follow the steps and requirements for use of Title I, Part A funds that are identified in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds](#) document for all expenditures regardless of dollar amount. There is not a specific form that is required. There are some EDGAR-related expenditure forms that can be found on the [TEA Forms for Prior Approval, Disclosure, and Justification webpage](#).

Q21: Where can we find the form that TEA uses to determine if an expenditure/activity is allowable (i.e., for Field Trips)?

A21: TEA requires that an LEA follow the steps and requirements for use of Title I, Part A funds that are identified in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds](#) document for all expenditures. There are some EDGAR-related expenditure forms that can be found on the [TEA Forms for Prior Approval, Disclosure, and Justification webpage](#).

Q22: What guidance is available related to providing “light meals” using Title I, Part A Parent and Family Engagement (PFE) funds reserved at the LEA level or on a campus?

A22: As per the most current [Budgeting Costs Guidance Handbook](#), “The following costs are allowable:

- Food necessary to conduct nutrition education programs for parents
- Parent involvement activities in which refreshments are necessary to encourage participation or attendance by parents, such as in low-income areas, and thus meet program objectives.

Full meals for parents or students are unallowable for these purposes under any circumstances. Expenditures must be reasonable in cost, necessary to accomplish program objectives, and an integral part of the instructional program.”

Q23: What is the definition of “nutritional” when it comes to providing snacks with Title I, Part A funds?

A23: There is no specific guidance on the definition of “nutritional.” However, the LEA can use the Smart Snack standards that have been established by the US Department of Agriculture. The following website provides information about smart snacks: <https://www.fns.usda.gov/cn/tools-schools-focusing-smart-snacks>.

Q24: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to assist schools in identifying and serving gifted and talented students which includes the following activities: a testing program to identify students, GT curriculum, pay a teacher working with GT students, extension program during the school day, and general supplies for GT students?

A24: All the items listed would be an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds on a schoolwide program campus as long as the LEA/campus ensures that it is following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#). Specifically, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan. The LEA/campus would also need to be able to document how this use of funds meets the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps.

Q25: For an LEA that is running a summer school program as an intervention for students to pass their STAAR assessments, can they use Title I, Part A funds to pay for students who are out-of-district students? Examples of students would include students visiting for the summer or students who attend charter schools.

A25: In the scenario described above, you would have to limit the non-district or non-Title I students to less than 5-10% of the total participants and ensure the non-district or non-Title I students are not taking time in instruction, Q&A, or discussions away from the Title I students.

Program Income:

Any tuition paid is generating program income from the Title I, Part A funds. The LEA would have to reduce its Title I, Part A allocation by the amount of program income generated unless the LEA files a form with TEA for program income.

The LEA must have prior approval from TEA to add this program income back to its Title I, Part A program (creates a larger Title I, Part A program). Any Title I, Part A student in the district could attend the summer school program without tuition. Tuition paid by non-district students or non-Title I students is considered program income.

The non-district students should be charged the full cost of their seat in the summer school. Teacher's students (teacher kids) should be charged the same way if they are not Title I students in the LEA.

Teacher's student and out-of-district student registration should only be opened after all in-district Title I students have had the opportunity to register, followed by in-district non-Title I students; otherwise, the LEA is planning for program income which becomes profit. Profit is strictly prohibited by federal regulations.

Q26: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to purchase additional lunches and breakfasts for Title I, Part A students?

A26: Title I, Part A is intended to address the academic needs of children who are not meeting, or most at-risk of not meeting, challenging State academic standards. Generally, given this purpose, Title I, Part A funds are used for instructional strategies that are designed to improve the academic achievement of low-achieving students, not for meals.

Having said this, however, the statute recognizes that students may have needs, such as hunger, that prevent them from being able to take full advantage of the educational program they are offered. Accordingly, section 1115(e)(2) authorizes a local educational agency (LEA) to use a portion of its Title I funds, as a last resort, to provide health, nutrition, and other social services not otherwise available to Title I participating students if the school, if appropriate, has engaged in a comprehensive needs assessment and established a collaborative partnership with local service providers and funds are not reasonably available from other public or private sources to provide such services. Thus, an LEA may use Title I funds to provide an extra breakfast or lunch to those Title I students that it identifies as needing the additional meal provided that this service is

reasonable and necessary to the success of a school’s Title I program; the activity is consistent with the school’s comprehensive assessment of the academic needs of the Title I children served; and funds for this service are not otherwise available from other public or private sources for those purposes.

In these limited instances, an LEA would have to demonstrate that it has exhausted all other sources of funding before it pays for nutrition services with Title I funds. This might include, for example, checking whether any programs administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture can meet the needs of these students. If the LEA ultimately cannot identify another source of funding for the second breakfast or lunch for those Title I students in need of this service, then under section 1115(e)(2) it may use some of its Title I funds to address the need.

Q27: An LEA is considering budgeting a large amount of Title I, Part A funds for out-of-state travel. How does the LEA determine if the amount is reasonable and necessary?

A27: As per the [Program Guidelines 2022-2023 ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application](#), out-of-state travel costs are allowable Title I, Part A expenditures; however, they should be minimal, reasonable and necessary to meet the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. Grantees must retain documentation that participation of an individual in a conference is necessary for the project. Travel costs are allowable, as long as the expenses for transportation, lodging, subsistence, and related items are only incurred by employees on official business of the grantee and follow the grantee’s regular business operations and written travel policy. The LEA should retain travel documentation locally as noted in the [Budgeting Costs Guidance Handbook](#), so that such documentation may be provided to the LEA’s independent auditor or to TEA monitors if the LEA is selected for a review.

The LEA should take the following into consideration when deciding to use Title I, Part A funds for out-of-state travel:

- As with any use of Title I, Part A funds, the LEA would need to follow the steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).
- As per the [Budgeting Costs Guidance Handbook](#), grant funds may not be used for out-of-state training when the same type and quality of training is available in state.
- The LEA is aware that “minimal” is subject to interpretation by the LEA’s independent auditor or TEA monitor, and the LEA should be prepared to justify that the expenditure is considered to be “minimal” as per its local policies and procedures.
- As per the [Program Guidelines 2022-2023 ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application](#), travel costs for officials, such as the executive director, superintendent, or board members, may not be funded under Title I, Part A until further guidance is available from USDE.

If the LEA plans on using grant funds for out-of-state travel, they are required to complete the appropriate [TEA justification form\(s\)](#) and retain the documentation at the local level. The LEA must keep and maintain the form(s) so that it may be provided to the LEA’s independent auditor or to TEA monitors if the LEA is selected for a review.

Q28: Can Title I, Part A funds be used to purchase a marquee or similar signage for a campus?

A28: The intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. It would be difficult to justify and document that this type of use of Title I, Part A funds is reasonable and necessary to meet the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A.

Q29: Is it allowable use of Title I, Part A funds to pay mileage for LEA/campus Title I, Part A staff attending one-day workshops that meet the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program?

A29: As with any use of the Title I, Part A funds, the campus would need to ensure that they are following the steps and requirements for use of Title I, Part A funds that are referenced in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#). Although using Title I, Part A funds to pay for travel costs associated with Title I, Part A related travel would be allowable if the steps and requirements for use of funds are met, the LEA would need to follow its local policies and procedures to determine if it is permissible to reimburse an employee for mileage for a one-day workshop.

Q30: Is it allowable for an LEA to use Title I, Part A funds to pay for the costs associated with travel (registration, airfare, lodging, meals, etc.) for 12 LEA-level administrators to attend an out-of-state national conference?

A30: Since the positions you reference are LEA-level positions, the funds used would have to be Title I, Part A LEA-reserved funds. It would be difficult to connect that activity with an authorized use of Title I, Part A LEA-reserved funds noted below. The newly released US Department of Education [guidance on Within-LEA Allocations](#) references the following authorized use of Title I, Part A LEA-reserved funds.

In addition to the required Title I, Part A reservations, an LEA, at its discretion, may reserve funds for:

- Children in local institutions for delinquent children and neglected or delinquent children in community-day programs (ESEA section 1113I(3)(A)(iii); 34 C.F.R. § 200.77(a)(3));
- Financial incentives and rewards to teachers who serve students in Title I schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement or implementing targeted support and improvement plans under section 1111(d) of the ESEA for the purpose of attracting and retaining qualified and effective teachers, in an amount that does not exceed five percent of the LEA's total Title I allocation (ESEA section 1113(c)(4); 34 C.F.R. § 200.77(b));
- Administration of Title I programs for public school children, including the option of paying for variations in personnel costs, such as seniority pay differentials or fringe benefit differentials, as LEA-wide administrative costs, rather than as part of the funds allocated to schools (34 C.F.R. § 200.77(e)); and

- Other authorized activities, such as early childhood education, school improvement, and coordinated services. (ESEA section 1113(c)(5); 34 C.F.R. § 200.77(f)).

Additionally, Title I, Part A LEA-reserved funds must be used to support Title I, Part A served campuses. If the positions provide support and leadership across the LEA and the LEA has non-Title I, Part A served campuses, it would be difficult to justify this use of funds as reasonable and necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program.

Please refer to the information from the following documents related to Out-of-State Travel.

[Program Guidelines – 2022-2023 ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application – Title I, Part A](#)

Out-of-state travel costs are allowable; however, they should be minimal, reasonable, and necessary to meet the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program. LEAs must retain documentation that participation of an individual in a conference is necessary for the project. Travel costs are allowable, as long as the expenses for transportation, lodging, subsistence, and related items are only incurred by employees on official business of the grantee and follow the grantee’s regular business operations and written travel policy. If you plan on using Title I, Part A funds for out-of-state travel, you will be required to complete the appropriate TEA justification form(s) and retain the documentation at the local level. You must keep and maintain this form so that it may be provided to your independent auditor or to TEA monitors if your LEA is selected for a review.

[TEA Budgeting Costs Guidance Handbook](#)

Unallowable Other Operating Costs (6400)

Grant funds may not be used for the following:

- Out-of-state training when the same type and quality of training is available in state

Q31: If an LEA transfers 100% of its Title II, Part A or Title IV, Part A funds through funding transferability into the Title I, Part A program, can those funds be used for Title I, Part A served and non-Title I, Part A served campuses in an LEA?

A31: The funds become Title I, Part A funds, so they can only be used for Title I, Part A served campuses, unless they are to be used to provide services to Homeless Children & Youth and/or Children in Local Institutions for Neglected Children.

Q32: Is it allowable use of Title I, Part A funds to pay for costs associated with a Title I, Part A field trip that was canceled?

A32: It would be unallowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay for costs associated with a Title I, Part A field trip that was canceled because such use does not provide benefit to the program and doesn’t meet the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps.

***Q33: Is it allowable use of Title I, Part A funds to purchase a program that sends out age-appropriate books to students up to 3 years old who are in the LEA? The books come with questioning stems for parents to assist them in learning how to read with their child and what types of questions to ask. The LEA would be doing this to try and increase students' exposure to literacy prior to enrolling in their preschool program.**

*A33: Table 1 (Page 10) of the [USDE Non-Regulatory Guidance on early learning](#) has a chart that describes several ways in which Title I, Part A funds may be used to support preschool programs.

The LEA would need to be sure that the preschool students served are residing in the attendance area of a schoolwide campus, or if the students reside in the attendance area of a targeted assistance campus that they are identified according to the LEA's criteria as at risk of failing to meet the State's academic achievement standards when they reach school age.

The students served in such preschool programs should be reported at the end of the year on the PR1000 as students (ages 0-2) or students (ages 3-5, not reported in PEIMS).

As with any Title I, Part A activity, the LEA must ensure that it addresses a need that has been identified in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, is included in the District and/or Campus Improvement Plan, and meets the other items listed in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).

***Q34: How does an LEA determine whether a use of Title I, Part A funds is considered reasonable and necessary?**

*A34: Page 19 of the [TEA General and Fiscal Guidelines](#) provides an explanation of "Reasonable and Necessary" that an LEA would use to determine allowability. It would be up to the LEA to maintain documentation to demonstrate that such costs were reasonable and necessary in the case of an audit. In the event of an audit, TEA or audit staff would make the final determination concerning whether the documentation is sufficient to demonstrate compliance.

***Q35: Is it an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds to purchase virtual reality equipment that will allow students to explore and be exposed to instructional activities through virtual reality?**

*A35: If the campuses using the devices are Schoolwide campuses, the use of Title I, Part A funds for purchasing virtual reality devices is allowable, as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. If one or more of the campuses is Targeted Assistance, the LEA would have to ensure that only students identified as most in need of services were benefiting from the equipment. If one or more of the campuses is a non-Title I campus, this would not be an allowable use of funds for those campuses because Title I, Part A funds can only be used to serve Title I, Part A students.

The use of funds would need to be in accordance with the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds Reference Document](#). The need for this particular use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan for the campuses. The LEA would also need to be able to document that the use of funds meets the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. Additionally,

the cost of the devices would need to be considered reasonable and necessary to meet the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program.

Payroll/Personnel Use of Funds

When determining Title I, Part A use of funds allowability, an LEA/campus should always reference the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#).

Q1: If our LEA has determined through the needs assessment process that additional focus is needed on early literacy and parental involvement strategies, is it possible to fund a Director or Program Coordinator for early literacy or parental involvement from Title I, Part A funds?

A1: Based on the job duties and responsibilities associated with the position of Director or Program Coordinator, the position could be considered a direct program cost or a direct administrative cost. Additional information about such costs can be found in the [ESSA Consolidated Application Instructions](#) (BS6001 Section). Such costs are generally allowable under Title I, Part A as long as the LEA meets the Title I, Part A Use of Funds requirements as noted on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). Additionally, if the position is an LEA-level position, it would need to be budgeted as funds reserved at the LEA level.

Q2: If we are going to be running a district-wide summer school for students that are failing, do all students have to be from Title I campuses in order to pay the teachers with Title I, Part A funds?

A2: The basic way in which an LEA should determine whether certain activities are allowable uses of Title I, Part A funds has not changed. Title I-funded summer school needs to be for Title I eligible students. Which would mean that the program for failing students from non-Title I campuses would be paid with SCE funds. The LEA would need to ensure that they retain documentation showing this in the case of an audit or random validation monitoring review. The LEA should refer to the items listed in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#) and ascertain whether the LEA is in compliance.

Per the "[COVID-19 AND FEDERAL GRANT FUNDS: FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS](#)," Use of Funds Section, Question 6:

“LEAs will receive all flexibilities available to TEA in the use of their federal grant funds. Information on stimulus funding for education is expected in the next 30 days to address COVID-19 needs; therefore, we do not anticipate significant changes to how you expend your current federal grant funds unless the needs of your students and school communities change. After you update your comprehensive needs assessment, you may consider changes to the planned uses of your federal grant funds. Refer to the When to Amend guidance document and submit amendments (by email or eGrants only) when necessary.

District’s planning process for the next school year may also need to be altered. TEA will be flexible in compliance reviews if you document your circumstances and try to meet the intent of the law as best as you can at the time.”

- Q3: Our LEA has a Parent Engagement Specialist that is 50% funded from the district reservation for parent engagement. The specialist, while not specifically assigned to any one campus, facilitates the compacts, policies, and parent engagement activities at each of the campuses. Can the funding for the specialist remain at the LEA level, or should the specialist be split-funded across each of the campuses?**
- A3: If the employee is providing LEA-specific PFE responsibilities, the time the employee spends on such responsibilities would be considered district reservation time. If the employee is providing Campus-specific PFE responsibilities, the time the employee spends on such responsibilities would be considered at the campus level. Additionally, the LEA would need to ensure that it is following LEA policies and procedures related to the classification of employees (LEA vs. campus). The LEA would need to retain detailed documentation in case of an audit or random validation monitoring review.
- Q4: Can we pay a current employee for contracted services (6200) out of Federal Funds (Title I) for leading professional development outside of her normal contract days or would this be an Extra-Duty Pay Agreement and be paid out of 6100 Salaries?**
- A4: Professional development is an allowable use of funds under Title I, Part A as long as it is being provided for Title I, Part A teachers and the use of funds steps and requirements are followed as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA would also need to ensure it is compliant with the SNS requirements associated with Title I, Part A. For Title I, Part A, the LEA would meet the SNS requirement by having a valid SNS methodology or Statement of Exemption.
- As far as the method used to pay for the services, the LEA would need to follow its local policies and procedures related to employee compensation in determining how to compensate the employee for providing professional development services.
- Q5: Is it allowable to provide incentive pay out of Title I, Part A to non-STAAR teachers (K-6), Instructional Coach, Interventionist and an Assistant Principal?**
- A5: The LEA would need to ensure that it is following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA would specifically need to be able to document that this use of funds meets the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. Providing incentive pay to the individuals listed might not meet the intent and purpose of the law. It would be advisable that the LEA pay for its STAAR teachers out of Title I, Part A funds because that would be more in line with the intent and purpose and use local funds to pay for their non-STAAR teachers and the other administrators noted. Additionally, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment.

Q6: The district has selected to use a majority of its Title I, Part A funds to pay for a district-wide Curriculum director. The responsibilities include managing the ESSA program and provide curriculum support K-12. The district does qualify for an SNS exemption. They can answer yes questions outlined on the “Use of Funds” page. Would this be allowable with Title I, Part A funds?

A6: If the LEA meets all the Title I, Part A use of funds requirements, it would be considered allowable to pay the salary of a district-wide Curriculum Director taking into consideration the following guidance. For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that demonstrates that the time and effort requirements are met and documentation that supports the funds being charged to Title I, Part A are related to time spent working directly on Title I, Part A activities. It would also be advisable to note the Title I, Part A duties in the job descriptions for audit and/or random validation purposes. Additionally, if the LEA has any non-schoolwide campuses, this is a difficult thing to justify. The curriculum is to the benefit of all the LEA’s students.

The LEA should also consider that the time spent on program administration activities would be considered activities to be conducted with reserved funds. If the employee is providing LEA-specific Title I, Part A responsibilities, the time the employee spends on such responsibilities would be considered district reservation time. If the employee is providing campus-specific Title I, Part A responsibilities, the time the employee spends on such responsibilities would be considered at the campus level. Additionally, the LEA would need to ensure that it is following LEA policies and procedures related to the classification of employees (LEA vs. campus). The LEA would need to maintain detailed documentation in case of an audit or random validation monitoring review.

Q7: We are working on an idea to help parents get their students registered for Pre-Kindergarten remotely. Online registration can be challenging for some parents, and we typically have a large group come into our early childhood education centers to get help filling out documents. The assistant typically sits with parents and does the online registration with the parents. In preparing for the possibility that we may not be able to do this in person, we want to set up a helpline for parents to call in and get assistance with registration. Can the funds from the Title I Pre-K district reservation be used to pay teacher assistants extra-duty pay to assist parents with this process?

A7: Costs associated with providing parents with support for navigating school systems and processes are allowable under Title I, Part A as long as the LEA meets the requirements noted on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan.

If all the students will be attending Title I, Part A schoolwide campuses, it shouldn’t be an issue. On a targeted assistance campus, services should only be provided to students identified as most in need to receive the Title I, Part A services. The only potential issue is providing parent support for non-Title I campuses as it would be an unallowable use of funds for those campuses.

Q8/Q9/Q10 Scenario: We have 2 district Home/School Liaisons who are paid on a 187-day contract out of our ESSA fund allocation. Throughout the school year, they are also reimbursed for mileage when using their personal vehicles to address student/family needs. Recently, they submitted mileage reimbursement forms for days that they were not officially on contract indicating that they were still working to address student needs throughout the summer.

Q8: Can they be reimbursed for activities when they were not officially on contract from federal funds?

A8: If the employees were not authorized to be paid extra-duty pay outside of the contract, the district is not obligated to pay for extra-duty pay and/or mileage. However, if the district determines that services were allowable and allocable to the grant and wants to pay for mileage, the reimbursements must be supported by documentation that at a minimum should include an actual mileage log for each trip contemporaneously maintained by the claimant, list of services provided during the trip, dates of services, locations where services were provided and the list of participants who received services on each trip and in accordance with the district's policies and procedures regarding mileage reimbursement. Generally, such mileage reimbursement is considered reasonable and necessary when the employee is performing their duties that meet the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program considering that all the [steps and requirements for use of Title I, Part A funds](#) are met (including that it is based on an identified needs in the comprehensive needs assessment; and documented in the campus improvement plan).

Q9: In order to justify that expense, should we also request timesheets and pay them extra-duty to pay for the services performed using their personal vehicle?

A9: If the employees were not authorized to be paid extra-duty pay outside of the contract, the district is not obligated to pay for extra-duty pay and/or mileage. However, if the district determines that services were allowable and allocable to the grant and wants to pay extra-duty pay, it must be supported by documentation and in accordance with the district's policies and procedures regarding extra-duty pay. Generally, such extra-duty pay is considered reasonable and necessary when the employee is performing their duties that meet the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program considering that all the [steps and requirements for use of Title I, Part A funds](#) are met (including that it is based on an identified needs in the comprehensive needs assessment; and documented in the campus improvement plan).

Q10: What documentation would/should be required to comply with regulations.

A10: The LEA would need to maintain the following documentation locally: payroll, extra-duty pay, an actual mileage log for each trip contemporaneously maintained by the claimant, list of services provided during the trip, dates of services, locations where services were provided and the list of participants who received services on each trip in accordance with the district's policies and procedures regarding mileage reimbursement and [Title I, Part A Use of Funds](#) (including that it meets the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A; is based on

an identified needs in the comprehensive needs assessment; and documented in the campus improvement plan) documentation.

Q11: Is it allowable to leverage Title I, Part A funds to pay for District Coordinator for School Improvement (DCSI) support services provided by an Education Service Center (ESC) for campuses with an “F” rating identified in need of intervention by the state? Since the services provided are state required, would this use of funds be considered a supplant?

A11: Professional and contracted services necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A would be an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds as long as the steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#) are met. The LEA would need to document how the support received by the ESC for the DCSI services meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program. Additionally, the campus/es benefitting from the services would have to be Title I, Part A Schoolwide Program campus/es.

Since the inception of ESSA, the Supplement, Not Supplant requirements for Title I, Part A changed. For Title I, Part A, LEAs are no longer required to adhere to the traditional presumptions of supplant (of which one traditional presumption included state requirements). The requirement related to Supplement, Not Supplant for Title I, Part A is that the LEA must have a valid Supplement, Not Supplant Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. For more information related to the methodology or statement of exemption, [click here to access the most current version of the Supplement, Not Supplant Handbook](#).

Please note that the traditional presumptions of supplant are still in place for other federal programs (i.e., including, but not limited to Title II, Part A and Title IV, Part A). For a complete list of federal programs that still take into account the traditional presumptions of supplant, [click here to access the most current version of the Supplement, Not Supplant Handbook](#).

Q12: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay for the salary (100%) of the District Coordinator for School Improvement (DCSI)?

A12: If the LEA meets all the [Title I, Part A use of funds requirements](#) (including documenting an identified need as a result of a comprehensive needs assessment and documenting the activity in the campus improvement plan), it would be considered allowable to pay the salary of the DCSI, taking into consideration the following guidance. For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that demonstrates that the time and effort requirements are met and documentation that supports the funds being charged to Title I, Part A are related to time spent working directly on activities that meet the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program. It would also be advisable to note the Title I, Part A duties in the job description for audit and/or random validation purposes. However, if the LEA has any non-schoolwide campuses, this is a difficult thing to justify because school improvement is to the benefit of all the LEA’s students.

The LEA should also consider that the time spent on program administration activities would be considered activities to be conducted with LEA reserved funds. If the employee is providing LEA-specific Title I, Part A responsibilities, the time the employee spends on such responsibilities would

be considered district reservation time. If the employee is providing campus-specific Title I, Part A responsibilities, the time the employee spends on such responsibilities would be considered at the campus level. Additionally, the LEA would need to ensure that it is following LEA policies and procedures related to the classification of employees (LEA vs. campus). The LEA would need to maintain detailed documentation in case of an audit or random validation monitoring review.

Q13: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay for the salary of an aide to assist a school nurse with assessing student illness to prevent students from having to lose instructional time from waiting on the nurse?

A13: It would be difficult to justify and maintain documentation demonstrating how this use of funds is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps.

Q14: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay a receptionist to transfer phone calls to teachers after regular school hours?

A14: It would be difficult to justify and maintain documentation demonstrating how this use of funds is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps.

Q15: Would it be an allowable expense to pay for the educational aid certificate for the parent liaison?

A15: Paying for the costs associated with a paraprofessional meeting highly qualified requirements is allowable under Title I, Part A as long as the LEA meets the Title I, Part A Use of Funds requirements as noted on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).

Q16: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay an ESL teacher who works with students on language building skills?

A16: The LEA would need to ensure that it is following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA needs to be able to document how the activity meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. The use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan. Additionally, the services could only be provided for students attending schoolwide campuses as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. If a campus is a Targeted Assistance campus, the LEA would have to ensure that only students identified as most in need receive the Title I, Part A services. If the students attend non-Title I campuses, this would not be an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds for those campuses.

For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that demonstrates that the time and effort requirements are met and documentation that

supports the funds being charged to Title I, Part A are related to time spent working directly on Title I, Part A activities. It would also be advisable to note the Title I, Part A duties in the job description for audit and/or random validation purposes.

Q17: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds for extra-duty pay for instructional coaches training teachers on non-duty days?

A17: Professional development is an allowable use of funds under Title I, Part A, as long as it is being provided for Title I, Part A teachers on a Title I, Part A Schoolwide program campus or teachers providing services to Title I, Part A students on a Targeted Assistance program campus and the use of funds steps and requirements are followed as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA needs to be able to document how the activity meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. The LEA would also need to ensure it is compliant with the Supplement, Not Supplant (SNS) requirements associated with Title I, Part A. For Title I, Part A, the LEA would meet the SNS requirement by having a valid SNS methodology or Statement of Exemption.

As far as the method used to pay for the services, the LEA would need to follow its local policies and procedures related to employee compensation in determining how to compensate the employee for providing professional development services outside of their normal contract duty days. Extra-duty pay must be supported by documentation and in accordance with the LEA's policies and procedures regarding extra-duty pay.

Q18: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay the salary for a Communities in Schools (CIS) position?

A18: The LEA would need to ensure that it is following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA would specifically need to be able to document that this use of funds meets the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. The use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan.

Additionally, the CIS services could only be provided for students attending schoolwide campuses as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. If a campus is a Targeted Assistance campus, the LEA would have to ensure that only students identified as most in need receive the Title I, Part A services. If the students attend non-Title I campuses, this would not be an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds for those campuses.

Q19: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay a stipend or extra-duty pay to a counselor to mentor other counselors?

A19: If the LEA meets all the steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#) (including documenting an identified need as a result of a comprehensive needs assessment and documenting the activity in the campus improvement plan), it would be considered allowable to

pay stipends/extra-duty pay, taking into consideration the following guidance and ensuring that the LEA is able to document how the activity meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps.

If the stipend/extra-duty pay would benefit campuses identified as schoolwide program campuses, this would not be a problem, as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. It would be difficult to document this use of funds for a Targeted Assistance campus and it would not be allowable for anyone providing services to a non-Title I, Part A campus.

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

Time and effort documentation is required for any type of compensation paid with federal funds, including stipends. A stipend should be paid based on policies and procedures adopted by the board or local authorities. A good example is a board approving a policy to pay a stipend in the amount of \$1000 for all teachers with graduate degrees. There is a good chance that this position's regular salary is paid with local funds, but the stipend will be paid out of federal funds. The LEA must maintain time and effort documentation that describes a policy/reason adopted by the appropriate authority or the board supporting the stipend for such activities. The document must be signed and dated by the supervisor authorizing the stipend. If the employee was paid for extra-duty pay outside of the normal working hours, the time and effort documentation would include a time sheet of extra duties performed and a supplemental pay agreement approved by the supervisor for specific services provided that are eligible under the federal program.

Q20: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to fund a summer instructional program for students who will start Pre-Kindergarten for the first time in the Fall?

A20: Strategies for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (including providing early instruction through a summer program for students who will be enrolling in a PK program) is an allowable use of funds under Title I, Part A as long as the steps and requirements noted on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#) are followed. The LEA needs to be able to document how the activity meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. The use of funds would need to have been identified as a need in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan. If all the students will be attending Title I, Part A schoolwide campuses, it shouldn't be an issue. On a targeted assistance campus, services should only be provided to students identified as most in need to receive the Title I, Part A services.

Q21: If an employee is retiring and they were paid out of Title I, Part A funds and the LEA has a policy to pay out any unused sick leave, can the LEA use Title I, Part A funds to pay the balance of unused sick days?

A21: The Title I, Part A use of funds referenced is to be treated like other fringe benefits under 200.431 of EDGAR, but, generally, the LEA must follow their local policy and treat federal funds the same as state and local funds in this instance. So, if the LEA's local policy pays for unused sick leave by their funding pattern, then Title I, Part A can pay its share by the funding pattern; however, if their policy is to pay all unused sick leave from local funds, then Title I, Part A can't be charged.

Q22: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay for professional development/training for non-core content area teachers?

A22: If the LEA has a valid SNS methodology or Statement of Exemption, the use of Title I, Part A funds to pay for professional development for teachers would be an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds as long as it is being provided for schoolwide program/targeted assistance program teachers and the use of funds steps and requirements are followed as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan. To pay for professional development for non-core content area teachers using Title I, Part A funds, the LEA would specifically need to be able to document that the use of funds for non-core-content instruction teachers meets the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps.

Q23: Is it allowable for Title I, Part A funds to be used to pay teachers extra-duty pay for a planning session to develop a tutoring program, or can they only be paid extra-duty pay when they are serving students and student attendance is reported?

A23: Title I, Part A funds can be used to pay teachers extra-duty pay for planning to develop the tutoring program as long as the LEA is following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA would need to be able to document how this use of funds is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. Additionally, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and included in the campus improvement plan. Extra-duty pay must be supported by documentation and in accordance with the LEA's policies and procedures regarding extra-duty pay.

Q24: Is it allowable for Title I, Part A funds to be used to pay a tutoring coordinator who will manage the scheduling, paperwork, and identifying which students will be served?

A24: Title I, Part A funds can be used to pay a tutoring coordinator as long as the LEA is following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA would need to be able to document how this use of funds is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational

achievement gaps. Additionally, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and included in the campus improvement plan. For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that demonstrates that the time and effort requirements are met and documentation that supports the funds being charged to Title I, Part A are related to time spent working directly on activities that meet the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program.

Q25: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay the salary of the Title I Coordinator if their job duties include writing the ESSA grant application?

A25: LEA positions that are 100% paid with federal funds cannot write grant applications. They would need a small percentage of state and/or local funds in their time and effort to cover writing and submitting grant applications/amendments. The work preparing the responses for the application is part of the planning and budget process from evaluating the prior year's program effectiveness. Writing the grant application is defined as completing the application forms and submitting the application to TEA, but the LEA can define it more broadly.

Q26: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay the salary of a 504 facilitator?

A26: It would be difficult to justify and maintain documentation demonstrating how this use of funds is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. However, if the LEA can document that paying the salary of a 504 facilitator meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program because it is related to student academic achievement, they would need to ensure that they have followed the steps and requirements noted on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#) and that the need has been identified as a result of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process and listed in the Campus Improvement Plan. Additionally, the services could only be provided for students attending schoolwide campuses as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. If a campus is a Targeted Assistance campus, the LEA would have to ensure that only students identified as most in need receive the Title I, Part A services. If the students attend non-Title I campuses, this would not be an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds for those campuses.

For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that demonstrates that the time and effort requirements are met and documentation that supports the funds being charged to Title I, Part A are related to time spent working directly on Title I, Part A activities. It would also be advisable to note the Title I, Part A duties in the job description for audit and/or random validation purposes.

Q27: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay the salary of a Dyslexia teacher?

A27: The LEA would need to ensure that it is following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). Although utilizing Title I, Part A funds to pay a Dyslexia Teacher's salary is allowable based on the general duties of a teacher and the connection to student academic achievement, the use of funds would need to have been

identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan. Additionally, the services could only be provided for students attending schoolwide campuses as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. If a campus is a Targeted Assistance campus, the LEA would have to ensure that only students identified as most in need receive the Title I, Part A services. If the students attend non-Title I campuses, this would not be an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds for those campuses.

For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that demonstrates that the time and effort requirements are met and documentation that supports the funds being charged to Title I, Part A are related to time spent working directly on Title I, Part A activities. It would also be advisable to note the Title I, Part A duties in the job description for audit and/or random validation purposes.

Q28: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay for stipends?

A28: First, the LEA would need to determine and maintain documentation if the reason for the stipend meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. If the LEA meets all the steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#) (including documenting an identified need as a result of a comprehensive needs assessment and documenting the activity in the campus improvement plan), it would be considered allowable to pay stipends, taking into consideration the following guidance. As noted in the Title I, Part A Use of Funds document, the stipend amount should also be reasonable and necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program.

If the stipend would benefit campuses identified as schoolwide program campuses, this would not be a problem, as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. It would be difficult to document this use of funds for a Targeted Assistance campus and it would not be allowable for anyone providing services to a non-Title I, Part A campus.

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

Time and effort documentation is required for any type of compensation paid with federal funds, including stipends. A stipend should be paid based on policies and procedures adopted by the board or local authorities. A good example is a board approving a policy to pay a stipend in the amount of \$1000 for all teachers with graduate degrees. There is a good chance that this position's regular salary is paid with local funds, but the stipend will be paid out of federal funds. The LEA must maintain time and effort documentation that describes a policy/reason adopted by the appropriate authority or the board supporting the stipend for such activities. The document must be signed and dated by the supervisor authorizing the stipend.

Q29: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay for the salary of an interventionist?

A29: The LEA would need to ensure that it is following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). Although utilizing Title I, Part A funds to pay an Interventionist's salary is generally allowable based on the general duties of an interventionist and the connection to student academic achievement, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan. The LEA would need to ensure that all the duties the position would be performing meet the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps.

Additionally, the services could only be provided for students attending schoolwide campuses as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. If a campus is a Targeted Assistance campus, the LEA would have to ensure that only students identified as most in need receive the Title I, Part A services. If the students attend non-Title I campuses, this would not be an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds for those campuses.

For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that demonstrates that the time and effort requirements are met and documentation that supports the funds being charged to Title I, Part A are related to time spent working directly on Title I, Part A activities. It would also be advisable to note the Title I, Part A duties in the job description for audit and/or random validation purposes.

Q30: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay the salary of career and technical education (CTE) teacher?

A30: The LEA would need to ensure that it is following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). Although utilizing Title I, Part A funds to pay a teacher's salary is generally allowable based on the general duties of a teacher and the connection to student academic achievement, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan. The LEA would need to ensure that all the duties the position would be performing meet the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps.

Additionally, the services could only be provided for students attending schoolwide campuses as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. If a campus is a Targeted Assistance campus, the LEA would have to ensure that only students identified as most in need receive the Title I, Part A services. If the students attend non-Title I campuses, this would not be an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds for those campuses.

For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that demonstrates that the time and effort requirements are met and documentation that supports the funds being charged to Title I, Part A are related to time spent working directly on

Title I, Part A activities. It would also be advisable to note the Title I, Part A duties in the job description for audit and/or random validation purposes.

Q31: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay the salary of school counselor?

A31: The LEA would need to ensure that it is following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). Although utilizing Title I, Part A funds to pay a portion of a Counselor’s salary is allowable based on the general duties of a counselor and the connection to student academic achievement, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan. Additionally, the services could only be provided for students attending schoolwide campuses as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. If a campus is a Targeted Assistance campus, the LEA would have to ensure that only students identified as most in need receive the Title I, Part A services. If the students attend non-Title I campuses, this would not be an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds for those campuses.

For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that demonstrates that the time and effort requirements are met and documentation that supports the funds being charged to Title I, Part A are related to time spent working directly on Title I, Part A activities. It would also be advisable to note the Title I, Part A duties in the job description for audit and/or random validation purposes.

Q32: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay the salary of a computer technician that provides technology support for student devices at Title I, Part A campuses?

A32: The LEA would need to ensure that it is following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA would specifically need to maintain documentation demonstrating how this use of funds is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. Although utilizing Title I, Part A funds to pay a Computer Technician’s salary may be allowable, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan. Additionally, the services could only be provided for students attending schoolwide campuses as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. If a campus is a Targeted Assistance campus, the LEA would have to ensure that only students identified as most in need receive the Title I, Part A services. If the students attend non-Title I campuses, this would not be an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds for those campuses.

For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that demonstrates that the time and effort requirements are met and documentation that supports the funds being charged to Title I, Part A are related to time spent working directly on Title I, Part A activities. It would also be advisable to note the Title I, Part A duties in the job description for audit and/or random validation purposes.

Q33: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay board-approved retention stipends to employees that are paid out of Title I, Part A?

A33: If the LEA meets all the steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#) (including documenting an identified need as a result of a comprehensive needs assessment and documenting the activity in the campus improvement plan), it would be considered allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay retention stipends to employees that are paid out of Title I, Part A, taking into consideration the following guidance and ensuring that the LEA is able to document how the activity meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. As noted in the Title I, Part A Use of Funds document, the stipend amount should also be reasonable and necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program.

If the stipend would benefit campuses identified as schoolwide program campuses, this would not be a problem, as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. It would be difficult to document this use of funds for a Targeted Assistance campus and it would not be allowable for anyone providing services to a non-Title I, Part A campus.

For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that demonstrates that the time and effort requirements are met. Time and effort documentation is required for any type of compensation paid with federal funds, including stipends. An employee paid 100% from grant funds will be covered under the periodic certifications.

A stipend should be paid based on policies and procedures adopted by the board or local authorities. A good example is a board approving a policy to pay a stipend in the amount of \$1000 for all teachers with graduate degrees. The LEA must maintain time and effort documentation that describes a policy/reason adopted by the appropriate authority or the board supporting the stipend for such activities. The document must be signed and dated by the supervisor authorizing the stipend.

Q34: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay the salary of summer school staff (principals, assistant principals, school nurses, PEIMS clerks, registrars, and attendance clerks)?

A34: When determining whether Title I, Part A funds can be used for payroll it is important to ensure that the use of funds is reasonable and necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. An LEA would need to be able to document that the use of funds would meet such intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program.

It would be difficult to justify and maintain documentation demonstrating how the use of funds for the positions referenced (principals, assistant principals, school nurses, PEIMS clerks, registrars, and attendance clerks) is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. However, if the LEA can document that

paying the salary for any of those positions meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A, they would need to ensure that they have followed the steps and requirements noted on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#) and that the need has been identified as a result of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process and listed in the Campus Improvement Plan. Additionally, the use of funds would only be allowed on Title I, Part A Schoolwide campuses since Title I, Part A funds can only be used to serve Title I, Part A students. It would be difficult to justify and document such payroll costs on a Targeted Assistance campus.

For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that demonstrates that the time and effort requirements are met and documentation that supports the funds being charged to Title I, Part A are related to time spent working directly on Title I, Part A activities. It would also be advisable to note the Title I, Part A duties in the job description for audit and/or random validation purposes.

Q35: As part of the HB3 Reading Academies requirement, our LEA has decided to utilize existing LEA staff to serve as the blended facilitators for this program. To date, the salaries for these staff members are federally funded under Title I, Part A. It has been recommended by our LEA leadership that a one-time stipend be added on top of the annual salary for these duties. Is this allowable under Title I, Part A since the HB3 Reading Academies are a state requirement? If it is unallowable, would it be allowable to fund the stipend out of another fund source for the employees that are paid with Title I, Part A funds?

A35: If the LEA has a valid SNS methodology or Statement of Exemption, the use of Title I, Part A funds to pay for costs associated with the state-required Reading Academies would be an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds. Once that is accomplished, either through a Title I-neutral SNS Methodology or by through a Statement of Exemption, the supplemental requirement for Title I, Part A funds at the campus level has been met. For district-level funds, the LEA must ensure that it is using State and local funds that are retained at the LEA level in a Title I neutral manner. Then any Title I, Part A funds that are reserved at the LEA level are also considered to be supplemental in nature. Professional development is an allowable use of funds under Title I, Part A as long as it is being provided for schoolwide program/targeted assistance program teachers and the use-of-funds steps and requirements are followed as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).

Since the inception of ESSA, the method of determining compliance with the Supplement, Not Supplant requirements for Title I, Part A changed. For Title I, Part A, LEAs are no longer required to adhere to the traditional presumptions of supplant (of which one traditional presumption included state requirements). The requirement related to Supplement, Not Supplant for Title I, Part A is that the LEA must have a valid Supplement, Not Supplant Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. For more information related to the methodology or statement of exemption, [click here to access the most current version of the Supplement, Not Supplant Handbook](#).

Please note that the traditional presumptions of supplant are still in place for other federal programs (i.e., including but not limited to Title II, Part A and Title IV, Part A). For a complete list of federal programs that still take into account the traditional presumptions of supplant, [click here to access the most current version of the Supplement, Not Supplant Handbook](#).

To utilize Title I, Part A funds to pay for a stipend, the LEA would first need to determine and maintain documentation if the reason for the stipend meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. If the LEA meets all the steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#) (including documenting an identified need as a result of a comprehensive needs assessment and documenting the activity in the campus improvement plan), it would be considered allowable to pay stipends, taking into consideration the following guidance. As noted in the Title I, Part A Use of Funds document, the stipend amount should also be reasonable and necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program.

If the stipend would benefit campuses identified as schoolwide program campuses, this would not be a problem, as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. It would be difficult to document this use of funds for a Targeted Assistance campus, and it would not be allowable for anyone providing services to a non-Title I, Part A campus.

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

Time and effort documentation is required for any type of compensation paid with federal funds, including stipends. A stipend should be paid based on policies and procedures adopted by the board or local authorities. A good example is a board approving a policy to pay a stipend in the amount of \$1000 for all teachers with graduate degrees. There is a good chance that this position's regular salary is paid with local funds, but the stipend will be paid out of federal funds or vice versa. The LEA must maintain time and effort documentation that describes a policy/reason adopted by the appropriate authority or the board supporting the stipend for such activities. The document must be signed and dated by the supervisor authorizing the stipend.

It is allowable for an employee whose salary is paid out of Title I, Part A to be paid a stipend from another fund source as long as it meets the use of funds requirements for that fund source.

Q36: May Title I, Part A funds be used to pay for employee benefits such as pension plans, unemployment insurance coverage, health insurance, severance pay, and life insurance?

A36: Yes. Employers' contributions for employee benefits such as these are an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds provided the benefits are granted under approved plans and the costs are distributed equitably to the Title I, Part A grant and to other activities.

Q37: May Title I, Part A funds be used to pay the salary costs for employees during periods of authorized absences such as annual leave, sick leave, and sabbatical leave?

A37: Yes. Employee benefits in the form of compensation paid during reasonable authorized absences from the job are an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds if the benefits are provided under an

established leave system and the costs are equitably allocated to all related activities, including the Title I, Part A program.

Q38: Can Title I, Part A funds be used to pay, in-full or in-part, the salaries of music, art, or physical education teachers?

A38: The LEA would need to ensure that it is following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). Although utilizing Title I, Part A funds to pay a teacher's salary is generally allowable based on the general duties of a teacher and the connection to student academic achievement, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan. The LEA would need to ensure that all the duties the position would be performing meet the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps.

Additionally, the services could only be provided for students attending schoolwide campuses as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. If a campus is a Targeted Assistance campus, the LEA would have to ensure that only students identified as most in need receive the Title I, Part A services. If the students attend non-Title I campuses, this would not be an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds for those campuses.

For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that demonstrates that the time and effort requirements are met and documentation that supports the funds being charged to Title I, Part A are related to time spent working directly on Title I, Part A activities. It would also be advisable to note the Title I, Part A duties in the job description for audit and/or random validation purposes.

Q39: Can Title I, Part A funds be used to pay for the salary of the social and emotional learning (SEL) executive director at the LEA level? The position supports all campuses in the LEA and all campuses in the LEA are Title I, Part A served campuses that implement a schoolwide program.

A39: If the LEA meets all the [Title I, Part A use of funds requirements](#), it would be considered allowable to pay the salary of a district-wide Executive Director with tasks associated with social and emotional learning taking into consideration the following guidance. For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that demonstrates that the time and effort requirements are met and documentation that supports the funds being charged to Title I, Part A are related to time spent working directly on Title I, Part A activities. It would also be advisable to note the Title I, Part A duties in the job descriptions for audit and/or random validation purposes.

The LEA should also consider that the time spent on program administration activities would be considered activities to be conducted with reserved funds. If the employee is providing LEA-specific Title I, Part A responsibilities, the time the employee spends on such responsibilities would be considered district reservation time. If the employee is providing campus-specific Title I, Part A responsibilities, the time the employee spends on such responsibilities would be considered at the campus level. Additionally, the LEA would need to ensure that it is following LEA policies and

procedures related to the classification of employees (LEA vs. campus). The LEA would need to maintain detailed documentation in case of an audit or random validation monitoring review.

Q40: Is there a sample or form for Supplemental Pay Agreement?

A40: A sample Supplemental Pay Agreement is not available.

Q41: For Extra-Duty Pay, what is the "Supplemental Pay Agreement"? Is that as simple as a description of the function or purpose of the extra duty?

A41: The supplemental pay agreement for extra duty is like a contract for the work that will be completed outside of the normal workday. It will list the terms and agreement for both parties (dollars per hour, the type of work to be completed, the total allowable amount of pay, etc.). Both parties will sign prior to the work being completed.

Q42: Does the district Personnel Action Form (district personnel documentation form) support the Supplemental Pay Agreement for extra-duty pay?

A42: The PAR is used for duties during the regular school day. A separate time and effort form needs to be kept for extra-duty pay (e.g., a record for a after school tutor would show who was tutored, on what day, and for how long).

Q43: What type of documentation would need to be kept for substitute teacher costs paid with Title I, Part A funds?

A43: Documentation would include the teacher of record, payroll authorizations, and a board-approved document showing the daily rates for subs.

Q44: Can a one-time retention stipend be paid out of Title I, Part A funds if the employee is funded out of Title I, Part A and all employees are getting a retention stipend?

A44: If the LEA meets all the steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#) (including documenting an identified need as a result of a comprehensive needs assessment and documenting the activity in the campus improvement plan), it would be considered allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay retention stipends to employees that are paid out of Title I, Part A, taking into consideration the following guidance and ensuring that the LEA is able to document how the activity meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. As noted in the Title I, Part A Use of Funds document, the stipend amount should also be reasonable and necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program.

If the stipend would benefit campuses identified as schoolwide program campuses, this would not be a problem, as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. It would be difficult to document this use of funds for a Targeted Assistance campus and it would not be allowable for anyone providing services to a non-Title I, Part A campus.

For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that demonstrates that the time and effort requirements are met. Time and effort documentation is required for any type of compensation paid with federal funds, including stipends. An employee paid 100% from grant funds will be covered under the periodic certifications.

A stipend should be paid based on policies and procedures adopted by the board or local authorities. A good example is a board approving a policy to pay a stipend in the amount of \$1000 for all teachers with graduate degrees. The LEA must maintain time and effort documentation that describes a policy/reason adopted by the appropriate authority or the board supporting the stipend for such activities. The document must be signed and dated by the supervisor authorizing the stipend.

Q45: Can core subject campus department heads be paid from Title I, Part A funds?

A45: The LEA would need to ensure that it is following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). Although utilizing Title I, Part A funds to pay a teacher's salary is generally allowable based on the general duties of a teacher and the connection to student academic achievement, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan. The LEA would need to ensure that all the duties the position would be performing meet the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps.

Additionally, the services could only be provided for students attending schoolwide campuses as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. It would be difficult to document this use of funds for a Targeted Assistance campus and it would not be allowable for anyone providing services to a non-Title I, Part A campus.

For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that demonstrates that the time and effort requirements are met and documentation that supports the funds being charged to Title I, Part A are related to time spent working directly on Title I, Part A activities. It would also be advisable to note the Title I, Part A duties in the job description for audit and/or random validation purposes.

Q46: Can an employee funded by the Title I, Part A program perform non-instructional duties such as supervising hallways, student arrival/dismissal duties, and cafeteria monitoring duties?

A46: Title I, Part A funded staff can perform such duties, as long as other staff in similar positions are also performing such duties. As per the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), Section 1115 (d)(2), "School personnel who are paid with Title I, Part A funds may assume limited duties that are assigned to similar personnel who are not so paid, including duties beyond classroom instruction or that do not benefit participating children, so long as the amount of time spent on such duties is the same proportion of total work time as prevails with respect to similar personnel at the same school."

Q47: A campus has an interventionist that is funded by Title I, Part A funds. The interventionist resigned, so there is no one in the position currently. While they have the position posted, can they pay for a "long term substitute" with Title I, Part A funds for the position?

A47: The LEA can pay for an individual to perform the duties of the interventionist that was previously paid with Title I, Part A funds as long as the use of funds meets the steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#). The LEA would need to follow their local policies and procedures in determining how to classify the employee performing the duties. Technically, the person would not be performing in a traditional substitute role because there is no one currently in the position. For documentation purposes and to maintain a clean audit trail, it would be advised that the employee performing the interventionist duties not be classified as a "substitute." The LEA would need to follow their local policies and procedures in determining how to classify the employee performing the interventionist duties.

***Q47.1: What time and effort documentation would need to be maintained locally for the employee?**

*A47.1: **Staff Member Paid 100% with Federal Funds:** Time and effort must be documented appropriately for any employee compensation that is paid, in full or in part, with federal funds. The new EDGAR does not list specific types of documentation for time and effort, rather it lists seven characteristics of documentation that must be met (See [EDGAR FAQ 8.1](#)).

Substitute: Time and effort must be documented appropriately for any employee compensation that is paid, in full or in part, with federal funds. The subgrantee generally will either have a policy or procedure that all substitute pay is paid from state and/or local, not federal or state grant, funds or the substitute pay follows the same pay as the staff members for whom the substitute is working. If the substitute pay follows the employees funding distribution, the LEA's after-the-fact documentation must identify the teacher or staff for whom the substitute is working. Either a statement signed by the substitute or other system documentation would be sufficient. (Source: [EDGAR FAQ 8.3](#))

Q48: When teachers are funded out of Title I, Part A funds, can they be placed in a grade level based on the results of a comprehensive needs assessment or do they need to be placed in a certain grade level?

A48: There is no statutory requirement that references that Title I, Part A-funded teachers are to be placed in a particular grade level. As with any use of Title I, Part A funds, LEAs are required to follow the steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The Title I, Part A program is a campus-based program, and funds should also be distributed to campuses as per the statutory requirements for ranking and serving Title I, Part A eligible campuses. Schoolwide program campuses should use their funds based on the results of a comprehensive needs assessment and what has been included in the campus improvement plan.

Q49: Is it allowable for an LEA to use Title I, Part A funds for extra-duty pay to meet with parents to discuss student progress and the parent-school compact?

A49: If the LEA meets all the steps and requirements noted in the Title I, Part A Use of Funds document (including documenting an identified need as a result of a comprehensive needs assessment and documenting the activity in the campus improvement plan), it would be considered allowable to pay extra-duty pay for duties performed outside of the normal working hours of the employee, taking into consideration the following guidance and ensuring that the LEA is able to document how the activity meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps.

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

If the employee was paid for extra-duty pay outside of the normal working hours, the time and effort documentation would include a time sheet of extra duties performed and a supplemental pay agreement approved by the supervisor for specific services provided that are eligible under the federal program.

***Q49.1: How would HB 4545 requirements affect this requirement if both are happening simultaneously?**

*A49.1: If the LEA has a valid Supplement, Not Supplant Methodology or Statement of Exemption, use of Title I, Part A funds for this activity would not be considered a supplant.

Q50: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay a stipend to an experienced teacher to mentor a non-core subject area new teacher?

A50: It would be an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds to pay a stipend to a veteran teacher to mentor a new teacher even if the new teacher does not teach one of the core subject areas, as long as the following requirements related to stipends are met.

First, the LEA would need to determine and maintain documentation if the reason for the stipend meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. If the LEA meets all the steps and requirements noted in the Title I, Part A Use of Funds document (including documenting an identified need as a result of a comprehensive needs assessment and documenting the activity in the campus improvement plan), it would be considered allowable to pay stipends, taking into consideration the following guidance.

As noted in the Title I, Part A Use of Funds document, the stipend amount should also be reasonable and necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program.

If the stipend would benefit campuses identified as schoolwide program campuses, this would not be a problem, as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. It would be difficult to document this use of funds on a Targeted Assistance campus for a teacher that is not serving Title I, Part A students, and it would not be allowable for anyone providing services to a non-Title I, Part A campus.

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

Time and effort documentation is required for any type of compensation paid with federal funds, including stipends. A stipend should be paid based on policies and procedures adopted by the board or local authorities. A good example is a board approving a policy to pay a stipend in the amount of \$1000 for all teachers with graduate degrees. There is a good chance that this position's regular salary is paid with local funds, but the stipend will be paid out of federal funds. The LEA must maintain time and effort documentation that describes a policy/reason adopted by the appropriate authority or the board supporting the stipend for such activities. The document must be signed and dated by the supervisor authorizing the stipend.

Q51: Can Title I, Part A funds be used to pay for substitutes for teachers who are absent expending their local sick/leave days or state leave days? These substitute costs were previously paid out of local district funds and not from their campus allocation.

A51: Yes, it is technically allowable. However, TEA recommends only paying for substitutes for actual campus staff whose salary is paid from Title I, Part A funds, even on a schoolwide campus.

In this instance, as long as the LEA has an appropriately implemented supplement, not supplant methodology, it is not a supplant to pay for these substitute costs from Title I, Part A. However, several things need to be considered and well documented before doing so. If using other federal grant funds to pay substitutes, the LEA must consider the presumptions of supplanting that are in effect for that fund source.

If the LEA decides to pay for all substitute costs on a campus, this could potentially result in an audit finding or impact for the LEA's compliance with maintenance of effort (MOE) requirements due to the shifting of state and local expenditures in the previous year to federal funds in the current year.

When paying substitute costs with any federal grant funds, the LEA must consider and document whether the cost is reasonable, necessary, and allocable to determine if it is programmatically an allowable cost.

In addition to consideration regarding reasonable, necessary, and allocable, for Title I, Part A funds to be used, the LEA must document:

- What need to pay all substitute costs was identified in the comprehensive needs assessment?
- How is this activity identified in the CIP?
- How will this activity be evaluated and show the substitutes were effective in improving student academic achievement?

Q52: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay a portion of the salary of a district-wide Special Programs Director for the position's Title I, Part A-related duties? If yes, what is the documentation needed to be maintained locally for compliance?

A52: If the LEA meets all the Title I, Part A use of funds requirements as per the [Title I, Part A use of funds reference document](#), it would be considered allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay a portion of a district-wide Special Programs Director's salary taking into consideration the following guidance.

- The LEA must have a valid Supplement, Not Supplant methodology for allocating State and local funds to campuses, or Statement of Exemption. In both situations, the LEA must also ensure that State and local funds that are reserved at the LEA level are used to support activities that do not take the Title I status of campuses into account.
- As with the use of any Title I, Part A funds, the LEA would need to ensure that it is able to document how the activity meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps.
- For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that demonstrates that the time and effort requirements are met (personnel activity report) and documentation that supports the funds being charged to Title I, Part A are related to time spent working directly on Title I, Part A activities. It would also be advisable to note the Title I, Part A duties in the job descriptions for audit and/or random validation purposes.
- The LEA should also consider that the time spent on program administration activities would be considered activities to be conducted with reserved funds. If the employee is providing LEA-specific Title I, Part A responsibilities, the time the employee spends on such responsibilities would be considered district reservation time. If the employee is providing campus-specific Title I, Part A responsibilities, the time the employee spends on such responsibilities would be considered at the campus level. Additionally, the LEA would need to ensure that it is following LEA policies and procedures related to the classification of employees (LEA vs. campus). The LEA would need to maintain detailed documentation in case of an audit or random validation monitoring review.
- As per the [TEA Budgeting Costs Guidance Handbook](#), Title I, Part A funds may not be used for grant writing or obtaining grant funds, which includes the ESSA Consolidated Federal Grant Application.

Q53: Does a teacher have to be off official contract hours before being paid for extra-duty activities such as tutorials?

A53: Although extra-duty pay for teachers to provide instructional support to students during afterschool tutorials is an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds on a schoolwide program campus and for students meeting the criteria on a targeted assistance campus, extra-duty pay for tutorials would be considered allowable, reasonable, and necessary only when such duties are performed outside of the scheduled working hours for the teachers. If the teacher's normal schedule is Monday – Friday from 7:30 am – 4:00 pm, the teacher could only be compensated with extra-duty pay for tutorials that take place on Saturday, Sunday, and/or before/after the teacher's normal scheduled working hours. As with any use of Title I, Part A funds, the LEA would need to follow the steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA would also need to ensure that it is following its local procedures for extra-duty pay compensation and that it is able to maintain the appropriate time and effort documentation.

Q54: Is it allowable use of Title I, Part A funds for class-size reduction?

A54: As with any use of the Title I, Part A funds, the campus would need to ensure that it is following the steps and requirements for use of Title I, Part A funds that are referenced in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#). If the LEA has a valid Supplement, Not Supplant (SNS) methodology or statement of exemption, they have met the SNS requirement for this specific use of Title I, Part A funds. Although Title I, Part A statute does not specifically reference class-size reduction, use of Title I, Part A funds must be used in accordance with the intent and purpose of the program, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. This would include ensuring that such activities are evidence-based as referenced in the [USDE Non-Regulatory Guidance: Using Evidence to Strengthen Education Investments](#) that applies to Title I, Part A.

Q55: Can the salary of a Migrant Education Program Specialist be paid with Title I, Part A funds? This person only works on the Migrant Program and nothing else.

A55: If the steps and requirements for use of Title I, Part A funds noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#) are met, it is allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay for the salary of the Migrant Education Program Specialist on a Title I, Part A **Schoolwide Program** campus taking into consideration the following guidance. As with the use of any Title I, Part A funds, the campus would need to ensure that the LEA is able to document how the activity meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps.

On a Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance campus, Title I, Part A funds may not be used to provide services that are otherwise required by law to be made available to Migrant children but may be used to coordinate or supplement such services.

For audit and/or random validation purposes, the LEA would need to keep documentation on file that demonstrates that the time and effort requirements are met and documentation that

supports the funds being charged to Title I, Part A are related to time spent working directly on Title I, Part A activities. It would also be advisable to note the Title I, Part A duties in the job descriptions for audit and/or random validation purposes.

The LEA should also consider that the time spent on program administration activities would be considered activities to be conducted with reserved funds. If the employee is providing LEA-specific Title I, Part A responsibilities, the time the employee spends on such responsibilities would be considered district reservation time. If the employee is providing campus-specific Title I, Part A responsibilities, the time the employee spends on such responsibilities would be considered at the campus level. Additionally, the LEA would need to ensure that it is following LEA policies and procedures related to the classification of employees (LEA vs. campus). The LEA would need to maintain detailed documentation in case of an audit or random validation monitoring review.

Response Revised 11/30/2022

Q56: Is it allowable for a Title I, Part A campus to use Title I, Part A funds to hire a full-time administrative position to manage the climate and culture on the campus?

A56: The LEA would need to ensure that it is following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA would specifically need to be able to document that this use of funds meets the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. The use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan. Additionally, this position would need to be on a Schoolwide program campus.

Q57: Is it allowable use of Title I, Part A funds to support paraprofessionals in obtaining their alternative certification?

A57: Paying for the costs associated with a paraprofessional obtaining certification as a teacher through an Alternative Certification Program is allowable under Title I, Part A, as long as the LEA meets the Title I, Part A Use of Funds requirements as noted on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).

***Q58: To justify payroll expenditures for extra-duty pay for tutoring, is it required to maintain the following documentation locally: student sign-in sheets, tutoring agreement, and tutor timesheet?**

*A58: If the LEA were to have an audit, all three documents would be needed. It is appropriate to document the procedures related to this process in the local Administrative Procedures Manual to demonstrate adequate internal controls. The documents themselves are required to demonstrate compliance with allowability. Requirements for internal controls are found in 2 CFR 200.302 and allowability requirements are referenced in 2 CFR 200.403.

Professional Development Use of Funds

When determining Title I, Part A use of funds allowability, an LEA/campus should always reference the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#).

Q1: Can Title I, Part A funds be used to send a teacher to a workshop?

A1: It depends. The campus/LEA must be able to show that the workshop is an integral part of the teacher’s development plan to improve in one or more of the areas described on the previous two pages. Additionally, the campus/LEA must refer to the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#) to ensure that all use of funds criteria are met.

Q2: What is considered evidence-based?

A2: Section 8101(21)(A) of the ESEA defines evidence-based as “...the term ‘evidence-based,’ when used with respect to an LEA, or school activity, means an activity, strategy, or intervention that –

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

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

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

(III) *promising evidence* from at least one well-designed and well-implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias; or

(ii) *demonstrates a rationale* based on high-quality research findings or positive evaluation that such activity, strategy, or intervention is likely to improve student outcomes or other *relevant outcomes*; and

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

For detailed information and guidance on the definition of “Evidence-Based,” see [USDE Non-Regulatory Guidance: Using Evidence to Strengthen Education Investments](#).

Q3: Can Title I, Part A funds be used to provide teachers with stipends to attend professional development outside of their work schedule (for example, after hours, during the summer or on weekends)?

A3: It depends. The campus/LEA must be able to show that the workshop is an integral part of the teacher’s development plan to improve in one or more of the areas described on the previous two pages. Additionally, the campus/LEA must refer to the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#) to ensure that all use of funds criteria are met.

Q4: Can Title I, Part A funds be used to provide new teachers with stipends to attend new teacher orientation which is considered outside of their contracted workdays?

A4: It depends. The campus/LEA must be able to show that the workshop is an integral part of the teacher's development plan to improve in one or more of the areas described on the previous two pages. New teacher orientations are known for providing general information about campus/LEA policies and procedures and in part do not focus on improving student academic achievement related to the State's challenging academic standards. Additionally, such orientations may not meet standard for professional development activities that are sustained (not stand-alone, 1-day, or short-term workshops), intensive, collaborative, job-embedded, data-driven, and classroom-focused. If a campus/LEA determines that it meets the professional development requirements noted in the ESSA definition for professional development, they will also need to refer to the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#) to ensure that all use of funds criteria are met.

Q5: Can Title I, Part A funds be used to pay for professional development for music and physical education teachers?

A5: Professional development is an allowable use of funds under Title I, Part A, as long as it is being provided for Title I, Part A teachers on a Title I, Part A Schoolwide program campus or teachers providing services to Title I, Part A students on a Targeted Assistance program campus, and the use of funds steps and requirements are followed as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA needs to be able to document how the activity meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. The LEA would also need to ensure it is compliant with the Supplement, Not Supplant (SNS) requirements associated with Title I, Part A. For Title I, Part A, the LEA would meet the SNS requirement by having a valid SNS methodology or Statement of Exemption.

Q6: If a Title I, Part A campus is operating a targeted assistance program and all the teachers on the campus have at least 1 Title I, Part A student in their classroom, can Title I, Part A funds be used for campus-wide Professional Development for all of them?

A6: Professional development is an allowable use of funds under Title I, Part A, as long as it is being provided for Title I, Part A teachers on a Title I, Part A Schoolwide program campus or teachers providing services to Title I, Part A students on a Targeted Assistance program campus and the use of funds steps and requirements are followed as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA needs to be able to document how the activity meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. The LEA would also need to ensure it is compliant with the Supplement, Not Supplant (SNS) requirements associated with Title I, Part A. For Title I, Part A, the LEA would meet the SNS requirement by having a valid SNS methodology or Statement of Exemption.

***Q7: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds for professional development activities for a school nurse?**

*A7: It would be difficult to justify how the use of campus Title I, Part A funds for professional development for a school nurse meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program, which

is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. However, if the LEA is able to document how the activity meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program, the LEA may choose to use Title I, Part A funds for such purpose. Professional development is an allowable use of funds under Title I, Part A, as long as it is being provided for staff on a Title I, Part A Schoolwide program campus or staff providing services to Title I, Part A students on a Targeted Assistance program campus, and the use of funds steps and requirements are followed as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).

Supplies and Materials Use of Funds

When determining Title I, Part A use of funds allowability, an LEA/campus should always reference the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#).

- Q1:** Our LEA wants to purchase a print instructional resource to send home to parents who do not have technology available. We want to use Title I, Part A funds to pay for this for the eligible campuses and will use other funds for the non-Title I funds. While this has become a district initiative due to COVID-19, it is mostly an equity issue for students and families who are unable to afford multiple devices, or any, to complete schoolwork. We are hoping to also purchase summer school materials to send home to lessen the summer slide for all students. Is this an allowable Title I, Part A use of funds?
- A1:** Elements of this question are answered in the [Federal Funding & Grants COVID 19 FAQ Document](#) (5/7/2020) published on the TEA website referenced below:

Eligible Uses of Grant Funds Section

2. Can LEAs use federal grant funds to provide hotspots for students without home Internet access or other costs associated with Learning from Home programs? Updated April 14, 2020

Many school systems around the state are working to expand wireless hotspot locations in communities where free commercial Internet services are not otherwise available. Please document all costs associated with these expenditures, in anticipation that additional funding streams may become available as Congress continues to authorize financial support for COVID-19.

In the meantime, there are many sources of funds currently available to be redeployed for these types of purposes:

ESSA, Title I, Part A served Schoolwide campuses may use their Title I, Part A funds to provide internet hot spots, technology resources, and other at home learning costs as long as it is identified in the campus comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) as a need.

Note: *As long as the LEA has the required supplement, not supplant methodology documented and implemented, there is not a supplanting issue.*

ESSA, Title IV, Part A may also be a potential federal fund source. However, Title IV has the traditional rules of supplant so it is only allowable if the LEA has not previously spent state or local funds for the same costs this year or in the prior year.

Other state or local funds may also be used for these types of activities, but keep in mind it may cause a supplant issue for the use of ESSA, Title IV, Part A funds as described above.

Please refer to the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#) as well.

Q2: Our Homeless Department has requested to purchase face coverings for teachers and students that are tutoring and/or being tutored at local homeless shelters. Would this be allowable with Title I, Part A funds?

A2: Costs associated with the purchasing of face coverings directly related to and necessary to carry out the objectives of the grant are allowable under Title I, Part A as long as the LEA meets the requirements as noted on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).

Q3: Can cap and gowns be purchased with Title I Part A funds?

A3: Costs associated with the purchasing of caps and gowns for students are allowable under Title I, Part A as long as the LEA meets the Title I, Part A Use of Funds requirements as noted on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan. The LEA should consider purchasing the caps and gowns and retaining them for future use.

Additionally, the caps and gowns could only be purchased for students attending schoolwide campuses as long as the LEA has a valid SNS Methodology or a Statement of Exemption in place. If a campus is a Targeted Assistance campus, the LEA would have to ensure that only students identified as most in need receive the Title I, Part A services. If the students attend non-Title I campuses, this would not be an allowable use of funds for those campuses.

Q4: Scenario: Schools A, B, C & D were Title I, Part A Schoolwide Campuses in 2019-2020; Schools A & B fell out of Title I eligibility in 2020-2021; Schools C & D remain Title I, Part A Schoolwide Campuses in 2020-2021

Question: If electronic devices were purchased with Title I, Part A funds for students in Schools A, B C & D in 2019-2020 and were issued to students, does the LEA have to take the devices from students in Schools A & B for 2020-2021 and transfer the devices for use in Schools C & D in 2020-2021?

A4: There are 2 options your LEA has to ensure compliance with EDGAR.

Option 1: The LEA would determine if there is a need for the devices at any Title I, Part A campuses. If yes, the devices would need to be transferred to the Title I, Part A campuses where there is a need. If no, the LEA would need to document that such a need doesn't exist, why a need doesn't exist and how the LEA made that determination, and then proceed to determine if there is a need for the devices in any other Federal Program. If yes, the devices would need to be transferred to the other Federal Program where there is a need. If no, the LEA would need to document that such a need doesn't exist, why a need doesn't exist and how the LEA made that determination.

If the LEA determines and documents that a need doesn't exist for the devices in any Title I, Part A campus nor in any other Federal Program, then the devices can remain on the non-Title I, Part A campuses. Maintain documentation locally in the case of an audit.

Option 2: The LEA can purchase them at the depreciated rate with local/state funds and the funds from the purchase would go back into the Title I, Part A Program. This would need to be documented locally in the case of an audit.

- Q5: I have a question regarding the possibility of leasing computers with Title I, Part A funds. Could you tell me where I might find guidance on this and if it is an allowable use of funds?**
- A5: Costs associated with the purchasing or leasing of computers are allowable under Title I, Part A as long as the LEA meets the requirements noted on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).
- As per the [Budgeting Costs Guidance Handbook](#), rentals and leases for equipment, including the rental or lease of computers are considered Professional and Contracted Services (6200) costs that do not require specific approval.
- Q6: I received a request to purchase an instructional software program for special education students only that are at a Title I, Part A campus. Is this allowable?**
- A6: Costs associated with software programs used to support students are allowable under Title I, Part A as long as the LEA meets the requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan.
- If all the students will be attending Title I, Part A schoolwide campuses, it shouldn't be an issue. On a targeted assistance campus, services should only be provided to students identified as most in need to receive the Title I, Part A services.
- Q7: A Title I, Part A schoolwide campus would like to install a Smart TV to enhance the music and art program. Is this allowable if they include it in the CIP?**
- A7: The LEA would need to ensure that they are following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA would specifically need to be able to document how this use of funds is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. Additionally, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and included in the campus improvement plan.
- Q8: Is it allowable under Title I, Part A to purchase face coverings, gloves, hand sanitizer, zip-lock bags, and other health and safety-related items for students to use?**
- A8: Costs associated with the purchasing of face coverings, gloves, hand sanitizer, zip-lock bags, and other health and safety-related items directly related to and necessary to carry out the objectives of the grant are allowable under Title I, Part A, as long as the LEA meets the requirements noted on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).
- Although these items could possibly be an allowable expense, as described above, there might be better options: such as using Title IV, Part A funds or school safety funds.

Q9: Can we purchase face coverings for homeless students? Is there an exception to use the Title I, Part A set-aside funds for the homeless?

A9: The LEA can use the Title I, Part A funds reserved at the LEA level for services to Homeless students to purchase face coverings for homeless students as long as the need is identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and all other steps and requirements are followed as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).

Q10: Is it allowable to spend 2019-2020 Title 1 funds on computer software/programs/licenses to be used for this upcoming school year (2020-2021)?

A10: Since the end date of the 2019-2020 ESSA Federal Consolidated Grant was extended to September 30, 2021, costs associated with software programs/licenses used to support students in 2020-2021 from 2019-2020 Title I, Part A funds are allowable under Title I, Part A as long as the LEA meets the requirements noted on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The use of funds would need to have been identified as a need in the 2020-2021 comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the 2020-2021 campus improvement plan.

If all the students will be attending Title I, Part A schoolwide campuses, it shouldn't be an issue. On a targeted assistance campus, services should only be provided to students identified as most in need to receive the Title I, Part A services.

Additional information related to the extension of the 2019-2020 ESSA Federal Consolidated Grant can be found in the [News Bulletin sent out on June 26, 2020](#).

Q11: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to purchase laptops that will be utilized to provide tutoring and instructional services for homeless students?

A11: It is an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds reserved at the LEA level for Services to Homeless Students to purchase laptops that will be utilized to provide tutoring and instructional services for homeless students. As with any use of Title I, Part A funds, the LEA would need to follow the steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).

Q12: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to purchase teacher desktop computers?

A12: Desktop computers for teacher use (instruction) at a schoolwide campus is an allowable use of Title I, Part A funds, as long as the LEA follows the steps and requirements as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA needs to be able to document how the activity meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. The use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan.

Q13: A campus would like to purchase mounted projectors for the family engagement spaces used on the campus. The campus would provide monthly parent and family engagement (PFE) events and provide weekly before and after school events. Can the campus use the Title I, Part A LEA PFE reserved funds to purchase the projectors?

A13: The LEA would need to ensure that they are following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA would specifically need to be able to document how this use of funds is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. Additionally, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and included in the campus improvement plan.

The LEA would also need to ensure that they are following the requirements for PFE reserved funds which are noted in ESSA Section 1116(a)(3)(D)(i-v) referenced below.

Funds reserved to carry out parent and family engagement activities shall be used to carry out activities and strategies that are consistent with the LEA's parent and family engagement policy, including at least one of the following:

- Supporting schools and nonprofit organizations in providing professional development for LEA and school personnel regarding parent and family engagement strategies, which may be provided jointly to teachers, principals, other school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, early childhood educators, parents, and family members.
- Supporting programs that reach parents and family members at home, in the community, and at school.
- Disseminating information on best practices focused on parent and family engagement, especially best practices for increasing the engagement of economically disadvantaged parents and family members.
- Collaborating, or providing subgrants to schools to enable such schools to collaborate, with community-based or other organizations or employers with a record of success in improving and increasing parent and family engagement.
- Engaging in any other activities and strategies that the LEA determines are appropriate and consistent with the LEA's parent and family engagement policy.

Q14: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to purchase CPR mannequins to train students?

A14: The LEA would need to ensure that they are following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA would specifically need to be able to document how this use of funds is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. Additionally, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and included in the campus improvement plan.

Q15: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to purchase security cameras for Title I, Part A Schoolwide campuses?

A15: It would be difficult to justify/document that purchasing security cameras would meet the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. However, if the LEA can justify and document such an expense, they would need to follow the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). Additionally, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and included in the campus improvement plan.

Q16: One of our Title I, Part A Schoolwide campuses is planning a parent engagement event whose purpose is to provide parents with community resources and communicate next school year’s district and school initiatives. The parent coordinator at the school would like to be able to provide parents with a canvas tote bag with the campus logo and fill it with pamphlets from local community resources, snacks, and a water bottle with the campus logo. Are these costs allowable use of Title I, Part A funds?

A16: The guidance noted in the most recent version of the [TEA Budgeting Costs Guidance Handbook](#) states the following as it relates to the items referenced.

Page 15 “Supplies and Materials (6300)”

Grant funds **may not** be used for the following:

- Supplies and materials, including electronic devices, for personal use. Must be used only for grant-related activities.
- Costs associated with awards banquets, ceremonies, celebrations, and social events
- Cell phones for personal use
- Gifts or items that could be construed as a gift
- Souvenirs, memorabilia, or promotional items (such as T-shirts, caps, tote bags, key chains, or imprinted pens)

NOTE: Refer to the “Other Specific Items of Cost” section of this handbook for information on incentives to participate and awards for recognition.

Thus, it would be an unallowable use of Title I, Part A funds to purchase the promotional items referenced.

Q17: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to purchase school supplies for students identified as socioeconomically disadvantaged?

A17: Costs associated with the purchasing of school supplies used to support students attending Title I, Part A schoolwide campuses are allowable under Title I, Part A as long as the LEA meets the Title I, Part A Use of Funds requirements as noted on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). On a targeted assistance campus, services should only be provided to students identified as most in need to receive the Title I, Part A services. The use of funds would need to have been identified as a need in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan.

Q18: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to purchase clothing items such as school uniforms, shoes, socks, and basic hygiene items for students experiencing homelessness?

A18: Costs associated with the purchasing of clothing items such as school uniforms, shoes, socks, and basic hygiene items for students experiencing homelessness are allowable under Title I, Part A regardless of whether a campus is Title I, Part A served. The LEA can utilize the funds reserved at the LEA level for services to homeless students. The homeless set-aside may be used to provide services to homeless students in Title I schools that are not ordinarily provided to other Title I students. The [USDE Education for Homeless Children and Youths Program Non-Regulatory Guidance](#) states the following (Pages 40-41 Question M-4):

“Title I, Part A funds may be used to provide a wide variety of services to homeless students. In addition to providing services to assist homeless students in meeting the State’s challenging academic standards, Title I, Part A funds may be used to provide services to homeless children and youths, including those in Title I schools, that may not ordinarily be provided to other Title I students. (ESEA section 1113(c)(3)(C)(ii)). For example, to help homeless students effectively take advantage of educational opportunities, an LEA may use Title I, Part A funds to provide, where appropriate, items or services including, but not limited to—

- Items of clothing, particularly if necessary to meet a school’s dress or uniform requirement;
- Clothing and shoes necessary to participate in physical education classes;
- Student fees that are necessary to participate in the general education program;
- Personal school supplies such as backpacks and notebooks;
- Birth certificates necessary to enroll in school;
- Immunizations;
- Food;
- Medical and dental services;
- Eyeglasses and hearing aids;
- Counseling services to address anxiety related to homelessness that is impeding learning;
- Outreach services to students living in shelters, motels, and other temporary residences;
- Extended learning time (before and after school, Saturday classes, summer school) to compensate for lack of quiet time for homework in shelters or other overcrowded living conditions;
- Tutoring services, especially in shelters or other locations where homeless students live;
- Parental involvement specifically oriented to reaching out to parents of homeless students;
- Fees for AP and IB testing;
- Fees for college entrance exams such as SAT or ACT; and
- GED testing for school-age students.

Two principles govern the use of Title I, Part A funds to provide such services to homeless students. First, the services must be reasonable and necessary to assist homeless students to take advantage of educational opportunities. (ESEA section 1113(c)(3)(A); 2 CFR § 200.403(a)). Second, Title I, Part A funds must be used only as a last resort when funds or services are not available from other public or private sources, such as the USDA’s National School Lunch Program and

Breakfast Program, public health clinics, or local discretionary funds (sometimes provided by the PTA) used to provide similar services for economically disadvantaged students generally. (See ESEA section 1115(e)(2)).”

Q19: May Title I, Part A funds be used to purchase band instruments with approximately half of the LEA’s Title I, Part A allocation?

A19: The LEA would need to ensure that they are following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA would specifically need to be able to document how this use of funds is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. As noted in the Title I, Part A Use of Funds document, the amount should also be reasonable. It could be difficult to justify that using half of the LEA’s Title I, Part A allocation for band instruments is reasonable and necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program. The LEA would also need to consider the rank and serve requirements related to campus allocations to ensure that the funds used to purchase the instruments are from a campus allocation. However, if the LEA can document and provide a rationale that justifies the use of funds, it may use Title I, Part A funds. In the case of an audit, the LEA would need to have auditable documentation justifying the use of funds. Additionally, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and included in the campus improvement plan.

Q20: May Title I, Part A funds be used to purchase furniture (i.e., shelves for a library, locked cabinets for chemical storage in a science lab)?

A20: The LEA would need to ensure that they are following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). The LEA would specifically need to be able to document how this use of funds is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. Additionally, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and included in the campus improvement plan (CIP).

When a campus writes a CIP, they usually tie their activities to strategies and goals. If they can tie the purchase of furniture to an activity, strategy, and goal, then they could evaluate the effectiveness of how the use of funds was in meeting the goal identified. They could also use this rationale as part of their documentation related to how the use of funds is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program.

On another note, when it comes to furniture, the [Budgeting Costs Guidance Handbook](#) does mention that it is possible that furniture could be capitalized depending on the cost of the furniture and local policies/procedures for capital outlay. In that case, “all capital outlay requires specific approval from TEA.”

Q21: Is it allowable use of Title I, Part A funds for a schoolwide campus to purchase two-way communication radios?

A21: It would be difficult to justify/document that purchasing two-way communication radios would meet the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. However, if the LEA can justify and document such an expense, they would need to follow the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#). Additionally, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and included in the campus improvement plan.

Q22: Is it allowable use of Title I, Part A funds for a schoolwide campus to purchase furniture?

A22: The LEA would need to ensure that they are following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#). The LEA would specifically need to be able to document how this use of funds is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. Additionally, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and included in the campus improvement plan (CIP).

When a campus writes a CIP, it usually ties its activities to strategies and goals. If the campus can tie the purchase of furniture to an activity, strategy, and goal, then it could evaluate the effectiveness of how the use of funds contributed to meeting the goal identified. The campus could also use this rationale as part of its documentation related to how the use of funds is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program.

On another note, when it comes to furniture, the [Budgeting Costs Guidance Handbook](#) does mention that it is possible that furniture could be capitalized depending on the cost of the furniture and local policies/procedures for capital outlay. In that case, “all capital outlay requires specific approval from TEA.”

Q23: Is it allowable use of Title I, Part A funds for a schoolwide campus to purchase furniture and/or supplies for an Art class?

A23: The LEA would need to ensure that it is following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#). The LEA would specifically need to be able to document how this use of funds is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. Additionally, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and included in the campus improvement plan (CIP).

When a campus writes a CIP, it usually ties its activities to strategies and goals. If the campus can tie the purchase of furniture to an activity, strategy, and goal, then it could evaluate the effectiveness of how the use of funds contributed to meeting the goal identified. The campus

could also use this rationale as part of its documentation related to how the use of funds is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program.

On another note, when it comes to furniture, the [Budgeting Costs Guidance Handbook](#) does mention that it is possible that furniture could be capitalized depending on the cost of the furniture and local policies/procedures for capital outlay. In that case, “all capital outlay requires specific approval from TEA.”

Keep in mind that on a schoolwide program campus, the LEA may use funds to upgrade the entire educational program of a school that meets Title I, Part A eligibility criteria. Thus, there is no distinction to be made as it relates to using funds for elective and/or core content courses.

Q24: Is it allowable use of Title I, Part A funds for a schoolwide campus to purchase drawstring bags for a campus parent and family engagement activity?

A24: The LEA should be cautious with the use of funds being requested under the Title I, Part A program because it may be considered to be a promotional item and as per the guidance below, promotional items are an unallowable use of funds.

The guidance noted in the most recent version of the [TEA Budgeting Costs Guidance Handbook](#) states the following as it relates to the items referenced.

Page 15 “Supplies and Materials (6300)”

Grant funds may not be used for the following:

- Supplies and materials, including electronic devices, for personal use. Must be used only for grant-related activities.
- Costs associated with awards banquets, ceremonies, celebrations, and social events
- Cell phones for personal use
- Gifts or items that could be construed as a gift
- Souvenirs, memorabilia, or promotional items (such as T-shirts, caps, tote bags, key chains, or imprinted pens)

NOTE: Refer to the “Other Specific Items of Cost” section of the TEA Budgeting Costs Guidance Handbook for information on incentives to participate and awards for recognition.

However, if the LEA can document and maintain such documentation locally justifying that the purchase is not a promotional item and that it would meet the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program, then the LEA can proceed with using Title I, Part A funds for the drawstring bags. Such documentation would need to be readily available and provided to an auditor for consideration in the case of an audit. The need for this particular use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and noted in the campus improvement plan. As with any other Title I, Part A use of funds, the LEA would need to follow the steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#).

Q25: Is it allowable use of Title I, Part A funds to purchase hygiene items for students who are not experiencing homelessness?

A25: It would be difficult for an LEA/campus to justify and document that the purchase of hygiene items for students who are not experiencing homelessness with Title I, Part A funds would be a reasonable and necessary expense to meet the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program. The LEA/campus could reach out to other public or private sources in the community used to provide such items for economically disadvantaged students.

If the LEA/campus is able to justify such a purchase with Title I, Part A funds as being reasonable and necessary to meet the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program, it would need to maintain documentation locally to that effect in the case of an audit. Such documentation would also need to include documentation that other public or private sources in the community were not available to provide such items.

Q26: Can Title I, Part A funds be used to purchase flexible seating options for students?

A26: The intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. If the LEA can justify and document that the use of funds on a schoolwide campus meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program and such use is based on the needs identified in the most current comprehensive needs assessment and documented in the most current campus improvement plan, the use of Title I, Part A funds for the purchase of flexible seating options for students would be allowable as long as the other steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A use of funds](#) reference document have been met.

Q27: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to pay for medication needed to meet the academic needs of a student experiencing homelessness?

A27: Use of Title I, Part A LEA-reserved funds for homeless children and youth could be justified for medical and dental services for homeless students if the following two principles are met in addition to the items listed on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds Reference Document](#). As per the [USDE Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program Non-Regulatory Guidance](#), two principles govern the use of Title I, Part A funds to provide such services to homeless students. First, the services must be reasonable and necessary to assist homeless students to take advantage of educational opportunities. (ESEA section 1113(c)(3)(A); 2 CFR § 200.403(a)). Second, Title I, Part A funds must be used only as a last resort when funds or services are not available from other public or private sources, such as the USDA's National School Lunch Program and Breakfast Program, public health clinics, or local discretionary funds (sometimes provided by the PTA) used to provide similar services for economically disadvantaged students generally. Best practice is to maintain documentation locally for reaching out to at least 3 entities for services.

Q28: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to purchase clear backpacks for all students on Title I, Part A campuses in an LEA?

A28: It would be difficult to justify that this type of expense for all students on Title I, Part A campuses in your LEA would be reasonable and necessary to meet the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. However, if the LEA feels that it can justify that this type of expense meets the intent and purpose and is reasonable and necessary, the LEA should follow the steps and requirements noted in the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds Reference Document](#) and keep the documentation to that effect. In the case of an audit, the auditor would make the final determination of allowability.

Use of Title I, Part A LEA-reserved funds for homeless children and youth could be justified for purchasing the clear backpacks for homeless students if the following two principles are met in addition to the items listed on the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds Reference Document](#). As per the [USDE Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program Non-Regulatory Guidance](#), two principles govern the use of Title I, Part A funds to provide such services to homeless students. First, the services must be reasonable and necessary to assist homeless students to take advantage of educational opportunities. (ESEA section 1113(c)(3)(A); 2 CFR § 200.403(a)). Second, Title I, Part A funds must be used only as a last resort when funds or services are not available from other public or private sources, such as the USDA's National School Lunch Program and Breakfast Program, public health clinics, or local discretionary funds (sometimes provided by the PTA) used to provide similar services for economically disadvantaged students generally.

***Q29: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to purchase t-shirts that the “watchdog” volunteers can wear while they are on campus?**

*A29: It would be difficult to justify how the use of campus Title I, Part A funds to pay for t-shirts that the “watchdog” volunteers can wear while they are on campus meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. If the LEA chooses to use Title I, Part A funds for that purpose, it would be up to the LEA to document how the activity meets the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program, and ensure that the use of funds steps and requirements are followed as per the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds document](#). In the case of an audit, the auditor would make the determination of allowability.

***Q30: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to purchase flexible learning seating/tables?**

*A30: The LEA would need to ensure that it is following the steps and requirements for Title I, Part A use of funds according to the [Title I, Part A Use of Funds reference document](#). The LEA would specifically need to be able to document how this use of funds is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A, which is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. Additionally, the use of funds would need to have been identified in the comprehensive needs assessment and included in the campus improvement plan (CIP).

When a campus writes a CIP, it usually ties its activities to strategies and goals. If the campus can tie the purchase of furniture to an activity, strategy, and goal, then it could evaluate how effective the use of funds was in meeting the goal identified. The campus could also use this rationale as part of its documentation for how the use of funds is necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of the Title I, Part A program.

On another note, when it comes to furniture, the [Budgeting Costs Guidance Handbook](#) does mention that it is possible that furniture could be capitalized depending on the cost of the furniture and local policies/procedures for capital outlay. In that case, “all capital outlay requires specific approval from TEA.

***Q31: Is it allowable to use Title I, Part A funds to provide clothing to migrant students who attend Title I, Part A schoolwide program campuses?**

*A31: As described in more detail below, except under very limited circumstances, an LEA may not use Title I, Part A funds to purchase clothing for migrant students.

Section 1113(c)(3)(C)(ii) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) authorizes an LEA to use Title I, Part A funds to provide services, such as purchasing clothing, for homeless children and youth that are not ordinarily provided to other Title I, Part A students. This authority only applies to homeless children and youth and, therefore, does not apply to other groups of Title I, Part A students, such as migrant students served by Title I, Part A.

Under very limited circumstances, an LEA may use Title I, Part A funds to purchase clothing for Title I students on an individual student basis. More specifically, under ESEA section 1115(e)(2)(B), an LEA may use Title I, Part A to provide comprehensive services for a Title I student “as a last resort” if “funds are not reasonably available from other public or private sources.” Such services might include the purchase of clothing if such clothing is necessary to enable the student to participate in school. Please note that an LEA would have to evaluate such need on a case-by-case basis irrespective of a student being part of a particular subgroup (e.g., migrant students). In other words, a student may not be provided clothing just by virtue of being a member of the migrant student subgroup; there must be a student-specific need. Moreover, the cost of the clothing must be reasonable for its purpose, and the LEA must have exhausted other sources of funds or services, such as community clothing banks. We note that, while this authority is specific to targeted assistance programs, the same principles would also apply similarly to a schoolwide program if otherwise consistent with the school’s needs assessment and comprehensive schoolwide plan.

We note that documentation of the LEA’s efforts to investigate other available resources is important for ensuring compliance with the statute. It also serves as evidence of compliance in case of State or Federal monitoring or audit.