

Under the Congressional Review Act, Congress has passed, and the President has signed, a resolution of disapproval of the accountability and State plans final regulations that were published on November 29, 2016 (81 FR 86076). Because the resolution of disapproval invalidates the accountability and State plan final regulations, the portions of this guidance document that rely on those regulations are no longer applicable. The remainder of this document, however, is unaffected by the resolution of disapproval.



Non-Regulatory Guidance for Title II, Part A:
**Building Systems of Support for Excellent
Teaching and Leading**

U.S. Department of Education Non-Regulatory Guidance
Title II, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965,
as Amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015
September 27, 2016

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Purpose of this Guidance	2
Part 1: Support for Educators	3
Multiple Pathways to Teaching and Leading	4
Teacher, Principal, or Other School Leader Preparation Academies	4
Teacher and School Leader Residencies	7
Alternative Routes	8
Preparation Standards and Approval, Certification, Licensure, and Tenure	8
Induction and Mentorship	9
Novice Teacher and Principal Induction and Mentorship	9
Meaningful Evaluation and Support	10
Principles for Strong Educator Evaluation and Support Systems	10
Strong Teacher Leadership	12
Leveraging Teacher Expertise and Leadership	12
Transformative School Leadership	14
Ongoing Professional Learning for Principals and Other School Leaders	14
State-level Activities and Optional Additional Funding	15
Principal Supervisors	16
Supporting a Diverse Educator Workforce Across the Career Continuum	17
Part 2: Educator Equity	18
Equitable Access to Excellent Educators	18
Attracting and Retaining Excellent Educators in High-Need Schools	21
Supporting Early Learning Educators: Ensuring All of Our Youngest Learners Start Strong	24
Part 3: Strengthening Title II, Part A Investments	25
Understanding the Use of Title II, Part A Funding	26
Consultation to Strengthen Title II, Part A Investments	26
A Cyclical Framework for Maximizing Title II, Part A Investments	29
Appendix A: Guidance on the Definition of “Evidence-Based”	35
Appendix B: Title II, Part A Statutory Language	35

The U.S. Department of Education does not mandate or prescribe practices, models, or other activities in this non-regulatory guidance document. This guidance contains examples of, adaptations of, and links to resources created and maintained by other public and private organizations. This information, informed by research and gathered in part from practitioners, is provided for the reader's convenience and is included here to offer examples of the many resources that educators, parents, advocates, administrators, and other concerned parties may find helpful and use at their discretion. The U.S. Department of Education does not control or guarantee the accuracy, relevance, timeliness, or completeness of this outside information. Further, the inclusion of links to items and examples do not reflect their importance, nor are they intended to represent or be an endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any views expressed, or materials provided.

State Educational Agencies (SEAs) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) must comply with Federal civil rights laws that prohibit discrimination based on race, color, national origin, sex, disability, and age. These laws include Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Equal Educational Opportunities Act (EEOA), Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Age Discrimination Act of 1975. Further, Section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. §1228a(a)) requires each SEA to include in its application for Title II, Part A funds a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally-assisted program for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs. In addition, LEAs must include this description in their applications to the SEA for Title II, Part A funds. This provision allows applicants discretion in developing the required description. The statute highlights six types of barriers that can impede equitable access or participation: gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. Based on local circumstances, SEAs and LEAs should determine whether these or other barriers may prevent their students, teachers, etc. from such access or participation in, the Federally-funded project or activity.

Introduction

Great teachers, principals, and other school leaders (collectively, educators) matter enormously to the learning and the lives of children.¹ Yet, we have struggled as a nation to meaningfully support educators so they can help their students be prepared to succeed in college and careers. The Title II, Part A program is designed, among other things, to provide students from low-income families and minority students with greater access to effective educators. It is critical that State educational agencies (SEAs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) consider how to best use Title II, Part A funds, among other funding sources, to ensure equity of educational opportunity. New provisions in Title II, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), offer new opportunities SEAs and LEAs to more effectively attract, select, place, support, and retain excellent educators; revisit traditional uses of these funds; and consider new and additional uses of Title II, Part A funds that are innovative and evidence-based.

Strategies outlined in this document, and examples of this work in action, can often be supported by other sources of funding as well, and should not be thought of as tools, policies or programs only made possible through the use of Title II, Part A funds. States and districts are encouraged to explore sources of funding available at the State and local level, as well as other formula and competitive grant awards from the U.S. Department of Education and other sources. This initial Title II, Part A guidance is not exhaustive; rather it highlights some of the new and important ways SEAs and LEAs can use their Title II, Part A funds **more strategically** and for **greater impact**. This initial guidance also reflects feedback the Department received from States, districts, and a variety of other stakeholders and educators, during listening sessions regarding high-priority areas for guidance related to these funds. Throughout this guidance, any reference to “educators” refers to teachers, principals, and other school leaders. Unless otherwise indicated, citations to the ESEA refer to the ESEA, as amended by the [ESSA](#).

Purpose of this Guidance

The U.S. Department of Education (Department) has determined that this guidance is significant guidance under the Office of Management and Budget’s Final Bulletin for Agency Good Guidance Practices, 72 Fed. Reg. 3432 (Jan. 25, 2007). See www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/memoranda/fy2007/m07-07.pdf. Significant guidance is non-binding and does not create or impose new legal requirements. The Department is issuing this guidance to provide SEAs and LEAs with information to assist them in meeting their obligations under Title II, Part A provisions. This guidance also provides members of the public with information about their rights under the law and regulations.

This guidance supersedes the Department’s previous guidance on Title II, Part A of the ESEA as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), entitled Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, issued on October 5, 2006.

If you are interested in commenting on this guidance, please email us your comment at OESEGuidanceDocument@ed.gov or write to us at the following address:

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

For further information about the Department’s guidance processes, please visit www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/significant-guidance.html.

¹ Teachers Matter: Understanding Teachers' Impact on Student Achievement. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2012. http://www.rand.org/pubs/corporate_pubs/CP693z1-2012-09.html; B. Rowan, R. Correnti, & R. J. Miller (2002). “What Large-Scale Survey Research Tells Us About Teacher Effects on Student Achievement: Insights from the Prospects Study of Elementary Schools. *Teachers College Record*, 104: 1525-1567; S.G. Rivkin, E. Hanushek, & J.F. Kain (2000). “Teachers, Schools, and Academic Achievement (Working Paper W6691).” *National Bureau of Economic Research*. Retrieved from www.cgp.upenn.edu/pdf/Hanushek_NBER.PDF

Part 1: Support for Educators



High-quality teaching and learning requires a diverse cohort of educators, including teachers, principals, and other school leaders, to be prepared and supported to meet the many challenging demands that they and their students face, particularly underserved students and students of color. The continuum of the educator profession and associated opportunities to support educators, from recruitment through career advancement, may be viewed broadly as five interrelated steps that build upon one another. There are many opportunities to use Title II, Part A funds to develop new ways to support educators at various points in this continuum, as well as augment and strengthen existing efforts to improve individual parts and the overall system of supports. While not exhaustive, this section highlights important opportunities to support educators, while acknowledging that Title II, Part A funds alone likely are not enough to fully address and support the entire educator career continuum. Additional information that is helpful in understanding how Title II, Part A investments can be strengthened is included in Part 3 of this guidance.

Multiple Pathways to Teaching and Leading



Most LEAs obtain the majority of their new teachers from traditional preparation programs at IHEs; in many States, some LEAs also are able to obtain new teachers through alternative sources. When considering its support of various pathways into teaching and school leadership, an SEA and LEA should first understand how well these differing sources meet educators' and students' needs. Title II, Part A funds may be used to support both traditional and non-traditional pathways through the development of new teacher, principal, or other school leader preparation academies, teacher and principal residencies and other alternative routes. Additionally, Title II, Part A funds may be used to support the effective recruitment, selection, and hiring of the most promising educators; additional information on this topic is included in Part 3 of this guidance.

Teacher, Principal, or Other School Leader Preparation Academies

Under ESEA section 2101(c)(4)(B)(xii), from the amount the SEA reserves for State-level activities (without consideration of additional funds that would otherwise be provided in LEA subgrants, and that it may use under section 2101(c)(3) for principal and other school leader activities), an SEA may use *up to 2 percent of the State's total Title II, Part A State allocation*) to establish or expand teacher, principal, or other school leader preparation academies to prepare teachers, principals, and other school leaders to serve in high-need schools. Under ESEA section 2101(c)(3), an SEA may also reserve *up to an additional 3 percent of the total amount available for LEA subgrants* to support activities for principals or other school leaders. Therefore, an SEA may reserve a maximum of 4.85 percent of the State's Title II, Part A total State allocation to establish or expand academies that train and support principals or other school leaders. For more information, see Understanding Title II, Part A Flow of Funding Chart in Part 3 (page 26) of this Guidance document.

Academies allow SEAs to create outcomes-based training programs for educators, including early educators, which are based on innovative best practices and rigorous case-studies, and are directly responsive to needs SEAs identify among their LEAs. Under ESEA section 2002(4), an academy may be established by a public or other nonprofit entity, including an IHE or an organization affiliated with an IHE. To use Title II, Part A State activities funds to establish or expand an academy, the Governor must first designate a **State authorizer** consistent with ESEA section 2002(3) that will enter into an agreement with an academy that specifies the academy's expected goals.

Recommended Strategies

Some strategies to consider when designating a **State authorizer** include:

- Developing and participating in a community of practice among State education leaders, to support the creation of principles and standards for effective academy authorization, which should be informed by best practices regarding the preparation of effective educators.
- Adopting a publicly transparent performance framework for how the state will evaluate and hold accountable the authorizer, considering such things as the rigor of its ongoing monitoring and oversight process; the extent to which the authorizer holds academies accountable for performance; and how performance data of academies is shared with the public.
- Identifying and articulating “essential practices” for the authorizer to use, such as external expert panels, initial term lengths, renewal criteria, annual reporting, etc.
- Establishing outcome-oriented performance metrics to facilitate oversight by the authorizer and provide common expectations and standards for academies. This may include developing rigorous qualifications for teacher and/or principal candidates to successfully complete the program, such as demonstration of cultural competency, classroom management skills, subject area and content-specific knowledge, and the ability to use standards-based, data-driven and differentiated instruction.

While these State authorizers would be new, States can look to other types of authorizers, such as charter school authorizers, for best practices. Though not a perfect analogue to the role the state authorizer will play with these academies, some resources to consider include: The National Alliance of Charter School Authorizer's (NACSA) [Principles and Standards](#), and NACSA's [12 Essential Practices](#). The Council for Higher Education Accreditation also has [resources](#) that may be worth considering.

Then, the SEA may use Title II, Part A funds to support a teacher, principal, or other school leader academy that, consistent with the requirements of ESSA:

- (1) Enters into an agreement with the State authorizer that includes:
 - (a) A requirement that prospective candidates receive a significant part of their training through clinical preparation that includes partnerships with effective educators, as determined by the State, with a demonstrated record of increasing student academic achievement, while also receiving concurrent instruction from the academy in the content area in which the candidates will become certified or licensed that links to the clinical preparation experience;
 - (b) Data on the number of educators who will demonstrate success in increasing student academic achievement that the academy will prepare;
 - (c) A requirement that the academy will award a certificate of completion to a teacher only after the teacher demonstrates that the teacher is an effective teacher, as determined by the State, with a demonstrated record of increasing student academic achievement either as a student-teacher or teacher of record on an alternative certificate, license or credential;

- (d) A requirement that the academy will award a certificate of completion to a principal or other school leader only after the principal or other school leader demonstrates a record of success in improving student performance; and
 - (e) Timelines for producing cohorts of graduates and conferring certificates of completion. (ESEA section 2002(4)(A)).
- (2) Does not unnecessarily restrict the methods the academy will use to train prospective candidates, including restrictions on:
- (a) Specific faculty credentials or responsibilities;
 - (b) The academy's physical infrastructure;
 - (c) Required course credits;
 - (d) The undergraduate coursework of teachers; and
 - (e) The academy's accreditation. (ESEA section 2002(4)(B)).
- (3) Limits admission to prospective candidates who demonstrate strong potential to improve student academic achievement, based on a rigorous selection process that reviews a candidate's prior academic achievement or record of professional accomplishment. (ESEA section 2002(4)(C)).
- (4) Ensures that successful completion results in a certificate of completion or degree that may be recognized by the State as at least the equivalent of a master's degree in education for the purposes of hiring, retention, compensation, and promotion after a State's review of the academy's results in producing effective candidates. (ESEA section 2002(4)(D)).

The State must also:

- (1) Ensure that an academy is allowable under State Law. (ESEA section 2101(c)(4)(B)(xii)(I)).
- (2) Allow candidates attending an academy to be eligible for State financial aid to the same extent as participants in other State-approved teacher or principal preparation programs, including alternative certification, licensure, or credential programs. (ESEA section 2101(c)(4)(B)(xii)(II)).
- (3) Allows candidates who are teaching or working while on alternative certificates, licenses, or credentials to teach or work in the State while enrolled in an academy. (ESEA section 2101(c)(4)(B)(xii)(III)).

Additional resources to consider when designing teacher, principal, or other school leader academies include those from Deans for Impact and The Council for Chief State School Officers: [From Chaos to Coherence: A Policy Agenda for Accessing and Using Outcomes in Educator Preparation](#), and [Our Responsibility, Our Promise: Transforming Educator Preparation and Entry into the Profession](#).

Teacher and School Leader Residencies

SEAs and LEAs may also use Title II, Part A funds to establish, improve, or support school-based residency programs for teachers and school leaders. **Teacher residency programs** must, for at least one academic year, provide prospective teachers: (a) significant teaching experience working alongside an effective teacher of record; and (b) concurrent instruction by LEA personnel or faculty of the teacher preparation program in the content area in which the teachers will become certified or licensed. In addition, the residencies must provide prospective teachers with effective teaching skills as demonstrated through completion of the residency program or other indicator as determined by the State. (ESEA section 2002(5), 2101(c)(4)(B)(xi), 2103(b)(3)(B)). **School leader residency programs** must, for at least one academic year, provide prospective principals or other school leaders: (a) sustained and rigorous clinical learning in an authentic school setting; (b) evidence-based coursework, to the extent the State determines in consultation with LEAs that evidence is reasonably available; (c) ongoing support from an effective mentor principal or school leader; (d) substantial leadership responsibilities; and (e) an opportunity to practice and be evaluated in a school setting. (ESEA sections 2002(1), 2101(c)(4)(B)(xi), 2103(b)(3)(C)). SEA residency programs may be implemented in conjunction with a State agency of higher education consistent with ESEA section 2101(c)(4)(A).

Pathways in Action: Clinical Experience in a Teacher Residency Program

*Many organizations have created effective teacher residency programs. For example, **California State University, Dominguez Hills**, has developed Lab Schools that their Urban Teacher Residency program candidates participate in as part of their year-long clinical residency. Through a partnership with local high-need LEAs, Lab School sessions are held twice a month on Saturday and during the summer. Students from the partner high-need LEAs attend the Lab Schools, which in the past have provided science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) courses the LEAs otherwise may not have been able to offer, to receive extra academic support. Simultaneously, the residents are observed and coached by experienced mentor teachers, and sometimes school principals, to help them improve their pedagogical and classroom management skills. An external evaluation of the 2013-2014 Saturday and summer Lab Schools, reported positive outcomes for student learning, through pre- and post-tests; and teacher candidates showed high levels of satisfaction, reporting that in particular they valued, "the exposure to different teaching styles, having the opportunity to collaborate, as well as obtaining feedback from lead teachers and interacting with students."*

SEAs may consult several resources to better understand how they may use teacher and school leader residencies to address equitable access challenges when preparing teachers. One example is the Urban Teacher Residency report, highlighted in a webinar, entitled [Teacher Residency Programs Improve Access to Excellent Educators](#).

Alternative Routes

SEAs may also use their Title II, Part A State activities funds to support programs that establish, expand, or improve alternative routes to State certification for educators, especially for teachers of children with disabilities, English learners, STEM subjects, or other areas where the State experiences a shortage of educators. (ESEA section 2101(c)(4)(B)(iv)). There are several resources that SEAs may consult when considering options for designing and improving alternative pathways to certification including a policy brief issued by GTL: [Alternative Routes to Teaching: What Do We Know About Effective Policies?](#). See also the Department's [Strengthening Principal Prep Progress Blog](#) for additional resources.

Through alternative routes to State certification, LEAs may fill educator shortages, such as those for teachers of children with disabilities, English learners, or teachers of STEM subjects, by recruiting individuals who, though not trained in a traditional preparation program, have the potential to become effective teachers, principals, or other school leaders. (ESEA section 2103(b)(3)(C)). These individuals may come from widely diverse backgrounds – for example, individuals who already have Bachelor’s or advanced degrees, mid-career professionals, paraprofessionals, former military personnel, and other recent IHE graduates with records of academic distinction.

Pathways in Action: Developing Local Pipelines of Teachers

*Many LEAs have created local teacher pipeline programs. For example, Teach Tomorrow in Oakland (TTO), developed by **Oakland Unified School District**, is a program that complements candidates receiving alternative certification through higher education teacher preparation programs by creating a pathway into teaching for new educators, most of whom are recruited locally and are people of color from minority groups that are underrepresented in the teaching profession. The program has focused significant attention on removing barriers associated with becoming a teacher; TTO has developed partnerships with local community colleges to enable teacher candidates to take additional coursework necessary for certification, and offers test preparation support and funding to cover the costs of State certification exams. Using a cohort model to provide additional peer and mentor support for candidates after completion, TTO has achieved a 3-year retention rate of 79% for its teachers.*

Preparation Standards and Approval, Certification, Licensure, and Tenure

Under ESEA section 2101(c)(4)(B)(i), SEAs may use Title II, Part A funds to support reform efforts with the entities that oversee preparation standards and approval, certification, licensure, and tenure in order to ensure that:

- Teachers have the necessary subject-matter knowledge and teaching skills in the academic subjects that they teach to help students meet challenging State academic standards (as demonstrated through measures determined by the State, which may include teacher performance assessments);
- Principals or other school leaders have the instructional leadership skills to help teachers teach and to help students meet challenging State academic standards; and
- Teacher certification or licensing requirements are aligned with challenging State academic standards.

Induction and Mentorship



Novice Teacher and Principal Induction and Mentorship

SEAs and LEAs are encouraged to use Title II, Part A funds to establish and support high quality educator induction and mentorship programs that where possible are evidence-based and are designed to improve classroom instruction and

student learning and achievement and increase the retention of effective teachers, principals, or other school leaders. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(vii)(III) and 2103(b)(3)(B)(iv)). Research shows that high-quality induction and mentoring programs can increase teacher retention as well as increase student achievement. For instance, comprehensive induction programs can cut the new teacher turnover rate in half.² Additionally, students of novice teachers who experienced strong induction “in general, achieve in patterns that mirror the achievement rates of students assigned to more experienced mid-career teachers.”³ Taking into account the high cost of teacher turnover, investments in mentoring and induction programs not only benefit students and teachers, but also reduce costs for LEAs and SEAs. Title II, Part A funds may be used to support a mentoring and induction program by providing early release time for mentoring, compensation for mentors, and evidence-based professional development for novice educators and mentors.

SEAs and LEAs should consider many factors when designing and implementing educator mentorship and induction programs, including potential partners that can support these efforts, such as educator preparation programs. In particular, partnerships with educator preparation programs can provide continuity for novice teachers’ transitions into the classroom, as well as offer educator preparation programs the opportunity to align their programs with the needs of LEAs.

There are several resources that identify factors to consider in developing such programs, including the New Teacher Center report [Support from the Start: A 50-State Review of Policies on New Educator Induction and Mentoring](#), which includes recommendations such as:

- Requiring that all beginning teachers and principals receive induction support during their first two years.
- Requiring a rigorous mentor/induction coach selection process.
- Establishing criteria for how and when mentors/induction coaches are assigned to beginning educators, and determining the training they will receive to serve in this role.
- Requiring regular observation by mentors/induction coaches and opportunities for new teachers to observe classrooms.⁴

Additional resources on educator mentorship and induction include REL: Central Region’s [How Do School Districts Mentor New Teachers?](#) and GTL’s [The Excellent Educators for All Initiative: Connecting State Priorities with Practical Induction and Mentoring Strategies](#).

² A. Kaiser & F. Cross (2011). “Beginning Teacher Attrition and Mobility: Results from the First through Third Waves of the 2007-08 Beginning Teacher Longitudinal Study.” Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education: National Center for Education Statistics. <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011318.pdf>

³ A. Villar & M. Strong (2007). Is Mentoring Worth the Money? A Benefit-Cost Analysis and Five-year Rate of Return of a Comprehensive Mentoring Program for Beginning Teachers. *Educational Research Service*, (25)3: 1-17.

⁴ L. Goldrick (2016). “Support from the Start: A 50-State Review of Policies on New Educator Induction and Mentoring.” The New Teacher Center. <https://newteachercenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2016CompleteReportStatePolicies.pdf>

Induction in Action: Providing Local Context through Induction Programs

Many entities have created effective induction programs. For example, the Urban Center at Illinois State University, in partnership with Chicago Public Schools, Peoria School District, and Decatur Public Schools, has developed a summer immersion opportunity for their pre-baccalaureate teacher preparation program, Teacher+PLUS. To increase teacher candidates' investment in serving in these schools and communities upon graduation, and to support their understanding of the cultural context and needs of local students, the program made changes to the content of their coursework and began providing pre-service teacher candidates the opportunity to spend the summer months prior to their formal clinical experience living with and learning from local families and community-based organizations. These teacher candidates also gain practical experience working with students by participating in tutoring and other academic enrichment programs. An external evaluation of the Teacher+PLUS program found that the redesigned coursework and clinical experience showed a "statistically significant positive impact on teacher candidates' initial attitudes towards their intentions to teach in urban areas and their attitudes towards working within diverse urban cultural communities."

Meaningful Evaluation and Support



Principles for Strong Educator Evaluation and Support Systems

The Department encourages SEAs and LEAs to establish and continuously improve human capital management systems, including educator evaluation and support systems. Title II, Part A funds may be used by SEAs and LEAs to develop, implement, and improve rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation and support systems if these systems are based in part on evidence of student achievement, which may include student growth, and must: (1) include multiple measures of educator performance, such as high-quality classroom observations, and (2) provide clear, timely and useful feedback to educators. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(ii) and 2103(b)(3)(A)).

Well-designed and implemented educator evaluation and support systems will:

- **Continually improve instruction:** The primary goal of educator evaluation and support systems is to support instructional improvement and inform opportunities for educators to grow and improve. Evaluation and support systems should generate frequent, timely, and actionable feedback for educators. Training evaluators, including principal evaluators, in both assessing educators and providing meaningful feedback is critically important. Supplementing that feedback with additional support in the form of ongoing, job-embedded professional development opportunities is critical to ensuring that educators have access to the necessary resources and opportunities to improve their practice. SEAs, LEAs, and schools should consider what structures, capacity, and leadership will be necessary to incorporate on-going professional development opportunities for educators into their systems of evaluation and support. **ESEA section 8101(42) defines “professional development,” specifically noting that the professional development activities are sustained (not stand-alone, 1-day, or short term workshops), intensive, collaborative, job-embedded, data-driven, and classroom-focused.** Educator evaluation

and support systems should not be used as a mechanism to put teachers into binary positive or negative categories, but rather to help educators improve.

- **Meaningfully involve educators and other stakeholders:** Educator support and evaluation systems should directly connect to opportunities for educators to improve instruction. As such, educators should be involved in the development and implementation of evaluation and support systems. Educator expertise in the innovation and improvement of these systems is critical to successful implementation and may include, for example, encouraging teachers to design measures for the overall evaluation and support systems.
- **Be valid, reliable, and fair:** To be effective, educator evaluation and support systems should be technically and educationally sound, and implemented by well-trained educators and administrators. Generally SEAs and LEAs should convene technical advisory committees that include experts in assessment of student growth and other educator evaluation measures to help SEAs determine the most appropriate measures to include in their systems, as well as to suggest the types of training and resources that districts will need for successful implementation. Even with a valid, reliable, and fair system, the decision to dismiss an educator should never be made on the basis of a single test score or a lone evaluation rating.
- **Include multiple measures:** Educator evaluation and support systems supported with Title II, Part A funds must include multiple measures. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(ii) and 2103(b)(3)(A)). No single measure can provide a comprehensive assessment of an educator's contribution, and so multiple measures are necessary.
 - Observations, along with other measures of professional practice, are at the heart of most systems, and research shows that short, frequent, formative observations by multiple well-trained observers lead to a more complete and accurate picture of an educator's practice⁵. Supervisors, independent observers, peers, or a combination of individuals across these categories can conduct observations and provide feedback. Consistent with ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(ii) and 2103(b)(3)(A), Title II, Part A funds may be used to train and support observers.
 - If SEAs or LEAs choose to use Title II, Part A funds for educator evaluation and support systems, the systems must be based in part on evidence of student academic achievement. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(ii) and 2103(b)(3)(A)). One common way that SEAs and LEAs measure student academic achievement is by looking at the growth students achieved between two points in time for the students in a teacher's classroom or a principal's school. Measuring growth, instead of point-in-time achievement, allows every teacher to have the opportunity to excel, by giving credit for student learning no matter where students were at the beginning of the year. Student growth may be measured using changes in State assessment results, when available, or changes in results on other kinds of assessments. Often, evaluation systems require educators to set growth goals (sometimes called student learning objectives (SLOs)) for students and measure results using local assessments, rubric-based reviews of student work portfolios, or another method of judging student performance against the goal in a consistent manner.
 - Including additional measures, such as parent, teacher, and student perception/satisfaction surveys can also provide teachers and leaders with valuable feedback that can be used to inform their practice. The following resources may be useful to consider: [Multiple Choices: Options for Measuring Teacher Effectiveness](#) from the Rand Corporation, [Missouri Department of Education Surveys](#), and [Gathering Feedback for Teaching](#) from the Gates Foundation.

⁵ E. Taylor & J. Tyler (2012). "The Effect of Evaluation on Teacher Performance." *American Economic Review*, 102(7): 3628-51.

- **Be transparent:** The inputs, outputs, and outcomes of educator evaluation and support systems should be transparent and comprehensible. Educators should participate in the development and implementation of evaluation and other human capital plans. All teachers and school leaders should have a clear understanding of the metrics on which they are being evaluated before the data collection process begins, as well as confidence that evaluation scores will be used to support professional development that will ultimately help educators better serve their students. Educators should have access to their individual performance measures, not just their summative ratings. Resources should be readily available for educators to access in order to improve in areas they and their evaluators jointly identify as areas of need. Clear processes and procedures should also be in place for educators to dispute results they think are unfair.
- **Help ensure educational equity:** The Department shares with SEAs and LEAs the goal of ensuring that the most vulnerable students in the highest-need schools have access to excellent teachers and leaders. To realize this goal, educator evaluation and support systems should be put in place – whether funded by Title II, Part A or other sources – to identify excellent teachers and leaders as an important first step towards ensuring that all students have equal access to them. See Part 3 for more information on Educator Equity.

Some resources that may be helpful in developing, implementing, and improving evaluation and support systems include: GTL’s [State Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policies](#); [Educator Evaluation Tools](#); and [Brief: Alternative Measures of Teacher Performance](#); and TNTP’s [Teacher Evaluation 2.0](#).

Strong Teacher Leadership



Leveraging Teacher Expertise and Leadership

Sustainable teacher career paths should give teachers the opportunity to exercise increased responsibility and to grow professionally, while keeping effective teachers in the classroom. Moreover, the availability of teacher leadership opportunities positively impacts teacher recruitment and retention, job satisfaction, and student achievement.⁶

With the recommended strategies below, and all other permissible activities, Title II, Part A funds may be used to support “time banks” or flexible time for collaborative planning, curriculum writing, peer observations, and leading trainings; which may involve using substitute teachers to cover classes during the school day. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(v) and 2103(b)(3)(E)). Furthermore, funds may be used to compensate teachers for their increased leadership roles and responsibilities. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(vii)(I) and 2103(b)(3)(B)).

⁶ C. Natale, L. Gaddis, K. Bassett, & K. McKnight (2016). “Teacher Career Advancement Initiatives: Lessons Learned from Eight Case Studies.” Pearson and the National Network of State Teachers of the Year. http://www.nnstoy.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/RINVN829_Teacher-Career-Adv-Initiatives_Rpt_WEB_f.pdf

Recommended Strategies

Title II, Part A funds may be used for a full range of activities to better leverage and support teacher leadership, for example:

- Career opportunities and advancement initiatives for effective teachers that promote professional growth and emphasize multiple career paths. This includes creating hybrid roles that allow instructional coaching of colleagues while remaining in the classroom, as well as assuming other responsibilities such as collaborating with administrators to develop and implement distributive leadership models and leading decision-making groups. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(vii)(I) and 2103(b)(3)(B));
- Supporting peer-led, evidence-based¹ professional development in LEAs and schools. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(v)(I) and 2103(b)(3)(E));
- Recruiting and retaining talented and effective educators, including mentoring new educators. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(v) and 2103(b)(3)(B));
- Participating in community of learning opportunities and other professional development opportunities with diverse stakeholder groups such as parents, civil rights groups, and administrators, to positively impact student outcomes; for example, through a forum to discuss the implication of a policy or practice on a school community, or organizing a community-wide service learning project, where teachers afterwards work together to imbed conclusions of these activities into their teaching. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(vii) and 2103(b)(3)(E)).

Teacher Leadership in Action: Learning From Teacher Leaders

*Many LEAs have developed effective professional learning programs to support teacher leadership. For example, educators from the **Albuquerque Public Schools (ABQ)**, working in coalition with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) Network to Transform Teaching, are leveraging the knowledge and expertise of National Board certified teachers (NBCTs) as leaders to bridge the gap between professional learning and classroom practice. The ABQ-NBCT project is developing and deepening a shared understanding of how educator leadership provides the strongest possible educational environment for students and promotes student learning. Educational stakeholders from across the State have been involved with learning about the work of the teacher leaders and strategizing about supporting their endeavors. Stakeholders pledged significant commitments that will amplify and expand the lesson study model both within ABQ and Educational stakeholders from across the State have been involved with learning about the work of the teacher leaders and strategizing about supporting their endeavors. Stakeholders pledged significant commitments that will amplify and expand the lesson study model both within ABQ and across other school districts.*

Transformative School Leadership



Ongoing Professional Learning for Principals and Other School Leaders

Effective principals, assistant principals, and other school leaders are essential to school success, particularly in schools with large numbers of students from low-income families and minority students⁷. Strong principals attract teachers with great potential for success, support the ongoing professional learning of teachers, and retain excellent teachers.

Recommended Strategies

SEAs and LEAs may use Title II, Part A funds to support school principals, through a variety of strategies such as:

- Partner with organizations to provide leadership training and opportunities for principals and other school leaders to hone their craft and bring teams together to improve school structures. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(viii) and 2103(b)(3)(B)).
- Offer community of learning opportunities where principals and other school leaders engage with their school teams to fully develop broad curriculum models. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(viii) and 2103(b)(3)(E)).
- Develop opportunities for principals and other school leaders to collaborate, problem-solve, and share best practices. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(viii) and 2103(b)(3)(E)).

A resource on how SEAs and LEAs may produce a large and steady supply of high-performing school principals and support their effective supervision is The Wallace Foundation’s [Building Principal Pipelines: A Strategy to Strengthen Education Leadership](#). An additional resource that SEAs and LEAs may consider when selecting evidence-based interventions related to school leadership is [School Leadership Interventions under the Every Student Succeeds Act](#) from RAND Corporation. This report describes opportunities for supporting school leadership, discussing the standards of

⁷ See for example K. Leithwood (2004). “How Leadership Influences Student Learning.” The Wallace Foundation. <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/pages/executive-summary-how-leadership-influences-student-learning.aspx>

evidence, and synthesizing the research with respect to those standards.

Leadership in Action: Supporting Promising Principals

*Many LEAs have developed effective supports for individuals transitioning into school leadership roles. For example, the **Maryland Department of Education** has developed a program for Promising Principals to provide promising leaders, most of whom are assistant principals, with a year-long professional development program that includes multi-day convenings, one-on-one coaching sessions with veteran principals, and the opportunity to receive feedback as they tackle challenges they will likely face as principals. In addition, the veteran principals that participate as coaches, selected due to their track records of success, have found that they gain professional development through this experience in coaching emerging leaders.*

State-level Activities and Optional Additional Funding

Under Title II, Part A of the ESEA, SEAs have broad authority and flexibility in the use of State activities funds. SEAs may use some of these funds to improve the quality and retention of effective teachers. However, we strongly encourage each SEA to devote a significant portion of its State activities funds to improving school leadership; and in doing so consider its flexibility to reserve an additional 3 percent of Title II, Part A LEA subgrants for States activities that support principals or other school leaders. (ESEA section 2101(c)(3)).

Recommended Strategies

In addition to the examples of principal support activities identified above, SEAs have significant discretion when deciding how to use their State activities funds to support principals and school leaders. Allowable activities include:

- Reforming school leader certification, tenure systems, or preparation program standards and approval processes, so that school leaders have the instructional leadership skills to help teachers teach and students achieve (ESEA section 2101(b)(4)(B)(i));
- Developing or improving alternative pathways to school leadership positions (ESEA section 2101(b)(4)(B)(iv));
- Helping LEAs implement school leader evaluation and support systems that are based in part on evidence of student academic achievement (ESEA section 2101(b)(4)(B)(ii));
- Helping LEAs recruit and retain school leaders who are effective in improving student academic achievement through means that include differential and performance pay for principals in low-income schools and districts (ESEA sections 2101(b)(4)(B)(v) and (vii)); and
- Developing new school leader evidence-based mentoring, induction, and other professional development programs for new school leaders (ESEA section 2101(b)(4)(B)(vii) and (viii)).

Principal Supervisors

When developing strategies for supporting principals and other school leaders, SEAs and LEAs may use Title II, Part A funds to improve the effectiveness of principals, assistant principals, and other school leaders, which includes an employees or officers of an elementary or secondary school, LEA, or other entity operating a school who are “responsible for the daily instructional leadership and managerial operations in the elementary school or secondary school building.” (ESEA section 8101(44)).

Leadership in Action: Supporting Principal Supervisors

*Principal supervisors enable principals to focus on improving instruction, rather than on administration and compliance. Some LEAs, such as **Tulsa Public Schools (TPS)** and **District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)** are investing in and expanding the importance of this position and have rethought the principal supervisor’s job. TPS and DCPS give supervisors fewer schools to oversee to ensure they can provide adequate and individualized support for principals. The result is that principal supervisors are now fixtures in schools, conducting classroom walkthroughs to observe strengths and areas for growth, providing timely and meaningful feedback to principals, and helping to develop solutions to challenges. To truly support the role of the principal supervisor, LEAs must treat the position as critical and provide effective professional development for individuals filling this role. Under ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(vii) and 2103(b)(3)(B), Title II, Part A funds can be used to support those principal supervisors that actively and frequently take responsibility for helping principals with instructional leadership and the school’s managerial operations.*

By including principal supervisors who are responsible for the daily instructional leadership and managerial operations in the elementary school or secondary school building, the ESEA section 8101(44) definition of “school leader” acknowledges the importance of school leaders who are actively responsible for successful instruction and management in the school. This means that the ESEA considers those LEA staff, such as the principals’ supervisors, who actively mentor and support principals and by doing so are themselves “responsible for the school’s daily instructional leadership and managerial operations,” to also be eligible for Title II, Part A funded support. (ESEA section 8101(44)). We encourage SEAs and LEAs to extend Title II, Part A-funded services to these principal supervisors to the extent that those individuals actively and frequently take responsibility for helping principals with instructional leadership and the school’s managerial operations.

Supporting a Diverse Educator Workforce Across the Career Continuum



Research shows that diversity in schools, including representation of underrepresented minority groups among educators, can provide significant benefits to all students⁸⁹. In addition to benefits for all students, improving the

⁸⁹N. Tyler, Z. Yzquierdo, N. Lopez-Reyna, & S. Saunders Flippin (2004). "Cultural and Linguistic Diversity and the Special Education Workforce: A Critical Overview." *The Journal of Special Education*, 38(1): 22-38.

diversity of the educator workforce may be particularly beneficial for minority students¹⁰ helping to close the achievement gap. When considering how to better support educators, SEAs and LEAs should consider supporting a diverse educator workforce as a critical component of all strategies across the career continuum (for example, as framed by this Part 2). Relevant resources include the Department’s report: [The State of Racial Diversity in the Educator Workforce](#) and GTL’s blog post: [States Can Lead on Teacher Recruitment Pipelines](#).

SEAs and LEAs may use Title II, Part A funds to improve the recruitment, placement, support, and retention of culturally competent and responsive educators, especially educators from underrepresented minority groups, to meet the needs of diverse student populations.

⁹ A. Egalite, B. Kisida, & M. Winters (2015). “Representation in the Classroom: The Effect of Own-race Teachers on Student Achievement.” *Economics of Education Review*, 45: 44-52; T. Dee (2004). “Teachers, Race, and Student Achievement in a Randomized Experiment.” *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86: 195-210.

¹⁰ J. Grissom & C. Redding (2016). “Discretion and Disproportionality: Explaining the Underrepresentation of High-Achieving Students of Color in Gifted Programs,” *AERA Open*, 2: 1–25; A. M. Villegas & J. J. Irvine (2010). “Diversifying the Teaching Force: An Examination of Major Arguments.” *The Urban Review*, 42: 175–192.

Recommended Strategies

Under ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(v) and 2103(b)(3)(B), these efforts may include, but are not limited to:

- Providing financial support to educator recruitment programs within the community to improve hiring and retention of a diverse workforce;
- Offering career advancement opportunities for current staff members, such as paraprofessionals, who have worked in the community for an extended period of time, to support their efforts to gain the requisite credentials to become classroom instructors;
- Partnering with preparation providers including local community colleges, Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs), Minority Serving Institutions, and alternative route providers, to build a pipeline of diverse candidates;
- Providing ongoing professional development aimed at cultural competency and responsiveness and equity coaching, designed to improve conditions for all educators and students, including educators and students from underrepresented minority groups, diverse national origins, English language competencies, and varying genders and sexual orientations;
- Providing time and space for differentiated support for all teachers, including affinity group support;
- Supporting leadership and advancement programs aimed to improve career and retention outcomes for all educators, including educators from underrepresented minority groups; and
- Developing and implementing other innovative strategies and systemic interventions designed to better attract, place, support, and retain culturally competent and culturally responsive effective educators, especially educators from underrepresented minority groups, such as having personnel or staff-time dedicated to recruiting diverse candidates of high-quality who can best teach to the diversity of the student population.
- Although efforts to recruit a diverse workforce may not be limited on the basis of race, differentiation of supports for educators from diverse backgrounds is permissible.

Part 2:

Educator Equity

To ensure that every student has access to excellent educators, SEAs and LEAs must work together to develop, attract, and retain excellent educators in all schools, especially in high-need schools. Part of the purpose of the Title II, Part A program is to provide students from low-income families and minority students greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders. (ESEA section 2001). To realize this outcome, SEAs and LEAs are strongly encouraged to use Title II, Part A funds to improve equitable access to effective teachers. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(iii) and 2103(b)(3)(B)).

Equitable Access to Excellent Educators

The Title II, Part A program is designed, among other things, to provide students from low-income families and minority students with greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders. Under ESEA sections 1111(g)(1)(B) and 1112(b)(2), SEAs must describe how low-income and minority children are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field or inexperienced teachers and **identify and address any disparities** that exist in the rates at which these students are taught by teachers in these categories. To eliminate any such disparities, an SEA and its LEAs should develop and implement strategies that are responsive to the root causes of those disproportionate rates; Title II, Part A funds can be used -- and in certain cases may be directed -- to provide students from low-income families and minority students with greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders.

The most effective strategies are designed to support the students for whom there are the greatest rates of disproportionality in access to excellent educators, while also addressing the underlying factor or factors causing or contributing to these disproportionalities.

For example, SEAs and LEAs in which students from low-income families are taught at higher rates by inexperienced teachers may discover that this is driven by a lack of teacher retention in rural areas. Such SEAs and LEAs may consider developing “grow your own” initiatives, through which resources are devoted to recruiting local talent to counteract teacher shortages, particularly in high-need schools in rural areas, because teachers who grew up in a particular rural area are more likely to stay there over the long term¹¹. These initiatives, which exist in urban areas as well as rural areas, often involve partnering with local high schools and IHEs to promote education as a career pathway and may include experiential learning opportunities in high-need schools.

Depending on the root causes identified by an SEA or LEA for the absence of excellent educators, the SEA or LEA may also want to consider making strategic investments in data systems to ensure that decision-makers have ready access to comprehensive, timely, and high-quality data. These data would help to inform decisions and target resource allocations. In a case where the root cause analysis demonstrated that appropriate incentives were not in place to help ensure that excellent educators are attracted to and remain in high-need schools, Title II, Part A funds could be used to incentivize and reward excellent educators serving in an SEA’s or an LEA’s highest-need schools. An SEA or an LEA might further consider implementing specific initiatives designed to increase the diversity of its educator workforce. For example, they might support an initiative to increase the number of pre-college students from underrepresented minority groups who are interested in education careers, by helping them to become certified to teach, and supporting them to ultimately become effective educators that are recruited and hired. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(iii) and (v)).

SEA Tools to Ensuring Equitable Access to Effective Educators

To help ensure the purposes of Title II, Part A are met, an SEA may require an LEA to describe how it will provide students from low-income families and minority students with greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders in its local Title II, Part A application. (ESEA sections 2001 and 2102(b)).

¹¹ G. Bornfield, N. Hall, P. Hall, & J. H. Hoover (1997). “Leaving Rural Special Education: It’s a Matter of Roots.” *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 16(1), 30–37; T. Collins (1999). “Attracting and Retaining Teachers in Rural Areas.” Retrieved July 26, 2016, from World of Education, <http://library.educationworld.net/a8/a8-102.html>

As with other programs and consistent with the General Education Provisions Act, an SEA has the authority to require changes before approving an LEA's application for Title II, Part A funds if an LEA fails to address local application requirements. (ESEA section 2102(b)). The LEA application review process is among the most significant levers available to each SEA. When well-implemented, this process can help ensure that each LEA faithfully implements the ESEA's requirements. Consequently, the Department encourages each SEA to invest in robust LEA application design, review, and approval systems. In the context of Title II, Part A, this means that an SEA's LEA application review systems and processes should be sufficient to identify any LEA application that inadequately addresses how that LEA will meet the purposes of Title II, Part A, including how the LEA will ensure that students from low-income families and minority students have greater access to effective teachers, principals and other school leaders. SEAs should require an LEA to address any existing deficiencies prior to its receipt of Title II, Part A funds. SEAs should also carefully consider an LEA's local context and needs. As part of this consideration, an SEA should consider meaningful input from a variety of stakeholders, including those stakeholders that will be instrumental in deploying an LEA's strategies to eliminate existing equity gaps.

Proposed Educator Equity Requirements

To support SEAs and LEAs in providing students from low-income families and minority students greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders, on May 31, 2016, the Department published an NPRM in the *Federal Register* regarding an SEA's authority to direct an LEA to use Title II, Part A funds to promote educator equity. Under proposed § 299.18(c)(7)(i), an SEA may direct an LEA to use a portion of its Title II, Part A funds to provide low-income and minority students greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders, provided that it does so in a manner that is consistent with the allowable activities outlined in ESEA section 2103. Additionally, under proposed §299.18(c)(7)(ii), an SEA may require an LEA to describe how it will use Title II, Part A funds to address any identified equity gaps. Please note that these regulations are proposed. The comment period for the NPRM closed on August 1, 2016. The Department is in the process of finalizing the regulations and intends to provide further guidance when the regulations are final.

Equity in Action: Examples of Innovative Plans to Increase Equitable Access to Effective Educators

Missouri – Missouri is focusing on correcting its imbalance of teacher supply and demand in hard-to-staff content areas and geographic locations by developing and implementing an educator Shortage Predictor Model. This Shortage Predictor Model pinpoints where educator shortages will likely occur by region and certification area across the State, so that Missouri can target its recruitment and retention efforts in a way that helps to minimize educator shortages and, ultimately, helps to ensure that all of Missouri's students will have access to excellent educators. Additional information about Missouri's Educator Equity Plan can be accessed [here](#).

Delaware – In order to address gaps related to teacher turnover in high-need schools, Delaware is examining ways to implement differentiated compensation opportunities for educators and create career pathways, one of which is a Teacher-Leader Pilot in the 2016-2017 school year, which will provide teachers with career development opportunities without requiring them to leave the classroom. Additional information about Delaware's Educator Equity Plan can be accessed [here](#).

Additional resources on how SEAs and LEAs can help ensure students have equitable access to excellent educators include: The Education Trust - [Achieving Equitable Access to Strong Teachers: A Guide for District Leaders](#); and The Equitable Access Support Network - [Resources on Equitable Access Topics Areas](#).

Attracting and Retaining Excellent Educators in High-Need Schools

Between the 2011-12 and 2012-13 school years, 22 percent of teachers in high-poverty schools either moved to another school or left the profession, a rate that is roughly 70 percent higher than in low-poverty schools.¹² In addition to higher turnover, one study found that four times as many math and science teachers transfer from high-poverty schools to low-poverty schools than transfer from low-poverty schools to high-poverty schools.¹³ Given these statistics and the urgency of students' needs in high-poverty schools, SEAs and LEAs need bold approaches that fundamentally change the nature of the teaching job in these schools and change it in ways that are responsive to what teachers say are needed in order to attract and keep a diverse set of talented educators.

Recommended Strategies

To realize the equity goals of the ESEA, Title II, Part A funds may be used by LEAs **in high-need schools** to:

- Create incentives for effective educators to teach in high-need schools, and ongoing incentives for such educators to remain and grow in such schools. (ESEA section 2103(b)(3)(B)).
- Develop and implement initiatives to assist in recruiting, hiring, and retaining effective teachers to improve within-district equity, particularly in districts that are not implementing districtwide reforms, such as initiatives targeted to high-need schools that provide (ESEA section 2103(b)(3)(B)):
 - Expert help in screening candidates and enabling early hiring;
 - Differential and incentive pay for educators in high-need schools, which may include performance-based compensation systems;
 - Differential and incentive pay for teachers in high-need academic subject areas and specialty areas (e.g., serving English learners and children with disabilities), which may include performance-based compensation systems;
 - Educator advancement and professional growth and an emphasis on leadership opportunities, which may include hybrid teacher/leader and leadership positions, multiple career paths, pay differentiation and incentives for effective educators to receive additional certifications in high-need areas;
 - Co-teaching of classes, especially co-teaching by an experienced effective teacher and a novice teacher.

¹² 2012-13 NCES Teacher Follow-up Survey https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/tables/TFS1213_2014077_cf1n_002.asp; the percentage of “movers” and “leavers” in schools with 75 percent or more of students approved for free or reduced-price lunch was 22 percent, compared to 12.8 percent in schools with 0-34 percent of students approved for free or reduced-price lunch.

¹³ 2012-13 NCES Teacher Follow-up Survey https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/tables/TFS1213_2014077_cf1n_002.asp; the percentage of “movers” and “leavers” in schools with 75 percent or more of students approved for free or reduced-price lunch was 22 percent, compared to 12.8 percent in schools with 0-34 percent of students approved for free or reduced-price lunch.

Recommended Strategies (Continued)

- New educator induction or mentoring programs designed to improve classroom instruction and student learning and achievement and increase the retention of effective educators;
 - Many of the other strategies highlighted earlier in this document with a focus on the highest-need schools.
 - Development and provision of training for school leaders, coaches, mentors, and evaluators on how to accurately differentiate performance, provide useful feedback and use evaluation results to inform decision-making about professional development, improvement strategies and personnel decisions;
- Develop feedback mechanisms to improve working conditions, including through periodically and publicly reporting results of educator support and working conditions feedback which may leverage teacher leadership and community partners. (ESEA section 2103(b)(3)(N)).
 - Carry out in-service training for school personnel in addressing issues related to school conditions for student learning, such as safety, peer interaction, drug and alcohol abuse, and chronic absenteeism. (ESEA section 2103(b)(3)(I)(iv)).
 - Create teams of educators for teachers in high-need schools who convene regularly to learn, problem solve, and look over student work together, or provide time during the school day for educators to observe one another and reflect on new teaching and leading practices. A recent Department blog entry, [Top Atlanta Teachers Put Good Teaching on Display](#), describes one approach to innovative use of time.
 - Provide “teacher time banks” to allow effective teachers and school leaders in high-need schools to work together to identify and implement meaningful activities to support teaching and learning. For example, when implementing teacher time banks, Title II, Part A funds may be used to pay the costs of additional responsibilities for teacher leaders, use of common planning time, use of teacher-led developmental experiences for other educators based on educators’ assessment of the highest leverage activities, and other professional learning opportunities. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(v)(I) and 2103(b)(3)(E)(iv) and reasonable and necessary cost principles in 2 CFR § 200.403).
 - Improve working conditions for teachers through high-impact activities based on local needs, such as improving access to educational technology, reducing class size to a level that is evidence-based, to the extent the State determines that such evidence is reasonably available, or providing ongoing cultural proficiency training to support stronger school climate for educators and students. (ESEA sections 2103(b)(3)(B), (D) and (E)).

Supporting Early Learning Educators: Ensuring All of Our Youngest Learners Start Strong

The ESEA explicitly includes new ways SEAs and LEAs may use Title II, Part A funds to support early learning so that all children, no matter their zip code, begin kindergarten ready to succeed. Title II, Part A funds may be used to support the professional development of early educators. These funds have a wide variety of possible applications for early educators and the ESEA explicitly includes new ways SEAs and LEAs may use Title II, Part A funds to support early learning.

Recommended Strategies

Title II, Part A funds may be used by SEAs and LEAs for the following strategies:

- For the first time, allowing LEAs to support joint professional learning and planned activities designed to increase the ability of principals or other school leaders to support teachers, teacher leaders, early childhood educators, and other professionals to meet the needs of students through age eight. (ESEA section 2103(b)(3)(G)). The National Academy of Medicine's [Transforming the Workforce for Children Birth through Age 8: A Unifying Foundation](#) offers recommendations to build a workforce that is unified by the foundation of the science of child development and early learning and the shared knowledge and competencies that are needed to provide consistent, high-quality support for the development and early learning of children from birth through age eight.
- Supporting LEAs to increase the knowledge base of teachers, principals, or other school leaders regarding instruction in the early grades and developmentally appropriate strategies to measure how young children are progressing. (ESEA section 2103(b)(3)(G)). [Leading Pre-K-3 Learning Communities: Competencies for Effective Principal Practice \(Executive Summary\)](#), from the National Association of Elementary School Principals, defines new competencies, and outlines a practical approach to high-quality early childhood education that is critical to laying a strong foundation for learning for young children from age three to third grade.
- Supporting LEA training on the identification of students who are gifted and talented, and implementing instructional practices that support the education of such students, including early entrance to kindergarten. (ESEA section 2103(b)(3)(J)).
- Allowing SEAs to support opportunities for principals, other school leaders, teachers, paraprofessionals, early childhood education program directors, and other early childhood education program providers (to the extent the State defines elementary and secondary education to include preschool; explained further in the Early Learning Guidance) to participate in joint efforts to address the transition to elementary school, including issues related to school readiness. (ESEA section 2101(c)(4)(B)(xvi)).

Part 3:


Strengthening Title II, Part A Investments

The Title II, Part A program is designed to increase student achievement; improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other school leaders; increase the number of teachers, principals, and other school leaders who are effective at improving student academic achievement; and provide students from low-income families and minority students greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders. (ESEA section 2001). Title II, Part A investments should align with an SEA's or LEA's overall strategies to support effective instruction in order to improve student academic outcomes. Additional information about how these funds can be used to improve access to effective educators for students from low-income families and minority students can be found in Part 2 of this document.

Understanding the Use of Title II, Part A Funding

Generally, the amount of funds reserved for spending at the SEA and LEA levels has not changed with the reauthorization of the ESEA. However, Title II, Part A of the ESEA includes new optional SEA reservations of funds for principal and school leader support and teacher, principal, or other school leader preparation academies.

The Flow of Title II, Part A Funding



Note that Title II, Part A also reserves .5% for schools operated or funded by the Bureau of Indian Education and .5% for Outlying Areas from the total authorization of Title II, Part A appropriations, which are not displayed here.

Consultation to Strengthen Title II, Part A Investments

Consultation is a critical part of ensuring that Title II, Part A funds are used effectively and decisions about resource allocation are fully informed. SEAs and LEAs must engage in meaningful consultation with a broad range of stakeholders from diverse backgrounds (e.g., families, students, educators, private school officials, community partners), as required by ESEA sections 2101(d)(3) and 2102(b)(3).

Under Title II, Part A and Title VIII, SEAs and LEAs are **required** to:

- Meaningfully consult with teachers, principals and other school leaders, paraprofessionals (including organizations representing such individuals), specialized instructional support personnel, charter school leaders (in a State that has charter schools), parents, community partners, and other organizations or partners with relevant and demonstrated expertise in programs and activities designed to meet the statutory purpose of Title II, Part A;

- Seek advice from these stakeholders regarding how best to improve the Title II, Part A activities;
- Coordinate the activities with other related strategies, programs or activities in the State or LEA (ESEA sections 2101(d)(3) and 2102(b)(3)); and
- Provide for the equitable participation of private school teachers and other educational personnel in private schools and engage in timely and meaningful consultation with private school officials during the design and development of their Title II, Part A programs.¹⁴ (ESEA sections 8501).

Recommended Strategies

SEAs and LEAs should consider engaging in the following activities to help meet the consultation requirements described above and strengthen Title II, Part A planning and implementation:

- Conduct outreach to, and solicit input from relevant stakeholders during the design and development of plans for Title II, Part A funds ensuring that there is a diverse representation of educators from across the State or LEA, especially those who work in high-need schools and in early education.
- Be flexible when consulting with stakeholders, especially educators, by holding meetings or conferences outside the hours of the school day or by using a variety of communications tools, such as electronic surveys.
- Seek out diverse perspectives within stakeholder groups, when possible, and ensure that consultation is representative of the State or LEA as much as possible.
- Make stakeholders aware of past and current uses of Title II, Part A funds, and research or analysis of the effectiveness of those uses, if available, as well as research or analysis of proposed new uses of funds, in order to consider the best uses for schools and districts to support teacher and school leader development.
- Consider the concerns identified during consultation, and revise uses of Title II, Part A funds when appropriate.

When designing the consultation process, SEAs and LEAs should consider the Department’s guidance on [State Plans to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators](#), the Department’s [policy letter on stakeholder engagement](#), and the Reform Support Network’s [Communications and Engagement Assessment Rubric](#) which include information on consultation and stakeholder engagement.

¹⁴ New or changed requirements that affect the equitable participation of private school teachers and other educational personnel under the ESEA will be addressed in forthcoming guidance. Except as otherwise provided in that guidance, the existing non-regulatory *Title IX, Part E Uniform Provisions, Subpart 1 – Private Schools (Revised March 2009)* will remain applicable.

On May 31, 2016, the Department published a [Notice of Proposed Rulemaking \(NPRM\)](#) in the *Federal Register* that proposed specific requirements for engaging in timely and meaningful consultation when developing, revising, or amending State plans, which has implications for an SEA's plans for spending Title II, Part A funds. Proposed 34 C.F.R. §§ 299.13 and 299.15 outlines specific requirements for how an SEA must engage in timely and meaningful consultation with stakeholders.

To meet these proposed requirements, each SEA would need to:

- Provide public notice, in a format and language, to the extent practicable, that the public can access and understand in compliance with the requirements under proposed 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(b)(1)-(3), of the SEA's processes and procedures for developing and adopting its State plan;
- Conduct outreach to, and solicit input from, the required stakeholders identified in proposed 34 C.F.R. § 299.15(a) for a consolidated State plan or the specific Title II, Part A stakeholders in ESEA section 2101(d)(3)(A), in each case during the design and development of the plan, prior to submission of the plan, by making the plan available for public comment for a period of not less than 30 days, and prior to the submission of any revisions or amendments to the plan;
- Describe how the consultation and public comment were taken into account in the plan submitted for approval, including how issues and concerns were addressed and any changes made as a result of consultation and public comment; and
- Meet the requirements under section 8540 of the ESEA regarding consultation with the Governor.

Please note that these regulatory provisions are what the Department has proposed— they are not final requirements. They may change based on the Department's review of comments received during the public comment period, which closed on August 1, 2016. The Department has included the proposed regulations here so that SEAs that choose to begin the consultation process prior to the issuance of final regulations may consider following them. Since the proposed regulations are not yet in effect, SEAs are not required at this time to follow them. However, they represent sound procedures for engaging in timely and meaningful consultation, and SEAs would meet their statutory consultation obligations if they followed them. The Department intends to provide updated guidance when the regulations are final.


A Cyclical Framework for Maximizing Title II, Part A Investments

Title II, Part A interventions are more likely to result in sustained, improved outcomes for students if:

- 1) Chosen interventions align with **identified local needs**;
- 2) The **evidence base** and **the local capacity** are considered when **selecting a strategy**;
- 3) There is a robust **implementation plan**;
- 4) Adequate resources are provided so the **implementation** is well-supported;
- 5) Information is gathered regularly to **examine** the strategy and to **reflect** on and **inform** next steps.

This framework is designed to help decision-makers make more effective Title II, Part A investments and to make the use of evidence, research, and data part of the decision-making process. The remainder of this section of the guidance will explain each step in detail. Additionally, a series of questions to consider when using this framework have been included on pages 12-13 of this document.

Here's how this framework should look in practice:



1. IDENTIFY LOCAL NEEDS

SEAs and LEAs **must** engage in meaningful consultation with a broad range of stakeholders (further described on pages 26-28), as required by ESEA sections 2101(d)(3) and 2102(b)(3), and should examine relevant data to understand students' and educators' most pressing needs, including the potential root causes of those needs given local context. Interviews, focus groups, and surveys, as well as student data, school data, and educator data, may also provide insights into local needs. [The Distribution of Teachers in Delaware report](#) in Chapter 3 of the Center on Great Teachers and Leader's (GTL) Teacher Effectiveness and Equity Guide discusses the survey and interview protocols developed as part of

a collaboration between the Delaware Department of Education, the Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center, and GTL to assess teacher distribution patterns and job satisfaction in the state.

Here are a few examples of sources SEAs and LEAs might examine when identifying local needs:

Stakeholders	Student Data	School Data	Educator Data
Educators	Demographics	Resources	Effectiveness
Students	Achievement and Growth	Safety	Retention Rates
Families	Graduation Rates	Climate	Areas of Expertise and Shortages
Community			Job Satisfaction

Historically, LEAs were required to conduct a needs assessment to engage key stakeholders under section 2122(c) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. While Title II, Part A of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, does not require the same formal needs assessment (although a needs assessment is required under other sections of ESEA), such an assessment may help ensure that Title II, Part A funds are used strategically, to maximize educator effectiveness and student outcomes.



2. SELECT RELEVANT, EVIDENCE-BASED STRATEGIES

Once needs have been identified, SEAs and LEAs, along with stakeholders through consultation, need to determine the approaches most likely to be effective. By using rigorous and relevant evidence to identify appropriate evidence-based strategies and assessing the local context to identify the capacity (e.g., funding, staff, staff skills, and stakeholder support), SEAs and LEAs are more likely to implement evidence-based approaches successfully.

Best Practices and Resources for Using Evidence

In order to leverage evidence, SEAs and LEAs should consider the rigor and relevance of evidence and the local capacity to implement the evidence-based activity. Those concepts and related resources are discussed below:

- Activities supported by higher levels or rigor of evidence, specifically strong or moderate evidence as defined in ESEA section 8101(21), are more likely to improve student outcomes because there is evidence about their effectiveness. Activities supported by strong and moderate evidence should be prioritized, and if not available, promising evidence may suggest that an activity is worth exploring. For some activities, there may be no evidence and in those cases, the activities should demonstrate a rationale for how they will achieve their goals. Clarification about this “evidence-based” definition in ESEA section 8101(21) and the evidence levels is available in the Appendix.
- The relevance of the evidence – namely the *setting* (e.g., elementary school) and/or *population* (e.g., students with disabilities, English Learners) of the evidence – may predict how well an evidence-based activity will work. SEAs and LEAs should look for activities supported by promising, strong, or moderate evidence in a similar *setting* and/or *population* to the ones being served. The [What Works Clearinghouse™ \(WWC\)](#) uses rigorous standards to review evidence of effectiveness on a wide range of activities and also summarizes the *settings* and *populations*.

- In addition to the WWC, the Department’s [Regional Educational Laboratories \(RELs\)](#) and other federally-funded technical assistance centers may provide summaries of the evidence on various activities and strategies and guidance on how existing research aligns to the ESEA evidence levels discussed in the Appendix.
- Local capacity also helps predict the success of an activity, so the available funding, staff resources, staff skills, and support for activities should be considered when selecting an evidence-based activity. SEAs can work with individual and/or groups of LEAs to improve their capacity to implement evidence-based activities.

Suggested SEA Strategies for Using Evidence in Title II, Part A Activities

When using Title II, Part A funds for professional development¹⁵ and class size reduction, an SEA may require an LEA to only use Title II, Part A funds on evidence-based activities, to the extent that the State determines evidence is reasonably available. (ESEA section 2103(b)(3)(D) and (E)). Historically, SEAs and LEAs have used the majority of Title II, Part A funds to support reductions in class size and to provide professional development. While some of these efforts are evidence-based and have been effective in supporting teachers and students in certain contexts, many class size and professional development activities have resulted in negligible impacts for many students.¹⁶ An SEA may consider the following ways to implement the Title II, Part A evidence requirements, including:

- An SEA, in consultation with LEAs, may determine after reviewing available evidence that activities for class-size reduction and professional development, when designed and implemented in certain ways, have sufficient levels of evidence (i.e., those meeting promising, strong, or moderate evidence levels, as defined in ESEA section 8101(21) and clarified in the Appendix).¹⁷
- If higher levels of evidence are not available (i.e., those meeting promising, strong, or moderate evidence levels as defined in ESEA section 8101(21) and clarified in the Appendix), an SEA may require that Title II, Part A activities demonstrate a rationale (as defined in ESEA section 8101(21) and clarified in the Appendix) for how they will achieve their goals.
- If, when applying for an LEA Title II, Part A subgrant, an LEA requests to spend Title II, Part A funds on class size reduction and professional development, an SEA may require LEAs to use Title II, Part A funds for only those activities that the State determines are evidence-based, as defined in ESEA section 8101(21) and clarified in the Appendix.
- If an SEA provides a list of evidence-based strategies, an SEA must also allow LEAs to choose activities not on the list if the LEA can demonstrate that the professional development or class size reduction activity has evidence reasonably available to support using Title II, Part A funds for that strategy. (ESEA section 2103(b)(3)(D) and (E)).
- An SEA, in consultation with LEAs, should help generate and share evidence about particular interventions.

¹⁵ ESEA section 8101(42) defines “professional development,” specifically noting that the professional development activities are sustained (not stand-alone, 1-day, or short term workshops), intensive, collaborative, job-embedded, data-driven, and classroom-focused.

¹⁶ See The Center for Public Education’s research review of 19 studies on the benefits, challenges, and impact of class-size reduction programs: “Class Size and Student Achievement: Research Review.” Retrieved from <http://www.centerforpubliceducation.org/Main-Menu/Organizing-a-school/Class-size-and-student-achievement-At-a-glance/Class-size-and-student-achievement-Research-review.html>

¹⁷F. Mosteller & R. Boruch (2002). “Evidence Matters: Randomized Trials in Education Research.” Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press. http://www.brookings.edu/press/books/chapter_1/evidence_matters.pdf



3. PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION

An implementation plan, developed with input from stakeholders, while not required by statute, sets up LEAs and schools for successful implementation (see [here for a sample implementation planning and monitoring tool](#) from REL: Pacific). Implementation plans may include the following components:

- A **logic model**, which demonstrates a theory of action by visually connecting the intervention to expected outcomes that are stated as well-defined and measurable goals, clarifies how the intervention will work (some resources that may be of use are [the Department's definition of logic models](#), and a [description of logic models](#) and [sample logic model creation software](#) from REL: Pacific);
- **Well-defined, measurable goals;**
- **Clearly outlined roles** and responsibilities for people involved, including the person or people responsible for the intervention's success, those with a deep understanding of the intervention, and those working to implement the intervention on the ground;
- Implementation **timelines** for successful execution;
- Identified **resources** required to support the intervention; and
- Strategies to **monitor performance** and **ensure continuous improvement**, including plans for data collection, analysis and/or an evaluation.



4. IMPLEMENT

Effective implementation of the LEA's selected Title II, Part A intervention is essential to reaching its goals. Inevitably, there will be unexpected hurdles during implementation, so having an ongoing mechanism outlined during the planning stage to identify and address issues as they arise is crucial. Resources related to implementation include GTL's [Identifying Implementation Support](#) and [Implementation Playbook Resources](#). Also see the next section titled Examine and Reflect for more details on the use of performance monitoring and evaluation to examine success.



5. EXAMINE AND REFLECT

Under ESEA sections 2102(b)(2)(D) and 2102(b)(3), LEAs are required to use data and ongoing consultation to continually improve their Title II, Part A funded activities. LEAs must use Title II, Part A funds to develop, implement, and *evaluate* comprehensive programs and activities. (ESEA section 2103(a)). To ensure effective Title II, Part A investments, it is important to track and measure the short-term and long-term impacts of an intervention. There are different ways to examine how activities are working. Performance monitoring, for instance, involves frequently tracking data about an activity to see how outcomes compare to identified targets and goals. Rigorous evaluations, on the other hand, measure the effectiveness of an activity, answering questions about the impact of a specific activity on measured outcomes. Both types of knowledge help inform future decisions and investment, and should be reflected upon and shared with key stakeholders to make future decisions. Performance monitoring and evaluations of effectiveness are described below:

- **Performance monitoring** involves regularly collecting and analyzing data in order to track progress against targets and goals. For example, performance monitoring can help identify whether key elements of a logic model are being implemented as planned and whether the intervention is meeting interim goals and milestones, and suggest ways

the intervention could be changed for continuous improvement. Performance information can also provide insight into whether the expected outcomes are being achieved.

- **Evaluations of effectiveness** may be appropriate when SEAs and/or LEAs want to know if an activity was effective in that the activity affected the intended student or educator outcomes. These types of evaluations may meet strong or moderate evidence levels, as defined in ESEA section 8101(21) and clarified in the Appendix. In order to ensure these evaluations of effectiveness produce credible results, SEAs or LEAs can leverage Department of Education technical assistance, including working with local [RELS](#) to plan, implement, and conduct evaluations, engage university faculty as research partners, and/or by using supporting resources like this [free software](#) to simplify analysis and reporting of evaluation results.

Putting a Cyclical Framework into Practice: Questions to Consider

Identifying Local Needs

- What data are available or needed to best understand local needs?
- How do student outcomes compare to identified performance goals? Are there inequities in student outcomes across the State or district?
- What are the potential root causes of areas where performance falls short of goals or of inequities in student outcomes?
- What kinds of support, including better resource alignment, might further progress toward goals or address inequities in student outcomes? How might support need to vary to serve the needs of different student subgroups (e.g., English Learners and students with disabilities)?
- How should needs be prioritized when several are identified?

Selecting Relevant, Evidence-Based Strategies: Using Evidence

- Are there interventions that are supported by higher levels of evidence that could address local needs around student outcomes or educator effectiveness?
- Are the findings in this study or studies positive and statistically significant?
- Are these findings relevant to this particular context, including the students aimed to be served (e.g., students with disabilities and/or English Learners)?
- Are there other rigorous studies with contradictory (e.g., negative or null) findings?
- If strong evidence or moderate evidence is not available, is there correlational evidence?
- Is the intervention rationale-based with some evidence that suggests this approach may work (e.g., represented in a [logic model](#))?
- How will the effectiveness of the intervention be measured?

Selecting Relevant, Evidence-Based Strategies: Understanding Local Capacity

- What resources are required to implement this intervention? Will the potential impact of this intervention justify the costs, or are there more cost-effective strategies that will accomplish the same outcomes?
- What is the local capacity to implement this intervention?
 - Are there available funds? Could resources be reallocated to support the intervention? How do costs for the intervention compare to other potential interventions?
 - Does staff have the skills necessary to implement this intervention? If not, what is the plan to help them develop such skills?
 - Does the intervention require hiring of additional staff or individuals with other expertise?
 - Do the individuals who will implement the intervention believe it is something they can and should do?
 - Will stakeholders support the intervention? If not, what additional consensus-building might be required?
 - Is external support necessary to help ensure this intervention is successful?
- How does this intervention fit into larger strategic goals and other existing efforts?
 - Will this be an additional intervention, or will it replace an existing intervention or strategy?
- Are there reasons to believe this intervention will not work in the local setting, and if so, how can those issues be mitigated?
- How will this intervention be sustained over time?

Implementing

- Is the implementation plan being followed as designed? If not, why not? Are changes necessary?*
- What information will be collected to monitor the quality of implementation? Is additional information needed to understand how the implementation is working?*
- What does the information being collected suggest about the success of the implementation?*
- Are more resources required?*
- Do resources need to be realigned or timelines adjusted?*
- Are stakeholders being regularly engaged about implementation? How do they think implementation is working?*
- What are unforeseen barriers to successful implementation?*
- How is implementation working among other existing efforts?*
- Is the intervention ready to be scaled to more students or educators?*
- How were the decisions informed by consultation? How is the information being conveyed to stakeholders?*
- How will stakeholders be included in all implementation phases, including the initial announcement, to ensure smooth implementation?*

Examining and Reflecting

- What are reasonable expectations of success and how can success be measured?*
- What are interim progress and performance milestones that can be tracked?*
- Is there the need and/or the capacity to examine the effectiveness of an intervention (i.e., a study that would produce strong or moderate evidence under ESEA section 8101(21)) or would a correlational study (e.g., a study that would produce promising evidence under ESEA section 8101(21)) or use of performance data suffice?*
- Are the necessary data being collected and examined at the right frequency to monitor performance and make needed adjustments? Are the data high quality?*
- What have participants (i.e., students and educators) in the intervention shared about their experience and how the intervention was implemented?*
- How could knowledge about this intervention be shared with others and incorporated into decision-making? Who needs to be briefed and how can information be made more accessible to them?*
- What do stakeholders think the information suggests about how to improve going forward?*
- Do the data or evaluation results suggest that the intervention should continue being implemented as is, that the intervention should be modified, or that another approach should be identified?*

Appendix A: Guidance on the Definition of “Evidence-Based”

Evidence is a powerful tool to identify ways to address education problems and build knowledge on what works. ESEA emphasizes the use of evidence-based activities, strategies, and interventions (collectively referred to as “interventions”). Section 8101(21)(A) of the ESEA defines an evidence-based intervention as being supported by *strong evidence*, *moderate evidence*, *promising evidence*, or evidence that *demonstrates a rationale* (see text box below). Some ESEA programs encourage the use of “evidence-based” interventions while others, including several competitive grant programs and Title I, section 1003 funds, require the use of “evidence-based” interventions that meet higher levels of evidence.

In order to help SEAs, LEAs, schools, educators, and partner organizations (collectively referred to as “stakeholders”) understand and identify the rigor of evidence associated with various interventions, below are the recommended considerations, resources, and criteria for each of ESSA’s four evidence levels. These recommendations are applicable to all programs in ESSA. This guidance does not address the specific role of evidence in each ESSA program and therefore should be used in conjunction with program-specific guidance. *Italicized* words are defined in the endnotes.

WHAT IS AN “EVIDENCE-BASED” INTERVENTION? (from section 8101(21)(A) of the ESEA)

“...the term ‘evidence-based,’ when used with respect to a State, local educational agency, 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) (I) *demonstrates a rationale* based on high-quality research findings or positive evaluation that such activity, strategy, or intervention is likely to improve student outcomes or other *relevant outcomes*; and
(II) includes ongoing efforts to examine the effects of such activity, strategy, or intervention.

Evidence Considerations, Resources, and Criteria for Levels

While the ESEA definition of “evidence-based” states that “at least one study” is needed to provide *strong evidence*, *moderate evidence*, or *promising evidence* for an intervention, SEAs, LEAs, and other stakeholders should consider the entire body of relevant evidence. Additionally, when available, interventions supported by higher levels of evidence, specifically *strong evidence* and *moderate evidence*, which describe the *effectiveness of an intervention*¹ through *causal inference*,² should be prioritized. Stakeholders should also consider whether there is evidence that an intervention has substantially improved an important education outcome (e.g., credit accumulation and high school graduation). The What Works Clearinghouse (WWC), an initiative of ED’s Institute of Education Sciences, is a helpful resource for locating the evidence on various education interventions.³ For a longer discussion of key steps and considerations for decision-making, including but not limited to the use of evidence-based interventions, see Part III of this guidance.

The criteria below represent the Department’s recommendations for identifying evidence at each of the four levels in ESEA (also summarized in Table 1 on page 41).

- ❖ **Strong Evidence.** To be supported by *strong evidence*, there must be at least one well-designed and well-implemented experimental study (e.g., a *randomized control trial*⁴) on the intervention. The Department considers an experimental study to be “well-designed and well-implemented” if it meets *WWC Evidence Standards without reservations*⁵ or is of the equivalent quality for making *causal inferences*. Additionally, to provide *strong evidence*, the study should:
 - 1) Show a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other *relevant outcome*;⁶
 - 2) Not be overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence on the same intervention in other studies that meet *WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations*⁷ or are the equivalent quality for making *causal inferences*;
 - 3) Have a *large sample*⁸ and a *multi-site sample*⁹; and
 - 4) Have a sample that overlaps with the populations (i.e., the types of students served)¹⁰ AND settings (e.g., rural, urban) proposed to receive the intervention.

- ❖ **Moderate Evidence.** To be supported by *moderate evidence*, there must be at least one well-designed and well-implemented *quasi-experimental study*¹¹ on the intervention. The Department considers a quasi-experimental study to be “well-designed and well-implemented” if it meets *WWC Evidence Standards with reservations* or is of the equivalent quality for making *causal inferences*. Additionally, to provide *moderate evidence*, the study should:
 - 1) Show a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other relevant outcome;
 - 2) Not be overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence on that intervention from other findings in studies that meet *WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations* or are the equivalent quality for making *causal inferences*;
 - 3) Have a *large sample* and a *multi-site sample*; and
 - 4) Have a sample that overlaps with the populations (i.e., the types of students served) OR settings (e.g., rural, urban) proposed to receive the intervention.

- ❖ **Promising Evidence.** To be supported by *promising evidence*, there must be at least one well-designed and well-implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias¹² on the intervention. The Department considers a correlational study to be “well-designed and well-implemented” if it uses sampling

and/or analytic methods to reduce or account for differences between the intervention group and a comparison group. Additionally, to provide *promising evidence*, the study should:

- 1) Show a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other *relevant outcome*; and
- 2) Not be overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence on that intervention from findings in studies that meet *WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations* or are the equivalent quality for making *causal inferences*.

❖ **Demonstrates a Rationale.** To demonstrate a rationale, the intervention should include:

- 1) A well-specified *logic model*¹³ that is informed by research or an evaluation that suggests how the intervention is likely to improve *relevant outcomes*; and
- 2) An effort to study the effects of the intervention, ideally producing promising evidence or higher, that will happen as part of the intervention or is underway elsewhere (e.g., this could mean another SEA, LEA, or research organization is studying the intervention elsewhere), to inform stakeholders about the success of that intervention.

¹ The *effectiveness of the intervention* is measured in a rigorous study (e.g. one that allows for *causal inference*) as the difference between the average outcomes for the two groups in the study.

² *Causal inference* is the process of drawing a conclusion that an activity or intervention was likely to have affected an outcome.

³ WWC is available at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

⁴ An experimental study is designed to compare outcomes between two groups of individuals that are otherwise equivalent except for their assignment to either the intervention group or the control group. A common type of experimental study is a *randomized control trial* or RCT. A *randomized controlled trial*, as defined by Part 77.1 of the [Education Department General Administration Regulations](#) (EDGAR), is a study that employs random assignment of, for example, students, teachers, classrooms, schools, or districts to receive the intervention being evaluated (the treatment group) or not to receive the intervention (the control group). The estimated effectiveness of the intervention is the difference between the average outcomes for the treatment group and for the control group. These studies, depending on design and implementation, can meet *What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations*. An RCT, for example, may look at the impact of participation in a magnet program that relies on a lottery system for admissions. The treatment group could be made up of applicants admitted to the magnet program by lottery and the control group could be made up of applicants that were not admitted to the magnet program by lottery. If an RCT is well-designed and well-implemented, then students in the treatment and control groups are expected to have similar outcomes, on average, except to the extent that the outcomes are affected by program admission. The comparability of the two groups could be compromised if there are problems with design or implementation, which may include problems with sample attrition, changes in group status after randomization, and investigator manipulation.

⁵ *WWC Evidence Standards without reservations* is the highest possible rating for a group design study reviewed by the WWC. Studies receiving this rating provide the highest degree of confidence that an observed effect was caused by the intervention. Well-implemented randomized controlled trials (i.e., RCTs that are not compromised by problems like attrition) may receive this highest rating. These standards are described in the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, which can be accessed at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/documentsum.aspx?sid=19>.

⁶ A *relevant outcome*, as defined by Part 77.1 of EDGAR, means the student outcome(s) (or the ultimate outcome if not related to students) the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice is designed to improve; consistent with the specific goals of a program.

⁷ *WWC Evidence Standards with reservations* is the middle possible rating for a group design study reviewed by the WWC. Studies receiving this rating provide a lower degree of confidence that an observed effect was caused by the intervention. RCTs that are not as well implemented or have problems with attrition, along with strong quasi-experimental designs, may receive this rating. These standards are described in the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, which can be assessed at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/documentsum.aspx?sid=19>.

⁸ A *large sample*, as defined by Part 77.1 of EDGAR, is an analytic sample of 350 or more students (or other single analysis units), or 50 or more groups (such as classrooms or schools) that contain 10 or more students (or other single analysis units). As EDGAR provides, multiple studies can cumulatively meet the large sample requirement and the multi-site sample requirement, as long as each study meets the other requirements corresponding with the specific level of evidence.

⁹ A *multi-site sample*, as defined by Part 77.1 of EDGAR, consists of more than one site, where site can be defined as an LEA, locality, or State. As EDGAR provides, multiple studies can cumulatively meet the large sample requirement and the multi-site sample requirement, as long as each study meets the other requirements corresponding with the specific level of evidence.

¹⁰ In order to demonstrate overlap with the population, the study or studies should show that the intervention has a statistically significant and positive effect on the specific population and/or subgroup of interest being served by the intervention.

¹¹ A *quasi-experimental study* (as known as a quasi-experimental design study or QED), as defined by Part 77.1 of EDGAR, means a study using a design that attempts to approximate an experimental design by identifying a comparison group that is similar to the treatment group in important respects. These studies, depending on design and implementation, can meet *What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards*. An example of a QED is a study comparing outcomes for two groups of classrooms matched closely on the basis of student demographics and prior mathematics achievement, half of which are served by teachers who participated in a new mathematics professional development (PD) program, and half of which are served by other teachers. This study uses a nonequivalent group design by attempting to match or statistically control differences between the two groups. Another type of QED is a regression discontinuity design (RDD), which uses a cutoff or threshold above or below which an intervention is assigned to individuals.

¹² A correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias is designed to examine the strength of the relationship (not the *causal relationship*) between an intervention and a student outcome by comparing two similar groups. In an example correlational study, researchers may look at how two classrooms with similar characteristics perform on a reading assessment after one of the classes (the treatment group) participates in a new reading program. While the researcher is looking at outcomes in classrooms that look similar, there may be other important differences between the classrooms (e.g. previous reading assessment scores) that are not accounted for, but would be in more rigorous studies like experimental studies or QEDs. These types of studies cannot meet WWC standards.

¹³ A *logic model* (also known as a theory of action), as defined by Part 77.1 of EDGAR, means a well-specified conceptual framework that identifies key components of the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice (i.e., the active “ingredients” that are hypothesized to be critical to achieving the *relevant outcomes*) and describes the relationships among the key components and outcomes, theoretically and operationally. More information on logic models can be found at <http://ies.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=REL2015057>.

Table 1. Summary of Recommended Study Criteria for Each Evidence Level

	Strong Evidence	Moderate Evidence	Promising Evidence	Demonstrates a Rationale
Study Design	Experimental study	Quasi-experimental study	Correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias	Provides a well-specified logic model informed by research or evaluation
WWC Standard	Meets WWC Evidence Standards <u>without</u> reservations (or is the equivalent quality)	Meets WWC Evidence Standards <u>with</u> or <u>without</u> reservations (or is the equivalent quality)	N/A	N/A
Favorable Effects	Shows a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other relevant outcome	Shows a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other relevant outcome	Shows a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other relevant outcome	Relevant research or an evaluation that suggests that the intervention is likely to improve a student outcome or other relevant outcome
Other Effects	Is not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence from other findings in studies that meet WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations (or are the equivalent quality)	Is not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence from other findings in studies that meet WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations (or are the equivalent quality)	Is not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence from other findings in studies that meet WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations (or are the equivalent quality)	An effort to study the effects of the intervention, ideally producing promising evidence or higher, will happen as part of the intervention or is underway elsewhere
Sample Size and Overlap	Includes a large sample and a multi-site sample, overlapping with populations <u>and</u> settings proposed to receive the intervention	Includes a large sample and a multi-site sample, overlapping with populations <u>or</u> settings proposed to receive the intervention	N/A	N/A

Appendix B: Title II, Part A Statutory Language

Title II, Part A statutory language can be found as part of the full [Title II Legislation](#).

Legislation, regulations, guidance, and other policy documents for the [Every Student Succeeds Act \(ESSA\)](#), and other topics can be found at the Department's [Policy Landing Webpage](#).