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The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) provides funds to states and districts to improve the quality of their teachers and administrators in order to raise student achievement. These funds are provided through Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title II, Part A (“Improving Teacher Quality State Grants—Subgrants to LEAs”). Under NCLB, funds can be used for a variety of teacher quality activities in any subject area. In the 2007-08 school year, Title II, Part A provided states with approximately $2.77 billion for teacher quality reforms. For school districts, which receive the majority of these funds, allowable uses of funds include:

- Recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers;
- Offering professional development in core academic areas;
- Promoting growth and rewarding quality teaching through mentoring, induction and other support services;
- Testing teachers in academic areas; and
- Reducing class size.

In order to have a better understanding of how school districts used the funds available to them in the 2007-08 school year, a nationally representative sample of 800 districts was surveyed. The sample of districts was drawn from the Common Core of Data (CCD) and stratified by district size and level of poverty. The key findings in this document summarize the completed surveys from 83 percent of the sampled districts. All weights were adjusted for nonresponse. District poverty data are from the U.S. Census Bureau.

Survey results show that 97 percent of districts received Title II, Part A funding for the 2007-08 school year, with the highest poverty districts and largest districts receiving the bulk of the funds (Exhibit 1). Overall, the majority of the funds were used for professional development activities for teachers, paraprofessionals and administrators (50 percent) and to hire highly qualified teachers to reduce class size (27 percent) (Exhibit 2). Districts have used their Title II, Part A funds primarily for these activities since first surveyed in 2002-03; however, the percentage of funds used for reducing class size decreased from 57 percent in 2002-03 to 27 percent in 2007-08, and the percentage of funds used for professional development increased from 27 percent in 2002-03 to 50 percent in 2007-08. In addition, more districts are using Title II, Part A funds for professional development for teachers (70 percent of districts) than for reducing class size (50 percent of districts). In 2007-08, 12 percent of districts allocated all of their available funds to reducing class size, and 8 percent of districts spent all of their funds on professional development for teachers.

Districts also reported on the professional development activities in which their teachers participated. Overall, 95 percent of teachers received high quality professional development in 2007-08. Of these teachers, 96 percent were highly qualified. Over 4.7 million teachers took part

---

1 Districts reported expending more funds than the total allocated to states in 2007-08 due to the use of carryover funds from previous years.
in full-day workshops, and more than 3.3 million teachers attended after-school professional development activities.

Exhibit 1
Title II, Part A Allocations by District Poverty Level and Size 2007-08

Note: Districts reported expending more funds than were allocated to states in 2007-08 due to the use of carryover funds from previous years.
Highlights From the 2007-08 Survey on the Use of Funds Under Title II, Part A

- Ninety-seven percent of districts received Title II, Part A funding for the 2007-08 school year.

- The highest poverty districts received a greater share of the funds than the lowest poverty districts (61 percent of the total allocation versus 8 percent).

- The larger districts, with 10,000 or more students enrolled, received a greater share of the funds than the smaller districts, with fewer than 1,000 students enrolled (66 percent of the total allocation versus 5 percent).

- Overall, the majority of the funds were used for professional development activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and administrators (50 percent) and to hire highly qualified teachers to reduce class size (27 percent).

Note: Districts reported expending more funds than were allocated to states in 2007-08 due to the use of carryover funds from previous years.
Four percent of Title II, Part A funds were spent on mechanisms and strategies to help schools recruit and retain highly qualified teachers, principals and specialists in core academic areas, such as scholarships, loan forgiveness, signing bonuses or differential pay for teachers. Six percent was allocated for initiatives to promote professional growth and reward quality teaching, such as mentoring, induction or exemplary teacher programs.

Five percent of funds were spent on professional development for teachers in eligible non-public schools.

One percent of the funds were combined with other Federal program funds under the provisions of the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP), and 3 percent of the funds were transferred to another Title through the NCLB funding transferability provisions. The most common Title funds were transferred to were Title I and Title V.

Twelve percent of districts allocated all of their available funds to reducing class size, and 8 percent of districts spent all of their funds on professional development for teachers.

The percentage of funds used for reducing class size decreased from 57 percent in 2002-03 to 27 percent in 2007-08, and the percentage of funds used for professional development increased from 27 percent in 2002-03 to 50 percent in 2007-08.

While districts can use their funds for multiple purposes, most districts are using Title II, Part A funds for professional development for teachers (70 percent of districts) and reducing class size (50 percent of districts). Fifty percent of districts did not allocate any Title II, Part A funds for class size reduction.

The majority of the funds used for professional development for teachers were allocated to activities in the subject areas of science (50 percent), math (21 percent) and reading (16 percent).

Districts spent 3 percent of their professional development funds on other academic subjects and 4 percent of their funds on professional development in other non-academic topics. The most common other academic subjects on which professional development funds were spent included fine arts and foreign languages. The most common non-academic topics on which professional development funds were used included classroom management strategies, the use of assessments and curriculum development.

Differences in the Use of Funds by District Poverty and District Size

In 2007-08, the lowest poverty districts and highest poverty districts allocated more Title II, Part A funds for professional development for teachers than for class size reduction. The highest poverty districts used 56 percent of the funds on professional development for teachers and 17 percent on class size reduction, while the lowest poverty districts allocated 39 percent for professional development and 33 percent for class size reduction.
• Districts classified as mid-low poverty districts and mid-high poverty districts allocated more Title II, Part A funds for class size reduction than for professional development for teachers. The mid-low poverty districts used 32 percent of the funds on professional development for teachers and 46 percent on class size reduction, while the mid-high poverty districts allocated 32 percent to professional development and 47 percent of their funds to class size reduction.

• The smaller districts (fewer than 300 students enrolled and 300-599 students) used more funds on professional development for teachers than on class size reduction (25 percent versus 18 percent for the smallest districts and 31 percent versus 23 percent for the districts with 300-599 students).

• The largest districts (at least 25,000 students enrolled) also allocated more funds for professional development for teachers than for class size reduction (61 percent versus 11 percent).

High Quality Professional Development Activities

• Districts reported that a total of 3.2 million teachers teach in the core academic content areas; 96 percent of these teachers are highly qualified.

• Of the 3.2 million core academic content area teachers, 95 percent received professional development in 2007-08. Of the teachers receiving professional development, 96 percent were highly qualified.

• Most teachers engaged in professional development because it was embedded in the school day (23 percent). An equal percentage of teachers participated in professional development to improve student performance and improve their teaching practices (19 percent each).

• Over 1.9 million teachers took part in daily learning team sessions, and more than 4.7 million teachers participated in full-day workshops during the school day.²

• More than 1.9 million teachers participated in one day workshops that took place outside of the school day, and more than 1 million teachers attended multi-day workshops.

² Districts may have included non-core academic content teachers in the counts of teachers participating in professional development activities.