

Implementation of Key Federal Education Policies in the Wake of the Coronavirus Pandemic:

State and District Actions During the 2020-21 School Year

NCEE 2025-003c
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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



U.S. Department of Education

Miguel Cardona
Secretary

Institute of Education Sciences

Matthew Soldner
Acting Director

National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance

Matthew Soldner Marsha Silverberg
Commissioner *Associate Commissioner*

Erica Johnson Thomas Wei
Project Officer *K-12 Branch Chief*

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

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

This compendium was prepared for IES under Contract No. ED-IES-11-C-0063 and Contract No. 91990021D0002, Task Order 91990022F0051 by Westat and Mathematica. The content of the publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of IES or the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

October 2024

This compendium is in the public domain. Although permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, it should be cited as:

Troppe, P. Isenberg, E., Rizzo, L., Standing, K., Deacon, G., Ross, C., Gill, B.P., Li, A., Williams, B. (2024). *Implementation of Key Federal Education Policies in the Wake of the Coronavirus Pandemic: State and District Actions During the 2020-21 School Year* (NCEE 2025-003c). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee>

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

Implementation of Key Federal Education Policies in the Wake of the Coronavirus Pandemic: State and District Actions During the 2020-21 School Year

October 2024

Patricia Troppe

Eric Isenberg

Louis Rizzo

Kimberly Standing

Westat

Grady Deacon

Christine Ross

Brian P. Gill

Ann Li

Breyon Williams

Mathematica

The coronavirus pandemic led to widespread disruptions to school operations beginning in the spring of 2020, as school buildings shut down and instruction moved online. The transition to remote learning not only added new stressors to education systems but also placed additional burdens on families. With many education systems ill-equipped to operate online and families experiencing health and economic crises, students from vulnerable and at-risk populations faced considerable barriers to continuing their education.¹ In response, Congress provided large amounts of federal funding to states and school districts, starting with the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act, to offset the potential declines in state education spending and address the costs associated with the shift to remote learning.

The purpose of this compendium is to provide a record of state and local responses to this historic disruption to the U.S. educational system. The data provide a national picture of how states and districts operated schools, used their early federal COVID-19 relief funds, supported students and schools, and implemented key provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) during this period.

The data in this compendium come from a survey of state education agency officials administered to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, as well as a survey of a nationally representative sample of school districts during spring and summer 2021. The surveys focused on the first full school year (2020-21) during the pandemic.

Chapter 1 of this compendium describes the technical methods underlying the data presented, including how the sample was selected, how the survey was administered, and what statistical tests were used. Chapter 2 includes a comprehensive set of exhibits using the survey data. Chapter 3 includes the state and district survey instruments.

¹ See for example, Office for Civil Rights (2021). *Education in a Pandemic: The disparate impacts of COVID-19 on America's students*. U.S. Dept of Education. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED619629.pdf>; Kuhfeld, M., Soland, J., Tarasawa, B., Johnson, A., Ruzek, E., & Lewis, K. (2020). *How is COVID-19 affecting student learning?* Brown Center Chalkboard. <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2020/12/03/how-is-covid-19-affecting-student-learning/>; and Artiga, S., Garfield, R., & Orgera, K. (2020). *Communities of color at higher risk for health and economic challenges due to COVID-19*. Kaiser Family Foundation Issue Brief. <https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/issue-brief/communities-of-color-at-higher-risk-for-health-and-economic-challenges-due-to-covid-19/>

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Chapter 1. Methodology | 1 |
| Data Sources | 3 |
| Surveys | 4 |
| <i>Development of State and District Surveys</i> | 4 |
| <i>Sample Design for the State Survey</i> | 5 |
| <i>Sample Design for the District Survey</i> | 5 |
| <i>Survey Administration and Response Rates for the State and District Surveys</i> | 8 |
| <i>Survey Weights</i> | 9 |
| Other Data..... | 12 |
| Statistical Tests | 12 |
| References | 13 |
| Chapter 2. Exhibits | 15 |
| Overview..... | 16 |
| 2.1 School Operations | 17 |
| <i>School Closures</i> | 17 |
| <i>Reductions in state instructional time requirements</i> | 21 |
| <i>Instructional modes: In person, hybrid, or remote</i> | 22 |
| <i>Remote learning: Instructional time requirements and attendance tracking during remote learning</i> | 29 |
| 2.2 Supports for Schools | 32 |
| <i>Provision of guidance documents or resource materials</i> | 32 |
| <i>Curricula or instructional materials for remote learning</i> | 34 |
| <i>Professional Development</i> | 35 |
| <i>Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning</i> | 46 |
| <i>Strategies to address students' social-emotional or mental health needs</i> | 55 |
| <i>Support for using evidence-based practices</i> | 60 |
| 2.3 Assessments..... | 64 |
| <i>Beginning-of-year assessments for 2020-21</i> | 64 |
| <i>Summative assessments for 2020-21</i> | 68 |
| <i>Changes to student attainment, progress measures, or federal accountability measures</i> | 70 |

| | | |
|--|--|------------|
| | <i>Effects of not having 2019-20 summative assessment data</i> | 72 |
| 2.4 | CARES Act Funding..... | 75 |
| | <i>District use of CARES Act funds</i> | 75 |
| | <i>District targeting of CARES Act funds</i> | 78 |
| | <i>District staffing and CARES Act funding</i> | 80 |
| | <i>State education agency ESSER funding</i> | 81 |
| 2.5 | Standard Errors..... | 83 |
| Chapter 3. Survey Instruments | | 121 |
| | Overview..... | 122 |
| | Implementation of Key Federal Education Policies in the Wake of the Coronavirus Pandemic: State Educational Survey..... | 123 |
| | Implementation of Key Federal Education Policies in the Wake of the Coronavirus Pandemic: District Survey..... | 147 |
| Acknowledgements | | 182 |
| Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest | | 182 |

Exhibits

Chapter 1. Methodology..... 1

Exhibit 1.1. Summary of data sources..... 3

Exhibit 1.2. District sample by primary poverty strata and district-size strata 8

Chapter 2. Exhibits 15

2.1 School Operations..... 17

School Closures 17

Exhibit 2.1.1. Number of states that closed school buildings statewide for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus 17

Exhibit 2.1.2. Number of states in which districts closed school buildings for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus, by states’ reports of the percentage of districts..... 17

Exhibit 2.1.3. Percentage of districts that closed school buildings districtwide for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus, and the percentage of students affected by these closures: 2020-21 18

Exhibit 2.1.4. Percentage of districts that closed school buildings districtwide for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus, by district poverty status: 2020-21 19

Exhibit 2.1.5. Percentage of districts that closed school buildings districtwide for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus, by district urbanicity and the percentage of students affected by these closures 20

Reductions in state instructional time requirements 21

Exhibit 2.1.6. Number of states that reduced, waived, or eliminated the minimum instructional time requirement in response to the coronavirus pandemic 21

Exhibit 2.1.7. Number of states that made statewide reduction to or granted waivers from the minimum instructional time requirement, and the percentage of districts that received waivers 21

| | | |
|--|---|-----------|
| Exhibit 2.1.8. | Percentage of districts that received a waiver from the state’s minimum instructional time requirement due to the coronavirus pandemic | 21 |
| Instructional modes: In person, hybrid, or remote | | 22 |
| Exhibit 2.1.9. | Percentage of districts that reported most students received in-person, hybrid, or remote instruction during three time periods in the school year | 22 |
| Exhibit 2.1.10. | Percentage of students in districts that reported most students received in-person, hybrid, or remote instruction during three time periods in the school year | 23 |
| Exhibit 2.1.11. | Percentage of districts that reported most students received the same or different types of instruction across three time periods in the school year, and the percentage of students in these districts: 2020-21..... | 24 |
| Exhibit 2.1.12. | Percentage of districts that reported most students received in-person, hybrid, or remote instruction during three time periods in the school year, by district poverty status: 2020-21 | 25 |
| Exhibit 2.1.13. | Percentage of districts that reported most students received the same or different types of instruction across three time periods in the school year, by district poverty status: 2020-21 | 26 |
| Exhibit 2.1.14. | Percentage of districts that reported most students received the same or different types of instruction across three time periods in the school year, by district urbanicity: 2020-21 | 27 |
| Exhibit 2.1.15. | Percentage of districts that gave priority to groups of students for in-person, in-school instruction, and the percentage of students in these districts: 2020-21 | 28 |
| Remote learning: Instructional time requirements and attendance tracking during remote learning | | 29 |
| Exhibit 2.1.16. | Number of states that required an approach for counting remote learning hours and tracking or defining attendance during remote learning..... | 29 |
| Exhibit 2.1.17. | Percentage of districts that required a minimum number of minutes of synchronous instruction for fourth grade students in remote learning | 30 |

| | | |
|-----------------|---|-----------|
| Exhibit 2.1.18. | Percentage of districts that routinely and systematically examined data on student participation in remote learning activities | 31 |
| 2.2 | Supports for Schools..... | 32 |
| | Provision of guidance documents or resource materials | 32 |
| Exhibit 2.2.1. | Number of states that developed and prioritized new or updated guidance documents or resource materials on selected topics..... | 32 |
| Exhibit 2.2.2. | Percentage of districts that developed new or updated guidance documents or resource materials on selected topics, and percentage that prioritized the topic..... | 33 |
| | Curricula or instructional materials for remote learning..... | 34 |
| Exhibit 2.2.3. | Number of states that provided access to curricula or other instructional materials for use in remote learning | 34 |
| | Professional Development..... | 35 |
| Exhibit 2.2.4. | Number of states that provided or arranged for professional development (PD) on selected topics for all, some, or no schools or districts, and the number that prioritized the topic | 35 |
| Exhibit 2.2.5. | Number of states that provided the same number of professional development (PD) hours on selected topics for all schools or districts or provided more PD hours for some schools or districts, by type of school or district..... | 36 |
| Exhibit 2.2.6. | Percentage of districts that provided or arranged for professional development (PD) on selected topics for all, some, or no schools, and the percentage that prioritized the topic | 37 |
| Exhibit 2.2.7. | Percentage of districts that prioritized selected topics for professional development (PD), by district instruction type | 38 |
| Exhibit 2.2.8. | Percentage of districts that prioritized health and safety guidance for professional development (PD), by district urbanicity and district instruction type | 39 |
| Exhibit 2.2.9. | Percentage of districts that prioritized health and safety guidance for professional development (PD), by district poverty status and district instruction type | 39 |

| | | |
|--|--|-----------|
| Exhibit 2.2.10. | Percentage of districts that prioritized SEL guidance for professional development (PD), by district urbanicity and district instruction type | 40 |
| Exhibit 2.2.11. | Percentage of districts that prioritized SEL guidance for professional development (PD), by district poverty status and district instruction type..... | 40 |
| Exhibit 2.2.12. | Percentage of districts that prioritized remote learning teaching strategies for professional development (PD), by district instruction type..... | 41 |
| Exhibit 2.2.13. | Percentage of districts that prioritized remote learning teaching strategies for professional development (PD), by district poverty status and district instruction type..... | 42 |
| Exhibit 2.2.14. | Percentage of districts that prioritized remote learning teaching strategies for professional development (PD), by district urbanicity and district instruction type..... | 43 |
| Exhibit 2.2.15. | Percentage of all districts that provided the same amount of professional development (PD) to all schools on selected topics, and the percentage of districts with specific types of schools that provided PD hours for those schools: 2020-21 | 44 |
| Exhibit 2.2.16. | Percentage of districts that increased, maintained, or reduced the number of hours of professional development (PD) provided to teachers compared to the previous year | 45 |
| Exhibit 2.2.17. | Percentage of districts that increased, maintained, or reduced the number of hours of professional development (PD) provided to teachers compared to the previous year, by district poverty status: 2020-21 | 45 |
| Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | | 46 |
| Exhibit 2.2.18. | Percentage of districts that required all, some, or no schools to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | 46 |
| Exhibit 2.2.19. | Percentage of districts that required schools to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning, by type of school | 47 |
| Exhibit 2.2.20. | Percentage of districts that required all or some schools to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning, by district poverty status: 2020-21..... | 49 |

| | | |
|--|---|-----------|
| Exhibit 2.2.21. | Percentage of districts that required all or some schools to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning, by district urbanicity..... | 50 |
| Exhibit 2.2.22. | Percentage of districts that required more, about the same number, or fewer schools than the previous year to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | 52 |
| Exhibit 2.2.23. | Percentage of districts that required more schools than the previous year to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning, by district poverty status..... | 54 |
| Strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs | | 55 |
| Exhibit 2.2.24. | Percentage of districts that required all, some, or no schools to use strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs | 55 |
| Exhibit 2.2.25. | Percentage of districts that required schools to use strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs, by type of school: 2020-21 | 56 |
| Exhibit 2.2.26. | Percentage of districts that required all or some schools to use strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs, by district poverty status: 2020-21 | 57 |
| Exhibit 2.2.27. | Percentage of districts that required all or some schools to use strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs, by district urbanicity..... | 58 |
| Exhibit 2.2.28. | Percentage of districts that required more, about the same number, or fewer schools than the previous year to use strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs | 59 |
| Support for using evidence-based practices | | 60 |
| Exhibit 2.2.29. | Number of states that used strategies to promote the use of evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies to improve student achievement..... | 60 |
| Exhibit 2.2.30. | Number of states that developed a list of approved evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies to improve student achievement..... | 61 |

| | | |
|-----------------|---|-----------|
| Exhibit 2.2.31. | Number of states that considered specific criteria and the relative weight of the criteria in choosing what to include on the list of approved models, interventions, and strategies to improve student achievement | 61 |
| Exhibit 2.2.32. | Number of states that considered particular sources of information and the relative weight of the source to determine that the models, interventions, and strategies on the state’s approved list have evidence of effectiveness | 62 |
| Exhibit 2.2.33. | Number of states that required schools to select strategies to improve student academic achievement from a list of approved evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies, by type of school | 62 |
| Exhibit 2.2.34. | Percentage of districts that consulted sources to choose a new intervention, program, or practice..... | 63 |
| 2.3 | Assessments | 64 |
| | Beginning-of-year assessments for 2020-21 | 64 |
| Exhibit 2.3.1. | Number of states and percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment to some or all students at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year | 64 |
| Exhibit 2.3.2. | Percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment to some or all students at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year, by district poverty status | 64 |
| Exhibit 2.3.3. | Percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment to some or all students at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year, by district urbanicity | 65 |
| Exhibit 2.3.4. | Number of states and percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year, by type of school where assessment required..... | 66 |
| Exhibit 2.3.5. | Number of states and percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year, by type of school where assessment required and type of student assessed | 67 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Summative assessments for 2020-21 | 68 |
| Exhibit 2.3.6. Number of states that changed their summative assessments used for federal accountability for this school year (2020-21), compared with before the pandemic (2018-19) | 68 |
| Exhibit 2.3.7. Number of states by administration requirement for state-mandated summative assessments for the 2020-21 school year, by grade and subject..... | 69 |
| Changes to student attainment, progress measures, or federal accountability measures | 70 |
| Exhibit 2.3.8. Number of states and percentage of districts that specified and required changes to the criteria for student attainment or progress measures for this school year (2020-21) | 70 |
| Exhibit 2.3.9. Percentage of districts that changed their criteria for student measures for this school year (2020-21), compared with before the coronavirus pandemic, and whether change was required by state | 71 |
| Exhibit 2.3.10. Number of states that changed measures used in the state’s federal accountability system for 2020-21, compared with measures used before the coronavirus pandemic (2018-19)..... | 71 |
| Effects of not having 2019-20 summative assessment data | 72 |
| Exhibit 2.3.11. Number of states reporting the extent to which not having the 2019-20 statewide summative assessment data had a moderate or substantial effect on states’ ability to conduct functions and processes this school year (2020-21) | 72 |
| Exhibit 2.3.12. Percentage of districts reporting the extent to which not having the 2019-20 statewide summative assessment data had a moderate or substantial effect on districts’ and schools’ ability to conduct functions and processes this school year (2020-21)..... | 73 |
| Exhibit 2.3.13. Number of states reporting the extent to which not having the 2019-20 statewide summative assessment data affected states’ ability to conduct functions and processes this school year (2020-21) | 73 |

| | | |
|-----------------|--|-----------|
| Exhibit 2.3.14. | Percentage of districts reporting the extent to which not having the 2019-20 statewide summative assessment data affected districts' and schools' ability to conduct functions and processes this school year (2020-21) | 74 |
| 2.4 | CARES Act Funding | 75 |
| | District use of CARES Act funds | 75 |
| Exhibit 2.4.1. | Cumulative percentage of districts that first received ESSER, CRF, and GEER funds from the state, by month | 75 |
| Exhibit 2.4.2. | Mean percentage of ESSER, GEER, and CRF funds used for activities and purposes during the 2020-21 school year | 76 |
| Exhibit 2.4.3. | Percentage of districts that used CARES Act funding to carry out activities related to distance education or remote learning during the 2020-21 school year | 76 |
| Exhibit 2.4.4. | Percentage of districts that used CARES Act funding to carry out activities to maintain physical distance or other safety precautions in school buildings during the 2020-21 school year | 77 |
| Exhibit 2.4.5. | Percentage of districts that used CARES Act funding during the 2020-21 school year to provide supports or services intended to help students catch up academically or adjust to the effects of the coronavirus pandemic | 77 |
| | District targeting of CARES Act funds | 78 |
| Exhibit 2.4.6. | Percentage of districts that carried out CARES Act-funded activities related to distance education and remote learning during the 2020-21 school year, by school type..... | 78 |
| Exhibit 2.4.7. | Percentage of districts that carried out CARES Act-funded activities related to maintaining physical distance or other safety precautions in school buildings during the 2020-21 school year, by school type | 79 |
| Exhibit 2.4.8. | Percentage of districts that carried out CARES Act-funded activities related to supports or services intended to help students catch up or adjust to the effects of the coronavirus pandemic during the 2020-21 school year, by school type..... | 79 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| District staffing and CARES Act funding | 80 |
| Exhibit 2.4.9. Median and average percentage of teachers and staff whose employment was supported by CARES funds in districts, and percentage of districts supporting all, some, or no staff with CARES Act funds..... | 80 |
| Exhibit 2.4.10. Percentage of districts with change in FTE staffing from October 2019 to October 2020..... | 80 |
| State education agency ESSER funding | 81 |
| Exhibit 2.4.11. Percent of ESSER funds in SEA reserve by round of funding..... | 81 |
| Exhibit 2.4.12. Average percentage of March 2020 ESSER funds allocated from SEA reserve, by activity | 82 |
| 2.5 Standard Errors | 83 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S1. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that closed school buildings districtwide for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus, and the percentage of students affected by these closures: 2020-21..... | 83 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S2. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that closed school buildings districtwide for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus, by district poverty status: 2020-21 | 83 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S3. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that closed school buildings districtwide for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus, by district urbanicity and the percentage of students affected by these closures | 84 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S4. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that received a waiver from the state’s minimum instructional time requirement due to the coronavirus pandemic | 84 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S5. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that reported most students received in-person, hybrid, or remote instruction during three time periods in the school year | 84 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S6. Standard errors for the percentage of students in districts that reported most students received in-person, hybrid, or remote instruction during three time periods in the school year | 85 |

| | | |
|------------------|--|----|
| Exhibit 2.5.S7. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that reported most students received the same or different types of instruction across three time periods in the school year, and the percentage of students in these districts: 2020-21 | 85 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S8. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that reported most students received in-person, hybrid, or remote instruction during three time periods in the school year, by district poverty status: 2020-21 | 86 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S9. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that reported most students received the same or different types of instruction across three time periods in the school year, by district poverty status: 2020-21 | 87 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S10. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that reported most students received the same or different types of instruction across three time periods in the school year, by district urbanicity: 2020-21 | 88 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S11. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that gave priority to groups of students for in-person, in-school instruction, and the percentage of students in these districts..... | 89 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S12. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required a minimum number of minutes of synchronous instruction for fourth grade students in remote learning..... | 89 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S13. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that routinely and systematically examined data on student participation in remote learning activities..... | 90 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S14. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that developed new or updated guidance documents or resource materials on selected topics, and percentage that prioritized the topic | 91 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S15. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that provided or arranged for professional development (PD) on selected topics for all, some, or no schools, and the percentage that prioritized the topic | 92 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S16. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that prioritized selected topics for professional development (PD), by district instruction type | 93 |

| | | |
|------------------|--|----|
| Exhibit 2.5.S17. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that prioritized health and safety guidance for professional development (PD), by district urbanicity and district instruction type | 93 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S18. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that prioritized health and safety guidance for professional development (PD), by district poverty status and district instruction type | 94 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S19. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that prioritized SEL guidance for professional development (PD), by district urbanicity and district instruction type | 94 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S20. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that prioritized SEL guidance for professional development (PD), by district poverty status and district instruction type..... | 94 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S21. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that prioritized remote learning teaching strategies for professional development (PD), by district instruction type | 95 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S22. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that prioritized remote learning teaching strategies for professional development (PD), by district poverty status and district instruction type | 95 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S23. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that prioritized remote learning teaching strategies for professional development (PD), by district urbanicity and district instruction type..... | 95 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S24. | Standard errors for the percentage of all districts that provided the same amount of professional development (PD) to all schools on selected topics, and the percentage of districts with specific types of schools that provided PD hours for those schools..... | 96 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S25. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that increased, maintained, or reduced the number of hours of professional development (PD) provided to teachers compared to the previous year | 96 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S26. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that increased, maintained, or reduced the number of hours of professional development (PD) provided to teachers compared to the previous year, by district poverty status: 2020-21..... | 97 |

| | | |
|------------------|---|-----|
| Exhibit 2.5.S27. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required all, some, or no schools to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning..... | 98 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S28. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required schools to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning, by type of school..... | 99 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S29. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required all or some schools to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning, by district poverty status: 2020-21..... | 100 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S30. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required all or some schools to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning, by district urbanicity | 101 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S31. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required more, about the same number, or fewer schools than the previous year to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | 102 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S32. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required more schools than the previous year to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning, by district poverty status | 103 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S33. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required all, some, or no schools to use strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs | 104 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S34. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required schools to use strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs, by type of school: 2020-21 | 105 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S35. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required all or some schools to use strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs, by district poverty status: 2020-21 | 106 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S36. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required all or some schools to use strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs, by district urbanicity..... | 106 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S37. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required more, about the same number, or fewer schools than the previous year to use strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs | 107 |

| | | |
|------------------|--|-----|
| Exhibit 2.5.S38. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that consulted sources to choose a new intervention, program, or practice | 108 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S39. | Standard errors for the number of states and percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment to some or all students at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year | 108 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S40. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment to some or all students at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year, by district poverty status | 109 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S41. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment to some or all students at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year, by district urbanicity | 109 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S42. | Standard errors for the number of states and percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year, by type of school where assessment required | 110 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S43. | Standard errors for the number of states and percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year, by type of school where assessment required and type of student assessed | 111 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S44. | Standard errors for the number of states and percentage of districts that specified and required changes to the criteria for student attainment or progress measures for this school year: 2020-21..... | 111 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S45. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that changed their criteria for student measures for this school year (2020-21), compared with before the coronavirus pandemic, and whether change was required by state | 112 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S46. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts reporting the extent to which not having the 2019-20 statewide summative assessment data had a moderate or substantial effect on districts' and schools' ability to conduct functions and processes this school year (2020-21) | 113 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S47. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts reporting the extent to which not having the 2019-20 statewide summative assessment data affected districts' and schools' ability to conduct functions and processes this school year (2020-21) | 113 |

| | | |
|------------------|--|-----|
| Exhibit 2.5.S48. | Standard errors for the cumulative percentage of districts that first received ESSER, CRF, and GEER funds from the state, by month | 114 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S49. | Standard errors for the mean percentage of ESSER, GEER, and CRF funds used for activities and purposes during the 2020-21 school year | 114 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S50. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that used CARES Act funding to carry out activities related to distance education or remote learning during the 2020-21 school year | 115 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S51. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that used CARES Act funding to carry out activities to maintain physical distance or other safety precautions in school buildings during the 2020-21 school year | 116 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S52. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts that used CARES Act funding during the 2020-21 school year to provide supports or services intended to help students catch up academically or adjust to the effects of the coronavirus pandemic..... | 116 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S53. | Standard errors for percentage of districts that carried out CARES Act-funded activities related to distance education and remote learning during the 2020-21 school year, by school type..... | 117 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S54. | Standard errors for percentage of districts that carried out CARES Act-funded activities related to maintaining physical distance or other safety precautions in school buildings during the 2020-21 school year, by school type | 118 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S55. | Standard errors for percentage of districts that carried out CARES Act-funded activities related to supports or services intended to help students catch up or adjust to the effects of the coronavirus pandemic during the 2020-21 school year, by school type..... | 119 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S56. | Standard errors for the median and average percentage of teachers and staff whose employment was supported by CARES funds in districts, and percentage of districts supporting all, some, or no staff with CARES Act funds..... | 119 |
| Exhibit 2.5.S57. | Standard errors for the percentage of districts with change in FTE staffing from October 2019 to October 2020 | 120 |

Chapter 1. Methodology

This chapter describes the data sources and statistical tests used for the exhibits presented in chapter 2 of this compendium that address the collection’s research questions. The data cover state and district policies and practices in 2020-21, providing a national picture of how states and districts operated schools, used their early federal COVID-19 relief funds,² supported students and schools, and implemented key provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) during the first full school year of the pandemic. While the data are not designed to produce causal inferences, nor to measure the effects of federal policies, they can help to address the following important questions:

- 1. What choices did states and districts make about school closures, remote, hybrid, and in-person instruction, and minimum instructional time during the 2020-21 school year?** For example, how many states closed school buildings statewide for in-person instruction? For states that require a minimum amount of instructional time, did any districts receive a waiver from this requirement? If so, how many? To what extent were districts using remote learning to provide continuity of education and tracking participation in remote learning activities? Did districts prioritize in-person, in-school instruction for any student groups? If so, which student groups?
- 2. How did the pandemic relate to state and district implementation of ESEA, such as around annual state assessments and supporting low-performing schools?** For example, to what extent did states change the student assessments and measures used for accountability? To what extent did states and districts report altering school improvement and support activities in light of the pandemic? What were the strategies and content areas of support provided? How have states and districts supported schools’ use of remote learning and strategies for addressing students’ social-emotional or mental health needs? How are states and districts supporting students who need to catch up or accelerate their learning?
- 3. How were early federal COVID-19 relief funds being used to support recovery?** How did states and districts spend their CARES Act funds for elementary and secondary education? What strategies or activities did they fund? How quickly were funds first received by districts?
- 4. To what extent were states and districts addressing equity in their recovery efforts by prioritizing schools and students in need of greater support?** For example, to what extent were states and districts targeting additional supports to Title I schools,

²The district survey included questions about receipt and use of the Coronavirus Aid Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act funds. The CARES Act was enacted in March 2020 and included the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) fund, the Governor’s Emergency Education Relief (GEER) fund, the Coronavirus Relief Fund (CRF), and the Education Stabilization Fund Rethink K-12 Education Models (ESF-REM) grants. The SEA survey included questions about the amount the SEA reserved from the ESSER allocations under the CARES Act, the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act, and the American Rescue Plan Act. The SEA survey also asked how the state ESSER reserve funds under the CARES Act were distributed across various activities.

schools identified as Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools,³ or in other ways in response to the pandemic?

Data Sources

The tables in this compendium primarily used data collected through a state survey and a district survey administered during spring and summer 2021. Some analyses used other data submitted to the U.S. Department of Education and data from state education agency (SEA) websites. These data sources are summarized in Exhibit 1.1 and additional details are provided in this chapter.

Exhibit 1.1. Summary of data sources

| Data source | Sample | Number responding | Response rate | Data obtained |
|---|---|-------------------|------------------|---|
| Data collected for this study | | | | |
| State survey | State education agencies (SEAs) in all 50 states, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico | 51 | 98% | School operation policies, supports for schools, measuring student and school improvement, and amount of SEA Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) fund reserves (March 2020 - March 2021) and allocation of March 2020 reserves |
| District survey | 551 nationally representative sample of traditional public school districts and independent charter local education agencies in the 50 states, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico ^a | 518 | 95% ^b | School operation practices, supports for schools, measuring student and school improvement, and receipt and use of Coronavirus Aid Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act funds |
| U.S. Department of Education's ESSER funds allocations | SEAs in all 50 states, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico | 52 | 100% | ESSER funds allocations for the state March 2020 - March 2021 |
| Data used for sampling and to construct subgroups | | | | |
| U. S. Department of Education's Common Core of Data (CCD) nonfiscal universe data | SEAs in all 50 states, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico | 52 | 100% | Student enrollment, region, urbanicity, charter status |
| U.S. Department of Education's <i>EDFacts</i> accountability data | SEAs in all 50 states, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico | 52 | 100% | Whether district had at least one school identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) |

³ CSI schools are those in the bottom 5 percent of all Title I schools and schools with graduation rates below 67 percent, as defined under ESEA for federal accountability.

Exhibit 1.1. Summary of data sources—Continued

| Data source | Sample | Number responding | Response rate | Data obtained |
|---|--|-------------------|---------------|---|
| Data used for sampling and to construct subgroups—Cont. | | | | |
| U.S. Census Bureau’s Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates data (SAIPE) school district estimates | Estimates for 13,009 geographically based school districts in the 50 states, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, of 17,501 in the sampling frame ^c | 13,009 | NA | Percentage of children in families in poverty for geographically defined school districts in the sample |

^a Five sampled districts were ultimately not eligible for the survey, primarily because of closures.

^b The table presents the unweighted response rate for the district survey. The weighted district survey response rate was 94 percent.

^c SAIPE does not cover districts without a geographic catchment area such as charter schools.

NA = not applicable. The SAIPE data provide model-based income and poverty estimates for all geographically defined school districts based on county-level population and income estimates, federal tax information, and multi-year survey data. For more information see: <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/saipe/about.html>

Surveys

Development of State and District Surveys

The state and district surveys focused on policies and practices during the 2020-21 school year in four areas: school operations, supports for schools, measuring student and school improvement, and federal funding. Survey development was guided by the questions of interest listed at the beginning of this chapter, input from Department staff, reviews of materials from other Department studies related to the pandemic and relief funding,⁴ and feedback from pretests of the instruments.

Survey pretests. The survey instruments were reviewed by Department staff and pretested with state education agency (SEA) and district staff.

Four SEAs pretested the state survey. Because the survey had a focus on accountability, assessment, and school improvement, the survey was initially sent to the Title I program director or deputy chief of staff. But because the survey also covered a wide range of topics, the state contact often asked one or two colleagues who were most knowledgeable about particular policy areas to help complete the survey. Respondents who completed the survey sections included Title I and II program directors, a deputy chief of staff, and a federal grants director. Regardless of how many SEA staff provided input, each SEA was asked to ultimately provide one unified response to the survey.

⁴ For example, the study team reviewed information from the NAEP 2021 Monthly School Survey, which focused on learning opportunities for students during the pandemic, and held discussions with Department project officers about information on ESSER, GEER, and CRF funding collected as part of the [Study of District and State Uses of Federal Education Funds](#).

Five districts pretested the district survey. Pretest districts included small, medium, and large districts, and districts delivering instruction in person, virtually, or using a hybrid model. The district survey was sent to the district superintendent or their designee. As with the SEAs, additional district staff contributed to completing the survey in some pretest districts, including directors of compliance, effectiveness, assessment, or institutional research.

The study team developed protocols to guide the debriefing sessions with pretest respondents. In addition to the survey content, the protocols solicited respondent feedback on wording and clarity, information availability, and response burden. The survey pretesting ensured that question wording and terminology related to school operations and support during the pandemic was clear and understood by the majority of the survey pretest respondents. Significant attention was also placed on ensuring the average survey completion time was within the 45 minute target. The study team revised the surveys based on feedback from the pretest debriefings and additional comments from Department staff.

Sample Design for the State Survey

The state survey included all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The study excluded other territories, the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE), and the Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA).⁵

Sample Design for the District Survey

The sample for the district survey was designed to be nationally representative of all districts in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, consistent with the state survey universe.

The district sampling frame. The study team received permission from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to use the 2021 district frame for the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) as the starting frame for the data collection. The 2021 NAEP frame was based on the official 2018-19 NCES Common Core of Data (CCD) district universe file. The NAEP frame-building process filters out entities such as intermediate units.⁶ The study team processed this frame to remove additional entities that were of less interest for the purposes of this survey, including districts with no operational schools, only schools with pre-kindergarten or kindergarten grades, or only schools with no enrollment. Consistent with the state

⁵ Other territories and DoDEA were excluded because they are not required to submit accountability data to the U.S. Department of Education's ED Facts reporting system (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.), and this information was used in the sample design. BIE was excluded because it is a federal agency, and therefore, some provisions of ESSA that are applicable to states do not similarly apply to the BIE. Instead, they are defined by an agreement between the Departments of the Interior and the Department of Education (Bureau of Indian Education [2020], p. 3).

⁶ Intermediate units are designed to provide support to school districts such as instructional materials, but do not have students enrolled themselves. The website <https://www.iu5.org> provides one illustrative example from Pennsylvania (Northwest Tri-County Intermediate Unit 5).

survey universe, the frame included Puerto Rico but excluded other U.S. territories, BIE schools, and Department of Defense schools.

Selection of the district sample. The study team selected a nationally representative sample of 551 districts using a stratified simple random sample approach. The frame was stratified by district poverty level, defined as the percentage of children in families below the poverty threshold. The high-poverty stratum includes all districts above the 75th percentile in poverty level. Other districts were in the low-/medium-poverty stratum.⁷ District poverty level comes from the Census Bureau’s Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program. For districts not included in the SAIPE file, the study team used the percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch from the CCD for schools within the district as a proxy for the percentage of children in families below the poverty level.

The district sample size was set at a level sufficient to achieve the study’s precision objectives for national estimates and power objectives to detect differences between groups of districts. The sample size supported a coefficient of variation (CV) of 5.4 percent for national estimates, while also achieving no larger than a 15 percent minimum detectable difference (MDD) for comparisons of the high-poverty to low-medium-poverty district strata and urban-suburban vs town-rural district domains.⁸ Based on the two earlier rounds of data collection and analyses under this study, this is an adequate degree of precision for a descriptive implementation study.⁹

Each poverty stratum was further stratified by district size, with stratum sampling rates proportional to the square root of mean enrollment for each stratum.¹⁰ The study team

⁷ Classifying high-poverty districts as those above the 75th percentile in poverty level follows the classification used in earlier rounds of the study’s data collection. The percentiles are weighted percentiles, weighted by enrollment, so that for example the high-poverty district represents 25 percent of enrollment, not 25 percent of districts with the highest poverty levels. The high-poverty stratum includes districts where child poverty rates were 22.41 percent or greater; the medium-poverty stratum included districts with child poverty rates of 9.40 percent up to 22.41 percent or missing rates; and the low-poverty stratum included districts with child poverty rates up to 9.40 percent.

⁸ A CV of 5.4 percent means that for a characteristic with a national mean percentage of 50 percent, the standard error will be 2.7 percent, resulting in a 95 percent confidence interval of [44.7 percent, 55.3 percent]. A 15 percent MDD means that a difference of 15 percentage points or greater can be detected with at least 80 percent probability using a two-sided test with 95 percent confidence.

⁹ For more information about the study’s earlier rounds, see: Troppe et al. (2017) and Troppe et al. (2020).

¹⁰ This approach is similar to the district sample design for the sample drawn for the 2014 round of the IES study, Implementation of Title I/II-A Program Initiatives (the Title I/II-A study). For that sample, the team used a ‘minimax’ approach that included a stratified random sample of districts (equal probabilities within strata), with higher sampling rates proportional to a root of mean district enrollment (within the stratum). The root was 0.535 and was chosen to balance the precision of unit-based and enrollment-based estimates. For this 2021 district data collection, there was less interest in enrollment-based estimates. As such, the team used the slightly smaller but simpler root of 0.5 (that is, the square root). See the study’s first report for more information: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20174014/>

oversampled high-poverty districts by a factor of two.¹¹ Oversampling means that the sample includes a higher proportion of districts with particular characteristics than what would occur if the sample included the same percentage of these districts as that found in the population. The emphasis on poverty and size was driven by the desire to have adequate national representation of districts with varying poverty and size levels. Sufficient variation is needed to compare survey responses among these types of districts, where differences are hypothesized given federal funding and policies that typically target based on poverty level and enrollment.

Within these highest-level strata, the study team also implicitly stratified districts¹² to improve the representativeness of the sample on the following district characteristics that are of policy interest and hypothesized to be potentially related to varying district experiences:¹³

- District CSI school status (district does not have a CSI school or district has at least one CSI school);
- District charter status (charter district [only has charter schools], regular district with charters, or regular district with no charters);
- Urbanicity (urban, suburban, town, or rural);
- District poverty strata (three poverty strata based on two quartiles for poverty: high-poverty greater than 75th percentile, medium-poverty between 25th and 75th percentile, or low-poverty below 25th percentile);
- Census Region (Northeast, South, Central, or West); and
- Student enrollment.

Exhibit 1.2 presents a breakdown of district-size strata within the two poverty strata based on the working district frame developed from the processed 2021 NAEP district frame, relative sampling

¹¹ The two-times high-poverty oversampling provided a larger set of high-poverty districts that would likely have considerable relief funding than would occur without oversampling. For example, the Elementary and Secondary School Education Relief Funds was allocated based on the Title I funding, which in turn is based on an estimate of the number of children in families in poverty in the district. At equal poverty levels, we expect larger districts to receive a larger share of these funds, and at equal enrollment levels, we expect higher-poverty districts to receive a larger share of funds. As a result, the district sample design oversampled larger districts and higher-poverty districts.

¹² This implicit stratification determines the sort order for systematic sampling using the probabilities of selection. The highest levels in the implicit stratification hierarchy will have the greatest control in sample sizes (that is, the smallest variation of sample size from target sample size)

¹³ The Title I/II-A study included a spring 2022 data collection of states, districts, and schools. IES was interested in maximizing the overlap in the district samples for the 2021 and 2022 data collections to facilitate comparisons over time. As a result, the implicit stratification for the 2021 district sample included district's CSI school status and district's charter status since these were important for the school sample selection for the 2022 data collection. Urbanicity is included as an implicit stratification variable since survey responses were expected to differ by urbanicity.

rates, strata representation on the frame and sample, expected sample size, and realized sample size. There were 12 strata as represented in Exhibit 1.2.

Exhibit 1.2. District sample by primary poverty strata and district-size strata

| Poverty stratum | District size strata | Number of districts | Mean enrollment | Relative sampling rate | Percent of frame districts | Percent of sampled districts | Expected sample size | Realized sample size |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| High | E1--Enroll 1 to 500 | 2,092 | 240 | 1.00 | 44.00% | 19.16% | 42.0 | 42 |
| High | E2--Enroll 501 to 1,500 | 1,384 | 855 | 1.89 | 29.11% | 23.90% | 52.4 | 52 |
| High | E3--Enroll 1,501 to 5,000 | 854 | 2,673 | 3.34 | 17.96% | 26.08% | 57.1 | 58 |
| High | E4--Enroll 5,001 to 15,000 | 296 | 8,215 | 5.85 | 6.23% | 15.85% | 34.7 | 34 |
| High | E5--Enroll 15,001 to 50,000 | 107 | 27,344 | 10.67 | 2.25% | 10.45% | 22.9 | 23 |
| High | E6/E7--Enroll 50,001+ | 22 | 146,934 | 21.29 | 0.46% | 4.54% | 10.9 | 11 |
| High | Total | 4,755 | 2,641 | | 100.00% | 100.00% | 220.0 | 220 |
| Low/Med | E1--Enroll 1 to 500 | 4,603 | 240 | 1.00 | 36.11% | 13.91% | 45.9 | 46 |
| Low/Med | E2--Enroll 501 to 1,500 | 3,716 | 900 | 1.94 | 29.15% | 21.76% | 71.8 | 72 |
| Low/Med | E3--Enroll 1,501 to 5,000 | 2,942 | 2,761 | 3.39 | 23.08% | 30.18% | 99.6 | 100 |
| Low/Med | E4--Enroll 5,001 to 15,000 | 1,066 | 8,273 | 5.87 | 8.36% | 18.93% | 62.5 | 63 |
| Low/Med | E5--Enroll 15,001 to 50,000 | 350 | 25,270 | 10.26 | 2.75% | 10.86% | 35.8 | 36 |
| Low/Med | E6--Enroll 50,001+ | 69 | 105,228 | 20.94 | 0.54% | 4.37% | 14.4 | 14 |
| Low/Med | Total | 12,746 | 2,941 | | 100.00% | 100.00% | 330.0 | 331 |
| Total | Total | 17,501 | 2,859 | | | | 550 | 551 |

Note: The largest two high-poverty-size strata (E6 and E7) were combined in this table for disclosure avoidance purposes.

Five of the 551 sampled districts were identified as ineligible as they were not a regular district, charter LEA, or an eligible supervisory union, resulting in the eligible sample of 546 districts.

Survey Administration and Response Rates for the State and District Surveys

Web-based survey instruments. The study team developed web-based state and district surveys. Each survey was designed in sections by topic area. The introduction in each survey informed respondents that there were four sections: school operations, support for schools, measuring student and school improvement, and federal funding. The district survey introduction also stated that there was a preliminary set of questions on the number and types of schools in the district. These questions were used to navigate respondents efficiently through the survey (for example, the survey would only ask districts questions related to Title I schools if they self-identified as having such schools in the preliminary section). The survey introductions indicated that a representative with broad knowledge of the school system, such as the deputy superintendent or chief of staff, would be well suited to respond to Sections 1 through 3 of the survey on school operations, support for schools, and measuring student and school improvement (and the preliminary section of the district survey). The most appropriate

respondent for Section 4 on use of federal funds was suggested to be the state or district's chief financial officer. The surveys did not collect information about the people who contributed to the state or district response.

The design of the web-based surveys allowed respondents to navigate directly to the section of questions for which they had the most knowledge. The web surveys ensured appropriate skips and wording displays based on a respondent's answers, and included edit checks to ensure consistent responses across questions.

Survey administration. The state survey administration began in April 2021 by notifying the state's chief school officer and the state's Title I director of the survey. This notification included a letter from the study team and a letter of support for the data collection from the Department's Deputy Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education. A separate survey invitation letter (with a link to the survey) was then sent to the state's Title I director. The survey link allowed the Title I director to easily share the survey with staff best suited for responding to questions in any of the four survey sections. The study team followed up with states via email and calls to encourage response. As part of follow-up activities, the Department's project officer for the study also sent a letter to nonresponding state Title I directors. State survey administration ended in August 2021.

The district survey administration began in March 2021 with a study team notification letter sent to the superintendent or chief administrator for each sampled district. This was followed by survey invitation emails containing the survey link, which could be shared. Follow up was conducted by email and telephone for nonrespondents, and included emails from the Department's project officer, and a final reminder letter sent by overnight delivery to districts that had not responded late in the data collection period. District survey administration ended in June 2021.

Response rates. Both surveys achieved high response rates. All but one state responded to the survey, yielding a response rate of 98 percent. A total of 518 of the 546 eligible districts responded, yielding an unweighted response rate of 95 percent and a weighted response rate of 94 percent.

Survey Weights

No sampling weights were needed for the state data since the survey was sent to all states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and all but one responded.

District Survey Weights. The study team generated two sets of analysis and replicate¹⁴ weights for the district data. The first is a set of "unit-based" district weights that represent all eligible school districts, with each district counted as one in the population. Percentage estimates using

¹⁴ Replicate weights are used for producing standard errors. While analysis weights alone produce approximately unbiased percentage point estimates, replicate weights are needed in conjunction with appropriate variance estimation techniques to produce approximately unbiased estimates of the standard errors (see for example Valliant, R., Dever, J.A., & Kreuter, F. (2013)).

the unit-based weights can be interpreted as the percentage of districts with a particular characteristic. The second is a set of “enrollment-based” district weights, with each district weighted by the number of enrolled students within the district. Percentage estimates using the enrollment-based weights can be interpreted as the percentage of enrolled students who are in districts with a particular characteristic, which for some questions, such as the percentage of students in districts that were targeted for additional supports, may be a policy relevant way to present the information. Creating these district weights involved the following three steps:

- 1. Base Weights.** The first step in generating analysis weights is creating the base weights. The unit-based district-level base weight is equal to the inverse of the district’s probability of selection.¹⁵ The aggregate of these base weights is an unbiased estimate of the total number of districts. The enrollment-based base weight is equal to the district’s student enrollment divided by the district probability of selection. The aggregate of the enrollment-based base weights is an unbiased estimate of the total number of students.
- 2. Replicate Base Weights.** The study team relied on replication methods and generated district replicate base weights using the jackknife replication method (in particular the method called JK2, following the NAEP procedures).¹⁶ Both the unit-based and enrollment-based replicate weights were generated by separating the districts into district variance strata based on the sort order used in the district sampling process. Finite population corrections¹⁷ were also incorporated into the replicate weights, following a procedure developed for NAEP.¹⁸
- 3. District-level nonresponse adjustments to the base and replicate base weights.** Nonresponse adjustments were computed to account for the 6 percent (weighted) of sampled districts that did not complete the survey. Nonresponse adjustments adjust the base and replicate base weights for respondents so that they can better represent both respondents and nonrespondents.

The study team investigated patterns of survey nonresponse rates across key district characteristics, including an analysis of nonresponse rates for the interaction of characteristics. Significant differences in the likelihood of response were found by district size, district CSI school status (that is, the district has or does not have at least one CSI school), urbanicity, district charter status (that is, the district has or does not have at least

¹⁵ One district was selected with certainty. Its district base weight was set to one, as were each of the replicate weights (to indicate that it does not contribute to the variance of estimates).

¹⁶ Jackknife replication provides a system of weights based on the systematic deletion of sample units, with correspondent reweighting of the remaining units (simulating a slightly smaller sample). Replicate estimates are computed from each of these alternative set of weights. The sum of squares of the difference between the replicate estimates and the main estimate, suitably adjusted by an appropriate factor, can then provide an accurate estimate of the sampling variance. For more information, see Johnson & Rust (1992).

¹⁷ A finite population correction is a reduction in variance (as compared to simple random sampling) that occurs when the samples are a large fraction of the population.

¹⁸ Rizzo, L., & Rust, K. (2001).

one charter school), and census region within the poverty strata. No significant differences were found for the interactions.

As the pattern of nonresponse was relatively simple, adjustments for the patterns of district-level nonresponse were done in a single step. The base weights and the replicate base weights for the responding and ineligible districts were adjusted (or raked) to match population totals (called control totals) for cells in several dimensions. The population totals were generated from the sampling frame.

The base weights and the replicate base weights for the responding and ineligible districts were raked to match frame control totals for cells in several dimensions.¹⁹ Separate control totals were created for the unit- and enrollment-based weights. Raking adjustments were fully nested within the two cells defined by high- and low-poverty status. Within these two cells the raking dimensions used were:²⁰

- District size class (up to six cells); and
- District CSI school status (district does not have a CSI school or district has at least one CSI school);
- Urbanicity (urban, suburban, town, or rural);
- District charter status (charter district (only has charter schools), regular district with charters, or regular district with no charters);
- Census Region (Northeast, South, Central, or West).

The final adjusted nonresponse weights were computed by taking the unit-based and enrollment-based base weights and base replicate weights, and carrying them through the iterative process so that the final analysis and replicate weights simultaneously match the control totals. This is known as iterative proportional fitting in which the weights are aligned for each dimension in sequence so that the weighted totals equal the frame totals for each level of each dimension simultaneously. Note that the same unit- (enrollment-) control totals were used to adjust unit-based (enrollment-based) base weights and to adjust unit-based (enrollment-based) replicate base weights.

Item-level nonresponse was not an issue for the surveys. All state and district survey items had a response rate above 85 percent.

¹⁹ See, for example, Valliant, R., Dever, J. A., & Kreuter, F. (2013), Section 14.2.

²⁰ Cells were collapsed when the sample sizes were too small (that is, less than 13). The one certainty district for this study was a respondent. The calibrated weights for this district are equal to its base weights.

Other Data

As noted in Exhibit 1.1, the study team relied on additional data from other sources primarily for sampling and constructing subgroups including:

- **The NCES 2018–19 CCD.** The study team used the district universe data to define subgroups of districts by poverty status, size (based on student enrollment), urbanicity, charter status, and Census region.
- **The U.S. Census Bureau’s SAIPE 2018 School District Estimates.** The study team used the SAIPE percentages of children in families in poverty to determine district poverty level. However, the percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch from the CCD was used instead when SAIPE was unavailable.
- **EDFacts and SEA website data.** The study team used these two data sources to create an indicator of whether a district had at least one CSI school. The team prepared a 2018-19 CSI schools universe file, drawing primarily on school performance information in the Department’s EDFacts database, which is based on annual reporting by state agencies. Because of reporting issues noted by the Department’s EDFacts personnel, the data came directly from the state’s own website for three states. CSI school information was not available for one state.
- **State allocations from ESSER Funds.** The study team obtained each state’s allocation from the three ESSER funding cycles between March 2020 and March 2021. ESSER allocation information is available from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.²¹ The allocation information was pre-populated into each state’s survey. States could then refer to the allocation when responding to questions about the amount the state education agency reserved (rather than allocated to districts).

Statistical Tests

The study team conducted statistical tests to examine differences between subgroups of districts to provide a broader understanding of how policies are implemented across types of districts. Statistical tests show how likely it is to observe a pattern by chance when there really is no pattern. Therefore, if a statistically significant pattern is observed, it suggests with some confidence that the pattern is in fact real and not simply an artifact of random sampling error. Statistical testing was not used to examine the state data because the survey was administered to

²¹ See: [ESSER Awards - Office of Elementary and Secondary Education](#) for ESSER I (March 2020); [Final ESSERII Methodology Table 1.5.21.pdf \(ed.gov\)](#) for ESSER II (December 2020); and [Department of Education Announces American Rescue Plan Funds for All 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia to Help Schools Reopen](#) (March 2021).

all states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. There should not be any sampling error as a result and only a limited possibility of nonresponse bias.

The study team ran statistical tests for a selection of district-level subgroup analyses, primarily by district poverty status and urbanicity. Poverty is included because the allocation method for the bulk of the CARES Act relief funds for K-12 education follows the Title I formula. Title I funds are specifically intended to ameliorate the effects of poverty on local funding constraints and educational opportunity. Urbanicity is included because of the relationship between educational opportunity and rural isolation and the concentration of poverty in urban schools. In addition, urbanicity may be related to varying local (education) policies in response to the coronavirus pandemic. The statistical tests were run using the replicate weights, which measure correctly the variance generated from sampling error.

Statistical tests comparing differences across subgroups were conducted by testing the null hypothesis of no difference in the particular item percentage of interest, between the two subgroups. The null hypothesis of no difference was tested by taking the calculated weighted difference in percentages divided by the replicate standard error for this difference and computing a two-sided p -value (assuming a t -distribution with degrees of freedom equal to the number of replicate weights). This procedure correctly accounts for the covariance that may exist between the domain means. The data tables note where statistical differences between subgroups were statistically significant at the standard $p < .05$ level.²²

References

- Bureau of Indian Education. (2020, January 14). *The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act, Bureau of Indian Education, Agency Plan*. U.S. Department of the Interior. https://www.bie.edu/sites/default/files/documents/bie-agency-plan-approved-011420_1.pdf
- Johnson, E., & Rust, K. (1992). Population inferences and variance estimation for NAEP data. *Journal of Educational Statistics*, 17(2), 175-190.
- Rizzo, L., & Rust, K. (2011). Finite population correction (FPC) for NAEP variance estimation. *Proceedings of the Survey Research Methods Section, American Statistical Association*, 2501-2515. <http://www.asasrms.org/Proceedings/y2011f.html>

²² Note that as all of the analyses are exploratory, there is no correction in the p -values for multiple comparisons.

- Troppe, P., Isenberg, E., Milanowski, A., Garrison-Mogren, R., Rizzo, L., Gill, B. P., Ross, C., Dillon, E., & Li, A. (2020). The transition to ESSA: State and district approaches to implementing Title I and Title II-A in 2017-18 (NCEE 2021-002). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/2021002/pdf/2021002.pdf>
- Troppe, P., Milanowski, A. T., Heid, C., Gill, B., & Ross, C. (2017). Implementation of Title I and Title II-A program initiatives: Results from 2013-14 (NCEE 2017-4014). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20174014/>
- U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.) *Reporting entities by data file/program*. [reporting-entities-other-than-50-states-by-program-or-data-group.docx](#)
- Valliant, R., Dever, J., & Kreuter, F. (2013). *Practical tools for designing and weighting survey samples*. Springer. <http://www.springer.com>

Chapter 2. Exhibits

Overview

This chapter presents data from the state and district surveys. Where applicable, the district data are disaggregated by district poverty level or urbanicity and statistically significant differences noted.

The exhibits cover all questions in each survey except for the preliminary questions in the district survey that were used for survey navigation purposes. Each exhibit has a source note that identifies the survey question(s) covered. Readers are encouraged to review the state and district survey instruments in Chapter 3 to fully understand the question wording.

The exhibits are grouped into four major topics covered by the surveys: school operations, support for schools, assessments (measuring student and school improvement), and CARES Act funding. Within each major topic, the exhibits are further organized by subtopic. To assist readers, page headers indicate the corresponding topic and subtopic. Given the large number of exhibits, readers are encouraged to review the table of contents and list of exhibits to more easily identify exhibits related to particular topics and subtopics of interest.

Section 2.5 of this chapter includes the standard errors for estimates from the district data. Each exhibit in sections 2.1 through 2.4 with district data includes a note that directs the reader to the section 2.5 exhibit with the corresponding standard errors for the estimates.

2.1 School Operations

School Closures

Exhibit 2.1.1. Number of states that closed school buildings statewide for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus

| Number of days school buildings closed statewide¹ | Number of states |
|---|-------------------------|
| Any number of school days | 9 |
| 1-40 days | 5 |
| 41-80 days | 2 |
| 81-120 days | 1 |
| More than 120 days | 1 |
| No school days | 41 |
| Number of states responding | 50 |

¹This includes the number of school days closed from the start of this school year in fall 2020 through the day the state responded to the survey.

Notes: School buildings closed for in-person instruction could have occurred with or without remote learning. The survey question asked respondents to include only closures in response to the coronavirus. The number of days does not include school closures due to other emergencies such as weather-related disruptions or closures for school holidays or break periods. After confirming with one state department of education, researchers found that one state responded to this question erroneously, answering that school buildings were closed for 180 days when the state actually closed school buildings for 0 days. The data for this state has been updated in the table above.

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 1-3).

Exhibit 2.1.2. Number of states in which districts closed school buildings for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus, by states' reports of the percentage of districts

| State policy on district closures | Number of states¹ |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| States that permitted and tracked districts that close school buildings districtwide | 29 |
| 0% of districts | 1 |
| >0-25% of districts | 16 |
| >25-50% of districts | 4 |
| >50-75% of districts | 5 |
| >75-100% of districts | 3 |
| States that permitted but did not track districts closing school buildings districtwide | 20 |
| Districts not permitted to close school buildings | 2 |
| Number of states responding | 51 |

¹Based on state report. This number does not include statewide closures.

Notes: School buildings closed for in-person instruction could have occurred with or without remote learning. The survey question asked respondents to include only closures in response to the coronavirus. It does not include school closures due to other emergencies such as weather-related disruptions or closures for school holidays or break periods.

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 1-4 and 1-4a); CCD Elementary/Secondary Information System export, 2019-20.

2.1 School Operations: School Closures

Exhibit 2.1.3. Percentage of districts that closed school buildings districtwide for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus, and the percentage of students affected by these closures: 2020-21

| Number of days school buildings closed districtwide¹ | Percent of districts | Percent of students |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Any number of school days | 65 | 63 |
| 1-40 days | 43 | 35 |
| 41-80 days | 9 | 12 |
| 81-120 days | 6 | 8 |
| More than 120 days | 7 | 8 |
| No school days | 35 | 37 |
| Mean number of school days (including 0) | 27 days (0-185) | 32 days (0-185) |
| Number of districts or students represented | 17,084 | 49,964,471 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 518 |

¹This includes the number of school days closed from the start of this school year in fall 2020 through the day the district responded to the survey.

Notes: School buildings closed for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus could have occurred with or without remote learning. The number of days does not include school closures due to other emergencies, such as weather-related disruptions, or closures for school holidays or break periods. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S1.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 1-3).

2.1 School Operations: School Closures

Exhibit 2.1.4. Percentage of districts that closed school buildings districtwide for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus, by district poverty status: 2020-21

| Number of days school buildings closed districtwide ¹ | Percent of: | | |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | All districts | High poverty districts | Medium or low poverty districts |
| Any number of school days ² | 65 | 73 | 62 |
| 1-40 days | 43 | 41 | 44 |
| 41-80 days | 9 | 13 | 7 |
| 81-120 days | 6 | 6! | 6 |
| More than 120 days | 7 | 13* | 5! |
| No school days ² | 35 | 27 | 38 |
| Mean number of school days (including 0) ² | 27 days (0-185) | 38 days (0-185) | 23 days (0-149) |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 4,664 | 12,420 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 203 | 315 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage of medium to low poverty districts ($p < .05$).

¹ This includes the number of school days closed from the start of this school year in fall 2020 through the day the district responded to the survey.

² Percentages and means are not tested for significance.

Notes: School buildings closed for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus could have occurred with or without remote learning. The number of days does not include school closures due to other emergencies, such as weather-related disruptions, or closures for school holidays or break periods. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S2.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 1-3).

2.1 School Operations: School Closures

Exhibit 2.1.5. Percentage of districts that closed school buildings districtwide for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus, by district urbanicity and the percentage of students affected by these closures

| Number of days school buildings closed districtwide ¹ | Percent of: | | | | | Students |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| | All districts | Urban districts | Suburban districts | Town districts | Rural districts | |
| Any number of school days² | 65 | 74 | 66 | 63 | 61 | 63 |
| 1-40 days | 43 | 23* | 41 | 44 | 52* | 35 |
| 41-80 days | 9 | 13! | 10 | 14! | 4! | 12 |
| 81-120 days | 6 | 18!* | 6!* | .* | .* | 8 |
| More than 120 days | 7 | 19* | 9!* | .* | .* | 8 |
| No school days | 35 | 26 | 34 | 37 | 39 | 37 |
| Mean number of school days (including 0)² | 27 days (0-185) | 56 days (0-180) | 31 days (0-185) | 20 days (0-143) | 14 days (0-157) | 32 days (0-185) |
| Number of districts or students represented | 17,084 | 3,206 | 4,159 | 2,560 | 7,159 | 49,964,471 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 111 | 160 | 92 | 155 | 518 |

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes, because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate, or complementary cell suppression for disclosure avoidance.

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage of districts not included in the column ($p < .05$). For example, in the urban districts column, districts in urban locales are compared to districts in suburban, town, and rural locales.

¹This includes the number of school days closed from the start of this school year in fall 2020 through the day the district responded to the survey.

²Percentages and means are not tested for significance.

Notes: School buildings closed for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus could have occurred with or without remote learning. The number of days does not include school closures due to other emergencies, such as weather-related disruptions, or closures for school holidays or break periods. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S3.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 1-3).

2.1 School Operations: Reductions in state instructional time requirements

Reductions in state instructional time requirements

Exhibit 2.1.6. Number of states that reduced, waived, or eliminated the minimum instructional time requirement in response to the coronavirus pandemic

| Change in minimum instructional time requirement policy | Number of states |
|--|-------------------------|
| Reduced, waived, or eliminated instructional time requirement for 2020-21 school year | 19 |
| Reduced instructional time requirement for 2020-21 school year ¹ | 5 |
| 1-5 days reduced | 2 |
| >5-10 days reduced | 3 |
| Waived or eliminated instructional time requirements in 2020-21 | 14 |
| Did not reduce, waive, or eliminate instructional time requirements | 32 |
| Number of states responding | 51 |

¹One state responded using instructional hours. We converted instructional hours into days for comparison by dividing the number of hours by the state's minimum number of hours per school day.

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 1-1 and 1.1a).

Exhibit 2.1.7. Number of states that made statewide reduction to or granted waivers from the minimum instructional time requirement, and the percentage of districts that received waivers

| | Number of states | Percent of districts that received waivers in these states |
|--|-------------------------|---|
| State instructional time waivers | | |
| Reduced, waived or eliminated instructional time requirements | 19 | † |
| Made statewide reductions to instructional time requirements | 7 | † |
| Granted waivers to some districts and schools | 12 | 40 |
| Number of states responding | 51 | 12 |

† Not applicable.

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 1-1, 1-2, and 1-2a); CCD Elementary/Secondary Information System export, 2019-20.

Exhibit 2.1.8. Percentage of districts that received a waiver from the state's minimum instructional time requirement due to the coronavirus pandemic

| State instructional time waivers | Percent of districts |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Received a waiver | 27 |
| Did not receive a waiver | 73 |
| Number of districts represented | 16,477 |
| Number of districts responding | 498 |

Notes: Four percent of districts responded N/A to this question, signifying that their state had no instructional time requirement. These districts were removed from the sample of districts that responded to the question above. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S4.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 1-11).

2.1 School Operations: Instructional modes: In person, hybrid, or remote

Instructional modes: In person, hybrid, or remote

Exhibit 2.1.9. Percentage of districts that reported most students received in-person, hybrid, or remote instruction during three time periods in the school year

| Type of instruction most students received | Percent of districts during the: | | |
|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| | First month of school year | First month after New Year's holiday | Month prior to the survey ¹ |
| In person only, in school buildings | 30 | 38 | 56 |
| Hybrid learning ² | 31 | 36 | 31 |
| Remote learning only ³ | 36 | 23 | 10 |
| Other ⁴ | 3! | 3 | 2! |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 17,084 | 17,084 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 518 | 518 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

¹Month prior to the survey refers to the one-month period prior to the day the district responded to the survey. Nearly all districts (85 percent) used March and April as a reference point for the month prior to the survey. If the district responded to the survey after schools have closed for the summer, it refers to the final month of the school year.

²Hybrid learning occurs when groups of students receive a mix of in-person, in-school instruction and remote learning on alternating days or weeks, or with different start and end times to the school day.

³Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

⁴Other includes the same amount of students receiving in-person instruction as remote; the same amount of students receiving all three types of instruction; and remote Mondays only.

Note: The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S5.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 1-1, 1-2 and 1-2a).

2.1 School Operations: Instructional modes, in-person, hybrid, or remote

Exhibit 2.1.10. Percentage of students in districts that reported most students received in-person, hybrid, or remote instruction during three time periods in the school year

| Type of instruction most students received | Percent of students during the: | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| | First month of school year | First month after New Year's holiday | Month prior to the survey ¹ |
| In-person only, in school buildings | 16 | 26 | 47 |
| Hybrid learning ² | 32 | 39 | 38 |
| Remote learning only ³ | 49 | 29 | 11 |
| Other ⁴ | 3 | 7 | 4! |
| Number of students represented | 49,964,471 | 49,964,471 | 49,964,471 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 518 | 518 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

¹Month prior to the survey refers to the one-month period prior to the day the district responded to the survey. Nearly all districts (85 percent) used March and April as a reference point for the month prior to the survey. If the district responded to the survey after schools have closed for the summer, it refers to the final month of the school year.

²Hybrid learning occurs when groups of students receive a mix of in-person, in-school instruction and remote learning on alternating days or weeks, or with different start and end times to the school day.

³Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

⁴Other includes the same amount of students receiving in-person instruction as remote; the same amount of students receiving all three types of instruction; and remote Mondays only.

Note: The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S6.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 1-1, 1-2, and 1-2a).

2.1 School Operations: Instructional modes, in-person, hybrid, or remote

Exhibit 2.1.11. Percentage of districts that reported most students received the same or different types of instruction across three time periods in the school year, and the percentage of students in these districts: 2020-21

| Type of instruction most students received | Percent of districts | Percent of students |
|---|----------------------|---------------------|
| Same type of instruction across three time periods | 54 | 44 |
| In-person only, in school buildings | 31 | 17 |
| Hybrid learning ¹ | 13 | 15 |
| Remote learning only ² | 10 | 12 |
| Different types of instruction across three time periods | 46 | 56 |
| Remote in fall or winter to in-person in spring | 10 | 15 |
| Hybrid in fall or winter to in-person in spring | 21 | 23 |
| Remote in fall or winter to hybrid in spring | 20 | 27 |
| Number of districts or students represented | 16,150 | 45,090,745 |
| Number of districts responding | 481 | 481 |

¹Hybrid learning occurs when groups of students receive a mix of in-person, in-school instruction and remote learning on alternating days or weeks, or with different start and end times to the school day.

²Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

Notes: The categories under ‘Different types of instruction across three time periods’ are not mutually exclusive or exhaustive. For example, districts may be in both the ‘Remote in fall or winter to in-person in spring’ and ‘Hybrid in fall or winter to in-person in spring’ categories. The table does not include districts that reported ‘other’ types of instructional modes or other combinations of types of instruction across the three time periods because of the small number of districts in these categories. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S7.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 1-1, 1-2 and 1-2a).

2.1 School Operations: Instructional modes, in-person, hybrid, or remote

Exhibit 2.1.12. Percentage of districts that reported most students received in-person, hybrid, or remote instruction during three time periods in the school year, by district poverty status: 2020-21

| Type of instruction most students received | Percent of: | | |
|--|---------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | All districts | High poverty districts | Medium to low poverty districts |
| First month of school year | | | |
| In-person only, in school buildings | 30 | 26 | 32 |
| Hybrid learning ¹ | 31 | 22* | 34 |
| Remote learning only ² | 36 | 49* | 31 |
| Other ³ | 3! | 2! | 4! |
| First month after New Year's holiday | | | |
| In-person only, in school buildings | 38 | 31* | 41 |
| Hybrid learning | 36 | 31 | 38 |
| Remote learning only | 23 | 35* | 19 |
| Other | 3 | 3! | 3! |
| Month prior to the survey⁴ | | | |
| In-person only, in school buildings | 56 | 45* | 60 |
| Hybrid learning | 31 | 34 | 30 |
| Remote learning only | 10 | 21* | 7 |
| Other | 2! | #* | 3! |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 4,664 | 12,420 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 203 | 315 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage of medium to low poverty districts ($p < .05$).

Rounds to zero.

¹Hybrid learning occurs when groups of students receive a mix of in-person, in-school instruction and remote learning on alternating days or weeks, or with different start and end times to the school day.

²Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

³Other includes the same amount of students receiving in-person instruction as remote; the same amount of students receiving all three types of instruction; and remote Mondays only.

⁴Month prior to the survey refers to the one-month period prior to the day the district responded to the survey. Nearly all districts (85 percent) used March and April as a reference point for the month prior to the survey. If the district responded to the survey after schools have closed for the summer, it refers to the final month of the school year.

Note: The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S8.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 1-1, 1-2 and 1-2a).

2.1 School Operations: Instructional modes, in-person, hybrid, or remote

Exhibit 2.1.13. Percentage of districts that reported most students received the same or different types of instruction across three time periods in the school year, by district poverty status: 2020-21

| Type of instruction most students received | Percent of: | | |
|---|---------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | All districts | High-poverty districts | Medium-to low-poverty districts |
| Same type of instruction across three time periods¹ | 54 | 58 | 52 |
| In-person only, in school buildings | 31 | 27 | 32 |
| Hybrid learning ² | 13 | 12 | 13 |
| Remote learning only ³ | 10 | 19* | 7 |
| Different types of instruction across three time periods¹ | 48 | 42 | 48 |
| Remote in fall or winter to in-person in spring | 10 | 9 | 10 |
| Hybrid in fall or winter to in-person in spring | 21 | 11* | 24 |
| Remote in fall or winter to hybrid in spring | 20 | 23 | 18 |
| Number of districts represented | 16,150 | 4,499 | 11,651 |
| Number of districts responding | 481 | 192 | 289 |

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage of medium- to low-poverty districts ($p < .05$).

¹ Percentages are not tested for significance.

² Hybrid learning occurs when groups of students receive a mix of in-person, in-school instruction and remote learning on alternating days or weeks, or with different start and end times to the school day.

³ Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

Notes: The categories under ‘Different types of instruction across three time periods’ are not mutually exclusive or exhaustive. For example, districts may be in both the ‘Remote in fall or winter to in-person in spring’ and ‘Hybrid in fall or winter to in-person in spring’ categories. The table does not include districts that reported ‘other’ types of instructional modes or other combinations of types of instruction across the three time periods because of the small number of districts in these categories. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S9.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 1-1, 1-2 and 1-2a).

2.1 School Operations: Instructional modes, in-person, hybrid, or remote

Exhibit 2.1.14. Percentage of districts that reported most students received the same or different types of instruction across three time periods in the school year, by district urbanicity: 2020-21

| Type of instruction most students received | Percent of: | | | |
|---|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| | All districts | Urban districts | Suburban districts | Town and rural districts |
| Same type of instruction across three time periods¹ | 54 | 30 | 48 | 64 |
| In-person only, in school buildings | 31 | 2!* | 11!* | 48 |
| Hybrid learning ² | 13 | 8! | 21* | 11 |
| Remote learning only ³ | 10 | 20* | 15 | 4* |
| Different types of instruction across three time periods¹ | 48 | 70 | 52 | 36 |
| Remote in fall or winter to in-person in spring | 10 | 16! | 15 | 6 |
| Hybrid in fall or winter to in-person in spring | 21 | 15! | 18 | 24 |
| Remote in fall or winter to hybrid in spring | 20 | 42* | 29 | 8 |
| Number of districts represented | 16,150 | 3,175 | 3,784 | 9,191 |
| Number of districts responding | 481 | 106 | 144 | 231 |

¹ Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage of districts not included in the column ($p < .05$). For example, in the urban districts column, districts in urban locales are compared to districts in suburban, town, and rural locales.

¹ Percentages are not tested for significance.

² Hybrid learning occurs when groups of students receive a mix of in-person, in-school instruction and remote learning on alternating days or weeks, or with different start and end times to the school day.

³ Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

Notes: The categories under 'Different types of instruction across three time periods' are not mutually exclusive or exhaustive. For example, districts may be in both the 'Remote in fall or winter to in-person in spring' and 'Hybrid in fall or winter to in-person in spring' categories. The table does not include districts that reported 'other' types of instructional modes or other combinations of types of instruction across the three time periods because of the small number of districts in these categories. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S10.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 1-1, 1-2 and 1-2a).

2.1 School Operations: Instructional modes, in-person, hybrid, or remote

Exhibit 2.1.15. Percentage of districts that gave priority to groups of students for in-person, in-school instruction, and the percentage of students in these districts: 2020-21

| Groups of students given priority | Percent of districts | Percent of students |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Any group of students given priority | 47 | 68 |
| Students in specific grade levels | 25 | 42 |
| PreK | 14 | 28 |
| K-3 | 21 | 36 |
| 4-5 | 13 | 25 |
| 6-8 | 9 | 15 |
| 9-12 | 8 | 17 |
| Students with disabilities | 44 | 64 |
| English learners | 31 | 44 |
| Economically disadvantaged students or students in Title I schools | 20 | 28 |
| Students with limited access to technology | 24 | 34 |
| Students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 25 | 36 |
| Academically at-risk students ¹ | 26 | 35 |
| Other category of students ² | 5 | 9 |
| No group of students given priority | 53 | 32 |
| Number of districts or students represented | 16,452 | 49,383,474 |
| Number of districts responding | 504 | 504 |

¹Academically at-risk students include students with poor performance on formative assessments, students who were credit deficient or at risk of failing, students who were exhibiting social emotional concerns, a lack of engagement in remote learning, or chronic absenteeism, students who received teacher or parent referrals due to academic performance, and students who were pregnant or incarcerated.

²Other categories of students include Native American students, students with medical needs, students with no adult at home during the day, students of staff members, students whose parents were essential workers, students in gifted and talented programs, students in band or athletics, and students in CTE programs or alternative school programs.

Notes: This exhibit excludes districts that reported all school buildings were closed to all students this school year, and therefore, no students received in-person, in-school instruction. Priority includes districts that brought back certain groups of students before other students. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S11. Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 1-3, 1-9, 1-10).

2.1 School Operations: Remote learning: Instructional time requirements and attendance tracking during remote learning

Remote learning: Instructional time requirements and attendance tracking during remote learning

Exhibit 2.1.16. Number of states that required an approach for counting remote learning hours and tracking or defining attendance during remote learning

| Remote learning approach | Number of states |
|---|------------------|
| Approach for counting remote learning hours toward instructional time requirements | |
| Required approach | 22 |
| Recommended approach | 14 |
| Not required or recommended | 14 |
| Attendance tracking during remote learning | |
| Required | 48 |
| Not required | 3 |
| Definition or standard for what constitutes attendance during remote learning | |
| Yes | 30 |
| No, allowed schools and districts to define attendance | 21 |
| <hr/> | |
| Number of states responding | 51 |

Notes: Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 1-5, 1-6, and 1-7).

2.1 School Operations: Remote learning: Instructional time requirements and attendance tracking during remote learning

Exhibit 2.1.17. Percentage of districts that required a minimum number of minutes of synchronous instruction for fourth grade students in remote learning

| Synchronous instruction policy | Percent of districts | Average number of minutes per day |
|---|-----------------------------|--|
| Required minimum number of minutes | 53 | n.a. |
| Same for all fourth grade students | 48 | 221 |
| Different thresholds for fourth grade subgroups | 5! | n.a. |
| Students with disabilities | 5! | 163 |
| English learners | 3! | 128! |
| Other category of students | 2! | 134! |
| No minimum number of minutes | 47 | † |
| Number of districts represented | 12,235 | 12,235 |
| Number of districts responding | 408 | 408 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

† Not applicable.

n.a. Not available (data were not collected).

Notes: Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons). This exhibit excludes districts that did not have remote learning or the fourth grade. This table also excludes districts that met both of the following conditions: 1) They reported most students received instruction in-person during the first month of the school year, the month after New Year’s break, and the month prior to answering this survey; and 2) They reported that they did not close school buildings for in-person instruction any days this school year. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S12.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 1-1, 1-2, 1-2a, 1-3, 1-4, 1-5a, and 1-5b).

2.1 School Operations: Remote learning: Instructional time requirements and attendance tracking during remote learning

Exhibit 2.1.18. Percentage of districts that routinely and systematically examined data on student participation in remote learning activities

| Data examined | Percent of districts |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Student participation in remote learning activities | 95 |
| Participation of specific subgroups | 84 |
| Students in low-performing schools | 46 |
| Students in specific grade levels | 74 |
| PreK | 32 |
| K-3 | 72 |
| 4-5 | 71 |
| 6-8 | 69 |
| 9-12 | 47 |
| Students with disabilities | 78 |
| English learners | 63 |
| Economically disadvantaged students or students in Title I schools | 70 |
| Students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 60 |
| Academically at-risk students ¹ | 61 |
| Other category of students ² | 6 |
| Number of districts represented | 12,235 |
| Number of districts responding | 408 |

¹Academically at-risk students include students with poor grades or performance on formative assessments, students who were disengaged, who were credit deficient, who were exhibiting social emotional concerns, lack of engagement in remote learning, or chronic absenteeism, and students who received teacher or parent referrals for academic performance, or students who were pregnant or incarcerated.

²Other categories of students include students who had parent referrals, students without a parent at home, students of color (including Native American students), students with medical needs, students in gifted and talented programs, students in alternative school programs, and military connected students.

Notes: Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons). Data on student participation could include student log-ins, student interactions with teachers or online learning platforms, or completion of assignments. This table excludes districts that answered that they had no remote learning. This table also excludes districts that met both of the following conditions: 1) They reported most students received instruction in-person during the first month of the school year, the month after New Year’s break, and the month prior to answering this survey; and 2) They reported that they did not close school buildings for in-person instruction any days this school year. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S13.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 1-8).

2.2 Supports for Schools

Provision of guidance documents or resource materials

Exhibit 2.2.1. Number of states that developed and prioritized new or updated guidance documents or resource materials on selected topics

| Topics of guidance documents/resource materials | Number of states that: | | | |
|---|---|-------------------|---|-----------|
| | Developed guidance documents/resource materials | Prioritized topic | Developed guidance documents/resource materials | Unsure |
| Curricula, standards, and subject matter content | 43 | 13 | 4 | 4 |
| Teaching strategies for remote learning ¹ | 50 | 24 | 0 | . |
| Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 46 | 14 | 1 | 4 |
| Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | 42 | 18 | 3 | 6 |
| Supporting students' social, emotional, and mental health needs | 50 | 26 | 1 | . |
| Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures | 51 | 24 | 0 | . |
| Engaging students and families | 47 | 9 | 1 | 3 |
| Specific ways to support English learners (ELs) | 46 | 2 | 4 | . |
| Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs) | 49 | 17 | 0 | . |
| Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 42 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Number of states responding | 51 | 51 | 51 | 51 |

. Complementary cell suppression for disclosure avoidance

¹Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

Notes: A topic is considered a priority if a) the state responded that new or updated guidance documents or resource materials were developed during the 2020-21 school year and b) the state ranked the topic in its top three in the amount of time and resources spent during the 2020-21 school year.

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 2-1 and 2-1a).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Provision of guidance documents or resource materials

Exhibit 2.2.2. Percentage of districts that developed new or updated guidance documents or resource materials on selected topics, and percentage that prioritized the topic

| Topics of guidance documents/resource materials | Percent of districts that: | | |
|---|---|-------------------|---|
| | Developed guidance documents/resource materials | Prioritized topic | Did not develop guidance documents/resource materials |
| Curricula, standards, and subject matter content | 58 | 25 | 41 |
| Teaching strategies for remote learning ¹ | 92 | 76 | 8 |
| Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 85 | 30 | 14 |
| Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | 73 | 22 | 24 |
| Supporting students' social, emotional, and mental health needs | 88 | 48 | 10 |
| Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures | 94 | 46 | 6 |
| Engaging students and families | 83 | 19 | 15 |
| Specific ways to support English learners (ELs) | 55 | 2 | 40 |
| Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs) | 80 | 14 | 18 |
| Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 51 | . | 40 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 17,084 | 17,084 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 518 | 518 |

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

¹Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

Notes: A topic is considered a priority if a) the district responded that new or updated guidance documents or resource materials were developed during the 2020-21 school year and b) the district ranked the topic in its top three in the amount of time and resources spent during the 2020-21 school year. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S14.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 2-1 and 2-2).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Curricula or instructional materials for remote learning

Curricula or instructional materials for remote learning

Exhibit 2.2.3. Number of states that provided access to curricula or other instructional materials for use in remote learning

| Access to curricula or instructional materials | Number of states |
|---|-------------------------|
| Provided access to curricula or other instructional materials for use in remote learning | |
| Yes | 44 |
| No | 7 |
| Required use of the provided curricula or other instructional materials | |
| State required use of the curricula | 0 |
| Use of the curricula was optional | 40 |
| State required use of some curricula or materials | 4 |
| Number of states responding | 51 |

Notes: Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 2-6 and 2-6a).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Professional Development

Professional Development

Exhibit 2.2.4. Number of states that provided or arranged for professional development (PD) on selected topics for all, some, or no schools or districts, and the number that prioritized the topic

| Professional development (PD) topics | Number of states that provided PD for: | | | Number of states that prioritized topic |
|---|--|------------------------|----------------------|---|
| | All schools/districts | Some schools/districts | No schools/districts | |
| Curricula, standards, and subject matter content | 33 | 17 | 1 | 20 |
| Teaching strategies for remote learning ¹ | 39 | 11 | 1 | 31 |
| Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 27 | 16 | 7 | 7 |
| Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | 31 | 17 | 3 | 20 |
| Supporting students' social, emotional, and mental health needs | 36 | 15 | 0 | 28 |
| Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures | 35 | 13 | 3 | 13 |
| Engaging students and families | 33 | 17 | 1 | 7 |
| Specific ways to support English learners (ELs) | 28 | 19 | 3 | 6 |
| Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs) | 39 | 12 | 0 | 13 |
| Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 24 | 21 | 6 | 0 |
| Number of states responding | 51 | 51 | 51 | 51 |

¹Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

Notes: Professional development (PD) includes training, seminars, workshops, or courses in large or small group settings intended to develop staff capacity to perform in the topic area. A topic is considered a priority if a) the state responded that "All schools or districts" or "Some schools or districts" provided or arranged for PD and b) the state ranked the topic in its top three in the amount of time and resources spent during the 2020-21 school year.

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 2-2 and 2-5).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Professional Development

Exhibit 2.2.5. Number of states that provided the same number of professional development (PD) hours on selected topics for all schools or districts or provided more PD hours for some schools or districts, by type of school or district

| Professional development (PD) topics | Number of states that provided: | | Number of states that provided more PD hours for: | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Same hours for all schools/districts | More hours for some schools/districts ¹ | CSI schools/districts with a CSI school | Title I schools/districts | Other types of schools/districts |
| Curricula, standards, and subject matter content | 24 | 26 | 16 | 11 | 14 |
| Teaching strategies for remote learning ² | 32 | 18 | 10 | 5 | 12 |
| Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 23 | 20 | 9 | 9 | 16 |
| Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | 24 | 24 | 12 | 8 | 16 |
| Supporting students' social, emotional, and mental health needs | 31 | 20 | 10 | 7 | 14 |
| Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures | 33 | 15 | 7 | 7 | 11 |
| Engaging students and families | 26 | 24 | 14 | 11 | 15 |
| Specific ways to support English learners (ELs) | 23 | 24 | 9 | 9 | 19 |
| Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs) | 34 | 17 | 5 | 4 | 13 |
| Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 21 | 24 | 8 | 11 | 17 |
| Number of states responding | 51 | 51 | 51 | 51 | 51 |

¹ This column includes states that provided the professional development to some schools or districts only as well as states that provided professional development to all schools or districts while prioritizing some schools or districts to receive more of it.

² Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

Notes: Professional development (PD) includes training, seminars, workshops, or courses in large or small group settings intended to develop staff capacity to perform in the topic area.

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 2-2, 2-3, 2-4).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Professional Development

Exhibit 2.2.6. Percentage of districts that provided or arranged for professional development (PD) on selected topics for all, some, or no schools, and the percentage that prioritized the topic

| Professional development (PD) topics | Percent of districts that provided PD for: | | | Percent of districts that prioritized topic |
|---|--|---------------|---------------|---|
| | All schools | Some schools | No schools | |
| Curricula, standards, and subject matter content | 76 | 7 | 17 | 43 |
| Teaching strategies for remote learning ¹ | 90 | 2 | 7 | 80 |
| Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 71 | 3 | 26 | 23 |
| Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | 66 | 9 | 25 | 18 |
| Supporting students' social, emotional, and mental health needs | 84 | 5 | 11 | 43 |
| Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures | 87 | 21 | 11 | 35 |
| Engaging students and families | 72 | 10 | 18 | 14 |
| Specific ways to support English learners (ELs) | 45 | 15 | 41 | 5 |
| Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs) | 75 | 6 | 19 | 16 |
| Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 44 | 11 | 45 | # |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 17,084 | 17,084 | 17,084 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 518 | 518 | 518 |

¹ Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Rounds to zero.

² Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

Notes: Professional development (PD) includes training, seminars, workshops, or courses in large or small group settings intended to develop staff capacity to perform in the topic area. A topic is considered a priority if a) the district responded that "All schools" or "Some schools" provided or arranged for PD and b) the district ranked the topic in its top three in the amount of time and resources spent during the 2020-21 school year. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S15.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 2-3 and 2-6).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Professional Development

Exhibit 2.2.7. Percentage of districts that prioritized selected topics for professional development (PD), by district instruction type

| Topics prioritized for professional development (PD) | Percent of districts that were: | |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | Remote or hybrid at any point | Not remote or hybrid at any point |
| Curricula, standards, and subject matter content | 44 | 41 |
| Teaching strategies for remote learning ¹ | 83 | 73 |
| Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 18* | 34 |
| Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | 18 | 19 |
| Supporting students' social, emotional, and mental health needs | 50* | 28 |
| Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures | 34 | 36 |
| Engaging students and families | 13 | 17 |
| Specific ways to support English learners (ELs) | 5 | 4 |
| Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs) | 15 | 17 |
| Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 1!* | 0 |
| Number of districts represented | 11,652 | 5,432 |
| Number of districts responding | 386 | 132 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage of districts that were not remote or hybrid at any point ($p < .05$).

¹ Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

Notes: Professional development (PD) includes training, seminars, workshops, or courses in large or small group settings intended to develop staff capacity to perform in the topic area. A topic is considered a priority if a) the district responded that it provided or arranged for PD for “All schools” or “Some schools” and b) the district ranked the topic in its top three in the amount of time and resources spent during the 2020–21 school year. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S16.

Source: 2020–21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 1-1, 1-2, 1-2a, 2-3, 2-6).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Professional Development

Exhibit 2.2.8. Percentage of districts that prioritized health and safety guidance for professional development (PD), by district urbanicity and district instruction type

| District instruction type | Percent of districts that prioritized health/safety guidance for PD | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | All districts | Urban districts | Suburban districts | Town districts | Rural districts |
| All districts | 35 | 29 | 32 | 38 | 38 |
| Districts where either in-person or hybrid learning occurred at any point ¹ | 37 | 36 | 35 | 37 | 39 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 3,206 | 4,159 | 2,560 | 7,159 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 111 | 160 | 92 | 155 |

¹Row percentages represent 15,234, 2,534, 3,511, 2,464, and 6,725 districts among all districts, urban districts, suburban districts, town districts, and rural districts, respectively.

Notes: Professional development (PD) includes training, seminars, workshops, or courses in large or small group settings intended to develop staff capacity to perform in the topic area. The topic is considered a priority if a) the district responded that it provided or arranged for PD for “All schools” or “Some schools” and b) the district ranked the topic in its top three in the amount of time and resources spent during the 2020–21 school year. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S17.

Source: 2020–21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 1-1, 1-2, 1-2a, 2-6).

Exhibit 2.2.9. Percentage of districts that prioritized health and safety guidance for professional development (PD), by district poverty status and district instruction type

| District instruction type | Percent of districts that prioritized health/safety guidance for PD | | |
|--|---|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | All districts | High poverty districts | Medium to low poverty districts |
| All districts | 35 | 32 | 36 |
| Districts where either in-person or hybrid learning occurred at any point ¹ | 37 | 36 | 37 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 4,664 | 12,420 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 203 | 315 |

¹Row percentages represent 15,234, 3,756, and 11,479 districts among all districts, high poverty districts, and medium to low poverty districts columns, respectively.

Notes: Professional development (PD) includes training, seminars, workshops, or courses in large or small group settings intended to develop staff capacity to perform in the topic area. The topic is considered a priority if a) the district responded that it provided or arranged for PD for “All schools” or “Some schools” and b) the district ranked the topic in its top three in the amount of time and resources spent during the 2020–21 school year. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S18.

Source: 2020–21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 1-1, 1-2, 1-2a, 2-6).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Professional Development

Exhibit 2.2.10. Percentage of districts that prioritized SEL guidance for professional development (PD), by district urbanicity and district instruction type

| District instruction type | Percent of districts that prioritized SEL guidance for PD | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | All districts | Urban districts | Suburban districts | Town districts | Rural districts |
| All districts | 43 | 57 | 59 | 41 | 29 |
| Districts where either in-person or hybrid learning occurred at any point ¹ | 43 | 58 | 58* | 43 | 29* |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 3,206 | 4,159 | 2,560 | 7,159 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 111 | 160 | 92 | 155 |

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage of districts not included in the column ($p < .05$). For example, in the urban districts column, districts in urban locales are compared to districts in suburban, town, and rural locales.

¹ Row percentages represent 15,234, 2,534, 3,511, 2,464, and 6,725 districts among the all districts, urban districts, suburban districts, town districts, and rural districts columns, respectively.

Notes: Professional development (PD) includes training, seminars, workshops, or courses in large or small group settings intended to develop staff capacity to perform in the topic area. The topic is considered a priority if a) the district responded that it provided or arranged for PD for “All schools” or “Some schools” and b) the district ranked the topic in its top three in the amount of time and resources spent during the 2020-21 school year. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S19.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 1-1, 1-2, 1-2a, 2-6).

Exhibit 2.2.11. Percentage of districts that prioritized SEL guidance for professional development (PD), by district poverty status and district instruction type

| District instruction type | Percent of districts that prioritized SEL guidance for PD | | |
|--|---|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | All districts | High poverty districts | Medium to low poverty districts |
| All districts | 43 | 36 | 46 |
| Districts where either in-person or hybrid learning occurred at any point ¹ | 43 | 34 | 45 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 4,664 | 12,420 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 203 | 315 |

¹ Row percentages represent 15,234, 3,756, and 11,479 districts among the all districts, high poverty districts, and medium to low poverty districts columns, respectively.

Notes: Professional development (PD) includes training, seminars, workshops, or courses in large or small group settings intended to develop staff capacity to perform in the topic area. The topic is considered a priority if a) the district responded that it provided or arranged for PD for “All schools” or “Some schools” and b) the district ranked the topic in its top three in the amount of time and resources spent during the 2020-21 school year. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S20.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 1-1, 1-2, 1-2a, 2-6).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Professional Development

Exhibit 2.2.12. Percentage of districts that prioritized remote learning teaching strategies for professional development (PD), by district instruction type

| District instruction type | Percent of districts that prioritized remote learning teaching strategies for PD |
|---|--|
| All districts | 80 |
| Among districts where | |
| In-person learning occurred in all three time periods ¹ | 72 |
| Remote learning occurred all three time periods ² | 91 |
| Either remote learning or hybrid occurred all three time periods ³ | 83 |
| Either remote learning or hybrid occurred in at least one but not all three time periods ⁴ | 82 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 |

¹Row percentage represents 4,932 districts where in-person learning occurred in all three time periods.

²Row percentage represents 1,640 districts where remote learning occurred in all three time periods.

³Row percentage represents 7,016 districts where hybrid learning occurred in all three time periods.

⁴Row percentage represents 4,636 districts where either remote or hybrid learning occurred in at least one but not all three time periods.

Notes: Professional development (PD) includes training, seminars, workshops, or courses in large or small group settings intended to develop staff capacity to perform in the topic area. The topic is considered a priority if a) the district responded that it provided or arranged for PD for “All schools” or “Some schools” and b) the district ranked the topic in its top three in the amount of time and resources spent during the 2020-21 school year. Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons). The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S21.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 1-1, 1-2, 1-2a, 2-6).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Professional Development

Exhibit 2.2.13. Percentage of districts that prioritized remote learning teaching strategies for professional development (PD), by district poverty status and district instruction type

| District instruction type | Percent of districts that prioritized remote learning teaching strategies for PD | | |
|--|--|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | All districts | High poverty districts | Medium to low poverty districts |
| All districts | 80 | 81 | 79 |
| Districts where either in-person or hybrid learning occurred at any point ¹ | 78 | 78 | 79 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 4,664 | 12,420 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 203 | 315 |

¹Row percentages represent 15,234, 3,756, and 11,479 districts among the all districts, high poverty districts, and medium to low poverty districts columns, respectively.

Notes: Professional development (PD) includes training, seminars, workshops, or courses in large or small group settings intended to develop staff capacity to perform in the topic area. The topic is considered a priority if a) the district responded that it provided or arranged for PD for “All schools” or “Some schools” and b) the district ranked the topic in its top three in the amount of time and resources spent during the 2020-21 school year. Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons). The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S22.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 1-1, 1-2, 1-2a, 2-6).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Professional Development

Exhibit 2.2.14. Percentage of districts that prioritized remote learning teaching strategies for professional development (PD), by district urbanicity and district instruction type

| District instruction type | Percent of districts that prioritized remote learning teaching strategies for PD | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | All districts | Urban districts | Suburban districts | Town districts | Rural districts |
| All districts | 80 | 84 | 82 | 81 | 76 |
| Districts where either in-person or hybrid learning occurred at any point ¹ | 78 | 80 | 82 | 81 | 75 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 3,206 | 4,159 | 2,560 | 7,159 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 111 | 160 | 92 | 155 |

¹Row percentages represent 15,234, 2,534, 3,511, 2,464, and 6,725 districts among the all districts, urban districts, suburban districts, town districts, and rural districts columns, respectively.

Notes: Professional development (PD) includes training, seminars, workshops, or courses in large or small group settings intended to develop staff capacity to perform in the topic area. The topic is considered a priority if a) the district responded that it provided or arranged for PD for “All schools” or “Some schools” and b) the district ranked the topic in its top three in the amount of time and resources spent during the 2020-21 school year. Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons). The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S23.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 1-1, 1-2, 1-2a, 2-6).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Professional Development

Exhibit 2.2.15. Percentage of all districts that provided the same amount of professional development (PD) to all schools on selected topics, and the percentage of districts with specific types of schools that provided PD hours for those schools: 2020-21

| Professional development (PD) topics | Percent of districts that provided the same number of PD hours across all schools | Percent of districts with specific types of schools that provided more PD hours for: | | |
|---|---|--|-----------------|------------------------|
| | | CSI schools | Title I schools | Other types of schools |
| Curricula, standards, and subject matter content | 67 | 16 | 13 | 3 |
| Teaching strategies for remote learning ¹ | 83 | 12! | 9 | 2 |
| Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 65 | 11! | 7 | 1! |
| Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | 61 | 19 | 12 | 3 |
| Supporting students' social, emotional, and mental health needs | 77 | 13 | 11 | 1 |
| Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures | 83 | 7! | 6 | 1! |
| Engaging students and families | 67 | 14 | 15 | 2 |
| Specific ways to support English learners (ELs) | 41 | 11 | 14 | 5 |
| Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs) | 69 | 7! | 9 | 2 |
| Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 41 | 9 | 11 | 3 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,061 | 2,571 | 15,630 | 17,061 |
| Number of districts responding | 516 | 139 | 493 | 516 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

¹ Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

Notes: Professional development (PD) includes training, seminars, workshops, or courses in large or small group settings intended to develop staff capacity to perform in the topic area. Percentages for CSI schools and Title I schools were based on the number of districts that had these types of schools. Percentages for other types of schools include all districts. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S24.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 0-2, 0-4, 2-4, 2-5).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Professional Development

Exhibit 2.2.16. Percentage of districts that increased, maintained, or reduced the number of hours of professional development (PD) provided to teachers compared to the previous year

| Change in professional development (PD) hours to teachers | Percent of districts |
|--|-----------------------------|
| More hours | 51 |
| About the same hours | 37 |
| Fewer hours | 12 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 |

Notes: Professional development (PD) includes training, seminars, workshops, or courses in large or small group settings intended to develop staff capacity to perform in the topic area. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S25.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 2-7).

Exhibit 2.2.17. Percentage of districts that increased, maintained, or reduced the number of hours of professional development (PD) provided to teachers compared to the previous year, by district poverty status: 2020-21

| Change in professional development (PD) hours to teachers | Percent of: | | |
|--|----------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| | All districts | High poverty districts | Medium to low poverty districts |
| More hours | 51 | 53 | 50 |
| About the same hours | 37 | 35 | 37 |
| Fewer hours | 12 | 12 | 13 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 4,664 | 12,420 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 203 | 315 |

Notes: Professional development (PD) includes training, seminars, workshops, or courses in large or small group settings intended to develop staff capacity to perform in the topic area.

There were no statistically significant differences between the percentage of high poverty compared to medium to low poverty districts ($p < .05$). The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S26.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 2-7).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning

Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning

Exhibit 2.2.18. Percentage of districts that required all, some, or no schools to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning

| Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | Percent of districts that required strategy in: | | |
|--|---|---------------|---------------|
| | All schools | Some schools | No schools |
| Instructional changes | | | |
| Reduce the scope of new material or content taught | 39 | 6 | 55 |
| Repeat more material or content from the student’s previous grade than usual | 44 | 8 | 48 |
| Provide more math or English language arts (ELA) instruction (e.g., “double-dosing” with two periods of math or ELA) | 19 | 11 | 70 |
| Assign students to multiple classes with the same set of peers (small learning communities) | 28 | 17 | 55 |
| Purposefully assign students to at least one of the same teachers as last year (teacher looping) | 9 | 6 | 85 |
| Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction | | | |
| Use paraprofessionals or instructional aides to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 59 | 19 | 22 |
| Provide tutoring for students identified as needing academic help | 68 | 15 | 17 |
| Dedicate time during the day or week for teachers to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 72 | 9 | 18 |
| Credit recovery or course progression strategies | | | |
| Offer or expand credit recovery programs during the school year | 25 | 32 | 43 |
| Offer or expand competency-based learning for students ¹ | 21 | 13 | 66 |
| Offer dual-enrollment or dual-credit coursework for high school students ² | 33 | 36 | 31 |
| Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | | | |
| Offer or expand after- or before-school programs that provide supplemental academic instruction | 35 | 14 | 51 |
| Increase the length of the school day | 6 | 1 | 93 |
| Increase the length of the school year | 5 | 1 | 94 |
| Offer or expand summer school | 64 | 11 | 25 |
| Family engagement | | | |
| Use family engagement liaisons, individual outreach, or a family engagement protocol to re-engage students who dropped out or lost contact | 62 | 7 | 31 |
| Provide or increase home visits by district or school staff | 46 | 12 | 43 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 17,084 | 17,084 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 518 | 518 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

¹ Competency-based learning is a system of instruction, grading, or assessment based on students’ demonstrating that they have learned the expected knowledge and skills needed to progress to the next academic content, grade, or level.

² Districts without high school grades (grades 9-12; 9% of districts responding or 15 percent of districts represented) were excluded from the percentages in this row.

Note: The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S27.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 2-8).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning

Exhibit 2.2.19. Percentage of districts that required schools to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning, by type of school

| Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | Percent of districts that required strategy in: | | |
|---|---|------------------------------|-----------------|
| | CSI schools | Other low-performing schools | Title I schools |
| Instructional changes | | | |
| Reduce the scope of new material or content taught | 49 | 52 | 44 |
| Repeat more material or content from the student’s previous grade than usual | 42 | 43 | 51 |
| Provide more math or English language arts (ELA) instruction (e.g., “double-dosing” with two periods of math or ELA) | 33 | 23 | 27 |
| Assign students to multiple classes with the same set of peers (small learning communities) | 36 | 25 | 41 |
| Purposefully assign students to at least one of the same teachers as last year (teacher looping) | 10! | 8! | 11 |
| Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction | | | |
| Use paraprofessionals or instructional aides to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 74 | 71 | 74 |
| Provide tutoring for students identified as needing academic help | 81 | 74 | 79 |
| Dedicate time during the day or week for teachers to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 80 | 73 | 80 |
| Credit recovery or course progression strategies | | | |
| Offer or expand credit recovery programs during the school year | 42 | 55 | 37 |
| Offer or expand competency-based learning for students ¹ | 27 | 29 | 27 |
| Offer dual-enrollment or dual-credit coursework for high school students ² | 50 | 61 | 46 |
| Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | | | |
| Offer or expand after- or before-school programs that provide supplemental academic instruction | 51 | 61 | 46 |
| Increase the length of the school day | 11! | 7! | 7 |
| Increase the length of the school year | 12! | 10! | 5 |
| Offer or expand summer school | 83 | 88 | 75 |

2.2 Supports for Schools: Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning

Exhibit 2.2.19. Percentage of districts that required schools to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning, by type of school—Continued

| Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | Percent of districts that required strategy in: | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|-----------------|
| | CSI schools | Other low-performing schools | Title I schools |
| Family engagement | | | |
| Use family engagement liaisons, individual outreach, or a family engagement protocol to re-engage students who dropped out or lost contact | 78 | 88 | 69 |
| Provide or increase home visits by district or school staff | 61 | 81 | 56 |
| Number of districts represented | 2,571 | 819 | 15,652 |
| Number of districts responding | 139 | 81 | 495 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

¹ Competency-based learning is a system of instruction, grading, or assessment based on students' demonstrating that they have learned the expected knowledge and skills needed to progress to the next academic content, grade, or level.

² Districts without high school grades (grades 9-12; 9% of districts responding or 15 percent of districts represented) were excluded from the percentages in this row.

Notes: Percentages for CSI schools, other low-performing schools, and Title I schools were based on the number of districts that had these types of schools. Districts that required the strategy included both those that required it in all schools and those that required it in a type of school (e.g., CSI schools). The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S28.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 0-2, 0-4, 0-5, 2-8, 2-9).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning

Exhibit 2.2.20. Percentage of districts that required all or some schools to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning, by district poverty status: 2020-21

| Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | Percent of: | | |
|--|---------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | All districts | High poverty districts | Medium to low poverty districts |
| Instructional changes | 80 | 84 | 79 |
| Reduce the scope of new material or content taught | 45 | 44 | 46 |
| Repeat more material or content from the student’s previous grade than usual | 52 | 65* | 47 |
| Provide more math or English language arts (ELA) instruction (e.g., “double-dosing” with two periods of math or ELA) | 30 | 35 | 28 |
| Assign students to multiple classes with the same set of peers (small learning communities) | 45 | 48 | 44 |
| Purposefully assign students to at least one of the same teachers as last year (teacher looping) | 15 | 19 | 13 |
| Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction | 93 | 94* | 93 |
| Use paraprofessionals or instructional aides to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 78 | 83 | 76 |
| Provide tutoring for students identified as needing academic help | 83 | 88* | 81 |
| Dedicate time during the day or week for teachers to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 82 | 86 | 80 |
| Credit recovery or course progression strategies | 73 | 71 | 74 |
| Offer or expand credit recovery programs during the school year | 57 | 63 | 55 |
| Offer or expand competency-based learning for students ¹ | 34 | 37 | 33 |
| Offer dual-enrollment or dual-credit coursework for high school students ² | 69 | 67 | 69 |
| Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | 83 | 83* | 83 |
| Offer or expand after- or before-school programs that provide supplemental academic instruction | 49 | 55 | 46 |
| Increase the length of the school day | 7 | 11 | 6 |
| Increase the length of the school year | 6 | 9 | 5! |
| Offer or expand summer school | 75 | 79 | 74 |
| Family engagement | 79 | 90* | 75 |
| Use family engagement liaisons, individual outreach, or a family engagement protocol to re-engage students who dropped out or lost contact | 69 | 80* | 66 |
| Provide or increase home visits by district or school staff | 57 | 70* | 53 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 4,664 | 12,420 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 203 | 315 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage of medium to low poverty districts ($p < .05$).

¹ Competency-based learning is a system of instruction, grading, or assessment based on students’ demonstrating that they have learned the expected knowledge and skills needed to progress to the next academic content, grade, or level.

² Districts without high school grades (grades 9-12; 9% of districts responding or 15 percent of districts represented) were excluded from the percentages in this row.

Note: The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S29.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 2-8).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning

Exhibit 2.2.21. Percentage of districts that required all or some schools to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning, by district urbanicity

| Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | Percent of districts that required all or some schools to use strategy | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | All districts | Urban districts | Suburban districts | Town districts | Rural districts |
| Instructional changes | | | | | |
| Reduce the scope of new material or content taught | 45 | 53 | 56* | 43 | 37* |
| Repeat more material or content from the student's previous grade than usual | 52 | 47 | 44 | 47 | 61* |
| Provide more math or English language arts (ELA) instruction (e.g., "double-dosing" with two periods of math or ELA) | 30 | 36 | 26 | 33 | 28 |
| Assign students to multiple classes with the same set of peers (small learning communities) | 45 | 52 | 47 | 46 | 40 |
| Purposefully assign students to at least one of the same teachers as last year (teacher looping) | 15 | 18! | 20 | 16 | 10* |
| Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction | | | | | |
| Use paraprofessionals or instructional aides to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 78 | 75 | 72 | 83 | 81 |
| Provide tutoring for students identified as needing academic help | 83 | 84 | 73* | 89 | 85 |
| Dedicate time during the day or week for teachers to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 82 | 90 | 83 | 72 | 80 |
| Credit recovery or course progression strategies | | | | | |
| Offer or expand credit recovery programs during the school year | 57 | 42* | 56 | 68* | 60 |
| Offer or expand competency-based learning for students ¹ | 34 | 33 | 39 | 36 | 30 |
| Offer dual-enrollment or dual-credit coursework for high school students ² | 69 | 33* | 71 | 80* | 78* |
| Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | | | | | |
| Offer or expand after- or before-school programs that provide supplemental academic instruction | 49 | 50 | 48 | 50 | 47 |
| Increase the length of the school day | 7 | . | 6! | 10! | 8 |
| Increase the length of the school year | 6 | . | 2!* | 6! | 7 |
| Offer or expand summer school | 75 | 70 | 82 | 86* | 70 |

2.2 Supports for Schools: Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning

**Exhibit 2.2.21. Percentage of districts that required all or some schools to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning, by district urbanicity—
Continued**

| Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | Percent of districts that required all or some schools to use strategy | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | All districts | Urban districts | Suburban districts | Town districts | Rural districts |
| Family engagement | | | | | |
| Use family engagement liaisons, individual outreach, or a family engagement protocol to re-engage students who dropped out or lost contact | 69 | 79 | 83* | 70 | 57* |
| Provide or increase home visits by district or school staff | 57 | 56 | 66 | 64 | 50* |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 3,206 | 4,159 | 2,560 | 7,159 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 111 | 160 | 92 | 155 |

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage of districts not included in the column ($p < .05$). For example, in the urban districts column, districts in urban locales are compared to districts in suburban, town, and rural locales.

¹ Competency-based learning is a system of instruction, grading, or assessment based on students' demonstrating that they have learned the expected knowledge and skills needed to progress to the next academic content, grade, or level.

² Districts without high school grades (grades 9-12; 9% of districts responding or 15 percent of districts represented) were excluded from the percentages in this row.

Note: The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S30.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 2-8).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning

Exhibit 2.2.22. Percentage of districts that required more, about the same number, or fewer schools than the previous year to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning

| Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | Percent of districts that required strategy in: | | Percent of districts that did not require strategy |
|---|---|--|--|
| | More schools ¹ | About the same number of schools or fewer schools ² | |
| Instructional changes | | | |
| Reduce the scope of new material or content taught | 32 | 14 | 55 |
| Repeat more material or content from the student’s previous grade than usual | 32 | 20 | 48 |
| Provide more math or English language arts (ELA) instruction (e.g., “double-dosing” with two periods of math or ELA) | 11 | 19 | 70 |
| Assign students to multiple classes with the same set of peers (small learning communities) | 21 | 24 | 55 |
| Purposefully assign students to at least one of the same teachers as last year (teacher looping) | 4 | 10 | 85 |
| Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction | | | |
| Use paraprofessionals or instructional aides to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 38 | 40 | 22 |
| Provide tutoring for students identified as needing academic help | 40 | 43 | 17 |
| Dedicate time during the day or week for teachers to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 43 | 39 | 18 |
| Credit recovery or course progression strategies | | | |
| Offer or expand credit recovery programs during the school year | 23 | 34 | 43 |
| Offer or expand competency-based learning for students ³ | 13 | 21 | 66 |
| Offer dual-enrollment or dual-credit coursework for high school students ⁴ | 9 | 59 | 31 |
| Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | | | |
| Offer or expand after- or before-school programs that provide supplemental academic instruction | 21 | 27 | 51 |
| Increase the length of the school day | 3 | 4 | 93 |
| Increase the length of the school year | 2 | 4 | 94 |
| Offer or expand summer school | 45 | 31 | 25 |

2.2 Supports for Schools: Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning

Exhibit 2.2.22. Percentage of districts that required more, about the same number, or fewer schools than the previous year to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning—Continued

| Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | Percent of districts that required strategy in: | | Percent of districts that did not require strategy |
|--|---|--|--|
| | More schools ¹ | About the same number of schools or fewer schools ² | |
| Family engagement | | | |
| Use family engagement liaisons, individual outreach, or a family engagement protocol to re-engage students who dropped out or lost contact | 35 | 34 | 31 |
| Provide or increase home visits by district or school staff | 35 | 22 | 43 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 17,084 | 17,084 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 518 | 518 |

¹Across these 16 strategies, 116 districts responded in a previous question that no schools were required to use the strategy to accelerate learning this school year, but also responded that more schools this school year than last year were required to use the same strategies. Those 116 districts have been removed from the results in the table above.

²Across these 16 strategies, 48 districts responded in a previous question that all schools were required to use the strategy to accelerate learning this school year, but also responded that fewer schools this school year than last year were required to use the same strategies. Those 48 districts have remained in the table above, as they may have experienced school closings over the previous two years to explain this phenomenon.

³Competency-based learning is a system of instruction, grading, or assessment based on students' demonstrating that they have learned the expected knowledge and skills needed to progress to the next academic content, grade, or level.

⁴Districts without high school grades (grades 9-12; 9% of districts responding or 15 percent of districts represented) were excluded from the percentages in this row.

Note: The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S31.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 2-8 and 2-10).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning

Exhibit 2.2.23. Percentage of districts that required more schools than the previous year to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning, by district poverty status

| Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | Percent of districts that required strategy in more schools than previous year | | |
|--|--|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | All districts | High poverty districts | Medium to low poverty districts |
| Instructional changes | | | |
| Reduce the scope of new material or content taught | 32 | 34 | 31 |
| Repeat more material or content from the student’s previous grade than usual | 32 | 46* | 27 |
| Provide more math or English language arts (ELA) instruction (e.g., “double-dosing” with two periods of math or ELA) | 11 | 18* | 9 |
| Assign students to multiple classes with the same set of peers (small learning communities) | 21 | 24 | 20 |
| Purposefully assign students to at least one of the same teachers as last year (teacher looping) | 4 | 5! | 4! |
| Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction | | | |
| Use paraprofessionals or instructional aides to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 38 | 40 | 37 |
| Provide tutoring for students identified as needing academic help | 40 | 45 | 38 |
| Dedicate time during the day or week for teachers to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 43 | 47 | 41 |
| Credit recovery or course progression strategies | | | |
| Offer or expand credit recovery programs during the school year | 23 | 21 | 24 |
| Offer or expand competency-based learning for students ¹ | 13 | 15 | 13 |
| Offer dual-enrollment or dual-credit coursework for high school students ² | 9 | 10 | 8 |
| Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | | | |
| Offer or expand after- or before-school programs that provide supplemental academic instruction | 21 | 26 | 20 |
| Increase the length of the school day | 3 | 3! | 4 |
| Increase the length of the school year | 2 | 2! | 2! |
| Offer or expand summer school | 45 | 47 | 44 |
| Family engagement | | | |
| Use family engagement liaisons, individual outreach, or a family engagement protocol to re-engage students who dropped out or lost contact | 35 | 38 | 34 |
| Provide or increase home visits by district or school staff | 35 | 43 | 32 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 4,664 | 12,420 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 203 | 315 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage of medium to low poverty districts ($p < .05$).

¹ Competency-based learning is a system of instruction, grading, or assessment based on students’ demonstrating that they have learned the expected knowledge and skills needed to progress to the next academic content, grade, or level.

² Districts without high school grades (grades 9-12; 9% of districts responding or 15 percent of districts represented) were excluded from the percentages in this row.

Note: The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S32.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions item 2-8 and 2-10).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs

Strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs

Exhibit 2.2.24. Percentage of districts that required all, some, or no schools to use strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs

| Strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs | Percent of districts that required strategy in: | | |
|---|---|---------------|---------------|
| | All schools | Some schools | No schools |
| Increase the number of staff to support students’ mental health (e.g., by increasing the number of counselors, psychologists, social workers, behavioral aides, or the use of external mental health providers) | 38 | 9 | 53 |
| Offer or expand district-provided social-emotional learning (SEL) programs | 62 | 12 | 26 |
| Offer or expand positive school climate and/or cyber bullying prevention programs | 58 | 10 | 31 |
| Systematically identify signs of trauma or a mental health crisis among students | 73 | 7 | 20 |
| Conduct a needs assessment of students needing meals, technology to access school resources, or other supports | 86 | 3! | 11 |
| Offer or expand the use of student peer advisors for student mentoring and support | 23 | 12 | 65 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 17,084 | 17,084 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 518 | 518 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S33.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 2-11).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Strategies to address students' social-emotional or mental health needs

Exhibit 2.2.25. Percentage of districts that required schools to use strategies to address students' social-emotional or mental health needs, by type of school: 2020-21

| Strategies to address students' social-emotional or mental health needs | Percent of districts that required strategy in: | | | |
|---|---|--------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| | All or some schools | CSI schools | Other low-performing schools | Title I schools |
| Increase the number of staff to support students' mental health (e.g., by increasing the number of counselors, psychologists, social workers, behavioral aides, or the use of external mental health providers) | 47 | 60 | 52 | 45 |
| Offer or expand district-provided social-emotional learning (SEL) programs | 74 | 78 | 85 | 73 |
| Offer or expand positive school climate and/or cyber bullying prevention programs | 69 | 74 | 78 | 67 |
| Systematically identify signs of trauma or a mental health crisis among students | 80 | 83 | 83 | 80 |
| Conduct a needs assessment of students needing meals, technology to access school resources, or other supports | 89 | 88 | 92 | 89 |
| Offer or expand the use of student peer advisors for student mentoring and support | 35 | 34 | 25 | 29 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 2,571 | 819 | 15,652 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 139 | 81 | 495 |

Notes: Percentages for CSI schools, other low-performing schools, and Title I schools were based on the number of districts that had these types of schools. Districts that required the strategy include both those that required it in all schools and those that required it in a type of school (e.g., CSI schools). The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S34.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 0-2, 0-4, 2-11 and 2-12).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Strategies to address students' social-emotional or mental health needs

Exhibit 2.2.26. Percentage of districts that required all or some schools to use strategies to address students' social-emotional or mental health needs, by district poverty status: 2020-21

| Strategies to address students' social-emotional or mental health needs | Percent of: | | |
|---|---------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | All districts | High poverty districts | Medium to low poverty districts |
| Increase the number of staff to support students' mental health (e.g., by increasing the number of counselors, psychologists, social workers, behavioral aides, or the use of external mental health providers) | 47 | 49 | 46 |
| Offer or expand district-provided social-emotional learning (SEL) programs | 74 | 75 | 73 |
| Offer or expand positive school climate and/or cyber bullying prevention programs | 69 | 70 | 68 |
| Systematically identify signs of trauma or a mental health crisis among students | 80 | 84 | 78 |
| Conduct a needs assessment of students needing meals, technology to access school resources, or other supports | 89 | 90 | 89 |
| Offer or expand the use of student peer advisors for student mentoring and support | 35 | 41 | 33 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 4,664 | 12,420 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 203 | 315 |

Notes: There were no statistically significant differences between the percentage of high poverty compared to medium to low poverty districts ($p < .05$). The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S35.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 2-11).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs

Exhibit 2.2.27. Percentage of districts that required all or some schools to use strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs, by district urbanicity

| Strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs | Percent of districts that required all or some schools to use strategy | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | All districts | Urban districts | Suburban districts | Town districts | Rural districts |
| Increase the number of staff to support students’ mental health (e.g., by increasing the number of counselors, psychologists, social workers, behavioral aides, or the use of external mental health providers) | 47 | 51 | 51 | 53 | 40* |
| Offer or expand district-provided social-emotional learning (SEL) programs | 74 | 73 | 86* | 83* | 64* |
| Offer or expand positive school climate and/or cyber bullying prevention programs | 69 | 60 | 70 | 75 | 70 |
| Systematically identify signs of trauma or a mental health crisis among students | 80 | 80 | 79 | 88* | 77 |
| Conduct a needs assessment of students needing meals, technology to access school resources, or other supports | 89 | 89 | 91 | 87 | 88 |
| Offer or expand the use of student peer advisors for student mentoring and support | 35 | 36 | 33 | 38 | 34 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 3,206 | 4,159 | 2,560 | 7,159 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 111 | 160 | 92 | 155 |

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage of districts not included in the column ($p < .05$). For example, in the urban districts column, districts in urban locales are compared to districts in suburban, town, and rural locales.

Note: The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S36.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 2-11).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs

Exhibit 2.2.28. Percentage of districts that required more, about the same number, or fewer schools than the previous year to use strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs

| Strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs | Percent of districts that required strategy in: | | Percent of districts that did not require strategy |
|---|---|--|--|
| | More schools ¹ | About the same number of schools or fewer schools ² | |
| Increase the number of staff to support students’ mental health (e.g., by increasing the number of counselors, psychologists, social workers, behavioral aides, or the use of external mental health providers) | 31 | 16 | 53 |
| Offer or expand district-provided social-emotional learning (SEL) programs | 41 | 33 | 26 |
| Offer or expand positive school climate and/or cyber bullying prevention programs | 26 | 43 | 31 |
| Systematically identify signs of trauma or a mental health crisis among students | 42 | 38 | 20 |
| Conduct a needs assessment of students needing meals, technology to access school resources, or other supports | 56 | 33 | 11 |
| Offer or expand the use of student peer advisors for student mentoring and support | 13 | 22 | 65 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 | 17,084 | 17,084 |
| Number of districts responding | 518 | 518 | 518 |

¹ Across these 6 strategies, 12 districts responded in a previous question that no schools were required to use the strategy to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs this school year, but also responded that more schools this school year than last year were required to use the same strategies. Those 12 districts have been removed from the results in the table above.

² Across the 6 strategies, 4 districts responded in a previous question that all schools were required to use the strategy to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs this school year, but also responded that fewer schools this school year than last year were required to use the same strategies. Those 4 districts have remained in the table above, as they may have experienced school closings over the previous two years to explain this phenomenon.

Note: The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S37.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 2-11 and 2-13).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Support for using evidence-based practices

Support for using evidence-based practices

Exhibit 2.2.29. Number of states that used strategies to promote the use of evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies to improve student achievement

| Strategies to promote evidence-based interventions | Number of states | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | Primary strategy used | Used more extensively than other strategies | Used equally with other strategies | Did not use this strategy |
| The state refers district and school leaders to the What Works Clearinghouse, Evidence for ESSA, or another organization that rates evidence to obtain information on evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies to improve student performance | 7 | 7 | 34 | 3 |
| The state links district and school leaders with staff from the U.S. Department of Education's Regional Educational Laboratories or Comprehensive Centers to obtain information on evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies to improve student performance | 0 | 10 | 24 | 17 |
| The state provides district and school leaders with information about evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies to improve student performance | 7 | 14 | 30 | 0 |
| The state provides a list of vetted partners that district and school leaders can engage to implement approved evidence-based strategies | 2 | 10 | 17 | 22 |
| The state requires districts to describe the evidence base for proposed interventions in applications for school improvement funds or districts receive competitive preference for describing such evidence | 6 | 17 | 20 | 8 |
| The state requires districts to include plans for evaluating the effectiveness of interventions in applications for school improvement funds or districts receive competitive preference for evaluation plans | 5 | 15 | 22 | 9 |
| Some other strategy ¹ | 0 | 0 | 4 | 47 |

¹Other strategies include: District-led strategies confirmed by the State Education Agency for meeting evidenced standards.

Notes: Exhibit is based on 51 responding states.

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 2-7).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Support for using evidence-based practices

Exhibit 2.2.30. Number of states that developed a list of approved evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies to improve student achievement

| State list of approved evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies | Number of states |
|--|------------------|
| Developed a list | 21 |
| Did not develop a list | 30 |
| Number of states responding | 51 |

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 2-8).

Exhibit 2.2.31. Number of states that considered specific criteria and the relative weight of the criteria in choosing what to include on the list of approved models, interventions, and strategies to improve student achievement

| Criteria for inclusion | Number of states | | | | |
|--|------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
| | Required | Considered with more weight | Considered with equal weight | Considered with minimal weight | Did not consider |
| Has research from studies using a well-implemented experimental or quasi-experimental design (meets ESSA Tier 1 or 2 evidence ¹) | 5 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| Has research showing promising evidence from a well-implemented, correlational study that statistically controls for selection bias (meets ESSA Tier 3 evidence ²) | 4 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 2 |
| Has high-quality research showing that the intervention is likely to improve student outcomes, and an effort to study the effects of the intervention is underway (meets ESSA Tier 4 evidence ³) | 2 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 5 |
| Evidence of effectiveness that meets other evidence criteria | 0 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 3 |
| Instructional design of the program (structure and sequencing, support materials, skills targeted) | 4 | 4 | 9 | 1 | 3 |
| Alignment with the state's academic content standards | 7 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Availability of aligned assessments to monitor student progress and/or attainment | 3 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 5 |
| Alignment with school or district identified needs | 5 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 3 |

¹ESSA Tier 1 or 2 evidence comes from studies using a well-implemented experimental or quasi-experimental design.

²ESSA Tier 3 evidence comes from a well-implemented, correlational study that statistically controls for selection bias.

³ESSA Tier 4 evidence based on high-quality research that the intervention is likely to improve student outcomes and an effort to study the effects of the intervention is underway.

Notes: This table only includes those responding states (n=21) with a list of approved evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies.

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 2-9).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Support for using evidence-based practices

Exhibit 2.2.32. Number of states that considered particular sources of information and the relative weight of the source to determine that the models, interventions, and strategies on the state’s approved list have evidence of effectiveness

| Information source | Number of states | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
| | This was the primary source of information | Considered with more weight | Considered with equal weight | Considered with minimal weight | Did not consider |
| Research published by third-party organizations that evaluate programs or by college/university researchers | 4 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 0 |
| Information provided by the program’s developer or vendor | 0 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 4 |
| Recommendations from other states, or from schools and districts within the state | 0 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 4 |
| The What Works Clearinghouse, Evidence for ESSA, or other organization that rates evidence | 2 | 9 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center | 0 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 3 |
| Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory | 2 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 3 |
| Another source ¹ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 19 |
| Number of states responding | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 |

¹Other sources include: Persistence of the model in the state and in surrounding states, and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO).

Notes: This table only includes responding states with a list of approved evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies (n=21).

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 2-10).

Exhibit 2.2.33. Number of states that required schools to select strategies to improve student academic achievement from a list of approved evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies, by type of school

| Type of school | Number of states |
|--|------------------|
| All schools | 2 |
| CSI schools | 9 |
| TSI and/or ATSI schools | 9 |
| Title I schools | 7 |
| Some other type of school ¹ | 2 |
| Number of states responding | 21 |

¹Other types of schools include state-identified schools for continuous improvement and schools that required urgent intervention due to discipline concerns.

Notes: This table only includes those responding states (n = 21) with a list of approved evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies.

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 2-11).

2.2 Supports for Schools: Support for using evidence-based practices

Exhibit 2.2.34. Percentage of districts that consulted sources to choose a new intervention, program, or practice

| Sources consulted for new strategies | Percent of districts |
|---|----------------------|
| Districts implemented a new intervention, program or practice | 52 |
| Sources consulted by districts that implemented a new intervention, program, or practice | |
| District’s needs assessment | 82 |
| Guidance or advice from the state education department or a technical assistance center funded by the state | 44 |
| A list of vendors approved by the state | 23 |
| A list of evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies provided by the state | 55 |
| Information provided by the selected intervention’s developer or vendor | 49 |
| Recommendations from colleagues in other school districts | 73 |
| Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center | 11 |
| Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory | 8 |
| Information from the What Works Clearinghouse, Evidence for ESSA, or another organization that rates evidence | 36 |
| Information from the district’s research/evaluation office | 51 |
| Information from professional associations | 56 |
| Information from a college/university researcher | 26 |
| Other source ¹ | 11 |
| Number of districts represented that implemented a new intervention, program, or practice | 8,908 |
| Number of districts responding that implemented a new intervention, program, or practice | 286 |

¹Other sources include assessment data, benchmark data, school pilots, union focus groups, family and community engagement, curriculum specialists, district superintendents, district IT Department, charter school leadership cohorts, other districts, county-level consortiums, state education agency websites, New Teacher Center, and national research centers.

Note: The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S38.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 2-14 and 2-15).

2.3 Assessments

Beginning-of-year assessments for 2020-21

Exhibit 2.3.1. Number of states and percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment to some or all students at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year

| Schools and students required to assess | Number of states | Percent of districts |
|---|------------------|----------------------|
| All schools, all students | 10 | 60 |
| All schools, some students | 1 | 4 |
| Some schools, all students | 1 | 12 |
| Some schools, some students | 4 | 1! |
| Test not required | 35 | 24 |
| Number of districts represented | | 17,079 |
| Number of states or districts responding | 51 | 517 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: For this table, beginning of the year assessments exclude regular screenings to identify students with disabilities and English-learners. Percentages sum to greater than 100 due to rounding. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S39.

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic and 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 3-1 and 3-3).

Exhibit 2.3.2. Percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment to some or all students at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year, by district poverty status

| Type of instruction most students received | Percent of: | | |
|--|---------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | All districts | High-poverty districts | Medium- to low-poverty districts |
| All schools, all students | 60 | 74 | 55* |
| All schools, some students | 4 | 4! | 4! |
| Some schools, all students | 12 | 4 | 14* |
| Some schools, some students | 1! | 0 | 1* |
| Test not required | 24 | 17 | 26* |
| Number of districts represented | 17,079 | 4,664 | 12,415 |
| Number of districts responding | 517 | 203 | 314 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from high-poverty districts ($p < .05$).

Note: For this table, beginning of the year assessments exclude regular screenings to identify students with disabilities and English-learners. Percentages sum to greater than 100 due to rounding. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S40.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 3-1 and 3-3).

2.3 Assessments: Beginning-of-year assessments for 2020-21

Exhibit 2.3.3. Percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment to some or all students at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year, by district urbanicity

| Type of instruction most students received | Percent of: | | | | |
|--|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | All districts | Urban districts | Suburban districts | Town districts | Rural districts |
| All schools, all students | 60 | 71 | 63 | 50* | 57 |
| All schools, some students | 4 | 1! | . | . | . |
| Some schools, all students | 12 | 8! | 11 | 20* | 10 |
| Some schools, some students | 1! | 0 | . | . | . |
| Test not required | 24 | 20! | 21 | 24 | 27 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,079 | 3,206 | 4,154 | 2,560 | 7,159 |
| Number of districts responding | 517 | 111 | 159 | 92 | 155 |

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes, because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate, or complementary cell suppression for disclosure avoidance.

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from urban districts.

Note: For this table, beginning of the year assessments exclude regular screenings to identify students with disabilities and English-learners. Percentages sum to greater than 100 due to rounding. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S41.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 3-1 and 3-3).

2.3 Assessments: Beginning-of-year assessments for 2020-21

Exhibit 2.3.4. Number of states and percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year, by type of school where assessment required

| Type of school | Number of states | Percent of districts |
|---|------------------|----------------------|
| All schools | 11 | 64 |
| Some schools | 5 | 12 |
| CSI schools | 1 | ! |
| TSI or ATSI schools | 1 | n.a. |
| Other low-performing schools | n.a. | ! |
| Elementary schools | n.a. | 10 |
| Middle schools | n.a. | 11 |
| High schools | n.a. | 10 |
| Title I schools | 1 | 2! |
| Other types of schools | 5 | . |
| Test not required | 35 | 24 |
| Number of districts represented | | 17,079 |
| Number of states or districts responding | 51 | 517 |

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

n.a. Not available; item was not asked on the state survey.

Notes: For this table, beginning of the year assessments exclude regular screenings to identify students with disabilities and English-learners. The 5 states that reported other types of schools reported requiring the assessment in schools that include elementary grades. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S42.

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic and 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 3-1 and 3-2).

2.3 Assessments: Beginning-of-year assessments for 2020-21

Exhibit 2.3.5. Number of states and percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year, by type of school where assessment required and type of student assessed

| Type of school and student | Number of states | Percent of districts |
|---|------------------|----------------------|
| All schools | 11 | 64 |
| All students | 10 | 60 |
| Some students | 1 | 4 |
| Students in specific grade levels | n.a. | 4 |
| PK-grade 5 | n.a. | 4 |
| Grade 6-grade 8 | n.a. | 3 |
| Grade 9-grade 12 | n.a. | 2 |
| Some schools | 5 | 12 |
| All students | 1 | 12 |
| Some students | 4 | 1! |
| Students in specific grade levels | 4 | 1! |
| PK-grade 5 | 4 | 1! |
| Grade 6-grade 8 | 0 | . |
| Grade 9-grade 12 | 0 | . |
| Not required | 35 | 24 |
| Number of districts represented | | 17,079 |
| Number of states or districts responding | 51 | 517 |

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

n.a. Not available due to nonresponse.

Note: For this table, beginning of the year assessments exclude regular screenings to identify students with disabilities and English-learners. The “some students” category in this exhibit presents estimates only for students in specific grade levels even though the survey question asked about additional student subgroups such as students with disabilities, English learners, and economically disadvantage students. The survey question was not clear as to whether districts that selected students in specific grade levels should also select the student subgroups of the students in the specific grade levels. Because of this ambiguity, the exhibit only presents the estimates for students in specific grade levels.

The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S43.

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic and 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (questions 3-1, 3-3, and 3-4).

2.3 Assessments: Summative assessments for 2020-21

Summative assessments for 2020-21

Exhibit 2.3.6. Number of states that changed their summative assessments used for federal accountability for this school year (2020-21), compared with before the pandemic (2018-19)

| Change | Number of states | | |
|---|------------------|----|----------------|
| | Yes | No | Not applicable |
| Used a shorter version of the state assessment (i.e., the assessment had fewer items) | 16 | 31 | 4 |
| Used an assessment with fewer constructed-response or performance-based items | 12 | 37 | 2 |
| Moved from one end-of-year summative assessment to a series of interim assessments during the course of the academic year that result in a single summative score | 0 | 46 | 5 |
| Allowed some or all students to take state assessments from home | 9 | 40 | 2 |
| Allowed districts to administer state assessments in summer or fall 2021 | 7 | 40 | 4 |

Note: Table is based on 51 states responding. Between 2 and 5 states reported that the change was not applicable.
 Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 3-6).

2.3 Assessments: Summative assessments for 2020-21

Exhibit 2.3.7. Number of states by administration requirement for state-mandated summative assessments for the 2020-21 school year, by grade and subject

| Grade/subject | Number of states | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| | State required all districts to: | | | State did not set a requirement for administration |
| | Administer in-person, in-school for all students | Administer remotely for all students | Offer a mix of in-person, in-school and remote | |
| Grade 4 | | | | |
| English language Arts (ELA) | 39 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| Math | 39 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| English language proficiency (ELP) assessment | 43 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| Grade 8 | | | | |
| ELA | 39 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| Math | 39 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| ELP | 43 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| High School | | | | |
| ELA | 40 | 0 | 5 | 6 |
| Math | 40 | 0 | 5 | 6 |
| ELP | 43 | 0 | 3 | 4 |

Note: Rows for ELA and math are based on 51 responding states. ELP rows are based on 50 responding states.

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 3-9).

2.3 Assessments: Changes to student attainment, progress measures, or federal accountability measures

Changes to student attainment, progress measures, or federal accountability measures

Exhibit 2.3.8. Number of states and percentage of districts that specified and required changes to the criteria for student attainment or progress measures for this school year (2020-21)

| Attainment or progress measure | Number of states | Percent of districts |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Use of state assessment results to determine whether a student can graduate from high school | 11 | 16 |
| Other changes to high school graduation requirements | 8 | 17 |
| Use of state assessment results to determine grade retention | 6 | 12 |
| Other changes in standards for grade retention | 1 | 12 |
| Use of state assessment results in course grades | 3 | 14 |
| Other changes in standards for course grades | 1 | 12 |
| Other changes | 4 | 3! |
| Number of districts represented | | 17,070 |
| Number of states or districts responding | 51 | 516 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S44.

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 3-7) and 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 3-6).

2.3 Assessments: Changes to student attainment, progress measures, or federal accountability measures

Exhibit 2.3.9. Percentage of districts that changed their criteria for student measures for this school year (2020-21), compared with before the coronavirus pandemic, and whether change was required by state

| Attainment or progress measure | Percent of districts | | |
|--|--------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|
| | Change required by state | Changed, but not required by state | Did not change |
| Use of summative assessment results to determine whether a student can graduate from high school | 14 | 2! | 84 |
| Other changes to high school graduation requirements | 11 | 6 | 83 |
| Use of summative assessment results to determine grade retention | 7 | 5 | 88 |
| Other changes in standards for grade retention | 4 | 8 | 88 |
| Use of summative assessment results in course grades | 4 | 10 | 86 |
| Other changes in standards for course grades | 1! | 11 | 88 |
| Other changes | . | . | 97 |

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes, because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate, or complementary cell suppression for disclosure avoidance.

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: Table is based on 17,070 districts represented and 516 districts responding. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S45.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 3-6).

Exhibit 2.3.10. Number of states that changed measures used in the state’s federal accountability system for 2020-21, compared with measures used before the coronavirus pandemic (2018-19)

| Measure | Number of states | | | |
|---|------------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|
| | Increased | Did not change | Decreased | Not applicable |
| Number of times state summative assessments are administered | 1 | 42 | 5 | 3 |
| Number of subjects tested other than math and English language arts (ELA) | 0 | 43 | 6 | 2 |
| Number of grades tested other than grades 3-8 and once in high school | 1 | 43 | 4 | 3 |
| The minimum score students need to achieve on the state assessment to be identified as proficient in ELA or math | 0 | 48 | 0 | 3 |
| Number of measures included in the School Quality and Student Success indicator (e.g., school climate measures, attendance, or post-secondary outcomes) | 0 | 37 | 7 | 7 |
| Threshold for the number of days absent or percentage of days absent for a student to be counted as chronically absent | 0 | 43 | 1 | 7 |
| The minimum subgroup size (e.g., “minimum n-size”) | 0 | 47 | 0 | 4 |

Note: Table is based on 51 states.

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 3-5).

2.3 Assessments: Effects of not having 2019-20 summative assessment data

Effects of not having 2019-20 summative assessment data

Exhibit 2.3.11. Number of states reporting the extent to which not having the 2019-20 statewide summative assessment data had a moderate or substantial effect on states' ability to conduct functions and processes this school year (2020-21)

| Function or process | Number of states |
|--|-------------------------|
| Calculating indicators used in the state's federal accountability system | 43 |
| Understanding general district/schools performance | 42 |
| Developing or monitoring district or school improvement plans | 32 |
| Allocating additional resources to districts to implement district or school improvement plans | 17 |
| Implementing or expanding remote learning options for districts, schools, or families | 5 |
| Evaluating teacher performance | 15 |
| Evaluating the effectiveness of interventions | 23 |
| Reviewing the state's academic content or achievement standards | 12 |
| Evaluating attendance definitions or criteria | 7 |
| Determining professional development (PD) or technical assistance needs | 16 |
| Number of states responding | 51 |

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 3-8).

2.3 Assessments: Effects of not having 2019-20 summative assessment data

Exhibit 2.3.12. Percentage of districts reporting the extent to which not having the 2019-20 statewide summative assessment data had a moderate or substantial effect on districts' and schools' ability to conduct functions and processes this school year (2020-21)

| Function or process | Percent of districts |
|---|----------------------|
| Measuring and monitoring school improvement | 44 |
| Allocating funding, staff, other resources to schools | 14 |
| Evaluating teacher performance | 24 |
| Determining professional development (PD) needs | 27 |
| Identifying students needing additional academic support | 36 |
| Placing students in classes or in small groups for targeted instruction | 29 |
| Identifying English learners (ELs) who can exit EL services | 28 |
| Measuring and monitoring the progress of student subgroups | 40 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 |
| Number of districts responding | 517 |

Note: The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S46.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 3-5).

Exhibit 2.3.13. Number of states reporting the extent to which not having the 2019-20 statewide summative assessment data affected states' ability to conduct functions and processes this school year (2020-21)

| Function or process | Number of states | | | |
|--|---|--------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| | No effect or assessment not used for this purpose | Small effect | Moderate effect | Substantial effect |
| Calculating indicators used in the state's federal accountability system | 6 | 2 | 6 | 37 |
| Understanding general district/schools performance | 4 | 5 | 15 | 27 |
| Developing or monitoring district or school improvement plans | 5 | 14 | 18 | 14 |
| Allocating additional resources to districts to implement district or school improvement plans | 13 | 21 | 13 | 4 |
| Implementing or expanding remote learning options for districts, schools, or families | 42 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Evaluating teacher performance | 28 | 8 | 7 | 8 |
| Evaluating the effectiveness of interventions | 11 | 17 | 13 | 10 |
| Reviewing the state's academic content or achievement standards | 28 | 11 | 7 | 5 |
| Evaluating attendance definitions or criteria | 40 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| Determining professional development (PD) or technical assistance needs | 19 | 16 | 11 | 5 |

Note: Table is based on 51 responding states

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 3-8).

2.3 Assessments: Effects of not having 2019-20 summative assessment data

Exhibit 2.3.14. Percentage of districts reporting the extent to which not having the 2019-20 statewide summative assessment data affected districts’ and schools’ ability to conduct functions and processes this school year (2020-21)

| Function or process | Percent of districts | | | |
|---|---|--------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| | No effect or assessment not used for this purpose | Small effect | Moderate effect | Substantial effect |
| Measuring and monitoring school improvement | 25 | 31 | 30 | 14 |
| Allocating funding, staff, other resources to schools | 59 | 28 | 11 | 31 |
| Evaluating teacher performance | 49 | 27 | 16 | 8 |
| Determining professional development (PD) needs | 41 | 32 | 22 | 5 |
| Identifying students needing additional academic support | 32 | 32 | 23 | 13 |
| Placing students in classes or in small groups for targeted instruction | 44 | 26 | 22 | 7 |
| Identifying English learners (ELs) who can exit EL services | 52 | 21 | 18 | 10 |
| Measuring and monitoring the progress of student subgroups | 29 | 31 | 26 | 14 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: Table is based on 17,084 districts represented and 517 districts responding. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S47.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 3-5).

2.4 CARES Act Funding

District use of CARES Act funds

Exhibit 2.4.1. Cumulative percentage of districts that first received ESSER, CRF, and GEER funds from the state, by month

| Month and year | Cumulative percentage that had first received ESSER funds by this month | Cumulative percentage that had first received CRF | Cumulative percentage that had first received GEER funds by this month | Cumulative percentage had received any CARES Act funds by this month |
|----------------|---|---|--|--|
| March 2020 | 5 | 1! | 1! | 5 |
| April 2020 | 9 | 2 | 1! | 10 |
| May 2020 | 18 | 6 | 2 | 21 |
| June 2020 | 25 | 9 | 4 | 30 |
| July 2020 | 35 | 13 | 8 | 41 |
| August 2020 | 49 | 21 | 12 | 57 |
| September 2020 | 65 | 34 | 16 | 72 |
| October 2020 | 73 | 43 | 22 | 82 |
| November 2020 | 78 | 47 | 24 | 86 |
| December 2020 | 81 | 49 | 32 | 90 |
| January 2021 | 84 | 51 | 36 | 92 |
| February 2021 | 86 | 52 | 38 | 93 |
| March 2021 | 89 | 53 | 42 | 94 |
| April 2021 | 92 | 54 | 44 | 97 |
| May 2021 | 93 | 55 | 44 | 97 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: Exhibit is based on 17,037 districts (516 districts unweighted). The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S48.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 4-1).

2.4 CARES Act Funding: District use of CARES Act funds

Exhibit 2.4.2. Mean percentage of ESSER, GEER, and CRF funds used for activities and purposes during the 2020-21 school year

| Activity/purpose | Mean percentage spent by funding source | | |
|---|---|--------------|--------------|
| | ESSER | GEER | CRF |
| Providing distance education and remote learning during full or partial school closures, including purchasing educational technology to support remote learning | 33 | 47 | 45 |
| Changing facilities or schedules to maintain physical distance and enhance safety for students and staff, modifying cleaning and sanitation procedures, or purchasing personal protective equipment (PPE) | 23 | 19 | 29 |
| Continuing to employ existing staff | 18 | 9 | 6 |
| Other regular district or school operations | 14 | 9 | 11 |
| Adding academic, social-emotional, or mental health support to aid students | 9 | 14 | 7 |
| Planning and coordination with other agencies and entities in preparation for continuation of the pandemic or a future disaster | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Number of districts represented | 15,830 | 7,560 | 9,352 |
| Number of districts responding | 490 | 240 | 301 |

Note: The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S49.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 4-10).

Exhibit 2.4.3. Percentage of districts that used CARES Act funding to carry out activities related to distance education or remote learning during the 2020-21 school year

| Activity related to distance education and remote learning | District carried out the CARES Act-funded activity in: | | |
|--|--|--------------|---------------------|
| | All schools | Some schools | Some or all schools |
| Purchasing and distributing digital devices or Internet access to students and their families | 84 | 5 | 89 |
| Purchasing and maintaining technology (hardware, software, connectivity) to be used by school staff to support remote learning | 82 | 5 | 88 |
| Purchasing new online instructional programs or materials | 70 | 5 | 75 |
| Professional development or training to help teachers and instructional support staff provide instruction in a distance learning environment | 61 | 3! | 64 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: Exhibit is based on 16,642 districts that received CARES Act funds (507 districts unweighted). The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S50.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 4-4).

2.4 CARES Act Funding: District use of CARES Act funds

Exhibit 2.4.4. Percentage of districts that used CARES Act funding to carry out activities to maintain physical distance or other safety precautions in school buildings during the 2020-21 school year

| Activity related to maintaining physical distance or other safety precautions | District carried out the CARES Act-funded activity in: | |
|---|--|--------------|
| | All schools | Some schools |
| Modifying cleaning and sanitation procedures to minimize the spread of infectious diseases, including purchasing supplies, training, or expanding staff | 91 | . |
| Purchasing masks or other personal protective equipment for students or staff | 89 | . |
| Purchasing needed supplies and re-arranging classroom space to create more room among students and teachers | 81 | 3! |
| Changing student transportation options and schedules | 39 | 1! |

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: Exhibit is based on 16,642 districts that received CARES Act funds (507 districts unweighted). The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S51.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 4-6).

Exhibit 2.4.5. Percentage of districts that used CARES Act funding during the 2020-21 school year to provide supports or services intended to help students catch up academically or adjust to the effects of the coronavirus pandemic

| Activity to support students | District used CARES Act-funding to add support in: | | |
|---|--|--------------|---------------------|
| | All schools | Some schools | Some or all schools |
| Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction | 45 | 9 | 54 |
| Expanding social, emotional, or mental health support | 49 | 6 | 54 |
| Introducing or expanding family engagement | 35 | 6 | 40 |
| Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | 11 | 2 | 13 |

Note: Exhibit is based on 16,642 districts that received CARES Act funds (507 districts unweighted). The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S52.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 4-8).

2.4 CARES Act Funding: District targeting of CARES Act funds

District targeting of CARES Act funds

Exhibit 2.4.6. Percentage of districts that carried out CARES Act-funded activities related to distance education and remote learning during the 2020-21 school year, by school type

| Activity related to distance education and remote learning | Districts carried out this activity in CSI schools | Districts carried out this activity in other low-performing schools | Districts carried out this activity in Title I schools | Districts carried out this activity in other types of schools |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| Purchasing and distributing digital devices or Internet access to students and their families | 2! | 2! | 3! | . |
| Purchasing and maintaining technology (hardware, software, connectivity) to be used by school staff to support remote learning | 2! | 2! | 2! | . |
| Professional development (PD) or training to help teachers and instructional support staff provide instruction in a distance learning environment | . | . | 2! | . |
| Purchasing new online instructional programs or materials | . | . | . | . |

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: Table is based on 16,642 districts that received CARES Act funds (507 districts unweighted). The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S53.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 4-5).

2.4 CARES Act Funding: District targeting of CARES Act funds

Exhibit 2.4.7. Percentage of districts that carried out CARES Act-funded activities related to maintaining physical distance or other safety precautions in school buildings during the 2020-21 school year, by school type

| Activity related to distance education and remote learning | Districts carried out this activity in CSI schools | Districts carried out this activity in other low-performing schools | Districts carried out this activity in Title I schools | Districts carried out this activity in other types of schools |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| Purchasing needed supplies and re-arranging classroom space to create more room among students and teachers | . | . | . | . |
| Changing student transportation options and schedules | 2! | 1! | 3! | . |
| Modifying cleaning and sanitation procedures to minimize the spread of infectious diseases, including purchasing supplies, training, or expanding staff | . | . | . | . |
| Purchasing masks or other personal protective equipment (PPE) for students or staff | . | . | . | . |

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: Table is based on 16,642 districts that received CARES Act funds (507 districts unweighted). The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S54.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 4-7).

Exhibit 2.4.8. Percentage of districts that carried out CARES Act-funded activities related to supports or services intended to help students catch up or adjust to the effects of the coronavirus pandemic during the 2020-21 school year, by school type

| Activity related to distance education and remote learning | Districts carried out this activity in CSI schools | Districts carried out this activity in other low-performing schools | Districts carried out this activity in Title I schools | Districts carried out this activity in other types of schools |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction | 8! | 2! | 7! | 4! |
| Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | . | . | . | . |
| Expanding social, emotional, or mental health support | 5! | 4! | 9! | 2! |
| Introducing or expanding family engagement | 6! | 2! | 7! | . |

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: Table is based on 16,642 districts that received CARES Act funds (507 districts unweighted). The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S55.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 4-9).

2.4 CARES Act Funding: District staffing and CARES Act funding

District staffing and CARES Act funding

Exhibit 2.4.9. Median and average percentage of teachers and staff whose employment was supported by CARES funds in districts, and percentage of districts supporting all, some, or no staff with CARES Act funds

| Full-time equivalent (FTE) staff | Median percent supported by CARES Act funds | Average percent supported by CARES Act funds | Percent of districts that supported employment of: | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----|
| | | | None | Some staff (less than 20% of staff) | Some staff (more than 20% of staff) | All |
| Staff (including teachers) | 1! | 19 | 37 | 43 | 5 | 15 |
| Teachers | 0 | 19 | 52 | 28 | 5 | 15 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: Exhibit is based on 15,314 districts that received CARES Act funds (474 districts unweighted). This exhibit presents a national average of districts rather than a national average of teachers. The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S56.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 4-11).

Exhibit 2.4.10. Percentage of districts with change in FTE staffing from October 2019 to October 2020

| District change in FTE staffing | Percent of districts | |
|--|----------------------|---------------|
| | All staff | Teachers |
| >5% decrease | 12 | 9 |
| 5% decrease to 5% increase | 70 | 73 |
| >5% increase | 18 | 18* |
| Number of districts represented | 15,047 | 14,987 |
| Number of districts responding | 459 | 459 |

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage of districts with a more than a five percent decrease in the number of teachers ($p < .05$).

Note: The analysis is limited to districts that included non-zero data on staff or teachers in the 2019-20 and 2020-21 school years. All changes in staffing refer to changes in FTEs rather than head counts of staff or teachers.

Note: The standard errors for the district estimates are presented in Exhibit 2.5.S57.

Source: 2020-21 district survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 4-11).

2.4 CARES Act Funding: State education agency ESSER funding

State education agency ESSER funding

Exhibit 2.4.11. Percent of ESSER funds in SEA reserve by round of funding

| State | Percent | | |
|---------------------------|------------|---------------|------------|
| | March 2020 | December 2020 | April 2021 |
| Alabama | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Alaska | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Arizona | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Arkansas | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| California | 10.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 |
| Colorado | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Connecticut | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Delaware | 9.5 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| District of Columbia | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Florida | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| Georgia | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Hawaii | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Idaho | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Illinois | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Indiana | 9.5 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Iowa | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Kansas | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Kentucky | 10.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 |
| Louisiana | 0.5 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Maine | 9.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Maryland | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Massachusetts | 10.0 | 9.3 | 0.0 |
| Michigan | 10.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 |
| Minnesota | 10.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 |
| Mississippi | 6.5 | 10.0 | 0.0 |
| Missouri | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Montana | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Nebraska | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Nevada | 10.0 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| New Hampshire | 10.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 |
| New Jersey | 5.3 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| New Mexico | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| New York | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| North Carolina | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| North Dakota | 10.0 | 9.3 | 10.0 |
| Ohio | 10.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 |
| Oklahoma | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Oregon | 10.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 |
| Pennsylvania | 9.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Puerto Rico | 0.4 | 0.5 | 5.0 |
| Rhode Island | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| South Carolina | 9.9 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| South Dakota | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Texas | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| Utah | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Vermont | 10.0 | 9.5 | 10.0 |
| Virginia | 10.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 |
| Washington | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| West Virginia | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Wisconsin | 10.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 |
| Wyoming | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Average percentage | 8.8 | 8.8 | 6.8 |
| Number of states | 51 | | |

n.a. Not available due to nonresponse.

Source: 2020–21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 4-1);

[ESSER Awards - Office of Elementary and Secondary Education](#) for ESSER I (March 2020);

[Final ESSERII Methodology Table 1.5.21.pdf \(ed.gov\)](#) for ESSER II (December 2020); and [Department of Education](#)

[Announces American Rescue Plan Funds for All 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia to Help Schools](#)

[Reopen](#) (March 2021).

2.4 CARES Act Funding: State education agency ESSER funding

Exhibit 2.4.12. Average percentage of March 2020 ESSER funds allocated from SEA reserve, by activity

| Activity | Average percentage allocated per state | Percentage of all funds |
|---|--|-------------------------|
| Improving school capacity for and student access to remote learning through hardware, software, and connectivity | 21 | 18 |
| Developing and disseminating information on instructional strategies and best practices for remote learning, including through training and professional development for teachers and other staff | 10 | 9 |
| Promoting parent awareness of how they can support their children's participation in remote learning | 1 | 1 |
| Minimizing the spread of infectious disease through providing sanitation supplies, personal protective equipment, and training for school and district staff | 3 | 2 |
| Other emergency needs as determined by the SEA to address issues responding to the coronavirus | 24 | 33 |
| Administrative costs | 7 | 3 |
| Additional funds allocated to LEAs from the state-reserved funds | 28 | 28 |
| State-reserved funds not yet allocated to a specific state activity | 5 | 6 |
| Number of states | 47 | |

Source: 2020-21 state survey on implementation of federal education policies in the wake of the pandemic (question 4-2).

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S1. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that closed school buildings districtwide for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus, and the percentage of students affected by these closures: 2020-21

| Number of days school buildings closed districtwide | Percent of districts | Percent of students |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Any number of school days | 2.8 | 3.1 |
| 1-40 days | 2.5 | 2.6 |
| 41-80 days | 1.3 | 2.2 |
| 81-120 days | 1.2 | 1.6 |
| More than 120 days | 1.6 | 1.5 |
| No school days | 2.8 | 3.1 |
| Mean number of school days (including 0) | 2.1 | 2.7 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.1.3. See that exhibit for additional details.

Exhibit 2.5.S2. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that closed school buildings districtwide for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus, by district poverty status: 2020-21

| Number of days school buildings closed districtwide | Percent of: | | |
|--|----------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| | All districts | High poverty districts | Medium or low poverty districts |
| Any number of school days | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.6 |
| 1-40 days | 2.5 | 3.4 | 3.2 |
| 41-80 days | 1.3 | 2.8 | 1.5 |
| 81-120 days | 1.2 | 2.2 | 1.5 |
| More than 120 days | 1.6 | 3.0 | 1.9 |
| No school days | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.6 |
| Mean number of school days (including 0) | 2.1 | 3.4 | 2.4 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.1.4. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S3. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that closed school buildings districtwide for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus, by district urbanicity and the percentage of students affected by these closures

| Number of days school buildings closed districtwide | Percent of: | | | | | Students |
|---|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|
| | All districts | Urban districts | Suburban districts | Town districts | Rural districts | |
| Any number of school days | 65 | 74 | 66 | 63 | 61 | 63 |
| 1-40 days | 2.5 | 5.5 | 4.3 | 5.1 | 4.5 | 2.6 |
| 41-80 days | 1.3 | 4.1 | 2.3 | 4.6 | 1.8 | 2.2 |
| 81-120 days | 1.2 | 5.6 | 1.9 | ‡ | ‡ | 1.6 |
| More than 120 days | 1.6 | 5.7 | 4.1 | ‡ | ‡ | 1.5 |
| No school days | 2.8 | 6.6 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 3.1 |
| Mean number of school days (including 0) | 2.1 | 5.6 | 4.9 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.7 |

‡ Not applicable. Estimate either rounds to zero or cannot be reported because reporting standards are not met.
Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.1.5. See that exhibit for additional details.

Exhibit 2.5.S4. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that received a waiver from the state’s minimum instructional time requirement due to the coronavirus pandemic

| State instructional time waivers | Percent of districts |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Received a waiver | 2.6 |
| Did not receive a waiver | 2.6 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.1.8. See that exhibit for additional details.

Exhibit 2.5.S5. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that reported most students received in-person, hybrid, or remote instruction during three time periods in the school year

| Type of instruction most students received | Percent of districts during the: | | |
|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | First month of school year | First month after New Year’s holiday | Month prior to the survey |
| In person only, in school buildings | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.4 |
| Hybrid learning | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.5 |
| Remote learning only | 1.7 | 1.9 | 1.5 |
| Other | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.8 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.1.9. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S6. Standard errors for the percentage of students in districts that reported most students received in-person, hybrid, or remote instruction during three time periods in the school year

| Type of instruction most students received | Percent of students during the: | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | First month of school year | First month after New Year's holiday | Month prior to the survey |
| In-person only, in school buildings | 1.9 | 2.4 | 3.1 |
| Hybrid learning | 2.1 | 2.7 | 3.1 |
| Remote learning only | 2.5 | 2.5 | 1.5 |
| Other | 0.8 | 1.8 | 1.1 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.1.10. See that exhibit for additional details.

Exhibit 2.5.S7. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that reported most students received the same or different types of instruction across three time periods in the school year, and the percentage of students in these districts: 2020-21

| Type of instruction most students received | Percent of districts | Percent of students |
|---|----------------------|---------------------|
| Same type of instruction across three time periods | 2.4 | 2.9 |
| In-person only, in school buildings | 2.1 | 1.9 |
| Hybrid learning | 1.8 | 2.3 |
| Remote learning only | 1.5 | 1.7 |
| Different types of instruction across three time periods | 2.4 | 3.0 |
| Remote in fall or winter to in-person in spring | 1.5 | 2.5 |
| Hybrid in fall or winter to in-person in spring | 2.2 | 2.5 |
| Remote in fall or winter to hybrid in spring | 2.0 | 2.4 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.1.11. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S8. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that reported most students received in-person, hybrid, or remote instruction during three time periods in the school year, by district poverty status: 2020-21

| Type of instruction most students received | Percent of: | | |
|---|---------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | All districts | High poverty districts | Medium to low poverty districts |
| First month of school year | | | |
| In-person only, in school buildings | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.7 |
| Hybrid learning | 2.2 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| Remote learning only | 1.7 | 2.7 | 2.1 |
| Other | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.4 |
| First month after New Year's holiday | | | |
| In-person only, in school buildings | 2.2 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| Hybrid learning | 2.4 | 3.7 | 2.9 |
| Remote learning only | 1.9 | 3.2 | 2.3 |
| Other | 0.8 | 1.2 | 1.0 |
| Month prior to the survey | | | |
| In-person only, in school buildings | 2.4 | 3.0 | 3.1 |
| Hybrid learning | 2.5 | 4.0 | 3.1 |
| Remote learning only | 1.5 | 3.6 | 1.6 |
| Other | 0.8 | ‡ | 1.1 |

‡ Not applicable. Estimate either rounds to zero or cannot be reported because reporting standards are not met.

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.1.12. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S9. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that reported most students received the same or different types of instruction across three time periods in the school year, by district poverty status: 2020-21

| Type of instruction most students received | Percent of: | | |
|---|---------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | All districts | High poverty districts | Medium to low poverty districts |
| Same type of instruction across three time periods | 2.4 | 3.9 | 3.1 |
| In-person only, in school buildings | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.7 |
| Hybrid learning | 1.8 | 2.8 | 2.3 |
| Remote learning only | 1.5 | 3.4 | 1.6 |
| Different types of instruction across three time periods | 2.4 | 3.9 | 3.1 |
| Remote in fall or winter to in-person in spring | 1.5 | 2.6 | 1.9 |
| Hybrid in fall or winter to in-person in spring | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.9 |
| Remote in fall or winter to hybrid in spring | 2.0 | 2.9 | 2.5 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.1.13. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S10. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that reported most students received the same or different types of instruction across three time periods in the school year, by district urbanicity: 2020-21

| Type of instruction most students received | Percent of: | | | |
|---|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| | All districts | Urban districts | Suburban districts | Town and rural districts |
| Same type of instruction across three time periods | 2.4 | 5.2 | 4.8 | 3.4 |
| In-person only, in school buildings | 2.1 | 0.7 | 3.1 | 3.5 |
| Hybrid learning | 1.8 | 3.1 | 4.5 | 2.4 |
| Remote learning only | 1.5 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 0.9 |
| Different types of instruction across three time periods | 2.4 | 5.2 | 4.8 | 5.9 |
| Remote in fall or winter to in-person in spring | 1.5 | 5.6 | 3.3 | 4.3 |
| Hybrid in fall or winter to in-person in spring | 2.2 | 5.5 | 3.1 | 4.4 |
| Remote in fall or winter to hybrid in spring | 2.0 | 7.3 | 4.9 | 4.9 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.1.14. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S11. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that gave priority to groups of students for in-person, in-school instruction, and the percentage of students in these districts

| Groups of students given priority | Percent of districts | Percent of students |
|--|----------------------|---------------------|
| Any group of students given priority | 2.6 | 2.7 |
| Students in specific grade levels | 2.3 | 3.0 |
| PreK | 1.6 | 2.8 |
| K-3 | 2.2 | 2.9 |
| 4-5 | 1.7 | 2.7 |
| 6-8 | 1.5 | 2.3 |
| 9-12 | 1.2 | 2.3 |
| Students with disabilities | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| English learners | 2.3 | 2.9 |
| Economically disadvantaged students or students in Title I schools | 2.0 | 2.9 |
| Students with limited access to technology | 2.3 | 2.9 |
| Students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 2.3 | 2.9 |
| Academically at-risk students | 2.2 | 2.7 |
| Other category of students | 1.0 | 1.9 |
| No group of students given priority | 2.6 | 2.7 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.1.15. See that exhibit for additional details.

Exhibit 2.5.S12. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required a minimum number of minutes of synchronous instruction for fourth grade students in remote learning

| Synchronous instruction policy | Percent of districts | Average number of minutes per day |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Required minimum number of minutes | 53 | † |
| Same for all fourth grade students | 2.8 | 9.7 |
| Different thresholds for fourth grade subgroups | 1.6 | † |
| Students with disabilities | 1.5 | 34.6 |
| English learners | 1.0 | 51.8 |
| Other category of students | 0.9 | 66.5 |
| No minimum number of minutes | 3.0 | † |

† Not applicable.

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.1.17. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S13. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that routinely and systematically examined data on student participation in remote learning activities

| Data examined | Percent of districts |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Student participation in remote learning activities | 1.1 |
| Participation of specific subgroups | 2.2 |
| Students in low-performing schools | 3.1 |
| Students in specific grade levels | 2.6 |
| PreK | 2.7 |
| K-3 | 2.7 |
| 4-5 | 2.6 |
| 6-8 | 2.9 |
| 9-12 | 2.9 |
| Students with disabilities | 2.6 |
| English learners | 2.7 |
| Economically disadvantaged students or students in Title I schools | 3.0 |
| Students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 2.8 |
| Academically at-risk students | 3.0 |
| Other category of students | 1.4 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.1.18. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S14. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that developed new or updated guidance documents or resource materials on selected topics, and percentage that prioritized the topic

| Topics of guidance documents/resource materials | Percent of districts that: | | |
|---|---|-------------------|---|
| | Developed guidance documents/resource materials | Prioritized topic | Did not develop guidance documents/resource materials |
| Curricula, standards, and subject matter content | 2.5 | 2.1 | 2.5 |
| Teaching strategies for remote learning | 1.4 | 2.4 | 1.4 |
| Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 1.9 | 2.5 | 1.9 |
| Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.3 |
| Supporting students' social, emotional, and mental health needs | 1.7 | 2.9 | 1.5 |
| Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures | 1.3 | 3.1 | 1.3 |
| Engaging students and families | 2.0 | 2.4 | 1.8 |
| Specific ways to support English learners (ELs) | 2.6 | 0.7 | 2.7 |
| Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs) | 2.3 | 1.9 | 2.3 |
| Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 2.9 | ‡ | 2.7 |

‡ Not applicable. Estimate either rounds to zero or cannot be reported because reporting standards are not met.

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.2. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S15. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that provided or arranged for professional development (PD) on selected topics for all, some, or no schools, and the percentage that prioritized the topic

| Professional development (PD) topics | Percent of districts that provided PD for: | | | Percent of districts that prioritized topic |
|---|--|--------------|------------|---|
| | All schools | Some schools | No schools | |
| Curricula, standards, and subject matter content | 2.4 | 1.2 | 2.2 | 2.9 |
| Teaching strategies for remote learning | 1.6 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 2.5 |
| Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 2.7 | 0.8 | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | 2.7 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 1.7 |
| Supporting students' social, emotional, and mental health needs | 2.1 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 3.0 |
| Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures | 1.9 | 0.8 | 1.7 | 2.8 |
| Engaging students and families | 2.3 | 1.4 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| Specific ways to support English learners (ELs) | 2.5 | 1.6 | 2.6 | 1.0 |
| Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs) | 2.4 | 1.2 | 2.3 | 2.2 |
| Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 2.6 | 1.4 | 2.6 | ‡ |

‡ Not applicable. Estimate either rounds to zero or cannot be reported because reporting standards are not met.
 Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.6. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S16. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that prioritized selected topics for professional development (PD), by district instruction type

| Topics prioritized for professional development (PD) | Percent of districts that were: | |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | Remote or hybrid at any point | Not remote or hybrid at any point |
| Curricula, standards, and subject matter content | 3.6 | 4.8 |
| Teaching strategies for remote learning | 2.9 | 4.2 |
| Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 2.5 | 6.0 |
| Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | 2.1 | 3.4 |
| Supporting students' social, emotional, and mental health needs | 3.7 | 4.9 |
| Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures | 3.0 | 5.2 |
| Engaging students and families | 2.3 | 4.9 |
| Specific ways to support English learners (ELs) | 1.5 | 0.8 |
| Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs) | 2.7 | 3.9 |
| Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 0.3 | 0.0 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.7. See that exhibit for additional details.

Exhibit 2.5.S17. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that prioritized health and safety guidance for professional development (PD), by district urbanicity and district instruction type

| District instruction type | Percent of districts that prioritized health/safety guidance for PD | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | All districts | Urban districts | Suburban districts | Town districts | Rural districts |
| All districts | 2.8 | 6.9 | 4.4 | 5.7 | 4.8 |
| Districts where either in-person or hybrid learning occurred at any point | 3.1 | 8.6 | 5.1 | 5.9 | 5.0 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.8. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S18. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that prioritized health and safety guidance for professional development (PD), by district poverty status and district instruction type

| District instruction type | Percent of districts that prioritized health/safety guidance for PD | | |
|---|---|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | All districts | High poverty districts | Medium to low poverty districts |
| All districts | 2.8 | 3.5 | 3.7 |
| Districts where either in-person or hybrid learning occurred at any point | 3.1 | 4.0 | 3.9 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.9. See that exhibit for additional details.

Exhibit 2.5.S19. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that prioritized SEL guidance for professional development (PD), by district urbanicity and district instruction type

| District instruction type | Percent of districts that prioritized SEL guidance for PD | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | All districts | Urban districts | Suburban districts | Town districts | Rural districts |
| All districts | 3.0 | 8.3 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 4.1 |
| Districts where either in-person or hybrid learning occurred at any point | 3.1 | 9.6 | 5.2 | 7.2 | 4.1 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.10. See that exhibit for additional details.

Exhibit 2.5.S20. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that prioritized SEL guidance for professional development (PD), by district poverty status and district instruction type

| District instruction type | Percent of districts that prioritized SEL guidance for PD | | |
|---|---|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | All districts | High poverty districts | Medium to low poverty districts |
| All districts | 3.0 | 4.3 | 3.7 |
| Districts where either in-person or hybrid learning occurred at any point | 3.1 | 4.6 | 3.8 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.11. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S21. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that prioritized remote learning teaching strategies for professional development (PD), by district instruction type

| District instruction type | Percent of districts that prioritized remote learning teaching strategies for PD |
|--|--|
| All districts | 2.5 |
| Among districts where | |
| In-person learning occurred in all three time periods | 4.4 |
| Remote learning occurred all three time periods | 4.8 |
| Either remote learning or hybrid occurred all three time periods | 3.7 |
| Either remote learning or hybrid occurred in at least one but not all three time periods | 4.0 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.12. See that exhibit for additional details.

Exhibit 2.5.S22. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that prioritized remote learning teaching strategies for professional development (PD), by district poverty status and district instruction type

| District instruction type | Percent of districts that prioritized remote learning teaching strategies for PD | | |
|---|--|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | All districts | High poverty districts | Medium to low poverty districts |
| All districts | 2.5 | 3.7 | 3.1 |
| Districts where either in-person or hybrid learning occurred at any point | 2.6 | 4.4 | 3.2 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.13. See that exhibit for additional details.

Exhibit 2.5.S23. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that prioritized remote learning teaching strategies for professional development (PD), by district urbanicity and district instruction type

| District instruction type | Percent of districts that prioritized remote learning teaching strategies for PD | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | All districts | Urban districts | Suburban districts | Town districts | Rural districts |
| All districts | 2.5 | 5.8 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 3.9 |
| Districts where either in-person or hybrid learning occurred at any point | 2.6 | 7.3 | 4.8 | 5.2 | 4.2 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.14. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S24. Standard errors for the percentage of all districts that provided the same amount of professional development (PD) to all schools on selected topics, and the percentage of districts with specific types of schools that provided PD hours for those schools

| Professional development (PD) topics | Percent of districts that provided the same number of PD hours across all schools | Percent of districts with specific types of schools that provided more PD hours for: | | |
|---|---|--|-----------------|------------------------|
| | | CSI schools | Title I schools | Other types of schools |
| Curricula, standards, and subject matter content | 2.6 | 3.8 | 1.8 | 0.7 |
| Teaching strategies for remote learning | 1.9 | 3.6 | 1.5 | 0.5 |
| Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 2.8 | 3.5 | 1.4 | 0.4 |
| Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | 2.8 | 4.0 | 1.6 | 0.5 |
| Supporting students' social, emotional, and mental health needs | 2.4 | 3.2 | 1.5 | 0.4 |
| Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures | 2.2 | 2.6 | 1.4 | 0.3 |
| Engaging students and families | 2.4 | 3.4 | 1.7 | 0.4 |
| Specific ways to support English learners (ELs) | 2.5 | 3.0 | 1.6 | 0.9 |
| Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs) | 2.5 | 2.6 | 1.5 | 0.5 |
| Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 2.6 | 2.7 | 1.4 | 0.7 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.15. See that exhibit for additional details.

Exhibit 2.5.S25. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that increased, maintained, or reduced the number of hours of professional development (PD) provided to teachers compared to the previous year

| Change in professional development (PD) hours to teachers | Percent of districts |
|---|----------------------|
| More hours | 2.8 |
| About the same hours | 3.0 |
| Fewer hours | 1.8 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.16. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S26. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that increased, maintained, or reduced the number of hours of professional development (PD) provided to teachers compared to the previous year, by district poverty status: 2020-21

| Change in professional development (PD) hours to teachers | Percent of: | | |
|--|----------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| | All districts | High poverty districts | Medium to low poverty districts |
| More hours | 2.8 | 4.8 | 3.4 |
| About the same hours | 3.0 | 4.7 | 3.4 |
| Fewer hours | 1.8 | 2.8 | 2.3 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.17. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S27. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required all, some, or no schools to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning

| Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | Percent of districts that required strategy in: | | |
|--|---|--------------|------------|
| | All schools | Some schools | No schools |
| Instructional changes | | | |
| Reduce the scope of new material or content taught | 2.4 | 1.3 | 2.6 |
| Repeat more material or content from the student’s previous grade than usual | 2.8 | 1.3 | 2.7 |
| Provide more math or English language arts (ELA) instruction (e.g., “double-dosing” with two periods of math or ELA) | 2.2 | 1.3 | 2.4 |
| Assign students to multiple classes with the same set of peers (small learning communities) | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.6 |
| Purposefully assign students to at least one of the same teachers as last year (teacher looping) | 1.7 | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction | | | |
| Use paraprofessionals or instructional aides to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 2.9 | 1.9 | 2.5 |
| Provide tutoring for students identified as needing academic help | 2.3 | 1.8 | 1.9 |
| Dedicate time during the day or week for teachers to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 2.4 | 1.4 | 2.1 |
| Credit recovery or course progression strategies | | | |
| Offer or expand credit recovery programs during the school year | 2.6 | 1.9 | 2.7 |
| Offer or expand competency-based learning for students | 2.4 | 1.5 | 2.7 |
| Offer dual-enrollment or dual-credit coursework for high school students | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.7 |
| Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | | | |
| Offer or expand after- or before-school programs that provide supplemental academic instruction | 2.5 | 1.3 | 2.6 |
| Increase the length of the school day | 1.1 | 0.4 | 1.2 |
| Increase the length of the school year | 1.2 | 0.4 | 1.3 |
| Offer or expand summer school | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.2 |
| Family engagement | | | |
| Use family engagement liaisons, individual outreach, or a family engagement protocol to re-engage students who dropped out or lost contact | 2.5 | 1.1 | 2.4 |
| Provide or increase home visits by district or school staff | 2.6 | 1.5 | 2.5 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.18. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S28. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required schools to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning, by type of school

| Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | Percent of districts that required strategy in: | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|-----------------|
| | CSI schools | Other low-performing schools | Title I schools |
| Instructional changes | | | |
| Reduce the scope of new material or content taught | 4.7 | 6.7 | 2.5 |
| Repeat more material or content from the student's previous grade than usual | 6.1 | 6.8 | 2.8 |
| Provide more math or English language arts (ELA) instruction (e.g., "double-dosing" with two periods of math or ELA) | 6.4 | 5.3 | 2.4 |
| Assign students to multiple classes with the same set of peers (small learning communities) | 6.0 | 5.5 | 2.7 |
| Purposefully assign students to at least one of the same teachers as last year (teacher looping) | 3.5 | 2.9 | 1.7 |
| Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction | | | |
| Use paraprofessionals or instructional aides to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 4.3 | 6.5 | 2.7 |
| Provide tutoring for students identified as needing academic help | 3.4 | 5.3 | 2.1 |
| Dedicate time during the day or week for teachers to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 4.8 | 6.0 | 2.3 |
| Credit recovery or course progression strategies | | | |
| Offer or expand credit recovery programs during the school year | 6.1 | 6.3 | 2.7 |
| Offer or expand competency-based learning for students | 5.9 | 5.9 | 2.5 |
| Offer dual-enrollment or dual-credit coursework for high school students | 6.3 | 7.1 | 2.8 |
| Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | | | |
| Offer or expand after- or before-school programs that provide supplemental academic instruction | 5.7 | 6.8 | 2.6 |
| Increase the length of the school day | 4.2 | 2.9 | 1.3 |
| Increase the length of the school year | 4.4 | 3.7 | 1.3 |
| Offer or expand summer school | 6.0 | 5.1 | 2.1 |
| Family engagement | | | |
| Use family engagement liaisons, individual outreach, or a family engagement protocol to re-engage students who dropped out or lost contact | 6.0 | 3.8 | 2.7 |
| Provide or increase home visits by district or school staff | 5.3 | 4.8 | 2.8 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.19. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S29. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required all or some schools to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning, by district poverty status: 2020-21

| Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | Percent of: | | |
|--|---------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | All districts | High poverty districts | Medium to low poverty districts |
| Instructional changes | 2.3 | 2.7 | 3.1 |
| Reduce the scope of new material or content taught | 2.6 | 3.4 | 3.3 |
| Repeat more material or content from the student’s previous grade than usual | 2.7 | 3.9 | 3.6 |
| Provide more math or English language arts (ELA) instruction (e.g., “double-dosing” with two periods of math or ELA) | 2.4 | 4.0 | 3.0 |
| Assign students to multiple classes with the same set of peers (small learning communities) | 2.6 | 3.9 | 3.4 |
| Purposefully assign students to at least one of the same teachers as last year (teacher looping) | 2.0 | 3.7 | 2.4 |
| Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.8 |
| Use paraprofessionals or instructional aides to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 2.5 | 2.9 | 3.3 |
| Provide tutoring for students identified as needing academic help | 1.9 | 2.5 | 2.4 |
| Dedicate time during the day or week for teachers to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 2.1 | 2.5 | 2.9 |
| Credit recovery or course progression strategies | 2.3 | 3.5 | 3.0 |
| Offer or expand credit recovery programs during the school year | 2.7 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Offer or expand competency-based learning for students | 2.7 | 4.3 | 3.5 |
| Offer dual-enrollment or dual-credit coursework for high school students | 2.7 | 4.0 | 3.5 |
| Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | 2.1 | 3.3 | 2.7 |
| Offer or expand after- or before-school programs that provide supplemental academic instruction | 2.6 | 4.1 | 3.4 |
| Increase the length of the school day | 1.2 | 2.7 | 1.2 |
| Increase the length of the school year | 1.3 | 2.5 | 1.4 |
| Offer or expand summer school | 2.2 | 3.7 | 2.8 |
| Family engagement | 2.0 | 2.8 | 2.6 |
| Use family engagement liaisons, individual outreach, or a family engagement protocol to re-engage students who dropped out or lost contact | 2.4 | 3.8 | 3.1 |
| Provide or increase home visits by district or school staff | 2.5 | 4.5 | 3.1 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.20. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S30. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required all or some schools to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning, by district urbanicity

| Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | Percent of districts that required all or some schools to use strategy | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | All districts | Urban districts | Suburban districts | Town districts | Rural districts |
| Instructional changes | | | | | |
| Reduce the scope of new material or content taught | 2.6 | 6.4 | 5.2 | 5.5 | 4.6 |
| Repeat more material or content from the student's previous grade than usual | 2.7 | 7.5 | 5.1 | 5.7 | 4.0 |
| Provide more math or English language arts (ELA) instruction (e.g., "double-dosing" with two periods of math or ELA) | 2.4 | 7.5 | 4.2 | 4.8 | 4.3 |
| Assign students to multiple classes with the same set of peers (small learning communities) | 2.6 | 6.4 | 4.9 | 5.2 | 4.4 |
| Purposefully assign students to at least one of the same teachers as last year (teacher looping) | 2.0 | 6.2 | 4.5 | 4.9 | 2.5 |
| Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction | | | | | |
| Use paraprofessionals or instructional aides to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 2.5 | 6.4 | 5.1 | 4.7 | 4.1 |
| Provide tutoring for students identified as needing academic help | 1.9 | 5.2 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.0 |
| Dedicate time during the day or week for teachers to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 2.1 | 4.9 | 4.5 | 5.9 | 3.7 |
| Credit recovery or course progression strategies | | | | | |
| Offer or expand credit recovery programs during the school year | 2.7 | 6.4 | 4.7 | 5.4 | 4.7 |
| Offer or expand competency-based learning for students | 2.7 | 6.2 | 5.1 | 5.9 | 4.6 |
| Offer dual-enrollment or dual-credit coursework for high school students | 2.7 | 5.1 | 4.6 | 5.4 | 4.8 |
| Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | | | | | |
| Offer or expand after- or before-school programs that provide supplemental academic instruction | 2.6 | 8.1 | 4.4 | 5.4 | 4.5 |
| Increase the length of the school day | 1.2 | ‡ | 2.2 | 3.1 | 2.2 |
| Increase the length of the school year | 1.3 | ‡ | 0.8 | 2.6 | 1.9 |
| Offer or expand summer school | 2.2 | 6.5 | 4.5 | 2.8 | 3.9 |
| Family engagement | | | | | |
| Use family engagement liaisons, individual outreach, or a family engagement protocol to re-engage students who dropped out or lost contact | 2.4 | 5.7 | 3.9 | 5.2 | 4.5 |
| Provide or increase home visits by district or school staff | 2.5 | 6.9 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 4.3 |

‡ Not applicable. Estimate either rounds to zero or cannot be reported because reporting standards are not met.

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.21. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S31. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required more, about the same number, or fewer schools than the previous year to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning

| Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | Percent of districts that required strategy in: | | Percent of districts that did not require strategy |
|--|---|---|--|
| | More schools | About the same number of schools or fewer schools | |
| Instructional changes | | | |
| Reduce the scope of new material or content taught | 2.3 | 1.9 | 2.6 |
| Repeat more material or content from the student’s previous grade than usual | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.7 |
| Provide more math or English language arts (ELA) instruction (e.g., “double-dosing” with two periods of math or ELA) | 1.4 | 2.3 | 2.4 |
| Assign students to multiple classes with the same set of peers (small learning communities) | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.6 |
| Purposefully assign students to at least one of the same teachers as last year (teacher looping) | 1.1 | 1.6 | 2.0 |
| Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction | | | |
| Use paraprofessionals or instructional aides to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 2.6 | 2.9 | 2.5 |
| Provide tutoring for students identified as needing academic help | 2.6 | 2.8 | 1.9 |
| Dedicate time during the day or week for teachers to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.1 |
| Credit recovery or course progression strategies | | | |
| Offer or expand credit recovery programs during the school year | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.7 |
| Offer or expand competency-based learning for students ³ | 1.8 | 2.3 | 2.7 |
| Offer dual-enrollment or dual-credit coursework for high school students ⁴ | 1.5 | 2.9 | 2.7 |
| Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | | | |
| Offer or expand after- or before-school programs that provide supplemental academic instruction | 1.9 | 2.7 | 2.6 |
| Increase the length of the school day | 0.8 | 0.9 | 1.2 |
| Increase the length of the school year | 0.5 | 1.2 | 1.3 |
| Offer or expand summer school | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.2 |
| Family engagement | | | |
| Use family engagement liaisons, individual outreach, or a family engagement protocol to re-engage students who dropped out or lost contact | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.4 |
| Provide or increase home visits by district or school staff | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.5 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.22. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S32. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required more schools than the previous year to use strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning, by district poverty status

| | Percent of districts that required strategy in more schools than previous year | | |
|--|--|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | All districts | High poverty districts | Medium to low poverty districts |
| Strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | | | |
| Instructional changes | | | |
| Reduce the scope of new material or content taught | 2.3 | 3.5 | 3.0 |
| Repeat more material or content from the student’s previous grade than usual | 2.3 | 4.6 | 2.7 |
| Provide more math or English language arts (ELA) instruction (e.g., “double-dosing” with two periods of math or ELA) | 1.4 | 2.5 | 1.6 |
| Assign students to multiple classes with the same set of peers (small learning communities) | 2.0 | 3.4 | 2.5 |
| Purposefully assign students to at least one of the same teachers as last year (teacher looping) | 1.1 | 2.4 | 1.2 |
| Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction | | | |
| Use paraprofessionals or instructional aides to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 2.6 | 4.0 | 3.2 |
| Provide tutoring for students identified as needing academic help | 2.6 | 4.4 | 3.0 |
| Dedicate time during the day or week for teachers to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 2.5 | 4.4 | 3.0 |
| Credit recovery or course progression strategies | | | |
| Offer or expand credit recovery programs during the school year | 2.2 | 3.4 | 2.8 |
| Offer or expand competency-based learning for students | 1.8 | 3.3 | 2.0 |
| Offer dual-enrollment or dual-credit coursework for high school students | 1.5 | 2.7 | 1.8 |
| Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | | | |
| Offer or expand after- or before-school programs that provide supplemental academic instruction | 1.9 | 3.8 | 2.2 |
| Increase the length of the school day | 0.8 | 1.2 | 1.0 |
| Increase the length of the school year | 0.5 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| Offer or expand summer school | 2.3 | 4.2 | 2.8 |
| Family engagement | | | |
| Use family engagement liaisons, individual outreach, or a family engagement protocol to re-engage students who dropped out or lost contact | 2.5 | 3.8 | 3.0 |
| Provide or increase home visits by district or school staff | 2.2 | 4.4 | 2.8 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.23. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S33. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required all, some, or no schools to use strategies to address students' social-emotional or mental health needs

| Strategies to address students' social-emotional or mental health needs | Percent of districts that required strategy in: | | |
|---|---|--------------|------------|
| | All schools | Some schools | No schools |
| Increase the number of staff to support students' mental health (e.g., by increasing the number of counselors, psychologists, social workers, behavioral aides, or the use of external mental health providers) | 2.6 | 1.2 | 2.8 |
| Offer or expand district-provided social-emotional learning (SEL) programs | 3.0 | 1.7 | 2.5 |
| Offer or expand positive school climate and/or cyber bullying prevention programs | 3.1 | 1.5 | 2.9 |
| Systematically identify signs of trauma or a mental health crisis among students | 2.8 | 1.2 | 2.6 |
| Conduct a needs assessment of students needing meals, technology to access school resources, or other supports | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.1 |
| Offer or expand the use of student peer advisors for student mentoring and support | 2.4 | 1.1 | 2.6 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.24. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S34. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required schools to use strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs, by type of school: 2020-21

| Strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs | Percent of districts that required strategy in: | | | |
|---|---|-------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| | All or some schools | CSI schools | Other low-performing schools | Title I schools |
| Increase the number of staff to support students’ mental health (e.g., by increasing the number of counselors, psychologists, social workers, behavioral aides, or the use of external mental health providers) | 2.8 | 6.0 | 6.9 | 2.9 |
| Offer or expand district-provided social-emotional learning (SEL) programs | 2.5 | 5.4 | 4.6 | 2.8 |
| Offer or expand positive school climate and/or cyber bullying prevention programs | 2.9 | 5.4 | 5.0 | 2.9 |
| Systematically identify signs of trauma or a mental health crisis among students | 2.6 | 4.9 | 5.2 | 2.5 |
| Conduct a needs assessment of students needing meals, technology to access school resources, or other supports | 2.1 | 4.6 | 3.8 | 2.1 |
| Offer or expand the use of student peer advisors for student mentoring and support | 2.6 | 5.7 | 5.8 | 2.5 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.25. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S35. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required all or some schools to use strategies to address students' social-emotional or mental health needs, by district poverty status: 2020-21

| Strategies to address students' social-emotional or mental health needs | Percent of: | | |
|---|---------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | All districts | High poverty districts | Medium to low poverty districts |
| Increase the number of staff to support students' mental health (e.g., by increasing the number of counselors, psychologists, social workers, behavioral aides, or the use of external mental health providers) | 2.8 | 3.8 | 3.5 |
| Offer or expand district-provided social-emotional learning (SEL) programs | 2.5 | 3.9 | 3.0 |
| Offer or expand positive school climate and/or cyber bullying prevention programs | 2.9 | 3.8 | 3.7 |
| Systematically identify signs of trauma or a mental health crisis among students | 2.6 | 2.8 | 3.4 |
| Conduct a needs assessment of students needing meals, technology to access school resources, or other supports | 2.1 | 2.5 | 2.8 |
| Offer or expand the use of student peer advisors for student mentoring and support | 2.6 | 3.7 | 3.2 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.26. See that exhibit for additional details.

Exhibit 2.5.S36. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required all or some schools to use strategies to address students' social-emotional or mental health needs, by district urbanicity

| Strategies to address students' social-emotional or mental health needs | Percent of districts that required all or some schools to use strategy | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | All districts | Urban districts | Suburban districts | Town districts | Rural districts |
| Increase the number of staff to support students' mental health (e.g., by increasing the number of counselors, psychologists, social workers, behavioral aides, or the use of external mental health providers) | 2.8 | 6.3 | 5.6 | 5.9 | 4.4 |
| Offer or expand district-provided social-emotional learning (SEL) programs | 2.5 | 6.3 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 4.6 |
| Offer or expand positive school climate and/or cyber bullying prevention programs | 2.9 | 6.6 | 5.4 | 5.1 | 4.9 |
| Systematically identify signs of trauma or a mental health crisis among students | 2.6 | 7.0 | 5.2 | 2.9 | 4.4 |
| Conduct a needs assessment of students needing meals, technology to access school resources, or other supports | 2.1 | 6.1 | 3.4 | 4.5 | 3.4 |
| Offer or expand the use of student peer advisors for student mentoring and support | 2.6 | 7.4 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.3 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.27. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S37. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required more, about the same number, or fewer schools than the previous year to use strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs

| Strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs | Percent of districts that required strategy in: | | Percent of districts that did not require strategy |
|---|---|---|--|
| | More schools | About the same number of schools or fewer schools | |
| Increase the number of staff to support students’ mental health (e.g., by increasing the number of counselors, psychologists, social workers, behavioral aides, or the use of external mental health providers) | 2.4 | 1.7 | 2.8 |
| Offer or expand district-provided social-emotional learning (SEL) programs | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.5 |
| Offer or expand positive school climate and/or cyber bullying prevention programs | 2.3 | 2.8 | 2.9 |
| Systematically identify signs of trauma or a mental health crisis among students | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.6 |
| Conduct a needs assessment of students needing meals, technology to access school resources, or other supports | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.1 |
| Offer or expand the use of student peer advisors for student mentoring and support | 1.6 | 2.3 | 2.6 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.28. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S38. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that consulted sources to choose a new intervention, program, or practice

| Sources consulted for new strategies | Percent of districts |
|---|----------------------|
| Districts implemented a new intervention, program or practice | 2.8 |
| Sources consulted by districts that implemented a new intervention, program, or practice | |
| District's needs assessment | 3.1 |
| Guidance or advice from the state education department or a technical assistance center funded by the state | 4.0 |
| A list of vendors approved by the state | 2.8 |
| A list of evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies provided by the state | 3.6 |
| Information provided by the selected intervention's developer or vendor | 3.5 |
| Recommendations from colleagues in other school districts | 3.4 |
| Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center | 2.5 |
| Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory | 2.0 |
| Information from the What Works Clearinghouse, Evidence for ESSA, or another organization that rates evidence | 3.5 |
| Information from the district's research/evaluation office | 3.6 |
| Information from professional associations | 3.4 |
| Information from a college/university researcher | 3.7 |
| Other source | 2.4 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.2.34. See that exhibit for additional details.

Exhibit 2.5.S39. Standard errors for the number of states and percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment to some or all students at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year

| Schools and students required to assess | Number of states | Percent of districts |
|---|------------------|----------------------|
| All schools, all students | ‡ | 2.6 |
| All schools, some students | ‡ | 0.9 |
| Some schools, all students | ‡ | 1.4 |
| Some schools, some students | ‡ | 0.3 |
| Test not required | ‡ | 2.6 |
| Number of districts represented | | 17,079 |
| Number of states or districts responding | 51 | 517 |

‡ Not applicable. For state data, the standard error is not applicable because the survey was administered to the entire population rather than a sample.

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.3.1. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S40. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment to some or all students at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year, by district poverty status

| Type of instruction most students received | Percent of: | | |
|--|---------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | All districts | High-poverty districts | Medium- to low-poverty districts |
| All schools, all students | 2.6 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All schools, some students | 0.9 | 1.8 | 1.2 |
| Some schools, all students | 1.4 | 1.1 | 2.0 |
| Some schools, some students | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| Test not required | 2.6 | 3.0 | 3.4 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,079 | 4,664 | 12,415 |
| Number of districts responding | 517 | 203 | 314 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.3.2. See that exhibit for additional details.

Exhibit 2.5.S41. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment to some or all students at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year, by district urbanicity

| Type of instruction most students received | Percent of: | | | | |
|--|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | All districts | Urban districts | Suburban districts | Town districts | Rural districts |
| All schools, all students | 2.6 | 6.4 | 4.5 | 4.9 | 5.0 |
| All schools, some students | 0.9 | 0.6 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Some schools, all students | 1.4 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 4.9 | 2.4 |
| Some schools, some students | 0.3 | 0.0 | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Test not required | 2.6 | 6.0 | 4.2 | 5.6 | 4.4 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,079 | 3,206 | 4,154 | 2,560 | 7,159 |
| Number of districts responding | 517 | 111 | 159 | 92 | 155 |

‡ Not applicable. Estimate either rounds to zero or cannot be reported because reporting standards are not met.
Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.3.3. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S42. Standard errors for the number of states and percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year, by type of school where assessment required

| Type of school | Number of states | Percent of districts |
|---|------------------|----------------------|
| All schools | ‡ | 2.7 |
| Some schools | ‡ | 1.5 |
| CSI schools | ‡ | 0.5 |
| TSI or ATSI schools | ‡ | ‡ |
| Other low-performing schools | ‡ | 0.5 |
| Elementary schools | ‡ | 1.3 |
| Middle schools | ‡ | 1.4 |
| High schools | ‡ | 1.3 |
| Title I schools | ‡ | 0.6 |
| Other types of schools | ‡ | ‡ |
| Test not required | ‡ | 2.6 |
| Number of districts represented | | 17,079 |
| Number of states or districts responding | 51 | 517 |

‡ Not applicable. Estimate either rounds to zero or cannot be reported because reporting standards are not met. For state data, the standard error is not applicable because the survey was administered to the entire population rather than a sample.

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.3.4. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S43. Standard errors for the number of states and percentage of districts that required schools to administer an academic needs assessment at the beginning of the 2020-21 school year, by type of school where assessment required and type of student assessed

| Type of school and student | Number of states | Percent of districts |
|---|------------------|----------------------|
| All schools | ‡ | 2.7 |
| All students | ‡ | 2.6 |
| Some students | ‡ | 0.9 |
| Students in specific grade levels | ‡ | 0.9 |
| PK-grade 5 | ‡ | 0.9 |
| Grade 6-grade 8 | ‡ | 0.8 |
| Grade 9-grade 12 | ‡ | 0.6 |
| Some schools | ‡ | 1.5 |
| All students | ‡ | 1.4 |
| Some students | ‡ | 0.3 |
| Students in specific grade levels | ‡ | 0.3 |
| PK-grade 5 | ‡ | 0.3 |
| Grade 6-grade 8 | ‡ | ‡ |
| Grade 9-grade 12 | ‡ | ‡ |
| Not required | ‡ | 2.6 |
| Number of districts represented | | 17,079 |
| Number of states or districts responding | 51 | 517 |

‡ Not applicable. Estimate either rounds to zero or cannot be reported because reporting standards are not met. For state data, the standard error is not applicable because the survey was administered to the entire population rather than a sample.

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.3.5. See that exhibit for additional details.

Exhibit 2.5.S44. Standard errors for the number of states and percentage of districts that specified and required changes to the criteria for student attainment or progress measures for this school year: 2020-21

| Attainment or progress measure | Number of states | Percent of districts |
|--|------------------|----------------------|
| Use of state assessment results to determine whether a student can graduate from high school | ‡ | 1.8 |
| Other changes to high school graduation requirements | ‡ | 1.9 |
| Use of state assessment results to determine grade retention | ‡ | 1.8 |
| Other changes in standards for grade retention | ‡ | 1.8 |
| Use of state assessment results in course grades | ‡ | 2.0 |
| Other changes in standards for course grades | ‡ | 1.9 |
| Other changes | ‡ | 1.1 |
| Number of districts represented | | 17,070 |
| Number of states or districts responding | 51 | 516 |

‡ Not applicable. For state data, the standard error is not applicable because the survey was administered to the entire population rather than a sample.

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.3.8. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S45. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that changed their criteria for student measures for this school year (2020–21), compared with before the coronavirus pandemic, and whether change was required by state

| Attainment or progress measure | Percent of districts | | |
|--|--------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|
| | Change required by state | Changed, but not required by state | Did not change |
| Use of summative assessment results to determine whether a student can graduate from high school | 1.7 | 0.8 | 1.8 |
| Other changes to high school graduation requirements | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.9 |
| Use of summative assessment results to determine grade retention | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.8 |
| Other changes in standards for grade retention | 0.9 | 1.5 | 1.8 |
| Use of summative assessment results in course grades | 0.7 | 1.8 | 2.0 |
| Other changes in standards for course grades | 0.5 | 1.8 | 1.9 |
| Other changes | ‡ | ‡ | 1.1 |

‡ Not applicable. Estimate either rounds to zero or cannot be reported because reporting standards are not met.
 Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.3.9. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S46. Standard errors for the percentage of districts reporting the extent to which not having the 2019-20 statewide summative assessment data had a moderate or substantial effect on districts' and schools' ability to conduct functions and processes this school year (2020-21)

| Function or process | Percent of districts |
|---|----------------------|
| Measuring and monitoring school improvement | 2.5 |
| Allocating funding, staff, other resources to schools | 1.9 |
| Evaluating teacher performance | 2.2 |
| Determining professional development (PD) needs | 2.6 |
| Identifying students needing additional academic support | 2.6 |
| Placing students in classes or in small groups for targeted instruction | 2.2 |
| Identifying English learners (ELs) who can exit EL services | 1.9 |
| Measuring and monitoring the progress of student subgroups | 2.6 |
| Number of districts represented | 17,084 |
| Number of districts responding | 517 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.3.12. See that exhibit for additional details.

Exhibit 2.5.S47. Standard errors for the percentage of districts reporting the extent to which not having the 2019-20 statewide summative assessment data affected districts' and schools' ability to conduct functions and processes this school year (2020-21)

| Function or process | Percent of districts | | | |
|---|---|--------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| | No effect or assessment not used for this purpose | Small effect | Moderate effect | Substantial effect |
| Measuring and monitoring school improvement | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 1.6 |
| Allocating funding, staff, other resources to schools | 2.9 | 2.4 | 1.7 | 0.9 |
| Evaluating teacher performance | 2.5 | 2.1 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Determining professional development (PD) needs | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 1.2 |
| Identifying students needing additional academic support | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 2.0 |
| Placing students in classes or in small groups for targeted instruction | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 1.4 |
| Identifying English learners (ELs) who can exit EL services | 2.4 | 1.9 | 1.6 | 1.7 |
| Measuring and monitoring the progress of student subgroups | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 1.8 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.3.14. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S48. Standard errors for the cumulative percentage of districts that first received ESSER, CRF, and GEER funds from the state, by month

| Month and year | Cumulative percentage that had first received ESSER funds by this month | Cumulative percentage that had first received CRF | Cumulative percentage that had first received GEER funds by this month | Cumulative percentage had received any CARES Act funds by this month |
|----------------|---|---|--|--|
| March 2020 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 1.2 |
| April 2020 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 1.6 |
| May 2020 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 2.2 |
| June 2020 | 2.3 | 1.8 | 0.8 | 2.4 |
| July 2020 | 2.6 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 2.5 |
| August 2020 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 2.6 |
| September 2020 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 2.5 |
| October 2020 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 2.3 |
| November 2020 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 2.1 | 2.0 |
| December 2020 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 1.8 |
| January 2021 | 1.9 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 1.9 |
| February 2021 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 1.8 |
| March 2021 | 1.7 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 1.6 |
| April 2021 | 1.5 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 1.1 |
| May 2021 | 1.4 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 1.1 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.4.1. See that exhibit for additional details.

Exhibit 2.5.S49. Standard errors for the mean percentage of ESSER, GEER, and CRF funds used for activities and purposes during the 2020-21 school year

| Activity/purpose | Mean percentage spent by funding source | | |
|---|---|--------------|--------------|
| | ESSER | GEER | CRF |
| Providing distance education and remote learning during full or partial school closures, including purchasing educational technology to support remote learning | 1.6 | 3.0 | 2.3 |
| Changing facilities or schedules to maintain physical distance and enhance safety for students and staff, modifying cleaning and sanitation procedures, or purchasing personal protective equipment (PPE) | 1.3 | 2.6 | 1.9 |
| Continuing to employ existing staff | 1.8 | 2.2 | 1.1 |
| Other regular district or school operations | 1.5 | 1.9 | 1.8 |
| Adding academic, social-emotional, or mental health support to aid students | 1.2 | 2.3 | 0.8 |
| Planning and coordination with other agencies and entities in preparation for continuation of the pandemic or a future disaster | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| Number of districts represented | 15,830 | 7,560 | 9,352 |
| Number of districts responding | 490 | 240 | 301 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.4.2. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S50. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that used CARES Act funding to carry out activities related to distance education or remote learning during the 2020-21 school year

| Activity related to distance education and remote learning | District carried out the CARES Act-funded activity in: | | |
|--|--|--------------|---------------------|
| | All schools | Some schools | Some or all schools |
| Purchasing and distributing digital devices or Internet access to students and their families | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.7 |
| Purchasing and maintaining technology (hardware, software, connectivity) to be used by school staff to support remote learning | 2.2 | 1.1 | 1.9 |
| Purchasing new online instructional programs or materials | 2.8 | 0.9 | 2.6 |
| Professional development or training to help teachers and instructional support staff provide instruction in a distance learning environment | 2.6 | 0.9 | 2.7 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.4.3. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S51. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that used CARES Act funding to carry out activities to maintain physical distance or other safety precautions in school buildings during the 2020-21 school year

| Activity related to maintaining physical distance or other safety precautions | District carried out the CARES Act-funded activity in: | |
|---|--|--------------|
| | All schools | Some schools |
| Modifying cleaning and sanitation procedures to minimize the spread of infectious diseases, including purchasing supplies, training, or expanding staff | 1.6 | ‡ |
| Purchasing masks or other personal protective equipment for students or staff | 1.7 | ‡ |
| Purchasing needed supplies and re-arranging classroom space to create more room among students and teachers | 2.2 | 0.9 |
| Changing student transportation options and schedules | 2.6 | 0.3 |

‡ Not applicable. Estimate either rounds to zero or cannot be reported because reporting standards are not met.

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.4.4. See that exhibit for additional details.

Exhibit 2.5.S52. Standard errors for the percentage of districts that used CARES Act funding during the 2020-21 school year to provide supports or services intended to help students catch up academically or adjust to the effects of the coronavirus pandemic

| Activity to support students | District used CARES Act-funding to add support in: | | |
|---|--|--------------|---------------------|
| | All schools | Some schools | Some or all schools |
| Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction | 2.6 | 1.4 | 2.5 |
| Expanding social, emotional, or mental health support | 2.6 | 1.0 | 2.6 |
| Introducing or expanding family engagement | 2.5 | 1.0 | 2.6 |
| Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | 1.5 | 0.5 | 1.6 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.4.5. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S53. Standard errors for percentage of districts that carried out CARES Act-funded activities related to distance education and remote learning during the 2020-21 school year, by school type

| Activity related to distance education and remote learning | Districts carried out this activity in CSI schools: | Districts carried out this activity in other low-performing schools | Districts carried out this activity in Title I schools | Districts carried out this activity in other types of schools |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| Purchasing and distributing digital devices or Internet access to students and their families | 0.9 | 0.8 | 1.4 | ‡ |
| Purchasing and maintaining technology (hardware, software, connectivity) to be used by school staff to support remote learning | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 | ‡ |
| Professional development (PD) or training to help teachers and instructional support staff provide instruction in a distance learning environment | ‡ | ‡ | 0.8 | ‡ |
| Purchasing new online instructional programs or materials | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |

‡ Not applicable. Estimate either rounds to zero or cannot be reported because reporting standards are not met.

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.4.6. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S54. Standard errors for percentage of districts that carried out CARES Act-funded activities related to maintaining physical distance or other safety precautions in school buildings during the 2020-21 school year, by school type

| Activity related to distance education and remote learning | Districts carried out this activity in CSI schools | Districts carried out this activity in other low-performing schools | Districts carried out this activity in Title I schools | Districts carried out this activity in other types of schools |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| Purchasing needed supplies and re-arranging classroom space to create more room among students and teachers | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Changing student transportation options and schedules | 0.8 | 0.5 | 1.3 | ‡ |
| Modifying cleaning and sanitation procedures to minimize the spread of infectious diseases, including purchasing supplies, training, or expanding staff | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Purchasing masks or other personal protective equipment (PPE) for students or staff | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |

‡ Not applicable. Estimate either rounds to zero or cannot be reported because reporting standards are not met.
 Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.4.7. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S55. Standard errors for percentage of districts that carried out CARES Act-funded activities related to supports or services intended to help students catch up or adjust to the effects of the coronavirus pandemic during the 2020-21 school year, by school type

| Activity related to distance education and remote learning | Districts carried out this activity in CSI schools | Districts carried out this activity in other low-performing schools | Districts carried out this activity in Title I schools | Districts carried out this activity in other types of schools |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction | 3.4 | 0.9 | 2.0 | 1.3 |
| Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Expanding social, emotional, or mental health support | 1.6 | 1.4 | 3.1 | 0.9 |
| Introducing or expanding family engagement | 2.4 | 0.8 | 2.4 | ‡ |

‡ Not applicable. Estimate either rounds to zero or cannot be reported because reporting standards are not met.
Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.4.8. See that exhibit for additional details.

Exhibit 2.5.S56. Standard errors for the median and average percentage of teachers and staff whose employment was supported by CARES funds in districts, and percentage of districts supporting all, some, or no staff with CARES Act funds

| Full-time equivalent (FTE) staff | Median percent supported by CARES Act funds | Average percent supported by CARES Act funds | Percent of districts that supported employment of: | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|------------|
| | | | None | Some staff (less than 20% of staff) | Some staff (more than 20% of staff) | All |
| Staff (including teachers) | 0.5 | 2.1 | 296.4 | 297.4 | 157.5 | 208.3 |
| Teachers | 0.3 | 2.1 | 292.3 | 243.8 | 134.2 | 210.6 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.4.9. See that exhibit for additional details.

2.5 Standard Errors

Exhibit 2.5.S57. Standard errors for the percentage of districts with change in FTE staffing from October 2019 to October 2020

| District change in FTE staffing | Percent of districts | |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| | All staff | Teachers |
| >5% decrease | 2.8 | 2.2 |
| 5% decrease to 5% increase | 2.8 | 2.6 |
| >5% increase | 3.2 | 2.9 |
| Number of districts represented | 15,047 | 14,987 |
| Number of districts responding | 459 | 459 |

Notes: Standard errors in this exhibit correspond to the estimates presented in Exhibit 2.4.10. See that exhibit for additional details.

Chapter 3. Survey Instruments

Overview

This chapter contains the state and district survey instruments used to collect the data presented in this compendium. Both surveys were administered online.

OMB#: 1850-0958

Expiration Date: 3/31/2024

Implementation of Key Federal Education Policies in the Wake of the Coronavirus Pandemic

State Educational Agency Survey

2020-21



Notice of Confidentiality

Information collected for this study comes under the confidentiality and data protection requirements of the Institute of Education Sciences (The Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, Title I, Part E, Section 183). Responses to this data collection will be used only for statistical purposes. While individual states may be identified in reporting, individual respondents will not be identified. All of the information you provide may be used only for statistical purposes and may not be disclosed, or used, in identifiable form for any other purpose except as required by law (20 U.S.C. §9573 and 6 U.S.C. §151). States receiving funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) are expected to cooperate with Department evaluations (Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) (34 C.F.R. § 76.591)).

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1850-0958. The approximate time required to complete the survey is estimated to be 45 minutes including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-4651.

INTRODUCTION TO SURVEY

The U.S. Department of Education is examining the influence of the coronavirus pandemic on how states and districts implement key provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA), and use federal funds, including those provided specifically to help districts recover from the pandemic. The study includes surveys of officials from all states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico as well as from a nationally representative set of school districts.

- **The survey may require more than one respondent, given the scope of topics.** There are four sections: school operations, support for schools, measuring student and school improvement, and federal funding. We expect that a state educational agency representative with broad knowledge of the state’s school system, such as the Deputy Superintendent or Chief of Staff, would be well suited to respond to Sections 1 through 3 of the survey on school operations, support for schools, and measuring student and school improvement. The state’s Chief Financial Officer would likely be the most appropriate respondent for Section 4 of the survey on use of federal funds.
- **States may be identified in reporting, but individual respondents will not be identified.** Reports for this study and for collaborating studies funded by the Department will be published following the Notice of Confidentiality on the cover. While individual states may be identified in reporting, reports will not associate responses with a specific individual, and individual respondents will not be identified. There are no foreseeable risks with participating in the survey, and your state will be able to use the information in the reports to compare its strategies and policies to those reported by other states across the nation.
- **Your state’s responses are critical to drawing lessons about the implementation of federal policies during the pandemic.** States receiving funds under the ESEA are expected to cooperate with Department evaluations (Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) (34 C.F.R. § 76.591)).

The study, including this survey, is being conducted by Westat and its partner, Mathematica. For questions about this survey, please contact Kristina Rall of Mathematica at 202-264-3468 or krall@mathematica-mpr.com.

**Click the Next Button to
Start the Survey**

Section 1. School Operations

Definitions for this section

Attendance can be measured using any method during periods of remote learning. It may include collecting data on participation such as students who log into online learning platforms, join live classes by video, submit online or paper assignments, or communicate with their teachers.

Periods of remote learning include periods of time when school buildings are closed for in-person instruction and when schools use a hybrid of in-person and remote learning. Hybrid in-person and remote learning occurs when groups of students receive in-person instruction in schools on alternating days or weeks, or with staggered start and end times to the school day.

Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

These definitions also are available to respondents by hovering over the words that appear in blue text in the survey.

This section asks about the amount of instructional time required by your state, school closures, and remote learning during the 2020-21 school year.

1-1. Has your state reduced, waived, or eliminated, the minimum number of required instructional days or hours/minutes for this school year (2020-21) compared to the policy in place before the coronavirus pandemic?

- 2 Yes, the state reduced the minimum instructional time requirement for the 2020–21 school year
- 1 Yes, the state waived or eliminated the minimum instructional time requirement for the 2020–21 school year
- 0 No
- NA Not applicable - state has no instructional time requirement

Q.1-1 SKIP INSTRUCTION

States that answer “Yes, the state reduced” to Q.1-1 go to Q.1-1a.

States that answer “Yes, the state waived or eliminated” to Q.1-1 skip to Q.1-2

States that answer “No” to Q.1-1 skip to Q.1-3.

States that answer “Not applicable” to Q.1-1 skip to Q.1-3.

1-1a. By how many instructional days, hours, or minutes did your state reduce the minimum time requirement this school year (2020-21) compared to the policy in place before the coronavirus pandemic? (Select one response.)

Note: Fill in the number of instructional days, hours, or minutes most appropriate for your state's requirement. Please fill in requirements based on a school-year total and not minutes per quarter or semester.

Number of instructional days reduced over the school year

Number of instructional hours reduced over the school year

Number of instructional minutes reduced over the school year

1-2. Did your state grant waivers from the minimum instructional time requirement for this school year (2020-21)? (Select one response.)

1 State did not grant any instructional time waivers

2 State granted instructional time waivers to some districts or schools

Q.1-2 SKIP INSTRUCTION

States that answer "State granted instructional time waivers to some districts or schools" go to Q.1-2a.

States that answer "State did not grant any instructional time waivers" skip to Q.1-3.

1.2a. How many districts received waivers from the minimum instructional time requirement for this school year (2020-21)? (Please provide your best estimate.)

Number of districts that received a waiver

1-3. How many total days, if any, did your state close school buildings statewide for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus this school year (2020-21)?

Note: Count the total number of instructional days your state closed school buildings statewide for in-person instruction, with or without [remote learning](#), in response to the coronavirus. Do not include school closures due to other emergencies such as weather-related disruptions or for school holidays or break periods.

Number of total instructional days school buildings closed statewide for in-person instruction

1-4. This school year (2020-21), other than statewide closures, were individual districts permitted by your state to close school buildings for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus?

Note: Only consider instances when a district is permitted to close school buildings for in-person instruction, with or without [remote learning](#), in response to the coronavirus.

1 Yes

0 No

Q.1-4 SKIP INSTRUCTION

States that answer "Yes" go to Q.1-4a.

States that answer "No" skip to Q.1-5.

1-4a. Other than statewide closures, approximately how many districts closed school buildings *districtwide* for in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus at any point during this school year (2020-21)? (Please provide your best estimate.)

Note: Only consider instances when a district closed school buildings districtwide for in-person instruction, with or without [remote learning](#), in response to the coronavirus. Do not include school closures due to other emergencies such as weather-related disruptions or for school holidays or break periods.

Number of districts that closed school buildings districtwide for in-person instruction

NA My state does not track this information

1-5. For this school year (2020-21), did your state require or recommend an approach for schools and districts to count [remote learning](#) hours toward your state’s instructional time requirements? (Select one response.)

For example, states may provide guidance on how to count asynchronous [remote learning](#) time toward instructional time requirements.

1 Yes, the state **requires** schools and districts to follow a state-defined approach

2 Yes, the state **recommends** schools and districts follow a state-defined approach

0 No, the state does not require or recommend a state-defined approach

NA Not applicable - no [remote learning](#)

1-6. For this school year (2020-21), did your state require attendance tracking during periods of [remote learning](#)?

1 Yes

0 No

NA Not applicable - no [remote learning](#)

Q.1-6 SKIP INSTRUCTION

States that answer “Yes” or “No” go to Q.1-7.
States that answer “Not applicable” skip to Q.2-1.

1-7. For this school year (2020-21), did your state specify a definition or standard for what constitutes attendance during a day of [remote learning](#)?

1 Yes

0 No, the state allows schools and districts to determine what constitutes attendance

Section 2. Supports for Schools

Definitions for this section

Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) schools are those with subgroup achievement at very low levels, comparable to overall achievement in the bottom 5 percent of all Title I schools, as defined under ESEA for federal accountability.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools are those in the bottom 5 percent of all Title I schools and schools with graduation rates below 67 percent, as defined under ESEA for federal accountability.

ESSA Tier 1 or 2 evidence comes from studies using a well-implemented experimental or quasi-experimental design.

ESSA Tier 3 evidence comes from a well-implemented, correlational study that statistically controls for selection bias.

ESSA Tier 4 evidence based on high-quality research that the intervention is likely to improve student outcomes and an effort to study the effects of the intervention is underway.

Professional development (PD) includes training, seminars, workshops, or courses in large or small group settings intended to develop staff capacity to perform in the topic area.

Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) schools are those with one or more consistently underperforming subgroups, as defined under ESEA federal accountability.

Title I schools include those with targeted assistance and schoolwide Title I programs.

These definitions also are available to respondents by hovering over the words that appear in blue text in the survey.

The first set of questions asks about the kinds of support your state provided to districts and schools this school year (2020-21).

2-1. Has your state developed any new or updated guidance documents or resource materials on the following topics for use this school year (2020-21)?

| TOPIC | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | | |
|---|---------------------------------|----|------------|
| | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW |
| a. Curricula, standards, and subject matter content..... | 1 | 0 | DK |
| b. Teaching strategies for remote learning | 1 | 0 | DK |
| c. Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access . | 1 | 0 | DK |
| d. Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | 1 | 0 | DK |
| e. Supporting students' social, emotional, and mental health needs | 1 | 0 | DK |
| f. Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures | 1 | 0 | DK |
| g. Engaging students and families..... | 1 | 0 | DK |
| h. Specific ways to support English learners (ELs)..... | 1 | 0 | DK |
| i. Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs) | 1 | 0 | DK |
| j. Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care..... | 1 | 0 | DK |

Q.2-1 and Q.2-1a INSTRUCTION

Each item in Q.2-1 where the state answers “Yes,” the item will appear in Q.2-1a. Note: The online form will allow respondents to select at most three topics across all topics listed in Q.2-1a.

2-1a. Indicate the topics of new or updated guidance documents or resource materials on which your state spent the most staff time and resources this school year (2020-21)? (Select up to three.)

| |
|---|
| <p>SELECT UP TO 3 RESPONSES TOPICS ON WHICH YOUR STATE SPENT THE MOST TIME AND RESOURCES</p> |
|---|

| TOPIC | |
|--|---|
| a. Curricula, standards, and subject matter content | 1 |
| b. Teaching strategies for remote learning | 1 |
| c. Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 1 |
| d. Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning..... | 1 |
| e. Supporting students’ social, emotional, and mental health needs..... | 1 |
| f. Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedure | 1 |
| g. Engaging students and families | 1 |
| h. Specific ways to support English learners (ELs) | 1 |
| i. Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs)..... | 1 |
| j. Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 1 |

2-2. During this school year (2020–21), did your state provide or arrange for **professional development (PD)** on the following topics? Indicate whether your state provided or arranged for PD on the topic for no schools/districts, some schools/districts, or all schools/districts.

| PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (PD) TOPIC | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| | STATE PROVIDED OR ARRANGED FOR PD ON TOPIC FOR: | | |
| | NO SCHOOLS/ DISTRICTS | SOME SCHOOLS/ DISTRICTS | ALL SCHOOLS/ DISTRICTS |
| a. Curricula, standards, and subject matter content | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| b. Teaching strategies for remote learning | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| c. Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| d. Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning .. | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| e. Supporting students' social, emotional, and mental health needs..... | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| f. Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| g. Engaging students and families | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| h. Specific ways to support English learners (ELs) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| i. Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| j. Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care..... | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Q.2-2 SKIP INSTRUCTION

For each item in Q.2-2 where the state answers “All schools/districts,” the item will appear in Q.2-3.

For each item in Q.2-2 where the state answers “Some schools/districts,” the item will appear in Q.2-4.

2-3. Did your state provide or arrange for the same number of hours of **professional development (PD)** on the topic for all schools/districts? If not, identify the types of schools/districts where the state provided or arranged for *more hours of PD* on the topic.

| TOPIC | DID STATE PROVIDE OR ARRANGE FOR SAME NUMBER OF HOURS OF PD ON TOPIC ACROSS ALL SCHOOLS/DISTRICTS? | | IF NO, FOR WHICH SCHOOLS/DISTRICTS DID YOUR STATE PROVIDE OR ARRANGE FOR <i>MORE HOURS</i> OF PD? (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY IN EACH ROW) | | |
|---|--|----|--|---------------------------|--|
| | YES | NO | CSI SCHOOLS/DISTRICTS WITH A CSI SCHOOL | TITLE I SCHOOLS/DISTRICTS | OTHER TYPES OF SCHOOLS/DISTRICTS (SPECIFY) |
| a. Curricula, standards, and subject matter content | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |
| b. Teaching strategies for remote learning | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |
| c. Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |
| d. Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning..... | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |
| e. Supporting students' social, emotional, and mental health needs | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |
| f. Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures..... | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |
| g. Engaging students and families | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |
| h. Specific ways to support English learners (ELs) | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |
| i. Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs)..... | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |
| j. Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care..... | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |

2-4. For which schools/districts did your state provide or arrange for PD on the topic?

| PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (PD) TOPIC | SELECT ALL THAT APPLY IN EACH ROW | | |
|---|---|----------------------------------|--|
| | STATE PROVIDED OR ARRANGED FOR PD ON THE TOPIC FOR: | | |
| | CSI SCHOOLS/ DISTRICTS WITH A CSI SCHOOL | TITLE I SCHOOLS/ DISTRICTS | OTHER TYPES OF SCHOOLS/ DISTRICTS (SPECIFY) |
| a. Curricula, standards, and subject matter content | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |
| b. Teaching strategies for remote learning | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |
| c. Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |
| d. Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning .. | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |
| e. Supporting students' social, emotional, and mental health needs..... | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |
| f. Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |
| g. Engaging students and families | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |
| h. Specific ways to support English learners (ELs) | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |
| i. Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs) | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |
| j. Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care..... | 1 | 2 | 3 _____ |

Q.2-5 INSTRUCTION

Q.2-5 will list all items from Q.2-2 where the state answered “All schools/districts” or “Some schools/districts.”

2-5. Indicate the topic areas on which your state spent the most time and resources providing or arranging for professional development (PD) to schools and districts during this school year (2020-21). (Select up to three)

**SELECT UP TO 3
PD TOPICS ON WHICH
YOUR STATE SPENT
THE MOST TIME AND
RESOURCES**

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (PD) TOPIC

| | |
|--|---|
| a. Curricula, standards, and subject matter content | 1 |
| b. Teaching strategies for remote learning..... | 1 |
| c. Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 1 |
| d. Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning..... | 1 |
| e. Supporting students’ social, emotional, and mental health needs..... | 1 |
| f. Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures..... | 1 |
| g. Engaging students and families | 1 |
| h. Specific ways to supporting English learners (ELs)..... | 1 |
| i. Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs)..... | 1 |
| j. Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 1 |

2-6. Has your state provided access to curricula or other instructional materials for use in remote learning?

- Yes
- No

Q.2-6 SKIP INSTRUCTION

States that answer “Yes” go to Q.2-6a.
States that answer “No” skip to Q.2-7.

2-6a. Are the curricula or other instructional materials for use in remote learning that your state provided required or optional for this school year (2020-21)? (Select one response.)

- Required
- Optional
- Both, some are required and some are optional

The next set of questions asks about how your state supports schools and districts in identifying and implementing evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies to improve student learning.

2-7. To what extent does your state use the following strategies to promote the use of evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies to improve student achievement during this school year (2020-21)?

| STATE STRATEGIES TO PROMOTE THE USE OF EVIDENCE-BASED INTERVENTIONS | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | DID NOT USE THIS STRATEGY | USED THIS STRATEGY ALONG WITH OTHER STRATEGIES EQUALLY | USED THIS STRATEGY MORE EXTENSIVELY THAN OTHER STRATEGIES | THIS WAS THE PRIMARY STRATEGY FOR PROMOTING EVIDENCE USE |
| a. The state refers district and school leaders to the What Works Clearinghouse, Evidence for ESSA, or another organization that rates evidence to obtain information on evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies to improve student performance..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b. The state links district and school leaders with staff from the U.S. Department of Education’s Regional Educational Laboratories or Comprehensive Centers to obtain information on evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies to improve student performance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c. The state provides district and school leaders with information about evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies to improve student performance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d. The state provides a list of vetted partners that district and school leaders can engage to implement approved evidence-based strategies..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e. The state requires districts to describe the evidence base for proposed interventions in applications for school improvement funds or districts receive competitive preference for describing such evidence | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| f. The state requires districts to include plans for evaluating the effectiveness of interventions in applications for school improvement funds or districts receive competitive preference for evaluation plans..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| g. Something else..... (Specify): _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

2-8. Has your state developed a list of approved evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies for any schools and districts to improve student achievement?

Yes → Please provide a link to the list if publicly available: _____

No

Q.2-8 SKIP INSTRUCTION
 States that answer “Yes” go to Q.2-9.
 States that answer “No” skip to Q.3-1

2-9. To what extent did your state consider the following criteria in choosing what to include on the list of approved models, interventions, and strategies to improve student achievement?

| CRITERIA FOR INCLUSION | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------|
| | NOT CONSIDERED | CONSIDERED WITH MINIMAL WEIGHT | CONSIDERED WITH EQUAL WEIGHT | CONSIDERED, WITH MORE WEIGHT | REQUIRED |
| a. Has research from studies using a well-implemented experimental or quasi-experimental design (meets ESSA Tier 1 or 2 evidence) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. Has research showing promising evidence from a well-implemented, correlational study that statistically controls for selection bias (meets ESSA Tier 3 evidence) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. Has high-quality research showing that the intervention is likely to improve student outcomes, and an effort to study the effects of the intervention is underway (meets ESSA Tier 4 evidence) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d. Evidence of effectiveness that meets other evidence criteria | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e. Instructional design of the program (structure and sequencing, support materials, skills targeted) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f. Alignment with the state’s academic content standards | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| g. Availability of aligned assessments to monitor student progress and/or attainment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| h. Alignment with school or district identified needs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

2-10. To what extent did your state consider any of these sources of information to determine that the models, interventions, and strategies on the state’s approved list have evidence of effectiveness?

| INFORMATION SOURCE | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| | DID NOT CONSIDER THIS SOURCE | CONSIDERED WITH MINIMAL WEIGHT | CONSIDERED WITH EQUAL WEIGHT | CONSIDERED WITH MORE WEIGHT | THIS WAS THE PRIMARY SOURCE OF INFORMATION |
| a. Research published by third-party organizations that evaluate programs or by college/university researchers..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. Information provided by the program’s developer or vendor | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. Recommendations from other states, or from schools and districts within the state..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d. The What Works Clearinghouse, Evidence for ESSA, or other organization that rates evidence | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e. Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f. Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| g. Another source | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (Specify): _____ | | | | | |

2-11. Are any of the following types of schools (and their districts) required to select strategies to improve student academic achievement from your state’s list of approved evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies?

| SCHOOLS THAT MUST SELECT FROM STATE-APPROVED LIST | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | |
|---|------------------------------------|----|
| | YES | NO |
| a. All schools..... | 1 | 0 |
| b. CSI schools..... | 1 | 0 |
| c. TSI and/or ATSI schools | 1 | 0 |
| d. Title I schools | 1 | 0 |
| e. Another type of school | 1 | 0 |
| (Specify): _____ | | |

Q.2-11 SKIP INSTRUCTION

States that select “Yes” for all schools, skip to Section 3.
 (Q.2-11 rows b, c, d, and e will be grayed out.)
 Otherwise states respond to rows b through e.

Section 3. Measuring Student and School Improvement

Definitions for this section

Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) schools are those with subgroup achievement at very low levels, comparable to overall achievement in the bottom 5 percent of all Title I schools as defined under ESEA for federal accountability.

Assessments provide teachers and schools with information about students' current mastery of grade-level knowledge and skills in English language arts (ELA) or math. For the purposes of the questions in this section, assessments are valid and reliable measures of the content; and are not teacher-developed, formative, or ad-hoc classroom assessments used as part of daily instruction.

Attendance can be measured using any method during periods of remote learning. It may include collecting data on participation such as students who log into online learning platforms, join live classes by video, submit online or paper assignments, or communicate with their teachers.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools are those in the bottom 5 percent of all Title I schools and schools with graduation rates below 67 percent, as defined under ESEA for federal accountability.

Grade retention refers to repeating the current grade in the next school year.

High school graduation requirements refers to accumulating the minimum number of course credits in prescribed courses, demonstrating academic proficiency in required content, and meeting other requirements to earn a standard or regular high school diploma.

Interim assessments are generally school or district-level assessments administered at the beginning or middle of instruction. Results can be aggregated across students, administration windows, or concepts. Information gained can be used to predict a student's ability to succeed on a large scale summative assessment, evaluate a program or pedagogy, or identify gaps in a student's knowledge and adjust instruction. Interim assessments are also known as "benchmark," "predictive," or "through" assessments.

Professional development (PD) includes training, seminars, workshops, or courses in large or small group settings intended to develop staff capacity to perform in the topic area.

Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided on-line lessons).

State's federal accountability system as described in your state's accountability plan required under ESEA and approved by the U.S. Secretary of Education.

Summative assessments are state-mandated tests required for accountability purposes that are intended to measure students' knowledge and skills at (or near) the end of a school year or course relative to grade-level content standards.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) schools are those with consistently underperforming subgroups as defined by the State in its consolidated State plan for ESEA for federal accountability.

Technical assistance includes any guidance or best practices resources your state developed or distributed, referrals to other sources of information, and targeted communications or consultations with staff at individual schools or groups of schools to provide advice. It does not include professional development or training.

Title I schools includes those with targeted assistance and schoolwide Title I programs.

These definitions also are available to respondents by hovering over the words that appear in blue text in the survey.

The first set of questions asks about using assessments that are valid, reliable measures of students’ mastery of grade-level knowledge and skills in English language arts (ELA) or math.

3-1. Other than regular screening to identify students with disabilities and English-learners, did your state REQUIRE districts to administer an assessment to determine students’ academic needs at the beginning of this school year (2020-21)?

- Yes, state required districts to administer an assessment in **all** schools
- Yes, state required districts to administer an assessment in **some** schools
- No, the state did not require districts to administer an assessment

Q.3-1 SKIP INSTRUCTION

States that answer “No” skip to Q.3-5.
 States that answer “Yes, all schools” skip to Q.3-3.
 States that answer “Yes, some schools” go to Q.3-2.

3-2. Which schools were REQUIRED to administer the assessment to determine students’ academic needs at the beginning of this school year (2020–21)?

| SCHOOL TYPE | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----|
| | YES | NO |
| a. CSI schools | 1 | 0 |
| b. TSI and/or ATSI schools | 1 | 0 |
| c. Title I schools | 1 | 0 |
| d. Other types of schools | 1 | 0 |
| (Specify): _____ | | |

3-3. In schools that were required to administer an assessment at the beginning of this school year, was the assessment required of all students or specific groups of students? (Select one response.)

- Assessment was required of **all students**
- Assessment was required of **some students**

Q.3-3 SKIP INSTRUCTION

States that answer “all students” skip to Q. 3-5.
 States that answer “some students” go to Q. 3-4.

3-4. For which groups of students were schools REQUIRED to administer an assessment at the beginning of this school year (2020-21)?

| GROUPS OF STUDENTS | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | |
|--|---------------------------------|----|
| | YES | NO |
| a. Students in specific grade levels..... (Specify grade levels: PK K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12) _____ | 1 | 0 |
| b. Students with disabilities (SWDs) | 1 | 0 |
| c. English learners (ELs) | 1 | 0 |
| d. Economically disadvantaged students..... | 1 | 0 |
| e. Students with no or limited access to technology (devices or internet connection)..... | 1 | 0 |
| f. Students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 1 | 0 |
| g. Academically at-risk students..... (Specify how district defines these students) _____ | 1 | 0 |
| h. Other category of students..... (Specify how district defines these students) _____ | 1 | 0 |

The next set of questions asks about how your state is assessing student achievement and measuring and monitoring school improvement during the 2020-21 school year.

3-5. How, if at all, has your state changed the measures used in the state’s federal accountability system for this school year (2020-21), compared with measures used before the coronavirus pandemic (2018-19)?

| TYPE OF MEASURE | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|
| | INCREASED | DID NOT CHANGE | DECREASED | NOT APPLICABLE |
| a. Number of times state summative assessments are administered | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |
| b. Number of subjects tested other than math and English language arts (ELA) | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |
| c. Number of grades tested other than grades 3-8 and once in high school | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |
| d. The minimum score students need to achieve on the state assessment to be identified as proficient in ELA or math | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |
| e. Number of measures included in the School Quality and Student Success indicator (e.g., school climate measures, attendance, or post-secondary outcomes)..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |
| f. Threshold for the number of days absent or percentage of days absent for a student to be counted as chronically absent | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |
| g. The minimum subgroup size (e.g., “minimum n-size”) | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |

3-6. Has your state changed any **summative assessments** used for federal accountability in the following ways for this school year (2020–21), compared with **summative assessments** used before the coronavirus pandemic (2018–19)?

| CHANGE FOR 2020–21 | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | | |
|---|------------------------------------|----|-------------------|
| | YES | NO | NOT APPLICABLE |
| a. We used a shorter version of the state assessment (i.e., the assessment had fewer items) | 1 | 2 | NA |
| b. We used an assessment with fewer constructed-response or performance-based items | 1 | 2 | NA |
| c. We moved from one end-of-year summative assessment to a series of interim assessments during the course of the academic year that result in a single summative score..... | 1 | 2 | NA |
| d. We allowed some or all students to take state assessments from home | 1 | 2 | NA |
| e. We allowed districts to administer state assessments in summer or fall 2021 | 1 | 2 | NA |

3-7. For this school year (2020-21), did your state specify and require changes to the criteria for the following student attainment or progress measures?

| ATTAINMENT OR PROGRESS MEASURES | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | |
|---|------------------------------------|----|
| | YES | NO |
| a. Use of state assessment results to determine whether a student can graduate from high school | 1 | 0 |
| b. Other changes to high school graduation requirements | 1 | 0 |
| c. Use of state assessment results to determine grade retention | 1 | 0 |
| d. Other changes in standards for grade retention | 1 | 0 |
| e. Use of state assessment results in course grades..... | 1 | 0 |
| f. Other changes in standards for course grades | 1 | 0 |
| g. Other changes..... (Please specify): _____ | 1 | 0 |

3-8. To what extent did NOT having statewide **summative assessment** data from last year (2019-20), due to the coronavirus pandemic, affect your state’s ability to conduct the following functions and processes this school year (2020-21)?

| FUNCTIONS/PROCESSES | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | | | |
|---|--|--------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| | NO EFFECT/ STATE ASSESSMENTS NOT USED FOR THIS PURPOSE | SMALL EFFECT | MODERATE EFFECT | SUBSTANTIAL EFFECT |
| a. Calculating indicators used in the state’s federal accountability system..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b. Understanding general district/schools performance . | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c. Developing or monitoring district or school improvement plans | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d. Allocating additional resources to districts to implement district or school improvement plans | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e. Implementing or expanding remote learning options for districts, schools, or families | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| f. Evaluating teacher performance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| g. Evaluating the effectiveness of interventions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| h. Reviewing the state’s academic content or achievement standards | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| i. Evaluating attendance definitions or criteria | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| j. Determining professional development (PD) or technical assistance needs..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

3-9. How will (or did) districts in your state administer state-mandated **summative assessments** for the 2020-21 school year in English language arts (ELA) and math, and for English language proficiency for students in the following grades?

| ASSESSMENT | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | ALL DISTRICTS REQUIRED TO ADMINISTER IN PERSON, IN SCHOOL FOR ALL STUDENTS | ALL DISTRICTS REQUIRED TO ADMINISTER REMOTELY FOR ALL STUDENTS | ALL DISTRICTS REQUIRED TO OFFER A MIX OF IN PERSON, IN SCHOOL AND REMOTE ADMINISTRATIONS | STATE DID NOT SET REQUIREMENT FOR ADMINISTRATION |
| GRADE 4 | | | | |
| a. ELA..... | 3 | 3 | 3 | NA |
| b. Math | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |
| c. English language proficiency (ELP) assessment | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |
| GRADE 8 | | | | |
| d. ELA..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |
| e. Math | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |
| f. ELP assessment..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |
| High school grade or course chosen for your state's federal accountability system | | | | |
| g. ELA..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |
| h. Math | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |
| i. ELP assessment..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |

Section 4. Federal Funding

Definitions for this section

Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided on-line lessons).

Three laws referred to in this section provided federal assistance to reduce the public health and economic impacts of the coronavirus pandemic:

- **The Coronavirus Aid Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act**, enacted in March 2020.
- **The Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act**, enacted in December 2020.
- **The American Rescue Plan Act**, enacted in March 2021.

The Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) Fund provided funding for state education agencies (SEAs) and local education agencies (LEAs) through a formula.

The definitions also are available to respondents by hovering over the words that appear in blue text in the survey.

The questions in this section ask about the ways in which your state allocated funding for the Education Stabilization Fund (ESF), including funds initially provided under the Coronavirus Aid Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act in March 2020 as well as additional funding provided by the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act in December 2020 and the American Rescue Plan Act in March 2021. Please respond to the questions in this section based on actions your state has taken since receiving ESF funds. The state’s Chief Financial Officer would likely be the most appropriate respondent for Section 4 of the survey on use of federal funds.

- 4-1. **The Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) Fund allows state education agencies (SEAs) to reserve up to 10 percent in an SEA reserve. Please provide the dollar amount reserved. You may estimate if you do not have exact figures.**

Note: We will pre-populate the total allocation from an extant source.

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Federal ESSER funds allocation for [STATE] based on March 2020 funding: | [\$xxx,xxx,xxx] |
| a. Amount of SEA reserve from March 2020 funding | \$ |
| Federal ESSER funds allocation for [STATE] based on December 2020 funding: | [\$xxx,xxx,xxx] |
| b. Amount of SEA reserve from December 2020 funding | \$ |
| Federal ESSER funds allocation for [STATE] based on March 2021 funding: | [\$xxx,xxx,xxx] |
| c. Amount of SEA reserve from March 2021 funding | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Check here if your state has not determined its SEA reserve amount from the March 2021 funding | |

Q.4-1 SKIP INSTRUCTION

States that enter an amount > 0 in row a go to Q.4-2.
 States that enter "0" in row a skip to End.

4-2. Please estimate the approximate percentage of the state’s March 2020 ESSER reserve funds allocated for each of the activities or purposes listed below. Please account for funds allocated through March 31, 2021.

| ACTIVITY | Percent |
|--|---------|
| a. Improving school capacity for and student access to remote learning through hardware, software, and connectivity | |
| b. Developing and disseminating information on instructional strategies and best practices for remote learning , including through training and professional development for teachers and other staff | |
| c. Promoting parent awareness of how they can support their children’s participation in remote learning | |
| d. Minimizing the spread of infectious disease through providing sanitation supplies, personal protective equipment, and training for school and district staff..... | |
| e. Other emergency needs as determined by the SEA to address issues responding to the coronavirus | |
| f. Administrative costs..... | |
| g. Additional funds allocated to LEAs from the state-reserved funds | |
| h. State-reserved funds not yet allocated to a specific state activity | |

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY.

OMB#: 1850-0958

Expiration Date: 3/31/2024

Implementation of Key Federal Education Policies in the Wake of the Coronavirus Pandemic

District Survey

2020-21



Notice of Confidentiality

Information collected for this study comes under the confidentiality and data protection requirements of the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) (The Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, Title I, Part E, Section 183). Responses to this data collection will be used only for statistical purposes. Reports will summarize findings across the sample and will not associate responses with a specific district or individual. All of the information you provide may be used only for statistical purposes and may not be disclosed, or used, in identifiable form for any other purpose except as required by law (20 U.S.C. §9573 and 6 U.S.C. §151). IES will keep all data collected from this survey confidential. Districts receiving funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) are expected to cooperate with Department evaluations (Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) (34 C.F.R. § 76.591)).

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1850-0958. The approximate time required to complete the survey is estimated to be 45 minutes, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-4651.

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Department of Education is examining the influence of the coronavirus pandemic on how states and districts implement key provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA) and use federal funds, including those provided specifically to help districts recover from the pandemic. The study includes surveys of officials from all state educational agencies and from a nationally representative set of school districts.

- **This survey may require more than one respondent, given the scope of topics.** There are four sections: school operations, support for schools, measuring student and school improvement, and federal funding. There also is a preliminary set of questions on the number and types of schools in the districts. We expect that a district representative with broad knowledge of the district's school system, such as the Deputy Superintendent or Chief of Staff, would be well suited to respond to the preliminary questions and Sections 1 through 3 of the survey on school operations, support for schools, and measuring student and school improvement. The district's Chief Financial Officer would likely be the most appropriate respondent for Section 4 of the survey on use of federal funds.
- **Districts will not be identified in reporting.** The reports prepared for the study and collaborating Department-funded studies will summarize findings across the set of districts and will not associate responses with a specific district or individual (see Notice of Confidentiality on cover). The Department's Institute of Education Sciences (IES) will keep all data collected from this survey confidential. There are no foreseeable risks with participating in the survey, and your district will be able to use the information in the reports to compare your district's strategies and policies to those reported in aggregate by other districts across the nation.
- **Your district's responses are critical to drawing lessons about the implementation of federal policies during the pandemic.** Districts receiving funds under ESEA are expected to cooperate with Department evaluations (Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) (34 C.F.R. § 76.591)).

The study, including this survey, is being conducted by Westat and its partner, Mathematica. For any questions about the study, email Title-IIStudy@westat.com or call 855-780-0647.

**Click the Next Button to
Start the Survey**

Preliminary Questions on the Number and Types of Schools in the District: MUST BE COMPLETED FIRST

Definitions for this section

Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) schools are those with subgroup achievement at very low levels, comparable to overall achievement in the bottom 5 percent of all Title I schools, as defined under ESEA for federal accountability.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools are those in the bottom 5 percent of all Title I schools and schools with graduation rates below 67 percent, as defined under ESEA for federal accountability.

Low-performing schools refers to schools in your district that have been formally identified as low-performing based on low achievement, low graduation rates, and/or low growth in student achievement, including any schools identified as eligible for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), or otherwise identified by your state’s accountability system as low performing.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) schools are those with one or more consistently underperforming subgroups, as defined under ESEA for federal accountability.

Title I schools refer to schools in your district that receive any amount of Title I, Part A funds, including those with targeted assistance and schoolwide Title I programs.

These definitions also are available to respondents by hovering over the words that appear in blue text in the survey.

Some questions in this survey vary depending on the number of schools the district operates and whether it has Title I schools or low-performing schools. Please review the definitions and respond to the questions below so we ensure that your district receives the appropriate survey questions.

The responses to these questions are so critical to survey navigation that they will be locked once saved. If you need to change the response at a later point, you will need to contact the Title I/II COVID study help desk to request that the questions be unlocked for changes.

0-1. During this school year (2020–21), is your district operating only one school or more than one school?

- One school
- More than one school

0-2. What is the number of schools in your district receiving Title I, Part A funds during this school year (2020–21)? If you are unsure, please consult your district’s contact for Federal Programs.

Note: If none of the schools in your district received Title I, Part A funds this year, enter “0.”

Number of Title I schools in the district

0-3. Does your district have any low-performing schools?

- Yes
- No

Q.0-3 SKIP INSTRUCTION

Districts that answer “Yes” go to Q.0-4.

Districts that answer “No” skip to end of section.

0-4. Are any of the low-performing schools designated as Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools? If you are unsure, please consult your district's contact for Federal Programs.

Yes

No

Q.0-4 SKIP INSTRUCTION

Districts that answer "Yes" and have more than one school go to Q.0-5.

Districts that answer "Yes" and have only one school, skip to end of section.

Districts that answer "No" skip to Q.0-6.

0-5. Does your district have any other low-performing schools (i.e., those not designated as a CSI school)?

Yes

No

Q.0-5 SKIP INSTRUCTION

Districts that answer "Yes" go to Q.0-6.

Districts that answer "No" skip to end of section.

0-6. Are any of the low-performing schools designated as Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) or Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) schools? If you are unsure, please consult your district's contact for Federal Programs.

Yes

No

Click the Next Button to Return to
Main Menu

Section 1. School Operations

Definitions for this section

During the past month refers to the one-month period prior to the day you respond to the survey. If you are responding to the survey after schools have closed for the summer, please use the final month of the school year.

Hybrid in-person and remote learning occurs when groups of students receive a mix of in-person, in-school instruction and remote learning on alternating days or weeks, or with different start and end times to the school day.

Most students refers to the largest percentage of students.

Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

Synchronous instruction involves live delivery of instruction or interaction between the teacher and student(s) such as a live whole-class, small group, or individual meeting via an online platform or in-person.

These definitions also are available by hovering over the words that appear in blue in the text of questions, items, and response categories in the survey.

This section asks how schools in your district are operating in terms of in-person or remote instruction and the amount of instructional time during the 2020-21 school year.

- 1-1.** During the **first month of the 2020–21 school year**, what type of instruction did **MOST students** receive from your district and its schools? *(Select one response.)*
- 1 In-person only, in school buildings
 - 2 **Remote learning** only
 - 3 **Hybrid in-person and remote learning**
 - 4 Other *(Specify)*: _____
- 1-2.** During the **first month after the New Year’s holiday in January 2021**, what type of instruction did **MOST students** receive from your district and its schools? *(Select one response.)*
- 1 In-person only, in school buildings
 - 2 **Remote learning** only
 - 3 **Hybrid in-person and remote learning**
 - 4 Other *(Specify)*: _____
- 1-2a.** **During the past month**, what type of instruction did **MOST students** receive from your district and its schools? *(Select one response.)*
- 1 In-person only, in school buildings
 - 2 **Remote learning** only
 - 3 **Hybrid in-person and remote learning**
 - 4 Other *(Specify)*: _____

1-3. From the start of this school year in fall 2020 through [today], for how many school days did your district close school buildings districtwide for all in-person instruction in response to the coronavirus?

Note: We will pre-populate 'today' with the date the respondent is viewing the survey.

Note: Count the number of school days your district closed school buildings to all students *districtwide* for in-person instruction, *with or without remote learning*. Do not include school closures due to other emergencies such as weather-related disruptions or for school holidays or break periods.

Number of school days district closed school buildings districtwide for in-person instruction as of [today]. *If none, enter '0'.*

1-4. During this school year (2020–21), did your district require a minimum number of minutes that fourth grade students in remote learning should receive synchronous instruction?

- 2 Yes, our district set a minimum number of minutes of synchronous instruction that is **the same for all fourth grade students** in remote learning
- 1 Yes, our district set a minimum number of minutes of synchronous instruction that is **different for some fourth grade student subgroups** in remote learning
- 0 No, our district did not set any minimum number of minutes
- NA Not applicable, our district had no remote student learning this school year (2020–21) or does not offer fourth grade

Q. 1-4 SKIP INSTRUCTION

Districts that answer “Yes, our district set a minimum number of minutes of synchronous instruction that is the same for all fourth grade students in remote learning,” go to Q.1-5a.

Districts that answer “Yes, our district set a minimum number of minutes of synchronous instruction that is different for some fourth grade student subgroups in remote learning” skip to Q.1-5b.

Districts that answer “No” or “NA” skip to Q.1-6.

1-5a. What is the minimum number of minutes per day that all fourth grade students in remote learning should receive synchronous instruction?

Note: Fill in the number of minutes per day most appropriate for your district’s requirement. If necessary, please change requirements for minutes per class, half-day, or week into the average per full school day.

Minimum number of minutes per day that fourth grade students in remote learning should receive synchronous instruction

1-5b. What is the minimum number of minutes per day that fourth grade students in **remote learning should receive **synchronous instruction** for the following groups?**

Note: Fill in the number of minutes per day most appropriate for your district’s requirement. If necessary, please change requirements for minutes per class, half-day, or week into the average per full school day. If your district has not set a minimum requirement for a group of students, enter “0.”

| STUDENTS WITH VARYING MINIMUM LENGTH OF SYNCHRONOUS INSTRUCTION TIME | MINIMUM NUMBER OF MINUTES PER DAY |
|---|--|
| a. Students with disabilities | _____ |
| b. English learners..... | _____ |
| c. Other category of students | _____ |

(Specify how the district defined these students): _____

1-6. Has your district routinely and systematically examined data on student participation in **remote learning activities?**

Note: Data on student participation could include student log-ins, student interactions with teachers or online learning platforms, or completion of assignments.

- Yes
- No

Q. 1-6 SKIP INSTRUCTION

Districts that answer “Yes” go to Q.1-7.
 Districts that answer “No” skip to Q.1-9.

1-7. Did your district routinely and systematically examine data on participation in **remote learning for specific schools, grade levels, or student subgroups?**

- Yes
- No

Q. 1-7 SKIP INSTRUCTION

Districts that answer “Yes” go to Q.1-8.
 Districts that answer “No” skip to Q.1-9.

1-8. For which subgroups did your district routinely and systematically examine data on participation in remote learning?

| STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN REMOTE LEARNING | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | |
|---|------------------------------------|----|
| | YES | NO |
| a. Students in low-performing schools | 1 | 0 |
| b. Students in specific grade levels | 1 | 0 |
| <i>(Specify grade levels: PK K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12):</i> _____ | | |
| c. Students with disabilities | 1 | 0 |
| d. English learners | 1 | 0 |
| e. Economically disadvantaged students | 1 | 0 |
| f. Students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care . | 1 | 0 |
| g. Academically at-risk students | 1 | 0 |
| <i>(Specify how the district defined these students):</i> _____ | | |
| h. Other category of students | 1 | 0 |
| <i>(Specify how the district defined these students):</i> _____ | | |

1-9. Has your district given priority to any groups of students for in-person, in-school instruction this school year (2020-21)?

Note: Consider whether your district brought back certain groups of students before other students.

1 Yes

0 No

NA Not applicable, school buildings in the district have not opened this school year (2020-21)

Q. 1-9 SKIP INSTRUCTION

Districts that answer “Yes” go to Q.1-10.

Districts that answer “No” or “Not applicable” skip to Q.1-11.

1-10. For which of the following groups of students has your district given priority for in-person, in-school instruction this school year (2020-21)?

| GROUPS OF STUDENTS | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | |
|--|------------------------------------|----|
| | YES | NO |
| a. Students in specific grade levels (Specify grade levels: PK K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12): _____ | 1 | 0 |
| b. Students with disabilities | 1 | 0 |
| c. English learners | 1 | 0 |
| d. Economically disadvantaged students | 1 | 0 |
| e. Students with no or limited access to technology (devices or internet connections)..... | 1 | 0 |
| f. Students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care . | 1 | 0 |
| g. Academically at-risk students (Specify how the district defined these students): _____ | 1 | 0 |
| h. Other category of students (Specify how the district defined these students): _____ | 1 | 0 |

1-11. Did your district receive a waiver from the state’s minimum instructional time requirement for the school year 2020-21 due to the coronavirus?

1 Yes

0 No

NA Not applicable, state has no requirement for a minimum number of instructional days, hours, or minutes this school year

Section 2. Supports for Schools

Definitions for this section

Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) schools are those with subgroup achievement at very low levels, comparable to overall achievement in the bottom 5 percent of all Title I schools, as defined under ESEA for federal accountability.

Competency-based learning is a system of instruction, grading, or assessment based on students' demonstrating that they have learned the expected knowledge and skills needed to progress to the next academic content, grade, or level.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools are those in the bottom 5 percent of all Title I schools and schools with graduation rates below 67 percent, as defined under ESEA for federal accountability.

Low-performing schools refers to schools in your district that have been formally identified as low-performing based on low achievement, low graduation rates, and/or low growth in student achievement, including any schools identified as eligible for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), Additional Support and Improvement (ATSI), or otherwise identified by your state's accountability system as low performing.

Most teachers refers to the largest percentage of teachers districtwide.

Professional development (PD) includes training seminars, workshops, or courses in large or small group settings intended to develop staff capacity to perform in the topic area.

Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) schools are those with one or more consistently underperforming subgroups, as defined under ESEA for federal accountability.

Technical assistance includes any guidance or best practices resources your district developed or distributed, referrals to other sources of information, and targeted communications or consultations with staff at individual schools or groups of schools to provide advice. It does not include professional development or training.

Title I schools refer to schools in your district that receive any amount of Title I, Part A funds, including those with targeted assistance and schoolwide Title I programs.

These definitions also are available by hovering over the words that appear in blue in the text of questions, items, and response categories in the survey.

The first set of questions asks about the kinds of support your district provided to schools this school year (2020-21).

2-1. Has your district developed any new or updated guidance documents or resource materials on the following topics for use this school year (2020-21)?

| TOPIC | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | | |
|--|---------------------------------|----|------------|
| | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW |
| a. Curricula, standards, and subject matter content..... | 1 | 0 | DK |
| b. Teaching strategies for remote learning..... | 1 | 0 | DK |
| c. Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 1 | 0 | DK |
| d. Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning..... | 1 | 0 | DK |
| e. Supporting students' social, emotional, and mental health needs | 1 | 0 | DK |
| f. Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures..... | 1 | 0 | DK |
| g. Engaging students and families..... | 1 | 0 | DK |
| h. Specific ways to support English learners (ELs)..... | 1 | 0 | DK |
| i. Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs) | 1 | 0 | DK |
| j. Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 1 | 0 | DK |

Q. 2-1 SKIP INSTRUCTION

For each item where the district answers “Yes,” the item will appear in Q.2-2.
 Districts that only answer “Yes” to three or fewer items will skip to Q.2-3.

2-2. Indicate the topics of new or updated guidance documents or resource materials on which your district spent the most staff time and resources this school year (2020-21). (Select up to three.)

Note: The online form will allow districts to select at most three topics across all items listed.

| TOPIC | SELECT UP TO 3 RESPONSES |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| a. Curricula, standards, and subject matter content..... | 1 |
| b. Teaching strategies for remote learning..... | 1 |
| c. Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 1 |
| d. Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning..... | 1 |
| e. Supporting students’ social, emotional, and mental health needs | 1 |
| f. Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures | 1 |
| g. Engaging students and families..... | 1 |
| h. Specific ways to support English learners (ELs)..... | 1 |
| i. Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs) | 1 |
| j. Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 1 |

2-3. During this school year (2020-21), did your district provide or arrange for professional development (PD) on the following topics? Indicate whether the district provided or arranged for PD on the topic for no schools, some schools, or all schools.

Note: Districts with only one school should select either “No schools” or “All schools.”

| PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (PD) TOPIC | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | | |
|---|--|--------------|-------------|
| | DISTRICT PROVIDED OR ARRANGED FOR PD ON TOPIC FOR: | | |
| | NO SCHOOLS | SOME SCHOOLS | ALL SCHOOLS |
| a. Curricula, standards, and subject matter content | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| b. Teaching strategies for remote learning | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| c. Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| d. Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| e. Supporting students’ social, emotional, and mental health needs..... | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| f. Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| g. Engaging students and families | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| h. Specific ways to support English learners (ELs) | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| i. Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs) | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| j. Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care..... | 0 | 1 | 2 |

Q. 2-3 SKIP INSTRUCTION

For each item where the district answers “All schools,” the item will appear in Q. 2-4.

For each item where the district answers “Some schools,” the item will appear in Q. 2-5.

2-4. Did your district provide or arrange for the same number of hours of **professional development (PD)** on the topic for all schools? If not, identify the types of schools where the district provided or arranged for *more hours* of **PD** on the topic?

Note: The online survey will only display the appropriate columns for a district based on its responses to the preliminary questions. The wording of the header may also change based on the response to these questions. For example, for districts with low-performing schools, but no CSI schools, the CSI schools column will not appear and the “other low-performing schools” header will change to “low-performing schools.”

| PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (PD) TOPIC | DID DISTRICT PROVIDE OR ARRANGE FOR SAME NUMBER OF HOURS OF PD ON TOPIC ACROSS SCHOOLS? | | IF NO, FOR WHICH SCHOOLS DID THE DISTRICT PROVIDE OR ARRANGE FOR MORE HOURS OF PD? (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY IN EACH ROW) | | | |
|--|---|----|---|------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| | YES | NO | CSI SCHOOLS | OTHER LOW-PERFORMING SCHOOLS | TITLE I SCHOOLS | OTHER TYPES OF SCHOOLS (SPECIFY) |
| a. Curricula, standards, and subject matter content..... | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| b. Teaching strategies for remote learning | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| c. Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| d. Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| e. Supporting students’ social, emotional, and mental health needs .. | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| f. Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| g. Engaging students and families | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| h. Specific ways to support English learners (ELs)..... | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| i. Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs)..... | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| j. Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |

2-5. For which schools did your district provide or arrange for PD on the topic?

Note: The online survey will only display the appropriate columns for a district based on its responses to the preliminary questions. The wording of the header may also change based on the response to these questions. For example, for districts with low-performing schools, but no CSI schools, the CSI schools column will not appear and the “other low-performing schools” header will change to “low-performing schools.”

| PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (PD) TOPIC | SELECT ALL THAT APPLY IN EACH ROW | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| | DISTRICT PROVIDED OR ARRANGED FOR PD ON THE TOPIC FOR: | | | |
| | CSI SCHOOLS | OTHER LOW-PERFORMING SCHOOLS | TITLE I SCHOOLS | OTHER TYPES OF SCHOOLS (SPECIFY) |
| a. Curricula, standards, and subject matter content ... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| b. Teaching strategies for remote learning | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| c. Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| d. Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| e. Supporting students’ social, emotional, and mental health needs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| f. Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| g. Engaging students and families | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| h. Specific ways to support English learners (ELs) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| i. Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs)..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| j. Specific ways to support students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |

2-6. Indicate the topics on which your district provided the most hours of professional development (PD) to the MOST teachers during this school year (2020-21). (Select up to three.)

Note: The online form will allow districts to select at most three topics across all items listed.

| PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (PD) TOPIC | SELECT UP TO 3 RESPONSES |
|--|---------------------------------|
| a. Curricula, standards, and subject matter content..... | 1 |
| b. Teaching strategies for remote learning..... | 1 |
| c. Strategies to support remote learning for students with limited internet access | 1 |
| d. Specific strategies to help students catch up or accelerate learning..... | 1 |
| e. Supporting students’ social, emotional, and mental health needs | 1 |
| f. Strategies to support physical distancing and other health or safety-related procedures | 1 |
| g. Engaging students and families..... | 1 |
| h. Specific ways to support English learners (ELs)..... | 1 |
| i. Specific ways to support students with disabilities (SWDs) | 1 |
| j. Specific ways to support students experiencing homeless, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 1 |

2-7. Overall, do you estimate that your district provided more hours of professional development (PD) to teachers, about the same, or fewer hours of PD this school year (2020-21) compared to last school year (2019-20)? (Select one response.)

- 3 Teachers received **more** hours of PD this school year (2020-21)
- 2 Teachers received **about the same** number of hours of PD this school year (2020-21)
- 1 Teachers received **fewer** hours of PD this school year (2020-21)

The next set of questions asks about the strategies your district required schools to implement this school year (2020-21) and how they differed from last school year (2019-20).

2-8. During this school year (2020-21), did your district *REQUIRE* schools to use any of the following strategies to help either all or a subset of students catch up or accelerate learning? Indicate whether the district required use of the strategy for no schools, some schools, or all schools.

Note: Districts with only one school should select either “No schools” or “All schools.”

| STRATEGY | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | | |
|---|---------------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| | DISTRICT REQUIRED STRATEGY IN: | | |
| | NO SCHOOLS | SOME SCHOOLS | ALL SCHOOLS |
| Instructional changes | | | |
| a. Reduce the scope of new material or content taught | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| b. Repeat more material or content from the student’s previous grade than usual... | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| c. Provide more math or English language arts (ELA) instruction (e.g., “double-dosing” with two periods of math or ELA) | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| d. Assign students to multiple classes with the same set of peers (small learning communities)..... | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| e. Purposefully assign students to at least one of the same teachers as last year (teacher looping)..... | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction | | | |
| f. Use paraprofessionals or instructional aides to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction..... | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| g. Provide tutoring for students identified as needing academic help | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| h. Dedicate time during the day or week for teachers to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction..... | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Credit recovery or course progression strategies | | | |
| i. Offer or expand credit recovery programs during the school year | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| j. Offer or expand competency-based learning for students..... | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| k. Offer dual-enrollment or dual-credit coursework for high school students..... check here <input type="checkbox"/> if your district does not have high school grades and skip this row | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | | | |
| l. Offer or expand after- or before-school programs that provide supplemental academic instruction..... | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| m. Increase the length of the school day | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| n. Increase the length of the school year | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| o. Offer or expand summer school..... | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Family engagement | | | |
| p. Use family engagement liaisons, individual outreach, or a family engagement protocol to re-engage students who dropped out or lost contact | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| q. Provide or increase home visits by district or school staff..... | 0 | 1 | 2 |

Q.2-8 SKIP INSTRUCTION

For each item where the district answers “Some schools,” the item will appear in Q.2-9.

Note: All districts receive all items in Q.2-10.

2-9. Which schools were *REQUIRED* to use the following strategies to catch up or accelerate learning during the 2020-21 school year?

Note: The online survey will only display the appropriate columns for a district based on its responses to the preliminary questions. The wording of the header may also change based on the response to these questions. For example, for districts with low-performing schools, but no CSI schools, the CSI schools column will not appear and the “other low-performing schools” header will change to “low-performing schools.”

| STRATEGY | SELECT ALL THAT APPLY IN EACH ROW DISTRICT REQUIRED THE STRATEGY IN: | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| | CSI SCHOOLS | OTHER LOW-PERFORMING SCHOOLS | TITLE I SCHOOLS | OTHER TYPES OF SCHOOLS (SPECIFY) |
| Instructional changes | | | | |
| a. Reduce the scope of new material or content taught | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| b. Repeat more material or content from the student’s previous grade than usual | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| c. Provide more math or English language arts (ELA) instruction (e.g., “double-dosing” with two periods of math or ELA) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| d. Assign students to multiple classes with the same set of peers (small learning communities)..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| e. Purposefully assign students to at least one of the same teachers as last year (teacher looping)..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction | | | | |
| f. Use paraprofessionals or instructional aides to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction ... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| g. Provide tutoring for students identified as needing academic help | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| h. Dedicate time during the day or week for teachers to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| Credit recovery or course progression strategies | | | | |
| i. Offer or expand credit recovery programs during the school year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| j. Offer or expand competency-based learning for students..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| k. Offer dual-enrollment or dual-credit coursework for high school students..... check here <input type="checkbox"/> if your district does not have high school grades and skip this row | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |

2-9. (continued)

| STRATEGY | SELECT ALL THAT APPLY IN EACH ROW DISTRICT REQUIRED THE STRATEGY IN: | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| | CSI SCHOOLS | OTHER LOW-PERFORMING SCHOOLS | TITLE I SCHOOLS | OTHER TYPES OF SCHOOLS (SPECIFY) |
| Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | | | | |
| l. Offer or expand after- or before-school programs that provide supplemental academic instruction..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| m. Increase the length of the school day | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| n. Increase the length of the school year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| o. Offer or expand summer school..... | | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| Family engagement | | | | |
| p. Use family engagement liaisons, individual outreach, or a family engagement protocol to re-engage students who dropped out or lost contact..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| q. Provide or increase home visits..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |

2-10. Do you estimate that your district REQUIRED use of these strategies this school year (2020-21) in fewer schools, about the same number of schools, or more schools than last year (2019-20)?

Note: If your district did not require a strategy last year, but did require the strategy this school year, please indicate that the strategy was required in “more schools this year than last year.” If your district required a strategy last year, but did not require the strategy this school year, please indicate that the strategy was required in “fewer schools this year than last year.”

| SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW DISTRICT REQUIRED THE STRATEGY IN: | | |
|---|---|--|
| FEWER SCHOOLS THIS YEAR THAN LAST YEAR | ABOUT THE SAME NUMBER OF SCHOOLS | MORE SCHOOLS THIS YEAR THAN LAST YEAR |

STRATEGY:

Instructional changes

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Reduce the scope of new material or content taught | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| b. Repeat more material or content from the student’s previous grade than usual... | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| c. Provide more math or English language arts (ELA) instruction (e.g., “double-dosing” with two periods of math or ELA) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| d. Assign students to multiple classes with the same set of peers (small learning communities)..... | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| e. Purposefully assign students to at least one of the same teachers as last year (teacher looping)..... | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| f. Use paraprofessionals or instructional aides to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction..... | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| g. Provide tutoring for students identified as needing academic help | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| h. Dedicate time during the day or week for teachers to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction..... | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Credit recovery or course progression strategies

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| i. Offer or expand credit recovery programs during the school year | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| j. Offer or expand competency-based learning for students..... | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| k. Offer dual-enrollment or dual-credit coursework for high school students..... check here <input type="checkbox"/> if your district does not have high school grades and skip this row | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| l. Offer or expand after- or before-school programs that provide supplemental academic instruction..... | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| m. Increase the length of the school day | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| n. Increase the length of the school year | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| o. Offer or expand summer school..... | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Family engagement

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| p. Use family engagement liaisons, individual outreach, or a family engagement protocol to re-engage students who dropped out or lost contact | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| q. Provide or increase home visits..... | 1 | 2 | 3 |

2-11. During this school year (2020-21), did your district *REQUIRE* schools to use the following strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs? Indicate whether the district required the strategy in no schools, some schools, or all schools.

Note: Districts with only one school should select either “No schools” or “All schools.”

| STRATEGY | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| | DISTRICT REQUIRED STRATEGY IN: | | |
| | NO SCHOOLS | SOME SCHOOLS | ALL SCHOOLS |
| a. Increase the number of staff to support students’ mental health (e.g., by increasing the number of counselors, psychologists, social workers, behavioral aides, or the use of external mental health providers) | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| b. Offer or expand district-provided social-emotional learning (SEL) programs | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| c. Offer or expand positive school climate and/or cyber bullying prevention programs | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| d. Systematically identify signs of trauma or a mental health crisis among students. | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| e. Conduct a needs assessment of students needing meals, technology to access school resources, or other supports | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| f. Offer or expand the use of student peer advisors for student mentoring and support | 0 | 1 | 2 |

Q.2-11 SKIP INSTRUCTION

For each item where districts answer “Some schools,” the item will appear in Q.2-12.

Note: All districts receive all items in Q.2-13.

2-12. Which schools were *REQUIRED* to use the following strategies to address students’ social-emotional or mental health needs during the 2020-21 school year?

Note: The online survey will only display the appropriate columns for a district based on its responses to the preliminary questions. The wording of the header may also change based on the response to these questions. For example, for districts with low-performing schools, but no CSI schools, the CSI schools column will not appear and the “other low-performing schools” header will change to “low-performing schools.”

| STRATEGY | SELECT ALL THAT APPLY IN EACH ROW | | | |
|--|---|--|----------------------------|---|
| | DISTRICT REQUIRED THE STRATEGY IN: | | | |
| | CSI SCHOOLS | OTHER LOW- PERFORMING SCHOOLS | TITLE I SCHOOLS | OTHER TYPES OF SCHOOLS (SPECIFY) |
| a. Increase the number of staff to support students’ mental health (e.g., by increasing the number of counselors, psychologists, social workers, behavioral aides, or the use of external mental health providers) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| b. Offer or expand district-provided social-emotional learning (SEL) programs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| c. Offer or expand positive school climate and/or cyber bullying prevention programs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| d. Systematically identify signs of trauma or a mental health crisis among students..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| e. Conduct a needs assessment of students needing meals, technology to access school resources, or other supports..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| f. Offer or expand the use of student peer advisors for student mentoring and support | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |

2-13. Do you estimate that your district *REQUIRED* use of these strategies this school year (2020-21) in fewer schools, about the same number of schools, or more schools than last year (2019-20)?

Note: If your district did not require a strategy last year, but did require the strategy this school year, please indicate that the strategy was required in “more schools this year than last year.” If your district required a strategy last year, but did not require the strategy this school year, please indicate that the strategy was required in “fewer schools this year than last year.”

| STRATEGY | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW DISTRICT REQUIRED THE STRATEGY IN: | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | FEWER SCHOOLS THIS YEAR THAN LAST YEAR | ABOUT THE SAME NUMBER OF SCHOOLS | MORE SCHOOLS THIS YEAR THAN LAST YEAR |
| a. Increase the number of staff to support students’ mental health (e.g., by increasing the number of counselors, psychologists, social workers, behavioral aides, or the use of external mental health providers)..... | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| b. Offer or expand district-provided social-emotional learning (SEL) programs .. | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| c. Offer or expand positive school climate and/or cyber bullying prevention programs | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| d. Systematically identify signs of trauma or a mental health crisis among students..... | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| e. Conduct a needs assessment of students needing meals, technology to access school resources, or other supports | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| f. Offer or expand the use of student peer advisors for student mentoring and support..... | 1 | 2 | 3 |

The next set of questions asks about new strategies your district implemented to improve student achievement this school year (2020–21).

2-14. Did your district implement a new intervention, program, or practice in this school year (2020–21) to improve student achievement?

Note: “New” intervention, program, or practice is one that was not implemented in 2019–20.

- Yes
- No

Q.2-14 SKIP INSTRUCTION
 Districts that answer “Yes” go to Q.2-15.
 Districts that answer “No” skip to Q.3-1.

2-15. Did your district rely on information from the following sources to choose a *new* intervention, program, or practice in any of your schools for this school year (2020–21)?

| SOURCES CONSULTED FOR NEW STRATEGIES | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | | |
|--|--|-----------|-----------------------|
| | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW |
| a. District’s needs assessment | 1 | 0 | DK |
| b. Guidance or advice from the state education department or a technical assistance center funded by the state | 1 | 0 | DK |
| c. A list of vendors approved by the state | 1 | 0 | DK |
| d. A list of evidence-based models, interventions, or strategies provided by the state | 1 | 0 | DK |
| e. Information provided by the selected intervention’s developer or vendor | 1 | 0 | DK |
| f. Recommendations from colleagues in other school districts | 1 | 0 | DK |
| g. Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center | 1 | 0 | DK |
| h. Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory | 1 | 0 | DK |
| i. Information from the What Works Clearinghouse, Evidence for ESSA, or another organization that rates evidence | 1 | 0 | DK |
| j. Information from the district’s research/evaluation office | 1 | 0 | DK |
| k. Information from professional associations | 1 | 0 | DK |
| l. Information from a college/university researcher | 1 | 0 | DK |
| m. Other source | 1 | 0 | DK |
| (Specify): _____ | | | |

Section 3. Measuring Student and School Improvement

Definitions for this section

Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) schools are those with subgroup achievement at very low levels, comparable to overall achievement in the bottom 5 percent of all Title I schools, as defined under ESEA for federal accountability.

Assessments provide teachers and schools with information about students' current mastery of grade-level knowledge and skills in English language arts (ELA) or math. For the purposes of the questions in this section, assessments are valid and reliable measures of the content; and are not teacher-developed, formative, or ad-hoc classroom assessments used as part of daily instruction.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools are those in the bottom 5 percent of all Title I schools and schools with graduation rates below 67 percent, as defined under ESEA for federal accountability.

Grade retention refers to repeating the current grade in the next school year.

High school graduation requirements refers to accumulating the minimum number of course credits in prescribed courses, demonstrating academic proficiency in required content, and meeting other requirements to earn a standard or regular high school diploma.

Low-performing schools refers to schools in your district that have been formally identified as low-performing based on low achievement, low graduation rates, and/or low growth in student achievement, including any schools identified as eligible for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), or otherwise identified by your state's accountability system as low-performing.

Professional development (PD) includes training seminars, workshops, or courses in large or small group settings intended to develop staff capacity to perform in the topic area.

Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in a teleconference or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

Summative assessments are state-mandated tests required for accountability purposes that are intended to measure students' knowledge and skills at (or near) the end of a school year or course relative to grade-level content standards.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) schools are those with one or more consistently underperforming subgroups, as defined under ESEA for federal accountability.

Title I schools refer to schools in your district that receive any amount of Title I, Part A funds, including those with targeted assistance and schoolwide Title I programs.

These definitions also are available by hovering over the words that appear in blue in the text of questions, items, and response categories in the survey.

The next set of questions asks about using assessments that are valid, reliable measures of students’ mastery of grade-level knowledge and skills in English language arts (ELA) or math.

3-1. Other than regular screenings to identify students with disabilities and English Learners, did your district REQUIRE schools to administer an assessment to determine students’ academic needs at the beginning of this school year (2020-21)? Indicate whether the district required assessments to students in all schools, some schools, or no schools. (Select one response.)

Note: Districts with only one school should select either “No schools” or “All schools.”

- 2 Yes, the district required **all** schools to administer an assessment
- 1 Yes, the district required **some** schools to administer an assessment.
- 0 No, the district did not require schools to administer an assessment.

Q.3-1 SKIP INSTRUCTION

Districts that answer “No” skip to Q.3-5

Districts that answer “Yes, all schools” skip to Q.3-3.

Districts that answer “Yes, some schools” go to Q.3-2.

3-2. Which schools were REQUIRED to administer the assessment to determine students’ academic needs at the beginning of this school year (2020-21)?

Note: The online survey will only display the appropriate rows for a district based on its responses to the preliminary questions. The wording of the row may also change based on the response to these questions. For example, for districts with low-performing schools, but no CSI schools, the CSI schools row will not appear and the “other low-performing schools” row will change to “low-performing schools.”

| SCHOOL TYPE | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----|
| | YES | NO |
| a. CSI schools..... | 1 | 0 |
| b. Other low-performing schools..... | | |
| c. Title I schools..... | 1 | 0 |
| d. Elementary schools..... | 1 | 0 |
| e. Middle schools..... | 1 | 0 |
| f. High schools..... | 1 | 0 |
| g. Other types of schools..... | 1 | 0 |
| (Specify): _____ | | |

3-3. In schools that required the assessment at the beginning of this school year, was the assessment required of all students or specific groups of students? (Select one response.)

- 2 Assessment was required of **all students**
- 1 Assessment was required of **some students**

Q.3-3 SKIP INSTRUCTION

Districts that answer “some students” go to Q.3-4

Districts that answer “all students” skip to Q.3-5.

3-4. For which groups of students did your district REQUIRE schools to administer an assessment at the beginning of the school year?

| GROUPS OF STUDENTS | SELECT ONE REPOSE IN EACH ROW | |
|---|-------------------------------|----|
| | YES | NO |
| a. Students in specific grade levels (Specify grade levels: PK K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12) _____ | 1 | 0 |
| b. Students with disabilities (SWDs)..... | 1 | 0 |
| c. English learners (ELs) | 1 | 0 |
| d. Economically disadvantaged students | 1 | 0 |
| e. Students with no or limited access to technology (devices or internet connection)..... | 1 | 0 |
| f. Students experiencing homelessness, students in migrant families, or students in foster care | 1 | 0 |
| g. Academically at-risk students..... (Specify how district defines these students) _____ | 1 | 0 |
| h. Other category of students..... (Specify how district defines these students) _____ | 1 | 0 |

3-5. To what extent did NOT having statewide summative assessment data from last year (2019-20), due to the coronavirus pandemic, affect your district’s and schools’ ability to conduct the following functions and processes this school year (2020-21)?

| FUNCTIONS/PROCESSES | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| | NO EFFECT/ STATE ASSESSMENTS NOT USED FOR THIS PURPOSE | SMALL EFFECT | MODERATE EFFECT | SUBSTANTIAL EFFECT |
| a. Measuring and monitoring school improvement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b. Allocating funding, staff, other resources to schools . | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c. Evaluating teacher performance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d. Determining professional development (PD) needs .. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e. Identifying students needing additional academic support..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| f. Placing students in classes or in small groups for targeted instruction | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| g. Identifying English learners (ELs) who can exit EL services | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| h. Measuring and monitoring the progress of student subgroups..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

The next question asks about changes in measuring student progress and attainment in your district.

3-6. Compared to before the coronavirus pandemic, have the criteria for these student measures changed for this school year (2020-21)? If your district made a change to the criteria for these student measures, was that a district or state decision?

| ATTAINMENT OR PROGRESS MEASURES | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|----|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | HAVE CRITERIA CHANGED? | | IF YES, WAS CHANGE REQUIRED BY STATE? | |
| | YES | NO | STATE REQUIRED CHANGE | STATE DID NOT REQUIRE CHANGE |
| a. Use of summative assessment results to determine whether a student can graduate from high school | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| b. Other changes to high school graduation requirements | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| c. Use of summative assessment results to determine grade retention | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| d. Other changes in standards for grade retention | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| e. Use of summative assessment results in course grades..... | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| f. Other changes in standards for course grades | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| g. Other changes..... (Specify): _____ | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

Section 4. Federal Funding

Definitions for this section

Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) schools are those with subgroup achievement at very low levels, comparable to overall achievement in the bottom 5 percent of all Title I schools, as defined under ESEA for federal accountability.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools are those in the bottom 5 percent of all Title I schools and schools with graduation rates below 67 percent, as defined under ESEA for federal accountability.

Instruction expenditures refers to the total current operation expenditure for activities dealing with the interaction of teachers and students in the classroom, home, or hospital as well as co-curricular activities. Report amounts for activities of teacher and instructional aides engaged in regular instruction, special education, and vocational education programs. Exclude adult education programs.

Low-performing schools refers to schools in your district that have been formally identified as low-performing based on low achievement, low graduation rates, and/or low growth in student achievement, including any schools identified as eligible for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), Targeted Support for Improvement (TSI), Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), or otherwise identified by your state's accountability system as low-performing.

Professional development (PD) includes training seminars, workshops, or courses in large or small group settings intended to develop staff capacity to perform in the topic area.

Remote learning is a method of instruction in which teachers and students are in different locations and interact through internet-based or non-internet-based mechanisms. It may include instruction that is both synchronous (simultaneous, such as in teleconferences or a phone call) and asynchronous (non-simultaneous, such as via email or paper packets, pre-recorded videos, or self-guided online lessons).

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) schools are those with one or more consistently underperforming subgroups, as defined under ESEA for federal accountability.

The Coronavirus Aid Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act, enacted in March 2020, provides federal assistance to reduce the public health and economic impacts of the coronavirus pandemic. Key sections of the CARES Act include:

The Governor's Emergency Education Relief (GEER) Fund, which could provide funding for state education agencies (SEAs) and local education agencies (LEAs) if the Governor chose to do so.

The Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) Fund, which provided funding for state education agencies (SEAs) and local education agencies (LEAs) through a formula.

The Coronavirus Relief Fund (CRF), which provided states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Territories with grants to fund short-term needs related to the coronavirus public health emergency. In some states, the CRF was used to support services in K-12 schools such as distance learning, personal protective equipment, and instructional recovery programs.

The Education Stabilization Fund-Rethink K-12 Education Models (ESF-REM) grants, which provided support to State educational agencies to address specific educational needs of students, their parents, and teachers.

Title I schools refer to schools in your district that receive any amount of Title I, Part A funds, including those with targeted assistance and schoolwide Title I programs.

These definitions also are available by hovering over the words that appear in blue in the text of questions, items, and response categories in the survey.

The questions in this section ask about receipt and use of the Coronavirus Aid Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act funds. The CARES Act was enacted in March 2020. Please do not include funding from the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act, enacted in December 2020, or the American Rescue Plan Act, enacted in March 2021. The district’s Chief Financial Officer would likely be the most appropriate respondent for Section 4 of the survey on use of federal funds.

4-1. Did your district receive funds from the state under the following Coronavirus Aid Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act funding programs authorized by Congress in March 2020 to help in recovering from the coronavirus pandemic?

| TYPE OF GRANT UNDER THE CARES ACT | DISTRICT RECEIVED FUNDS? | | IF YES, IN WHAT MONTH AND YEAR WERE THE FUNDS FIRST RECEIVED FROM THE STATE? (ENTER A RESPONSE (IN MM/20YY FORMAT) IN EACH RELEVANT ROW) |
|---|--------------------------|----|---|
| | YES | NO | |
| a. Elementary and secondary school emergency relief (ESSER) fund ... | 1 | 0 | _____ |
| b. Governor’s emergency education relief (GEER) fund | 1 | 0 | _____ |
| c. Coronavirus Relief Fund (CRF) | 1 | 0 | _____ |
| d. Education Stabilization Fund Rethink K-12 Education Models grants (ESF-REM)..... | 1 | 0 | _____ |

Q. 4-1 SKIP INSTRUCTIONS
Districts that respond “No” to all of Q.4-1a, b, c, and d (i.e., did not receive any CARES Act funding) skip to Q.4-11.

4-2. DELETED

4-3. Did your district use CARES Act funding to carry out the following disaster planning and preparation activities during the 2020-21 school year?

| ACTIVITY | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | |
|--|---------------------------------|----|
| | YES | NO |
| a. Coordinating with state or local public health departments and related agencies to obtain data and advice on safety precautions | 1 | 0 |
| b. Collaborating with state educational agency on guidelines for opening or closing schools in response to the pandemic or other emergencies | 1 | 0 |
| c. Planning and coordination for providing meals to eligible students during long-term closures | 1 | 0 |
| d. Developing strategies and plans for supporting continuity of operations in the district .. | 1 | 0 |
| e. Other planning and coordination during long-term closures | 1 | 0 |

4-4. Did your district use CARES Act funding to carry out the following activities related to distance education or remote learning during the 2020-21 school year? Indicate whether the district carried out the CARES Act-funded activity in no schools, some schools, or all schools.

Note: Districts with only one school should select either “No schools” or “All schools.”

| ACTIVITY RELATED TO DISTANCE EDUCATION AND REMOTE LEARNING | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | | |
|--|--|--------------|-------------|
| | DISTRICT CARRIED OUT THE CARES ACT-FUNDED ACTIVITY IN: | | |
| | NO SCHOOLS | SOME SCHOOLS | ALL SCHOOLS |
| a. Purchasing and distributing digital devices or Internet access to students and their families | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| b. Purchasing and maintaining technology (hardware, software, connectivity) to be used by school staff to support remote learning.. | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| c. Professional development (PD) or training to help teachers and instructional support staff provide instruction in a distance learning environment | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| d. Purchasing new online instructional programs or materials | 0 | 1 | 2 |

Q. 4-4 SKIP INSTRUCTION
For each item where the district answers “Some schools,” the item will appear in Q.4-5.

4-5. For which schools did your district carry out the CARES Act-funded activity related to distance education and remote learning during the 2020-21 school year?

Note: The online survey will only display the appropriate columns for a district based on its responses to the preliminary questions. The wording of the header may also change based on the response to these questions. For example, for districts with low-performing schools, but no CSI schools, the CSI schools column will not appear and the “other low-performing schools” header will change to “low-performing schools.”

| ACTIVITY RELATED TO DISTANCE EDUCATION AND REMOTE LEARNING | SELECT ALL THAT APPLY IN EACH ROW | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| | DISTRICT CARRIED OUT THIS ACTIVITY IN: | | | |
| | CSI SCHOOLS | OTHER LOW-PERFORMING SCHOOLS | TITLE I SCHOOLS | OTHER TYPES OF SCHOOLS (SPECIFY) |
| a. Purchasing and distributing digital devices or Internet access to students and their families | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| b. Purchasing and maintaining technology (hardware, software, connectivity) to be used by school staff to support remote learning | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| c. Training to help teachers and instructional support staff provide instruction in a distance learning environment..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| d. Purchasing new online instructional programs or materials . | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |

4-6. Did your district use CARES Act funding to carry out the following activities to maintain physical distance or other safety precautions in school buildings during this school year (2020-21)? Indicate whether the district carried out the CARES Act-funded activity in no schools, some schools, or all schools.

Note: Districts with only one school should select either “No schools” or “All schools.”

| ACTIVITY RELATED TO MAINTAINING PHYSICAL DISTANCE OR OTHER SAFETY PRECAUTIONS | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | | |
|--|--|--------------|-------------|
| | DISTRICT CARRIED OUT THE CARES ACT-FUNDED ACTIVITY IN: | | |
| | NO SCHOOLS | SOME SCHOOLS | ALL SCHOOLS |
| a. Purchasing needed supplies and re-arranging classroom space to create more room among students and teachers | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| b. Changing student transportation options and schedules..... | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| c. Modifying cleaning and sanitation procedures to minimize the spread of infectious diseases, including purchasing supplies, training, or expanding staff | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| d. Purchasing masks or other personal protective equipment (PPE) for students or staff | 0 | 1 | 2 |

Q. 4-6 SKIP INSTRUCTION
 For each item where the district answers “Some schools,” the item will appear in Q.4-7.

4-7. For which schools did your district carry out the CARES Act-funded activity related to maintaining physical distance or other safety precautions in school buildings during 2020-21 school year?

Note: The online survey will only display the appropriate columns for a district based on its responses to the preliminary questions. The wording of the header may also change based on the response to these questions. For example, for districts with low-performing schools, but no CSI schools, the CSI schools column will not appear and the “other low-performing schools” header will change to “low-performing schools.”

| ACTIVITY RELATED TO MAINTAINING PHYSICAL DISTANCE OR OTHER SAFETY PRECAUTIONS | SELECT ALL THAT APPLY IN EACH ROW | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| | DISTRICT CARRIED OUT THIS ACTIVITY IN: | | | |
| | CSI SCHOOLS | OTHER LOW-PERFORMING SCHOOLS | TITLE I SCHOOLS | OTHER TYPES OF SCHOOLS (SPECIFY) |
| a. Purchasing needed supplies and re-arranging classroom space to create more room among students and teachers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| b. Changing student transportation options and schedules..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| c. Modifying cleaning and sanitation procedures to minimize the spread of infectious diseases, including purchasing supplies, training, or expanding staff | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| d. Purchasing masks or other personal protective equipment (PPE) for students or staff..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |

4-8. Did your district use CARES Act funding during 2020-21 school year to provide the following supports or services intended to help students *catch up academically or adjust* to the effects of the coronavirus pandemic? Indicate whether the district used CARES Act-funding to provide the supports or services to help students catch up in no schools, some schools, or all schools.

Note: Districts with only one school should select either “No schools” or “All schools.”

| ACTIVITY TO SUPPORT STUDENTS | SELECT ONE RESPONSE IN EACH ROW | | |
|---|--|--------------|-------------|
| | DISTRICT USED CARES ACT FUNDING TO ADD SUPPORT IN: | | |
| | NO SCHOOLS | SOME SCHOOLS | ALL SCHOOLS |
| a. Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction .. | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| b. Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| c. Expanding social, emotional, or mental health support..... | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| d. Introducing or expanding family engagement | 0 | 1 | 2 |

Q. 4-8 SKIP INSTRUCTION
 For each item where the district answers “Some schools,” the item will appear in Q.4-9.

4-9. For which schools did your district carry out the CARES Act-funded activity related to supports or services intended to help students *catch up or adjust* to the effects of the coronavirus pandemic during the 2020-21 school year?

Note: The online survey will only display the appropriate columns for a district based on its responses to the preliminary questions. The wording of the header may also change based on the response to these questions. For example, for districts with low-performing schools, but no CSI schools, the CSI schools column will not appear and the “other low-performing schools” header will change to “low-performing schools.”

| ACTIVITY TO SUPPORT STUDENTS | SELECT ALL THAT APPLY IN EACH ROW | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| | DISTRICT CARRIED OUT THIS ACTIVITY IN: | | | |
| | CSI SCHOOLS | OTHER LOW-PERFORMING SCHOOLS | TITLE I SCHOOLS | OTHER TYPES OF SCHOOLS (SPECIFY) |
| a. Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| b. Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| c. Expanding social, emotional, or mental health support..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |
| d. Introducing or expanding family engagement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 _____ |

Q. 4-10 SKIP INSTRUCTION

Districts that responded “Yes” to Q.4-1d (ESF-REM), “No” to Q.4-1a (ESSER), “No” to Q.4-1b (GEER), and “No” to Q.4-1c (CRF) (i.e., only received ESF-REM) skip to Q.4-11.

4-10. For what purposes did your district use ESSER, GEER, and CRF funds during the 2020-21 school year? Estimate the approximate percentage of funds from each funding source that was used for each of the activities or purposes listed below. Include expenditures on training or technology that are relevant to each activity. (Round to the nearest whole number.)

Note: If your district used CARES Act funds to hire new staff to carry out activities described in items “a” through “d,” please include those expenditures in the appropriate category. Expenditures to maintain the employment of existing staff carrying out these activities should be included in item “e.”

Note: The online survey will only display the appropriate columns for a district based on its responses to question 4-1.

| ACTIVITY/PURPOSE | ENTER ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE IN EACH ROW FOR EACH COLUMN | | |
|--|---|-------------|-------------|
| | ESSER | GEER | CRF |
| a. Planning and coordination with other agencies and entities in preparation for continuation of the pandemic or a future disaster..... | ___% | ___% | ___% |
| b. Providing distance education and remote learning during full or partial school closures, including purchasing educational technology to support remote learning | ___% | ___% | ___% |
| c. Changing facilities or schedules to maintain physical distance and enhance safety for students and staff, modifying cleaning and sanitation procedures, or purchasing personal protective equipment (PPE) | ___% | ___% | ___% |
| d. Adding academic, social-emotional, or mental health support to aid students | ___% | ___% | ___% |
| e. Continuing to employ existing staff | ___% | ___% | ___% |
| f. Other regular district or school operations..... | ___% | ___% | ___% |
| TOTAL | 100% | 100% | 100% |

4-11. Estimate the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff the district intended to support with CARES Act funds as of October 1, 2020, and the total number of FTE staff employed in the district as of October 1, 2020 and as of October 1, 2019 (prior year).

| FTE STAFF | FTE STAFF SUPPORTED BY CARES ACT FUNDS AS OF OCTOBER 1, 2020 (CURRENT YEAR) | TOTAL FTE STAFF AS OF OCTOBER 1, 2020 (CURRENT YEAR) | TOTAL FTE STAFF AS OF OCTOBER 1, 2019 (PRIOR YEAR) |
|---|--|--|--|
| a. All staff (including teachers) | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| b. All teachers | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Examples of Activities to Support Students

Adapt staffing to provide individualized or small group instruction. Examples of activities to support students include:

- Use paraprofessionals or instructional aides to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction
- Provide tutoring for students identified as needing academic help
- Dedicate time during the day or week for teachers to provide additional, individualized, and/or small group instruction

Expanding length of school year, school week, or school day. Examples of activities to support students include:

- Offer or expand after- or before-school programs that provide supplemental academic instruction
- Increase the length of the school day
- Increase the length of the school year
- Offer or expand summer school

Expanding social, emotional, or mental health support. Examples of activities to support students include:

- Increase the number of staff to support students' mental health (e.g., by increasing the number of counselors, psychologists, social workers, and behavioral aides, or the use of external mental health providers)
- Offer or expand district-provided social-emotional learning (SEL) programs
- Offer or expand positive school climate and/or cyber bullying prevention programs
- Systematically identify signs of trauma or a mental health crisis among students
- Conduct a needs assessment of students needing meals, technology to access school resources, or other supports
- Offer or expand the use of student peer advisors for student mentoring and support

Introducing or expanding family engagement. Examples of activities to support students include:

- Use family engagement liaisons, individual outreach, or a family engagement protocol to re-re-engage students who dropped out or lost contact
- Provide or increase home visits

The examples also are available to respondents by hovering over the words that appear in blue text in the survey.

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY.

Acknowledgements

We very gratefully acknowledge the cooperation and involvement of the many state and local education agency staff who participated in survey activities.

In addition to the authors, many others played important roles in survey development, data collection, analysis, and the preparation of the compendium and corresponding data files. At Westat, Michelle Osowski contributed to survey instrument development, pretesting, and data analysis. Kim Standing, Molly Hershey-Arista, Laura Collins, and Priscilla Quintanilla also carried out the district survey pretests. Greg Norman and Leslie Wallace assisted with sampling and weighting activities. The district data collection was led by Cindy Gray with considerable support from Kim Standing, Stephany Bell-Caldwell, Diana Crudup, Kumar DeSilva, Caryn Fleishman, Libby Matthews, Marcia Parks, Christina Fetzko, Sarah Glidden, and Mihiri Silva. Yevgeniy Kalmanovich led the programming for the district online survey and the survey management system, with support from Valentine Polii and oversight from Ed Mann. Fei Shi and Yong Lee provided programming support. Chelsea Burfeind, Liz Park, and Eleanore Spies contributed to table production support. Valerie Orellana provided substantial assistance on a range of activities. Roberta Garrison-Mogren provided critical support on many data quality-related activities throughout the project. Sylvie Warren provided document production support for the district survey instrument and compendium.

At Mathematica, Erin Dillon contributed to survey instrument development and helped with the state education agency pretests. State data collection was led by Kristina Rall and Ava Madoff. Lauren O’Keefe programmed the state survey. Anna Heckler helped to develop the survey programming specifications, test the web survey, and reach out to states to participate in the survey. Hannah Fox reached out to Puerto Rico to encourage their state and local education agencies to participate in the survey. Juha Sohlberg led programming for the state data processing and analysis programming. Jeremy Berman and Jeff Harrington provided programming for related data analysis activities.

Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest

The team for this compendium consists of contractors Westat and Mathematica. Neither of these organizations or their key staff has financial interests that could be affected by findings from this compendium.