

# Teacher Incentive Allotment Annual Report 2022

## Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
Program Overview Analysis .....	3
Statewide Allotments and Designations .....	3
Local Designation System Participating Systems by Rural and High-Needs .....	3
Local Designation System Participating Systems by Region .....	4
Local Designation System Analysis.....	5
System Application Approval Rates .....	5
System Approval Rates .....	6
Designated Teacher Analysis .....	7
Impact Analysis .....	8

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

The Texas Commission on Public School Finance was created in the 86<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature's First Special Session to address the teacher turnover rate and number of beginning teachers. The Commission heard over 80 hours of testimony from more than 155 individuals, including representatives from 19 school districts, six institutions of higher education, and more than 100 advocates, policy experts, and stakeholders. After months of research, discussion, and deliberation, the Commission produced their 2018 report, [Funding for Impact: Equitable Funding for Students Who Need It the Most](#). The report gave recommendations for improvements to the current public school finance system and proposed new methods for financing public schools.

Thanks to the efforts of the Commission and the bipartisan work between the members of the Texas House and Senate, House Bill 3 was passed by the 86th Texas Legislature in 2019 and signed by Governor Greg Abbott. This sweeping and historic school finance bill provided more money for Texas classrooms, increased teacher compensation, and established the Teacher Incentive Allotment (TIA). HB 3 is one of the most transformative Texas education bills in recent history.

TIA was established with the goal of providing outstanding teachers an accessible pathway to a six-figure salary. Unlike previous education programs, the Teacher Incentive Allotment is not a grant. TIA is based in two sections of the Texas Education Code (TEC), [§21.3521 \(Local Optional Teacher Designation System\)](#) and [§48.112 \(Teacher Incentive Allotment\)](#). Local teacher designation systems allow districts to identify and designate highly effective teachers using single or multi-year appraisal data. The allotment component allows districts employing designated teachers to receive additional funding through the Foundation School Program.

TIA elevates the education profession by recognizing and rewarding effective teaching and incentivizing outstanding teachers to remain in the classroom and improve student outcomes. Districts use TIA funds to retain their best teachers, recruit promising new teachers, and incentivize teachers to work in high-needs schools and difficult to staff positions.

The 2021-2022 Annual Report covers 4 targeted areas:

1. Program Overview Analysis-Including allotments and designations.
2. Local Designation System Analysis- Including participation rates, system application approval rates, and full system approval rates.
3. Designated Teacher Analysis- Including demographics, National Board vs. Local Optional Teacher Designation System, and teacher education preparation routes.
4. Impact Analysis- Including teacher movement, teacher retention, and teacher exit rates.

The purpose of this document is to provide transparent information regarding the Teacher Incentive Allotment. Key takeaways from 2021-2022:

- ***TIA system application approval rates are remaining steady at ~90% from Cohorts A-E.***
- ***Rural continues to have a higher system application and full system approval rates than other groups.***
- ***Designated teachers had a higher retention, higher retention rate within the same district, and a lower exit rate than statewide rates for these groups.***

# PROGRAM OVERVIEW ANALYSIS

This section provides key information regarding allotments both within the state, region, and district as well as total number of teachers receiving an allotment. This section also provides key information regarding designations including number of districts employing designated teachers and designations by region.

## Statewide Allotments and Designations

Year	Total Allotments <sup>1</sup>	Districts Receiving Allotments <sup>1</sup>	Number of Designated Teachers
2020	\$40,237,770	43	3,976
2021	\$43,046,976	127	4,617
2022	\$55,437,701	179	6,246

## Local Designation System Participating Systems by Rural and High-Needs

There are a total of 378 district systems that are participating in TIA. Participating in TIA is defined as a district or 1882 partnership that has been approved for their system application.

Rural	Count	Percent
Rural <sup>3</sup>	178	47%
Non-Rural <sup>3</sup>	200	53%

High-Needs	Count	Percent
High-Need <sup>4</sup>	115	30%
Non-High-Needs <sup>4</sup>	263	70%

<sup>1</sup> Allotments include: teacher allotments, reimbursed designated teacher fees and reimbursed national board fees

<sup>2</sup> Designations are new or higher designations

<sup>3</sup> High Needs is defined as districts with greater than or equal to 80% economically disadvantaged students

<sup>4</sup> Rural is defined as districts meeting the rural definition according to [TIA rule](#)

## Local Designation System Participating Systems by Region

Regional data shows that we have consistent involvement across the state in every region of Texas.

Region <sup>1</sup>	Count	Percent	Region <sup>1</sup>	Count	Percent
ESC 01- Edinburg	29	8%	ESC 11-Fort Worth	20	5%
ESC 02-Corpus Christi	18	5%	ESC 12-Waco	25	7%
ESC 03-Victoria	7	2%	ESC 13-Austin	20	5%
ESC 04-Houston	31	8%	ESC 14-Abilene	17	5%
ESC 05-Beaumont	15	4%	ESC 15-San Angelo	8	2%
ESC 06-Huntsville	24	6%	ESC 16-Amarillo	4	1%
ESC 07-Kilgore	37	10%	ESC 17-Lubbock	15	4%
ESC 08-Mount Pleasant	9	2%	ESC 18-Midland	12	3%
ESC 09-Wichita Falls	17	5%	ESC 19-El Paso	8	2%
ESC 10-Richardson	35	9%	ESC 20-San Antonio	27	7%

<sup>1</sup> High Needs is defined as districts with greater than or equal to 80% economically disadvantaged students

<sup>2</sup> Rural is defined as districts meeting the rural definition according to [TIA rule](#)

## LOCAL DESIGNATION SYSTEM ANALYSIS

This section provides key information regarding the progress of TIA participants through the TIA process. TIA participants first go through system application approval then system approval through the TTU data validation process. TIA participants are defined by a specific Cohort. Our Rural and High-Needs groups typically outperformed the overall passing rate for each Cohort.

### System Application Approval Rates

Cohort	Group	Denied	Passed	Total
Cohort A	Total	5 (15%)	29 (85%)	34
	High Needs	3 (19%)	13 (81%)	16
	Rural	1 (14%)	6 (86%)	7
Cohort B	Total	4(36%)	7 (64%)	11
	High Needs	1 (20%)	4 (80%)	5
	Rural	2(67%)	1 (33%)	3
Cohort C	Total	15 (20%)	60 (80%)	75
	High Needs	8 (31%)	18 (69%)	26
	Rural	4 (15%)	22 (85%)	26
Cohort D	Total	17(8%)	185(92%)	202
	High Needs	5 (7%)	63 (93%)	68
	Rural	7 (8%)	84(92%)	91
Cohort E	Total	9(6%)	137(94%)	146
	High Needs	5 (13%)	33 (87%)	38
	Rural	3 (4%)	72(96%)	75
EXP-MOD-E	Total	0(0%)	85(100%)	85
	High Needs	0(33%)	28(100%)	28
	Rural	0 (9%)	22 (100%)	22
Overall	Total	50(9%)	503(91%)	553
	High Needs	20 (11%)	159(89%)	179
	Rural	17 (8%)	207 (92%)	147

<sup>1</sup> High Needs is defined as districts with greater than or equal to 80% economically disadvantaged students

<sup>2</sup> Rural is defined as districts meeting the rural definition according to [TIA rule](#)

## System Approval Rates

System approval is defined as districts being approved through both step 1 (system application) and step 2 (data validation). The following approval rates shows that our overall approval rates remained steady between 70-80%.

Cohort	Approval Status	Overall	Rural <sup>2</sup>	Non-Rural <sup>2</sup>	High-Needs <sup>1</sup>	Non High-Needs <sup>1</sup>
Cohort A	Denied	7 (21%)	1 (14%)	6 (23%)	4 (27%)	3 (17%)
	Full Approval	15(45%)	4 (57%)	11 (42%)	6 (40%)	9 (50%)
	Provisional 2-Year Approval	4 (12%)	--	4 (15%)	--	4 (22%)
	Provisional Approval	7 (21%)	2 (29%)	5 (19%)	5 (33%)	2 (11%)
Cohort B	Denied	1 (20%)	--	1 (20%)	1 (33%)	--
	Provisional Approval	4 (80%)	--	4 (50%)	2 (67%)	2 (100%)
Cohort C	Denied	13 (27%)	4 (21%)	9 (30%)	4 (31%)	9 (25%)
	Full Approval	36 (73%)	15 (79%)	21 (70%)	9 (69%)	27 (75%)

<sup>1</sup> High Needs is defined as districts with greater than or equal to 80% economically disadvantaged students

<sup>2</sup> Rural is defined as districts meeting the rural definition according to [TIA rule](#)

## DESIGNATED TEACHER ANALYSIS

### Academic Year 2019-2020 New Designations

Group	Total	American Indian / Alaska Native		Asian		Black/African American		Hispanic / Latino		Pacific Islander		White		Two or More Races / Ethnicities	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Statewide	368,282	1253	.3%	6,460	2%	39,408	11%	103,144	28%	645	.18%	213,152	58%	4,220	1%
TIA Participating <sup>1</sup> Districts	31,119	123	.4%	936	3%	6,168	20%	12,205	39%	106	.34%	11,124	36%	457	1%
Designated <sup>2*</sup>	3,976	26	.65%	157	4%	861	22%	1,320	33%	5	.13%	1,475	37%	66	2%

\*66 designated teachers had missing demographic information

### Academic Year 2020-2021 New or Higher Designations

Group	Total	American Indian / Alaska Native		Asian		Black/African American		Hispanic / Latino		Pacific Islander		White		Two or More Races / Ethnicities	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Statewide	370,826	1282	.34%	6,735	2%	41,746	11%	106,186	28%	627	.17%	214,250	57%	4,387	1%
TIA Participating <sup>1</sup> Districts	37,552	125	.33%	1,024	3%	7,137	19%	15,949	42%	76	.20%	12,705	34%	536	1%
Designated <sup>2*</sup>	695	1	.14%	36	5%	79	11%	267	38%	--	--	292	42%	11	2%

\*9 designated teachers had missing demographic information

### Academic Year 2021-2022 New or Higher Designations

Group	Total	American Indian / Alaska Native		Asian		Black/African American		Hispanic / Latino		Pacific Islander		White		Two or More Races / Ethnicities	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Statewide	376,100	1,263	.34%	7,051	2%	41,809	11%	108,282	29%	559	.15%	212,759	57%	4,377	1%
TIA Participating <sup>1</sup> Districts	79,759	236	.30%	2,218	3%	13,643	17%	29,393	37%	108	.14%	33,138	42%	1,023	1%
Designated <sup>2*</sup>	1,750	4	.23%	64	4%	269	15%	515	29%	2	.11%	865	49%	26	1%

\*5 designated teachers had missing demographic information

<sup>1</sup> TIA participating is defined as any district that has an approved step 1 system application

<sup>2</sup> Designations are issued new or higher designations for the academic year

# IMPACT ANALYSIS

---

## Teacher and Student Impact

This analysis looks at teacher full time equivalent counts and district student enrollment counts both found in PEIMS. Purpose of this analysis is to get a sense of the population in Texas that is impacted by the Teacher Incentive Allotment.

Group	FTE Teachers (PEIMS)	District Enrollment (PEIMS)
TIA Participating Districts	171,648 (47%)	2,547,889 (47%)
Statewide	367,953	5,428,613