



Association of Texas
Professional Educators
305 E. Huntland Dr., Suite 300
Austin, TX 78752-3792

Phone: (512) 467-0071
Fax: (512) 467-2203
Email: info@atpe.org
Online: atpe.org

June 30, 2026

The Hon. Russell Vought
Director, Office of Management and Budget
725 17th Street NW
Washington, DC 20503

Submitted to: <https://www.regulations.gov/document/OMB-2026-0034-0001>

RE: ATPE Comment on Proposed Rule: Uniform Grants Regulation (OMB-2024-0010 / RIN 0348-AB82).

Dear Director Vought:

On behalf of the Association of Texas Professional Educators (ATPE), the largest educator association in Texas and one of the largest independent associations representing public educators in the nation, we appreciate the opportunity to submit comments regarding the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) proposed rule, "Uniform Grants Regulation" (UGR), published on May 29, 2026.

ATPE has serious concerns, both procedural and substantive, that this rule, as proposed, will negatively impact the Texas Education Agency (TEA), the 1,200 independent school districts in Texas, as well as the ability of the more than 340,000 public educators in Texas to teach our state's 5.4 million K-12 students attending public schools. Specifically, our concerns are as follows:

Concentration of Grantmaking Authority at OMB:

The proposed UGR establishes a singular, government-wide effective date that bypasses individual agency rulemaking. Historically, when OMB modifies grant guidance, the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) and other federal agencies go through an implementation process that gives TEA and local school boards a vital "buffer period" to update their internal accounting, compliance frameworks, and local board policies.

Eliminating this buffer period by ending grant-related rulemaking at the individual agencies will force Texas school districts—many of which operate with limited administrative staff—to instantly comply with sweeping regulatory overhauls without adequate time for training or systemic adjustment. This sudden shift threatens the continuity of compliance tracking for critical programs such as Title I and IDEA, leaving districts vulnerable to administrative errors and funding delays during critical hiring and procurement windows. Texas public education requires predictable, phased timelines to ensure accurate compliance.

Political Appointee Review, Agency Termination of Grants Create Funding Instability:

Texas districts rely heavily on competitive, multi-year federal grants to fund critical innovations, such as school safety initiatives, mental health support, and career and technical education (CTE)

Your Ally. Your Voice.

atpe.org

pathways. The proposed UGR in Section 200.205 grants senior political appointees final approval power over discretionary grants, rendering expert peer-review panels purely advisory.

Furthermore, Section 200.340 it gives agencies broad authority to terminate or suspend active grants mid-cycle based on shifting “national interests” or “agency priorities.” Competitive federal education grants (such as Full-Service Community Schools or specific after-school innovations) could be withheld or denied based on alignment with the administration’s political priorities. Allowing federal funding to be disrupted mid-stream, potentially after districts have already obligated expenses, introduces severe budgetary instability.

Texas school boards cannot responsibly launch multi-year student programs or hire specialized personnel if the underlying federal funding can be arbitrarily canceled by a federal agency prior to the grant’s natural conclusion. These sections of the proposed UGR will create immense budget uncertainty for multi-year public school initiatives and should be revised before finalization to address these concerns.

Elimination of Fixed-Amount Awards/Subawards

The proposal in Section 200.201 of the UGR to eliminate fixed-amount subawards in favor of a strict cost-reimbursement model will severely harm Texas schools, especially those in rural areas. TEA frequently utilizes simplified fixed-amount subawards to distribute smaller pools of federal funds to rural and smaller districts and community partners providing targeted Title I reading intervention or specialized IDEA after-school services.

Smaller districts rarely have the upfront cash reserves or the clerical capacity to manage complex cost-reimbursement frameworks. Forcing these streamlined agreements into a cost-reimbursement model will bury school business officials under mountains of redundant invoicing and receipt tracking and should be revised before the rule is finalized.

Expansion of Non-Funded Facility Mandates

The proposed "discriminatory event services" clause in Section 200.219 of the proposed UGR expands federal compliance oversight to any event held on school district property, regardless of whether that specific event or facility utilizes federal funds.

Texas school districts frequently rent their facilities to community groups, scouting troops, religious organizations, and local sports leagues to generate revenue and foster community ties. Forcing local school boards into complex, federally mandated viewpoint-neutrality frameworks for non-federally funded operations creates severe local legal exposure and subverts the authority of locally elected school boards.

Prohibitions on DEI and Gender Ideology

The proposed rule updates Section 200.300 to explicitly prohibit federal grant funds from being used to “fund, promote, encourage, subsidize, or facilitate” Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) or gender ideology, both of which are largely undefined. Texas school districts could lose federal funding if funding is used for equity-focused staff training, diverse curriculum materials, or support services. TEA, acting as a pass-through entity, would be legally required to monitor local school districts to ensure absolute compliance with these restrictions.

Texas public schools are already navigating highly complex state laws regarding curriculum and district operations. The introduction of vague, sweeping federal restrictions attached to formula grant programs such as Title I and IDEA could leave Texas educators and administrators trapped between conflicting state and federal interpretations. Without clear, narrow definitions, school districts face the constant, paralyzing threat of total federal funding claw backs for standard, well-intentioned professional development, mandatory IDEA cultural competence frameworks, or targeted Title I student support services.

ATPE thanks you for consideration of these comments, and as OMB moves to finalize the proposed UGR, we ask that it be revised to address the concerns expressed herein. Additionally, we offer our organization as a further resource to OMB on how this proposed rule will negatively impact our members and public education in Texas as well as throughout the country. We would be happy to meet with you or your staff at any time.

Sincerely,



Shannon J. Holmes, Ed.D.
Executive Director