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Education Code §8.103 states the following:

The commissioner shall conduct an annual evaluation of each executive director and regional education service center.

Each evaluation must include:

1. an audit of the center's finances;
2. a review of the center's performance on the indicators adopted under Section 8.101;
3. a review of client satisfaction with services provided under Subchapter B; and
4. a review of any other factor the commissioner determines to be appropriate.

The annual evaluation is designed to meet the statutory requirements as well as to guide the Commissioner of Education and the Executive Director of the ESC to an effective dialogue. The annual evaluation process has three broad goals:

1. To clarify expectations between the Texas Education Agency (TEA) Commissioner and the ESC executive director on roles, responsibilities, and job expectations.
2. To provide the Commissioner the opportunity to share perception of executive director’s strengths, limitations, and overall performance; and
3. To foster the growth and development of both the executive director and the ESC.

The evaluation scoring matrix is as follows:

**Meets Standards** - Performance consistently meets standards in all areas and meets normal expectations. This performance rating is given to ESCs and executive directors who meet all of the performance expectations/goals as outlined in Texas Education Code (TEC) Chapter 8.

**Needs Improvement** - Performance is below standards or does not meet expectations. Improvement is required. This performance rating given to ESCs and executive directors who fail to achieve performance expectations/goals as outlined in TEC Chapter 8.

**Not Applicable or Did Not Report** – Not applicable or did not report.
PERFORMANCE STANDARD 1

Student Performance in School Districts and Charter Schools Served - TEC §8.101(1)

ESCs impact student performance in school districts and charter schools served by providing programs, products, services, and resources to enhance teacher and school district leaders’ effectiveness. ESC goals and objectives take into consideration student performance in school districts and charter schools served on an ongoing basis. Products and services developed by ESCs are developed and/or designed to assist school districts and charter schools in meeting student performance standards.

INDICATOR 1-1

Products and services provided by ESCs are developed and/or designed to increase student performance at all campuses in the region. Regional performance index reports are based on annual TEA performance data collected from school districts and charter schools for all four indexes (1 – Student Achievement, 2 – Student Progress, 3 – Closing Performance Gaps, and 4 – Postsecondary Readiness). The information analyzed is broken down by subject and ethnic/race groups, including special education, economically disadvantaged, and LEP.

Based on the 2013-14 school year STAAR testing data and information provided in the Annual Standards and Indicators Report for 2014-2015, the region rates as follows for this indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable or Did Not Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

Student Performance Data 2013-14 School Year compared to 2012-13 School Year

Index 1 – Student Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Index 1 Region 16</th>
<th>Index 1 Statewide</th>
<th>Index 1 Goal</th>
<th>Region Score / Statewide Average</th>
<th>Region Score / Index Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>154%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>142%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2014, Region 16 continues to perform at or slightly above the statewide average as well as above the index 1 goal. From 2013 to 2014, Region 16 saw 1.30% growth from the statewide average in Index 1: Student Achievement. The Index 1 Goal increased from 50 in 2013 to 55 in 2014. The Region 16 scores increased from 77 in 2013 to 78 in 2014. Therefore, Region 16’s growth from the index goal for each respective year was -7.91%.
Index 2 – Student Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Index 2 Region 16</th>
<th>Index 2 Statewide</th>
<th>Index 2 Goal</th>
<th>Region Score / Statewide Average</th>
<th>Region Score / Index Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>157%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>244%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2014, Region 16 continues to perform below the statewide average, yet above the index 2 goal. From 2013 to 2014, Region 16 saw 0.45% growth from the statewide average in Index 2: Student Progress. The Index 2 Goal decreased from 21 in 2013 to 16 in 2014. The Region 16 scores increased from 33 in 2013 to 39 in 2014. Therefore, Region 16’s growth from the index goal for each respective year was 55.11%.

Index 3 – Closing Performance Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Index 3 Region 16</th>
<th>Index 3 Statewide</th>
<th>Index 3 Goal</th>
<th>Region Score / Statewide Average</th>
<th>Region Score / Index Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>127%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>136%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2014, Region 16 performs at the statewide average, yet above the index 3 goal. From 2013 to 2014, Region 16 saw 1.43% growth from the statewide average in Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps. The Index 3 Goal decreased from 55 in 2013 to 28 in 2014. The Region 16 scores decreased as well from 70 in 2013 to 38 in 2014. However, Region 16 sustained a growth rate of 6.63% from the index goal for each respective year.

Index 4 – Post Secondary Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Index 4 Region 16</th>
<th>Index 4 Statewide</th>
<th>Index 4 Goal</th>
<th>Region Score / Statewide Average</th>
<th>Region Score / Index Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>111%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>112%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2014, Region 16 performed below the statewide average, yet above the index 4 goal. From 2013 to 2014, Region 16 saw -5.01% growth from the statewide average in Index 4: Post-Secondary Readiness. The Index 4 goal decreased from 75 in 2013 to 57 in 2014. The Region 16 scores also decreased from 83 in 2013 to 64 in 2014. Therefore, Region 16’s growth from the index goal for each respective year was 1.46%.

Although there are areas of improvement in student performance indexes, Region 16 has a primary focus on improving student performance. Examples include but are not limited to the following:

Programs and services provide to districts to increase student performance and achievement

- ESC 16 has implemented new programs developed specifically for campus and district-level instructional leaders and aligns consistently with Texas Education Agency guidelines to assist campuses in identifying instructional interventions specifically targeted to address academic and achievement-gap deficiencies (e.g., Texas Center for School and District Support (TCDSS) Critical Success Factors, and Elementary and Secondary Education Act turnaround principles. The focus on instructional leadership enables Region 16 to resourcefully support/train campus/district leaders to focus on system-wide instructional initiatives that improve student achievement by defining and monitoring instruction.
• Special Education Accountability Overview
  • Provided, through the use of district data, customized professional development, coaching and technical assistance to districts and campuses in the areas of ELA, math, science and social studies
  • Provided professional development and technical assistance in instructional and all areas under §8.101
  • Offered certification classes for specialized areas of high need in the region. The ESCs role consists of monitoring student instruction, site visits required for certification and documentation to support certification. Courses are provided for the following: Speech Language Pathology, Visual Impairment, and CTE all through various collaborations.
  • Provided regional conferences for the following areas: Mathematics, Social Studies, Science, English/Language Arts, Instructional Strategies, and Assistive Technology

Programs and services to aid districts in closing achievement gaps
• Provided Closing the Gap training to help campuses identify gaps in student performance and incorporate instructional strategies in their everyday practice.
• Provided Using Data to Inform Instruction & Support Continuous Improvement. This session also helped campuses identify widest performance gaps and address strategies to improve instruction.
• Provided Texas Accountability Intervention System (TAIS) training to all low performing districts and campuses focusing on the four components: data analysis needs assessment, improvement planning and implementation and monitoring.
• Developed an annual plan for improvement that includes a data analysis component detailing subpopulations and overall student performance, a needs assessment, a detailed description of interventions, strategies, activities, and tactics along with a description of the services provided by the ESC

School Improvement Activities
• Provided Texas Accountability Intervention System (TAIS) training to all Improvement Required, Priority and Focus campuses.
• The Region 16 Turnaround Team meets regularly to address and identify needs of Improvement Required, Priority and Focus campuses.
• Each low performing campus is assigned a Turnaround Team contact. The contact communicates with the campus on a regular basis to provide technical assistance and support.
• Provided professional development based on identified regional needs such as Figure 19 training in ELA (266 participants)
• Have collaborative meetings at the ESC to communicate identified and requested needs from low performing campuses and districts.
• Provided technical assistance, coaching and support to 2,467 contacts in the area of school improvement
• Provide technical assistance to districts including inclusive practices to improve performance of students with disabilities.

The 2014 Customer Satisfaction Survey included a category for rating satisfaction with Improving Student Performance. Region 16 received a rating of **4.91 out of 5.00** in this category.

**INDICATOR 1-2**
Regional college readiness data is based on annual TEA performance data collected from the school districts and charter schools. Information analyzed for each region includes attendance rate, AP/IB Results – Examinees >= Criterion, SAT/ACT Results at/Above Criterion, and College-Ready Graduates in both English
Language Arts and Math. The information analyzed is broken down by ethnic/race groups, including special
education, economically disadvantaged, and LEP.

Based on the information provided in the Annual Standards and Indicators Report for 2014-2015, the
region rates as follows for this indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable or Did Not Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

College-Readiness Data 2012-13 School Year compared to 2011-12 School Year

Attendance Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Attendance Rate Region 16</th>
<th>Attendance Rate Statewide</th>
<th>Region 16 / Statewide</th>
<th>Growth / (Decline) from Previous Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>100.1%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>(0.3125%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduation Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Graduation Rate Region 16</th>
<th>Graduation Rate Statewide</th>
<th>Region 16 / Statewide</th>
<th>Growth / (Decline) from Previous Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>100.8%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>100.6%</td>
<td>0.1131%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AP/IB Results – Examinees >= Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>AP/IB Region 16</th>
<th>AP/IB Statewide</th>
<th>Region 16 / Statewide</th>
<th>Growth / (Decline) from Previous Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>1.7766%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAT / ACT Results – Examinees >= Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>SAT/ACT Region 16</th>
<th>SAT/ACT Statewide</th>
<th>Region 16 / Statewide</th>
<th>Growth / (Decline) from Previous Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>(2.2321%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

College Ready Graduates in ELA and Math

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>College Ready ELA and Math Region 16</th>
<th>College Ready ELA and Math Statewide</th>
<th>Region 16 / Statewide</th>
<th>Growth / (Decline) from Previous Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>(3.7037%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region 16 has put forth efforts to strengthen post-secondary readiness in 2014-15 school year. Examples of where emphasis has been placed is listed below, however, this is not an exhausting list:

- HB5 meetings were facilitated by Region 16. The meetings were between IHEs and districts (4 meetings were facilitated and held at Region 16 with administrators).
- HB 5 meeting held with Panhandle School Board Association to discuss graduation requirements, course offerings and post-secondary connections.
- Administrator and counselor training for HB 5 implementation and planning.
- Region 16 coordinated, hosted and facilitated meetings between public schools and their higher education partners through the P-16 initiative. Region 16 has been instrumental in fostering these relationships between public education and higher education and providing opportunities for the strengthening of their partnerships. All college and university presidents in the Region 16 service area participated in these meetings. Four meetings specifically related to discussing the college preparatory course requirements of House Bill 5 were facilitated and held at Region 16 and attended by higher education administrators and ISD administrators.
- P-16 meetings throughout 2013-14 were geared toward discussion of college readiness and new TSI requirements.
- P-16 served as the “clearinghouse” to distribute the college preparatory courses in ELA and math, as well as the accompanying Memorandum of Understanding that were developed collaboratively by Amarillo ISD and Amarillo College and provided for use by all ISDs in the region at no charge.
- P-16 coordinated a videoconference from Region 16 available to all ISDs in the region regarding the House Bill 5 requirements for the college preparatory courses. Presenters were ELA and math faculty from Amarillo ISD and Amarillo College, and the Region 16 P-16 Specialist.
- Offering technical assistance and training centered around career clusters, career guidance and endorsement areas.
PERFORMANCE STANDARD 2


ESCs impact school district and charter school effectiveness and efficiency by providing programs, services, and resources to enhance teacher and school district and charter school leader effectiveness. ESC programs and services for technical assistance and program support enable school districts and charter schools to operate more effectively and efficiently. ESCs promote effective use of professional development funds and activities to support school district and charter school improvement.

INDICATOR 2-1

ESCs annually report the number of consulting and technical assistance contact hours delivered to school districts and charter schools. Contact hours include face to face, telephone, email, or other electronic media.

Based on the information provided in the Annual Standards and Indicators Report for 2014-2015, the region rates as follows for this indicator:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable or Did Not Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

Region 16 reported a total of 55,434 contact hours in consulting and technical assistance with school districts and charter schools in the region.

The 2014 Customer Satisfaction Survey included a categories for Efficient and Economical School Operations. Region 16 received a rating of 4.91 out of 5.00 in this category.

INDICATOR 2-2

The percentage of school districts and charter schools in each region receiving standard achievement and above rating on Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas (FIRST) is assessed by TEA. For school districts and charter schools that do not attain this rating, ESCs will report technical assistance provided in coordination with TEA.

Based on the annual FIRST ratings report for 2013-14, the region rates as follows for this indicator:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable or Did Not Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMENTS:

According to the 2013-14 FIRST ratings for districts and charter schools (based on 2012-13 information), Region 16 had 98.4% of all schools in the region scored at or above a standard achievement rating. Of the 62 school districts in the region, 54 scored a superior achievement, 6 scored above standard achievement, 1 scored standard achievement, and 1 scored substandard achievement. The one charter school in the region scored above standard achievement.

For the school district not scoring at least a standard achievement, Region 16 provides the following services:

- Support with the annual financial audit:
  - fund balance projections
  - providing data to the auditor
  - attending the board meeting
  - food service transfers
  - balance sheet adjustments
  - federal funds compliance
  - setting up due to's and due from's

- Revenue projections
  - state funding projections and cash flow analysis
  - local tax projections
  - calculating the effective tax rate and rollback rates
  - calculating M&O and I&S tax rates based on values and the bond amortization schedule
  - assistance with the public notice and the posting requirements

- Budget analysis
  - Analysis of historical spending
  - Spending comparisons with other districts

- Providing bond information
- Assistance with budgets
  - Public notice
  - web site publishing requirements

INDICATOR 2-3

ESCs annually report on school finance related technical assistance provided to school districts and charter schools. The types of products and services provided to school districts and charter schools are listed and the total number of contact hours related to school finance technical assistance is reported.

Based on the information provided in the Annual Standards and Indicators Report for 2014-2015, the region rates as follows for this indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Region 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable or Did Not Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMENTS:

Region 16 provides school finance related technical assistance to district and charter schools in various ways that prove to be effective in the region. Region 16 provides support with the annual financial audit, revenue projections, federal spending compliance, Special Ed MOE compliance, State spending requirements, Payroll, bank reconciliations, bank bidding process, monthly board reports, budget assistance, and guidance with TEA spending requirements.

Region 16 had a total **1,920 hours of technical assistance related to school finance.**
PERFORMANCE STANDARD 3

Economical and Efficient School Operation TEC, §8.101(3)

ESC programs are made available to school districts and charter schools at a cost that enables the school districts and charter schools to operate more economically and efficiently while adequately covering the costs of the ESC. Programs, products, and services offered are priced based on a cost benefit analysis to ensure that pricing is fair and equitable. Savings achieved by school districts and charter schools as a result of purchasing products and services provided by an ESC as compared to similar products and services provided by other entities are also documented.

INDICATOR 3-1

ESCs biennially report school district and charter school cost efficiencies for products and services provided as compared to similar products and services provided by other entities through a statewide sampling of school districts and charter schools.

Based on the information provided in the Annual Standards and Indicators Report for 2014-2015, the region rates as follows for this indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>Improvement Needed</th>
<th>Not Applicable or Did Not Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

COMMENTS:

Based on the five school districts/charter schools included in the 2014 Rider 38 Report to assess school district savings in the areas of professional development, ESC products, ESC direct services, and ESC technical assistance, as per the certification of the school district or charter school superintendent, Region 16 saved these school districts **$1,540,387**. Cost savings for each of the six districts are as follows (amounts rounded to the nearest whole dollar):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Student WADA</th>
<th>Cost Savings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Profess. Devel.</td>
<td>ESC Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLean ISD</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>$28,772</td>
<td>$10,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plemons-Stinnett-Phillips CISD</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>$120,323</td>
<td>$68,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channing ISD</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>$25,057</td>
<td>$6,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimmitt ISD</td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>$179,941</td>
<td>$46,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vega ISD</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>$48,714</td>
<td>$88,271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDICATOR 3-2

ESCs annually report the percentage of school districts and charter schools participating in cooperative agreements in the region. ESCs provide a listing and description of cooperative agreements provided to school districts and charter schools in the region. Cost efficiencies for cooperative agreements are included in the biennial report (reported in even numbered years) required in Indicator 3-1.

Based on the information provided in the Annual Standards and Indicators Report for 2014-2015, the region rates as follows for this indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>Improvement Needed</th>
<th>Not Applicable or Did Not Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

Region 16 reports 100% of school districts and charter schools in the region participate in at least 1 cooperative or shared service arrangement, with most belonging to multiple cooperatives.

Examples of the cooperative or shared service arrangements available in Region 16 include, but are not limited to, the following:

**MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP TRAINING** - Technical assistance and professional development for central office and campus leadership in the form of legal updates, accountability updates, various networks, mandated trainings, optional professional growth opportunities and legal services discounts.

**BUSINESS SUPPORT SERVICES** - The ESC will provide three options with this contract to include: (1) finance/state aid support; (2) additional business services in preparation for districts audits; (3) and/or full business office services with accounting and budgeting segments.

**TxEIS (BUSINESS AND STUDENT)** - Web-based and fully integrated, TxEIS supports the operational and reporting requirements of local school districts for both student and business applications. Specialists will provide technical support via e-mail, phones, a remote desktop application, and through trainings on all applications within the software and PEIMS.

**SKYWARD SOFTWARE SUPPORT** - Web-based and fully integrated, Skyward supports the operational and reporting requirements of local school districts for student applications. Specialists will provide technical support via e-mail, phones, a remote desktop application, and through trainings on all applications within the software and PEIMS.

**INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SUPPORT SERVICES** - District may secure additional days of basic software consulting services upon request and may be structured to meet district specific needs such as data entry services for attendance, accounting, PEIMS assistance, or actual data entry services.

**STAAR ONE TEXAS AND ACCESS 4 PUBLISHING SYSTEM** - STAAR One provides assessment items in reading, mathematics, science, and social studies for all STAAR assessed grade levels and courses. The ESC offers the STAAR One item bank and Access 4 Publishing System to school districts. Technical assistance and training are provided for the product on an as needed basis.
PERFORMANCE STANDARD 4

School District and Charter School Assistance in Core Services TEC, §8.101(4)

Each ESC provides core services as specified in TEC, §8.051, to develop, maintain, and deliver services to improve student, school district, and charter school performance. Core services funds (TEC, §8.121) appropriated by the Texas Legislature to ESCs (via General Appropriations Act, 83rd Legislature, Article III, Texas Education Agency, Rider 38) are utilized specifically for core services or for payment of necessary administrative and operational expenses of the center related to the provisions of core services.

INDICATOR 4-1

ESCs maintain core services for purchase by school districts and charter schools based on TEC, §8.051. ESCs annually report a listing and description of the core services provided to school districts and charter schools. Cost efficiencies for core services are included in the biennial report (in even numbered years) required in Indicator 3-1.

INDICATOR 4-2

ESCs annually report how state appropriated core services funding (TEC, §8.121) is utilized at the center to either provide core services or for the payment of necessary administrative and operational expenses of the center related to the provision of these services. Reporting period is September 1 through August 31 of previous year.

Based on the information provided in the Annual Standards and Indicators Report for 2014-2015, the region rates as follows for this indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Level</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable or Did Not Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

Region 16 has provided a listing of services made available to school districts and charter schools with regard to the statutory requirements of TEC §8.051. Additionally, Region 16 has developed strategies and described activities performed to meet the statutory requirements in TEC §8.051.

Examples include, but are not limited to, the follow:

TEC §8.051 (a) – Improve Student and School District Performance:

1. Provide technical assistance and professional development support to districts and charters to improve student and school district performance.

2. Develop common instructional language to assist districts with the alignment of curriculum and instruction initiatives.
3. Develop a plan for improvement focused on improving student performance measures.

The 2014 Annual Customer Satisfaction Survey included a category for “Improving Student Performance”. **Region 16 scored 4.91 out of 5.00.**

TEC §8.051 (b) – Annual Plan for Improvement

1. Develop a targeted plan outlining service center support for low performing campuses by analyzing and disaggregating regional, district, and campus data, and needs assessment to determine global regional needs as well as district/campus needs.

2. Develop best practices for instructional monitoring and feedback through the use of a collaborative system for monitoring instructional delivery and student outcomes.

3. Provide districts targeted, updated, content-based support and professional development that addresses the needs of all learners, including special populations.

TEC §8.051 (c) – Efficient and Economical School District Operations

1. Providing cooperative professional development services and hosting conferences for 62 school districts in an effort to improve teacher and principal quality, allowing districts to benefit economically as funds are pooled and services are cooperatively provided toward these activities.

2. Provide direct service to rural/small districts that are unable to recruit, hire or fund individual employees in support services areas.

3. Provide technical assistance and support to districts to enable them to operate more efficiently and economically.

The 2014 Annual Customer Satisfaction Survey included a category for “Efficient and Economical School Operations”. **Region 16 scored 4.91 out of 5.00.**

TEC §8.051 (d) (1) (A) – Training and Assistance in Subject Areas Assessed under Section 39.023 (Mathematics, Reading, Writing, Social Studies, Science, and any other subject and grade required by federal law)

1. Developing common instructional language: Assisting districts with the alignment of curriculum and instruction initiatives.

2. Developing best-practices for instructional monitoring and feedback.

3. Providing districts targeted, updated, content-based support and professional development that addresses the need of all learners, including special populations.

The 2014 Annual Customer Satisfaction Survey included categories for “Mathematics, Reading and Language Arts, Social Studies, and Science”. **Region 16 scored as follows in each category:**

- Reading and Language Arts – 4.87 out of 5.00
- Mathematics - 4.87 out of 5.00
- Social Studies – 4.77 out of 5.00
Science – 4.82 out of 5.00

TEC §8.051 (d) (1) (B) – Training and Assistance in Personal Financial Literacy as required under Section 28.0021

1. Provide personal financial Literacy Professional Development: Personal Financial Literacy for Teens and Tweens.
2. Teaching Personal Financial Literacy TEKS 6-8 and TEKS 3-5

TEC §8.051 (d) (2) – Training and Assistance in Programs related to TEC Section 42.151 (special education), 42.152 (educationally disadvantaged), 42.153 (bilingual education), or 42.156 (gifted and talented)

1. Provide training and technical assistance for training and assistance in providing programs for special populations including special education, bilingual education, gifted and talented and economically disadvantaged.

The 2014 Annual Customer Satisfaction Survey included categories for “Special Education, At-Risk and Compensatory Education, Bilingual and ESL Education, and Advanced Academic Education”. Region 16 scored as follows in each category:

Special Education – 4.82 out of 5.00
At-Risk and Compensatory Education – 4.87 out of 5.00
Bilingual and ESL Education – 4.79 out of 5.00
Advanced Academic Education – 4.78 out of 5.00

TEC §8.051 (d) (3) – Training and Assistance for School Districts or Campuses Assigned Unacceptable Performance Ratings related to TEC Section 39.054

1. Provide technical assistance and support to low performing campuses
2. Provide professional development to low performing campuses
3. Develop a plan for improvement focused on improving student performance measures.

TEC §8.051 (d) (4) – Training and Assistance to Teachers, Administrators, Members of District Boards of Trustees, and Members of Site-Based Decision-Making Committees

1. Provide multiple levels of school board trainings locally to allow school board members to obtain training hours without incurring the expense of travel.
2. Bring leadership teams from local ISD’s together to create strategies for improving student performance.
3. Hold leadership trainings to help principals, superintendents, and other leaders better use time, activities, and plans for student performance.
The 2014 Annual Customer Satisfaction Survey included a category for “School Board Training Services”. **Region 16 scored 4.91 out of 5.00**

**TEC §8.051 (d) (5) – Training and Assistance to School Districts Out of Compliance with State and Federal Special Education Requirements**

1. Provide Inclusive Schools training for campus teams at all non-compliant districts.
2. Provide on-site individualized campus-based Inclusive Schools trainings for all staff at 6 identified schools.
3. Provide ongoing technical assistance and support for noncompliant districts.

**TEC §8.051 (d) (6) – Training and Assistance in Complying with State Laws and Rules**

1. Provide technical assistance and support specifically designed for a school district or campus in complying with state laws and rules
2. Provide professional development to school districts and charter schools designed to assist with complying with state laws and rules
3. Provide mentoring support and leadership training for new superintendents, principals and administrators.

The 2014 Annual Customer Satisfaction Survey included a category for “Federal and State Regulation Compliance”. **Region 16 scored 4.87 out of 5.00**
PERFORMANCE STANDARD 5

State and Federal Grant Program Implementation and Results TEC, §8.101(5)

ESCs that receive grants and/or contracts from the state (TEA) or any other federal, state, local, private or public organization (TEC, §8.125) must spend funds in accordance with all programmatic guidelines and provisions of the grant and/or contract. ESCs will report to TEA on the progress and results of federal and/or state grants and/or contracts received from TEA in the fiscal year. Reports will assess quantitative and qualitative performance metrics developed by TEA and the ESC.

INDICATOR 5-1

TEA programs establish qualitative performance metrics for state and federal grants and/or contracts to accurately measure the quality of each state and federal grant and/or contract implemented by the ESC. ESCs report these metrics to TEA as required by the TEA program.

Based on the information provided in the Annual Standards and Indicators Report for 2014-2015, the region rates as follows for this indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Region Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable or Did Not Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

Below are comments on improvements identified and received (if any) from TEA program areas with regard to ESC performance on various grants and/or contracts:

**TEA Standards and Programs Division**
No identified areas of improvement.

**TEA Information Technology/Statewide Education Data System**
No identified areas of improvement.

The overall rating of the ESC is Meets Standard. TEA program areas identified no areas of improvement and provided feedback indicating Region 16 provides outstanding service in accordance with the state and federal grant guidance and meets all performance metrics. It is also noted that Region 16 provides outstanding and high quality support in Information Technology/Statewide Education Data Systems. It is expected and anticipated that Region 16 will continue to perform at this level in the upcoming 2015-16 evaluation period.
INDICATOR 5-2

ESCs comply with goals and performance metrics for federal and state grant awards or contracts received from TEA. ESCs monitor and evaluate the performance of the grant or contract and make adjustments as needed to ensure results through performance monitoring.

Based on the information provided in the Annual Standards and Indicators Report for 2014-2015, the region rates as follows for this indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>Improvement Needed</th>
<th>Not Applicable or Did Not Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

The indicator rating indicates “Not Applicable or Did Not Report”. This does not mean the ESC did not report performance or monitoring activities to TEA, nor does it mean the ESC is not responsible for reporting their performance and monitoring activities to TEA. The ESC has been given this rating because the process for reporting has just begun, and there were no TEA identified deficiencies that needed to be addressed in this format until this fiscal year when TEA conducted the first program area survey of ESC performance. TEA has conducted an internal program area survey which allowed the program areas of TEA to report on specific grant and/or contract activities and performance of ESCs. The results of the survey are indicated in this annual evaluation in Indicator 5-1.

Although ESCs may already be addressing identified performance issues on any deficiencies identified above, TEA will not assess the compliance of Indicator 5-2 until the annual evaluation for 2015-16 to allow enough time for the ESC to assess their own programs based on Indicator 5-1 feedback and make any necessary adjustments.

If TEA program areas did not identify any areas of deficiency in grant and/or contract performance and monitoring, Indicator 5-1 will state such and there will be no need to report specifics in Indicator 5-2 in the 2015-16 annual evaluation. However, TEA will still require the ESC to report on Indicator Report 5-2 for 2015-16, specifying in general (rather than in specifics - as indicted in the last paragraph of this section if deficiencies are identified in Indicator 5-1) what they continue to do to keep their programs at or above the expected performance level.

It should be noted that the ESC did report information to TEA for this indicator in the 2014-15 Indicator Report. However, TEA did not include specific information reported for this fiscal year in the annual evaluation as we did not have specific program area deficiencies for the ESC to report on at the time the indicator report was due. So, the information provided by the ESC was general information on how grants and contracts are monitored, which will be used as a baseline for future indicator reporting cycles and annual evaluations.

Based on the results of TEA program area survey related to ESC performance on grants and contracts (as reported above in Indicator 5-1), it is expected and anticipated the ESC will address any deficiencies identified this evaluation period (2014-15) in the grants and contracts performance, and will report on improvements and adjustments made in the 2015-16 annual evaluation reporting period. The report for 2015-16 should include specific information on how the ESC addressed the deficiencies, monitored the
progress of improvement, and evaluated performance of the grant or contract. The ESC should also report any adjustments made to ensure results through the performance monitoring conducted at the ESC.
PERFORMANCE STANDARD 6

Effective and Efficient Fiscal and Operations Management

ESCs practice effective and efficient fiscal and operations management, including risk management, accounting, payroll, cash management, appropriate personnel policies and systems for staffing, and planning for appropriate use of technology and technological systems. All funds are managed effectively and efficiently with solid planning and budgeting, accurate monitoring, and transparent financial assessments.

INDICATOR 6-1

TEA will conduct federal grant sub-recipient monitoring based on risk assessment methodology. ESCs will have internal control systems and processes in place including but not limited to: policies and procedures related to managing federal/state grants; consolidating information systems to assist in managing grants; providing grant management training to staff and grantees; and coordinating programs with similar goals and purposes.

Based on the information provided in the Annual Standards and Indicators Report for 2014-2015, the region rates as follows for this indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable or Did Not Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

Region 16 did not have a sub-recipient monitoring review conducted by TEA in 2014. Region 16 will be scheduled for a sub-recipient monitoring review at a future date, at which time this indicator will be assessed.

INDICATOR 6-2

ESCs are required to submit an annual single audit and if necessary will implement a corrective action plan to resolve all identified findings within 60 days.

Based on the information provided in the Annual Standards and Indicators Report for 2014-2015, the region rates as follows for this indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable or Did Not Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:
## Results of the 2013-14 Annual Single Audit

(At the time of this evaluation, TEA had not completed the 2014-15 review)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Findings</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Findings</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there were findings, was corrective action implemented in 60 days?</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INDICATOR 6-3

As evidenced in TEA federal grant sub-recipient monitoring, ESCs manage federal and state grant funds in a manner that demonstrates effective practices as evidenced by the following:
1) Accurate, current and complete financial reporting
2) Detailed accounting records
3) Effective internal controls
4) Budget controls to compare projected amounts to outlays
5) Allowable costs under cross-cutting and program specific rules
6) Source documentation
7) Cash management to minimize time between drawdown and disbursement

Based on the information provided in the Annual Standards and Indicators Report for 2014-2015, the region rates as follows for this indicator:

- **Meets Standard**
- **Improvement Needed**
- **Not Applicable or Did Not Report** X

**COMMENTS:**

Region 16 did not have a sub-recipient monitoring review conducted by TEA in 2014. Region 16 will be scheduled for a sub-recipient monitoring review at a future date, at which time this indicator will be assessed.

### INDICATOR 6-4

ESCs annually report FTE count, job titles, descriptions, and salaries for each employee.

Based on the information provided in the Annual Standards and Indicators Report for 2014-2015, the region rates as follows for this indicator:

- **Meets Standard** X
- **Improvement Needed**
- **Not Applicable or Did Not Report**

**COMMENTS:**
Region 16 reported FTE count and salaries to TEA via use of PEIMS. Region 16 certifies the ESC maintains job titles and descriptions for each ESC employee.

**INDICATOR 6-5**

ESCs annually report all sources of funding received and amounts expended from federal, state, local, private, and public entities.

Based on the information provided in the Annual Standards and Indicators Report for 2014-2015, the region rates as follows for this indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable or Did Not Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**

Region 16 reports all source of funding and expenditures via the annual financial report submitted to TEA in January 2015.
8.103 (1) – AUDIT OF CENTER'S FINANCES

TEA receives annual financial audits from ESCs. TEA reviews and conducts comparison ratios on various budgetary aspects. The results of the finding from the analysis is identified below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable or Did Not Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

All financial data presented in the tables below were taken from the ESC’s Annual Financial Reports (AFR) for 2013-14, 2012-13, and 2011-12. The tables below are a summary of the ESC’s financial data for the past three years. Therefore, some components may not sum to totals because of (i) adjustments made by the ESC during the fiscal year, (ii) transfers in, or (iii) transfers out. Although detailed financial data was not presented in the tables below, the information can be found in the ESC’s AFRs which are available at http://tuna.tea.state.tx.us/audit/PDFviewer.asp.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Net Position</th>
<th>Percentage Increase (Decrease) in Net Position</th>
<th>Change in Net Position</th>
<th>Percentage Change in Net Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>$16,367,996</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>$1,243,094</td>
<td>524.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>$15,124,902</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>$199,106</td>
<td>(77.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$14,925,796</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$876,106</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governmental Funds, General Fund Only(a) (Schedules C-1, C-2, and C-3 in the ESC AFR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>General Fund Balance</th>
<th>Percentage Increase (Decrease) in General Fund Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>$3,536,132</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>$3,489,875</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$3,308,623</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2013-14 Unrestricted Fund Balances in the General Fund\(^{(b)}\)
(Schedules C-1, C-2, and C-3 in the ESC AFR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unrestricted Funds</th>
<th>Fund Balance</th>
<th>Fund Balance as Percentage of Total Unrestricted</th>
<th>Months of General Fund Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committed</td>
<td>$1,731,273</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td>$1,607,180</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Unrestricted</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,398,453</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.51</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Internal Service Fund Net Position\(^{(c)}\)
(Schedule D-2 in the ESC AFR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Net Position</th>
<th>Change in Net Position</th>
<th>Percentage Increase (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>$771,266</td>
<td>$14,511</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>$756,755</td>
<td>$19,333</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$737,422</td>
<td>$68,661</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Internal Service Fund Cash Flows
(Schedule D-3 in the ESC AFR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Net Cash Provided by Operating Activities</th>
<th>Percentage Increase (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>($247,536)</td>
<td>(265.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>$149,504</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$144,541</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes/References:**


(b) Note: The Unassigned Fund Balance does not require ESC Board approval to be used if a contingency arises. Therefore, the GFOA's calculation to determine the minimum amount of Unrestricted Fund Balance a government should carry is performed using the Unassigned Fund Balance only to determine if the ESC could meet contingencies without action from the ESC Board.

(c) Reference for ISF limitations: Governmental Accounting, Auditing, and Financial Reporting (GAAFR) Blue Book, Chapter 4, pg. 45.
PERFORMANCE STANDARD 7

External Liaison and Public Image

ESCs establish and maintain positive and effective relationships with stakeholder groups, including school districts, charter schools, the legislature, and the citizens of Texas. ESC employees visibly demonstrate ethical, honest, and transparent behaviors and outcomes and follow through to the best of their ability in the timeliest manner possible in order to produce results that benefit school districts, charter schools, and the public.

INDICATOR 7-1

ESC annual satisfaction survey rates are determined by an annual Client Satisfaction Survey. The target for annual survey results is 4.50 on a 5.0 scale.

Based on the information provided in the Annual Standards and Indicators Report for 2014-2015, the region rates as follows for this indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable or Did Not Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

Region 16 had an overall score of **4.85** in the 2014 Annual Customer Satisfaction Survey, which is 0.147% less than the 2013 overall score of 4.86.
COMMISSIONER’S 2014-15 PRIORITIES FOR ESCs

1) Assist TEA in **leading** a statewide campaign to insure that **EVERY** student earns postsecondary credits while still in high school.

2) Assist TEA in **maintaining** the best campus/district accountability system in the nation, with great emphasis on ending the academic performance gap.

3) Assist TEA in **developing** an educator preparation program accountability system that produces new teachers with the classroom management skills and content knowledge sufficient to thrive in classrooms with ever increasing ethnic and socioeconomic diversity and teacher evaluation systems that transform the paradigm from compliance to continued teacher feedback and support.

Based on the information provided in the Annual Standards and Indicators Report for 2014-2015, the region rates as follows for this indicator:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable or Did Not Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**

1) Assist TEA in **leading** a statewide campaign to insure that **EVERY** student earns postsecondary credits while still in high school.

- HB 5 meetings were facilitated by Region 16. The meetings were between IHEs and districts. (4 meetings were facilitated and held at Region 16 with administrators)
- HB 5 meeting held with Panhandle School Board Association to discuss graduation requirements, course offerings and post- secondary connections.
- Administrator and counselor training for HB 5 implementation and planning.
- Region 16 coordinated, hosted and facilitated meetings between public schools and their higher education partners through the P-16 initiative. Region 16 has been instrumental in fostering these relationships between public education and higher education and providing opportunities for the strengthening of their partnerships. All college and university presidents in the Region 16 service area participated in these meetings. Four meetings specifically related to discussing the college preparatory course requirements of House Bill 5 were facilitated and held at Region 16 and attended by higher education administrators and ISD administrators.
- Connected districts with college/university instructors to obtain dual-credit in English III, English IV, US History, Government, and Economics.
- Conducted annual training to promote post-secondary/dual credit instruction over videoconferencing to district representatives.
- In 2014-15, Region 16 successfully connected with West Texas A&M University, Frank Phillips College, Midwestern State University, Oklahoma Panhandle State University, Clarendon College and Texas Tech University for post-secondary courses offered via videoconference at regional high schools.
- Region 16 provided worry-free technology processes and access to dual credit courses.
• P-16 served as the “clearinghouse” to distribute the college preparatory courses in ELA and math, as well as the Memorandum of Understanding that were developed collaboratively by Amarillo ISD and Amarillo College and provided for use by all ISDs in the region at no charge.
• P-16 coordinated a videoconference from Region 16 available to all ISDs in the region regarding the House Bill 5 requirements for the college preparatory courses. Presenters were ELA and math faculty from Amarillo ISD and Amarillo College, and the Region 16 P-16 Specialist.
• Offered technical assistance and training centered around career clusters, career guidance and endorsement areas.
• Facilitated sessions with local community colleges and high school staff to develop articulation agreements which provide post-secondary college credit for high school students that want to pursue a field of study after graduation.
• Provided a migrant college access specialist who works with migrant juniors and seniors assisting them to pursue post-secondary educational opportunities supplemental to assistance from the LEA.
• Provided a migrant counselor who works with other migrant high school students with supplemental academic and counseling needs not met by the school counselor.
• Advanced Placement Summer Institutes (APSIs) were held at ESC 16 offering Professional Development in the areas of US History and English Language and Composition. Participants received 4 full days (32 hour per topic) of training with a College Board approved AP Consultant. Region 16 ESC is one of only three Education Service Centers in Texas conducting APSI’s.

2) Assist TEA in maintaining the best campus/district accountability system in the nation, with great emphasis on ending the academic performance gap.

• Provided Texas Accountability Intervention System (TAIS) training to all Improvement Required, Priority and Focus campuses.
• Provided How to Stay Off the List training to help campuses identify gaps in student performance and incorporate instructional strategies in their everyday practice.
• Provided campus training to assist with identifying widest performance gaps and address strategies to improve instruction.
• Each low performing campus is assigned a Turnaround Team contact. The contact communicates with the campus on a regular basis to provide technical assistance and support.
• Provided professional development based on identified regional needs.
• Aligned Professional development offerings with TCDSS Critical Success Factors, TEC Chapter 8, and TEA Accountability Indices.
• Provided work days at the ESC for low performing campuses to provide assistance with the TAIS process.
• Scheduled on-site meetings with all low performing campuses.
• Provided technical assistance and support to low performing campuses in the improvement planning process.
• Provided four work days at the ESC to provide assistance to IR campuses in their improvement planning.
• Established contacts with each identified low performing campus to communicate updates and provide technical assistance.
• Attended Turnaround Team meetings as scheduled by the Texas Center for District and School Support.
• Provided webinars on the Critical Success Factors.
• Provided data disaggregation training.
• Provided technical assistance, coaching and support in the area of school improvement.
• Provided technical assistance to districts including inclusive practices to improve performance of students with disabilities.
• Provided technical assistance and professional development to districts supporting research based instructional practices/strategies for LEP students
• Provided working sessions with district leadership to align instructional programs and curriculum development
• Provided technical assistance and professional development for writing Campus and District Improvement Plans

3) Assist TEA in developing an educator preparation program accountability system that produces new teachers with the classroom management skills and content knowledge sufficient to thrive in classrooms with ever increasing ethnic and socioeconomic diversity and teacher evaluation systems that transform the paradigm from compliance to continued teacher feedback and support.

• Provided technical support, assistance, and training to ensure completion of the annual principal survey for educational preparation programs.
• Provided in-district annual updates for the state adopted teacher appraisal system.
• Provided annual Instructional Leadership Development training for administrators.
• Provided evaluator training for the state adopted teacher appraisal system.
• Provided annual updates to the Commissioner’s recommended administrator evaluation.
• Collaborated with West Texas A&M University Alternative Certification Program (PACE) program to offer new candidates professional development in core content areas.
• Coordinated and provided support for Career and Technical Education Alternative Certification program for regional teachers.
• Partnered with Region 4 Alternative Certification Program to provide supervision and support to alternative teacher candidates.
FINAL COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2015-16

COMMENTS:

Region 16 has done an outstanding job of providing services to the school districts in the region. In addition, on December 26, 2014, TEA received a commendation letter from USDE’s Director of Outreach to Parents and Families for the Family Engagement Conference put on by Region 16 in San Marcos, TX.

Region 16 continues to make significant strides to maintain high student performance and provide assistances to schools which could do better.

Mr. John Bass, current ESC Region 16 executive director, will be retiring effective August 31, 2015. John has done a tremendous and outstanding job at Region 16. His replacement is Mr. Ray Cogburn. It is expected that Mr. Cogburn will provide assistance to school districts in the region at the same level as Mr. Bass, therefore, it is expected there will be no loss of performance on the part of Region 16.

TEA Education Service Center Director: Julie V. Beisert-Smith

Signature: Julie V. Beisert-Smith

Date: May 28, 2015