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Introduction

The following report is prepared by the Texas Education Agency in response to Section 39.333 of the Texas Education Code. The report includes regional and district level information for the two preceding school years (i.e., 2015-2016 and 2016-2017) on the following five subjects.

1. **Student and Teacher Ratios:**
   - a summary of school district compliance with the student/teacher ratios and class-size limitations prescribed by Sections 25.111 and 25.112, including:
     - the number of campuses and classes at each campus granted an exception from Section 25.112; and
     - for each campus granted an exception from Section 25.112, a statement of whether the campus has been awarded a distinction designation under Subchapter G or has been identified as an unacceptable campus under Chapter 39A

2. **Exemptions and Waivers:**
   - a summary of the exemptions and waivers granted to campuses and school districts under Section 7.056 or 39.232 and a review of the effectiveness of each campus or district following deregulation

3. **Regional Education Service Center Evaluation:**
   - an evaluation of the performance of the system of regional education service centers based on the indicators adopted under Section 8.101 and client satisfaction with services provided under Subchapter B, Chapter 8

4. **Accelerated Instruction Programs Evaluation:**
   - an evaluation of accelerated instruction programs offered under Section 28.006, including an assessment of the quality of such programs and the performance of students enrolled in such programs

5. **Non-Certified Teachers:**
   - the number of classes at each campus that are currently being taught by individuals who are not certified in the content areas of their respective classes.
Section I: Student and Teacher Ratios

TEC §25.111 and TEC §25.112 prescribe student-teacher ratios and class size limitations on school districts. TEC §39.333(1) requires a summary of school district compliance with the student/teacher ratios and class-size limitations prescribed by Sections 25.111 and 25.112, including:

- the number of campuses and classes at each campus granted an exception from Section 25.112; and
- for each campus granted an exception from Section 25.112, a statement of whether the campus has been awarded a distinction designation under Subchapter G or has been identified as an unacceptable campus under Chapter 39A.

TEC §25.111 states, “Except as provided by Section 25.112, each school district must employ a sufficient number of teachers certified under Subchapter B, Chapter 21, to maintain an average ratio of not less than one teacher for each 20 students in average daily attendance.”

TEC §25.112 states, “Except as otherwise authorized by this section, a school district may not enroll more than 22 students in a kindergarten, first, second, third, or fourth grade class. That limitation does not apply during:

(1) any 12-week period of the school year selected by the district, in the case of a district whose average daily attendance is adjusted under Section 42.005(c); or
(2) the last 12 weeks of any school year in the case of any other district.

(b) Not later than the 30th day after the first day of the 12-week period for which a district whose average daily attendance is adjusted under Section 42.005(c) is claiming an exemption under Subsection (a), the district shall notify the commissioner in writing that the district is claiming an exemption for the period stated in the notice.

(c) In determining the number of students to enroll in any class, a school district shall consider the subject to be taught, the teaching methodology to be used, and any need for individual instruction.

(d) On application of a school district, the commissioner may except the district from the limit in Subsection (a) if the commissioner finds the limit works an undue hardship on the district. An exception expires at the end of the school year for which it is granted.

(e) A school district seeking an exception under Subsection (d) shall notify the commissioner and apply for the exception not later than the later of:

(1) October 1; or
(2) the 30th day after the first school day the district exceeds the limit in Subsection (a).

(f) If a school district repeatedly fails to comply with this section, the commissioner may take any appropriate action authorized to be taken by the commissioner under Section 39.131.”

Student-Teacher Ratios¹:
The statewide student-teacher ratio for 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 was 15.1 (i.e., 15.1 students to one teacher).

¹ In this report, teacher data is presented by Full-Time Equivalents (FTE) instead of headcounts. While headcount is the actual number of teachers, FTE is the percentage of a teacher’s day spent teaching. For example, an individual spending half a day in the classroom teaching and the other half as school counselor would be considered 0.5 teacher FTE.
The district-level analysis on student-teacher ratios indicated 8 or 0.67% of districts reported ratios greater than the student-teacher ratio requirement of 22.0. Additionally, 269 or 22% of districts reported ratios greater than the statewide student-teacher ratio of 15.1. However, the data includes observations of open-enrollment charter schools, which have no student-teacher ratio requirements per TEC §12.104. Therefore, these observations were excluded so only schools with student-teacher ratio requirements were analyzed. After excluding open-enrollment charter schools from the analysis, the number of districts reporting a student-teacher ratio greater than 22.0 decreases to 0 districts. The number of districts reporting ratios greater than the statewide student-teacher ratio of 15.2 decreases to 178 or 14.8% of districts.

The figure below presents the percentage of districts reporting student-teacher ratios for the following five ranges: less than 4.0, 4.0 to 10.0, 10.1 to 15.2, 15.3 to 22.0, and 22.0 and above. As Figure 2 shows, the majority of districts (i.e., 72%) reported student-teacher ratios between 10.1 and 15.2 for the 2017-2018 school year.

---

**Figure 1: Statewide Student-Teacher Ratios (2002-2003 and 2009-2010 to 2017-2018)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Student-Teacher Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 Data sources: Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) and Texas Academic Performance Reports (TAPR) State Data Downloads.

3 The statewide student-teacher ratios reported in this section were obtained from AEIS and TAPR reports. These reports do not distinguish between statewide student-teacher ratios for school districts and charter schools. Therefore, the statewide student-teacher ratios reported in Figure 1 include charter schools even though charter schools are not subject to student-teacher ratio requirements per TEC §12.104.
Class Size Averages:
In 2017-2018, the statewide class size averages for grades K – 4 were all below 22, satisfying the student-teacher ratio requirement of 22.0 per TEC §25.112. There are no class size average limitations for grades 5 and 6, or grades 9 through 12 (secondary). However, the statewide class size averages for these grades were all less than 22. From 2015-2016 to 2017-2018, the statewide class size average for Math, Science, Social Studies, English/LA, and Foreign Language decreased. Over the same time period, only grades 4 and 5 saw a slight increase in class size averages with a 1.1% and 1.9% increase, respectively.

Figure 3:
Statewide Class Size Averages (2012-2013 to 2015-2018)5,6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level or Subject</th>
<th>2015-2016</th>
<th>2016-2017</th>
<th>2017-2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K - 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Grade</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Grade</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Grade</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Grade</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/LA</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Lang.</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The district-level analysis on grades K – 4 indicated between 4.5% and 6.1% of districts reported class size averages greater than 22 depending upon the grade level observed. However, the data includes observations of open-enrollment charter schools, which have no class size limitations per TEC §12.104. Therefore, these observations were excluded so only schools with class size limitations were analyzed. After excluding open-enrollment charter

4 Secondary classes are considered to be grades 9 – 12 according to the TAPR Glossary. (Glossary for the TAPR 2015-2016, [http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/tapr/2016/glossary.pdf].)
5 Data source: TAPR.
6 The statewide class size averages reported in this section were obtained from TAPR reports. The TAPR reports do not distinguish between statewide class size averages for school districts and charter schools. Therefore, the statewide class size averages reported in Figure 3 include charter schools even though charter schools are not subject to class size limitations per TEC §12.104.
schools from the analysis, the percentage of districts reporting class size averages greater than 22 for grades K – 4 decreases to between 2.3% and 3.5% depending upon grade level observed. Using the same methodology, approximately 15.3% of districts reported class size averages greater than 22 for grade 5, and 12.7% for 6. For secondary subjects, between 0.8% and 8.7% of districts reported class size averages greater than 22 depending upon the subject observed.

Figure 4: Districts with Class Size Averages Greater Than 22 Excludes Open-Enrollment Charter Schools (2017-2018)³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level or Subject</th>
<th>Number of Districts with Class Size Averages Greater than 22</th>
<th>Number of Districts Observed¹⁰</th>
<th>Percentage of Districts with Class Size Averages Greater than 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K - 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Grade</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Grade</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Grade</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Grade</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Secondary             |                                                             |                               |                                                               |
| Math                  | 32                                                          | 1011                          | 3.2%                                                          |
| Science               | 67                                                          | 1011                          | 6.6%                                                          |
| Social Studies        | 88                                                          | 1011                          | 8.7%                                                          |
| English/LA            | 8                                                           | 1011                          | 0.8%                                                          |
| Foreign Lang.         | 72                                                          | 928                           | 7.8%                                                          |

Class Size Waivers:
This section includes class size waiver data for school districts in and out of compliance with TEC §25.111 and TEC §25.112, both of which prescribe student-teacher ratios and class size limitations for public schools. More specifically, TEC §25.112 states, “a school district may not enroll more than 22 students in a kindergarten, first, second, third, or fourth grade class.”¹¹ For schools unable to comply with the required student-teacher ratio, they may apply to the Texas Education Agency for a class size waiver. However, the Commissioner of Education may only grant a class size waiver in cases of undue hardship and if the campus received a minimum academic performance rating.

⁷ When open-enrollment charters are included, approximately 16% of districts report class size averages greater than 22 for grade 5 and 6 in the 2015-2016 school year.
⁸ When open-enrollment charters are included, between 3% and 11% of districts report class size averages greater than 22 depending upon the secondary subject observed in the 2015-2016 school year.
⁹ Data source: TAPR.
¹⁰ The number of districts observed changes between grade levels for several reasons (e.g., a district only serves high school students).
¹¹ Please see TEC §25.111 and TEC §25.112.
School districts must select at least one of the four undue hardship criteria when applying for a class size waiver. The four hardships include:

1) unable to employ qualified teachers;
2) unable to provide educational facilities;
3) financial hardship (i.e., a district which has budgeted for a class size ratio of 22:1 in grades K – 4 but has a campus (or campuses) with enrollment increases or shifts); or
4) unanticipated growth in student enrollment.

For the 2017-2018 school year, due to the aftermath of hurricane-related issues the undue hardship reason of Hurricane Harvey was added for a class size waiver.

Approximately 235 and 168 school districts applied for class size waivers in 2016-2017 and 2017-2018, respectively. However, not all class size waivers were approved by TEA due to waivers being withdrawn, duplicative, or denied. A class size waiver is denied when a campus has not met the minimum academic performance rating. Figure 5 includes the number of class size waivers approved by TEA during the four preceding school years.

Figure 5:
Number of Approved Class Size Waivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Districts</strong></td>
<td>253</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campuses</strong></td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>1,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K – 4 Classes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Grade</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Grade</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Grade</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>1,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Grade</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>1,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total K – 4 Classes</strong></td>
<td>6,358</td>
<td>4,512</td>
<td>4,419</td>
<td>4,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most Commonly Cited Hardship</strong></td>
<td>Unanticipated Growth</td>
<td>Unanticipated Growth</td>
<td>Unanticipated Growth</td>
<td>Financial Hardship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Figure 5, between 2014-2015 and 2015-2016, the number of class size waivers for districts and campuses decreased 4% and 11% respectively, while the number for total K-4 classes decreased 29%.

---

12 In 2013 to 2016, school districts, charter schools, and campuses received performance ratings of either Met Standard, Met Alternative Standard, Improvement Required or Not Rated. If a campus received an Improvement Required performance rating, the class size waiver was denied.

13 Due to a change in 2017 to the reporting system, the totals from prior years may contain variances.
Between 2015-2016 and 2016-2017, the number of class size waivers for districts and campuses decreased 8% and 6% respectively, while the number for total K – 4 classes decreased 2.1%. Between 2016-2017 and 2017-2018, the number of class size waivers for districts decreased 29% and campuses increased 5%, while the number for total K – 4 classes increased 5%

Overall the number of districts requesting class size waivers has decreased since 2014-2015, and the total number of classes requesting waivers significantly decreased from 2014-2015, however, the total number of class size waivers has had minor variance since 2015-2016. From 2014-2015 to 2016-2017, unanticipated growth was the most commonly cited hardship for class size waivers. In 2017-2018, financial hardship was the most commonly cited hardship for class size waivers. In addition, H.B. 1842 (84th Session of the Texas Legislature) in part amended Chapter 12 of the TEC to create Districts of Innovations. Districts are eligible for designation if certain performance requirements are met and the district follows certain procedures for adoption as outlined in Statute. The designation provides the district will be exempt from certain sections of the TEC that inhibit the goals of the district as outlined in the locally adopted Innovation Plan. As of March 2019, 131 and 370, Districts of Innovation have exempted from the requirements under TEC §25.111 and TEC §25.112 respectively.
Section II: Exemptions and Waivers

TEC §39.333(2) requires a summary of the exemptions and waivers granted to campuses and school districts under Section 7.056 or 39.232 and a review of the effectiveness of each campus or district following deregulation.

State Waivers Granted 2016-2017 and 2017-2018:
In the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 school years, the Commissioner of Education granted a combined total of 3,362 state waivers and 613 class size exceptions applications. In Figure 6 below, state waivers granted in the two preceding school years are presented by waiver type. The most frequently requested waivers were for early release days, low attendance days and other miscellaneous waivers.14

Figure 6: State Waivers Granted (16-17 and 17-18)15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waiver Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development Days</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Release Days</td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development for Reading/language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed School Days</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Attendance Days</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Data Portal</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Schedule State Assessment Testing Days</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline for Accelerated Instruction</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Waivers</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Miscellaneous</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 “Other Waivers” category which includes six types of state waivers and accounted for 126 total waivers approved over the two preceding school years.

15 Waivers approved from 06/01/2016 through 05/31/2017 and from 6/01/2017 through 05/31/2018.
Early Release Day Waivers:
The type of waiver most frequently requested was classified as “Early Release Day.” This type of waiver accounted for 22.5% of state waiver applications granted during the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 application years. According to TEA, an Early Release Day waiver “allows the districts and charter schools to conduct school for less than seven hours for a total of six days of student instruction a year. These days may provide additional training in education methodologies or provide time to meet the needs of student and local communities.” During the 85th Legislative session, House Bill 2442 modified the operational day for schools from days to overall minutes. Many districts applied for the waiver to continue to allow for early release days during the school year and to receive minutes towards the operational minute total.

Attendance Waivers:
The second type of waiver most frequently requested was classified as “Low Attendance Day,” accounting for 18.0% of state waiver applications granted during the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 application years. An additional attendance waiver, the “Missed School Day” waiver accounted for 10.1% of granted applications. Collectively, these attendance-related waivers accounted for 28.1% of total state waivers granted during the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 application years. According to TEA, Low Attendance Day waivers are, “waiver[s] to excuse any instructional days from ADA calculations and FSP funding that have attendance at least 10 percent below the last school year’s average attendance due to inclement weather, health, safety-related, or other issues.” Missed Instruction Day waivers are, “for excused absences if instructional days are missed due to inclement weather, health, safety-related, or other issues.”

“Other” Waivers:
The third type of waiver most frequently requested was classified as “Other”. This type of waiver accounted for 12.1% of state waiver applications granted during the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 application years. Any miscellaneous waivers that do not fit into any other category of waiver offered may be applied for as an “other” waiver. For the 2017-2018 application year, a significant portion of these waivers were Hurricane Harvey related requests (105 waivers of the 272 for 17-18 were for waiver of 21.401(c) due to Hurricane Harvey).

Section III: Regional Education Service Center Evaluation

TEC §39.333(3) requires an evaluation of the performance of the system of regional education service centers based on the indicators adopted under Section 8.101 and client satisfaction with services provided under Subchapter B, Chapter 8.

Since their creation in 1967, the twenty regional education service centers (ESCs) have played an integral role in the provision of necessary and essential services to school districts and charter schools, also known as Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in the implementation of school reform and school improvement. In that effort, the ESCs have carried out the mandates of the legislature and the commissioners of education to assist LEAs of all sizes in their efforts to improve the education of Texas school children. These efforts have proved critical in the positive improvement of LEAs and the education of Texas school children over the past fifty years. In that cause, the ESCs have focused their collective and individual expertise and resources on providing Texas’ educators with professional development and technical assistance as well as administrative and financial support, which have assisted in their success. In recent years, the ESCs have taken the lead in preparing Texas teachers in core subject areas to meet the ever-increasing demands of the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS). Additionally, the ESCs have been focused on assisting the Texas Education Agency (TEA) in promoting the financial health and viability of Texas LEAs during rapidly changing and more complicated financial times.

Purpose:
The Texas Legislature clearly defined the purpose of the ESCs (TEC 8.003):

- Assist LEAs in improving student performance in each region of the system;
- Enable LEAs to operate more efficiently and economically; and
- Implement initiatives assigned by the legislature or the commissioner of education.

In that effort, the commissioner, in consultation with the executive directors of the ESCs, establishes performance goals as they relate to LEAs and their students.

Background:
The ESCs provide training, technical assistance, administrative support, and an array of other services as determined by the legislature, the commissioner of education, and the needs of LEAs across the state. The annual evaluation of client satisfaction indicates that superintendents, principals, and teachers in LEAs overwhelmingly rate the work of the ESCs as high across all sizes and types of districts.

ESC services are reviewed annually by the commissioner of education in a multi-phased review of the ESCs and the quality and effectiveness of their services as reflected in an analysis of both student achievement and client satisfaction measures.

At the direction of the 78th Texas Legislature, the ESCs as well as the TEA and the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) came under sunset review. Additionally, the legislature passed Senate Bill 929 requiring an extensive audit of the ESCs. Under the direction and supervision of the Legislative Budget Board (LBB), MGT of America, Inc. conducted the audit. Recommendations from that audit, the LBB, and the Texas Sunset Commission have directed the current and future work of the ESCs.
Education Service Center Location and Governance:
The map of the ESCs, shown below, shows the location of the 20 ESCs. ESCs are assigned responsibility for providing core services to each LEA within their respective regional boundaries. In accordance with state law, LEAs may elect to receive services from any ESC in the state. In 1967, the State Board of Education defined the regions as geographic areas of counties and the encompassed LEAs.

Each ESC is governed by a locally elected board of directors. Seven of those directors have voting power and are elected by the boards of trustees of school districts within the region. The eighth member is appointed by the commissioner of education to represent charter schools within the region and is a non-voting member. ESCs that do not currently have a charter operating within their region do not have a charter representative. Each ESC’s board of directors, with the approval of the commissioner of education, selects an executive director who serves as the chief executive officer of that ESC. The ESC’s board establishes policies that govern the operation of the ESC. In addition to its board of directors, each ESC has several advisory committees composed of stakeholders in the various service areas, including teachers, principals, superintendents, directors of charter schools, and other LEA administrators. These committees provide input to the executive director regarding programs and services.

Map of the Education Service Centers of Texas:
Education Service Center Staffing:
The responsibility of each ESC’s executive director, operating under the policies of the ESC, is to employ necessary personnel to carry out the functions of the ESC. For the 2016–2017 school year, the ESCs employed a total of 4,896 full-time employees. Of these, 1,272 were Head Start employees, both professional and support, located in Regions 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 19 and 20. 82 percent of all ESC employees are assigned to either direct or support services to schools and school personnel. The remaining employees represent the ESCs' administrative, operations, and management functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Service Center</th>
<th>Executive Director</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 1 – Edinburg</td>
<td>Dr. Cornelio Gonzales</td>
<td>1900 West Schunior Edinburg, TX 78751</td>
<td>(956) 984-6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2 – Corpus Christi</td>
<td>Dr. Rick Alvarado</td>
<td>209 North Water St Corpus Christi, TX 78401</td>
<td>(361) 561-8400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3 – Victoria</td>
<td>Ms. Charlotte Baker</td>
<td>1905 Leary Lane Victoria, TX 77901</td>
<td>(361) 573-0731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4 – Houston</td>
<td>Dr. Pam Wells</td>
<td>7145 West Tidwell Rd. Houston, TX 77092</td>
<td>(713) 462-7708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5 – Beaumont</td>
<td>Dr. Danny Lovett</td>
<td>350 Pine St. #500 Beaumont, TX 77701</td>
<td>(409) 951-1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 6 – Huntsville</td>
<td>Mr. Michael Holland</td>
<td>3332 Montgomery Rd Huntsville, TX 77340</td>
<td>(936) 435-8400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 7 – Kilgore</td>
<td>Mrs. Elizabeth Abernethy</td>
<td>1909 North Longview St Kilgore, TX 75662</td>
<td>(903) 988-6700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 8 – Mt. Pleasant/Pittsburg</td>
<td>Dr. David Fitts</td>
<td>4845 US Hwy 271 N Pittsburg, TX, 75686</td>
<td>(903) 572-8551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 9 – Wichita Falls</td>
<td>Mr. Wes Pierce</td>
<td>301 Loop 11 Wichita Falls, TX 76306</td>
<td>(940) 322-6928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2016 – 2017 Budget Revenues:
The ESCs have access to a combination of financial resources (state, federal, and local) to provide services within each region. For 2016 - 2017, federal grants were the largest element of ESC revenues representing 48 percent of total revenues for 2016 - 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region 10 – Richardson</th>
<th>Dr. Gordon Taylor</th>
<th>400 East Spring Valley Rd Richardson, TX 75081</th>
<th>(972) 348-1700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 11 – Fort Worth</td>
<td>Dr. Clyde W. Steelman, Jr.</td>
<td>1451 South Cherry Ln White Settlement, TX 76108</td>
<td>(817) 740-3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 12 – Waco</td>
<td>Dr. Jerry Maze</td>
<td>2101 West Loop 340 Waco, TX 76702</td>
<td>(254) 297-1212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 13 – Austin</td>
<td>Dr. Rich Elsasser</td>
<td>5701 Springdale Rd Austin, TX 78723</td>
<td>(512) 919-5313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 14 – Abilene</td>
<td>Mr. Shane Fields</td>
<td>1850 Hwy 351 Abilene, TX 79601</td>
<td>(325) 675-8600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 15 – San Angelo</td>
<td>Mr. Scot Goen</td>
<td>612 South Irene St San Angelo, TX 76903</td>
<td>(325) 658-6571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 16 – Amarillo</td>
<td>Mr. Ray Cogburn</td>
<td>5800 Bell St Amarillo, TX 79109</td>
<td>(806) 677-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 17 – Lubbock</td>
<td>Dr. Kyle Wargo</td>
<td>1111 West Loop 289 Lubbock, TX 79416</td>
<td>(806) 792-4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 18 – Midland</td>
<td>Dr. DeWitt Smith</td>
<td>2811 LaForce Blvd Midland, TX 79711</td>
<td>(432) 563-2380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 19 – El Paso</td>
<td>Dr. Armando Aguirre</td>
<td>6611 Boeing, El Paso, TX 79925</td>
<td>(915) 780-5052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 20 – San Antonio</td>
<td>Dr. Jeff Goldhorn</td>
<td>1314 Hines Ave San Antonio, TX 78208</td>
<td>(210) 370-5200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ESC Revenue for the 2016 – 2017 School Year

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants</td>
<td>$ 287,654,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>$ 63,305,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Appropriations</td>
<td>$ 12,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Revenues</td>
<td>$ 242,168,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 605,401,774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Distribution of these funds ranges from over $9.9 million in Region 8 to over $76.2 million in Region 10. The three regions (Regions 4, 10, and 11) with the largest number of students (comprising 49 percent of the total students served in the state) received 22 percent of the total revenue. Likewise, the three regions (Region 3, 9, and 15) with the smallest number of students (comprising 2.7 percent of the total students served in the state) received 7 percent of the total revenue.

A review of the primary sources of ESC revenue reveals that nine ESCs receive the greatest portion of the revenue from federal sources, including flow through funding. The remaining eleven ESCs receive the greatest portion from local LEA revenue.

**Legislative Appropriations:**
Rider 34 of the General Appropriations Act of 2015, 84th Legislative Session, directs the distribution of $12,500,000 in fiscal year 2016 and $12,500,000 in fiscal year 2017 to ESCs. These funds are divided and distributed by the commissioner of education. Twenty percent of the funding is divided equally among all the ESCs; 40 percent of the funding is distributed on a geographic basis determined by the number of students per square mile and give more money to those ESCs with a lower population density; and 40 percent of the funding is distributed to ESCs that serve LEAs with average daily attendance (ADA) of 1,600 or less (rural schools).18

Those revenues can be classified into the following categories: core services; ESC operations; legislative initiatives; and commissioner initiatives. ESCs supplement through other forms of revenue to ensure the completion of these categories.

For 2016 – 2017, the legislative appropriations totaled $12.5 million, or 2.06 percent of the total 2016 – 2017 ESC revenues.

**State Grants and Contracts:**
State grants and contracts represent funds flowing from the TEA and other state agencies to the ESCs through several different means. Legislative initiatives include such appropriations as those for the Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System (TTESS), Texas Principal Evaluation and Support System (TPESS), Reading Academies, and Math Academies.

For 2016 – 2017, the state grants and contracts totaled $63.3 million, or 10.5 percent of the total

---

18 Legislative Budget Board, *Regional Education Service Centers: An Issue Brief*, September 2012
2016 – 2017 ESC revenues.

**Federal Grants:**
Federal grants represents federal (discretionary and formula) categorical funds, which flow through the TEA or other agencies to the ESCs either through a competitive or non-competitive grant process. Although classified as discretionary funds, federal grants such as Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) funds are distributed on a formula basis. Federal grants also include direct federal grants (e.g., Head Start) and categorical funding that flows from other state agencies (e.g., Early Childhood Intervention). ESCs also receive funds from the Texas Department of Agriculture to help execute the National School Lunch and Breakfast Programs for schools across the state. This program is funded through the United States Department of Agriculture.

For 2016 – 2017, the federal grants totaled over $287.7 million, or 47.5 percent of the total 2016-2017 ESC revenues.

In addition to federal program, technical assistance, and professional development funds, the ESCs also administer the statewide operation of certain federal competitive and non-competitive programs such as the McKinney-Vento Education for Homeless Children and Youth Grant.

**Local Revenues:**
The ESCs have no taxing authority. Participation by LEAs in ESC programs/services is strictly voluntary. As a result, ESCs must customize and market their services to LEAs and private schools as well as outside individuals and entities to generate local revenue. In large measure, local revenues are generated in three ways: fee-for-service; fees generated from sources (e.g., sale of products, etc.); and revenues from other local sources including the internal service fund and from other public and private entities.

For 2016 – 2017, local revenues totaled over $242.2 million, or 40 percent of 2016-2017 ESC revenues.

**2016 – 2017 Budget Expenditures**:19
The ESCs budget, expend, and account for funds within the accounting system delineated in TEA’s Financial Accountability System Resource Guide. This system utilizes multilevel accounting including accounting by fund, function, and expenditure codes. Because ESCs are organized to accomplish a service mission that is different from LEAs, the costs associated with various functions differ from that of LEAs. In the area of shared services arrangements, the ESCs frequently serve as fiscal agents for a large number of LEAs in order to increase the LEAs’ buying power. For example, all ESCs operate or participate in various types of purchasing cooperatives. These purchasing cooperatives guarantee member districts greater purchasing power through economies of scale.

**Cost of Services:**
The cost of providing similar levels of services in the different regions also varies by regional economic factors. Certain demographic variables, though not restricted to any one ESC, determine the cost levels of these similar services. Among the factors influencing these costs are:

- Geographic size of the region;

---
19 Financial data is taken from the 2017 Annual Data Collection.
• Average daily attendance (ADA) of the region;
• Scarcity and density of districts and campuses within the region;
• Number of districts and campuses served;
• Regional economic conditions; and
• Student population characteristics.

Fund Balances:
According to the fund balance categories as outlined in the Financial Accountability System Resource Guide, all fund balances are listed within each ESC’s independent audit report and reflect individual governmental funds’ accumulated revenues in excess of expenditures. As recommended by the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA), fund balance in the general fund should be no less than 2 months of general fund expenditures; however, some ESCs may need larger fund balances due to cash flow issues with regards to the timing of reimbursements for large state and federal grants. Circumstances may require other fund balance classifications.

Services:
Services provided by the ESCs to LEAs and other entities are of six major types: core services identified in statute; decentralized agency functions; administrative support for LEAs; instructional support for schools; direct student instruction; and other locally determined services. The chief purposes of these services are to assist in the improvement of student performance, to assist schools to operate more efficiently and effectively, and to carry out the initiatives of the legislature and/or the commissioner of education.

Distance Learning:
In the 2016 – 2017 school year, 6,447 Texas school students accessed Interactive Video Conferences (IVC) distance learning classes to meet their needs in dual enrollment classes. Another 4,517 students accessed distance learning classes to meet the needs of the required high school curriculum. Approximately, 4,275 electronic field trips were taken by more than 251,651 students. In 2016-2017, more than 605,849 Texas educators accessed professional development, and over 2,196 Texas educators received certification coursework through distance learning means, resulting in a significant savings of time and funds.

Texas Educational Telecommunications Network (TETN):
Since its inception in 1996, the Texas Education Telecommunications Network (TETN) has provided video, voice, and data services among the 20 ESCs and the TEA. The TETN cooperative was formed to accomplish three main goals: save out-of-pocket expenses by reducing travel required to attend meetings in Austin; enhance productivity to service ESC staff, district personnel, administrators, teachers and students; and create “added value” to network users.

The network was developed in a cost-share model in which all users shared equally, thereby assuring the inclusion of all ESCs across the state without undue burden. The network is currently highly utilized for video conferencing, statewide activities for students, distance learning, and traditional telecommunication services.

Beginning in 2007 with the initiation of the TETN Plus project, TETN began building Gigabit connections to provide a high-speed, high capacity backbone as recommended in the Texas Education Long Range Plan for Technology. Peering with Texas higher education was implemented and shared Internet2 services were established by utilizing the infrastructure of the
Lone Star Education and Research Network (LEARN).

Network Services:
TETN’s distinct network services to ESCs includes: video, intranet, internet2, commodity internet, disaster recovery transport, and backhauling. Benefits of the network include:

- Access to internet bandwidth at significantly reduced rates;
- Enhanced quality access to over 90,000 institutions, agencies, and corporations on Internet2;
- Enhanced quality access to the commodity internet through Internet2;
- Direct access to state universities and ESCs and their services, allowing for the removal of dedicated circuits for significant cost savings; and
- Shared applications and service between ESCs without bandwidth constraints or quality of service issues via the private intranet.

Video Services:
Utilizing the TETN video network, all ESCs provide Interactive Video Conferences (IVC) to classrooms across the state. IVC is used to provide dual-credit courses, graduate courses, professional development, certification programs, TEA policy updates, and student programs.

TETN works with the ESCs to design and market: programs that utilize state specific content standards; events customized to fit ESC needs; broadband specific tools; and a host of other services (http://www.tetn.net). In collaboration with consortium members, the TETN activities include:

- 8,818 electronic field trips statewide from July 2015 to June 2017 to over 545,965 students
- 1,064,532 staff members received professional development through online events from July 2015 to June 2017

Due to changes in the IVC technology, students and teachers are able to utilize more direct connections to electronic field trips and resources for their classrooms. These direct connections do not require access through TETN and ESCs. TETN and ESCs continue to promote valuable content and provide the broadband support and resources for LEAs to enrich their curriculum through IVC opportunities.

Texas State Virtual School Network (TxVSN):
The Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN) provides a statewide course catalog of supplemental online courses for credit toward high school graduation to students enrolled in grades 8 to 12. Since its inception in January 2009, the TxVSN has provided Texas high school students with a valuable avenue for interactive, collaborative, instructor-led online courses taught by state certified and appropriately credentialed teachers. Statute authorizes the commissioner of education to contract with an ESC to operate the network. Region 10 currently serves as central operations for the TxVSN and is responsible for managing all systems used to operate the network, providing and maintaining TxVSN telecom and infrastructure, managing course review, and coordinating activities with providers, receiver districts, and stakeholders.

Alternative Certification Programs:
During the 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school years, the 15 ESCs which operate education preparation programs (EPPs), prepared 5,398 teachers and administrators who received initial
certification in those classes. Of that number, 4,308 were teachers and 904 were principals. The following table lists the combined number of initially licensed teachers and administrators during the 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 academic years from the 15 ESCs which operate EPPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Number of Teacher Certifications</th>
<th>Number of Principal Certifications</th>
<th>Number of Superintendent Certifications</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,011</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3,702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: TEA Department of Educator Preparation and Program Accountability, November 2016*

**Core Services (Section 8.051 and 8.121):**
The ESCs develop, maintain, and deliver services designed to improve student performance. Additionally, the ESCs offer services which enable LEAs to operate more efficiently and economically, and core services in the following areas:

- Training and technical assistance in teaching reading, mathematics, writing, English language arts, social studies, and science;
- Training in personal financial literacy;
- Training and technical assistance to programs of special education, compensatory education, bilingual education, and gifted and talented education;
- Assistance specifically designed for an LEA rated academically unacceptable or a campus whose performance is considered unacceptable;
- Training and assistance to teachers, administrators, members of district boards of trustees, and members of site-based decision-making committees;
- Assistance specifically designed for an LEA that is considered out of compliance with state or federal special education requirements, based on the agency’s most recent compliance review of the district’s special education programs; and
- Assistance in complying with state laws and rules
List of Products and Services Offered by the ESCs:
The following is a list of products/services provided by various ESCs; however, services do change to meet the needs and requests of LEAs:

- 504
- 5E Instructional Model
- Academic Achievement Record (AAR)
- Accelerated Curriculum
- Accessible Instructional Materials
- Accommodations in Instruction and Assessment
- Accountability
- Accountability Monitoring
- Accountability Turnaround Team
- Adapted PE
- Advanced Academics
- Advancing Educational Leadership
- Alternative Education Program
- Adapted Literature/Digital Books Library
- Adopted Materials (Textbooks)
- Adult Basic Education (GED and ESL)
- Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD)
- Administrative Services
- Advancing Educational Leadership (AEL)
- Advanced Academics
- Afforded Care Act (ACA) Training and Support
- Afterschool Centers on Education (ACE) Grant Cycles 7 and 8
- Agency Partners
- Alternative Certification Programs
- Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)
- AppleCare Warranty Support
- Application and Compliance Preparation
- Assessment Creation and Support
- Assessment/Progress Monitoring
- Assistive Technology / Lending Libraries
- Attendance Accountant Compliance Assessment
- At Risk/Dropout Prevention
- Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) Support/Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) Support
- Authentic Learning and Assessment Background Checks

Behavior
- Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs)
- Classroom
- Discipline Management
- Incident Tracking and Reporting
- Restorative Discipline
- Bilingual Education Monitoring
- Bilingual/English As a Second Language (ESL)
- Bridging the Leadership Team Institute
- Bright Bytes Clarification
- Bullying Prevention
- Bus Audits
- Bus Driver Training
- Business Managers Roundtable, Training and Support
- Business Services
  - Information Management
  - TxEIS and iTCCS Support
- Calendar and Required Minutes Training and Support
- Canvas-Learning Management System
- Career and Technical Education Work Study Program
- Career Clusters
- Career Day
- Career/Technical Education
- Certified Orientation and Mobility Specialist Services
- CHAMPS
- Charter Schools
- Child Find Services
- Campus/District Improvement Team Training
- Coaching (Instructional, Leadership)
- College and Career Readiness
- College Preparation for English Language Arts and Mathematics
- Commissioner's Rule Review Process
- Communities in Schools (CIS)
- Community Resource Coordination Groups
- Compliance Services
- Content Filtering Services
- Cooperative Purchasing Networks
- Co-Teaching
- Counselor Support and Certification
- CPR/First Aid Training
- Credit by Exam (CBE)
- Crisis Prevention Intervention (CPI)
- Crisis Management
Curriculum Leadership for Principals
Curriculum Services
Cycle Menus for Schools
Data Backup Solution
Data Digs
Data Processing/Information Management
Data Validation Monitoring
Deaf Education Certification Program
Dell Warranty Support
Desktop Computer Support
Diagnostician Support
Differentiated Instruction (DI)
Digital Media Production
Disabilities Services-
  • Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorders (ADD/ADHD)
  • Auditory Impairments
  • Autism Spectrum Disorders
  • Deaf-blindness
  • Dyslexia
  • Emotional Disturbances/Behavior Disorders
  • Intellectual Disabilities
  • Learning Disabilities
  • Other Health Impairments
  • Orthopedic/Physical Impairments
  • Speech/Language Disorders
  • Traumatic Brain Injuries
  • Visual Impairments
Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP)
Discovery Education/Streaming
Disproportionate Representation
DMAC Solutions- Data Management for Assessment Curriculum
DNS Services
Driver Education Classroom- Simulation and In-Car Instruction
Driver Education 32 House License on Line (LOL)
Driver Education Parent Taught Course “Ready, Set, Drive”
Dropout Training and Supports
Dual Credit Classes – Scheduling and Bridging Via Video Conference
Dual Language Support
Early Childhood Data System (ECDS)
Early Childhood Education
Early Childhood Intervention
Early Childhood Transition

Early Head Start
Early Reading Instruments
Ecoland Learning Center
Educator Placement Service
Eduhero
Eduphoria
Email Scanning Services
EMAT
English Language Arts Support
English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS) Academics
Email Hosting
Employment Application Software and Support
End of Course Success Support
English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS) Academies
E-Rate Training
ETEDA- East Texas Educational Diagnosticians’ Association
Evaluation for Special Education
Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)
Everyone S.H.A.R.E. the Road Program
Facilitated Individualized Education Plan (IEP)
Fine Arts
Firewall Services
Financial Integrity Rating System (FIRST)
Financial Review and Support
Focus Campus Grant Support
Focus/Priority Schools Support
Food Services
  • Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)
  • Child Nutrition Services
  • Commodity Processing
  • Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program
  • Summer Food Programs
Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA)
Gifted and Talented (G/T)
Grade Point Average/Transcript Audits
Grade Placement Committee (GPC)
Grade Advancement (SSI)
Graduation Requirements
Grants Management
Guidance/Counseling
HB 5 Training and Support
Head Start
Help Desk Ticketing Services
High Quality Prekindergarten Grant
  Program Training and Support
High Reliability Schools
High School Redesign and Restructuring
Higher Education Support
Highly Qualified Paraprofessional
  Recruitment
Homebound Services
Homeless
Homeschool Support
Human Resources Assistance
IT Services
IT Network Services
Immigrant Support
Information Management Software –
  Business
Information Management Software –
  Student
Information Technology (IT) Services
Individualized Education Programs (IEP)
Innovation Districts Support
Instructional Materials Allotment (IMA)
Instructional Rounds Training and Support
Instructional Technology and Coordination
Internet Access
  • Broadband
  • Equipment
    Support/Ordering/Troubleshooting
  • Filtering
  • Network Assessment Services
  • Network Server Support
  • Safety
  • Server Hosting
Interactive Television (ITV) - Equipment
  Support/Troubleshooting
ITV - Scheduling/Instruction
Job Fairs
Juvenile Justice Alternative Education
  Services
Kindergarten Readiness System (KRS)
Language Proficiency Assessment
  Committees (LPAC) Decision-Making
Languages Other Than English
Leadership Development
LearnKey – Online training and
  Certifications
Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)
Legal Framework for the Child-Centered
  Special Education Process
Lesson Study
Library/Librarian Support
Licensed Specialist in School Psychology
  (LSSP) Support
Literacy Academies
Literacy Cohort
Local Area Network Support and
  Maintenance
Lynda.com – Online Training Manual
Maintenance Efficiency Study
Management Services
Manifestation Determination Review (MDR)
Mapping a Pathway to Student Success
  (MAPPS)
Math Academies
Math Coaching Academy
Meeting Rooms
Mentoring for Teachers and Administrators
Middle School Students in Texas: Algebra
  Ready
Migrant Education Information
Military Child Education Coalition
Mobile Application Services
Moodle
Multi-Cultural and Diverse Learners
Multi-Regional Library System (MrLibS)
National School Lunch Program
NCCER Certification Training
Netstart/Website Software for School
  Districts
New Teacher Orientation and Training
NovaNet Consortium
Nutrition
Occupational Therapy
Occupational Therapy Technical Assistance
  and CEUs
Online Expert – Online Training and
  Coaching
Online Professional Development
Online Storage Services
On TRACK
Open Records Requests
Operations Support
Opportunity Culture
Orientation and Mobility (O&M) Support
Outreach Grant
P-16 Initiative
Parenting and Paternity Awareness (PAPA)
Paraprofessional Training
Parent Complaints (Calls and Resolution)
Parent Involvement
Parent Training
Pathway for Emerging Leaders Academy
Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) Support
Person Enrollment Tracking (PET) Training and Support
Person Identification Database (PID) Training and Support
Personal Financial Literacy Training
Personnel Services – including on demand personnel
Physical Fitness Assessment Initiative
Physical Therapy
Physical Therapy Technical Assistance and CEUs
Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS)
Poverty Training
Preschool Program for Children with Disabilities (PPCD)
Pregnancy, Education, and Parenting (PEP)
Principal Certification Program
Principal Mentoring
Principal Tools for STAAR
Printing Services
Priority and Focus Schools Support
Private Schools
Project Share (see Texas Gateway)
Program Director Support (Curriculum, Career/Technical, English Language, Special Education, Title I)
Program Reviews
Progress in the General Curriculum (PGC)
Promotion/Retention Law (Student Assessment)
Public Education Grant (PEG)
Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS)
PEIMS Edit Plus
Purchasing Cooperatives
RDSPD - Regional Day School Programs for the Deaf
Reading Academies
Reading is Fundamental (RIF)
Reading Recovery
Recommendations for Serving on Educator Committees
Regional Education Television Network (RETN)
Regional Emergency and Mass Communications
Related Services
Residential Facilities
Resources for Teaching (Creative Corner, Copy Center, Print Shop)
Response to Intervention (RtI)
Retirement Asset Management System (RAMS)
REVEAL Data Warehouse Dropout Early Prevention
RIF - Reading Is Fundamental
Router Maintenance
Rural Schools Support
Satellite Downlinks
Scholarship Resources
School Board Member Training
School Bus Driver Drug and Alcohol Testing
School Bus Driver Training – 20 hour Certification and 8 hour Recertification Training
School Bus Safety
School Bus Simulation Training
School Finance Support for School Districts
School Health Education
School Meal Initiative and Menus
School Reach
School Readiness Integration (SRI)
School Safety and Audits
Science
Scripting and Automation of Data Exchanges and Automation of Data Exchanges between Software Packages
Server Administration
Shared Services Arrangements (SSAs)
• Career and Technical Education (CTE) Carl Perkins
• Private Non-Profit
• Title I A
• Title I C Migrant
• Title II
• Title III Bilingual/ESL
Sheltered Instruction
Six Traits Writing
Skyward Software Training, Support and Accounting Services
Social Studies
Spanish Language Arts
Spam Filtering Services
Special Education Compliance
Special Education Funding
Special Education Monitoring
Speech and Language Pathology
Speech Language Pathologist Support
Spinal Screening Certification Training
STAAR
STAAR Alternate 2
STAAR Online
STARR One Item Bank
State and Federal Statutes, Rules, Regulations, and Guidance
State Initiatives
State Performance Plan (Special Education)
State Waivers Applications
Streaming Video
Student Attendance Accounting Handbook (SAAH) Training and Support
Student GPS Dashboards
Student Information Management Software
Student Learning Objectives
Strategic and Systemic Planning
Substitute Teacher Training
Suicide Prevention
Superintendent Academy
Superintendent Certification Program
Superintendent of the Year
Surrogate Parent Training Support
Survey Services
Teacher Appraisal
Teacher Certification
Teacher Effectiveness
Teacher of the Year
Teacher Recruitment
Technical Support Services
Technology Assessments
Technology Integration
Technology Planning
TEKS Bank
TEKS Clarification
TEKS Professional Development in Core Content Areas
TEKS Resource System
Testing – Federal and State
TETN
Texas 21 Career Investigation and Career Planning
Texas Academic Performance Reports (TAPR)
Texas Accountability Intervention System (TAIS) Training
Texas Adolescent Literacy Academies (TALA)
Texas Behavior Support Initiative (TBSI)
Texas Center for District and School Support (TCDSS)
Texas Computer Cooperative (TCC)
  • CareerPortal
  • Internet-based Texas Computer Cooperative Software (iTCCS)
  • Texas Education Information System (TxEIS)
Texas Counselor Academy
Texas Education Agency Login (TEAL)/ Educator Certification Online System (ECOS) Account Support
Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS) Training and Support
Texas Education Telecommunications Network Access (TETN)
Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS)
Texas Gateway
Texas High School Project
Texas Library Connection
Texas Literacy Initiative (TLI)
Texas Math Initiative
Texas Math and Science Diagnostic (TMSDS)
Texas Middle School Fluency Assessment (TMSFA)
Texas Primary Reading Inventory (TPRI)
Texas Principal Excellence Program (TxPEP)
Texas Principal Evaluation and Support System (T-PESS)
Texas Records Exchange System (TREx)
Texas Regional Math Collaborative
Texas Regional Science Collaborative
Texas School Ready Certification System
Texas Student Data System (TSDS)
Texas Success (online supports for Reading and Math)
Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System (T-TESS)
Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN)
Texas Women’s University Distance Venue (TETN) Master’s Degree Program in Speech-Language Pathology
Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES)
TexQuest
Textbook Viewing Room
Time & Effort Software
TimeClock Plus Software Training and Support
Title I School Support
Title III Support
Texas Math and Science Diagnostic System (TMSDS)
Traffic SAFETY Education Staff Training
Transition Planning - High School
Texas Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (T-STEM)
Unlicensed Diabetic Care Assistance Training
Unique ID Training and Support
Upward Bound Grants
Video Conference Bridging
Video Conference CD/DVD Recording and Distribution of Events
Video Conference Scheduling and Bridging of Dual Credit Classes
Video Conference Technical Support
Vision Screening Certification Training
Visually Impaired/Orientation and Mobility Services (VI/O&M)
Visually Impaired Teacher Services
Videoconference Fieldtrip Facilitation
Videoconference Services and Support
VISION Computing and Network Support Services
Vision/Hearing/Scoliosis Screening Training/Certification
Voice-Over IP Solutions
Web Hosting
Wireless Internet Consortium
Write for Texas
Writing Coaches and Support
Region Composition and Student Demographics:
The ESCs also provide a full range of services to all 1,003 school districts and 200 operating charter school districts in the state. Services, which are available to LEAs and campuses, include professional development, instructional services, financial services, and administrative support. As with school districts, charter schools may choose the ESCs from which they receive services. In addition to LEAs, ESCs provide services to private schools in each region.

The chart below illustrates the number of school districts and charter school districts each ESC serves. Please note, this graph describes how many charters are held within each region. ESCs might have charter school campuses within their region that are not accounted for because the charter is held in a different region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of School Districts</th>
<th>Number of Charter School Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TEA, Division of Charter Schools, 2016-2017 ESC Snapshot Report Data
### 2016 Student Demographics by ESC Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESC Region</th>
<th>Regional ADA</th>
<th>Number Campuses</th>
<th>Percent Black or African American</th>
<th>Percent Hispanic</th>
<th>Percent White</th>
<th>Percent American Indian or Alaska Native</th>
<th>Percent Asian</th>
<th>Percent Native Hawaiian/Other or Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Percent Two or More Races</th>
<th>Percent Economically Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>426,678</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>97.40%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>101,511</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>74.40%</td>
<td>20.50%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>61.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>54,259</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>56.70%</td>
<td>31.90%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>61.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,190,725</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>18.80%</td>
<td>50.30%</td>
<td>21.90%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>58.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>81,699</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>26.40%</td>
<td>19.60%</td>
<td>49.00%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>57.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>189,507</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>49.30%</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>49.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>171,224</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1740.00%</td>
<td>5160.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>6090.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>56,352</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2010.00%</td>
<td>5460.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>360.00%</td>
<td>6430.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>37,821</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>740.00%</td>
<td>6010.00%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>130.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>5760.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>810,622</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>1850.00%</td>
<td>2930.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>640.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>5660.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>569,487</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>1430.00%</td>
<td>4210.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>460.00%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>270.00%</td>
<td>4940.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>169,637</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>1970.00%</td>
<td>4030.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>200.00%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>390.00%</td>
<td>5890.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>394,846</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>700.00%</td>
<td>3860.00%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>430.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>280.00%</td>
<td>4730.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>59,871</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>760.00%</td>
<td>5190.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>190.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>300.00%</td>
<td>5050.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>49,364</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>260.00%</td>
<td>3770.00%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>150.00%</td>
<td>5990.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>85,739</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>500.00%</td>
<td>4330.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>280.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>200.00%</td>
<td>5860.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>83,903</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>690.00%</td>
<td>3260.00%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>110.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>150.00%</td>
<td>6020.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>87,686</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>440.00%</td>
<td>2540.00%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>110.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>110.00%</td>
<td>4730.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>179,096</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>240.00%</td>
<td>620.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>7450.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>440,411</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>610.00%</td>
<td>1870.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>170.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>190.00%</td>
<td>6210.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Totals</td>
<td>5,240,438</td>
<td>8,646</td>
<td>700.38%</td>
<td>3301.7%</td>
<td>2670.72%</td>
<td>29.60%</td>
<td>152.20%</td>
<td>11.52%</td>
<td>165.95%</td>
<td>4059.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TEA Student Data, 2017
Accountability:
The current accountability system for ESCs includes the following (TEC 8.103):

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 ESC’s finances;
2. A review of the ESC’s performance on the indicators adopted under Section 8.101;
   - Student performance in districts served;
   - District effectiveness and efficiency in the LEAs served resulting from technical assistance and program support;
   - Direct services provided or regionally shared services arranged by the ESC which produce more economical and efficient school operations;
   - Direct services provided or regionally shared services arranged by the ESC which provided for assistance in core services; and
   - Grants received for implementation of state initiatives and the results achieved by the ESC under the terms of the grant contract.
3. A review of client satisfaction with ESC core services, state initiatives, and any other services provided in excess of those core services and state initiatives; and
4. A review of any other factor the commissioner of education determines to be appropriate.

At the direction of the 78th Texas Legislature, the ESCs as well as the TEA and the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) came under sunset review. Additionally, the Legislature passed Senate Bill 929 requiring an extensive audit of the ESCs. As a result of the MGT Audit and the findings of the LBB, the Sunset Commission recommended the continuation of the ESCs. The 79th Texas Legislature reauthorized the ESCs and did not call for their future review by the Sunset Commission. The 82nd Texas Legislature placed the ESCs back under sunset review; all ESCs are due to go under sunset review in 2021.

Since 2005, the Texas Regional Education Service Centers have contracted with The Organizational Excellence Group of The University of Texas at Austin’s School of Social Work. The Organizational Excellence Group developed an on-line survey, which was modified and approved by the commissioner of education, and sent to each LEA in the state. The 2017 evaluation of the ESCs occurred over the period of fall 2017 and received a 74 percent response rate. The results of the survey indicated that, of the 885 respondents, 804 were traditional independent school district superintendents’, and 81 were charter school administrators.

The survey provides an opportunity for LEAs to indicate their evaluation of the ESCs’ products/services. Fourteen different services were rated on a five (5) point scale: five (5) being the highest rating and one (1) being the lowest. Additionally, demographic information was collected on the participants including length of time of service for both superintendents and charter school directors. The following chart provides an overview of these areas surveyed and the ratings ESCs received:
Survey Item Score Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Language Arts</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>0.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>0.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Risk and Compensatory Education</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual and ESL Education</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Academic Education (e.g. gifted and talented and AP)</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services to help the district/charter school operate more efficiently and economically (e.g. shared services, cooperatives, curriculum support business services, teacher recruitment, etc.)</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>0.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and support for PEIMS</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>0.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services to assist the district/charter school in complying with federal and state regulation and guidelines (e.g. ESSA, PBM, Child Nutrition)</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and assistance to help improved student performance</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board training services</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>0.506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ESC Client Satisfaction Survey, Organizational Excellence Group, U.T. Austin, 2017

As stated in the survey results, “any item with an average (mean) score above the neutral point of ‘3.0’ suggests that the respondents perceive the issue more positively than negatively. Scores of ‘4.0’ or higher indicate a substantial strength for the organization. Conversely, scores below ‘3.0’ are viewed more negatively and should be a significant source of concern.”

Student Achievement:
The TEA’s accountability system ratings are based largely on performance on state standardized tests, including the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR). Ratings specifically examine student achievement, student progress, efforts to close the achievement gap, and post-secondary readiness.

The following chart displays on a regional basis the latest STAAR data from the 2016 and 2017 Accountability Data Tables.
### 2016 Performance on STAAR by ESC Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESC Region</th>
<th>Performance Index</th>
<th>Set Target</th>
<th>Statewide Average</th>
<th>% Student Achievement Per Subjects</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>60 22 28 60</td>
<td></td>
<td>All Subjects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>73 43 45 81</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68 77 69 78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>70 41 37 73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68 73 66 72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70 37 34 71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68 72 64 75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>76 40 41 75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74 78 69 80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>71 36 35 72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69 71 67 75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>76 39 37 74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74 77 70 80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>74 38 36 75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73 76 69 75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>74 38 36 75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73 76 69 75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>73 35 35 75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73 74 67 75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>76 41 40 77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74 77 71 80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>77 39 40 74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76 78 72 81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>73 38 37 69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72 75 66 77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>78 40 39 78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77 79 72 81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>74 38 36 70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75 74 68 74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>72 36 37 74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70 73 68 74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>76 38 42 69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73 79 69 79</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>72 37 35 77</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71 73 67 77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>63 36 31 68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63 63 58 68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>76 40 43 74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73 79 72 80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>72 39 39 75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71 73 65 77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 State Accountability Data
## 2016 Performance on STAAR by ESC Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Index</th>
<th>% Student Achievement Per Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set Target</strong></td>
<td>60 22 28 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statewide Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ESC Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>All Subjects</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 2016 State Accountability Data*
### 2017 Performance on STAAR by ESC Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Index</th>
<th>% Student Achievement Per Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set Target</strong></td>
<td>60 20 28 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statewide Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ESC Region</strong></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2017 State Accountability Data
Education Service Centers: Positioned to Assist

ESCs provide a wide variety of products/services that support LEAs. These products/services range from professional development, technical assistance, and support in the instructional, technology, and administrative areas. As indicated on surveys, LEAs are consistently very satisfied with ESCs’ products/services and strongly believe that ESCs assist LEAs to improve student performance and operate more efficiently and economically. The ESCs have also played a vital role in implementing legislative and commissioner initiatives. As LEAs continue to face both financial and school performance challenges, ESCs are positioned to assist LEAs in that endeavor.
Section IV: Acceleration Instruction Programs Evaluation

TEC §39.333(4) requires an evaluation of accelerated instruction programs offered under Section 28.006, including an assessment of the quality of such programs and the performance of students enrolled in such programs.

TEC §28.006 refers to accelerated reading programs for kindergarten through grade 2 (K–2) and grade 7.

Accelerated Reading Instruction for K–2 Students

TEC §28.006 requires school districts to administer reading instruments to students in kindergarten through grade 2 to assess their reading development and comprehension. The statute further requires that a school district implement an accelerated reading instruction program for students who are determined, on the basis of their reading instrument results, to be at risk for dyslexia or other reading difficulties. In the case of a student in special education who does not perform satisfactorily on a reading diagnostic instrument, the student’s admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) committee must determine the manner in which the student will participate in an accelerated reading instruction program.

Under TEC, §28.006, school districts must provide accelerated reading instruction to students in kindergarten through grade 2 who may be at risk for reading difficulties, including dyslexia, based on the results of a reading diagnostic instrument. The reading diagnostic instrument used may be chosen from the Commissioner’s List of Reading Instruments (“Commissioner’s List”), which is available on the TEA website. There are several reading instruments school districts and charter schools may choose from for each grade level requiring an assessment. For example, the 2014–2018 Commissioner’s List of Reading Instruments included the following English language reading diagnostic instruments for kindergarten:

- Texas Primary Reading Inventory (TPRI)
- Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills, Next (DIBELS Next)
- easyCBM
- Istation’s Indicators of Progress, Early Reading (ISIP-ER)
- mCLASS: Reading 3D—Text Reading and Comprehension (TRC)
- Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)
- Phonemic Awareness & Phonics Inventory (PAPI-E)
- Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS)
- Reading Analysis and Prescription System (RAPS 360)
- Woodcock Johnson Diagnostic Reading Battery (WJ III DRB)

The 2014–2018 list also included the following Spanish language reading diagnostic instruments for kindergarten:

- El Inventario de Lectura en Español de Tejas (Tejas LEE)
- Indicadores Dinamicos Del Exito en la Lectura Solution (IDEL)
- Istation’s Indicators of Progress, Española (ISIP Español)
- Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Inventory—Spanish (PAPI-S)
The TPRI and its Spanish counterpart, Tejas LEE, have been the most widely used reading diagnostic instruments per TEA data. The reading diagnostic instruments are designed to identify struggling students in kindergarten through grade 2 before they become vulnerable to failing the Grade 3 STAAR® reading assessment.

**Accelerated Reading Instruction for Middle School Students**

In 2007, the 80th Texas Legislature added a requirement to TEC §28.006 that grade 7 students who failed the state reading assessment in grade 6 be administered a reading instrument adopted by the commissioner. The instrument developed in response to the new requirement was the Texas Middle School Fluency Assessment or TMSFA. Currently, districts and open-enrollment charters may use the TMSFA or another instrument included on the Commissioner's List of Reading Instruments. Districts may also select an “alternate diagnostic reading instrument” that meets criteria established in Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §101.6001. Just as with TMSFA and other instruments included on the commissioner's list, “an alternate diagnostic reading instrument must

1. be based on published scientific research in reading;
2. be age and grade-level appropriate, valid and reliable;
3. identify specific skill difficulties in word analysis, fluency, and comprehension, and
4. assist the teacher in making individualized instructional decisions based on the assessment results.”

The results of grade 7 reading diagnostic assessments give teachers information on how to provide accelerated instruction based on individual student needs. The Texas Adolescent Literacy Academies (TALA), which were created as a result of legislation passed in the 80th Texas Legislature (R), provide training on reading instruction and interventions at the middle school level. The TALA model consists of two academies: the Content Area Academy (Tier I) and the English Language Arts (ELA) Academy (Tiers II & III).

The Content Area Academy prepares all middle school teachers to provide appropriate reading instruction for all students, including those struggling with reading due to limited English proficiency, learning disabilities, dyslexia, and other risk factors for reading difficulties. Training is available at no cost to teachers through ESCs and through an online course. The online course, posted on the Texas Gateway, is open to all teachers. Teachers who complete the training receive nine continuing professional education (CPE) credits and are able to download materials for classroom use.
The ELA Academy (designed specifically for English language arts teachers) provides additional training in administering the Texas Middle School Fluency Assessment (TMSFA), interpreting TMSFA results, and providing Tiers II and III interventions for struggling readers. Training is available at no cost to teachers through ESCs and through an online course. The online course, posted on the Texas Gateway, is open to all teachers. Teachers who complete the training receive 10 continuing CPE credits and are able to download classroom materials and the TMSFA.

Literacy Achievement Academies

In 2015, the 84th Texas Legislature passed Senate Bill 925, establishing literacy achievement academies for teachers who provide reading instruction to students at the kindergarten or first, second, or third grade level. Following a competitive solicitation, a contract was awarded to Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk (MCPER) in collaboration with the Institute for Public School Initiatives (IPSI) at The University of Texas at Austin for development of the content and training-of-trainers for three-day literacy achievement academies. Literacy Achievement Academies provide support for teachers of students in Kindergarten-grade 3 and focus on effective and systematic instructional practices in reading, including phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. In summer 2016, TEA launched Literacy Achievement Academies for teachers who provide reading instruction to students in kindergarten and grade 1. In 2016, over 8,500 teachers participated in Literacy Achievement Academies. Teachers who successfully complete an academy are eligible to receive a $350 stipend. Teachers who attended academies will also receive access to online resources hosted on the Texas Gateway to support reading instruction.
to students in grades 2 and 3 will be made available in summer 2017. Additionally, Reading-to-Learn Academies will be made available in summer 2017 for teachers who provide reading comprehension instruction to students in Grades 4 and 5. Reading-to-Learn Academies will include effective instructional practices that promote student development of reading comprehension and inferential and critical thinking.
Section V: Non-Certified Teachers

TEC §39.333(5) requires the reporting of the number of classes at each campus that are currently being taught by individuals who are not certified in the content areas of their respective classes. This determination is based on 19 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Chapter 231: Requirements for Public School Personnel Assignments.

This report uses teacher full-time equivalent (FTE) counts instead of teacher headcounts from 2017-2018. Teacher FTE counts are based on the percentage of an individual’s day spent teaching and are the best statistical approximation of “number of classes at each campus.” Teachers teaching in traditional school districts are counted in this report; teachers at public charter schools are also included for Bilingual/English as a Second Language (ESL) and Special Education.

21 The teacher out-of-field data is a combination of PEIMS and certification data that includes the following.
- Total FTEs. The aggregate number of teacher FTEs by campus that are (a) in field and (b) out of field.
- In field. FTEs assigned to an appropriate field and grade level based on the teacher’s certification. Standard, Provisional (lifetime), Probationary, Intern, One-year, and Visiting International Teacher certificates were included, as were Renewals and Probationary Extensions. Permits for persons teaching JROTC were included as in field. In-field certificates included only certificates that were effective and unexpired on the PEIMS Snapshot date and Renewals occurring between the PEIMS Snapshot date and the end of August. Certificates that are considered in field with work approval or verification of competency were counted as in field. Self-Contained, Core Subjects, Bilingual, and English as a Second Language certificates that are in field for other subject areas, such as Mathematics and Social Studies, were counted as in field for those subject areas.
- Out of field. The number of teacher FTEs (a) not certified in the appropriate field and/or grade level, or (b) have no teaching certificate at all. Permits other than for JROTC were counted out of field. Certificates that are considered in field only with additional coursework or a specified degree were counted as out of field.

22 Teacher FTEs have been excluded for the following reasons.
- Teachers assigned to subjects in the “Other” and “Not Applicable” categories were not included in the data because these subjects do not require certification that TEA can confirm. Examples include study hall, tutorials, and locally developed courses.
- For teachers assigned both to subjects which do and do not require certification, only the FTEs assigned to the “Other” and “Not Applicable” subject(s) are excluded from the data.
- Self-contained assignments at the high school level were excluded.
Teachers who were assigned to more than one campus and teachers assigned to campus names that could not be found in the PEIMS data, AskTED, or the online Campus Lookup were excluded.
Teachers Outside Content Area or Grade Level - Statewide Results

In 2017-2018, 91.1% teacher FTEs in Texas were teaching in an appropriate field and grade level (in field), and 9.0% were teaching outside the content area or grade level of their certification (out of field). At the elementary school level, 96.5% of teacher FTEs were in field. At the middle school level 91.0% FTEs were in field, and at the high school level 82.5% FTEs were in field.\textsuperscript{23} Statewide, 92.3% of Bilingual FTEs and 91.7% of Special Education FTEs were in field.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{23} Only certificates that are in field for each grade 7-12 or grade 9-12, respectively, were counted as in field for High School (Grades 7-12) or High School (Grades 9-12).

\textsuperscript{24} Traditional districts and charters were included for the Bilingual/ESL and Special Education subject areas. Only traditional districts were included for all other subject areas. Although open-enrollment charter schools are not required to follow all teacher certification requirements, they must follow the certification requirements for teachers in Special Education and Bilingual positions. Please see TEC Chapter 12, Subchapters C and D.
Teachers Outside Content Area or Grade Level - Regional Results
The incidence of out-of-field teaching varies across Texas, with the smallest percentage occurring in Region Education Service Center 20 (San Antonio) and the largest in Regional Education Service Center 8 (Mount Pleasant). Regional Education Service Center 14 (Abilene) has the fewest out-of-field teachers (283.5 FTEs) while Regional Education Service Center 4 (Houston) has the most out-of-field teachers (5,589.8 FTEs).

Figure 24: Percentage of Out-of-Field Teachers by Region 2017-2018
Teachers Outside Content Area or Grade Level - Campus Results
Of the 8,153 campuses included in this analysis, 7,577 (approximately 93%) reported that 20% or less of their teacher FTEs were assigned outside their field or grade level, including 2,019 campuses (24.8%) with 0% out-of-field FTEs. There were 178 (2.2%) campuses that reported 40% or more of their teacher FTEs being assigned outside their field or grade level. Many of the campuses reporting a high percentage of out-of-field FTEs were alternative or disciplinary campuses. Teachers in campuses with high out-of-field percentages represented approximately 2% of the overall out-of-field teacher population.

Figure 25: Percentage of Campuses by Out-of-Field (OOF) Range 2017-2018