Our Goal: Region of Excellence
Regional Recovery & Resounding Resilience
Regional Recovery & Resilience

- 2017: Steady Progress
- 2018
- 2019
- March 2020: COVID-19
- 2020: RESPONSE
- 2021
- 2022
- CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT
- REBUILDING AND REFINING
- RESILIENCE AND RECOVERY
Texas A-F Accountability System: 2020 and 2021 Ratings

Not Rated: Declared State of Disaster
2022 State of Texas
A-F Accountability System Overview
2022 Accountability System & Methodology for Calculating Ratings

Better of Achievement or Progress: Weighted at 70%

OR

Domain I: Student Achievement
A-F Rating Label Assigned

Domain II: Part A – Academic Growth
A-F Rating Label Assigned

Domain II: Part B – Relative Performance
A-F Rating Label Assigned

OR

Domain III: Closing The Gaps
A-F Rating Label Assigned

AND

Weighted at 30%

OVERALL RATING
Districts and campuses receive an overall rating, as well as a rating for each domain.

**A, B, or C**

Assigned rating label for **overall performance** & for performance **in each domain** to:
- ✔ Districts
- ✔ Campuses
- ✔ Those evaluated under alternative education accountability (AEA)

**Not Rated (NR)**

Assigned to districts and campuses that do not meet the performance target to earn at least a C

**2022 Accountability Rating Labels**

Senate Bill 1365
Regional A-F Accountability
Performance Results
2022 State Accountability
ESC vs State Letter Rating Percentage

HIGH PERFORMING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R (D)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R (F)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2022 State Accountability
Performance Ratings
Percentage of High Performing Districts

78%  78%  81%  83%  84%  85%  86%  86%  87%  87%  88%  89%  89%  90%  93%  93%  94%  95%  95%  95%
13: AUSTIN
20: SAN ANTONIO
05: BEAUMONT
10: RICHARDSON
02: CORPUS CHRISTI
06: HUNTSVILLE
02: VICTORIA
08: MT PLEASANT
12: WACO
11: PORT WORTH
04: HOUSTON
14: ABILENE
07: KILGORE
15: SAN ANGELO
18: AMARILLO
09: WICHITA FALLS
17: LUBBOCK
19: EL PASO
01: EDINBURG
2022 State Accountability Performance Ratings
Percentage of Districts Rated "A"
Congratulations!

REGION ONE ESC
2021-2022 Texas Education Agency

"A" RATED SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Brownsville ISD
Edinburg CISD
Hidalgo ISD
Jim Hogg County ISD
Laredo ISD
Los Fresnos CISD
Lyford CISD
McAllen ISD
Pharr-San Juan-Alamo ISD
Raymondville ISD
Rio Grande City Grulla ISD
Roma ISD
San Peralta ISD
Sharyland ISD
South Texas ISD
Triumph Public HS-Laredo
Triumph Public HS-RGV
United ISD
Valley View ISD
Vanguard Academy
2022 State Accountability Performance Ratings
Percentage of Districts Rated "B"
## Congratulations!

**REGION ONE ESC**

2021-2022 Texas Education Agency

"**B**" RATED SCHOOL SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brooks County ISD</th>
<th>Monte Alto ISD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donna ISD</td>
<td>Point Isabel ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edcouch-Elsa ISD</td>
<td>Progreso ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in Leadership Academy</td>
<td>Rio Hondo ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlingen CISD</td>
<td>San Benito CISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea Public Schools</td>
<td>San Isidro ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Feria ISD</td>
<td>Santa Maria ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Joya ISD</td>
<td>Santa Rosa ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasara ISD</td>
<td>Webb CISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercedes ISD</td>
<td>Weslaco ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission CISD</td>
<td>Zapata County ISD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2022 State Accountability Performance Ratings
Percentage of Districts Rated "C"
2022 State Accountability Performance Ratings
Percentage of Districts Not Rated: SB 1365

- San Antonio: 12%
- Houston: 5%
- Beaumont: 5%
- Waco: 5%
- El Paso: 5%
- Richardson: 4%
- Victoria: 3%
- Huntsville: 3%
- Kilgore: 3%
- Wichita Falls: 3%
- Austin: 3%
- Lubbock: 3%
- Midland: 2%
- Corpus Christi: 2%
- San Angelo: 2%
- Edinburg: 1%
- Fort Worth: 0%
- MT Pleasant: 0%
- Abilene: 0%
- Amarillo: 0%
2022 State Accountability Performance Ratings
Percentage of Campuses Rated "A"
2022 State Accountability Performance Ratings
Percentage of Campuses Rated "B"

- 07: KILGORE 53%
- 19: EL PASO 52%
- 15: SAN ANGELO 51%
- 12: WACO 50%
- 08: MT PLEASANT 48%
- 02: CORPUS CHRISTI 48%
- 05: BEAUMONT 47%
- 09: VICTORIA 47%
- 10: RICHARDSON 46%
- 11: ABBEVILLE 46%
- 06: HUNTSVILLE 45%
- 16: LUBBOCK 45%
- 09: WICHITA FALLS 44%
- 17: ABRILLO 44%
- 12: EDMONTON 43%
- 20: SAN ANTONIO 42%
- 13: AUSTIN 38%
2022 State Accountability Performance Ratings
Percentage of Campuses Rated "C"
2022 State Accountability
Performance Ratings
Percentage of Campuses Not Rated: SB 1365

- Beaumont: 16%
- Midland: 13%
- Abilene: 12%
- Lubbock: 11%
- Victoria: 11%
- San Angelo: 10%
- Waco: 10%
- Austin: 9%
- Wichita Falls: 9%
- Richardson: 7%
- Fort Worth: 7%
- Corpus Christi: 6%
- Huntsville: 5%
- Killeen: 5%
- Houston: 4%
- Amarillo: 4%
- El Paso: 2%
- Edinburg: 2%
2022 State Accountability
Domain Performance
Region vs State Average Comparison

- Domain 1: Student Achievement
  - Region: 83%
  - State: 84%

- Domain 2A: Student Progress
  - Region: 90%
  - State: 82%

- Domain 2B: Relative Performance
  - Region: 89%
  - State: 84%

- Domain 3: Closing the Gaps
  - Region: 81%
  - State: 81%
Percentage of 3-8 Reading and English I and English II Assessments at Approaches Performance Level or Higher, 2012-2022

"Approaches" performance level includes "Meets" & "Masters" levels
"Meets" performance level includes "Masters" level.
Percentage of 3-8 Mathematics and Algebra I Assessments at Approaches Performance Level or Higher, 2012-2022

"Approaches" performance level includes "Meets" & "Masters" levels.
"Meets" performance level includes "Masters" level
Percentage of Science Assessments at Approaches Performance Level or Higher, 2012-2022

"Approaches" performance level includes "Meets" & "Masters" levels

Assessment Year:
- 2012: 27%
- 2013: 29%
- 2014: 33%
- 2015: 34%
- 2016: 35%
- 2017: 43%
- 2018: 45%
- 2019: 49%
- 2020: 50%
- 2021: 53%
- 2022: 74%

COVID period:
- 2020: 30%
- 2021: 42%
- 2022: 73%
"Meets" performance level includes "Masters" level
Percentage of Social Studies Assessments at Approaches Performance Level or Higher, 2012-2022

"Approaches" performance level includes "Meets" & "Masters" levels

Assessment Year


23% 17% 27% 33% 40% 41% 49% 50% 48% 38% 73%

26% 27% 39% 44% 47% 49% 52% 54% 72% 73%

Region State

COVID
"Meets" performance level includes "Masters" level.
Regional Distinction Designation
Outstanding Achievement Performance Results
Distinction Designations

- **Campus Only**
  - Academic Achievement
    - English Language Arts & Reading
  - Academic Achievement
    - Mathematics
  - Academic Achievement
    - Science
  - Top 25 Percent: Comparative
    - Academic Growth
  - Top 25 Percent: Comparative
    - Closing the Gaps
  - Academic Achievement
    - Social Studies

- **District & Campus**
  - Postsecondary Readiness
2022 State Accountability
Academic Achievement Distinction Designation (AADD)
Percentage of Eligible Districts Earning Postsecondary Distinction by ESC
Regional Distinction Designation:
Post-Secondary Readiness District Distinction

- Brownsville ISD
- Edinburg ISD
- Hidalgo ISD
- IDEA Public Schools
- Jim Hogg County ISD
- Laredo ISD
- Los Fresnos ISD
- McAllen ISD
- Raymondville ISD
- Roma ISD
- San Perlita ISD
- South Texas ISD
- Valley View ISD
- Vanguard Academy
- United ISD
2022 State Accountability
Percentage of Campuses With One or More Distinctions

Region: 82%
State: 58%
2022 State Accountability
Academic Achievement Distinction Designation (AADD)
Percentage of Eligible Campuses Earning One or More Distinction(s) by ESC

82%

18: MIDLAND
13: AUSTIN
11: BEAUMONT
14: ABILENE
12: WACO
10: RICHARDSON
15: SAN ANGELO
06: HUNTSVILLE
04: HOUSTON
03: VICTORIA
08: WICHITA FALLS
02: CORPUS CHRISTI
19: EL PASO
17: LUBBOCK
07: KILLEEN
16: AMARILLO
01: EDINBURG
Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)
Federal Accountability Performance Results
Our Goal: Region of Excellence
Ensuring a Powerful & Equitable Recovery
Regional Transformation through:

- Equity of Service
- Equity of Quality
- Equity of Optimal Impact

Photo courtesy of McAllen ISD
"These results show our state's significant investment in the post-pandemic academic recovery of Texas public school students is bearing fruit,"

-Commissioner Mike Morath
Region One ESC
Questions and Feedback

Dr. Cris Valdez, Deputy Director for Instructional Support
(956) 984-6022 | cvaldez@esc1.net

Kelly VanHee, Administrator for Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment
(956) 984-6151 | kkvanhee@esc1.net

Tammie L. Garcia, Administrator for School Improvement, Accountability and Compliance
(956) 984-6173 | tgarcia@esc1.net

Melissa I. Lopez, Administrator for College, Career and Life Readiness
(956) 984-6046 | mlopez@esc1.net
2021-2022 Preliminary Ratings
Based on Fiscal Year Data 2020-2021
FIRST Objectives & Goals

Objectives:
• Assess the quality of Financial Management
• Publicly Report this assessment
• Implement a rating system that fairly and equitably evaluates the quality of management decisions

Goals:
• Strengthen fiscal accountability
• Facilitate effective and efficient use of resources
How Ratings are Assessed

• Based upon indicators
  • 20 for School Districts
  • 21 for Charter Schools

• Failure to pass any of the CRITICAL indicators will result in an automatic failing grade

• Determine the rating by the applicable number of points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>POINTS EARNED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A = Superior Achievement</td>
<td>90 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B = Above Standard Achievement</td>
<td>80 - 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C = Meets Standard Achievement</td>
<td>70 - 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F = Substandard Achievement</td>
<td>&lt; 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School District
Preliminary Ratings
School Districts Preliminary Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donna ISD</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburg CISD</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo ISD</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laredo ISD</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Fresnos CISD</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAllen ISD</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission ISD</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Isabel ISD</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSJA ISD</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharyland ISD</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weslaco ISD</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zapata County ISD</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownsville ISD</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Joya ISD</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymondville ISD</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma ISD</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito ISD</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan ISD</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria ISD</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Texas ISD</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks County ISD</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercedes ISD</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progreso ISD</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito CISD</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan ISD</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Fea ISD</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Alto ISD</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlingen CISD</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Hogg County ISD</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United ISD</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyford CISD</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley View ISD</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Villa ISD</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb CISD</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Hondo ISD</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasara ISD</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Orange** = Superior
- **Blue** = Above
- **Green** = Meets Standard
- **Gray** = Substandard Achievement
Preliminary School District State Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>2020-2021</th>
<th></th>
<th>2021-2022</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A = Superior Achievement</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>83.92%</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>86.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B = Above Standard Achievement</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>10.88%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>9.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C = Meets Standard Achievement</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.12%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F = Substandard Achievement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,020</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,019</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Preliminary School District Region One Ratings

#### Region One Rating Counts Two Year Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>2020-2021</th>
<th>2021-2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = Superior Achievement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B = Above Standard Achievement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C = Meets Standard Achievement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F = Substandard Achievement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical Indicators

- Indicator 1: Timely Filing of the Annual Financial Report (AFR)
- Indicator 2: Unmodified Opinion in the AFR
- Indicator 3: Compliance with Debt Agreements
- Indicator 4: Timely Payments to Government Agencies
- Indicator 5: Unrestricted Net Position Balance (not being scored)
Critical Indicators 1-4

Indicator 1: 37 (Yes: 1, No: 1)
Indicator 2: 37 (Yes: 1, No: 1)
Indicator 3: 38 (Yes: 0, No: 0)
Indicator 4: 37 (Yes: 1, No: 1)
Solvency Indicators

- Indicator 6: 3 Year Change in Fund Balance (ceiling – max 89 points)
- Indicator 7: Number of Days of Cash on Hand
- Indicator 8: Current Assets to Current Liabilities Ratio
- Indicator 9: General Fund Revenues Equal or Exceed Expenditures
- Indicator 10: Budgeted to Actual Revenues 3 Year Comparison (not being scored)
- Indicator 11: Long-Term Liabilities to Total Assets Ratio
- Indicator 12: Debt per $100 of Assessed Property Value
- Indicator 13: Administrative Cost Ratio
- Indicator 14: Student to Staff Ratio over 3 Year Period
Solvency Indicators 6-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Max Points</th>
<th>Less than max points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Competency Indicators

- Indicator 15: Enrollment Variance (not being scored)
- Indicator 16: PEIMS to AFR Data Quality (ceiling – max 89 points)
- Indicator 17: Material Weakness in Internal Controls over Financial Reporting (ceiling – max 79 points)
- Indicator 18: Material Noncompliance Disclosed on AFR
- Indicator 19: Transparency – Required Financial Postings
- Indicator 20: Property Values and Funding Lag Discussion with the Board of Trustees (ceiling – max 89 points)
Charter Schools
Preliminary Ratings
Charter Schools Preliminary Rating

- Excellence in Leadership Academy: 100
- Triumph Public HS RGV: 100
- Triumph Public HS Laredo: 100
- IDEA Public Schools: 96
- Vanguard Academy: 89
- Horizon Montesorri Public Schools: 0

Key:
- Yellow = Superior
- Blue = Above Standard
- Gray = Substandard Achievement
## Preliminary Charter School State Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>2020-2021</th>
<th></th>
<th>2021-2022</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = Superior Achievement</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>60.82%</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>70.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B = Above Standard Achievement</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25.73%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C = Meets Standard Achievement</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.94%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F = Substandard Achievement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Preliminary Charter School Region One Ratings

### Region One Rating Counts Two Year Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>2020-2021</th>
<th></th>
<th>2021-2022</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = Superior Achievement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B = Above Standard Achievement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C = Meets Standard Achievement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F = Substandard Achievement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical Indicators

- Indicator 1: Timely Filing of the Annual Financial Report (AFR)
- Indicator 2: Unmodified Opinion in the AFR.
- Indicator 3: Compliance with Debt Agreements
- Indicator 4: Timely Payments to Government Agencies
- Indicator 5: Total Net Asset Balance
Critical Indicators 1-5

Indicator 1
Indicator 2
Indicator 3
Indicator 4
Indicator 5

Yes  No

5 1
6 0
6 0
6 0
6 0

© 2022
Solvency Indicators

- Indicator 6: 3 Year Change in Total Net Assets (ceiling – max 89 points)
- Indicator 7: Number of Days of Cash on Hand
- Indicator 8: Current Assets to Current Liabilities Ratio
- Indicator 9: Revenues Equal or Exceed Expenditures
- Indicator 10: Budgeted to Actual Revenues 3 Year Comparison (**not being scored**)
- Indicator 11: Long-Term Liabilities to Total Assets Ratio
- Indicator 12: Debt Service Coverage Ratio
- Indicator 13: Reasonable Debt to Capitalization Percentage
- Indicator 14: Administrative Cost Ratio
- Indicator 15: Student to Staff Ratio over 3 Year Period
Solvency Indicators 6-15
Financial Competency Indicators

- Indicator 16: ADA Variance (not being scored)
- Indicator 17: PEIMS to AFR Data Quality (ceiling – max 89 points)
- Indicator 18: Material Weakness in Internal Controls over Financial Reporting (ceiling – max 79 points)
- Indicator 19: Material Noncompliance Disclosed on AFR
- Indicator 20: Transparency – Required Financial Postings
- Indicator 21: Charter school serves students in geographic boundaries (not being scored) (ceiling – max 89 points)
Financial Competency Indicators 16-20

Indicator 16: 6 Max points
Indicator 17: 5 Max points, 1 Less than max points
Indicator 18: 6 Max points
Indicator 19: 6 Max points
Indicator 20: 6 Max points
Our Goal: Region of Excellence
Supporting Academic Excellence through Financial Leadership
Regional Transformation through:

- Equity of Service
- Equity of Quality
- Equity of Optimal Impact

Photo courtesy of McAllen ISD
Region One ESC

Questions and Feedback

Rumalda Ruiz,
Deputy Director for Business, Operations & Finance Support
(956) 984-6290
Rruiz@esc1.net