

Chapter 2 – The Basics: *Base Indicators*

To determine ratings under the standard accountability procedures, the 2007 accountability rating system for Texas public schools and districts uses four base indicators:

- spring 2007 performance on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS),
- spring 2007 performance on the State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II),
- the Completion Rate I for the class of 2006, and
- the 2005-06 Annual Dropout Rate for grades 7 and 8.

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

The TAKS indicator is the percent of students who scored high enough to meet the standard to pass the test. This is calculated as the number of students who met the TAKS student passing standard divided by the number tested. Results for the English version of the TAKS (grades 3-11) and the Spanish version (grades 3-6) are summed across grades for each subject. Results for each subject tested are evaluated separately to determine ratings.

Who is evaluated for TAKS: Districts and campuses that test students on any TAKS subject:

- **Reading/ELA** – Reading is tested in grades 3-9; English language arts (ELA) is tested in grades 10 & 11. Note that this is a combined indicator. It includes all students tested on and passing either the TAKS reading test or the TAKS English language arts test. The first two administrations of grade 3 and grade 5 TAKS reading results are included. See *Reading/ELA Combined* and *Student Success Initiative* in *Other Information* below.
- **Writing** – Writing is tested in grades 4 & 7.
- **Social Studies** – Social Studies is tested in grades 8, 10, & 11.
- **Mathematics** – Mathematics is tested in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, & 11. The first two administrations of grade 5 TAKS mathematics results are included. See *Student Success Initiative* in *Other Information* below.
- **Science** – Science is tested in grades 5, 8, 10, & 11. (*Performance on the grade 8 science test will not be used for accountability purposes until 2008.*)

Standard: The *Academically Acceptable* standard varies by subject, while the *Recognized* and *Exemplary* standards are the same for all subjects:

- **Exemplary** – For every subject, at least 90% of the tested students pass the test.
- **Recognized** – For every subject, at least 75% of the tested students pass the test.
- **Academically Acceptable** – Varies by subject:
 - *Reading/ELA* – At least 65% of the tested students pass the test.
 - *Writing* – At least 65% of the tested students pass the test.
 - *Social Studies* – At least 65% of the tested students pass the test.
 - *Mathematics* – At least 45% of the tested students pass the test.
 - *Science* – At least 40% of the tested students pass the test.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of students passing [TAKS subject]}}{\text{number of students tested in [TAKS subject]}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- *All Students.* These results are always evaluated regardless of the number of examinees. However, districts and campuses with a small number of total students tested on TAKS will receive Special Analysis. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more detailed information about Special Analysis.
- *Student Groups.*
 - Any student group with fewer than 30 students tested is not evaluated.
 - If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
 - If there are at least 50 students within the student group, it is evaluated.
 - Student group size is calculated subject by subject. For this reason the number of student groups evaluated will sometimes vary. For example, an elementary school with grades 3, 4, & 5 tested may have enough Hispanic students to be evaluated on reading and mathematics, but not enough to be evaluated on writing (tested in grade 4 only) or science (tested in grade 5 only).

Year of Data: 2006-07

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other Information:

- *TAKS Grade 8 Science.* In 2006, grade 8 students were assessed for the first time in TAKS science. Performance on this assessment will not be used in determining accountability ratings for 2007. However both the 2006 and 2007 science results will be shown on the AEIS reports released in the fall of 2007. See *Chapter 17 – Preview of 2008 and Beyond.*
- *Student Success Initiative.* For grades 3 and 5 reading and grade 5 mathematics performance, a cumulative percent passing is calculated by combining the first and second administrations of the TAKS. The results include performance on the Spanish versions of these tests.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who take the TAKS is included in the TAKS indicator.
- *Testing Window.* Results for students given a make-up test within the testing window are included in the accountability indicators.
- *Reading/ELA Combined.* Reading (grades 3-9) and ELA (grades 10 & 11) results are combined and evaluated as a single subject. This affects districts and campuses that offer both grade 9 and grades 10 and/or 11. In these cases, counts of reading and ELA students who met the standard are summed and divided by the total number taking reading or ELA.

- *TAKS Spanish.* The TAKS tests are given in Spanish in reading and mathematics for grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; writing in grade 4; and science in grade 5. Performance on these tests is combined with performance on the English-language TAKS for the same subject to determine a rating.
- *Student Passing Standards.* To determine whether the student counts as a passer, the student must meet the passing standard adopted by the State Board of Education (SBOE) for the current year. Please note the following:
 - For 2007, the student passing standard is panel recommendation (PR) for students in all grades and all subjects, except grade 8 science.
 - The TAKS grade 8 science passing standard for 2007 is lower while it is phased in. Performance on this test will not be part of the accountability system until 2008.
 - Some 11th graders who have repeated a grade may have a passing standard other than PR, depending on which standard was in place when they first entered 10th grade.
- *Sum of All Grades Tested.* Results for each subject are summed across grades. This refers to the grades tested at the particular campus or district. For example, the percent passing for TAKS reading in an elementary school with a grade span of K-5 is calculated as:

$$\frac{\text{number of students who passed the reading test in grades 3, 4, \& 5}}{\text{number of students who took the reading test in grades 3, 4, \& 5}}$$
- *Exit-level TAKS.* The performance of all juniors tested for the first time during the primary spring administration (ELA in February; mathematics, science, and social studies in April) is included in determining accountability ratings.
- *October 2006 administration.* Some juniors eligible for early graduation took the TAKS in October 2006. The performance of these students is included with the performance of other juniors taking the exit-level test if:
 - they were juniors at the time of testing;
 - they were taking the exit-level TAKS for the first time in October 2006; and
 - they passed all four assessments at that time.
 Students tested in October who failed any of the tests in October could retest in the spring; however, in the event of a retest, neither performance — from October *or* from the spring retest — is included in the accountability calculations. If October results are used, they are not adjusted for mobility.
- *Students Tested.* Only answer documents marked “Score” are included; answer documents coded “Absent,” “Exempt,” or “Other” are excluded. For example, results for limited English proficient students taking a linguistically accommodated TAKS or SDAA II reading or mathematics tests are not included in the state accountability system.
- *Rounding of Met Standard Percent.* The *Met Standard* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%; 79.4999% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.
- *Rounding of Student Group Percent.* The *Student Group* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 9.5% is rounded to 10%.

STATE-DEVELOPED ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT II

This test assesses special education students in grades 3-10 who are receiving instruction in the state's curriculum but for whom the TAKS test is not an appropriate measure of their academic progress. Tests are given in the areas of reading/ELA, writing, and mathematics, on the same schedule as TAKS.

A single performance indicator is evaluated for SDAA II. The indicator sums across grades tested (3-10) and across subjects. This indicator is not based on the number of students tested but on the number of tests taken. It is calculated as the number of *tests* meeting ARD committee expectations divided by the number of SDAA II *tests* for which ARD expectations were established. Students who take multiple SDAA II tests are included multiple times (for each and every SDAA II test they take).

This year, 2007, is the last year the SDAA II will be administered. See *Chapter 17 – Preview of 2008 and Beyond* for information on future alternate assessments for students with disabilities.

Who is evaluated for SDAA II: Districts and campuses that test students on any SDAA II subject.

Standard:

- **Exemplary** – Results on at least 90% of tests taken meet ARD expectations.
- **Recognized** – Results on at least 70% of tests taken meet ARD expectations.
- **Academically Acceptable** – Results on at least 50% of tests taken meet ARD expectations.

Student Groups: Performance for the percent *Meeting ARD Expectations* is evaluated for All Students only. Student group performance is not evaluated separately.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of SDAA II tests meeting ARD expectations}}{\text{number of SDAA II tests taken}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- SDAA II performance is evaluated for districts and campuses with results from 30 or more tests (summed across grades and subjects). Depending on grade level, an individual student might be counted as many as three times if he or she takes SDAA II tests in reading, writing, and mathematics. In this case, the minimum size requirement of 30 tests could represent as few as 10 students.
- There is no Special Analysis done on SDAA II performance.

Year of Data: 2007 (Spring SDAA II Administration)

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other Information:

- **TAKS-I.** Since 2006, students served in special education have been able to take the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills Inclusive (TAKS-I) in subjects and grades

where the SDAA II is not available. TAKS-I performance will not be used in determining accountability ratings for 2007. However, 2006 and 2007 performance on this indicator will be shown on the AEIS reports released in the fall of 2007. See *Chapter 17 – Preview of 2008 and Beyond*.

- *Students Tested on both SDAA II and TAKS.* In some cases, students may take both the SDAA II and TAKS. For example, a grade 6 student may take the TAKS for mathematics, and the SDAA II for reading. In this case, the student's TAKS performance is included with the TAKS indicators and the SDAA II performance is included with the SDAA II indicator.
- *Rounding of Met ARD Expectation Percent.* The *Met ARD Expectation* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%; 79.4999% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.

ACCOUNTABILITY SUBSET

For the TAKS and SDAA II indicators, only the performance of students enrolled on the PEIMS fall "as-of" date of October 27, 2006, are considered in the ratings. This is referred to as the *accountability subset* (sometimes also referred to as the *October subset* or the mobility adjustment). This adjustment is not applied to any other base indicator.

Students who move from district to district are excluded from the campus and district's TAKS and SDAA II results. Further, students who move from campus to campus within a district are kept in the district's results but are excluded from the campus's TAKS and SDAA II results. No campus is held accountable for students who move between campuses after the PEIMS "as-of" date and before the date of testing, even if they stay within the same district. The subsets are determined as follows:

Campus-level accountability subset: If a student was reported in membership at one campus on October 27, 2006, but moves to another campus before the TAKS or SDAA II test, that student's performance is removed from the accountability results for both campuses, whether the campuses are in the same district or different districts. Campuses are held accountable only for those students reported to be enrolled in the campus in the fall and tested in the same campus in the second semester.

District-level accountability subset: If a student was in one district on October 27, 2006, but moved to another district before the TAKS or SDAA II test, that student's performance is taken out of the accountability subset for both districts. However, if the student moved from campus to campus within the district, his or her performance is included in that district's results, even though it does not count for either campus. This means that district performance results do not match the sum of the campus performance results.

Examples of how the accountability subset criteria are applied are provided in the following table. Note that these apply to both SDAA II and TAKS performance results. For more information, see *Tables 30, 31, and 32* in *Appendix D – Data Sources*.

Table 3: Accountability Subset

Student Situation	In Whose Accountability Subset?
General	
1. Grade 9 student is enrolled at campus A in the fall and tests there on TAKS reading in February and mathematics in April.	This student's results affect the rating of both campus A and the district.
2. Grade 6 student is enrolled in district A in the fall and moves to district B at the semester break. The student is tested on TAKS reading and mathematics in April.	This student's results do not affect the rating of any campus or district. Results are reported to district B.
3. Grade 6 student is enrolled at campus Y (district A) in the fall and then moves to campus Z (district A) at the semester break. The student is tested on TAKS reading and mathematics in April.	This student's results do not affect the rating of campus Y or Z, but they do affect district A. Results for both tests are reported to campus Z.
4. Grade 6 student is reported in enrollment in district A at campus Z, but is withdrawn for home schooling on November 10 th . Parents re-enroll the student at the same campus on April 1. The student is tested in TAKS reading and mathematics in April.	Performance on both tests is reported and included in the ratings evaluation for campus Z and district A. The fact that the student was enrolled on the "as of" date and tested in the same campus and district are the criteria for determining the accountability subset.
5. A 12 th grade student moves to a district from another state at the beginning of the school year. She takes the exit-level tests in October and fails; she takes them again during the spring. Will her performance affect the district or campus?	No. The performance of 12 th graders is not used for accountability purposes.
Mobility between Writing/ELA and other tests	
6. Grade 4 student enrolls in campus A in the fall and takes the TAKS writing test there in February. The student then transfers to campus B in the same district and tests on TAKS reading and mathematics in April.	This student's results do not affect the rating of campus A or B. Although writing was assessed at the same campus where the student was enrolled in the fall, the writing results are reported to campus B, where the student tested last. The results affect the district rating. Results for all tests are reported to campus B.
7. Grade 4 student enrolls in campus A in the fall and takes the writing TAKS there in February. The student then transfers to campus B in a different district and tests on TAKS reading and mathematics in April.	This student's results do not affect the rating of either campus or district. Test results are reported to the campus where the student tested last. Results for all tests are reported to campus B.

Table 3: Accountability Subset (continued)

Student Situation	In Whose Accountability Subset?
8. A first-time 11th grade student is enrolled in district A in the fall and takes the TAKS ELA in February. He then moves to district B, where he takes the last three tests.	This student's results do not affect the rating of either campus or district. Results for all tests are reported to the campus where the student tested last in district B.
9. A first-time 11th grade student is enrolled in district A in the fall and takes the TAKS ELA in February. She then moves out of state. She does not take the last three tests.	This student's results on ELA will be used in determining both campus and district A ratings.
10. A first-time 11th grade student is enrolled in high school Y, district A in the fall and takes the TAKS ELA in February. He then is sent to a "boot camp" (disciplinary campus) for the rest of the year, where he takes the rest of the TAKS tests. Will the student's performance count toward the sending campus?	<p>If the disciplinary campus is a JJAEP or DAEP, the student's performance must be coded back to the sending campus, and it will be used in determining both campus and district ratings.</p> <p>If the disciplinary campus is operated by the Texas Youth Commission (TYC), the performance will not count toward either the sending campus or district rating.</p> <p>If the disciplinary campus is not a JJAEP, DAEP, or TYC campus, but is in district A, the performance will be used in determining the district rating, but not the campus rating.</p>
11. Grade 7 student is reported in enrollment in district A and takes the writing test in that district at campus Y. In March, the student transfers to district B and takes the remaining Grade 7 TAKS tests there. The answer documents submitted by district B use different name spellings than did the one submitted by district A.	To the test contractor these are two different students. Performance on the student's writing test is reported to district A and counts toward its rating and the rating of campus Y. The student's results in reading and mathematics are reported to district B but do not contribute to the rating of either the district or the campus where the student tested because the student was not there in the fall.
<p>Grades 3 and 5 Reading; Grade 5 Mathematics (Student Success Initiative) <i>(See Tables 30 and 31 in Appendix D – Data Sources for further information.)</i></p>	
12. Grade 3 student takes reading in February at campus A where she was enrolled in the fall, passes the test and moves to campus B (in the same district) where, in April, she takes and fails the mathematics test.	This student's results do not affect the rating of campus A or B. The reading results from the February test are reported to campus A and the mathematics results are reported to campus B. Results from both tests affect the district.

Table 3: Accountability Subset (continued)

Student Situation	In Whose Accountability Subset?
<p>13. Grade 3 student enrolls in campus A in the fall, but then moves to campus B (in the same district) in December. In February the student takes the reading test there, and passes. In early April the student moves back to campus A, where he takes and passes the mathematics test.</p>	<p>This student's reading results do not affect the rating of campus A or B, but the math results affect the rating of campus A. The reading results from the February test are reported to campus B, and the math results are reported to campus A. Results from both reading and mathematics tests affect the district.</p>
<p>14. Grade 5 student takes reading in February at campus A where he was enrolled in the fall, and fails the test. In March he moves to campus B (in the same district) where he retakes in April and passes reading, mathematics, and science.</p>	<p>This student's results do not affect the rating of campus A or B. The February reading results are reported to campus A, even though math, science and the 2nd reading results are reported to campus B. Results from reading, science, and mathematics tests affect the district.</p>
<p>15. Grade 3 student takes TAKS reading in February at the campus where she was enrolled in the fall. She fails the test. In March, the student moves out of state. She does not take TAKS mathematics.</p>	<p>This student's TAKS reading results do not affect the rating for the campus or district.</p>
<p>16. Grade 5 student takes TAKS reading in February at the campus where she was enrolled in the fall, and passes the test. In April she takes the TAKS mathematics test but fails. The student then moves to another district, where she takes TAKS science and retakes in mathematics and fails again.</p>	<p>This student's TAKS reading, mathematics, and science results do not affect the rating for any campus or district.</p>
<p>17. Grade 5 student takes TAKS reading in February at the campus where she was enrolled in the fall, and passes the test. In April she takes the TAKS mathematics test but fails. The student and her family then move out of state. She does not take TAKS science or retest in mathematics.</p>	<p>The three subjects are handled differently: <i>Science:</i> She did not test in science at all, so there are no results to attribute. <i>Reading:</i> She did not need to retest in reading; however, the fact that she did not take the science test in mid-April establishes her as mobile, so her reading results are taken out of the accountability subset. <i>Mathematics:</i> There are no results available for her in May, nor are there answer documents for any of the mathematics passers, as there is no other TAKS test given at that time. For this reason, the April performance on mathematics is retained and will affect the rating of this campus and district.</p>

Table 3: Accountability Subset (continued)

Student Situation	In Whose Accountability Subset?
Spanish TAKS	
18. A grade 6 student’s LPAC committee directs that she be tested in reading on the Spanish TAKS and in mathematics on the English TAKS. She remains at the same campus the entire year.	Performance on both tests is reported and included in the rating evaluation for the campus and district. Results on both English and Spanish versions of the TAKS contribute to the overall passing rate.
Both SDAA II and TAKS	
19. The ARD committee for a grade 6 student in special education directs that she be tested in reading on the SDAA II and in mathematics on the TAKS. She remains at the same campus the entire year.	Performance on both tests is reported and included in the rating evaluation for the campus and district. This student’s reading results are included with the SDAA II performance, and the mathematics results contribute to the TAKS results.
20. Grade 3 student takes TAKS reading in February and fails the test. Her ARD committee decides she should take the SDAA II reading in April, on which she meets ARD expectations. She also takes TAKS mathematics and passes. She remains at the same campus the entire year.	This student’s TAKS reading (failure) and mathematics (passing) results will affect the TAKS performance for the campus and the district. The SDAA II reading results (passing) will affect the SDAA II indicator for the campus and district.

COMPLETION RATE I

This longitudinal rate shows the percent of students who first attended ninth grade in the 2002-03 school year and have completed or are continuing their education four years later. Known as the 2002-03 cohort, these students were tracked over the four years using data provided to TEA by districts and data available in the statewide General Educational Development (GED) database.

To count as a "completer" for standard accountability procedures, a student must have received a high school diploma with his/her class (or earlier) or have re-enrolled in the fall of 2006 as a continuing student.

Who is evaluated for Completion Rate I:

- Districts and campuses that serve grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12.
- *Use of District Rate.* A completion rate is evaluated for any campus that served students in grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12 in the fall of the 2006-07 school year. However, a completion rate is calculated only for campuses or districts that offered grades 9 through 12 since 2002-03. When a campus serves only some of those grades—for example, a senior high school that only serves grades 11 and 12—the district’s completion rate is attributed to that campus because it does not have its own completion rate. Campuses that

have been in existence for fewer than five years will also be evaluated using their districts' completion rates.

Standard:

- **Exemplary** – Completion Rate I of 95.0% or more.
- **Recognized** – Completion Rate I of 85.0% or more.
- **Academically Acceptable** – Completion Rate I of 75.0% or more.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of completers}}{\text{number in class}^*}$$

*See *Appendix D* for the definition of *number in class*.

Minimum Size Requirements:

- *All Students.* These results are evaluated if:
 - there are at least 10 students in the class *and*
 - there are at least 5 dropouts.
- *Student Groups.* These results are evaluated if there are at least 5 dropouts within the student group *and*:
 - there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students; or
 - there are at least 50 students within the student group.

Years of Data: 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-06, and 2006-07.

Data Source: PEIMS submission 1 enrollment data, 2002-03 through 2006-07; PEIMS submission 1 leaver data, 2003-04 through 2006-07; PEIMS submission 3 attendance data, 2002-03 through 2005-06; and General Educational Development records as of August 31, 2006.

Other Information:

- *NCES Dropout Definition.* As of the 2007 accountability rating cycle, the definition of a dropout has changed to be aligned with the NCES definition. See *Appendix I – NCES Dropout Definition* for more information.
- *School Leaver Provision for 2007.* In 2007, a campus or district completion rate cannot be the cause for a lowered rating. As a safeguard to this provision, districts are subject to identification and intervention by Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) for dropout rates and leaver reporting. Additionally, campuses that avoid being rated *Academically Unacceptable* because of this provision will be subject to technical assistance team (TAT) intervention requirements in the 2007-08 school year.
- *Additions and Deletions.* Any student who joins the cohort is added to it, and any student who leaves the cohort is subtracted from it. For example, a student new to Texas who

moves to a district as an 11th grader would be added to the cohort that began when he was first in 9th grade.

- *Retained Students.* Students who repeat a year are kept with their original cohort.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 74.875% is rounded to 74.9%, not 75%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.
- *Special Education.* The completion status of special education students is included in this measure.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE (GRADES 7-8)

For accountability purposes, the annual dropout rate is used to evaluate campuses and districts with students in grades 7 and/or 8. This is a one-year measure, calculated by summing the number of dropouts across the two grades.

This year for the first time, TEA will use the more rigorous NCES dropout definition. See *Appendix I – NCES Dropout Definition* for a detailed explanation.

Who is evaluated for Annual Dropout Rate: Districts and campuses that serve students in grades 7 and/or 8.

Standard:

- *Exemplary* – An Annual Dropout Rate of 0.2% or less.
- *Recognized* – An Annual Dropout Rate of 0.7% or less.
- *Academically Acceptable* – An Annual Dropout Rate of 1.0% or less.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of grade 7-8 dropouts}}{\text{number of grade 7-8 students who were in attendance at any time during the school year}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- *All Students.* These results are evaluated if:
 - there are at least 10 students in grades 7-8 *and*
 - there are at least 5 dropouts.
- *Student Groups.* These results are evaluated if there are at least 5 dropouts within the student group *and*:
 - there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students; or
 - there are at least 50 students within the student group.

Year of Data: 2005-06

Data Source: PEIMS submission 1 enrollment data 2005-06; PEIMS submission 1 leaver data, 2006-07; PEIMS submission 3 attendance data, 2005-06.

Other Information:

- *School Leaver Provision for 2007.* In 2007, a campus or district dropout rate cannot be the cause for a lowered rating. As a safeguard to this provision, districts are subject to identification and intervention by Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) for dropout rates and leaver reporting. Additionally, campuses that avoid being rated *Academically Unacceptable* due to this provision will be subject to technical assistance team (TAT) intervention requirements in the 2007-08 school year.
- *Cumulative Attendance.* A cumulative count of students is used in the denominator. This method for calculating the dropout rate neutralizes the effects of mobility by including in the denominator every student ever reported in attendance at the campus or district throughout the school year, regardless of length of stay.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 2.49% is rounded to 2.5%, and 0.25% is rounded to 0.3%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.
- *Special Education.* Dropouts served in special education programs are included in this measure.

Chapter 3 – The Basics: *Additional Features*

As shown in *Chapter 2 – The Basics: Base Indicators*, districts and campuses can achieve a rating by meeting the absolute standards for the different indicators. However, under certain conditions, a campus or district can achieve a rating:

- by meeting *Required Improvement (RI)*; and/or
- by using the *Exceptions Provision*.

Additionally, under certain circumstances a district’s rating may be restricted to *Academically Acceptable*. These additional requirements for districts are explained in the last part of this chapter.

All additional features are applied and calculated automatically by TEA before ratings are released. Districts and campuses do not need to request the use of additional features.

Required Improvement to *Academically Acceptable*

Campuses or districts initially rated *Academically Unacceptable* may achieve an *Academically Acceptable* rating using the Required Improvement feature.

Who is evaluated for Required Improvement: Districts and campuses whose performance is *Academically Unacceptable* for any TAKS subject, SDAA II, or Completion Rate I measure evaluated. Note that because of the change to the NCES dropout definition, no Required Improvement is possible for the Annual Dropout Rate indicator in 2007.

TAKS

Improvement Standard: In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district to *Academically Acceptable*, the campus or district must have shown enough improvement on the deficient TAKS measures since 2006 to be able to meet the current year accountability standard in two years.

There are different standards for the *Academically Acceptable* rating for TAKS:

- *Reading/ELA, Writing, and Social Studies.* Any measure below the standard must achieve enough gain to meet a standard of **65%** in two years.
- *Mathematics.* Any measure below the standard must achieve enough gain to meet a standard of **45%** in two years.
- *Science.* Any measure below the standard must achieve enough gain to meet a standard of **40%** in two years.

Methodology: The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Actual Change} \\ \text{[performance in 2007]} - \text{[performance in 2006]} \geq \frac{\text{Required Improvement}}{2} \\ \frac{\text{[standard for 2007]} - \text{[performance in 2006]}}{2} \end{array}$$

Example. For 2007, a high school campus has performance above the *Academically Acceptable* standard in all areas except for their Economically Disadvantaged student group in TAKS mathematics; only 39% met the standard. Their performance in 2006 for the same group and subject was 29%.

First calculate their *actual change*:

$$39 - 29 = 10$$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{45 - 29}{2} = 8$$

Then compare the two numbers to see if the *actual change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*:

$$10 \geq 8$$

Result: the campus meets Required Improvement, so its rating is *Academically Acceptable*.

Minimum Size Requirements: In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have test results (for the subject and student group) for at least 10 students in 2006.

Other Information:

- *Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.* The 2007 performance results of students who were displaced during the 2005-06 school year due to the hurricanes are included in the 2007 accountability data. This means that Required Improvement will be based on 2007 data that includes these students, compared with 2006 results that do not.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are done on performance rates and standards that have been rounded to whole numbers. Required Improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

SDAA II

Improvement Standard: In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district to *Academically Acceptable*, the campus or district must have shown enough improvement on the SDAA II indicator since 2006 to be at a standard of **50%** in two years.

Methodology: The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

Actual Change	Required Improvement
[performance in 2007] – [performance in 2006] ≥	$\frac{[50] - [\text{performance in 2006}]}{2}$

Minimum Size Requirements: In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have SDAA II results for at least 10 tests in 2006.

Other Information:

- *Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.* The 2007 performance results of students who were displaced during the 2005-06 school year due to the hurricanes are included in the 2007

accountability data. This means that Required Improvement will be based on 2007 data that includes these students, compared with 2006 results that do not.

- *All Students.* Performance for the percent *Meeting ARD Expectations* is evaluated for All Students only. Student group performance is not evaluated separately.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are done on performance rates and standards that have been rounded to whole numbers. Required improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

COMPLETION RATE I

Improvement Standard: In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district to *Academically Acceptable*, the campus or district must have shown enough improvement on the deficient Completion Rate I measures between the classes of 2005 and 2006 to be at a standard of **75.0%** in two years.

Methodology: The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{\text{Actual Change}}{\text{[completion rate for class of 2006] minus [completion rate for class of 2005]}} \geq \frac{\text{Required Improvement}}{\frac{[75.0] - [\text{completion rate for class of 2005}]}{2}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have had at least 10 students (in the same student group) in the class of 2005 completion rate.

Other Information:

- *District Substitution.* Campuses that serve students in grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12 but do not have their own completion rate will be evaluated using their districts' completion rates. Depending on the school's configuration over the years, the district rate may be used for current year, prior year, or both in determining if it met Required Improvement.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 2.85% is rounded to 2.9%, not 3%.

Required Improvement to *Recognized*

Who is evaluated for Required Improvement: Districts and campuses whose performance is at the high end of *Academically Acceptable* for any TAKS subject, SDAA II, or Completion Rate I, and who also meet the minimum "floor" for prior year performance. Note that because of the change to the NCES dropout definition, no Required Improvement is possible for the Annual Dropout Rate indicator in 2007.

TAKS

Improvement Standard: In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*, the campus or district must have:

- performance ranging from 70% to 74% on the measure, and
- shown enough improvement on TAKS since 2006 to be at **75%** in two years.

Methodology: The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Actual Change} \\ \text{[performance in 2007]} - \text{[performance in 2006]} \end{array} \geq \frac{\begin{array}{c} \text{Required Improvement} \\ \text{[75]} - \text{[performance in 2006]} \end{array}}{2}$$

Example. For 2007, a district has performance above the *Recognized* standard in all areas except for their Economically Disadvantaged student group in TAKS science; only 70% met the standard. Their performance in 2006 for the same group and subject was 66%.

First determine if their current year performance is *at or above the floor* of 70%:

$$70 \geq 70$$

Next calculate their *actual change*:

$$70 - 66 = 4$$

Then calculate the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{75 - 66}{2} = 5 \text{ (4.5 rounds to 5)}$$

Finally, compare the two numbers to see if the *actual change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*:

$$4 \text{ is not greater than or equal to } 5$$

Result: the district does not meet Required Improvement, so its rating remains *Academically Acceptable*.

Minimum Size Requirements: For Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have test results (for the subject and student group) for at least 10 students in 2006.

Other Information:

- *Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.* The 2007 performance results of students who were displaced during the 2005-06 school year due to the hurricanes are included in the 2007 accountability data. This means that Required Improvement will be based on 2007 data that includes these students, compared with 2006 results that do not.
- *Standards.* The *Recognized* standard for the TAKS indicator (75%) is the same for all subjects.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are done on performance rates and standards that have been rounded to whole numbers. Required Improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

SDAA II

Improvement Standard: In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*, the campus or district must have:

- performance ranging from 65% to 69% on the measure, and

- shown enough improvement on SDAA II since 2006 to be at **70%** in two years.

Methodology: The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{\text{Actual Change}}{[\text{performance in 2007}] - [\text{performance in 2006}]} \geq \frac{\text{Required Improvement}}{[70] - [\text{performance in 2006}]}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have at least 10 test results for SDAA II in 2006.

Other Information:

- *Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.* The 2007 performance results of students who were displaced during the 2005-06 school year due to the hurricanes are included in the 2007 accountability data. This means that Required Improvement will be based on 2007 data that includes these students, compared with 2006 results that do not.
- *All Students.* Performance for the percent *Meeting ARD Expectations* is evaluated for All Students only. Student group performance is not evaluated separately.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are done on performance rates and standards that have been rounded to whole numbers. Required improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

COMPLETION RATE I

Improvement Standard: In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*, the campus or district must have:

- a completion rate ranging from 80.0% to 84.9% on the measure, and
- shown enough improvement on the deficient completion rate measures between the classes of 2005 and 2006 to be at **85.0%** in two years.

Methodology: The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{\text{Actual Change}}{[\text{completion rate for class of 2006}] \text{ minus } [\text{completion rate for class of 2005}]} \geq \frac{\text{Required Improvement}}{[85.0] - [\text{completion rate for class of 2005}]}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have had at least 10 students (in the same student group) in the class of 2005 completion rate.

Other Information:

- *District Substitution.* Campuses that serve students in grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12 but do not have their own completion rate will be evaluated using their districts' completion rates. Depending on the school's configuration over the years, the district rate may be used for current year, prior year, or both in determining if it met Required Improvement.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 2.85% is rounded to 2.9%, not 3%.

Exceptions

Campuses or districts evaluated as *Academically Unacceptable* after application of Required Improvement may be able to “gate up” to *Academically Acceptable* using up to three exceptions for TAKS and/or SDAA II measures.

The Exceptions Provision provides relief to larger campuses and districts with more diverse student populations who are evaluated on more measures.

The number of exceptions available for a campus or district is dependent on the number of assessment measures on which the campus or district is evaluated, as shown in the following table.

Number of Assessment Measures Evaluated	Maximum Number of Exceptions Allowed
1 – 5	0 exceptions
6 – 10	1 exception
11 – 15	2 exceptions
16 or more	3 exceptions

The Exceptions Provision applies to any of the 25 TAKS measures (5 subjects multiplied by 5 groups: All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged), and the SDAA II measure. The Exceptions Provision does not apply to either Completion Rate I or Annual Dropout Rate indicators.

Other Information:

- *Performance Floor.* Performance on the measure to which the Exceptions Provision will be applied must be no more than five percentage points below the accountability standard for the *Academically Acceptable* rating. In the example below, the high school qualifies to use their exceptions because both their mathematics and science performance were within five points of the standards of 45% and 40%, respectively.
- *One-Time Use.* An exception will not be granted for the same measure for two consecutive years. For example, if a campus was granted an exception for white student science performance in 2006, the campus is not eligible for an exception for white student science performance in 2007. In the example below the high school will not be able to use exceptions on economically disadvantaged performance in TAKS mathematics or science in 2008.
- *Only Successful Application.* The Exceptions Provision is only applied if it will successfully move a campus or district from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*. For example, a campus may be eligible for two exceptions, but if it actually needs three exceptions in order to raise its rating to *Academically Acceptable*, then no exceptions are used; the campus remains *Academically Unacceptable*. This means that in 2008, all measures will be eligible for use as exceptions since none were used in 2007.
- *Only for Assessment.* The provision applies to assessment measures, TAKS and SDAA II, not to the Completion Rate I or Annual Dropout Rate indicators. That is, if a campus or district is *Academically Unacceptable* due to either the Completion Rate I or Annual Dropout Rate indicators, the Exceptions Provision is not applied.

Example. A large high school with a diverse population is evaluated on all student groups for reading/ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies, for a total of 20 measures. Their performance on all indicators meets the *Academically Acceptable* standards except for the performance of their economically disadvantaged students in mathematics (41%) and science (38%), and they did not demonstrate Required Improvement for either of these measures.

Performance on mathematics and science are within five points of the standards (45% and 40%, respectively). Because they are evaluated on 16 or more assessment measures, (20) they are eligible to use up to three exceptions. Therefore, their performance in these two areas meets the Exceptions Provision requirements.

Result: the campus rating is *Academically Acceptable*. The two exception areas must be addressed in their campus improvement plan.

Note: Because of the one-time exception rule, the campus will not be eligible to use exceptions for either of these measures (economically disadvantaged students in mathematics and economically disadvantaged students in science) in 2008.

- *Appeals.* Exceptions are automatically calculated and assigned prior to the release of ratings. There is no need to appeal for exceptions to be applied.
- *Other “Charged” Exceptions.* There are cases where a district or campus may be “charged” with an exception in the process of Special Analysis, or in granting appeals. In these cases, the campus or district is not able to use that exception in the following year. For example, districts or campuses granted an appeal in 2006 due to coding errors on the SDAA II answer documents were charged an exception and were notified that they will not be able to use an exception for SDAA II in 2007.
- *Only for Academically Acceptable.* The Exceptions Provision is only applied at the *Academically Unacceptable* rating level to move the campus or district to the *Academically Acceptable* rating. It cannot be used to move a campus or district to *Recognized* or *Exemplary*.
- *Move only one level.* The Exceptions Provision cannot be used to move up more than one rating level. For example, if a campus meets the *Exemplary* criteria on all accountability measures except for one assessment measure, and fails to meet the *Academically Acceptable* criteria on that one measure, the Exceptions Provision will only move the campus from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*.
- *Campus Improvement Plan.* Any campus that uses one or more exceptions must address performance on those measures to which the exceptions are applied in its campus improvement plan.

Additional Issues for Districts

DISTRICTS WITH *ACADEMICALLY UNACCEPTABLE* CAMPUSES

Any district that has one or more campuses rated *Academically Unacceptable* cannot receive a rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*. However, the *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating does not prevent an *Exemplary* or *Recognized* district rating.

UNDERREPORTED STUDENTS

Beginning with the 2006-07 PEIMS data collection, there are significant differences to the procedures for collecting leaver data. Now a leaver is defined to be a student who is enrolled in Texas public school in grades 7-12 in the prior year and does not return to Texas public school during the school-start window in the following fall. A student who moves or officially transfers from one Texas public school district to another is no longer reported as a leaver, meaning districts are no longer required to report leaver reason codes for these students. This is a significant change from previous reporting requirements. The determination of whether students are movers is made by TEA by checking other districts' enrollment and attendance records.

Students without leaver records who cannot be confirmed by TEA to be returning students, movers, previous Texas graduates, or GED recipients become underreported students. See *Appendix I* for more information.

In order to maintain a rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*, districts must not exceed the accountability standards for underreporting students.

Standard: Because key features of the leaver reporting system are new, the underreported standards for 2007 have been changed from the standards published in the *2006 Accountability Manual*. Districts must meet the standard for both of the following measures in order to maintain a rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*:

- *Count of Underreported Students:* Must be fewer than or equal to 200 (compared to 100 previously published).
- *Percent of Underreported Students:* Must be less than or equal to 5.0% (compared to 1.5% previously published for 2007).

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of underreported students}}{\text{number of students served in grades 7-12 in previous school year}} \leq 5.0\%$$

Numerator: Underreported students are those 2005-06 students in grades 7–12 who are not accounted for by TEA as returning students, movers, previous Texas graduates or GED recipients, and for whom no school leaver record can be found.

Denominator: The denominator is an unduplicated count of students who were reported in enrollment in 2005-06 PEIMS submission 1 or in attendance in 2005-06 PEIMS submission 3.

Minimum Size Requirements: Districts with 5 or more underreported students will be evaluated.

Data Source and Year: PEIMS submission 1 (October 2005, October 2006); PEIMS submission 3 (June 2006)

Other Information:

- *School Leaver Provision for 2007.* Due to a number of factors—change in the definition of a dropout, changes to the PEIMS leaver data collection, and the effect of students displaced by Hurricane Katrina on the 2005-06 dropout rate—the School Leaver

Provision has been added for 2007. This means that a district's underreported student count or rate cannot be the cause for a lowered rating.

- *System Safeguard*. Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) will continue to evaluate this indicator at the 2007 standards in its Data Validation system. This will provide a safeguard feature to the use of the School Leaver Provision for this indicator in the state rating system.
- *Unduplicated Count*. The methodology eliminates any duplicate records. For example, students are not counted twice because they appear on both attendance and enrollment records.
- *Rounding*. This calculation is rounded to one decimal place. For example, 5.46% is rounded to 5.5%, not 5%.

ADDITIONAL STUDENTS IN DISTRICT RATINGS

Generally speaking, districts are held accountable for the performance of all their students, including those who attend alternative education campuses that are registered for evaluation under AEA procedures. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information on various campus situations and how they affect the district's performance data.

Additionally, districts are responsible for the performance of students who are not in any campus accountability subset because they changed campuses within the district between the October "as of" date and the date of testing. See *Table 3* in *Chapter 2 – The Basics: Base Indicators* for more information on the accountability subset.

Chapter 4 – The Basics: *Determining a Rating*

The previous two chapters described the base indicators and the additional features of the system (Required Improvement and the Exceptions Provision). This chapter describes how to use the indicator data results with the additional features to determine campus and district ratings. The ratings for the overwhelming majority of campuses and districts can be determined this way. Some campuses and districts must be evaluated using different procedures. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for details about which campuses and districts are affected and how they are evaluated.

WHO IS RATED?

The state accountability system is required to rate all districts and campuses that serve students in grades 1 through 12. The first step is to identify the universe of districts and campuses that can be considered for a rating. For 2007, the universe is determined to be those districts and campuses that reported students in membership in any grades (early education through grade 12) in the fall of the 2006-07 school year. The universe is then divided into those campuses and districts to be evaluated under Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) procedures (see *Part 2 – Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures*) and those evaluated using standard procedures. Most districts and campuses identified for standard procedures receive one of the four primary rating labels (*Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Academically Acceptable*, or *Academically Unacceptable*). Some receive a label of *Not Rated*. Rating labels and their uses are described below.

Once the universe of standard campuses and districts is established, the next step is to determine if the district or campus has TAKS results on which it can be evaluated. In order to attain one of the four primary rating labels, districts and campuses must have at least one TAKS test result in the accountability subset. An effort is made through the pairing process to supply TAKS results to campuses (with any grades from 1 to 12) with no students in the grades tested so that they can also be evaluated. For more information on pairing see *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances*.

Districts and campuses that have only SDAA II results, only completion rates, only dropout rates, or only combinations of these three will not receive one of the four primary ratings in 2007. To be eligible to be *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Academically Acceptable*, or *Academically Unacceptable*, TAKS results are required and *only* TAKS results are required. Districts and campuses need not have data for the SDAA II, dropout, or completion indicators in order to receive a rating. Furthermore, performance on any one of the TAKS subjects is sufficient for a rating to be assigned (science, mathematics, reading/ELA, writing, or social studies).

Though at least one TAKS tester (in the accountability subset) is required to be considered for a rating, some places with very small numbers of total TAKS test results may ultimately receive a *Not Rated* label. The process of Special Analysis is employed when there are very small numbers of total test takers to determine if a rating is appropriate. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for details about Special Analysis.

STANDARD RATING LABELS

Rating labels for districts are specified in statute. For 2007, standard campuses and districts will be assigned one of the following rating labels.

Table 4: Standard Rating Labels

	District or Charter Operator Use	Campus Use (non-charter and charter)
<i>Exemplary</i>	Used for districts or charter operators with at least one TAKS test result (in any subject) in the accountability subset. Small numbers subject to Special Analysis.	Used for campuses serving grades 1-12 with at least one TAKS test result (in any subject) in the accountability subset. Includes campuses with TAKS data due to pairing. Small numbers subject to Special Analysis.
<i>Recognized</i>		
<i>Academically Acceptable</i>		
<i>Academically Unacceptable</i>		
<i>Not Rated: Other</i>	Used for districts or charter operators in the unlikely event that there is insufficient data to rate due to no TAKS results in the accountability subset.	Used if the campus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ has no students enrolled in grades higher than kindergarten; ○ has insufficient data to rate due to no TAKS results in the accountability subset; ○ has insufficient data to rate through Special Analysis due to very small numbers of TAKS results in the accountability subset; ○ is a designated Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP) or a designated Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP).
<i>Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues</i>	<p>Used in the rare situation where the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results are compromised and it is not possible to assign a rating label based on the evaluation of performance. This label may be assigned temporarily pending an on-site investigation or may be assigned as the final rating label for the year.</p> <p>This rating label is not equivalent to an <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> rating. The Commissioner of Education also has the authority to lower a rating or assign an <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> rating to address problems with the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results that are discovered through accountability system safeguards, Performance-Based Monitoring, or other monitoring and compliance reviews.</p> <p>Data quality is considered to be a district responsibility. It is possible for a district rating to be <i>Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues</i> without any of its campuses having that rating label. If any campus within a district receives a rating of <i>Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues</i>, then the district's rating will be affected. The district may receive a rating of <i>Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues</i>, either temporarily or permanently, or the district's rating may also be changed to <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> for data quality reasons.</p> <p>See <i>Chapter 15 – Responsibilities and Consequences</i> for more information about the circumstances that trigger this rating label.</p>	

Registered alternative education campuses will receive ratings under the AEA procedures. See *Chapter 12 – AEA Ratings* for information on the AEA rating labels.

NOTIFICATION OF RATINGS (AUGUST 1, 2007)

Notification of campus and district accountability ratings will occur on August 1, 2007. This consists of release of the campus and district data tables and the district summary reports on TEA’s website. Ratings for both standard and registered alternative education campuses (AECs) will be included.

NOTIFICATION OF RATINGS (LATE OCTOBER, 2007)

Accountability ratings are finalized when the accountability appeals process is completed. Agency web products related to state accountability (both public and secure sites) will be updated to reflect the outcome of appeals and to add the Gold Performance Acknowledgments information in late October, 2007. See *Chapter 18 – Calendar* and *Chapter 14 – Appealing the Ratings* for more information.

USING THE DATA TABLE TO DETERMINE A RATING

In late July, prior to finalizing all computations necessary for accountability ratings, TEA will provide districts with access to preview data tables for the district and each campus within the district through the TEASE website.

These tables will *not* show a rating and will *not* provide calculations for Required Improvement or the Exceptions Provision. However, using the data on the tables and the *2007 Accountability Manual*, districts can anticipate their ratings in advance of the TEA ratings release. *These preview data tables will contain unmasked data and must be treated as confidential.* That is, information that reveals the performance of an individual student may be shown.

Sample data tables (unmasked) are excerpted on the following pages to present a step-by-step explanation of how ratings are determined.

Table 5: Sample Data Table

This preview information is confidential.

Preview data tables similar to this one will be made available to districts in late July. Final data tables will be available on the public and secure websites on August 1st.

This indicates that this campus was evaluated under standard procedures. AECs will receive a different data table. See *Part 2 – Alternative Education Accountability Procedures*.

July 2007
Confidential

2007 (PREVIEW) ACCOUNTABILITY DATA TABLES – STANDARD PROCEDURES

PAGE 1

DISTRICT NAME: SAMPLE
CAMPUS NAME: SAMPLE SCHOOL
CAMPUS NUMBER: 999999999

Campus Rating: 06 - 12
Grade Span:

Ratings are not available for the preview tables; this area is blank.

Analysis groups used to determine ratings are marked with an 'X'.
Academically Acceptable standards are shown in parentheses.

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS) TABLE

Performance Results	2007				2006			Required Improvement			
	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Stu Grp %	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?
Reading/ELA (65%)											
X All Students	137	209	66%	100%	144	214	67%		-1		
X African Amer	90	136	66%	65%	107	144	74%		-8		
X Hispanic	47	72	65%	34%	36	69	52%		13		
X White	0	0	-	0%	1	1	100%		-		
X Econ Disadv	137	207	66%	99%	144	214	67%		-1		
Writing (65%)											
X All Students	66	74	89%	100%	62	92	67%		22		
X African Amer	45	51	88%	69%	40	55	73%		15		
X Hispanic	21	23	91%	31%	21	36	58%		33		
X White	0	0	-	0%	1	1	100%		-		
X Econ Disadv	65	73	89%	99%	62	92	67%		22		
Social Studies (65%)											
X All Students	50	75	67%	100%	61	88	69%		-2		
X African Amer	34	46	74%	61%	50	64	78%		-4		
X Hispanic	16	28	57%	37%	11	24	46%		11		
X White	0	0	-	0%	0	0	-		-		
X Econ Disadv	50	74	68%	99%	61	88	69%		-1		
Mathematics (45%)											
X All Students	108	208	52%	100%	74	226	33%		19		
X African Amer	70	135	52%	65%	53	142	37%		15		
X Hispanic	38	72	53%	35%	21	83	25%		28		
X White	0	0	-	0%	0	1	0%		-		
X Econ Disadv	108	206	52%	99%	74	226	33%		19		
Science (40%)											
X All Students	116	122	95%	100%	75	85	88%		7		
X African Amer	13	15	87%	12%	12	16	75%		12		
X Hispanic	30	33	91%	27%	7	10	70%		21		
X White	63	64	98%	52%	51	54	94%		4		
X Econ Disadv	17	20	85%	16%	13	18	72%		13		

Note this new feature.

STATE-DEVELOPED ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT II (SDAA II) TABLE

SDAA II Results (50%)	2007				2006			Required Improvement			
	# Tests Met ARD	# Tests	Pct Met ARD	Stu Grp %	# Tests Met ARD	# Tests	Pct Met ARD	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?
X All Students	165	171	96%	100%	127	164	77%		19		

EXCEPTIONS TABLE

Number Msrs Evaluated	Number Allowed	Number Needed	Floor(s) Met?	Msr(s) Used in 2006?	Exceptions Applied
18	3				

RI, exceptions data, and rating do not appear here. These will be on the final data table on 8/1/2007.

DISTRICT NAME: SAMPLE
CAMPUS NAME: SAMPLE SCHOOL
CAMPUS NUMBER: 99999999

Campus Rating:
Grade Span: 06 - 12

Analysis groups used to determine ratings are marked with an 'X'.
Academically Acceptable standards are shown in parentheses.

COMPLETION RATE I TABLE (Gr. 9-12) (75.0%)

	Class of 2006					Class of 2005			Required Improvement			
	# Com-pleters	# dropouts	# in Class	Comp Rate	Stu Grp %	# Com-pleters	# in Class	Comp Rate	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?
X All Students	145	5	150	96.7%	100%	158	160	98.8%		-2.1		
African Amer	24	2	26	92.3%	17%	22	22	100.0%		-7.7		
Hispanic	31	2	33	93.9%	22%	43	44	97.7%		-3.8		
White	89	1	90	98.9%	60%	93	94	98.9%		0.0		
Econ Disadv	45	1	46	97.8%	31%	51	51	100.0%		-2.2		

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE TABLE (Gr. 7-8) (1.0%)

	# Dropouts	# 7-8 Graders	Dropout Rate	Stu Grp %
All Students	1	29	3.4%	100%
African Amer	1	1	100.0%	3%
Hispanic	0	4	0.0%	14%
White	0	23	0.0%	79%
Econ Disadv	1	10	10.0%	34%

Annual Dropout Rate for the prior year is not shown on report.

Due to the definitional changes, Annual Dropout Rate Required Improvement is not calculated in 2007.

RI, exceptions data, and rating do not appear here. These will be on the final data table on 8/1/2007.

The design of both the preview and final data tables may vary slightly from the samples shown.

TAKS

Analysis Group Marker – An 'X' to the left of a group label indicates that performance results for that group are used to determine an accountability rating because minimum size criteria were met. If no 'X' appears, then the size minimums were not met and performance results for that group are not used to determine the accountability rating. Note that 'All Students' results for TAKS are always evaluated.

Percent Met Standard – This value is the key number for TAKS: it shows what percent of the student group passed that test.

Performance Results	2007			
	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Stu Grp %
Reading/ELA (65%)				
X All Students	137	209	66%	100%
X African Amer	90	136	66%	65%
X Hispanic	47	72	65%	34%
White	0	0	-	0%
X Econ Disadv	137	207	66%	99%
Writing (65%)				
X All Students	66	74	89%	100%
X African Amer	45	51	88%	69%
Hispanic	21	23	91%	31%
White	0	0	-	0%
X Econ Disadv	65	73	89%	99%

Number Met Standard – This value is the numerator used to calculate percent met standard.

Number Taking – This value is the denominator used to calculate percent met standard.

SDAA II

The SDAA II has only one measure: percent met ARD expectations (summed across grades and subjects; All Students only.)

STATE-DEVELOPED ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT II (SDAA II) TABLE				
----- 2007 -----				
SDAA II Results (50%)	# Tests Met ARD	# Tests	Pct Met ARD	Stu Grp %
X All Students	165	171	96%	100%

Number of Tests – This value is the denominator used to calculate the percent met ARD Expectations. There must be at least 30 tests for SDAA II to be evaluated.

Number of Tests that Met ARD Expectations – This value is the numerator used to calculate the percent met ARD Expectations.

Completion Rate

COMPLETION RATE I TABLE (Gr. 9-12) (75.0%)				
----- Class of 2006 -----				
	# Completers	# dropouts	# in Class	Comp Rate
X All Students	145	5	150	96.7%
African Amer	24	2	26	92.3%
Hispanic	31	2	33	93.9%
White	89	1	90	98.9%
Econ Disadv	45	1	46	97.8%

To calculate the completion rate, divide the *number of completers* (in this example, 145) by the *number in the class of 2006* (150). This equals the *completion rate* (96.7%). The completion rate for this campus is within the *Exemplary* level.

Number in Class – This value is the denominator used to calculate the completion rate. Due to space limitations, the number of GED recipients is not shown as a separate column. These students are included in the # in Class.

Number of Completers – This value is the numerator used to calculate the completion rate. (It does not include GED recipients.)

Minimum Size – The *number of dropouts* and the *number in class* are used together to determine whether there are enough students for a group to be evaluated.

Annual Dropout Rate

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE TABLE (Gr. 7-8) (1.0%)			
----- 2005-06 -----			
	# Dropouts	# 7-8 Graders	Dropout Rate
All Students	1	29	3.4%
African Amer	1	1	100.0%
Hispanic	0	4	0.0%
White	0	23	0.0%
Econ Disadv	1	10	10.0%

To calculate the annual dropout rate, divide the *number of dropouts* by the *number of 7th and 8th graders*.

Number of 7th and 8th Graders – This value is the denominator used to calculate the annual dropout rate.

Number of Dropouts – This value is the numerator used to calculate the annual dropout rate.

Minimum Size – Note that at this campus there was only one dropout, fewer than the minimum number required (5) for the indicator to be evaluated.

Student Group Percent

Student group percentages are shown to help explain which student groups meet the minimum size criteria for the indicator. These percents are rounded to whole numbers.

Performance Results	2007		Pct Met Std	Stu Grp %
	Number Met Std	Number Taking		
Social Studies				
X All Students	28	50	56%	100%
X African Amer	25	44	57%	88%
Hispanic	2	4	50%	8%
White	1	1	100%	2%
X Econ Disadv	27	49	55%	98%

At this campus note that while the number of African American and Economically Disadvantaged students is between 30 and 50, their student group percents are much higher than the minimum size criteria of 10%. An "X" indicates that these two groups are analyzed for this subject.

Required Improvement

Campuses and districts may achieve a higher rating using *Required Improvement*. In 2007, it can be applied to three base indicators – TAKS, SDAA II, and Completion – to raise a rating from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable* or to raise a rating from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*. All calculations for Required Improvement will be done automatically by TEA and shown on the final data tables.

Performance Results	2007				2006			Required Improvement			
	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Stu Grp %	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?
Reading/ELA (65%)											
X All Students	1,048	1,564	67%	100%	1,066	1,476	72%		-5		
X African Amer	494	753	66%	48%	465	686	68%		-2		
X Hispanic	238	395	60%	25%	219	348	63%	yes	-3		
X White	282	373	76%	24%	347	399	87%	yes	-11		
X Econ Disadv	343	566	61%	36%	309	486	64%		-3		
Mathematics (45%)											
X All Students	540	940	56%	100%	755	1,436	53%		3		
X African Amer	739	1,673	44%	48%	273	673	41%		3		
X Hispanic	390	740	52%	25%	159	327	49%	yes	3		
X White	367	457	80%	24%	288	391	74%		6		
X Econ Disadv	557	1,114	45%	36%	184	469	39%		6		

At this campus, all performance is at the *Academically Acceptable* standard or above for all measures except TAKS reading and mathematics.

To see if the rating can be raised by applying Required Improvement, first check to see if each measure meets the minimum size for the prior year (at least 10 test takers).

This campus meets the minimum size for Required Improvement.

Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?
1,066	1,476	72%		-5		
465	686	68%		-2		
219	348	63%	yes	-3	1	no
347	399	87%		-11		
309	486	64%	yes	-3	1	no
755	1,436	53%		3		
273	673	41%	yes	3	2	yes
159	327	49%		3		
288	391	74%		6		
184	469	39%		6		

Next, determine the Required Improvement: The formula is *the standard for 2007 minus the campus's performance in 2006, divided by 2*.

Finally, for each measure, see if the actual change is greater than or equal to the Required Improvement. A negative number indicates performance has declined.

This campus met Required Improvement in one measure, but not the other two.

Exceptions

Campuses or districts evaluated to be *Academically Unacceptable* even after applying Required Improvement may be able to “gate up” to *Academically Acceptable* using the Exceptions Provision for the TAKS and/or SDAA II measures. (Exceptions cannot be used to move a campus or district to *Recognized* or *Exemplary*.)

This campus was evaluated on 21 assessment measures, so it is allowed up to 3 exceptions.

After applying Required Improvement, this campus has 2 measures that are still at *Academically Unacceptable*.

Next, determine if the 2007 performance in the deficient areas meets the floor: each must be no more than 5 percentage points below the standard (at least 60% for reading).

EXCEPTIONS TABLE

Number Msrs Evaluated	Number Allowed	Number Needed	Floor(s) Met?	Msr(s) Used in 2006?	Exceptions Applied
21	3	2	yes	no	Reading - Hispanic Reading - Econ. Disadvantaged

Finally, check to make sure this measure was not used in 2006 (*exceptions cannot be repeated for the same subject and student group in consecutive years*). These measures were not used in 2006, so this campus is able to use two of their three exceptions and gate up to a rating of *Academically Acceptable*.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON AUGUST DATA TABLES

The sample shown is of a *preview* data table. These will be made available to districts on the TEASE website in late July. Data tables with rating labels will be released on August 1, 2007.

The following items are the additional information not present on the preview, but added to the August data tables and the updated tables released in October:

- *Accountability Ratings.* (A list of possible rating labels is shown in *Table 4* in this chapter.)
- *Pairing.* Any standard campus with enrollment within grades 1-12, but no students tested on TAKS will be paired for accountability. A message will indicate the campus it is paired with.
- *Messages.* These messages appear in the top section of the data table when applicable:
 - Special Analysis used. (*campus or district*)
 - Rating change due to appeal. (*campus or district*)
 - Rating is not based on data shown in the table. (*campus or district*)
 - District rating limited to *Academically Acceptable* due to having one or more *Academically Unacceptable* campuses. (*district only*)
 - Rating changed after [date] due to Data Integrity Issues. (*campus or district*)
 - Rating is not based on data shown in the table (School Leaver Provision used). (*campus or district*)
 - Grade 8 science results are not included because they are not used in the 2007 accountability system. (*campus or district with grade 8*)
 - Special Analysis used. Exception applied for [subject - student group] (*campus or district*)

- *Required Improvement.* The final data table shows all calculations for Required Improvement:
 - Met Min Size - Met Minimum Size shows “yes” or “no.”
 - RI - This shows the amount of change needed for Required Improvement to be met.
 - Met RI? - If Required Improvement is calculated, this shows “yes” or “no” depending on the comparison of actual change to the change needed (RI).
 - *Blank* - If Required Improvement is not applicable, the columns are blank.
 - *Footnotes.* A footnote appears if the Required Improvement floor is not met thus preventing the use of Required Improvement to change a rating from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*.
- *Exceptions.* The final data table shows all calculations for the Exceptions Provision:
 - Number Needed - This shows the number of assessment measures below the *Academically Acceptable* standard that did not meet Required Improvement.
 - Floor(s) Met? - This shows “yes” or “no” depending on whether or not the performance floor was met for all the assessment measures needing exception. If any don’t meet the floor, “no” appears.
 - Msr(s) Used in 2006? – The same exception cannot be used in consecutive years. This shows “yes” or “no” depending on whether or not any of the exceptions needed in 2007 were used in 2006.
 - Exceptions Applied - This shows the subject and group for which an exception is used. Up to three may be listed.
 - *Blank* - If the Exceptions Provision is not applicable, only the *Number Msrs Evaluated* and *Number Allowed* columns show a number; other areas are blank.

Masked Data

Performance posted to the public website is masked when there are fewer than five students in the denominator of the measure. Additionally, all performance at or near 0% or 100% is masked. It is necessary to mask data that potentially reveals the performance of every student to be in compliance with the *Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act* (FERPA).

SYSTEM SUMMARY

The following tables summarize the 2007 system. *Table 6* provides an overview of the requirements for each rating level. A district or campus must meet the criteria for every applicable measure to be rated *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, or *Academically Acceptable*; otherwise the next lower rating is assigned. The Exceptions Provision can elevate to a rating of *Academically Acceptable* but no higher.

Districts can have no *Academically Unacceptable* campuses to receive a rating of *Recognized* or *Exemplary*. They must also not have excessive underreported students; however, for 2007, the School Leaver Provision means a district’s underreported student count or rate cannot be the cause for a lowered rating.

Table 7 is a single-page overview that provides details of the 2007 system, with the base indicators listed as columns. For each of the indicators, users can see brief definitions, the rounding methodology, the accountability subset methodology, the standards, minimum size criteria, subjects and student groups used, application of Required Improvement, and the Exceptions Provision.

Table 6: Requirements for Each Rating Category

	Academically Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
Base Indicators			
TAKS (2006-07) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students and each student group meeting minimum size: • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv. 	meets each standard: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/ELA ... 65% • Writing 65% • Social Studies.. 65% • Mathematics 45% • Science 40% OR meets Required Improvement	meets 75% standard for each subject OR meets 70% floor and Required Improvement	meets 90% standard for each subject
SDAA II (2007) All students (if meets minimum size criteria)	Meets 50% standard (Met ARD Expectations) OR meets Required Improvement	Meets 70% standard (Met ARD Expectations) OR meets 65% floor and Required Improvement	Meets 90% standard (Met ARD Expectations)
Completion Rate I (class of 2006) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students and each student group meeting minimum size: • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv. 	meets 75.0% standard OR meets Required Improvement	meets 85.0% standard OR meets 80.0% floor and Required Improvement	meets 95.0% standard
Annual Dropout Rate (2005-06) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students and each student group meeting minimum size: • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv. 	meets 1.0% standard	meets 0.7% standard	meets 0.2% standard
Additional Provisions			
Exceptions	Applied if district/campus would be <i>AU</i> due to not meeting <i>AA</i> criteria. (See detailed explanation.)	Exceptions cannot be used to move to a rating of <i>Recognized</i> .	Exceptions cannot be used to move to a rating of <i>Exemplary</i> .
Check for Academically Unacceptable Campuses (District only)	Does not apply to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> districts.	A district with a campus rated <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> cannot be rated <i>Recognized</i> .	A district with a campus rated <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> cannot be rated <i>Exemplary</i> .
Underreported Students (District only)	Does not apply to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> districts.	A district that underreports more than 200 students or more than 5.0% of its prior year students cannot be rated <i>Recognized</i> .	A district that underreports more than 200 students or more than 5.0% of its prior year students cannot be rated <i>Exemplary</i> .
School Leaver Provision for 2007	A campus or district annual dropout rate, completion rate and/or underreported student measures cannot be the cause for a lowered rating.		

Table 7: Overview of 2007 System Components

	TAKS	SDAA II	Completion Rate I	Dropout Rate
Definition	Results (gr. 3-11) summed across grades by subject. ELA & reading results are combined. Cumulative results used for first two administrations of gr. 3 reading, gr. 5 reading & math.	A single (gr. 3-10) indicator calculated as the number of tests meeting ARD expectations (summed across grades & subjects) divided by the number of SDAA II tests.	Graduates and continuers expressed as a % of total students in the class. Campuses serving any of gr. 9-12 w/out a completion rate are assigned the district completion rate.	Gr. 7 and 8 dropouts as a % of total gr. 7 & 8 students who were in attendance any time during the prior school year.
Rounding	Whole Numbers	Whole Numbers	One Decimal	
Standards Exemplary Recognized Acceptable	Ex.: All Subjects ≥ 90% Re.: All Subjects ≥ 75% Acc.: Reading/ELA ≥ 65% Writ./Soc St ≥ 65% Mathematics ≥ 45% Science ≥ 40%	Ex.: ≥ 90% Re.: ≥ 70% Acc.: ≥ 50%	Ex.: ≥ 95.0% Re.: ≥ 85.0% Acc.: ≥ 75.0%	Ex.: ≤ 0.2% Re.: ≤ 0.7% Acc.: ≤ 1.0%
Mobility Adjustment (Accountability Subset)	<u>District ratings:</u> results for students enrolled in the district in the fall and tested in the same district. <u>Campus ratings:</u> results for students enrolled in the campus in the fall and tested in the same campus.		None	
Subjects	Reading/ELA gr. 3-11 Writing gr. 4, 7 Mathematics gr. 3-11 Social Studies gr. 8, 10, 11 Science gr. 5, 10, 11	Reading/ELA Writing Mathematics N/A N/A	N/A	
Student Groups	<u>All & Student Grps:</u> African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadv.	<u>All Students Only</u>	<u>All & Student Grps:</u> African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadv.	
Minimum Size Criteria				
All	No minimum size requirement—special analysis for small numbers	≥ 30 tests	≥ 5 dropouts AND ≥ 10 students	
Groups	30/10%/50	N/A	≥ 5 dropouts AND 30/10%/50	
Required Improvement (RI)				
Actual Chg	2007 minus 2006 performance	2007 minus 2006 performance	Class of 2006 rate minus Class of 2005 rate	N/A in 2007
RI	Gain needed to reach standard in 2 yrs.		Gain needed to reach standard in 2 yrs.	N/A in 2007
Use	Gate up to <i>Acceptable</i> and <i>Recognized</i>			N/A in 2007
Floor (Recognized)	≥ 70%		≥ 80.0%	N/A in 2007
Minimum Size	Meets minimum size in current year and has ≥ 10 students tested in prior year.	Meets minimum size in current year and has ≥ 10 tests in prior year.	Meets min. size current year and has ≥ 10 in prior year class.	N/A in 2007
Exceptions	This provision may be applied if the campus or district would be <i>AU</i> solely due to not meeting the <i>AA</i> criteria on up to 3 assessment measures. Applies to 26 measures.			N/A
Use	As a gate up to <i>Acceptable</i>			
Floor	No more than 5 percentage points below <i>Acceptable</i> std.			
Number of Exceptions Allowed (variable)	# of Assessment Measures Evaluated (at campus or district)	Maximum Exceptions Allowed		
	1 – 5	0		
	6 – 10	1		
	11 – 15	2		
	16 – 26	3		
School Leaver Provision for 2007	N/A		In 2007, campus/district rating will not be lowered due to annual dropout or completion rates.	

Chapter 5 – Gold Performance Acknowledgments

The Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) system acknowledges districts and campuses for high performance on indicators other than those used to determine accountability ratings. These indicators are in statute (*Texas Education Code*) or determined by the Commissioner of Education. Acknowledgment is given for high performance on:

- Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion
- Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate Results
- Attendance Rate
- Commended Performance: Reading/English Language Arts
- Commended Performance: Mathematics
- Commended Performance: Writing
- Commended Performance: Science
- Commended Performance: Social Studies
- Comparable Improvement: Reading/English Language Arts
- Comparable Improvement: Mathematics
- Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program
- SAT/ACT Results (College Admissions Tests)
- Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: English Language Arts
- Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: Mathematics

Acknowledgment Categories

Acknowledged. The campus or district is rated *Academically Acceptable* or higher, has results to be evaluated, and has met the acknowledgment criteria on one or more of the indicators. Acknowledgments are awarded separately on each of the 14 indicators.

Does Not Qualify. Either of the following:

- The campus or district has performance results to be evaluated but did not meet the acknowledgment criteria.
- The campus or district has performance results to be evaluated but is rated *Academically Unacceptable*. (Those that are later granted a higher rating on appeal are eligible to be evaluated and may earn acknowledgments.)

Not Applicable. Any of the following:

- The campus or district does not have results to be evaluated for the acknowledgment.
- The campus or charter is evaluated under alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures.
- The campus or district is labeled *Not Rated: Other* (for example, campuses that only serve students in Pre-K/K, or campuses not rated due to insufficient data).
- The campus or district is labeled *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*.
- The campus is paired. Campuses are not awarded acknowledgments for indicators that use paired data. Paired campuses may be acknowledged on their non-paired indicators.

Table 8: Gold Performance Acknowledgment Standards for 2007

Indicator	Description	Standard (changes for 2007 in bold)	Year of Data
Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion	Percent of 9 th –12 th graders completing and receiving credit for at least one Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course	25.0% or more**	2005-06
AP / IB Results	Percent of 11 th and 12 th graders taking at least one AP or IB examination <i>AND</i>	15.0% or more <i>AND</i>	2005-06
	Percent of 11 th and 12 th grade examinees scoring at or above the criterion on at least one examination (3 and above for AP; 4 and above for IB)	50.0% or more*	
Attendance Rate	Attendance Rate for students in grades 1-12, the total number of days present divided by the total number of days in membership	District: 96.0%** Multi-Level: 96.0%** High School: 95.0%** Middle/Jr High: 96.0%** Elementary: 97.0%**	2005-06
Commended Performance: Reading/ELA	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard (scale score of 2400 with a 2 or higher on the essay)	25% or more**	Spring 2007
Commended Performance: Mathematics	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard (scale score of 2400)	25% or more**	Spring 2007
Commended Performance: Writing	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard (scale score of 2400 with a 3 or higher on the essay)	25% or more**	Spring 2007
Commended Performance: Science	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard (scale score of 2400)	25% or more**	Spring 2007
Commended Performance: Social Studies	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard (scale score of 2400)	25% or more**	Spring 2007
Comparable Improvement: Reading/ELA	Average Texas Growth Index (TGI) in TAKS Reading/ELA	Top Quartile (top 25%)***	Spring 2007
Comparable Improvement: Mathematics	Average Texas Growth Index (TGI) in TAKS Mathematics	Top Quartile (top 25%)***	Spring 2007
Recommended High School Program/DAP	Percent of graduates meeting or exceeding requirements for the RHSP/Distinguished Achievement Program	80.0% or more**	Class of 2006
SAT/ACT Results	Percent of graduates taking either the SAT or ACT <i>AND</i>	At least 70.0% of graduates <i>AND</i>	Class of 2006
	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the criterion score (SAT 1110; ACT Composite 24)	40.0% or more at or above criterion*	
TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component: English Language Arts	Percent of grade 11 examinees with a scale score of 2200 or more and a score of 3 or higher on the essay	50% or more**	Spring 2007
TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component: Mathematics	Percent of grade 11 examinees with a scale score of 2200 or more	50% or more**	Spring 2007

* Indicator evaluates performance for All Students & the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, and White. Economically Disadvantaged status is not available from the testing results.

** Indicator evaluates performance for All Students & the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

*** Acknowledgment for Comparable Improvement is available to campuses only. It is evaluated for All Students only.

Acknowledgment Indicators

ADVANCED COURSE/DUAL ENROLLMENT COMPLETION

This indicator is based on a count of students who complete and receive credit for at least one advanced course in grades 9-12. Advanced courses include dual enrollment courses. Dual enrollment courses are those for which a student gets both high school and college credit. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for a link to a list of advanced courses.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses with grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12 that have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, at least 25.0% of the 2005-06 students in grades 9 through 12 must receive credit for at least one advanced course.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of students in grades 9 through 12 who received credit for at least one advanced course}}{\text{number of students in grades 9 through 12 who completed at least one course}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of students. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 students in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2005-06

Data Source: PEIMS submission 3 (June 2006)

Other information:

- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 24.879% is rounded to 24.9%, not 25.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

ADVANCED PLACEMENT/INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE RESULTS

This refers to the results of the College Board Advanced Placement (AP) examinations and the International Baccalaureate (IB) examinations taken by Texas public school students in a given school year. High school students may take these examinations, ideally upon completion of AP or IB courses, and may receive advanced placement or credit, or both, upon entering college. Generally, colleges will award credit or advanced placement for scores of 3, 4, or 5 on AP examinations and scores of 4, 5, 6, or 7 on IB examinations. Requirements vary by college and by subject tested.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses with grades 11 and/or 12 that have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must meet both a participation and a performance standard. It must:

- have 15.0% or more of its non-special education 11th and 12th graders taking at least one AP or IB examination; *and* of those tested,
- have 50.0 % or more scoring at or above the criterion score on at least one examination.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, and White.

Methodology:

Participation:

$$\frac{\text{number of 11th and 12th graders taking at least one AP or IB examination}}{\text{total non-special education students enrolled in 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ grades}}$$

and

Performance:

$$\frac{\text{number of 11th and 12th graders with at least one score at or above the criterion score}}{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ graders with at least one AP or IB examination}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers or number of non-special education students enrolled in the 11th and 12th grades. To be included in the evaluation for GPA, a student group must have:

- in the numerator of the participation measure: at least 10 test takers; and,
- in the denominator of the participation measure: at least 30 non-special education 11th and 12th graders;
 - if there are 30 to 49 students and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated; or
 - if the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2005-06 school year

Data Source: The College Board; The International Baccalaureate Organization; and PEIMS submission 1 (October 2005)

Other information:

- *Criterion Score.* The criterion score is 3 or above on Advanced Placement tests and 4 or above on International Baccalaureate examinations.
- *Special Education.* For *participation*, special education 11th and 12th graders who take an AP or IB examination are included in the numerator, but not the denominator. This may have a slight positive effect on the percent reported.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 49.9%, not 50.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

ATTENDANCE RATE

Attendance rates are based on student attendance for the entire school year for students in grades 1-12.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses whose grade span is within grades 1-12 and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: (Variable)

- District/Multi-Level campuses.... At least 96.0%
- Middle School/Junior High At least 96.0%
- High School At least 95.0%
- Elementary At least 97.0%

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were present in 2005-06}}{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were in membership in 2005-06}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: For attendance, the minimum size is based on total days in membership rather than individual student counts. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 5,400 total days in membership (30 students x 180 school days) for the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 5,400 to 8,999 total days in membership and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students total days in membership, it is evaluated.
- If there are at least 9,000 total days in membership (50 students x 180 school days) for the student group, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2005-06

Data Source: PEIMS submission 3 (June 2006)

Other information:

- *Campus Type.* The campus type (elementary, high school, etc.) is assigned using the low and high grades taught as determined from the 2006-07 PEIMS submission 1 enrollment records. Multi-level campuses are those that provide instruction in both the elementary and secondary grade level categories. Examples are K-12, K-8, and 6-12 campuses.
- *Time Span.* Attendance for the entire school year is used.
- *Special Education.* This measure includes both non-special education and special education students.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 95.877% is rounded to 95.9%, not 96.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: READING/ELA

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set by the State Board of Education on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS reading (grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, & 9) or English language arts (grades 10 & 11) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 25% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of test takers achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on reading or ELA}}{\text{total number of test takers in reading or ELA}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2006-07

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other information:

- *Scale Score.* For reading, Commended Performance is a scale score of 2400 or more. For ELA, a scale score of 2400 or more with a score of 2 or higher on the essay is required to be Commended.
- *Student Success Initiative.* Students who meet the Commended Performance standard in either the February or April administrations of TAKS reading are included.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on *Commended Performance*.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.

- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: MATHEMATICS

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set by the State Board of Education on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS mathematics (grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, & 11) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 25% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on mathematics}}{\text{total number of examinees in mathematics}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2006-07

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other information:

- *Scale Score.* Commended Performance is a scale score of 2400 or more on the TAKS.
- *Student Success Initiative.* Students who meet the Commended Performance standard in either the April or May administrations of TAKS mathematics are included.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on *Commended Performance*.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.

- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: WRITING

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set by the State Board of Education on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS writing (grades 4 & 7) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 25% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on writing}}{\text{total number of examinees in writing}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2006-07

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other information:

- *Scale Score.* Commended Performance is a scale score of 2400 or more with a score of 3 or higher on the essay.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on *Commended Performance*.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.

- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: SCIENCE

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set by the State Board of Education on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS science (grades 5, 10, & 11) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher. Because grade 8 TAKS science is not part of the accountability system in 2007, the grade 8 science results are not included in the GPA commended indicator for science.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 25% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on science}}{\text{total number of examinees in science}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2006-07

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other information:

- *Scale Score.* Commended Performance is a scale score of 2400 or more on the TAKS.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on *Commended Performance*.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.

- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: SOCIAL STUDIES

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set by the State Board of Education on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS social studies (grades 8, 10, & 11) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 25% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on social studies}}{\text{total number of examinees in social studies}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2006-07

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other information:

- *Scale Score.* Commended Performance is a scale score of 2400 or more on the TAKS.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on *Commended Performance*.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.

- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

COMPARABLE IMPROVEMENT: READING/ELA

Comparable Improvement (CI) is a measure that calculates how student performance on the TAKS test has changed (or grown) from one year to the next, and compares the change to that of the 40 schools that are demographically most similar to the target school.

Who is eligible: Campuses that test students on TAKS reading or English language arts in grades 4 - 11 and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher. Districts are not eligible because CI is not calculated at the district level.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus must have an average Texas Growth Index (TGI) within the top quartile (the top 25%) of their 40-member campus comparison group for reading/ELA.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students only.

Methodology: First, determine the campus's average Texas Growth Index:

$$\frac{\text{sum of matched student TGI values for reading/ELA}}{\text{total number of matched students in reading/ELA}}$$

Then, determine which quartile the campus is in within its 40-member campus comparison group. See *Appendix E – Texas Growth Index* and *Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group* for a complete explanation of the methodology for this measure.

Minimum Size Requirements: Students must be matched to the spring 2006 TAKS administration—anywhere in the state—to find their prior year scale score for reading or ELA. Any campus with fewer than 10 matched students for a subject will not be assigned a quartile position.

Year of Data: 2007 and 2006 (Spring TAKS Administrations)

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other information:

- *Grade 3.* Growth is not calculated for third grade test takers since that is their first TAKS test. For this reason, campuses with a high grade of 3 are not eligible for acknowledgment on CI.
- *Student Success Initiative.*
 - For grade 5 students who take TAKS reading in both February and April, the performance used is the score they achieved in the February administration. That student will be matched to their single grade 4 administration from 2006 to determine their TGI.
 - For grade 4 students who—as third graders in 2006—took TAKS reading in both February and April 2006, the TGI is determined by matching the score they achieved on their single grade 4 administration from 2007 to the score they achieved on their February administration in 2006.

- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on CI.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All TGI calculations are rounded to two decimal points. For example, 1.877 is rounded to 1.88, not 2. Demographic values for the 40 members of the comparison group are rounded to one decimal point. For example, 69.877% is rounded to 69.9%. Average scale scores are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 2243.44 is rounded to 2243.

COMPARABLE IMPROVEMENT: MATHEMATICS

Comparable Improvement (CI) is a measure that calculates how student performance on the TAKS test has changed (or grown) from one year to the next, and compares the change to that of the 40 schools that are demographically most similar to the target school.

Who is eligible: Campuses that test students on TAKS mathematics in grades 4 – 11 and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher. Districts are not eligible because CI is not calculated at the district level.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus must have an average Texas Growth Index (TGI) within the top quartile (the top 25%) of their 40-member campus comparison group for mathematics.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students only.

Methodology: First, determine the campus’s average Texas Growth Index:

$$\frac{\text{sum of matched student TGI values for mathematics}}{\text{total number of matched students in mathematics}}$$

Then determine which quartile the campus is in within its 40-member campus comparison group. See *Appendix E – Texas Growth Index* and *Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group* for a complete explanation of the methodology for this measure.

Minimum Size Requirements: Students must be matched to the spring 2006 TAKS administration—anywhere in the state—to find their prior year scale score for mathematics. Any campus with fewer than 10 matched students for a subject will not be assigned a quartile position.

Year of Data: 2007 and 2006 (Spring TAKS Administrations)

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other information:

- *Grade 3.* Growth is not calculated for third grade test takers since that is their first TAKS test. For this reason, campuses with a high grade of 3 are not eligible for acknowledgment on CI.
- *Student Success Initiative.* For grade 5 students who take TAKS mathematics in both April and May, the performance used is the score they achieved in the April administration. That student will be matched to their single grade 4 administration from 2006 to determine their TGI.

- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on CI.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All TGI calculations are rounded to two decimal points. For example, 1.877 is rounded to 1.88, not 2. Demographic values for the 40 members of the comparison group are rounded to one decimal point. For example, 69.877% is rounded to 69.9%. Average scale scores are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 2243.44 is rounded to 2243.

RECOMMENDED HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM/DAP

This indicator shows the percent of graduates who were reported as having satisfied the course requirements for the Texas State Board of Education Recommended High School Program or Distinguished Achievement Program.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that have graduates and that are rated *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, 80.0% of all 2006 graduates reported must meet or exceed the requirements for the Recommended High School Program or Distinguished Achievement Program.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of graduates reported with graduation codes for Recommended High School Program or Distinguished Achievement Program}}{\text{number of graduates}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of graduates. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 graduates in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 graduates within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: Class of 2006

Data Source: PEIMS submission 1 (October 2006)

Other information:

- *Special Education.* This measure includes both non-special education and special education graduates.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 79.877% is rounded to 79.9%, not 80.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

SAT/ACT RESULTS

This indicator shows the performance and participation on two college admissions tests: the College Board's SAT Reasoning Test and ACT, Inc.'s ACT Assessment.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that have graduates and that are rated *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must meet both a participation and a performance standard. It must:

- have 70.0% or more of the class of 2006 non-special education graduates taking either the ACT or the SAT; *and* of those examinees
- have 40.0% or more scoring at or above the criterion score on at least one examination.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, and White.

Methodology:

Participation:

$$\frac{\text{number of graduates taking either the SAT or the ACT}}{\text{total non-special education graduates}}$$

and

Performance:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees at or above the criterion score}}{\text{number of graduates taking either the SAT or the ACT}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers or graduates. To be included in the evaluation for GPA, a student group must have:

- in the numerator of the participation measure: at least 10 test takers; and,
- in the denominator of the participation measure: at least 30 non-special education graduates;
 - if there are 30 to 49 students and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated; or
 - if the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: Class of 2006

Data Source: The College Board (SAT) and ACT, Inc. (ACT)

Other information:

- *SAT Reasoning Test.* This is the first year the new SAT will be used in determining GPA. It differs somewhat from the former SAT, although scores are still comparable between the two tests. The new test includes a writing assessment, but performance on writing is not used for determining GPA. The writing component may be incorporated into this GPA indicator in the future.

- *Criterion.* The criterion score is 1110 on the SAT (the sum of the critical reading and mathematics scores) or 24 on the ACT (composite).
- *Most Recent Test.* Both testing companies annually provide the agency with information on the most recent test participation and performance of graduating seniors from all Texas public schools. Only one record is sent per student. If a student takes an ACT or SAT test more than once, the agency receives the record for the most recent examination taken, not necessarily the examination with the highest score.
- *Both Tests Taken.* If a student takes both the SAT and the ACT, the information is combined so that an unduplicated count of students is used. If the student scored above the criterion on either the SAT or ACT, that student is counted as having scored above the criterion.
- *Campus ID.* The student taking the test identifies the campus to which a score is attributed.
- *Special Education.* For *participation* special education graduates who take the ACT or SAT are included in the numerator, but not the denominator. This may have a slight positive effect on the percent reported.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 69.877% is rounded to 69.9%, not 70.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

TEXAS SUCCESS INITIATIVE (TSI) – HIGHER EDUCATION READINESS COMPONENT: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS (ELA)

This indicator shows the percent of grade 11 students who are considered ready to begin college-level work, based on their performance on the TAKS exit-level examination.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test grade 11 students on the exit-level TAKS English language arts and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator the campus or district must have 50% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the TSI standard. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board set the standard of college readiness on the exit-level TAKS at a scale score of 2200 for ELA and a score of 3 or higher on the essay.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of grade 11 test takers with a scale score of 2200} \\ \text{and a score of 3 or higher on the essay of the ELA test}}{\text{total number of grade 11 students taking ELA}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.

- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2006-07

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other information:

- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on TSI.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

TEXAS SUCCESS INITIATIVE (TSI) – HIGHER EDUCATION READINESS COMPONENT: MATHEMATICS

This indicator shows the percent of grade 11 students who are considered ready to begin college-level work, based on their performance on the TAKS exit-level examination.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test grade 11 students on the exit-level TAKS mathematics and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator the campus or district must have 50% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the TSI standard. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board set the standard of college readiness on the exit-level TAKS at a scale score of 2200 for mathematics.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of test takers with a scale score of 2200 on mathematics}}{\text{total number of grade 11 test takers in mathematics}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.

- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2006-07

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other information:

- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on TSI.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

NOTIFICATION OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Notification of Gold Performance Acknowledgment will occur in late October 2007 at the same time as the 2007 ratings update that follows the resolution of all appeals. (See *Chapter 18 – Calendar* for more details.) At that time, the district lists and data tables on the TEA website will be updated to show the acknowledgments earned.

Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances

The vast majority of the standard accountability ratings can be determined through the process detailed in *Chapters 2-4: The Basics*. However, there are special circumstances that require closer examination. Accommodating all Texas campuses and districts increases the complexity of the accountability system, but it also increases the fairness of the ratings ultimately assigned. This chapter describes pairing, Special Analysis, and the treatment of non-traditional campuses and their data under the standard accountability procedures.

Pairing

IDENTIFYING CAMPUSES

All campuses serving grades 1-12 must receive an accountability rating. Beginning in 1994, campuses with no state assessment results due to grade-span served were incorporated into the accountability system by having districts choose another campus within the same district with which to pair for accountability purposes. The campuses shared TAAS data. The pairing process was continued with the advent of the new accountability system in 2004. A new feature, begun with the 2004 system, allows districts to pair a campus with the district and be evaluated on the district's results.

TEA determines which campuses need to be paired for any given accountability cycle after analyzing enrollment files submitted on PEIMS submission 1. All districts with campuses with enrollment in grades higher than kindergarten, and solely in grades with no TAKS data, *i.e.*, grades 1, 2, or 12, receive a request for pairing. Charters and registered AECs are not asked to pair any of their campuses.

For campuses that are paired, only TAKS performance is shared. The paired campus is evaluated on any non-TAKS indicator data it may have. The campus with which it is paired does not share any dropout, completion, SDAA II, or GPA indicator data it may have.

ADDITIONAL FEATURES

Required Improvement. Paired campuses are eligible for Required Improvement (RI). Note, however, that RI is calculated with 2007 data based on the pairing relationships established in 2007. The 2006 data is based on the pairing relationships established in 2006. Campuses with pairing statuses that change between years may have improvement calculations that differ from the campuses they are paired with.

Exceptions. Paired campuses are eligible for exceptions, using the paired data. As with Required Improvement, Exceptions are applied and calculated automatically by TEA before ratings are released. Districts and campuses do not need to request the use of Required Improvement or Exceptions.

Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA). Paired data are not used for GPA indicators, including all TAKS-based GPA—Commended Performance and Comparable Improvement. For that reason, paired campuses cannot receive GPA for those indicators. They may however, receive GPA for other indicators.

PAIRING PROCESS

Districts are given the opportunity to use the same pairing relationship they used in the prior year or to select a new relationship by completing special data entry screens on the TEA website. In late March, districts with campuses that needed to be paired received instructions on how to access this on-line application. Pairing decisions were due by April 27, 2007.

If a district fails to inform the state, pairing decisions are made by agency staff. In the case of campuses that have been paired in the past, staff will assume that prior year pairing relationships still apply. In the case of campuses identified as needing to be paired for the first time in the 2006-07 school year, pairing selections will be made based on the guidelines given in this section in conjunction with analysis of attendance and enrollment patterns using PEIMS data.

GUIDELINES

Campuses that are paired should have a "feeder" relationship with the selected campus and the grades should be contiguous. For example, a K-2 campus should be paired with the 3-5 campus that accepts its students into 3rd grade.

Another option is to pair a campus with the district instead of with another campus. This option is suggested for cases where the campus has no clear relationship with another single campus in the district. A campus paired with the district will be evaluated using the district's TAKS results (for all grades tested in the district). Note that pairing with the district is not required in these cases. Districts have the choice of selecting another campus or selecting the district. For example, in cases where a K-2 campus feeds into several 3-5 campuses, one of the 3-5 campuses may be selected, or the district can be selected. A 12th grade center serving students from several high school campuses can select one of the high school campuses or the district may be selected. In these cases, the district should make the best choice based on local criteria.

Multiple pairings are possible: If several K-2 campuses feed the same 3-5 campus, all of the K-2 campuses may be paired with that 3-5 campus.

Districts may change pairings from year to year; however, these changes should be justifiable (*e.g.*, a change in attendance zones affecting feeder patterns).

Special Analysis

Districts and campuses with small numbers of students pose a special challenge to the accountability system. There are two types of small numbers situations. One is small numbers of students within a group, *e.g.*, few African American test-takers in science. These are handled by applying the minimum size criteria described in *Chapter 2 – The Basics: Base Indicators*. The second type is small numbers of *total* students, that is, few students tested in the All Students category.

Districts and campuses with small numbers of total students raise issues regarding the stability of the data. Special analysis is used to ensure that ratings based on small numbers of TAKS results are appropriate. As a result of special analysis, a rating can remain unchanged, be elevated, or be changed to *Not Rated*. If special analysis is applied, only All Students performance is examined.

IDENTIFYING CAMPUSES AND DISTRICTS

Campuses and districts that are eligible for special analysis fall into two categories. The first are those that have fewer than six TAKS testers in each and every subject and do not have their own leaver data of sufficient size to evaluate. These campus and district ratings are changed to *Not Rated: Other*. Beyond these that receive this automatic change, a campus or district undergoes special analysis if:

- the campus or district is *Academically Unacceptable* due to TAKS only, with fewer than 30 All Students tested in one or more of the *Academically Unacceptable* subject(s); *OR*
- the campus or district is limited to *Academically Acceptable* or *Recognized* due to TAKS only, and the evaluation is governed by the results of fewer than six All Students tested.

The following are examples of campuses and districts that will NOT undergo special analysis:

- Campuses or districts that are *Not Rated*.
- Campuses or districts that are not small (30 or more testers in all subjects).
- Campuses or districts that have few students tested in TAKS, but whose rating of *Academically Unacceptable*, *Academically Acceptable*, or *Recognized* is due to other indicators.

METHODS FOR SPECIAL ANALYSIS

Campuses or districts that undergo special analysis receive professional review based on analysis of all available performance data. The professional review process involves producing a summary report of the district or campus data, analyzing the data, and arriving at a consensus decision among a group of TEA staff members familiar with the standard accountability procedures. The summary report includes available indicator data for all TAKS tested years (2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007). Trends and aggregate data are reviewed.

Because of the small numbers of test takers involved, it can be difficult to assign a rating that is considered reliable and fair. Thus, professional review can result in a *Not Rated* label for some campuses or districts not otherwise meeting the automatic criteria for *Not Rated*.

New Campuses

All campuses—established or new—are rated. A new campus may receive a rating of *Academically Unacceptable* in its first year of operation. This can occur even though the campus does not have prior-year data on which to calculate improvement. The management of campus identification numbers across years is a district responsibility. See *Chapter 15 – Responsibilities and Consequences* for more information regarding the possible consequences of changing campuses numbers.

Charters

Based on fall PEIMS data for the 2006-07 school year, there were 191 charter operators serving approximately 81,000 students. Most charter operators have only one campus (132 of the 191); however, some operate multiple campuses.

By statute, charter operators are subject to most of the same federal and state laws as other public school districts, including reporting and accountability requirements. Prior to the 2004 accountability system, only the campuses operated by the charter received an accountability rating. Beginning with 2004, charters as well as the campuses they operate are rated, meaning charter operators are rated under district rating criteria based on the aggregate performance of the campuses operated by the charter. This means charter operators are also subject to the additional performance requirements applied to districts (underreported student standards and the check for *Academically Unacceptable* campuses). Because they are rated, charter operators and their campuses are eligible for *Gold Performance Acknowledgments*.

In 2007, there are some differences between the treatment of charter operators and traditional districts. These are:

- A charter operator may be rated under the alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures. This can occur in two cases: when the charter operates only registered AECs; or, when 50% or more of the charter operator's students are enrolled at registered AECs and the operator opts to be evaluated under AEA procedures.
- A charter operator may be labeled *Not Rated: Other*. This can occur in cases where the charter operator has too little or no TAKS data on which it can be evaluated.
- Charter operators are not asked to pair any of their campuses. Charters are unique in that they either have only one campus or they have multiple campuses with no feeder relationships; therefore, pairing charter campuses is problematic.

As with non-charter campuses, a charter campus that is a registered AEC will be rated under AEA procedures.

Alternative Education Campuses

As previously stated, all campuses in the state serving grades 1–12 must receive a campus rating; however, the accountability system recognizes that some campuses offering alternative education programs may need to be evaluated under different criteria than standard campuses.

In 2007, AECs meeting certain eligibility criteria may register to be evaluated under AEA procedures. See *Part 2* of this *Manual* for all details on the AEA procedures.

Other campuses providing alternative education programs may not be registered. Either they chose not to register, did not meet the ten registration criteria, or did not meet the at-risk registration criterion to be registered for evaluation under AEA procedures. These campuses are evaluated under standard procedures and will be rated *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Academically Acceptable*, *Academically Unacceptable*, *Not Rated: Other*, or *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*.

Generally speaking, districts are responsible for the performance of all their students, including those who attend AECs that are registered for evaluation under AEA procedures. That is, the performance results for students who attend campuses evaluated under AEA procedures *are included* in the district's performance and *are used* in determining the district's rating and acknowledgments. There are some exceptions to this rule. The table below lists various campus types and whether the performance data are included or excluded from the district evaluation.

Table 9: Inclusion or Exclusion of Performance Data

Campus Type	Attribution of Data		Statute
	Dropouts	TAKS/SDAA II	
Residential Treatment Centers (RTCs)	Dropout data is attributed to sending campus and district for students meeting criteria.*	Results are included in the evaluation of RTC and the district (accountability subset).	39.073(f)
Detention Centers and Correctional Facilities	Dropout data is attributed to sending campus and district for students meeting criteria.*	Results are included in the evaluation of center/facility and the district (accountability subset).	39.073(f)
Students Confined to TYC Facilities	Dropout data included for the <i>campus</i> , but excluded from <i>district</i> results.	Results included for the <i>campus</i> , but excluded from <i>district</i> results.	39.072(d)
JJAEPs	Dropout data is attributed to non-JJAEP campus using PEIMS attendance data or district-supplied campus of accountability. Students who cannot be attributed to a non-JJAEP campus will remain dropouts at the JJAEP campus.	No assessment data should be reported to the JJAEP, but if it is mistakenly reported to the JJAEP, it will be included in the district results.	37.011(h)
DAEPs	Dropout data is attributed to non-DAEP campus using PEIMS attendance data or district-supplied campus of accountability. Students who cannot be attributed to a non-DAEP campus will remain dropouts at the DAEP campus.	No assessment data should be reported to the DAEP, but if it is mistakenly reported to the DAEP, it will be included in the district results.	n/a

* Students who cannot be attributed back to a sending district will be attributed to the district where the center or facility is located.

RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT CENTERS

A district that has a privately operated residential treatment center (RTC) within its geographic boundaries is not held accountable for students who drop out if they are from outside the district and were served at the center for fewer than 85 days. With student attribution codes and attendance data collected through PEIMS, TEA is able to attribute the majority of these dropouts to the appropriate sending campus and district. Students who cannot be attributed back to a sending district will be attributed to the district where the center is located.

DETENTION CENTERS AND CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

A district that has a registered pre-adjudication detention center or post-adjudication correctional facility within its geographic boundaries is not held accountable for students who drop out if they are from outside the district. With student attribution codes and attendance data collected through PEIMS, TEA is able to attribute the majority of these dropouts to the appropriate sending campus and district. Students who cannot be attributed back to a sending district will be attributed to the district where the facility is located. Only dropout records for students served in pre-adjudication detention centers and post-

adjudication correctional facilities registered with the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC) are subject to this process.

STUDENTS CONFINED TO TEXAS YOUTH COMMISSION FACILITIES WITHIN TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The performance results (TAKS/SDAA II, completion, and dropout) of students confined by court order in a residential treatment program or facility operated by or under contract with the Texas Youth Commission (TYC) are not included in the district results for the district where the TYC is located. The district's TYC campuses are evaluated, either under standard or AEA procedures, but the district rating is not affected by the performance data reported on these campuses.

JUVENILE JUSTICE ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND DISCIPLINARY ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Programs (JJAEPs) and Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs (DAEPs) are two types of campuses that are not rated under either standard or AEA procedures.

JJAEPs. Statute prohibits the attribution of performance results to JJAEPs. For counties with a population of 125,000 or more, Texas Education Code §37.011(h) requires that a student enrolled at a JJAEP be reported as if the student were attending and being tested at his or her “sending” campus. Each district that sends students to a JJAEP is responsible for properly attributing all performance data according to the PEIMS Data Standards and the testing guidelines.

By statute, procedures for evaluating the educational performance of JJAEPs in large counties are the responsibility of the TJPC. In the state accountability system, campuses identified to be JJAEPs will be labeled *Not Rated: Other*. Any accountability data erroneously reported to a JJAEP campus are subject to further investigation.

DAEPs. Statutory intent prohibits the attribution of performance results to a DAEP. Each district that sends students to a DAEP is responsible for properly attributing all performance data according to the PEIMS Data Standards and the testing guidelines.

All campuses identified to be DAEPs will be labeled *Not Rated: Other*. Accountability data erroneously reported to a DAEP campus are subject to further investigation.

SPECIAL EDUCATION CAMPUSES

Campuses where all students are served in special education programs *and none are tested on TAKS* will be labeled *Not Rated: Other*, because they have no TAKS results on which to be evaluated. See *Chapter 4 – The Basics: Determining a Rating* for more information on the use of this rating label.

Chapter 10 - AEA Base Indicators

To determine ratings, the alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures use four base indicators:

- performance on the *Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)*,
- performance on the *State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II)*,
- *Completion Rate II* for the Class of 2006, and
- *2005-06 Annual Dropout Rate* for grades 7–12.

TAKS PROGRESS INDICATOR

A single performance indicator is evaluated for TAKS. The TAKS Progress indicator sums performance results across grades (3-12) and across subjects to determine alternative education campus (AEC) and charter ratings under AEA procedures. This indicator is not based on the number of students tested but on the number of tests taken. Students who take multiple TAKS tests are included multiple times (for every TAKS test taken). Students who take multiple TAKS exit-level retests are included only when the passing standard is met.

The TAKS Progress indicator numerator is calculated as the number of tests meeting the student passing standard *or* having a Texas Growth Index (TGI) score that meets the student growth standard of 0 (zero) or higher *and* TAKS exit-level retests meeting the student passing standard at the February and April administrations or in the previous October or July. The denominator is the number of TAKS tests taken *and* the number of TAKS exit-level retests meeting the student passing standard at the February and April administrations or in the previous October or July.

The TAKS Progress indicator includes the following results:

- TAKS grades 3-11 Spring 2007 primary administration:
 - Panel Recommendation student passing standard
 - TGI: 2006 to 2007, growth of 0 (zero) or higher
 - Campus accountability subset
- TAKS grade 12 April 2007, February 2007, October 2006, and July 2006 administrations:
 - Actual student passing standard
 - Tests meeting passing standard
 - No accountability subset
- TAKS grade 11 April 2007, February 2007, October 2006, and July 2006 administrations:
 - Retests only
 - Actual student passing standard
 - Tests meeting passing standard
 - No accountability subset

Who is evaluated for the TAKS Progress Indicator:

- AECs that test students on any TAKS subject.
- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities.
- *Use of District At-Risk Data.* If the AEC does not meet the accountability standard based on results for fewer than 10 tests, or if there are no TAKS results for the AEC, then the AEC is evaluated on the district performance of at-risk students. See *Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA*. If there are results for fewer than 10 at-risk tests in the district, then Special Analysis is conducted. See *Chapter 12 – AEA Ratings*.
- Charters that operate only registered AECs.
- Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

Table 10: TAKS Progress Indicator

	2007	2008	2009	2010
AEA: Academically Acceptable	45%	45%	50%	50%
TAKS Progress Indicator	TAKS + TGI + Exit-Level Retests			
Accountability Subset	District and Campus Accountability Subset; Accountability Subset does not apply to exit-level retests			

Standard:

- *AEA: Academically Acceptable* – At least 45%.
- The TAKS Progress standard will be reviewed annually and is subject to change.

Student Groups: TAKS performance is always evaluated for All Students. The following student groups that meet minimum size requirements are evaluated: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of TAKS tests that meet the standard } \mathbf{or} \text{ have a TGI } \geq 0 \mathbf{ and} \text{ number of TAKS exit-level retests that meet the standard}}{\text{number of TAKS tests taken } \mathbf{and} \text{ number of TAKS exit-level retests that meet the standard}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- *All Students.* All Students performance is always evaluated.
- *Student Groups.* Student groups are evaluated if there are:
 - 30 to 49 tests for the student group and the student group represents at least 10% of All Students tests; *or*
 - at least 50 tests for the student group even if these tests represent less than 10% of All Students tests.

Accountability Subset:

- *Campus Accountability Subset.* AECs are accountable for TAKS results for students enrolled on the AEC on the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date.
- *District Accountability Subset.* Charters are accountable for TAKS results for students enrolled at the charter on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date and on the testing date.
- Accountability subset does not apply to TAKS exit-level results.

Years of Data:

- Spring 2007 grades 3-11 TAKS results (primary administration)
- April 2007, February 2007, October 2006, and July 2006 grade 11 exit-level retest results
- April 2007, February 2007, October 2006, and July 2006 grade 12 exit-level results

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other Information:

- *Grades and Subjects.* The TAKS results for English (grades 3-11) and Spanish (grades 3-6) are summed across grades and subjects and are evaluated for All Students and each student group that meets minimum size requirements. Second administration results of grades 3 and 5 reading and grade 5 mathematics are included.
- *Testing Window.* Results for students given a make-up test within the testing window are included in the accountability measures.
- *Student Passing Standard.* The TAKS Progress indicator is calculated as percent *Met Standard* using the student passing standard adopted by the State Board of Education (SBOE) for the current year. See *Chapter 2 – The Basics: Base Indicators*.
- *Rounding.* The TAKS Progress indicator percent *Met Standard* calculations are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%; 79.4999% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.
- *TGI.* The TGI has been developed for accountability purposes to evaluate individual student growth from one year to the next on the TAKS. The TGI compares how students taking a TAKS subject test in one year perform on the same TAKS subject test in the next higher grade the following year. An individual TGI score indicates the amount of growth for each student in relation to the average growth of all students who performed at the same level in the base year. The TGI score of zero (0) indicates that the year-to-year change in scale score is equal to the average change. The TGI measures growth for a student who passes as well as a student who does not pass the TAKS.

The TGI calculation is limited to students who have test results in the same subject for two consecutive years, in consecutive grades:

Reading/ELA – grades 4–11
Mathematics – grades 4–11
Social Studies – grade 11
Science – grade 11

Detailed TGI information can be found in *Appendix E – Texas Growth Index*.

SDAA II INDICATOR

The SDAA II assesses students with disabilities in grades 3-10 who receive instruction in the state’s curriculum but for whom the TAKS test is not an appropriate measure of their academic progress. SDAA II tests are given in the areas of reading, English language arts (ELA), writing, and mathematics. Students are assessed at their appropriate instructional levels, as determined by their Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committees.

The SDAA II is administered on the same schedule as TAKS and designed to measure annual growth based on appropriate expectations for each student, as decided by the student's ARD committee.

A single performance indicator is evaluated for SDAA II. Performance results are summed across grades (3-10) and across subjects. This indicator is not based on the number of students tested but on the number of tests taken. The SDAA II indicator is calculated as the number of *tests* meeting ARD committee expectations divided by the number of SDAA II *tests* for which ARD expectations were established. Students who take multiple SDAA II tests are included multiple times (for every SDAA II test taken).

2007 is the last year the SDAA II will be administered. See *Chapter 17 – Preview of 2008 and Beyond* for information on future alternate assessments for students with disabilities.

Who is evaluated for SDAA II:

- AECs that test students on any SDAA II subject.
- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities.
- Charters that operate only registered AECs.
- Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

Standard: *AEA: Academically Acceptable* – At least 45% of SDAA II tests taken must meet ARD expectations.

Student Groups:

- Performance for the percent *Meeting ARD Expectations* is evaluated for All Students only.
- Student group performance is not evaluated separately.

Methodology:

number of SDAA II tests *Meeting ARD Expectations*

number of SDAA II tests taken

Minimum Size Requirements:

- SDAA II performance is evaluated for AECs and charters with results from 30 or more tests (summed across grades and subjects).
- Special Analysis is not conducted on SDAA II performance.

- Student groups are not evaluated separately.

Accountability Subset:

- *Campus Accountability Subset.* AECs are accountable for SDAA II results for students enrolled on the AEC on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date.
- *District Accountability Subset.* Charters are accountable for SDAA II results for students enrolled at the charter on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date and on the testing date.

Year of Data: Spring 2007 grades 3-10 SDAA II results

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other Information:

- *Students Tested in both SDAA II and TAKS.* In some cases, students may take both the SDAA II and TAKS. For example, a grade 6 student may take the TAKS for mathematics, but the SDAA II for reading. In this case, the student’s performance is included in both indicators.
- *TAKS-I.* Beginning in 2006, students served in special education may take the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills Inclusive (TAKS-I) in subjects and grades where the SDAA II is not available. TAKS-I performance is not used in determining the accountability ratings in 2007, but will be shown on the AEIS reports released in the fall.
- *Rounding.* The *Met ARD Expectation* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%; 79.4999% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.

COMPLETION RATE II (GRADES 9-12) INDICATOR

This longitudinal rate shows the percent of students who first attended grade 9 in the 2002-03 school year who graduated, received a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, or who are continuing their education four years later. Known as the 2002-03 cohort, these students’ progress was tracked over the four years using data provided to TEA by districts and charters and data available in the statewide GED database.

Completion Rate II includes graduates, continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year), and GED recipients in the definition of Completion Rate II for AECs of Choice and charters evaluated under AEA procedures.

Beginning with 2007 accountability, the definition of a dropout changes to comply with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition. The transition to the NCES dropout definition also impacts the Completion Rate II indicator. Beginning with 2007 accountability, the dropout component of the Completion Rate denominator changes. In 2007, only one of the four years in the cohort is affected. In 2008, two years of the cohort are affected, and so on, until 2010 when the Completion Rate denominator uses the NCES dropout definition for all four years of the cohort. See *Appendix I – NCES Dropout Definition* for detailed information on the NCES dropout definition.

Who is evaluated for Completion Rate II:

- AECs of Choice that have served students in grades 9, 10, 11, and 12 for the last five years.
- Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.
- If the AEC of Choice does not serve students in any of grades 9-12 in the 2006-07 school year, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II.
- *Use of District At-Risk Rate.* If the AEC of Choice does not meet the accountability standard, does not meet minimum size requirements for All Students, or if the AEC of Choice has students in any of grades 9-12 but does not have a Completion Rate II, then the AEC of Choice is evaluated on Completion Rate II (including GED recipients) of at-risk students in the district. If at-risk students in the district do not meet minimum size requirements for All Students, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II. See *Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA.*
- Charters that operate only registered AECs.
- Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

Table 11: Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12) Indicator

	2007 Class of 2006; 9th grade 02-03	2008 Class of 2007; 9th grade 03-04	2009 Class of 2008; 9th grade 04-05	2010 Class of 2009; 9th grade 05-06
AEA: Academically Acceptable	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%
Completion Rate II	Graduates + Continuing Students + GED Recipients			
Dropout Definition	Phase in NCES definition			NCES definition
Accountability Subset	School Leaver data are attributed to the last campus of attendance			

Standard:

- *AEA: Academically Acceptable* – At least 75.0% Completion Rate II.
- The Completion Rate II standard will be reviewed annually and is subject to change.

Student Groups: Completion Rate II is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups that meet minimum size requirements: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of completers (graduates + continuing students + GED recipients)}}{\text{number of students in class}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- *All Students.* These results are evaluated if there are:
 - at least 5 dropouts (non-completers), **and**
 - at least 10 students in the AEC of Choice or charter Completion Rate II class.

- *Student Groups.* These results are evaluated if there are:
 - at least 5 dropouts (non-completers) within the student group, **and**;
 - 30 to 49 students in the student group and the student group represents at least 10% of All Students in the class; **or**
 - at least 50 students in the group even if they represent less than 10% of All Students in the class.
- Special Analysis is not conducted on Completion Rate II.

Accountability Subset:

- Completion data are attributed to the student’s last campus of attendance.
- The 85-day rule is phased out completely.

Years of Data:

- Graduating Class of 2006 (results are based on the original 2002-03 cohort, whether the students remain on grade level or not)
- Continued enrollment in 2006-07
- GED records as of August 31, 2006

Data Sources:

- PEIMS Submission 1 enrollment data for 2002-03 through 2006-07
- PEIMS Submission 1 leaver data for 2003-04 through 2006-07
- PEIMS Submission 3 attendance data for 2002-03 through 2005-06
- GED records as of August 31, 2006

Other Information:

- *School Leaver Provision for 2007.* For 2007 AEA ratings, if the Completion Rate II and/or Annual Dropout Rate indicator(s) are the only cause for an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* label. As a safeguard to this provision, districts are subject to identification and intervention by Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) for dropout rates and leaver reporting. Additionally, campuses that avoid being rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* due to this provision will be subject to technical assistance team (TAT) intervention requirements in the 2007-08 school year. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information on the School Leaver Provision.
- *Transfers.* Any student who transfers into the cohort is added to it, and any student who transfers out of the cohort is subtracted from it.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 74.875% is rounded to 74.9%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.
- *Students with Disabilities.* The completion status of students with disabilities is included in this measure.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE (GRADES 7-12) INDICATOR

The Annual Dropout Rate indicator is grade 7-12 dropouts as a percent of total students enrolled at the AEC or charter in grades 7-12 in a single school year.

Beginning with 2007 accountability, the more rigorous NCES definition will be used. See *Appendix I – NCES Dropout Definition* for detailed information on the NCES dropout definition.

Who is evaluated for Annual Dropout Rate:

- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that serve students in any of grades 7-12.
- Charters that operate only registered AECs.
- Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

Table 12: Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12) Indicator

	2007 from 2005-06	2008 from 2006-07	2009 from 2007-08	2010 from 2008-09
AEA: Academically Acceptable	10.0%	10.0%	TBD	TBD
Dropout Definition	NCES definition			
Accountability Subset	School Leaver data are attributed to the last campus of attendance			

Standard:

- *AEA: Academically Acceptable* – An Annual Dropout Rate of 10.0% or less.
- The Annual Dropout Rate standard will be reviewed annually and is subject to change.

Student Groups: Annual Dropout Rate is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups that meet minimum size requirements: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of grade 7-12 students designated as 'official' dropouts}}{\text{number of grade 7-12 students in attendance at any time during the school year}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- *All Students.* These results are evaluated if there are:
 - at least 5 dropouts, **and**
 - at least 10 students in grades 7-12.
- *Student Groups.* These results are evaluated if there are:
 - at least 5 dropouts within the student group, **and;**
 - 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group represents at least 10% of All Students in grades 7-12; **or**
 - 50 students within the student group even if they represent less than 10% of All Students in grades 7-12.
- Special Analysis is not conducted on Annual Dropout Rate.

- If the AEC or charter does not meet the minimum size requirements for All Students, then the AEC or charter is not evaluated on Annual Dropout Rate.

Accountability Subset:

- Dropout data are attributed to the student's last campus of attendance.
- The 85-day rule is phased out completely.

Year of Data: 2005-06

Data Sources:

- PEIMS Submission 1 data for 2005-06 and 2006-07
- PEIMS Submission 1 leaver data for 2006-07
- PEIMS Submission 3 attendance data for 2005-06

Other Information:

- *School Leaver Provision for 2007.* For 2007 AEA ratings, if the Completion Rate II and/or Annual Dropout Rate indicator(s) are the only cause for an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* label. As a safeguard to this provision, districts are subject to identification and intervention by PBM for dropout rates and leaver reporting. Additionally, campuses that avoid being rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* due to this provision will be subject to TAT intervention requirements in the 2007-08 school year. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information on the School Leaver Provision.
- *Cumulative Attendance.* A cumulative count of students is used in the denominator. This method for calculating the dropout rate neutralizes the effects of mobility by including in the denominator every student reported in attendance at the AEC or charter throughout the school year, regardless of length of stay.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 2.49% is rounded to 2.5%, and 0.25% is rounded to 0.3%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.
- *Students with Disabilities.* Students with disabilities who drop out of school are included in this measure.

This page is intentionally blank.

Chapter 11 - Additional Features of AEA

As shown in *Chapter 10 – AEA Base Indicators*, alternative education campuses (AECs) can achieve a rating by meeting the absolute standards for the different indicators. However, under certain conditions, AECs can achieve a rating by:

- meeting Required Improvement; and/or
- using the accountability data for at-risk students in the district.

All additional features are applied and calculated automatically by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) before ratings are released. AECs do not need to request the use of additional features.

Additional requirements for charters are explained later in this chapter.

Required Improvement

AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities can achieve an *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating by meeting the absolute standards for the alternative education accountability (AEA) indicators or by demonstrating Required Improvement. AECs initially rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* may achieve an *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating using the Required Improvement feature. Required Improvement can be applied to three of the base indicators: Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) Progress, State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II), and Completion Rate II. Annual Dropout Rate Required Improvement will not be calculated in 2007 due to changes to the dropout definition which prevent comparisons of rates used in 2006 and 2007.

Required Improvement compares prior-year performance to current-year performance. In order to qualify for this comparison, the target group (All Students or any student group) must meet a minimum size requirement for the prior year. See *Minimum Size Requirements* in this chapter for each indicator.

Who is evaluated for Required Improvement:

- AECs of Choice whose performance is *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* for any TAKS Progress, SDAA II, or Completion Rate II measure.
- Residential Facilities whose performance is *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* for any TAKS Progress or SDAA II measure. (Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.)
- Charters evaluated under AEA procedures whose performance is *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* for any TAKS Progress, SDAA II, or Completion Rate II measure.

TAKS PROGRESS INDICATOR

Improvement Standard: In order for Required Improvement to move an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, the AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient improvement on the deficient TAKS measures to meet a standard of **45%** within two years.

Methodology:

The *Actual Change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*.

Actual Change is the difference between performance in 2007 and 2006.

Required Improvement is the result of the 2007 standard minus performance in 2006 divided by 2.

Example:

In 2007, an AEC has performance above the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* standard in all student groups except for Economically Disadvantaged; only 38% meet the standard. Performance in 2006 for the same group is 20%.

First calculate the *Actual Change*: $38 - 20 = 18$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*: $(45 - 20) / 2 = 13$ (12.5 rounds to 13)

Then compare *Actual Change* to *Required Improvement* to determine if *Actual Change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*: $18 \geq 13$

The AEC meets *Required Improvement*, so its rating is *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

Minimum Size Requirements: Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has less than 10 test results (for the student group) in 2006.

Other Information:

- *Performance in 2006.* Prior-year performance includes Spring 2006 grades 3-11 TAKS results (primary administration); Texas Growth Index (TGI) for 2005 to 2006, growth of 0 (zero) or higher; April and February 2006, and December, October, July, and June 2005 grade 11 TAKS retests meeting the passing standard; and April and February 2006, and December, October, July, and June 2005 grade 12 results meeting the student passing standard.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations of performance rates and standards are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

SDAA II INDICATOR

Improvement Standard: In order for Required Improvement to move an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, the AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient improvement on the SDAA II indicator to meet a standard of **45%** within two years.

Methodology:

The *Actual Change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*.

Actual Change is the difference between performance in 2007 and 2006.

Required Improvement is the result of the 2007 standard minus performance in 2006 divided by 2.

Example:

In 2007, an AEC has performance below the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* standard; only 28% of All Students meet the standard. Performance in 2006 is 11%.

First calculate the *Actual Change*: $28 - 11 = 17$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*: $(45 - 11) / 2 = 17$

Then compare *Actual Change* to *Required Improvement* to determine if *Actual Change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*: $17 \geq 17$

The AEC meets *Required Improvement*, so its rating is *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

Minimum Size Requirements: Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has less than 10 test results in 2006.

Other Information: All improvement calculations of performance rates and standards are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

COMPLETION RATE II INDICATOR

Improvement Standard: In order for Required Improvement to move an AEC of Choice or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, the AEC of Choice or charter must demonstrate sufficient improvement on the deficient Completion Rate II measures for the Class of 2005 to meet a standard of **75.0%** within two years.

Methodology:

The *Actual Change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*.

Actual Change is the difference between the Completion Rate II for the Class of 2006 and the Class of 2005.

Required Improvement is the result of the 2007 standard minus the Completion Rate II for the Class of 2005 divided by 2.

Example:

An AEC of Choice has a Class of 2006 Completion Rate II of 72.3% for the White student group. The Class of 2005 Completion Rate II for this same group is 63.8%.

First calculate the *Actual Change*: $72.3 - 63.8 = 8.5$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*: $(75.0 - 63.8) / 2 = 5.6$

Then compare *Actual Change* to *Required Improvement* to determine if *Actual Change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*: $8.5 \geq 5.6$

The AEC of Choice meets *Required Improvement*, so its rating is *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

Minimum Size Requirements: Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC of Choice or charter has less than 10 students (in the same student group) in the Completion Rate II Class of 2005.

Other Information:

- *Completion Rate II Definition.* Completion Rate II for the prior year is computed using the same definition as the current year so that gain from the prior year to the current year uses comparable data for both years. Specifically, the Completion Rate II definition includes graduates, General Educational Development (GED) recipients, and continuing students as completers.

- *NCES Definition.* Beginning with 2007 accountability, the definition of a dropout changes to comply with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition. This transition to the NCES dropout definition impacts the Completion Rate II indicator. Beginning with 2007 accountability, the dropout component of the Completion Rate denominator changes. In 2007, only one of the four years in the cohort is affected. In 2008, two years of the cohort are affected, and so on, until 2010 when the Completion Rate denominator uses the NCES dropout definition for all four years of the cohort. See *Appendix I – NCES Dropout Definition* for detailed information on the NCES dropout definition.
- *School Leaver Provision for 2007.* For 2007 AEA ratings, if the Completion Rate II and/or Annual Dropout Rate indicator(s) are the only cause for an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* label. As a safeguard to this provision, districts are subject to identification and intervention by Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) for dropout rates and leaver reporting. Additionally, campuses that avoid being rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* due to this provision will be subject to technical assistance team (TAT) intervention requirements in the 2007-08 school year. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information on the School Leaver Provision.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 4.85% is rounded to 4.9%.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE INDICATOR

Changes to the dropout definition prevent comparisons of rates used in 2006 and 2007; therefore, Annual Dropout Rate Required Improvement will not be calculated in 2007.

Other Information:

- *School Leaver Provision for 2007.* For 2007 AEA ratings, if the Completion Rate II and/or Annual Dropout Rate indicator(s) are the only cause for an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* label. As a safeguard to this provision, districts are subject to identification and intervention by PBM for dropout rates and leaver reporting. Additionally, campuses that avoid being rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* due to this provision will be subject to TAT intervention requirements in the 2007-08 school year. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information on the School Leaver Provision.

Use of District At-Risk Data

In limited circumstances, data for at-risk students in the district are used to evaluate registered AECs. Use of data for at-risk students in the district acknowledges that AECs are part of the overall district strategy for education of students at risk of dropping out of school.

AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities may be evaluated on the TAKS Progress indicator using data for at-risk students in the district. AECs of Choice may be evaluated on Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district.

TAKS PROGRESS INDICATOR

Who is evaluated for the TAKS Progress Indicator using performance data of at-risk students in the district:

- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that do not meet the 45% standard, do not demonstrate Required Improvement, and have results for fewer than 10 tests in the current year.
- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities with no TAKS results.

Table 13: Use of TAKS Data of At-Risk Students in the District

Number of TAKS tests at the AEC	Does the AEC meet the performance standard on its own data?	Does the AEC demonstrate Required Improvement (RI) on its own data?	Does the AEC meet the performance standard using district performance data of at-risk students?
10 or more	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A
	No	Yes – assign rating	N/A
		No – assign rating	
Less than 10	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A
	No	Yes – assign rating	N/A
		No	Yes – assign rating
			No – calculate district RI
None	N/A	N/A	Yes – assign rating
			No – calculate district RI

Required Improvement: If the AEC does not meet the performance standard based on district performance data of at-risk students, then Required Improvement is calculated using district performance data of at-risk students.

Minimum Size Requirements: If there are less than 10 at-risk TAKS test results in the district, then Special Analysis is conducted.

Special Analysis: Special Analysis consists of analyzing current and past performance data to determine if the initial rating assigned under the automated evaluation process is an aberration or an indication of consistent performance. Methods of Special Analysis are discussed in *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances*.

COMPLETION RATE II INDICATOR

Who is evaluated for Completion Rate II using data of at-risk students in the district:

- AECs of Choice that do not meet the 75.0% accountability standard or demonstrate Required Improvement.
- AECs of Choice that have completion data, but do not meet minimum size requirements for All Students.
- AECs of Choice that serve students in any of grades 9-12, but do not have a Completion Rate II.

- If the AEC of Choice does not serve students in any of grades 9-12 in the 2006-07 school year, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II.

Table 14: Use of Completion Rate II Data of At-Risk Students in the District

Does the AEC of Choice serve students in grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12 in 2006-07?	Does the AEC of Choice have a Completion Rate II and meet minimum size requirements in 2005-06?	Does the AEC of Choice meet the accountability standard on its own data?	Does the AEC of Choice demonstrate Required Improvement (RI) on its own data?	Do at-risk students in the district meet minimum size requirements?	Does the AEC of Choice meet the accountability standard using Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district?
Yes	Yes	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A	N/A
		No	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A
			No	Yes	Yes – assign rating
				No	No – calculate district RI
	No	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes – assign rating
				No	No – calculate district RI
		N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes – assign rating
				No	No – calculate district RI
No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Required Improvement: If the AEC of Choice does not meet the accountability standard based on at-risk students in the district then Required Improvement is calculated using Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district.

Minimum Size Requirements:

- Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district is evaluated if there are:
 - at least 5 at-risk dropouts (non-completers), **and**
 - at least 10 students in the district at-risk Completion Rate II class.
- If at-risk students in the district do not meet minimum size requirements, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II.

Additional Requirements for Charters

Underreported Students: Charters evaluated under AEA procedures are subject to underreported student standards as described in *Chapter 3 – The Basics: Additional Features*. Although the charter AEA rating is not affected, PBM will continue to evaluate this indicator at the 2007 standards in its Data Validation system.

Additional Students in Charter Ratings: Charters evaluated under AEA procedures are responsible for the performance of all students, including those who attend campuses that receive a rating of *AEA: Not Rated – Other*.

AECs Rated AEA: Academically Unacceptable

Registered AECs rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* do not prevent a district rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*.

Chapter 12 - AEA Ratings

This chapter illustrates how to apply the alternative education accountability (AEA) indicator data results and the additional features of AEA to determine ratings for registered alternative education campuses (AECs) and charters evaluated under AEA procedures.

WHO IS RATED?

The state accountability system is required to rate all districts and campuses serving students in grades 1-12. Under the new AEA procedures, the first step in determining AEA ratings is to identify the universe of AECs and charters. The AEA universe consists of:

- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that meet the registration criteria, register as an AEC, and meet the at-risk registration criterion;
- charters that operate only registered AECs; and
- charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

The next step is to determine whether the AEC or charter has TAKS results on which it can be evaluated. In order to attain an *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating, AECs and charters must have at least one Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) test result. Furthermore, performance on any one of the TAKS subjects is sufficient for a rating to be assigned. AECs with no TAKS test results are evaluated using district at-risk performance results. Information on use of district at-risk data is in *Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA*. AECs and charters need not have data for the State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II), Completion Rate II, and Annual Dropout Rate indicators to receive an AEA rating. Charters that have only SDAA II results, Completion Rate II, and/or Annual Dropout Rate will not receive an AEA rating.

AECs and charters with very small numbers of TAKS test results in the accountability subset may ultimately receive an *AEA: Not Rated – Other* label. Special Analysis is employed when very small numbers of total tests determine whether a rating is appropriate. AECs undergo Special Analysis when the AEC is evaluated on district at-risk data and there are fewer than 10 at-risk TAKS tests in the district. Charters are rated on the aggregate performance of all students in the charter. Charters with TAKS results for fewer than 10 tests will receive Special Analysis under circumstances similar to those used in the standard accountability procedures. Special Analysis consists of analyzing current and past performance data to determine if the initial rating assigned under the evaluation process is an aberration or an indication of consistent performance. Additional details on Special Analysis are in *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances*.

AEA RATING LABELS

Accountability rating labels for districts are specified in statute. Beginning in 2004, campuses are assigned the same labels as districts under the standard accountability procedures. Registered AECs and charters rated under AEA procedures are assigned three rating labels:

- *AEA: Academically Acceptable*

- *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*
- *AEA: Not Rated – Other*

Table 15: AEA Rating Labels

	AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities	Charters
<i>AEA: Academically Acceptable</i>	Assigned to registered AECs with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ at least one TAKS test (summed across grades and subjects); or ○ no TAKS test results and are evaluated using district at-risk performance results. 	Assigned to charters with at least one TAKS test (summed across grades and subjects). Charters with fewer than 10 TAKS test results receive Special Analysis.
<i>AEA: Academically Unacceptable</i>		
<i>AEA: Not Rated – Other</i>	Assigned to registered AECs with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ no students enrolled in grades tested; or ○ no TAKS data in the accountability subset or exit-level data on which to rate. 	Assigned to charters with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ no students enrolled in grades tested; or ○ no TAKS data in the accountability subset or exit-level data on which to rate.

Accountability ratings are final when the accountability appeals process for the year is completed in the fall following release of the ratings in August.

USING THE DATA TABLE TO DETERMINE AN AEA RATING

On June 21, completion/dropout data from the Texas Education Agency (TEA) will be released to districts and campuses in the TEA Secure Environment (TEASE). On July 20, prior to finalizing all computations necessary for accountability ratings, preview data tables will be available in TEASE for the district and each campus.

These tables will *not* show a rating and will *not* provide calculations for Required Improvement. However, by using the preview data tables and the *2007 Accountability Manual*, districts can anticipate their ratings in advance of the TEA ratings release on August 1. *The preview data tables will contain unmasked data and must be treated as confidential.* The performance of individual students may be shown.

A sample unmasked preview data table for a campus serving grades 9-12 follows. This grade span includes data for all AEA indicators.

Table 16: Sample AEA Data Table

July 2007

Texas Education Agency
CONFIDENTIAL

Page 1 of 2

1

2007 Preview Accountability Data Table
Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures

3

District Name: SAMPLE ISD
Campus Name: SAMPLE ALTERNATIVE LEARNING CENTER
Campus Number: 999999999
Campus Type: AEC of Choice

Grade Span: 09 – 12
% At-Risk: 75%

2

4

Rating:

District at-risk TAKS data used.
SDAA II not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data.
District at-risk Completion Rate II used.

5

Analysis groups used to determine ratings are marked with an 'X.'

6

	District At-Risk	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ Disadv
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) (Grades 3-12)						
Analysis Groups Evaluated	X	X				
2006-07 Progress Measure						
# Tests Met Standard	33,197	2	0	2	0	2
# Tests	46,756	8	0	8	0	8
% Met Standard	71%	25%	0%	25%	0%	25%
Student Group %	n/a	100%	0%	100%	0%	100%
2005-06 Progress Measure						
# Tests Met Standard	26,881	3	0	3	0	3
# Tests	44,067	9	0	9	0	9
% Met Standard	61%	33%	0%	33%	0%	33%
Required Improvement						
Actual Change	10	-8	0	-8	0	-8

7

	District At-Risk	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ Disadv
State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II) (Grades 3-10)						
Analysis Groups Evaluated						
2006-07 SDAA II Results						
# Tests Met ARD Expectations	n/a	18	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
# Tests	n/a	26	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Met ARD Expectations	n/a	69%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2005-06 SDAA II Results						
# Tests Met ARD Expectations	n/a	13	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
# Tests	n/a	20	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Met ARD Expectations	n/a	65%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Required Improvement						
Actual Change	n/a	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

'n/a' indicates that the data are not applicable.
(-) indicates that data are not available.

Table 16: Sample AEA Data Table (continued)

July 2007

Texas Education Agency
CONFIDENTIAL

Page 2 of 2

2007 Preview Accountability Data Table
Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures

District Name: SAMPLE ISD
Campus Name: SAMPLE ALTERNATIVE LEARNING CENTER
Campus Number: 999999999
Campus Type: AEC of Choice

Grade Span: 09 – 12
% At-Risk: 75%

Rating:

District at-risk TAKS data used.
SDAA II not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data.
District at-risk Completion Rate II used.

Analysis groups used to determine ratings are marked with an 'X.'

	District At-Risk	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ Disadv
8 Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12)						
Analysis Groups Evaluated Class of 2006	X	X		X		
# Completers	1,824	29	2	22	5	20
# Non-completers	181	16	3	13	0	9
# in Class	2,005	45	5	35	5	29
Completion Rate	91.0%	64.4%	40.0%	62.9%	100%	69.0%
Student Group %	n/a	100%	11%	78%	11%	64%
Class of 2005						
# Completers	1,661	25	2	19	4	19
# in Class	1,992	43	4	34	5	28
Completion Rate	83.4%	58.1%	50.0%	55.9%	80.0%	67.9%
Required Improvement						
Actual Change	7.6	6.3	-10.0	7.0	20.0	1.1

9 Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12)						
Analysis Groups Evaluated 2005-06		X		X		X
# Dropouts	n/a	10	1	9	0	8
# Students in Grades 7-12	n/a	83	7	68	8	81
Dropout Rate	n/a	12.0%	14.3%	13.2%	0.0%	9.9%
Student Group %	n/a	100%	8%	82%	10%	98%

Required Improvement
Due to definitional changes, Annual Dropout Rate Required Improvement is not calculated in 2007.

'n/a' indicates that the data are not applicable.
(-) indicates that data are not available.

The sample preview data table above illustrates the types of information provided. See *Chapter 10 – AEA Base Indicators* for more information about each measure. The final AEA data table released in August may include minor modifications. An explanation of each numbered topic follows.

1. **Confidential:** Performance data are unmasked on the AEA data tables posted in TEASE. For this reason, personal student information may be shown. To be compliant with the federal *Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act* (FERPA), all unmasked data must be treated as confidential.

Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures: This indicates that the AEC or charter is rated under AEA procedures. Campuses not registered for evaluation under AEA procedures are evaluated under standard accountability procedures.

2. **% At-Risk:** All registered AECs must meet the at-risk registration criterion or the applicable safeguards in order to remain registered and be evaluated under AEA procedures.
3. **Campus Type:** Each AEC registered for evaluation under AEA procedures is designated as an AEC of Choice or Residential Facility.
4. **Rating:** AEA rating labels are not available for the preview data tables.
5. **Messages:** A complete list of messages that may appear on AEA data tables is provided later in this chapter.

District at-risk TAKS data used: If an AEC has no TAKS results or does not meet the 45% TAKS Progress standard based on results for fewer than 10 tests, then the AEC is evaluated on performance of at-risk students in the district.

If the AEC does not meet the performance standard based on district performance data of at-risk students, then Required Improvement is calculated using district performance data of at-risk students.

SDAA II not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data: If the AEC or charter does not serve students in grades 3-10 or has fewer than 30 SDAA II test results in the accountability subset, then the AEC or charter is not evaluated on SDAA II.

District at-risk Completion Rate II used: If the AEC of Choice does not meet the 75.0% Completion Rate II standard or demonstrate Required Improvement, does not meet minimum size requirements for All Students, or if the AEC of Choice serves students in any of grades 9-12 but does not have a Completion Rate II, then the AEC of Choice is evaluated on the Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district.

If the AEC of Choice does not meet the accountability standard based on at-risk students in the district, then Required Improvement is calculated using Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district.

6. **Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) (Grades 3-12):** One of the four AEA base indicators on which AECs and charters are evaluated. The TAKS Progress indicator evaluates test results across grades and subjects.

Analysis Groups Evaluated: Analysis groups used to determine AEA ratings are marked with an ‘X.’

Tests Met Standard: The numerator used to calculate *% Met Standard* – TAKS tests meeting the standard or having a TGI score of 0 (zero) or higher and exit-level retests meeting the standard at the spring administrations or in the previous fall or summer.

Tests: The denominator used to calculate *% Met Standard* – TAKS tests taken and exit-level retests meeting the standard at the spring administrations or in the previous fall or summer.

% Met Standard: The percent of tests that met the TAKS Progress standard.

Student Group %: Used to identify which student groups meet minimum size requirements for the indicator. TAKS performance is always evaluated for All Students and the following student groups meeting minimum size requirements: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

TAKS Required Improvement: Moves an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable* if the AEC or charter demonstrates sufficient improvement on the deficient TAKS measures to meet a standard of 45% within two years. Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has fewer than 10 test results (for the student group) in 2006.

Actual Change: The difference between performance in 2007 and 2006. *Actual Change* is always shown when two years of data are available.

- 7. State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II) (Grades 3-10):** One of the four AEA base indicators on which AECs and charters are evaluated. SDAA II assesses grades 3-10 students with disabilities who receive instruction in the state's curriculum but for whom the TAKS test is inappropriate.

Analysis Groups Evaluated: Analysis groups used to determine AEA ratings are marked with an 'X.'

SDAA II performance is evaluated for All Students only. Student groups are not evaluated.

Tests Met ARD Expectations: The numerator used to calculate *% Met ARD Expectations* – SDAA II tests *Meeting ARD Expectations*.

Tests: The denominator used to calculate *% Met ARD Expectations* – SDAA II tests taken.

% Met ARD Expectations: The percent of tests that *Met ARD Expectations*.

SDAA II Required Improvement: Moves an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable* if the AEC or charter demonstrates sufficient improvement to meet a standard of 45% within two years. Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has fewer than 10 test results in 2006.

Actual Change: The difference between performance in 2007 and 2006. *Actual Change* is always shown when two years of data are available.

- 8. Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12):** One of the four AEA base indicators on which AECs of Choice and charters are evaluated. Completion Rate II counts graduates, continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year), and General Educational Development (GED) recipients as completers. This longitudinal rate shows the percent of students who first attended grade 9 in the 2002-03 school year who completed or are continuing their education four years later. Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.

Analysis Groups Evaluated: Analysis groups used to determine AEA ratings are marked with an ‘X.’

Completers: The numerator used to calculate Completion Rate II – number of completers.

Non-completers: Used together with *# in Class* to determine if minimum size requirements are met for a group to be evaluated.

in Class: The denominator used to calculate Completion Rate II – number of students in the class.

Completion Rate II: The percent of the student group that completed high school – *# Completers* divided by *# in Class*.

Student Group %: Used to identify which student groups meet minimum size requirements for the indicator. All Students and the following student groups meeting minimum size requirements are evaluated: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12) Required Improvement: Moves an AEC of Choice or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable* if the AEC of Choice or charter demonstrates sufficient improvement on the deficient Completion Rate II measures for the Class of 2005 to meet a standard of 75.0% within two years.

Actual Change: The difference between the Completion Rate II for the Classes of 2006 and 2005. *Actual Change* must be equal to or greater than the *Improvement Required*. *Actual Change* is always shown when two years of data are available.

In this example, Required Improvement will be calculated; therefore, *Met Minimum Size Requirements?*, *Improvement Required*, and *Met Required Improvement?* will be shown on the final data table for the analysis groups evaluated.

9. **Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12):** One of the four AEA base indicators on which AECs and charters are evaluated. This annual rate is grade 7-12 dropouts as a percent of all students enrolled at the AEC or charter in grades 7-12 in a single school year.

Analysis Groups Evaluated: Analysis groups used to determine AEA ratings are marked with an ‘X.’

Dropouts: The numerator used to calculate Annual Dropout Rate – number of grade 7-12 students designated as official dropouts.

Students in Grades 7-12: The denominator used to calculate Annual Dropout Rate – number of grade 7-12 students in attendance at any time during the school year.

Dropout Rate: The percent of the student group that dropped out of school – *# Dropouts* divided by *# Students in Grades 7-12*.

Student Group %: Used to identify which student groups meet minimum size requirements for the indicator. All Students and the following student groups meeting minimum size requirements are evaluated: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged. If the AEC does not meet the minimum size requirements for All Students, then the AEC is not evaluated on Annual Dropout Rate.

Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12) Required Improvement: Due to the definitional changes, Annual Dropout Rate Required Improvement is not calculated in 2007.

FINAL DATA TABLES

Preview data tables will be available only via TEASE prior to finalizing accountability ratings. Ratings will be released on August 1, 2007. Final data tables that include masked data will be online and available to districts and the public on August 1. See *Chapter 18 – Calendar* for other important dates.

The following will appear on the final data tables:

Accountability Ratings. AEA rating labels are:

- *AEA: Academically Acceptable,*
- *AEA: Academically Unacceptable, or*
- *AEA: Not Rated – Other.*

Messages. When applicable, these messages appear in the top section of the data table after the rating label:

- District at-risk TAKS data used. (AEC only)
- District at-risk Completion Rate II used. (AEC of Choice only)
- Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II. (Residential Facility only)
- This campus is not rated due to grade span. (AEC only)
- Charter operates only Residential Facilities. (charter only)
- Charter exceeds threshold for underreported students. (charter only)
- Special Analysis conducted. (AEC or charter)
- SDAA II not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data. (AEC or charter)
- Completion Rate II not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data. (AEC of Choice or charter)
- Annual Dropout Rate not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data. (AEC or charter)
- Rating is not based on data shown in the table (School Leaver Provision used). (AEC or charter)
- Rating changed due to an appeal. Data not modified. (AEC or charter)

Required Improvement. The final data table shows all calculations for Required Improvement when calculated:

- *Met Minimum Size Requirements?* – “Y” or “N” is shown.
- *Actual Change* – The difference between current-year and prior-year data.

- *Improvement Required* – The amount of change needed for Required Improvement to be met.
- *Met Required Improvement?* – If Required Improvement is calculated, “Y” or “N” is shown depending on the comparison of *Actual Change* to the *Improvement Required*.

MASKED DATA

As in the past, performance on the data tables posted to the agency website is masked when there are very small numbers of tests or students in the denominator of the measure. Additionally, all performance at or near 0% or 100% is masked. It is necessary to mask data that potentially reveals the performance of a student in order to be in compliance with *FERPA*.

AEA SUMMARY

Two tables follow that summarize the 2007 AEA procedures. *Table 17* provides an overview of the requirements for achieving the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating label. An AEC or charter must meet the criteria for every applicable measure to be rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*. If the criteria are not met for every measure, then *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* is assigned.

For example, to be rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, an AEC or charter must satisfy all requirements for each indicator evaluated. As shown, AECs and charters can meet the criteria for the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating by either meeting an absolute performance standard or demonstrating Required Improvement for the indicators.

Table 18 provides a detailed overview of the 2007 AEA procedures, with the base indicators listed as columns. For example, for each of the indicators, *Table 18* provides a brief definition, use of district at-risk data, the rounding methodology, the standards, the accountability subset methodology, subjects, student groups, minimum size criteria, and application of Required Improvement.

Table 17: Requirements for 2007 AEA: Academically Acceptable Rating

Indicators/Features	AECs of Choice	Residential Facilities	Charters
Assessment Indicators			
TAKS Progress All Students and each student group that meets minimum size criteria: African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged	Meets 45% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement (RI) or Meets 45% Standard Using District At-Risk Data or Demonstrates RI Using District At-Risk Data		Meets 45% Standard or Demonstrates RI
SDAA II All Students if minimum size criteria are met	Meets 45% Standard or Demonstrates RI		
Completion/Dropout Indicators			
Completion Rate II All Students and each student group that meets minimum size criteria: African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged	Meets 75.0% Standard or Demonstrates RI or Meets 75.0% Standard Using District At-Risk Data or Demonstrates RI Using District At-Risk Data	Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.	Meets 75.0% Standard or Demonstrates RI
Annual Dropout Rate All Students and each student group that meets minimum size criteria: African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged	Meets 10.0% Standard		
Additional Features			
Required Improvement (RI)	RI is calculated for the TAKS Progress, SDAA II, and Completion Rate II indicators when the standards are not met and when prior year minimum size requirements are met.		
Use of District At-Risk Data	TAKS data of at-risk students in the district are used when the 45% standard and RI are not met based on fewer than 10 tests or when there are no TAKS tests.	Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.	Performance results of all students in the accountability subset are used in determining the charter rating. The charter rating is not limited to evaluation of at-risk students.
	Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district is used when the 75.0% standard and RI are not met or when students in any grades 9-12 are served but there is no Completion Rate II.		
Special Analysis	Special Analysis is conducted when there are fewer than 10 at-risk TAKS tests in the district or charter.	Special Analysis is conducted when there are fewer than 10 TAKS tests in the charter.	
Data Integrity	None		Charters are subject to underreported student standards, although the charter AEA rating is not affected.
School Leaver Provision	If the Completion Rate II and/or Annual Dropout Rate indicator(s) are the only cause for an AEA: Academically Unacceptable rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the AEA: Academically Acceptable label.		

Table 18: Overview of 2007 AEA Procedures

	TAKS Progress Grades 3-12	SDAA II Grades 3-10	Completion Rate II Grades 9-12	Annual Dropout Rate Grades 7-12
Use/Definition	<p>TAKS tests meeting the student passing standard or having a TGI score of 0 (zero) or higher and TAKS exit-level retest results meeting the student passing standard at the spring administrations or in the previous fall or summer divided by total TAKS tests taken and TAKS exit-level retests meeting the standard.</p> <p>Results are summed across grades and subjects. Spanish results are included. Second administration results of grades 3 and 5 reading and grade 5 mathematics are included. Make-up tests taken within testing window are included.</p>	<p>The number of SDAA II tests meeting ARD expectations summed across grades and subjects divided by the total number of SDAA II tests for which ARD expectations were established.</p>	<p>A prior year indicator that evaluates graduates, continuing students, and GED recipients, expressed as a percent of total students in the Completion Rate II class.</p> <p>AECs of Choice that do not serve students in any of grades 9-12 are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.</p> <p>Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.</p>	<p>A prior year indicator that evaluates the number of grade 7-12 students designated as official dropouts divided by the number of grade 7-12 students in attendance at any time during the school year.</p> <p>If minimum size requirements for All Students are not met, then do not evaluate Annual Dropout Rate.</p>
District At-Risk Data	<p>The AEC is evaluated on performance of at-risk students in the district if the AEC does not meet the standard or demonstrate RI based on fewer than 10 tests or if the AEC has no TAKS results.</p>	N/A	<p>The AEC of Choice is evaluated on Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district if the AEC of Choice does not meet the standard or demonstrate RI or if the AEC of Choice serves students in any of grades 9-12 but does not have a Completion Rate II.</p>	N/A
Rounding	Whole Numbers		One Decimal	
Standards	45%		75.0%	10.0%
Accountability Subset	<p>Campus accountability subset holds the AEC accountable for students enrolled at the AEC on the fall snapshot and testing dates, but does not apply to exit-level retests.</p> <p>District accountability subset holds the charter accountable for students enrolled at the charter on the fall snapshot and testing dates, but does not apply to exit-level retests.</p>		Completion/Dropout data are attributed to the student's last campus of attendance.	
Subjects	<p>Reading/ELA Writing Mathematics Social Studies Science</p>	<p>Reading/ELA Writing Mathematics</p>	N/A	
Student Groups	<p>All Students and African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged</p>	All Students only	<p>All Students and African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged</p>	<p>All Students and African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged</p>
Minimum Size Criteria				
All Students	All Students tests are always evaluated	30 or more tests summed across grades and subjects	<p>≥ 5 dropouts (non-completers) and ≥ 10 students</p>	<p>≥ 5 dropouts and ≥ 10 students</p>
Student Groups	<p>30-49 tests for the student group and the student group represents at least 10% of All Students tests or at least 50 tests</p>	N/A	<p>≥ 5 dropouts (non-completers) and 30/10%/50</p>	<p>≥ 5 dropouts and 30/10%/50</p>

Table 18: Overview of 2007 AEA Procedures (continued)

	TAKS Progress Grades 3-12	SDAA II Grades 3-10	Completion Rate II Grades 9-12	Annual Dropout Rate Grades 7-12
Required Improvement (RI) – A gate up to AEA: Academically Acceptable				
Use/Definition	The AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient gain in TAKS Progress to be at 45% within 2 years.	The AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient gain in SDAA II to be at 45% within 2 years.	The AEC of Choice or charter must demonstrate sufficient gain in Completion Rate II to be at 75.0% within 2 years. Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.	Changes to the dropout definition prevent comparisons of rates used in 2006 and 2007; therefore, Annual Dropout Rate Required Improvement will not be calculated in 2007.
Actual Change	2007 performance minus 2006 performance	2007 performance minus 2006 performance	Class of 2006 rate minus Class of 2005 rate	n/a in 2007
Improvement Required	Gain needed to reach 45% standard in 2 years	Gain needed to reach 45% standard in 2 years	Gain needed to reach 75.0% standard in 2 years	n/a in 2007
Minimum Size	Meets minimum size in current year and has at least 10 tests in prior year	Meets minimum size in current year and has at least 10 tests in prior year	Meets minimum size in current year and has at least 10 students in Completion Rate II class in prior year	n/a in 2007
Rounding	Whole Numbers		One Decimal	

Chapter 14 – Appealing the Ratings

Providing superintendents with the opportunity to appeal accountability ratings has been a feature of the state accountability system since 1994. The opportunity to appeal is supported in the 2007 system as well.

Superintendents may appeal the state accountability ratings for both standard and alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures, by following the guidelines provided in this chapter. Below are the dates for appealing ratings. **These deadlines are final. To maintain a fair appeals process, no late appeals will be considered.**

APPEALS CALENDAR

June 21, 2007	<i>Dropout/Completion Lists.</i> Superintendents are given access to confidential lists of dropouts and lists of completion cohort membership. These reports provide a preview of the data that will be used to calculate the Annual Dropout Rate and Completion Rate base indicators for the state accountability ratings.
July 20, 2007	<i>Preview Data Tables.</i> Superintendents are given access to confidential preview accountability data tables for their district and campuses showing all state accountability indicator data. Principals and superintendents can use these data tables to anticipate their campus and district accountability ratings. Appeals may be submitted <i>by the superintendent</i> after receipt of the preview data tables.
August 1, 2007	<i>Ratings Release.</i> Due to the short timeline between the transmittal of the preview data tables and the ratings release date, no appeals will be resolved before the ratings release.
August 17, 2007	<i>Appeals Deadline.</i> Appeals must be postmarked no later than August 17, 2007 in order to be considered.
Late October, 2007	<i>Ratings Update.</i> The outcome of all appeals will be reflected in the ratings update scheduled for October, 2007. At that time the TEA website will be updated.

A more detailed calendar can be found in *Chapter 18 – Calendar*.

General Considerations

APPEALS ARE NOT A DATA CORRECTION OPPORTUNITY!

The numbers shown on the data tables (and later on other agency products, such as the AEIS reports) are final and cannot be changed, even if an appeal is granted.

Appeals should be based upon a data or calculation error attributable to the Texas Education Agency, regional education service centers, or the test contractor for the student assessment program. However, problems due to district errors in PEIMS data submissions or on TAKS answer sheets are considered on a case-by-case basis. Also, statute permits consideration of data reporting quality in evaluating the merits of an appeal. Poor data quality is not a valid reason to appeal.

CHANGED RATINGS ONLY

Only appeals that would result in a changed rating will be considered.

NO GUARANTEED OUTCOMES

Appeals that follow these guidelines are not guaranteed to be granted. Each appeal is evaluated based on the details of its unique situation. Well-written appeals that follow the guidelines are more easily processed, but they are not necessarily granted.

SITUATIONS NOT FAVORABLE FOR APPEAL

One strength of the state accountability system is that the rules are applied uniformly to all campuses and districts. Therefore, a request to make exceptions for how the rules are applied to a single campus or district is viewed unfavorably and will most likely be denied. Examples of some appeals seeking inconsistent rule application follow. Because some examples apply to both standard and AEA procedures and some are unique to one set of procedures or the other, the examples are subdivided accordingly:

Examples applicable to both standard and AEA procedures:

- *Campus Mobility.* A request to include the performance of students who were excluded due to the appropriate use of the campus mobility subset criteria would likely be denied.
- *Grade 3 and Grade 5 Cumulative.* A request to alter the TEA methodology for combining the first and second administrations of grade 3 reading results, or for the first and second administrations of grade 5 reading and mathematics results would likely be denied.
- *Rounding.* A request to compute Required Improvement, student group percentages, or indicator values differently from the method described in this *Manual* would likely be denied.
- *Minimum Size Criteria.* A request to evaluate student groups using minimum size criteria different from those described in this *Manual* would likely be denied.

Examples applicable to standard procedures:

- *Exceptions Provision.* Exceptions are automatically applied; a request for additional exceptions or changes to the application of the Exceptions Provision would likely be denied.
- *Pairing.* A request to alter pairing relationships that districts had the opportunity to determine by April 27, 2007 would likely be denied.
- *New and Academically Unacceptable.* A request to assign the *Not Rated: Other* label to campuses that are *Academically Unacceptable* in their first year of operation would likely be denied.
- *Floors.* A request to waive the floor requirements when applying either the Exceptions Provision or Required Improvement would likely be denied.

Examples applicable to AEA procedures:

- *Late Registration Requests.* A request submitted after September 22, 2006 to be registered as an alternative education campus (AEC) in order to be evaluated under AEA procedures would likely be denied.
- *At-risk Criterion.* A request by AECs or charter operators to be evaluated under AEA procedures when they did not meet the at-risk criterion or applicable safeguards in 2006-07 would likely be denied.

Guidelines

TAKS APPEALS

If a problem is identified with data received from the test contractor, the TAKS data may be appealed. An appeal of the TAKS indicators should reflect a serious problem such as a missing grade level or campus. However, coding errors on TAKS answer sheets will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

- If the district has requested that writing results be rescored, a copy of the dated request to the test contractor and the outcome of the rescored tests should be provided with the appeal. If the rescored results impact the rating, these appeals are necessary since rescored results may not be processed in time to include in the assessment data used to determine the accountability ratings released on August 1.
- If other serious problems are found, copies of correspondence with the test contractor should be provided with the appeal.
- Coding errors related to student demographic or program participation fields on the TAKS answer documents will be evaluated by reviewing the student's history in PEIMS.

SDAA II APPEALS

As with TAKS appeals, an appeal of the SDAA II indicator should include copies of any correspondence with the test contractor. Other information available to the agency about special education students will be used in evaluating SDAA II appeals; for example, Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) indicators pertaining to SDAA II will be examined in concert with the supporting documentation provided by the district. Any SDAA II appeals that result in raising a rating from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable* will incur the use of an exception. For that reason, if an SDAA II exception was used in 2006, no SDAA II appeal can be granted in 2007, as the same exception cannot be used in two consecutive years.

SCHOOL LEAVER PROVISION

Due to a number of factors—change in the definition of a dropout, changes to the PEIMS leaver data collection, the effect of students displaced by Hurricane Katrina on the 2005-06 dropout rate, and the absence of Required Improvement for the Annual Dropout Rate this year—the School Leaver Provision has been added for 2007. This means that leaver indicators (either alone or in combination) cannot cause a lowered campus or district rating. The School Leaver Provision applies to Completion Rates I and II, both Annual Dropout Rates (for grades 7-8 and grades 7-12), and Underreported Students.

The School Leaver Provision will be automatically applied. There is no need to appeal any of the leaver indicators, as none of them will cause a lowered rating.

Campuses that avoid being rated *Academically Unacceptable* in 2007 due to the application of the School Leaver Provision will be subject to technical assistance team (TAT) intervention requirements in the 2007-08 school year. Additionally, districts will be subject to identification and intervention under Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) for dropout rates and leaver reporting.

For more information on the dropout definition changes, see *Appendix I: NCES Dropout Definition*. For more information on technical assistance teams, see *Chapter 15: Responsibilities and Consequences*.

GOLD PERFORMANCE ACKNOWLEDGMENT APPEALS

Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA) cannot be appealed. Campuses or districts that appeal an *Academically Unacceptable* rating will automatically receive any GPA earned if their appeal is granted and their rating is raised to *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Special Circumstance Appeals

GRADE 11 RESULTS

Grade 11 assessments are administered multiple times during the school year. For accountability purposes, the performance of all juniors tested for the first time during the primary spring administration and some juniors testing for the first time during the October administration are included. (See *Chapter 2*.) A district may appeal to include additional grade 11 results for first-time tested students as part of the TAKS base indicator. These appeals will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. As with all appeals, no changes will be made to the data shown on the reports.

HURRICANES KATRINA AND RITA

The 2007 performance results of students who were displaced during the 2005-06 school year due to the hurricanes are included in the 2007 accountability data. This means that Required Improvement will be based on 2007 results that include these students, compared with 2006 results that do not.

A district may appeal to include the prior year performance of students who were excluded from assessment results in 2006, for purposes of meeting Required Improvement. Districts must provide evidence that inclusion of these students' results in 2006 will have an impact on the campus and/or district rating.

In evaluating the appeal, TEA will consider the performance of *all* students coded KRI in 2006, not a subset of these students.

These appeals will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. As with all appeals, no changes will be made to the data shown on the reports.

EARLY COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOLS

High schools created to serve special populations of gifted and talented and/or early college bound students may appeal the use of the district completion rate when the use of this district

value is the sole reason for not achieving the next higher rating. Early college high schools are designed to produce graduates who earn both a high school diploma and a college degree. The appeal must provide justification for why the use of the district completion rate is not an appropriate substitute.

How to Submit an Appeal

Superintendents appealing an accountability rating must transmit a letter prior to the appeal deadline that includes the following:

- A statement that the letter is an appeal of the 2007 state accountability rating;
- The name and ID number of the district and/or campuses for which the appeal is being submitted;
- The specific indicator(s) appealed;
- The problem, including details of the data affected and what caused the problem;
- If applicable, the reason(s) why the cause of the problem is attributable to the Texas Education Agency, a regional education service center, or the test contractor;
- The reason(s) why the change would result in a different rating, including calculations that support the different outcome;
- A statement that all information included in the appeal is true and correct to the superintendent's best knowledge and belief; and,
- The superintendent's signature on official district letterhead.

Other Information:

- Appeals for more than one campus within a district may be included in the same letter.
- Appeals for more than one indicator may be included in the same letter.
- Appeals of ratings issued under both standard and AEA procedures may be included in the same letter.
- Districts have only one opportunity to appeal each indicator for any campus or the district.
- When student-level information is in question, supporting information must be provided for review, i.e., a list of the students in question by name and identification number. It is not sufficient to claim data are in error without providing information with which the appeal can be researched and evaluated. *Confidential student-level documentation included in the appeal packet will be processed and stored in a secure location and will be accessible only by TEA staff authorized to view confidential student results.*
- It is the district's responsibility to ensure all relevant information is included in the appeal as districts will not be prompted for additional materials.

- Envelope should be addressed to the Division of Performance Reporting as follows:

Your ISD Your address City, TX zip	Division of Performance Reporting Texas Education Agency 1701 Congress Avenue Austin, TX 78701-1494	<i>stamp</i>
<u>Attn: Accountability Ratings Appeal</u>		

- Appeal letter should be addressed to Dr. Shirley Neeley, Commissioner of Education (see letter examples, below).
- Appeal letter must be postmarked on or before August 17, 2007. Appeals postmarked after this date will not be considered. Appeals delivered directly to TEA by district staff must be time-stamped in the Division of Performance Reporting by 5:00 p.m. on August 17, 2007.
- **Only send one copy of the appeal letter and/or supporting documentation.**
- Districts are encouraged to obtain delivery confirmation services from their mail courier.

Examples of satisfactory and unsatisfactory appeals are provided on the following page for illustration.

Appeal Letter Examples

Satisfactory Appeal:	Unsatisfactory Appeals:
<p>Dear Commissioner Neeley,</p> <p>This is an appeal of the 2007 state accountability rating issued for Elm Street Elementary School (ID 123456789) in Elm ISD.</p> <p>Specifically, I am appealing TAKS mathematics for the Hispanic student group. This is the only indicator keeping Elm Street Elementary from achieving a rating of <i>Academically Acceptable</i>.</p> <p>My analysis shows a coding change made to one student's ethnicity on the answer document at the time of testing was in error. One 5th grade Hispanic student was miscoded as White on the answer document. Had this student, who passed the mathematics test, been included in the Hispanic student group, the percent passing for this group would have met the <i>Academically Acceptable</i> standard. Removing this student from the White student group does not cause the White student group performance to fall below the <i>Acceptable</i> standard.</p> <p>Attached is the student's identification information as well as the PEIMS data for this student for the last six years (kindergarten through 5th grade) showing we have consistently reported this student as Hispanic.</p> <p>The second attachment shows the recalculated mathematics percent passing statistics for both the White and Hispanic student groups for Elm Elementary.</p> <p>We recognize the importance of accurate data coding, and have put new procedures in place to prevent this from occurring in the future.</p> <p>By my signature below, I certify that all information included in this appeal is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>J. Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools</p> <p><i>attachments</i></p>	<p>Dear Commissioner Neeley,</p> <p>I have analyzed the percentage passing for the economically disadvantaged mathematics students. The campus is allowed two exceptions. The floor for using the exception table is 40% for mathematics. The campus has 39%. Therefore, the campus was not able to use both exceptions. I am seeking consideration for the 39% in mathematics for the economically disadvantaged student group. If granted, the school's rating would become <i>Academically Acceptable</i>. Attached is a copy of the preliminary accountability data table.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>J. Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools</p> <p><i>attachment</i></p> <hr/> <p>Dear Commissioner Neeley,</p> <p>Maple ISD feels that its rating should be <i>Exemplary</i>. The discrepancy occurs because TEA shows that the performance for Hispanic Writing is 89%.</p> <p>We have sent two compositions back for scoring, and are confident they will be changed to passing.</p> <p>If you have questions, do not hesitate to contact us, at 701-555-1234.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>J. Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools</p> <p><i>(no attachments)</i></p>

How an Appeal Will Be Processed by the Agency

Once an appeal is received by the Division of Performance Reporting, the process for evaluating the information will be followed as outlined below:

- The details of the appeal are entered into a database for tracking purposes.
- Researchers evaluate the request using agency data sources to validate the statements made to the extent possible. The agency examines all relevant data, *not just the results for the students specifically named in the correspondence.*
- Researchers analyze the effect that granting a campus appeal may have on other campuses in the district (such as paired campuses), whether they are specifically named in the appeal or not. Similarly, the effect that granting a campus appeal may have on the district is evaluated, whether the district is named in the appeal or not. In single-campus districts, both the campus and the district are evaluated, whether the district submits the appeal as a campus or district appeal.
- Staff prepares a recommendation and forwards it to an external panel for review. Legislation passed in 2006 requires use of an appeals panel to ensure independent oversight of the appeals process. The use of an external, independent, three-member panel has been a feature of the state accountability system since 2004.
- The review panel examines the appeal, supporting documentation, staff research, and the staff recommendation. The panel determines its recommendation.
- The panel's recommendation is forwarded to the commissioner.
- The commissioner makes a final decision.
- The superintendent is notified in writing of the commissioner's decision and the rationale upon which the decision was made. The decision of the commissioner is final and is not subject to further negotiation at this point. The commissioner will respond in writing to each appeal received.
- *If an appeal is granted, the data upon which the appeal was based will not be modified.* Accountability and AEIS reports, as well as all other publications reflecting accountability data, must report the data as they are submitted to the TEA. Accountability data are subject to scrutiny by the Office of the State Auditor.

When a rating is changed due to a granted appeal, the letter from the commissioner serves as notification of the official rating for the district or campus. Districts may publicize the changed rating at that time. The agency website and other state accountability products will be updated after the resolution of all appeals. This update will occur in October 2007 concurrent with the release of the Gold Performance Acknowledgments. Note that the update will reflect only the changed *rating*; the values shown on the report, such as percent met standard, are never modified. Between the time of receipt of the letter granting an appeal and the update of agency state accountability products, the agency sources will not reflect the changed campus or district rating.

Chapter 15 – Responsibilities and Consequences

This section describes the responsibilities the various entities involved in public education have with respect to the state accountability system. These include statutory requirements as well as other responsibilities that are not mandated in statute. Many responsibilities are shared between the Texas Education Agency and local districts. Due to the passage of House Bill 1 during the Third Called Session of the 79th Legislature in 2006, there are many new requirements for both districts and the state. This chapter describes these to the extent they are known at the time of publication.

Consequences—those actions that occur as a result of the accountability system—are also described. Consequences include interventions and rewards. All statutes referenced in this section are listed in *Appendix B – Texas Education Code* which provides the web address for the complete citations.

Local Responsibilities

Districts have responsibilities associated with the state accountability system. Primarily these involve following statutory requirements, collecting and submitting accurate data, properly managing campus identification numbers, and implementing an optional local accountability system.

STATUTORY COMPLIANCE

A number of state statutes direct local districts and/or campuses to perform certain tasks or duties in response to the annual issuance of the state accountability ratings. Key statutes are discussed below.

Public Discussion of Ratings (TEC §11.253 (g)). Each campus site-based decision-making committee must hold at least one public meeting annually after the receipt of the annual campus accountability rating for the purpose of discussing the performance of the campus and the campus performance objectives. The confidentiality of the performance results should be ensured before public release of the data table. The data tables available on the TEA public website have been masked to protect confidentiality of individual student results.

Notice in Student Report Card and on Website (TEC §39.251 and TEC §39.252). Districts are required to publish accountability ratings on their websites and include the rating in the student report cards. These statutes require districts:

1. by the 10th day of the new school year to have posted on the district website the most current accountability ratings, Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) reports, and School Report Cards (SRC); and,
2. to include the most current campus performance rating with the first student report card each year, along with an explanation of the rating.

A document addressing frequently asked questions regarding these requirements is available on the agency website at: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/3297_faq.html.

Public Education Grant Program (TEC §§29.201 - 29.205). In 1995, the Texas Legislature created the Public Education Grant (PEG) program. The PEG program permits parents with

children attending campuses that are on the PEG list to request that their children be transferred to another campus within the same district or to another district. If a transfer is granted to another district, funding is provided to the receiving district. A list of campuses identified under the PEG criteria is generated and transmitted to districts annually. By February 1 following the release of the list, districts must notify each parent of a student assigned to attend a campus on the PEG list. For more information on the PEG program, please refer to *PEG Frequently Asked Questions*, available at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/peg_faq.html.

Actions Required Due to Low Ratings or Low Accreditation Statuses (TEC §§39.076, 39.131-39.132, 39.1322-39.1324, 39.1327, 39.1331, 39.133-39.136, 39.302). As mentioned previously, House Bill 1 significantly amended TEC Chapter 39. Districts with *Academically Unacceptable* ratings (campus or district) or *Accredited Probation/Accredited Warned* accreditation statuses will be required to follow directives from the Commissioner designed to remedy the issues of concern. Requirements will vary depending on the circumstances for each district affected. At the time of this manual's publication, Commissioner of Education rules have been proposed to define the implementation details of these statutory changes. Further information on these rules will be available on the TEA website or on the website for the TEA Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions, at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/pmi/>.

ACCURATE DATA

Accurate data is critical to the success of the ratings system. The bulk of the responsibility for the quality of the indicators used in establishing campus and district ratings rests with local districts. Though the state shares responsibility for ensuring the quality of the data used, the system depends on the responsible collection and submission of assessment and Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) information by local school districts.

CAMPUS IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS

In a given year, districts may need to change, delete, or add one or more of their campus identification numbers, the unique 9-digit county-district-campus number (CDC), due to closing old schools, opening new schools, or changing the grade span or population served by an existing school. Unintended consequences can occur when districts "recycle" campus ID numbers. Because two-year performance changes are a component of the accountability system, and merging prior year files with current year files is driven by campus identification numbers, comparisons may be inappropriate when a campus configuration has changed. The following example illustrates this situation:

Example: A campus served grades 7 and 8 in 2006, but in 2007, serves as a 6th grade center. The district did not request a new campus number for the new configuration. Instead, the same identifying number used in 2006 was maintained (recycled). Therefore, in 2006, grade 6 performance on the assessments would be compared to prior year grade 7 and 8 performance. Also, any dropouts reported for the campus for 2005-06 would be subject to evaluation for the 2007 accountability rating for the 6th grade center.

Whether or not to change a campus number is, in most cases, a local decision. However, districts should exercise caution in requesting new numbers and in continuing to use existing numbers when the student population or the grades offered change significantly. Districts are

strongly encouraged to request new campus numbers when school organizational configurations change dramatically.

New TEA policy requires school districts and charters to request campus number changes of existing campuses for the current school year by October 1 to ensure time for processing before the PEIMS fall snapshot date in late October. Changes for a subsequent school year will not be processed before November 1. This policy does not apply to new active campuses opening mid-year or to campuses under construction.

School districts and charters must receive TEA approval to change the campus number of a campus rated *Academically Unacceptable* or *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*. The determination of whether or not accountability ratings histories will be linked to new campus numbers will be made at the time the new numbers are approved so that districts are aware of the accountability consequences of changing campus numbers.

Although the ratings history may be linked across campus numbers for purposes of determining consecutive years of *Academically Unacceptable* ratings, data will not be linked across campus numbers. This includes PEIMS data, assessment data, and accountability indicators that draw on those data. Campuses with new campus numbers cannot take advantage of Required Improvement provisions of the accountability system to gate up to higher ratings the first year under a new number. Therefore, changing a campus number under these circumstances can be to the disadvantage of an *Academically Unacceptable* campus, which should be considered by districts and charters when requesting campus number changes for *Academically Unacceptable* campuses. In the rare circumstance where a charter district receives a new district number, the ratings history is also linked while the data are not linked across the district numbers.

Analyses to screen for the inappropriate use of campus numbers are part of *System Safeguards*, described below. TEA's PEIMS Division can assist in establishing new or retiring old campus numbers. For TEA contact information, see *Appendix G – Contacts*.

COMPLEMENTARY LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS

Although the statewide accountability system has been designed to address the guiding principles articulated in the *Introduction*, it is not a comprehensive system of performance evaluation. Communities across Texas have varied needs and goals for the school districts educating their students. Local systems of accountability can best address those priorities.

Districts are encouraged to develop their own complementary local accountability systems to plan for continued student performance improvement. Such systems are entirely voluntary and for local use only. Performance on locally-defined indicators does not affect the ratings determined through the statewide system.

Examples of locally-defined indicators include:

- level of parent participation;
- progress on locally administered assessments;
- progress on goals identified by campus improvement plans;
- progress compared to other campuses in the district;
- progress on professional development goals; and

- school safety measures.

As a different approach, districts may choose to expand the state-designated accountability ratings. For example, they may wish to further differentiate among campuses rated *Academically Acceptable* or *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

A third approach might be to examine those base indicators, both currently in use and planned for implementation, that fall short of local expectations. Additional performance measures could be constructed to track efforts to improve performance in those areas.

Regardless of the strategy chosen, local accountability systems should be designed to serve the needs of the local community and to improve performance for all students.

State Responsibilities

The Texas Education Agency also has responsibilities associated with the state accountability system. As is true for districts, TEA must follow statutory requirements related to the implementation of the accountability system. In addition, TEA applies a variety of system safeguards to ensure the integrity of the system. Finally, TEA is charged with taking actions to intervene when conditions warrant. The agency may also offer certain exemptions to districts when excellent performance is attained.

SYSTEM SAFEGUARDS

System safeguards are those activities conducted by TEA to ensure the integrity of the system. These help protect the system from purposeful manipulation as well as from the use of data of such poor quality—whether intentional or not—that no reliable rating can be determined.

Campus Number Tracking. *Academically Unacceptable* ratings received under two different campus numbers may be considered to be consecutive years of *Academically Unacceptable* ratings for accountability interventions and sanctions for an *Academically Unacceptable* campus whose campus number changes. Furthermore, in determining consecutive years of *Academically Unacceptable* ratings for purposes of accountability interventions and sanctions, only years that the campus is assigned an accountability rating of *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Academically Acceptable*, *Academically Unacceptable*, *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*, or equivalent ratings in previous years, will be considered. That is, the consecutive years of AU ratings could be separated by more than one year of temporary closure or *Not Rated* ratings. This policy applies to districts and charters as well as campuses when *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* and *Not Rated: Other* ratings are assigned. However, the policy does not apply to districts (charters) or campuses that receive a rating of *AEA: Not Rated – Other* under the Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Residential Facility procedures.

School Leaver Provision Safeguards. Campuses that avoid being rated *Academically Unacceptable* in 2007 due to the application of the School Leaver Provision will be subject to technical assistance team (TAT) intervention requirements in the 2007-08 school year. This is because campuses rated *Academically Acceptable* in 2007 are identified for technical assistance teams (TATs) if their 2007 accountability results do not meet the 2008 accountability standards. Since the 2008 dropout/completion standards are identical to those waived in 2007 through the application of the School Leaver Provision, these campuses are

automatically subject to the requirements for TAT campuses and are not eligible to receive a waiver from the commissioner.

Districts that avoid being rated *Academically Unacceptable* in 2007 due to the application of the School Leaver Provision will be subject to identification and intervention under Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) for dropout rates and leaver reporting.

Data Validation. Analyses designed to identify questionable data include, but are not limited to, audits of leaver data and examination of assessment data including data attributed to JJAEPs and/or DAEPs. Also, TEA-conducted data quality analyses are incorporated into the data validation monitoring component of the PBM system. For more information, see the PBM website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/pbm/>.

Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues. A rating can also be changed to *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*. This rating is used in the rare situation where the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results have been compromised and it is not possible to assign a rating based on the evaluation of performance. This label may be assigned temporarily pending an on-site investigation, or may be assigned as the final rating label for the year. This rating label is not equivalent to an *Academically Unacceptable* rating, though the Commissioner of Education has the authority to assign an *Academically Unacceptable* rating due to data quality issues. All districts and campuses with a final rating label of *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* are automatically subject to desk audits the following year.

System safeguard activities can occur either before or after the ratings release. Sanctions can be imposed at any time. To the extent possible, ratings for the year are finalized when updated ratings are released following the resolution of appeals (in 2007 the update is scheduled for late October 2007). A rating change resulting from an imposed sanction will stand as the final rating for the year.

DISTRICT ACCREDITATION STATUS

Amendments to TEC §39.071 require the Commissioner of Education to determine an accreditation status for districts and charters. This new accreditation status is to be assigned beginning in 2007. In determining accreditation status and sanctions, TEA is to take into account the district's state accountability rating and its financial accountability rating. As with other changes to Chapter 39 resulting from HB 1, rules have been proposed that will define the procedures for determining a district's accreditation status. These rules will be available on the TEA website or on the website for the TEA Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions, at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/pmi/>.

PUBLIC EDUCATION GRANT PROGRAM CAMPUS LISTS

TEA is responsible for annually producing the list of campuses identified under the PEG criteria. In December 2007 the list of 2008-09 PEG campuses will be transmitted. This list will identify campuses at which 50 percent or more of the students did not pass TAKS in any two of the preceding three years (2005, 2006, or 2007) **or** that were rated *Academically Unacceptable* in any one of the preceding three years (2005, 2006, or 2007). At the time of publication for this manual, the Texas Legislature is considering at least one bill that would significantly alter the PEG program criteria. If any PEG-related legislation passes, districts will be notified as soon as possible.

For more information on the PEG program, please refer to *PEG Frequently Asked Questions*, available at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/peg_faq.html.

INTERVENTIONS

Interventions are those activities conducted by TEA to follow-up with districts and campuses either at-risk of a future low rating, or already assigned a low rating. Interventions are more aggressive when multiple years of low ratings are involved.

Identification of Technical Assistance Team Campuses. Texas Education Code §39.1322 requires the assignment of a technical assistance team (TAT) to a campus rated *Academically Acceptable* if that campus would be rated *Academically Unacceptable* using the accountability standards for the subsequent year. The purpose of the TAT identification is to serve as an early warning system and, therefore, provide interventions that may prevent the campus from being rated *Academically Unacceptable* in the subsequent year.

TAT schools were first identified for the 2006-07 school year, but technical assistance teams will not be fully implemented until the 2007-08 school year. TEA will provide the 2007-08 list of TAT campuses to affected districts by November 1, 2007, following the release of the final 2007 accountability ratings.

For the 2007-08 school year, campuses rated *Academically Acceptable* in 2007 under either standard or alternative education accountability procedures are identified for technical assistance teams if their 2006-07 performance does not meet the accountability standards established for the 2008 school year.

Campuses identified for technical assistance teams that demonstrate improvement over the preceding three years are eligible to receive a waiver from the Commissioner. A campus must be evaluated under the same accountability procedures, either standard or alternative education accountability, in each of the preceding three years in order to be eligible for the waiver. Campuses meet the TAT required improvement if the sum of actual change averaged across the three prior years is equal to or greater than the improvement needed to achieve each standard established for the subsequent school year. The improvement needed is the difference between the standard established for the subsequent school year and actual performance in the current school year.

Questions regarding the methodology used to identify the TAT campuses should be directed to the Division of Performance Reporting at performance.reporting@tea.state.tx.us or (512) 463-9704. Questions regarding interventions for TAT campuses should be directed to the Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions at pmdivision@tea.state.tx.us or (512) 463-9414.

Academically Unacceptable Campus/District Ratings and Accredited Warned/Accredited Probation District Accreditation Statuses. The Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions handles all inquiries regarding the interventions that take place when a campus or district is rated *Academically Unacceptable* or *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* or when a district accreditation status is accredited-warned or accredited-probation. For more information, contact this division at pmdivision@tea.state.tx.us or (512) 463-9414.

EXCELLENCE EXEMPTIONS

Texas Education Code §39.112 automatically exempts districts and campuses rated *Exemplary* from some statutes and rules. The exemptions remain in effect until the Commissioner of Education determines that achievement levels of the district or campus have declined, or the district or campus rating changes.

Statute lists a number of areas in law and regulation to which the exemption does not apply. These include criminal behavior, due process, federal and state program requirements, the curriculum essential knowledge and skills, public school accountability, extracurricular activities, and employee rights and benefits. (See TEC §39.112 for a complete list.) Under specific circumstances the Commissioner may exempt a campus from class size limits for elementary grades.

Chapter 16 – Accountability Standards for 2008

This chapter provides information about the commissioner’s final decisions for 2008 accountability standards. The purpose of this chapter is to inform educators about this key component of the system well in advance of the 2008 accountability year. Given this advance information, districts and campuses can better prepare for changes to the base indicator standards that will take place in 2008.

Other components of the 2008 system will be reevaluated during the annual development process that will begin for the next cycle in early 2008. See *Chapter 17: Preview of 2008 and Beyond* for details as they are currently planned for all components of the 2008 year as well as 2009 and 2010.

The tables below show 2008 standards for standard and AEA procedures, respectively.

Table 19: Standards for 2008 Ratings - Standard Procedures

Indicators/Features	Academically Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
Assessment Indicator (<i>Certain TAKS-I assessments are combined with TAKS in 2008*</i>)			
TAKS (2007-08)* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students and each student group meeting minimum size: • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv. 	Meets each standard: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/ELA.... 70% • Writing 65% • Social Studies .. 65% • Mathematics..... 50% • Science..... 45% OR Meets Required Improvement	Meets 75% standard for each subject or Meets floor criteria and Required Improvement	Meets 90% standard for each subject
<i>* The 2008 TAKS indicator will include Grade 8 Science and the following TAKS-I results: Science (English) for grades 5, 8, 10, 11; Science (Spanish) for grade 5; Social Studies for grades 8, 10, & 11; ELA for grade 11; Mathematics for grade 11</i>			
Completion/Dropout Indicators			
Completion Rate I (class of 2007) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students and each student group meeting minimum size: • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv. 	Meets 75.0% standard or Meets Required Improvement	Meets 85.0% standard or Meets floor criteria and Required Improvement	Meets 95.0% standard
Annual Dropout Rate Grades 7-8 (2006-07) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students and each student group meeting minimum size: • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv. 	Meets 1.0% standard or Meets Required Improvement	Meets 0.7% standard or Meets floor criteria and Required Improvement	Meets 0.2% standard

Table 19: Standards for 2008 Ratings - Standard Procedures (cont.)

Indicators/Features	Academically Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
Additional Provisions			
Underreported Students (District only)	Does not apply to Academically Acceptable districts.	A district that underreports more than 200 students or more than 5.0% of its prior year students cannot be rated <i>Recognized</i> .	A district that underreports more than 200 students or more than 5.0% of its prior year students cannot be rated <i>Exemplary</i> .
<i>Districts with fewer than 5 underreported students will not be subject to this provision.</i>			

Table 20: Standards for 2008 Ratings - AEA Procedures

Indicators/Features	AECs of Choice	Residential Facilities	Charters
Assessment Indicator (Certain TAKS-I assessments are combined with TAKS in 2008**)			
TAKS Progress (2007-08)** <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Students and each student group meeting minimum size: • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv. 	Meets 45% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement or Meets 45% Standard Using District At-Risk Data or Demonstrates Required Improvement Using District At-Risk Data		Meets 45% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement
<i>** The 2008 TAKS Progress indicator will include grade 8 Science and the following TAKS-I results: Science (English) for grades 5, 8, 10, 11; Science (Spanish) for grade 5; Social Studies for grades 8, 10, 11; ELA for grade 11; Mathematics for grade 11.</i>			
Completion/Dropout Indicators			
Completion Rate II (Class of 2007) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Students and each student group meeting minimum size: • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv. 	Meets 75.0% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement or Meets 75.0% Standard Using District At-Risk Data or Demonstrates Required Improvement Using District At-Risk Data	Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II	Meets 75.0% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement
Annual Dropout Rate—Grades 7-12 (2006-07) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Students and each student group meeting minimum size: • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv. 	Meets 10.0% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement		