

Chapter 8 - Overview of Alternative Education Accountability (AEA)

ABOUT PART 2 OF THIS MANUAL

Part 2 of this *Manual* is a technical resource to explain the criteria and procedures applied by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) in evaluating the performance of alternative education campuses (AECs) including charters and charter campuses that:

- are dedicated to serving students at risk of dropping out of school;
- are eligible to receive an alternative education accountability (AEA) rating; and
- register annually for evaluation under AEA procedures.

Registered AECs and charters rated under AEA procedures will be subject to all the terms and provisions of this *Manual*.

EDUCATOR INPUT

While it was the role of the Commissioner of Education to develop AEA procedures, during the past year, the commissioner relied extensively on the detailed review, study, and advice of staff, educators, and other education stakeholders. The resulting procedures contain appropriate indicators for AECs with increased rigor phased in over time.

HISTORY OF AEA

Enacted by the Texas legislature in 1993, accountability legislation mandated creation of an accountability system for all Texas schools. This accountability system integrated the statewide curriculum; the state criterion-referenced assessment system; district and campus accountability; district and campus recognition for high performance and significant increases in performance; sanctions for poor performance; and school, district, and state reports.

As a result of statewide educator feedback, an alternative set of performance measures for campuses serving at-risk students was developed in late 1994 and implemented in the 1995-96 school year. In order for a campus to qualify as alternative, it was required to serve one or more of the following student populations: students at risk of dropping out; recovered dropouts; pregnant or parenting students; adjudicated students; students with severe discipline problems; or expelled students.

For the 1995-96 school year, alternative accountability ratings were based on state-approved district proposals that included student performance indicators, current-year data, and comparisons of pre- and post-assessment results. Following a review of campus data by the local board of trustees, each district made an initial determination of the campus rating. This initial determination was then forwarded to the TEA where it was reviewed by a panel of peer reviewers who sent a recommendation to the commissioner.

From the 1995-96 to 2001-02 school years, revisions were made to the ratings criteria and procedures determined by an *ad hoc* Alternative Education Advisory Committee:

- Minimum performance levels for an *Acceptable* rating were established in 1996-97.
- Beginning in 1996-97, school districts were required to select campus-based performance indicators from a menu of state-established indicators.
- In 1997-98, TEA staff assumed responsibility for the review and analysis of all campus performance data.
- In 1999-00, TEA required that the rating for each AEC be determined on three base indicators: Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) passing rates for reading and mathematics, dropout rates, and attendance rates.
- In 1999-00, disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs) and juvenile justice alternative education programs (JJAEPs) were no longer permitted to register for AEA. Instead, the performance of students served in these programs was attributed to the campuses where these students would otherwise have attended.
- In 2000-01, campuses were required to serve “students at risk of dropping out of school” as defined in Texas Education Code (TEC) §29.081 in order to be eligible to receive an accountability rating under AEA procedures.

House Bill 6, enacted by the 77th Texas Legislature, called for a pilot program to examine issues surrounding accountability of alternative education programs. The purposes of this pilot were to analyze the existing status of AECs and to make recommendations regarding the methods of evaluating the performance of these campuses. In order to achieve these purposes, the following activities were undertaken in 2002:

- a set of surveys for principals, teachers/counselors, parents, and students at all AECs was administered;
- a more detailed survey was administered and follow-up telephone calls were made to a small sample of AECs;
- an analysis of existing Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data was undertaken; and
- individual student data from a small sample of AECs was compiled and analyzed.

Results of the pilot program are published in the *Report on the Alternative Education Accountability Pilot* (Texas Education Agency, December 1, 2002).

While these pilot activities were conducted, *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), Public Law 107-110, was signed into law. This federal legislation, which focuses on increasing state and school accountability for student progress, was considered as part of the pilot project report. Accountability provisions of NCLB require that all campuses, including AECs, be evaluated annually for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

The 2003 Educator Focus Group on Accountability made a recommendation to develop new AEA procedures for 2005 and beyond. The new AEA procedures are based on the following guidelines:

- The AEA indicators must be based on data submitted through standard data submission processes such as PEIMS or by the state testing contractor.
- The AEA measures should be appropriate for alternative education programs offered on AECs rather than just setting lower standards on the same measures used in the standard accountability procedures. Furthermore, these measures should ensure that all students demonstrate proficiency on the state assessments in order to graduate.
- The Texas Growth Index (TGI) and other improvement indicators should be evaluated as base indicators for AEC ratings.
- Additional AEA criteria should be researched. For example, AECs should have a minimum percentage of at-risk students (based on PEIMS data reported on current year fall enrollment records) to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

Also, in 2003, ratings for all campuses were suspended for one year while the new Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) assessments were implemented for the first time and the new state accountability system was developed. In 2004, registered AECs received a rating of *Not Rated: Alternative Education* while new AEA procedures were developed.

PHILOSOPHY OF AEA

Throughout the 2005 AEA development process, TEA worked closely with educators and other education stakeholders to create new AEA procedures based on the following principles:

- Procedures apply to AECs, not programs.
- Procedures apply to AECs dedicated to serving students at risk of dropping out of school.
- Procedures apply only to those AECs that qualify and register for evaluation under AEA procedures.
- Procedures do not apply to DAEPs or JJAEPs. Statute or interpretation of statutory intent requires that DAEP and JJAEP data are attributed to the student's home campus.
- Procedures do not apply to standard campuses, even if the campus primarily serves at-risk students.

During the development of the new AEA procedures, the following issues were identified as affecting many components and were considered at many decision points. For example, whether to make recommendations for Residential Facilities and AECs of Choice was addressed as decisions were made.

- Small numbers of test results and mobility – AECs are smaller on average than standard campuses and have high mobility rates.
- Attribution of data – High mobility also affects attribution of data and complicates evaluation of AEC data.
- Residential Facilities – Education services are provided to students in residential programs and facilities operated under contract with the Texas Youth Commission (TYC), students in detention centers and correctional facilities that are registered with the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC), and students in private residential treatment centers (PRTC).

OVERALL DESIGN OF AEA PROCEDURES

The overall design of the new AEA procedures is an improvement model. In 2005 and beyond, AECs can meet either an absolute performance standard or an improvement standard for each accountability measure.

The new AEA procedures include these major components for 2005:

- Rating labels – *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*, and *AEA: Not Rated – Other*;
- AEC registration criteria and requirements;
- Base Indicators – TAKS, State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II), Completion Rate II, and Annual Dropout Rate; and
- Additional Features – Required Improvement and use of district at-risk data.

Chapter 9 - AEA Registration Criteria and Requirements

Registration criteria restrict use of alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures to:

- campuses that offer nontraditional programs rather than programs within a standard campus,
- charters that operate only alternative education campuses (AECs), and
- charters that meet an AEC enrollment criterion.

Alternative Education Campuses (AECs)

AECs including charter AECs must serve students “at risk of dropping out of school” as defined in Texas Education Code (TEC) §29.081(d) and provide accelerated instructional services to these students. Each AEC registered for evaluation under AEA procedures is designated as an AEC of Choice or Residential Facility.

AEC of Choice. At-risk students enroll at AECs of Choice to expedite progress toward performing at grade level and high school completion.

Residential Facility. Education services are provided to students in residential programs and facilities operated under contract with the Texas Youth Commission (TYC), students in detention centers and correctional facilities that are registered with the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC), and students in private residential treatment centers (PRTC).

In this *Manual* the terms “AEC” and “registered AEC” refer collectively to AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that are registered for evaluation under AEA procedures.

AEC ELIGIBILITY

AECs have the option to be rated under the AEA procedures and indicators. Campuses that choose not to register as an AEC are evaluated under the standard accountability procedures. The performance results of students at registered AECs are included in the district’s performance and used in determining the district’s accountability rating and acknowledgments.

The following types of campuses had the option to register as an AEC in 2005.

- **Local District AEC:** Serves students at risk of dropping out of school as defined in TEC §29.081(d). Students are provided accelerated instruction designed to enable students to be promoted at the elementary and middle school levels or complete credits and pass the assessments necessary to attain a high school diploma.
- **Charter AEC:** AEC operated by a charter.
- **Community-Based AEC:** As described in TEC §29.081(e), a “district may use a private or public community-based dropout recovery education program to provide alternative education programs for students at risk of dropping out of school.”
- **Shared Service Arrangement (SSA) AEC (local district or fiscal agent):** The district in which the AEC is located or the fiscal agent district registers the AEC number.

- **SSA AEC (virtual campus number of a participating district):** Member districts of an alternative education SSA establish and register virtual AEC numbers on which to track long-term alternative education students.

The following types of campuses are ineligible for evaluation under AEA procedures. The data for these campuses are attributed to the home campus:

- disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs);
- juvenile justice alternative education programs (JJAEPs); and
- stand-alone General Educational Development (GED) programs.

See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information on DAEPs and JJAEPs.

AEC REGISTRATION PROCESS

Since the 1999-00 school year, AEC registration has governed the alternative education component of the CAMPUS-ID-OF-ACCOUNTABILITY data processing in the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) and attribution of AEC student data.

AECs registered in 2003-04 were re-registered automatically in 2004-05. A rescission letter was required from AECs not wishing to remain registered for AEA. A *2004-05 Alternative Education Accountability Campus Registration Form* was required for each AEC not already on the list of registered AECs that wished to be evaluated under 2004-05 AEA procedures. The 2005 registration process closed on September 10, 2004. The list of 2005 registered AECs is available on the AEA website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/aea>.

AEC REGISTRATION CRITERIA

Ten criteria are required for campuses to be registered for AEA. However, the requirements in criteria (6)-(10) may not apply to charter campuses (depending on the terms of the charter) or for community-based dropout recovery campuses established in accordance with TEC §29.081(e). The requirements in criterion (9) apply to Residential Facilities only if students are placed in the facility by the district.

- (1) The AEC must have its own county-district-campus (CDC) number to which PEIMS data are submitted and test answer documents are coded. A program operated within or supported by another campus does not qualify.
- (2) The AEC must be identified in AskTED (Texas School Directory database) as an alternative campus.
- (3) The AEC must be dedicated to serving “students at risk of dropping out of school” as defined in TEC §29.081(d).
- (4) The AEC must operate on its own campus budget.
- (5) The AEC must offer nontraditional settings and methods of instructional delivery designed to meet the needs of the students served on the AEC.
- (6) The AEC must have an appropriately certified, full-time administrator whose primary duty is the administration of the AEC.

- (7) The AEC must have appropriately certified teachers assigned in all areas including special education, bilingual education, and/or English as a second language (ESL) to serve students eligible for such services.
- (8) The AEC must provide each student the opportunity to attend a 7-hour school day as defined in TEC §25.082(a), according to the needs of each student.
- (9) If the campus serves students with disabilities, the students must be placed at the AEC by their Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committee.
- (10) Students with disabilities must receive all services outlined in their current individualized education programs (IEPs). Limited English proficient (LEP) students must receive all services outlined by the language proficiency assessment committee (LPAC). Students with disabilities and LEP students must be served by appropriately certified teachers.

An at-risk registration criterion will be phased in beginning in 2006. See *Chapter 14 – Preview of 2006 and Beyond* for information on this new at-risk registration criterion.

Charters

In this publication the term “charter” refers to the charter operator, not an individual charter campus. The terms “charter campus” and “charter AEC” refer to an individual campus.

CHARTERS EVALUATED UNDER AEA PROCEDURES

Under standard and AEA procedures, charter ratings are based on aggregate performance of the campuses operated by the charter. Performance results of all students in the charter are included in the charter’s performance and used in determining the charter’s rating.

Charters receiving ratings under AEA procedures are evaluated on the same indicators as registered AECs:

- 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 2004, and
- *2003-04 Annual Dropout Rate* for grades 7 through 12.

Charters that operate only registered AECs. Beginning in 2005, charters that operate only registered AECs will be evaluated under AEA procedures. Charters that operate only registered Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.

Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs. Also beginning in 2005, charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs have the option to be evaluated under AEA procedures if the AEC enrollment criterion described below is met. TEA will contact each charter to obtain their preference. If a preference cannot be obtained, then the charter will be evaluated under the standard accountability procedures.

AEC ENROLLMENT CRITERION FOR CHARTERS

In order for a charter that operates both standard campuses and registered AECs to be eligible for evaluation under AEA procedures, the charter must meet an AEC enrollment criterion. At least 50% of the charter's students must be enrolled at registered AECs. AEC enrollment is verified through current year PEIMS fall enrollment data.

Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs will be evaluated under the standard accountability procedures if fewer than 50% of the charter's students are enrolled at registered AECs.

Chapter 10 - Attribution of AEC Data

BACKGROUND

Since the 1999-00 school year, student data (attendance, completion/dropout, and performance) are attributed to alternative education campuses (AECs) registered for evaluation under alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures only when the student attends the registered AEC for 85 days or more. Under the previous AEA procedures, the AEC accountability rating was based on performance of students enrolled on the campus for 85 days or more. The 85-day rule was implemented before the campus accountability subset was incorporated in the state accountability system.

In 2004, the campus accountability subset was applied for the first time in the state accountability system. Under the campus accountability subset, only test results for students enrolled on the same campus on the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date are included in the campus performance measure.

For data collected through PEIMS, attribution of attendance and leaver records to the home campus is automated for most students based on attendance data reported for the student. A CAMPUS-ID-OF-ACCOUNTABILITY data element is required when a student's only campus of enrollment is a registered AEC that the student attends for less than 85 days, and/or a disciplinary alternative education program (DAEP), and/or a juvenile justice alternative education program (JJAEP). For assessment data, the test answer document is physically submitted with the answer documents for the student's home campus.

Student data and test documents are only reattributed within the same school district. For this reason, charter campus data are not reattributed. For students who have not attended a standard campus in the district, local policy determines to which campus the short-term AEC student data are attributed.

A comparison of 2003-04 attendance reattribution and test answer documents suggests that the reattribution is not always conducted consistently for PEIMS data (an automated process conducted at the state level) and test results (a local process). Often, test answer documents for students enrolled on the AEC for fewer than 85 days were not sent back to the student's home campus.

ATTRIBUTION OF DATA

AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities. The 85-day rule will be phased out under the new AEA procedures on the timeline provided below. When the 85-day rule is discontinued, the accountability subset definition will govern whether or not test results are included in the performance indicators used for ratings.

- For 2005 accountability, AEC test answer documents and leaver data are attributed according to current policies based on the 85-day rule.
- For 2006 accountability, campus accountability subset determines attribution of AEC test data. 2004-05 leaver data are attributed according to the 85-day rule for AECs that were registered for evaluation under AEA procedures in 2005. 2004-05 leaver

data are attributed to the last campus of attendance for AECs that were not registered for evaluation under AEA procedures in 2005, but are registered in 2006.

- For 2007 accountability, campus accountability subset determines attribution of AEC test data. Leavers are attributed to the last campus attended.

DAEPs and JJAEPs. As required in statute, DAEP and JJAEP student data are attributed to the student's home campus.

Chapter 11 - 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 2004, and
- 2003-04 *Annual Dropout Rate* for grades 7 through 12.

TAKS PROGRESS INDICATOR

A single performance indicator is evaluated for TAKS. The TAKS Progress indicator sums performance results across grades (3-11) and across subjects to determine alternative education campus (AEC) 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 April 2005 administration:
 - Actual student passing standard
 - TGI: 2004 to 2005, growth of 0 (zero) or higher
 - Campus accountability subset
- TAKS grade 12 April 2005, February 2005, October 2004, and July 2004 administrations:
 - Actual student passing standard
 - Students who meet passing standard
 - No accountability subset
- TAKS grade 11 April 2005, February 2005, October 2004, and July 2004 administrations:
 - Retesters only
 - Actual student passing standard
 - Students who meet 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 12 – 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 13 – 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 12: TAKS Progress Indicator**

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<i>AEA: Academically Acceptable</i>	40%	40%	45%	45%	50%	50%
TAKS Progress Indicator	TAKS + TGI + Exit-Level Retesters					
Accountability Subset	85-day rule and Campus Accountability Subset	Campus Accountability Subset				

TAKS Progress Standard:

- *AEA: Academically Acceptable* – At least 40%.
- The TAKS Progress standard will be reviewed annually and is subject to change.

Student Groups: TAKS performance is evaluated for All Students and for the following student groups that meet minimum size requirements: 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:

- Test answer documents are attributed to the AEC only when the student attends the registered AEC for 85 days or more.
- The 85-day rule does not apply to charter AECs and charters.
- *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 (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date.
- Accountability subset does not apply to TAKS exit-level retesters.

Years of Data:

- April 2005 grades 3-11 TAKS results (primary administration)
- April 2005, February 2005, October 2004, and July 2004 grade 11 exit-level retester results
- April 2005, February 2005, October 2004, and July 2004 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.
- *Testing Window.* Results for students given a make-up test within the testing window are included in the accountability measures.
- *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.
- *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 each specific year. See *Chapter 2 – The Basics: Base Indicators* for more detailed information.
- *TGI.* A 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 through 11

Mathematics – grades 4 through 11

Social Studies – grade 11

Science – grade 11

More 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 an inappropriate 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. The indicator sums performance results 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. 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 every SDAA II test taken).

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* – Results on at least 40% of tests taken must meet ARD expectations.
- The SDAA II standard will be reviewed annually and is subject to change.

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 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:

- Test answer documents are attributed to the AEC only when the student attends the registered AEC for 85 days or more.
- The 85-day rule does not apply to charter AECs and charters.
- *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 (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date.

Year of Data: Spring 2005 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.
- *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%.

COMPLETION RATE II (GRADES 9-12) INDICATOR

This longitudinal rate shows the percent of students who first attended grade 9 in the 2000-01 school year who completed or who are continuing their education four years later. Known as the 2000-01 cohort, these students' progress was tracked over the four years using data provided to TEA by districts and charters.

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

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 grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12 in the 2004-05 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, or if the AEC of Choice has students in grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 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 12 – 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 13: Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12) Indicator**

	2005 Class of 2004; 9th grade 00-01	2006 Class of 2005; 9th grade 01-02	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
<i>AEA: Academically Acceptable</i>	75.0%	75.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Completion Rate II	Graduates + Continuing Students + GED Recipients					
Dropout Definition	Current state definition	Current state definition	Phase in NCES definition	Phase in NCES definition	Phase in NCES definition	NCES definition
Accountability Subset	85-day rule	85-day rule	None	None	None	None

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:

number of completers (graduates + continuing students + GED recipients)

number of students in class (original cohort)

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 AEC of Choice only when the student attends the registered AEC of Choice for 85 days or more.
- The 85-day rule does not apply to charter AECs and charters.

Years of Data:

- Graduating Class of 2004 (results are based on the original cohort, whether the students remain on grade level or not)
- Continued enrollment in 2004-05
- GED records for 1999 through 2005

Data Sources:

- PEIMS Submission 1 enrollment data for 2000-01 through 2004-05
- PEIMS Submission 1 leaver data for 2001-02 through 2004-05
- PEIMS Submission 3 attendance data for 2000-01 through 2003-04
- GED records as of March 1, 2005

Other Information:

- *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.

Who is evaluated for Annual Dropout Rate:

- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that serve students in grades 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and/or 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 14: Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12) Indicator**

	2005 from 2003-04	2006 from 2004-05	2007 from 2005-06	2008 from 2006-07	2009 from 2007-08	2010 from 2008-09
<i>AEA: Academically Acceptable</i>	10.0%	10.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Dropout Definition	Current state definition	Current state definition	NCES definition	NCES definition	NCES definition	NCES definition
Accountability Subset	85-day rule	85-day rule	None	None	None	None

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 AEC only when the student attends the registered AEC for 85 days or more.
- The 85-day rule does not apply to charter AECs and charters.

Year of Data: 2003-04

Data Sources:

- PEIMS Submission 1 enrollment data for 2003-04 and 2004-05
- PEIMS Submission 1 leaver data for 2004-05
- PEIMS Submission 3 attendance data for 2003-04

Other Information:

- *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.