

Alternative Education Accountability (AEA): 2005 and Beyond Framework for Alternative Education Accountability Procedures

The following recommendations represent Educator Focus Group decisions on individual AEA topics.

AEA Topic	Alternative Education Campuses (AECs) of Choice	Residential Facilities
Registration Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue existing eligibility criteria in 2005 and beyond. • Implement a campus at-risk criterion beginning in 2006 requiring a minimum percentage of at-risk students. Phase in beginning at 65% and increase by 5 percentage points per year to 75% by 2008. Incorporate a safeguard for campuses falling below the requirement such as averaging the rate across years. 	
Accountability Subset	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion and Dropouts: none • TAKS: campus accountability subset 	
TAKS/TGI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate campus results on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) Progress Indicator summed across subjects. The TAKS Progress Indicator combines student growth, absolute performance, and includes results from the additional administrations of the exit-level test. • Model 40% accountability standard at 2005 student passing standard [Gr. 3-10 at Panel Recommended (PR), Gr. 11 at 1 standard error of measurement (SEM) below PR]. Phase in to higher standard to reach 50% by 2010. • If campus meets the 40% accountability standard based on results for fewer than 10 tests, then use campus performance. • If campus does not meet the accountability standard based on results for fewer than 10 tests, or if there are no TAKS results for the campus, then use district performance of at-risk students. • If there are results for fewer than 10 at-risk tests in the district, then conduct special analysis. • Revisit phase-in schedule before 2007 to evaluate the effect of discontinuing the 85-day rule. 	
Completion Rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate campus Grade 9-12 Completion Rate II (including GED recipients) against a 75.0% accountability standard. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ If campus does not meet the accountability standard, or if the campus does not have a Completion Rate, but the campus has students in grades 9-12, then evaluate campus using Completion Rate II (including GED recipients) of at-risk students in the district. ➤ If district does not meet minimum size criteria for All Students, then do not evaluate campus on Completion Rate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate.
Annual Dropout Rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate campus Grade 7-12 Annual Dropout Rate against 10.0% accountability standard (or 90.0% non-dropout rate standard). • If campus does not meet minimum size criteria for All Students, then do not evaluate this measure. • Revisit 10.0% accountability standard before 2007 due to discontinuation of the 85-day rule and implementation of the NCES dropout definition. 	
SDAA II	Evaluate campus on the same SDAA II indicator as in the standard accountability system at a 40% standard.	
Required Improvement	Required Improvement is applied and calculated the same as in the standard accountability system for TAKS/TGI, Completion Rate, and Annual Dropout Rate – amount of improvement required to meet standard in two years.	

Alternative Education Accountability Procedures for 2005 and Beyond Educator Focus Group Proposal

This proposal includes accountability procedures developed for alternative education campuses (AECs) that qualify and are registered for evaluation under alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures. The new AEA procedures contain appropriate indicators for AECs with increased rigor phased in over time. AEA procedures do not apply to disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs) or juvenile justice alternative education programs (JJAEPs).

During the development of new AEA procedures, the following issues were identified that affect many components of the system. These issues must be considered at many decision points. For example, whether to make recommendations for Residential Facilities and AECs of Choice must be addressed as AEA decisions are made.

1. Small numbers of test results and mobility – AECs are smaller on average than regular campuses and have high mobility rates.
2. Attribution of data under the 85-day rule – Attribution of data under the 85-day rule complicates evaluation of AEC data.
3. 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).

A background and history of AEA along with the campus grouping used for 2005 AEA modeling are in *Appendix A*. Issues specific to Residential Facilities are in *Appendix B*.

Overall Design: Improvement Model

1. Accountability Criteria. The overall design of AEA procedures is an improvement model. For each measure used in the ratings evaluation, AECs can meet the standard for *Academically Acceptable* by meeting **either** an absolute performance standard **or** an improvement standard.

Rationale: Improvement criteria allow a gate out of *Academically Unacceptable* and are incorporated without increasing the number of indicators and measures in the system. Higher absolute performance standards can be established without penalizing large numbers of AECs that realistically cannot be expected to reach these standards for several years, especially given that, by definition, AECs provide services for students at risk of dropping out of school. Conversely, lower performing AECs are rewarded for making gains. Since gains are required on each measure for which the absolute standard is not met, attention is given to each student group.

2. AEC Rating Labels. AEA: *Academically Acceptable*
 AEA: *Academically Unacceptable*

Rationale: Using two of the same rating labels for AECs that are used for campuses and districts evaluated under the standard accountability system will simplify AEA procedures.

Alternative Education Campus Registration Requirements

AECs have been registering for evaluation under AEA procedures since 1995-96. Since 1999-00, AEC registration also governs 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.

2005. AECs that were registered in 2003-04 were registered automatically in 2004-05. A rescission letter was required from those AECs that did not wish to continue AEA registration. A 2004-05 Alternative Education Accountability Campus Registration Form was required for each AEC that was not already on the list of registered AECs but wished to be evaluated under 2004-05 AEA procedures. There are 453 AECs registered for evaluation under AEA procedures in 2005.

2004. AECs that registered and were eligible in 2002-03 were automatically registered in 2003-04 unless the agency was notified to the contrary. A rescission letter was required from those AECs that did not wish to continue AEA registration. AECs that were not registered for evaluation under AEA procedures used an on-line Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE) registration process. There were 400 AECs registered for evaluation under AEA procedures in 2004.

Percent At-Risk Students in 2003-04

	All Campuses (2004 Accountability Universe)	Registered Alternative Education Campuses	Residential Facilities (TYC, TJPC, PRTC)	At-Risk Campuses (75% at risk)
Number of Campuses	7,813	357	77	800
% At-Risk Students	46%	82%	85%	89%

Source: PEIMS Fall Enrollment 2003-04.

1. Registration Criteria. To be evaluated under AEA procedures, each AEC must meet the following registration criteria.
 - a. The AEC must have its own county-district-campus number that is used for submitting PEIMS data and coding test answer documents;
 - b. The AEC must be identified in AskTED (Texas School Directory database) as an alternative campus;
 - c. The AEC must be dedicated to serving “students at risk of dropping out of school” as defined in Texas Education Code (TEC) §29.081(d);
 - d. The AEC must operate on its own campus budget;
 - e. The AEC must offer nontraditional methods of instructional delivery designed to meet the needs of the students served on the campus;
 - f. The AEC must have an appropriately certified, full-time administrator whose primary duty is the administration of the AEC;
 - g. 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;
 - h. The AEC must provide each student the opportunity to attend a 7-hour school day;
 - i. If the campus serves special education students, the students must be placed at the AEC by their admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) committee; and
 - j. Special education students 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). Special education and LEP students must be served by appropriately certified teachers.

All requirements in criteria f. – j. 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 criteria i. may not apply to Residential Facilities if students are not placed in the facility by the district.

Rationale: Registration criteria restrict use of AEA procedures to campuses that offer nontraditional instructional programs and/or settings rather than programs within a regular campus.

2. At-Risk Registration Criterion. An at-risk registration criterion will be phased in beginning in 2006. Each AEC must have a minimum percentage of at-risk students enrolled on the AEC verified through current year PEIMS fall enrollment data in order to be evaluated under AEA procedures. The at-risk criterion will begin at 65% in 2006 and increase by five percentage points each year until it reaches 75% in 2008 where it is expected to remain as described below.

2005 – criterion not applied

2006 – 65% or higher at-risk student enrollment at the AEC

2007 – 70% or higher at-risk student enrollment at the AEC

2008 – 75% or higher at-risk student enrollment at the AEC

A safeguard will be incorporated for those campuses that fall below the at-risk requirement such as averaging the rate over multiple years.

Rationale: Implementation of an at-risk registration criterion recognizes that by definition AECs are designed to serve students at risk of dropping out of school, restricts use of AEA procedures to AECs that are dedicated to serving at-risk students, and enhances at-risk data quality.

Attribution of AEC Data

Beginning in the 1999-00 school year, student data (attendance, dropout/completion, and performance) cannot be attributed to AECs registered for evaluation under AEA procedures unless the student attends the registered AEC for 85 days or more. Under the previous AEA procedures, a student's "home" or "sending" regular campus was held accountable for the student. The AEC accountability rating was based on performance of students enrolled on the campus for 85 days or more. This policy was implemented before the use of a campus accountability subset in the state accountability system, which began in 2004. Under the campus accountability subset, only test results for students enrolled on the same campus from the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) through the testing date are included in the campus performance measure.

For data collected through PEIMS, this 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 DAEP, and/or a 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 that reason, charter school data are not reattributed. For students who have not attended a regular campus in the district, district policy determines to which campus the short-term AEC student data is attributed.

Based on an analysis of 2003-04 attendance data, about two-thirds of registered AECs are primarily used for short-term placements. Attendance data for all or most of their students are attributed to a regular campus in the district, meaning the students were on the AEC for fewer than 85 days. The other one-third of registered AECs are charter campuses or AECs that offer longer-term programs. A comparison of attendance reattribution and test answer documents also suggests that the reattribution is not always conducted consistently for PEIMS data, which is an automated process conducted at the state level, and test results, which is a local process. Often, test answer documents for students who were on the AEC for fewer than 85 days were not sent back to the student's home campus.

As required in statute, JJAEP and DAEP student data will continue to be attributed back to a student's regular campus.

The 85-day rule will be discontinued under the new AEA procedures. 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. There are approximately 65 instructional days between the last Friday in October 2004 (PEIMS snapshot date) and the fourth week of February 2005 (TAKS testing). There are approximately 100 instructional days between the last Friday in October 2004 (PEIMS snapshot date) and the third week of April 2005 (TAKS testing).

1. 2005 Accountability. AEC test answer documents and leaver data are attributed according to current policies based on the 85-day rule.
2. 2006 Accountability. Campus accountability subset determines attribution of AEC test data. Leaver data are attributed according to current policies based on the 85-day rule.
3. 2007 Accountability. Campus accountability subset determines attribution of AEC test data. Leavers are attributed to the last campus attended.

Rationale: Campus accountability subset is consistently applied in both AEA procedures and the standard accountability system. Leavers are attributed to the last campus attended for all campuses. Because leaver data are prior-year data, it will take one additional year to discontinue to 85-day rule for leaver data. Under the 85-day rule, some Residential Facilities have not registered for evaluation under AEA procedures because a regular campus will be accountable for students they've never seen; regular campuses may be reluctant to transfer students to AECs because they lose control of students' educational performance; and decisions about intra-district transfers are taken away from the district. Inconsistency of TAKS and PEIMS data attribution under the 85-day rule is addressed.

Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) Indicator

This indicator applies to AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities. Additional TAKS and Texas Growth Index (TGI) information is in *Appendix C*.

1. General TAKS Decisions Applicable to AEA Procedures

Grades. The TAKS results for English (grades 3-11) and Spanish (grades 3-6) are summed across grades and are evaluated for All Students and each student group that meets minimum size requirements.

Reading/English Language Arts (ELA). Reading (grades 3-9) and ELA (grades 10-11) results are combined and evaluated as a single subject.

Testing Window. Results for students given a make-up test within the testing window are included in the accountability measures.

Grade 3 Reading/Grade 5 Reading and Mathematics. Results from the first and second administrations of the grade 3 Reading tests and grade 5 Reading and Mathematics tests are incorporated into the TAKS indicator. (For students enrolled at the AEC for both administrations of the test, results of the second administration will be used for students who failed or were absent from the first administration.) This decision will be applied to grade 8 Reading and Mathematics beginning in 2008 when the social promotion testing requirements under the Student Success Initiative are extended to grade 8 subjects.

Student Passing Standard. The TAKS performance indicator is calculated as percent *Met Standard* using the student passing standard adopted by the State Board of Education (SBOE) for each specific year.

Rationale: These decisions were made during development of the 2004 standard accountability system. Incorporating grade 3 Reading and grade 5 Reading and Mathematics results from the first and second administrations gives credit to AECs for those students who pass the test on the second administration; it also discourages manipulation of attendance on test dates by including the results of first-time test takers during the second administration.

2. TAKS Progress Indicator

Indicator. AECs are evaluated on the average percentage of students who either pass the TAKS or have a Texas Growth Index (TGI) score that meets the student growth standard of 0 (zero) or higher and on students retesting who pass exit-level TAKS at the spring administration or in the previous fall or summer.

Subjects. TAKS results are summed across subjects.

TAKS Results Included in the AEC Evaluation in 2005

* 2004 for Required Improvement	2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAKS grades 3-10: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Recalculated at Panel Recommended student passing standard ➤ TGI: 2003 to 2004, growth of 0 (zero) or higher ➤ Campus accountability subset 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAKS grades 3-10: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Panel Recommended student passing standard ➤ TGI: 2004 to 2005, growth of 0 (zero) or higher ➤ Campus accountability subset
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAKS grade 11 spring 2004 administration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ First time testers ➤ Recalculated at 1 SEM student passing standard ➤ TGI: 2003 to 2004, growth of 0 (zero) or higher ➤ Campus accountability subset 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAKS grade 11 spring 2005 administration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ First time testers ➤ Actual student passing standard (1 SEM for most students) ➤ TGI: 2004 to 2005, growth of 0 (zero) or higher ➤ Campus accountability subset
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAKS grades 11 and 12 spring 2005 administration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Retesters ➤ Actual student passing standard ➤ Students who meet passing standard ➤ No accountability subset
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAKS grades 11 and 12 fall 2004 administration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Retesters ➤ Actual student passing standard ➤ Students who meet passing standard ➤ No accountability subset
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAKS grades 11 and 12 summer 2004 administration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Retesters ➤ Actual student passing standard ➤ Students who meet passing standard ➤ No accountability subset

* Beginning in 2006, prior year data will include students retesting who pass the exit-level TAKS in the spring or in the previous fall or summer.

Rationale: The TAKS Progress Indicator combines student growth, absolute performance, and includes results from the additional administrations of the exit-level test. Summing results across subjects increases the number of TAKS test results on which AECs are evaluated.

3. Accountability Subset, Student Groups, Minimum Size Requirements, TAKS Standard, Special Analysis, and Required Improvement

Campus Accountability Subset. AEC ratings are based on test results for students enrolled on the campus on the PEIMS October enrollment snapshot date. (Accountability subset does not apply to exit-level retesters.)

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

- African American
- Hispanic
- White
- Economically Disadvantaged

Minimum Size Requirements. 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**
- if there are at least 50 tests for the student group even if that represents less than 10% of All Students tests.

All Students performance is always evaluated. (See TAKS Progress Standard and Special Analysis below.)

TAKS Progress Standard. A TAKS Progress Indicator standard of 40% is required for AECs.

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 on the TAKS Progress Indicator.

If there are results for fewer than 10 at-risk tests in the district, then conduct special analysis.

The TAKS Progress Indicator accountability standard will increase over time. The following phase-in is recommended. The phase-in schedule will be revisited before 2007 to evaluate the effect of discontinuing the 85-day rule.

2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
40%	40%	45%	45%	50%	50%

Special Analysis. AECs with TAKS results for fewer than 10 at-risk tests in the district will receive special analysis under circumstances similar to those used in the standard accountability system. 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.

Required Improvement. AECs that do not meet the *Academically Acceptable* standard for the TAKS Progress Indicator can meet the accountability criteria by demonstrating RI. AEA RI is applied and calculated the same as in the standard accountability system – amount of improvement required to meet the standard in two years.

Rationale: Under the campus accountability subset, AECs are held accountable only for students whose learning they have had an opportunity to influence. Use of district results for at-risk students acknowledges that AECs are part of the overall district strategy for education of students at risk. Special analysis ensures that AECs with small numbers of students are rated fairly.

Required Improvement provides a gate up to *Academically Acceptable*. Larger gains are required for AECs farther from meeting the TAKS performance standard.

Completion Rate (Grades 9–12) Indicator

This indicator applies only to AECs of Choice. Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate.

1. Completion Rate Definition. Completion Rate II – count graduates, continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year), and General Educational Development (GED) recipients in the definition of Completion Rate for AECs evaluated under AEA procedures.
2. AEC Ratings. Completion Rate II is evaluated for all AECs of Choice that have served grades 9–12 for the last five years.
3. Student Groups. Completion Rate II is evaluated for All Students and for the following student groups that meet minimum size requirements:
 - African American
 - Hispanic
 - White
 - Economically Disadvantaged
4. Minimum Size Requirements. Student groups are evaluated if the AEC Completion Rate class has:
 - at least 5 dropouts (non-completers) in the student group; **and**
 - if there are 30 to 49 students in the student group and the student group represents at least 10% of All Students in the class; **or**
 - if there are at least 50 students in the student group even if that represents less than 10% of All Students in the class.

Completion Rates are evaluated at the All Students level if there are:

- at least 5 dropouts (non-completers) **and**
 - at least 10 students in the AEC Completion Rate class.
5. Completion Rate II Standard. The *Academically Acceptable* standard for 2005 and beyond is at least 75.0% Completion Rate.

Completion Rate II (Grades 9–12) Accountability Standard						
	2005 Class of 2004; 9 th grade 00-01	2006 Class of 2005; 9 th grade 01-02	2007 Class of 2006; 9 th grade 02-03	2008 Class of 2007; 9 th grade 03-04	2009 Class of 2008; 9 th grade 04-05	2010 Class of 2009; 9 th grade 05-06
<i>AEA: Academically Acceptable</i>	75.0%	75.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Completion Rate Definition	Graduates + GED Recipients + Continued HS					
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

If the AEC does not meet the accountability standard, or if the AEC has students in grades 9–12 but does not have a Completion Rate, then evaluate the AEC on Completion Rate II (including

GED recipients) of at-risk students in the district. If the district does not meet minimum size requirements for All Students, then do not evaluate the AEC on Completion Rate.

6. Required Improvement. AECs that do not meet the *Academically Acceptable* standard for Completion Rate can meet the accountability criteria for Completion Rate by demonstrating Required Improvement (RI). AEA RI is applied and calculated the same as in the standard accountability system – amount of improvement required to meet the standard in two years.

Rationale: The majority of feedback from AECs supports counting GED recipients as completers in the calculation of Completion Rate. Counting GED recipients as completers recognizes that many students attending AECs have very few credits, making a diploma difficult to earn; the GED program may be seen as the best or only option for many students attending AECs. Fifth-year continuing students are included so that students who take longer than four years to complete high school are not counted as leavers while they are still enrolled and working toward completion. Using the Completion Rate of at-risk students in the district allows use of a longitudinal measure for those AECs that have a completion/student status rate but also provides for evaluation of Completion Rates for AECs that do not have a longitudinal rate. The standards are held constant for 2005 and 2006 and will be revisited before 2007 to evaluate the effect of discontinuing the 85-day rule and phase-in of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition. Required Improvement provides a gate up to *Academically Acceptable*. Larger gains are required for AECs farther from meeting the Completion Rate performance standard.

Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7–12) Indicator

This indicator applies to AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities.

1. Annual Dropout Rate Definition. The Annual Dropout Rate indicator is grade 7–12 dropouts as a percent of total students enrolled at the AEC in grades 7–12 in a single school year.
2. AEC Ratings. Use the grade 7–12 Annual Dropout Rate for AECs that have students in grades 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and/or 12.
3. Student Groups. Annual Dropout Rates are evaluated for All Students and for the following student groups that meet minimum size requirements:
 - African American
 - Hispanic
 - White
 - Economically Disadvantaged
4. Minimum Size Requirements. Student groups are evaluated if the AEC has:
 - at least 5 dropouts; **and**
 - if there are 30 to 49 students in the student group and the student group represents at least 10% of All Students in grades 7–12; **or**
 - if there are at least 50 students in the student group even if that represents less than 10% of All Students in grades 7–12.

Annual Dropout Rates are evaluated at the All Students level if there are:

- at least 5 dropouts **and**
 - at least 10 students in grades 7–12.
5. Annual Dropout Rate Standard. The *Academically Acceptable* standard for 2005 and 2006 is 10.0% or less Annual Dropout Rate.

Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7–12) Accountability Standard						
	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

If the AEC does not meet the minimum size requirements, then do not evaluate the AEC on Annual Dropout Rate.

The 10.0% Annual Dropout Rate standard will be revisited before 2007 due to discontinuation of the 85-day rule and implementation of the NCES dropout definition in 2007.

6. Required Improvement. AECs that do not meet the *Academically Acceptable* standard for Annual Dropout Rate can meet the accountability criteria for Annual Dropout Rate by demonstrating RI. AEA RI is applied and calculated the same as in the standard accountability system – amount of improvement required to meet the standard in two years.

Rationale: Despite past criticisms, Annual Dropout Rate focuses on the dropout prevention mission of AECs. If the 85-day rule is discontinued, then more AECs will have a Grade 7–12 Annual Dropout Rate on which to be evaluated. The standards are held constant for 2005 and 2006. Standards for 2007 and beyond are to be determined. Annual Dropout Rate standards for 2007 and beyond will be determined when campus data are available to set the standards on a dropout rate calculated under the NCES definition. Required Improvement provides a gate up to *Academically Acceptable*. Greater improvement (or a larger decline in dropouts) is required for AECs farther from meeting the Annual Dropout Rate performance standard.

State-Developed Alternative Assessment (SDAA) II Indicator

AECs will be evaluated on the same SDAA II indicator as in the standard accountability system. The performance standards for the SDAA II indicator are set at the same level as the TAKS standard of 40%.

Alternative Education Accountability (AEA): 2005 and Beyond Educator Focus Group Recommendation -- Model of 2005 AEA Procedures

Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) model specifications:

- TAKS results for Grades 3-11 summed across subjects and evaluated at **40%** accountability standard: Reading/English Language Arts, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Science. (All TAKS subjects and grades are included in the actual indicator. This model does not include Grades 4 and 7 Writing results, Grade 8 Social Studies results, or Grade 5 Science results.)
- TAKS 2003-04 results at 2005 student passing standard [Gr. 3-10 at Panel Recommended (PR) and Gr. 11 at 1 standard error of measurement (SEM) below PR]
- Texas Growth Index (TGI) 2002-03 to 2003-04 growth with student growth requirement of at least 0
- Subsequent passing scores for exit-level testers included (fall 2004 and summer 2004 used in model)
- Campus accountability subset (students enrolled on the campus on October enrollment snapshot date included in AEC evaluation)
- All students and student groups meeting minimum size criteria evaluated (30/10%/50)
- District performance of at-risk students on the TAKS Progress Measure is used for any campus that does not meet the *Academically Acceptable* standard based on test results for fewer than 10 students at the All Students level, or if there are no TAKS results for the campus

Completion Rate and Annual Dropout Rate model specifications:

- Campus Grade 9-12 Completion Rate II (including GED recipients) for class of 2003 is evaluated against a 75.0% accountability standard. If campus does not meet the accountability standard, or if the campus does not have a Completion Rate, but the campus has students in grades 9-12, then the campus is evaluated using Completion Rate II (including GED recipients) of at-risk students in the district. If the district does not meet minimum size criteria for All Students, then the campus is not evaluated on Completion Rate. Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate.
- Campus 2002-03 Grade 7-12 Annual Dropout Rate is evaluated against a 10.0% accountability standard. If the campus does not meet minimum size criteria for All Students, then the campus is not evaluated on Annual Dropout Rate.

Features not modeled:

- Expected performance improvement is not modeled for any of the indicators
- Required Improvement (will be implemented as amount of improvement at campus level required to reach accountability standard in two years)
- Special Analysis and Appeals could result in changing ratings from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable* or *Not Rated*

Model results (see table on the next page):

- Numbers in **bold** sum to total; percentages in **bold** may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
- Numbers in *italics* show campuses that do not meet the *Academically Acceptable* standard for each indicator; these numbers cannot be summed because some campuses fail to meet the standard on more than one indicator.

Campus Ratings Distribution	AECs of Choice		Residential Facilities	
	Number	%	Number	%
All AECs				
AEA: Academically Acceptable	293	82%	63	82%
AEA: Academically Unacceptable	61	17%	11	14%
<i>AU TAKS Progress</i>	40	11%	9	12%
<i>AU Completion Rate</i>	4	1%	n/a	n/a
<i>AU Annual Dropout Rate</i>	23	6%	2	3%
<i>AU SDAA</i>	0	0%	0	0%
AEA: Not Rated	3	1%	2	3%
Total	357	100%	77	100%
Non-charter AECs				
AEA: Academically Acceptable	193	86%	52	85%
AEA: Academically Unacceptable	32	14%	9	15%
<i>AU TAKS Progress</i>	22	10%	7	11%
<i>AU Completion Rate</i>	0	0%	n/a	n/a
<i>AU Annual Dropout Rate</i>	13	6%	2	3%
<i>AU SDAA</i>	0	0%	0	0%
AEA: Not Rated	0	0%	0	0%
Total	225	100%	61	100%
Charter AECs				
AEA: Academically Acceptable	100	76%	12	75%
AEA: Academically Unacceptable	29	22%	2	13%
<i>AU TAKS Progress</i>	18	14%	2	13%
<i>AU Completion Rate</i>	4	3%	n/a	n/a
<i>AU Annual Dropout Rate</i>	10	8%	0	0%
<i>AU SDAA</i>	0	0%	0	0%
AEA: Not Rated	3	2%	2	13%
Total	132	100%	16	100%

Appendix A

Alternative Education Accountability: 2005 and Beyond Background and History

Background

Accountability legislation enacted by the Texas legislature in 1993 mandated creation of an overarching accountability system for all Texas schools. This accountability system was based on eight guiding principles and 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 feedback from educators across the state, 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 they were 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
- expelled students

For the 1995-96 school year, alternative accountability ratings were based on state approved district proposals that included student performance indicators, current school year data, and comparisons of pre-assessment and post-assessment results. Following a review of campus data by the local board of trustees each district made an initial determination of whether the campus should be rated *Acceptable* or *Needing Peer Review*. This initial determination was then forwarded to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) where it was reviewed by a panel of peer reviewers who sent a recommendation to the Commissioner.

From 1995-96 through 2001-02 a number of revisions were made to the ratings criteria and procedures. Many of the amendments came from an ad hoc Alternative Education Advisory Committee. Some of the more significant changes to the system were:

- Minimum performance levels for an *Acceptable* rating established in 1996-97.
- School districts required to select campus-based performance indicators from a menu of state-established indicators from 1996-97.
- TEA staff assumed responsibility for the review and analysis of all campus performance data in 1997-98.
- A campus rating of *Commended* was introduced in 1999-00.
- In 1999-00 TEA required that the rating for each alternative education campus (AEC) be based, in part, on three base indicators: Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) passing rates for reading and mathematics, dropout rates, and attendance rates.
- In 1999-00 clarification was given that disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEP) and juvenile justice alternative education programs (JJAEP) were not permitted to register for alternative education accountability (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 clarification was given by the agency that a campus must serve “students at risk of dropping out of school” as defined in the state statute (TEC §29.081) in order to be eligible to receive an accountability rating under AEA procedures.

The following table shows AEC accountability ratings from 1996 through 2002 under the former AEA procedures. In 1996, all AECs received a rating of *Alternative Education* while the new procedures were implemented. In 2003, state accountability ratings for campuses were suspended for one year while the new accountability system was developed. In 2004, AECs received a rating of *Not Rated: Alternative Education* while new AEA procedures are developed.

Academic Year	Number of AECs	AEC Accountability Ratings			
		<i>Commended</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Needing Peer Review</i>	<i>Not Rated</i>
1995-96	306	NA	NA	NA	306
1996-97	331	NA	284	47	NA
1997-98	406	NA	316	67	23
1998-99	394	NA	354	24	16
1999-00	326	5	272	33	16
2000-01	338	12	246	66	14
2001-02	387	7	259	70	51
2002-03	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2003-04	381	NA	NA	NA	381

AEA Development for 2005 and Beyond

House Bill 6, enacted by the 77th Texas Legislature, called for a pilot program to examine issues surrounding accountability of alternative education programs. This pilot was 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 goals 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 phone calls were made to a small sample of AECs;
- an analysis of existing Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data was undertaken; and
- a collection of individual student data from a small sample of AECs was compiled and analyzed.

At the same time these pilot activities were being conducted, the *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB) was signed into law. This federal legislation, which focuses on increasing state and school accountability for student progress, and its likely impact were 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 2003/2004 Educator Focus Group on Accountability made a recommendation to develop new AEA procedures for 2005 and beyond. The new AEA procedures will be 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 test contractor.
- Educators desire to develop measures appropriate for alternative education programs offered on AECs rather than just setting lower standards on the same measures used in the regular

accountability ratings. However, these measures must be cognizant that all students are required to demonstrate proficiency on the state assessments in order to graduate.

- There is considerable interest in using the Texas Growth Index (TGI) when evaluating AECs. The TGI and other improvement indicators will be evaluated for use as base indicators for AEC ratings.
- Additional AEA criteria will be researched. For example, AECs may be required to have a minimum percentage of at-risk students (based on PEIMS data reported on the current year 110 Student Enrollment Records) to be evaluated under AEA procedures. New criteria could result in registered AECs being removed from the list for 2005.

The four campus groupings described on the next page are used for 2005 AEA modeling. The tables on the following page show campus and student counts, and student demographics for the four campus groupings.

Alternative Education Accountability: 2005 and Beyond Campus Groupings Used for Modeling

2004 Accountability Universe: This group represents the universe of campuses that are included in the state accountability rating system – all campuses that reported students in membership in any grades (early education through grade 12) in the fall of the 2003-04 school year. [7,813 campuses]

Registered Alternative Education Campuses (AEC): campuses in the 2004 Accountability Universe who registered for alternative education accountability for 2005, excluding Residential Facilities. [357 campuses]

Residential Facilities: campuses in the 2004 Accountability Universe that fall into one or more of the following three categories, regardless of whether or not they are registered for alternative education accountability or identified as alternative campuses in AskTED. [77 campuses]

Texas Youth Commission (TYC) – campuses serving students in residential programs and facilities operated by or under contract with TYC. (contracted facilities and halfway houses with separate county-district-campus numbers)

Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC) – campuses serving students in pre-adjudication detention centers and post-adjudication correctional facilities registered with TJPC. (facilities with separate county-district-campus numbers)

Private Residential Treatment Centers (PRTC) – campuses serving students in privately operated residential treatment centers. (facilities with separate county-district-campus numbers that were identified as PRTC when they registered as AECs)

At-Risk Campuses: campuses in the 2004 Accountability Universe with at least 75 percent of students identified as at risk, that are not Registered AECs or Residential Facilities. [800 campuses]

Data for the above groupings can be disaggregated based on other campus characteristics, such as charter campus versus non-charter campus.

Campus and Student Counts by Type of Campus	Number of Campuses	Percent of All Campuses	Number of Students	Percent of All Students
Registered AECs	357	5%	46,136	1%
Regular (Non-Charter) Campuses	225	3%	18,327	<1%
Charter Campuses	132	2%	27,809	1%
Residential Facilities	77	1%	4,793	<1%
Regular (Non-Charter) Campuses	61	1%	3,050	<1%
Charter Campuses	16	<1%	1,743	<1%
Regular Accountability At-Risk Campuses	800	10%	316,020	7%
Regular (Non-Charter) Campuses	773	10%	310,465	7%
Charter Campuses	27	<1%	5,555	<1%
Accountability Universe (All campuses)	7,813	100%	4,311,502	100%

Student Demographics by Type of Campus	African American	Hispanic	White	Economically Disadvantaged
Registered AECs	25%	52%	23%	60%
Regular (Non-Charter) Campuses	15%	54%	30%	54%
Charter Campuses	31%	50%	18%	63%
Residential Facilities	28%	46%	25%	69%
Regular (Non-Charter) Campuses	24%	48%	27%	53%
Charter Campuses	37%	41%	21%	97%
Regular Accountability At-Risk Campuses	14%	80%	5%	86%
Regular (Non-Charter) Campuses	13%	81%	5%	86%
Charter Campuses	59%	34%	6%	83%
Accountability Universe (All campuses)	14%	44%	39%	53%

Appendix B

Alternative Education Accountability: 2005 and Beyond Issues Specific to Residential Facilities (Texas Youth Commission, Texas Juvenile Probation Commission, and Private Residential Treatment Centers)

Background

Texas school districts and charters provide education services 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). Many of these facilities have a campus number and, consequently, receive a campus rating under the state accountability system.

Not all residential treatment centers, detention centers, and correctional facilities served by school districts have a separate campus number and not all those that do have a separate campus number are registered for alternative education accountability (AEA). Some educational programs offered by districts may not be eligible for campus numbers. For example, general educational development (GED) programs offered by school districts cannot be assigned a separate campus number. Although those that have a separate number are eligible to register for AEA, under the previous accountability system performance of students on registered alternative education campuses (AEC) for fewer than 85 days was attributed back to the home campus in the district. Some districts do not register their detention centers and correctional facilities because they do not want the performance of those students attributed to another campus.

Whether or not performance of students at these facilities is included in the district performance measures, campus performance can affect district accountability ratings. Under both the former and current accountability systems, a district that has one or more campuses rated *Academically Unacceptable* cannot receive a rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*. Sanctions for *Academically Unacceptable* campuses have also increased in severity under legislation passed in 2003 (TEC §39.132). If a campus is rated *Academically Unacceptable*, the district must submit a focused student achievement plan to the Texas Education Agency addressing each area of unacceptable performance or participate in an innovative redesign of the campus. If a campus is rated *Academically Unacceptable* for two consecutive years, the campus must be closed or reconstituted.

Including Residential Facilities in District Performance Measures

From 1996 through 1999 under the prior state accountability system, performance of students served at residential treatment centers was not included in district performance measures. This policy was changed in 2000 because analysis showed that including the results of students served at these centers would not have affected the rating of any district. Districts were given the option of appealing if a rating was adversely affected by inclusion of results for students in privately operated residential treatment centers.

Legislation passed in 2001 and 2003 affects inclusion of performance of students served at residential facilities in the performance measures of the campus and/or district serving the facility in the following circumstances. The table on the following page shows how these rules affect calculation of performance measures in 2004-05.

1. Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC): Texas Education Code (TEC) §39.073(f), passed in 2001, prohibits including in campus and district dropout and completion rates those students who do not return to school after leaving a TJPC detention center or correctional facility, unless the campus and district in which the facility is located is the one to which the student is regularly assigned.

2. Private Residential Treatment Centers (PRTC): TEC §39.073(f) also prohibits including in campus and district dropout and completion rates those students who leave a residential treatment center after receiving treatment for fewer than 85 days, unless the campus and district in which the center is located is the one to which the student is regularly assigned.
3. Texas Youth Commission (TYC): TEC §39.072(d), passed in 2003, prohibits including in district performance measures the performance of students in residential programs and facilities operated by or under contract with TYC. Also, for purposes of accountability ratings these students are not considered to be students of the district.
4. National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Dropout Rate: TEC §39.051(b)(2), also passed in 2003, requires that dropout and completion rates be computed in accordance with standards and definitions adopted by NCES. The NCES dropout definition does not make provisions for students incarcerated or served by public schools at residential treatment centers, pre-adjudication detention facilities, post-adjudication correctional facilities, or alternative education programs or campuses. This amendment, which has an effective date of 2005-06, prohibits excluding dropouts from the district dropout rate because they are not excluded under the NCES definition, unless statute explicitly allows such an exclusion. Only TEC §39.072(d) contains language explicitly allowing the exclusion to continue after 2004-05.

Students Excluded from District and Campus Performance Measures – through 2004-05

	District	Campus
TYC	<i>Measures:</i> all TEC Chapter 39 measures including TAKS and SDAA <i>Students:</i> all students	NA
TJPC	<i>Measures:</i> dropout and completion rates <i>Students:</i> students not regularly assigned to the district	<i>Measures:</i> dropout and completion rates <i>Students:</i> students not regularly assigned to the campus
PRTC	<i>Measures:</i> dropout and completion rates <i>Students:</i> students not regularly assigned to the district who received treatment for fewer than 85 days	<i>Measures:</i> dropout and completion rates <i>Students:</i> students not regularly assigned to the campus who received treatment for fewer than 85 days

NOTE: The class of 2005 Completion Rate and 2004-05 Annual Dropout Rate are used for 2006 accountability ratings.

Changes will be implemented in 2005-06 when the NCES dropout definition is introduced. Bills passed during the 2005 legislative session could affect final decisions regarding exclusions.

Accountability Options for Residential Facilities

Developing appropriate indicators for residential facilities is particularly difficult for a number of reasons.

- Education may not be the primary mission of the facility. The primary mission of residential facilities that are detention centers, correctional facilities, and drug treatment centers is typically associated with the problem that resulted in the student being assigned to the facility.
- The school district in which the facility is located may not have control over assignment of students to the facility. For example, the criminal justice system places students in detention centers and correctional facilities.
- The facility may serve students from outside the district geographic boundaries.

- The majority of students in the facility are short-term placements. This has implications for calculation of completion rates.
- Long-term students in these facilities are a minority of the students served; they may also be the students most at risk. For example, long-term students in a correctional facility are the students who committed the most serious crimes. This has implications for evaluation of test results. Based on analysis of attendance data, it is estimated that the campus accountability subset for Residential Facilities includes test results for approximately 7 percent of the students served by these facilities throughout the year.
- Few residential facilities have 10 or more students that meet the criteria for calculation of performance growth using the Texas Growth Index (TGI) because students were either not in school the prior year or did not earn enough credits to advance to the next grade. Few residential facilities have 10 or more students tested on the exit-level test. For this reason, none of the TAKS/TGI measures provide a good solution for evaluation of residential facilities.

Appendix C

Alternative Education Accountability: 2005 and Beyond TAKS Indicator and Texas Growth Index

Student Passing Standards

Table 1 contains the student passing standard adopted by the State Board of Education (SBOE) for each specific year.

Table 1: Student Passing Standards

Subjects	Grades	2004 Student Met Standard	2005 Student Met Standard	2006 Student Met Standard
Reading ELA *	3-9 10	1 SEM *	Panel Recommendation Panel Recommendation	Panel Recommendation
ELA	11	2 SEM	1 SEM	
Writing	4, 7	1 SEM	Panel Recommendation	Panel Recommendation
Mathematics	3-10 11	1 SEM 2 SEM	Panel Recommendation 1 SEM	Panel Recommendation
Social Studies	8, 10 11	1 SEM 2 SEM	Panel Recommendation 1 SEM	Panel Recommendation
Science	5, 10 11	1SEM 2 SEM	Panel Recommendation 1 SEM	Panel Recommendation Panel Recommendation

* ELA – English language arts; SEM – standard error of measurement

Texas Growth Index

A Texas Growth Index (TGI) has been developed to evaluate individual student growth from one year to the next on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (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 student TGI score indicates the amount of growth for each student in relation to growth made by all students who performed at the same level in the first year. There is particular interest in using a student growth measure for evaluation of alternative education campuses (AECs). Through the feedback process, educators stated that many students attending AECs perform two or more grade levels below their enrolled grade level. One advantage of the TGI is that it provides a way to measure growth for a student who does not pass the test.

A TGI has been developed to measure growth in the same subject from the next lower grade level for the following subjects/grades. The 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

Tables 2 and 3 show distribution of student TGI scores. As Table 2 shows, with TGI scores rounded to a whole number, the majority of student scores fall in the range of -2 to +2 for all subjects. In Table 3 the TGI scores for Mathematics are rounded to one decimal position to show the distribution for students with scores greater than -1 and less than +1.

Table 2
Texas Growth Index (TGI)
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)
2002-03 to 2003-04 Growth
Student Growth Requirement

Standard	Students Meeting Student Growth Requirement			
	Mathematics	Reading	Social Studies	Science
-2	99%	99%	99%	99%
-1	94%	94%	95%	95%
0	71%	71%	71%	70%
1	29%	29%	28%	28%
2	6%	6%	6%	7%

Table 3
Texas Growth Index (TGI)
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)
2002-03 to 2003-04 Growth
Students Meeting Student Growth Requirement in Mathematics

Standard	% of Students
-0.9	85%
-0.8	82%
-0.7	79%
-0.6	76%
-0.5	73%
-0.4	69%
-0.3	65%
-0.2	61%
-0.1	56%
0.0	52%
0.1	48%
0.2	43%
0.3	39%
0.4	34%
0.5	31%
0.6	27%
0.7	23%
0.8	21%
0.9	18%

Table 4 shows average TGI scores by subject for the campus groupings used for alternative education accountability (AEA) modeling. The average TGI score is the sum of individual student TGI scores divided by the number of student TGI scores.

Table 4: Texas Growth Index (TGI)

Reading/ELA	Average TGI Score				
	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Economically Disadvantaged
Accountability Universe	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.02	-0.01
Charter	-0.03	0.01	-0.02	-0.04	-0.05
Non-charter	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.02	-0.01
Registered AECs	-0.14	-0.13	-0.12	-0.10	-0.13
Charter	-0.14	-0.16	-0.12	-0.07	-0.13
Non-charter	-0.14	-0.08	-0.11	-0.15	-0.13
Residential Facilities	0.09	0.17	0.01	0.30	0.14
Charter	-0.01	-0.14	0.01	0.54	0.00
Non-charter	0.12	0.29	0.01	0.21	0.19
Regular At-Risk Campuses	0.01	-0.01	0.02	0.00	0.01
Charter	0.08	-0.01	0.33	-0.02	0.09
Non-charter	0.01	-0.01	0.02	0.00	0.01

Mathematics	Average TGI Score				
	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Economically Disadvantaged
Accountability Universe	0.00	-0.03	0.01	0.00	-0.01
Charter	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.06	-0.01
Non-charter	0.00	-0.03	0.01	0.00	-0.01
Registered AECs	-0.15	-0.13	-0.13	-0.03	-0.13
Charter	-0.13	-0.14	-0.08	-0.06	-0.12
Non-charter	-0.20	-0.11	-0.20	0.01	-0.16
Residential Facilities	-0.17	-0.06	-0.25	0.06	-0.16
Charter	-0.17	-0.15	-0.38	0.43	-0.19
Non-charter	-0.16	-0.03	-0.22	-0.03	-0.15
Regular At-Risk Campuses	0.06	0.03	0.06	0.05	0.06
Charter	0.27	.019	.030	-0.05	0.25
Non-charter	0.06	0.02	0.06	0.05	0.06

Table 4: TGI (continued)

Social Studies	Average TGI Score				
	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Economically Disadvantaged
Accountability Universe	0.01	0.05	0.01	-0.01	0.01
Charter	-0.16	-0.10	-0.14	-0.13	-0.23
Non-charter	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.01
Registered AECs	-0.18	0.07	-0.19	-0.16	-0.20
Charter	-0.22	-0.04	-0.31	-0.22	-0.37
Non-charter	-0.16	0.12	-0.13	-0.13	-0.11
Residential Facilities	-0.06	-0.32	-0.30	0.27	0.03
Charter	-0.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.34
Non-charter	-0.03	-0.35	-0.33	0.29	0.07
Regular At-Risk Campuses	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.11	0.15
Charter	0.31	0.24	-0.06	0.14	0.33
Non-charter	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.11	0.15

Science	Average TGI Score				
	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Economically Disadvantaged
Accountability Universe	0.01	0.00	0.02	-0.02	0.02
Charter	-0.09	-0.12	0.06	-0.11	-0.06
Non-charter	0.01	0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.02
Registered AECs	-0.15	-0.06	-0.10	-0.14	0.02
Charter	-0.13	-0.13	-0.04	-0.04	-0.06
Non-charter	-0.17	-0.02	-0.13	-0.19	0.06
Residential Facilities	0.17	-0.04	-0.05	0.21	0.05
Charter	-0.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.28
Non-charter	0.20	-0.04	-0.05	0.22	0.08
Regular At-Risk Campuses	0.15	0.16	0.13	0.12	0.13
Charter	-0.19	0.06	-0.10	-0.26	0.02
Non-charter	0.15	0.16	0.13	0.12	0.13

Summed Across Subjects	Average TGI Score				
	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Economically Disadvantaged
Accountability Universe	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	-0.01
Charter	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01	-0.05	-0.04
Non-charter	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	-0.01
Registered AECs	-0.15	-0.11	-0.13	-0.08	-0.13
Charter	-0.14	-0.14	-0.11	-0.07	-0.13
Non-charter	-0.17	-0.06	-0.15	-0.09	-0.12
Residential Facilities	-0.02	0.05	-0.11	0.19	0.01
Charter	-0.07	-0.14	-0.14	0.49	-0.08
Non-charter	-0.01	0.11	-0.10	0.10	0.03
Regular At-Risk Campuses	0.05	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.05
Charter	0.17	0.09	0.31	-0.04	0.17
Non-charter	0.05	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.05

Alternative Education Accountability TAKS Indicator

Small Numbers

AECs are smaller on average than regular campuses. Average enrollment of AECs in 2003-04 was about 117 students compared to 552 students for all campuses in the state. AECs also differ from the state in that a larger percentage of their students transfer to the campus during the school year. The mobility rate for campuses statewide is about 21 percent [2002-03 number], meaning 21 percent of students are in membership on the campus for fewer than 150 days. For Registered AECs, the mobility rate in 2003-04 was 69 percent and for Residential Facilities the rate was 96 percent. Campus size and mobility have implications for evaluation of TAKS results. Performance rates based on small numbers of tests may not be reliable indicators of campus performance, especially if the students tested on the campus represent a small percentage of the students who are served on the campus throughout the year.

Subjects

Under the state accountability system, each subject is evaluated separately. Summing test results across subjects as well as across grades is one strategy for increasing the numbers for the TAKS indicator. As Table 5 shows, more Registered AECs and Residential Facilities have TAKS results for 10 or more tests with all subjects combined – a total of 319 campuses (74%) have results for 10 or more tests compared to 256 campuses (59%) that have results for 10 or more reading/ELA tests.

Table 5: Alternative Education Campuses with TAKS Results, 2003-04

	Campuses in Group	Reading/ELA (District Accountability Subset)			All Subjects Combined (District Accountability Subset)		
		No TAKS results	TAKS results for fewer than 10 students	TAKS results for 10 or more	No TAKS results	TAKS results for fewer than 10 tests	TAKS results for 10 or more
Registered AECs	357	42 (12%)	86 (24%)	229 (64%)	33 (9%)	46 (13%)	278 (79%)
Residential Facilities	77	14 (18%)	36 (47%)	27 (35%)	14 (18%)	22 (29%)	41 (53%)

Progress Measure: The Progress Measure is the percentage of students who *either* pass the test or have a TGI score that meets a specified student growth requirement. A TGI score of 0 or higher is used in this calculation. The Progress Measure also gives the campus credit for exit-level retesters who pass the test at the spring administration or in previous fall or summer. (Exit-level retester who fail the test do not count against the AEC.)

Table 6 is a sample calculation for the TAKS Progress Measure. The sample shows ELA tests evaluated in the measure – the actual measure will include all subjects. All the students from the spring administration who are in the accountability subset are included in the measure. Exit-level retesters are included if they passed the test. (Most of these students are re-testers who failed the test the previous spring.) The accountability subset does not apply to exit-level retesters.

Table 6: Sample Campus Progress Measure

TAKS Tests Evaluated	Student TGI Score	Student Passed Test in 2003-04	Student Passed or Met TGI	Test Included in Measure
ELA Grade 10				
Student A	0	No	Yes (TGI)	Yes
Student B	1	Yes	Yes (Both)	Yes
Student C	-2	No	No	Yes
Student D		Yes	Yes (Passed)	Yes
ELA Grade 11 Spring				
Student E	0	No	Yes (TGI)	Yes
Student F	1	Yes	Yes (Both)	Yes
Student G	-2	No	No	Yes
Student H		Yes	Yes (Passed)	Yes
Student I	-2	No	No	Yes
Student J		Yes	Yes (Passed)	Yes
ELA Grade 12 Spring				
Student K	NA	No	No	No
Student L	NA	Yes	Yes (Passed)	Yes
ELA Exit-Level Fall				
Student M	NA	No	No	No
Student N	NA	Yes	Yes (Passed)	Yes
ELA Exit-Level Summer				
Student O	NA	No	No	No
Student P	NA	Yes	Yes (Passed)	Yes
Total			Progress = 10	Tests = 13
Campus Progress Measure for ELA (10 divided by 13) = 77%				

The Progress Measure has the advantage of combining student growth and absolute performance. All current year test results are included in the indicator, and the campus receives credit for all students who pass the test even if they do not show sufficient growth. However, students who fail the test and do not have a TGI lower the campus performance rate.

Use of the TAKS exit-level test results for evaluation of AECs is attractive for a number of reasons. All subjects are tested at the exit-level and a TGI can be calculated for all exit-level subjects. In addition, students who fail an exit-level test have an opportunity to re-test. The Progress Measure combines student growth and absolute performance, and provides maximum opportunity for AECs to demonstrate performance.

Table 7 shows the TAKS Progress Measure by subject for the campus groupings used for AEA modeling.

Table 7: TAKS Progress Measure

Reading/ELA	Campus Average Progress Measure Rate				
	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Economically Disadvantaged
Accountability Universe	88	84	83	93	83
Charter	77	74	75	86	74
Non-charter	88	84	84	93	83
Registered AECs	68	59	66	78	66
Charter	67	58	67	79	66
Non-charter	69	64	65	76	64
Residential Facilities	63	53	60	79	59
Charter	67	55	71	79	66
Non-charter	60	52	55	78	53
Regular At-Risk Campuses	80	78	79	88	79
Charter	77	74	81	80	76
Non-charter	80	79	79	88	79

Mathematics	Campus Average Progress Measure Rate				
	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Economically Disadvantaged
Accountability Universe	82	75	78	89	77
Charter	64	62	61	72	62
Non-charter	83	75	78	89	77
Registered AECs	48	42	46	56	46
Charter	49	42	49	57	48
Non-charter	46	42	40	56	41
Residential Facilities	31	24	26	49	27
Charter	25	23	20	45	25
Non-charter	34	24	28	50	28
Regular At-Risk Campuses	74	69	74	82	74
Charter	71	66	76	69	70
Non-charter	74	69	74	83	74

Social Studies	Campus Average Progress Measure Rate				
	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Economically Disadvantaged
Accountability Universe	88	82	81	94	79
Charter	74	64	70	89	69
Non-charter	88	83	81	94	79
Registered AECs	71	59	66	84	65
Charter	69	58	67	85	66
Non-charter	72	61	66	83	64
Residential Facilities	68	54	63	86	67
Charter	74	55	83	75	76
Non-charter	66	54	54	87	63
Regular At-Risk Campuses	77	76	75	91	75
Charter	70	68	70	84	68
Non-charter	77	76	75	91	75

Table 7: TAKS Progress Measure (continued)

Science	Campus Average Progress Measure Rate				
	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Economically Disadvantaged
Accountability Universe	67	53	54	80	52
Charter	42	31	36	61	36
Non-charter	67	53	55	80	52
Registered AECs	37	26	31	54	31
Charter	34	24	30	52	29
Non-charter	40	28	32	54	33
Residential Facilities	31	18	24	48	31
Charter	24	8	25	50	25
Non-charter	33	21	24	48	33
Regular At-Risk Campuses	48	43	46	72	45
Charter	39	39	28	51	39
Non-charter	48	43	46	72	45

Summed Across Subjects	Campus Average Progress Measure Rate				
	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Economically Disadvantaged
Accountability Universe	84	77	79	90	78
Charter	69	65	66	78	66
Non-charter	84	78	79	91	78
Registered AECs	57	49	55	68	54
Charter	57	48	57	69	56
Non-charter	57	51	52	68	52
Residential Facilities	50	40	45	67	46
Charter	51	42	51	68	51
Non-charter	49	39	43	66	43
Regular At-Risk Campuses	74	70	74	84	74
Charter	72	68	77	73	71
Non-charter	74	70	74	85	74