

**Accountability System for 2006 and Beyond - Alternative Education Accountability Procedures
Commissioner of Education Final Decisions
April 2006**

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 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).

The following issues affect many components of the AEA procedures.

- Small numbers of test results and mobility – AECs are smaller on average than regular campuses and have high mobility rates.
- Attribution of data – Attribution of data under the 85-day rule complicates evaluation of AEC data. The impact of phasing out the 85-day rule is unpredictable. 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.

An overview of 2005 AEA is in *Attachment A*.

Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) Progress Indicator

1. 2006 Standard. In September 2005, the commissioner of education announced final decisions on the 2006 accountability standards for the TAKS Progress indicator. For 2006 accountability ratings, the TAKS Progress standard for *AEA: Academically Acceptable* remains 40%.
2. 2007 and Beyond Standards. Maintain the current phase-in plan for the TAKS Progress indicator in 2007 and beyond as shown in the table below.

TAKS Progress Indicator					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<i>AEA: Academically Acceptable</i>	40%	45%	45%	50%	50%
TAKS Progress Indicator	TAKS + TGI + Exit-Level Retests				
Accountability Subset	District and Campus Accountability Subsets Accountability Subset does not apply to exit-level retests				

Rationale: The TAKS Progress indicator standard will increase over time. Advance notice of standards is provided. Stable targets are provided while other changes are taking place in the assessment program and while the impact of discontinuing the 85-day rule in 2007 is analyzed. The accountability standard is held constant between 2007 and 2008 while grade 8 science results are included for the first time.

State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II) Indicator

1. 2006 Standard. In September 2005, the Commissioner of Education announced final decisions on the 2006 accountability standards for the SDAA II indicator. For 2006 accountability ratings, the SDAA II standard for *AEA: Academically Acceptable* remains 40%.
2. 2007 Standard. Increase the SDAA II standard to 45%, the same standard as the TAKS Progress indicator.
3. Required Improvement. For 2006 and 2007, the Required Improvement feature will be added to the SDAA II indicator allowing registered AEC and charter ratings to improve from *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* to *AEA: Academically Acceptable*. As with the other three AEA indicators, the SDAA II Required Improvement calculation is based on meeting the standard in two years.

Rationale: The SDAA II standard is set at the same level and will increase at the same pace as the TAKS Progress indicator standard. Required Improvement provides a means of achieving *AEA: Academically Acceptable* without meeting the absolute standard.

Completion Rate II (Grades 9–12) Indicator

The dropout component of the Completion Rate denominator will change in 2007. Beginning with 2005-06 dropouts reported in 2006-07, the definition of a dropout will change to comply with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition. In 2007, only one of the four years in the cohort will be affected. In 2008, two years of the cohort are affected, and so on, until 2010 when the denominator uses the NCES dropout definition for all four years of the cohort.

Under the NCES definition, the count of dropouts used in the Completion Rate are certain to be higher than the counts under the current state definition. A larger denominator will cause completion rates to decline. The magnitude of this effect is unpredictable and current data cannot be modeled using the new definition; therefore, it is difficult to set appropriate standards for the 2007 accountability cycle. Dropout data under the NCES definition will not be available for analysis until the 2009 development cycle.

2005-06 school leaver data are attributed to the last campus of attendance; the 85-day rule is phased-out completely for 2007 and beyond accountability.

1. 2006 and 2007 Standards. For 2006 and 2007 accountability ratings, the Completion Rate II standard remains 75.0% as shown in the following table.
2. Required Improvement. Required Improvement will not be calculated in 2007; the changes to the dropout definition will prevent comparisons of rates used in 2006 and 2007.
3. 2008 and Beyond Standards. Required Improvement will be applied. Set standards for 2008 and beyond during the 2007 development cycle.

Completion Rate II (Grades 9–12) Indicator					
	2006 Class of 2005	2007 Class of 2006	2008 Class of 2007	2009 Class of 2008	2010 Class of 2009
<i>AEA: Academically Acceptable</i>	75.0%	75.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD
Completion Rate Definition	Graduates + GED Recipients + Continuing Students				
Dropout Definition	Current state definition	Phase-in NCES definition			NCES definition
Accountability Subset	85-day rule	School Leaver data are attributed to the last campus of attendance			

Rationale: Maintaining the 75.0% standard balances the impact of increased rigor in this indicator. Advance notice of standards is provided. Stable targets are provided while definitional changes occur and while the impact of discontinuing the 85-day rule in 2007 is analyzed. Changes in the dropout definition and attribution of data are certain to result in lower completion rates; however, the extent of the decrease cannot be predicted. The effect of the changes to the Completion Rate is unpredictable and current data cannot be fully modeled using the new definition.

If necessary, a focus group subcommittee will be formed to address completion rate issues due to the complexities of predicting completion rate values under the NCES definition.

Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7–12) Indicator

The dropout definition is transitioning from the current state definition to the NCES definition. Students dropping out of school during the 2005-06 school year are reported in 2006-07 in accordance with the NCES dropout definition. The Annual Dropout Rate indicator under AEA procedures includes grades 7-12; therefore, registered AECs and charters evaluated under AEA procedures will experience the full impact of implementing the NCES dropout definition. Below are six groups of students counted as dropouts by NCES that are not counted as dropouts by TEA.

- a student who withdraws to enroll in an approved adult education General Educational Development (GED) preparation program and does not receive a GED by the beginning of the next school year;
- a senior who meets all graduation requirements but does not pass the exit-level test;
- a student previously counted as a dropout;
- a student enrolled in school but not eligible for state Foundation School Program funds;
- a dropout for whom the last district of attendance cannot be determined; and,
- a student who returns to school after the school-start window.

All six definitional changes affect grade 7-12 dropout calculations.

2005-06 school leaver data are attributed to the last campus of attendance; the 85-day rule is phased-out completely for 2007 and beyond accountability. Also, the 2005-06 Annual Dropout Rate used for 2007 accountability will be affected by students from out of state displaced by Hurricane Katrina.

1. 2006 and Beyond Standards. For 2006 through 2008, the Annual Dropout Rate standard remains 10.0% as shown in the table below. Standards for 2009 and beyond will be set during the 2008 development cycle.
2. 2007 Hold Harmless Provision. A “hold harmless” provision will be applied in 2007. If a registered AEC or charter will be assigned the *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating label due solely to not meeting the Annual Dropout Rate standard, then the “hold harmless” provision is applied and the AEC or charter will be assigned the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* label.
3. Required Improvement. Required Improvement will not be calculated in 2007. In 2008, the Required Improvement feature will be applied.

Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7–12) Indicator					
	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%	10.0%	TBD	TBD
Dropout Definition	Current state definition	NCES definition			
Accountability Subset	85-day rule	School Leaver data are attributed to the last campus of attendance			

Rationale: The 2005-06 annual dropout rates will be the first calculated using the NCES dropout definition. This means 2007 will be the first accountability year to evaluate grade 7-12 dropout rates using the new, more rigorous definition. Maintaining the 10.0% standard balances the impact of increased rigor in this indicator. Advance notice of standards is provided. Stable targets are provided while definitional changes occur and while the impact of discontinuing the 85-day rule in 2007 is analyzed. Changes in the dropout definition and attribution of data are certain to result in higher dropout rates; however, the extent of the increase cannot be predicted. The effect of the changes to the Annual Dropout Rate is unpredictable and current data cannot be fully modeled using the new definition. The lack of a Required Improvement feature in 2007 will coincide with the one year “hold harmless” provision for this indicator. Districts were assured by the commissioner that serving hurricane displaced students would not have an adverse effect on accountability ratings should dropout rates be inflated for one year because of difficulties tracking or retaining these students. Dropout data under the NCES definition will not be available for analysis until the 2009 development cycle.

If necessary, a focus group subcommittee will be formed to address dropout rate issues due to the complexities of predicting dropout rate values under the NCES definition.

AEA Rating Labels

In regard to developing AEA rating labels above *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, one of the guiding principles of the AEA procedures is that indicators are appropriate for alternative education programs offered on AECs, rather than simply setting lower standards on the same indicators under the standard accountability procedures. Additionally, AEA indicators must be cognizant that all students are required to demonstrate proficiency on the state assessments in order to graduate. The design of AEA procedures is pass/fail. Performance is acknowledged at two levels: acceptable and unacceptable. Recognition at incremental levels would require redevelopment of the AEA procedures.

2006 and Beyond. The current AEA rating labels below will be maintained. The new AEA procedures were first implemented in 2005. When three years of data are available, this issue will be reconsidered.

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

Rationale: Maintaining the current AEA rating labels continues application of indicators appropriate for AECs. Recognition above *AEA: Academically Acceptable* requires redevelopment of the AEA procedures. The TAKS Progress indicator already includes TAKS exit-level retests and tests with a Texas Growth Index (TGI) score of 0 or higher. This indicator would have to be reevaluated to (1) analyze appropriateness of using TGI scores at levels above 0 and (2) analyze appropriateness of including all exit-level retest results (retests meeting and not meeting the student passing standard). Use of district at-risk data to evaluate AECs for higher rating levels would also have to be considered.

Evaluation of Residential Facilities

Texas school districts and charters provide education services to students in residential programs and facilities operated under contract with the TYC, students in detention centers and correctional facilities that are registered with the TJPC, and students in private residential treatment centers. Many of these facilities have a campus number and receive a campus rating under the state accountability system.

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.
- Few residential facilities have 10 or more students that meet the criteria for calculation of performance growth using the 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.
- Individual evaluation of Residential Facilities would create an unmanageable host of issues such as defining the difference between a program and a campus.

2006 and Beyond. Residential Facilities will continue to be evaluated under the current AEA indicators (TAKS Progress, SDAA II, and Annual Dropout Rate).

Rationale: The current AEA procedures contain appropriate indicators on which Residential Facilities are evaluated. Residential Facilities serve primarily short-term students; therefore, Residential Facilities are not evaluated on the Completion II Rate indicator. Better alternatives for evaluation of Residential Facilities have not been identified.

Attachment A AEA: Overview of 2005

Background

New alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures were developed and implemented in 2005. AEA procedures are based on the following principles:

- Procedures apply to alternative education campuses (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 disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs) or juvenile justice alternative education programs (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.

Part 2 of the *2005 Accountability Manual* explains the AEA criteria and procedures applied by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) in evaluating the performance of AECs including charters and charter campuses that:

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

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. 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.

Registered AECs Evaluated under AEA Procedures

In 2005, a total of 453 AECs registered for evaluation under AEA procedures. 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.

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 Texas Education Code (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 Public Education Information Management System (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.

Charter Operators Evaluated under 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.

Charters that operate only registered AECs. Beginning in 2005, charters that operate only registered AECs are 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 contacts each charter to obtain their preference. If a preference cannot be obtained, then the charter is evaluated under the standard accountability procedures.

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 are evaluated under the standard accountability procedures if fewer than 50% of the charter's students are enrolled at registered AECs.

2005 AEA Ratings – Registered AECs and Charter Operators

A total of 424 alternative education campuses (AECs) and 89 charter operators received ratings under AEA procedures in 2005. The AEA ratings distributions are below.

AEA Campus Type	AEA: Academically Acceptable	AEA: Academically Unacceptable	AEA: Not Rated – Other	Total
AEC Of Choice	323	25	0	348
Residential Facility	69	6	1	76
Total	392	31	1	424

2005 AEA Ratings – Charter Operators	Total
<i>AEA: Academically Acceptable</i>	74
<i>AEA: Academically Unacceptable</i>	15
Total	89

A summary of the reasons why AECs and charter operators were rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* in 2005 is below.

Reasons	2005	
	AECs	Charter Operators
Failed TAKS Progress Only	15	5
Failed SDAA II Only	1	1
Failed Completion Rate II Only	4	3
Failed Annual Dropout Rate Only	8	3
Failed TAKS Progress and Completion Rate II	0	1
Failed TAKS Progress and Annual Dropout Rate	2	1
Failed Completion Rate II and Annual Dropout Rate	1	1
Total	31	15

Appendix A contains a list of the 31 registered AECs rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* in 2005. *Appendix B* contains a list of the 15 charter operators rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* in 2005. The campus rated *AEA: Not Rated – Other*, Laurel Ridge Residential Treatment Center in North East ISD, serves students with severe psychological problems. In July 2005, this campus became part of the University Charter School.

The table below compares campuses and districts rated *Academically Unacceptable* under 2005 standard accountability and AEA procedures.

<i>Academically Unacceptable</i>	Campuses		Districts	
	Number of Campuses	% of Total Campuses	Number of Districts	% of Total Districts
Total	264	3.3%	52	4.2%
Standard Procedures	233	2.9%	37	3.0%
AEA Procedures	31	0.4%	15	1.2%

AEA Indicators

The 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 [including General Educational Development (GED) recipients], and
- Annual Dropout Rate for grades 7 through 12.

TAKS Progress Indicator

The TAKS Progress indicator sums performance results across grades (3-11) and across subjects to determine ratings under AEA procedures. This indicator is based on the number of tests taken, not on

the number of students tested. In 2005, 22,594 students enrolled at AECs took a total of 55,386 TAKS tests.

The numerator for the TAKS Progress indicator 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 is calculated as:

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

Impact of Including TAKS TGI and Exit-Level Data. The following analysis was performed to determine the impact of including TGI and exit-level data in the TAKS Progress indicator. First, a TAKS Progress indicator was calculated using only TAKS tests that met the student passing standard. If the campus did not meet the 40% TAKS Progress standard based on this initial examination, then TAKS tests that had a TGI score of 0 (zero) or higher were also included in the calculation of a second TAKS Progress indicator. Finally, if the campus still did not meet the 40% standard, then exit-level data were included for a third TAKS Progress indicator calculation. Based on this analysis, the campus counts below are mutually exclusive.

In 2005, when only TAKS tests that met the all student passing standard were examined, 162 AECs did not meet the 40% TAKS Progress standard for All Students. When TAKS tests that met the student passing standard or had a TGI score that met the student growth standard of 0 (zero) or higher were examined, 89 AECs did not meet the 40% standard for All Students. When exit-level data in addition to TGI data were evaluated, 19 AECs did not meet the 40% standard for All Students.

Total number of AECs not meeting the 40% TAKS Progress Indicator standard based on:	2005 TAKS Tests Evaluated		
	TAKS tests that met the student passing standard	TAKS tests that had a TGI score of 0 (zero) or higher	Exit-level retests
162	√		
89	√	√	
19	√	√	√

By including TGI data, an additional 73 AECs met the 40% standard for All Students. When exit-level and TGI data were evaluated, an extra 70 AECs met the 40% standard for All Students.

Twenty-three (23) AECs had only exit-level data. Thirty (30) AECs met minimum size requirements when exit-level data were combined with TAKS data from the spring administrations. If exit-level data had not been a component of the TAKS Progress indicator, then these 53 AECs would have been evaluated on district at-risk data (in addition to the 51 AECs referenced below).

In 2005, when the analysis above is performed for charter operators, 20 charter ratings were elevated from AEA: AU to AEA: AA when TGI data were evaluated. An additional 8 charter ratings were elevated from AEA: AU to AEA: AA when exit-level data were included.

Use of District At-Risk TAKS Data. If the AEC does not meet the 40% TAKS Progress standard based on results for fewer than 10 TAKS tests, or if there are no TAKS results for the AEC, then the AEC is evaluated on the district performance of at-risk students. If there are results for fewer than 10 at-risk tests

in the district, then Special Analysis is conducted. In 2005, district at-risk TAKS data were used to evaluate 51 AECs. Special Analysis was conducted for one charter.

Attribution of TAKS Data. For 2005 accountability, TAKS answer documents were attributed to the AEC only when the student attended the registered AEC for 85 days or more. The 85-day rule does not apply to charter AECs and charter operators. AECs are accountable for TAKS results for students enrolled on the AEC on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date. Charters are accountable for TAKS results for students enrolled at the charter on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date and on the testing date. Accountability subset does not apply to TAKS exit-level retests.

SDAA II Indicator

A single performance indicator is evaluated for SDAA II. The indicator sums performance results across grades (3-10) and across subjects. Like the TAKS Progress indicator, the SDAA II indicator is based on the number of tests taken, not on the number of students tested. In 2005, 2,472 students took a total of 4,547 SDAA II tests. The SDAA II indicator is calculated as:

$$\frac{\text{number of tests meeting Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) expectations}}{\text{number of SDAA II tests for which ARD expectations were established}}$$

Attribution of SDAA II Data. For 2005 accountability, SDAA II answer documents were attributed to the AEC only when the student attended the registered AEC for 85 days or more. The 85-day rule does not apply to charter AECs and charter operators. AECs are accountable for SDAA II results for students enrolled on the AEC on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date and on the testing date. Charters are accountable for SDAA II results for students enrolled at the charter on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date and on the testing date.

Completion Rate II Indicator

This longitudinal rate shows the percent of students who completed or who are continuing their education four years after first attending grade 9. Students' progress is 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 GED recipients in the definition of Completion Rate II for AECs and charters evaluated under AEA procedures.

Residential Facilities are not evaluated on the Completion Rate II indicator.

Use of District At-Risk Completion Rate II Data. 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. In 2005, district at-risk Completion Rate II data were used to evaluate 137 AECs of Choice.

Attribution of Completion Data. For 2005 accountability, completion data were attributed to the AEC of Choice only when the student attended the registered AEC of Choice for 85 days or more. The 85-day rule does not apply to charter AECs and charter operators.

Annual Dropout Rate 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.

Attribution of Dropout Data. Dropout data were attributed to the AEC only when the student attended the registered AEC for 85 days or more. The 85-day rule does not apply to charter AECs and charter operators.

Appendix A
List of Registered AECs Rated AEA: Academically Unacceptable in 2005

District Name	Campus Name	Campus Number	AEA Campus Type
Academy of Dallas	Academy of Dallas	057810101	AEC of Choice
American Youthworks Charter School	American Youthworks Charter School	227801002	AEC of Choice
Dalhart ISD	X I T Secondary School	056901002	AEC of Choice
Dallas ISD	Maya Angelou Health Special High School	057905030	AEC of Choice
Eagle Academy of Bryan	Eagle Academy of Bryan	021802001	AEC of Choice
Eagle Academy of Dallas	Eagle Academy of Dallas	057823001	AEC of Choice
Eagle Academy of Fort Worth	Eagle Academy of Fort Worth	220807001	AEC of Choice
Eagle Academy of San Antonio	Eagle Academy of San Antonio	015818001	AEC of Choice
Eagle Academy of Waco	Eagle Academy of Waco	161804001	AEC of Choice
Eagle Academy of Waco	Eagle Academy of Waco at Trinity	161804002	AEC of Choice
Ector County ISD	A I M	068901006	AEC of Choice
Evolution Academy Charter School	Evolution Academy Charter School	057834001	AEC of Choice
Gulf Shores Academy	Gulf Shores High School	101843001	AEC of Choice
Gulf Shores Academy	Gulf Shores Residential Treatment	101843002	Res. Fac.
Harlandale ISD	Tejeda Junior Academy	015904048	AEC of Choice
Houston ISD	Accelerated Learning And Transition	101912341	AEC of Choice
Houston ISD	Houston Drop Back In Academy	101912318	AEC of Choice
Houston ISD	Houston Night High School	101912032	AEC of Choice
Liberty-Eylau ISD	Juvenile Justice Detention Center	019908003	Res. Fac.
Manor ISD	EXCEL High School	227907002	AEC of Choice
Panola Charter School	Panola Charter School	183801001	AEC of Choice
Raven School	Raven School	236801001	Res. Fac.
Rice CISD	Colorado County Juvenile Boot	045903601	Res. Fac.
Richard Milburn Academy (Amarillo)	Richard Milburn Academy (Amarillo)	188801001	AEC of Choice
Richard Milburn Academy (Suburban)	Richard Milburn Academy (Suburban)	101854001	AEC of Choice
San Antonio Technology Academy	San Antonio Technology Academy	015823001	AEC of Choice
Seguin ISD	Mercer & Blumberg Learning Center	094901002	AEC of Choice
Sundown ISD	PEP Alternative School	110907002	AEC of Choice
University Charter School	Depelchin Campus	227806021	Res. Fac.
University Charter School	San Marcos Treatment Center	227806028	Res. Fac.
Waco ISD	STARS High School	161914007	AEC of Choice
Total			31

Appendix B
List of Charter Operators Rated AEA: Academically Unacceptable in 2005

Charter Operator Name	Charter Number
Academy of Dallas	057810
American Youthworks Charter School	227801
Eagle Academy of Bryan	021802
Eagle Academy of Dallas	057823
Eagle Academy of Fort Worth	220807
Eagle Academy of San Antonio	015818
Eagle Academy of Waco	161804
Evolution Academy Charter School	057834
Gulf Shores Academy	101843
Nancy Ney Charter School	046801
Panola Charter School	183801
Raven School	236801
Richard Milburn Academy (Amarillo)	188801
Richard Milburn Academy (Suburban)	101854
San Antonio Technology Academy	015823
Total	15