

**2006 Accountability Rating System
for Texas Public Schools and School Districts**

Part 2

**Alternative Education
Accountability (AEA)
Procedures**

In Part 2:

Chapter 7 – Overview of
AEA.....73

Chapter 8 – AEA
Registration Criteria and
Requirements.....77

Chapter 9 – Attribution of
AEC Data.....81

Chapter 10 – AEA Base
Indicators..... 83

Chapter 11 – Additional
Features of AEA.....93

Chapter 12 – AEA
Ratings..... 99

Chapter 13 – AEA Glossary
and Index.....111

This page is intentionally blank.

Chapter 7 - Overview of AEA

ABOUT PART 2 OF THIS *MANUAL*

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

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

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

EDUCATOR INPUT

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

HISTORY OF AEA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In 2005, registered AECs were evaluated for the first time under the newly developed, redesigned AEA procedures.

PHILOSOPHY OF AEA

AEA procedures are based on the following principles:

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

The following issues affect many components of the accountability system.

- Small numbers of test results and mobility – AECs are smaller on average than standard campuses and have high mobility rates.
- Attribution of data – High mobility also affects attribution of data and complicates evaluation of AEC data.

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

OVERALL DESIGN OF AEA PROCEDURES

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

The AEA procedures include these major components:

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

Chapter 8 - AEA Registration Criteria and Requirements

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

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

Alternative Education Campuses (AECs)

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

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

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

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

AEC ELIGIBILITY

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

The following types of campuses have the option to register for evaluation under AEA procedures:

- AEC of Choice; and
- Residential Facility.

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

- disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs);
- juvenile justice alternative education programs (JJAEPs); and

- stand-alone General Educational Development (GED) programs.

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

AEA CAMPUS REGISTRATION PROCESS

AECs registered in 2004-05 were re-registered automatically in 2005-06. A rescission letter was required from AECs not wishing to remain registered for AEA. A *2005-06 Alternative Education Accountability Campus Registration Form* was required for each AEC not already on the list of registered AECs that wished to be evaluated under 2005-06 AEA procedures. The 2006 registration process closed on August 31, 2005. The list of registered AECs is available on the AEA website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/aea>.

AEA REGISTRATION CRITERIA

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

- (1) The AEC must have its own county-district-campus (CDC) number to which 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.

AT-RISK REGISTRATION CRITERION

Beginning in 2006, an at-risk registration criterion will be implemented under AEA procedures. Each registered 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 remain registered and be evaluated under AEA procedures. The at-risk criterion begins at 65% and increases by five percentage points annually until it reaches 75% in 2008, where it is expected to remain.

- 2006 – 65% or higher at-risk student enrollment at the registered AEC
- 2007 – 70% or higher at-risk student enrollment at the registered AEC
- 2008 – 75% or higher at-risk student enrollment at the registered AEC

An at-risk registration criterion accomplishes two goals. It restricts use of AEA procedures to AECs that serve large populations of at-risk students and enhances at-risk data quality.

The following safeguards are incorporated for AECs not meeting the at-risk registration criterion. The Prior-Year PEIMS At-Risk Data and New Campus safeguards are permanent and apply in 2006 and beyond. Since 2006 is the first year of implementation, an At-Risk Statewide Average safeguard has been developed for AECs not meeting the 65% at-risk registration criterion. The At-Risk Statewide Average safeguard is a one-year accommodation and applies in 2006 only.

Prior-Year PEIMS At-Risk Data Safeguard. If a registered AEC does not meet the at-risk criterion in the current year, then it remains under AEA if the AEC meets the at-risk criterion in the prior year. For example, an AEC with an at-risk enrollment of 64% in 2006 and 65% in 2005 remains registered in 2006.

New Campus Safeguard. If a new campus is registered for evaluation under AEA procedures, then the AEC is not required to meet the at-risk criterion in its first year of operation. This safeguard provides an accommodation for new campuses with no prior-year data.

At-Risk Statewide Average Safeguard. The 2006 at-risk statewide average is 49%. If a registered AEC does not meet the 65% at-risk registration criterion and the two safeguards above are not applicable, then the AEC remains under AEA if the AEC has at least 49% at-risk enrollment in 2006. This safeguard is a one-time accommodation for the new at-risk registration criterion and applies in 2006 only.

Due to timing between AEC registration, PEIMS fall enrollment submission, and PEIMS fall data availability in the spring, the at-risk registration criterion cannot be applied until early April. The 2006 AEA campus registration is rescinded for AECs not meeting the at-risk registration criterion or utilizing the safeguards. As a result, the AEC does not qualify for evaluation under AEA procedures and will receive a 2006 rating under standard accountability procedures. The AECs that shifted from AEA to standard accountability received a letter from TEA in late April to notify them that the AEC would be evaluated under the standard accountability procedures.

The final list of 2006 registered AECs was posted on the AEA website in May 2006. Additionally, an email was sent to all superintendents when the list was available.

The at-risk registration criterion will be evaluated annually to determine whether adjustments are necessary.

Charters

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

CHARTERS EVALUATED UNDER AEA PROCEDURES

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

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

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

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

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

AEC ENROLLMENT CRITERION FOR CHARTERS

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

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

Chapter 9 - Attribution of AEC Data

BACKGROUND

From 1999-00 to 2004-05, student data (attendance, completion/dropout, and performance) were attributed to alternative education campuses (AECs) registered for evaluation under alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures only when the student attended the registered AEC for 85 days or more. Under the previous AEA procedures, the AEC accountability rating was based on performance of students enrolled on the campus for 85 days or more. The 85-day rule was implemented before the campus accountability subset was incorporated in the state accountability system.

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

In 2005, both the campus accountability subset and the 85-day rule were applied. AECs evaluated under AEA procedures were accountable for test results for students enrolled on the AEC on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date and on the testing date if the student had been enrolled on the AEC for 85 days or more. Campus accountability subset does not apply to exit-level retests. 2003-04 leaver data were attributed to the AEC if the student had been enrolled on the AEC for 85 days or more and the AEC was registered for evaluation under AEA procedures in 2004.

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

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

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

ATTRIBUTION OF DATA

AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities. The 85-day rule will be phased out under the AEA procedures as described below. The accountability subset definition governs whether or not test results are included in the performance indicators used for ratings.

- For 2006 accountability, campus accountability subset determines attribution of AEC test data. 2004-05 leaver data are attributed according to the 85-day rule for AECs that were registered for evaluation under AEA procedures in 2005. 2004-05 leaver data are attributed to the last campus of attendance for AECs that were not registered for evaluation under AEA procedures in 2005, but are registered in 2006.
- For 2007 accountability, campus accountability subset determines attribution of AEC test data. 2005-06 leaver data are attributed to the last campus of attendance.

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

Chapter 10 - AEA Base Indicators

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

- performance on the *Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)*,
- performance on the *State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II)*,
- *Completion Rate II* for the Class of 2005, and
- *2004-05 Annual Dropout Rate* for grades 7 through 12.

TAKS PROGRESS INDICATOR

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

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

The TAKS Progress indicator includes the following results:

- TAKS grades 3-11 Spring 2006 primary administration:
 - Panel Recommendation student passing standard
 - TGI: 2005 to 2006, growth of 0 (zero) or higher
 - Campus accountability subset
- TAKS grade 12 April 2006, February 2006, December 2005, October 2005, July 2005, and June 2005 administrations:
 - Actual student passing standard
 - Tests meeting passing standard
 - No accountability subset
- TAKS grade 11 April 2006, February 2006, December 2005, October 2005, July 2005, and June 2005 administrations:
 - Retests only
 - Actual student passing standard
 - Tests meeting passing standard
 - No accountability subset

Who is evaluated for the TAKS Progress Indicator:

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

Table 10: TAKS Progress Indicator

	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 Subset; Accountability Subset does not apply to exit-level retests				

Standard:

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

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

Methodology:

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

Minimum Size Requirements:

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

Accountability Subset:

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

Years of Data:

- Spring 2006 grades 3-11 TAKS results (primary administration)
- April 2006, February 2006, December 2005, October 2005, July 2005, and June 2005 grade 11 exit-level retest results
- April 2006, February 2006, December 2005, October 2005, July 2005, and June 2005 grade 12 exit-level results

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other Information:

- *Grades and Subjects.* The TAKS results for English (grades 3-11) and Spanish (grades 3-6) are summed across grades and subjects and are evaluated for All Students and each student group that meets minimum size requirements. First administration results of grades 3 and 5 reading and grade 5 mathematics are included.
- *Testing Window.* Results for students given a make-up test within the testing window are included in the accountability measures.
- *Student Passing Standard.* The TAKS Progress indicator is calculated as percent *Met Standard* using the student passing standard adopted by the State Board of Education (SBOE) for each specific year. See *Chapter 2 – The Basics: Base Indicators* for more detailed information.
- *Hurricanes Katrina-Rita Indicator (KRI).* The performance of students displaced by Hurricane Katrina and/or Hurricane Rita who are tested in Texas school districts in 2005-06 is not included in the indicators used for 2006 accountability ratings. For more information, see *Appendix I*.
- *Rounding.* The TAKS Progress indicator percent *Met Standard* calculations are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%; 79.4999% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.
- *TGI.* The TGI has been developed for accountability purposes to evaluate individual student growth from one year to the next on the TAKS. The TGI compares how students taking a TAKS subject test in one year perform on the same TAKS subject test in the next higher grade the following year. An individual TGI score indicates the amount of growth for each student in relation to the average growth of all students who performed at the same level in the base year. The TGI score of zero (0) indicates that the year-to-year change in scale score is equal to the average change. The TGI measures growth for a student who passes as well as a student who does not pass the TAKS.

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

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

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

SDAA II INDICATOR

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

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

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

Who is evaluated for SDAA II:

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

Standard:

- *AEA: Academically Acceptable* – At least 40% of SDAA II tests taken must meet ARD expectations.
- The SDAA II standard will be reviewed annually and is subject to change.

Student Groups:

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

Methodology:
$$\frac{\text{number of SDAA II tests Meeting ARD Expectations}}{\text{number of SDAA II tests taken}}$$
Minimum Size Requirements:

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

Accountability Subset:

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

Year of Data: Spring 2006 grades 3-10 SDAA II results**Data Source:** Pearson Educational Measurement**Other Information:**

- *Students Tested in both SDAA II and TAKS.* In some cases, students may take both the SDAA II and TAKS. For example, a grade 6 student may take the TAKS for mathematics, but the SDAA II for reading. In this case, the student's performance is included in both indicators.
- *TAKS-I.* For the first time in 2006, students served in special education may take the new Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills Inclusive (TAKS-I) in subjects and grades where the SDAA II is not available. TAKS-I performance is not used in determining the accountability ratings in 2006, but will be shown on the AEIS reports released in the fall.
- *Hurricanes Katrina-Rita Indicator (KRI).* The performance of students displaced by Hurricane Katrina and/or Hurricane Rita who are tested in Texas school districts in 2005-06 is not included in the indicators used for 2006 accountability ratings. For more information, see *Appendix I*.
- *Rounding.* The *Met ARD Expectation* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%; 79.4999% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.

COMPLETION RATE II (GRADES 9-12) INDICATOR

This longitudinal rate shows the percent of students who first attended grade 9 in the 2001-02 school year who graduated, received a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, or who are continuing their education four years later. Known as the 2001-02 cohort, these students' progress was tracked over the four years using data provided to TEA by districts and charters and data available in the statewide GED database.

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

Who is evaluated for Completion Rate II:

- AECs of Choice that have served students in grades 9, 10, 11, and 12 for the last five years. (Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.)
- If the AEC of Choice does not serve students in any of grades 9-12 in the 2005-06 school year, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II.
- *Use of District At-Risk Rate.* If the AEC of Choice does not meet the accountability standard, or if the AEC of Choice has students in any of grades 9-12 but does not have a Completion Rate II, then the AEC of Choice is evaluated on Completion Rate II (including GED recipients) of at-risk students in the district. If at-risk students in the district do not meet minimum size requirements for All Students, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II. See *Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA.*
- Charters that operate only registered AECs.
- Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

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

	2006 Class of 2005; 9th grade 01-02	2007 Class of 2006; 9th grade 02-03	2008 Class of 2007; 9th grade 03-04	2009 Class of 2008; 9th grade 04-05	2010 Class of 2009; 9th grade 05-06
<i>AEA: Academically Acceptable</i>	75.0%	75.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD
Completion Rate II	Graduates + Continuing Students + GED Recipients				
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			

Standard:

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

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

Methodology:

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

number of students in class

Minimum Size Requirements:

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

Accountability Subset:

- Completion data are attributed to the AEC of Choice only when the student attended the AEC of Choice for 85 days or more and the AEC of Choice was registered for evaluation under AEA in 2005.
- The 85-day rule does not apply to charter AECs and charters.

Years of Data:

- Graduating Class of 2005 (results are based on the original 2001-02 cohort, whether the students remain on grade level or not)
- Continued enrollment in 2005-06
- GED records as of March 1, 2006

Data Sources:

- PEIMS Submission 1 enrollment data for 2001-02 through 2005-06
- PEIMS Submission 1 leaver data for 2002-03 through 2005-06
- PEIMS Submission 3 attendance data for 2001-02 through 2004-05
- GED records as of March 1, 2006

Other Information:

- *Transfers.* Any student who transfers into the cohort is added to it, and any student who transfers out of the cohort is subtracted from it.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 74.875% is rounded to 74.9%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

- *Students with Disabilities.* The completion status of students with disabilities is included in this measure.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE (GRADES 7-12) INDICATOR

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

Who is evaluated for Annual Dropout Rate:

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

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

	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			

Standard:

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

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

Methodology:

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

Minimum Size Requirements:

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

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

Accountability Subset:

- Dropout data are attributed to the AEC only when the student attended the AEC for 85 days or more and the AEC was registered for evaluation under AEA in 2005.
- The 85-day rule does not apply to charter AECs and charters.

Year of Data: 2004-05

Data Sources:

- PEIMS Submission 1 data for 2004-05 and 2005-06
- PEIMS Submission 1 leaver data for 2005-06
- PEIMS Submission 3 attendance data for 2004-05

Other Information:

- *Cumulative Attendance.* A cumulative count of students is used in the denominator. This method for calculating the dropout rate neutralizes the effects of mobility by including in the denominator every student reported in attendance at the AEC or charter throughout the school year, regardless of length of stay.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 2.49% is rounded to 2.5%, and 0.25% is rounded to 0.3%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.
- *Students with Disabilities.* Students with disabilities who drop out of school are included in this measure.

This page is intentionally blank.

Chapter 11 - Additional Features of AEA

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

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

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

Additional requirements for charters are explained later in this chapter.

Required Improvement

AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities can achieve an *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating by meeting the absolute standards for the alternative education accountability (AEA) indicators or by demonstrating Required Improvement. AECs initially rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* may achieve an *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating using the Required Improvement feature. Required Improvement can be applied to all four base indicators: Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) Progress, State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II), Completion Rate II, and Annual Dropout Rate.

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

Who is evaluated for Required Improvement:

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

TAKS PROGRESS INDICATOR

Improvement Standard: In order for Required Improvement to move an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, the AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient improvement on the deficient TAKS measures to meet a standard of **40%** within two years.

Methodology:

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

Actual Change is the difference between performance in 2006 and 2005.

Required Improvement is the result of the 2006 standard minus performance in 2005 divided by 2.

Example:

In 2006, an AEC has performance above the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* standard in all student groups except for Economically Disadvantaged; only 38% meet the standard. Performance in 2005 for the same group is 20%.

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

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*: $(40 - 20) / 2 = 10$

Then compare *Actual Change* to *Required Improvement* to determine if *Actual Change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*: $18 \geq 10$

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

Minimum Size Requirements: Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has less than 10 test results (for the student group) in 2005.

Other Information:

- *Student Passing Standard.* Prior year percent *Met Standard* is recalculated using the current-year student passing standard so gain from the prior year to the current year uses comparable performance data for two years. Therefore the 2005 performance of 20% for the AEC in the example above is based on a student passing standard of *Panel Recommendation* so that it is comparable to performance in 2006.
- *Performance in 2005.* Prior-year performance includes Spring 2005 grades 3-11 TAKS results (primary administration); Texas Growth Index (TGI) for 2004 to 2005, growth of 0 (zero) or higher; April and February 2005, and October and July 2004 grade 11 TAKS retests meeting the passing standard; and April and February 2005, and October and July 2004 grade 12 results meeting the student passing standard.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations of performance rates and standards are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

SDAA II INDICATOR

Improvement Standard: In order for Required Improvement to move an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, the AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient improvement on the SDAA II indicator to meet a standard of **40%** within two years.

Methodology:

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

Actual Change is the difference between performance in 2006 and 2005.

Required Improvement is the result of the 2006 standard minus performance in 2005 divided by 2.

Example:

In 2006, an AEC has performance below the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* standard; only 28% of All Students meet the standard. Performance in 2005 is 10%.

First calculate the *Actual Change*: $28 - 10 = 18$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*: $(40 - 10) / 2 = 15$

Then compare *Actual Change* to *Required Improvement* to determine if *Actual Change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*: $18 \geq 15$

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

Minimum Size Requirements: Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has less than 10 test results in 2005.

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

COMPLETION RATE II INDICATOR

Improvement Standard: In order for Required Improvement to move an AEC of Choice or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, the AEC of Choice or charter must demonstrate sufficient improvement on the deficient Completion Rate II measures since the Class of 2004 to be at **75.0%** within two years.

Methodology:

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

Actual Change is the difference between the Completion Rate II for the Class of 2005 and the Class of 2004.

Required Improvement is the result of the 2006 standard minus the Completion Rate II for the Class of 2004 divided by 2.

Example:

An AEC of Choice has a Class of 2005 Completion Rate II of 72.3% for the White student group. The Class of 2004 Completion Rate II for this same group is 63.8%.

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

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

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

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

Minimum Size Requirements: Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC of Choice or charter has less than 10 students (in the same student group) in the Completion Rate II Class of 2004.

Other Information:

- *Completion Rate II Definition.* Completion Rate II for the prior year is computed using the same definition as the current year so that gain from the prior year to the current year uses comparable data for both years. Specifically, the Completion Rate II definition includes graduates, General Educational Development (GED) recipients, and continuing students as completers.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 4.85% is rounded to 4.9%.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE INDICATOR

Improvement Standard: In order for Required Improvement to move an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, the AEC or charter must demonstrate a decline in the Annual Dropout Rate to be at **10.0%** within two years.

Methodology:

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

Actual Change is the difference between the 2004-05 and 2003-04 Annual Dropout Rates.

Required Improvement is the result of the 2006 standard minus the 2003-04 Annual Dropout Rate divided by 2.

This calculation measures declines in rates. The *Actual Change* in the Annual Dropout Rate must be less than or equal to the *Required Improvement* for the standard to be met and will contain negative numbers. The *Actual Change* needs to be a larger negative number than the required change.

Example:

In 2004-05, an AEC had an Annual Dropout Rate for the Hispanic student group of 12.8%. The Annual Dropout Rate in 2003-04 for the same group was 24.2%.

First calculate the *Actual Change*: $12.8 - 24.2 = -11.4$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*: $(10.0 - 24.2) / 2 = -7.1$

Then compare *Actual Change* to *Required Improvement* to determine if the *Actual Change* is less than or equal to the *Required Improvement*: $-11.4 \leq -7.1$

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

Minimum Size Requirements: Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has less than 10 grade 7-12 students (in the same student group) in 2003-04.

Other Information: All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, -1.875% is rounded to -1.9%.

Use of District At-Risk Data

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

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

TAKS PROGRESS INDICATOR

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

- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that do not meet the 40% standard, do not demonstrate Required Improvement, and have results for fewer than 10 tests in the current year.
- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities with no TAKS results.

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

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

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

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

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

COMPLETION RATE II INDICATOR

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

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

- If the AEC of Choice does not serve students in any of grades 9-12 in the 2005-06 school year, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II.

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

Does the AEC of Choice serve students in grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12 in 2005-06?	Does the AEC of Choice have a Completion Rate II in 2004-05?	Does the AEC of Choice meet the accountability standard on its own data?	Does the AEC of Choice demonstrate Required Improvement (RI) on its own data?	Do at-risk students in the district meet minimum size requirements?	Does the AEC of Choice meet the accountability standard using Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district?	
Yes	Yes	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A	N/A	
		No	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A	
			No	Yes	Yes – assign rating No – calculate district RI	
	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes – assign rating No – calculate district RI
					No	N/A
					No	N/A
No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

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

Minimum Size Requirements:

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

Additional Requirements for Charters

Underreported Students: Charters evaluated under AEA procedures are subject to underreported student standards as described in *Chapter 3 – The Basics: Additional Features*.

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

AECs Rated AEA: Academically Unacceptable

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

Chapter 12 - AEA Ratings

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

WHO IS RATED?

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

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

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

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

AEA RATING LABELS

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

- *AEA: Academically Acceptable*

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

Table 15: AEA Rating Labels

	AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities	Charters
<i>AEA: Academically Acceptable</i>	Assigned to registered AECs with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ at least one TAKS test (summed across grades and subjects) in the accountability subset; or ○ no TAKS test results and are evaluated using district at-risk performance results. 	Assigned to charters with at least one TAKS test (summed across grades and subjects) in the accountability subset. Charters with fewer than 10 TAKS test results receive Special Analysis.
<i>AEA: Academically Unacceptable</i>		
<i>AEA: Not Rated – Other</i>	Assigned to registered AECs with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ no students enrolled in grades tested; or ○ no TAKS data in the accountability subset or exit-level data on which to rate. 	Assigned to charters with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ no students enrolled in grades tested; or ○ no TAKS data in the accountability subset or exit-level data on which to rate.
In 2006, this rating may be assigned to AECs and charters impacted by Hurricane Rita as outlined in <i>Appendix I</i> .		

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

USING THE DATA TABLE TO DETERMINE AN AEA RATING

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

These tables will *not* show a rating and will *not* provide calculations for Required Improvement. However, by using the preview data tables and the *2006 Accountability Manual*, districts can anticipate their ratings in advance of the TEA ratings release on August 1. *The preview data tables will contain unmasked data and must be treated as confidential.* The performance of individual students may be shown.

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

Table 16: Sample AEA Data Table

July 2006

Texas Education Agency
CONFIDENTIAL

Page 1 of 2

1

2006 Preview Accountability Data Table
Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures

3

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

Grade Span: 09 – 12
% At-Risk: 75%

2

4

Rating:

5

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

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

6

	District At-Risk	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ Disadv
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) (Grades 3-12)						
Analysis Groups Evaluated	X	X		X		X
2005-06 Progress Measure						
# Tests Met Standard	33,197	2	0	2	0	2
# Tests	46,756	8	0	8	0	8
% Met Standard	71%	25%	0%	25%	0%	25%
Student Group %	n/a	100%	0%	100%	0%	100%
2004-05 Progress Measure						
# Tests Met Standard	26,881	3	0	3	0	3
# Tests	44,067	9	0	9	0	9
% Met Standard	61%	33%	0%	33%	0%	33%
Required Improvement						
Actual Change	10	-8	0	-8	0	-8

7

State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II) (Grades 3-10)						
Analysis Groups Evaluated						
2005-06 SDAA II Results						
# Tests Met ARD Expectations	n/a	18	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
# Tests	n/a	26	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Met ARD Expectations	n/a	69%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2004-05 SDAA II Results						
# Tests Met ARD Expectations	n/a	13	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
# Tests	n/a	20	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Met ARD Expectations	n/a	65%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Required Improvement						
Actual Change	n/a	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

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

Table 16: Sample AEA Data Table (continued)

July 2006

Texas Education Agency
CONFIDENTIAL

Page 2 of 2

2006 Preview Accountability Data Table
Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures

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

Grade Span: 09 – 12
% At-Risk: 75%

Rating:

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

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

	District At-Risk	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ Disadv
8 Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12)						
Analysis Groups Evaluated	X	X		X		
Class of 2005						
# Completers	1,824	29	2	22	5	20
# Non-completers	181	16	3	13	0	9
# in Class	2,005	45	5	35	5	29
Completion Rate	91.0%	64.4%	40.0%	62.9%	100%	69.0%
Student Group %	n/a	100%	11%	78%	11%	64%
Class of 2004						
# Completers	1,661	25	2	19	4	19
# in Class	1,992	43	4	34	5	28
Completion Rate	83.4%	58.1%	50.0%	55.9%	80.0%	67.9%
Required Improvement						
Actual Change	7.6	6.3	-10.0	7.0	20.0	1.1
9 Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12)						
Analysis Groups Evaluated		X		X		X
2004-05						
# Dropouts	n/a	10	1	9	0	8
# Students in Grades 7-12	n/a	83	7	68	8	81
Dropout Rate	n/a	12.0%	14.3%	13.2%	0.0%	9.9%
Student Group %	n/a	100%	8%	82%	10%	98%
2003-04						
# Dropouts	n/a	14	2	12	0	14
# Students in Grades 7-12	n/a	75	8	59	8	70
Dropout Rate	n/a	18.7%	25.0%	20.3%	0.0%	20.0%
Required Improvement						
Actual Change	n/a	-6.7	-10.7	-7.1	0.0	-10.1

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

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

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

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

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

District at-risk TAKS data used: If an AEC has no TAKS results or does not meet the 40% TAKS Progress standard based on results for fewer than 10 tests, then the AEC is evaluated on performance of at-risk students in the district.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TAKS Required Improvement: Moves an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable* if the AEC or charter demonstrates sufficient improvement on the deficient TAKS measures to meet a standard of 40% within two years. Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has fewer than 10 test results (for the student group) in 2005.

Actual Change: The difference between performance in 2006 and 2005. *Actual Change* is always shown when two years of data are available.

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

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

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

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

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

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

SDAA II Required Improvement: Moves an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable* if the AEC or charter demonstrates sufficient improvement to meet a standard of 40% within two years. Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has fewer than 10 test results in 2005.

Actual Change: The difference between performance in 2006 and 2005. *Actual Change* is always shown when two years of data are available.

- 8. Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12):** One of the four AEA base indicators on which AECs of Choice and charters are evaluated. Completion Rate II counts graduates, continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year), and General Educational Development (GED) recipients as completers. This longitudinal rate shows the percent of students who first attended grade 9 in the 2001-02 school year who completed or are continuing their education four years later. Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12) Required Improvement: Moves an AEC of Choice or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable* if the AEC of Choice or charter demonstrates sufficient improvement on the deficient Completion Rate II measures since the Class of 2004 to be at 75.0% within two years.

Actual Change: The difference between the Completion Rate II for the Classes of 2005 and 2004. *Actual Change* must be equal to or greater than the *Improvement Required*. *Actual Change* is always shown when two years of data are available.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12) Required Improvement: Moves an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable* if the AEC or charter demonstrates a sufficient decline in the Annual Dropout Rate to be at 10.0% in two years.

Actual Change: The difference between the 2004-05 and 2003-04 Annual Dropout Rates. *Actual Change* must be less than or equal to the *Improvement Required* and will contain negative numbers. The *Actual Change* needs to be a larger negative number than the *Required Improvement*. *Actual Change* is always shown when two years of data are available.

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

FINAL DATA TABLES

Preview data tables will be available only via TEASE prior to finalizing accountability ratings. Ratings will be released on August 1, 2006. Final data tables that include masked data will be online and available to districts and the public on August 1. See *Chapter 18 – Calendar* for other important dates.

The following will appear on the final data tables:

Accountability Ratings. AEA rating labels are:

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

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

- District at-risk TAKS data used. (AEC only)
- District at-risk Completion Rate II used. (AEC of Choice only)
- Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II. (Residential Facility only)
- This campus is not rated due to grade span. (AEC only)
- Charter operates only Residential Facilities. (charter only)
- Charter exceeds threshold for underreported students. (charter only)
- Special Analysis conducted. (AEC or charter)
- SDAA II not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data. (AEC or charter)
- Completion Rate II not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data. (AEC of Choice or charter)
- Annual Dropout Rate not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data. (AEC or charter)

- Rating is not based on data shown in the table (due to consolidation/annexation). (AEC or charter)
- Rating is not based on data shown in the table (Hurricane Rita provision used). (AEC or charter)
- Rating changed due to an appeal. Data not modified. (AEC or charter)

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

- *Met Minimum Size Requirements?* – “Y” or “N” is shown.
- *Actual Change* – The difference between current-year and prior-year data.
- *Improvement Required* – The amount of change needed for Required Improvement to be met.
- *Met Required Improvement?* – If Required Improvement is calculated, “Y” or “N” is shown depending on the comparison of *Actual Change* to the *Improvement Required*.

MASKED DATA

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

AEA SUMMARY

Two tables follow that summarize the 2006 AEA procedures. *Table 17* provides an overview of the requirements for achieving the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating label. An AEC or charter must meet the criteria for every applicable measure to be rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*. If the criteria are not met for every measure, then *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* is assigned.

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

Table 18 provides a detailed overview of the 2006 AEA procedures, with the base indicators listed as columns. For example, for each of the indicators, *Table 18* provides a brief definition, use of district at-risk data, the rounding methodology, the standards, the accountability subset methodology, subjects, student groups, minimum size criteria, and application of Required Improvement.

Table 17: Requirements for 2006 AEA: Academically Acceptable Rating

Indicators/Features	AECs of Choice	Residential Facilities	Charters
Assessment Indicators			
TAKS Progress All Students and each student group that meets minimum size criteria: African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged	Meets 40% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement or Meets 40% Standard Using District At-Risk Data or Demonstrates Required Improvement Using District At-Risk Data		Meets 40% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement
SDAA II All Students if minimum size criteria are met	Meets 40% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement		
Completion/Dropout Indicators			
Completion Rate II All Students and each student group that meets minimum size criteria: African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged	Meets 75.0% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement or Meets 75.0% Standard Using District At-Risk Data or Demonstrates Required Improvement Using District At-Risk Data	Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.	Meets 75.0% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement
Annual Dropout Rate All Students and each student group that meets minimum size criteria: African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged	Meets 10.0% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement		
Additional Features			
Required Improvement	Required Improvement is calculated for the TAKS Progress, SDAA II, Completion Rate II, and Annual Dropout Rate indicators when the standards are not met and when prior year minimum size requirements are met.		
Use of District At-Risk Data	TAKS data of at-risk students in the district are used when the 40% standard and Required Improvement are not met based on fewer than 10 tests or when there are no TAKS tests.		Performance results of all students in the accountability subset are used in determining the charter rating. The charter rating is not limited to evaluation of at-risk students.
	Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district is used when the 75.0% standard and Required Improvement are not met or when students in any grades 9-12 are served but there is no Completion Rate II.	Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.	
Special Analysis	Special Analysis is conducted when there are fewer than 10 at-risk TAKS tests in the district or charter.		Special Analysis is conducted when there are fewer than 10 TAKS tests in the charter.
Data Integrity	None		Charters are subject to underreported student standards, although the charter AEA rating is not affected.

Table 18: Overview of 2006 AEA Procedures

	TAKS Progress Grades 3-12	SDAA II Grades 3-10	Completion Rate II Grades 9-12	Annual Dropout Rate Grades 7-12
Use/Definition	<p>TAKS tests meeting the student passing standard or having a TGI score of 0 (zero) or higher and TAKS exit-level retest results meeting the student passing standard at the spring administrations or in the previous fall or summer divided by total TAKS tests taken and TAKS exit-level retests meeting the standard.</p> <p>Results are summed across grades and subjects. Spanish results are included. First administration results of grades 3 and 5 reading and grade 5 mathematics are included. Make-up tests taken within testing window are included.</p>	<p>The number of SDAA II tests meeting ARD expectations summed across grades and subjects divided by the total number of SDAA II tests for which ARD expectations were established.</p>	<p>A prior year indicator that evaluates graduates, continuing students, and GED recipients, expressed as a percent of total students in the Completion Rate II class.</p> <p>AECs of Choice that do not serve students in any of grades 9-12 are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.</p> <p>Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.</p>	<p>A prior year indicator that evaluates the number of grade 7-12 students designated as official dropouts divided by the number of grade 7-12 students in attendance at any time during the school year.</p> <p>If minimum size requirements for All Students are not met, then do not evaluate Annual Dropout Rate.</p>
District At-Risk Data	<p>The AEC is evaluated on performance of at-risk students in the district if the AEC does not meet the standard or demonstrate RI based on fewer than 10 tests or if the AEC has no TAKS results.</p>	N/A	<p>The AEC of Choice is evaluated on Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district if the AEC of Choice does not meet the standard or demonstrate RI or if the AEC of Choice serves students in any of grades 9-12 but does not have a Completion Rate II.</p>	N/A
Rounding	Whole Numbers		One Decimal	
Standards	40%		75.0%	10.0%
Accountability Subset	<p>Campus accountability subset holds the AEC accountable for students enrolled at the AEC on the fall snapshot and testing dates, but does not apply to exit-level retests.</p> <p>District accountability subset holds the charter accountable for students enrolled at the charter on the fall snapshot and testing dates, but does not apply to exit-level retests.</p>		<p>Completion/Dropout data are attributed to the AEC only when the student attends the AEC for 85 days or more and the AEC was registered for evaluation under AEA in 2005.</p>	
Subjects	<p>Reading/ELA Writing Mathematics Social Studies Science</p>	<p>Reading/ELA Writing Mathematics</p>	N/A	
Student Groups	<p>All Students and African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged</p>	All Students only	<p>All Students and African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged</p>	<p>All Students and African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged</p>
Minimum Size Criteria				
All Students	All Students tests are always evaluated	30 or more tests summed across grades and subjects	<p>≥ 5 dropouts (non-completers) and ≥ 10 students</p>	<p>≥ 5 dropouts and ≥ 10 students</p>
Student Groups	<p>30-49 tests for the student group and the student group represents at least 10% of All Students tests or at least 50 tests</p>	N/A	<p>≥ 5 dropouts (non-completers) and 30/10%/50</p>	<p>≥ 5 dropouts and 30/10%/50</p>

Table 18: Overview of 2006 AEA Procedures (continued)

	TAKS Progress Grades 3-12	SDAA II Grades 3-10	Completion Rate II Grades 9-12	Annual Dropout Rate Grades 7-12
Required Improvement (RI) – A gate up to AEA: Academically Acceptable				
Use/Definition	The AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient gain in TAKS Progress to be at 40% within 2 years.	The AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient gain in SDAA II to be at 40% within 2 years.	The AEC of Choice or charter must demonstrate sufficient gain in Completion Rate II to be at 75.0% within 2 years. Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.	The AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient decline in Annual Dropout Rate to be at 10.0% within 2 years. Improvement will appear as a negative number to demonstrate decline in the dropout rate.
Actual Change	2006 performance minus 2005 performance	2006 performance minus 2005 performance	Class of 2005 rate minus Class of 2004 rate	2004-05 rate minus 2003-04 rate
Improvement Required	Gain needed to reach 40% standard in 2 years	Gain needed to reach 40% standard in 2 years	Gain needed to reach 75.0% standard in 2 years	Decline needed to reach 10.0% standard in 2 years
Minimum Size	Meets minimum size in current year and has at least 10 tests in prior year	Meets minimum size in current year and has at least 10 tests in prior year	Meets minimum size in current year and has at least 10 students in Completion Rate II class in prior year	Meets minimum size in current year and has at least 10 students in grades 7-12 in the prior year
Rounding	Whole Numbers		One Decimal	

Chapter 13 - AEA Glossary and Index

Alternative Education Campus (AEC) of Choice: Alternative education programs provide accelerated instructional services to students at risk of dropping out of school. At-risk students enroll at AECs of Choice to expedite progress toward performing at grade level and high school completion.

Annual Dropout Rate: Grade 7-12 dropouts as a percent of total students enrolled at the AEC in grades 7-12 in a single school year. A dropout is defined as a student who is enrolled in school during the school year but either leaves school during the school year without an approved reason or completes the school year and does not return the following year.

At-Risk: In accordance with Texas Education Code (TEC) §29.081(d), a "student at risk of dropping out of school" includes each student who is under 21 years of age and who:

- (1) was not advanced from one grade level to the next for one or more school years;
- (2) if the student is in grade 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, or 12, did not maintain an average equivalent to 70 on a scale of 100 in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum during a semester in the preceding or current school year or is not maintaining such an average in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum in the current semester;
- (3) did not perform satisfactorily on an assessment instrument administered to the student under TEC Subchapter B, Chapter 39, and who has not in the previous or current school year subsequently performed on that instrument or another appropriate instrument at a level equal to at least 110 percent of the level of satisfactory performance on that instrument;
- (4) if the student is in prekindergarten, kindergarten, or grade 1, 2, or 3, did not perform satisfactorily on a readiness test or assessment instrument administered during the current school year;
- (5) is pregnant or is a parent;
- (6) has been placed in an alternative education program in accordance with TEC §37.006 during the preceding or current school year;
- (7) has been expelled in accordance with TEC §37.007 during the preceding or current school year;
- (8) is currently on parole, probation, deferred prosecution, or other conditional release;
- (9) was previously reported through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) to have dropped out of school;
- (10) is a student of limited English proficiency, as defined by TEC §29.052;
- (11) is in the custody or care of the Department of Protective and Regulatory Services or has, during the current school year, been referred to the department by a school official, officer of the juvenile court, or law enforcement official;
- (12) is homeless, as defined by 42 U.S.C. Section 11302, and its subsequent amendments; or
- (13) resided in the preceding school year or resides in the current school year in a residential placement facility in the district, including a detention facility, substance abuse treatment facility, emergency shelter, psychiatric hospital, halfway house, or foster group home.

Campus Accountability Subset: Only test results for students enrolled on the same campus on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date are included in the campus performance measure.

Completion Rate II: Longitudinal rate that shows the percent of students who first attended grade 9 in the 2001-02 school year who graduated, received a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, or who are continuing their education four years later. Known as the 2001-02 cohort, these students' progress was tracked over the four years using data provided to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) by districts and charters and data available in the statewide GED database. Graduates, continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year), and GED recipients are counted as completers in the calculation of Completion Rate II.

District Accountability Subset: Only test results for students enrolled in the same charter on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date are included in the charter performance measure.

Registered AEC: Term used to refer collectively to AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that are registered for evaluation under alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures and meet the at-risk registration criterion.

Required Improvement: Compares prior year performance to current year performance. In order to qualify for this comparison, the target group (All Students or any student group) must meet a minimum size requirement for the prior year.

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.

Special Analysis: Ensures that ratings based on small numbers of tests are assigned appropriately. 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. Special analysis is conducted at the AEC level when there are fewer than 10 at-risk TAKS test in the district or charter. Special analysis is conducted at the charter level when there are fewer than 10 TAKS tests in the charter.

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

TAKS Progress Indicator: The TAKS Progress indicator includes TAKS 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 spring administrations (April and February) or in the previous fall or summer (December, October, June, and July).

Texas Growth Index (TGI): Developed for accountability purposes to evaluate individual student growth from one year to the next on the TAKS. The TGI compares how students taking a TAKS subject test in one year perform on the same TAKS subject test in the next higher grade the following year. An individual TGI score indicates the amount of growth for each student in relation to the average growth of all students who performed at the same level in the base year. The TGI score of zero (0) indicates that the year-to-year change in scale score is equal to the

average change. The TGI measures growth for a student who passes as well as a student who does not pass the TAKS.

AEA Index

AEC Enrollment Criterion	80
AEC of Choice	77, 88, 89, 95, 98, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 109, 110
Annual Dropout Rate	76, 80, 83, 90, 91, 93, 96, 99, 102, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111
At-Risk	79, 88, 97, 98, 101, 102, 103, 108, 109, 111
At-Risk Registration Criterion	77, 79, 99, 103
Campus Accountability Subset	84, 85, 87, 111
Completion Rate II	76, 80, 83, 88, 89, 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 112
DAEP	75, 81, 82
District Accountability Subset	85, 87, 112
JJAEP	75, 81, 82
Registered AEC	73, 98, 99, 112
Required Improvement	76, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 110, 112
Residential Facility	77, 103, 106, 112
SDAA II	76, 80, 83, 86, 87, 93, 94, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 108, 109, 110, 112
Special Analysis	84, 87, 89, 90, 97, 99, 100, 106, 108, 112
Student Groups	84, 87, 88, 89, 90, 109
TAKS Progress Indicator	83, 84, 93, 97, 112
Texas Growth Index (TGI)	75, 83, 94, 112
Use of District At-Risk Data	84, 96, 108