

Accountability System for 2007 and Beyond - Alternative Education Accountability Procedures
Commissioner of Education Final Decisions
April 2007

These decisions apply to accountability procedures developed for alternative education campuses (AECs) that qualify and are registered for evaluation under alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures. The AEA procedures contain appropriate indicators for AECs with increased rigor phased in over time. An at-risk registration criterion restricts use of AEA procedures to AECs that serve large populations of at-risk students and enhances at-risk data quality. AEA procedures do not apply to disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs) or juvenile justice alternative education programs (JJAEPs).

The following issues affect many components of the AEA procedures.

- Small numbers of test results and mobility – AECs are smaller on average than regular campuses and have high mobility rates.
- Attribution of data – Attribution of data under the 85-day rule was discontinued in 2005-06. The impact of phasing out the 85-day rule is unpredictable, since 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.

TAKS Progress Indicator

The Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) Progress indicator is a single performance indicator that sums TAKS results across grades (3-12) and across subjects. The numerator is the number of 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 February and April administrations or in the previous October or July. The denominator is the number of TAKS tests taken **and** the number of TAKS exit-level retests meeting the student passing standard at the February and April administrations or in the previous October or July.

1. 2007 Standard. In April 2006, the Commissioner of Education announced final decisions on the 2007 accountability standard for the TAKS Progress indicator. The 2007 standard was published in the *2006 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule by July 30, 2006. For 2007 accountability ratings, the TAKS Progress standard for *AEA: Academically Acceptable* increases by five percentage points to 45% as shown in the TAKS Progress Indicator table below.
2. 2007 Required Improvement (RI). TAKS Progress RI will be used in 2007 as it was in 2006. RI is calculated for All Students and each student group evaluated and is the amount of gain in percent *Met Standard* required to reach the current year standard in two years.

There is no need to recalculate the prior year percent *Met Standard* since the student passing standard was phased-in fully in both 2006 and 2007. Note that the 2007 performance results of students who were displaced in 2005 due to the hurricanes will not be excluded from the 2007 accountability data. Therefore, RI will be based on 2007 data that includes these students, compared with 2006 results that do not.

3. 2008 and Beyond Standards. The current phase-in plan for the TAKS Progress indicator in 2008 and beyond will be maintained as shown in the table below. Grade 8 science results will be included. TAKS-Inclusive (TAKS-I) results will be phased in as shown in the following TAKS-I Test Administration table.
4. 2008 Required Improvement. For 2008 accountability, prior-year (2007) assessment results will be recalculated to include both grade 8 science and TAKS-I results. This will make 2007 and 2008 performance comparable and enable the use of RI in 2008.

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

Bold indicates an increase of five percentage points from the prior year.

TAKS-I Test Administration				
2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Report Only First time for: Sci. (5, 8, 10, 11) Sci. (5 Spanish) S.S. (8, 10, 11) ELA (11) Math (11)	Report Only Second time for: Sci. (5, 8, 10, 11) Sci. (5 Spanish) S.S. (8, 10, 11) ELA (11) Math (11)	Report Only First time for: Rdg./ELA (3-10) Rdg. (3-6 Spanish) Math (3-10) Math (3-6 Spanish) Wrt. (4&7) Wrt. (4 Spanish) Use for Ratings Sci. (5, 8, 10, 11) Sci. (5 Spanish) S.S. (8, 10, 11) ELA (11) Math (11)	Report Only Second time for: Rdg./ELA (3-10) Rdg. (3-6 Spanish) Math (3-10) Math (3-6 Spanish) Wrt. (4&7) Wrt. (4 Spanish) Use for Ratings Sci. (5, 8, 10, 11) Sci. (5 Spanish) S.S. (8, 10, 11) ELA (11) Math (11)	Use for Ratings Rdg./ELA (3-10) Rdg. (3-6 Spanish) ELA (11) Math (3-10) Math (3-6 Spanish) Math (11) Wrt. (4&7) Wrt. (4 Spanish) Sci. (5, 8, 10, 11) Sci. (5 Spanish) S.S. (8, 10, 11)

Rationale: Maintaining the phase-in plan as shown in the TAKS Progress Indicator table provides advance notice of standards and stable targets while other changes are taking place in the assessment program. The accountability standard is held constant between 2007 and 2008 when grade 8 science and TAKS-I results are included for the first time and between 2009 and 2010 when results for all TAKS-I subjects and grades are included for the first time.

SDAA II Indicator

The State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II) indicator is a single performance indicator evaluated for all SDAA II-tested grades (3-10). The indicator is calculated as the number of tests meeting admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) committee expectations (summed across grades and subjects) divided by the number of SDAA II tests for which ARD expectations were established (summed across grades and subjects). The SDAA II indicator is evaluated at the All Students level only. The minimum size criterion is 30 tests.

1. 2007 Standard. In April 2006, the Commissioner of Education announced final decisions on the 2007 accountability standard for the SDAA II indicator. The 2007 standard was published in the *2006 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule by July 30, 2006. For 2007 accountability ratings, the SDAA II standard for *AEA: Academically Acceptable* increases by five percentage points to 45%, the same standard as the TAKS Progress indicator.
2. 2007 Required Improvement. For 2007, the SDAA II RI feature is maintained. RI allows a campus or district to gate up to *AEA: Academically Acceptable* if the gain in SDAA II performance is enough to meet the standard in two years.
3. 2008. The SDAA II test will not be administered after the 2007 accountability year.

Rationale: Continued use of the SDAA II in 2007 ensures that some assessment results for students with disabilities who do not take the TAKS are included continuously in the state accountability system while new assessments are phased in fully. The 2007 accountability year is the last time that SDAA II results are used in the system because this is the last year the SDAA II test is administered.

Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7–12) Indicator

Beginning with 2007 accountability, the definition of a dropout changes to comply with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition. Under the NCES definition, a dropout is a student who is enrolled in Texas public schools in grades 7-12, does not return to Texas public school the following fall, is not expelled, and does not graduate, receive a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, continue high school outside the Texas public school system or begin college, or die.

Under AEA procedures, a grade 7-12 annual dropout rate is used. Therefore, registered AECs and charters evaluated under AEA procedures will experience the full impact of implementing the NCES dropout definition. Below are six groups of students counted as dropouts by NCES that were not counted as dropouts under the state definition. All six definitional changes affect grade 7-12 dropout calculations.

- a. a student who withdraws (or is court-ordered) to enroll in an approved adult education GED preparation program and does not receive a GED by August 31 of the school year in which the student left;
- b. a senior who meets all graduation requirements but does not pass the exit-level test;
- c. a student previously counted as a dropout;
- d. a student enrolled in school but not eligible for state Foundation School Program funds;
- e. a dropout for whom the last district of attendance cannot be determined; and,
- f. a student who returns to school after the school-start window.

Beginning with 2007 accountability, the 85-day rule is phased-out completely. The campus accountability subset determines attribution of AEC test data. Leaver data are attributed to the last campus of attendance. These changes in attribution of data are certain to result in higher dropout rates; however, the extent of the increase cannot be predicted. Dropout data under the NCES definition will not be available for analysis until the 2008 development cycle. Also, the 2005-06 Annual Dropout Rate used for 2007 accountability will be affected by students displaced by Hurricane Katrina.

1. 2007 Standard. In April 2006, the Commissioner of Education announced final decisions on the 2007 accountability standard for the Annual Dropout Rate indicator. The 2007 standard was published in the *2006 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule by July 30, 2006. For 2007 accountability ratings, the Annual Dropout Rate standard remains 10.0% as shown in the table below.
2. 2007 Required Improvement. Annual Dropout Rate RI will not be calculated in 2007. Changes to the dropout definition prevent comparisons of rates used in 2006 and 2007.
3. 2007 School Leaver Provision. In April 2006, the Commissioner of Education announced final decisions on the 2007 School Leaver Provision for the Annual Dropout Rate indicator. The provision was published in *Chapter 17 – Preview of 2007 and Beyond* of the *2006 Accountability Manual*. If the Annual Dropout Rate indicator causes an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* label.

Although some campuses will avoid being rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* in 2007 due to the application of the School Leaver Provision, these same campuses will be subject to technical assistance team (TAT) intervention requirements in the 2007-08 school year, as required by commissioner's rule, 19 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §97.1002, *Identification of Technical Assistance Team Campuses*. This is because campuses rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable* in 2007 are identified for TATs if their 2007 accountability results do not meet the 2008 accountability standards. The 2008 dropout/completion standards are identical to those waived in 2007 through the application of the School Leaver Provision. The purpose of the TAT identification is to serve as an early warning system and, therefore, provide interventions that may prevent the campus from being rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* in the subsequent year.

In addition, districts are subject to identification and intervention under the Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) system for dropout rates and leaver reporting.

4. 2008 Standard. For 2008 accountability ratings, the Annual Dropout Rate standard remains 10.0% as shown in the table below.
5. 2008 Required Improvement. Annual Dropout Rate RI will be calculated as it was in 2006. Two years of dropout rates under the NCES definition will be available. Dropout rates used in 2007 and 2008 will be comparable.
6. 2008 School Leaver Provision. This provision applies only to the AEA Annual Dropout Rate indicator in 2008. If the Annual Dropout Rate is the only indicator causing an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* label.

Although some campuses will avoid being rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* in 2008 due to the application of the School Leaver Provision, these same campuses may be subject to TAT intervention requirements in the 2008-09 school year, as required by commissioner's rule, 19 TAC §97.1002, *Identification of Technical Assistance Team Campuses*. This is because campuses rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable* in 2008 are identified for TATs if their 2008 accountability results do not meet the 2009 accountability standards. The purpose of the TAT identification is to serve as an early warning system and, therefore, provide interventions that may prevent the campus from being rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* in the subsequent year. In addition, districts are subject to identification and intervention under the PBM system for dropout rates and leaver reporting.

Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7–12) Indicator				
	2007 from 2005-06	2008 from 2006-07	2009 from 2007-08	2010 from 2008-09
<i>AEA: Academically Acceptable</i>	10.0%	10.0%	TBD	TBD
Dropout Definition	NCES definition			
Accountability Subset	School Leaver data are attributed to the last campus of attendance			

Rationale: 2007 will be the first accountability year to evaluate grade 7-12 dropout rates using the new, more rigorous NCES definition. Maintaining the 10.0% standard in 2007 and 2008 balances the impact of increased rigor in this indicator, provides advance notice of standards, and provides stable targets while definitional changes occur and while the impact of discontinuing the 85-day rule in 2007 is analyzed. Changes in the dropout definition and attribution of data are certain to result in higher dropout rates; however, the extent of the increase cannot be predicted. The effects of the changes to the Annual Dropout Rate are unpredictable and current data cannot be fully modeled using the new definition. The School Leaver Provision is appropriate for AECs and charters that would be labeled *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* in 2007 or 2008 due to this indicator undergoing such significant change, the lack of an RI feature in 2007, and the absence of data on which to set appropriate standards.

Completion Rate II Indicator

The transition to the NCES dropout definition also impacts the Completion Rate II indicator. Beginning with 2007 accountability, the dropout component of the Completion Rate denominator changes. In 2007, only one of the four years in the cohort is affected. In 2008, two years of the cohort are affected, and so on, until 2010 when the Completion Rate denominator uses the NCES dropout definition for all four years of the cohort.

Under the NCES definition, the count of dropouts used in the Completion Rate calculation will be higher than the counts under the state definition. A larger denominator will cause completion rates to decline. The magnitude of this effect is unpredictable and current data cannot be modeled using the new definition; therefore, it is difficult to set appropriate standards. Dropout data under the NCES definition will not be available for analysis until the 2008 development cycle.

Beginning with 2007 accountability, the 85-day rule is phased-out completely. Leaver data are attributed to the last campus of attendance. Changes in attribution of data will affect completion rates; however, the impact cannot be predicted. Also, the completion rates used for 2007 accountability will be affected by students displaced by Hurricane Katrina.

1. 2007 Standard. In April 2006, the Commissioner of Education announced final decisions on the 2007 accountability standards for the Completion Rate II indicator. The 2007 standard was published in the *2006 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule by July 30, 2006. For 2007 accountability ratings, the Completion Rate II standard remains 75.0% as shown in the table below.
2. 2007 Required Improvement. Completion Rate II RI will be used in 2007 as it was in 2006. Changes to the dropout definition do not prevent comparisons of completion rates used in 2006 and 2007.

3. 2007 School Leaver Provision. If the Completion Rate II and/or Annual Dropout Rate indicator(s) cause an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* label. This provision will not apply to the Completion Rate II indicator in 2008.

Although some campuses will avoid being rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* in 2007 due to the application of the School Leaver Provision, these same campuses will be subject to TAT intervention requirements in the 2007-08 school year, as required by commissioner's rule, 19 TAC §97.1002, *Identification of Technical Assistance Team Campuses*. This is because campuses rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable* in 2007 are identified for TATs if their 2007 accountability results do not meet the 2008 accountability standards. The 2008 dropout/completion standards are identical to those waived in 2007 through the application of the School Leaver Provision. The purpose of the TAT identification is to serve as an early warning system and, therefore, provide interventions that may prevent the campus from being rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* in the subsequent year. In addition, districts are subject to identification and intervention under the PBM system for dropout rates and leaver reporting.

4. 2008 and Beyond Standards. For 2008 – 2010 accountability ratings, the Completion Rate II standard remains 75.0% as shown in the table below.
5. 2008 and Beyond Required Improvement. Completion Rate II RI will be applied.

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

Rationale: Maintaining the 75.0% standard through 2010 balances the impact of increased rigor in this indicator, provides advance notice of standards, and provides stable targets while definitional changes phase in fully and while the impact of discontinuing the 85-day rule in 2007 is analyzed. Changes in the dropout definition and attribution of data are certain to result in lower completion rates; however, the extent of the decrease cannot be predicted. The effects of the changes to the Completion Rate are unpredictable and current data cannot be fully modeled using the new definition. The School Leaver Provision is appropriate for AECs and charters that would be labeled *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* in 2007 due to this indicator undergoing such significant change and the absence of data on which to set appropriate standards.