

SUMMARY OF FINAL 2004 AYP RESULTS
As of March 31, 2005

DISTRICTS

Of the **1,227** districts, **955** districts (**77.8%**) met AYP and **82** districts (**6.7%**) did not meet AYP in 2004. **190** districts (**15.5%**) were charter operators that were not evaluated in 2004, but will be evaluated for AYP in 2005. Since charter operators were given approximately a one-year notice that they were to be evaluated for the first time in 2004 in the state accountability system, the 2004 AYP Guide provided similar notice to charter districts that they will be evaluated for AYP in 2005.

The **82** districts that did not meet AYP were all Title I school districts. For more information about the school improvement requirements for these districts, go to the NCLB Coordination website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/nclb/>.

Of the **481** valid appeals submitted for districts, **435** appeals (**90.4%**) were granted and **46** appeals (**9.6%**) were not granted.

For the State of Texas, the state was evaluated on each of the 29 possible AYP measures. Texas did not meet AYP on one measure only – reading performance for special education students. There are no consequences since 2004 is the first year that the AYP standards were not met at the state level.

CAMPUSES

Of the **7,813** campuses, **6,516** campuses (**83.4%**) met AYP and **393** campuses (**5.0%**) did not meet AYP in 2004. **904** campuses (**11.6%**) were not evaluated in 2004 since they were either new campuses, pre-Kindergarten through Kindergarten only campuses, or other types of campuses, such as Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP), Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP), and alternative education campuses (AECs) with short term placements where students are not served for the full academic year at the AEC.

Of the **393** campuses that did not meet AYP, **285** campuses (**72.5%**) are Title I campuses that will potentially be subject to school improvement requirements in the 2005-06 school year. The remaining **108** campuses (**27.5%**) are non -Title I campuses that are not subject to the school improvement requirements.

Of the **199** Title I campuses that were subject to the school improvement requirements in the 2004 – 05 school year, **108** campuses (**54.2%**) submitted an appeal that was granted. These campuses are no longer in Title I school improvement, though they are required to continue to offer the school improvement options through the end of the school year.

91 of the **199** Title I campuses (**45.7%**) either did not submit an appeal or submitted an appeal that was not granted and, therefore, remain in Title I school improvement for the 2004 – 05 school year and will also be subject to school improvement requirements in the 2005-06 school year.

Of the **1,519** appeals submitted for campuses, **1,325** appeals (**87.2%**) were granted, and **194** appeals (**12.8%**) were not granted.

Of the **393** campuses that did not meet AYP, **200** campuses (**50.9%**) submitted an appeal that was not granted, and **193** campuses (**49.1%**) did not submit an appeal.

For more information about the school improvement requirements for these campuses, go to the NCLB Coordination website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/nclb/>.

COMPARISON OF 2003 AND 2004 AYP RESULTS

Of the **1,224** districts evaluated in 2003, **1,001** districts (**81.8%**) met AYP and **37** districts (**3.0%**) did not meet AYP in 2003. In 2004, **82** districts (**6.7%**) did not meet AYP which is an increase of **45** districts from 2003.

Of the **7,733** campuses evaluated in 2003, **6,262** campuses (**81.0%**) met AYP and **563** campuses (**7.3%**) were identified as Needs Improvement. In 2004, **393** campuses (**5.0%**) did not meet AYP, a decrease of **170** campuses from 2003.

In comparing reasons campuses missed AYP between 2003 and 2004, there was a significant decline in the number of campuses that missed AYP due to participation in mathematics. In 2003, **291** of the **563** campuses were labeled as Needs Improvement due to mathematics participation only, while **71** of the **393** campuses missed AYP in 2004 due to mathematics participation only. The improvement in participation is the reason the total number of campuses not meeting AYP in 2004 is lower than 2003.

The decrease of **220** campuses can be attributed to the creation of a testing window in the student assessment program for the grades evaluated by AYP during the spring 2004 administration. The decline was not as significant for reading/ELA participation between 2003 and 2004 due to severe weather in 2003 which necessitated a hold-harmless provision of the 95% participation standard for AYP purposes in 2003.

SUMMARY OF 2004 AYP APPEALS

The 2004 AYP Guide provided districts with instructions for submitting appeals and guidelines describing the circumstances under which AYP data may be appealed and the documentation required in support of the appeal. The 2004 AYP Appeals Guidelines were developed to ensure that the appeals process was applied fairly and consistently for each appeal and reflected state policy related to federal accountability determinations. The guidelines include a brief rationale for granting or denying the most common appeal reasons.

The 2004 AYP Appeals Guidelines were reviewed by an external panel who were familiar with the state and federal accountability systems and served as the external review panel for the 2004 state accountability appeals. The guidelines were recommended by the review panel as reconciling state and federal assessment and accountability policies fairly without compromising the high standards that are the foundation of both systems.

The 2004 AYP Guide and the AYP Appeals Guidelines can be found online at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/2004/index.html>.

APPEALS ON THE 1% CAP

Of the **435** appeals granted for districts, **385** appeals (**89%**) were granted based on the 1% cap only. Of the **1,325** appeals granted for campuses, **1,067** appeals (**81%**) were granted based on the 1% cap only.

Justification: For special education students, the state policies and procedures related to assessment decision making were provided to districts in early fall 2003 in the TEA publication titled *Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) Committee Decision-making Process for the Texas Assessment Program*. In October 2003, in the absence of final USDE regulations regarding inclusion of test results for students with disabilities in AYP, TEA sent a letter to all districts stating that it is critically important that local school districts follow the state policies and procedures to ensure that appropriate assessments are selected and administered to students with disabilities. In order to grant the appeal, the superintendent must have certified that local documentation is available to indicate that each student identified as exceeding the 1% cap was tested appropriately under the state guidelines.

APPEALS ON LEP MATH PARTICIPATION

Of the **435** appeals granted for districts, **11** appeals (**3%**) were granted based on LEP mathematics participation only. **25** appeals (**6%**) were granted that were a combination of 1% cap and LEP mathematics participation.

Of the **1,325** appeals granted for campuses, **99** appeals (**7%**) were granted based on LEP mathematics participation only. **68** appeals (**5%**) were granted that were a combination of 1% cap and LEP mathematics participation.

Justification: For students with limited English proficiency, state policies and procedures are detailed in the TEA publication titled *LPAC Decision-Making Process for the Texas Assessment Program*, which outlines procedures for districts to follow to ensure that LEP students are assessed appropriately and at the earliest practical date. This manual was provided to districts in early fall 2003. In order to grant the appeal, the superintendent must have certified that local documentation is available to indicate that the students identified were appropriately exempted from the TAKS mathematics test by the LPAC committee following state exemption guidelines or that the students were tested with a released TAKS test with linguistic accommodations.

OTHER APPEALS

14 of the 435 district appeals (3%) and 87 of the 1325 campuses appeals (7%) were granted for a variety of other reasons listed below.

- Absences due to medical emergencies with documentation provided of an excused absence for medical reasons.
- Appeals based on other reasons for absence if proper documentation was provided and there were fewer than five students absent during the testing period.
- Appeals based on coding errors if districts submitted the proper documentation to prevent clerical errors from affecting AYP status.
- LEP students exempt from the mathematics assessment if districts provided documentation of a valid exemption given that testing these students was optional.
- Appeals that requested the review of current year Attendance information if the updated information affected the AYP status of the campus or district.
- Appeals that requested the exclusion of special education students with 5-year IEP plans from the graduation rate calculation and the change in the rate results in a change in the AYP status.
- An Alternative Education campus requests the exclusion of students who received a General Educational Development (GED) certificate from the graduation rate calculation and the recalculation of the graduation rate results in a change in the AYP status.
- An Alternative Education campus requests the exclusion of continuing students from the graduation rate calculation and the recalculation of the graduation rate results in a change in the AYP status.
- An Alternative Education campus requests the exclusion of continuing students transferred to the campus in the fall following their expected graduation date. These are students who enter a campus in the fall of the 2003-04 school year after their classmates in the Class of 2003 have completed school. The exclusion of these students from the graduation rate calculation must result in a change in the AYP status.

23 district appeals from school districts currently under review for special education performance or program effectiveness by the Performance-Based Monitoring System based on the following two criteria were denied:

- Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS) Performance Level 3 on 4 or more indicators
- PBMAS Performance Level 3 on any one of the following individual indicators: TAKS Participation, SDAA Participation and ARD Exemptions.