

**Summary of TEA Proposal for 2004 AYP
With USDE Responses**

Proposed Criteria or System Change	USDE Response
<p>Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1% Cap: Timeline extension on implementing regulations that limit use of results from alternative assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No cap in 2004 ○ Some reduction from current levels in 2005 and 2006 (a total of 9% tested on SDAA or LDAA in 2003) 	<p>Denied</p> <p>In 2004 the following tests are subject to the 1% cap:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LDAA Met ARD Expectations ▪ SDAA Met ARD Expectations for students tested below their enrolled grade level <p>In 2004 districts must appeal status of <i>Missed AYP</i> based on failure to meet the 1% cap.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Count students as “proficient” based on requirements of state assessment program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TAKS at or above <i>Met Standard</i> set by SBOE ○ SDAA <i>Met ARD expectations</i> for students tested on enrolled grade level ○ SDAA <i>Met ARD expectations</i> for students tested below enrolled grade level ○ SDAA baseline tests with no ARD expectation: exclude from performance measure ○ LDAA <i>Met ARD expectations</i> ○ RPTE proficiency level based on number of years in U.S. schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1st year in U.S. schools—not included in performance measure ▪ 2nd year in U.S. schools—baseline testers who score <i>Intermediate</i> or <i>Advanced</i> or previous testers who score one level higher than prior year ▪ 3rd year in U.S. schools—baseline and previous testers who score <i>Advanced</i> ○ Local mathematics for LEP exempt students: exclude from performance measure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approved ○ Approved ○ Approved: subject to 1% cap ○ Denied: include baseline testers and count as failing ○ Approved: subject to 1% cap ○ Approved ○ Denied: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LEP students in the 1st year in U.S. schools are excluded from performance measure ▪ Include all other LEP exempt students and count as failing

**Summary of TEA Proposal for 2004 AYP
With USDE Responses**

Proposed Criteria or System Change	USDE Response
<p>Performance (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use results from 1st and 2nd administrations of grade 3 Reading in the Performance Rate calculation 	<p>Approved</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Round performance rate calculations to integers • Round performance standards Reading – 47% Mathematics – 33% 	<p>Approved Approved</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include pairing in the evaluation of small districts and campuses and those with no students in grades tested 	<p>Approved</p>
<p>Participation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Count students as participating if tested on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TAKS (English or Spanish) ○ SDAA ○ LDAA (ARD exempt) ○ RPTE (LEP exempt) ○ Local mathematics (LEP exempt) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2004 data are collected on local mathematics assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approved ○ Approved ○ Approved ○ Approved ○ Approved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Round participation rate calculations to integers 	<p>Approved</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation rate improvement “safe harbor” for those not meeting 95% 	<p>Denied</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numerator control for participation rate; rate not evaluated if fewer than 5 students absent 	<p>Denied</p> <p>Districts can appeal to have students who cannot test due to significant medical emergencies excluded from the participation rate calculation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use results from 1st and 2nd administrations of grade 3 Reading in the Participation Rate calculation 	<p>Approved</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use data from the previous one or two years to calculate average participation rate for a school or student group as needed 	<p>Approved</p> <p>Average of the 2003 and 2004 participation rates will be calculated.</p>

**Summary of TEA Proposal for 2004 AYP
With USDE Responses**

Proposed Criteria or System Change	USDE Response
<p>Graduation Rate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include continuing students in the completion rate indicator definition, aligning with the state accountability system by 2006 	<p>Denied</p> <p>Districts can appeal to have the following continuing students included in the graduation rate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ recent immigrant LEP students ▪ students with disabilities if the IEP is a 5 year or longer graduation plan
<p>Targeted Assistance Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop procedures for considering the achievement only of Title I students when calculating AYP for targeted assistance schools 	<p>Approved (Updated 8/4/04)</p> <p>All students will be included in the AYP calculations for targeted assistance schools.</p> <p>Districts may appeal to have AYP decisions for a targeted assistance campus based on the performance of only Title I students if the campus contains at least 50 Title I students.</p>
<p>School Improvement Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply two consecutive years rule to the same specific measure rather than overall Mathematics or Reading <p>For example, a campus or district that fails to meet AYP for Economically Disadvantaged student Mathematics participation in one year would have to fail to meet AYP for Economically Disadvantaged student Mathematics participation the following year to trigger the “two consecutive years” provision.</p>	<p>Denied</p>
<p>Alignment with State Accountability Ratings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment with state accountability system for release date, labels, and appeals process dates 	<p>Approved</p> <p>Alignment will not be possible in 2004 due to delay in AYP.</p>