

SUMMARY OF FINAL 2005 AYP RESULTS

DISTRICTS

Of the **1,229** districts, **1,087** districts (**88.4%**) met AYP and **131** districts (**10.7%**) did not meet AYP in 2005.

Of the **131** districts that missed AYP, **130** districts (**99.2%**) were Title I school districts that will potentially be subject to school improvement requirements in the 2005-06 school year. The remaining district (**0.8%**) is a non -Title I district that is not subject to the school improvement requirements.

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/>.

For the State of Texas, the state was evaluated on each of the 29 possible AYP measures. Texas met AYP across all 29 measures in 2005.

CAMPUSES

Of the **7,908** campuses, **6,204** campuses (**78.5%**) met AYP and **816** campuses (**10.3%**) did not meet AYP in 2005. **888** campuses (**11.2%**) were not evaluated in 2005 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 **816** campuses that did not meet AYP, **620** campuses (**76.0%**) are Title I campuses that will potentially be subject to school improvement requirements in the 2005-06 school year. The remaining **196** campuses (**24.0%**) are non -Title I campuses that are not subject to the school improvement requirements.

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 2004 AND 2005 AYP RESULTS

Of the **1,227** districts evaluated in 2004, **955** districts (**77.8%**) met AYP and **82** districts (**6.7%**) did not meet AYP in 2004. In 2005, **131** districts (**10.7%**) did not meet AYP which is an increase of **49** districts from 2004.

Of the **7,813** campuses evaluated in 2004, **6,516** campuses (**83.4%**) met AYP and **393** campuses (**5.0%**) were identified as Missed AYP. In 2005, **816** campuses (**10.3%**) did not meet AYP, an increase of **423** campuses from 2004.

The increase of **423** campuses can be attributed to a lower number of appeals in 2005, as well as more stringent criteria for granting appeals (see below).

SUMMARY OF 2005 AYP APPEALS AND EXCEPTIONS

The 2005 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 2005 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.

In addition, exceptions to the federal 5% cap were considered in 2005. The 2005 AYP Guide provided districts with instructions for submitting applications for exception to the 5% cap. Similar to the appeals process, the 2005 AYP Exceptions Guidelines were developed to ensure that the exceptions process was applied fairly and consistently for each application and reflected state policy related to federal accountability determinations.

The 2005 AYP Appeals and Exceptions Guidelines were reviewed by an external panel that was familiar with the state and federal accountability systems and served as the external review panel for the 2005 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 2005 AYP Guide, the AYP Appeals Guidelines, and the AYP Exceptions Guidelines can be found online at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/2005/index.html>.

APPEALS AND EXCEPTIONS TO THE 5% CAP

A total of 55 school districts requested exceptions to the 5% cap for either the district or specific campuses. Of the 26 district exception requests, 6 (10.9%) were granted and 4 (15.4%) resulted in the district's AYP status changing from *Missed AYP* to *Meets AYP*. Here is a list detailing which districts were granted exceptions and whether this resulted in a change to their AYP status.

District Name	District Number	Change in District Status
BROWNWOOD ISD	025902	No District Appeal
GLADEWATER ISD	092901	Yes-Missed AYP to Met AYP
HARLANDALE ISD	015904	No District Appeal
JOHN H WOOD CHARTER SCHOOL	015808	Yes-Missed AYP to Met AYP
MEXIA ISD	147903	Yes-Missed AYP to Met AYP
UNIVERSITY CHARTER SCHOOL	227806	Yes-Missed AYP to Met AYP

Of the 72 campus exception requests, 12 (16.7%) were granted and 8 (1.1%) resulted in the campus' AYP status changing from *Missed AYP* to *Meets AYP*.

APPEALS

Of 56 appeals for districts, 14 (25.0%) resulted in the district's AYP status changing from *Missed AYP* to *Meets AYP*. Of the 325 appeals for campuses, 66 (20.3%) resulted in campus' AYP status changing from *Missed AYP* to *Meets AYP*.

APPEALS RELATED TO SDAA II

Of the 14 appeals granted for districts, none of these appeals were granted for performance indicator appeals based on the results of SDAA II. There were also no appeals granted for districts that involved a combination of SDAA II and other reasons.

Of the **66** appeals granted for campuses, **2 (3.0%)** were granted based on the results of SDAA II. There were no appeals granted for campuses that involved a combination of SDAA II and other reasons.

APPEALS RELATED TO CONFIDENCE INTERVALS APPLIED TO PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT

Of the **14** appeals granted for districts, **2 (14.3%)** were granted due to the application of confidence intervals applied to performance improvement. There were no appeals granted for districts that involved a combination of confidence intervals and other reasons.

Of the **66** appeals granted for campuses, **7 (10.6%)** were granted due to the application of confidence intervals. **1 appeal (1.5%)** was granted that involved a combination of confidence intervals and other reasons.

OTHER APPEALS

10 of the **56** district appeals (**17.9%**) and **31** of the **325** campus appeals (**9.5%**) 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 for absence if proper documentation was provided and there were fewer than five students absent during the testing period.
- 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 2004-05 school year after their classmates in the Class of 2004 have completed school. The exclusion of these students from the graduation rate calculation must result in a change in the AYP status.