

2006 AYP APPEALS GUIDELINES

AYP appeals will generally request a review of one of the indicators used to determine the AYP status: Performance, Participation, and the Other Indicator.

General Guidelines Related to All Appeals:

Appeals are only considered for the district or campuses specifically stated in the appeal letter, even if circumstances appealed and granted would result in a different AYP status for other campuses or the district. Texas Education Agency (TEA) staff will not make assumptions about district intent to appeal other campuses or the district AYP results.

TEA staff will not contact school districts for additional information if the documentation provided is not sufficient. The appeal will be evaluated based on information provided in the appeal letter.

Decision Guidelines for Performance Appeals:

Note that appeals of the results of the application of the Federal 3% cap will not be considered. Appeals to the performance indicators include the following categories.

Appeal of the Use of SDAA II:

Appeals to the performance indicators based on the results of SDAA II are found in the following two categories.

- Coding errors on Achievement Levels that either defaulted to Level III or other Achievement Levels due to the error. These appeals are recommended to be granted based on the following criteria:
 - The district provided sufficient documentation of the ARD Committee decision to assign an Achievement Level other than the coded level for the students in question and the documentation was dated prior to the administration of the SDAA II.
 - The student(s) performance met or exceeded expectations based on the actual SDAA II achievement levels.
 - The district provides a reasonable explanation for why the documents were improperly coded at the time of testing.
 - Review appeals in prior year. Districts must not have a similar appeal in the prior year.
 - The SDAA II achievement level was on the same grade level as the enrolled grade level. If the student results are for below grade level SDAA assessments, the school district must not exceed the federal cap limit on proficient results from alternative assessments and must have sufficient cap space available for the additional miscoded results found to be proficient.
 - Recalculation of the proficiency rate to include changes to SDAA II outcomes results in meeting the AYP performance indicator requirements.

Justification: The 2006 ARD assessment procedures and test coordinators manual instruct districts to establish expectations for all students who are taking

2006 AYP APPEALS GUIDELINES

the SDAA II test and to code the ARD expectations on the test answer document. Sufficient documentation regarding any miscoded answer documents must be included to grant this appeal.

- Requests to use SDAA II proficient results from the second administration of Reading or Mathematics assessments for Grades 3 and 5 (rather than the results from the first administration of TAKS). These appeals are recommended to be granted based on the following criteria:
 - The district provided sufficient documentation of the ARD Committee decision to assess using the SDAA II.
 - The SDAA II achievement level was on the same grade level as the enrolled grade level. If the student results are for below grade level SDAA II assessments, the school district must not exceed the federal cap limit on proficient results from alternative assessments and must have sufficient cap space available.
 - The student(s) performance met or exceeded expectations based on the actual SDAA II achievement levels.
 - Recalculation of the proficiency rate to include changes to SDAA II outcomes results in meeting the AYP performance indicator requirements.
 - The school district PBMAS special education indicator results show Performance Level (PL) = 3 on less than **three** PBMAS special education indicators; or, the combination of PL = 3 on less than **two** indicators and PL =2 on less than **four** indicators.

Justification: SDAA II results are an integral part of a single AYP performance indicator, and therefore, SDAA II performance cannot be removed or added without consideration to the Federal 3% cap. For this reason, requests to consider student proficient results on SDAA II below grade level assessments are only considered if the district has not exceeded the 3% cap. Requests to include SDAA II results for students assessed on a grade level equal to their enroll grade level are not subject to the federal cap, and therefore may be considered favorably.

The PBMAS indicators are used to evaluate student performance and program effectiveness for special programs and to establish school district performance levels to assist in the identification of districts for further intervention or monitoring. PBMAS indicators are used to help evaluate SDAA II appeals in order to prevent granting an appeal related to special education student performance for a district that is involved with interventions because of special education performance problems.

Appeal of student performance:

Appeals based on assessment document coding errors will be recommended to be granted based on the submission of sufficient documentation. Appeals based on coding errors that occurred due to the administration of TAKS mathematics tests using linguistic accommodations include the following.

2006 AYP APPEALS GUIDELINES

- Appeal of mathematics performance based on the submission of documentation that LEP students exempt from the TAKS mathematics assessment by the Language Proficiency Assessment Committee (LPAC) were administered a TAKS mathematics test using linguistic accommodations.
- Appeal of reading and/or mathematics performance based on evidence that current or monitored LEP students were not appropriately identified.

Each appeal found in the above categories is recommended to be granted based on the following criteria:

- Assessment data, PEIMS Fall Enrollment data, and PEIMS Attendance data are used to confirm LEP student status.
- Review appeals in prior year. Districts must not have a similar appeal in the prior year.

Justification: LEP students who are exempt from the TAKS mathematics test were tested with linguistic accommodations on the secure TAKS test. Also, monitored-LEP status was coded on the test answer document. Sufficient documentation regarding any miscoded answer documents must be included to grant this appeal.

Appeal of the Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor provision based on confidence intervals are not considered.

Appeal requests to apply confidence intervals to the Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor results are recommended to be denied.

Justification: In February, 2006, TEA submitted amendments to the AYP plan requesting the inclusion of the Safe Harbor Confidence Interval process for the preliminary evaluation of AYP. The USDE rejected the request and stated that the confidence interval amendment was not fully aligned with regulations and statute, and that the use of a confidence interval on the safe harbor calculation was unnecessary since the minimum size criteria used by Texas is much higher than most states. Considering previous USDE monitoring findings regarding granted AYP appeals, requests that effectively circumvent the approved USDE procedures for determining AYP are unfavorable for appeal.

Decision Guidelines for Participation Appeals:

Participation appeals will be recommended to be granted for each of the following reasons, given that sufficient documentation is provided:

- Absences due to medical emergencies with documentation provided of an excused absence for medical reasons.

Justification: USDE guidelines allow states to exclude students from the participation indicator if they were absent during the testing period due to a medical emergency. Information on reason for absence are not available at the state level; therefore, this provision can only be implemented through the appeals process.

- Appeals based on coding errors.

2006 AYP APPEALS GUIDELINES

Justification: The test administration policies for the state assessment program do not allow districts to correct coding errors on the test answer documents after the documents have been submitted for scoring. The most common coding errors are students coded as absent who withdrew or transferred prior to testing, and special education students coded as absent on the TAKS answer document who were tested on SDAA II or LDAA. If districts submit the proper documentation, appeals will be granted to prevent clerical errors from affecting AYP status.

- Linguistically Accommodated tests administered to LEP students exempt from the TAKS mathematics tests, or reading or mathematics tests administered to current or monitored LEP students, miscoded and not appropriately calculated in the participation indicator.

Justification: Linguistically Accommodated tests were issued for the first time during 2004-05. Current and Monitored LEP status was coded on the test answer document. Districts must submit proper documentation of a LAT administration or validation that the tested student is either a current or monitored LEP.

Decision Guidelines for Appeals on the Other Indicator:

AYP appeal for review of the other indicator (either Attendance or Graduation Rate) is recommended to be granted under the following conditions. These rules apply to evaluation of the other indicator and to use of the other indicator in the performance rate safe harbor provision.

Attendance Rate Appeals:

- The appeal requests review of current year Attendance information and it does affect the AYP results of the other indicator of the campus or district.

Justification: The prior year attendance data were used for the 2006 AYP indicator since the current year attendance data were not available when the preliminary AYP data were provided to districts. Current year attendance data may be substituted for the prior year data to ensure that the appeal decision is based on the most current data available. If the attendance indicator is reevaluated using 2005-06 attendance data, all measures based on attendance will be reevaluated. A district or campus cannot meet some 2006 AYP standards using 2004-05 Attendance Rates and meet other standards using 2005-06 Attendance Rates.

Graduation Rate Appeals:

Accuracy of leaver data submitted to TEA by the district is a factor considered in evaluation of the merits of all Graduation Rate appeals.

- The appeal requests the exclusion of special education students with 5-year IEP plans from the graduation rate calculation and the change in the rate results in meeting the AYP requirement for other indicator or performance indicator (regardless of the results of the other indicator). A recalculated graduation rate is determined for a specific student group and must result in either 1) an improvement in the rate for the specific student group as required under performance improvement, or 2) reduces the denominator below the minimum size criteria for the student group.

Justification: USDE approved exclusion of special education students with 5 year (or longer) IEP from the graduation rate calculation. Texas does not collect information

2006 AYP APPEALS GUIDELINES

related to student IEPs and can only implement this provision through the appeals process. Students must continue to be enrolled in school and districts must provide documentation from the IEP.

- The appeal requests the exclusion of recent immigrant students (students first year in a U.S. school) from the graduation rate calculation and the change in the rate results in meeting the AYP requirement for other indicator or performance indicator (regardless of the results of the other indicator). A recalculated graduation rate is determined for a specific student group and must result in either 1) an improvement in the rate for the specific student group as required under performance improvement, or 2) reduces the denominator below the minimum size criteria for the student group.

Justification: USDE approved exclusion of recent immigrant LEP students from the graduation rate calculation. This condition is not included in the completion rate methodology and the exclusion can only be implemented through the appeals process.

Decision Guidelines for Graduation Rate Appeals from Alternative Education Campuses:

AYP appeals for review of the Graduation Rate from alternative education campuses require that the campus provide evidence the campus serves “students at risk of dropping out of school.” They may do this by either having registered as an Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) campus under the state accountability alternative education campus registration process, or showing that they are eligible for registration as an AEA campus but have chosen not to register.

District Appeals

School district appeals are considered for appeal requests to remove students served in a Texas Youth Commission (TYC) facility who were included in the graduation rate calculation. Sufficient student identification information must be provided. The school district appeal is recommended to be granted when the recalculation excluding these students results in meeting the AYP graduation indicator requirements or the indicator no longer meeting minimum size requirements.

District appeal requests for a recalculation of the district graduation rate based on allowable appeals for alternative education campuses are not considered except for charter districts that are registered for evaluation under AEA procedures.

Campus Appeals

Alternative education campus appeals for a recalculation of the graduation rate are recommended to be granted when the recalculation results in meeting the AYP graduation indicator requirements. Appeal requests are considered for:

- An alternative education campus requests the exclusion of students who received a General Educational Development (GED) certificate.
- An alternative education campus requests the exclusion of continuing students.
- 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 2005-06 school year after their classmates in the Class of 2005 have completed school.

2006 AYP APPEALS GUIDELINES

- An alternative education campus requests that the Graduation Rate not be evaluated if the AEC did not have students enrolled in Grade 12 in the 2005-06 school year.
- An alternative education campus requests the exclusion of either GED or continuing students from the graduation rate calculation *as an appeal for the performance indicator* (regardless of the results of the other indicator). A recalculated graduation rate is determined for a specific student group and must result in either 1) an improvement in the rate for the specific student group as required under performance improvement, or 2) reduces the denominator below the minimum size criteria for the student group.

Justification: The completion/student status rate is a longitudinal indicator that tracks individual students from the time they enter grade 9 to the fall following their expected graduation date. Students are classified at the end of this period as 4-year graduates, continuing students, GED recipients, or dropouts – the four components add to 100 percent. Including continuing students and GED recipients in the graduation rate calculation has a negative impact on alternative education campuses. The USDE National Center for Education Statistics includes only graduates and dropouts in their estimated completion rate. [Note: In summer 2005, USDE endorsed a graduation rate definition developed by the National Governor's Association (NGA) that does not exclude GED and continuing students.] In addition, the longitudinal rate is calculated for campuses that serve grades 9 – 12 and classifies students as 4-year graduates. Alternative education campuses may not have any students enrolled in Grade 12 and as a result, the calculation of a 4-year longitudinal graduation rate is inappropriate.

Decision Guidelines for Appeals to the Hurricane Rita Provision:

The 2006 AYP Hurricane Rita provision eligibility criteria required that 1) the district must be located in a county designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as a disaster area that qualifies for public assistance due to Hurricane Rita, and 2) The district must have been closed for seven or more instructional days between September 21, 2005 and November 3, 2005.

District appeals to reconsider the AYP Hurricane Rita Provisions will be recommended to be granted for each of the following reasons, given that sufficient documentation is provided:

- The district is located in Region 4 or 5.
- The district is located in a county designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as a disaster area that qualifies for *individual* assistance due to Hurricane Rita.
- The district has sufficient documentation to show that the closure was effectively seven instructional days.