

## *SUMMARY OF FINAL 2006 AYP RESULTS*

### *DISTRICTS*

---

Of the **1,227** districts, **1,079** districts (**87.9%**) met AYP and **132** districts (**10.8%**) did not meet AYP in 2006.

An additional **7** districts (**0.6%**) were not evaluated due to the application of the Hurricane Rita Provision.

Of the **132** districts that missed AYP, **all** were Title I school districts that will potentially be subject to school improvement requirements in the 2006-07 school year.

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 31 possible AYP measures. There were 31 measures this year due to the addition of the Displaced Student participation measures. Texas met AYP across all 31 measures in 2006.

### *CAMPUSES*

---

Of the **7,956** campuses, **6,516** campuses (**81.9%**) met AYP and **541** campuses (**6.8%**) did not meet AYP in 2006. **873** campuses (**11.0%**) were not evaluated in 2006 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.

An additional **26** campuses (**0.3%**) were not evaluated due to the application of the Hurricane Rita Provision.

Of the **541** campuses that did not meet AYP, **416** campuses (**76.9%**) are Title I campuses that will potentially be subject to school improvement requirements in the 2006-07 school year. The remaining **125** campuses (**23.1%**) 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 2005 AND 2006 AYP RESULTS*

---

Of the **1,229** districts evaluated in 2005, **1,087** districts (**88.4%**) met AYP and **131** districts (**10.7%**) did not meet AYP in 2005. In 2006, **1,079** districts (**87.9%**) met AYP which is a decrease of **8** districts from 2005.

Of the **7,908** campuses evaluated in 2005, **6,204** campuses (**78.4%**) met AYP and **816** campuses (**10.3%**) were identified as Missed AYP. In 2006, **6,516** campuses (**81.9%**) met AYP, an increase of **312** campuses from 2005.

The increase of **312** campuses meeting AYP can be attributed to increases in the performance results of campuses, since the performance standards of 53% proficient in Reading and 42% in Mathematics remained the same as in 2005.

## SUMMARY OF 2006 AYP APPEALS AND EXCEPTIONS

The 2006 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 2006 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 3% cap were considered in 2006. The 2006 AYP Guide provided districts with instructions for submitting applications for exception to the 3% cap. Similar to the appeals process, the 2006 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 2006 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 2006 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 2006 AYP Guide, the AYP Appeals Guidelines, and the AYP Exceptions Guidelines can be found online at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/2006/index.html>.

A total of **129** school district appeal requests were received after the 2006 preliminary release, **61 (47.3%)** of which requested exceptions to the 3% federal cap.

### *EXCEPTIONS TO THE 3% CAP*

---

A total of **61** school districts requested exceptions to the 3% cap for either the district or specific campuses, **35 (57.4%)** of which were approved. Of the approved exception requests, **29** were requests for districts and **103** for campuses.

Of the **29** district exception requests, **3 (9.1%)** resulted in the district's AYP status changing from *Missed AYP* to *Meets AYP*.

Of the **103** campus exception requests, **23 (22.3%)** resulted in the campus' AYP status changing from *Missed AYP* to *Meets AYP*.

### *APPEALS AND EXCEPTIONS*

---

Of the total requests for appeals and exceptions, **58** were appeals for districts results, and **233** for campuses. Of the 58 district appeals, **16 (27.6%)** resulted in the district's AYP status changing from *Missed AYP* to *Meets AYP*. Of the 233 appeals for campuses, **79 (33.9%)** resulted in campus' AYP status changing from *Missed AYP* to *Meets AYP*.

### *APPEALS FOR THE HURRICANE RITA PROVISION*

---

An additional **4 (1.7%)** campuses appealed to change their AYP status from *Missed AYP* to *Not Evaluated* by requesting the application of the Hurricane Rita Provision. Based on the documentation of the devastating events in their districts, all **4** appeals were granted.

### *APPEALS RELATED TO GRADUATION RATE IN ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION DISTRICTS AND CAMPUSES*

---

Of the **16** appeals granted for districts, **5 (31.3%)** were granted due to the fact that they were a district rated under Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) procedures (or qualified for rating under AEA procedures but chose to be rated under standard accountability procedures) that requested the exclusion of students who received a General Educational Development (GED) certificate and continuing students from the graduation rate calculation.

Of the 79 appeals granted for campuses, 19 (24.1%) were granted due to the fact that they were a campus rated under Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) procedures that requested the exclusion of students who received a General Educational Development (GED) certificate and continuing students from the graduation rate calculation.

#### *OTHER APPEALS*

---

11 of the 58 district appeals (19.0%) and 59 of the 233 campus appeals (25.3%) 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 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.
- Appeals that requested the inclusion of students in the participation rate calculation who took a Linguistically Accommodated TAKS (LAT) for Mathematics where LAT Information fields were left blank on the test document.
- Appeals that requested the inclusion of students in the Limited English Proficient (LEP) measure for Reading or Mathematics Performance where the student qualified for LEP Current Year, Monitored Year 1, or Monitored Year 2 status (based on Attendance data) but the LEP field was left blank on the test document.