

SUMMARY OF FINAL 2007 AYP RESULTS

DISTRICTS

Of the **1,222** districts, **1,069** districts (**87.5%**) met AYP and **136** districts (**11.1%**) did not meet AYP in 2007.

Of the **136** districts that missed AYP, **131** were Title I school districts that will potentially be subject to school improvement requirements in the 2007-08 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 29 possible AYP measures. Texas met AYP across all 29 measures in 2007.

CAMPUSES

Of the **8,061** campuses, **6,447** campuses (**80.0%**) met AYP and **664** campuses (**8.2%**) did not meet AYP in 2007. **950** campuses (**11.8%**) were not evaluated in 2007 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 **664** campuses that did not meet AYP, **485** campuses (**73.0%**) are Title I campuses that will potentially be subject to school improvement requirements in the 2007-08 school year. The remaining **179** campuses (**27.0%**) 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 2006 AND 2007 AYP RESULTS

Of the **1,227** districts evaluated in 2006, **1,079** districts (**87.9%**) met AYP and **132** districts (**10.8%**) did not meet AYP in 2006. In 2007, **1,069** districts (**87.5%**) met AYP which is a decrease of **10** districts from 2006.

Of the **7,956** campuses evaluated in 2006, **6,516** campuses (**81.9%**) met AYP and **541** campuses (**6.8%**) were identified as Missed AYP. In 2007, **6,447** campuses (**80.0%**) met AYP, a decrease of **69** campuses from 2006.

Increases in the 2007 AYP performance standard for both Reading/English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics in 2007 explain the slightly lower number of district and campuses meeting AYP. The Reading/ELA performance standard increased from 53% in 2006 to 60% in 2007, while the Mathematics performance standard increased from 42% to 50%.

SUMMARY OF 2007 AYP APPEALS AND EXCEPTIONS

The 2007 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 2007 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 2007. The 2007 AYP Guide provided districts with instructions for submitting applications for exception to the 3% cap. Similar to the appeals process, the 2007 AYP Exceptions section of the AYP Guide was 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 2007 AYP Appeals and Exceptions processes 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 2007 state accountability appeals. These processes 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 2007 AYP Guide and the AYP Appeals Guidelines can be found online at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/2007/index.html>

A total of **114** school district appeal requests were received after the 2007 preliminary release, **23 (20.2%)** of which requested exceptions to the 3% federal cap.

EXCEPTIONS TO THE 3% CAP

A total of **23** school districts requested exceptions to the 3% cap for either the district or specific campuses. Of the exception requests that were evaluated, **1** request was for a district and **3** requests were for campuses.

All exception requests evaluated resulted in the AYP status changing from *Missed AYP* to *Meets AYP*.

APPEALS AND EXCEPTIONS

Of the total requests for appeals and exceptions, **52** were appeals for districts results, and **203** for campuses. Of the 52 district appeals, **13 (25.0%)** resulted in the district's AYP status changing from *Missed AYP* to *Meets AYP*. Of the **203** appeals for campuses, **73 (36.0%)** resulted in campus' AYP status changing from *Missed AYP* to *Meets AYP*.

APPEALS RELATED TO GRADUATION RATE IN ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION DISTRICTS AND CAMPUSES

Of the **13** appeals granted for districts, **2 (15.4%)** 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 **73** appeals granted for campuses, **12 (16.4%)** 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 52 district appeals (21.1%) and 61 of the 203 campus appeals (30.0%) 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 Testing (LAT) for TAKS in Reading or 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.