

SUMMARY OF FINAL 2009 AYP RESULTS

DISTRICTS

Of the 1,235 districts, 1,000 districts (81%) met AYP and 209 districts (17%) did not meet AYP in 2009. A total of 207 (99%) of the districts that missed AYP are Title I school districts that will potentially be subject to school improvement requirements in the 2009-10 school year.

For more information about the school improvement requirements for these districts, go to the NCLB Coordination website at <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/nclb/titleia/sip/2009-2010/sip-district.html>.

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 2009.

CAMPUSES

Of the 8,322 campuses, 6,736 campuses (81%) met AYP and 353 campuses (4%) did not meet AYP in 2009. Of all campuses, 1,233 campuses (15%) were not evaluated in 2009. Most of the campuses that were not evaluated for AYP 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. The 2009 Hurricane Ike Provision, approved by the US Department of Education (USDE), resulted in 84 campuses with no evaluation, 7% of all campuses not evaluated for 2009 AYP.

Of the 353 campuses that did not meet AYP, 257 campuses (73%) are Title I campuses that will potentially be subject to school improvement requirements in the 2009-10 school year. The remaining 96 campuses (27%) 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://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/nclb/titleia/sip/2009-2010/sip-campus.html>.

COMPARISON OF 2008 AND 2009 AYP RESULTS

Of the 1,229 districts evaluated in 2008, final results indicate that 824 districts (67%) met AYP and 391 districts (32%) did not meet AYP. The final results for 2009, as a result of appeals, indicate that 209 districts (17%) did not meet AYP, which is a decrease of 182 districts from 2008.

Of the 8,195 campuses evaluated in 2008, the final results indicate that 6,170 campuses (75%) met AYP and 1,109 campuses (14%) were identified as *Missed AYP*. The final results for 2009, as a result of appeals, indicate that 353 campuses (4%) did not meet AYP, a decrease of 756 campuses from 2008.

SUMMARY OF FINAL 2009 AYP RESULTS

COMPARISON TO STATE ACCOUNTABILITY

Of the 1,000 districts that met AYP in 2009, 968 districts (97%) were issued a state accountability rating of *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, or *Academically Acceptable* (in standard or AEA procedures); 32 districts (3%) were rated *Academically Unacceptable* in either state standard or alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures. Of the 209 districts that missed AYP, 39 districts (19%) received an *Academically Unacceptable* rating (in standard or AEA procedures); 136 districts (65%) were rated *Academically Acceptable* in either standard or AEA procedures, and 34 districts (16%) were rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized*.

Of the 6,736 campuses that met AYP, 6,597 (98%) campuses received a state accountability rating of *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, or *Academically Acceptable* (in standard or AEA procedures). 134 campuses (2%) of those that met AYP were rated *Academically Unacceptable* in either standard or AEA procedures. Of the 353 campuses that missed AYP, 97 campuses (27%) received an *Academically Unacceptable* rating (in standard or AEA procedures); 219 campuses (62%) were rated *Academically Acceptable* in either standard or AEA procedures, and 34 campuses (10%) were rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized*.

HURRICANE IKE PROVISION

The US Department of Education (USDE) approved a Hurricane Ike Provision for 2009 AYP evaluations that allows special consideration for districts and campuses that miss AYP for either the Reading or Mathematics performance indicators. Under the criteria for eligibility for the Hurricane Ike Provision, 49 districts and all of their 465 campuses were eligible for consideration. Another 97 campuses were eligible although their districts were not, totaling 562 eligible campuses.

IMPACT OF THE TEXAS PROJECTION MEASURE (TPM)

The Texas Projection Measure (TPM) was used for the first time in 2009 to determine AYP results. The TPM feature was used throughout the entire AYP process, including the selection of students for the federal cap. Of the 1,235 districts evaluated for AYP, 126 districts (10%) met AYP due to TPM that would have otherwise missed AYP in 2009. Of the 8,322 campuses evaluated, 528 campuses (6%) met AYP due to TPM that would not have had TPM been excluded from the AYP process.

SUMMARY OF NOT EVALUATED DISTRICTS AND CAMPUSES

District

Only 26 of the 1,235 districts evaluated for AYP (2%) are assigned a *Not Evaluated* status. Of these, 12 (48%) are new charter districts. Another 11 (42%) districts received the status of *Not Evaluated: Other*, which included 8 districts with insufficient data upon which to base an evaluation, and 3 that were not evaluated for other reasons. Of those not evaluated, 3 were assigned *Not Evaluated: Hurricane Ike Provision*.

SUMMARY OF FINAL 2009 AYP RESULTS

Campus

Of the **8,322** campuses evaluated for AYP, **1,233 (15%)** are assigned a *Not Evaluated* status for the following reasons:

New Campus	316
PK-K Only	150
Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP)	140
Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP)	133
Hurricane Ike Provision	84
AYP Special Analysis for Small Numbers	228
Other reasons (such as No TAKS Results)	182

SUMMARY OF 2009 AYP APPEALS AND EXCEPTIONS

The 2009 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 2009 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 1% cap were considered in 2009. The 2009 AYP Guide provided districts with instructions for submitting applications for exception to the 1% cap.

The 2009 AYP Appeals process was reviewed by an external panel that was familiar with the state and federal accountability systems and served as the external review panel for the 2009 state accountability appeals. The process was 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 2009 AYP Guide and the AYP Appeals Guidelines can be found online at <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/2009/index.html>.

APPEALS AND EXCEPTIONS

A total of **76** school district appeal requests were received after the 2009 preliminary release, **12 (16%)** of which requested exceptions to the 1% federal cap. There were **123** total appeal requests to either the district or campus statuses, **66 (54%)** were granted.

Of the total requests for appeals and exceptions, **38** were appeals for districts results, and **85** for campuses.

Of the 38 district appeals, **8 (21%)** resulted in the district's AYP status changing from *Missed AYP* to *Meets AYP*. Of the 85 appeals for campuses, **40 (47%)** resulted in campus' AYP status changing from *Missed AYP* to *Meets AYP*.