

## Appendix D: Calculating 2010 AYP Results for Sample School

---

Following is a step-by-step description of the 2010 AYP Status calculation for Sample School. This example illustrates a hypothetical Title I campus receiving a preliminary 2010 AYP Status of *Missed AYP* whose sample data table is shown in *Appendix C*. The sample has been designed to maximize illustration of the information that can be provided on the data table and the types of calculations that will be performed before the preliminary release. The samples described in this section include:

AYP Data Table Results.....	Page 128
AYP Explanation Table .....	Page 137
Reconciling Student Level Data .....	Page 137
How to Calculate the 1% and 2% Federal Cap Limit.....	Page 142

### AYP Data Table Results

The 2010 AYP Data Table has been expanded to include the TPM measure. The data table now includes three sections for Performance results along with Participation and Other Indicator.

<u>Reading/English Language Arts</u>	<u>Mathematics</u>
<b>Performance</b>	<b>Performance</b>
AYP Proficiency Rate ..... Steps 1 – 7	AYP Proficiency Rate ..... Steps 10 – 16
Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor ..... Step 8	Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor ..... Steps 17 – 18
AYP Proficiency Rate with Growth ..... Step 9	AYP Proficiency Rate with Growth ..... Step 19
<b>Participation</b> ..... Steps 20 – 28	<b>Participation</b> ..... Steps 29 – 36
<b>Other Indicator</b> ..... Steps 37	

Please refer to the Sample AYP Unmasked Data Table shown in *Appendix C*.

## **Performance: Reading/English Language Arts**

### ***AYP Proficiency Rate***

**All Students:** Sample School tested 316 total students (students enrolled on the campus for the full academic year) in Reading/English Language Arts. Therefore, no special conditions for small campuses apply.

Step 1. All Students: 83% *Met Standard* exceeds the 73% performance standard

**Student Groups:** Performance minimum size requirements for the student groups is 50 students **and** the student group must also represent at least 10 percent of all students; ***or*** the student group is at least 200 students.

Step 2. African American: not evaluated (only 23 students tested)

Step 3. Hispanic: 82% *Met Standard* exceeds the 73% performance standard  
There are 73 students who represent 23 percent of students tested.

Step 4. White: 84% *Met Standard* exceeds the 73% performance standard  
There are 198 students who represent 63 percent of students tested.

Step 5. Economically Disadvantaged: 50% *Met Standard* does not meet the 73% performance standard – go to the improvement calculation in Step 8.  
There are 107 students who represent 34 percent of students tested.

Step 6. Special Education: not evaluated (only 16 students tested)

Step 7. LEP: not evaluated (only 35 students tested)  
(Although there were only 35 LEP students tested in 2009–10, there were 56 students identified in the LEP performance measure. See *Section III* for more information.)

### ***Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor***

Improvement is calculated for any student group (or all students) that does not meet the performance standard for Reading/English Language Arts or Mathematics. The Economically Disadvantaged student group did not meet the Reading/English Language Arts performance standard. If this student group met performance improvement/safe harbor for the respective measures, they will be considered to have met the AYP performance standard. To meet performance improvement/safe harbor, students must show: 1) a 10 percent decrease from the prior year in the percent of students not passing the subject area test **and** 2) meet the absolute standard **or** meet improvement criteria on the Graduation Rate, if minimum size requirements on the Graduation Rate are met for the current year.

#### **Calculating Improvement Required for Reading/English Language Arts**

Step 8. Reading/English Language Arts performance requirement for Economically Disadvantaged student group

(1) *a 10 percent decrease from the prior year in the percent of students not passing the subject area test*

Based on Reading/English Language Arts Economically Disadvantaged students, performance improvement is determined by:  
 $100\% - 45\% \text{ Met Standard in } 2008-09 = 55\% \text{ of students not passing the Reading/English Language Arts test in } 2008-09$

$55\% \times 10\% \text{ decrease} = 5.5\%$  (this rounds up to 6%, see *Section III* for rounding rules) decrease in students not passing **or** 6% increase in students *Met Standard* is required

Note: This calculation is the equivalent of improvement required to reach a standard of 100% in ten years.

$100\% - 45\% \text{ Met Standard in } 2008-09 = 55\%$  improvement required to reach a standard of 100%

$55\%$  divided by 10 years = 5.5% (rounds up to 6%) improvement required over a one year period **or** 6% increase in students *Met Standard* is required

For the Sample School Reading/English Language Arts performance results for the Economically Disadvantaged student group,  $50\% \text{ Met Standard in } 2009-10 \text{ minus } 45\% \text{ in } 2008-09 = \underline{5\% \text{ increase, which does not meet the } 6\% \text{ improvement required.}}$

***and***

(2) meet the Graduation Rate criteria *if minimum size requirements on the Graduation Rate are met for the current year alone.*

Graduation Rate minimum size requirements for the student groups in the current year of 50 students, **and** the student group must also represent at least 10 percent of all students; **or** the student group is at least 200 students. This school must then meet the 2010 AYP Graduation Rate criteria (see step 37, other indicator, for more information).

However, due to lack of required improvement in improvement, the Reading/English Language Arts performance requirement for Economically Disadvantaged students is not met.

### ***AYP Proficiency Rate including Growth***

The students that are projected to meet the passing standard based on the Texas Projection Measure (TPM) or on track to meet the standard by the TAKS–Alt growth measure are included in the AYP results. Additional students are added to the AYP Proficiency Rate numerator who met the projected TPM for all student groups. The Economically Disadvantaged student group in Sample School did not meet the Reading/English Language Arts performance standard. If this student group meets the AYP Targets by the AYP Proficiency Rate with growth for the respective measures, it will be considered to have met the AYP performance standard.

Step 9. **Reading/English Language Arts** proficiency rate including Growth for the Economically Disadvantaged student group: *60% Met Standard* – does not meet the *73%* performance standard.

The Reading/English Language Arts Performance requirement is not met due to the Economically Disadvantaged student group.

### **Performance: Mathematics**

#### ***AYP Proficiency Rate***

**All Students:** Sample School tested 318 total students (students enrolled on the campus for the full academic year) in Mathematics. Therefore, no special conditions for small campuses apply.

Step 10. All Students: *88% Met Standard* exceeds the *67%* performance standard

**Student Groups:** Performance minimum size requirements for the student groups is 50 students **and** the student group must also represent at least 10 percent of all students; **or** the student group is at least 200 students.

Step 11. African American: not evaluated (only 23 students tested)

Step 12. Hispanic: 77% *Met Standard* exceeds the 67% performance standard  
There are 74 students who represent 23 percent of students tested.

Step 13. White: 86% *Met Standard* exceeds the 67% performance standard  
There are 198 students who represent 62 percent of students tested.

Step 14. Economically Disadvantaged: 52% *Met Standard* does not meet the 67% performance standard – go to performance improvement/safe harbor calculation in Step 17  
There are 112 students who represent 35 percent of students tested.

Step 15. Special Education: not evaluated (only 20 students tested)

Step 16. LEP: 47% *Met Standard* – does not meet the 67 % performance standard – go to performance improvement/safe harbor calculation in Step 18

There are 50 students who represent 16 percent of students tested in 2009–10. The percent *Met Standard* is based on the performance results of 53 students identified in the LEP performance measure. (See *Section III* for more information.)

### ***Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor***

Step 17. The Economically Disadvantaged student group in Sample School did not meet the Mathematics performance standard.

Improvement Required:

100% – 48% *Met Standard* in 2008–09 = 52% improvement required to reach a standard of 100%

52% divided by 10 years = 5% improvement required over a one year period or 5% increase in students *Met Standard* is required

For the Sample School Mathematics performance results for the Economically Disadvantaged student group, 52% *Met Standard* in 2009–10 *minus* 48% in 2008–09 = 4% increase, which does not meet the 5% gain required

However, regardless of the outcome of the other measure, the Mathematics performance requirement for Economically Disadvantaged students is not met due to lack of required improvement – go to AYP Proficiency Rate including Growth calculation in Step 19.

Step 18. The LEP student group in Sample School did not meet the **Mathematics** performance standard.

Improvement Required:

100% – 40% *Met Standard* in 2008–09 = 60% improvement required to reach a standard of 100%

60% divided by 10 years = 6% improvement required over a one year period **or** 6% increase in students *Met Standard* is required

For the Sample School Mathematics performance results for LEP student group, 47% *Met Standard* in 2009–10 **minus** 40% in 2008–09 = 7% increase, which meets the 6% gain required

*and*

Graduation Rate minimum size requirements for student groups in current year of 50 students and the student group represents at least 10 percent of all students are not met. Minimum size criteria for the graduation rate LEP student group is based on the number of students identified as LEP in the four-year longitudinal graduation/completion total in class for the class of 2009.

The Class of 2009 four-year longitudinal cohort Number in Class of 13 students does not meet the minimum size requirement – meeting the Graduation Rate criteria is not required.

The Mathematics performance requirement for LEP students is met.

### ***AYP Proficiency Rate including Growth***

Step 19. **Mathematics** proficiency rate with growth for the Economically Disadvantaged student group: 66% *Met Standard or Growth*, which does not meet the 67% performance standard.

### **Participation: Reading/English Language Arts**

**All Students:** All Students participation rate is evaluated if at least 40 students are enrolled on the day of testing.

Step 20. All Students: 96% participation – exceeds the 95% participation standard

There are 371 students enrolled on the test date.

**Student Groups:** Participation minimum size requirements for the student groups is 50 students, **and** the student group must also represent at least 10 percent of all students; or the student group is at least 200 students.

Step 21. African American: not evaluated (only 30 students enrolled on the test date)

Step 22. Hispanic: 96% participation – exceeds 95% participation standard  
There are 97 students who represent 26 percent of students enrolled on the test date.

Step 23. White: 94% participation – does not meet 95% standard – use the average participation rate.  
There are 220 students enrolled on the test date, which is greater than the 200 student minimum size requirement.

Step 24. White Average Two-Year Participation Rate: 95% participation – meets the 95% participation standard.  
The total number participating for 2009-10 is 207, and for 2008-09, 215. The total participants for both years is 422. The total number of students for 2009-10 of 220, combined with the total for 2008-09 of 224 is 444. The average participation rate is  $422 / 444 = 95\%$ .

Step 25. Economically Disadvantaged: 94% participation – does not meet 95% standard – use the average participation rate.  
There are 121 students who represent 33 percent of students enrolled on the test date.

Step 26. Economically Disadvantaged Average Two-Year Participation Rate: 93% participation – does not meet 95% participation standard  
The total number participating for 2009-10 and 2008-09 is  $114 + 98 = 212$ . The total number of students for 2009-10 and 2008-09 is  $121 + 108 = 229$ . The average participation rate is  $212 / 229 = 93\%$ .

Step 27. Special Education: not evaluated (only 39 students enrolled on the test date)

Step 28. LEP: not evaluated (only 47 students enrolled on the test date)

## **Participation: Mathematics**

**All Students:** All Students participation rate is evaluated if at least 40 students are enrolled on the day of testing.

Step 29. All Students: 95% participation – meets the 95% participation standard  
There are 370 students enrolled on the test date.

**Student Groups:** Participation minimum size requirements for the student groups is 50 students, **and** the student group must also represent at least 10 percent of all students; **or** the student group is at least 200 students.

Step 30. African American: not evaluated (only 26 students enrolled on the test date)

Step 31. Hispanic: 90% participation – does not meet 95% participation standard – use the average two-year participation rate.  
There are 100 students who represent 27 percent of students enrolled on the test date.

Step 32. Hispanic Average Two-Year Participation Rate: 91% participation – does not meet 95% participation standard  
The average participation rate is the total number participating for 2009-10 and 2008-09 ( $90 + 90 = 180$ ) divided by the total number of students for 2009-10 and 2008-09 ( $100 + 98 = 198$ ), or 91%.

Step 33. White: 96% participation – exceeds 95% participation standard  
There are 215 students enrolled on the test date, which is greater than the 200 student minimum size requirement.

Step 34. Economically Disadvantaged: 95% participation – meets the 95% participation standard  
There are 123 students who represent 33 percent of students enrolled on the test date.

Step 35. Special Education: not evaluated (only 39 students enrolled on the test date)

Step 36. LEP: 95% participation – meets the 95% participation standard  
There are 58 students who represent 16 percent of students enrolled on the test date.

### **Other Indicator**

Graduation Rate is the Other Indicator for Sample School. All Students Graduation Rate is evaluated if the Number in Class is at least 40 students. The 2010 AYP Graduation Rate goal and alternative targets are evaluated when the minimum size criteria are met.

Step 37. Evaluate the 2010 AYP Graduation Rate criteria.

All Students: there are 326 students in the total Number in Class which meets the minimum size criteria. The graduation

rate criteria are evaluated including the goal, targets, and each alternative.

*Four-year Longitudinal Graduation Rates*

*(1) Graduation Rate Statewide Goal of 90%*

The Class of 2009 four-year Graduation Rate of 72.7% does not meet the goal.

*(2) 2010 Annual Graduation Rate Target of 75%*

Since the goal was not met, the annual target is measured. The Class of 2009 four-year Graduation Rate of 72.7% does not meet the annual target.

*Graduation Rate Alternative Targets:*

*(3) Safe Harbor Target defined as a 10% decrease in difference between the prior year rate and the Goal*

Since the annual target was not met, the safe harbor target is measured. The safe harbor target is determined by

the goal 90.0% - 78.9% the Class of 2008 four-year Graduation Rate = 11.1% difference,

11.1% x 10% decrease = 1.1% safe harbor target required.

The 72.7% Class of 2009 Graduation Rate *minus* the 78.9% Class of 2008 four-year Graduation Rate = - 6.2 improvement, which does not meet the safe harbor target.

*(4) Improvement Target of 1.0 percent increase from the prior year*

Since the safe harbor target was not met, the improvement is measured. 72.7% Graduation Rate minus the Class of 2008 four-year Graduation Rate 78.9% = - 6.2 improvement shown. This does not meet the 1.0% improvement requirement.

*Five-year longitudinal Graduation Rate Target of 80%*

The final alternative is the five-year graduation rate. The Class of 2008 five-year Graduation Rate of 80.3% meets the five-year annual target.

The Other Indicator requirement is met.

## **AYP Explanation Table**

Sample School does not meet the AYP requirement in four measures:

- Reading/English Language Arts performance requirement due to the economically disadvantaged student group (Step 9 of this example), the explanation table shows that this student group did not meet the standard because of the federal cap. The symbol “%” appears in the appropriate column.
- Mathematics performance requirement due to the economically disadvantaged student group (Step 19 of this example), the explanation table shows that this measure missed AYP. The symbol “X” appears in the appropriate column for this measure.
- Reading/English Language Arts participation requirement due to the economically disadvantaged student group (Steps 25 and 26 of this example), the symbol “X” appears in the explanation table for this measure.
- Mathematics participation requirement due to the Hispanic student group (Steps 31 and 32 of this example), the symbol “X” appears in the explanation table for this measure.

The campus will receive a 2010 AYP Status of *Missed AYP*.

### **Performance Measure failure due to the Federal Cap**

The symbol “%” in the explanation table for the economically disadvantaged student group indicates that without the application of the 1% and 2% federal caps, this student group would have met the AYP performance requirement. Page 1 of the 2010 AYP Source Data Table (see page 122) indicates that the economically disadvantaged student group would have met the performance improvement/safe harbor calculation had the federal cap not been applied.

### **Reconciling Student Level Data**

Since 2004, school districts have received AYP student listings in order to identify how students were processed for the AYP campus or district results and to identify the number of students who exceed the cap.

Refer to the sample AYP Unmasked Data Table and sample AYP Source Data Table. The AYP Explanation Table shown on page 116 indicates that the same four AYP measures were not met as described above.

## Reading/English Language Arts Performance

The AYP Data Table categories are shown on the student data listing and may be reconciled or matched to the data table total for each district and campus. The following steps help describe how the AYP Reading/English Language Arts student listings match the AYP data table for the sample school shown in *Appendix C*.

### AYP Student List, Total Students “TOTAL =”

Step 1. Page 3 of the 2010 AYP Unmasked Data Table (see page 114).

#### **Participation: Reading/English Language Arts** 2009-10 Assessments

All Students group, number of *Total Students*: 371

Step 2. 2010 AYP Student Data Listings for subject: **Reading/English Language Arts** (see page 127). Begin at the bottom of the listing.

Total = 371

### AYP Student List category labeled “NON-PARTICIPANT”

Step 1. Page 3 of the 2010 AYP Unmasked Data Table

All Students group, number of *Total Students*: 371

All Students group, total *Number Participating*: 357

Difference in the numerator:  $371 - 357 = 14$

Step 2. 2010 AYP Student Data Listings for the same subject.

The AYP Student Listing category labeled “NON-PARTICIPANT” shows 14 students. These were not included in the *Number Participating*.

Step 3. The 2010 AYP Unmasked Data Table, **Explanation Table** (see page 116) that indicates the economically disadvantaged student group *Missed AYP* due to the Participation rate.

Page 3 of the 2010 AYP Unmasked Data Table shows (see page 114.)

Economically disadvantaged student group, *Number Participating*: 114

Economically disadvantaged student group, *Total Students*: 121

Difference in the numerator:  $121 - 114 = 7$

Step 4. 2010 AYP Student Data Listings for the same subject.

The AYP Student Listing category labeled “NON-PARTICIPANT” shows 14 students. Seven of the students shown (not shown in the example student listing) will indicate they are included in the economically disadvantaged student group.

#### **AYP Student List category labeled “PARTICIPANT”**

Step 1. Page 3 of the 2010 AYP Unmasked Data Table  
All Students group, total *Number Participating*: 357

Step 2. Page 1 of the 2010 AYP Unmasked Data Table (see page 112.)

**Performance: Reading/English Language Arts**  
2009-10 Assessments

All Students group, total *Number Tested*: 316

Difference:  $357 - 316 = 41$

Step 3. 2010 AYP Student Data Listings for the same subject

The AYP Student Listing category labeled “PARTICIPANT” shows 41 students. These were not included in the performance measure, *Number Tested*.

### **AYP Student List category labeled “PROFICIENT-MET STANDARD”**

Step 1. Page 1 of the 2010 AYP Unmasked Data Table

All Students group, total that *Met Standard*: 261

Step 2. 2010 AYP Student Data Listings for the same subject.

The AYP Student Listing category labeled “PROFICIENT” shows 261 students. This category includes student test results that met the passing standard that were selected for inclusion in the 1% and 2% federal caps.

### **AYP Student List category labeled “PROFICIENT-DUE TO TPM”**

Step 1. Page 1 of the 2010 AYP Unmasked Data Table

**Performance: Reading/English Language Arts**  
2009-10 Assessments

AYP Proficiency Rate, All Students group, total *Met Standard*: 261

On the same page, AYP Proficiency Rate with Growth, All Students group, total *Met Standard with Growth*: 276

Difference:  $276 - 261 = 15$

Step 2. 2010 AYP Student Data Listings for the same subject.

The AYP Student Listing category labeled “PROFICIENT-TPM/GROWTH” shows 15 students. This category lists students that did not meet the passing standard but were projected to meet the standard by TPM or on track to meet the standard by the TAKS–Alt growth measure.

## AYP Student List category labels “EXCEEDED 1% CAP” and “EXCEEDED 2% CAP”

Step 1. Page 1 of the 2010 AYP Unmasked Data Table

All Students group, total *Met Standard*: 261

Step 2. Page 1 of the 2010 AYP Source Data Table (see page 122)

**Performance: Reading/English Language Arts**  
2009-10 Assessments

All Students group, total *Met Standard*: 271

Difference:  $271 - 261 = 10$

Step 3. 2010 AYP Student Data Listings for the same subject.

The AYP Student Listing category labeled “EXCEEDED 1% CAP–DUE TO GROWTH” shows 3 students and the category labeled “EXCEEDED 1% CAP– MET STANDARD” shows 3 students. This category lists students that were not selected for the 1% federal cap on TAKS–Alt passing test results.

The AYP Student Listing category labeled “EXCEEDED 2% CAP–DUE TO TPM” shows 2 students and the category labeled “EXCEEDED 2% CAP– MET STANDARD” shows 2 students. This category lists students that were not selected for the 2% federal cap on TAKS–M or LAT TAKS–M passing test results.

A total of:  $(3+3) + (2+2) = 10$

Step 4. The 2010 AYP Unmasked Data Table, **Explanation Table** (see page 116) that indicates the economically disadvantaged student group failed to *Meet AYP* due to the federal caps.

Page 1 of the 2010 AYP Unmasked Data Table shows

Economically disadvantaged student group, number that *Met Standard*: 54

Step 5. Page 1 of the 2010 AYP Source Data Table  
Economically disadvantaged student group, number that *Met Standard*: 58

$$\text{Difference: } 58 - 54 = 4$$

Step 6. 2010 AYP Student Data Listings for the same subject.

The AYP Student Listing categories labeled “EXCEEDED” show a total of 10 students. Four of the students shown (not shown in the example student listing) will indicate they are included in the economically disadvantaged student group.

### **AYP Student List category labeled “NON-PROFICIENT”**

Step 1. Page 1 of the 2010 AYP Unmasked Data Table

AYP Proficiency Rate with Growth, All Students group, *Number Tested*: 316

AYP Proficiency Rate with Growth, All Students group, total *Met Standard or Growth*: 276

$$\text{Difference in the numerator: } 316 - 276 = 40$$

Step 2. 2010 AYP Student Data Listings for the same subject.

The AYP Student Listing categories labeled “NON-PROFICIENT” shows 30 students.

The Student Listing categories labeled “EXCEEDED” show 10 students. A total of  $30 + 10 = 40$  students were not included in the number that *Met Standard or Growth*, and are considered non-proficient for AYP purposes only.

### **How to Calculate the 1% and 2% Federal Cap Limits**

The following steps describe the Sample District Federal Cap Calculation shown in *Appendix C* for the subject Reading/English Language Arts only. *Section III* of the AYP Guide describes the calculation for a school district’s federal cap limit.

## Reading/English Language Arts

Step 1. **AYP participation denominator:** The number of students enrolled in Sample ISD in Grades 3 – 8 and 10 on the day of testing, is reported as the AYP District Participation denominator by subject.

The third page of the 2010 AYP Unmasked Data Table (see page 114)

### **Performance: Reading/English Language Arts** 2009-10 Assessments

All Students group, number of *Total Students*: 371

Step 2. **Calculate the Cap Limits:** The federal cap limits are calculated for TAKS–M and TAKS–Alt separately.  
TAKS–M 2% federal cap limit is  $371 \times .02 = 7.42$ . The percentage is rounded up to the next whole number for any decimal value, so the 2% limit is 8.

TAKS–Alt 1% federal cap limit is  $371 \times .01 = 3.71$ . The percentage is rounded up to the next whole number for any decimal value, so the 1% limit is 4.

The overall 3% federal cap on both TAKS–M and TAKS–Alt is  $8 + 4 = 12$ .

Step 3. **Identify the overall Performance results:** The sample federal cap calculation includes a table of possible assessment results submitted from Sample ISD. Beginning in 2010, the federal cap limit applies to TAKS–M or TAKS–Alt test results that meet the passing standard or meet growth criteria; either projected to meet the passing standard by TPM on TAKS–M or on track to meet the passing standard based on the TAKS–Alt growth measure. The sample Source data table shows

Total, *Met Standard*: 271

Total, *Number Tested*: 316

District assessment proficiency rate:  $286 / 316 = 91\%$

Step 4. **AYP Proficiency Rate including Growth:** The sample federal cap assessment table shows

Total, *AYP Calculation*: 276

Total, *Number Tested*: 316  
 District AYP performance rate:  $276 / 316 = 87\%$

**Identify the number of students that exceed the cap**

Step 5. **TAKS–M results:** The sample federal cap assessment table on page 124 shows 9 students met the TAKS–M student passing standard or met by TPM, and 3 students met the LAT TAKS–M student passing standard or met by TPM. The federal cap determines the number of students that exceed the cap limit and reclassifies those students to non-proficient for AYP purposes.

TAKS–M, *Met Standard or Growth*: 9  
 LAT TAKS–M, *Met Standard or Growth*: 3  
 Total: 12

TAKS–M, *AYP Calculation*: 8  
 (The 2% federal cap limit on TAKS–M)

Number of students that exceed the 2% cap limit:  $12 - 8 = 4$

Step 6. **TAKS–Alt results:** The sample federal cap assessment table shows 10 students met the TAKS–Alt student passing standard or met the TAKS–Alt growth measure. The number of TAKS–Alt student results that exceed the cap limit is calculated below.

TAKS–Alt, *Met Standard or Growth*: 10

TAKS–Alt, *AYP Calculation*: 4  
 (The 1% federal cap limit on TAKS–Alt)

Number of students that exceed the cap limit on TAKS–Alt:  $10 - 4 = 6$

Step 7. 2010 AYP Student Data Listings for the same subject.

The AYP Student Listing category labeled “EXCEEDED” shows a total of 10 students, which include students that were not selected for the 1% and 2% federal caps tested on either TAKS–M or TAKS–Alt. The “EXCEEDED” categories include:

EXCEEDED 1% CAP – DUE TO GROWTH	EXCEEDED 2% CAP – DUE TO TPM
EXCEEDED 1% CAP – MET STANDARD	EXCEEDED 2% CAP – MET STANDARD