

## SUMMARY OF FINAL 2010 AYP RESULTS

### DISTRICTS

Of the 1,237 districts, 969 districts (78%) met AYP and 250 districts (20%) did not meet AYP in 2010. A total of 249 (99%) of the districts that missed AYP are Title I school districts that will potentially be subject to school improvement requirements in the 2010-11 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/2010-2011/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 2010.

### CAMPUSES

Of the 8,435 campuses, 7,241 campuses (86%) met AYP and 368 campuses (4%) did not meet AYP in 2010. Of all campuses, 826 campuses (10%) were not evaluated in 2010. 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.

Of the 368 campuses that did not meet AYP, 298 campuses (81%) are Title I campuses that will potentially be subject to school improvement requirements in the 2010-11 school year. The remaining 70 campuses (19%) 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/2010-2011/sip-campus.html>.

### COMPARISON OF 2009 AND 2010 AYP RESULTS

Of the 1,235 districts evaluated in 2009, final results indicate that 1,000 districts (81%) met AYP and 209 districts (17%) did not meet AYP. The final results for 2010, as a result of appeals, indicate that 250 districts (20%) did not meet AYP, which is an increase of 41 districts from 2009.

Of the 8,322 campuses evaluated in 2009, the final results indicate that 6,736 campuses (81%) met AYP and 353 campuses (4%) were identified as *Missed AYP*. The final results for 2010, as a result of appeals, indicate that 368 campuses (4%) did not meet AYP, an increase of 15 campuses from 2009.

## SUMMARY OF FINAL 2010 AYP RESULTS

### COMPARISON TO STATE ACCOUNTABILITY

Of the **969** districts that met AYP in 2010, **959** districts (**99%**) were issued a state accountability rating of *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, or *Academically Acceptable* (in standard or AEA procedures); **10** districts (**1%**) were rated *Academically Unacceptable* in either state standard or alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures. Of the **250** districts that missed AYP, **27** districts (**11%**) received an *Academically Unacceptable* rating (in standard or AEA procedures); **103** districts (**41%**) were rated *Academically Acceptable* in either standard or AEA procedures, and **120** districts (**48%**) were rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized*.

Of the **7,241** campuses that met AYP, **7,137** (**99%**) campuses received a state accountability rating of *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, or *Academically Acceptable* (in standard or AEA procedures). **40** campuses (**1%**) of those that met AYP were rated *Academically Unacceptable* in either standard or AEA procedures. Of the **368** campuses that missed AYP, **58** campuses (**16%**) received an *Academically Unacceptable* rating (in standard or AEA procedures); **241** campuses (**65%**) were rated *Academically Acceptable* in either standard or AEA procedures, and **68** campuses (**18%**) were rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized*.

### SUMMARY OF NOT EVALUATED DISTRICTS AND CAMPUSES

---

#### District

Only **18** of the **1,237** districts evaluated for AYP (**1%**) are assigned a *Not Evaluated* status. Of these, **7** (**39%**) are new charter districts. Another **11** (**61%**) districts received the status of *Not Evaluated: Other*, all of which had insufficient data upon which to base an evaluation.

#### Campus

Of the **8,435** campuses evaluated for AYP, **826** (**10%**) are assigned a *Not Evaluated* status for the following reasons:

New Campus	257
PK-K Only	156
Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP)	142
Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP)	145
AYP Special Analysis for Small Numbers	6
Other reasons (such as No TAKS Results)	120

## **SUMMARY OF FINAL 2010 AYP RESULTS**

### SUMMARY OF 2010 AYP APPEALS AND EXCEPTIONS

The 2010 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 2010 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 2010. The 2010 AYP Guide provided districts with instructions for submitting applications for exception to the 1% cap.

The 2010 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 2010 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 2010 AYP Guide and the AYP Appeals Guidelines can be found online at <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/2010/index.html>.

### *APPEALS AND EXCEPTIONS*

A total of 52 school district appeal requests were received after the 2010 preliminary release, 12 (23%) of which requested exceptions to the 1% federal cap. There were 81 total appeal requests to either the district or campus statuses, 51 (63%) were granted.

Of the total requests for appeals and exceptions, 25 were appeals for district results, and 56 were appeals for campus results.

Of the 25 district appeals, 7 (28%) resulted in the district's AYP status changing from *Missed AYP* to *Meets AYP*. Of the 56 appeals for campuses, 41 (73%) resulted in campus' AYP status changing from *Missed AYP* to *Meets AYP*.