

**Accountability System for 2009 and Beyond – Standard Procedures**  
**Commissioner of Education Final Decisions**  
**April 2009**

**State Assessment Indicators**

1. Phase-in of TAKS (Accommodated). The TAKS (Accommodated), previously known as TAKS-Inclusive, was administered in 2005-06 and 2006-07 in grades and subjects that were not assessed with the State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II). Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, the TAKS (Accommodated) expanded to include the grades and subjects that were tested with SDAA II. The TAKS (Accommodated) is a form of TAKS that has the same test questions and the same passing standards as the general assessment, but that includes format accommodations (larger font, fewer items per page, etc.) and contains no embedded field-test items. In addition, certain accommodations are allowed on this version of the test that are not available on the general assessment.

During the 2007 accountability development cycle, the Educator Focus Group and Commissioner's Accountability Advisory Committee (CAAC) reviewed options for inclusion of the TAKS (Accommodated) results in the state accountability system. Their recommendation was to combine the TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) results into a single indicator beginning with the 2008 accountability ratings. The advisory groups noted several reasons that a combined indicator was appropriate to incorporate in the ratings beginning in 2008.

- Students served by special education who take the TAKS (Accommodated) form are assessed on the same test questions given to all students, including special education students, who are assessed on the regular TAKS.
- The TAKS (Accommodated) uses the TAKS *Met Standard* and *Commended Performance* student passing standards.
- Special education students taking the regular state assessment tests on grade level have been included in the state rating system since 1998-99.
- Combining the results maintains the same number of measures in the state accountability system.
- Inclusion of TAKS (Accommodated) with TAKS parallels the use of the combined results in the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) system beginning in 2007-08.

As planned, in 2009 the TAKS (Accommodated) results that will be combined with the TAKS results will be for the same grades and subjects used in 2008. These are:

Science (grades 5, 8, 10, & 11—English; grade 5—Spanish)  
Social Studies (grades 8, 10, & 11)  
English Language Arts (ELA) (grade 11)  
Mathematics (grade 11)

Beginning in 2010, the TAKS indicator will include these additional TAKS (Accommodated)-tested grades and subjects:

Reading/ELA (grades 3 through 10—English; grades 3 through 6—Spanish)  
Mathematics (grades 3 through 10—English; grades 3 through 6—Spanish)  
Writing (grades 4 and 7—English; grade 4—Spanish)

*Rationale:* The phase-in schedule for use of TAKS (Accommodated) results follows the established “report, report, use” policy. Educators were given advance notice of the plan in both the 2007 and 2008 accountability manuals.

2. TAKS Standards. Standards for 2009 were published in the *2008 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule to provide districts and campuses with advance notice before the 2008-09 school year began. The 2009 *Academically Acceptable* standards are 70% for reading/ ELA, writing, and social studies; 55% for mathematics; and 50% for science. These standards represent increases of five percentage points to the *Academically Acceptable* standards for four of the five subjects (writing, social studies, mathematics, and science.) The 2009 *Recognized* standard of 75%, which applies to all subjects, is unchanged from the prior year.

Standards for 2010 will be published in the *2009 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule before the 2009-10 school year begins. The 2010 *Recognized* standard will increase by five percentage points to 80% as previously planned. The 2010 *Academically Acceptable* standards will increase by five percentage points for both mathematics and science to 60% and 55%, respectively. The reading/ELA, writing, and social studies standards will remain at 70% in 2010 to align with a recommended goal of standards of 70%, 80%, and 90% for *Academically Acceptable*, *Recognized*, and *Exemplary*, respectively, for all subject areas.

State Accountability Standards				
	2008 Used	2009 Adopted	2010 Final Decision	2011 Preview*
<i>Exemplary</i>	90%	90%	90%	90%
<i>Recognized</i>	75%	75%	<b>80%</b>	80%
<i>Acceptable</i>				
<b>Reading/ELA</b>	<b>70%</b>	70%	70%	70%
<b>Writing, Soc. St.</b>	65%	<b>70%</b>	70%	70%
<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>65%</b>
<b>Science</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>60%</b>
<b>Changes to Indicator</b>	Gr. 8 science; TAKS (Accommodated) – partial grades/subjects	Texas Projection Measure (TPM)	TAKS (Accommodated) –all grades/subjects; Vertical Scale Recalibration	Include new assessments: TAKS-Alt, TAKS-M, and ELL Progress Measure

Numbers in **bold** indicate an increase from the prior year.

\* Standards for 2011 will be reviewed in 2010 and are subject to change.

*Rationale:* Maintaining a 70% standard in reading/ELA, writing, and social studies in 2010 still represents increased rigor due to the planned phase-in of all TAKS (Accommodated) results in 2010. The addition of the remaining TAKS (Accommodated) grades and subjects adds approximately 100,000 more test takers to the accountability system. In 2008 these students had average passing rates ranging from 17% for Economically Disadvantaged in mathematics to 43% for White students in reading. Adding their results to the other 2.6 million students tested caused about a 3 point decline in state average percent passing rates. Campus and district level effects can be much more extreme than the averages shown at the state level. Even with the inclusion of additional TAKS (Accommodated) results in 2010 at grades 3 - 10, the passing standard for mathematics will continue to increase by five points toward the 70% goal for *Academically Acceptable*. In addition, while science continues to be the primary reason that districts and campuses are limited from achieving the next higher rating, the planned five point increase in science will also continue the annual increase in rigor toward the goal of 70% for *Academically Acceptable*.

For *Recognized*, the standard increases as planned from 75% to 80% in 2010 despite the increased rigor from the inclusion of all TAKS (Accommodated) results in 2010.

In addition to the inclusion of all TAKS (Accommodated) grades and subjects in 2010, the conversion to the new vertical scale for grades 3 through 8 in reading and mathematics will also make the system

more rigorous that year. Under Section 39.036 of the Texas Education Code (TEC), the TEA was required to develop a vertical scale for assessing student performance on the TAKS assessments in reading and mathematics for grades 3 through 8. With the vertical scale, a student's scale score in one grade can be compared to that student's scale score in another grade. The vertical scale will provide information about student growth compared to prior years. Vertical scale scores will be reported in 2009 but will not be used for accountability rating determinations until 2010. The student-level passing standards based on the vertical scale will be more rigorous for grades 6 and 8 reading (English); grade 6 reading (Spanish); and grades 3, 4, and 6 mathematics (Spanish).

3. Use of Texas Projection Measure. On January 8, 2009, the USDE approved the use of the Texas Projection Measure (TPM) in the calculations for AYP in 2009. The TPM provides a method for measuring annual student improvement that also satisfies state legislative requirements passed during the 79<sup>th</sup> and 80<sup>th</sup> Texas legislative sessions. TEC §39.034 requires the measurement of annual improvement of student achievement. The TPM that was developed for TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), and linguistically accommodated tests (LAT) is a multi-level regression-based prediction model. The model predicts student performance separately by subject in the next high-stakes grade (defined by Texas legislation as grades 5, 8, and 11). It uses current year scale scores and campus-level mean scores. Projection equations are developed the year before they are applied, so that the formulas can be published and shared across the state before they are used in state accountability or federal AYP calculations. For example, projection equations developed in 2008 will be applied in 2009 to predict student performance. A student projected to be at or above proficiency in the next high stakes grade is determined to have met the improvement standard. Projections will be made each year for all subjects for all students who have valid scores in reading/English language arts and mathematics. The equations will be updated each year after the spring TAKS administration and will be published before their use the following year.

Beginning in 2009, the Texas Projection Measure (TPM) will be used to determine state accountability ratings. The TPM will be evaluated as a means of elevating a campus or district rating in cases where neither the TAKS base indicator nor Required Improvement (RI) are sufficient to allow a campus or district to earn the next higher rating. For any TAKS measure not meeting the standard for the next higher rating, RI, TPM, or the Exceptions Provision can elevate the rating one level, and only one level. Combinations of RI, TPM, and the Exceptions Provision cannot be used together for one measure to elevate a rating more than one level. Different features can be used for different measures to successfully elevate a rating, but multiple features cannot be used for any one measure.

Of the population of students who did not pass the test for a given subject, the number who met the TPM is determined. This count of failers who are projected to pass at the next high-stakes grade level is added to the count of passers and a new percentage is calculated. The new percentage is named "TAKS Met Standard with TPM." If the "TAKS Met Standard with TPM" value is greater than or equal to the accountability standard for the subject, the measure meets the criteria for the next higher rating. If a student does not have a TPM for a test, that student is included in the TAKS indicator based on performance on the current year test. A TPM will be calculated for all grades and subjects except grade 7 writing and all subjects in grade 11. A TPM will not be available for grade 8 science until 2010.

*Required Improvement:* Required Improvement (RI) will continue to be a feature of the system in addition to the use of TPM. RI evaluates gain demonstrated by an entire campus or district for a given measure, rather than individual student growth. RI is calculated as the amount of gain in percent *Met Standard* required to reach the current year accountability standard in two years. RI for the TAKS indicator will continue to be defined as actual change in percent of students who scored high enough to meet the standard to pass the test. TPM will not be included in either the calculation to determine the Required Improvement standard or the calculation of actual change.

*Exceptions:* The Exceptions Provision will continue to be a feature of the system in addition to the use of TPM. Minimum performance floor requirements provide a safeguard to this provision. The evaluation of the floor values will continue to be based on the percent of students passing the test.

Performance on the TPM will not be included in the calculation to determine if the measure meets the performance floor.

*Rationale:* The inclusion of the new student projection measure in the state accountability ratings system will parallel the use of the projection measure in the federal accountability system. The TPM has been approved with conditions by the USDE for use in the 2009 AYP calculations and will be reported on each student's Confidential Student Report (CSR) in spring 2009.

Educators have anticipated the development of a measure that rewards the progress that a student demonstrates toward achieving grade-level proficiency. A Student Assessment Advisory Committee of educators who provided feedback to the TEA during development of the projection model supported use of the TPM in the state accountability system in 2009 without a reporting phase-in as long as the measure was applied in a way that could only help districts and campuses. Using it in a limited way that cannot have negative consequences in the accountability ratings is appropriate without a phase-in.

4. Exceptions Provision Minimum Performance Floor. The Exceptions Provision has been a feature of the accountability system since the 2004 ratings year. The rationale for the provision was to provide a mechanism for avoiding the *Academically Unacceptable* rating for new indicators or indicators that were being phased-in to the system. The mechanism was designed to provide greater relief for larger campuses and districts serving more diverse student populations who are evaluated on more measures. Since its implementation, very few campuses and districts have been limited by the safeguard that prevents the reuse of an exception for the same measure in consecutive years. For example, in 2008 only 11 campuses and one district could not use exceptions because the same measure was used in 2007. This indicates that campuses and districts are attending to the needs of the deficient student group(s) during the year of the exception. In short, data support that this provision is working as intended and that the safeguards appropriately prevent its abuse.

The Exceptions Provision was significantly modified in 2008. For the first time, districts and campuses could use the Exceptions Provision to achieve a *Recognized* or *Exemplary* rating. In addition, the number of exceptions allowed was increased from three to four in order to achieve the *Recognized* or *Academically Acceptable* ratings. (A maximum of one exception was permitted to achieve *Exemplary*.)

In 2008 the minimum performance floor for mathematics and science was relaxed to 10 points below the standard. Beginning in 2009, the minimum performance floor that must be met for an exception to be used will return to five points below the standard for all subjects.

*Rationale:* The use of the TPM in the 2009 ratings system supports the increased rigor of higher minimum floors in mathematics and science.

### **Completion Rate Indicator**

The completion rate indicator is calculated as the number of completers expressed as a percent of total students in the class [graduates, continuing students, General Educational Development (GED) recipients, and dropouts]. Beginning with the class of 2005 and the ratings issued in 2006, only graduates and continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year) count as high school completers for the completion rate evaluated under standard accountability procedures (Completion Rate I). Under alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures, alternative education campuses and charters are evaluated using Completion Rate II, which does include GED recipients as completers.

In 2008, the *Exemplary* standard was a Completion Rate I of 95.0% or more. The *Recognized* standard was a Completion Rate I of 85.0% or more, and the *Academically Acceptable* standard was a Completion Rate I of 75.0% or more. In 2008, the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* standard for Completion Rate II was 70.0% or more.

The 2007 accountability year (class of 2006) was the first year the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition was used. As shown in the table below, in the first year the new definition affected only one of four years in the cohort. For the class of 2007 two years of the cohort are affected, and so on, until the class of 2009 when the NCES dropout definition is used for all four years of the cohort.

### Completion Rate Transition

				Completion Rate Method	
Accountability Year	Class of	Cohort Years	Dropout Definition	Numerator (CR I)	Denominator (CR I and CR II)
2007	2006	2002-03 2003-04 2004-05 <b>2005-06</b>	TEA TEA TEA <b>NCES</b>	Graduates + Continuers	Graduates+ Continuers+ GED Recipients+ Dropouts
2008	2007	2003-04 2004-05 <b>2005-06</b> <b>2006-07</b>	TEA TEA <b>NCES</b> <b>NCES</b>	Graduates + Continuers	Graduates+ Continuers+ GED Recipients+ Dropouts
2009	2008	2004-05 <b>2005-06</b> <b>2006-07</b> <b>2007-08</b>	TEA <b>NCES</b> <b>NCES</b> <b>NCES</b>	Graduates + Continuers	Graduates+ Continuers+ GED Recipients+ Dropouts
2010	2009	<b>2005-06</b> <b>2006-07</b> <b>2007-08</b> <b>2008-09</b>	<b>NCES</b> <b>NCES</b> <b>NCES</b> <b>NCES</b>	Graduates + Continuers	Graduates+ Continuers+ GED Recipients+ Dropouts

*Text in **bold** indicates the years of the cohort that use the NCES definition of a dropout.*

Under the NCES dropout definition, there is an increase in the completion rate denominator and an increase in the number of dropouts. The longitudinal dropout rate more than doubled the first year of the phase-in of the NCES definition (class of 2006).

1. School Leaver Provision. During the public comment period following publication of the proposed Commissioner of Education rule adopting portions of the *2008 Accountability Manual*, the agency received numerous comments regarding use of the completion and dropout indicators in the 2008 accountability system. In response to these concerns, the School Leaver Provision (SLP) that was implemented in 2007 was extended to the 2008 ratings. Under the SLP the completion rate, annual dropout rate, and underreported students indicators could not be the sole cause for a lowered campus or district rating.

As a safeguard to the SLP, districts were subject to identification and intervention by Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) for dropout rates and leaver reporting. Additionally, campuses that avoided being rated *Academically Unacceptable* because of this provision are subject to technical assistance team (TAT) intervention requirements in the 2008-09 school year.

As detailed in the September 10, 2008, correspondence to district superintendents, the commissioner stated that the SLP will not continue beyond the 2008 accountability year. The letter encouraged districts to submit correct and complete leaver data and asked districts to continue to encourage students to return to school to complete coursework or exit-level testing requirements.

2. Standards. Standards for 2009 were published in the *2008 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule to provide districts and campuses with advance notice before the 2008-09 school year began. The 2009 standards are 75.0% for *Academically Acceptable*, 85.0% for *Recognized*, and 95.0% for *Exemplary*. The standards for 2010 will stay the same.

Completion Rate   Accountability Standards				
	Used	Adopted	Final Decision	Preview*
	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Academically Acceptable</b>	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%
<b>Recognized</b>	≥ 85.0%	≥ 85.0%	≥ 85.0%	≥ 85.0%
<b>Exemplary</b>	≥ 95.0%	≥ 95.0%	≥ 95.0%	≥ 95.0%
<b>Dropout Definition (by Cohort Years)</b>	2003-04 – TEA 2004-05 – TEA <b>2005-06 – NCES</b> <b>2006-07 – NCES</b>	2004-05 – TEA <b>2005-06 – NCES</b> <b>2006-07 – NCES</b> <b>2007-08 – NCES</b>	<b>2005-06 – NCES</b> <b>2006-07 – NCES</b> <b>2007-08 – NCES</b> <b>2008-09 – NCES</b>	NCES definition
	School Leaver Provision (SLP) Applied	No SLP	No SLP	

**Bold numbers and text indicate a change from the prior year.**

\* Standards for 2011 will be reviewed in 2010 and are subject to change.

*Rationale:* The class of 2008 was the second class to graduate under the panel recommended passing standard on the TAKS exit-level test. At least a portion of the decline in completion rates between the classes of 2006 and 2007 for many districts and campuses was attributable to the increase in the student passing standards on the exit-level tests that occurred between these two classes. With the second class at the stable standard, improved passing rates are expected. A corresponding positive effect on the Class of 2008 completion rates may occur for some campuses and districts, though the degree to which this will offset the continued phase-in of the NCES dropout definition is unknown. Though the SLP is no longer available and the RI feature may not prove to be a significant benefit in 2009, maintaining high expectations for completion rates is important to ensure all students are prepared for post-secondary success.

3. **Required Improvement.** Districts and campuses will be able to meet the completion rate criteria for achieving *Academically Acceptable* or *Recognized* by either meeting the absolute standard or demonstrating RI. Campuses and districts that demonstrate enough improvement in their rates to reach the *Academically Acceptable* or *Recognized* standard in two years will be considered to have met the completion rate criteria. A campus or district cannot be prevented from a rating of *Recognized* or *Academically Acceptable* if it has either met the absolute completion rate standard or demonstrated completion rate RI. No minimum floor is required to be able to use RI for the completion rate when moving to *Academically Acceptable*; however, a floor of 75.0% is required to use RI to move to *Recognized*.

### Grade 7-8 Annual Dropout Rate Indicator

For standard accountability purposes, the annual dropout rate has been used to evaluate campuses and districts with students in grades 7 and/or 8 since 2004. It is a one year measure, calculated by summing the number of dropouts across the two grades. Performance is evaluated for "All Students" and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged. The methodology for this rate is the number of grade 7-8 students designated as dropouts divided by the number of grade 7-8 students who were in attendance at any time during the school year. These results are evaluated at the "All Students" level if there are at least 10 students in grades 7-8 and there are at least 5 dropouts. The other student groups are evaluated if there are at least 5 dropouts within the student group and the student group is at least 30 students and comprises at least 10% of "All Students," or there are at least 50 students within the group.

1. **School Leaver Provision.** The 2007 accountability cycle (which evaluated 2005-06 dropouts) was the first year the NCES dropout definition was used. That year the SLP was added to the system. Under

the SLP the annual dropout rate, completion rate, or underreported students indicator could not be the sole cause for a lowered campus or district rating. As with the completion rate and the underreported indicator, the SLP was extended to the 2008 ratings year. However, the SLP is discontinued for this indicator beginning with the 2009 accountability ratings cycle.

2. **Standards.** In 2008 the grade 7-8 annual dropout rate standard was reset to 2.0% for all rating levels, with a multi-year phase-in process for ultimately achieving a rate of 1.0%. Doubling the standard from 1.0% to 2.0% made it comparable to the standard used to evaluate rates under the prior definition. The recommendation is to continue with the phase-in plan previously published. See the following table.

Grade 7-8 Annual Dropout Rate Accountability Standards				
	Used	Adopted	Final Decision	Preview*
	2008 Ratings	2009 Ratings	2010 Ratings	2011 Ratings
	2006-07 dropouts	2007-08 dropouts	2008-09 dropouts	2009-10 dropouts
<i>Exemplary, Recognized, Academically Acceptable</i>	2.0%	2.0%	1.8%	1.6%

\* Standards for 2011 will be reviewed in 2010 and are subject to change.

**Rationale:** A standard of 2.0% was set for both 2008 and 2009 to provide additional time for campuses and districts to adjust local programs to target categories of students not previously identified as dropouts and to adjust recovery activities to correlate with the school-start window. Also, beginning with dropouts from 2007-08, the grade 8 Student Success Initiative is implemented. The effect of that policy on the grade 8 dropout rate used for 2009 ratings is unknown. Beginning with the 2008-09 dropouts (2010 ratings) a gradual phase-in of more rigorous dropout rate standards is initiated with the ultimate goal of a 1.0% grade 7-8 annual dropout rate.

### Underreported Students Indicator

An underreported student is a student in grades 7-12 reported in enrollment or attendance in one school year that has not been accounted for through district records or TEA processing the next school year. Districts account for students by reporting that students re-enrolled in school or withdrew from school. TEA accounts for students by determining that students either moved from one district into another, received GED certificates, or graduated in a previous school year.

The underreported students' rate is calculated by dividing the number of underreported students by the total number of students served in the prior year. From 2005-06 to 2006-07, the number of underreported students at the state level declined by 2,571 to 13,316, and the underreported students' rate decreased by 0.1 percentage points to 0.7 percent.

### Underreported Students, 2005-06 and 2006-07

Accountability year	Underreported students data year	Underreported students		
		Numerator	Denominator	Rate (%)
2007	2005-06	15,887	2,018,935	0.8
2008	2006-07	13,316	2,025,937	0.7

The counts and rates of underreported students have been used as data quality measures in the accountability system since the 2000 accountability year. Performance is evaluated for "All Students." Districts cannot be rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized* if either the count or rate of underreported students exceeds the standards. Results are evaluated if there are at least 5 underreported students.

The underreported students indicator has also been used in the PBM Data Validation System since 2004. Districts that did not meet the underreported standards were subject to interventions. The interventions are graduated depending on district data results on each leaver data validation indicator, patterns across all leaver data validation indicators, and prior leaver data validation history. The standards proposed will be applied to the PBM Data Validation System for 2009 and beyond.

1. School Leaver Provision. The SLP is discontinued for this indicator beginning with the 2009 accountability ratings cycle.
2. Standards. In 2010, change the underreported students indicator by increasing the rigor of the rate to 4.0%, but maintain the count standard at 150. Continue to increase the rigor of the rate by decreasing one percentage point in 2011. See table below.

<b>Underreported Students Indicator Accountability Standards</b>			
<b>Counts / Rates</b>			
Used	Adopted	Final Decision	Preview*
2008 (2006-07 data)	2009 (2007-08 data)	2010 (2008-09 data)	2011 (2009-10 data)
200 / 5.0%	150 / 5.0%	150 / 4.0%	150 / 3.0%

\* Standards for 2011 will be reviewed in 2010 and are subject to change.

*Rationale:* These rates reflect the rates many districts are already achieving. Maintaining a count of 150 underreported students is a more reasonable standard for larger districts given that the count represents a very small percentage of their students. The increases in rates accelerate progress toward previous standards that were in place prior to processing changes associated with implementation of the NCES dropout definition.

The underreported measure provides important safeguards to the dropout rate and completion rate indicators, as students who might otherwise be dropouts or non-completers cannot go unreported. Also, the quality of any longitudinal data depends heavily on the accuracy of student tracking over time.

## **Hurricane Ike**

Hurricane Ike made landfall near Galveston on September 13, 2008. That same day FEMA declared 29 Texas counties and 14 Louisiana parishes as disaster areas that qualify for both individual and public assistance. The disaster areas include all counties in ESC regions 4 and 5, more than half the counties in ESC regions 6 and 7, and Matagorda County in region 3.

On September 25 the commissioner informed superintendents that TEA had declared Hurricane Ike a state education-related crisis, activating PEIMS Crisis Code reporting for students displaced by the hurricane for the 2008-09 data submissions. In this case, the PEIMS Crisis Code is used for students who were enrolled in one of the disaster counties or parishes before September 9, and were enrolled on the PEIMS snapshot date in another Texas public school district or in a different campus in the same district because of Hurricane Ike. See the table on the following page for a description of the two crisis codes.

1. Displaced Students. Performance results of all students displaced due to Hurricane Ike will be removed from assessment indicators before determining 2009 accountability ratings. The PEIMS Crisis Code from the student fall 2008 enrollment record will be used to identify displaced students. Use of the code will rely on matching student identifying information on the test answer document with the PEIMS record. Test answer documents for matched students with PEIMS Crisis Code values

of '01' or '02' will be excluded from the accountability results. It is estimated that about 7,500 students meet these criteria.

Code	Translation
01	Indicates that a student was enrolled in a Texas school before September 9, 2008, in a Texas county declared a disaster area because of Hurricane Ike, and the student enrolled in another Texas public school district, or moved from a Hurricane Ike impacted campus, to a non-impacted campus during the 2008-09 school year.
02	Indicates that a student came to Texas after September 9, 2008, from a Louisiana parish declared a disaster area because of Hurricane Ike and the student enrolled in a Texas public school district during the 2008-09 school year.

Guidelines will be developed for the evaluation of appeals related to the performance of displaced students.

2. Districts Directly Affected by Hurricane Ike. A Hurricane Ike Provision will be implemented that follows the example of the Hurricane Rita Provision used in 2006. Districts directly affected by Hurricane Ike will be eligible for special evaluation if (a) they are located in one of the 29 Texas counties designated by FEMA as a disaster area due to Hurricane Ike and (b) they were closed for ten or more instructional days between September 10, 2008, and late October 2008. However, unlike the Rita Provision, the application of this provision will be restricted to ratings governed by the TAKS indicator only. Ratings for 2009 determined by either the dropout or completion rates are not eligible for this provision.

Under the Hurricane Ike Provision, accountability ratings will be generated for eligible districts and campuses using available data. If the 2009 rating is either *Academically Unacceptable* or lower than the rating received in 2008 and is based on 2008-09 assessment results, TEA will issue a rating of *Not Rated: Other* on July 31. For these campuses and districts, a message will be included on the data table stating that the Hurricane Ike Provision was used. Districts may appeal to have the system-generated rating assigned. Any hurricane-affected district/campus not identified as eligible for this provision may appeal under the regular appeals process. For purposes of counting consecutive years of ratings, 2008 and 2010 will be considered consecutive for districts and campuses receiving a *Not Rated: Other* label in 2009 due to hurricane-related issues.

*Rationale:* These recommendations are similar to the decisions made in 2006 regarding Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. The recommendation to exclude the performance of displaced students recognizes that districts and campuses should not be penalized through the accountability system for serving students who have been through a traumatic event that puts them at an educational disadvantage. The recommendation to apply a special evaluation of the rating generated for districts closed for ten or more instructional days recognizes the extreme hardship caused by the hurricane in some communities. The restricted application of this provision to ratings governed by the TAKS indicator ensures that ratings governed by prior year dropout or completion rates are appropriately issued since those data were from the school year prior to the hurricane.

### Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA)

1. RHSP/DAP Indicator. For 2010 and 2011, the combined RHSP/DAP indicator will be maintained as previously defined and campuses and districts will be evaluated using the standards shown in the following table. Counts of DAP graduates may be reported separately from the RHSP graduates on the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS).
2. SAT/ACT Indicator. For 2010 and 2011 only the critical reading and mathematics components of the SAT will be used, as will be done in 2009. The standards used in 2008 will be continued. New

options for the SAT/ACT indicator will be discussed during the 2010 development cycle. Options will be explored for reporting SAT writing results on the 2009-10 AEIS.

3. Comparable Improvement Indicator. The Texas Growth Index (TGI) will continue to be used as the measure to establish Comparable Improvement (CI) for the 2009 ratings cycle. Beginning in 2010 CI must use a different measure of improvement. Research will be conducted and options will be presented to advisory groups in 2010 for implementation using a new measure beginning with the 2010 ratings cycle.
4. College-Ready Graduates. A new GPA indicator, the college-ready graduates indicator, will be added. This indicator has been reported in the AEIS reports since 2006-07. It will be evaluated for "Both Subjects" only at a standard of 35%. As with other GPA indicators, "All Students" results will always be evaluated, regardless of the number of students. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size. The 30/10%/50 rule will be applied to determine if student groups meet the minimum size criteria.

To be considered college-ready as defined by this indicator, a graduate must have met or exceeded the college-ready criteria on the TAKS exit-level test, or the SAT test, or the ACT test. The criterion for each is:

Subject	Exit-level TAKS		SAT		ACT
ELA	>= 2200 scale score on ELA test AND a "3" or higher on the essay	OR	>=500 on Critical Reading AND >=1070 Total*	OR	>= 19 on English AND >= 23 Composite
Math	>= 2200 scale score on mathematics test	OR	>=500 on Math AND >=1070 Total*	OR	>= 19 on Math AND >= 23 Composite

\* "Total" is the sum of Critical Reading and Mathematics. It does not include Writing.

College-ready in both subjects is the count of graduates who scored at or above the college-ready criteria on both the ELA and mathematics subjects divided by the number of graduates with results in both subjects to evaluate.

*Rationale:* Use of this indicator in 2009 follows the established "report, report, use" phase-in policy. This is the only indicator among the "college-readiness" indicators reported on the AEIS that is not a GPA indicator. Adding it gives it similar status. Evaluating the "Both Subjects" measure instead of the individual subjects distinguishes it from the TSI ELA and mathematics indicators.

5. Standards. GPA standards for 2009 were set in 2008 and are shown in the following table. In 2009, standards increase for nine of the 14 previous indicators. The new college-ready graduates indicator is implemented in 2009 with a standard of 35%.

The standards for the two TSI indicators will increase again in 2010. No increases for any of the 15 indicators are recommended for 2011.

The GPA indicators in the following table will continue to be evaluated for AEA campuses and charters as will the new college-ready graduates indicator. Under AEA GPA procedures, the same standards are applied as are used under standard accountability procedures, with the following exceptions:

- o The two CI indicators are not evaluated for AEA campuses.
- o An attendance rate standard of 95% is applied to all AEA campuses and charters.
- o Only the "All Students" group is evaluated for AEA GPA purposes.

	GPA Indicators	2009	2010	2011
		Final Decision	Final Decision	Preview*
1	Advanced Course / Dual Enrollment Completion	<b>&gt;= 30.0%</b>	>= 30.0%	>= 30.0%
2	Advanced Placement / International Baccalaureate Results	>=15.0% and >=50.0%	>=15.0% and >=50.0%	>=15.0% and >=50.0%
3	Attendance Rate	>=95.0% (HS & AEA)  >=96.0% (MS, K-12, & district)  >=97.0% (EL)	>=95.0% (HS & AEA)  >=96.0% (MS, K-12, & district)  >=97.0% (EL)	>=95.0% (HS & AEA)  >=96.0% (MS, K-12, & district)  >=97.0% (EL)
4 – 8	Commended Performance: Reading/English Language Arts Mathematics Writing Science Social Studies	<b>&gt;=30.0%</b>	>=30.0%	>=30.0%
9	Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program	<b>&gt;=85.0%</b>	>=85.0%	>=85.0%
10	SAT/ACT Results (College Admissions Tests) Reading and mathematics components of the new SAT only.	>=70.0% and >=40.0%	>=70.0% and >=40.0%	>=70.0% and >=40.0%
11	Texas Success Initiative: Higher Education Readiness Component—English Language Arts	<b>&gt;=60.0%</b>	<b>&gt;=65.0%</b>	>=65.0%
12	Texas Success Initiative: Higher Education Readiness Component—Mathematics	<b>&gt;=60.0%</b>	<b>&gt;=65.0%</b>	>=65.0%
13- 14	Comparable Improvement (campus-only, and not evaluated for AEA) Reading/ELA Mathematics	Top Quartile (top 25%)	Top Quartile (top 25%)	Top Quartile (top 25%)
15	College-Ready Graduates (New)	>=35.0%	>=35.0%	>=35.0%

Text in **bold** indicates a five percentage point increase from the prior year.

\* Standards for 2011 will be reviewed in 2010 and are subject to change.

### TAKS-Modified and TAKS-Alternate

TAKS-Modified (TAKS-M) is an alternate assessment based on modified academic achievement standards designed to meet the requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). TAKS-M is intended for a small number of students served by special education who meet participation criteria. TAKS-M is based on the grade-level Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) curriculum, but the assessment itself is modified. In the 2007-08 school year, TAKS-M was administered to students in grades and subjects required for federal accountability; beginning in 2008-09 the test will be administered in additional grades as shown in the

following table. To meet federal accountability requirements, the student passing standard was set in summer 2008 on the grades and subjects assessed statewide that year. In the summer of 2009, student passing standards will be set on the remaining grades and subjects.

Introduction of TAKS-M to Assessment Program		
	2007-08	2008-09
Reading/ELA (grades 3-8, & 10) Mathematics (grades 3-8, & 10) Science (grades 5, 8, & 10)	First statewide administration with results used to set student passing standard  Report only in AEIS (state-level only)	Second statewide administration  Report only in AEIS
Reading/ELA (grades 9 & 11) Writing (grades 4 & 7) Mathematics (grades 9 & 11) Science (grade 11) Social Studies (grades 8, 10, & 11)	Field test only	First statewide administration with results used to set student passing standard  Report only in AEIS

TAKS-Alternate (TAKS-Alt) is an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards and is designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities. TAKS-Alt is not a traditional paper or multiple-choice test. It is a teacher observation assessment that measures student progress on prerequisite skills that are linked to grade-level content standards. TAKS-Alt is administered in the same grades and subjects as the TAKS: reading at grades 3-9; ELA at grades 10 and 11; writing at grades 4 and 7; mathematics at grades 3-11; science at grades 5, 8, 10, and 11; and social studies at grades 8, 10, and 11.

On July 30, 2008, TEA signed a Memorandum of Agreement with USDE that outlined the criteria for adjustments needed to bring TAKS-Alt into compliance for use as an alternate assessment for students with disabilities. In order to meet the USDE requirements, and also to incorporate feedback from districts, a number of changes were implemented for the 2008-09 TAKS-Alt administration. Final approval of the TAKS-Alt assessment is anticipated in summer 2009.

1. Separate Indicators or Combined Results. The TAKS-Modified (TAKS-M) results will be added to the TAKS base indicator. The TAKS base indicator will combine results on TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), and TAKS-M. The TAKS-Alternate (TAKS-Alt) results will be evaluated as a separate base indicator with test scores summed across grades and subjects and evaluated at the "All Students" level only.
2. Growth for TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt. The TPM will be used as soon as it becomes available for each TAKS-M grade rather than waiting until the TPM is available for all TAKS-M grades. Growth for TAKS-Alt will be incorporated into the system once a growth model is developed and data can be analyzed.
3. Schedule for Use of TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt. Begin using TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt results for accountability ratings with the 2011 ratings. This schedule follows the established "report, report, use" phase-in policy recommended for integration of new assessment results into the accountability ratings. Preview indicators will be reported in the 2008-09 and 2009-10 AEIS reports. The 2010 educator focus group will evaluate options when impact models can be developed that incorporate TAKS-M results for all grades and TAKS-Alt results under the revised test. Decisions regarding

implementation, including decisions regarding accountability standards for 2011 and beyond for the TAKS base indicator and new TAKS-Alt indicator are yet to be determined.

*Rationale:* Both TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt are linked to the same grade-level curriculum standards as the TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated). The TAKS-M assessment covers the same grade-level content as TAKS, but TAKS-M tests have been changed in format (larger font, fewer items per page, etc.) and test design (fewer answer choices, simpler vocabulary and sentence structure, etc.). The inclusion of TAKS-M in the base indicator will significantly increase the number of special education students evaluated in the rating system. However, scoring of the TAKS-Alt is done by the teacher of record and combining TAKS-Alt results with the other TAKS results may have the unintended consequence of lowering expectations so that overall TAKS performance will rise. Using the TAKS-Alt assessment as a separate base indicator will parallel the use of the SDAA II in the state ratings system in 2005 – 2007.

### **English Language Learners Progress Measure**

1. Schedule for Use of ELL Progress Measure. The English Language Learners (ELL) progress measure will be incorporated into the rating system as a separate indicator that is evaluated at the “All Students” level only, beginning with the 2011 ratings. This schedule follows the established “report, report, use” phase-in policy recommended for integration of new assessment results into the accountability ratings. The ELL progress measure based on TELPAS reading will be reported in the 2008-09 and 2009-10 AEIS reports. The 2008-09 ELL progress measure is based on 2007-08 and 2008-09 TELPAS reading results and 2008-09 TAKS performance. Based on the 2008-09 ELL progress measure, the 2010 focus group will recommend accountability standards on this new indicator for 2011. Other issues such as eligibility for the Exceptions Provision, Required Improvement, and minimum size criteria will also be established during the 2010 development cycle.
2. Growth for ELL. A proposal for including the TPM in the ELL progress measure will be developed for focus group consideration during the 2010 development cycle.

*Rationale:* The performance of ELL students is not available for use in accountability before 2011 since two years of TELPAS reading results are needed to create one year of ELL progress. The 2008-09 ELL progress results will be used during the 2010 development cycle to set standards and determine other criteria.

When the ELL measure is integrated into the state accountability system, a number of students will be evaluated in the system that have formerly not been included due to exemptions from the TAKS assessments. For example, students who are served by district LEP programs and LEP-exempt from the TAKS test and assessed on TELPAS reading only will be included in the state accountability system for the first time. Until then, although ELL students are not evaluated on a separate indicator or as a separate student group, the overwhelming majority of ELL students will continue to be included in the state accountability system through the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) tests in English and Spanish in selected subjects and grades and in the completion and dropout rate indicators. In the federal accountability system, the ELL students have been evaluated as a separate student group for both performance and participation components of the reading/ELA and mathematics indicators as defined in AYP since 2003.