

**Accountability System for 2010 and 2011 – Standard Procedures  
Educator Focus Group Proposal**

**State Assessment Indicators**

1. TAKS (Accommodated). 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) form, however, includes format accommodations (larger font, fewer items per page, etc.) and contains no embedded field-test items, and the assessment allows certain accommodations to be made during the test administration. In 2010, the additional TAKS (Accommodated) results used as part of the TAKS base indicator will be reading, mathematics, and writing for grades 3-10 as shown in the second row of the following table. This will be the majority of the TAKS (Accommodated) testers. In 2009, the TAKS (Accommodated) results included in state accountability represented approximately 47,000 students. The number of TAKS (Accommodated) testers in reading, mathematics, and writing at grades 3-10 was approximately 83,000 in 2009.

<b>Use of TAKS (Accommodated) in Accountability Ratings</b>			
	2008	2009	2010
Science (grades 5, 8, 10 & 11) Science (grade 5 Spanish) Social Studies (grades 8, 10, & 11) English Language Arts (grade 11) Mathematics (grade 11)	Use in Accountability	Use	Use
Reading/ELA (grades 3 – 10) Reading (grades 3 – 6 Spanish) Mathematics (grades 3 – 10) Mathematics (grades 3 – 6 Spanish) Writing (grades 4 & 7) Writing (grade 4 Spanish)	Report Only in AEIS	Report Only in AEIS	Use in Accountability

2. TAKS-Modified. 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 in special education programs who meet participation criteria. TAKS-M is based on the grade-level Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) curriculum, but the assessment itself is simplified. 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 was also administered to students in the remaining grades and subjects. 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 were set on the remaining grades and subjects.

The TAKS-Modified (TAKS-M) results are planned to be part of the TAKS base indicator beginning in 2011. The TAKS-M results included in accountability will be for all tested grades and subjects, including the second administration of TAKS-M for grades 5 and 8.

Among the TAKS-M subjects assessed in both 2008-09 and 2009-10, the numbers of students tested increased noticeably. To address the concern that excessive numbers of students may be tested on TAKS-M in the future, an option of placing limits on the use of TAKS-M results for state accountability ratings was considered. Attachment A outlines the number and percent of students served in special education in grades 3-8 and 10 who participated in each of the state assessments in 2008 and 2009.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Incorporate the TAKS-M results into the TAKS base indicator beginning in 2011 as previously planned. Do not place limits on the use of TAKS-M results for state accountability ratings.

*Rationale:* Other systems provide safeguards to ensure that students are appropriately tested. Beginning in 2010, the Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS) will assign performance levels to districts that exceed PBMAS standards for the percent of special education students in grades 3-11 tested on TAKS-M in all subjects. Since 2008, the federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) system applies a 2% cap on the TAKS-M proficient results that can be used for AYP performance calculations.

3. TAKS-Alternate. 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.

The TAKS-Alt was field tested in the spring of 2007 and administered for the first time in the spring of 2008. However, the TAKS-Alt assessments given in spring 2008 were not fully compliant with United States Department of Education (USDE) requirements. 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 was received from the USDE in the summer of 2009.

The 2009 Focus Group recommended that the TAKS-Alt results be evaluated as a separate base indicator beginning with the 2011 ratings cycle. During the 2010 development cycle, it was planned that decisions regarding minimum size and the use of additional features (RI, growth, and the Exceptions Provision) would be decided.

As a result of agency research on the TAKS-Alt data available for the first time in the summer of 2009, the scarcity of TAKS-Alt results across the state became apparent. Due to the very small numbers of TAKS-Alt tests, the option of combining TAKS-Alt results with the TAKS base indicator was presented again in March 2010 for Focus Group consideration.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Beginning in 2011, combine TAKS-Alt results with the TAKS base indicator rather than evaluating these results as a separate indicator as was originally recommended.

*Rationale:* Few districts and campuses would be evaluated on a separate TAKS-Alt indicator and many of those that would be evaluated have relatively few students in this indicator. In addition to validity and reliability concerns, there is an issue of fairness because those that meet minimum size criteria for TAKS-Alt will be larger districts and campuses that are already evaluated on a greater number of measures. Also, evaluation as a separate indicator could unduly influence TAKS-Alt participation and the observation-based scoring by teachers to avoid negative accountability consequences. Since performance of most students served in special education will be in the TAKS base indicator with the TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), and in 2011, TAKS-M results, this combines the performance of all students served in special education in one measure. This approach is also more similar to the use of TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt results in AYP calculations, except that the proficient results of these alternate assessments are subject to the AYP federal caps. This use of TAKS-Alt performance does not add another hurdle but may result in evaluation of more student groups. This should provide adequate incentive to focus on the performance of this group of students receiving special education services.

4. Use of Texas Projection Measure and the Exceptions Provision. In 2009, little to no data analysis regarding the impact of the Texas Projection Measure (TPM) on state accountability ratings was possible prior to publication of final accountability decisions for 2009. Given the impact of TPM on the 2009 ratings, two options were considered that would restrict the use of additional features in the system beginning with the 2010 accountability cycle. One option maintained Required Improvement (RI), TPM, and Exceptions Provision as features, but added a minimum performance floor requirement for TPM. Specifically, minimum performance floors of 85% and 75% for *Exemplary* and *Recognized*, respectively, were considered.

Attachments B and C, Campuses/Districts Using Additional Features, show that of the campuses and districts using additional features 18% of campuses and 17% of districts used combinations of the features. The remainder needed only one of the three to successfully elevate a rating. TPM was used most. TPM, either alone or in combination, accounted for improvement in 2,561 campus ratings and 331 district ratings.

Among the campuses and districts using the TPM feature in 2009, the percentage of students passing the test is very high, relative to the rating level achieved. For example, the average percent of students passing the test among the 1,115 campuses using TPM to achieve *Exemplary* is at least 90% for all subjects. See the tables below.

2009 Average TAKS Passing Rates and Completion Rates for Campuses that used TPM to Achieve Next Higher Rating							
Campus Accountability Rating	Number of Campuses in Category	Reading	Mathematics	Writing	Social Studies	Science	Completion Rate
<i>Acad. Acceptable</i>	358	84%	66%	83%	89%	65%	88%
<i>Recognized</i>	1,088	91%	80%	90%	95%	80%	94%
<i>Exemplary</i>	1,115	95%	92%	94%	99%	92%	98%

2009 Average TAKS Passing Rates and Completion Rates for Districts that used TPM to Achieve Next Higher Rating							
District Accountability Rating	Number of Districts in Category	Reading	Mathematics	Writing	Social Studies	Science	Completion Rate
<i>Acad. Acceptable</i>	79	87%	72%	89%	87%	64%	91%
<i>Recognized</i>	179	93%	83%	94%	94%	80%	93%
<i>Exemplary</i>	73	97%	92%	97%	98%	91%	97%

**Focus Group Recommendation:** Do not restrict the use of the TPM feature or the Exceptions Provision features in 2010 or 2011.

**Rationale:** Use of the TPM aligns with the use of a growth measure which will be a required feature in the system under House Bill (HB) 3. Also, use of the TPM in state accountability aligns with the AYP system, which incorporates TPM and is sanctioned by the USDE. The rigor of the TAKS base indicator is increasing in 2010 due to the inclusion of all TAKS (Accommodated) results, use of new vertical scale standards, and the loss of the second administration of grade 3 reading. In addition, *Academically Acceptable* standards for two subjects are increasing and the *Recognized* standard is increasing to 80% for all five subjects. Therefore, the continued use of the TPM feature is recommended.

Use of Exceptions Provision aligns with a similar feature required in HB 3. The Exceptions Provision has worked as expected. Performance tends to improve in deficient area(s) and very few campuses or districts are prevented from reusing an exception in a subsequent year. In addition, the inclusion

of the TAKS (Accommodated) results for all grades and subjects will mean more student groups are evaluated and, therefore, there may be a greater need for the Exceptions Provision in 2010 compared to 2009. Since 2004, the majority of districts and campuses have used only one exception.

5. Growth for TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt. Previous recommendations called for the use of TPM as soon as it becomes available for each TAKS-M grade rather than waiting until the TAKS-M TPM is available for all grades. Similarly, the Focus Group recommends using growth for TAKS-Alt as soon as a growth model is developed. Options for the use of TPM projections for TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt growth in the 2011 ratings system will be explored during the 2011 development process.

First Year TAKS-M TPM Projections Available	Grades
2010	4, 7, 10
2011	3, 6, 9
2012	5, 8

6. Use of Commended Performance. HB 3 made significant changes to the accountability system by changing the focus from meeting proficiency standards on the state assessments to meeting both proficiency and college-ready standards on new assessments that are linked to postsecondary readiness.

The 2010 Focus Group considered options for additional requirements for the 2010 and 2011 ratings system that would serve to better prepare districts for the future HB 3 requirements. These options proposed that districts and campuses also meet a commended performance standard in order to achieve the *Recognized* or *Exemplary* rating. The additional hurdles would be based on the percent of students achieving the commended level or projected to meet the commended level at the next high stakes grade level based on the TPM. These additional hurdles would apply to the subject areas of reading/ELA and mathematics only.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* It is the Focus Group’s recommendation that these additional hurdles not be added to the current accountability system. Districts and campuses will already be significantly challenged to achieve the higher ratings in 2011 due to the increase in the TAKS standards for mathematics and science, the inclusion of all TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt results in the TAKS base indicator, and the addition of the ELL Progress Measure indicator (discussed later in this document). However, the Focus Group acknowledged that if commended performance was necessary to include in the current rating system, it should be added in 2011, not 2010, and should be applied to “All Students” only with standards of 15% and 25%, respectively, for *Recognized* and *Exemplary*. If used, the Focus Group recommended the Exception Provision be eligible to be applied to these new measures as well. Further, it is the Focus Group’s recommendation that Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) for the five commended performance indicators be continued at a standard of 30%.

*Rationale:* Adding two additional measures significantly changes the structure of the current system, which only has two years left. Maintaining the stability of the current system is more desirable than trying to anticipate the effect of new legislation prior to its implementation. No preview report or advance notice has been provided to Texas public schools to notify them that the ratings under the current system will be based on commended performance results.

If commended performance is used, application to the subjects of reading/ELA and mathematics only is appropriate. This would align with the HB 3 requirement that higher ratings can only be achieved by meeting a higher standard of performance on the college-ready indicators that will be set on the Algebra II and English III end-of-course tests. Delaying use of these new hurdles until 2011 provides some warning of the more rigorous requirements and informs district and campus expectations.

Because the commended performance and Percent Met indicators share the same denominators, applying these additional hurdles to “All Students” and each student group would double the number

of TAKS measures evaluated for each campus and district. Applying the requirements to “All Students” only would limit the number of additional hurdles to a maximum of two and allow this higher standard of performance to be “phased-in.”

7. English Language Learners Progress Indicator. The English Language Learners (ELL) Progress indicator combines results from the TAKS English reading/ELA tests and the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) reading tests.

The ELL Progress indicator was reported on the 2008-09 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) reports as a preview indicator for the 2011 accountability system. The ELL Progress indicator shows the percent of current and former (monitored) limited English proficient (LEP) students who:

- met the student passing standard on the TAKS English reading/ELA test, **or**
- met their proficiency level on TELPAS reading, **or**
- showed progress on TELPAS reading from the prior year.

Attachment D provides a detailed summary of the various components of the ELL progress measure.

Recommendations by previous focus groups and advisory committees stated that the ELL Progress indicator would be incorporated in the state ratings as a separate indicator and would be evaluated at the “All Students” level only. Other details discussed by the 2010 Focus Group included whether to set variable standards by rating category or apply a single standard as is done with the grade 7-8 Annual Dropout Rate indicator. Minimum size criteria were debated as were options for applying the indicator as a requirement at the district level only, and / or to certain rating categories only. Also, the application of additional features such as RI, TPM, and the Exceptions Provision were discussed.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Incorporate the ELL Progress indicator in the rating system as a separate indicator evaluated at the “All Students” level only, beginning with the 2011 ratings. Apply a single standard of 60% as an additional requirement for the *Recognized* and *Exemplary* ratings only. Districts that would otherwise be *Recognized* or *Exemplary*, but do not meet the ELL criteria would be limited to a rating of *Academically Acceptable*. This parallels how the Underreported Student indicator is used in the accountability system. However, apply this requirement to both campuses and districts, unlike the Underreported Student indicator which is a district level requirement only.

Use a minimum size of 30 students. In addition, use of RI with this indicator is recommended. The calculation would parallel that used with the TAKS base indicator. A district or campus could achieve a *Recognized* rating if improvement on this indicator was sufficient to meet the target in two years. Since only one year of data for the ELL Progress indicator is available at this time, model results with RI could not be provided, but RI could be implemented during 2011, the first year of use of this indicator.

Use of the TPM with this measure would add a student “progress” component to the TAKS reading/ELA results, similar to the TELPAS evaluation which includes credit for progress. Options for the inclusion of TPM in this measure will be explored for discussion during the 2011 development cycle. Note that the measure reported on the 2008-09 AEIS reports as the 2011 preview did not include TPM results.

Focus Group members also recommended that the Exceptions Provision be applied to this indicator. It is not the Focus Group’s intent to alter either the “look-up” table or the number of exceptions allowed. However, application of the Exceptions Provision to an indicator that only applies to the *Recognized* and *Exemplary* rating categories presents new challenges. Details for the appropriate determination of number of measures evaluated and the numbers of exceptions allowed have yet to be decided.

Assuming the ability to devise appropriate mechanisms for applying the Exceptions Provision to this indicator, the Focus Group recommended a performance floor of 55% (five points below the 60%

standard) and the safeguard that an exception for this indicator could not be repeated in a consecutive year.

*Rationale:* The use of this indicator in 2011 follows the established “report, report, use” phase-in policy recommended for integration of new assessment results into the accountability ratings.

Use of a single standard lessens the potential negative impact of a new indicator during its debut year, the last year of the current system. The new indicator is less punitive because it cannot lead to an *Academically Unacceptable* rating. Rather than focusing on a minimum standard, a standard is applicable only to campuses and districts that would otherwise be rated *Recognized* or *Exemplary*.

Evaluating both campuses and districts is important so that potentially poor secondary school performance is not masked by successful language education programs in elementary schools.

Use of the Exception Provision is appropriate because exceptions were intended to apply to new assessment measures, especially during their debut year. For example, the Exception Provision was applied to the SDAA II indicator during the time it was part of the accountability system.

8. TAKS Standards. In 2010, the TAKS base indicator differs from the 2009 indicator in these ways:

- Performance on all TAKS (Accommodated) tests will be evaluated, including the second administration of TAKS (Accommodated) reading and mathematics at grades 5 and 8;
- Performance for grade 3 reading will be based on a single administration;
- New vertical scale cut points for the student passing standards for selected grades and subjects in grades 3 – 8 reading and mathematics (English and Spanish) will be used;
- Grade 6 Spanish TAKS will no longer be administered; and,
- Results of students coded as refugees and/or asylees on the spring 2010 answer documents will be excluded.

Most of these changes will have the effect of depressing performance on this indicator. In spite of this, standards in 2010 will increase by five points for the mathematics and science *Academically Acceptable* standards (to 60% and 55%, respectively) and the *Recognized* standard will increase to 80% for all five subjects. These standards were published in the *2009 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule to provide districts and campuses with advance notice before the 2009-10 school year began. See Attachments E and F for a preview of the 2010 and 2011 TAKS base indicator based on 2009 assessment results.

In 2011, the TAKS base indicator will follow the methodology for 2010, except it will also include the following changes:

- Performance on all TAKS-M tests will be evaluated, including the second administration of TAKS-M reading and mathematics at grades 5 and 8;
- Performance on all TAKS-Alt tests will be evaluated;
- Performance on the ELL Progress indicator will be evaluated as a separate indicator at a 60% standard for *Recognized* and *Exemplary*;
- Additional commended performance measures may be evaluated at 15% and 25% for *Recognized* and *Exemplary*, respectively.

Standards for 2011 will be published in the *2010 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule before the 2010-11 school year begins.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* The 2011 *Academically Acceptable* standards are recommended to increase by five percentage points for both mathematics and science to 65% and 60%, respectively. The reading/English language arts (ELA), writing, and social studies standards for *Academically*

*Acceptable* are recommended to remain at 70% in 2011 and the *Recognized* standard is recommended to remain at 80%.

State Accountability Standards – Assessment Indicators					
	2009 Used	2010 Adopted	2011 Recommended	2011 Alternative	
TAKS Indicator				Met	Commended*
<i>Exemplary</i>	90%	90%	90%	90%	<b>25%</b>
<i>Recognized</i>	75%	<b>80%</b>	80%	80%	<b>15%</b>
<i>Acceptable</i>					
Reading/ELA	70%	70%	70%	70%	
Writing, Social Studies	<b>70%</b>	70%	70%	70%	
Mathematics	<b>55%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>65%</b>	
Science	<b>50%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>60%</b>	
Changes to TAKS Indicator	TPM	TAKS (Accommodated) –all grades/subjects; Vertical Scale Recalibration One administration of gr. 3 reading No grade 6 Spanish tests Refugee/Asylee results excluded	Include new assessments: TAKS-Alt and TAKS-M	Include new assessments: TAKS-Alt and TAKS-M	
ELL Progress Indicator					
<i>Exemplary</i>	n/a	n/a	<b>60%</b>	<b>60%</b>	
<i>Recognized</i>	n/a	n/a			

Numbers in bold indicate an increase from the prior year.

\* Evaluated for “All Students” only and evaluated for reading/ELA and mathematics only (two additional hurdles possible).

*Rationale:* Maintaining the *Recognized* standard at 80% and the reading/ELA, writing, and social studies *Academically Acceptable* standards at 70% aligns with the state goals of 70%, 80%, and 90% for *Academically Acceptable*, *Recognized*, and *Exemplary*, respectively. Steadily increasing mathematics and science by five points per year for both 2010 and 2011 keeps the focus on continued improvement for these two subjects which remain the reason for most *Academically Unacceptable* ratings.

### Completion Rate Indicator

Under standard accountability procedures, graduates and continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year) count as high school completers (Completion Rate I). Under alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures, alternative education campuses and charters are evaluated using Completion Rate II, which also includes General Educational Development (GED) recipients as completers.

Districts and campuses that have served grade 9 and grades 11 or 12 in the first and fifth years of the cohort are evaluated for Completion Rate I. High schools that did not meet this requirement were not evaluated on this indicator in 2009.

The 2007 accountability year (class of 2006) was the first year the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition was used for the dropout component of the completion rate indicator. The class of students that will be evaluated for the 2010 accountability cycle, the class of 2009, is the first class for which all years of the cohort use the NCES dropout definition.

A School Leaver Provision (SLP) was in place for both the 2007 and 2008 accountability years. 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.

1. Exclusions to Dropout and Completion Rates. HB 3 defined certain exclusions that the TEA must make when evaluating dropout and completion rates for state accreditation and performance ratings. The exclusions can be grouped into five categories:

- Previous dropouts;
- ADA ineligible students;
- Court-ordered GEDs, not earned;
- Incarcerated in facilities not served by Texas public schools; and,
- Refugees and asylees.

HB 3 explicitly requires use of the current NCES dropout definition until 2011-12. TEA is interpreting the 2011-12 effective date to mean the 2010-11 dropouts collected in the 2011-12 year. The 2008-09 dropouts collected in the 2009-10 year (2010 ratings) will be processed using current definitions with no new exclusions applied. The same definitions will also be used for the 2009-10 dropouts collected in the 2010-11 year (2011 ratings). The 2010-11 annual dropout rate and the class of 2011 longitudinal rates are the first rates affected by HB 3.

2. District Completion Rates Assigned to Campuses. A significant number of secondary campuses are not evaluated on completion rates. This is because either they don't meet the minimum size criteria, or because a completion rate is not calculated for their campus. Under current methodology, campuses must serve grade 9 and grades 11 or 12 in the first and fifth years of the cohort in order for a completion rate to be calculated for their school.

To address this issue, in the accountability system from 2004 through 2007, district completion rates were assigned to campuses that served students in any of the grades 9 through 12 but did not have their own completion data. The use of district assigned completion rates was suspended beginning with 2008 ratings until the phase-in of the NCES dropout definition was completed. The 2010 accountability cycle (class of 2009) is the first year this occurs; however, as stated in the *2009 Accountability Manual*, the use of the district rate for campuses without their own rate would not resume until 2011.

In addition to resuming the use of district completion rate values for campuses without their own rate, a proposal to expand the methodology for creating campus completion rates was shared with the Focus Group. Instead of the strict grade level requirements now used, campus completion rates can be calculated for all campuses serving grade 12. Using these different criteria for calculating campus rates would mean that primarily only 9<sup>th</sup> grade centers, grade 9-10 campuses, and grade 9-11 campuses would not have their own rates.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* In 2011 resume use of district substituted values for secondary campuses that do not have their own completion rates calculated. Expand the use of the methodology to create campus completion rates for any high schools that serve grade 12.

*Rationale:* Expanding the methodology for creating campus completion rates has the double benefits of fulfilling federal regulations for calculating a graduation rate for use in the AYP system and reducing the number of cases for which a district value would need to be substituted under the state system. Reinstating the use of district values for those remaining high school campuses ensures all high schools are accountable for student completion.

3. Ethnicity and Student Groups. TEA implemented collection of the new federal definition of ethnicity and race information beginning with Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data

collected in the 2009–10 school year. For this school year only, PEIMS also continued to collect race / ethnicity using the former definitions. Therefore, both former and new race / ethnicity data are available for all students for 2009-10. Beginning with the 2010-11 PEIMS data collection, race / ethnicity will be collected using the new definitions only.

Ethnicity designations for the classes of 2009 and 2010 (2010 and 2011 accountability) will use the old ethnic categories. New ethnic categories will be used beginning with the class of 2011. This means that inconsistent ethnic definitions will fall between the 2011 and 2012 accountability years for the completion rate indicator. No state ratings will be issued in 2012, so no improvement calculations are needed that year for accountability purposes.

4. Special Circumstance Appeals for Hurricanes. The class of 2009 completion rates may be negatively affected by students displaced by Hurricanes Katrina or Rita during 2005-06, or Hurricane Ike during 2008-09. Specific guidelines will be published in the *2010 Accountability Manual* for appealing the completion rate indicator when the campus or district rating is limited from the next higher rating due to displaced students with a non-completion status.

For these special circumstance appeals, the district will be required to supply appropriate documentation that the student was displaced due to a hurricane and for Ike-displaced students, district use of the PEIMS Crisis Code for appealed students will be researched. This will apply to both standard and AEA procedures. As with all granted appeals, no changes will be made to the data shown on the reports.

5. Standards. For 2010, the Completion Rate I standards are 75.0% / 85.0% / 95.0% for *Academically Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary*, respectively, as published in the *2009 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule.

New federal regulations allow states to propose use of a 5-year graduation rate for AYP. Texas has requested to use both the 4-year and 5-year graduation rates in the AYP system beginning with the release of the 2010 AYP statuses. In the request, districts and campuses could meet the graduation rate requirement by either meeting an annual target of 75.0% for the 4-year rate or an annual target of 80.0% for the 5-year rate.

The annual target of 75.0% for the 4-year rate represents an increase over the 2009 AYP system target of 70.0% for the graduation rate. With this increase, the impact of the graduation rate target in AYP is now more similar in rigor to the standard of 75.0% for Completion Rate I in the state accountability system. This is because the AYP standard is applied only at the All Students level while the state accountability standard is applied to all students and all student groups that meet minimum size criteria. Beginning in 2012, the AYP graduation targets are scheduled to extend to students groups and the state standards can be reevaluated as part of the development of the new accountability system that begins in 2013.

<b>Proposed Graduation Rate Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Targets</b>			
	<b>2009 Used</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>	<b>2011 Proposed</b>
	Class of 2008	Class of 2009	Class of 2010
<b>4-year Graduation Rate</b>	70.0%	<b>75.0%</b>	75.0%
<b>5-year Graduation Rate</b>	n/a	<b>80.0%</b>	80.0%

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Maintain the previously published standards for 2010 and 2011 of 75.0%, 85.0%, and 95.0% for this indicator.

Completion Rate   Accountability Standards			
	Used	Adopted	Recommended
Accountability Year	2009	2010	2011
Cohort Year	Class of 2008	Class of 2009	Class of 2010
<b>Academically Acceptable</b>	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%
<b>Recognized</b>	≥ 85.0%	≥ 85.0%	≥ 85.0%
<b>Exemplary</b>	≥ 95.0%	≥ 95.0%	≥ 95.0%
<b>Dropout Definition (by Cohort Years)</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

**Bold text indicates a change from the previous year.**

*Rationale:* Although standards have not changed since 2004, the definitional changes have significantly increased the rigor of the indicator. Also, the recommended standards maintain comparability to the rigor of the AYP graduation rate since the AYP system evaluates “All Students” only and the state system evaluates the individual student groups as well as “All Students.” Furthermore, the long term statewide goals are closely aligned – 90.0% for the AYP 4-year graduation rate and 95.0% (*Exemplary*) for the state accountability system completion rate.

Also, changes to graduation requirements to comply with attainment of the “4 x 4” curriculum that began with 2007-08 ninth graders will impact the class of 2011, the first class to graduate having completed four years of study in each of four core academic areas.

6. Required Improvement and the Exceptions Provision. Focus Group members discussed the lack of additional features available with the Completion Rate indicator compared with the TAKS indicator. Only RI is available as an alternative means of gating up to either *Academically Acceptable* or *Recognized*. RI has been used much less frequently with the Completion Rate indicator than with the TAKS indicator, especially in recent years as the change in the definition of a dropout has been phased-in. Focus Group members expressed interest in applying a change to the RI calculation for this indicator such that a 0.1 improvement in the rate would be sufficient for achieving RI. A floor of 80.0% would still apply for the use of RI to move to *Recognized*. Another option discussed was changing the denominator for the RI calculation from two years to four years to match the number of years in the cohort. Alternatively, members expressed interest in opening the Exceptions Provision to be applicable to the Completion Rate indicator. Focus group members requested these options be discussed with the CAAC members at the March 29 CAAC meeting.

*Rationale:* Under HB 3, a provision that is similar to the Exceptions Provision is required. This provision also applies to the completion rate indicator; therefore, use of exceptions for completion rates aligns with HB 3. Variations on the RI calculations have been presented to previous focus groups, but not pursued as model results did not indicate significant differences in rating results. Given the NCES dropout definition is now fully phased-in, rewarding districts and campuses for any improvement in rates would prove motivating. Because the completion rate is a longitudinal calculation and the statuses of students from several years in the past cannot be altered, a “point in time” look at a completion rate value should be mitigated by rewarding any incremental gain.

### 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 identified 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 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. 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% that year made it comparable to the standard used to evaluate rates under the prior definition.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* The recommendation is to continue with the phase-in plan previously published. See table below.

<b>Grade 7-8 Annual Dropout Rate Accountability Standards</b>			
	<b>Used</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Recommended</b>
Accountability Year	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
Data Year	2007-08 dropouts	2008-09 dropouts	2009-10 dropouts
<i>Exemplary, Recognized, Academically Acceptable</i>	2.0%	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>1.6%</b>

**Bold text indicates a change from the previous year.**

*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 (SSI) was implemented. In 2010 and 2011, the standard will become more rigorous by decreasing 0.2 points each year, ending at a standard of 1.6% the last year of the current accountability system.

### **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 General Educational Development (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 grade 7-12 students served in the prior year.

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—individual student groups are not evaluated. 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 five underreported students. This indicator does not apply to campuses.

The 2007 accountability cycle, which evaluated 2005-06 underreported students, was the first year the NCES dropout definition was used. A school leaver provision (SLP) was added to the system for the 2007 and 2008 ratings. Under the SLP, the annual dropout rate, completion rate, and underreported students indicators could not be the sole cause for a lowered campus or district rating. Use of the SLP was discontinued with the 2009 accountability cycle.

The underreported indicator has also been used in the Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) Data Validation System since 2004. Districts that do not meet the underreported standards are 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 recommended state accountability standards for this indicator will be applied to the PBM Data Validation System for 2010 and beyond.

1. **Standards.** Standards for 2010 were published in the *2009 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule to provide districts with advance notice before the 2009-10 school year began. The 2010 standards as adopted hold the count standard steady at 150 but decrease the rate from 5.0 percent to 4.0 percent. The recommendation for 2011 is to continue with a count standard of 150, but further increase the rigor of this indicator by decreasing the rate from 4.0 percent to 3.0 percent.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* The 2010 Focus Group recommends the 2011 standards as previously planned in order to continue to drive improvements in leaver data quality.

<b>Underreported Students Indicator Accountability Standards</b>		
<b>Counts / Rates</b>		
2009 Used (2007-08 data)	2010 Adopted (2008-09 data)	2011 Recommended (2009-10 data)
<b>150 / 5.0%</b>	<b>150 / 4.0%</b>	<b>150 / 3.0%</b>

*Bold text indicates a change from the previous year.*

2. **Minimum Rate Criterion.** There is strong inverse relationship between district size and underreported rates. The largest districts in the state are among those exceeding the count standard (150), but they tend to have rates well below the rate requirement (5.0% in 2009). There is a minimum size criterion on the count component—districts with fewer than five underreported students are not evaluated on this indicator. However, there is not a similar minimum imposed on the rate component of this indicator.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Beginning with the 2010 accountability cycle, add a minimum criterion of 1.0% to the rate component of the indicator. Districts with fewer than five underreported students **or** a rate that is less than 1.0% would not be evaluated on this indicator.

*Rationale:* For districts serving over 50,000 students in grades 7-12, achieving an underreported count that is less than 150 students represents a 0.3% “error” rate. The consequence of preventing a *Recognized* or *Exemplary* rating with this degree of error is too rigorous. Minimum size requirements are available for very small districts; similar safeguards should be available for districts at the other extreme end of the scale.

### **Gold Performance Acknowledgments**

1. **TAKS Changes and GPA Indicators.** Eight GPA indicators use TAKS performance: the five TAKS Commended indicators, the two Texas Success Initiative (TSI) indicators, and the College-Ready Graduates indicator. Beginning in 2010, the TAKS indicator used in the base rating system will include all TAKS (Accommodated) results. The TAKS-based indicators in the GPA system will be treated similarly. The additional TAKS (Accommodated) grades and subjects are reading and mathematics for grades 3-10 and writing (grades 4 and 7). These grades and subjects represent many more testers than were added in 2008 and will likely have a greater impact on the performance results.

In addition in 2010, the TAKS-based indicators will be affected by the recalibration to the new vertical scale. The recalibration affects the student performance needed to achieve the commended level in reading grades 6 and 8 (English), mathematics grades 5, 6, and 8 (English), and in mathematics grade 4 (Spanish).

2. Commended Performance. As described in the TAKS base indicator discussion, one option considered by the Focus Group is the use of commended performance as additional hurdles for the achievement of the *Recognized* or *Exemplary* ratings. The GPA standard for each of the five commended indicators (reading/ELA, mathematics, science, social studies, and writing) is 30% for both 2010 and 2011. If commended performance becomes a factor that determines ratings in 2011, the continued use of commended performance for acknowledgments was discussed.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Maintain all five subject area TAKS Commended GPAs, regardless of their use in determining base ratings.

*Rationale:* Because the GPA standard of 30% is higher than either the *Recognized* (15%) or *Exemplary* (25%) standards that might be used for reading/ELA and mathematics in the base ratings, the GPA system will continue to provide a gold standard for campuses and districts to strive to achieve beyond a *Recognized* or *Exemplary* rating. Improvement on measures of college-readiness is a goal of the state, so acknowledging campuses and districts with the highest percentages of students at the commended level is more important than ever before. Also, the possible use of commended performance in the base ratings evaluates "All Students" only, whereas the GPA commended indicators evaluate "All Students" and each student group. This places a focus on closing achievement gaps among the student groups, another goal of the rating system under HB 3.

3. SAT/ACT Indicator. The results of students taking either the SAT or the ACT are combined into a single GPA indicator. Districts and campuses have to meet both a participation and a performance standard to be acknowledged for this indicator.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* For 2010 and 2011 continue to use only the critical reading and mathematics components of the SAT, maintaining the 2009 standards for this indicator in 2010 and 2011; namely, 70.0% for participation and 40.0% for performance. Pursue options for reporting SAT writing results on the 2009-10 AEIS.

*Rationale:* Including writing requires a new criterion to be established. At the present time many institutions of higher learning have not established admissions standards on a score that includes the writing component. Also, as a result of state legislation, some funding is available for the administration of college admissions tests to high school students. In addition, some districts pay for students to take college admissions tests without the assistance of resources from the state. The trend toward making college admissions tests available to more students may be growing. To the extent that participation in college admission testing is affected by more instances of test administration during school hours and at less expense to students, the standards for both participation and performance on this GPA indicator will need to be reevaluated.

4. College-Ready Graduates. 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. College-Ready Graduates was added as a GPA indicator beginning with the 2009 accountability cycle.

To earn an acknowledgment on this indicator, at least 35% of the graduates must have scored at or above the criteria on both the ELA and mathematics tests. To be included in this calculation, students must have results in both subjects.

There is a strong correlation between campuses and districts that earn one or both of the TSI acknowledgments and those that earn the College-Ready Graduates acknowledgment. Standards are increasing for the two TSI acknowledgments in 2010, but were planned to remain unchanged for the College-Ready Graduates indicator. Currently, the number of campuses and districts earning these acknowledgments is similar indicating the rigor of their standards is similar. The Focus Group considered an option to raise the College-Ready Graduates standard from 35% to 40% in 2011.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Increase the College-Ready Graduates standard from 35% to 40% in 2011.

*Rationale:* Because college-readiness is of critical importance under HB 3, continued increases in rigor for this indicator for acknowledgment are appropriate. It is also appropriate to maintain comparable levels of rigor among the related college-ready indicators.

5. Standards for 2010 and 2011. In 2010 standards will increase for the two TSI indicators by five points, from 60% to 65% for each. In 2011 standards remain stable for all other GPA indicators with the exception of the College-Ready Graduates indicator, which is recommended to increase by five points from 35% to 40%.
6. Comparable Improvement Indicator. Comparable Improvement (CI) evaluates how much a school's students have improved in reading and mathematics by comparing current year performance to prior year performance for groups of similar campuses. The CI indicators are campus-level indicators only. Campuses can be acknowledged separately for reading/ELA and mathematics CI performance in the GPA system.

The CI methodology begins with placing each campus in the state into a unique group of 40 schools selected to be similar to the target school. For each subject, performance within the group is then rank ordered and campuses that sort to the top 25 percent of their group earn an acknowledgment. Since 2005, the rank order has been based on the average Texas Growth Index (TGI) value. The 2009 year was the last year TGI was available for grades 3 - 8.

The vertical scale scores will replace the current scale scores for students taking English TAKS reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 and Spanish TAKS reading and mathematics in grades 3-5. Since the vertical scale allows comparisons of a student's scale score in one grade to that student's scale score in another grade, the vertical scale score has a distinct advantage over the TGI. It measures the actual progress the student has made from the prior year, while the TGI provided an estimate of student growth on the TAKS scale score over two consecutive years in comparison to scale score changes between spring 2003 and spring 2004.

Since 2009 was the last year that the TGI values could be generated on the previous TAKS scale score for grades 3 - 8, the Focus Group considered the option of basing the 2010 and 2011 CI measures on the vertical scale score results. This would mean the CI methodology could only be applied to campuses that serve grades 4 – 8.

However, campus groups could continue to be created for all schools and aggregate group performance could still be reported on the AEIS and School Report Card products. Campus group membership lists could still be published for all schools.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Base the 2010 and 2011 CI measures on the vertical scale score results. Apply the CI methodology to campuses that serve grades 4 – 8 only. Continue to create campus groups for all schools and continue to report aggregate group performance on the AEIS and School Report Card products. Continue to publish campus group membership lists for all schools.

*Rationale:* Use of the vertical scale evaluates CI on the basis of actual progress achieved by the student; therefore, it provides a more valid measure of progress across the campus comparison groups. This methodology uses the vertical scale scores that will be reported on the 2010 Confidential Student Reports (CSRs). Even though high schools will no longer be able to compete for these two acknowledgments, six of the remaining 13 possible campus-level GPAs are applicable to high schools only. High schools have many more options in terms of earning GPAs.

## Race / Ethnicity

In October 2007, the USDE issued their final guidance to educational institutions on the adoption of new federal standards for collecting and reporting ethnicity and race data for students and staff. TEA implemented the new federal standard for the collection of ethnicity and race information beginning with PEIMS data collected for the 2009–10 school year.

For the 2009–10 school year only, PEIMS collected race and ethnicity information using both the old definitions and the new federal definitions. Beginning with the 2010-11 data collection, race / ethnicity data will be collected using the new definitions only.

The test answer document is the primary source for race / ethnicity information for assessment participation and performance data. The 2009-10 answer documents will collect both the old definitions and the new definitions. Both will be pre-coded from PEIMS. As with all demographic information that is pre-coded on the answer documents, changes can be made at the time of testing.

Under the old race / ethnicity categories, five reporting categories were available. Under the new race / ethnicity categories, seven reporting categories are available; one ethnic category (Hispanic), five individual race categories, and one multiple-race category, as shown in the following table.

### Race / Ethnicity Categories Under Old and New Definitions

Old Reporting Categories	New Reporting Categories
Native American <sup>a</sup>	American Indian or Alaska Native
Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
Black or African American <sup>b</sup>	Black or African American
Hispanic	Hispanic / Latino
White <sup>c</sup>	White
(not available)	Two or more races

<sup>a</sup> PEIMS category is "American Indian or Alaskan Native."

<sup>b</sup> PEIMS category is "Black, not of Hispanic origin."

<sup>c</sup> PEIMS category is "White, not of Hispanic origin."

Under the new reporting categories, respondents who select "Hispanic" for ethnicity will be counted in this category for aggregate reporting, regardless of the responses provided to the question on race. Respondents who select "Not Hispanic" for ethnicity, and select only one category for race, will be counted in the single racial category. Respondents who select "Not Hispanic" for ethnicity, and select more than one category for race, will be counted in the category "Two or More Races."

The table below provides a comparison of the two definitions that were collected in 2009-10. As a percent of all students, the American Indian or Alaska Native and Hispanic student groups increased slightly, while the Asian, African American, and White student groups declined as a percent of the total.

### Comparison of Old and New Race / Ethnicity Definitions for 2009-10 Student Counts

Old Definitions (2009-10)			New Definitions (2009-10)		
		Pct of Total			Pct of Total
Native American	18,984	0.4%	American Indian or Alaska Native	26,502	0.6%
Asian or Pacific Islander	180,008	3.7%	Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific	6,199	0.1%
			Asian	162,031	3.3%
African American	679,351	14.0%	Black or African American	632,402	13.1%
Hispanic	2,354,042	49.0%	Hispanic/Latino	2,398,598	49.5%
White	1,615,459	33.3%	White	1,547,746	31.9%
			Two or More Races	74,366	1.5%
Totals	4,847,844	100.0%	Totals	4,847,844	100.0%

The next table provides a detailed breakdown of the 1.5% reported to be two or more races. Most of these students (80.5%) were identified as either African American or White under the old definition.

**Counts of Students Classified as Two or More Races  
Compared to Race / Ethnicity Using Old Definitions  
2009-10**

	Old Definition (as reported in 2009-10)	Two or More Races* (as reported in 2009-10)	Pct of Total
1	Native American	2,497	3.4%
2	Asian or Pacific Islander	10,175	13.7%
3	African American	27,960	37.6%
4	Hispanic	1,806	2.4%
5	White	31,928	42.9%
	Total	74,366	100.0%

\* To be categorized as two or more races, students must be reported as Not Hispanic/Latino and be reported with at least two of the following races: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, and White.

State accountability, federal accountability, and the AEIS and its related reports (such as the School Report Card and Snapshot) will use the old race / ethnicity definitions for the 2009-10 reporting cycle and for 2010 accountability. The spring 2010 summary reports that will be provided to districts by the test contractor will also use the old race / ethnicity definitions.

As stated above, in 2010-11, PEIMS will collect race / ethnicity information using the new definitions only. The assessment answer documents will collect race / ethnicity information using the new definitions only (pre-coded from PEIMS). Therefore, state accountability, federal accountability, and AEIS and related reports will use the new definitions for all the current year (2010-11) indicators for the 2011 cycle.

Many performance indicators are based on data from the prior year. This is true for the annual dropout rate and the completion rate, as well as several GPA indicators. The transition of the prior year indicators to the new race / ethnicity definitions follows a different schedule than that planned for current year data such as the assessment results.

The three base indicators (TAKS, dropout, and completion) will use the old definitions for the 2010 accountability cycle. In 2011, the new definitions will be used for TAKS and the annual dropout rate; however, the old definitions will still be used for the completion rate. A sufficient number of cohort years collected with the new definitions will not be available for the completion rate until the class of 2011. By that year, three of the five cohort years will have been collected with the new race / ethnicity definitions and the switch to the new definition for the completion rate can take place (2012 report year).

1. 2011 State Accountability. Final recommendations for the selection of the race / ethnicity student groups to be evaluated for state accountability ratings for 2011 must be made by the 2011 Educator Focus Group. However, two options were discussed by the 2010 Focus Group. One option is to use the three most populous race / ethnicity categories that exist at the state level under the new definitions. Based on 2009-10 data, these are: Black / African American, Hispanic / Latino, and White. These correlate with the three major ethnic student groups used in previous years: African American, Hispanic, and White. This option has the advantage of being the simplest strategy to use in terms of implementation and explanation. Although students who are categorized as "Two or More Races" under the new definition will not be part of any student group, their performance will be evaluated as part of the "All Students" results. A distinct disadvantage is that coding students as two or more races at the time of testing would exclude those results from evaluation as part of a particular student group.

A second option is to use the three most populous race / ethnicity categories that exist at the state level under the new definitions as described above, but attempt to distribute the students categorized

as "Two or More Races" into either the African American or White groups based on 2009-10 reporting of these same students under the old definitions. This approach would circumvent any incentive to recode students at the time of testing into the two or more races category in order to exclude them from student group evaluation. This approach would more closely approximate the pool of student results currently evaluated by the accountability student groups. Federal guidance addresses "bridging" the "two or more races" categories back to a single-race category in order to make longitudinal comparisons. The disadvantages of this approach include that race / ethnicity under the old definition could only be used for students who can be matched in the prior year. No prior year information will be available for certain students, and the lack of prior year data may depend on district and campus characteristics. Also, the information under the former definitions is out-of-date, as race / ethnicity from 2009-10 would be used to assign student group membership in 2010-11. Finally, districts would not be able to easily replicate the assignment of students into student groups which makes the system less transparent to those affected.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Continue with plans for the 2011 Educator Focus Group to make recommendations for the selection of the race / ethnicity student groups to be evaluated for state accountability ratings for 2011.

*Rationale:* Student race / ethnicity should be reported in both PEIMS and on the answer documents at the time of testing based on the 2011 PEIMS Data Standards and the spring 2011 test administration instructions. During the 2011 development cycle, advisory groups will have more detailed analyses of the race / ethnicity results than those currently available. How the performance of students categorized as "two or more races" will be used in the accountability student groups (if at all) can be communicated in April 2011 with the release of the commissioner's final decisions that year. If the option to distribute these students into their former African American or White student groups is selected, the agency can make the details at the individual student level known to districts as soon as possible after test results are known.

**Two-Year Trend in Participation Status of  
All Students Enrolled on the Date of Testing for  
Grades 3-8 and 10 by Subject  
2007-08 and 2008-09**

School Year	Reading/ELA			
	2007-2008		2008-2009	
	Number of Students	Percent of Students	Number of Students	Percent of Students
<b>All Students</b>				
TAKS	2,159,516	90.4%	2,212,713	90.5%
TAKS (Accommodated)	92,873	3.9%	77,709	3.2%
TAKS-M	82,408	3.5%	97,046	4.0%
TAKS-Alt	16,679	0.7%	19,335	0.8%
<b>Special Education Students</b>				
TAKS	72,027	27.0%	57,772	22.7%
TAKS (Accommodated)	92,873	34.8%	77,709	30.6%
TAKS-M	82,408	30.9%	97,046	38.2%
TAKS-Alt	16,679	6.3%	19,335	7.6%

School Year	Mathematics			
	2007-2008		2008-2009	
	Number of Students	Percent of Students	Number of Students	Percent of Students
<b>All Students</b>				
TAKS	2,150,190	90.4%	2,203,038	90.5%
TAKS (Accommodated)	95,064	4.0%	77,954	3.2%
TAKS-M	82,664	3.5%	100,728	4.1%
TAKS-Alt	16,695	0.7%	19,336	0.8%
<b>Special Education Students</b>				
TAKS	68,436	25.8%	52,852	20.9%
TAKS (Accommodated)	95,064	35.9%	77,954	30.8%
TAKS-M	82,664	31.2%	100,728	39.9%
TAKS-Alt	16,695	6.3%	19,336	7.7%

**Campuses Using Additional Features  
Standard Procedures  
November 2009**

Provision Used	Academically Unacceptable to Academically Acceptable	Academically Acceptable to Recognized	Recognized to Exemplary	Total
Required Improvement Only	83	273	0	356
Texas Projection Measure Only	295	741	1,002	2,038
Exceptions Only	49	56	38	143
Required Improvement and Texas Projection Measure	52	320	0	372
Required Improvement and Exceptions	12	13	0	25
Texas Projection Measure and Exceptions	9	26	113	148
Required Improvement and Texas Projection Measure and Exceptions	2	1	0	3
<b>Total</b>	502	1,430	1,153	3,085

**Texas Education Agency  
Department of Assessment, Accountability, and Data Quality  
Division of Performance Reporting  
Table C.12**

**Districts Using Additional Features  
Standard Procedures  
November 2009**

Provision Used	Academically Unacceptable to Academically Acceptable	Academically Acceptable to Recognized	Recognized to Exemplary	Total
Required Improvement Only	8	74	0	82
Texas Projection Measure Only	70	123	66	259
Exceptions Only	0	6	1	7
Required Improvement and Texas Projection Measure	8	54	0	62
Texas Projection Measure and Exceptions	1	2	7	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>420</b>

**Texas Education Agency  
Department of Assessment, Accountability, and Data Quality  
Division of Performance Reporting  
Table D.11**

**Detailed Summary of English Language Learners Progress Measure  
(Preview of 2011)**

<b>Indicator Components</b>	<b>Details</b>	
<b>Assessments</b>	TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, TELPAS	
<b>Subjects, Grades, Test Language</b>	Reading/ELA in grades 3-11 in English ( <i>TAKS/TAKS (Accommodated)/TAKS-M</i> ) Reading component in grades 3-11 ( <i>TELPAS</i> )	
<b>Students</b>	Current and monitored LEP students enrolled in at least their second year in U.S. schools and tested in at least one of the specified assessments. For the assessments and LEP students specified, the performance of students served in special education is included.	
<b>Student Success Initiative TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), and TAKS-M</b>	Grades 5 and 8 – first and second administration results.	
<b>Student Passing Standards</b>	TAKS-M passing standards to be applied in 2010-11 TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) passing standards applied in 2010-11, including a vertical scale adjustment for grades 6 and 8 reading tests.	
<b>Accountability Subset</b>	The district indicator includes test results for students who were enrolled in the district in the fall and tested in the same district in the spring. The campus indicator includes students who were enrolled on the campus in the fall and tested in the same campus in the spring. TELPAS subsets and TAKS subsets are determined independently.	
<b>Texas Projection Measure (TPM)</b>	Use of TPM will be explored in 2011 development cycle.	
<b>Progress Criteria</b>	1) <i>Met Standard</i> on the TAKS/TAKS(Accommodated)/TAKS-M test, <b>or</b> 2) Met TELPAS criteria (TELPAS criteria vary depending on years in U.S. schools and whether first time or previous TELPAS tester. See TELPAS Criteria, below.)	
<b>TELPAS Criteria</b>	<b><i>1st time tester</i></b>	<b><i>Previous tester</i></b>
<b>1st Year in U.S. Schools</b>	Not Evaluated	Not Evaluated
<b>2nd Year in U.S. Schools</b>	<i>Intermediate</i> or higher	At least one level higher than the previous year or <i>Advanced</i> or higher
<b>3rd Year in U.S. Schools</b>	<i>Advanced</i> or higher	<i>Advanced</i> or higher
<b>4th or more years in U.S. Schools</b>	<i>Advanced High</i>	<i>Advanced High</i>
<b>Monitored LEP students first or second year after exit from LEP status</b>	N/A (Only TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), or TAKS-M evaluated.)	N/A (Only TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), or TAKS-M evaluated.)

**Preview of 2010 Indicator—2009 TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), and TPM Performance Results**

Subject and Student Group	2009 Accountability [TAKS and partial TAKS (Acc)]	2009 TAKS (Acc) Remaining Grades & Subjects Only	2009 TAKS and All TAKS (Acc) (3)	2009 Met TPM but Did Not Meet Std	2009 Met Std OR Met TPM (5)
	(1)	(2)	(1) + (2) + Vertical Scale*	(4)	(3) + (4)
<b>Reading/ELA</b>			[2010 Preview Indicator]		
All Students	2,438,016 / 2,672,965 = 91%	31,720 / 90,379 = 35%	2,416,763 / 2,763,344 = 87%	210,443 / 2,763,344 = 8%	2,627,206 / 2,763,344 = 95%
African American	314,325 / 358,202 = 88%	5,227 / 17,209 = 30%	310,358 / 375,411 = 83%	36,602 / 375,411 = 10%	346,960 / 375,411 = 92%
Hispanic	1,082,174 / 1,234,766 = 88%	9,475 / 41,088 = 23%	1,059,377 / 1,275,854 = 83%	131,481 / 1,275,854 = 10%	1,190,858 / 1,275,854 = 93%
White	934,999 / 969,550 = 96%	16,527 / 30,840 = 54%	941,008 / 1,000,390 = 94%	38,430 / 1,000,390 = 4%	979,438 / 1,000,390 = 98%
Economically Disadvantaged	1,209,035 / 1,393,829 = 87%	15,979 / 59,962 = 27%	1,185,715 / 1,453,791 = 82%	159,152 / 1,453,791 = 11%	1,344,867 / 1,453,791 = 93%
<b>Mathematics</b>					
All Students	2,182,097 / 2,656,338 = 82%	29,798 / 87,610 = 34%	2,207,322 / 2,743,948 = 80%	194,707 / 2,743,948 = 7%	2,402,029 / 2,743,948 = 88%
African American	253,189 / 354,585 = 71%	3,790 / 15,938 = 24%	256,973 / 370,523 = 69%	39,603 / 370,523 = 11%	296,576 / 370,523 = 80%
Hispanic	955,470 / 1,227,816 = 78%	12,482 / 40,190 = 31%	963,389 / 1,268,006 = 76%	102,438 / 1,268,006 = 8%	1,065,827 / 1,268,006 = 84%
White	869,040 / 963,384 = 90%	12,934 / 30,237 = 43%	881,971 / 993,621 = 89%	49,824 / 993,621 = 5%	931,795 / 993,621 = 94%
Economically Disadvantaged	1,052,467 / 1,384,783 = 76%	17,383 / 57,419 = 30%	1,065,501 / 1,442,202 = 74%	126,109 / 1,442,202 = 9%	1,191,610 / 1,442,202 = 83%
<b>Science</b>					
All Students	890,438 / 1,146,049 = 78%		890,438 / 1,146,049 = 78%	59,749 / 1,146,049 = 5%	950,187 / 1,146,049 = 83%
African American	103,017 / 156,083 = 66%		103,017 / 156,083 = 66%	11,271 / 156,083 = 7%	114,288 / 156,083 = 73%
Hispanic	357,526 / 509,961 = 70%		357,526 / 509,961 = 70%	33,799 / 509,961 = 7%	391,325 / 509,961 = 77%
White	386,459 / 432,133 = 89%		386,459 / 432,133 = 89%	13,310 / 432,133 = 3%	399,769 / 432,133 = 93%
Economically Disadvantaged	384,080 / 562,615 = 68%		384,080 / 562,615 = 68%	37,431 / 562,615 = 7%	421,511 / 562,615 = 75%
<b>Social Studies</b>					
All Students	777,675 / 834,436 = 93%		777,675 / 834,436 = 93%	41,426 / 834,436 = 5%	819,101 / 834,436 = 98%
African American	103,164 / 114,656 = 90%		103,164 / 114,656 = 90%	8,144 / 114,656 = 7%	111,308 / 114,656 = 97%
Hispanic	324,899 / 359,892 = 90%		324,899 / 359,892 = 90%	25,916 / 359,892 = 7%	350,815 / 359,892 = 97%
White	315,014 / 324,488 = 97%		315,014 / 324,488 = 97%	6,830 / 324,488 = 2%	321,844 / 324,488 = 99%
Economically Disadvantaged	344,718 / 386,150 = 89%		344,718 / 386,150 = 89%	30,298 / 386,150 = 8%	375,016 / 386,150 = 97%
<b>Writing</b>					
All Students	561,305 / 601,554 = 93%	10,342 / 19,066 = 54%	571,647 / 620,620 = 92%	23,859 / 620,620 = 4%	595,506 / 620,620 = 96%
African American	72,344 / 79,475 = 91%	1,754 / 3,381 = 52%	74,098 / 82,856 = 89%	4,233 / 82,856 = 5%	78,331 / 82,856 = 95%
Hispanic	262,342 / 285,620 = 92%	4,461 / 8,658 = 52%	266,803 / 294,278 = 91%	12,654 / 294,278 = 4%	279,457 / 294,278 = 95%
White	202,414 / 211,726 = 96%	3,952 / 6,740 = 59%	206,366 / 218,466 = 94%	6,630 / 218,466 = 3%	212,996 / 218,466 = 97%
Economically Disadvantaged	301,498 / 332,252 = 91%	6,227 / 12,459 = 50%	307,725 / 344,711 = 89%	17,694 / 344,711 = 5%	325,419 / 344,711 = 94%

\* Results in column (3) are the sum of columns (1) and (2) with adjustments made to reflect higher passing standards due to use of vertical scale scores in 2010.

### Preview of 2011 Indicator—2009 TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, and TPM Performance Results

Subject and Student Group	2009 TAKS and All TAKS (Acc) (1)	2009 TAKS-M (2)	2010 Preview and TAKS-M (3)	2009 Met TPM but Did Not Meet Std (4)	2011 Met Std OR Met TPM (5)
			(1) + (2) **		(3) + (4)
<b>Reading/ELA</b>	[2010 Preview Indicator]		[2011 Preview Indicator]		
All Students	2,416,763 / 2,763,344 = 87%	90,747 / 110,961 = 82%	2,506,085 / 2,872,187 = 87%	209,980 / 2,872,187 = 7%	2,716,065 / 2,872,187 = 95%
African American	310,358 / 375,411 = 83%	20,632 / 25,589 = 81%	330,709 / 400,571 = 83%	36,508 / 400,571 = 9%	367,217 / 400,571 = 92%
Hispanic	1,059,377 / 1,275,854 = 83%	43,807 / 54,608 = 80%	1,102,392 / 1,329,317 = 83%	131,240 / 1,329,317 = 10%	1,233,632 / 1,329,317 = 93%
White	941,008 / 1,000,390 = 94%	24,982 / 29,132 = 86%	965,660 / 1,028,998 = 94%	38,308 / 1,028,998 = 4%	1,003,968 / 1,028,998 = 98%
Economically Disadvantaged	1,185,715 / 1,453,791 = 82%	66,291 / 82,022 = 81%	1,250,881 / 1,534,203 = 82%	158,831 / 1,534,203 = 10%	1,409,712 / 1,534,203 = 92%
<b>Mathematics</b>					
All Students	2,207,322 / 2,743,948 = 80%	81,962 / 118,985 = 69%	2,289,284 / 2,861,770 = 80%	194,637 / 2,861,770 = 7%	2,483,921 / 2,861,770 = 87%
African American	256,973 / 370,523 = 69%	17,837 / 27,900 = 64%	274,810 / 398,160 = 69%	39,592 / 398,160 = 10%	314,402 / 398,160 = 79%
Hispanic	963,389 / 1,268,006 = 76%	39,147 / 56,235 = 70%	1,002,536 / 1,323,639 = 76%	102,404 / 1,323,639 = 8%	1,104,940 / 1,323,639 = 83%
White	881,971 / 993,621 = 89%	23,785 / 33,188 = 72%	905,756 / 1,026,519 = 88%	49,800 / 1,026,519 = 5%	955,556 / 1,026,519 = 93%
Economically Disadvantaged	1,065,501 / 1,442,202 = 74%	58,602 / 85,664 = 68%	1,124,103 / 1,527,019 = 74%	126,064 / 1,527,019 = 8%	1,250,167 / 1,527,019 = 82%
<b>Science</b>					
All Students	890,438 / 1,146,049 = 78%	27,178 / 53,559 = 51%	917,616 / 1,199,607 = 76%	59,749 / 1,199,607 = 5%	977,365 / 1,199,607 = 81%
African American	103,017 / 156,083 = 66%	5,486 / 12,312 = 45%	108,503 / 168,394 = 64%	11,271 / 168,394 = 7%	119,774 / 168,394 = 71%
Hispanic	357,526 / 509,961 = 70%	12,291 / 25,857 = 48%	369,817 / 535,818 = 69%	33,799 / 535,818 = 6%	403,616 / 535,818 = 75%
White	386,459 / 432,133 = 89%	9,033 / 14,639 = 62%	395,492 / 446,772 = 89%	13,310 / 446,772 = 3%	408,802 / 446,772 = 92%
Economically Disadvantaged	384,080 / 562,615 = 68%	18,475 / 38,326 = 48%	402,555 / 600,940 = 67%	37,431 / 600,940 = 6%	439,986 / 600,940 = 73%
<b>Social Studies</b>					
All Students	777,675 / 834,436 = 93%	21,586 / 33,739 = 64%	799,261 / 868,175 = 92%	41,426 / 868,175 = 5%	840,687 / 868,175 = 97%
African American	103,164 / 114,656 = 90%	4,819 / 8,051 = 60%	107,983 / 122,707 = 88%	8,144 / 122,707 = 7%	116,127 / 122,707 = 95%
Hispanic	324,899 / 359,892 = 90%	9,788 / 15,992 = 61%	334,687 / 375,884 = 89%	25,916 / 375,884 = 7%	360,603 / 375,884 = 96%
White	315,014 / 324,488 = 97%	6,682 / 9,246 = 72%	321,696 / 333,734 = 96%	6,830 / 333,734 = 2%	328,526 / 333,734 = 98%
Economically Disadvantaged	344,718 / 386,150 = 89%	14,562 / 23,746 = 61%	359,280 / 409,896 = 88%	30,298 / 409,896 = 7%	389,578 / 409,896 = 95%
<b>Writing</b>					
All Students	571,647 / 620,620 = 92%	20,139 / 27,789 = 72%	591,786 / 648,409 = 91%	23,859 / 648,409 = 4%	615,645 / 648,409 = 95%
African American	74,098 / 82,856 = 89%	4,266 / 6,032 = 71%	78,364 / 88,888 = 88%	4,233 / 88,888 = 5%	82,597 / 88,888 = 93%
Hispanic	266,803 / 294,278 = 91%	9,675 / 13,678 = 71%	276,478 / 307,956 = 90%	12,654 / 307,956 = 4%	289,132 / 307,956 = 94%
White	206,366 / 218,466 = 94%	5,877 / 7,674 = 77%	212,243 / 226,140 = 94%	6,630 / 226,140 = 3%	218,873 / 226,140 = 97%
Economically Disadvantaged	307,725 / 344,711 = 89%	14,713 / 20,848 = 71%	322,438 / 365,559 = 88%	17,694 / 365,559 = 5%	340,132 / 365,559 = 93%

\*\* Results in column (3) are the sum of columns (1) and (2) with adjustments made to reflect 3<sup>rd</sup> grade 1<sup>st</sup> administration only and test version interaction in SSI grades.