

Accountability System for 2010 and 2011 – Standard Procedures
Commissioner of Education Final Decisions
April 2010

State Assessment Indicators

1. TAKS Indicator. 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 5—Spanish)
Mathematics (grades 3 through 10—English; grades 3 through 5—Spanish)
Writing (grades 4 and 7—English; grade 4—Spanish)

In addition to the inclusion of all TAKS (Accommodated) tests, the 2010 TAKS base indicator will use grade 3 reading results based on a single administration. Also, 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. Also, the results of students coded as refugees and/or asylees on the spring 2010 answer documents will be excluded.

The 2011 TAKS base indicator will incorporate all changes described for 2010 and will also include all TAKS-Modified (TAKS-M) and TAKS-Alternate (TAKS-Alt) assessments.

Rationale: In 2008 and 2009 TAKS (Accommodated) results in science, social studies and all grade 11 assessments were combined with the TAKS results. The addition of the remaining TAKS (Accommodated) assessments in 2010 follows the established “report, report, use” phase-in policy. Educators were given advance notice of the plan in the 2007, 2008, and 2009 accountability manuals.

Since performance of most special education students will be in the TAKS base indicator with the TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) results, the inclusion of the TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt results combines the performance of all special education students in one measure. This approach is similar to use of TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt results in the federal accountability system, except that the proficient results of these alternate assessments are subject to the federal caps in the AYP calculations.

2. TAKS Standards. Standards for 2010 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. The 2010 *Academically Acceptable* standards are 70% for reading/ ELA, writing, and social studies; 60% for mathematics; and 55% for science. These standards represent increases of five percentage points to the *Academically Acceptable* standards for two of the five subjects (mathematics and science.) The 2010 *Recognized* standard also increases by five percentage points, to 80% for all five subjects.

Standards for 2011 will be published in the *2010 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule before the 2010-11 school year begins. The 2011 *Academically Acceptable* standards will increase by five percentage points for both mathematics and science to 65% and 60%, respectively. By 2011, 13 of the 15 standards will have attained the recommended goals of 70%, 80%, and 90% for *Academically Acceptable*, *Recognized*, and *Exemplary*, respectively, for all subject areas.

State Accountability Standards			
	2009 Used	2010 Adopted	2011 Final Decision
Exemplary (all five subjects)	90%	90%	90%
Recognized (all five subjects)	75%	80%	80%
Acceptable			
Reading/ELA	70%	70%	70%
Writing	70%	70%	70%
Social Studies	70%	70%	70%
Mathematics	55%	60%	65%
Science	50%	55%	60%
Changes to Indicator	Texas Projection Measure (TPM)	TAKS (Accommodated) –all grades/subjects; Vertical Scale Recalibration	Include new assessments: TAKS-Alt and TAKS-M

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

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

Rationale: The 2010 standards have already been published and adopted as commissioner rule. In 2010, the rigor increases due to the phase-in of all TAKS (Accommodated) results, but also due to the conversion to the new vertical scale for grades 3 through 8 in reading and mathematics. Vertical scale scores were reported in 2009 and will be used for accountability rating determinations in 2010 for the first time. The student-level passing standards based on the vertical scale will be more rigorous for grades 6 and 8 reading (English) and grades 3 and 4 mathematics (Spanish). Also, in 2010 there will only be one administration of the grade 3 reading assessment, so cumulative results from two administrations cannot be used as has been done in the past.

For *Recognized*, the standard increases from 75% to 80% in 2010 despite the increased rigor coming from other changes to the TAKS base indicator that year.

Standards for 2011 will remain as previously published due to the increased rigor of the TAKS base indicator that year due to the inclusion of TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt, and the addition of the ELL Progress indicator as a separate indicator, and due to the inclusion of commended performance as an additional indicator in 2011.

By 2011, only mathematics and science have not yet attained the goal of a 70% *Academically Acceptable* standard, but standards for both of these subjects continue to increase by five points per year through 2011, the last year of the current system. Though science and mathematics will not be at the 70% standard, these two subjects continue to be the primary reason that districts and campuses are prevented from achieving the next higher rating.

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 79th and 80th Texas legislative sessions. TEC §39.034 requires the measurement of annual improvement of student achievement. The TPM 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). A student projected to be at or above proficiency in the next high stakes grade is determined to have met the improvement standard.

Beginning in 2009, the Texas Projection Measure (TPM) was used to determine state accountability ratings. The TPM was evaluated as a means of elevating a campus or district rating in cases where

neither the TAKS base indicator nor Required Improvement (RI) were 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 was not available for grade 8 science in 2009, but will be available in 2010.

In 2010 and 2011 the TPM will continue to be used as an additional feature for the evaluation of the TAKS base indicator in the same manner in which it was used in 2009. The TPM for the TAKS-M will be included in the TAKS base indicator in 2011 for all available TAKS-M grades and subjects. A TAKS-Alt growth measure will also be applied to the TAKS base indicator for all available grades and subjects in 2011.

In 2010 and 2011, the TPM will also be used to evaluate commended performance. See discussion of commended performance, below.

Rationale: The inclusion of TPM in the state accountability ratings system paralleled the use of the projection measure in the federal accountability system. Continued use is justified given requirements in legislation that require evaluation of student improvement toward passing as a feature of the accountability system.

4. Use of Required Improvement. In both 2010 and 2011, Required Improvement (RI) will continue to be a feature for elevating ratings to *Academically Acceptable* or *Recognized* for all three base indicators. RI evaluates actual gain demonstrated by an entire campus or district for a given measure, rather than a projection of individual student growth that is measured by the TPM. 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 met the standard to pass the test. TPM will not be included in either the calculation to determine the RI standard or the calculation of actual change.

Rationale: RI is a statutory requirement and has been available since the inception of the system. RI is also the only improvement measure available for grade 11 (all subjects) and grade 7 writing.

5. Use of Commended Performance. In 2011, districts and campuses will be required to meet a Commended Performance (CP) standard in order to achieve the *Recognized* or *Exemplary* ratings. The CP indicator will be defined as the percent of students achieving the commended level or projected to meet the commended level at the next high stakes grade based on the TPM. The CP indicator will include the same test results as the TAKS base indicator. This means in 2011, CP will be evaluated for TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, and TAKS-Alt.

CP will be evaluated only for the subject areas of reading/ELA and mathematics and only for two student groups—All Students and Economically Disadvantaged, given minimum size criteria are met. The minimum size criteria are the same as those used for the TAKS base indicator.

CP standards will be 15% for *Recognized* and 25% for *Exemplary*. Neither RI nor the Exception Provision will be applied to the CP indicator. The absolute standards must be met by both student

groups (if applicable) for both subjects. Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPAs) for all five subject-area commended performance indicators will still be awarded at a standard of 30%. The GPA commended indicators evaluate All Students and the four additional student groups (African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.)

Rationale: House Bill 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. In anticipation of the more rigorous HB 3 requirements, districts and campuses will need to demonstrate performance at a higher level than Met Standard in order to achieve the *Recognized* or *Exemplary* rating. Since student performance on the end-of-course and the new grades 3 – 8 State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) tests are unknown at this time, the best proxy that is available on the current assessment is the commended performance standard.

Evaluation of CP in 2011 will serve as an early warning for the use of college readiness standards that will be incorporated in the new accountability system in 2014. Evaluation of CP for the two highest rating categories provides an incentive for campuses and districts to focus on the performance of higher performing students, in addition to those not passing the test. Reading and mathematics are targeted because these are the two subjects that will have college ready standards set and evaluated in 2014 under the new accountability system.

The All Students and Economically Disadvantaged student groups are evaluated on the CP indicator to encourage districts to continue to set high expectations for all students regardless of economic status while limiting the additional hurdles to two student groups initially as a phase-in to using all five student groups in 2014 under the new accountability system.

6. Use of Exceptions: The Exceptions Provision (EP) will continue to be a feature of the system in addition to the use of RI and TPM. The “look-up” table and number of exceptions allowed as well as the other safeguards for use of this provision will be maintained. In 2011, the use of this provision will be expanded to also apply to the new ELL Progress indicator. See discussion of ELL Progress indicator below. Exceptions will not be applied to the Commended Performance indicator.

The evaluation of the EP floor values will continue to be based on the percent of students passing the test. As in 2009, performance on the TPM is not included in the calculation to determine if the measure meets the performance floor.

Rationale: Use of this provision through the life of the current system maintains stability. The provision works as intended by allowing the larger, more diverse campuses and districts relief when only a single measure prevents them from a higher rating. The safeguard provisions ensure that deficiencies are addressed within one school year and that actual performance is very close to the standard.

English Language Learners Progress Indicator

1. ELL Progress Indicator. The English Language Learners (ELL) Progress indicator 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. The ELL Progress indicator is based on two years of TELPAS reading results and current year TAKS performance. Students who are served by district LEP programs; are LEP-exempt from the TAKS test; and are only assessed on TELPAS reading will be included in the state accountability system for the first time through the evaluation of this new indicator.
2. Standards. Campuses and districts must meet a standard of 60% on the ELL Progress indicator in order to attain a Recognized or Exemplary rating. A minimum size of 30 students will be applied.

3. Additional Features. RI will be used with this indicator in a manner that parallels the use of RI with the TAKS base indicator. In addition, the Exceptions Provision will be applied using a minimum performance floor of 55%.
4. ELL Growth. Options for the inclusion of TPM in this measure will be explored during the 2011 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 were used during the 2010 development cycle to set standards and determine other criteria.

This schedule also 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 before its first use in 2011.

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.

1. HB 3 Exclusions. New statutorily-required exclusions that the TEA must make when evaluating dropout and completion rates for state accreditation and performance ratings will not be implemented until the 2010-11 dropouts collected in the 2011-12 school year. Therefore, these exclusions will not apply to ratings issued in either 2010 or 2011.
2. District Completion Rates Assigned to Campuses. In 2011 the use of district substituted values for secondary campuses that do not have their own completion rates will resume. The use of modified methodology to create campus completion rates for any high school that serves grade 12 will be implemented beginning with the class of 2010 (2011 accountability) which will minimize the need for district substituted values.
3. Special Circumstance Appeals for Hurricanes. Hurricane displaced students in the completion cohort with a “dropout” status assigned during 2005-06 or 2008-09 may be appealed. 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.
4. Completion Rate I Standards. Standards for 2010 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. The 2010 standards are 75.0% for *Academically Acceptable*, 85.0% for *Recognized*, and 95.0% for *Exemplary*. The standards for 2011 will stay the same as 2010.

Completion Rate I Accountability Standards			
	Used	Adopted	Final Decision
	2009	2010	2011
Academically Acceptable	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%
Recognized	≥ 85.0%	≥ 85.0%	≥ 85.0%
Exemplary	≥ 95.0%	≥ 95.0%	≥ 95.0%
Dropout Definition (by Cohort Years)	2004-05 – TEA 2005-06 – NCES 2006-07 – NCES 2007-08 – NCES	2005-06 – NCES 2006-07 – NCES 2007-08 – NCES 2008-09 – NCES	NCES definition

*Text in **bold** indicates a change from the prior year.*

Rationale: The 2007 accountability year (class of 2006) was the first year the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition was used. The class of 2009 is the first class for which all four years of the cohort use the NCES dropout definition.

Under the NCES dropout definition, there is an increase in the completion rate denominator and an increase in the number of dropouts. For example, the first year of the phase-in of the NCES definition (class of 2006) the longitudinal dropout rate more than doubled. Although the Completion Rate I standards have been stable, the rigor of this indicator has increased due to the continued phase-in of the change to the NCES dropout definition.

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. 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
	2009 Ratings	2010 Ratings	2011 Ratings
	2007-08 dropouts	2008-09 dropouts	2009-10 dropouts
<i>Exemplary, Recognized, Academically Acceptable</i>	2.0%	1.8%	1.6%

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. 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 2006-07 to 2007-08, the number of underreported students at the state level declined by 648 to 12,668, and the underreported students' rate decreased by 0.1 percentage points to 0.6 percent.

Underreported Students, 2005-06 through 2007-08

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
2009	2007-08	12,668	2,044,475	0.6

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 Performance Based Monitoring (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. Standards. In 2010, the underreported rate standard will increase in rigor by decreasing to 4.0%. The count standard will stay steady at 150 underreported students. The rigor of the rate will continue to increase by decreasing one percentage point in 2011. See table below.

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

Rationale: 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.

2. Minimum Underreported Students Rate Criterion. In order for the underreported student count to be evaluated districts must have five or more underreported students. Currently there is no similar size criterion on the underreported rate. In 2011, a minimum rate of 1.0% will be required for the underreported rate to be evaluated. That year, districts with fewer than five underreported students or a rate that is less than 1.0% would not be evaluated on this indicator.

Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA)

1. TAKS-based GPA Indicators. The same definitional changes that will be made to the TAKS base indicator in 2010 and 2011 will be made to the eight GPA indicators that use TAKS performance. The eight TAKS-based GPA indicators are: the two TSI indicators, the five commended indicators, and the college-ready graduates indicator.
2. Commended Performance. In 2011, continue to award GPA for the five commended indicators (reading/ELA, writing, mathematics, science, and social studies) even though commended performance on reading/ELA and mathematics will also be evaluated for attaining a *Recognized* or *Exemplary* rating that year.

Rationale: Earning a GPA for commended performance is based on more rigorous criteria than those that will be required to achieve a rating of either *Recognized* or *Exemplary* in 2011. The GPA system evaluates All Students and each student group meeting minimum size criteria and applies a standard of 30%. The rating system will evaluate All Students and the Economically Disadvantaged student group at standards of 15% and 25% for *Recognized* and *Exemplary*, respectively.

3. SAT/ACT Indicator. For 2010 and 2011 only the critical reading and mathematics components of the SAT will be used, as was done in 2009. The standards used in 2009 will be continued.
4. Comparable Improvement Indicator. The 2010 and 2011 Comparable Improvement (CI) measures will be based on the vertical scale score results. The CI methodology will be applied to only those campuses that serve grades 4-8 because only these grade spans will have vertical scale scores. Campus groups will continue to be created for all schools and aggregate group performance will continue to be reported on the AEIS and School Report Card products. Campus group membership lists will continue to be reported for all schools.

Rationale: The TGI values are no longer available for grades 4-8 beginning with the 2009-10 year; therefore, a change to a new measure of improvement is necessary. Because gain based on vertical scale scores will only be available for campuses serving grades 4-8, high schools will be unable to earn a CI acknowledgment in 2010 and 2011. 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.

5. Standards. GPA standards for 2010 were set in 2009 and are shown in the following table. In 2010, standards will increase for the two TSI indicators by five points, from 60% to 65% for each. In 2011 standards will remain stable with the exception of the College-Ready Graduates indicator, which will increase by five points from 35% to 40%.

The GPA indicators 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.

Only indicators with changes in standards are shown in the following table.

GPA Indicators		2010	2011
		Final Decision	Preview*
1	Texas Success Initiative: Higher Education Readiness Component—English Language Arts	>=65.0%	>=65.0%
2	Texas Success Initiative: Higher Education Readiness Component—Mathematics	>=65.0%	>=65.0%
3	College-Ready Graduates	>=35.0%	>=40.0%

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

Rationale: Because college-readiness is of critical importance under HB 3, continued increases in rigor for this indicator for acknowledgment are appropriate.

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.

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.

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.

Final recommendations for the selection of the race / ethnicity student groups to be evaluated for state accountability ratings for 2011 will be made by 2011 accountability advisory groups.

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.