

# **2011**

# **Accountability Manual**

The 2011 Accountability Rating System  
for Texas Public Schools and School Districts

Texas Education Agency  
Department of Assessment, Accountability, and Data Quality  
Division of Performance Reporting  
May 2011

Copies of the *2011 Accountability Manual* may be purchased from:

Publications Distribution Office  
Texas Education Agency  
PO Box 13817  
Austin, TX 78711-3817  
pubsdist@tea.state.tx.us

Please use the order form on the last page of this publication. Remit \$12.00 for each copy for a non-profit institution, or \$14.00 for all others. These amounts include mailing and handling charges. Inventory of this publication is not guaranteed.

This publication can also be accessed and downloaded from the Texas Education Agency internet site at:

**<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2011/manual/index.html>**

**Copyright © Notice** The materials are copyrighted © and trademarked ™ as the property of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and may not be reproduced without the express written permission of TEA, except under the following conditions:

- 1) Texas public school districts, charter schools, and Education Service Centers may reproduce and use copies of the Materials and Related Materials for the districts' and schools' educational use without obtaining permission from TEA.
- 2) Residents of the state of Texas may reproduce and use copies of the Materials and Related Materials for individual personal use only without obtaining written permission of TEA.
- 3) Any portion reproduced must be reproduced in its entirety and remain unedited, unaltered and unchanged in any way.
- 4) No monetary charge can be made for the reproduced materials or any document containing them; however, a reasonable charge to cover only the cost of reproduction and distribution may be charged.

Private entities or persons located in Texas that are **not** Texas public school districts, Texas Education Service Centers, or Texas charter schools **or** any entity, whether public or private, educational or non-educational, located **outside the state of Texas** *MUST* obtain written approval from TEA and will be required to enter into a license agreement that may involve the payment of a licensing fee or a royalty.

For information contact: Office of Copyrights, Trademarks, License Agreements, and Royalties, Texas Education Agency, 1701 N. Congress Ave., Austin, TX 78701-1494; phone 512-463-9270; email: [copyrights@tea.state.tx.us](mailto:copyrights@tea.state.tx.us).

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
About the Accountability System .....	1
About This Manual .....	1
Advisory Groups .....	1
Guiding Principles .....	2
Reports Associated with the Accountability System .....	2
<b>Part 1 – Standard Procedures</b>	
<b>Chapter 1 – Overview</b> .....	7
System History .....	7
Comparison of 2010 and 2011 Standard Procedures .....	7
<b>Chapter 2 – The Basics: <i>Base Indicators</i></b> .....	11
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills .....	11
English Language Learners (ELL) Progress Indicator .....	15
Commended Performance .....	17
Accountability Subset .....	19
Completion Rate I [Graduates and Continuers] .....	24
Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-8) .....	26
<b>Chapter 3 – The Basics: <i>Additional Features</i></b> .....	29
<b>Required Improvement to <i>Academically Acceptable</i></b> .....	29
TAKS .....	29
Completion Rate I [Graduates and Continuers] .....	30
Annual Dropout Rate .....	31
<b>Required Improvement to <i>Recognized or Exemplary</i></b> .....	32
TAKS .....	32
English Language Learners (ELL) Progress Indicator .....	33
Completion Rate I [Graduates and Continuers] .....	34
Annual Dropout Rate .....	35
<b>Exceptions Provision</b> .....	35
Using Exceptions to move to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> or <i>Recognized</i> .....	36
Using Exceptions to move to <i>Exemplary</i> .....	37
Provision Safeguards .....	37
<b>Additional Issues for Districts</b> .....	38
Districts with <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> Campuses .....	38
Underreported Students .....	39
Additional Students in District Ratings .....	40
<b>Chapter 4 – The Basics: <i>Determining a Rating</i></b> .....	41
Who is Rated? .....	41
Standard Rating Labels .....	42

Notification of Ratings (July 29, 2011) .....	43
Notification of Ratings (Late October 2011) .....	43
Using the Data Table to Determine a Rating .....	43
Additional Information on Data Tables .....	46
Masked Data .....	46
System Summary .....	46
<b>Chapter 5 – Gold Performance Acknowledgments .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Acknowledgment Categories .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Acknowledgment Indicators .....</b>	<b>53</b>
Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion .....	53
Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate Results .....	53
Attendance Rate .....	55
College-Ready Graduates .....	56
Commended Performance: Reading/ELA .....	57
Commended Performance: Mathematics .....	58
Commended Performance: Writing .....	59
Commended Performance: Science .....	61
Commended Performance: Social Studies .....	62
Comparable Improvement: Reading .....	63
Comparable Improvement: Mathematics .....	64
Recommended High School Program/DAP .....	65
SAT/ACT Results .....	66
Texas Success Initiative (TSI) – Higher Education Readiness Component: ELA .....	67
Texas Success Initiative (TSI) – Higher Education Readiness Component:	
Mathematics .....	68
Notification of Acknowledgment .....	70
<b>Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances .....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Pairing .....</b>	<b>71</b>
Identifying Campuses .....	71
Additional Features .....	71
Pairing Process .....	72
Guidelines .....	72
<b>Special Analysis .....</b>	<b>73</b>
Identifying Campuses and Districts .....	73
Methods for Special Analysis .....	73
<b>New Campuses .....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>Charters .....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>Non-Traditional Educational Settings .....</b>	<b>75</b>
Residential Treatment Facilities .....	75
Texas Juvenile Probation Commission Campuses .....	75
Texas Youth Commission Facilities Within Texas Public School Districts .....	76

Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Programs and Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs .....	76
Special Education Campuses .....	77

## **Part 2 – Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures**

<b>Chapter 7 – Overview of AEA</b> .....	81
About Part 2 of This <i>Manual</i> .....	81
Educator Input .....	81
History of AEA .....	81
Philosophy of AEA .....	83
Overall Design of AEA Procedures .....	84
Comparison of 2010 and 2011 AEA Procedures .....	84
<b>Chapter 8 – AEA Registration Criteria and Requirements</b> .....	87
<b>Alternative Education Campuses (AECs)</b> .....	87
AEC Eligibility .....	87
AEA Campus Registration Process .....	88
AEC Registration Criteria .....	88
At-Risk Registration Criterion .....	89
<b>Charters</b> .....	89
Charters Evaluated Under AEA Procedures .....	89
AEC Enrollment Criterion for Charters .....	90
<b>Chapter 9 – Attribution of AEC Data</b> .....	91
Background .....	91
Attribution of Data .....	92
<b>Chapter 10 – AEA Base Indicators</b> .....	93
TAKS Progress Indicator .....	93
ELL Progress Indicator .....	96
Completion Rate II Indicator [Graduates, Continuers, GED Recipients] .....	97
Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12) Indicator .....	99
<b>Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA</b> .....	101
<b>Required Improvement</b> .....	101
TAKS Progress Indicator .....	101
ELL Progress Indicator .....	102
Completion Rate II Indicator [Graduates, Continuers, GED Recipients] .....	103
Annual Dropout Rate Indicator .....	104
<b>Use of District At-Risk Data</b> .....	105
TAKS Progress Indicator .....	105
Completion Rate II Indicator [Graduates, Continuers, GED Recipients] .....	106
Annual Dropout Rate Indicator .....	107
<b>Additional Requirements for Charters</b> .....	107

<b>AECs Rated <i>AEA: Academically Unacceptable</i></b> .....	107
<b>Chapter 12 – AEA Ratings</b> .....	109
Who is Rated? .....	109
AEA Rating Labels .....	110
Using the Data Table to Determine an AEA Rating .....	110
Final Data Tables .....	115
Masked Data .....	117
AEA Summary .....	117
<b>Chapter 13 – AEA Gold Performance Acknowledgments</b> .....	121
<b>Acknowledgement Categories</b> .....	121
<b>AEA GPA Indicators</b> .....	122
Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion .....	122
Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate (AP/IB) Results .....	123
Attendance Rate .....	124
College-Ready Graduates .....	124
Commended Performance Indicators: Reading/ELA, Mathematics, Writing, Science and Social Studies .....	125
Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program (RHSP/DAP) .....	126
SAT/ACT Results .....	127
Texas Success Initiative (TSI) – Higher Education Readiness Component Indicators: ELA and Mathematics .....	128
Notification of Acknowledgment .....	128
<b>Chapter 14 – AEA Glossary</b> .....	129
<b>Part 3 – Items Common to Standard and AEA Procedures</b>	
<b>Chapter 15 – Appealing the Ratings</b> .....	135
Appeals Calendar .....	135
<b>General Considerations</b> .....	136
Appeals are not a data correction opportunity! .....	136
Changed Ratings Only .....	136
No Guaranteed Outcomes .....	136
Situations NOT Favorable for Appeal .....	136
<b>Guidelines</b> .....	138
TAKS and Commended Performance Appeals .....	138
English Language Learners (ELL) Progress Indicator Appeals .....	139
Appeals of Leaver Data .....	139
Annual Dropout Rate Appeals .....	140
Completion Rate Appeals .....	141
Underreported Students Appeals .....	142
Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) Appeals .....	142
Not Rated Appeals .....	142

<b>Special Circumstance Appeals</b> .....	142
Hurricane Ike .....	142
Alternative Education Settings .....	143
ELL Required Improvement for Paired Campuses.....	143
<b>How to Appeal</b> .....	143
<b>How an Appeal Will Be Processed by the Agency</b> .....	145
<b>Chapter 16 – Responsibilities and Consequences</b> .....	147
<b>Local Responsibilities</b> .....	147
Statutory Compliance.....	147
Accurate Data.....	148
Campus Identification Numbers .....	148
Complementary Local Accountability Systems.....	149
<b>State Responsibilities</b> .....	150
System Safeguards .....	150
Public Education Grant Program Campus Lists .....	151
District Accreditation Status .....	151
<b>Consequences</b> .....	152
Interventions .....	152
Excellence Exemptions.....	153
<b>Chapter 17 – Calendar and Preview</b> .....	155
<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>Appendix A – Commissioner of Education Rule</b> .....	161
<b>Appendix B – Texas Education Code</b> .....	163
<b>Appendix C – Comparison of State and Federal Systems</b> .....	165
<b>Appendix D – Data Sources</b> .....	171
<b>Appendix E – Student Growth Measures</b> .....	191
<b>Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group</b> .....	193
<b>Appendix G – Contacts</b> .....	195
<b>Appendix H – Acknowledgments</b> .....	199
<b>Appendix I –TEA Secure Environment (TEASE)</b> .....	203
<b>Appendix J – Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision</b> .....	207
<b>Tables</b>	
Table 1: Definitions of Terms.....	4
Table 2: Comparison of 2010 and 2011 – Standard Procedures.....	8
Table 3: ELL Progress Indicator Guidelines .....	16
Table 4: Accountability Subset.....	20

Table 5: Additional Features by Indicator .....	35
Table 6: Standard Rating Labels.....	42
Table 7: Sample Data Table .....	44
Table 8: Requirements for Each Rating Category .....	48
Table 9: Overview of 2011 System Components .....	49
Table 10: Gold Performance Acknowledgment Standards for 2011 .....	52
Table 11: Inclusion or Exclusion of Performance Data.....	78
Table 12: Comparison of 2010 and 2011 – AEA Procedures .....	85
Table 13: TAKS Progress Indicator.....	94
Table 14: Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12) Indicator.....	98
Table 15: Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12) Indicator .....	99
Table 16: Use of TAKS Data of At-Risk Students in the District.....	105
Table 17: Use of Completion Rate II Data of At-Risk Students in the District.....	106
Table 18: Use of Annual Dropout Data of At-Risk Students in the District .....	107
Table 19: AEA Rating Labels.....	110
Table 20: Sample AEA Data Table .....	111
Table 21: Requirements for 2011 <i>AEA: Academically Acceptable</i> Rating.....	118
Table 22: Overview of 2011 AEA Procedures .....	119
Table 23: AEA GPA Standards for 2011.....	122
Table 24: 2011 Comparison of State and Federal Accountability (AYP) by Indicator...	166
Table 25: 2011 Grade Level Comparison of State (Standard Procedures) and Federal Accountability .....	170
Table 26: Assessments Used in Accountability.....	171
Table 27: PEIMS Record Types Used in Accountability .....	172
Table 28: Student Demographics.....	173
Table 29: Leaver Codes .....	179
Table 30: Race/Ethnicity Definition for Class of 2010 .....	183
Table 31: Accountability Subset Rules.....	187
Table 32: Accountability Subset for SSI - Grades 5 & 8 TAKS Reading and Mathematics .....	188
Table 33: Student Attribution Codes .....	189
Table 34: Comparison of Race and Ethnicity Categories, 2010 vs. 2011 .....	207

# Introduction

---

## ABOUT THE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

The state accountability system assigns ratings to every campus and district in the Texas public education system each year. In most cases, the system assigns one of four rating labels—ranging from lowest to highest—*Academically Unacceptable*, *Academically Acceptable*, *Recognized*, and *Exemplary*. To determine a rating label, the system evaluates indicators of performance, including assessment results on the state standardized assessment instruments as well as longitudinal completion rates and annual dropout rates. Generally, campuses and districts earn ratings by having performance that meets absolute standards or by demonstrating sufficient improvement toward the standard. In addition to evaluating performance for all students, the performance of individual groups of students is held to the rating criteria. The student groups are defined to be the major ethnic and racial groups as well as students designated as economically disadvantaged. All of the evaluated groups must meet the criteria for a given rating category in order to earn that label.

There are two sets of procedures within the state accountability system: one that evaluates standard campuses and districts and another that evaluates alternative education campuses (AECs) and charter operators that primarily serve students identified as at risk of dropping out of school. The indicators and criteria differ between the alternative education accountability (AEA) and standard procedures but the overall designs are similar.

The purpose of the state accountability system is first and foremost to improve student performance. The system sets reasonable standards for achievement and identifies and publicly recognizes high levels of performance and performance improvement. The system provides information about levels of student performance in each school district and on each campus, and the system identifies campuses and districts with inadequate performance and provides assistance.

## ABOUT THIS MANUAL

The *Accountability Manual* is a technical resource that explains how campuses and districts are evaluated. Part 1 pertains to standard procedures and Part 2 pertains to registered AECs as well as charter operators evaluated under AEA procedures. Part 3 pertains to areas covered by both standard and AEA procedures. The *Manual* includes the information necessary for determining 2011 ratings and acknowledgments.

As with previous *Manual* editions, selected chapters are adopted by reference as Commissioner of Education administrative rule. *Appendix A – Commissioner of Education Rule* describes the rule which will be effective in July 2011.

## ADVISORY GROUPS

For the purpose of reviewing the accountability procedures, Texas Education Agency (TEA) staff invited the assistance and advice of educators, school board members, business and community representatives, professional organizations, and legislative representatives from across the state. The commissioner considered all proposals and made final decisions that are reflected in this publication.

## GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Over the years, TEA has worked closely with public school personnel and others to develop an integrated accountability system. The standard and AEA procedures of the 2011 system are based upon these guiding principles:

- **STUDENT PERFORMANCE**  
The system is first and foremost designed to improve student performance;
- **RECOGNITION OF DIVERSITY**  
The system is fair and recognizes diversity among campuses and students;
- **SYSTEM STABILITY**  
The system is stable and provides a realistic, practical timeline for measurement, data collection, planning, staff development, and reporting;
- **STATUTORY COMPLIANCE**  
The system is designed to comply with statutory requirements;
- **APPROPRIATE CONSEQUENCES**  
The system sets reasonable standards for adequacy, identifies and publicly recognizes high levels of performance and performance improvement, and identifies campuses with inadequate performance and provides assistance;
- **LOCAL PROGRAM FLEXIBILITY**  
The system allows for flexibility in the design of programs to meet the individual needs of students;
- **LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY**  
The system relies on local school districts to develop and implement local accountability systems that complement the state system; and
- **PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW**  
The system supports the public's right to know levels of student performance in each school district and on each campus.

## REPORTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

*Accountability Data Tables.* Tables showing the performance used for determining accountability ratings are made public at the time of the ratings release, on or before the first of August each year. These tables provide the data necessary to understand a campus or district rating. Samples of these tables are shown in *Chapter 4 – The Basics: Determining a Rating* (for standard procedures) and *Chapter 12 – AEA Ratings* (for AEA procedures).

*Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS).* The AEIS is a comprehensive reporting system defined in state statute. Since 1990-91, campus and district AEIS reports have been generated and published annually for all campuses and districts in the state. Local districts share responsibility for disseminating the AEIS reports, including holding hearings for public discussion of the AEIS report content. All indicators used for accountability are reported in the AEIS, with additional disaggregations depicting how each grade level and each student group performed. Indicators that will potentially be used in future accountability ratings are also published in the AEIS when possible. The reports also show participation rates on the

state-administered tests. Additionally, the AEIS shows demographic information about students and staff, program information, and financial information, all of which provide context for interpreting accountability results.

*School Report Card (SRC)*. Also required by state statute, this agency-generated report provides a subset of the information found on the AEIS report and is produced at the campus level only. Campuses must provide the SRC to each student's family.

*Snapshot: School District Profiles*. This online TEA publication provides a state- and district-level overview of public education in Texas. Though no longer available as a printed publication, the *District Detail* section of *Snapshot*—up to 90 items of information for each public school district—is available on the agency website.

*Pocket Edition*. This brochure provides a quick overview of state-level statistics on performance, demographics, campus and district ratings, personnel, and finances.

*Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)*. AYP is a federal accountability program mandated under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). For information on similarities and differences between the federal and state accountability systems, see *Appendix C – Comparison of State and Federal Systems*.

*NCLB Report Card (NCLB RC)*. Section 1111(h)(1) and (2) of the NCLB Act describes the requirements for the annual reporting of student achievement and AYP information for the state, local educational agency, and school. TEA uses a web-based reporting system that generates the annual NCLB RC at the state-level and for each district and campus. The NCLB RC is available online at [http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=4638&menu\\_id=798](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=4638&menu_id=798).

*Online Reports*. Except for the NCLB RC, all of the reports cited above are available on the TEA website through the Division of Performance Reporting home page at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/>.

**Table 1: Definitions of Terms**

Throughout this *Manual*, the terms listed below are defined as shown, unless specifically noted otherwise. See *Chapter 14 – AEA Glossary* for definitions of terms specific to the AEA procedures.

<i>District</i>	This term includes charter operators as well as traditional independent school districts.
<i>Charter Operator</i>	A charter operator is treated like a district in the accountability system. The charter operator is identified with a unique six-digit number as are districts. The campus or campuses administered by a charter are identified with a unique nine-digit number. The charter operator may administer instruction at one or more campuses.
<i>Superintendent</i>	The educational leader and administrative manager of the district or charter operator. This term includes other titles that may apply to charter operators, such as chief executive officer, president, and chief administrative officer.
<i>Campus</i>	This term includes charter campuses as well as campuses administered by traditional independent school districts.
<i>Standard Campus</i>	A campus evaluated under standard accountability procedures. This includes campuses that serve students in alternative education settings, but that are not registered to be evaluated under the AEA procedures.
<i>Registered Alternative Education Campus (AEC)</i>	A campus registered for evaluation under AEA procedures that meets ten registration criteria as well as the 75% at-risk registration criterion. This term includes AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities.
<i>TAKS Test Results</i>	This phrase refers to TAKS assessments including the TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-Modified (TAKS-M), and TAKS-Alternate (TAKS-Alt) assessments that are part of the accountability calculations for 2011.
<i>Data Integrity</i>	Data integrity refers to the quality of the data used to determine an accountability rating. The integrity of data can be compromised either through purposeful manipulation or through unintentional errors made through the data reporting process. In either case, if data integrity is in question, it may not be possible to determine a reliable rating. When possible, data shown on accountability reports is annotated if the integrity of the data is in question.
<i>Measures and Analysis Groups</i>	Under standard accountability procedures, a campus or district can be evaluated on as many as 40 measures (five for each of the five TAKS subjects, one for the ELL Progress Indicator, four for Commended Performance, five for dropout rate, and five for completion rate.) On the data tables they are identified as Analysis Groups, and have an “X” next to each if used to evaluate the campus or district.

**The 2011 Accountability Rating System  
for Texas Public Schools and School Districts**

# Part 1

---

## Standard Procedures

**In Part 1:**

Chapter 1 – Overview .....7

Chapter 2 – The Basics:  
*Base Indicators* .....11

Chapter 3 – The Basics:  
*Additional Features*.....29

Chapter 4 – The Basics:  
*Determining a Rating*.....41

Chapter 5 – Gold  
Performance  
Acknowledgments.....51

Chapter 6 – Special Issues  
and Circumstances .....71



# Chapter 1 – Overview

---

## SYSTEM HISTORY

In 1993, the Texas Legislature enacted statutes that mandated the creation of the Texas public school accountability system to rate school districts and evaluate campuses. A viable and effective accountability system was achievable in Texas because the state already had the necessary infrastructure in place: a pre-existing student-level data collection system; a state-mandated curriculum; and a statewide assessment tied to the curriculum.

The system initiated with the 1993 legislative session remained in place through the 2001-02 school year. The ratings issued in 2002 were the last under that system. Beginning in 2003, a new assessment, the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), was administered. This assessment includes more subjects and grades, and is more difficult than the previous statewide assessment. A new rating system based on the TAKS was developed during 2003. Ratings established under the newly designed system were first issued in the fall of 2004.

This year, 2011, is the last year for the accountability rating system based on the TAKS.

## COMPARISON OF 2010 AND 2011 STANDARD PROCEDURES

The ratings issued in 2011 mark the eighth year of the current system. Many components of the 2011 system are the same as those that were in effect in 2010. However, there are several significant differences between 2010 and 2011:

- A new base indicator—Commended Performance—has been added to the 2011 accountability system.
- Another base indicator—English Language Learners (ELL) Progress Indicator—has been added to the 2011 accountability system.
- The new federal race and ethnicity definitions are used in determining student groups for the TAKS and annual dropout rate indicators.
- A new Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision will be applied to the TAKS met standard indicator in determining TAKS performance.
- In 2011, the TAKS indicator includes the performance on TAKS-Modified (TAKS-M) and TAKS-Alternate (TAKS-Alt) for all grades and subjects.
- The completion rate methodology has changed, resulting in more high schools receiving a completion rate.
- The TAKS indicator standards for *Academically Acceptable* increase for mathematics and science by five points each.
- Use of the Texas Projection Measure (TPM) and the Texas Growth Index (TGI) has been discontinued for the 2011 accountability system.
- The minimum performance floor required to apply the Exceptions Provision remains at five points below the standard. This minimum changes, however, whenever there are changes to the standard. Therefore, the floor to use exceptions for *Academically Acceptable* increases by five points for mathematics and science.

- The standard for the Annual Dropout Rate (grades 7-8) indicator is more rigorous for 2011, decreasing from 1.8% to 1.6%.
- The standard for Underreported Students, a data quality indicator, changes from a rate of less than or equal to 4.0% to less than or equal to 3.0%. The count standard remains no more than 150 students. However, the minimum size criterion of 5 students and 1.0% remain the same. Districts with underreported rates of 1.0% or less will not be evaluated.
- The standard for one Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA) indicator will increase. The College-Ready Graduates indicator will increase by five points to 40%.

The following table provides details on these and other changes between the 2010 and 2011 systems. Items in **bold** indicate a change for 2011.

**Table 2: Comparison of 2010 and 2011 – Standard Procedures**

Component	2010				2011			
Base Indicators for Determining Rating (Chapter 2)	TAKS and all TAKS (Accommodated)				TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated) <b>and all TAKS-M and all TAKS-Alt</b>			
	N/A				<b>ELL Progress Indicator</b>			
	N/A				<b>Commended Performance (CP)</b>			
	Completion Rate I				Completion Rate I			
	Annual Dropout Rate				Annual Dropout Rate			
Rating Standards (Chapter 2)		Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary		Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
	TAKS	55/60/70/70	80%	90%	TAKS	<b>60/65/70/70</b>	80%	90%
	Completion I	75.0%	85.0%	95.0%	Completion I	No Change		
	Dropout	1.8%			Dropout	<b>1.6%</b>		
	N/A				ELL Progress	<b>N/A</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>60%</b>
				Commended	<b>N/A</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>25%</b>	
Evaluation of Student Groups (Chapter 2)	TAKS, Completion, and Dropouts: All Students and White, Hispanic, African American, Economically Disadvantaged				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>TAKS and Dropouts: All Students and White, Hispanic, African American, Economically Disadvantaged, based on the new, federally-mandated definitions for race and ethnicity</b></li> <li>• <b>ELL Progress Indicator: All ELL Students</b></li> <li>• <b>Commended Performance: All Students and Economically Disadvantaged</b></li> <li>• Completion Rate: No Change</li> </ul>			
Number of Performance Measures (Chapter 2)	The larger and more diverse the campus or district, the more measures apply — up to 35				<b>4 new measures for Commended Performance and 1 new measure for ELL Progress — up to 40</b>			
Accountability Subset (TAKS, CP, and ELL Progress) (Chapter 2)	Students who move after the October PEIMS “as of” date and before the last TAKS administration are taken out of the subset for a district if they move to another district; students are taken out of the campus subset if they move to another campus (whether it is in the same district or not).				No Change			

**Table 2: Comparison of 2010 and 2011 – Standard Procedures (continued)**

Component	2010	2011
TAKS Subjects Evaluated (Chapter 2)	TAKS: All subjects individually	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TAKS: No Change</li> <li>• <b>ELL Progress Indicator: TAKS Reading (English) and/or TELPAS</b></li> <li>• <b>Commended Performance: TAKS Reading and Mathematics</b></li> </ul>
TAKS Student Success Initiative (Chapter 2)	Gr. 5 & 8 reading and mathematics, cumulative results used	No Change
TAKS Grades Tested (Chapter 2)	Summed across all grades tested (grades 3-11)	No Change
TAKS Minimum Size for All Students (Chapter 2)	TAKS: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TAKS: No Change</li> <li>• <b>ELL Progress Indicator: Minimum 30 students</b></li> <li>• <b>Commended Performance: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of size</b></li> </ul>
TAKS Minimum Size for Student Groups (Chapter 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If fewer than 30 test takers, not evaluated separately</li> <li>• If 30 to 49, evaluated if they comprise at least 10% of all test takers</li> <li>• If 50 or more, evaluated</li> </ul>	No Change
TAKS Special Analysis (Chapter 6)	Used for determining rating for very small campuses and districts	No Change
Pairing (Chapter 6)	Standard campuses without TAKS data are paired; paired data not used for GPA	No Change
Texas Projection Measure (TPM) (Chapter 3)	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.	<b>TPM not available for 2011</b>
Exceptions (Chapter 3)	<i>Academically Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary</i> rating possible by using exceptions	No Change
	Maximum of four for <i>Academically Acceptable</i> and <i>Recognized</i> ; One only for <i>Exemplary</i>	No Change
	Minimum performance floor is five points below the standard for all subjects.	No Change (when standards increase so do floors to stay within five points)
	N/A	<b>ELL Progress: One exception may be used</b>
	N/A	<b>Commended Performance: No Exceptions possible</b>
Completion Rate I (Chapter 2)	Use of district assigned completion rates remains suspended	No Change

**Table 2: Comparison of 2010 and 2011 – Standard Procedures (continued)**

Component	2010	2011
Required Improvement (Chapter 3)	TAKS: RI to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> and <i>Recognized</i> possible	No Change
	N/A	<b>ELL Progress:</b> <b>RI to <i>Recognized</i> and <i>Exemplary</i> possible</b>
	N/A	<b>Commended Performance: No RI possible</b>
	Annual Dropout Rate: RI to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> , <i>Recognized</i> , and <i>Exemplary</i> possible	No Change
	Completion Rate I: RI to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> and <i>Recognized</i> possible	No Change
Gold Performance Acknowledgment Indicators (Chapter 5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion</i></li> <li>• <i>AP/IB Results</i></li> <li>• <i>Attendance Rate</i></li> <li>• <i>College-Ready Graduates</i></li> <li>• <i>Commended Performance: Reading/ELA</i></li> <li>• <i>Commended Performance: Mathematics</i></li> <li>• <i>Commended Performance: Writing</i></li> <li>• <i>Commended Performance: Science</i></li> <li>• <i>Commended Performance: Social Studies</i></li> <li>• <i>Comparable Improvement: Reading/ELA</i></li> <li>• <i>Comparable Improvement: Mathematics</i></li> <li>• <i>Recommended High School Program/ Distinguished Achievement Program (RHSP/DAP)</i></li> <li>• <i>SAT/ACT Results</i></li> <li>• <i>TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component for English Language Arts</i></li> <li>• <i>TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component for Mathematics</i></li> </ul>	<p>No new or deleted indicators.</p> <p><b>All TAKS Commended Performance Acknowledgments now include TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt performance.</b></p>
GPA Standards (Chapter 5)	Varies by indicator	Same as 2010 for all acknowledgments except <b>College-Ready Graduates increases by five points to 40%</b>
Underreported Students (Chapter 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No more than 150 underreported students; and</li> <li>• No more than 4.0% underreported.</li> <li>• Districts with fewer than 5 underreported students or underreported rates less than 1.0% will not be evaluated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No more than 150 underreported students; and</li> <li>• No more than <b>3.0%</b> underreported.</li> <li>• Districts with fewer than 5 underreported students or underreported rates less than 1.0% will not be evaluated.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 2 – The Basics: *Base Indicators*

---

To determine ratings under the standard accountability procedures, the 2011 accountability rating system for Texas public schools and districts uses five base indicators:

- spring 2011 performance on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS),
  - spring 2011 performance of current and monitored limited English proficient (LEP) students on the English Language Learners (ELL) Progress Indicator,
  - spring 2011 Commended Performance on the TAKS,
  - Completion Rate I for the class of 2010, and
  - 2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate for grades 7 and 8.
- 

### TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

The TAKS indicator is the percent of students who scored high enough to meet the standard to pass the test. This is calculated as the number of students who met the TAKS student passing standard divided by the number tested. Results for the TAKS (grades 3-11) are summed across grades for each subject. Results for each subject tested are evaluated separately to determine ratings.

**Who is evaluated for TAKS:** Districts and campuses that test students on any TAKS subject:

- **Reading/ELA** – Reading is tested in grades 3-9; English language arts (ELA) is tested in grades 10 and 11. Note also:
  - TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-Modified, and TAKS-Alternate reading and ELA results for all grades are included.
  - This is a combined indicator. It includes all students tested on and passing either the TAKS reading test or the TAKS ELA test.
  - The cumulative percent passing from the first two administrations of TAKS reading in grades 5 and 8 is used.
  - Results for the Spanish version of TAKS reading (grades 3-5) are included.
- **Writing** – Writing is tested in grades 4 and 7. Note also:
  - TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, and TAKS-Alt writing results for all grades are included.
  - Results for the Spanish version of TAKS writing (grade 4) are included.
- **Social Studies** – Social studies is tested in grades 8, 10, and 11. TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, and TAKS-Alt social studies results for all grades are also included.
- **Mathematics** – Mathematics is tested in grades 3-11. Note also:
  - TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, and TAKS-Alt mathematics results for all grades are included.
  - The cumulative percent passing from the first two administrations of TAKS mathematics in grades 5 and 8 is used.
  - Results for the Spanish version of TAKS mathematics (grades 3-5) are included.

- **Science** – Science is tested in grades 5, 8, 10, and 11. Note also:
  - TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, and TAKS-Alt science results for all grades are included.
  - Results for the Spanish version of TAKS science (grade 5) are included.

For further details, see *Other Information* below.

**Standard:** The *Academically Acceptable* standard varies by subject, while the *Recognized* and *Exemplary* standards are the same for all subjects:

- **Exemplary** – For every subject, at least 90% of the tested students pass the test.
- **Recognized** – For every subject, at least 80% of the tested students pass the test.
- **Academically Acceptable** – Varies by subject:
  - *Reading/ELA* – At least 70% of the tested students pass the test.
  - *Writing* – At least 70% of the tested students pass the test.
  - *Social Studies* – At least 70% of the tested students pass the test.
  - *Mathematics* – At least 65% of the tested students pass the test.
  - *Science* – At least 60% of the tested students pass the test.

**Student Groups:** Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

**Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of students passing [TAKS subject]}}{\text{number of students tested in [TAKS subject]}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:**

- *All Students.* These results are always evaluated regardless of the number of examinees. However, districts and campuses with a small number of total students tested on TAKS receive Special Analysis. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more detailed information about Special Analysis.
- *Student Groups.*
  - Any student group with fewer than 30 students tested is not evaluated.
  - If there are 30 to 49 students tested within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
  - If there are at least 50 students tested within the student group, it is evaluated.
  - Student group size is calculated subject by subject. For this reason the number of student groups evaluated sometimes varies. For example, an elementary school with grades 3, 4, and 5 may have enough Hispanic students to be evaluated on reading and mathematics, but not enough to be evaluated on writing (tested in grade 4 only) or science (tested in grade 5 only).

**Year of Data:** 2010-11

**Data Source:** Pearson

## Other Information:

- *Texas Projection Measure (TPM)*. In 2009 and 2010, the TPM was used as an Additional Feature in the system to elevate campus and district ratings given certain conditions were met. In the 2011 accountability rating system, **the TPM has been discontinued** and is not available as an Additional Feature for any indicator for determining the 2011 accountability ratings.
- *TAKS Modified and TAKS Alternate*. In 2011 for the first time, results on TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt assessments for all grades and subjects are included in determining the 2011 accountability ratings.
- *Race and Ethnicity*. A student's racial or ethnic category is based on what is reported on the TAKS answer document. As of 2011, all race and ethnic categories are based on the new, federally-mandated definitions for White, Hispanic, and African American. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* and *Appendix J – Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision* for more information on the new definition for race and ethnicity.
- *Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision*. For 2011 accountability, a new Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision will be applied only to the TAKS indicator. Under this provision, students who indicate their ethnicity is not Hispanic/Latino and who select multiple races that include both the Black/African American and White categories will be distributed into either the African American or White groups based on the information submitted on the 2009-10 TAKS answer documents under the former definitions. If the recalculated student group performance results in a higher rating, then the higher rating is assigned. See *Appendix J – Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision* for more information.
- *TAKS Vertical Scale*. The student passing standards for TAKS reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 (and Spanish 3-5) are based on a vertical scale for these grades and subjects. With the vertical scale, a student's scale score in one grade can be compared to that student's scale score in another grade. It provides information about student growth compared to prior years. Note that a scale score of 2100 is still used as the passing standard for grades 9-11 and for all TAKS-M grades and subjects. For more information on the vertical scale, see *Appendix E – Student Growth Measures*.
- *Student Success Initiative (SSI)*. In determining accountability ratings, a cumulative percent passing is calculated by combining the first and second administrations of the TAKS in grades 5 and 8 reading and mathematics performance. Results include performance on the Spanish versions of these tests, as well as TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, and TAKS-Alt results.
- *TAKS Spanish*. The TAKS tests are given in Spanish in reading and mathematics for grades 3, 4, and 5; writing in grade 4; and science in grade 5. Performance on these tests is combined with performance on the English-language TAKS for the same subject to determine a rating.
- *Special Education*. The performance of students with disabilities who take the TAKS is included in the TAKS indicator, whether they took TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, TAKS-Alt, or the regular TAKS.

- *Reading/ELA Combined.* Reading (grades 3-9) and ELA (grades 10 and 11) results are combined and evaluated as a single subject. Counts of reading and ELA students who met the standard are summed and divided by the total number taking reading or ELA.
- *Testing Window.* Results for students given a make-up test within the testing window are included in the accountability indicators.
- *Exit-level TAKS.* The performance of all juniors tested for the first time during the primary spring administration (ELA in March; mathematics, science, and social studies in April) is included in determining accountability ratings. The performance of exit-level TAKS retesters is not included.
- *October 2010 administration.* Some juniors eligible for early graduation took the TAKS in October 2010. The performance of these students is included with the performance of other juniors taking the exit-level test if:
  - they were juniors at the time of testing;
  - they were taking the exit-level TAKS for the first time in October 2010; and
  - they passed all four assessments at that time.

Students tested in October who failed any tests in October could retest in the spring. However, in the event of a retest, neither performance — from October *nor* from the spring retest — is included in the accountability calculations. If October results are used, they are not adjusted for mobility. This means that if an 11<sup>th</sup> grader took and passed all the tests in October, then withdrew from school before the spring, that student’s results would count in determining the school’s accountability ratings. Conversely, if an 11<sup>th</sup> grader took but did not pass all the tests in October, and then withdrew from school before the spring, those student’s results would not count in determining the school’s accountability ratings.

- *Sum of All Grades Tested.* Results for each subject are summed across grades. This refers to the grades tested at the particular campus or district. For example, the percent passing for TAKS reading in an elementary school with a grade span of K-5 is calculated as:

$$\frac{\text{number of students who passed the reading test in grades 3, 4, \& 5}}{\text{number of students who took the reading test in grades 3, 4, \& 5}}$$

- *Excluded Students.* Only answer documents marked “Score” are included for TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), and TAKS-M. Answer documents coded “Absent,” “Exempt,” or “Other” are excluded. For students taking TAKS-Alt, a score code of “G” and assessment categories 2 or 3 are included. Assessment categories 1 and 4 are excluded.
- *Refugees and Asylees.* Results of students coded as refugees and/or asylees on the TAKS answer documents are not used in determining ratings. For more information, see *Appendix D – Data Sources*.
- *Linguistically Accommodated Testing (LAT).* Results for limited English proficient (LEP) students taking linguistically accommodated TAKS tests are not included in the state accountability system.
- *Rounding of Met Standard Percent.* The *Met Standard* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 59.877% is rounded to 60%; 79.4999% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.

- *Rounding of Student Group Percent.* The *Student Group* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. When determining if a student group is at least 10%, the rounded value is used. For example, 40 students in a group out of a total of 421 students is 9.5011876%. Because this rounds to the whole number 10, this student group is evaluated.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL) PROGRESS INDICATOR

This is a new indicator for 2011. Campuses and districts are evaluated on the percent of current and monitored limited English proficient (LEP) students who meet the TAKS reading/ELA standard or the criteria on the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) reading component. Performance on this indicator will be used to determine *Recognized* and *Exemplary* ratings.

**Who is evaluated for ELL Progress Indicator:** Districts and campuses that test LEP students on TAKS reading/ELA or TELPAS reading in grades 3-11. See *Table 3 – ELL Progress Indicator Guidelines*.

**Standard:** For both *Recognized* and *Exemplary* ratings, at least 60% of the LEP students must meet the ELL Progress Indicator criteria. This indicator cannot cause an *Academically Unacceptable* rating.

**Student Groups:** The ELL Progress Indicator is evaluated for All Students only; no student groups are evaluated. A single performance measure based on all current and monitored LEP students is evaluated.

### Methodology:

All current or monitored LEP students in grades 3-11 who met the TAKS reading/ELA standard or met the criteria on the TELPAS reading component

---

All current or monitored LEP students in grades 3-11 who took the TAKS reading/ELA test or the TELPAS reading component

**Minimum Size Requirements:** If the total number of current and monitored LEP students tested is fewer than 30, this indicator is not evaluated.

**Year of Data:** 2010-11

**Data Source:** Pearson

### Other Information:

- *Frequently Asked Questions.* Questions and answers regarding the new ELL Progress Indicator are available online at [http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/ell\\_faq.html](http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/ell_faq.html).
- *Texas Projection Measure.* The Texas Projection Measure (TPM) is *not* available for any indicator for determining the 2011 accountability ratings.
- *TAKS Spanish.* Performance on TAKS Spanish is not used in determining the ELL Progress Indicator.
- *TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt.* Results for LEP students taking the TAKS-M test are included along with TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) tests. However, TAKS-Alt results are not included, even if the TAKS-Alt students also take the reading component of TELPAS.

**Table 3: ELL Progress Indicator Guidelines**

<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> ) If a student takes any combination of these tests, the best result is evaluated. If a student takes a Spanish version of TAKS and also takes TELPAS, only the TELPAS result is evaluated.	
<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 assessments listed above (and not tested on any TAKS-Alt assessments). For the assessments and LEP students specified, the performance of students served in special education is included. <i>*A monitored LEP student is a student in his/her first or second year after exit from LEP status, as coded on their TAKS answer document.</i>	
<b>Student Success Initiative</b>	Grades 5 & 8 – includes first and second administration results (TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), & TAKS-M)	
<b>Years of Data</b> ( <i>Test Administration Used</i> )	TELPAS progress – 2011 and 2010 TELPAS met standard – 2011 TAKS/TAKS(Accommodated)/TAKS-M met standard – 2011	
<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.	
<b>Texas Projection Measure (TPM)</b>	The TPM is not available for determining 2011 ratings.	
<b>Progress Criteria</b>	1) <i>Met Standard</i> on the TAKS/TAKS(Accommodated)/TAKS-M test, or 2) Met TELPAS criteria. (TELPAS criteria vary depending on years in U.S. schools and whether first time or previous TELPAS tester. <i>See TELPAS Criteria, below.</i> )	
<b>TELPAS Criteria **</b>	<i>1st time tester</i>	<i>Previous tester</i>
<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>4 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 evaluated.)	N/A (Only TAKS evaluated.)

\*\* If years in U.S. schools is blank on the answer document, the student must achieve Advanced or higher to meet the TELPAS criteria.

- *Linguistically Accommodated Testing (LAT)*. Results for LEP students taking linguistically accommodated TAKS tests are not included in determining the ELL Progress Indicator.
- *Special Education*. The performance of LEP students with disabilities who take the TAKS reading/ELA is included in the ELL Progress Indicator, whether they took TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, or the regular TAKS.
- *Testing Window*. Results for students given a make-up test within the testing window are included in the accountability indicators.
- *Excluded Students*. Only answer documents marked “Score” are included. Answer documents coded “Absent,” “Exempt,” or “Other” are excluded.
- *Exit-level TAKS*. The performance of all juniors who took the ELA test during the primary spring administration is included in determining accountability ratings. The performance of exit-level TAKS retesters is not included.
- *Refugees and Asylees*. To the extent possible, the results of students coded as refugees and/or asylees are excluded from this indicator. All TAKS results for appropriately coded refugee and/or asylee students are excluded. The exclusion applies across all subject areas. It is not possible to count a student’s scores in some subjects but exclude them in others. The determination is made using TAKS answer documents. For refugee and/or asylee students with only TELPAS reading results this determination cannot be made. For more information, see *Appendix D – Data Sources*.
- *Rounding of Met Criteria Percent*. The *Met Criteria* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 59.877% is rounded to 60% and 59.4999% is rounded to 59%.

## COMMENDED PERFORMANCE

This is a new indicator for 2011. Campuses and districts are evaluated on the percent of students who score high enough on the TAKS reading and mathematics to achieve Commended Performance. This will be used to determine *Recognized* and *Exemplary* ratings.

**Who is evaluated for Commended Performance:** Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS reading and mathematics in grades 3-11. As with the TAKS indicator, the assessment results include TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, and TAKS-Alt.

### Standard:

- ***Exemplary*** – For both subjects, at least 25% of the tested students attain Commended Performance on the TAKS.
- ***Recognized*** – For both subjects, at least 15% of the tested students attain Commended Performance on the TAKS.

**Student Groups:** Performance is evaluated for All Students and the Economically Disadvantaged student group. The Commended Performance indicator shares a denominator with the TAKS indicator. Therefore, if All Students or the Economically Disadvantaged student group are evaluated for the TAKS indicator, they will be evaluated for Commended Performance as well.

**Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of students achieving Commended Performance on [TAKS subject]}}{\text{number of students tested in [TAKS subject]}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:**

- *All Students.* These results are evaluated regardless of the number of examinees. However, districts and campuses with a small number of total students tested on TAKS may receive Special Analysis. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more detailed information about Special Analysis.
- *Economically Disadvantaged Student Group.*
  - If the economically disadvantaged student group has fewer than 30 students tested, it is not evaluated.
  - If there are 30 to 49 students tested within the group and the group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
  - If there are at least 50 students tested within the group, it is evaluated.

**Year of Data:** 2010-11

**Data Source:** Pearson

**Other Information:**

- *Special Education.* The performance of students with disabilities who take the TAKS is included in determining Commended Performance, whether they took the regular TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, or TAKS-Alt.
- *Texas Projection Measure.* The Texas Projection Measure (TPM) is *not* available for any indicator for determining the 2011 accountability ratings.
- *TAKS Spanish.* Commended performance on the Spanish version of TAKS in reading and mathematics for grades 3, 4, and 5 is combined with commended performance on the English-language TAKS for the same subject to determine a rating.
- *Student Success Initiative (SSI).* In determining accountability ratings, a cumulative percent attaining Commended Performance is calculated by combining the first and second administrations of the TAKS in grades 5 and 8 reading and mathematics performance. Results include performance on the Spanish versions of these tests, as well as TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, and TAKS-Alt results.
- *Testing Window.* Results for students given a make-up test within the testing window are included in the accountability indicators.
- *Exit-level TAKS.* The commended performance of all juniors who took the ELA and mathematics tests for the first time during the primary spring administration is included in determining accountability ratings. The performance of exit-level TAKS retesters is not included.
- *October 2010 administration.* Some juniors eligible for early graduation took the TAKS in October 2010. The commended performance of these students is included with the performance of other juniors taking the exit-level test if:

- they were juniors at the time of testing;
- they were taking the exit-level TAKS for the first time in October 2010; and
- they passed all four assessments at that time.

Students tested in October who failed any tests in October could retest in the spring. However, in the event of a retest, neither performance — from October *nor* from the spring retest — is included in the accountability calculations. This means that in determining Commended Performance, all October testers who passed all October TAKS tests will be in the denominator, but not necessarily in the numerator.

- *Sum of All Grades Tested.* Results for each subject are summed across grades. This refers to the grades tested at the particular campus or district. For example, the percent meeting commended performance in reading in an elementary school with a grade span of K-5 is calculated as:

$$\frac{\text{number of students who met Commended Performance on the reading test in grades 3, 4, \& 5}}{\text{number of students who took the reading test in grades 3, 4, \& 5}}$$

- *Excluded Students.* Only answer documents marked “Score” are included for TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), and TAKS-M. Answer documents coded “Absent,” “Exempt,” or “Other” are excluded. For students taking TAKS-Alt, a score code of “G” and assessment categories 2 or 3 are included. Assessment categories 1 and 4 are excluded.
- *Refugees and Asylees.* Results of students coded as refugees and/or asylees on the TAKS answer documents are not used in determining ratings. For more information, see *Appendix D – Data Sources*.
- *Linguistically Accommodated Testing (LAT).* Results for limited English proficient students taking linguistically accommodated TAKS tests are not included in the state accountability system.
- *Rounding of Commended Performance Percent.* The Commended Performance calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 14.877% is rounded to 15%, and 24.4999% is rounded to 24%.
- *Rounding of Student Group Percent.* The *Student Group* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. When determining if a student group is at least 10%, the rounded value is used. For example, 40 students in a group out of a total of 421 students is 9.5011876%. Because this rounds to the whole number 10, this student group is evaluated.

## ACCOUNTABILITY SUBSET

For TAKS, Commended Performance, and the ELL Progress Indicator (this includes the TELPAS reading assessment), only the performance of students enrolled on the PEIMS fall “as-of” date of October 29, 2010, are considered in the ratings. This is referred to as the *accountability subset* (sometimes referred to as the *October subset* or the *mobility adjustment*). This adjustment is not applied to the dropout or completion base indicators.

Students who move from district to district are excluded from the campus and district assessment results. Further, students who move from campus to campus within a district are kept in the district’s results but are excluded from the campus’s assessment results. No

campus is held accountable for students who move between campuses after the PEIMS “as-of” date and before the date of testing, even if they stay within the same district. The subsets are determined as follows:

*Campus-level accountability subset:* If a student was reported to be enrolled at one campus on October 29, 2010, but moves to another campus before the test, that student’s performance is removed from the accountability results for both campuses, whether the campuses are in the same district or different districts. Campuses are held accountable only for those students reported to be enrolled in the campus in the fall and tested in the same campus in the second semester.

*District-level accountability subset:* If a student was enrolled in one district on October 29, 2010, but moved to another district before the test, that student’s performance is taken out of the accountability subset for both districts. However, if the student moved from campus to campus within the district, his or her performance is included in that district’s results, even though it does not count for either campus. This means that district performance results do not match the sum of the campus performance results.

Examples of how the accountability subset criteria are applied are provided in the following table. Note that these apply to TAKS (including TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, and TAKS-Alt) and TELPAS performance results. For more information, see *Tables 30 and 31 in Appendix D – Data Sources*.

**Table 4: Accountability Subset**

Student Situation	In Whose Accountability Subset?
<b>General</b>	
1. Grade 9 student is enrolled at campus A in the fall and tests there on TAKS reading in March and mathematics in April.	This student’s results affect the rating of both campus A and the district.
2. Grade 6 student is enrolled in district Y in the fall and moves to district Z at the semester break. The student is tested on TAKS reading and mathematics in April.	These results do not affect the rating of any campus or district. Results are reported to district Z.
3. Grade 6 student is enrolled at campus A in the fall and then moves to campus B in the same district at the semester break. The student is tested on TAKS reading and mathematics in April.	This student’s results do not affect the rating of campus A or B, but they do affect the district. Results for both tests are reported to campus B.
4. Grade 6 student is reported in enrollment at a campus, but is withdrawn for home schooling on November 10 <sup>th</sup> . Parents re-enroll the student at the same campus on April 1. The student is tested in TAKS reading and mathematics in late April.	Performance on both tests is reported and included in the ratings evaluation for the campus. The fact that the student was enrolled on the “as of” date and tested in the same campus and district are the criteria for determining the accountability subset.

**Table 4: Accountability Subset (continued)**

Student Situation	In Whose Accountability Subset?
<b>General</b>	
5. A 12 <sup>th</sup> grade student moves to a district from another state at the beginning of the school year. She takes the exit-level tests in October and fails; she takes them again during the spring. Does her performance affect the district or campus?	No. The performance of 12 <sup>th</sup> graders is not used for accountability purposes.
6. A student who is ADA ineligible is enrolled at the campus in the fall and takes the TAKS in the spring. Does her performance count for accountability purposes?	Yes, this student’s performance on the TAKS will count toward the school’s accountability rating, regardless of her ADA eligibility.
<b>Mobility between Writing/ELA and other tests</b>	
7. Grade 4 student enrolls in campus A in the fall and takes the TAKS writing test there in March. The student then transfers to campus B in the same district and tests on TAKS reading and mathematics in April.	This student’s results do not affect the rating of campus A or B. Although writing was assessed at the same campus where the student was enrolled in the fall, the writing results are reported to campus B, where the student tested last. The results affect the district rating. Results for all tests are reported to campus B.
8. Grade 4 student enrolls in campus A in the fall and takes the writing TAKS there in March. The student then transfers to campus B in a different district and tests on TAKS reading and mathematics in April.	This student’s results do not affect the rating of either campus or district. Test results are reported to the campus where the student tested last, in this case, campus B.
9. A first-time 11 <sup>th</sup> grade student is enrolled in district Y in the fall and takes the TAKS ELA in March. He then moves to district Z, where he takes the last three tests.	This student’s results do not affect the rating of either campus or district. Results for all tests are reported to the campus where the student tested last in district Z.
10. Grade 7 student is reported in enrollment in district Y and takes the writing test in that district at campus A. In early April, the student transfers to district Z and takes the remaining grade 7 TAKS tests there. The answer documents submitted by district Z use different name spellings than did the one submitted by district Y.	To the test contractor these are two different students. Performance on the student’s writing test is reported to district Y and counts toward its rating and the rating of campus A. The student’s results in reading and mathematics are reported to district Z but do not contribute to the rating of either the district or the campus where the student tested because the student was not there in the fall.

**Table 4: Accountability Subset (continued)**

Student Situation	In Whose Accountability Subset?
11. A first-time 11 <sup>th</sup> grade student is enrolled in district Y in the fall and takes the TAKS ELA in March. She then moves out of state. She does not take the last three tests.	This student’s results on ELA is used in determining both campus and district Y ratings.
12. A first-time 11 <sup>th</sup> grade student is enrolled in high school A, district Z in the fall and takes the TAKS ELA in March. He then is sent to a disciplinary campus for the rest of the year, where he takes the rest of the TAKS tests. He is not court-ordered to attend the disciplinary campus.	If the disciplinary campus is a JJAEP or DAEP, the student’s performance must be coded back to the sending campus, and it is used in determining both campus and district ratings. If the disciplinary campus is neither of the above but is in district Z, the performance is used in determining both the district and campus ratings.
<b>Grades 5 and 8 Reading and Mathematics (Student Success Initiative)</b> <i>(See Tables 30 and 31 in Appendix D – Data Sources for further information.)</i>	
13. Grade 5 student takes mathematics and reading in April at campus A where he was enrolled in the fall, and fails both tests. He then moves to campus B (in the same district) where he takes science and retests in reading and mathematics. He passes all tests.	This student’s results do not affect the rating of campus A or B. The April reading and mathematics results are reported to campus A, even though the other results are reported to campus B. The final results from all tests affect the district.
14. Grade 8 student takes TAKS reading and mathematics in early April at the campus where she was enrolled in the fall. She fails the mathematics test. The student then moves out of state. She does not take the other TAKS tests.	This student’s TAKS results for reading and mathematics affect the rating for both the campus and district.
15. Grade 5 student takes TAKS reading and mathematics in early April at the campus where she was enrolled in the fall, and fails both tests. The student then moves to another district, where she takes TAKS science and retests in May and fails again.	This student’s TAKS reading, mathematics, and science results do not affect the rating for any campus or district.
16. Grade 8 student takes reading and mathematics TAKS (Accommodated) in early April at the campus where he was enrolled in the fall, and fails both tests. His ARD committee decides he needs to retest with TAKS-M for both tests. He passes both.	The student’s TAKS-M results in reading and mathematics will be used in determining the school and district ratings. His results for science and social studies will also be used, regardless of version of TAKS taken.

**Table 4: Accountability Subset (continued)**

<b>Student Situation</b>	<b>In Whose Accountability Subset?</b>
<p>17. Grade 5 student takes TAKS reading and mathematics in early April at campus A in district A where she was enrolled in the fall. She fails mathematics. The student then moves to campus B (in another district) where she takes science. She does not take the mathematics retest in May.</p>	<p><i>Science:</i> Her science results do not affect the rating of any campus or district.  <i>Reading:</i> Her April reading results do affect the rating of campus A and district A. This is a change to the treatment of reading results from prior years.  <i>Mathematics:</i> The April performance on mathematics is retained and does affect the rating of campus A and district A.</p>
<b>Spanish TAKS</b>	
<p>18. A grade 3 student’s LPAC committee directs that she be tested in reading on the Spanish TAKS and in mathematics on the English TAKS. She remains at the same campus the entire year.</p>	<p>Performance on both tests is reported and included in the rating evaluation for the campus and district. Results on both English and Spanish versions of the TAKS contribute to the overall passing rate.</p>
<b>TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-Modified, and TAKS-Alternate</b>	
<p>19. A grade 8 student takes the TAKS mathematics test in April and passes it. She takes TAKS reading and fails the test. Her ARD committee decides she should take the TAKS (Accommodated) reading during the 2nd administration in May, which she passes. She has remained at the same campus the entire year.</p>	<p>This student’s TAKS (Accommodated) reading passing results and TAKS mathematics passing results are included in the TAKS performance for the campus and the district.</p>
<p>20. A grade 6 student’s ARD committee directs that she be tested in reading and mathematics subjects on the TAKS-Alt. She passes both tests. She remains at the same campus the entire year.</p>	<p>This student’s TAKS-Alt passing results are included in the TAKS and Commended Performance indicators for the campus and the district. (The inclusion of TAKS-Alt performance is new in 2011.)</p>
<p>21. A grade 5 student takes the TAKS (Accommodated) reading and mathematics tests in April and fails both. Her ARD committee directs that she take the TAKS-M reading and mathematics for the second administration. She passes mathematics but fails reading. She remains at the same campus the entire year.</p>	<p>This student’s TAKS-M mathematics passing result and TAKS-M reading failing result are included in the TAKS and Commended Performance indicators for the campus and the district. (The inclusion of TAKS-M performance is new in 2011.)</p>
<p>22. A grade 3 student takes and passes the TAKS (Accommodated) reading and the TAKS-M mathematics. He remains at the same campus the entire year.</p>	<p>Performance on both assessments will be included in determining the campus and district rating.</p>

**Table 4: Accountability Subset (continued)**

Student Situation	In Whose Accountability Subset?
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
23. A grade 9 current LEP student in his second year in U.S. schools takes the TELPAS reading test. He remains at the same campus the entire year.	This student’s results will be used in determining the ELL Progress Indicator for the district and campus.
24. Grade 6 LEP student is enrolled in district Y in the fall and moves to district Z at the semester break. The student is tested on TELPAS reading in April.	These results do not affect the rating of any campus or district. Results are reported to district Z.
25. A grade 6 LEP student takes the TAKS reading in English and fails. She also takes the TELPAS reading and meets the TELPAS progress criteria. She remains at the same campus the entire year.	Her performance will help the school and district meet the standard for the ELL Progress Indicator. However, her failure on the TAKS reading will also be used in calculating the school and district’s TAKS met standard and the Commended Performance.

**COMPLETION RATE I [GRADUATES AND CONTINUERS]**

This longitudinal rate shows the percent of students who first attended grade 9 in the 2006-07 school year and have graduated or are continuing their education four years later. Known as the 2006-07 cohort, these students were tracked over the four years using data provided to TEA by districts and data available in the statewide General Educational Development (GED) database.

To count as a “completer” for standard accountability procedures, a student must have received a high school diploma with his/her class (or earlier) or have re-enrolled in the fall of 2010 as a continuing student.

**Who is evaluated for Completion Rate I:** Beginning with the 2011 accountability cycle, the methodology for calculating completion rates has been expanded. The expanded methodology creates completion rates for campuses with grade 9 and either grade 11 or 12 in both year 1 (2006-07) and year 5 (2010-11); or, campuses with grade 12 in both year 1 and year 5. High schools that do not meet these requirements are not evaluated on this indicator in 2011. See *Other Information* below.

**Standard:**

- **Exemplary** – Completion Rate I of 95.0% or more.
- **Recognized** – Completion Rate I of 85.0% or more.
- **Academically Acceptable** – Completion Rate I of 75.0% or more.

**Student Groups:** Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

## Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of completers}}{\text{number in class}^*}$$

\*See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for the definition of *number in class*.

## Minimum Size Requirements:

- *All Students*. These results are evaluated if:
  - there are at least 10 students in the class; *and*
  - there are at least 5 dropouts.
- *Student Groups*. These results are evaluated if there are at least 5 dropouts within the student group *and*:
  - there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students; or
  - there are at least 50 students within the student group.

**Years of Data:** 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11.

**Data Source:** PEIMS submission 1 enrollment data, 2006-07 through 2010-11; PEIMS submission 1 leaver data, 2006-07 through 2010-11; PEIMS submission 3 attendance data, 2006-07 through 2009-10; and General Educational Development records as of August 31, 2010.

## Other Information:

- *Race and Ethnicity*. For the class of 2010, most students' race and ethnicity were based on a final status using the former definitions. Fifth-year continuers, whose status was reported in the 2010-11 school year, use race/ethnicity based on the new, federally-mandated definitions for White, Hispanic, and African American. Only these continuing students reported as "Two or More Races" in year 5 will be matched back to the prior year to obtain their former (previously reported) ethnicities. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for more information on race and ethnicity.
- *Economically Disadvantaged Status*. The economic status of a student is based on the economic disadvantage information reported by the accountable district in the student's final year of the cohort.
- *No Use of District Rate for High Schools*. In Texas, a typical public high school serves grades 9-12. High schools that serve only some of those grades may not have their own completion rate. In the past, the district rate would be attributed to such schools. The attribution of the district rate for high schools continues to be suspended through the 2011 accountability year.
- *Transfers in*. Students can be added to a district's cohort in one of two ways: 1) A student identified in the grade 9 2006-07 cohort is added to a district's cohort when the student moves from one Texas public school district to another. The student is removed from the sending district's cohort. 2) A student who is new to Texas public schools and enrolls in a district in the expected grade level of the cohort is added to the district's cohort. For example, a student who enrolls in grade 10 in 2007-08 when on-grade members of the cohort are in grade 10 is added to the district's cohort.

- *Retained Students.* Students who repeat a year are kept with their original cohort.
- *Rounding of Completion Rate.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 74.875% is rounded to 74.9%, not 75%.
- *Rounding of Student Group Percent (Minimum Size Requirements).* The *Student Group* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. When determining if a student group is at least 10%, the rounded value is used. For example, 40 students in a group out of a total of 421 students is 9.5011876%. Because this rounds to the whole number 10, this student group is evaluated.
- *Special Education.* The completion status of students with disabilities is included in this indicator.

## **ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE (GRADES 7-8)**

For accountability purposes, the annual dropout rate is used to evaluate campuses and districts with students in grades 7 and/or 8. This is a one-year measure, calculated by summing the number of dropouts across the two grades.

**Who is evaluated for Annual Dropout Rate:** Districts and campuses that serve students in grades 7 and/or 8.

**Standard:** The standard for the Annual Dropout Rate is 1.6% or less for all rating categories. Any district or campus with a rate higher than 1.6% that does not demonstrate Required Improvement is rated *Academically Unacceptable*.

**Student Groups:** Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

### **Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of grade 7-8 dropouts}}{\text{number of grade 7-8 students who were in attendance at any time during the school year}}$$

### **Minimum Size Requirements:**

- *All Students.* These results are evaluated if:
  - there are at least 10 students in grades 7-8; *and*
  - there are at least 5 dropouts.
- *Student Groups.* These results are evaluated if there are at least 5 dropouts within the student group *and*:
  - there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students; or
  - there are at least 50 students within the student group.

**Year of Data:** 2009-10

**Data Source:** PEIMS submission 1 enrollment data 2009-10; PEIMS submission 1 leaver data, 2010-11; PEIMS submission 3 attendance data, 2009-10.

## Other Information:

- *Race and Ethnicity.* A dropout's racial and ethnic category is based on what is reported on the 2010-11 PEIMS submission 1 (2009-10) leaver data. Because the leaver data is only available with the new federal race and ethnicity designations, for 2011 accountability, the White, Hispanic, and African American student groups for the Annual Dropout Rate indicator can only be created using the new federal race and ethnicity definitions. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for more information on race and ethnicity.
- *Economically Disadvantaged Status.* The economic status of a student is based on the economic disadvantage information reported by the accountable district.
- *Cumulative Attendance.* A cumulative count of students is used in the denominator. This method for calculating the dropout rate neutralizes the effects of mobility by including in the denominator every student ever reported in attendance at the campus or district throughout the school year, regardless of length of stay.
- *Rounding of Dropout Rate.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 1.65% is rounded to 1.7%.
- *Rounding of Student Group Percent (Minimum Size Requirements).* The *Student Group* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. When determining if a student group is at least 10%, the rounded value is used. For example, 40 students in a group out of a total of 421 students is 9.5011876%. Because this rounds to the whole number 10, this student group is evaluated.
- *Special Education.* Dropouts served by special education are included in this measure.



## Chapter 3 – The Basics: *Additional Features*

---

As shown in *Chapter 2 – The Basics: Base Indicators*, districts and campuses can achieve a rating by meeting the absolute standards for the different indicators. However, under certain conditions, a campus or district can raise their rating:

- by meeting *Required Improvement*; and/or
- by using the *Exceptions Provision*.

Not all features apply to all indicators. For a summary, see *Table 5 - Additional Features by Indicator* later in this chapter.

**The Texas Projection Measure (TPM) is not available for any indicator in 2011.**

Additional features are applied and calculated automatically by TEA before ratings are released. Districts and campuses do not need to request the use of additional features.

### Required Improvement to *Academically Acceptable*

---

Required Improvement to move to *Academically Acceptable* is available for three base indicators: *TAKS*, *Completion Rate I*, and the *Annual Dropout Rate*. It is not applicable for either Commended Performance or the ELL Progress Indicator because these two base indicators only affect the *Recognized* and *Exemplary* rating categories. Campuses or districts initially rated *Academically Unacceptable* may achieve an *Academically Acceptable* rating using the Required Improvement feature.

**Who is evaluated for Required Improvement:** Districts and campuses whose performance is *Academically Unacceptable* for any TAKS subject, Annual Dropout Rate, or Completion Rate I measure evaluated.

### TAKS

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district to *Academically Acceptable*, the campus or district must have shown enough improvement on the deficient TAKS measures since 2010 to be able to meet the current year accountability standard in two years.

There are different standards for the *Academically Acceptable* rating for TAKS:

- *Reading/ELA, Writing, and Social Studies*. Any measure below the standard must achieve enough gain to meet a standard of **70%** in two years.
- *Mathematics*. Any measure below the standard must achieve enough gain to meet a standard of **65%** in two years.
- *Science*. Any measure below the standard must achieve enough gain to meet a standard of **60%** in two years.

**Methodology:** The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Actual Change} \\ \text{[performance in 2011]} - \text{[performance in 2010]} \end{array} \geq \frac{\begin{array}{c} \text{Required Improvement} \\ \text{[standard for 2011]} - \text{[performance in 2010]} \end{array}}{2}$$

*Example:* For 2011, a high school campus has performance above the *Academically Acceptable* standard in all areas except for their Economically Disadvantaged student group in TAKS mathematics; only 59% met the standard. Their performance in 2010 for the same group and subject was 49%.

First calculate their *actual change*:

$$59 - 49 = 10$$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{65 - 49}{2} = 8$$

Then compare the two numbers to see if the *actual change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*:

$$10 \geq 8$$

Result: the campus meets Required Improvement, so its rating is *Academically Acceptable*.

**Minimum Size Requirements:** In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have test results (for the subject and student group) for at least 10 students in 2010.

**Other Information:**

- *Recalculation of Prior-year Results.* For purposes of calculating RI, the prior-year (spring 2010) assessment results have been rebuilt to include TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt results for all subjects and grades.
- *Race/Ethnicity.* Current year results use the new federal definition for race and ethnicity. The prior-year results use the former definition for race and ethnicity. See *Appendix J – Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision* for more information.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are done on performance rates and standards that have been rounded to whole numbers. Required Improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

**COMPLETION RATE I [GRADUATES AND CONTINUERS]**

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district to *Academically Acceptable*, the campus or district must have shown enough improvement on the deficient Completion Rate I measures between the classes of 2009 and 2010 to be at a standard of **75.0%** in two years.

**Methodology:** The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

<b>Actual Change</b>		<b>Required Improvement</b>
[completion rate for class of 2010] minus [completion rate for class of 2009]	≥	[75.0] – [completion rate for class of 2009] 2

**Minimum Size Requirements:** In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have had at least 10 students (in the same student group) in the class of 2009 completion rate.

**Other Information:**

- *Race/Ethnicity.* Both current and prior-year results use the former definition for race and ethnicity.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 2.85% is rounded to 2.9%, not 3%.

**ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE**

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district to *Academically Acceptable*, the campus or district must have shown enough decline in its dropout rate to be at **1.6%** in two years.

**Methodology:** The *actual change* must be equal to or less than the *Required Improvement*:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Actual Change} \\ \text{[2009-10 dropout rate]} - \text{[2008-09 dropout rate]} \end{array} \leq \frac{\begin{array}{l} \text{Required Improvement} \\ \text{[1.6]} - \text{[2008-09 dropout rate]} \end{array}}{2}$$

This calculation measures *reductions* in rates, not gains as with TAKS or Completion Rate I results. The actual change in the dropout rate needs to be *less than or equal to* the Required Improvement for the standard to be met, and will involve negative numbers. Stated another way, the actual change needs to be a larger negative number than the Required Improvement number.

**Minimum Size Requirements:** In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have had at least 10 grade 7-8 students (in the same student group) in 2008-09.

*Example:* In 2009-10, a middle school had performance at the *Academically Acceptable* level for all indicators except their dropout rate. The dropout rate for their Hispanic student group was 1.8%. Their dropout rate in 2008-09 for the same group was 2.6%.

First calculate their *actual change*:

$$1.8 - 2.6 = -0.8$$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{1.6 - 2.6}{2} = -0.5$$

Then compare the two numbers to see if the *actual change* is less than or equal to the *Required Improvement*:

$$-0.8 \leq -0.5$$

Result: the campus meets Required Improvement, so its rating is *Academically Acceptable*.

### Other Information:

- *Race and Ethnicity.* The current year results use the new, federal definitions for race and ethnicity and the prior-year results use the former definitions.
- *Floor.* No floor is required to use Required Improvement for the Annual Dropout Rate, either for moving to *Academically Acceptable*, *Recognized*, or *Exemplary*.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, -1.675% is rounded to -1.7%.

## Required Improvement to *Recognized* or *Exemplary*

---

Required Improvement to move to *Recognized* is available for four base indicators: TAKS, ELL Progress Indicator, Completion Rate I, and the Annual Dropout Rate. It is not available for Commended Performance. Required Improvement to move to *Exemplary* is also available for the ELL Progress Indicator and the Annual Dropout Rate. See *Table 5 – Additional Features by Indicator* for a summary.

**Who is evaluated for Required Improvement to *Recognized*:** Districts and campuses whose performance is at the high end of *Academically Acceptable* for any TAKS subject or Completion Rate I, and who also meet the minimum “floor” for current year performance. Campuses or districts that do not meet the 1.6% Annual Dropout Rate standard or the 60% ELL Progress Indicator criteria may also use Required Improvement to achieve a *Recognized* or *Exemplary* rating and no floors are imposed.

### TAKS

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*, the campus or district must have:

- performance ranging from 75% to 79% on the measure, and
- shown enough improvement on TAKS since 2010 to be at **80%** in two years.

**Methodology:** The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Actual Change} \\ \text{[performance in 2011]} - \text{[performance in 2010]} \end{array} \geq \frac{\begin{array}{c} \text{Required Improvement} \\ \text{[80]} - \text{[performance in 2010]} \end{array}}{2}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** For Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have test results (for the subject and student group) for at least 10 students in 2010.

### Other Information:

- *Standards.* The *Recognized* standard for the TAKS indicator (80%) is the same for all subjects.
- *Recalculation of Prior-year Results.* For purposes of calculating RI, the prior-year (spring 2010) assessment results have been rebuilt to include TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt results for all subjects and grades.

- *Race and Ethnicity.* Current year results use the new federal definition for race and ethnicity. The prior-year results use the former definition for race and ethnicity. See *Appendix J* for more information about the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are done on performance rates and standards that have been rounded to whole numbers. Required Improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

*Example:* For 2011, a district has performance above the *Recognized* standard for all indicators except for their Economically Disadvantaged student group in TAKS science; only 75% met the standard. Their performance in 2010 for the same group and subject was 71%.

First determine if their current year performance is *at or above the floor* of 75%:

$$75 \geq 75$$

Next calculate their *actual change*:

$$75 - 71 = 4$$

Then calculate the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{80 - 71}{2} = 5 \text{ (4.5 rounds to 5)}$$

Finally, compare the two numbers to see if the *actual change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*:

4 is not greater than or equal to 5

Result: the district does not meet Required Improvement, so its rating cannot be elevated above *Academically Acceptable* due to Required Improvement. However, use of the Exceptions Provision may apply.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL) PROGRESS INDICATOR

**Improvement Standard:** A campus or district cannot be prevented from a rating of *Recognized* or *Exemplary* if it has either met the ELL Progress Indicator standard or demonstrated Required Improvement.

Because there is only one standard (60%) for both *Recognized* and *Exemplary*, the same Required Improvement calculation is applied whether the campus or district is initially *Academically Acceptable* or *Recognized*. This means that no performance floor is imposed when using Required Improvement for the ELL Progress Indicator to achieve *Recognized* or *Exemplary*.

In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district to *Recognized* or *Exemplary*, the campus or district must have shown enough improvement on the ELL Progress Indicator since 2010 to be at a standard of **60%** in two years.

**Methodology:** The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

<b>Actual Change</b>	<b>Required Improvement</b>
[ELL performance in 2011] – [ELL performance in 2010] ≥	$\frac{[60] - [\text{ELL performance in 2010}]}{2}$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have test results for at least 10 ELL students in 2010.

**Other Information:**

- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are done on performance rates and standards that have been rounded to whole numbers. Required Improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

*Example:* For 2011, a campus has performance above the *Recognized* standard for all areas except for their ELL Progress Indicator; only 58% met the standard. Their performance in 2010 was 48%.

First calculate their *actual change*:

$$58 - 48 = 10$$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{60 - 48}{2} = 6$$

Then compare the two numbers to see if the *actual change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*:

$$10 \geq 6$$

Result: the campus meets Required Improvement, so its rating is *Recognized*.

## COMPLETION RATE I [GRADUATES AND CONTINUERS]

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*, the campus or district must have:

- a completion rate ranging from 75.0% to 84.9% on the measure, and
- shown enough improvement on the deficient completion rate measures between the classes of 2009 and 2010 to be at **85.0%** in two years.

**Methodology:** The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

<b>Actual Change</b>		<b>Required Improvement</b>
[completion rate for class of 2010] minus [completion rate for class of 2009]	≥	[85.0] – [completion rate for class of 2009] 2

**Minimum Size Requirements:** In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have had at least 10 students (in the same student group) in the class of 2009 completion rate.

**Other Information:**

- *Race/Ethnicity.* Both current and prior-year results use the former definition for race and ethnicity.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 2.85% is rounded to 2.9%, not 3%.

## ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE

A campus or district cannot be prevented from a rating of *Academically Acceptable*, *Recognized*, or *Exemplary* if it has either met the absolute dropout rate standard or demonstrated dropout rate Required Improvement.

Because there is only one standard (1.6%) to meet for the Annual Dropout Rate, the same Required Improvement calculation is applied whether the campus or district is initially *Academically Unacceptable*, *Academically Acceptable*, or *Recognized*. This means that no performance floor is imposed when using Required Improvement for the dropout rate to achieve *Recognized* or *Exemplary*. See page 31 for the methodology and other details.

**Table 5: Additional Features by Indicator**

	TAKS	Commended Performance	ELL Progress Indicator	Completion Rate I	Annual Dropout Rate
<b>Required Improvement</b>					
Use Required Improvement to move to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Academically Acceptable</i></li> <li>• <i>Recognized</i></li> </ul>	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Recognized</i></li> <li>• <i>Exemplary</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Academically Acceptable</i></li> <li>• <i>Recognized</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Academically Acceptable</i></li> <li>• <i>Recognized</i></li> <li>• <i>Exemplary</i></li> </ul>
RI Restrictions	Floor limit for <i>Recognized</i>	N/A	None	Floor limit for <i>Recognized</i>	None
<b>Exceptions</b>					
Use Exceptions to move to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Academically Acceptable</i></li> <li>• <i>Recognized</i></li> <li>• <i>Exemplary</i></li> </ul>	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Recognized</i></li> <li>• <i>Exemplary</i></li> </ul>	N/A	N/A
Exceptions Restrictions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Floor limit for All Ratings</li> <li>• No Reuse in Following Year</li> <li>• Limits on Number of Exceptions</li> </ul>	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Floor limit for All Ratings</li> <li>• No Reuse in Following Year</li> <li>• Limits on Number of Exceptions</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A

## Exceptions Provision

The Exceptions Provision provides relief to larger campuses and districts with more diverse student populations who are evaluated on more measures. After application of Required Improvement, campuses or districts may still “gate up” to a higher rating by using exceptions. The Exceptions Provision can be applied to any of the 25 TAKS measures (5 subjects multiplied by 5 groups: All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged), as well as the single ELL Progress Indicator measure. The Exceptions Provision does not apply to Commended Performance, Completion Rate I, or Annual Dropout Rate indicators. To be eligible to use this provision, minimum performance floors must be met and other safeguards are applied.

### Other Information:

- *ELL Progress Indicator.* There is one standard (60%) to meet on the ELL Progress Indicator to be rated *Recognized* or *Exemplary*. An available exception may be used for the ELL Progress Indicator to move to either of these ratings.
- *Exceptions Applied Automatically.* There is no need for a district or campus to request that the Exceptions Provision be applied. Exceptions are automatically calculated and assigned prior to the release of ratings, but only if use of the provision will successfully move a campus or district to a higher rating. For example, if a campus is eligible for two exceptions, but it actually needs three in order to raise its rating to *Academically Acceptable*, then no exceptions are used, and the campus remains *Academically Unacceptable*. If the provision successfully moves a campus or district to a higher rating, the provision will be used. A campus or district cannot request that exceptions not be used.
- *Only for TAKS and ELL Progress Indicator.* This provision only applies to the TAKS and ELL Progress indicators. If a rating is due to Commended Performance, Completion Rate I, or the Annual Dropout Rate, the Exceptions Provision is not applied.
- *Notification.* The accountability data table released with the ratings serves as notification of which exceptions, if any, have been used. See *Chapter 4 – The Basics: Determining a Rating* for details. Exceptions charged as a result of Special Analysis or granted appeals will be cited in a message at the top of the data table. Exceptions charged due to granted appeals are also noted in the commissioner’s response letter to the appeal.

### USING EXCEPTIONS TO MOVE TO *ACADEMICALLY ACCEPTABLE* OR *RECOGNIZED*

A campus or district may use up to four exceptions in order to achieve a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or up to four exceptions in order to achieve a rating of *Recognized*. To be eligible to use any exceptions, the campus or district must be evaluated on at least five TAKS measures and must meet the appropriate performance floor(s). Evaluation on the ELL Progress Indicator does not contribute to the number of measures evaluated.

The number of exceptions allowed is dependent on the number of TAKS measures evaluated, as shown in the following table:

<b>Exceptions for moving to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> or <i>Recognized</i></b>	
<b>Number of TAKS Measures Evaluated</b>	<b>Maximum Number of Exceptions Allowed</b>
1 – 4	0 exceptions
5 – 8	1 exception
9 – 11	2 exceptions
12 – 15	3 exceptions
16 or more	4 exceptions

### Performance Floor:

Performance on the measure to which the Exceptions Provision will be applied must be no more than five percentage points below the standard. See the table below for the minimum performance needed in 2011.

Floors			
Academically Acceptable		Recognized	
TAKS Indicator			
Mathematics	60%	All subjects	75%
Science	55%		
Reading/ELA, Writing & Social Studies	65%		
		Recognized or Exemplary	
ELL Progress Indicator	n/a	Reading/ELA	55%

### USING EXCEPTIONS TO MOVE TO *EXEMPLARY*

A campus or district may use one exception to gate up to a rating of *Exemplary*. To be eligible for this one exception, the campus or district must be evaluated on at least ten TAKS measures and meet the performance floor. Evaluation on the ELL Progress Indicator does not contribute to the number of measures evaluated.

**Performance Floor:** Performance on the measure to which the Exceptions Provision will be applied must be no more than five percentage points below the *Exemplary* standard. For the TAKS measures this means performance must range from 85% to 89% on the measure. For the ELL Progress Indicator performance must range from 55% to 59%.

Exceptions for moving to <i>Exemplary</i>	
Number of TAKS Measures Evaluated	Maximum Number of Exceptions Allowed
1 – 9	0 exceptions
10 or more	1 exception

### PROVISION SAFEGUARDS

- *One-Time Use.* An exception will not be granted for the same measure for two consecutive years. For example, if a campus was granted an exception for White student science performance in 2010, the campus is not eligible for an exception for White student science performance in 2011. This safeguard applies regardless of the rating achieved when the exception was used.
- *Other “Charged” Exceptions.* There are cases where a district or campus may be “charged” with an exception in the process of Special Analysis or in granting appeals.

*Example.* A large high school with a diverse population is evaluated on all TAKS student groups for reading/ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies, for a total of 20 measures. The percent passing on all indicators meets the *Academically Acceptable* standards except for the performance of their Economically Disadvantaged students in mathematics (61%) and science (58%). They did not demonstrate Required Improvement for either of these measures.

The percent of students passing mathematics and science are within five points of the *Academically Acceptable* standards (65% and 60%, respectively). Because they are evaluated on 16 or more assessment measures, (20) they are eligible to use up to four exceptions. Assuming they did not take an exception for either of these measures in the prior-year, they meet the Exceptions Provision requirements.

Result: the campus rating is *Academically Acceptable* and the campus is charged with use of an exception for Economically Disadvantaged students in mathematics and Economically Disadvantaged students in science. The two exception areas must be addressed in their campus improvement plan.

- *Move Only One Level for TAKS.* The Exceptions Provision cannot be used to move up more than one rating level if the area lacking is one of the TAKS measures. For example, if a campus meets the *Exemplary* criteria on all accountability measures except for one TAKS measure, and fails to meet the *Academically Acceptable* criteria on that one measure, the Exceptions Provision will only move the campus from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*.

Further, combinations of Required Improvement and the Exceptions Provision cannot be used together for one TAKS 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 TAKS measure.

- *Move more than one level for ELL Progress Indicator.* A campus or district that meets *Exemplary* criteria on all accountability measures except the ELL Progress Indicator can use the Exceptions Provision to be *Exemplary*.
- *Campus and District Improvement Plans.* Any campus or district that uses one or more exceptions must address performance on those measures to which the exceptions are applied in its campus or district improvement plan.

## **Additional Issues for Districts**

---

### **DISTRICTS WITH *ACADEMICALLY UNACCEPTABLE* CAMPUSES**

Any district that has one or more campuses rated *Academically Unacceptable* cannot receive a rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*. There are two exceptions to this rule. First, an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating for a campus does not prevent an *Exemplary* or *Recognized* district rating.

Second, some campuses are identified within the accountability system as Texas Youth Commission (TYC) campuses or Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC) campuses. A

rating of *Academically Unacceptable* on these campuses does not prevent an *Exemplary* or *Recognized* district rating. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information about these campus types.

## UNDERREPORTED STUDENTS

TEA must have leaver statuses on all grade 7-12 students who were enrolled at any time in the prior-year (2009-10) but who did not continue in the current year (2010-11). These students may have left the district because they graduated, transferred to another district, dropped out, or for some other reason. Districts must report a leaver code for all leavers except those who moved (transferred) to another Texas public school district, earned a GED by August 31, or graduated in a prior school year. The determination of whether students are movers is made by TEA by checking other districts' enrollment and attendance records. (Districts may obtain preliminary information about whether students have moved to another district by searching the Person Identification Database (PID) Enrollment Tracking (PET) application.)

Students without leaver records who cannot be confirmed by TEA as returning students, movers, previous Texas graduates, or GED recipients become underreported students.

In order to maintain a rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*, districts must not exceed the accountability standards for underreported students.

**Standard:** Districts must meet the standard for both of the following measures in order to maintain a rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*:

- *Count of Underreported Students:* Must be fewer than or equal to 150.
- *Percent of Underreported Students:* Must be less than or equal to 3.0%.

### Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of underreported students}}{\text{number of students served in grades 7-12 in previous school year}} \leq 3.0\%$$

*Numerator:* Underreported students are those 2009-10 students in grades 7–12 who are not accounted for by TEA as returning students, movers, previous Texas graduates or GED recipients, and for whom no school leaver record can be found.

*Denominator:* The denominator is an unduplicated count of students reported in enrollment in 2009-10 PEIMS submission 1 or in attendance in 2009-10 PEIMS submission 3.

**Minimum Size Requirements:** Districts with fewer than 5 underreported students are not evaluated. Districts with an underreported rate less than 1.0% are not evaluated. Stated another way, to be evaluated on this indicator, districts must have 5 or more underreported students and an underreported rate that is equal to or greater than 1.0%.

**Data Source and Year:** PEIMS submission 1 (October 2009, October 2010); PEIMS submission 3 (June 2010)

**Other Information:**

- *Unduplicated Count.* The methodology eliminates any duplicate records. For example, students are not counted twice because they appear on both attendance and enrollment records.
- *Rounding.* The rate calculation is rounded to one decimal place. For example, 3.46% is rounded to 3.5%, not 3.0%.

**ADDITIONAL STUDENTS IN DISTRICT RATINGS**

Generally, districts are held accountable for the performance of all their students, including those who attend campuses that receive a rating of *Not Rated: Other* and those who attend alternative education campuses (AECs) that are registered for evaluation under AEA procedures. In districts with campuses that are rated under both AEA and standard accountability procedures, the AEC performance is aggregated with the traditional campus performance and the district is evaluated using standard procedure indicators and criteria. Using the completion rate indicator as an example, the same students considered to be completers at the AEC campus by virtue of having received a GED certificate will be counted as non-completers in the district-level Completion Rate I indicator. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information on alternative campuses and how they affect a district’s performance data.

Additionally, districts are responsible for the performance of students who are not in any campus accountability subset because they changed campuses within the district between the October “as of” date and the date of testing. See *Table 4 in Chapter 2 – The Basics: Base Indicators* for more information on the accountability subset.

## Chapter 4 – The Basics: *Determining a Rating*

---

The previous two chapters described the base indicators and the additional features of the system (Required Improvement and the Exceptions Provision). This chapter describes how to use the indicator data results with the additional features to determine campus and district ratings. The ratings for the overwhelming majority of campuses and districts can be determined this way. A small number of campuses and districts must be evaluated using different procedures. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for details about which campuses and districts are affected and how they are evaluated.

### WHO IS RATED?

The state accountability system is required to rate all districts and campuses that serve students in grades 1 through 12. The first step is to identify the universe of districts and campuses that can be considered for a rating. For 2011, the universe is determined to be those districts and campuses that reported students in membership in any grades (early education through grade 12) in the fall of the 2010-11 school year. The universe is then divided into those campuses and districts to be evaluated under Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) procedures (see *Part 2 – Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures*) and those evaluated using standard procedures. Most districts and campuses identified for standard procedures receive one of the four primary rating labels (*Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Academically Acceptable*, or *Academically Unacceptable*). Some receive a label of *Not Rated*. Rating labels and their uses are described below.

Once the universe of standard campuses and districts is established, the next step is to determine if the district or campus has TAKS results on which it can be evaluated. In order to attain one of the four primary rating labels, districts and campuses must have at least one TAKS test result in the accountability subset. The phrase “TAKS test results” refers to any TAKS assessments. For the 2011 accountability cycle, this includes TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, or TAKS-Alt results. ELL Progress Indicator results are not considered to be “TAKS test results” even though TAKS information is a component of this indicator.

An effort is made through the pairing process to supply TAKS results to campuses (with any grades from 1 to 12) with no students in the grades tested so that they can also be evaluated. For more information on pairing see *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances*.

Districts and campuses that have only completion rates, only dropout rates, only ELL Progress data, or only combinations of these three will not receive one of the four primary ratings in 2011. To be eligible to be *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Academically Acceptable*, or *Academically Unacceptable*, TAKS indicator results are required and *only* TAKS indicator results are required. Districts and campuses need not have data for dropout, completion, or ELL Progress indicators in order to receive a rating. Performance on any one of the TAKS subjects is sufficient for a rating to be assigned, even if only TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, or TAKS-Alt results are available.

Though at least one TAKS tester (in the accountability subset) is required to be considered for a rating, some places with very small numbers of total TAKS test results may ultimately receive a *Not Rated* label. The process of Special Analysis is employed when there are very

small numbers of total test takers to determine if a rating is appropriate. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for details about Special Analysis.

Campuses and districts that close in the summer of 2011 subsequent to the end of the school year but prior to the July ratings release will receive a 2011 accountability rating assuming they meet the criteria outlined above (they reported students in membership for the 2010-11 school year and had at least one TAKS test result in the accountability subset.)

## STANDARD RATING LABELS

Rating labels for districts are specified in statute. For 2011, standard campuses and districts will be assigned one of the following rating labels.

**Table 6: Standard Rating Labels**

	District or Charter Operator Use	Campus Use (non-charter and charter)
<i>Exemplary</i>	Used for districts or charter operators with at least one TAKS test result (in any subject) in the accountability subset. Small numbers subject to Special Analysis.	Used for campuses serving grades 1-12 with at least one TAKS test result (in any subject) in the accountability subset. Includes campuses with TAKS data due to pairing. Small numbers subject to Special Analysis.
<i>Recognized</i>		
<i>Academically Acceptable</i>		
<i>Academically Unacceptable</i>		
<i>Not Rated: Other</i>	Used for districts or charter operators in the unlikely event that there is insufficient data to rate due to no TAKS results in the accountability subset or due to other highly unusual circumstances.	Used if the campus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ has no students enrolled in grades higher than kindergarten;</li> <li>○ has insufficient data to rate due to no TAKS results in the accountability subset;</li> <li>○ has insufficient data to rate through Special Analysis due to very small numbers of TAKS results in the accountability subset; or</li> <li>○ is a designated Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP) or a designated Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP).</li> </ul>
<i>Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues</i>	Used in the rare situation where the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results are compromised, and it is not possible to assign a rating label based on the evaluation of performance. This label may be assigned temporarily pending an on-site investigation or may be assigned as the final rating label for the year.  This rating label is not equivalent to an <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> rating. The Commissioner of Education also has the authority to lower a rating or assign an <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> rating to address problems with the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results that are discovered through accountability system safeguards, Performance-Based Monitoring, or other monitoring and compliance reviews. The accreditation status of a district may also be lowered due to data integrity issues.  A district or campus may receive a rating of <i>Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues</i> , either temporarily or permanently, or the campus or district rating may be lowered due to data integrity problems.  See <i>Chapter 16 – Responsibilities and Consequences</i> for more information about the circumstances that trigger this rating label.	

Registered alternative education campuses (AECs) and some charter operators will receive ratings under the AEA procedures. See *Chapter 12 – AEA Ratings* for information on the AEA rating labels.

### **NOTIFICATION OF RATINGS (JULY 29, 2011)**

Notification of campus and district accountability ratings will occur on July 29, 2011. This consists of release of the campus and district data tables and the district summary reports on TEA’s website. Ratings for both standard and AEA procedures will be released simultaneously on this date.

### **NOTIFICATION OF RATINGS (LATE OCTOBER 2011)**

Accountability ratings are finalized when the accountability appeals process is completed. Agency web products related to state accountability (both public and secure sites) will be updated to reflect the outcome of appeals and to add the Gold Performance Acknowledgment information in late October 2011. See *Chapter 17 – Calendar and Preview* and *Chapter 15 – Appealing the Ratings* for more information.

### **USING THE DATA TABLE TO DETERMINE A RATING**

Around the third week in July, prior to finalizing all computations necessary for accountability ratings, TEA will provide districts with access to preview data tables for the district and each campus within the district through the Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE) website.

These tables will *not* show a rating. However, using the data on the tables and the *2011 Accountability Manual*, districts can anticipate their ratings in advance of the TEA ratings release. *These preview data tables will contain unmasked data and must be treated as confidential.* That is, information that reveals the performance of an individual student may be shown.

Sample data tables (unmasked) are excerpted on the following pages to present a step-by-step explanation of how ratings are determined. The design of both the preview and final data tables may vary from the samples shown.

July 2011  
Confidential

2011 PREVIEW CAMPUS ACCOUNTABILITY DATA TABLES - STANDARD PROCEDURES

DISTRICT NAME: SAMPLE ISD  
CAMPUS NAME: Sample H S  
CAMPUS NUMBER: 255908003  
Analysis groups used to determine ratings are marked with an 'X'.  
Accountability standards are shown in parentheses.

Campus Rating: **09 - 12**  
Grade Span:

This indicates that this campus was evaluated under standard procedures. AECs will receive a different data table. See Part 2 – Alternative Education Accountability Procedures.

Preview data tables similar to this one will be made available to districts in mid-July. Final data tables will be available on the public and secure websites by July 29th.

Accountability standards are shown for each subject.

Ratings are not available on the preview tables; this area is blank.

The ELL Progress Indicator and Commended Performance are two new base indicators in 2011.

Number Taking is the same for TAKS and Commended Performance.

Neither RI nor the Exceptions Provision are available for use with Commended Performance, so this area is left blank.

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS) TABLE

Performance Results	2011				2010				Required Improvement			Status by Measure			
	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Stu Grp %	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?	STD	RI	EXCP	***
<b>Reading/ELA (70%/80%/90%)</b>															
X All Students	773	975	79%	100%	714	952	75%	Yes	4	3	Yes	AA	RE	-	RE
X African Amer	93	118	79%	12%	94	120	78%	Yes	1	1	Yes	AA	RE	-	RE
X Hispanic	637	807	79%	83%	558	758	74%	Yes	5	3	Yes	AA	RE	-	RE
X White	35	39	90%	4%	49	56	88%	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
X Econ Disadv	694	866	80%	89%	616	815	76%	-	4	-	-	RE	-	-	RE
<b>Writing (70%/80%/90%)</b>															
X All Students	0	0	0%	0%	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
X African Amer	0	0	0%	0%	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
X Hispanic	0	0	0%	0%	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
X White	0	0	0%	0%	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
X Econ Disadv	0	0	0%	0%	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Social Studies (70%/80%/90%)</b>															
X All Students	468	527	89%	100%	448	510	88%	-	1	-	-	RE	-	-	RE
X African Amer	56	62	90%	12%	51	59	86%	-	4	-	-	EX	-	-	EX
X Hispanic	377	426	88%	81%	351	402	87%	-	1	-	-	RE	-	-	RE
X White	29	31	94%	6%	34	36	94%	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
X Econ Disadv	410	460	89%	87%	374	422	89%	-	0	-	-	RE	-	-	RE
<b>Mathematics (65%/80%/90%)</b>															
X All Students	569	947	60%	100%	480	922	52%	Yes	8	7	Yes	AU	AA	-	AA
X African Amer	65	110	59%	12%	49	115	43%	Yes	16	11	Yes	AU	AA	-	AA
X Hispanic	466	786	59%	83%	381	738	52%	Yes	7	7	Yes	AU	AA	-	AA
X White	30	40	75%	4%	37	51	73%	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
X Econ Disadv	516	849	61%	90%	417	782	53%	Yes	8	6	Yes	AU	AA	-	AA
<b>Science (60%/80%/90%)</b>															
X All Students	360	532	68%	100%	314	514	61%	Yes	7	**	No	AA	-	-	AA
X African Amer	42	63	67%	12%	41	62	66%	Yes	1	**	No	AA	-	-	AA
X Hispanic	284	430	66%	81%	234	402	58%	Yes	8	**	No	AA	-	-	AA
X White	29	31	94%	6%	31	38	82%	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	-
X Econ Disadv	311	465	67%	87%	257	427	60%	Yes	7	**	No	AA	-	-	AA

ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL) PROGRESS INDICATOR TABLE (na/60%/60%)

Performance Results	Number Met	Number Taking	Pct Met	Stu Grp %
X ELL Students	331	453	73%	278

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE TABLE (NA/15%/25%)

Performance Results	Number Met	Number Taking	Pct Met	Stu Grp %
X All Students	122	975	13%	100%
X Econ Disadv	107	866	12%	89%
X All Students	74	947	8%	100%
X Econ Disadv	63	849	7%	90%

\*\*\* Summary column: The final outcome for this measure after use of RI and exceptions (if applicable).

Table 7: Sample Data Table

July 2011  
Confidential

2011 PREVIEW CAMPUS ACCOUNTABILITY DATA TABLES – STANDARD PROCEDURES

This preview information is confidential.

DISTRICT NAME: SAMPLE ISD  
SCHOOL NAME: Sample H S  
SCHOOL NUMBER: 255908003

Campus Rating: 09 - 12  
Grade Span: 09 - 12

This indicates that this campus was evaluated under standard procedures. AECs will receive a different data table. See Part 2 – Alternative Education Accountability Procedures.

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS) TABLE

Preview data tables similar to this one will be made available to districts in mid-July. Final data tables will be available on the public and secure websites by July 29th.

Accountability standards are shown for each subject.

Ratings are not available on the preview tables; this area is blank.

The ELL Progress Indicator and Commended Performance are two new base indicators in 2011.

Number Taking is the same for TAKS and Commended Performance.

Neither RI nor the Exceptions Provision are available for use with Commended Performance, so this area is left blank.

Status by Measure shows the level attained for each measure: meeting the standard, Required Improvement, and Exceptions. The \*\*\* column shows the final summary.

Subject	2011				2010				Required Improvement			Status by Measure			
	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Stu Grp %	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?	STD	RI	EXCP	***
<b>English Language Arts (ELA) (70%/80%/90%)</b>															
All Students	773	975	79%	100%	714	952	75%	Yes	4	3	Yes	AA	RE	-	RE
African American	93	118	79%	12%	94	120	78%	Yes	1	1	Yes	AA	RE	-	RE
Hispanic	637	807	79%	83%	558	758	74%	Yes	5	3	Yes	AA	RE	-	RE
Economic Disadv	35	39	90%	4%	49	56	88%	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
All Students	694	866	80%	89%	616	815	76%	-	-	-	-	RE	-	-	RE
<b>Mathematics (70%/80%/90%)</b>															
All Students	0	0	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
African American	0	0	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	0	0	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	0	0	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economic Disadv	0	0	-	0%	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Social Studies (70%/80%/90%)</b>															
All Students	468	527	89%	100%	448	510	88%	-	1	-	-	RE	-	-	RE
African American	56	62	90%	12%	51	59	86%	-	4	-	-	EX	-	-	EX
Hispanic	377	426	88%	81%	351	402	87%	-	1	-	-	RE	-	-	RE
White	29	31	94%	6%	34	36	94%	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economic Disadv	410	460	89%	87%	374	422	89%	-	0	-	-	RE	-	-	RE
<b>Mathematics (65%/80%/90%)</b>															
All Students	569	947	60%	100%	480	922	52%	Yes	8	7	Yes	AU	AA	-	-
African American	65	110	59%	12%	49	115	43%	Yes	16	11	Yes	AU	AA	-	-
Hispanic	466	786	59%	83%	381	738	52%	Yes	7	7	Yes	AU	AA	-	-
White	30	40	75%	4%	37	51	73%	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economic Disadv	516	849	61%	90%	417	782	53%	Yes	8	6	Yes	AU	AA	-	-
<b>Science (60%/80%/90%)</b>															
All Students	360	532	68%	100%	314	514	61%	Yes	7	**	No	AA	-	-	-
African American	42	63	67%	12%	41	62	66%	Yes	1	**	No	AA	-	-	-
Hispanic	284	430	66%	81%	234	402	58%	Yes	8	**	No	AA	-	-	-
White	29	31	94%	6%	31	38	82%	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economic Disadv	311	465	67%	87%	257	427	60%	Yes	7	**	No	AA	-	-	AA
** Met the minimum size requirement, but did not meet the 75% floor for Recognized.															
<b>ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL) PROGRESS INDICATOR TABLE (na/60%/60%)</b>															
Reading/ELA															
All ELL Students	331	453	73%	-	278	416	67%	-	6	-	-	EX	EX	EX	EX
<b>COMMENDED PERFORMANCE TABLE (NA/15%/25%)</b>															
Performance Results	Number Met	Number Taking	Pct Met	Stu Grp %											
Reading/ELA															
All Students	122	975	13%	100%											
Economic Disadv	107	866	12%	89%											
Mathematics															
All Students	74	947	8%	100%											
Economic Disadv	63	849	7%	90%											

\*\*\* Summary column: The final outcome for this measure after use of RI and exceptions (if applicable).

Table 7: Sample Data Table

July 2011  
Confidential

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY  
2011 PREVIEW CAMPUS ACCOUNTABILITY DATA TABLES – STANDARD PROCEDURES

PAGE 2

DISTRICT NAME: SAMPLE ISD  
CAMPUS NAME: Sample H S  
CAMPUS NUMBER: 255908003

Campus Rating:  
Grade Span: 09 - 12

Exceptions now appear on page 2.

Analysis groups used to determine ratings are marked with an 'X'.  
Accountability standards are shown in parentheses.

EXCEPTIONS TABLE

Number Msrs Evaluated	Number Allowed	Number Needed	Floor(s) Met?	Msr(s) Used in 2010?	Exceptions Applied
16	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Exceptions can only be applied to TAKS or ELL. N/A indicates the rating is driven by another indicator, either Commended Performance, Completion Rate, and/or Annual Dropout Rate.

The number of measures evaluated is the sum of all analysis groups with an "X" under the TAKS indicator (up to 25). It does not include the analysis groups for the other four indicators.

COMPLETION RATE I TABLE (Gr. 9-12) (75.0%/85.0%/95.0%)

	Class of 2010					Class of 2009			Required Improvement			
	# Com-pleters	# Dropouts	# in Class	Comp Rate	Stu Grp %	# Com-pleters	# in Class	Comp Rate	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?
X All Students	320	52	372	86.0%	100%	296	368	80.4%		5.6		
X African Amer	33	6	39	84.6%	10%	56	67	83.6%	Yes	1.0	0.7	Yes
X Hispanic	255	40	295	86.4%	79%	212	270	78.5%		7.9		
White	20	4	24	83.3%	6%	20	23	87.0%		-3.7		
X Econ Disadv	208	24	232	89.7%	62%	210	256	82.0%		7.7		

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE TABLE (Gr. 7-8) (1.6%)

	2009-10				2008-09			Required Improvement			
	# Dropouts	# 7-8 Graders	Dropout Rate	Stu Grp %	# Dropouts	# 7-8 Graders	Dropout Rate	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?
All Students	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-		
African Amer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-		
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-		
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-		
Econ Disadv	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-		

Dropout data not evaluated for your accountability rating due to grade span, small numbers, or no data.

To receive a rating of *Recognized* or *Exemplary*, districts cannot have any *Academically Unacceptable* campuses. In addition, *Recognized* and *Exemplary* districts must not have excessive underreported students. See *Chapter 3* for details.

*Table 9* is an overview that provides details of the 2011 system, with the base indicators listed as columns. For each of the indicators, users can see brief definitions, the rounding methodology, the accountability subset methodology, the standards, minimum size criteria, subjects and student groups used, and application of Required Improvement and the Exceptions Provision.

**Table 8: Requirements for Each Rating Category**

	<b>Academically Acceptable</b>	<b>Recognized</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>
<b>Base Indicators</b>			
<p><b>TAKS (2010-11)</b> (including TAKS (Acc), -Alt, and -M) All Students <i>and each student group meeting minimum size:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>African American</li> <li>Hispanic</li> <li>White</li> <li>Econ. Disadvantaged</li> </ul>	<p>Meets each standard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reading/ELA..... <b>70%</b></li> <li>Writing..... <b>70%</b></li> <li>Social Studies ..... <b>70%</b></li> <li>Mathematics..... <b>65%</b></li> <li>Science ..... <b>60%</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b> Meets Required Improvement</p>	<p>Meets <b>80%</b> standard for each subject <b>OR</b> Meets <b>75%</b> floor and Required Improvement</p>	<p>Meets <b>90%</b> standard for each subject</p>
<p><b>ELL Progress Indicator (2010-11)</b> TELPAS or TAKS All ELL Students <math>\geq</math> 30</p>	N/A	<p><b>60%</b> at or above criteria <b>OR</b> Meets Required Improvement</p>	<p><b>60%</b> at or above criteria <b>OR</b> Meets Required Improvement</p>
<p><b>Commended Performance (2010-11)</b> (including all TAKS) <i>if meets minimum size:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All Students and</li> <li>Econ. Disadvantaged</li> </ul>	N/A	<p>Meets <b>15%</b> standard for Reading/ELA and Mathematics</p>	<p>Meets <b>25%</b> standard for Reading/ELA and Mathematics</p>
<p><b>Completion Rate I (Class of 2010)</b> <i>if meets minimum size:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All Students</li> <li>African American</li> <li>Hispanic</li> <li>White</li> <li>Econ. Disadvantaged</li> </ul>	<p>Meets <b>75.0%</b> standard <b>OR</b> Meets Required Improvement</p>	<p>Meets <b>85.0%</b> standard <b>OR</b> Meets floor of <b>75.0%</b> and Required Improvement</p>	<p>Meets <b>95.0%</b> standard</p>
<p><b>Annual Dropout Rate (2009-10)</b> <i>if meets minimum size</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All Students</li> <li>African American</li> <li>Hispanic</li> <li>White</li> <li>Econ. Disadvantaged</li> </ul>	<p>Meets <b>1.6%</b> standard <b>OR</b> Meets Required Improvement</p>	<p>Meets <b>1.6%</b> standard <b>OR</b> Meets Required Improvement</p>	<p>Meets <b>1.6%</b> standard <b>OR</b> Meets Required Improvement</p>
<b>Additional Provisions</b>			
<p><b>Exception(s)</b> (See Chapter 3 for more details.)</p>	<p>May be applied to TAKS indicators if district or campus would be <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> due to not meeting <i>Academically Acceptable</i> criteria.</p>	<p>May be applied to TAKS or ELL indicators if district or campus would be <i>Academically Acceptable</i> due to not meeting <i>Recognized</i> criteria.</p>	<p>No more than one may be applied to TAKS or ELL indicators if district/campus would be <i>Recognized</i> due to not meeting <i>Exemplary</i> criteria.</p>
<p><b>Check for Academically Unacceptable Campuses (District only)</b></p>	N/A	<p>A district with a campus rated <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> cannot be rated <i>Recognized</i>.</p>	<p>A district with a campus rated <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> cannot be rated <i>Exemplary</i>.</p>
<p><b>Check for Underreported Students (District only)</b></p>	N/A	<p>A district that underreports more than <b>150</b> students or more than <b>3.0%</b> of its prior year students cannot be rated <i>Recognized</i>.</p>	<p>A district that underreports more than <b>150</b> students or more than <b>3.0%</b> of its prior year students cannot be rated <i>Exemplary</i>.</p>
<p><b>Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision</b> (See Appendix J)</p>	<p>If recalculated African American and White student group performance results in a higher rating for a campus or district, the higher rating will be assigned.</p>		

**Table 9: Overview of 2011 System Components**

	<b>TAKS (including TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-Ait, and TAKS-M)</b>	<b>ELL Progress Indicator</b>	<b>Commended Performance</b>	<b>Completion Rate I</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
<b>Definition</b>	TAKS passing results (gr. 3-11) summed across grades by subject. ELA & reading results are combined. Cumulative results used for first two administrations of grades 5 & 8 reading and mathematics.	Results (gr. 3-11) for TELPAS and TAKS for LEP students	Same as TAKS, but at <i>Commended</i> level.	Graduates and continuers expressed as a % of total students in the class.	Grade 7 and 8 dropouts as a % of students who were in attendance any time during the prior school year.
<b>Rounding</b>	Whole Numbers			One Decimal	
<b>Standards</b>	<i>Exemplary:</i> All Subjects..... ≥ 90% <i>Recognized:</i> All Subjects..... ≥ 80% <i>Acceptable:</i> Reading/ELA/Writ/Soc St ..... ≥ 70% Mathematics ..... ≥ 65% Science..... ≥ 60%	<i>Exemplary and Recognized:</i> ≥ 60%	<i>Exemplary:</i> R/ELA & M .... ≥ 25% <i>Recognized:</i> R/ELA & M .... ≥ 15%	EX: ≥ 95.0% RE: ≥ 85.0% AA: ≥ 75.0%	EX: ≤ 1.6% RE: ≤ 1.6% AA: ≤ 1.6%
<b>Mobility Adjustment</b> (Accountability Subset)	<u>District ratings:</u> results for students enrolled in the district in the fall and tested in the same district. <u>Campus ratings:</u> results for students enrolled in the campus in the fall and tested in the same campus.			None	
<b>Subjects</b>	Reading/ELA ..... gr. 3-11 Writing.....gr. 4, 7 Mathematics ..... gr. 3-11 Social Studies.....gr. 8, 10, 11 Science .....gr. 5, 8, 10, 11	Reading/ELA (TELPAS & TAKS - English only)	Reading/ELA gr. 3-11 Mathematics gr. 3-11	N/A	
<b>Student Groups</b>	All Students & Student Groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• African American</li> <li>• Hispanic</li> <li>• White</li> <li>• Econ. Disadvantaged</li> </ul>	All ELL Students	All Students & Econ. Disadvantaged	All Students & Student Groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• African American</li> <li>• Hispanic</li> <li>• White</li> <li>• Econ. Disadvantaged</li> </ul>	
<b>Minimum Size Criteria for All Students</b>	No minimum size requirement—special analysis for small numbers	30 Students	No minimum size requirement—special analysis for small numbers	≥ 5 dropouts AND ≥ 10 students	
<b>Minimum Size Criteria for Groups</b>	30/10%/50	N/A	30/10%/50	≥ 5 dropouts AND 30/10%/50	

**Table 9: Overview of 2011 System Components (continued)**

	TAKS (including TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-Alt, and TAKS-M)			ELL Progress Indicator	Commended Performance	Completion Rate I	Dropout Rate
<b>Required Improvement (RI)</b>							
<b>Actual Chg</b>	2011 minus 2010 performance			2011 minus 2010 performance	N/A	Class of 2010 rate minus Class of 2009 rate	2009-10 rate minus 2008-09 rate
<b>RI</b>	Gain needed to reach standard in 2 years				N/A	Gain needed to reach standard in 2 years	
<b>Use</b>	As a gate up to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> or <i>Recognized</i>			As a gate up to <i>Recognized</i> or <i>Exemplary</i>	N/A	As a gate up to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> or <i>Recognized</i>	As a gate up to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> or <i>Recognized</i> or <i>Exemplary</i>
<b>Floor</b>	≥ 75% for <i>Recognized</i> , no floor for <i>Academically Acceptable</i>			No floor	N/A	≥ 75% for <i>Recognized</i>	No floor
<b>Minimum Size</b>	Meets minimum size in current year and has ≥ 10 students tested in prior year			Meets min. size current year and has ≥ 10 students the prior year	N/A	Meets min. size current year and has ≥ 10 in prior year class.	Meets min. size current year and has ≥ 10 7 <sup>th</sup> – 8 <sup>th</sup> grade students the prior year
<b>Exceptions Provision</b> <i>Applies to TAKS and ELL Progress indicators only</i>							
<b>Use</b>	As a gate up to <i>Acceptable</i> , <i>Recognized</i> , or <i>Exemplary</i>			As a gate up to <i>Recognized</i> or <i>Exemplary</i>	Exceptions are Not Applicable to Commended Performance, Completion Rate or Dropout Rate		
<b>Floor</b>	<i>Academically Acceptable</i>	<i>Recognized</i>	<i>Exemplary</i>	55%			
R/ELA/W/SS	65%	75%	85%				
M/Sc	60% / 55%	75%	85%				
<b>Number of Exceptions Allowed</b>	1 - 4 measures..... 0 allowed 5 - 8 measures..... 1 allowed 9 - 11 measures..... 2 allowed 12 - 15 measures..... 3 allowed 16+ measures..... 4 allowed			If 10 or more measures, one exception allowed			

## Chapter 5 – Gold Performance Acknowledgments

---

The Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) system acknowledges districts and campuses for high performance on indicators other than those used to determine accountability ratings. These indicators are in statute (*Texas Education Code*) or determined by the Commissioner of Education. Acknowledgment is given for high performance on:

- Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion
- Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate Results
- Attendance Rate
- College-Ready Graduates
- Commended Performance: Reading/English Language Arts
- Commended Performance: Mathematics
- Commended Performance: Writing
- Commended Performance: Science
- Commended Performance: Social Studies
- Comparable Improvement: Reading
- Comparable Improvement: Mathematics
- Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program
- SAT/ACT Results (College Admissions Tests)
- Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: English Language Arts
- Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: Mathematics

Campuses and charters evaluated under alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures are eligible to earn GPAs. For details on the procedures for these campuses and charters see *Chapter 13 – AEA Gold Performance Acknowledgments*.

### Acknowledgment Categories

---

**Acknowledged.** The campus or district is rated *Academically Acceptable* or higher, has results to be evaluated, and has met the acknowledgment criteria on one or more of the indicators. Acknowledgments are awarded separately on each of the 15 indicators.

**Does Not Qualify.** Either of the following:

- The campus or district has performance results to be evaluated but did not meet the acknowledgment criteria.
- The campus or district has performance results to be evaluated but is rated *Academically Unacceptable*. (Those that are later granted a higher rating on appeal are eligible to be evaluated and may earn acknowledgments.)

**Not Applicable.** Any of the following:

- The campus or district does not have results to be evaluated for the acknowledgment.
- The campus or district is labeled *Not Rated: Other* (for example, campuses that only serve students in Pre-K/K, or campuses not rated due to insufficient data).
- The campus or district is labeled *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*.
- The campus is paired. Campuses are not awarded acknowledgments for indicators that use paired data. Paired campuses may be acknowledged on their non-paired indicators.

**Table 10: Gold Performance Acknowledgment Standards for 2011**

Indicator	Description	Standard (changes for 2011 in <b>bold</b> )	Year of Data
<b>Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion</b>	Percent of 9 <sup>th</sup> –12 <sup>th</sup> graders completing and receiving credit for at least one Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course	30.0% or more**	2009-10
<b>AP / IB Results</b>	Percent of 11 <sup>th</sup> and 12 <sup>th</sup> graders taking at least one AP or IB examination <i>AND</i>	15.0% or more <i>AND</i>	2009-10
	Percent of 11 <sup>th</sup> and 12 <sup>th</sup> grade examinees scoring at or above the criterion on at least one examination (3 and above for AP; 4 and above for IB)	50.0% or more*	
<b>Attendance Rate</b>	Attendance Rate for students in grades 1-12, the total number of days present divided by the total number of days in membership	District: 96.0%** Multi-Level: 96.0%** High School: 95.0%** Middle/Jr High: 96.0%** Elementary: 97.0%**	2009-10
<b>College-Ready Graduates</b>	Number of graduates who scored at or above the college-ready criteria on both ELA and mathematics, divided by the number of graduates with results in both subjects to evaluate.	<b>40%</b> or more**	Class of 2010
<b>Commended Performance: Reading/ELA</b>	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard	30% or more**	Spring 2011
<b>Commended Performance: Mathematics</b>	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard	30% or more**	Spring 2011
<b>Commended Performance: Writing</b>	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard	30% or more**	Spring 2011
<b>Commended Performance: Science</b>	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard	30% or more**	Spring 2011
<b>Commended Performance: Social Studies</b>	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard	30% or more**	Spring 2011
<b>Comparable Improvement: Reading</b>	Average vertical scale score growth in TAKS Reading	Top Quartile (top 25%)***	Spring 2011
<b>Comparable Improvement: Mathematics</b>	Average vertical scale score growth in TAKS Mathematics	Top Quartile (top 25%)***	Spring 2011
<b>Recommended High School Program/DAP</b>	Percent of graduates meeting or exceeding requirements for the RHSP/Distinguished Achievement Program	85.0% or more**	Class of 2010
<b>SAT/ACT Results</b>	Percent of graduates taking either the SAT or ACT <i>AND</i>	At least 70.0% of graduates <i>AND</i>	Class of 2010
	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the criterion score (SAT 1110; ACT Composite 24)	40.0% or more at or above criterion*	
<b>TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component: English Language Arts</b>	Percent of grade 11 examinees with a scale score of 2200 or more and a score of 3 or higher on the essay	65% or more**	Spring 2011
<b>TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component: Mathematics</b>	Percent of grade 11 examinees with a scale score of 2200 or more	65% or more**	Spring 2011

\* Indicator evaluates performance for All Students & the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, and White. Economically Disadvantaged status is not available from the testing results.

\*\* Indicator evaluates performance for All Students & the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

\*\*\* Acknowledgment for Comparable Improvement is available to campuses that serve grades 4-8 only. It is evaluated for All Students only.

## Acknowledgment Indicators

---

### ADVANCED COURSE/DUAL ENROLLMENT COMPLETION

This indicator is based on a count of students who complete and receive credit for at least one advanced course in grades 9-12. Advanced courses include dual enrollment courses. Dual enrollment courses are those for which a student gets both high school and college credit. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for a link to a list of advanced courses.

**Who is eligible:** Districts and campuses with grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12 that have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, at least 30.0% of the 2009-10 students in grades 9 through 12 must receive credit for at least one advanced course.

**Student Groups:** Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

**Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of students in grades 9 through 12 who received credit for at least one advanced course}}{\text{number of students in grades 9 through 12 who completed at least one course}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of students. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 students in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

**Year of Data:** 2009-10

**Data Source:** PEIMS submission 3 (June 2010)

**Other Information:**

- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 24.879% is rounded to 24.9%, not 25.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

### ADVANCED PLACEMENT/INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE RESULTS

This refers to the results of the College Board Advanced Placement (AP) examinations and the International Baccalaureate (IB) examinations taken by Texas public school students in a given school year. High school students may take these examinations, ideally upon completion of AP or IB courses, and may receive advanced placement or credit, or both, upon entering college. Generally, colleges will award credit or advanced placement for scores of 3, 4, or 5 on AP examinations and scores of 4, 5, 6, or 7 on IB examinations. Requirements vary by college and by subject tested.

**Who is eligible:** Districts and campuses with grades 11 and/or 12 that have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must meet both a participation and a performance standard. It must:

- have 15.0% or more of its non-special education 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> graders taking at least one AP or IB examination; *and* of those tested,
- have 50.0% or more scoring at or above the criterion score on at least one examination.

**Student Groups:** Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, and White.

**Methodology:**

*Participation:*

$$\frac{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and 12}^{\text{th}} \text{ graders taking at least one AP or IB examination}}{\text{total non-special education students enrolled in 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and 12}^{\text{th}} \text{ grades}}$$

*and*

*Performance:*

$$\frac{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and 12}^{\text{th}} \text{ graders with at least one score at or above the criterion score}}{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and 12}^{\text{th}} \text{ graders with at least one AP or IB examination}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers or number of non-special education students enrolled in the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grades. To be included in the evaluation for GPA, a student group must have:

- in the numerator of the participation measure: at least 10 test takers; and,
- in the denominator of the participation measure: at least 30 non-special education 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> graders;
  - if there are 30 to 49 students and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated; or
  - if the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

**Year of Data:** 2009-10

**Data Source:** The College Board; The International Baccalaureate Organization; and PEIMS submission 1 (October 2009)

**Other Information:**

- *Criterion Score.* The criterion score is 3 or above on Advanced Placement tests and 4 or above on International Baccalaureate examinations.
- *Special Education.* For *participation*, 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> graders served by special education who take an AP or IB examination are included in the numerator, but not the denominator. This may have a slight positive effect on the percent reported.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 49.9%, not 50.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

## ATTENDANCE RATE

Attendance rates are based on student attendance for the entire school year for students in grades 1-12.

**Who is eligible:** Districts and campuses whose grade span is within grades 1-12 and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

**Standard:** (Variable)

- District/Multi-Level campuses.....At least 96.0%
- Middle School/Junior High .....At least 96.0%
- High School .....At least 95.0%
- Elementary .....At least 97.0%

**Student Groups:** Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

**Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were present in 2009-10}}{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were in membership in 2009-10}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** For attendance, the minimum size is based on total days in membership rather than individual student counts. All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of total days in membership. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 5,400 total days in membership (30 students x 180 school days) for the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 5,400 to 8,999 total days in membership and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students total days in membership, it is evaluated.
- If there are at least 9,000 total days in membership (50 students x 180 school days) for the student group, it is evaluated.

**Year of Data:** 2009-10

**Data Source:** PEIMS submission 3 (June 2010)

**Other Information:**

- *Campus Type.* The campus type (elementary, high school, etc.) is assigned using the low and high grades taught as determined from the 2010-11 PEIMS submission 1 enrollment records. Multi-level campuses are those that provide instruction in both the elementary and secondary grade level categories. Examples are K-12, K-8, and 6-12 campuses.
- *Time Span.* Attendance for the entire school year is used.
- *Special Education.* This measure includes students served by special education.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 95.877% is rounded to 95.9%, not 96.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

## 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 exit-level TAKS, or the SAT, or the ACT.

**Who is eligible:** Districts and campuses with graduates in the class of 2010 that have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, at least 40% of the class of 2010 graduates must have scored at or above the college-ready criteria for both ELA and mathematics.

**Student Groups:** Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

### Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of graduates who scored at or above the college-ready criteria on both ELA \& mathematics}}{\text{number of graduates (class of 2010) with results in both subjects to evaluate}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

**Year of Data:** Class of 2010

**Data Source:** Pearson; the College Board; ACT Inc.; and PEIMS submission 1 (October 2010)

### Other Information:

- *Criteria.* The table below details the scores by subject that must be met for a graduate to be considered college-ready on this indicator.

Subject	Exit-Level TAKS		SAT		ACT
ELA	≥ 2200 scale score AND a “3” or higher on essay	OR	≥ 500 on Critical Reading AND ≥ 1070 Total*	OR	≥ 19 on English AND ≥ 23 Composite
Mathematics	≥ 2200 scale score	OR	≥ 500 on Mathematics AND ≥ 1070 Total*	OR	≥ 19 on Mathematics AND ≥ 23 Composite

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

- *Exit-level TAKS.* The TAKS component of this indicator uses the spring 2009 exit-level TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) results from when the 2010 graduates were 11<sup>th</sup> graders. The performance of retesters is not included. The performance of juniors who were eligible for early graduation and tested in October 2008 is not included.
- *TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt.* Because students are not required to pass the TAKS-M or TAKS-Alt in order to graduate, the performance for these alternate assessments is not included in this indicator.

- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on College-Ready Graduates.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 39.877% is rounded to 40%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

### **COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: READING/ELA**

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

**Who is eligible:** Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, or TAKS-Alt reading (grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, & 9) or English language arts (grades 10 & 11) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 30% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

**Student Groups:** Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

#### **Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on reading or ELA}}{\text{total number of examinees in reading or ELA}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

**Year of Data:** 2010-11

**Data Source:** Pearson

#### **Other Information:**

- *Commended Performance Base Indicator.* In 2011, campuses and districts must meet the standard for Commended Performance on TAKS reading/ELA and mathematics to be rated *Recognized* or *Exemplary*. See *Chapter 2 – The Basics: Base Indicators* for more information.
- *TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt.* Beginning in 2011, the evaluation of Commended Performance includes results for TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt.

- *Scale and Raw Score Commended Standards.* For some test versions and some grades the standard for Commended Performance is on the vertical scale and varies by grade level. For other grades and test versions the horizontal scale is used. On the ELA test administered in grades 10 and 11, a minimum score of 2 on the essay is required as well. TAKS-Alt Commended Performance is set based on a student’s raw score. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for commended performance standards by grade and test version.
- *Student Success Initiative.* Students who meet the Commended Performance standard in either of the first two administrations of TAKS reading for grades 5 and 8 are included.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 29, 2010 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 29, 2010 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 4 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on Commended Performance.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, or TAKS-Alt is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

## COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: MATHEMATICS

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

**Who is eligible:** Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, or TAKS-Alt mathematics (grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, & 11) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 30% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

**Student Groups:** Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

### Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \textit{ on mathematics}}{\text{total number of examinees in mathematics}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.

- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

**Year of Data:** 2010-11

**Data Source:** Pearson

**Other Information:**

- *Commended Performance Base Indicator.* In 2011, campuses and districts must meet the standard for Commended Performance on TAKS reading/ELA and mathematics to be rated *Recognized* or *Exemplary*. See *Chapter 2 – The Basics: Base Indicators* for more information.
- *TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt.* Beginning in 2011, the evaluation of Commended Performance includes results for TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt.
- *Scale and Raw Score Commended Standards.* For some test versions and some grades the standard for Commended Performance is on the vertical scale and varies by grade level. For other grades and test versions the horizontal scale is used. TAKS-Alt Commended Performance is set based on a student’s raw score. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for commended performance standards by grade and test version.
- *Student Success Initiative.* Students who meet the Commended Performance standard in either of the first two administrations of TAKS mathematics for grades 5 and 8 are included.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 29, 2010 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 29, 2010 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 4 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on Commended Performance.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, or TAKS-Alt is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

**COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: WRITING**

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

**Who is eligible:** Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, or TAKS-Alt writing (grades 4 & 7) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 30% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

**Student Groups:** Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

**Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on writing}}{\text{total number of examinees in writing}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

**Year of Data:** 2010-11

**Data Source:** Pearson

**Other Information:**

- *TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt.* Beginning in 2011, the evaluation of Commended Performance includes results for TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt.
- *Scale and Raw Score Commended Standards.* For TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) the standard for Commended Performance is on the vertical scale and varies by grade level. For TAKS-M the horizontal scale is used. A minimum score of 3 is also required on the essay. TAKS-Alt Commended Performance is set based on a student's raw score. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for commended performance standards by grade and test version.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 29, 2010 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 29, 2010 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 4 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on Commended Performance.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, or TAKS-Alt is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

## COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: SCIENCE

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

**Who is eligible:** Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, or TAKS-Alt science (grades 5, 8, 10, & 11) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 30% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

**Student Groups:** Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

### Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on science}}{\text{total number of examinees in science}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

**Year of Data:** 2010-11

**Data Source:** Pearson

### Other Information:

- *TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt.* Beginning in 2011, the evaluation of Commended Performance includes results for TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt.
- *Scale and Raw Score Commended Standards.* For some test versions and some grades the standard for Commended Performance is on the vertical scale and varies by grade level. For other grades and test versions the horizontal scale is used. TAKS-Alt Commended Performance is set based on a student's raw score. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for commended performance standards by grade and test version.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 29, 2010 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 29, 2010 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 4 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on Commended Performance.

- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, or TAKS-Alt is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

## COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: SOCIAL STUDIES

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

**Who is eligible:** Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, or TAKS-Alt social studies (grades 8, 10, & 11) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 30% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

**Student Groups:** Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

### Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on social studies}}{\text{total number of examinees in social studies}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

**Year of Data:** 2010-11

**Data Source:** Pearson

### Other Information:

- *TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt.* Beginning in 2011, the evaluation of Commended Performance includes results for TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt.
- *Scale and Raw Score Commended Standards.* For TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) the standard for Commended Performance is on the vertical scale and varies by grade. For grades 10 and 11 and for all TAKS-M grades, the horizontal scale standard of 2400 is used. TAKS-Alt Commended Performance is set based on a student's raw score. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for commended performance standards by grade and test version.

- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 29, 2010 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 29, 2010 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 4 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on Commended Performance.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

## COMPARABLE IMPROVEMENT: READING

Comparable Improvement (CI) is a measure that calculates how student performance on the TAKS test has changed (or grown) from one year to the next, and compares the change to that of the 40 schools that are demographically most similar to the target school.

**Who is eligible:** Campuses that test students on TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) reading in grades 4-8 and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher. Districts are not eligible because CI is not calculated at the district level. High schools are not eligible for this acknowledgment because vertical scale scores are not available above grade 8.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus must have average vertical scale score growth within the top quartile (the top 25%) of their 40-member campus comparison group for reading.

**Student Groups:** Performance is evaluated for All Students only.

**Methodology:** First, determine the campus’s vertical scale score growth by finding the difference between the current and prior year average scale scores:

$$\begin{array}{r} 2011 \text{ average campus scale score in reading} \\ \textit{minus} \\ 2010 \text{ average campus scale score in reading} \end{array}$$

Sort the differences for the 40 campuses in the comparison group from high to low. Then, determine which quartile the campus is in within its 40-member campus comparison group. See *Appendix E – Student Growth Measures* and *Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group* for a complete explanation of the methodology for this measure.

**Minimum Size Requirements:** Students must be matched to the spring 2010 TAKS administration—anywhere in the state—to find their prior year scale score for reading. Any campus with fewer than 10 matched students for a subject will not be assigned a quartile position.

**Year of Data:** 2011 and 2010 (Spring TAKS Administrations)

**Data Source:** Pearson

## Other Information:

- *Student Success Initiative.*
  - For grade 5 and grade 8 students who take both the first and second administrations of TAKS reading, the performance used is the score they achieved from the first administration. That student will be matched to their single grade 4 or grade 7 administration from 2010 to determine their scale score growth.
  - For grade 6 students who—as fifth graders in 2010—took TAKS reading in both early April and late April 2010, scale score growth is determined by subtracting the score they achieved on their single grade 6 administration in 2011 from the score they achieved on their early April administration in 2010.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on CI.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure. Performance on TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt is not included.
- *Rounding.* Demographic values for the 40 members of the comparison group are rounded to one decimal point. For example, 69.877% is rounded to 69.9%. Average scale scores are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 651.44 is rounded to 651.

## COMPARABLE IMPROVEMENT: MATHEMATICS

Comparable Improvement (CI) is a measure that calculates how student performance on the TAKS test has changed (or grown) from one year to the next, and compares the change to that of the 40 schools that are demographically most similar to the target school.

**Who is eligible:** Campuses that test students on TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) mathematics in grades 4-8 and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher. Districts are not eligible because CI is not calculated at the district level. Beginning in 2011, high schools are not eligible for this acknowledgment because vertical scale scores are not available above grade 8.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus must have average vertical scale score growth within the top quartile (the top 25%) of their 40-member campus comparison group for mathematics.

**Student Groups:** Performance is evaluated for All Students only.

**Methodology:** First, determine the campus's vertical scale score growth by finding the difference between the current and prior year average scale scores:

$$\begin{array}{r} 2011 \text{ average campus scale score in mathematics} \\ \textit{minus} \\ 2010 \text{ average campus scale score in mathematics} \end{array}$$

Sort the differences for the 40 campuses in the comparison group from high to low. Then, determine which quartile the campus is in within its 40-member campus comparison group. See *Appendix E – Student Growth Measures* and *Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group* for a complete explanation of the methodology for this measure.

**Minimum Size Requirements:** Students must be matched to the spring 2010 TAKS administration—anywhere in the state—to find their prior year scale score for mathematics. Any campus with fewer than 10 matched students for a subject will not be assigned a quartile position.

**Year of Data:** 2011 and 2010 (Spring TAKS Administrations)

**Data Source:** Pearson

**Other Information:**

- *Student Success Initiative.*
  - For grade 5 and grade 8 students who take both the first and second administrations of TAKS mathematics, the performance used is the score they achieved from the first administration. That student will be matched to their single grade 4 or grade 7 administration from 2010 to determine their scale score growth.
  - For grade 6 students who—as fifth graders in 2010—took TAKS mathematics in both early April and late April 2010, scale score growth is determined by subtracting the score they achieved on their single grade 6 administration in 2011 from the score they achieved on their early April administration in 2010.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on CI.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure. Performance on TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt is not included.
- *Rounding.* Demographic values for the 40 members of the comparison group are rounded to one decimal point. For example, 69.877% is rounded to 69.9%. Average scale scores are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 651.44 is rounded to 651.

## **RECOMMENDED HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM/DISTINGUISHED ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM**

This indicator shows the percent of graduates who were reported as having satisfied the course requirements for the Texas State Board of Education Recommended High School Program or Distinguished Achievement Program.

**Who is eligible:** Districts and campuses that have graduates and that are rated *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, 85.0% of all 2010 graduates reported must meet or exceed the requirements for the Recommended High School Program or Distinguished Achievement Program.

**Student Groups:** Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

**Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of graduates reported with graduation codes for Recommended High School Program or Distinguished Achievement Program}}{\text{number of graduates}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of graduates. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 graduates in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 graduates within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

**Year of Data:** Class of 2010

**Data Source:** PEIMS submission 1 (October 2010)

**Other Information:**

- *Special Education.* This measure includes graduates served by special education.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 84.877% is rounded to 84.9%, not 85.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

## SAT/ACT RESULTS

This indicator shows the performance and participation on two college admissions tests: the College Board's SAT Reasoning Test and ACT, Inc.'s ACT Assessment.

**Who is eligible:** Districts and campuses that have graduates and that are rated *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must meet both a participation and a performance standard. It must:

- have 70.0% or more of the class of 2010 non-special education graduates taking either the ACT or the SAT; *and* of those examinees
- have 40.0% or more scoring at or above the criterion score on at least one examination.

**Student Groups:** Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, and White.

**Methodology:**

*Participation:*

$$\frac{\text{number of graduates taking either the SAT or the ACT}}{\text{total non-special education graduates}}$$

*and*

*Performance:*

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees at or above the criterion score}}{\text{number of graduates taking either the SAT or the ACT}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers or graduates. To be included in the evaluation for GPA, a student group must have:

- in the numerator of the participation measure: at least 10 test takers; and,
- in the denominator of the participation measure: at least 30 non-special education graduates;
  - if there are 30 to 49 students and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated; or
  - if the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

**Year of Data:** Class of 2010

**Data Source:** The College Board (SAT) and ACT, Inc. (ACT)

**Other Information:**

- *SAT Reasoning Test.* Although the SAT now includes a writing assessment, performance on writing is not used for determining GPA.
- *Criterion.* The criterion score is 1110 on the SAT (the sum of the critical reading and mathematics scores) or 24 on the ACT (composite).
- *Most Recent Test.* Both testing companies annually provide the agency with information on the most recent test participation and performance of graduating seniors from all Texas public schools. Only one record is sent per student. If a student takes an ACT or SAT test more than once, the agency receives the record for the most recent examination taken, not necessarily the examination with the highest score.
- *Both Tests Taken.* If a student takes both the SAT and the ACT, the information is combined so that an unduplicated count of students is used. If the student scored above the criterion on either the SAT or ACT, that student is counted as having scored above the criterion.
- *Campus ID.* The student taking the test identifies the campus to which a score is attributed.
- *Special Education.* For *participation*, graduates served by special education who take the ACT or SAT are included in the numerator, but not the denominator. This may have a slight positive effect on the percent reported.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 69.877% is rounded to 69.9%, not 70.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

**TEXAS SUCCESS INITIATIVE (TSI) – HIGHER EDUCATION READINESS  
COMPONENT: ELA**

This indicator shows the percent of grade 11 students who are considered ready to begin college-level work, based on their performance on the TAKS exit-level examination.

**Who is eligible:** Districts and campuses that test grade 11 students on the exit-level TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) ELA and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator the campus or district must have 65% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the TSI standard. The Texas Higher Education

Coordinating Board set the standard of college readiness on the exit-level TAKS at a scale score of 2200 for ELA with a score of 3 or higher on the essay.

**Student Groups:** Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

**Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of grade 11 test takers with a scale score of 2200} \\ \text{and a score of 3 or higher on the essay of the ELA test}}{\text{total number of grade 11 students taking ELA}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

**Year of Data:** 2010-11

**Data Source:** Pearson

**Other Information:**

- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 29, 2010 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 29, 2010 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 4 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on TSI.
- *TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt.* The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board’s standard of college readiness on the exit-level TAKS does not apply to these alternate assessments because students are not required to pass the TAKS-M or TAKS-Alt in order to graduate. Therefore, the performance for these alternate assessments is not included in this indicator.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 64.877% is rounded to 65%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

**TEXAS SUCCESS INITIATIVE (TSI) – HIGHER EDUCATION READINESS  
COMPONENT: MATHEMATICS**

This indicator shows the percent of grade 11 students who are considered ready to begin college-level work, based on their performance on the TAKS exit-level examination.

**Who is eligible:** Districts and campuses that test grade 11 students on the exit-level TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) mathematics and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator the campus or district must have 65% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the TSI standard. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board set the standard of college readiness on the exit-level TAKS at a scale score of 2200 for mathematics.

**Student Groups:** Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

**Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of test takers with a scale score of 2200 on mathematics}}{\text{total number of grade 11 test takers in mathematics}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

**Year of Data:** 2010-11

**Data Source:** Pearson

**Other Information:**

- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 29, 2010 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 29, 2010 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 4 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on TSI.
- *TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt.* The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board’s standard of college readiness on the exit-level TAKS does not apply to these alternate assessments because students are not required to pass the TAKS-M or TAKS-Alt in order to graduate. Therefore, the performance for these alternate assessments is not included in this indicator.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 64.877% is rounded to 65%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

## **NOTIFICATION OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

Notification of Gold Performance Acknowledgment will occur in late October 2011 at the same time as the 2011 ratings update that follows the resolution of all appeals. (See *Chapter 17 – Calendar and Preview* for more details.) At that time, the district ratings lists and data tables on the TEA website will be updated to show the acknowledgments earned.

## Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances

---

The vast majority of the standard accountability ratings can be determined through the process detailed in *Chapters 2-4: The Basics*. However, there are special circumstances that require closer examination. Accommodating all Texas campuses and districts increases the complexity of the accountability system, but it also increases the fairness of the ratings ultimately assigned. This chapter describes pairing, Special Analysis, and the treatment of non-traditional campuses and their data under the standard accountability procedures.

### Pairing

---

#### IDENTIFYING CAMPUSES

All campuses serving grades 1-12 must receive an accountability rating. Beginning in 1994, campuses with no state assessment results due to grade span served were incorporated into the accountability system by having districts choose another campus within the same district with which to pair for accountability purposes. The campuses shared assessment data. Since 2004, districts have also been able to pair a campus with the district and be evaluated on the district's results. In 2011, pairing was expanded to meet new federal accountability requirements to assign Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) statuses to pre-kindergarten (PK) and kindergarten (K) campuses. These additional PK-K pairing relationships are used for AYP evaluations only. PK-K campuses under state rating procedures are still issued *Not Rated: Other* ratings.

TEA determines which campuses need to be paired for any given accountability cycle after analyzing enrollment files submitted on PEIMS submission 1. For the state accountability system, all districts with campuses with enrollment in grades higher than kindergarten, and solely in grades with no TAKS data, *i.e.*, grades 1, 2, or 12, receive a request for pairing. Charters and registered alternative education campuses (AECs) are not asked to pair any of their campuses.

For campuses that are paired, only indicators based on assessment data are shared (TAKS, Commended Performance, and the ELL Progress Indicator). The paired campus is evaluated on its own non-assessment indicator data, should it have any. The campus with which it is paired does not share any dropout, completion, or Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) indicator data it may have.

#### ADDITIONAL FEATURES

*Required Improvement.* Paired campuses are eligible for Required Improvement. Note, however, that Required Improvement is calculated with 2011 data based on the pairing relationships established in 2011. The 2010 ratings were based on the pairing relationships established in 2010. Campuses with pairing statuses that change between years may have improvement calculations that differ from the campuses they are paired with. Since the ELL Progress Indicator is new in 2011 there was no pairing of ELL Progress Indicator data in 2010; therefore, a campus with paired ELL Progress Indicator data in 2011 cannot participate in Required Improvement for this indicator this year. See *Chapter 15 – Appealing the Ratings* for more information about this situation. This is not an issue for paired Commended

Performance because Required Improvement is not available for the Commended Performance indicator.

*Exceptions Provision.* Paired campuses are eligible for exceptions using the paired data. However, as with Required Improvement, campuses with pairing statuses that change between years may have exceptions calculations that differ from the campuses they are paired with.

*GPA.* Paired data are not used for GPA indicators. This means that paired campuses cannot earn GPAs for the Commended Performance, Comparable Improvement, or Texas Success Initiative (TSI) indicators. They may, however, receive GPAs for other indicators based on their own data.

## **PAIRING PROCESS**

Districts are given the opportunity to use the same pairing relationship they used in the prior year or to select a new relationship by completing special data entry screens on the secure TEA website. In early April, districts with campuses that needed to be paired received instructions on how to access this on-line application. Pairing decisions were due by April 29, 2011.

If a district fails to inform the state, pairing decisions are made by agency staff. In the case of campuses that have been paired in the past, staff will assume that prior year pairing relationships still apply. In the case of campuses identified as needing to be paired for the first time in the 2010-11 school year, pairing selections will be made based on the guidelines given in this section in conjunction with analysis of attendance and enrollment patterns using PEIMS data.

## **GUIDELINES**

Campuses that are paired should have a “feeder” relationship with the selected campus and the grades should be contiguous. For example, a K-2 campus should be paired with the 3-5 campus that accepts its students into 3<sup>rd</sup> grade.

Another option is to pair a campus with the district instead of another campus. This option is suggested for cases where the campus has no clear relationship with another single campus in the district. A campus paired with the district will be evaluated using the district’s TAKS results (for all grades tested in the district). Note that pairing with the district is not required in these cases. Districts have the choice of selecting another campus or selecting the district. For example, in cases where a K-2 campus feeds into several 3-5 campuses, one of the 3-5 campuses may be selected, or the district can be selected. A 12<sup>th</sup> grade center serving students from several high school campuses can select one of the high school campuses or the district may be selected. In these cases, the district should make the best choice based on local criteria.

Multiple pairings are possible: If several K-2 campuses feed the same 3-5 campus, all of the K-2 campuses may be paired with that 3-5 campus.

Districts may change pairings from year to year; however, these changes should be justifiable (*e.g.*, a change in attendance zones affecting feeder patterns).

## Special Analysis

---

Districts and campuses with small numbers of students pose a special challenge to the accountability system. There are two types of small numbers situations. One is small numbers of students within a group, *e.g.*, few African American test-takers in science. These are handled by applying the minimum size criteria described in *Chapter 2 – The Basics: Base Indicators*. The second type is small numbers of *total* students, that is, few students tested in the All Students category.

Districts and campuses with small numbers of total students raise issues regarding the stability of the data. Special Analysis is used to ensure that ratings based on small numbers of TAKS or Commended Performance results are appropriate. As a result of Special Analysis, a rating can remain unchanged, be elevated, or be changed to *Not Rated*. If Special Analysis is applied, only All Students performance is examined.

### IDENTIFYING CAMPUSES AND DISTRICTS

Campuses and districts that are eligible for Special Analysis fall into two categories. The first are those that have fewer than six TAKS testers in each and every subject and do not have their own leaver data of sufficient size to evaluate. These campus and district ratings are changed to *Not Rated: Other*. Special Analysis is also applied when:

- the campus or district is *Academically Unacceptable* due to TAKS only, with fewer than 30 All Students tested in one or more of the *Academically Unacceptable* subject(s); or
- the campus or district is limited to *Academically Acceptable* or *Recognized* due to TAKS only, and the evaluation is governed by the results of fewer than six All Students tested; or
- the campus or district is limited to *Academically Acceptable* or *Recognized* due to Commended Performance only, and the evaluation is governed by the results of fewer than six All Students tested.

The following are examples of campuses and districts that will NOT undergo Special Analysis:

- Campuses or districts that are *Not Rated*.
- Campuses or districts that are not small (30 or more testers in all subjects).
- Campuses or districts that have few students tested in TAKS, but whose rating of *Academically Unacceptable*, *Academically Acceptable*, or *Recognized* is due to the Completion Rate or Dropout Rate indicators.
- Campuses or districts that have few students tested in TAKS, but whose rating of *Academically Acceptable* is due to the ELL Progress Indicator.

### METHODS FOR SPECIAL ANALYSIS

Campuses or districts that undergo Special Analysis receive professional review based on analysis of all available performance data. The professional review process involves producing a summary report of the district or campus data, analyzing the data, and arriving at a consensus decision among a group of TEA staff members familiar with the standard accountability procedures. The summary report includes available indicator data for all

TAKS tested years (2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011). Trends and aggregate data are reviewed.

Because of the small numbers of test takers involved, professional review can also result in a *Not Rated* label for some campuses or districts not otherwise meeting the automatic criteria for *Not Rated*.

## New Campuses

---

All campuses—established or new—are rated. A new campus is defined to be a campus with at least one student in membership in the current school year that did not have any students in membership in the immediate preceding school year. A new campus may receive a rating of *Academically Unacceptable* in its first year of operation. This can occur even though the campus does not have prior-year data on which to calculate improvement. The management of campus identification numbers across years is a district responsibility. See *Chapter 16 – Responsibilities and Consequences* for more information regarding the possible consequences of changing campuses numbers.

## Charters

---

Based on fall PEIMS data for the 2010-11 school year, there were 199 charter operators serving approximately 134,000 students. Most charter operators have only one campus (108 of the 199); however, about 46 percent operate multiple campuses.

By statute, charter operators are subject to most of the same federal and state laws as other public school districts, including reporting and accountability requirements. Prior to the 2004 accountability system, only the campuses operated by the charter received an accountability rating. Since then, charters as well as the campuses they operate are rated, meaning charter operators are rated using district rating criteria based on the aggregate performance of the campuses operated by the charter. This means charter operators are also subject to the additional performance requirements applied to districts (underreported student standards and the check for *Academically Unacceptable* campuses). Because they are rated, charter operators and their campuses are eligible for GPA.

In 2011, there are some differences between the treatment of charter operators and traditional districts. These are:

- A charter operator may be rated under the alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures. This can occur in two cases: when the charter operates only registered AECs; or, when 50% or more of the charter operator's students are enrolled at registered AECs and the operator opts to be evaluated under AEA procedures.
- A charter operator may be labeled *Not Rated: Other*. This can occur in cases where the charter operator has too little or no TAKS data on which it can be evaluated.
- Charter operators are not asked to pair any of their campuses. Charters are unique in that they either have only one campus, or they have multiple campuses with no feeder relationships; therefore, pairing charter campuses is problematic.

As with non-charter campuses, a charter campus that is a registered AEC will be rated under AEA procedures.

## Non-Traditional Educational Settings

---

As previously stated, all campuses in the state serving grades 1–12 must receive a campus rating; however, some situations require a different treatment.

Alternative Education Campuses (AEC) meeting certain eligibility criteria may register to be evaluated under Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) procedures. See *Part 2* of this *Manual* for all details on the AEA procedures.

Other AECs may not be registered for evaluation under AEA procedures: Either they chose not to register, did not meet the registration criteria, or did not meet the at-risk registration criterion to be registered for evaluation under AEA procedures. These campuses are evaluated under standard procedures and will be rated *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Academically Acceptable*, *Academically Unacceptable*, *Not Rated: Other*, or *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*.

Generally speaking, districts are responsible for the performance of all their students, including those who attend AECs that are registered for evaluation under AEA procedures. That is, the performance results for students who attend campuses evaluated under AEA procedures *are included* in the district's performance and *are used* in determining the district's rating and acknowledgments.

Certain state statutes mandate exceptions to the accountability ratings. In particular, Texas Education Code (TEC) in effect for the 2011 accountability year stipulates that the performance of students served in certain campuses cannot be used in evaluating the district where the campus is located. Three campus types that are specifically addressed in statute are Residential Treatment Facility (RTF) campuses, Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC) campuses, and Texas Youth Commission (TYC) campuses. *See note\* at the end of this chapter regarding statutory citations.*

### RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT FACILITIES

A district that has a privately operated RTF within its geographic boundaries is not held accountable for the TAKS or dropout data for students reported with certain student attribution codes. TEA identifies and removes dropouts with student attribution codes of 21, 22, or 23 from the serving district and campus rates. TEA identifies and removes TAKS results for students with student attribution codes of 21 or 22 from the serving district. (See TEC §39.073(f)\*.)

### TEXAS JUVENILE PROBATION COMMISSION CAMPUSES

A district with a registered pre-adjudication detention center or post-adjudication correctional facility within its geographic boundaries is not held accountable for the TAKS or dropout data for students reported with certain student attribution codes. TEA identifies and removes dropouts with student attribution codes of 13, 14, or 15 from the serving district and the non-TJPC campus rates. TEA identifies and removes TAKS results for students with student attribution codes of 13 or 14 from the serving district.

In addition, any completion or dropout data reported on campuses designated as TJPC campuses are not included in the district results for the district where the TJPC campus is located. The TJPC campus will be rated (either under standard or AEA procedures) on the

data assigned to it. The district rating is not affected by the completion or dropout data reported on these campuses. (See TEC §39.072(d)\* and §39.073(f)\*.)

Furthermore, a rating of *Academically Unacceptable* on a TJPC campus does not prevent an *Exemplary* or *Recognized* district rating in the district where the TJPC campus is located. (See *Chapter 3 – The Basics: Additional Features*.)

## **TEXAS YOUTH COMMISSION FACILITIES WITHIN TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS**

A district that has a TYC facility within its geographic boundaries is not held accountable for the TAKS or dropout data for students reported with certain student attribution codes. TEA identifies and removes dropouts with student attribution codes of 17, 18, or 19 from the serving district and the non-TYC campus rates. TEA identifies and removes TAKS results for students with student attribution codes of 17 or 18 from the serving district.

In addition, any completion or dropout data reported on campuses designated as TYC campuses are not included in the district results for the district where the TYC campus is located. The district's TYC campus will be rated (either under standard or AEA procedures) on the data assigned to it. The district rating is not affected by the completion or dropout data reported on these campuses. (See TEC §39.072(d)\*.)

Furthermore, a rating of *Academically Unacceptable* on a TYC campus does not prevent an *Exemplary* or *Recognized* district rating in the district where the TYC campus is located. (See *Chapter 3 – The Basics: Additional Features*.)

## **JUVENILE JUSTICE ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND DISCIPLINARY ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Programs (JJAEPs) and Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs (DAEPs) are two types of campuses that are not rated under either standard or AEA procedures.

*JJAEPs.* Statute prohibits the attribution of performance results to JJAEPs. For counties with a population of 125,000 or more, Texas Education Code §37.011(h) requires that a student enrolled at a JJAEP be reported as if the student were attending and being tested at his or her “sending” campus. Each district that sends students to a JJAEP is responsible for properly attributing all performance data according to the *PEIMS Data Standards* and the testing guidelines.

By statute, procedures for evaluating the educational performance of JJAEPs in large counties are the responsibility of the TJPC. In the state accountability system, campuses identified to be JJAEPs will be labeled *Not Rated: Other*. Any accountability data erroneously reported to a JJAEP campus are subject to further investigation.

*DAEPs.* Statutory intent prohibits the attribution of performance results to a DAEP. Each district that sends students to a DAEP is responsible for properly attributing all performance data according to the *PEIMS Data Standards* and the testing guidelines.

All campuses identified to be DAEPs will be labeled *Not Rated: Other*. Accountability data erroneously reported to a DAEP campus are subject to further investigation.

*Table 9* on the following page lists various campus types discussed above and indicates whether the performance data are included or excluded from the district evaluation.

## **SPECIAL EDUCATION CAMPUSES**

Campuses where all students are served in special education programs and are tested on TAKS (including TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, and TAKS-Alt) will be rated on the performance of their students.

---

\* These statutory citations reference TEC as it existed prior to the changes made by the 81<sup>st</sup> legislative session in 2009. The citations are in effect through the 2011 accountability year.

**Table 11: Inclusion or Exclusion of Performance Data**

Campus Type	Student-Level Processing	
	Dropout (2009-10)	TAKS (2010-11)
TJPC	PEIMS student attribution codes 13, 14, and 15: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove dropouts from serving district results.</li> <li>Remove dropouts from serving campus results if the campus is a regular campus.</li> </ul>	PEIMS student attribution codes 13 and 14 remove results from serving district results.
TYC	PEIMS student attribution codes 17, 18, and 19: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove dropouts from serving district results.</li> <li>Remove dropouts from serving campus results if the campus is a regular campus.</li> </ul>	PEIMS student attribution codes 17 and 18 remove results from serving district results.
RTF	PEIMS student attribution codes 21, 22, and 23: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove dropouts from serving district results.</li> <li>Remove dropouts from serving campus results.</li> </ul>	PEIMS student attribution codes 21 and 22 remove results from serving district results.
JJAEP	Dropout data are attributed to non-JJAEP campus using PEIMS attendance data or district-supplied campus of accountability. Students who cannot be attributed to a non-JJAEP campus remain dropouts at the JJAEP campus. Dropouts at the JJAEP campus will be included in the district results.	No assessment data should be reported to the JJAEP. Data reported mistakenly to the JJAEP will be included in the district results.
DAEP	Dropout data are attributed to non-DAEP campus using PEIMS attendance data or district-supplied campus of accountability. Students who cannot be attributed to a non-DAEP campus remain dropouts at the DAEP campus. Dropouts at the DAEP campus will be included in the district results.	No assessment data should be reported to the DAEP. Data reported mistakenly to the DAEP will be included in the district results.

Campus Type	Campus-Level Processing
	Dropout (2009-10) and Completion (Class of 2010)
TJPC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The TJPC campus is excluded from the district results.</li> <li>The TJPC campus is evaluated on the data it has.</li> </ul>
TYC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The TYC campus is excluded from the district results.</li> <li>The TYC campus is evaluated on the data it has.</li> </ul>
RTF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data remaining after student-level processing are included in the evaluation of the RTF campus.</li> <li>The RTF campus is included in the district results.</li> </ul>
JJAEP	No dropout, completion, or assessment data should be reported to the JJAEP. Data reported mistakenly to the JJAEP will be included in the district results.
DAEP	No dropout, completion, or assessment data should be reported to the DAEP. Data reported mistakenly to the DAEP will be included in the district results.

**The 2011 Accountability Rating System  
for Texas Public Schools and School Districts**

# Part 2

---

**Alternative Education  
Accountability (AEA)  
Procedures**

**In Part 2:**

Chapter 7 – Overview of  
AEA .....81

Chapter 8 – AEA  
Registration Criteria and  
Requirements .....87

Chapter 9 – Attribution of  
AEC Data .....91

Chapter 10 – AEA Base  
Indicators.....93

Chapter 11 – Additional  
Features of AEA.....101

Chapter 12 – AEA  
Ratings .....109

Chapter 13 – AEA Gold  
Performance  
Acknowledgments..... 121

Chapter 14 –  
AEA Glossary ..... 129



# Chapter 7 – Overview of AEA

---

## ABOUT PART 2 OF THIS *MANUAL*

Part 2 of this *Manual* is a technical resource to explain the criteria and procedures applied by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) in evaluating the performance of alternative education campuses (AECs) including charters and charter campuses that:

- are dedicated to serving students at risk of dropping out of school;
- are eligible to receive an alternative education accountability (AEA) rating; and
- register annually for evaluation under AEA procedures.

Registered AECs and charters rated under AEA procedures are subject to all the terms and provisions of this *Manual*.

## EDUCATOR INPUT

While it was the role of the Commissioner of Education to develop AEA procedures, the commissioner relied extensively on the detailed review, study, and advice of educators and other education stakeholders. The resulting procedures contain appropriate indicators for AECs and charters with increased rigor phased in over time.

## HISTORY OF AEA

Enacted by the Texas legislature in 1993, accountability legislation mandated the creation of an accountability system for all Texas schools. This accountability system integrated the statewide curriculum; the state criterion-referenced assessment system; district and campus accountability; district and campus recognition for high performance and significant increases in performance; sanctions for poor performance; and school, district, and state reports.

A set of alternative performance measures for campuses serving at-risk students was developed in late 1994 and implemented in the 1995-96 school year. In order for a campus to qualify as alternative, it was required to serve one or more of the following student populations: students at risk of dropping out; recovered dropouts; pregnant or parenting students; adjudicated students; students with severe discipline problems; or expelled students.

For the 1995-96 school year, alternative accountability ratings were based on state-approved district proposals that included student performance indicators, current-year data, and comparisons of pre- and post-assessment results. Following a review of campus data by the local board of trustees, each district made an initial determination of the campus rating. This initial determination was then forwarded to the TEA where it was reviewed by a panel of peer reviewers who sent a recommendation to the commissioner.

From the 1995-96 to 2001-02 school years, revisions were made to the ratings criteria and procedures determined by an *ad hoc* Alternative Education Advisory Committee:

- Minimum performance levels for an *Acceptable* rating were established in 1996-97.
- Beginning in 1996-97, school districts were required to select campus-based performance indicators from a menu of state-established indicators.

- In 1997-98, TEA staff assumed responsibility for the review and analysis of campus performance data.
- In 1999-00, TEA required that the rating for each AEC be determined on three base indicators: Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) passing rates for reading and mathematics, dropout rates, and attendance rates.
- In 1999-00, disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs) and juvenile justice alternative education programs (JJAEPs) were no longer permitted to register for AEA. Instead, the performance of students served in these programs was attributed to the campuses where these students would otherwise have attended.
- In 2000-01, campuses were required to serve “students at risk of dropping out of school” as defined in Texas Education Code (TEC) §29.081(d) in order to be eligible to receive an accountability rating under AEA procedures.

House Bill 6, enacted by the 77th Texas Legislature, called for a pilot program to examine issues surrounding accountability of alternative education programs. The purposes of this pilot were to analyze the existing status of AECs and to make recommendations regarding the methods of evaluating the performance of these campuses. In order to achieve these purposes, the following activities were undertaken in 2002:

- a set of surveys for principals, teachers/counselors, parents, and students at AECs was administered;
- a more detailed survey was administered and follow-up telephone calls were made to a small sample of AECs;
- an analysis of existing Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data was undertaken; and
- individual student data from a small sample of AECs were compiled and analyzed.

Results of the pilot program are published in the *Report on the Alternative Education Accountability Pilot* (Texas Education Agency, December 1, 2002).

While these pilot activities were conducted, the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), Public Law 107-110, was signed into law. This federal legislation was considered as part of the pilot project report. Accountability provisions of NCLB require that all campuses, including AECs, be evaluated annually for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

The 2003 Educator Focus Group on Accountability made a recommendation to develop new AEA procedures for 2005 and beyond. The new AEA procedures are based on the following guidelines:

- The AEA indicators are based on data submitted through standard data submission processes such as PEIMS or by the state testing contractor.
- The AEA measures are appropriate for alternative education programs offered on AECs rather than just setting lower standards on the same measures used in the standard accountability procedures. Furthermore, these measures ensure that all students demonstrate proficiency on the state assessments in order to graduate.

- The Texas Growth Index (TGI) and other improvement indicators are evaluated as base indicators for AEC ratings.
- Additional AEA criteria are included. For example, AECs must have a minimum percentage of at-risk students (based on PEIMS data reported on current-year fall enrollment records) to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

Also, in 2003, ratings for all campuses were suspended for one year while the new Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) assessments were implemented for the first time and the new state accountability system was developed. In 2004, registered AECs received a rating of *Not Rated: Alternative Education* while new AEA procedures were developed.

In 2005, registered AECs were evaluated for the first time under the newly developed, redesigned AEA procedures. From 2006 to 2011, the amendments below were made to the AEA procedures.

- The at-risk registration criterion began at 65% in 2006 and increased by five percentage points annually until it reached 75% in 2008, where it remains.
- Beginning in 2008, AEA campuses and charters are evaluated on Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) indicators.
- Beginning in 2009, the Texas Projection Measure (TPM) is used in the TAKS Progress indicator.
- Beginning in 2011, AEA campuses and charters are evaluated on a new English Language Learners (ELL) Progress indicator. TPM and TGI are not used for state or federal accountability in 2011.

## **PHILOSOPHY OF AEA**

AEA procedures are based on the following principles:

- Procedures apply to AECs, not programs.
- Procedures apply to AECs and charters dedicated to serving students at risk of dropping out of school.
- Procedures apply only to those AECs that qualify and register for evaluation under AEA procedures.
- Procedures do not apply to DAEPs or JJAEPs. Statute or interpretation of statutory intent requires that DAEP and JJAEP data are attributed to the student's home campus.
- Procedures do not apply to standard campuses, even if the campus primarily serves at-risk students.

The following issues affect many components of the accountability system.

- Small numbers of test results and mobility – AECs are smaller on average than standard campuses and have high mobility rates.
- Attribution of data – High mobility also affects attribution of data and complicates evaluation of AEC data.

- Residential Facilities – Education services are provided to students in residential programs and facilities operated under contract with the Texas Youth Commission (TYC), students in detention centers and correctional facilities that are registered with the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC), and students in private residential treatment centers.

## OVERALL DESIGN OF AEA PROCEDURES

The overall design of the AEA procedures is an improvement model that allows AECs and charters to meet either an absolute performance standard or an improvement standard for each accountability measure.

The AEA procedures include these major components:

- Rating labels – *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*, *AEA: Not Rated – Other*, and *AEA: Not Rated – Data Integrity Issues*;
- AEC registration criteria and requirements including an at-risk registration criterion;
- Base Indicators – TAKS Progress, ELL Progress, Completion Rate II, and Annual Dropout Rate;
- Additional Features – Required Improvement and use of district at-risk data; and
- AEA GPA recognize high performance on indicators other than those used to determine AEA ratings and are reported for AECs and charters rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

## COMPARISON OF 2010 AND 2011 AEA PROCEDURES

The AEA ratings issued in 2011 mark the seventh and last year of the current procedures. Many components of the 2011 system are the same as those that were in effect in 2010. However, there are several significant differences between 2010 and 2011:

- The standard for the TAKS Progress indicator increases by five points to 55%.
- TAKS-Modified and TAKS-Alternate results for all grades and subjects are evaluated for 2011 ratings.
- TPM and TGI are not used in state or federal accountability in 2011.
- A new ELL Progress indicator is evaluated for All Students at a 55% standard.
- The standard for the AEA GPA College-Ready Graduates indicator increases by five points to 40%.

The following table provides details on changes between the 2010 and 2011 systems. Components that are unchanged are provided as well.

**Table 12: Comparison of 2010 and 2011 – AEA Procedures**

<b>Component</b>	<b>2010</b>		<b>2011</b>	
Base Indicators for Determining Rating (Chapter 10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TAKS Progress</li> <li>• Completion Rate II</li> <li>• Annual Dropout Rate for grades 7–12</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TAKS Progress</li> <li>• Completion Rate II</li> <li>• Annual Dropout Rate for grades 7–12</li> <li>• ELL Progress</li> </ul>	
Rating Standards (Chapter 10)	TAKS Progress	50%	TAKS Progress	55%
	Completion Rate II	60.0%	Completion Rate II	No Change
	Dropout	20.0%	Dropout	No Change
	ELL Progress	Not evaluated	ELL Progress	55%
<b>TAKS Progress (Chapter 10 unless noted otherwise)</b>				
Grades Tested	Results are summed across grades and subjects		No Change	
TAKS (Accommodated)	All subjects and grades evaluated		No Change	
TAKS-Modified	Not evaluated		All subjects and grades evaluated	
TAKS-Alternate	Not evaluated		All subjects and grades evaluated	
TPM	TAKS grade 3-10 tests meeting TPM are included in the TAKS Progress numerator.		TPM is not used in state or federal accountability.	
TGI	TAKS grade 11 tests meeting TGI are included in the TAKS Progress numerator.		TGI is not used in state or federal accountability.	
Accountability Subset	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Campus Accountability Subset</i> – AECs are accountable for TAKS results for students enrolled on the AEC on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date and on the testing date.</li> <li>• <i>District Accountability Subset</i> – Charters are accountable for TAKS results for students enrolled at the charter on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date and on the testing date.</li> </ul>		No Change	
Evaluation of Student Groups	All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged using former ethnicity definitions		All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged using new race/ethnicity definitions	
Minimum Size Criteria for All Students	All Students performance is always evaluated.		No Change	
Minimum Size Criteria for Student Groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 30 to 49 tests for the student group and the student group represents at least 10% of All Students tests; <i>or</i></li> <li>• at least 50 tests for the student group even if these tests represent less than 10% of All Student tests.</li> </ul>		No Change	
District At-Risk Data	The AEC is evaluated on performance of at-risk students in the district if the AEC does not meet the standard or demonstrate RI based on fewer than 10 tests or if the AEC has no TAKS results.		No Change	
Special Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special Analysis is conducted for the charter when there are fewer than 10 TAKS tests in the charter.</li> <li>• Special Analysis is conducted for the AEC when there are fewer than 10 at-risk TAKS tests in the district/charter.</li> </ul>		No Change	

**Table 12: Comparison of 2010 and 2011 – AEA Procedures (continued)**

<b>Component</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
<b>ELL Progress (Chapter 10 unless noted otherwise)</b>		
Definition	Not evaluated	Current and monitored LEP students who meet TAKS reading/ELA standard or TELPAS reading component criteria
Grades Tested	Not evaluated	Results are summed across grades 3-11
Evaluation of Student Groups	Not evaluated	All Students (if minimum size criteria are met); Student groups are not evaluated.
AEA ELL Progress Provision	Not evaluated	If the ELL Progress indicator is the only cause for an AEA: AU rating, then the AEA: AA label is assigned.
<b>Completion Rate II (Chapter 10 unless noted otherwise)</b>		
Dropout Definition	NCES dropout definition	No Change
Evaluation of Student Groups	All Students (if minimum size criteria are met); Student groups are not evaluated.	No Change
District At-Risk Data	The AEC of Choice is evaluated on Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district if the AEC of Choice does not meet the standard or demonstrate RI or if the AEC of Choice serves students in any of grades 9-12 but does not have a Completion Rate II.	No Change
<b>Annual Dropout Rate (Chapter 10 unless noted otherwise)</b>		
Evaluation of Student Groups	All Students (if minimum size criteria are met); Student groups are not evaluated.	No Change
District At-Risk Data	The AEC is evaluated on Annual Dropout Rate of at-risk students in the district if the AEC does not meet the standard or demonstrate RI.	No Change
<b>Required Improvement (RI) and AEA GPA</b>		
Required Improvement (Chapter 11)	RI is calculated for the TAKS Progress, Completion Rate II, and Annual Dropout Rate indicators when the standards are not met and when prior year minimum size requirements are met.	RI is calculated for the TAKS Progress, ELL Progress, Completion Rate II, and Annual Dropout Rate indicators when the standards are not met and when prior year minimum size requirements are met.
AEA GPA Indicators and Standards (Chapter 13)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment <math>\geq 30.0\%</math></li> <li>• AP/IB Results <math>\geq 15\%</math> and <math>\geq 50\%</math></li> <li>• Attendance Rate <math>\geq 95.0\%</math></li> <li>• Commended Performance in TAKS Reading/ELA, Mathematics, Writing, Science, and Social Studies <math>\geq 30.0\%</math></li> <li>• RHSP/DAP <math>\geq 85.0\%</math></li> <li>• SAT/ACT Results <math>\geq 70\%</math> and <math>\geq 40\%</math></li> <li>• TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component in ELA and Mathematics <math>\geq 65.0\%</math></li> <li>• College-Ready Graduates <math>\geq 35\%</math></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• College-Ready Graduates <math>\geq 40\%</math></li> </ul>

## Chapter 8 – AEA Registration Criteria and Requirements

---

Registration criteria restrict use of alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures to:

- campuses that offer nontraditional programs rather than programs within a standard campus,
- campuses that meet the at-risk registration criterion,
- charters that operate only alternative education campuses (AECs), and
- charters that meet the AEC enrollment criterion.

### Alternative Education Campuses (AECs)

---

AECs including charter AECs must serve students “at risk of dropping out of school” as defined in Texas Education Code (TEC) §29.081(d) and provide accelerated instructional services to these students. Each AEC registered for evaluation under AEA procedures is designated as an AEC of Choice or Residential Facility.

*AEC of Choice.* At-risk students enroll at AECs of Choice to expedite progress toward performing at grade level and high school completion.

*Residential Facility.* Education services are provided to students in residential programs and facilities operated under contract with the Texas Youth Commission (TYC), students in detention centers and correctional facilities that are registered with the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC), and students in private residential treatment centers.

In this *Manual* the terms “AEC” and “registered AEC” refer collectively to AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that are registered for evaluation under AEA procedures and meet the at-risk registration criterion.

### AEC ELIGIBILITY

AECs have the option to be rated under AEA procedures and indicators. Campuses that choose not to register are evaluated under standard accountability procedures. The performance results of students at registered AECs are included in the district’s performance and used in determining the district’s accountability rating and for acknowledgments.

The following types of campuses have the option to register for evaluation under AEA procedures:

- AEC of Choice and
- Residential Facility.

The following types of campuses are ineligible for evaluation under AEA procedures. Data for these campuses are attributed to the home campus:

- disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs);
- juvenile justice alternative education programs (JJAEPs); and
- stand-alone General Educational Development (GED) programs.

See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information on DAEPs and JJAEPs.

## **AEA CAMPUS REGISTRATION PROCESS**

The AEA campus registration process is conducted online using the Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE) Accountability website. AECs rated under 2010 AEA procedures were re-registered automatically in 2011. An *AEA Campus Rescission Form* was required from AECs not wishing to remain registered for AEA. An *AEA Campus Registration Form* was required for each AEC not already on the list of registered AECs that wished to be evaluated under 2010-11 AEA procedures. AECs for which 2010 AEA registration was rescinded due to not meeting the at-risk registration criterion were required to submit a *2010-11 AEA Campus Registration Form* if the AEC wished to request AEA campus registration in 2011. The 2011 registration process occurred September 8–22, 2010. The list of registered AECs is available on the AEA website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/aea>.

## **AEA REGISTRATION CRITERIA**

Ten criteria are required for campuses to be registered for AEA. However, the requirements in criteria (6)-(10) may not apply to charter campuses (depending on the terms of the charter) or for community-based dropout recovery campuses established in accordance with TEC §29.081(e). The requirements in criterion (9) apply to Residential Facilities only if students are placed in the facility by the district.

- (1) The AEC must have its own county-district-campus (CDC) number to which Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data are submitted and test answer documents are coded. A program operated within or supported by another campus does not qualify.
- (2) The AEC must be identified in AskTED (Texas School Directory database) as an alternative campus.
- (3) The AEC must be dedicated to serving “students at risk of dropping out of school” as defined in TEC §29.081(d).
- (4) The AEC must operate on its own campus budget.
- (5) The AEC must offer nontraditional settings and methods of instructional delivery designed to meet the needs of the students served on the AEC.
- (6) The AEC must have an appropriately certified, full-time administrator whose primary duty is the administration of the AEC.
- (7) The AEC must have appropriately certified teachers assigned in all areas including special education, bilingual education, and/or English as a second language (ESL) to serve students eligible for such services.
- (8) The AEC must provide each student the opportunity to attend a 7-hour school day as defined in TEC §25.082(a), according to the needs of each student.
- (9) If the campus serves students with disabilities, the students must be placed at the AEC by their Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committee.

- (10) Students with disabilities must receive all services outlined in their current individualized education programs (IEPs). Limited English proficient (LEP) students must receive all services outlined by the language proficiency assessment committee (LPAC). Students with disabilities and LEP students must be served by appropriately certified teachers.

## **AT-RISK REGISTRATION CRITERION**

An at-risk registration criterion was implemented under 2006 AEA procedures. Each registered AEC must have a minimum percentage of at-risk students enrolled on the AEC verified through current-year PEIMS fall enrollment data in order to remain registered and be evaluated under AEA procedures. The at-risk criterion began at 65% in 2006 and increased by five percentage points annually until it reached 75% in 2008, where it remains.

An at-risk registration criterion accomplishes two goals. It restricts use of AEA procedures to AECs that serve large populations of at-risk students and enhances at-risk data quality.

The following safeguards are incorporated for AECs not meeting the at-risk registration criterion.

*Prior-Year PEIMS At-Risk Data Safeguard.* If a registered AEC does not meet the at-risk criterion in the current year, then it remains under AEA if the AEC meets the at-risk criterion in the prior year. For example, an AEC with an at-risk enrollment below 75% in 2011 and at least 75% in 2010 remains registered in 2011.

*New Campus Safeguard.* If a new campus is registered for evaluation under AEA procedures, then the AEC is not required to meet the at-risk criterion in its first year of operation. This safeguard provides an accommodation for new campuses with no prior-year data.

Due to timing between AEC registration, PEIMS fall enrollment submission, and PEIMS fall data availability in the spring, the at-risk registration criterion cannot be applied until April. The 2011 AEA campus registration is rescinded for AECs not meeting the at-risk registration criterion or utilizing the safeguards. As a result, the AEC does not qualify for evaluation under AEA procedures and will receive a 2011 rating under standard accountability procedures. The AECs that shifted from AEA to standard accountability received a letter from TEA in April to notify them that the AEC would be evaluated under the standard accountability procedures.

The final list of 2011 registered AECs was posted on the TEASE Accountability and public AEA websites in May 2011. Additionally, an email was sent to all superintendents when the list was available.

## **Charters**

---

In this publication the term “charter” refers to the charter operator, not an individual charter campus. The terms “charter campus” and “charter AEC” refer to an individual campus.

### **CHARTERS EVALUATED UNDER AEA PROCEDURES**

Under AEA and standard accountability procedures, charter ratings are based on aggregate performance of the campuses operated by the charter. Performance results of all students in

the charter are included in the charter's performance and used in determining the charter's accountability rating and for acknowledgments.

Charters receiving ratings under AEA procedures are evaluated on the same indicators as registered AECs:

- performance on the *Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)*,
- *English Language Learners (ELL) Progress*,
- *Completion Rate II*, and
- *Annual Dropout Rate* for grades 7–12.

*Charters that operate only registered AECs.* Charters that operate only registered AECs will be evaluated under AEA procedures. Charters that operate only registered Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.

*Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs.* Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs have the option to be evaluated under AEA procedures if the AEC enrollment criterion described below is met. TEA contacts each charter to obtain their preference. Charters submit their preference online using the TEASE Accountability website. If a preference cannot be obtained, then the charter will be evaluated under standard accountability procedures.

*Charters that operate only standard campuses.* Charters that operate only standard campuses, either because the campuses choose not to register for evaluation under AEA or the campuses do not meet the at-risk registration criterion, will be evaluated under standard accountability procedures.

## **AEC ENROLLMENT CRITERION FOR CHARTERS**

In order for a charter that operates both standard campuses and registered AECs to be eligible for evaluation under AEA procedures, the charter must meet the AEC enrollment criterion. At least 50% of the charter's students must be enrolled at registered AECs. AEC enrollment is verified through current-year PEIMS fall enrollment data.

Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs will be evaluated under standard accountability procedures if fewer than 50% of the charter's students are enrolled at registered AECs. Charters that operate only standard campuses will be evaluated under standard accountability procedures.

## Chapter 9 – Attribution of AEC Data

---

### BACKGROUND

From 1999-00 to 2004-05, student data (attendance, completion/dropout, and performance) were attributed to alternative education campuses (AECs) registered for evaluation under alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures only when the student attended the registered AEC for 85 days or more. Under the previous AEA procedures, the AEC accountability rating was based on performance of students enrolled on the campus for 85 days or more. The 85-day rule was implemented before the campus accountability subset was incorporated in the state accountability system.

In 2004, the campus accountability subset was applied for the first time in the state accountability system. Under the campus accountability subset, only test results for students enrolled on the same campus on the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date are included in the campus performance measure.

In 2005, both the campus accountability subset and the 85-day rule were applied. AECs evaluated under AEA procedures were accountable for test results for students enrolled on the AEC on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date and on the testing date if the student had been enrolled on the AEC for 85 days or more. Campus accountability subset does not apply to exit-level retests. 2003-04 leaver data were attributed to the AEC if the student had been enrolled on the AEC for 85 days or more and the AEC was registered for evaluation under AEA procedures in 2004.

For data collected through PEIMS, attribution of attendance and leaver records to the home campus was automated for most students based on attendance data reported for the student. A CAMPUS-ID-OF-ACCOUNTABILITY data element was required when a student's only campus of enrollment was a registered AEC that the student attended for less than 85 days, and/or a disciplinary alternative education program (DAEP), and/or a juvenile justice alternative education program (JJAEP). For assessment data, the test answer document was physically submitted with the answer documents for the student's home campus.

Student data and test documents were only reattributed within the same school district. For this reason, charter campus data were not reattributed. For students who had not attended a standard campus in the district, local policy determined to which campus the short-term AEC student data were attributed.

A comparison of 2003-04 attendance reattribution and test answer documents indicated that reattribution was not always conducted consistently for PEIMS data (an automated process conducted by the state) and test results (a local process). Often, test answer documents for students enrolled on the AEC for fewer than 85 days were not sent back to the student's home campus.

In 2006, the campus accountability subset determined attribution of AEC test data. 2004-05 leaver data were attributed according to the 85-day rule for AECs that were registered for evaluation under AEA procedures in 2005. 2004-05 leaver data were attributed to the last campus of attendance for AECs that were not registered for evaluation under AEA procedures in 2005, but were registered in 2006.

## **ATTRIBUTION OF DATA**

*AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities.* Campus accountability subset determines attribution of AEC test data. Only test results for students enrolled on the same campus on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date are included in the campus performance measure. Accountability subset does not apply to exit-level retests. School leaver data are attributed to the campus that the student last attended. The 85-day rule is phased out completely for accountability in 2007 and beyond.

*DAEPs and JJAEPs.* As required in statute, DAEP and JJAEP student data are attributed to the student's home campus.

## Chapter 10 – AEA Base Indicators

---

To determine ratings, the alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures use four base indicators:

- performance on the *Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)*,
- *English Language Learners (ELL) Progress*,
- *Completion Rate II* for the Class of 2010, and
- *2009-10 Annual Dropout Rate* for grades 7–12.

### TAKS PROGRESS INDICATOR

A single performance indicator is evaluated for TAKS. The TAKS Progress indicator sums performance results across grades (3-12) and across subjects to determine alternative education campus (AEC) and charter ratings under AEA procedures. This indicator is based on the number of tests taken, not on the number of students tested. Students who take multiple TAKS tests are included multiple times (for every TAKS test taken). Students who take multiple TAKS exit-level retests are included only when the passing standard is met.

The TAKS Progress indicator numerator is calculated as the number of tests meeting the student passing standard at the March or April/May administrations *and* exit-level retests meeting the student passing standard at the March or April/May administrations or in the previous October or July. The denominator is the number of tests taken at the March or April/May administrations *and* exit-level retests meeting the student passing standard at the March or April/May administrations or in the previous October or July.

The TAKS Progress indicator includes the following results:

- TAKS grades 3-11 Spring 2011 primary administration:
  - Tests meeting passing standard
  - Campus accountability subset
- TAKS grade 12 April/May 2011, March 2011, October 2010, and July 2010 administrations:
  - Tests meeting passing standard
  - No accountability subset
- TAKS grade 11 April/May 2011, March 2011, October 2010, and July 2010 administrations:
  - Retests only
  - Tests meeting passing standard
  - No accountability subset

### Who is evaluated for the TAKS Progress Indicator:

- AECs that test students on any TAKS subject.
- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities.

- *Use of District At-Risk Data.* If the AEC does not meet the accountability standard based on results for fewer than 10 tests, or if there are no TAKS results for the AEC, then the AEC is evaluated on the district performance of at-risk students. See *Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA*. If there are results for fewer than 10 at-risk tests in the district, then Special Analysis is conducted. See *Chapter 12 – AEA Ratings*.
- Charters that operate only registered AECs.
- Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

**Table 13: TAKS Progress Indicator**

	2010	2011
<b>AEA: Academically Acceptable</b>	50%	55%
<b>TAKS Progress Indicator</b>	TAKS + TPM (grades 3-10) + TGI (grade 11) + Exit-Level Retests	TAKS + Exit-Level Retests
<b>Accountability Subset</b>	District and Campus Accountability Subset; Accountability Subset does not apply to exit-level retests	

**Standard:** *AEA: Academically Acceptable* – At least 55%.

**Student Groups:** TAKS performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

**Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of TAKS tests that meet the standard } \mathbf{and} \text{ number of TAKS exit-level retests that meet the standard}}{\text{number of TAKS tests taken } \mathbf{and} \text{ number of TAKS exit-level retests that meet the standard}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:**

- *All Students.* All Students performance is always evaluated.
- *Student Groups.* Student groups are evaluated if there are:
  - 30 to 49 tests for the student group and the student group represents at least 10% of All Students tests; **or**
  - at least 50 tests for the student group even if these tests represent less than 10% of All Students tests.

**Accountability Subset:**

- *Campus Accountability Subset.* AECs are accountable for TAKS results for students enrolled on the AEC on the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date.
- *District Accountability Subset.* Charters are accountable for TAKS results for students enrolled at the charter on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date and on the testing date.
- Accountability subset does not apply to TAKS exit-level results.

**Years of Data:**

- Spring 2011 grades 3-11 TAKS results (primary administration)

- April/May 2011, March 2011, October 2010, and July 2010 grade 11 exit-level retest results
- April/May 2011, March 2011, October 2010, and July 2010 grade 12 exit-level results

**Data Source:** Pearson

**Other Information:**

- *Texas Growth Index (TGI) and Texas Projection Measure (TPM).* Use of TGI and TPM are discontinued in the 2011 state and federal accountability systems.
- *Race/Ethnicity.* Beginning in 2011, student groups are determined using the new federal race/ethnicity definitions reported on the TAKS answer document. See *Appendix D* for information on race/ethnicity.
- *Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision.* For 2011 accountability, a new Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision will be applied to the TAKS Progress indicator. Under this provision, students who indicate their ethnicity is not Hispanic/Latino and select multiple races that include both the Black/African American and White categories will be distributed into either the African American or White groups based on information submitted on the 2009-10 TAKS answer documents under the former definitions. If the recalculated student group performance results in a higher rating, then the higher rating is assigned. See *Appendix J* for information on the 2011 Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision.
- *Grades and Subjects.* The TAKS results for English (grades 3-11) and Spanish (grades 3-5) are summed across grades and subjects and are evaluated for All Students and each student group that meets minimum size requirements. Second administration results of grades 5 and 8 reading and mathematics are included.
- *TAKS (Accommodated).* Results for all TAKS (Accommodated) subjects and grades are included in the TAKS Progress indicator beginning in 2010.
- *TAKS-Modified and TAKS-Alternate.* Results for all TAKS-Modified and TAKS-Alternate subjects and grades are included in the TAKS Progress indicator beginning in 2011.
- *TAKS Vertical Scale.* The student passing standards for TAKS reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 (and Spanish grades 3-5) are based on a vertical scale. With the vertical scale, a student's scale score in one grade can be compared to that student's scale score in another grade. It provides information about student growth compared to prior years. A scale score of 2100 is still used for grades 9-11. For more information on the vertical scale, see *Appendix E – Student Growth Measures*.
- *Special Education.* The TAKS Progress indicator includes performance of students with disabilities who take the TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-Modified, and/or TAKS-Alternate tests.
- *Testing Window.* Results for students given a make-up test within the testing window are included in the accountability measures.
- *Refugees and Asylees.* Results of students coded as refugees and/or asylees on the TAKS answer documents are not used in determining ratings. See *Appendix D – Data Sources*.

- *Rounding of Met Standard Percent.* The percent *Met Standard* calculations are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%; 79.4999% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.
- *Rounding of Student Group Percent.* The *Student Group* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. When determining if a student group is at least 10%, the rounded value is used. For example, 40 students in a group out of a total of 421 students is 9.5011876%. Because this rounds to the whole number 10, this student group is evaluated.

## **ELL PROGRESS INDICATOR**

In 2011, a new ELL indicator evaluates the percent of current and monitored limited English proficient (LEP) results from the TAKS English reading/English language arts (ELA) and the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) reading tests.

### **Who is evaluated for the ELL Progress Indicator:**

- AECs that test current and/or monitored LEP students on TAKS reading/ELA and/or TELPAS reading.
- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities.
- Charters that operate only registered AECs.
- Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

**Standard:** *AEA: Academically Acceptable* – At least 55%.

**Student Groups:** ELL Progress is evaluated for All Students. Student groups are not evaluated separately.

### **Methodology:**

All current or monitored LEP students in grades 3-11  
who met the TAKS reading/ELA standard or the TELPAS reading criteria

---

All current or monitored LEP students in grades 3-11  
who took the TAKS reading/ELA test or the TELPAS reading component

### **Minimum Size Requirements:**

- ELL performance is evaluated for AECs and charters with results from 30 or more tests (summed across grades).
- Special Analysis is not conducted on ELL performance.

**Years of Data:** 2010-11

**Data Source:** Pearson

### **Other Information:**

- *AEA ELL Progress Provision.* For 2011 AEA ratings, if the ELL Progress indicator is the only cause for an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* label. The AEA ELL Progress Provision applies only to the ELL Progress indicator under AEA procedures in 2011.

- *Special Education.* The ELL Progress indicator includes performance of LEP students with disabilities who take the reading/ELA TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), or TAKS-Modified test, or the TELPAS reading test.
- *Testing Window.* Results for students given a make-up test within the testing window are included in the accountability indicators.
- *Refugees and Asylees.* To the extent possible, the results of students coded as refugees and/or asylees are excluded from this indicator. All TAKS results for appropriately coded refugee and/or asylee students are excluded. The exclusion applies across all subject areas. It is not possible to count a student's scores in some subjects but exclude them in others. The determination is made using TAKS answer documents. For refugee and/or asylee students with only TELPAS reading results this determination cannot be made. For more information, see *Appendix D – Data Sources*.
- *Rounding of Met Standard Percent.* The percent *Met Standard* calculations are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%; 79.4999% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.

## **COMPLETION RATE II INDICATOR [GRADUATES, CONTINUERS, GED RECIPIENTS]**

This longitudinal rate shows the percent of students who first attended grade 9 in the 2006-07 school year who graduated, received a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, or who are continuing their education four years later. Known as the 2006-07 cohort, these students' progress was tracked over the four years using data provided to TEA by districts and charters and data available in the statewide GED database.

Completion Rate II includes graduates, continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year), and GED recipients in the definition of Completion Rate II for AECs of Choice and charters evaluated under AEA procedures.

### **Who is evaluated for Completion Rate II:**

- AECs of Choice that served students in grades 9 and either 11 or 12 in the first (2006-07) and fifth (2010-11) years of the cohort or students in grade 12 in the first and fifth years of the cohort.
- Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.
- If the AEC of Choice does not serve students in any of grades 9-12 in the 2010-11 school year, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II.
- *Use of District At-Risk Rate.* If the AEC of Choice does not meet the accountability standard, does not meet minimum size requirements for All Students, or if the AEC of Choice has students in any of grades 9-12 but does not have a Completion Rate II, then the AEC of Choice is evaluated on Completion Rate II (including GED recipients) of at-risk students in the district. If at-risk students in the district do not meet minimum size requirements for All Students, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II. See *Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA*.
- Charters that operate only registered AECs.
- Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

**Table 14: Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12) Indicator**

	2010 Class of 2009; 9th grade 05-06	2011 Class of 2010; 9th grade 06-07
<b>AEA: Academically Acceptable</b>	60.0%	60.0%
<b>Completion Rate II</b>	Graduates + Continuers + GED Recipients	
<b>Dropout Definition</b>	NCES definition	
<b>Accountability Subset</b>	School Leaver data are attributed to the last campus of attendance	

**Standard:** *AEA: Academically Acceptable* – At least 60.0% Completion Rate II.

**Student Groups:** Completion Rate II is evaluated for All Students. Student groups are not evaluated separately.

**Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of completers (graduates + continuers + GED recipients)}}{\text{number of students in class}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:**

*All Students.* These results are evaluated if there are:

- at least 10 dropouts (non-completers), *and*
- at least 10 students in the AEC of Choice or charter Completion Rate II class.

**Accountability Subset:** Completion data are attributed to the student’s last campus of attendance.

**Years of Data:**

- Graduating Class of 2010 (results are based on the original 2006-07 cohort, even if students do not remain on grade level)
- Continued enrollment in 2010-11
- GED records as of August 31, 2010

**Data Sources:**

- PEIMS Submission 1 enrollment data for 2006-07 through 2010-11
- PEIMS Submission 1 leaver data for 2007-08 through 2010-11
- PEIMS Submission 3 attendance data for 2006-07 through 2009-10
- GED records as of August 31, 2010

**Other Information:**

- *Ethnic Groups.* For the completion rate indicator, a student’s ethnicity is determined from the year of final status. For the class of 2010, most students have a final status from years 1-4 (2006-07 through 2009-10). Only the continuers [students with a final status in year 5 (2010-11)] will be reported with new race/ethnicity definitions. Students reported

with multiple races in year 5 will be matched back to the prior year to obtain their former (previously reported) ethnicities. See *Appendix D* for information on race/ethnicity.

- *Transfers.* Any student who transfers into the cohort is added to it, and any student who transfers out of the cohort is subtracted from it.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 74.875% is rounded to 74.9%.
- *Students with Disabilities.* The completion status of students with disabilities is included in this indicator.

## ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE (GRADES 7-12) INDICATOR

The Annual Dropout Rate indicator is grade 7-12 dropouts as a percent of total students enrolled at the AEC or charter in grades 7-12 in a single school year.

### Who is evaluated for Annual Dropout Rate:

- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that serve students in any of grades 7-12.
- *Use of District At-Risk Rate.* If the AEC does not meet the accountability standard or demonstrate Required Improvement, then the AEC is evaluated on the Annual Dropout Rate of at-risk students in the district. See *Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA.*
- Charters that operate only registered AECs.
- Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

**Table 15: Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12) Indicator**

	2010 from 2008-09	2011 from 2009-10
<b>AEA: Academically Acceptable</b>	20.0%	20.0%
<b>Dropout Definition</b>	NCES definition	
<b>Accountability Subset</b>	School Leaver data are attributed to the last campus of attendance	

**Standard:** *AEA: Academically Acceptable* – An Annual Dropout Rate of 20.0% or less.

**Student Groups:** Annual Dropout Rate is evaluated for All Students. Student groups are not evaluated separately.

### Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of grade 7-12 students designated as 'official' dropouts}}{\text{number of grade 7-12 students in attendance at any time during the school year}}$$

### Minimum Size Requirements:

- *All Students.* These results are evaluated if there are:
  - at least 10 dropouts, **and**
  - at least 10 students in grades 7-12.
- If the AEC or charter does not meet the minimum size requirements for All Students, then the AEC or charter is not evaluated on Annual Dropout Rate.

**Accountability Subset:** Dropout data are attributed to the student's last campus of attendance.

**Year of Data:** 2009-10

**Data Sources:**

- PEIMS Submission 1 enrollment data for 2009-10 and 2010-11
- PEIMS Submission 1 leaver data for 2010-11
- PEIMS Submission 3 attendance data for 2009-10

**Other Information:**

- *Ethnic Groups.* The 2009-10 annual dropout rates used in 2011 accountability are calculated from enrollment and attendance data submitted in 2009-10 (denominator) and leaver data submitted in 2010-11 (numerator). The 2010-11 leaver data (numerator) are reported using the new race/ethnicity designations; therefore, the student groups for the 2011 Annual Dropout Rate indicator are created using the new race/ethnicity definitions. See *Appendix D* for information on race/ethnicity.
- *Cumulative Attendance.* A cumulative count of students is used in the denominator. This method for calculating the dropout rate neutralizes the effects of mobility by including in the denominator every student reported in attendance at the AEC or charter throughout the school year, regardless of length of stay.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 2.49% is rounded to 2.5%, and 0.25% is rounded to 0.3%.
- *Students with Disabilities.* Students with disabilities who drop out of school are included in this indicator.

## Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA

---

As shown in *Chapter 10 – AEA Base Indicators*, alternative education campuses (AECs) can achieve a rating by meeting the absolute standards for the different indicators. However, under certain conditions, AECs can achieve a rating by:

- meeting Required Improvement; and/or
- using the accountability data for at-risk students in the district.

All additional features are applied and calculated automatically by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) before ratings are released. AECs do not need to request the use of additional features.

Additional requirements for charters are explained later in this chapter.

### Required Improvement

---

AECs and charters initially rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* may achieve an *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating using the Required Improvement feature. Required Improvement can be applied to all four base indicators: Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) Progress, English Language Learners (ELL) Progress, Completion Rate II, and Annual Dropout Rate.

Required Improvement compares prior-year performance to current-year performance. In order to qualify for this comparison, the target group (All Students or any student group) must meet a minimum size requirement for the prior year. See *Minimum Size Requirements* in this chapter for each indicator.

#### Who is evaluated for Required Improvement:

- AECs of Choice whose performance is *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* for any TAKS Progress, ELL Progress, Completion Rate II, or Annual Dropout Rate measure.
- Residential Facilities whose performance is *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* for any TAKS Progress, ELL Progress, or Annual Dropout Rate measure. (Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.)
- Charters evaluated under AEA procedures whose performance is *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* for any TAKS Progress, ELL Progress, Completion Rate II, or Annual Dropout Rate measure.

### TAKS PROGRESS INDICATOR

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, the AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient improvement on the deficient TAKS measures to meet a standard of **55%** within two years.

**Methodology:**

The *Actual Change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*.

*Actual Change* is the difference between performance in 2011 and 2010.

*Required Improvement* is the result of the 2011 standard minus performance in 2010 divided by 2.

**Example:**

In 2011, an AEC has performance above the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* standard in all student groups except for Economically Disadvantaged; only 48% meet the standard. Performance in 2010 for the same group is 20%.

First calculate the *Actual Change*:  $48 - 20 = 28$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*:  $(55 - 20) / 2 = 18$  (17.5 rounds to 18)

Then compare *Actual Change* to *Required Improvement* to determine if *Actual Change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*:  $28 \geq 18$

The AEC meets *Required Improvement*, so its rating is *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

**Minimum Size Requirements:** Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has less than 10 test results (for the student group) in 2010.

**Other Information:**

- *Recalculation of Prior Year Results.* For purposes of calculating Required Improvement, 2010 assessment results will be rebuilt to include TAKS-Modified and TAKS-Alternate results for all subjects and grades and to exclude Texas Growth Index (TGI) and Texas Projection Measure (TPM).
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations of performance rates and standards are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

**ELL PROGRESS INDICATOR**

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, the AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient ELL improvement to meet a standard of **55%** within two years.

**Methodology:**

The *Actual Change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*.

*Actual Change* is the difference between performance in 2011 and 2010.

*Required Improvement* is the result of the 2011 standard minus performance in 2010 divided by 2.

**Example:**

In 2011, an AEC has performance below the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* standard; only 33% of All Students meet the standard. Performance in 2010 is 11%.

First calculate the *Actual Change*:  $33 - 11 = 22$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*:  $(55 - 11) / 2 = 22$

Then compare *Actual Change* to *Required Improvement* to determine if *Actual Change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*:  $22 \geq 22$

The AEC meets *Required Improvement*, so its rating is *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

**Minimum Size Requirements:** Required Improvement is not evaluated if the AEC or charter has less than 10 current and monitored limited English proficient (LEP) students in grades 3-11 who took the TAKS reading/English language arts (ELA) or the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) reading test.

**Other Information:**

*Rounding.* All improvement calculations of performance rates and standards are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

**COMPLETION RATE II INDICATOR [GRADUATES, CONTINUERS, GED RECIPIENTS]**

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move an AEC of Choice or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, the AEC of Choice or charter must demonstrate sufficient improvement in the Completion Rate II to meet a standard of **60.0%** within two years.

**Methodology:**

The *Actual Change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*.

*Actual Change* is the difference between the Completion Rate II for the Class of 2010 and the Class of 2009.

*Required Improvement* is the result of the 2011 standard minus the Completion Rate II for the Class of 2009 divided by 2.

**Example:**

An AEC of Choice has a Class of 2010 Completion Rate II of 57.3% for All Students. The Class of 2009 Completion Rate II for All Students is 48.8%.

First calculate the *Actual Change*:  $57.3 - 48.8 = 8.5$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*:  $(60.0 - 48.8) / 2 = 5.6$

Then compare *Actual Change* to *Required Improvement* to determine if *Actual Change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*:  $8.5 \geq 5.6$

The AEC of Choice meets *Required Improvement*, so its rating is *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

**Minimum Size Requirements:** Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC of Choice or charter has less than 10 students in the Completion Rate II Class of 2009.

**Other Information:**

- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 4.85% is rounded to 4.9%.
- *Completion Rate II Definition.* Completion Rate II for the prior year is computed using the same definition as the current year so that gain from the prior year to the current year uses comparable data for both years. Specifically, the Completion Rate II definition includes graduates, General Educational Development (GED) recipients, and continuing students as completers.

**ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE INDICATOR**

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, the AEC or charter must demonstrate a decline in the Annual Dropout Rate to be at **20.0%** within two years.

**Methodology:**

The *Actual Change* must be equal to or less than the *Required Improvement*.

*Actual Change* is the difference between the 2009-10 and 2008-09 Annual Dropout Rates.

*Required Improvement* is the result of the 2011 standard minus the 2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate divided by 2.

This calculation measures declines in rates. The *Actual Change* in the Annual Dropout Rate must be less than or equal to the *Required Improvement* for the standard to be met and will contain negative numbers. The *Actual Change* needs to be a larger negative number than the required change.

**Example:**

In 2009-10, an AEC had an Annual Dropout Rate for All Students of 22.8%. The Annual Dropout Rate in 2008-09 for All Students was 34.2%.

First calculate the *Actual Change*:  $22.8 - 34.2 = -11.4$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*:  $(20.0 - 34.2) / 2 = -7.1$

Then compare *Actual Change* to *Required Improvement* to determine if the *Actual Change* is less than or equal to the *Required Improvement*:  $-11.4 \leq -7.1$

The AEC meets *Required Improvement*, so its rating is *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

**Minimum Size Requirements:** Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has less than 10 grade 7-12 students in 2008-09.

**Other Information:**

*Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, -1.875% is rounded to -1.9%.

## Use of District At-Risk Data

In limited circumstances, data for at-risk students in the district are used to evaluate registered AECs. Use of data for at-risk students in the district acknowledges that AECs are part of the overall district strategy for education of students at risk of dropping out of school.

AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities may be evaluated on the TAKS Progress and Annual Dropout Rate indicators using data for at-risk students in the district. AECs of Choice may be evaluated on Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district.

### TAKS PROGRESS INDICATOR

**Who is evaluated for the TAKS Progress Indicator using performance data of at-risk students in the district:**

- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that do not meet the 55% standard, do not demonstrate Required Improvement, and have results for fewer than 10 tests in the current year.
- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities with no TAKS results.

**Required Improvement:** If the AEC does not meet the performance standard based on district performance data of at-risk students, then Required Improvement is calculated using district performance data of at-risk students.

**Minimum Size Requirements:** If there are less than 10 at-risk TAKS test results in the district, then Special Analysis is conducted.

**Special Analysis:** Special Analysis consists of analyzing current and past performance data to determine if the initial rating assigned under the automated evaluation process is an aberration or an indication of consistent performance. Methods of Special Analysis are discussed in *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances*.

**Table 16: Use of TAKS Data of At-Risk Students in the District**

Number of TAKS tests at the AEC	Does the AEC meet the performance standard on its own data?	Does the AEC demonstrate Required Improvement (RI) on its own data?	Does the AEC meet the performance standard using district performance data of at-risk students?
10 or more	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A
	No	Yes – assign rating	N/A
		No – assign rating	
Less than 10	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A
	No	Yes – assign rating	N/A
		No	Yes – assign rating
			No – calculate district RI; assign rating
None	N/A	N/A	Yes – assign rating
			No – calculate district RI; assign rating

## COMPLETION RATE II INDICATOR [GRADUATES, CONTINUERS, GED RECIPIENTS]

### Who is evaluated for Completion Rate II using data of at-risk students in the district:

- AECs of Choice that do not meet the 60.0% accountability standard or demonstrate Required Improvement.
- AECs of Choice that have completion data, but do not meet minimum size requirements for All Students.
- AECs of Choice that serve students in any of grades 9-12, but do not have a Completion Rate II.
- If the AEC of Choice does not serve students in any of grades 9-12 in the 2010-11 school year, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II.

**Required Improvement:** If the AEC of Choice does not meet the accountability standard based on at-risk students in the district, then Required Improvement is calculated using Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district.

### Minimum Size Requirements:

- Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district is evaluated if there are:
  - at least 10 at-risk dropouts (non-completers), *and*
  - at least 10 students in the district at-risk Completion Rate II class.
- If at-risk students in the district do not meet minimum size requirements, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II.

**Table 17: Use of Completion Rate II Data of At-Risk Students in the District**

Does the AEC of Choice serve students in grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12 in 2010-11?	Does the AEC of Choice have a Completion Rate II and meet minimum size requirements in 2009-10?	Does the AEC of Choice meet the accountability standard on its own data?	Does the AEC of Choice demonstrate Required Improvement (RI) on its own data?	Do at-risk students in the district meet minimum size requirements?	Does the AEC of Choice meet the accountability standard using Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district?	
Yes	Yes	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A	N/A	
		No	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A	
			No	Yes	Yes – assign rating	
		No	No	No – calculate district RI; assign rating		
	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes – assign rating
					No	No – calculate district RI; assign rating
		N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
					No	N/A
No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

## ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE INDICATOR

### Who is evaluated for Annual Dropout Rate using data of at-risk students in the district:

AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that do not meet the 20.0% standard or demonstrate Required Improvement.

**Required Improvement:** If the AEC does not meet the accountability standard based on at-risk students in the district, then Required Improvement is calculated using Annual Dropout Rate of at-risk students in the district.

**Minimum Size Requirements:** Annual Dropout Rate of at-risk students in the district is evaluated if there are:

- at least 10 at-risk dropouts (non-completers), *and*
- at least 10 at-risk students in the district in grades 7-12.

**Table 18: Use of Annual Dropout Data of At-Risk Students in the District**

Number of Dropouts	Does the AEC meet the accountability standard on its own data?	Does the AEC demonstrate Required Improvement (RI) on its own data?	Does the AEC meet the accountability standard using Annual Dropout Rate of at-risk students in the district?
10 or more	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A
	No	Yes – assign rating	N/A
		No	Yes – assign rating
			No – calculate district RI; assign rating
0 – 9	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Additional Requirements for Charters

**Underreported Students:** Charters evaluated under AEA procedures are subject to underreported student standards as described in *Chapter 3 – The Basics: Additional Features*. Although the charter AEA rating is not affected, Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) will continue to evaluate this indicator at the 2011 standards in its Data Validation system.

**Additional Students in Charter Ratings:** Charters evaluated under AEA procedures are responsible for the performance of all students, including those who attend campuses that receive a rating of *AEA: Not Rated – Other*.

## AECs Rated AEA: Academically Unacceptable

Registered AECs rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* do not prevent a district rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*.

*This page is intentionally blank.*

## Chapter 12 – AEA Ratings

---

This chapter illustrates how to apply the alternative education accountability (AEA) indicator data results and the additional features of AEA to determine ratings for registered alternative education campuses (AECs) and charters evaluated under AEA procedures.

### WHO IS RATED?

The state accountability system is required to rate all districts and campuses serving students in grades 1-12. Under the AEA procedures, the first step in determining AEA ratings is to identify the universe of AECs and charters. The AEA universe consists of:

- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that meet the registration criteria, register as an AEC, and meet the at-risk registration criterion;
- charters that operate only registered AECs; and
- charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

The next step is to determine whether the AEC or charter has Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) results on which it can be evaluated. In order to attain an *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating, AECs and charters must have at least one TAKS test result. The term "TAKS test result" includes TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-Modified, and TAKS-Alternate results used in TAKS Progress indicator calculations. In addition, performance on only the TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-Modified, and/or TAKS-Alternate assessments that are included in the TAKS Progress indicator is sufficient for a rating to be assigned. Furthermore, performance on any one of the TAKS subjects is sufficient for a rating to be assigned. AECs with no TAKS test results are evaluated using district at-risk performance results. Information on use of district at-risk data is in *Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA*. AECs and charters need not have data for the English Language Learners (ELL) Progress, Completion Rate II, and Annual Dropout Rate indicators to receive an AEA rating. Charters that have only ELL Progress, Completion Rate II, and/or Annual Dropout Rate will not receive an AEA rating.

AECs and charters with very small numbers of TAKS test results in the accountability subset may ultimately receive an *AEA: Not Rated – Other* label. Special Analysis is employed when very small numbers of total tests determine whether a rating is appropriate. AECs undergo Special Analysis when the AEC is evaluated on district at-risk data and there are fewer than 10 at-risk TAKS tests in the district accountability subset. Charters are rated on the aggregate performance of all students in the charter. Charters with TAKS results for fewer than 10 tests will receive Special Analysis under circumstances similar to those used in the standard accountability procedures. Special Analysis consists of analyzing current and past performance data to determine if the initial rating assigned under the evaluation process is an aberration or an indication of consistent performance. Additional details on Special Analysis are in *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances*.

## AEA Rating Labels

Accountability rating labels for districts are specified in statute. Beginning in 2004, campuses are assigned the same labels as districts under the standard accountability procedures. Registered AECs and charters rated under AEA procedures are assigned one of the following four rating labels.

**Table 19: AEA Rating Labels**

	Registered AECs	Charters
AEA: <i>Academically Acceptable</i>	Assigned to registered AECs with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ at least one TAKS test (summed across grades and subjects); or</li> <li>○ no TAKS test results and are evaluated using district at-risk performance results.</li> </ul>	Assigned to charters with at least one TAKS test (summed across grades and subjects). Charters with fewer than 10 TAKS test results receive Special Analysis.
AEA: <i>Academically Unacceptable</i>		
AEA: <i>Not Rated – Other</i>	Assigned to registered AECs and charters with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ no students enrolled in grades tested; or</li> <li>○ no TAKS data in the accountability subset or exit-level data on which to rate.</li> </ul>	
AEA: <i>Not Rated – Data Integrity Issues</i>	<p>Used in the rare situation where the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results are compromised and it is not possible to assign a rating label based on the evaluation of performance. This label may be assigned temporarily pending an on-site investigation or may be assigned as the final rating label for the year.</p> <p>This rating label is not equivalent to an <i>AEA: Academically Unacceptable</i> rating. The Commissioner of Education also has the authority to lower a rating or assign an <i>AEA: Academically Unacceptable</i> rating to address problems with the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results that are discovered through accountability system safeguards, Performance-Based Monitoring, or other monitoring and compliance reviews. The accreditation status of a district may also be lowered due to data integrity issues.</p> <p>The district or a campus may receive a rating of <i>AEA: Not Rated – Data Integrity Issues</i>, either temporarily or permanently, or the campus or district rating may be lowered due to data integrity problems.</p> <p>See <i>Chapter 16 – Responsibilities and Consequences</i> for more information about the circumstances that trigger this rating label.</p>	

Accountability ratings are final when the accountability appeals process for the year is completed in the fall following release of the ratings in July/August.

## USING THE DATA TABLE TO DETERMINE AN AEA RATING

In June, completion/dropout data are released to districts and campuses in the Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE). In late July, prior to finalizing all computations necessary for accountability ratings, preview data tables are available for districts and campuses in TEASE.

These tables do *not* show a rating and do *not* provide calculations for Required Improvement. However, by using the preview data tables and the *2011 Accountability Manual*, districts can anticipate their ratings in advance of the TEA ratings release on July 29. *The preview data tables contain unmasked data and must be treated as confidential.* The performance of individual students may be shown.

A sample unmasked preview data table for a campus serving grades 9-12 follows. This grade span includes data for all AEA indicators.

**Table 20: Sample AEA Data Table**

July 2011

Texas Education Agency  
CONFIDENTIAL

Page 1 of 2

1

2011 Preview Accountability Data Table  
Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures

3

District Name: SAMPLE ISD  
Campus Name: SAMPLE ALTERNATIVE LEARNING CENTER  
Campus Number: 999999999  
Campus Type: AEC of Choice

Grade Span: 09 – 12  
% At-Risk: 75% 2

4

Rating:

5

District at-risk TAKS data used.  
District at-risk Completion Rate II used.  
ELL Progress data not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data.

Analysis groups used to determine ratings are marked with an 'X.'

6

	District At-Risk	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ Disadv
<b>Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) (Grades 3-12)</b>						
Analysis Groups Evaluated	X	X				
2010-11 Progress Measure						
# Tests Met Standard	33,197	2	0	2	0	2
# Tests	46,756	8	0	8	0	8
% Met Standard	71%	25%	0%	25%	0%	25%
Student Group %	n/a	100%	0%	100%	0%	100%
2009-10 Progress Measure						
# Tests Met Standard	26,881	3	0	3	0	3
# Tests	44,067	9	0	9	0	9
% Met Standard	61%	33%	0%	33%	0%	33%
Required Improvement						
Actual Change	10	-8	0	-8	0	-8

7

English Language Learners (ELL) Progress

Analysis Groups Evaluated						
2010-11 ELL Progress						
# Tests Met Standard	n/a	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
# Tests	n/a	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Met Standard	n/a	75%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2009-10 ELL Progress						
# Tests Met Standard	n/a	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
# Tests	n/a	5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Met Standard	n/a	60%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Required Improvement						
Actual Change	n/a	15	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

'n/a' indicates that the data are not applicable.  
(-) indicates that data are not available.

**Table 20: Sample AEA Data Table (continued)**

July 2011

Texas Education Agency  
CONFIDENTIAL

Page 2 of 2

2011 Preview Accountability Data Table  
Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures

District Name: SAMPLE ISD  
Campus Name: SAMPLE ALTERNATIVE LEARNING CENTER  
Campus Number: 999999999  
Campus Type: AEC of Choice

Grade Span: 09 – 12  
% At-Risk: 75%

Rating:

District at-risk TAKS data used.  
District at-risk Completion Rate II used.  
ELL Progress data not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data.

Analysis groups used to determine ratings are marked with an 'X.'

	District At-Risk	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ Disadv
<b>8</b> Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12)						
Analysis Groups Evaluated Class of 2010	X	X				
# Completers	1,824	29	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
# Non-completers	181	24	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
# in Class	2,005	53	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Completion Rate	91.0%	54.7%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Class of 2009						
# Completers	1,661	25	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
# in Class	1,992	52	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Completion Rate	83.4%	48.1%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Required Improvement Actual Change	7.6	6.6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>9</b> Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12)						
Analysis Groups Evaluated 2009-10		X				
# Dropouts	190	20	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
# Students in Grades 7-12	2,405	208	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Dropout Rate	7.9%	9.6%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2008-09						
# Dropouts	31	6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
# Students in Grades 7-12	1,464	94	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Dropout Rate	2.1%	6.4%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Required Improvement Actual Change	5.8	3.2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

'n/a' indicates that the data are not applicable.  
(-) indicates that data are not available.

The sample preview data table illustrates the types of information provided. *Chapter 10 – AEA Base Indicators* contains detailed information about each measure. The final AEA data table released in July may include minor modifications. An explanation of each numbered topic follows.

1. **Confidential:** Performance data are unmasked on the AEA data tables posted in TEASE. For this reason, personal student information may be shown. To be compliant with the federal *Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act* (FERPA), all unmasked data must be treated as confidential.

**Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures:** This indicates that the AEC or charter is rated under AEA procedures. Campuses not registered for evaluation under AEA procedures are evaluated under standard accountability procedures.

2. **% At-Risk:** All registered AECs must meet the at-risk registration criterion or the applicable safeguards in order to remain registered and be evaluated under AEA procedures.
3. **Campus Type:** Each AEC registered for evaluation under AEA procedures is designated as an AEC of Choice or Residential Facility.
4. **Rating:** AEA rating labels are not available for the preview data tables.
5. **Messages:** A complete list of messages that may appear on AEA data tables is provided later in this chapter.

**District at-risk TAKS data used:** If an AEC has no TAKS results or does not meet the 55% TAKS Progress standard based on results for fewer than 10 tests, then the AEC is evaluated on performance of at-risk students in the district.

If the AEC does not meet the performance standard based on district performance data of at-risk students, then Required Improvement is calculated using district performance data of at-risk students.

**District at-risk Completion Rate II used:** If the AEC of Choice does not meet the 60.0% Completion Rate II standard or demonstrate Required Improvement, does not meet minimum size requirements for All Students, or if the AEC of Choice serves students in any of grades 9-12 but does not have a Completion Rate II, then the AEC of Choice is evaluated on the Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district.

If the AEC of Choice does not meet the accountability standard based on at-risk students in the district, then Required Improvement is calculated using Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district.

6. **Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) (Grades 3-12):** One of the four AEA base indicators on which AECs and charters are evaluated. The TAKS Progress indicator evaluates test results across grades and subjects.

**Analysis Groups Evaluated:** Analysis groups used to determine AEA ratings are marked with an 'X.'

**# Tests Met Standard:** The numerator used to calculate *% Met Standard* – TAKS grades 3-11 tests meeting the standard at the spring administrations and exit-level retests meeting the standard at the spring administrations or in the previous fall or summer.

**# Tests:** The denominator used to calculate *% Met Standard* – TAKS tests taken at the spring administrations and exit-level retests meeting the standard at the spring administrations or in the previous fall or summer.

**% Met Standard:** The percent of tests that met the TAKS Progress standard.

**Student Group %:** Used to identify which student groups meet minimum size requirements for the indicator. TAKS performance is always evaluated for All Students and the following student groups meeting minimum size requirements: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

**TAKS Required Improvement:** Moves an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable* if the AEC or charter demonstrates sufficient improvement on the deficient TAKS measures to meet a standard of 55% within two years. Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has fewer than 10 test results (for the student group) in 2010.

**Actual Change:** The difference between performance in 2011 and 2010. *Actual Change* is always shown when two years of data are available.

7. **English Language Learners (ELL) Progress:** One of the four AEA base indicators on which AECs and charters are evaluated. The ELL Progress indicator evaluates test results across grades.

**Analysis Groups Evaluated:** Analysis groups used to determine AEA ratings are marked with an ‘X.’

**# Tests Met Standard:** The numerator used to calculate *% Met Standard* – All current or monitored limited English proficient (LEP) students in grades 3-11 who met the TAKS reading/ELA standard or met the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) reading criteria.

**# Tests:** The denominator used to calculate *% Met Standard* – All current or monitored LEP students in grades 3-11 who took the TAKS reading/ELA or the TELPAS reading test.

**% Met Standard:** The percent of tests that met the ELL Progress standard.

**ELL Required Improvement:** Moves an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable* if the AEC or charter demonstrates sufficient improvement on the deficient ELL measures to meet a standard of 55% within two years. Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has fewer than 10 test results in 2010.

**Actual Change:** The difference between performance in 2011 and 2010. *Actual Change* is always shown when two years of data are available.

8. **Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12):** One of the four AEA base indicators on which AECs of Choice and charters are evaluated. Completion Rate II counts graduates, continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year), and General Educational Development (GED) recipients as completers. This longitudinal rate shows the percent of students who first attended grade 9 in the 2006-07 school year who completed or are continuing their education four years later. Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.

**Analysis Groups Evaluated:** Analysis groups used to determine AEA ratings are marked with an ‘X.’

**# Completers:** The numerator used to calculate Completion Rate II – number of completers.

**# Non-completers:** Number of grade 9-12 students designated as official dropouts.

**# in Class:** The denominator used to calculate Completion Rate II – number of students in the class.

**Completion Rate II:** The percent of students that completed high school – *# Completers* divided by *# in Class*.

**Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12) Required Improvement:** Moves an AEC of Choice or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable* if the AEC of Choice or charter demonstrates sufficient improvement on the Completion Rate II to meet a standard of 60.0% within two years.

**Actual Change:** The difference between the Completion Rate II for the Classes of 2010 and 2009. *Actual Change* must be equal to or greater than the *Improvement Required*. *Actual Change* is always shown when two years of data are available.

In this example, Required Improvement will be calculated; therefore, *Met Minimum Size Requirements?*, *Improvement Required*, and *Met Required Improvement?* will be shown on the final data table.

9. **Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12):** One of the four AEA base indicators on which AECs and charters are evaluated. This annual rate is grade 7-12 dropouts as a percent of all students enrolled at the AEC or charter in grades 7-12 in a single school year.

**Analysis Groups Evaluated:** Analysis groups used to determine AEA ratings are marked with an ‘X.’

**# Dropouts:** The numerator used to calculate Annual Dropout Rate – number of grade 7-12 students designated as official dropouts.

**# Students in Grades 7-12:** The denominator used to calculate Annual Dropout Rate – number of grade 7-12 students in attendance at any time during the school year.

**Dropout Rate:** The percent of students that dropped out of school – *# Dropouts* divided by *# Students in Grades 7-12*.

**Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12) Required Improvement:** Moves an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable* if the AEC or charter demonstrates a sufficient decline in the Annual Dropout Rate to be at 20.0% in two years.

**Actual Change:** The difference between the 2009-10 and 2008-09 Annual Dropout Rates. *Actual Change* is always shown when two years of data are available.

## FINAL DATA TABLES

Preview data tables will be available only via TEASE prior to finalizing accountability ratings. Ratings will be released on July 29, 2011. Final data tables that include masked data will be online and available to districts and the public on July 29.

The following will appear on the final data tables:

*Accountability Ratings.* AEA rating labels are:

- *AEA: Academically Acceptable,*
- *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*
- *AEA: Not Rated – Other, or*
- *AEA: Not Rated – Data Integrity Issues.*

*Messages.* When applicable, these messages appear in the top section of the data table after the rating label:

- District at-risk TAKS data used. (AEC only)
- District at-risk Completion Rate II used. (AEC of Choice only)
- District at-risk Annual Dropout Rate used. (AEC only)
- Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II. (Residential Facility only)
- This campus is not rated due to grade span. (AEC only)
- Charter operates only Residential Facilities. (charter only)
- Charter exceeds threshold for underreported students. (charter only)
- Special Analysis conducted. (AEC or charter)
- Rating is not based on data shown in the table (Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision used). (AEC or charter)
- AEA ELL Progress Provision applied. (AEC or charter)
- ELL Progress data not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data. (AEC or charter)
- Completion Rate II not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data. (AEC of Choice or charter)
- Annual Dropout Rate not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data. (AEC or charter)
- Campus data excluded from district rating calculation due to TEC §39.072(d). (AEC only)
- This charter is not rated. All campus data are excluded from the district rating calculation due to TEC §39.072(d). (charter only)
- Rating changed due to an appeal. Data not modified. (AEC or charter)
- Rating changed after [date] due to data integrity issues. (AEC or charter)

*Required Improvement.* The final data table shows all calculations for Required Improvement when calculated:

- *Met Minimum Size Requirements?* – “Y” or “N” is shown.
- *Actual Change* – The difference between current-year and prior-year data.
- *Improvement Required* – The amount of change needed for Required Improvement to be met.
- *Met Required Improvement?* – If Required Improvement is calculated, “Y” or “N” is shown depending on the comparison of *Actual Change* to the *Improvement Required*.

## **MASKED DATA**

Performance on the data tables posted to the agency website is masked when there are very small numbers of tests or students in the denominator of the measure. Additionally, all performance at or near 0% or 100% is masked. It is necessary to mask data that potentially reveals the performance of a student in order to be in compliance with *FERPA*.

## **AEA SUMMARY**

Two tables follow that summarize the 2011 AEA procedures. *Table 19* provides an overview of the requirements for achieving the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating label. An AEC or charter must meet the criteria for every applicable measure to be rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*. If the criteria are not met for every measure, then *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* is assigned.

For example, to be rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, an AEC or charter must satisfy all requirements for each indicator evaluated. As shown, AECs and charters can meet the criteria for the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating by either meeting an absolute performance standard or demonstrating Required Improvement for the indicators.

*Table 20* provides a detailed overview of the 2011 AEA procedures. For each of the indicators, *Table 20* provides a brief definition, use of district at-risk data, the rounding methodology, the standards, the accountability subset methodology, subjects, student groups, minimum size criteria, and application of Required Improvement.

**Table 21: Requirements for 2011 AEA: Academically Acceptable Rating**

Indicators/Features	AECs of Choice	Residential Facilities	Charters
<b>Assessment Indicators</b>			
<b>TAKS Progress</b> All Students and each student group that meets minimum size criteria: African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadv.	Meets <b>55%</b> Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement (RI) or Meets <b>55%</b> Standard Using District At-Risk Data or Demonstrates RI Using District At-Risk Data		Meets <b>55%</b> Standard or Demonstrates RI
<b>ELL Progress</b> All Students only (if minimum size criteria are met)		Meets <b>55%</b> Standard or Demonstrates RI	
<b>Completion/Dropout Indicators</b>			
<b>Completion Rate II</b> All Students only (if minimum size criteria are met)	Meets <b>60.0%</b> Standard or Demonstrates RI or Meets <b>60.0%</b> Standard Using District At-Risk Data or Demonstrates RI Using District At-Risk Data	Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.	Meets <b>60.0%</b> Standard or Demonstrates RI
<b>Annual Dropout Rate</b> All Students only (if minimum size criteria are met)	Meets <b>20.0%</b> Standard or Demonstrates RI or Meets <b>20.0%</b> Standard Using District At-Risk Data or Demonstrates RI Using District At-Risk Data		Meets <b>20.0%</b> Standard or Demonstrates RI
<b>Additional Features</b>			
<b>Required Improvement (RI)</b>	RI is calculated for the TAKS Progress, ELL Progress, Completion Rate II, and Annual Dropout Rate indicators when the standards are not met and when prior year minimum size requirements are met.		
<b>Use of District At-Risk Data</b>	TAKS data of at-risk students in the district are used when the 55% standard and RI are not met based on fewer than 10 tests or when there are no TAKS tests.  Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district is used when the 60.0% standard and RI are not met or when students in any grades 9-12 are served but there is no Completion Rate II.  Annual Dropout Rate of at-risk students in the district is used when the 20.0% standard and RI are not met.	Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.	Performance results of all students in the accountability subset are used in determining the charter rating. The charter rating is not limited to evaluation of at-risk students.
<b>Special Analysis</b>	Special Analysis is conducted when there are fewer than 10 at-risk TAKS tests in the district or charter.		Special Analysis is conducted when there are fewer than 10 TAKS tests in the charter.
<b>Data Integrity</b>		None	Charters are subject to under-reported student standards, although the charter AEA rating is not affected.
<b>AEA ELL Progress Provision</b>	If the ELL Progress indicator is the only cause for an AEA: AU rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the AEA: AA label.		
<b>Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision</b>	See <i>Appendix J</i> for information on the 2011 Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision.		

**Table 22: Overview of 2011 AEA Procedures**

<b>Indicators/ Features</b>	<b>TAKS Progress Grades 3-12</b>	<b>ELL Progress Grades 3-11</b>	<b>Completion Rate II Grades 9-12</b>	<b>Annual Dropout Rate Grades 7-12</b>
<b>Use/Definition</b>	<p>TAKS tests meeting the student passing standard at the spring administrations <b>and</b> TAKS exit-level retests meeting the student passing standard at the spring administrations or in the previous fall or summer divided by total TAKS tests taken <b>and</b> TAKS exit-level retests meeting the standard.</p> <p>Sum results across grades and subjects. Include Spanish results. Include 2nd administration results of grades 5 and 8 reading and mathematics. Include make-up tests taken within testing window. Include all TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-Modified, and TAKS-Alternate results.</p>	<p>Current/monitored LEP students who met TAKS English reading/ELA standard or TELPAS reading criteria divided by current/monitored LEP students who took TAKS English reading/ELA or TELPAS reading tests.</p> <p>Sum results across grades.</p>	<p>A prior year indicator that evaluates graduates, continuers, and GED recipients, expressed as a percent of total students in the Completion Rate II class.</p> <p>AECs of Choice that do not serve students in any of grades 9-12 are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.</p> <p>Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.</p>	<p>A prior year indicator that evaluates the number of grade 7-12 students designated as official dropouts divided by the number of grade 7-12 students in attendance at any time during the school year.</p> <p>If minimum size requirements for All Students are not met, then do not evaluate Annual Dropout Rate.</p>
<b>District At-Risk Data</b>	The AEC is evaluated on performance of at-risk students in the district if the AEC does not meet the standard or demonstrate RI based on fewer than 10 tests or if the AEC has no TAKS results.	N/A	The AEC of Choice is evaluated on Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district if the AEC of Choice does not meet the standard or demonstrate RI or if the AEC of Choice serves students in any of grades 9-12 but does not have a Completion Rate II.	The AEC is evaluated on Annual Dropout Rate of at-risk students in the district if the AEC does not meet the standard or demonstrate RI.
<b>Rounding</b>	Whole Numbers		One Decimal	
<b>Standards</b>	55%	55%	60.0%	20.0%
<b>Student Groups Evaluated</b>	All Students <b>and</b> African American, Hispanic, White, Econ. Disadv.	All Students	All Students	All Students
<b>Accountability Subset</b>	<p>Campus accountability subset holds the AEC accountable for students enrolled at the AEC on the fall snapshot and testing dates, but does not apply to exit-level retests.</p> <p>District accountability subset holds the charter accountable for students enrolled at the charter on the fall snapshot and testing dates, but does not apply to exit-level retests.</p>	<p>Campus accountability subset holds the AEC accountable for students enrolled at the AEC on the fall snapshot and testing dates.</p> <p>District accountability subset holds the charter accountable for students enrolled at the charter on the fall snapshot and testing dates.</p>	Completion/Dropout data are attributed to the student's last campus of attendance.	
<b>Subjects</b>	Mathematics, Reading/ELA, Social Studies, Science, Writing	TAKS Reading/ELA TELPAS Reading	N/A	

**Table 22: Overview of 2011 AEA Procedures (continued)**

Indicators/ Features	TAKS Progress Grades 3-12	ELL Progress Grades 3-11	Completion Rate II Grades 9-12	Annual Dropout Rate Grades 7-12
<b>Minimum Size Criteria</b>				
<b>All Students</b>	All Students tests are always evaluated	30 or more tests summed across grades	≥ 10 dropouts (non-completers) <b>and</b> ≥ 10 students	≥ 10 dropouts <b>and</b> ≥ 10 students
<b>Student Groups</b>	30-49 tests for the student group and the student group represents at least 10% of All Students tests <b>or</b> at least 50 tests	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Required Improvement (RI) – A gate up to AEA: Academically Acceptable</b>				
<b>Use/Definition</b>	The AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient gain to be at 55% within 2 years.		The AEC of Choice or charter must demonstrate sufficient gain in Completion Rate II to be at 60.0% within 2 years.  Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.	The AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient decline in Annual Dropout Rate to be at 20.0% within 2 years.  Improvement will appear as a negative number to indicate decline in the dropout rate.
<b>Actual Change</b>	2011 performance minus 2010 performance		Class of 2010 rate minus Class of 2009 rate	2009-10 rate minus 2008-09 rate
<b>Improvement Required</b>	Gain needed to reach 55% standard in 2 years.		Gain needed to reach 60.0% standard in 2 years	Decline needed to reach 20.0% standard in 2 years
<b>Minimum Size</b>	Meets minimum size in current year and has at least 10 tests in prior year.		Meets minimum size in current year and has at least 10 students in Completion Rate II class in prior year	Meets minimum size in current year and has at least 10 students in grades 7-12 in the prior year
<b>Rounding</b>	Whole Numbers		One Decimal	

## Chapter 13 – AEA Gold Performance Acknowledgments

---

The alternative education accountability (AEA) Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) system acknowledges alternative education campuses (AECs) and charters for high performance on indicators other than those used to determine accountability ratings.

There are significant differences between the AEA GPA indicators and the GPA indicators used under standard accountability procedures as described in *Chapter 5*.

- There are 13 AEA GPA indicators. The two Comparable Improvement indicators are inappropriate for AECs and charters and are not evaluated for AEA GPA.
- An Attendance Rate standard of 95.0% is applied to all AECs and charters under AEA GPA.
- Performance is evaluated for All Students only. Student groups are not evaluated separately.

The GPA indicators are in statute (*Texas Education Code*) or determined by the Commissioner of Education. Acknowledgment is given for high performance on the indicators below.

- Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion
- Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate (AP/IB) Results
- Attendance Rate
- College-Ready Graduates
- Commended Performance: Reading/English Language Arts (ELA)
- Commended Performance: Mathematics
- Commended Performance: Writing
- Commended Performance: Science
- Commended Performance: Social Studies
- Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program (RHSP/DAP)
- SAT/ACT Results (College Admissions Tests)
- Texas Success Initiative (TSI) – Higher Education Readiness Component: ELA
- Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: Mathematics

### Acknowledgment Categories

---

Acknowledgments are awarded separately on each of the 13 AEA GPA indicators.

**Acknowledged.** Assigned to AECs and charters with:

- a rating of *AEA: Academically Acceptable*; and
- performance results that meet the standard on the AEA GPA indicator(s).

**Does Not Qualify.** Assigned to AECs and charters with performance results to evaluate but:

- the performance results do not meet the standard; or
- the AEC or charter is rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*. (Those that are later granted a higher rating on appeal are eligible to be evaluated and may earn acknowledgments.)

**Not Applicable.** Assigned to AECs and charters with:

- no performance results to evaluate; or
- a rating of *AEA: Not Rated – Other* (due to insufficient data or no students enrolled in grades tested) or *AEA: Not Rated – Data Integrity Issues*.

**Table 23: AEA GPA Standards for 2011**

Indicator	Description	Standard	Year of Data
<b>Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion</b>	Percent of 9 <sup>th</sup> –12 <sup>th</sup> graders completing and receiving credit for at least one Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course	≥30.0%	2009-10
<b>AP/IB Results</b>	Percent of 11 <sup>th</sup> and 12 <sup>th</sup> graders taking at least one AP or IB examination <i>AND</i>	≥15.0% <i>AND</i>	2009-10
	Percent of 11 <sup>th</sup> and 12 <sup>th</sup> grade examinees scoring at or above the criterion on at least one examination (3 and above for AP; 4 and above for IB)	≥50.0%	
<b>Attendance Rate</b>	Attendance Rate for students in grades 1-12, the total number of days present divided by the total number of days in membership	95.0% (all AECs and charters)	2009-10
<b>College-Ready Graduates</b>	Percent of graduates who scored at or above the criterion score on both the TAKS exit-level, SAT, or ACT ELA and mathematics tests	≥40%	Class of 2010
<b>Commended Performance: Reading/ELA Mathematics Writing Science Social Studies</b>	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard	≥30%	Spring 2011
<b>RHSP/DAP</b>	Percent of graduates meeting or exceeding requirements for the RHSP/DAP	≥85.0%	Class of 2010
<b>SAT/ACT Results</b>	Percent of graduates taking either the SAT or ACT <i>AND</i>	≥70.0% of graduates <i>AND</i>	Class of 2010
	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the criterion score (SAT 1110; ACT Composite 24)	≥40.0% at or above criterion	
<b>TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component: ELA Mathematics</b>	Percent of grade 11 examinees with a scale score of 2200 or more and a score of 3 or higher on the ELA essay	≥65%	Spring 2011

## AEA GPA Indicators

### ADVANCED COURSE/DUAL ENROLLMENT COMPLETION

This indicator is based on a count of students who complete and receive credit for at least one advanced course in grades 9-12. Advanced courses include dual enrollment courses. Dual enrollment courses are those for which a student gets both high school and college credit. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for a link to a list of advanced courses.

**Who is eligible:** AECs and charters with grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12 that are rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, at least 30.0% of the 2009-10 students in grades 9-12 must receive credit for at least one advanced course.

**Methodology:** 
$$\frac{\text{number of students in grades 9-12 who received credit for at least one advanced course}}{\text{number of students in grades 9-12 who completed at least one course}}$$

**Year of Data:** 2009-10

**Data Source:** PEIMS Submission 3 (June 2010)

**Other information:**

- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 24.879% is rounded to 24.9%.

**AP/IB RESULTS**

This refers to the results of the College Board AP examinations and the IB examinations taken by Texas public school students in a given school year. High school students may take these examinations, ideally upon completion of AP or IB courses, and may receive advanced placement or credit, or both, upon entering college. Generally, colleges will award credit or advanced placement for scores of 3, 4, or 5 on AP examinations and scores of 4, 5, 6, or 7 on IB examinations. Requirements vary by college and by subject tested.

**Who is eligible:** AECs and charters with grades 11 and/or 12 that are rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, the AEC or charter must meet both participation and performance standards.

- At least 15.0% of the non-special education 11th and 12th graders must be taking at least one AP or IB examination; *and*
- At least 50.0 % of those tested must score at or above the criterion score on at least one AP or IB examination.

**Methodology:**

*Participation:* 
$$\frac{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ graders taking at least one AP or IB examination}}{\text{total non-special education students enrolled in 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ grades}}$$

*Performance:* 
$$\frac{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ graders with at least one score at or above the criterion score}}{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ graders with at least one AP or IB examination}}$$

**Year of Data:** 2009-10 school year

**Data Source:** The College Board; The International Baccalaureate Organization; and PEIMS Submission 1 (October 2009)

**Other information:**

- *Criterion Score.* The criterion score is 3 or above on AP tests and 4 or above on IB examinations.
- *Special Education.* For *participation*, 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> graders served by special education who take an AP or IB examination are included in the numerator, but not the denominator. This may have a slight positive effect on the percent reported.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 49.9%.

**ATTENDANCE RATE**

Attendance rates are based on student attendance for the entire school year for students in grades 1-12.

**Who is eligible:** AECs and charters whose grade span is within grades 1-12 that are rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, the AEC or charter must have at least 95.0% attendance rate.

**Methodology:** 
$$\frac{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were present in 2009-10}}{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were in membership in 2009-10}}$$

**Year of Data:** 2009-10

**Data Source:** PEIMS Submission 3 (June 2010)

**Other information:**

- *Time Span.* Attendance for the entire school year is used.
- *Special Education.* This measure includes students served by special education.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 95.877% is rounded to 95.9%.

**COLLEGE-READY GRADUATES**

This indicator measures the progress toward preparation for post-secondary success and shows the percent of graduates who scored at or above the criterion score on both the TAKS exit-level, SAT, or ACT ELA and mathematics tests.

A single College-Ready Graduates indicator combining ELA and mathematics is evaluated.

**Who is eligible:** AECs and charters with graduates that are rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, at least 40% of all 2010 graduates meet or exceed the criterion score on both the TAKS exit-level, SAT, or ACT ELA and mathematics tests.

**Methodology:** 
$$\frac{\text{number of graduates who scored at or above the college-ready criteria on ELA and mathematics}}{\text{number of graduates with results in ELA and mathematics to evaluate}}$$

**Year of Data:** Class of 2010

**Data Source:** PEIMS Submission 1 (October 2010); Pearson; The College Board (SAT); and ACT, Inc. (ACT)

**Other Information:**

- *Criteria Scores.* The table below details the criteria scores by subject that must be met for a graduate to be considered college-ready on this indicator.

Subject	Exit-Level TAKS		SAT		ACT
ELA	≥ 2200 scale score on ELA test and a "3" or higher on essay	or	≥ 500 on Critical Reading and ≥ 1070 Total *	or	≥ 19 on English and ≥ 23 Composite
Math	≥ 2200 scale score	or	≥ 500 on Math and ≥ 1070 Total *	or	≥ 19 on Math and ≥ 23 Composite

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

- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%.

**COMMENDED PERFORMANCE INDICATORS: READING/ELA, MATHEMATICS, WRITING, SCIENCE, AND SOCIAL STUDIES**

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

A Commended Performance indicator is evaluated for each of the following TAKS subjects: reading/ELA, mathematics, writing, science, and social studies.

**Who is eligible:** AECs and charters that are rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable* and test students in any of the TAKS subjects below:

- reading (grades 3-9) or ELA (grades 10 and 11),
- mathematics (grades 3-11),
- writing (grades 4 and 7),
- science (grades 5, 8, 10, and 11), or
- social studies (grades 8, 10, and 11).

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on these indicators, the AEC or charter must have at least 30% of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

**Methodology:** 
$$\frac{\text{number of test takers achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on reading/ELA, mathematics, writing, science, or social studies}}{\text{total number of test takers in reading/ELA, mathematics, writing, science, or social studies}}$$

**Year of Data:** 2010-11

**Data Source:** Pearson

**Other information:**

- *Scale Scores.* For grades 3-8 reading and mathematics, the Commended Performance standard on the vertical scale will vary by grade level. For grade 9 reading and grades 9-11 mathematics, the Commended Performance standard is a scale score of 2400 or higher. For grades 10 and 11 ELA, a scale score of at least 2400 with a score of 2 or higher on the essay is required. For writing, Commended Performance is a scale score of at least 2400 with a score of 3 or higher on the essay. For science and social studies, Commended Performance is a scale score of at least 2400.
- *Student Success Initiative.* Students who meet the Commended Performance standard in either of the first two administrations of TAKS reading or mathematics are included.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between AECs after October 29, 2010 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between charters after October 29, 2010 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of charters. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset in Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-Modified, or TAKS-Alternate is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%.

**RHSP/DAP**

This indicator shows the percent of graduates who were reported as having satisfied the course requirements for the Texas SBOE RHSP or DAP.

**Who is eligible:** AECs or charters with graduates that are rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, at least 85.0% of all 2010 graduates reported must meet or exceed the requirements for the RHSP or DAP.

**Methodology:** 
$$\frac{\text{number of graduates reported with graduation codes for RHSP or DAP}}{\text{number of graduates}}$$

**Year of Data:** Class of 2010

**Data Source:** PEIMS Submission 1 (October 2010)

**Other information:**

- *Special Education.* This measure includes graduates served by special education.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 79.877% is rounded to 79.9%.

## SAT/ACT RESULTS

This indicator shows the performance and participation on two college admissions tests: the College Board's SAT Reasoning Test and ACT, Inc.'s ACT Assessment.

**Who is eligible:** AECs and charters with graduates that are rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, the AEC or charter must meet both participation and performance standards.

- At least 70.0% of the class of 2010 non-special education graduates must take either the ACT or the SAT; *and*
- At least 40.0% of those examinees must score at or above the criterion score on at least one examination.

### Methodology:

*Participation:* 
$$\frac{\text{number of graduates taking either the SAT or the ACT}}{\text{total non-special education graduates}}$$

*Performance:* 
$$\frac{\text{number of examinees at or above the criterion score}}{\text{number of graduates taking either the SAT or the ACT}}$$

**Year of Data:** Class of 2010

**Data Source:** The College Board (SAT) and ACT, Inc. (ACT)

### Other information:

- *SAT Reasoning Test.* Although the SAT now includes a writing assessment, performance on writing is not used for determining GPA. The writing component may be incorporated into this GPA indicator in the future.
- *Criterion.* The criterion score is 1110 on the SAT (the sum of the critical reading and mathematics scores) or 24 on the ACT (composite).
- *Most Recent Test.* Annually, both testing companies provide the agency with information on the most recent test participation and performance of graduating seniors from all Texas public schools. Only one record is sent per student. If a student takes an ACT or SAT test more than once, the agency receives the record for the most recent examination taken, not necessarily the examination with the highest score.
- *Both Tests Taken.* If a student takes both the SAT and the ACT, the information is combined so that an unduplicated count of students is used. If the student scored above the criterion on either the SAT or ACT, that student is counted as having scored above the criterion.
- *Campus ID.* The student taking the test identifies the campus to which a score is attributed.
- *Special Education.* For *participation*, graduates served by special education who take the ACT or SAT are included in the numerator, but not the denominator. This may have a slight positive effect on the percent reported.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 69.877% is rounded to 69.9%.

## TSI – HIGHER EDUCATION READINESS COMPONENT INDICATORS: ELA AND MATHEMATICS

These indicators show the percent of grade 11 students who are considered ready to begin college-level work, based on their performance on the TAKS exit-level examination.

A TSI – Higher Education Readiness Component indicator is evaluated for each of the following TAKS subjects: ELA and mathematics.

**Who is eligible:** AECs and charters that test grade 11 students on the exit-level TAKS ELA or mathematics that are rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator the AEC or charter must have at least 65% of its examinees scoring at or above the TSI standard. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board set the standard of college readiness on the exit-level TAKS at a scale score of 2200 for mathematics and ELA with a score of 3 or higher on the ELA essay.

**Methodology:** 
$$\frac{\text{number of grade 11 test takers with a scale score of 2200 on mathematics or 2200 and a score of 3 or higher on the essay of the ELA test}}{\text{total number of grade 11 students taking mathematics or ELA}}$$

**Year of Data:** 2010-11

**Data Source:** Pearson

### Other information:

- *Mobility.* Students who move between AECs after October 29, 2010 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of AECs; students who move between charters after October 29, 2010 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset in Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure. However, TAKS-Modified and TAKS-Alternate results are not included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%.

### NOTIFICATION OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Notification of AEA GPA will occur in late October 2011 at the same time as the 2011 ratings update that follows the resolution of all appeals. At that time, the district lists and data tables on the TEA website will be updated to show the acknowledgments earned.

## Chapter 14 – AEA Glossary

---

### **Alternative Education Accountability Gold Performance Acknowledgment (AEA GPA):**

Recognizes charters and campuses rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable* for high performance on indicators other than those used to determine accountability ratings. Acknowledgment is given for high performance on the indicators below. See *Chapter 13 – AEA GPA* for detailed information.

- Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion
- Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate (AP/IB) Results
- Attendance Rate
- College-Ready Graduates
- Commended Performance: Reading/English Language Arts (ELA); Mathematics; Writing; Science; and Social Studies
- Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program (RHSP/DAP)
- SAT/ACT Results (College Admissions Tests)
- Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: ELA and Mathematics

**Alternative Education Campus (AEC) of Choice:** Alternative education programs provide accelerated instructional services to students at risk of dropping out of school. At-risk students enroll at AECs of Choice to expedite progress toward performing at grade level and high school completion.

**Annual Dropout Rate:** Grade 7-12 dropouts as a percent of total students enrolled at the AEC in grades 7-12 in a single school year. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Dropout Definition is later in this chapter.

**At-Risk:** In accordance with Texas Education Code (TEC) §29.081(d), a "student at risk of dropping out of school" includes each student who is under 21 years of age and who:

- (1) was not advanced from one grade level to the next for one or more school years;
- (2) if the student is in grade 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, or 12, did not maintain an average equivalent to 70 on a scale of 100 in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum during a semester in the preceding or current school year or is not maintaining such an average in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum in the current semester;
- (3) did not perform satisfactorily on an assessment instrument administered to the student under TEC Subchapter B, Chapter 39, and who has not in the previous or current school year subsequently performed on that instrument or another appropriate instrument at a level equal to at least 110 percent of the level of satisfactory performance on that instrument;
- (4) if the student is in prekindergarten, kindergarten, or grade 1, 2, or 3, did not perform satisfactorily on a readiness test or assessment instrument administered during the current school year;
- (5) is pregnant or is a parent;
- (6) has been placed in an alternative education program in accordance with TEC §37.006 during the preceding or current school year;
- (7) has been expelled in accordance with TEC §37.007 during the preceding or current school year;
- (8) is currently on parole, probation, deferred prosecution, or other conditional release;

- (9) was previously reported through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) to have dropped out of school;
- (10) is a student of limited English proficiency, as defined by TEC §29.052;
- (11) is in the custody or care of the Department of Protective and Regulatory Services or has, during the current school year, been referred to the department by a school official, officer of the juvenile court, or law enforcement official;
- (12) is homeless, as defined by 42 U.S.C. Section 11302, and its subsequent amendments; or
- (13) resided in the preceding school year or resides in the current school year in a residential placement facility in the district, including a detention facility, substance abuse treatment facility, emergency shelter, psychiatric hospital, halfway house, or foster group home.

**Campus Accountability Subset:** Only test results for students enrolled on the same campus on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date are included in the campus performance measure.

**Completion Rate II Indicator:** Longitudinal rate that shows the percent of students who graduate, receive a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, or who are continuing their education four years after first attending grade 9. These students' progress is tracked over the four years using data provided to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) by districts and charters and data available in the statewide GED database. Graduates, continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year), and GED recipients are counted as completers in the calculation of Completion Rate II.

**District Accountability Subset:** Only test results for students enrolled in the same charter on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date are included in the charter performance measure.

**English Language Learners (ELL) Progress Indicator:** Combines the results from the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) English reading/ELA and the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) reading tests.

**NCES Dropout Definition:** Under this definition, a dropout is a student who is enrolled in Texas public school in grade 7-12, does not return to Texas public school the following fall, is not expelled, and does not graduate, receive a GED certificate, continue high school outside the Texas public school system or begin college, or die.

**Registered AEC:** Term used to refer collectively to AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that are registered for evaluation under AEA procedures and meet the at-risk registration criterion.

**Required Improvement:** Compares prior-year performance to current-year performance. In order to qualify for this comparison, the target group (All Students or any student group) must meet a minimum size requirement for the prior year.

**Residential Facility:** Education services are provided to students in residential programs and facilities operated under contract with the Texas Youth Commission (TYC), students in detention centers and correctional facilities that are registered with the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC), and students in private residential treatment centers.

**Special Analysis:** Ensures that ratings based on small numbers of tests are assigned appropriately. Special Analysis consists of analyzing current and past performance data to determine if the initial rating assigned under the automated evaluation process is an aberration or

an indication of consistent performance. Special analysis is conducted at the AEC level when there are fewer than 10 at-risk TAKS tests in the district or charter. Special analysis is conducted at the charter level when there are fewer than 10 TAKS tests in the charter.

**TAKS (Accommodated):** This assessment has the same questions as the TAKS, but allows certain accommodations for students with disabilities.

**TAKS-Alternate:** This alternate assessment is designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities, is not a traditional paper or multiple-choice assessment, and involves teachers observing as students complete state-developed assessment tasks that link to the grade-level TEKS curriculum.

**TAKS-Modified:** This alternate assessment is based on modified academic achievement standards designed for students receiving special education services. Each test covers the same grade-level content as TAKS, but TAKS-Modified tests have been changed in format (larger font, fewer items per page, etc.) and test design (fewer answer choices, simpler vocabulary and sentence structure, etc.).

**TAKS Progress Indicator:** Includes TAKS tests meeting the student passing standard at the spring administrations (April/May and March) *and* TAKS exit-level retests meeting the student passing standard at the spring administrations or in the previous fall or summer (October and July).

*This page is intentionally blank.*

**The 2011 Accountability Rating System  
for Texas Public Schools and School Districts**

# Part 3

---

**Items Common to  
Standard and AEA Procedures**

**In Part 3:**

Chapter 15 – Appealing the  
Ratings ..... 135

Chapter 16 –  
Responsibilities and  
Consequences..... 147

Chapter 17 –  
Calendar and Preview .. 155



## Chapter 15 – Appealing the Ratings

Providing superintendents with the opportunity to appeal accountability ratings has been a feature of the state accountability system since 1994. Superintendents may appeal the state accountability ratings for both standard and alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures by following the guidelines provided in this chapter.

Districts should register their district and campus rating appeals using the Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE) Accountability website. This registration system provides a mechanism for tracking all state accountability rating appeals and allows districts to monitor the status of their appeals. After registering, districts must then submit their appeal via the mail. Submission of the TEASE registration form does not constitute an appeal. Districts are still required to mail an appeal packet by the appeal deadline and include all relevant information necessary for the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to process the appeal.

Below are the dates for appealing ratings. **These deadlines are final. To maintain a fair appeals process, late appeals will be denied.**

### APPEALS CALENDAR

June 16, 2011	<i>Dropout/Completion Lists.</i> Superintendents are given access to confidential lists of dropouts and completion cohort membership. These reports provide a preview of the data that will be used to calculate the Annual Dropout Rate and Completion Rate base indicators for the state accountability ratings.
July 19, 2011	<i>Preview Data Tables.</i> Superintendents are given access to confidential preview accountability data tables for their district and campuses showing all state accountability indicator data. Principals and superintendents can use these data tables to anticipate their campus and district accountability ratings.
July 19 through August 12, 2011	<i>2011 Appeals Window.</i> Appeals may be submitted <i>by the superintendent</i> after receipt of the preview data tables. Districts register their district and campus appeals using the TEASE Accountability website then submit the appeal with supporting documentation via the mail. Appeals not signed by the district superintendent will be denied. See “How to Appeal” later in this chapter for more details.
July 29, 2011	<i>Ratings Release.</i> No appeals will be resolved before the ratings release.
August 12, 2011	<i>Appeals Deadline.</i> Appeals must be postmarked or hand delivered no later than August 12, 2011, in order to be considered.
Late October 2011	<i>Decisions Released.</i> Commissioner’s decisions are mailed in the form of response letters to each appellant. Letters are posted to the TEASE site.
Late October 2011	<i>Ratings Update.</i> The outcome of all appeals will be reflected in the ratings update scheduled for October 2011. At that time, the TEASE and public websites will be updated.

A more detailed calendar can be found in *Chapter 17 – Calendar and Preview*.

## General Considerations

---

### APPEALS ARE NOT A DATA CORRECTION OPPORTUNITY!

The numbers shown on the data tables and on other agency products, such as the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) reports, are final and cannot be changed even if an appeal is granted.

Appeals should be based upon a data or calculation error attributable to TEA, regional education service centers, or the test contractor for the student assessment program. The appeals process is not intended to be a way to correct data that was inaccurately reported by the district. Poor data quality is not a valid reason to appeal. Statute permits consideration of data reporting quality in evaluating the merits of an appeal. However, problems due to district errors in Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data submissions or on Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAKS) answer documents are considered on a case-by-case basis. Specific guidelines for data quality issues are addressed for each type of indicator later in this chapter.

### CHANGED RATINGS ONLY

Only appeals that would result in a changed rating will be considered. In other words, a campus or district must meet all other requirements for a higher rating in order for its appeal to be evaluated. Except in extremely special cases, a granted appeal will only result in the elevation of a rating to the next higher rating category.

### NO GUARANTEED OUTCOMES

Appeals that follow these guidelines are not guaranteed to be granted. Each appeal is evaluated based on the details of its unique situation. Well-written appeals that follow the guidelines are more easily processed, but they are not automatically granted.

### SITUATIONS NOT FAVORABLE FOR APPEAL

Districts may appeal for any reason. However, a strength of the state accountability system is that the rules are applied uniformly to all campuses and districts. Therefore, a request to make exceptions for how the rules are applied to a single campus or district is viewed unfavorably, and will most likely be denied. Examples of some appeals seeking inconsistent rule application follow. Because some examples apply to both standard and AEA procedures and some are unique to one set of procedures or the other, the examples are subdivided accordingly:

*Examples applicable to both standard and AEA procedures:*

- *Campus Mobility.* A request to include the performance of students who were excluded due to the appropriate use of the campus mobility subset criteria will likely be denied.
- *Rounding.* A request to calculate Required Improvement (RI), student group percentages, or indicator values differently from the method described in this *Manual* will likely be denied.
- *Minimum Size Criteria.* A request to evaluate student groups using minimum size criteria different from those described in this *Manual* will likely be denied.

- *Campus Configuration Changes.* A request for recalculation of prior-year results due to changes in campus configurations will likely be denied.
- *TAKS-Modified (TAKS-M) and TAKS-Alternate (TAKS-Alt).* A request to exclude the TAKS-M or TAKS-Alt results from the indicators that include these results will likely be denied.
- *Student Attribution Codes.* Requests to change inaccurate or incomplete student attribution codes that were submitted in PEIMS by districts with Residential Treatment Facility (RTF) campuses, Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC) campuses, or Texas Youth Commission (TYC) campuses will likely be denied.

*Examples applicable to standard procedures:*

- *Exceptions Provision.* Exceptions are automatically applied. A request for additional exceptions or to defer use of an exception will likely be denied.
- *Pairing.* A request to alter pairing relationships that districts had the opportunity to determine by April 29, 2011, will likely be denied.
- *New and Academically Unacceptable.* A request to assign the *Not Rated: Other* label to campuses that are *Academically Unacceptable* in their first year of operation will likely be denied.
- *Floors.* A request to waive the floor requirements when applying either the Exceptions Provision or Required Improvement will likely be denied.
- *Texas Projection Measure (TPM).* A request to determine ratings using the discontinued TPM feature will be denied. Specifically, requests to include the TPM for TAKS and TAKS-M and the growth measure for TAKS-Alt in the accountability results will not be evaluated.
- *Special Analysis.* A request to be subjected to Special Analysis when the criteria for inclusion in this process are not met will likely be denied. A request to revisit the decision made as a result of Special Analysis will likely be denied.

*Examples applicable to AEA procedures:*

- *Late Registration Requests.* A request submitted after September 22, 2010 to be registered as an alternative education campus (AEC) in order to be evaluated under AEA procedures will likely be denied.
- *At-risk Criterion.* A request by AECs or charter operators to be evaluated under AEA procedures when they did not meet the at-risk criterion or applicable safeguards for 2011 ratings will likely be denied.
- *Late Requests by Charters with the Option to be Evaluated under AEA Procedures.* A request submitted after April 25, 2011, for a charter operator to be evaluated under AEA procedures will likely be denied.
- *Growth and the TAKS Progress Indicator.* Appeals to include either the Texas Growth Index (TGI) or TPM in the TAKS Progress Indicator will be denied.

## Guidelines

---

### TAKS AND COMMENDED PERFORMANCE APPEALS

If a problem is identified with data received from the test contractor, the TAKS data may be appealed. An appeal of the TAKS indicators should reflect a serious problem such as a missing grade level or campus. However, coding errors on the TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), or TAKS-M answer document or the online TAKS-Alt system will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Please note the following:

- If the district has requested that writing results be rescored, a copy of the dated request to the test contractor and the outcome of the rescored tests should be provided with the appeal. If the rescored results impact the rating, these appeals are necessary since rescored results may not be processed in time to be included in the assessment data used to determine the accountability ratings released by July 29, 2011.
- If other serious problems are found, copies of correspondence with the test contractor should be provided with the appeal.
- Coding errors related to student economic status on the TAKS answer documents will be evaluated by reviewing the student's history in PEIMS. These appeals are more likely to be granted when the majority of the PEIMS history supports the claim; or, in cases where a district provides sufficient documentation, such as the Free and Reduced Price School Meals Application, signed by a parent or guardian and dated prior to testing.
- If discrepancies in student economic statuses are found between test administrations for students in the Student Success Initiative (SSI) grades, the information from the first administration is used. However, if the district provides documentation that the correct demographics were submitted at the time of testing and before test results are known, these appeals may be granted.
- Due to the application of the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision to the 2011 state accountability ratings, appeals related to the reported race and ethnicity categories on test answer documents for administration during the 2009-10 and 2010-11 school year will not be considered. TEA will apply a Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision to the 2011 TAKS indicator to address multiracial students reporting more than one race that includes both Black/African American and White racial categories. Appeals to reconsider accountability results based on students' race and ethnicity reporting in any combination of multiple or single racial categories will not be considered. See *Appendix J*.
- As stated in *Chapter 2*, the TAKS indicator current year results use the new federal definition for race and ethnicity. The prior-year results that will be used in the calculation of RI use the former definitions. Appeals to use the new federal definition for race and ethnicity for the prior-year results for purposes of RI calculations will be denied.
- The student results included in the TAKS and the Commended Performance indicators are for the same students. Appeals to change information for a student in one indicator will also be evaluated in the other indicator.
- Appeals based on TAKS-Alt online test submission errors must include documentation or validation of the administration of the assessment.

- The TAKS indicator evaluated under the state accountability rating system is not the same as the performance indicator evaluated in the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) federal accountability system. Appeals to include or exclude students or alter performance outcomes based on a comparison to the AYP evaluation of performance will likely be denied.
- TEA offers districts the opportunity to correct the TEST TAKEN INFO field. This correction opportunity is available only for the primary administrations in the spring. Changes to the TEST TAKEN INFO field submitted within the correction window will be included in the TAKS data files used in determining the 2011 accountability ratings. Appeals from districts that missed this corrections window will likely be denied. Corrections to fields other than the TEST TAKEN INFO field will not be used in determining accountability ratings. For accountability purposes, student identification information, demographic or program participation, and score code status will be based on the information provided on the answer document at the time of testing.  
  
Appeals to change score codes will be considered on a limited basis when appropriate documentation is provided to support the change and evidence exists that efforts were made to correct the error prior to the release of ratings.
- In the case of appeals describing the extreme circumstance of a campus being shut down during a test administration, the issuance of a *Not Rated: Other* label is possible. In these cases, any affected results that may have been scored are not evaluated; nor can a rating be generated on the subset of results not impacted by the event. No reliable rating can be issued based on available data.

## **ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL) PROGRESS INDICATOR APPEALS**

If a problem is identified with data received from the test contractor, the ELL Progress Indicator may be appealed. An appeal of the ELL Progress Indicator should reflect a serious problem such as a missing grade level or campus. However, coding errors on the TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), or TAKS-M answer documents or the online Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Appeals based on TELPAS online test submission errors must include documentation or validation of the administration of the assessment. Generally, the guidelines outlined for the TAKS and Commended Performance indicators apply to this indicator as well.

The ELL Progress Indicator evaluated under the state accountability rating system is not the same as the limited English proficient (LEP) student group evaluated in the AYP federal accountability system. Appeals to include or exclude students or alter performance outcomes based on a comparison to the AYP evaluation of LEP students will likely be denied.

## **APPEALS OF LEAVER DATA**

Districts are responsible for providing accurate information to TEA, including student leaver data which are used to determine the grade 7-8 and grade 7-12 annual dropout rate indicators, the longitudinal Completion Rate I and II indicators, and the Underreported Students indicator. A January 5, 2011, letter was sent from the commissioner to remind school districts of the importance of submitting accurate leaver records prior to the January 20, 2011, PEIMS resubmission deadline. The commissioner noted that these leaver records would be used to produce the 2009-10 completion, graduation, and dropout rates that will be

evaluated in the 2011 state and federal accountability systems and used to fulfill 2011 state and federal monitoring requirements. The commissioner's letter also highlighted that state law requires use of an external panel to ensure independent oversight of the state accountability appeals process. For the 2009 and 2010 ratings, the state accountability appeal panel consistently recommended that appeals related to completion and dropout rates only be granted in limited circumstances given the opportunities that districts are provided to submit accurate leaver records for students who attended their schools in the prior year. Specific guidelines are addressed below for each leaver indicator.

*Dropout Exclusions under House Bill (HB) 3.* A request to apply dropout exclusions as specified in HB 3, passed during the 81<sup>st</sup> legislative session (2009) will be denied. These exclusions apply beginning with the 2012 year (the 2010-11 dropout year). HB 3 is clear that the current National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition of a dropout is to remain in place until 2011-12. The two most common dropout exclusions unsuccessfully appealed in prior years are for students who are court-ordered to receive a General Educational Development (GED) diploma and students who are incarcerated in adult jails.

## **ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE APPEALS**

With respect to appeals of the Annual Dropout Rate please note the following:

- In June, the agency provides superintendents access to lists of their dropouts as well as summary tables of the annual dropout rates. Only students shown as dropouts on these lists may be appealed. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for more information about the processing of dropout data.
- **NEW!!** No more than ten dropouts may be appealed for any campus or district. Appeals that exceed this limit will not be considered.
- **NEW!!** Appeals requiring a change in status of more than two students (from among the maximum ten appealed) will likely be denied.
- Appeals of the Annual Dropout Rate are more likely to be granted if all of the following conditions are true:
  - Documentation is provided that the non-dropout status for the students appealed occurred prior to the last day of the school-start window; and,
  - Documentation is provided that the non-dropout status was known prior to the PEIMS resubmission deadline; and,
  - The status of no more than two students needs to change from dropout to non-dropout to elevate the rating.
- Student groups for the annual dropout rate indicators are based on the new federal definitions for African American, Hispanic, and White. Since the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision does not apply to the annual dropout rate indicator, appeals to use student race/ethnicity values under the former definition will be evaluated on a limited basis for districts that find the omission of grade 7-8 students who are Two or More Races adversely affects their ratings.
- Data quality will be a consideration in evaluating the merits of a dropout rate appeal. Poor data quality is not a valid reason to appeal. Other indicators of leaver data quality

will be considered in concert with dropout appeals, such as excessive counts or rates of underreported students.

## COMPLETION RATE APPEALS

With respect to completion rate appeals please note the following:

- For 2011, the use of the district Completion Rate I for secondary campuses without their own data continues to be suspended. These secondary schools are not evaluated on the Completion Rate I indicator in 2011.
- In June, the agency provides superintendents access to longitudinal completion information. This includes lists showing the final status of students in the 2010 cohort and summary tables of the longitudinal completion rates that will be used for accountability. Only students shown on these lists may be appealed. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for more information completion data processing.
- NEW!! The status of no more than ten non-completers or one percent of the non-completers in the cohort (whichever is larger) may be appealed for any campus or district. Appeals that exceed this limit will not be considered.
- NEW!! Appeals requiring a change in status of more than two students (from among the maximum allowed) will likely be denied.
- Appeals of the longitudinal completion rate are more likely to be granted if all of the following conditions are true:
  - Documentation is provided that the correct status for the students appealed occurred prior to the last day of the school-start window; and,
  - Documentation is provided that the correct status was known prior to the PEIMS resubmission deadline; and,
  - The status of no more than two students needs to change to elevate the rating.
- Appeals to change the economic status of a student are more likely to be granted if the student was not enrolled on the October PEIMS “as of” date, meaning the district was unable to update the students’ economic information. Documentation supporting the status is required.
- Student groups for the longitudinal completion rate indicators are based on the former definitions for African American, Hispanic, and White. The Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision does not apply to the completion rate indicators. Appeals to use student race/ethnicity values under the new federal definitions will be denied.
- Data quality will be a consideration in evaluating the merits of a completion rate appeal. Poor data quality is not a valid reason to appeal. Other indicators of leaver data quality will be considered in concert with completion appeals, such as excessive counts or rates of underreported students.

## UNDERREPORTED STUDENTS APPEALS

Underreported students represent a data quality problem with leaver data. Only districts are held accountable for this indicator. An appeal of the Underreported Students indicator is more likely to be granted if the all of the following conditions are met:

- The appeal is based on no more than one or two underreported students; and,
- Leaver records were submitted for the underreported students, but weren't found due to matching problems (Personal Identification Database (PID) errors); especially when PID changes were done by another district; and, research of PEIMS data verifies the district statements; and,
- The district does not have a persistent history of underreported data problems; and,
- The district has good dropout data quality and low PID errors.

## GOLD PERFORMANCE ACKNOWLEDGMENT (GPA) APPEALS

GPA outcomes may not be appealed. Campuses or districts that appeal an *Academically Unacceptable* rating will automatically receive any GPA earned if their appeal is granted and their rating is raised to *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

## NOT RATED APPEALS

Districts rated *Not Rated: Other* are responsible for appealing this rating by the scheduled appeal deadline if the basis for this rating was a result of errors made by the district in their submission of PEIMS data, assessment data, or other data collections used to determine accountability ratings. If the agency determines that the *Not Rated: Other* rating was assigned due to district error, the agency can assign an updated rating based on the correct data.

## Special Circumstance Appeals

---

### HURRICANE IKE

The class of 2010 completion rates may be negatively affected by students displaced by Hurricane Ike during 2008-09. A district may appeal the Completion Rate indicator when the campus or district rating is limited from the next higher rating due to a displaced student with a non-completion status. For Hurricane Ike-displaced students, only students with a final status of "dropout" during 2008-09 (the year of the hurricane) will be considered favorable for appeal. This special circumstance appeal will be permitted through the 2013 accountability cycle, the last year students with a final status during 2008-09 are part of a cohort used for accountability.

For this special circumstance appeal, the district is required to supply appropriate documentation that the student was displaced due to Hurricane Ike. Use of the PEIMS Crisis Code for appealed students will be researched. This appeal category applies to both standard and AEA procedures. As with all granted appeals, no changes will be made to the data shown on the reports.

## ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION SETTINGS

In general, campuses and charter operators rated under standard procedures that appeal to be rated under AEA procedures are not recommended to be granted. As stated earlier in this chapter, requests after the deadline to be registered as an AEC in order to be evaluated under AEA procedures are situations unfavorable for appeal. However, AECs appealing to be *Not Rated* are evaluated on a case-by-case basis as these may involve very unique circumstances and students.

## ELL REQUIRED IMPROVEMENT FOR PAIRED CAMPUSES

As stated in *Chapter 6*, since the ELL Progress Indicator is new in 2011, there was no pairing of ELL Progress Indicator data in 2010. Therefore, a campus with paired ELL Progress Indicator data in 2011 cannot participate in RI for this indicator this year. Appeals to use paired ELL Progress Indicator data in the prior year will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for districts that find the application of ELL Progress Indicator RI for a paired campus would improve its rating.

## How to Appeal

---

A district wishing to appeal a campus or district rating should register their intention to appeal on the TEA Secure Environment (TEASE) Accountability website. To register an appeal:

- Log on to TEASE at <https://seguin.tea.state.tx.us/apps/logon.asp>
- Click on **ACCT – Accountability**.
- From the Welcome page, click on the **Appeals Registration** link and follow the instructions.
- The Appeals Registration site will be available during the appeals window, from July 19 through 5:00 p.m. CDT on August 12, 2011.
- The status of the appeal, *e.g.*, receipt of registration and receipt of documentation, will be available on the TEASE Accountability website.

Superintendents who do not have TEASE access must request access at the TEASE Applications Reference Page at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=2684>

Once the appeal is registered, districts have until August 12, 2011, to submit their appeal to TEA. As in past years, the submitted appeal must include:

- A letter stating it is an appeal of the 2011 state accountability rating;
- The name and identification number (county-district-campus) of the district and/or campuses to which the appeal applies;
- The specific indicator(s) appealed;
- The problem, including details of the data affected and the cause of the problem;
- If applicable, the reason(s) the cause of the problem is attributable to TEA, a regional education service center, or the test contractor;
- The reason(s) the change would result in a different rating, including calculations that support the different outcome;

- A statement that all information included in the appeal is true and accurate to the superintendent’s best knowledge and belief; and
- The superintendent’s signature on official district letterhead. Appeals that are not signed by the superintendent will not be considered.

**Other Information:**

- Appeals for more than one campus within a district may be included in the same letter.
- Appeals for more than one indicator may be included in the same letter.
- Appeals of ratings issued under both standard and AEA procedures may be included in the same letter.
- If the campus appeal will impact the rating of a paired campus, this must be noted.
- If the campus appeal will impact the rating of the district, this must be noted.
- When student-level information is in question, supporting information must be provided for review, e.g., a list of the students in question by name and identification number. It is not sufficient to claim data are in error without providing information with which the appeal can be researched and evaluated. *Confidential student-level documentation included in the appeal packet will be processed and stored in a secure location and will be accessible only by TEA staff authorized to view confidential student results.*
- It is the district’s responsibility to ensure all relevant information is included in the appeal as districts will not be prompted for additional materials.
- The appeal letter should be addressed to Mr. Robert Scott, Commissioner of Education.
- The appeal should be mailed to the Division of Performance Reporting as follows:

Your ISD Your Address City, TX Zip	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 60px; margin: 0 auto; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> <i>Postage</i> </div>
Division of Performance Reporting Texas Education Agency 1701 Congress Avenue Austin, TX 78701-1494	
<u>Attn: 2011 State Accountability Rating Appeal</u>	

- Appeal letters must be postmarked on or before August 12, 2011. Appeals postmarked after this date will not be considered. Appeals delivered to TEA in person must be time-stamped in the Division of Performance Reporting by 5:00 p.m. CDT on August 12, 2011. Overnight courier tickets or tracking documentation must indicate package pickup on or before August 12.
- Appeals delivered to TEA in person are processed in the same manner as mailed appeals.
- **Only send one copy of the appeal letter and/or supporting documentation.**
- Districts are encouraged to obtain delivery confirmation services from their mail courier.

## How an Appeal Will Be Processed by the Agency

---

Once an appeal is received by the Division of Performance Reporting, the information will be processed as outlined below:

- The TEASE Accountability website is updated to indicate when each appeal is received. Districts may monitor the status of their appeal(s) using the TEASE Accountability website. For example, this website will include the postmark date for each appeal and the date each appeal packet is received by the agency.
- Researchers evaluate the request using agency data sources to validate the statements made to the extent possible. The agency examines all relevant data, *not just the results for the students specifically named in the correspondence*.
- Researchers analyze the effect that granting a campus appeal may have on other campuses in the district (such as paired campuses), whether they are specifically named in the appeal or not. Similarly, the effect that granting a campus appeal may have on the district is evaluated, whether the district is named in the appeal or not. In single-campus districts, both the campus and the district are evaluated, whether the district submits the appeal as a campus or district appeal.
- Staff prepares a recommendation and forwards it to an external panel for review. Legislation passed in 2006 requires use of an appeals panel to ensure independent oversight of the appeals process. The use of an external, independent, three-member panel has been a feature of the state accountability system since 2004.
- The review panel examines the appeal, supporting documentation, staff research, and the staff recommendation. The panel determines its recommendation. Districts are not invited to present their appeal to the panel or the commissioner.
- The panel's recommendation is forwarded to the commissioner.
- The commissioner makes a final decision.
- The superintendent is notified in writing of the commissioner's decision and the rationale upon which the decision was made. The commissioner will respond in writing to each appeal received. The commissioner's response letters are posted to the TEASE site at the same time the letters are mailed. Superintendents are notified via email that the appeal decisions are available on TEASE.
- The decision of the commissioner is final and is not subject to further negotiation. There is no additional grievance process for denied appeals. State law specifies that the commissioner's decision may not be challenged in another proceeding if the district has had a previous opportunity to dispute the decision.
- *If an appeal is granted, the data upon which the appeal was based will not be modified.* Accountability and AEIS reports, as well as all other publications reflecting accountability data, must report the data as they are submitted to TEA. Accountability data are subject to scrutiny by the Office of the State Auditor.

When a rating is changed due to a granted appeal, the letter from the commissioner serves as notification of the official rating for the district or campus. Districts may publicize the

changed rating at that time. The agency website and other state accountability products will be updated after the resolution of all appeals. This update will occur in October 2011, concurrent with the release of the GPAs. Note that the update will reflect only the changed *rating*; the values shown on the report, such as percent met standard, are never modified. Between the receipt of the commissioner's letter granting an appeal and the update of agency state accountability products, the agency sources will not reflect the changed campus or district rating.

# Chapter 16 – Responsibilities and Consequences

---

This section describes the responsibilities the various entities involved in public education have with respect to the state accountability system. These include statutory requirements as well as other responsibilities that are not mandated in statute. Many responsibilities are shared between the Texas Education Agency and local districts.

Consequences—those actions that occur as a result of the accountability system—are also described. Consequences include interventions and rewards. All statutes referenced in this section are listed in *Appendix B – Texas Education Code*.

## Local Responsibilities

---

Districts have responsibilities associated with the state accountability system. Primarily these involve following statutory requirements, collecting and submitting accurate data, properly managing campus identification numbers, and implementing an optional local accountability system.

### STATUTORY COMPLIANCE

A number of state statutes direct local districts and/or campuses to perform certain tasks or duties in response to the annual issuance of the state accountability ratings. Key statutes are discussed below. *See note\* at the end of this chapter regarding statutory citations.*

- *Public Discussion of Ratings (TEC §11.253 (g)).* Each campus site-based decision-making committee must hold at least one public meeting annually after the receipt of the annual campus accountability rating for the purpose of discussing the performance of the campus and the campus performance objectives. The confidentiality of the performance results must be ensured before public release. The accountability data tables available on the TEA public website have been masked to protect confidentiality of individual student results.
- *Notice in Student Report Card and on Website (TEC §39.251 and TEC §39.252)\*.* Districts are required to publish accountability ratings on their websites and include the rating in the student report cards. These statutes require districts:
  1. by the 10th day of the new school year to have posted on the district website the most current accountability ratings, Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) reports, and School Report Cards (SRC); and,
  2. to include the most current campus performance rating with the first student report card each year, along with an explanation of the rating.

A document addressing frequently asked questions regarding these requirements is available on the agency website at [http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/3297\\_fa.html](http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/3297_fa.html).

- *Public Education Grant Program (TEC §§29.201 - 29.205).* In 1995, the Texas Legislature created the Public Education Grant (PEG) program. The PEG program permits parents with children attending campuses that are on the PEG list to request that their children be transferred to another campus within the same district or to another district. If a transfer is granted to another district, funding is provided to the receiving district. A list of campuses identified under the PEG criteria is generated and transmitted

to districts annually. By February 1 following the release of the list, districts must notify each parent of a student assigned to attend a campus on the PEG list. For more information on the PEG program, please refer to *PEG Frequently Asked Questions*, available at [http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/peg\\_faq.html](http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/peg_faq.html).

- *Actions Required Due to Low Ratings or Low Accreditation Statuses.* Districts with *Academically Unacceptable* ratings (campus or district) or *Accredited Probation/Accredited Warned* accreditation statuses will be required to follow directives from the commissioner designed to remedy the identified concerns. Requirements will vary depending on the circumstances for each individual district. Commissioner of Education rules that define the implementation details of these statutes are available on the website for the TEA Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions in the Accountability Monitoring link, at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/pmi>, and on the TEA Accreditation Status website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/accredstatus>.

## ACCURATE DATA

Accurate data is critical to the credibility of the ratings system. Responsibility for the quality of data used for the indicators that determine campus and district ratings rests with local districts. The system depends on the responsible submission and collection of assessment and Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) information by local school districts. Procedures for assuring test security have long been in place; however, beginning with spring 2008 testing, additional requirements were implemented that district personnel must fulfill.

## CAMPUS IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS

In a given year, districts may need to change, delete, or add one or more campus identification numbers, the unique 9-digit county-district-campus number (CDC), due to closing old schools, opening new schools, or changing the grades or populations served by an existing school. Unintended consequences can occur when districts "recycle" campus ID numbers. Because two-year performance changes are a component of the accountability system, and merging prior year files with current year files is driven by campus identification numbers, comparisons may be inappropriate when a campus configuration has changed. The following example illustrates this situation:

*Example:* A campus served grades 7 and 8 in 2010, but in 2011, serves as a 6th grade center. The district did not request a new campus number for the new configuration. Instead, the same identifying number used in 2010 was maintained (recycled). Therefore, in 2011, grade 6 performance on the assessments will be compared to prior year grade 7 and 8 performance. Also, any dropouts reported for the campus for 2009-10 will be subject to evaluation for the 2011 accountability rating for the 6th grade center.

Whether or not to change a campus number is, in most cases, a local decision. However, districts should exercise caution when either requesting new numbers or continuing to use existing numbers when the student population or the grades offered change significantly. Districts are strongly encouraged to request new campus numbers when school organizational configurations change dramatically.

TEA policy requires school districts and charters to request campus number changes of existing campuses for the current school year by October 1 to ensure time for processing before the PEIMS fall snapshot date in late October. Changes for a subsequent school year will not be processed before November 1. This policy does not apply to new active campuses opening mid-year or campuses under construction.

School districts and charters must receive TEA approval to change the campus number of a campus rated *Academically Unacceptable* or *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*. The determination of whether or not accountability ratings histories will be linked to new campus numbers will be made at the time the new numbers are approved so that districts are aware of the accountability consequences of changing campus numbers.

Although the ratings history may be linked across campus numbers for purposes of determining consecutive years of *Academically Unacceptable* ratings, data will not be linked across campus numbers. This includes PEIMS data, assessment data, and accountability indicators that draw on those data. Campuses with new campus numbers cannot take advantage of Required Improvement provisions of the accountability system to gate up to higher ratings the first year under a new number. Therefore, changing a campus number under these circumstances can be to the disadvantage of an *Academically Unacceptable* campus. This should be considered by districts and charters when requesting campus number changes for *Academically Unacceptable* campuses. In the rare circumstance where a charter district receives a new district number, the ratings history is also linked while the data are not linked across the district numbers.

An analysis to screen for the inappropriate use of campus numbers is part of *System Safeguards*, described below. TEA can assist in establishing new or retiring old campus numbers. For TEA contact information, see *Appendix G – Contacts*.

## COMPLEMENTARY LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS

Although the statewide accountability system has been designed to address the guiding principles articulated in the *Introduction*, it is not a comprehensive system of performance evaluation. Communities across Texas have varied needs and goals for the school districts educating their students. Local systems of accountability can best address those priorities.

Districts are encouraged to develop their own complementary local accountability systems to plan for continued student performance improvement. Such systems are entirely voluntary and for local use only. Performance on locally-defined indicators does not affect the ratings determined through the statewide system.

Examples of locally-defined indicators include:

- level of parent participation;
- progress on locally administered assessments;
- progress on goals identified by campus improvement plans;
- progress compared to other campuses in the district;
- progress on professional development goals; and
- school safety measures.

As a different approach, districts may choose to expand the state-designated accountability ratings. For example, they may wish to further differentiate among campuses rated *Academically Acceptable* or *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

A third approach might be to examine those base indicators, both currently in use and planned for implementation, that fall short of local expectations. Additional performance measures could be constructed to track efforts to improve performance in those areas.

Regardless of the strategy chosen, local accountability systems should be designed to serve the needs of the local community and to improve performance for all students.

## State Responsibilities

---

The Texas Education Agency also has responsibilities associated with the state accountability system. As is true for districts, TEA must follow statutory requirements related to the implementation of the accountability system. In addition, TEA applies a variety of system safeguards to ensure the integrity of the system. Finally, TEA is charged with taking actions to intervene when conditions warrant. The agency may also offer certain exemptions to districts when excellent performance is attained.

### SYSTEM SAFEGUARDS

System safeguards are those activities conducted by TEA to ensure the integrity of the system. These help protect the system from purposeful manipulation as well as from the use of data of such poor quality—whether intentional or not—that no reliable rating can be determined.

- *Campus Number Tracking.* *Academically Unacceptable* ratings received for the same campus under two different campus numbers may be considered to be consecutive years of *Academically Unacceptable* ratings for accountability interventions and sanctions.
- *Data Validation.* The Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) system is a comprehensive system designed to improve student performance and program effectiveness. The PBM system, like the state accountability rating system, is data-driven; therefore, the integrity of the data used is critical. To ensure data integrity, the PBM system includes annual data validation analyses. Data validation analyses use several different indicators to examine district leaver and dropout data, student assessment data, and discipline data. The process districts must engage in to either validate the accuracy of their data or determine that erroneous data were collected and/or submitted is fundamental to the integrity of all the agency's evaluation systems. For more information, see the Data Validation Manuals on the PBM website at [http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=4664&menu\\_id=2147483683](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=4664&menu_id=2147483683).
- *Test Security.* As part of ongoing efforts to improve security measures surrounding the assessment program, TEA has a comprehensive 14-point plan to assure parents, students, and the public that test results are meaningful and valid. Several aspects of the plan were implemented with the spring 2008 administrations and all but one of the recommendations have been implemented as of the 2010-11 school year. Among other measures, districts are required to implement seating charts during all administrations; students testing in grades 9, 10, and exit level are required to sign an honor statement

immediately prior to taking TAKS; and, districts are required to maintain test security materials for five years.

- *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues.* A rating can be changed to *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*. This rating is used in the rare situation where the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results have been compromised, and it is not possible to assign a rating based on the evaluation of performance. This label may be assigned temporarily pending an on-site investigation, or may be assigned as the final rating label for the year. This rating label is not equivalent to an *Academically Unacceptable* rating, though the Commissioner of Education has the authority to lower a rating or assign an *Academically Unacceptable* rating due to data quality issues. All districts and campuses with a final rating label of *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* are automatically subject to desk audits the following year.
- *Federal Race/Ethnicity Definition.* In order to monitor possible manipulation of the race/ethnicity data for accountability purposes, the agency plans to conduct analyses to identify districts and campuses with significant discrepancies between the percent of students who are classified as Two or More Races on the spring 2011 assessment documents and the fall 2010 PEIMS enrollment files.

System safeguard activities can occur either before or after the ratings release. Sanctions can be imposed at any time. To the extent possible, ratings for the year are finalized when updated ratings are released following the resolution of appeals (in 2011 the update is scheduled for late October 2011). A rating change resulting from an imposed sanction will stand as the final rating for the year.

## **PUBLIC EDUCATION GRANT PROGRAM CAMPUS LISTS**

TEA is responsible for annually producing the list of campuses identified under the PEG criteria. By early December 2011 the list of 2012-13 PEG campuses will be transmitted. This list will identify campuses at which 50 percent or more of the students did not pass TAKS in any two of the preceding three years (2009, 2010, or 2011) **or** that were rated *Academically Unacceptable* in any one of the preceding three years (2009, 2010, or 2011).

For more information on the PEG program, please refer to *PEG Frequently Asked Questions*, available at [http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/peg\\_faq.html](http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/peg_faq.html).

## **DISTRICT ACCREDITATION STATUS**

State statute requires the Commissioner of Education to determine an accreditation status for districts and charters. Accreditation statuses were first assigned to districts under this statute in 2007. To determine accreditation status and sanctions, TEA takes into account the district's state accountability rating and its financial accountability rating. There are other factors that may be considered in the determination of accreditation status. These include, but are not limited to, the integrity of assessment or financial data used to measure performance, the reporting of PEIMS data, and serious or persistent deficiencies in programs monitored in the Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System. Accreditation status can also be lowered as a result of data integrity issues or as a result of special accreditation investigations. The four possible accreditation statuses are: *Accredited*, *Accredited-Warned*, *Accredited-Probation*, and *Not Accredited-Revoked*.

Rules that define the procedures for determining a district's accreditation status, as well as the 2010-11 accreditation statuses for all districts and charters in Texas are available at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/accredstatus>.

## Consequences

---

Actions that occur as a result of the accountability system are described in this section. They include interventions and rewards.

### INTERVENTIONS

Interventions pertain to activities that result from the issuance of ratings under the state accountability system. State accountability-related interventions are those activities conducted by TEA to follow up with districts and campuses assigned a low rating. Intervention activities reflect an emphasis on increased student performance, focused improvement planning, data analysis, and data integrity. Required levels of intervention are determined based on the requirements of TEC, Chapter 39. See the Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/pmi> for more information.

- *Determination of Multiple-year Academically Unacceptable Status.* In determining consecutive years of *Academically Unacceptable* ratings for purposes of accountability interventions and sanctions, only years that a campus is assigned an accountability rating of *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Academically Acceptable*, *Academically Unacceptable*, *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*, or equivalent ratings in previous years, will be considered. That is, the consecutive years of *Academically Unacceptable* ratings may be separated by one or more years of temporary closure or *Not Rated* ratings. This policy applies to districts and charters as well as campuses when *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* and *Not Rated: Other* ratings are assigned. An exception applies to districts (charters) or campuses that receive a rating of *AEA: Not Rated – Other* under the Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Residential Facility procedures. For these residential facilities, *Academically Unacceptable* ratings separated by *AEA: Not Rated – Other* are not considered consecutive.
- *Identification of Campuses with Additional Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) Requirements.* For 2011 and 2012 there are no additional CIP requirements of a campus rated *Academically Acceptable*. In previous years, campuses rated *Academically Acceptable* that would be rated *Academically Unacceptable* using accountability standards for the subsequent year were subject to additional CIP requirements. Since no state accountability ratings will be issued in 2012, the identification of 2011 campuses at risk of a 2012 low rating cannot be determined. Similarly, since there will be no campuses identified as *Academically Acceptable* in 2012, the pool of campuses to screen for low ratings in 2013 cannot be determined.

## EXCELLENCE EXEMPTIONS

Texas Education Code §39.112\* automatically exempts districts and campuses rated *Exemplary* from some statutes and rules. The exemptions remain in effect until the Commissioner of Education determines that achievement levels of the district or campus have declined, or the district or campus rating changes.

Statute lists a number of areas in law and regulation to which the exemption does not apply. These include criminal behavior, due process, federal and state program requirements, the curriculum essential knowledge and skills, public school accountability, extracurricular activities, and employee rights and benefits. (See TEC §39.112\* for a complete list.) Under specific circumstances the commissioner may exempt a campus from class size limits for elementary grades.

---

\* These statutory citations reference TEC as it existed prior to the changes made by the 81<sup>st</sup> legislative session in 2009. The citations are in effect through the 2010-11 accountability year.



# Chapter 17 – Calendar and Preview

This chapter provides information about the 2011 state accountability system and a preview of 2012 and beyond.

## 2011 Accountability System

Dates significant to the current accountability system are listed below. Key dates directly related to accountability are bold. To the extent possible, descriptions of how products will be released (via mail, secure web, or public web) are provided. The fourth column shows whether the date applies to standard procedures, AEA procedures, or both.

Due to unforeseen circumstances, the calendar dates listed in this chapter may be modified at a later time.

Year	Date	Activity	Standard or AEA
2010	June 24	2009-10 PEIMS submission 3 due (2009-10 Attendance)	Both
	July 15	Last date for districts with traditional calendars to resubmit changes and corrections to 2009-10 PEIMS submission 3	Both
	<b>August 26</b>	Last date for districts with TEA-approved year-round calendars to resubmit 2009-10 PEIMS submission 3	Both
	<b>September 8-22</b>	<b>2011 AEA campus registration process (secure web)</b>	AEA
	September 24	School-Start Window closed for reporting dropouts	Both
	October 29	Snapshot date for enrolled students (2010-11 PEIMS submission 1)	Both
	November 5	Preliminary longitudinal cohorts to districts (secure web)	Both
	<b>November 17</b>	<b>TEA releases 2010-11 list of campuses with additional campus improvement plan (CIP) requirements [formerly Technical Assistance Team (TAT)] (secure web)</b>	Both
	<b>November 19</b>	<b>2010-11 list of campuses with additional CIP requirements (public web)</b>	Both
	December 2	2010-11 PEIMS submission 1 due (includes 2009-10 Leavers and 2010-11 Enrollment)	Both
	<b>December 14</b>	<b>TEA notifies districts of campuses identified under Public Education Grant (PEG) criteria effective for the 2011-12 school year (not applicable to charters or registered AECs)</b>	Standard
<b>December 16</b>	<b>PEG list e-mailed to districts and posted on the <i>To the Administrator Addressed</i> public webpage</b>	Standard	
2011	<b>January-March</b>	<b>Development of 2011 state accountability system</b>	Both
	January 20	Last date to resubmit changes and corrections to 2010-11 PEIMS submission 1	Both

Year	Date	Activity	Standard or AEA
2011 (cont.)	February 1	Districts notify parents of students in campuses identified under PEG criteria that they are eligible for transfer in 2011-12 (not applicable to charters or registered AECs)	Standard
	March 1	TAKS administered: grades 4 and 7 writing, grade 9 reading, grades 10 and 11 ELA	Both
	<b>April 11-29</b>	<b>Campus pairing process (secure web)</b>	Standard
	<b>April 12</b>	<b>TEA contacts AECs that do not meet the 2011 at-risk registration criterion</b>	AEA
	April 4-5	TAKS grade 5 & 8 reading and mathematics administered	Both
	April 26-29	TAKS administered: grades 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, & 11 mathematics; grades 3, 4, 6, & 7 reading; grade 5, 8, 10, & 11 science; grades 8, 10, & 11 social studies	Both
	<b>April 11</b>	<b>TEA contacts Charter Operators that have the option to be evaluated under 2011 AEA procedures</b>	AEA
	<b>April 25</b>	<b>Due date for responses from charters that have the option to be evaluated under 2011 AEA procedures (secure web)</b>	AEA
	<b>May 4</b>	<b>Final 2011 Registered Alternative Education Campuses and Final List of Charter Operators Evaluated Under 2011 Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures (on public web)</b>	AEA
	<b>May 17</b>	<b>Key chapters of the 2011 Accountability Manual posted (public web)</b>	Both
	May 17-18	TAKS grades 5 & 8 reading and mathematics retest	Both
	Mid-May	Districts receive TAKS results for all subjects and grades	Both
	<b>June 16</b>	<b>Districts receive confidential dropout and completion lists and rates from TEA (secure web only)</b>	Both
	<b>Mid-June</b>	<b>Entire 2011 Accountability Manual posted (public web)</b>	Both
	June 23	2010-11 PEIMS submission 3 due (2010-11 Attendance)	Both
	July 14	Last date for districts with traditional school year calendars to resubmit changes and corrections to 2010-11 PEIMS submission 3	Both
	<b>July 19</b>	<b>Districts receive confidential preview data tables from TEA (secure web only)</b>	Both
	<b>July 19</b>	<b>TEA begins accepting ratings appeals</b>	Both
	<b>July 28*</b>	<b>TEA issues 2011 district and campus accountability ratings (on secure web only)</b>	Both
	<b>July 29*</b>	<b>TEA issues 2011 district and campus accountability ratings (on public web)</b>	Both
<b>August 12</b>	<b>Last day to appeal 2011 state accountability ratings</b>	Both	

<b>Year</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Standard or AEA</b>
<b>2011 (cont.)</b>	August/ September	Districts must post current accountability rating, AEIS report, and SRC on district website	Both
	<b>August 25</b>	Last date for districts with TEA-approved year-round calendars to resubmit 2010-11 PEIMS submission 3	Both
	September/ October	Districts must include the most current campus accountability rating with the first student report card	Both
	<b>Late October</b>	<b>TEA notifies districts of appeal decisions (secure web)</b>	Both
	<b>Late October</b>	<b>Final ratings release after resolution of all appeals and 2011 GPA (secure and public websites)</b>	Both
	<b>October/ November</b>	<b>2010-11 AEIS reports (secure and public websites)</b>	Both
	November/ December	TEA releases preliminary longitudinal cohorts to districts (secure web only)	Both
	<b>November/ December</b>	<b>TEA notifies districts of campuses identified under PEG criteria effective for 2012-13 school year (not applicable to charters or registered AECs)</b>	Standard
	<b>November/ December</b>	<b>2010-11 School Report Cards (public web)</b>	Both

\* The public release of district and campus ratings will be posted online on July 29. Districts will have access to their list of district and campus ratings on the TEA Secure Environment (TEASE) Accountability site the afternoon of July 28. ESC's will receive a listing via email on July 29 showing the district and campus ratings for the districts in their region. Final masked data tables will be available on the TEA public website.

## 2012 and Beyond

---

Dates significant to the future state accountability system are listed below.

<b>December 1, 2010</b>	TEA delivered to the governor, lieutenant governor, and leaders of the Texas legislature a transition plan to implement HB 3 provisions.
<b>July 29, 2011</b>	2011 ratings are the last ratings issued under the current accountability system.
<b>2011-12 School Year</b>	Assignment of performance ratings are suspended for 2012. A new accountability system is developed with input from advisory groups. Districts will be informed of decisions as they are available.
<b>By August 8, 2013</b>	District and campus performance ratings are issued for the first time under the new accountability system. Ratings will be based on the percent proficient indicators. The percent college-ready indicators will be “report” only. Distinction designations will be issued to districts and campuses with acceptable performance concurrent with the release of performance ratings. Performance ratings issued in 2010-11 and 2012-13 school years will be considered consecutive.
<b>By August 8, 2014</b>	District and campus performance ratings will be issued for the second time. Ratings will be based on both percent proficient and percent college-ready indicators. Distinction designations will be issued to districts and campuses with acceptable performance concurrent with the release of performance ratings.

For more information on the future accountability system, please see the HB3 Transition Plan, at: <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/hb3plan/>.

**The 2011 Accountability Rating System  
for Texas Public Schools and School Districts**

# Appendices

---

**Appendices:**

Appendix A –  
Commissioner of Education  
Rule .....161

Appendix B – Texas  
Education Code .....163

Appendix C – Comparison  
of State and Federal  
Systems .....165

Appendix D –  
Data Sources .....171

Appendix E –  
Student Growth  
Measures .....191

Appendix F – Campus  
Comparison Group .....193

Appendix G –  
Contacts .....195

Appendix H –  
Acknowledgments .....199

Appendix I – TEA Secure  
Environment .....203

Appendix J – Federal Race/  
Ethnicity Provision .....207



## **Appendix A – Commissioner of Education Rule**

---

Beginning in 2000, a portion of the *Accountability Manual* has been adopted on an annual basis as a Commissioner of Education rule. With the publication of this *Manual*, the Texas Education Agency will file a Commissioner’s Rule amendment to 19 *Texas Administrative Code* §97.1001, *Accountability Rating System*, with the Office of the Secretary of State. This rule will adopt the *2011 Accountability Manual, Chapters 2-6, 8, 10-13, 15 and 16*, thus giving legal standing to the rating process and procedures.

Allowing for a 30-day comment period, final adoption should take effect by July 28, 2011. Once the rule becomes effective, it may be accessed online at:

**<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter097/ch097aa.html>**

### **Chapter 97. Planning and Accountability**

Subchapter AA. Accountability and Performance Monitoring

§97.1001. Accountability Rating System.



## Appendix B – Texas Education Code

---

The 2011 Accountability Rating System for Texas Public Schools and School Districts was developed based on statutory mandates of the Texas Legislature. The majority of the relevant legislation is contained in *TEC Chapter 39. Public School Accountability*. The following table of contents references statute in TEC as it existed prior to the changes made by the 81st legislative session in 2009. This statute is in effect through the 2010-2011 school year. The full text of Chapter 39 from the 80<sup>th</sup> Legislature is available at:

[http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2010/manual/TEC\\_CH\\_39\\_80th.pdf](http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2010/manual/TEC_CH_39_80th.pdf)

### Chapter 39. Public School System Accountability

#### Subchapter B. Assessment of Academic Skills

- Sec. 39.021 Essential Skills and Knowledge
- Sec. 39.022 Assessment Program
- Sec. 39.023 Adoption and Administration of Instruments
- Sec. 39.0231 Reporting of Results of Certain Assessments
- Sec. 39.0232 Use of End-of-Course Instrument as Placement Instrument
- Sec. 39.024 Satisfactory Performance
- Sec. 39.025 Secondary-Level Performance Required
- Sec. 39.026 Local Option
- Sec. 39.027 Exemption
- Sec. 39.028 Comparison of State Results to National Results
- Sec. 39.029 Migratory Children
- Sec. 39.030 Confidentiality; Performance Reports
- Sec. 39.031 Cost
- Sec. 39.032 Assessment Instrument Standards; Civil Penalty
- Sec. 39.033 Voluntary Assessment of Private School Students
- Sec. 39.034 Measure of Annual Improvement in Student Achievement

#### Subchapter C. Performance Indicators

- Sec. 39.051 Academic Excellence Indicators
- Sec. 39.052 Campus Report Card
- Sec. 39.053 Performance Report
- Sec. 39.054 Uses of Performance Report
- Sec. 39.055 Annual Audit of Dropout Records; Report

#### Subchapter D. Accreditation Status

- Sec. 39.071 Accreditation
- Sec. 39.072 Accreditation Standards
- Sec. 39.0721 Gold Performance Rating Program
- Sec. 39.073 Determining Accreditation Status
- Sec. 39.074 On-Site Investigations
- Sec. 39.075 Special Accreditation Investigations
- Sec. 39.076 Conduct of Investigations

#### Subchapter E. Successful School Awards

- Sec. 39.091 Creation of System
- Sec. 39.092 Types of Awards

- Sec. 39.093 Awards
- Sec. 39.094 Use of Awards
- Sec. 39.095 Funding
- Sec. 39.096 Confidentiality

Subchapter F. Additional Rewards

- Sec. 39.111 Recognition and Rewards
- Sec. 39.112 Excellence Exemptions
- Sec. 39.113 Recognition of High School Completion and Success and College Readiness Programs
- Sec. 39.114 High School Allotment

Subchapter G. Accreditation Sanctions

- Sec. 39.131 Sanctions For Districts
- Sec. 39.132 Sanctions For Academically Unacceptable and Certain Other Campuses
- Sec. 39.1321 Sanctions for Charter Schools
- Sec. 39.1322 Technical Assistance and Campus Intervention Teams
- Sec. 39.1323 Campus Intervention Team Procedures
- Sec. 39.1324 Mandatory Sanctions
- Sec. 39.1326 Transitional Sanctions Provisions
- Sec. 39.1327 Management of Certain Academically Unacceptable Campuses
- Sec. 39.133 Annual Review
- Sec. 39.1331 Acquisition of Professional Services
- Sec. 39.134 Costs Paid By District
- Sec. 39.135 Conservator Or Management Team
- Sec. 39.136 Board of Managers
- Sec. 39.137 Special Campus Intervention Team
- Sec. 39.138 Immunity From Civil Liability

Subchapter H. Reports By Texas Education Agency

- Sec. 39.181 General Requirements
- Sec. 39.182 Comprehensive Annual Report
- Sec. 39.183 Regional and District Level Report
- Sec. 39.184 Technology Report
- Sec. 39.185 Interim Report

Subchapter I. Financial Accountability

- Sec. 39.201 Definitions
- Sec. 39.202 Development and Implementation
- Sec. 39.203 Reporting
- Sec. 39.204 Rules

Subchapter J. Notice of Performance

- Sec. 39.251 Notice in Student Grade Report
- Sec. 39.252 Notice on District Website

Subchapter K. Procedures for Challenge of Accountability Rating or Sanction

- Sec. 39.301 Review by Commissioner: Accountability Ratings
- Sec. 39.302 Review by State Office of Administrative Hearings: Sanctions

## Appendix C – Comparison of State and Federal Systems

---

In addition to the state accountability system, which is mandated by the Texas legislature, there is also a federal system of public school accountability. Although the state system has been in place since 1993, the accountability provisions in the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act were first applied to the Texas public schools in 2003. Campuses, districts, and the state were evaluated for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for the first time in 2003.

The purpose of this appendix is to provide details comparing the state accountability system to the federal (AYP) system. Though there are some similarities and elements in common between the two, there are significant differences. For complete details about the federal system, see the *AYP Guide*. The *Guide* as well as other information about AYP can be found at the AYP website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/>.

### COMPARISON

The following tables provide comparisons of the state and federal systems. *Table 24* contains a side-by-side comparison of the indicators, restrictions, requirements, and source data for both systems.

*Table 25* is a comparison by grade level. With this table, a campus can compare the use of various indicators by grade. For example, a grade 3-5 campus is evaluated in both the state and federal systems on TAKS reading and mathematics, although AYP evaluates more student groups for each of these indicators. In a grade 3-5 campus, the campus's AYP status also depends on attendance and participation indicators, while its state rating includes TAKS writing and science results.

**Table 24: 2011 Comparison of State and Federal Accountability (AYP) by Indicator**

	<b>State Accountability (Standard Procedures)</b>	<b>AYP</b>
<b>TAKS, including TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS Modified, and TAKS Alternate</b>		
Subjects & Standards	Reading/ELA* ..... <i>Exemplary</i> 90% / <i>Recognized</i> 80% / <i>Acceptable</i> 70% Mathematics* ..... <i>Exemplary</i> 90% / <i>Recognized</i> 80% / <i>Acceptable</i> 65% Writing ..... <i>Exemplary</i> 90% / <i>Recognized</i> 80% / <i>Acceptable</i> 70% Social Studies ..... <i>Exemplary</i> 90% / <i>Recognized</i> 80% / <i>Acceptable</i> 70% Science ..... <i>Exemplary</i> 90% / <i>Recognized</i> 80% / <i>Acceptable</i> 60% <i>All values rounded to the nearest whole number.</i> <i>*Includes cumulative pass rate for grades 5 and 8 in reading and mathematics.</i>	Reading/ELA* ..... <i>Meets AYP</i> 80% Mathematics* ..... <i>Meets AYP</i> 75%  <i>All values rounded to nearest whole number.</i> <i>* Includes cumulative pass rate for grades 5 and 8 in reading and mathematics.</i>
Grades	3–11 (English); 3–5 (Spanish)	3–8, and 10 (English); 3–5 (Spanish)
Student Groups**	All Students African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged	All Students African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged Special Education Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Minimum Size	All Students ..... Any (Special Analysis if small) Student Groups ..... 30/10%/50	All Students ..... Any (Special Analysis if small) Student Groups ..... 50/10%/200
Improvement	To <i>Acceptable</i> : Has enough gain to meet <i>Acceptable</i> standard in 2 years. To <i>Recognized</i> : At 74% – 79% and has gain to meet 80% standard in 2 years.	10% decrease in percent <i>not passing</i> AND the relevant other measure requirements for the student group.
Texas Projection Measure (TPM)	Does not apply in 2011.	Does not apply in 2011.
Mobility Adjustment	District and campus accountability subsets used.	District and campus accountability subsets used.
Pairing	Paired with feeder campus (or district).	Paired with feeder campus (or district) in certain conditions.
Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision	Non-Hispanic/Latino students who select both the Black/African American and White races will be distributed into either the African American or White student groups based on 2009-10 TAKS answer documents. If the recalculated student group performance results in a higher rating, the higher rating is assigned.	Same
<b>Other Assessments</b>		
TAKS LAT	N/A: Assessment not included for determining ratings.	Combined with other TAKS results by subject for Performance and Participation.

\*\* The new federal race and ethnicity definitions are used for the 2011 TAKS administrations, for both state and federal systems.

**Table 24: 2011 Comparison of State and Federal Accountability (AYP) by Indicator (continued)**

	State Accountability (Standard Procedures)	AYP
<b>ELL Progress Indicator</b>		
Assessments & Standards	<i>New indicator for 2011.</i> TAKS Reading/ELA and TELPAS Reading <i>Recognized &amp; Exemplary</i> 60% meeting criteria	<i>No separate indicator.</i> TELPAS Reading results for ELL students are combined with TAKS results for Performance and Participation.
Grades	Grades 3-11	
Student Groups	All ELL Students, regardless of race or ethnicity	
Minimum Size	At least 30 students	
Improvement	To be <i>Recognized</i> or <i>Exemplary</i> , must have enough gain to meet 60% standard in 2 years.	
Mobility Adjustment	District and campus accountability subsets used.	
Pairing	Paired with feeder campus (or district).	
<b>Commended Performance</b>		
Assessments & Standards	<i>New indicator for 2011.</i> TAKS Reading/ELA* ..... <i>Exemplary</i> 25% / <i>Recognized</i> 15% Mathematics* ..... <i>Exemplary</i> 25% / <i>Recognized</i> 15% <i>All values rounded to the nearest whole number.</i> <i>*Includes cumulative Commended rate for grades 5 and 8.</i>	N/A
Grades	Grades 3-11	
Student Groups	All Students, Economically Disadvantaged	
Minimum Size	At least 30 students	
Improvement	No Improvement Feature available	
Mobility Adjustment	District and campus accountability subsets used.	
Pairing	Paired with feeder campus (or district).	
<b>Additional Assessment Features</b>		
Exceptions to the Standard	Up to 4 TAKS/ELL Progress Indicator exceptions allowed to move to <i>Acceptable</i> or <i>Recognized</i> . One exception allowed to move to <i>Exemplary</i> . Number of assessment measures evaluated, minimum performance floors, and prior use determine eligibility. Exceptions not available for Commended Performance.	N/A
Cap on Alternate Assessments	N/A	Cap on number of students counted as <i>proficient</i> on TAKS-Alt and TAKS-M.

**Table 24: 2011 Comparison of State and Federal Accountability (AYP) by Indicator (continued)**

Attendance Rate		
Standard	N/A: Used only for Gold Performance Acknowledgment	Meets AYP ..... 90.0% "Other Measure" for elementary and middle schools. All values rounded to nearest one-tenth of a percent.
Student Groups**		All Students only
Minimum Size		All Students ... 7,200 (40 students x 180 days) Student Groups* ..... 50/10%/200 * Student groups used only for performance gain.
Improvement		At least 0.1% improvement.
Annual Dropout Rate (grades 7 8)		
Standards	Grades 7-8... <i>Exemplary, Recognized, &amp; Acceptable</i> ..... ≤ 1.6% All values rounded to one-tenth.	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.
Student Groups**	All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged	
Minimum Size	All Students ..... At least 5 dropouts and 10 in denominator Student Groups ..... At least 5 dropouts and 30/10%/50 in denominator	
Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To <i>Acceptable, Recognized or Exemplary</i> : If rate has declined enough to meet the 1.6% standard in 2 years.</li> <li>Minimum Size (All Students and groups): At least 10 in prior year.</li> </ul>	
Middle School w/o dropout rate	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.	

\*\* The Attendance Rate student groups evaluated for Gold Performance Acknowledgment and AYP use the new federal definitions for race and ethnicity. The new federal race and ethnicity definitions are also used for the Annual Dropout Rate indicator.

**Table 24: 2011 Comparison of State and Federal Accountability (AYP) by Indicator (continued)**

	State Accountability (Standard Procedures)	AYP
<b>Completion Rate (grades 9-12)</b>		
Standards	Graduates+Continuers • Exemplary ..... 95.0% • Recognized ..... 85.0% • Acceptable ..... 75.0% All values rounded to nearest one-tenth of a percent.	Graduates only ..... 75.0% (statewide goal 90%) "Other Measure" for high schools and districts. All values rounded to nearest one-tenth of a percent.
Student Groups**	All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged	All Students only
Minimum Size	All Students ..... At least 5 dropouts and 10 in denominator Student Groups ..... At least 5 dropouts and 30/10%/50 in denominator	All Students ..... At least 40 in denominator Student Groups* ..... 50/10%/200 * Student groups used only for safe harbor.
Improvement	• To Acceptable: Has enough gain to meet 75.0% standard in 2 years • To Recognized: 75.0% - 84.9% and has enough gain to meet 85.0% standard in 2 yrs  Minimum Size (All Students and groups): At least 10 in prior year	• 4-year Graduation Rate alternatives: o Safe Harbor Target – a 10.0% decrease in difference between the prior 4-year graduation rate and the 90.0% statewide goal. o Improvement Target – a 1.0% increase from the prior year 4-year graduation rate. • 80% 5-year Graduation Rate.
High School w/o completion rate	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.
<b>Participation Rate: Reading/ELA &amp; Mathematics</b>		
Standard	N/A: Indicator not evaluated. Monitoring interventions may occur with excessive absences.	Tested at campus/district ..... 95% All values rounded to nearest whole number.
Student Groups**		All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged, Special Education, Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Minimum Size		All Students ..... At least 40 in denominator Student Groups ..... 50/10%/200
<b>Other Campus and District Situations</b>		
Registered Alternative Education Campuses	Rated under Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures.	Evaluated under same criteria as regular campuses.
Charter Operators	Evaluated under same criteria as regular districts.* * Charter Operators may be rated under AEA Procedures.	Evaluated under same criteria as regular districts.
Charter Schools	Evaluated under same criteria as regular campuses. (Charter schools are not paired.)	Evaluated under same criteria as regular campuses.
New Campuses	All campuses (established or new) are rated.	New campuses are not evaluated.
Additional District Requirements	• Must have no Unacceptable campuses to be Exemplary or Recognized. • Must meet Underreported Student standards to be Exemplary or Recognized.	No additional district requirements.

\*\* The former race and ethnicity definitions are used for the completion indicators.

**Table 25: 2011 Grade Level Comparison of State (Standard Procedures) and Federal Accountability**

		†Reading ELA	†Math	Writing	Social Studies	Science	**HS Completion	Annual Dropout	Attendance	Participation	
										Read/ELA	Math
Grade 1‡	All Students								AYP		
	AA/H/W/ED*										
	Special Ed & LEP										
Grade 2‡	All Students								AYP		
	AA/H/W/ED*										
	Special Ed & LEP										
Grade 3	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State						AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State							AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP							AYP	AYP
Grade 4	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State	State					AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State	State						AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP							AYP	AYP
Grade 5	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State			State			AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State			State				AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP							AYP	AYP
Grade 6	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State						AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State							AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP							AYP	AYP
Grade 7	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State	State				State	AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State	State				State		AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP							AYP	AYP
Grade 8	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State		State	State		State	AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State		State	State		State		AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP							AYP	AYP
Grade 9	All Students	State	State				AYP/State				
	AA/H/W/ED*	State	State				State				
	Special Ed & LEP										
Grade 10	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State		State	State	AYP/State			AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State		State	State	State			AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP							AYP	AYP
Grade 11	All Students	State	State		State	State	AYP/State				
	AA/H/W/ED*	State	State		State	State	State				
	Special Ed & LEP										
Grade 12‡	All Students						AYP/State				
	AA/H/W/ED*						State				
	Special Ed & LEP										

\* AA/H/W/ED refers to the student groups African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged. Note that new federal definitions are used for assessments and dropouts in 2011.

\*\* High School Completion is defined differently for AYP: Under AYP, only the *Graduates* component of the longitudinal Completion Rate is used, including 4-year and 5-year diploma recipients.

‡ Schools are paired when they do not have grades tested. The use of paired data differs between the two systems.

† Minimum size for student groups in AYP is 50/10%/200; for state accountability it is 30/10%/50. Also, AYP includes all LAT results for reading/ELA and math while state accountability does not.

## Appendix D – Data Sources

This appendix provides data sources for the indicators used in the state accountability system, including those used to assign Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA). The information is arranged alphabetically by indicator name.

For each indicator, the *Methodology* section shows the source for the numerator and denominator. *Student Demographics* shows the sources for the demographics used to disaggregate the "All Students" totals into the various student groups used in the accountability system. *Other Information* presents unique topics affecting each indicator.

The primary sources for all data used in the state accountability system are the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data collection, the various assessment companies, and the General Educational Development (GED) data file. *Tables 26, 27, and 28* describe these data sources in detail. The terms provided in these tables are referenced within the indicator discussion.

**Table 26: Assessments Used in Accountability**

Organization Name	Description
ACT, Inc.	The ACT, Inc. annually provides the agency with the ACT participation and performance data of graduating seniors from Texas public schools. Only one record is sent per student. If a student takes an ACT test more than once, the agency receives the record for the most recent examination taken. The ACT data as of the June administration is used in creating the SAT/ACT indicator.
College Board	The College Board annually provides the agency with the SAT participation and performance data of graduating seniors from Texas public schools. Only one record is sent per student. If a student takes an SAT test more than once, the agency receives the record for the most recent examination taken. The SAT data as of the June administration is used in creating the SAT/ACT indicator. In addition, the College Board provides the agency with the Advanced Placement (AP) examination results of Texas public school students each year. The AP data as of the May administration is used in creating the AP/IB indicator.
International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO)	The International Baccalaureate Organization provides the agency with the International Baccalaureate (IB) examination results of Texas public school students each year. The IB data as of the May administration is used in creating the AP/IB indicator.
Pearson	Pearson is the contractor for the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) testing program. After each test administration, the TEA Student Assessment Division receives student-level TAKS data from Pearson.
TEA GED Database	A TEA database containing information about examinee performance on the GED tests is maintained by the TEA GED Unit. Unlike the information in most other TEA data files, which is reported annually, receipt of a GED test(s) is reported as soon as the test is scored. A certificate is mailed once the examinee has passed all five tests, and the information is stored in a database. Candidates take GED tests at centers throughout the state in school districts, colleges and universities, education service centers, and correctional facilities. Tests are given year-round, and the results are transmitted electronically to TEA from the University of Texas Scoring Center.

**Table 27: PEIMS Record Types Used in Accountability**

Record	Name	Description	Submission/ Month
101	Student Demographic Data	Demographic information about each student, including the student's race, ethnicity, sex, date of birth, migrant status, as-of-status, campus of accountability, demographic revision confirmation code, and student attribution code. Beginning with the 2010-11 PEIMS submissions, race and ethnicity is collected using new federal definitions only. See Table 28 and each indicator description for details.	1 <sup>st</sup> /October, 3 <sup>rd</sup> /June
110	Student Enrollment Data	Enrollment information about each student, including the student's grade, Average Daily Attendance (ADA) eligibility, economically disadvantaged status, at-risk status, and indicators of the special programs in which the student participates.	1 <sup>st</sup> /October
203	Leaver Data	Information about students served in grades 7-12 in the prior school year (2009-10) who did not continue in enrollment the following fall, and who did not move to another Texas public school district, graduate before the 2009-10 school year, or receive a GED by August 31, 2010. The 2009-10 leavers are students who graduated in that school year, dropped out, or left school for non-dropout reasons (e.g., enrolled in school outside the Texas public school system, or returned to home country). This record contains the last campus of enrollment, the leaver reason, and additional information for graduates.	1 <sup>st</sup> /October
400	Basic Attendance Data	Information about each student for each of the 6 six-week attendance reporting periods in the year. For each student, for each six-week period, districts report grade level, number of days taught, days absent, and total eligible and ineligible days present and selected special program information.	3 <sup>rd</sup> /June
405	Special Education Attendance Data	Information about each student served in a special education program. For each student, for each six-week period, districts report grade-level and also instructional-setting codes.	3 <sup>rd</sup> /June
415	Course Completion Data	Information about each student who was in membership in grades 9-12 and who completed at least one state-approved course during the school year. This record contains campus of enrollment, course sequence, pass/fail credit indicator, distance learning indicator, and dual credit indicator.	3 <sup>rd</sup> /June

**Table 28: Student Demographics**

Trait	Description
At Risk	<p>A student is identified as at risk of dropping out of school based on state-defined criteria only (TEC §29.081). The statutory criteria for at-risk status include each student who is under 21 years of age and who:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) was not advanced from one grade level to the next for one or more school years;</li> <li>2) is in grade 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, or 12 and did not maintain an average equivalent to 70 on a scale of 100 in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum during a semester in the preceding or current school year or is not maintaining such an average in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum in the current semester;</li> <li>3) did not perform satisfactorily on an assessment instrument administered to the student under TEC Subchapter B, Chapter 39, and who has not in the previous or current school year subsequently performed on that instrument or another appropriate instrument at a level equal to at least 110 percent of the level of satisfactory performance on that instrument;</li> <li>4) is in prekindergarten, kindergarten or grade 1, 2, or 3 and did not perform satisfactorily on a readiness test or assessment instrument administered during the current school year;</li> <li>5) is pregnant or is a parent;</li> <li>6) has been placed in an alternative education program in accordance with TEC §37.006 during the preceding or current school year;</li> <li>7) has been expelled in accordance with TEC §37.007 during the preceding or current school year;</li> <li>8) is currently on parole, probation, deferred prosecution, or other conditional release;</li> <li>9) was previously reported through the PEIMS to have dropped out of school;</li> <li>10) is a student of limited English proficiency, as defined by TEC §29.052;</li> <li>11) is in the custody or care of the Department of Protective and Regulatory Services or has, during the current school year, been referred to the department by a school official, officer of the juvenile court, or law enforcement official;</li> <li>12) is homeless, as defined NCLB Title X, Part C, Section 725(2), the term “homeless children and youths,” and its subsequent amendments; or</li> <li>13) resided in the preceding school year or resides in the current school year in a residential placement facility in the district, including a detention facility, substance abuse treatment facility, emergency shelter, psychiatric hospital, halfway house, or foster group home.</li> </ol>
Economic Status	<p>A student may be identified as economically disadvantaged by the district if he or she:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• meets eligibility requirements for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Program;</li> <li>○ programs assisted under Title II of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA);</li> <li>○ Food Stamp benefits;</li> <li>○ Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) or other public assistance;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• received a Pell grant or comparable state program of need-based financial assistance; or</li> <li>• is from a family with an annual income at or below the official federal poverty line.</li> </ul>
Special Education Status	<p>Special education status indicates the student is participating in a special education instructional and related services program or a general education program using special education support services, supplementary aids, or other special arrangements.</p>

**Table 28: Student Demographics (continued)**

Trait	Description					
Race/ Ethnicity	For the 2010-11 school year, districts reported race and ethnicity for each student using codes based on the new federal definitions. Race and ethnicity is collected through PEIMS and also on the TAKS answer documents. For the 2011 accountability system not all demographic categories are used for accountability purposes. The following shows all race and ethnic categories under the federal definitions and which base indicator evaluates them as a student group.					
	Student Group	TAKS	ELL Progress Indicator	Commended Performance	Dropout Rate	Completion Rate†
	All Students*	Yes	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Yes
	American Indian	No	No	No	No	No
	Asian	No	No	No	No	No
	Pacific Islander	No	No	No	No	No
	African American	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes†
	Hispanic	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes†
	White	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes†
	Two or More Races	No**	No	No	No	No
	Econ. Dis.***	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	<p>* <i>All Students</i> includes all students, regardless of their race or ethnicity. <i>All Students</i> for the ELL Progress Indicator includes all ELL students, regardless of their race or ethnicity.</p> <p>** See the discussion on TAKS and the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision in <i>Appendix J</i>.</p> <p>*** <i>Economically Disadvantaged</i> includes all Economically Disadvantaged students, regardless of their race or ethnicity.</p> <p>† See the discussion on <i>Completion Rate</i> for more information on race and ethnicity codes used.</p>					

## Opportunities for Data Correction

### PEIMS

*General Data.* The PEIMS data collection has a prescribed process and calendar for correcting errors or omissions discovered after the original submission. *The accuracy of all reports, whether they show ratings, acknowledgments, or recognitions is wholly dependent on the accuracy of the information submitted.* Districts are responsible for the accuracy of all their PEIMS data. Several mechanisms are in place to facilitate the collection of accurate data. First, all submitted data must pass an editor program before being accepted. In addition, districts can access various summary reports through the *EDIT+* application to assist them in verifying the accuracy of their data prior to submission deadlines. For each submission, a resubmission window is provided so that districts have an opportunity to resubmit information if an error is detected. See the *PEIMS Data Standards* (available at [ritter.tea.state.tx.us/peims/standards/index.html](http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/peims/standards/index.html)) for the appropriate year for more details about the correction windows and submission deadlines.

*Person Identification Database (PID) Updates.* PID changes have profound ramifications throughout the Texas public education data system. Year-to-year and collection-to-collection matching are dependent upon stable PID records. *PEIMS Data Standards* should be followed to ensure that PID updates submitted by districts are processed properly. For information please see the edit process for PID, online at [ritter.tea.state.tx.us/peims/pid/index.html](http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/peims/pid/index.html).

## **ASSESSMENT DATA**

*TAKS.* Student identification, demographic data, and scoring status information as entered on the answer document at the time of testing are used to determine the accountability subset and student groups for campus and district ratings. After the testing dates, districts are able to provide corrections to the test contractor and request corrected reports; however, only a portion of the changes made after testing are incorporated into the TAKS results used for determining accountability ratings or subsequent reports (e.g. AEIS and School Report Cards). For the files used for accountability, districts do not have the option to change student demographics, program participation, or score code status after test results are known.

Districts do have the opportunity to correct the TEST TAKEN INFO field for the tests taken during the primary administrations in the spring. Changes to this field that are submitted within the correction window will be included in the TAKS data files used in determining the 2011 accountability ratings.

Districts have multiple opportunities to provide accurate information through their PEIMS submissions, pre-coded data files provided to the test contractor, and updates to the TAKS answer documents at the time of testing.

*SAT, ACT, AP, and IB.* The student taking the SAT, ACT, AP, or IB test identifies the school to which scores are attributed. Schools are encouraged to verify campus summary information on these tests immediately upon receipt. Discrepancies should be reported to the testing companies, not to TEA. Once the testing companies finalize results for yearly summaries, subsequent corrections are not reflected in any national, state, district, or school results released.

## **TREATMENT OF KNOWN COMPROMISED DATA**

In cases where it has been confirmed that accountability data are compromised, the following actions will occur. Rating consequences are determined by the commissioner as described in *Chapter 4: The Basics – Determining a Rating*. The compromised data may be reported but will be annotated to indicate the irregularities and that the data could not be used for rating evaluations. In the year following the data irregularity, the school may not be able to use additional features, including Required Improvement and the Exceptions Provision, to achieve a higher rating since the prior year results were compromised. When possible, the testing contractor may be asked to invalidate the assessment results used for accountability if district findings are known in time. Annotations on reports may appear on both campus and district reports and may continue into future years if the compromised data affects longitudinal indicators. Also, annotations may be required in future years to explain the lack of data for improvement calculations.

## Indicator Data Sources

---

### ADVANCED COURSE/DUAL ENROLLMENT COMPLETION

#### Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of students in grades 9 through 12 who received credit for at least one advanced course (from PEIMS 415)}}{\text{number of students in grades 9 through 12 who completed at least one course (from PEIMS 415)}}$$

**Year of Data:** 2009-10

#### Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Race/Ethnicity
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
<b>Date</b>	October 2009	June 2010

#### Other Information:

- *Race/Ethnicity.* The race and ethnicity used for Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion for 2011 accountability is based on the new federal definition.
- *Advanced Course List.* A list of courses designated as advanced is published each year in the *AEIS Glossary*. The most current list can be accessed online at [ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis/2011/glossary.html#appendc](http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis/2011/glossary.html#appendc).

### ADVANCED PLACEMENT/INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE EXAM RESULTS

#### Methodology:

##### *Participation:*

$$\frac{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ graders taking at least one AP or IB examination (from College Board and IBO)}}{\text{total non-special education students enrolled in 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ grades (from PEIMS 110)}}$$

##### *Performance:*

$$\frac{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ graders with at least one score at or above the criterion score (from College Board and IBO)}}{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ graders with at least one AP or IB examination (from College Board and IBO)}}$$

**Year of Data:** 2009-10

#### Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Race/Ethnicity	Special Education Status
<b>Source</b>	n/a	PEIMS 101 (primary) College Board (secondary)	PEIMS 110
<b>Date</b>	n/a	October 2009 (primary) May 2010 (secondary)	October 2009

**Other Information:**

- *Race/Ethnicity.* The race and ethnicity used for AP/IB Exam Results for 2011 accountability is based on the new federal definition. This information was submitted by districts through PEIMS (primary source). In the infrequent situations where the race and ethnicity data was not available on PEIMS, it was taken from the examination results data provided by the testing companies (secondary source).
- *Special Education.* Those students reported as receiving special education services are removed from the count of grade 11 and 12 enrollees used in the denominator of the participation calculation.

**ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE**

**Methodology for Grade 7-8 Annual Dropout Rate (Standard Procedures):**

$$\frac{\text{number of grade 7-8 dropouts (from PEIMS 203)}}{\text{number of grade 7-8 students served during the school year, including ADA ineligible students and students in the Optional Flexible School Day Program (from PEIMS 110, 400, and 500)}}$$

**Methodology for Grade 7-12 Annual Dropout Rate (AEA Procedures):**

$$\frac{\text{number of grade 7-12 dropouts (from PEIMS 203)}}{\text{number of grade 7-12 students served during the school year, including ADA ineligible students and students in the Optional Flexible School Day Program (from PEIMS 110, 400, and 500)}}$$

**Year of Data:** 2009-10

**Student Demographics:**

*Numerator*

	<b>Economic Status</b>	<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Grade</b>
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101 (primary & secondary)	PEIMS 110 (primary) PEIMS 400 (primary) PEIMS 500 (primary) PEIMS 101 (secondary)
<b>Date</b>	October 2009	October 2009 (primary) June 2010 (primary) October 2010 (secondary)	October 2009 (primary) June 2010 (primary) October 2010 (secondary)

*Denominator*

	<b>Economic Status</b>	<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Grade</b>
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101	PEIMS 110 PEIMS 400 PEIMS 500
<b>Date</b>	October 2009	October 2009 June 2010	October 2009 June 2010

## Other Information:

- *Race/Ethnicity.* The race and ethnicity used for Annual Dropout Rate for 2011 is based on the new federal definition.
- *Leaver Codes.* Districts are not required to report the status of grade 7-12 students if they moved to and enrolled in another Texas public school district, graduated in a previous school year (before 2009-10), or received a GED in Texas by August 31, 2010. The district must code all other grade 7-12 students who leave with one of the codes shown on *Table 29*. Students who leave due to reasons identified with an asterisk are not counted as dropouts. Only students reported with leaver code 98 are defined as dropouts.
- *Underreported Students.* Information about students reported in either enrollment or attendance in grades 7-12 the prior year but who were not accounted for as movers, previous Texas graduates, or GED recipients and who were not reported as either enrolled or as leavers in the current year are identified as underreported students. Lists of these students can be found on the *EDIT+* reports.
- *School-Start Window.* This is the period of time between the first day of school and the last Friday in September. The end of the school-start window is the day that students served in the prior year must return to school to not be considered leavers. For the current ratings cycle the end of the school start window was September 24, 2010.
- *Economically Disadvantaged.* The economic status of a student is based on the economically disadvantaged information reported by the accountable district.
- *Cumulative Denominator.* A cumulative count of students is used in the denominator with all annual dropout rate calculations. This method for calculating the dropout rate neutralizes the effects of mobility by including in the denominator every student ever reported in attendance at the campus or district throughout the school year, regardless of length of stay.
- *HB 3092 Campuses.* The base indicators (completion rates, dropout rates, and assessment results) and other performance indicators reported on the AEIS reports are processed in a manner to comply with TEC §39.072(d). In 2007 this statute was amended due to passage of House Bill 3092 during the 80<sup>th</sup> legislative session. See *Table 9* in *Chapter 6* for details about the inclusion or exclusion of performance data for the non-traditional educational settings addressed by this statute.
- *Migrant Students.* Migrant students who return after the school-start window but before the January PEIMS Submission 1 resubmission data are not counted as dropouts.
- *Campus of Accountability.* Leavers are assigned to the campuses they were attending when they left the Texas public school system. A student served at a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP) and/or a Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP) is assigned to a "campus of accountability" based on the campus he or she last attended when one can be identified. Campus of accountability may be reported by the district or may be determined by the agency based on PEIMS attendance records reported for the prior year. A detailed table showing assignment in specific situations may be found in the section of the *PEIMS Data Standards* describing the student demographic data (Record Type 101).

- *Summer Dropouts.* For state accountability purposes, summer dropouts are attributed to the school year just completed, based on the last campus the student attended the previous school year.
- *Primary and Secondary Sources.* Secondary sources are used when the primary source does not contain a match for the grade or race/ethnicity of every student.
- *Exclusions to the NCES Dropout Definition.* House Bill 3 as passed by the 81<sup>st</sup> Texas Legislature in 2009 defined certain exclusions when evaluating dropout and completion rates for accreditation and performance ratings. However, the statute explicitly requires use of the current NCES dropout definition until the 2011-12 school year. The 2009-10 dropouts collected in the 2010-11 year (for the 2011 ratings) will be processed using current definitions with no new exclusions applied.

**Table 29: Leaver Codes**

Code	Translation
01*	Graduated
03*	Died
16*	Return to Home Country
24*	College, Pursue Degree
60*	Home Schooling
66*	Removed-Child Protective Svcs
78*	Expelled, Cannot Return
81*	Enroll In TX Private School
82*	Enroll In School Outside Texas
83*	Withdrawn for non-residence
85*	Graduated Outside Texas Before Entering Texas Public School (TPS), Entered TPS, Left Again
86*	GED outside Texas
87*	Enroll in University High School Diploma Program
98	Other

\* Codes with asterisks are not counted as dropouts in determining the 2011 state accountability ratings.

## ATTENDANCE RATE

### Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were present (from PEIMS 400)}}{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were in membership (from PEIMS 400)}}$$

**Year of Data:** 2009-10

### Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Race/Ethnicity
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
<b>Date</b>	October 2009	June 2010

**Other Information:**

- *Race/Ethnicity.* The race and ethnicity used for Attendance Rate for 2011 accountability is based on the new federal definition.

**COLLEGE-READY GRADUATES**

**Methodology:**

number of graduates who scored at or above the college-ready criteria on both ELA & mathematics  
*(from Pearson, College Board, and ACT)*

---

number of graduates with results in both subjects to evaluate *(from PEIMS 203)*

**Year of Data:** Class of 2010

**Student Demographics:**

	<b>Economic Status</b>	<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101 (primary) College Board and ACT (secondary)
<b>Date</b>	October 2010	October 2010 (primary) June 2010 (secondary)

**Other Information:**

- *Race/Ethnicity.* The race and ethnicity used for College-Ready Graduates for 2011 accountability is based on the new federal definition.

**COMMENDED PERFORMANCE (BASE INDICATOR):  
READING/ELA AND MATHEMATICS**

**Methodology:**

number of test takers achieving *Commended Performance* on TAKS reading *(from Pearson)*

---

total number TAKS test takers (by subject) *(from Pearson)*

**and**

number of test takers achieving *Commended Performance* on TAKS mathematics *(from Pearson)*

---

total number TAKS test takers (by subject) *(from Pearson)*

**Year of Data:** 2010-11

**Student Demographics:**

	<b>Economic Status</b>
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 110
<b>Date</b>	October 2010

**Other Information:**

- *Race/Ethnicity.* The Commended Performance base indicator only evaluates *All Students* and the *Economically Disadvantaged* student groups.

- *Student Information.* The testing contractor, Pearson, pre-codes student information onto the answer documents from PEIMS data (see record types, above), or from district-supplied data files. The answer documents may also be coded by district staff on the day of testing.

**COMMENDED PERFORMANCE (GPA):  
READING/ELA, MATHEMATICS, WRITING, SCIENCE, SOCIAL STUDIES**

**Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of test takers achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on TAKS (by subject) (from Pearson)}}{\text{total number TAKS test takers (by subject) (from Pearson)}}$$

**Year of Data:** 2010-11

**Student Demographics:**

	<b>Economic Status</b>	<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
<b>Date</b>	October 2010	October 2010

**Other Information:**

- *Race/Ethnicity.* The race and ethnicity used for Commended Performance for 2011 is based on the new federal definition.
- *Student Information.* The testing contractor, Pearson, pre-codes student information onto the answer documents from PEIMS data (see record types, above), or from district-supplied data files. The answer documents may also be coded by district staff on the day of testing.

**COMPARABLE IMPROVEMENT: READING/ELA, MATHEMATICS**

**Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{sum of matched grade 3-8 students vertical scale growth (by subject) (from Pearson)}}{\text{total number of grade 3-8 students with vertical scale growth (by subject) (from Pearson)}}$$

**Years of Data:** 2011 and 2010 (Spring TAKS Administrations)

**Student Demographics:** Comparable Improvement is not disaggregated by race/ethnicity or economic status.

**Other Information:**

- *Grade Included.* Comparable Improvement is only available for campuses with any grades from 4 through 8. For this reason, most high schools are not eligible for acknowledgment on Comparable Improvement.
- *Vertical Scale Growth.* For TAKS reading and mathematics in grades 3-8, results are reported on a vertical scale. Growth is defined as a student’s vertical scale score in the current year minus that student’s vertical scale score from the prior year in the same subject and language. To create a campus average, the amount of vertical scale growth for each student is summed for all the students at a campus and divided by the number of

students. Because the vertical scale is only used for grades 3-8, only campuses serving students in grades 4-8 are eligible for acknowledgment on CI. See *Appendix E – Student Growth Measures* for more details.

- *Group.* Each campus has a unique comparison group of 40 campuses which closely match that campus on six demographic characteristics, including percent of African American students, Hispanic students, White students, economically disadvantaged students, limited English proficient students, and mobile students. Although high schools serving grades 9-10 do not have a Comparable Improvement report, they do still have a Comparison Group. See *Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group* for a detailed explanation.
- *Quartiles.* Within each 40-member campus comparison group, campus average vertical scale growth values are arranged from highest to lowest. Campuses with average growth within the top quartile (the top 25%) of their group qualify for CI acknowledgment.

## COMPLETION RATE

### Methodology for Completion Rate I:

$$\frac{\text{number of completers* (from PEIMS 101, 110, and 203 records)}}{\text{number in class (from PEIMS 101, 110, 203, 400, and 500 records and GED)}}$$

\* “completers” = graduates plus continuers

### Methodology for Completion Rate II:

$$\frac{\text{number of completers** (from PEIMS 101, 110, 203 records, and GED)}}{\text{number in class (from PEIMS 101, 110, 203, 400, and 500 records and GED)}}$$

\*\* “completers” = graduates plus continuers plus GED recipients

**Years of Data:** PEIMS submission 1 leaver data, 2007-08 through 2010-11; PEIMS submission 3 attendance data, 2006-07 through 2009-10; PEIMS submission 1 enrollment data, 2010-11, and General Educational Development records as of August 31, 2010.

### Student Demographics:

	<b>Economic Status</b>	<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>At Risk</b>
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 101 (continuers) PEIMS 110 (all others)	PEIMS 101	PEIMS 110
<b>Date</b>	October of year of final status by accountable district	June of year of final status or October of year of final status for continuers (see exceptions for continuers in ‘Race/Ethnicity’ below)	October of year of final status

### Other Information:

- *Race/Ethnicity.* The race and ethnicity used for Completion Rate for 2011 accountability is based on the former definition. This required attributing continuers, for whom only the new racial/ethnic categories were collected in 2010-11, to the former categories. Although most of the new racial/ethnic categories correspond to individual former categories, the categories "Asian," "Pacific Islander," and "multiracial" do not. To account for these students, Asian continuers and Pacific Islander continuers were

combined and counted in the former racial/ethnic category "Asian/Pacific Islander." Multiracial continuers, except those identified as Asian and Pacific Islander, were counted in the racial/ethnic categories collected for them in the most recent previous year. Multiracial continuers identified as Asian and Pacific Islander were counted in the former racial/ethnic category "Asian/Pacific Islander." See *Table 30* for the definitions that were available for each year of the cohort.

**Table 30: Race/Ethnicity Definition for Class of 2010**

Class of 2010		Race/Ethnicity Definition Available
Year 1	2006-07 ( <i>expected grade 9</i> )	Former
Year 2	2007-08 ( <i>expected grade 10</i> )	Former
Year 3	2008-09 ( <i>expected grade 11</i> )	Former
Year 4	2009-10 ( <i>expected grade 12</i> )	Former and New
Year 5	2010-11 (continuing students)	New

- *Class vs. Cohort.* The denominator of the Completion Rate calculation is defined as the “class.” The class is the sum of students from the original cohort who have a final status of “graduated,” “continued,” “received GED,” or “dropped out.” There are other students who are members of the original cohort but whose final status does not affect the completion rate calculation. These are:
  - students with a final status that is not considered to be either a completer, GED recipient, or a dropout. Examples include students who left public school to be home schooled or students who returned to home country;
  - students whose final status could not be determined because data errors prevented records from being matched or because final status records were not submitted; and,
  - students who are excluded from accountability ratings due to state statutory requirements.

Students in the cohort but not in the class do not affect the completion rate calculation at all—they are neither in the numerator nor the denominator. All rates are based on members of the class.

- *Cohort Members.* Students stay with their original cohort, whether they are retained or promoted. Students are members of one and only one cohort.
- *Economically Disadvantaged.* The economic status of a student is based on the information reported by the accountable district in the student’s final year of the cohort.
- *Standard and AEA Procedures.* The definition of a completer differs between standard and AEA procedures in that GED recipients are not considered to be completers under standard procedures, but are considered completers under AEA procedures. Completion Rate I is used for standard procedures. Completion Rate II is used for AEA procedures. Another difference between AEA and standard procedures is that under certain circumstances, completion rates for at-risk students are evaluated under AEA procedures. At-risk completion rates are not used under standard procedures.

## RECOMMENDED HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM/ DISTINGUISHED ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM

### Methodology:

number of graduates reported with graduation codes for *Recommended High School Program* or *Distinguished Achievement Program* (from PEIMS 203)

---

number of graduates (from PEIMS 203)

**Year of Data:** Class of 2010

### Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Race/Ethnicity
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
<b>Date</b>	October 2010	October 2010

### Other Information:

- *Graduation Requirements.* The State Board of Education has by rule defined the graduation requirements for Texas public school students. The rule delineates specific requirements for three levels: minimum requirements, the Recommended High School Program (RHSP), and the Distinguished Achievement Program (DAP).
- *Race/Ethnicity.* The race and ethnicity used for RHSP/DAP for 2011 accountability is based on the new federal definition.
- *Graduation Types.* RHSP graduates are students with type codes of 15, 19, 22, 25, or 28; DAP graduates are students with type codes of 17, 20, 23, 26, or 29. See the *PEIMS Data Standards* for more information.

## SAT/ACT RESULTS

### Methodology:

#### *Participation:*

$$\frac{\text{number of graduates taking either the SAT or the ACT (from College Board and ACT)}}{\text{total non-special education graduates (from PEIMS 203)}}$$

#### *Performance:*

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees at or above the criterion score (from College Board and ACT)}}{\text{number of examinees taking either the SAT or ACT (from College Board and ACT)}}$$

**Year of Data:** Class of 2010

### Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Race/Ethnicity	Special Education Status
<b>Source</b>	n/a	PEIMS 101 (primary) College Board and ACT (secondary)	PEIMS 405
<b>Date</b>	n/a	October 2009 (primary) June 2010 (secondary)	June 2010, October 2010

**Other Information:**

- *Race/Ethnicity.* The race and ethnicity used for SAT/ACT Results for 2011 accountability is based on the new federal definition. This information was submitted by districts through PEIMS (primary source). In the infrequent situations where the race and ethnicity data was not available on PEIMS, it was taken from the examination results data provided by the testing companies (secondary source).
- *Special Education.* Those students reported as receiving special education services in all six of the six-week attendance periods, or for whom the graduation type code on the 203 leaver record indicates special education (graduation type codes 04, 05, 06, 07, 18, 19, or 20) are removed from the count of total graduates used in the denominator of the participation calculation.

**TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS****Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of students passing TAKS (by subject) (from Pearson)}}{\text{total number TAKS test takers (by subject) (from Pearson)}}$$

**Year of Data:** 2010-11

**Student Demographics:**

	<b>Economic Status</b>	<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
<b>Date</b>	October 2010	October 2010

**Other Information:**

- *Race/Ethnicity.* The race and ethnicity used for TAKS for 2011 is based on the new federal definition.
- *Student Information.* The testing contractor, Pearson, pre-codes student information onto the answer documents from PEIMS data (see record types, above), or from district-supplied data files. The answer documents may also be coded by district staff on the day of testing.
- *Prior Year Results.* For purposes of calculating RI, the prior year assessment results have been rebuilt to include all TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt results. However, the prior year results use the former definition for race and ethnicity.
- *Refugee/Asylee Exclusions.* A student is classified as a Refugee/Asylee if:
  - The student is coded as participating in a state-approved bilingual or ESL program; and,
  - The student is coded as LEP; and,
  - For each tested subject, the following is true:
    - For LAT grades and subjects, the LAT FORM and LAT Info areas must be filled in; and,
    - For all grades and subjects, column A of the Agency Use field must be filled in.
 For more information, see Appendix H of the *2011 Texas Student Assessment Program Coordinator Manual* at [http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index3.aspx?id=3679&menu\\_id=793](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index3.aspx?id=3679&menu_id=793).

- *Source of Student Demographics across Test Administrations.* For students in grades other than the Student Success Initiative (SSI) grades, the source for demographic information is the primary April administration. This means that the demographics for students who take writing (grades 4 and 7) reading (grade 9) or ELA (grades 10 and 11) will be taken from their April answer documents. Demographics include race/ethnicity and economic status. For students in the SSI grades, the source for demographic information is from the first administration.
- *Accountability Subset Rules.* Table 31 illustrates the conditions under which a test result will be used for state accountability. For purposes of this table, students are assumed to be enrolled in the campus or district on the PEIMS October snapshot date. Students who are ADA ineligible (*i.e.* students with an ADA eligibility PEIMS value of “0”) are enrolled and are included in accountability results, if they meet the subset rules.

Although the table reflects a campus perspective, the conditions shown also apply to districts. Substitute “district” for “campus” throughout this table in order to use it to determine district assessment results.

The left half of the table shows the testing dates for each subject and grade. The right half shows the conditions that must be met for a test result to be used.

*Example:* The results for a grade 5 student who took the second TAKS reading administration (R2) will count for the campus if the student had an answer document submitted for the first administration of reading (R1) or mathematics (M1) or for the science administration at the same campus. If this is not true, the second TAKS reading result will not count for the campus.

*Example:* The results for a grade 9 student who took TAKS reading will NOT count at the campus if the student’s TAKS mathematics results were found at another campus.

The table addresses TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), and TAKS-M test takers. The rules apply to any combination of these tests; for subset purposes these test types are interchangeable.

The TAKS-Alt results are reported on a single assessment file; therefore, the accountability subset is determined by comparing the PEIMS October enrollment campus or district to the campus or district associated with the TAKS-Alt result. Since the TAKS-Alt assessments are administered during a testing window, the TAKS-Alt student transfer policy specifies a transfer deadline for students who move to a different district during the TAKS-Alt testing window. The TAKS-Alt results for all subject areas assessed are assigned to the last campus or district that appropriately registered the TAKS-Alt assessment as outlined in the TAKS-Alt student transfer policy.

**Table 31: Accountability Subset Rules**

(In this table, students are assumed to be enrolled at the campus for the October snapshot date.)

When TAKS (including TAKS (Accommodated) and TAKS M)* Test GIVEN										When Test COUNTS for Accountability Rating		
2010-11 Testing Calendar										This test will be used ...	IF this test was taken at my campus—√...	AND these other conditions apply (if any).
	Mar	April						May				
	1	4	5	26	27	28	29	17	18			
3				M	R					M	√.	
										R	√.	
4	W			M	R					W	√ or anywhere else and...	if M or R at my campus.
										W	√ and...	if no M or R anywhere.
										M	√.	
										R	√.	
5		M1	R1			SC		M2	R2	R1	√ and...	if no R2 or M2 anywhere.
										M1	√ and...	if no R2 or M2 anywhere.
										R2	√ and...	if R1 or M1 or SC at my campus.
										SC	√.	
										M2	√ and...	if M1 or R1 or SC at my campus.
6				M	R					Same as grade 3.		
7	W			M	R					Same as grade 4.		
8		M1	R1			SC	SS	M2	R2	R1	√ and...	if no R2 or M2 anywhere.
										M1	√ and...	if no R2 or M2 anywhere.
										R2	√ and...	if R1 or M1 or SC or SS at my campus.
										SC	√.	
										SS	√.	
										M2	√ and...	if M1 or R1 or SC or SS at my campus.
9	R					M				R	√ or anywhere else and...	if M at my campus.
										R	√ and...	if no M anywhere.
										M	√.	
10	ELA			M		SC		SS		ELA	√ or anywhere else and...	if M, SC, or SS at my campus.
										ELA	√ and...	if no M, SC, or SS anywhere.
										M	√.	
										SC	√.	
										SS	√.	
11	ELA				M	SC		SS		Same as grade 10.		

\* For accountability purposes, a TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), or TAKS-M result is sufficient to meet the condition.

**LEGEND:**

R = reading; R1 = 1<sup>st</sup> administration of reading; R2 = 2<sup>nd</sup> administration of reading

M = mathematics; M1 = 1<sup>st</sup> administration of mathematics; M2 = 2<sup>nd</sup> administration of mathematics

W = writing

SC = science

SS = social studies

ELA = English Language Arts

- *Student Success Initiative (SSI) Mobility Subset.* Mobility between administrations of the TAKS for students in SSI grades (grades 5 and 8) presents a special challenge for excluding mobile students. *Table 32* below shows different scenarios for inclusion and exclusion of students in the campus accountability subset in the SSI grades. If discrepancies in student demographics are found between test administrations in these grades, the information from the first administration is used.

**Table 32: Accountability Subset for SSI -  
Grades 5 & 8 TAKS Reading and Mathematics for TAKS, TAKS  
(Accommodated), and TAKS-M**

	Was the student enrolled in your campus on <b>Oct. 29<sup>th</sup></b> (snapshot date)?	Did the student take (or have answer documents submitted for) the <b>April 4 &amp; 5 TAKS Math and Reading</b> on your campus?	Did the student have an answer document submitted for any <b>TAKS April 28<sup>th</sup> or 29<sup>th</sup></b> on your campus?	Did the student take (or have answer documents submitted for) the <b>May 17 &amp; 18 TAKS Math and Reading</b> on your campus?	Student is in your <b>accountability subset</b> for TAKS
Scenario 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Scenario 2	Yes	Yes	Yes	No (answer documents for May 17 & 18 found at another campus)	No
Scenario 3	Yes	Yes	Yes	No (answer documents for May 17 & 18 cannot be found on another campus)	Yes
Scenario 4	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes (reading & math only)
Scenario 5	Yes	Yes	No	No (answer documents for May 17 & 18 found at another campus)	No
Scenario 6	Yes	Yes	No	No (answer documents for May 17 & 18 cannot be found on another campus)	Yes (reading & math only)
Scenario 7	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Scenario 8	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes (science & social studies only)
Scenario 9	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Scenario 10	Yes	No	No	No	No
Scenario 11	No	Yes or No	Yes or No	Yes or No	No

- *Student Attribution Codes.* The TAKS performance for some campuses and some students with certain attributes is excluded from district aggregate data due to state statutory requirements. Three campus types that are specifically addressed in statute are Residential Treatment Facility campuses, Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC) campuses, and Texas Youth Commission (TYC) campuses. For 2011 accountability, specific student assessment results are excluded based on the student attribution codes submitted by the district. Student results are excluded by using PEIMS student attribution codes of 13, 14, 17, 18, 21, and 22. See *Table 9* in *Chapter 6—Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information.

**Table 33: Student Attribution Codes**

Student Attribution Codes	
13	Texas Juvenile Probation Commission facility—by court order, not regularly assigned to the district
14	Texas Juvenile Probation Commission facility—by court order, regularly assigned to the district
17	Texas Youth Commission facility—by court order, not regularly assigned to the district
18	Texas Youth Commission facility—by court order, regularly assigned to the district
21	Residential treatment facility—by court order, not regularly assigned to the district
22	Residential treatment facility—by court order, regularly assigned to the district

**TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS – PROGRESS INDICATOR**  
(*AEA procedures only*)

**Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of TAKS tests that meet the standard and} \\ \text{number of TAKS exit-level retests that meet the standard (from Pearson)}}{\text{number TAKS tests taken and} \\ \text{number of TAKS exit-level retests that meet the standard (from Pearson)}}$$

**Years of Data:** 2011 and 2010

**Student Demographics:**

	Economic Status	Race/Ethnicity
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
<b>Date</b>	October 2010, October 2009	October 2010, October 2009

**Other Information:**

- *Race/Ethnicity.* The race and ethnicity used for the TAKS Progress Indicator for 2011 is based on the new federal definition.
- *Matched Demographics.* If discrepancies in student demographics are found between test administrations in the SSI grades, the information on the first administration is used. For students in grades other than the SSI grades, the source for demographic information is the primary April administration.

- *Student Information.* The testing contractor, Pearson, pre-codes student information onto the answer documents from PEIMS data (see record types, above), or from district-supplied data files. The answer documents may also be coded by district staff on the day of testing.

***Texas Success Initiative (TSI) – Higher Education Readiness Component:  
ELA and Mathematics***

**Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of test takers achieving TSI standard (by subject) (from Pearson)}}{\text{number of grade 11 test takers (by subject) (from Pearson)}}$$

**Year of Data:** 2010-11

**Student Demographics:**

	<b>Economic Status</b>	<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
<b>Date</b>	October 2010	October 2010

**Other Information:**

**Other Information:**

- *Race/Ethnicity.* The race and ethnicity used for TSI for 2011 is based on the new federal definition.
- *TSI Standard.* The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board sets the standard that students must achieve on the exit-level TAKS to be considered college ready.
- *Student Information.* The testing contractor, Pearson, pre-codes student information onto the answer documents from PEIMS data (see record types, above), or from district-supplied data files. The answer documents may also be coded by district staff on the day of testing.

## Appendix E – Student Growth Measures

---

Prior to the 2011 accountability year, up to three measures of student growth were used in various ways in the state accountability system: the Texas Growth Index (TGI), the Texas Projection Measure (TPM) and Vertical Scale Score Growth (VSG). As of the 2011 accountability year, among these three measures, only VSG plays a role in the state rating system. For information about the previous uses of TGI and TPM in state accountability, see *Appendix E* of the *2010 Accountability Manual*.

Vertical scales were developed in 2009 in response to state legislative requirements. Vertical scales were developed for TAKS reading and mathematics tests in grades 3–8 (including Spanish reading and mathematics in grades 3-5). Vertical scales are not reported for TAKS writing (grades 4 and 7), science (grades 5, 8, 10, and exit level), social studies (grades 8, 10, and exit level), reading and mathematics at grade 9, or English language arts and mathematics at grade 10 and exit level. Performance results on these assessments continue to have a scale score of 2100 for Met Standard and 2400 for Commended Performance.

With a vertical scale, a student’s scale score in one grade can be compared to the student’s scale score in another grade as long as the scores are in the same language and subject. Vertical scale score changes are actual changes in performance. A vertical scale enables the progress of students who have different initial proficiency levels to be compared.

### USES OF VERTICAL SCALE SCORE GROWTH IN 2011 STATE ACCOUNTABILITY

Prior to 2010, the TGI was used to calculate Comparable Improvement (CI), an acknowledgment awarded under the Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) system for campuses evaluated under standard procedures. CI is awarded separately for reading and mathematics. With the transition to the use of a vertical scale for reading and mathematics in grades 3-8, the TGI is no longer available for CI for these grades and subjects. Instead, beginning in 2010, VSG is used to determine CI. See *Chapter 5 – Gold Performance Acknowledgments* for information about CI criteria and standards.

**Who is included:** Students are included in a school’s CI calculation if they:

- took the spring 2011 TAKS reading and/or mathematics tests, in grades 4-8;
- are part of the 2011 *Accountability Subset* (see *Chapter 2*);
- can be matched to the spring 2010 TAKS administration—anywhere in the state—to find their prior year performance for reading, and/or mathematics; and,
- have been promoted to one higher grade than in 2010.

VSG is defined as a student’s vertical scale score in Year 2 minus the student’s vertical scale score in Year 1. An average VSG value for each campus is determined by summing the student-level VSG values to the campus level and dividing by the number of students. The campus average VSG value is rounded to a whole number.

Once the average VSG for a campus is determined, it is listed with the other average VSGs of the 40 schools in the school’s comparison group. The schools are arranged from highest to lowest average VSG. If the target school falls in the top quartile and all other eligibility criteria are met, it is awarded a GPA for CI. This is calculated separately by subject.

## Calculating Average VSG\*:

$$\text{average VSG(reading)} = \frac{\text{sum of individual student VSG values for reading}}{\text{total number of students with VSG in reading}}$$

$$\text{average VSG(mathematics)} = \frac{\text{sum of individual student VSG values for mathematics}}{\text{total number of students with VSG in mathematics}}$$

\* In *Chapter 5 – Gold Performance Acknowledgments*, the formula for calculating the campus average VSG was expressed differently; however, mathematically the results are the same.

## Other information:

- *Retesters.* For students who take TAKS retest administrations in the SSI grades—grades 5 and 8 reading and mathematics—the VSG is determined using the scale score from the first administration. This is true for both Year 2 and Year 1.
- *Quartile Size.* Because there are 40 schools in a comparison group, there are usually 10 schools in each quartile. Exceptions to this occur when a group has tied average VSG values at the border between quartiles. In case of tied values at the border between Q1 and Q2 all ties are assigned a Q1 position. The number of schools in a quartile can also vary when a school in a group has too few “matched students,” and is therefore not assigned an average VSG value or a quartile.
- *Quartile Rank.* High growth values do not necessarily imply that more students are passing the TAKS. It simply evaluates the performance growth of all students regardless of whether they passed or failed.
- *Quartile Position Across Subjects.* A school’s quartile position can vary by subject. For instance, a school may be Q1 in reading, but it may be Q2 in mathematics. Quartile position is relative to the performance of the other schools in the group.
- *Quartile Position Across Groups.* A school may be Q1 for its own group and Q4 as a member of another school’s group. (However, the quartile value evaluated for a particular school is the one determined for the school’s own group.)
- *Minimum Size.* Any school with fewer than 10 matched students for a subject will not have average VSG values calculated and will not be assigned a quartile position.
- *Number of Matched Students.* The number of matched students for reading may differ from the number of matched students for mathematics.
- *Range of Vertical Scale Scores Across Grades.* The distance in vertical scale score points between the Met Standard performance levels varies across adjacent grades. Collapsing vertical scale growth across grade spans (as is done with the CI methodology) assumes students have an equal opportunity for growth as they move from grade to grade. Because CI comparison groups are based on campus type (elementary, middle, high school, multi-level), the grade spans of schools compared for CI acknowledgment are similar. Additional information about the technical characteristics of the vertical scale scores can be found online at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/techdigest/>.

## Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group

---

Each campus is assigned to a unique comparison group of 40 other public schools (from anywhere in the state), that closely matches that school on six characteristics. Comparison groups are provided so that schools can compare their performance—shown on AEIS reports—to that of other schools with whom they are demographically similar. Comparison groups are also used for determining Comparable Improvement (See *Chapter 5 – Gold Performance Acknowledgments* and *Appendix E – Student Growth Measures*).

The demographic characteristics used to construct the campus comparison groups include those defined in statute as well as others found to be statistically related to performance.

They are:

- the percent of African American students enrolled for 2010-11;
- the percent of Hispanic students enrolled for 2010-11;
- the percent of White students enrolled for 2010-11;
- the percent of economically disadvantaged students enrolled for 2010-11;
- the percent of limited English proficient (LEP) students enrolled for 2010-11; and
- the percent of mobile students as determined from 2009-10 cumulative attendance.

All schools are first grouped by type (elementary, middle, high school, or multi-level). Then the group is determined on the basis of the most predominant features at the target school. Assume that Sample High School has the following percentages for the six groups:

- 7.6% African American,
- 36.8% Hispanic,
- 53.9% White,
- 28.2% economically disadvantaged,
- 10.7% LEP, and
- 23.7% mobile students.

Of these features, the most predominant (*i.e.*, the largest) is the percent of White students, followed by the percent of Hispanic students, the percent of economically disadvantaged students, the percent of mobile students, the percent of LEP students, and finally, the percent of African American students. The following steps illustrate how the group is determined from the pool of all high schools:

- Step 1: 100 high school campuses with percentages closest to 53.9% White students are identified;
- Step 2: 10 schools from the initial group of 100 are eliminated on the basis of being most distant from the value of 36.8% Hispanic;
- Step 3: 10 of the remaining 90 schools which are most distant from 28.2% economically disadvantaged students are eliminated;

- Step 4: 10 of the remaining 80 schools which are most distant from 23.7% mobile students are eliminated;
- Step 5: 10 of the remaining 70 schools which are most distant from 10.7% LEP students are eliminated;
- Step 6: 10 of the remaining 60 schools which are most distant from 7.6% African American students are eliminated; and
- Step 7: 10 of the remaining 50 schools which are most distant from 7.6% African American and/or 28.2% economically disadvantaged students are eliminated. (This last reduction step is based on the least predominant characteristics among the four student groups evaluated in the accountability system: African American, Hispanic, White, and economically disadvantaged.)

The final group size is 40 schools. This methodology creates a unique comparison group for every campus.

**Other Information:**

- Comparison groups are recreated each year to account for changes in demographics that may occur.
- With this methodology, the number of times a school appears as a member of other groups will vary.
- In cases where the campus has a missing mobility value, the district's average mobility is used as a proxy. This will happen for schools in their first year of operation, since mobility is based on prior year data.
- Districts are not grouped.

## Appendix G – Contacts

The *2011 Accountability Manual* contains detailed information about all aspects of the accountability system for Texas public schools and districts. However, if questions remain, your Education Service Center (ESC) representatives are available for further assistance.

### ESC ACCOUNTABILITY CONTACTS

ESC	Name	Email Address	Phone Number
1	Lisa Conner Belinda Gorena	lconner@esc1.net bgorena@esc1.net	(956) 984-6027 (956) 984-6173
2	Sonia A. Perez Dawn Schuenemann Linda P. Villarreal	sonia.perez@esc2.us dawn.schuenemann@esc2.us linda.villarreal@esc2.us	(361) 561-8407 (361) 561-8551 (361) 561-8404
3	Charlotte Baker Dina Rogers Nancy Sandlin	cbaker@esc3.net drogers@esc3.net nsandlin@esc3.net	(361) 573-0731 ext. 204 (361) 573-0731 ext. 237 (361) 573-0731 ext. 252
4	Liselotte Thompson	lthompson@esc4.net	(713) 744-6357
5	Monica Mahfouz	mmahfouz@esc5.net	(409) 923-5411
6	Dr. Jerry Hall Melinda Perzan	jhall@esc6.net mperzan@esc6.net	(936) 435-8210 (936) 435-8224
7	Jane Silvey	jsilvey@esc7.net	(903) 988-6796
8	Karla Coker Sheryl Pappa	kcoker@reg8.net spappa@reg8.net	(903) 572-8551 ext. 2731 (903) 572-8551 ext. 2781
9	Jean Ashton Wes Pierce Christie Walker	jean.ashton@esc9.net wes.pierce@esc9.net christie.walker@esc9.net	(940) 322-6928
10	Lorna Bonner Kerry Gain	lorna.bonner@region10.org kerry.gain@region10.org	(972) 348-1324 (972) 348-1480
11	Kathy Wright- Chapman	kwc@esc11.net	(817) 740-7546
12	Phil Gerik Stephanie Kucera Rudy Lopez Charlene Simpson	pgerik@esc12.net skucera@esc12.net rlopez@esc12.net csimpson@esc12.net	(254) 297-1103 (254) 297-1154 (254) 297-1110 (254) 297-1106
13	Ed Vara Erin Monge	ed.vara@esc13.txed.net erin.monge@esc13.txed.net	(512) 919-5313 (512) 919-5308
14	Karen E. Turner Lucy Smith	keturner@esc14.net lmsmith@esc14.net	(325) 675-8620 (325) 675-8641
15	Dean Munn	dean.munn@netxv.net	(325) 481-4026
16	Shirley Clark	shirley.clark@esc16.net	(806) 677-5130
17	Ty Duncan	tduncan@esc17.net	(806) 281-5832

ESC	Name	Email Address	Phone Number
18	Kaye Orr Denise Rives	kayeorr@esc18.net drives@esc18.net	(432) 567-3244 (432) 561-4355
19	Anthony Fraga Rebecca Ontiveros	afraga@esc19.net rontiveros@esc19.net	(915) 780-6553 (915) 780-5093
20	Sheila Collazo Rose Andrews Gina Christenson Dolores Sendejo Hunter Shelby	sheila.collazo@esc20.net rose.andrews@esc20.net gina.christenson@esc20.net dolores.sendejo@esc20.net hunter.shelby@esc20.net	(210) 370-5481 (210) 370-5410 (210) 370-5396 (210) 370-5475 (210) 370-5499

*This information is current as of July 2011. It is subject to change at any time.*

## OTHER CONTACTS

Questions related to indicators, programs, and policies not covered in the *Manual* should be directed to the appropriate contact listed below. *All telephone numbers are in the (512) area code unless otherwise indicated.*

Subject	Contact	Number
Academic Excellence Indicator System	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Accountability Ratings (methodology)	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Accountability Appeals (State or Federal)	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Alternative Education Accountability (AEA)	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Blue Ribbon Schools	Communications	463-9000
Campus ID (numbers)	Accountability Research (AskTED)	463-9809
Charter Schools	Charter Schools	463-9575
SAT	College Board, SWRN Regional Office	(866) 392-3017
ACT	ACT Regional Office	320-1850
Commended Performance	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP)	Chapter 37 – Safe Schools	463-3070
End-of-Course (EOC) Exams	Student Assessment	463-9536
Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA)	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Indicator Methodology:		
Advanced Course Completion	Performance Reporting	463-9704
AP/IB Results	Accountability Research	475-3523
Attendance Rate	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Dropout Rate	Accountability Research	475-3523
College-Ready Graduates	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Commended Performance	Performance Reporting	463-9704

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Contact</b>	<b>Number</b>
Comparable Improvement	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Completion Rate	Accountability Research	475-3523
ELL Progress Indicator	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Recommended High School Program	Performance Reporting	463-9704
SAT/ACT Results	Accountability Research	475-3523
Texas Success Initiative	Performance Reporting	463-9704
TAKS	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Interventions	Program Monitoring and Interventions	463-5226
Investigations	Program Monitoring and Interventions	463-5226
Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP)	Chapter 37 – Safe Schools	463-3070
Leavers (Dropouts, Completers)	Accountability Research	475-3523
No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act	NCLB Program Coordination	463-9374
Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS)	PEIMS	463-9229
Public Education Grant (PEG)	Parent Complaints/Concerns	463-9290
Public Hearings for <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> Campuses	Program Monitoring and Interventions	463-5226
Recommended High School Program (RHSP)	Curriculum	463-9581
Retention Policy	Curriculum	463-9581
School Report Card	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Special Education	Special Education	463-5226
STAAR Assessment	Student Assessment	463-9536
Statutory (Legal) Issues	Legal Services	463-9720
TAKS	Student Assessment	463-9536
TAKS Testing Contractor	Pearson	800-252-9186
TAKS-Modified/TAKS-Alternate	Student Assessment	463-9536
TELPAS	Student Assessment	463-9536
Texas Success Initiative (TSI)	Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB)	427-6100

## WEB LINKS

The following web links can be used to gather supplemental information from online sources.

Accountability Research ..... [http://www.tea.state.tx.us/acctres/home\\_index.html](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/acctres/home_index.html)  
*Provides publications on Dropouts, Retention, College Admissions, and many other topics.*

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) ..... [ritter.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/index.html](http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/index.html)  
*Provides AYP results for each campus and district, the AYP Guide, and other information related to AYP.*

- Alternative Education Accountability (AEA)..... [ritter.tea.state.tx.us/aea/index.html](http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/aea/index.html)  
*Provides extensive information on AEA.*
- Charter School ..... <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/charters.aspx>  
*Provides information and resources for charter school personnel, parents, students, potential charter applicants, and the general public as well as contact information, and answers to frequently asked questions.*
- House Bill (HB) 3 Transition Plan..... <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/hb3plan/>  
*Contains a detailed description of the process the commissioner of education will use to develop and implement the provisions of HB 3 (81st Texas Legislature, 2009), as required by Section 68 of the bill.*
- No Child Left Behind (NCLB) .... [http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=4261&menu\\_id=798](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=4261&menu_id=798)  
*Provides information on Title I, II, III, IV, V, and VI programs and other aspects of NCLB.*
- Pearson Education..... [www.pearsonaccess.com/cs/Satellite?pagename=Pearson/QuickLink/tx](http://www.pearsonaccess.com/cs/Satellite?pagename=Pearson/QuickLink/tx)  
*Testing contractor for Texas. Provides assessment results and other information for administrators, educators, and families.*
- PEIMS..... <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=3012>  
*The Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) database provides publications such as the Data Standards and information on EDIT+, PID, and other topics related to data collection.*
- Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM).....  
[http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=3843&menu\\_id=2147483683](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=3843&menu_id=2147483683)  
*Provides PBM Analysis System (PBMAS) reports and information on data integrity issues.*
- Performance Reporting ..... <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/>  
*Provides state and federal accountability data for each campus and district, AEIS reports, School Report Cards, NCLB Report Cards, and other publications.*
- Program Monitoring and Interventions.....  
[http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=2147495550&menu\\_id=2147483703](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=2147495550&menu_id=2147483703)  
*Provides information about accreditation monitoring, interventions, Campuses with Additional Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) Requirements, and Campus Improvement Teams (CIT).*
- Special Education..... <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=2147491399>  
*Provides extensive information about special education and the ARD process.*
- Student Assessment ..... [www.tea.state.tx.us/index3.aspx?id=3534&menu\\_id3=793](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index3.aspx?id=3534&menu_id3=793)  
*Provides extensive information on the statewide assessment program.*
- Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board..... [www.theccb.state.tx.us](http://www.theccb.state.tx.us)  
*Provides information on the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) and information on Texas public universities and community colleges.*
- University Interscholastic League (UIL) ..... <http://www.uil.utexas.edu/>  
*Provides information about UIL organized and supervised educational extracurricular academic, athletic, and music contests for Texas public schools.*

## Appendix H – Acknowledgments

---

Many people have contributed to the development of the *2011 Accountability Manual*. The project staff wish to thank these individuals for their expert advice and prompt review of our materials. Their comments greatly enhanced the accuracy and format of the document.

### TEA Staff

---

#### EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

Robert Scott, Commissioner of Education  
Lizzette Reynolds, Deputy Commissioner, Statewide Policy and Programs  
Criss Cloudt, Associate Commissioner for Assessment, Accountability, and Data Quality  
Laura Taylor, Associate Commissioner for Accreditation

#### PROJECT LEADERSHIP

Shannon Housson, Director, *Division of Performance Reporting*  
Cathy Long, *Division of Performance Reporting*  
Nancy Rinehart, *Division of Performance Reporting*  
Betty Weed, *Division of Performance Reporting*

#### CONTRIBUTORS

David Anderson	<i>TEA General Counsel</i>
Cynthia Carrasquillo	<i>Division of Performance Reporting</i>
John Haetinger	<i>Division of Performance Reporting</i>
Rachel Harrington	<i>Director, Division of Performance-Based Monitoring</i>
Diane J. Hernandez	<i>Division of Performance Reporting</i>
Gene Lenz	<i>Deputy Associate Commissioner for Special Programs</i>
Stacy McDonald	<i>Division of Performance Reporting</i>
Mary Perry	<i>Director, Division of Charter School Administration</i>
Ester Regalado	<i>Division of Performance Reporting</i>
Linda Roska	<i>Director, Division of Accountability Research</i>
Chris Schmitt	<i>Division of Performance Reporting</i>
Mariana Vassileva	<i>Division of Student Assessment</i>
Gloria Zyskowski	<i>Deputy Associate Commissioner, Student Assessment</i>

## **Educator Focus Group on Accountability**

---

Representatives from districts and regional service centers met in March 2011 to make recommendations that address major policy and design issues for 2011 accountability.

Nabor F. Cortez, Jr., Superintendent, *La Feria ISD, Region 1*

Daniel King, Superintendent, *Pharr-San Juan-Alamo ISD, Region 1*

Audra Ude, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, *Flour Bluff ISD, Region 2*

Charlotte Baker, Deputy Director for Programs and Services, *Region 3*

M. Annette Cluff, Superintendent, *The Varnett Charter School, Region 4*

Keith Haffey, Executive Director for Accountability and Research,

*Spring Branch ISD, Region 4*

Janelle James, Superintendent, *Southwest Schools, Region 4*

Dru Mushlian, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, *Hardin-Jefferson ISD, Region 5*

Jason Puente, Assistant Principal, Jane Long Middle School, *Bryan ISD, Region 6*

Mary Ann Whiteker, Superintendent, *Hudson ISD, Region 7*

Sarah Dildine, Director of Curriculum, Technology, and Special Programs,

*Hughes Springs ISD, Region 8*

Tim Powers, Assistant Superintendent, Instructional Services, *Wichita Falls ISD, Region 9*

Whitcomb Johnstone\*, Director of Planning, Evaluation, and Research, *Irving ISD, Region 10*

Francine Holland\*, Executive Deputy Director of Instructional Services, *Region 11*

Sharon Shields, Superintendent, *La Vega ISD, Region 12*

Nola Wellman, Superintendent, *Eanes ISD, Region 13*

Doyleen Terrell, Principal, Nancy Smith Elementary, *Albany ISD, Region 14*

Jana Anderson, Director of Special Education, *San Angelo ISD, Region 15*

Kelli Moulton, Superintendent, *Hereford ISD, Region 16*

Michael Motheral, Superintendent, *Sundown ISD, Region 17*

Benny P. Hernandez, Principal, Iraan-Sheffield High School, *Iraan-Sheffield ISD, Region 18*

Joseph Lopez, Associate Superintendent, Curriculum and Instruction, *El Paso ISD, Region 19*

Tom Harvey, Superintendent, *La Vernia ISD, Region 20*

Liza Rosenthal, Coordinator of Accountability and Compliance, *San Antonio ISD, Region 20*

\* Liaisons to the Commissioner's Accountability Advisory Committee

## Commissioner's Accountability Advisory Committee

---

Representatives from legislative offices, school districts, and the business community were invited to participate in resolving issues critical to the accountability system. The Commissioner's Accountability Advisory Committee met in March 2011 to review the recommendations made by the Educator Focus Group. The Advisory Committee either endorsed the Focus Group's proposals or recommended alternative proposals which were forwarded to the commissioner.

### LEGISLATIVE STAFF

Von Byer	Committee Director, <i>Senate Education Committee</i>
Kalese Hammonds	Governor's Advisor, <i>Office of Governor Perry</i>
Julie Harker	Public Education Advisor, <i>Office of Governor Perry</i>
Caasi Lamb	Education Policy Analyst, <i>Office of the Lieutenant Governor</i>
John McGeady	Public Education Team Manager, <i>Legislative Budget Board</i>
Andrea Sheridan	Senior Education Advisor, <i>Office of the Speaker of the House</i>
Jenna Watts	Policy Director, <i>House Public Education Committee</i>

### SCHOOL DISTRICT / ESC REPRESENTATIVES

Elizabeth Abernethy	Executive Director, <i>Region 7</i>
Bret Champion	Superintendent, <i>Leander ISD</i>
Jesus Chavez	Superintendent, <i>Round Rock ISD</i>
Ralph H. Draper	Superintendent, <i>Spring ISD</i>
Michael Hinojosa	Superintendent, <i>Dallas ISD</i>
Francine Holland*	Executive Deputy Director of Instructional Services, <i>Region 11</i>
Harlan Howell	Director of Research and Evaluation/Computer Services, <i>Harlingen CISD</i>
Whitcomb Johnstone*	Director of Planning, Evaluation, and Research, <i>Irving ISD</i>
Michael Motheral	Superintendent, <i>Sundown ISD</i>

### OTHER REPRESENTATIVES

Jim Crow	Executive Director, <i>Texas Association of School Boards</i>
David Dunn	Executive Director, <i>Texas Charter Schools Association</i>
Andrew Erben	President, <i>Texas Institute for Education Reform</i>
John Fitzpatrick	Executive Director, <i>Texas High Schools Project/Communities Foundation of Texas</i>
Bill Hammond	President and CEO, <i>Texas Association of Business</i>
Justin Keener	Vice President of Policy and Communications, <i>Texas Public Policy Foundation</i>
Sandy Kress	Partner, <i>Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer, and Feld</i>
Don McAdams	President, <i>Center for Reform of School Systems</i>
Jeri Stone	Executive Director/General Counsel, <i>Texas Classroom Teachers Association</i>
Johnny Veselka	Executive Director, <i>Texas Association of School Administrators</i>
Darv Winick	<i>Winick Consultants</i>

\*Liaisons to Educator Focus Group on Accountability

## Commissioner's TASA Cabinet of Superintendents

---

David G. Anthony	Cypress-Fairbanks ISD, <i>Region 4</i>
Jeff Black	Ganado ISD, <i>Region 3</i>
Reece Blincoe	Brownwood ISD, <i>Region 15</i>
Julie A. Carbajal	Flour Bluff ISD, <i>Region 2</i>
Jesus H. Chavez	Round Rock ISD, <i>Region 13</i>
L. Curti Culwell	Garland ISD, <i>Region 10</i>
Xavier De La Torre	Socorro ISD, <i>Region 19</i>
John M. Folks	Northside ISD, <i>Region 20</i>
Jose Franco	Fort Hancock ISD, <i>Region 19</i>
Tena Gray	Rankin ISD, <i>Region 18</i>
Randy Hancock	Royse City ISD, <i>Region 10</i>
Dee W. Hartt	Tatum ISD, <i>Region 7</i>
Mard A. Herrick	Dripping Springs ISD, <i>Region 13</i>
Shannon J. Holmes	Hardin-Jefferson ISD, <i>Region 5</i>
Melody A. Johnson	Fort Worth ISD, <i>Region 11</i>
Brad Lancaster	Midway ISD, <i>Region 12</i>
Mike Lee	Booker ISD, <i>Region 16</i>
Jeff A. McClure	Henrietta ISD, <i>Region 9</i>
Dawson R. Orr	Highland Park ISD, <i>Region 10</i>
Thomas Price	Splendora ISD, <i>Region 6</i>
Romeo Rodriguez, Jr.	Zapata County ISD, <i>Region 1</i>
Karen G. Rue	Northwest ISD, <i>Region 11</i>
Rod Schroder	Amarillo ISD, <i>Region 16</i>
Michelle Carrol Smith	Lytle ISD, <i>Region 20</i>
James V. Taliaferro	Slaton ISD, <i>Region 17</i>
Paul M. Trull	Paris ISD, <i>Region 8</i>
Jim White	Colorado ISD, <i>Region 14</i>
Mary Ann Whiteker	Hudson ISD, <i>Region 7</i>

## **Appendix I – TEA Secure Environment (TEASE)**

---

The Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE) is an authentication portal through which an authorized user can access sensitive or confidential TEA information resources. The TEASE portal includes several web applications that are relevant to administrators in school districts and education service centers. One such application is the *ACCT–Accountability* application. This provides authorized users with state accountability products (standard and alternative education), federal accountability products, Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS) products, and accountability research products pertaining to completion, dropout, and longitudinal cohort lists.

Additionally, the *ACCT–Accountability* application is the location for first access to the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) reports, listings of schools identified under the Public Education Grant (PEG) program, and other information specific to Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

District and education service center administrators are encouraged to apply for access to the TEASE portal. They may also designate others in their district to have access.

### **Gaining Access to TEASE**

---

The gateway to TEASE is located at:

<https://seguin.tea.state.tx.us/apps/logon.asp>

To access any TEASE application, district staff need to obtain a TEASE account. To request a TEASE account for the *ACCT–Accountability* application, district administrators must complete a form online, obtain the required signatures, and follow instructions for mailing or faxing the form.

The “Request for Access to Accountability” form can be downloaded at:

<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/forms/tease/accountability.htm>

There are specific registration forms for each TEASE web application. Forms for all available applications can be downloaded from the TEASE Applications Reference page at:

<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=2684>

Depending on the volume of requests, it may take several days for a request to be processed. Requestors will receive an email from TEA Security once the application(s) has/have been added to their TEASE accounts.

### **MULTIPLE DISTRICT ACCESS**

Certain charter operators and Education Service Center (ESC) staff may need access to the secure information for multiple school districts and/or schools. To gain access to TEASE Accountability information, multiple-district users must obtain the superintendent’s signature for each district to which the user requests access (one request form per district/charter). Multiple district login accounts do not provide access to all districts in any single ESC region, only to those districts that have granted access for the user. For information about

multiple-district TEASE user accounts for the Accountability application, please contact the Division of Performance Reporting via email at [performance.reporting@tea.state.tx.us](mailto:performance.reporting@tea.state.tx.us).

## Confidentiality

---

Data on many of the reports available through TEASE are NOT masked to protect individual student confidentiality. Remember that individual student information is confidential under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). The TEASE site is intended for district use or ESC use with district permission only.

## Most Current Products Only

---

The TEASE *ACCT–Accountability* site is not an archive of information; it is intended to contain only the most recent products released. When a reporting cycle begins for a new year, the prior year’s final products are taken off the site. Districts are encouraged to save the products provided on this site to a local secured location.

## State Accountability Products Available on TEASE

---

The following list shows the state accountability releases planned for the 2011 cycle in the order they are released. See *Chapter 17 – Calendar and Preview* for specific dates. Two items are new for 2011: lists of students included in the ELL Progress Indicator, and lists of students subject to the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision. Additional information is provided below about these new items.

- Pairing Application (Data Collection)
- AEA Charter Choice (Data Collection)
- AEA At-Risk Registration Criterion
- Completion and Dropout Data Posted
  - Lists of students who are dropouts
  - Campus and district dropout rates
  - Lists of students in the 4-year completion cohort
  - Campus and district 4-year completion and graduation rates
  - Lists of students in the 5-year completion cohort
  - Campus and district 5-year completion and graduation rates
- Preview Accountability Data Tables without Ratings Posted (Standard and AEA)
  - Campus and District Data Tables
  - Student Download for SSI grades
  - Student Download for ELL Progress Indicator (new in 2011)
  - Student Download for Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision (new in 2011)
- Ratings Appeal Registration System
- Accountability Data Tables with Ratings Posted (Standard and AEA)
  - Campus and District Data Tables
  - District Rating Summary Reports
- AEA Campus Registration Process (Data Collection)

- Appeals Response Letters Posted
- Ratings Update and Gold Performance Acknowledgments Posted (Standard and AEA)
  - Updated Campus and District Data Tables
  - Updated District Rating Summary Reports
  - Campus and District downloads of Data Table information
- Updated Preliminary Longitudinal Cohorts Posted
- Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) Reports Posted

## **ELL PROGRESS INDICATOR STUDENT DOWNLOADS**

Records are provided for ELL students meeting the criteria for inclusion in the ELL Progress Indicator. Variables show student identification, demographic, and program area participation information. Performance on TAKS, TELPAS, or both is shown. Mobility variables indicate whether or not the students meet the accountability subset criteria. Students are identified as contributing to the denominator and the numerator of this indicator. From these data districts will be able to replicate the 2011 ELL Progress Indicator percentage shown on their data tables.

## **FEDERAL RACE/ETHNICITY STUDENT DOWNLOADS**

Records are provided for students that were subject to the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision. Variables show the students' current year race and ethnicity values as well as their prior year ethnic information. An indicator is provided to show which students are evaluated under AEA procedures. From these data districts can see how many and which students were added to the African American and White student groups in order to reevaluate performance under the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision.

## **Registration of Appeals on TEASE**

---

Districts wishing to appeal a campus or district accountability rating should register their intention to appeal using the appeal application on the TEASE Accountability website. The 2011 State Accountability Ratings Appeals Registration Process allows districts to track the status of their state accountability rating appeal(s). The Appeal Registration Process is open from July 19 through August 12, 2011.

The link to appeal a state accountability rating is located on the ACCT page. Click on the ACCT tab at the top of any page, then scroll to the bottom of that page, under **Appeal of Rating**.

To register an appeal, districts must: 1) confirm or correct their district mailing address; and, 2) submit an appeal registration form. See the sample form on next page.

Submitting a 2011 State Accountability Appeals Registration Form informs TEA of your intention to appeal one or more 2011 state accountability ratings; however, submission of this form does not constitute an appeal. Districts must also mail an appeal packet that includes all relevant information necessary for TEA to process the appeal.

After registering, districts are encouraged to check the status of their appeal using the Appeal Status Report. This report provides a summary of the appeal registration and will also

indicate the date the mailed appeal packet was received by the Division of Performance Reporting.

Automated email notifications will be sent to districts when the electronic appeal registration form is submitted, when the mailed appeal packet arrives at TEA, and when the TEA response letter has been mailed to the district superintendent. The automated emails will be sent to the district superintendent and the person who submitted the appeal registration form in TEASE.

Appeals will be evaluated based on the required documentation submitted in the mailed appeal packet as described in *Chapter 15 – Appealing the Ratings* of this *Manual*. All appeals must meet the requirements outlined in Chapter 15.

## Appendix J – Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision

In October 2007, the United States Department of Education (USDE) issued their final guidance to educational institutions on the adoption of new federal standards for collecting and reporting race and ethnicity for students and staff. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) implemented the new federal standard beginning with the 2009-10 school year. That year, TEA collected race and ethnicity under both the new and former definitions, allowing for one year of transition.

Beginning with the 2010-11 data collection, race/ethnicity data were 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 2010-11 Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) answer documents were pre-coded from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) with the new definitions. As with all demographic information that is pre-coded on the answer documents, changes can be made at the time of testing.

### Comparison of Former and New Definitions

Under the former race/ethnicity categories, five reporting categories were available. Under the new race/ethnicity categories, seven reporting categories are available; one ethnic category (Hispanic/Latino), five individual race categories, and one multiple-race category.

**Table 34: Comparison of Race and Ethnicity Categories, 2010 vs. 2011**

<b>Former Race/Ethnicity Categories</b> (prior to and including 2009-10 school year)	<b>New Race/Ethnicity Categories</b> (beginning with 2009-10 school year)
Native American	American Indian or Alaska Native
Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
Black or African American	Black or African American
Hispanic	Hispanic/Latino
White	White
<i>(not available)</i>	Two or More Races

Under the new reporting definitions, respondents who select “Hispanic/Latino” 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/Latino” for ethnicity and only one category for race will be counted in the single racial category. Respondents who select “Not Hispanic/Latino” for ethnicity and more than one category for race will be counted in the category “Two or More Races.”

### Accountability Student Groups

A fundamental feature of Texas’ accountability systems [state and federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)] is that the performance of individual student groups is considered in determining ratings or statuses. While the specific student groups used varies between systems, both the AYP and state rating systems include an evaluation of the three most

populous race/ethnicity categories in the state: African American, Hispanic, and White. Under the 2011 state and AYP systems, indicators based on 2010-11 data will use the new, federal definitions for African American, Hispanic, and White. Even though there are more reporting categories under the federal definitions (seven instead of five), no additional racial or ethnic student groups will be evaluated in the state or federal accountability systems. This means results for students who indicate they are Two or More Races will be evaluated in the All Students student group only and not among the three individual race/ethnicity accountability student groups (African American, Hispanic, or White).

## **Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision**

---

Data collected for the 2009-10 and 2010-11 school years show that a large number of multiracial students who are now categorized as Two or More Races would have been included in either the African American or White student groups using the former definitions. The loss of these students from the African American or White groups could have an adverse effect on the group's performance. To minimize the impact of the new definitions on 2011 accountability, TEA will apply the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision. This provision will apply to the TAKS Met Standard indicator used for state accountability ratings and the Reading and Mathematics performance and participation results used for the AYP statuses. Under this provision, certain students coded as Two or More Races in 2011 will be re-attributed to either the White or African American student groups based on their racial category on the spring 2010 TAKS answer documents.

If the addition of these students into the White and/or African American groups results in a higher rating or status, then the campus or district will be assigned the higher outcome.

This provision applies for the 2011 accountability year only. Under state standard procedures only the TAKS Met Standard indicator is subject to the provision. Under state Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) procedures only the TAKS Progress indicator is affected. Under AYP, it applies to the Reading and Mathematics performance and participation results.

This provision does not apply to the ELL Progress, Annual Dropout Rate, Completion Rate, or Graduation Rate indicators. The provision does not apply to any Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) indicators. For a complete list of the race and ethnicity definitions used for these indicators, see *Appendix D* of this manual, or the *2011 AYP Guide*.

The provision will be applied automatically; there is no need to request it. The official accountability data for the assessment indicator(s) will be the data that does not include the multiracial students in the separate student groups. If a campus or district rating is raised due to this provision, a message on the data tables will state the provision was used.

### **STUDENTS IDENTIFIED**

Under this provision, students who indicate their ethnicity is not Hispanic/Latino and select multiple races that include both African American and White will be identified based on information submitted on their 2010-11 test answer documents at the time of testing.

The former race/ethnicity definitions for these students will be obtained from the 2009-10 TAKS answer documents. For students reported as African American or White in 2009-10, their 2011 performance will be added to the African American or White student group performance, respectively. Students reporting more than one race that includes both African

American and White are eligible for redistribution. Of these students, only the performance of those reported as either African American or White in 2009-10 TAKS results are redistributed to the appropriate student group.

## METHODOLOGY

Under the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision, all accountability systems (AYP, state standard, and state AEA) are computed using the modified student group performance. If the recalculated African American and White student group result produces a higher rating for a campus or district, the higher rating will be assigned. The use of the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision can only elevate accountability outcomes. In no case will the provision be used to lower a rating or status.

The performance of *all* the identified students will be redistributed: both those who meet the TAKS passing standard and those who do not.

Redistributed students will increase the size of the African American and White groups. As a result, the number of student groups meeting the minimum size criteria may also increase.

Modified student group results will affect improvement or safe harbor calculations.

The performance of identified students will be redistributed into all subjects. An improved accountability outcome is only achieved if the additional students' performance (or participation) in every relevant subject supports a better outcome. The performance of the additional students cannot be used for some subjects but not others.

## OTHER INFORMATION

- *Prior Year Unavailable.* Race/ethnicity under the former definition will be available only for students that can be matched in the prior year. No prior-year information will be available for some students, such as grade 3 students or students who moved to the state during the 2010-11 school year.
- *Prior Year Ethnicities on TAKS.* For students with multiple occurrences of ethnicity information on the prior year TAKS answer documents, the latest ethnicity will be used. This may mean a student's prior year ethnicity used for purposes of the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision may not be the same as the ethnic group used for this student in the 2010 accountability system outcomes.
- *Values shown on Accountability Data Tables.* The official accountability results shown on all accountability products and reports, such as data downloads and accountability data tables will reflect the African American and White student group performance without the redistributed results.
- *More than one Rating Category.* If the provision results in a higher state accountability rating, the highest rating will be assigned even in the unlikely event that the new rating is more than one category higher than the initial rating.
- *Required Improvement/Safe Harbor.* Under the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision, the recalculated student group results will be compared to the corresponding prior year results in order to evaluate Required Improvement for state accountability and apply the Safe Harbor provision for federal accountability. The prior year performance (or participation) results reported on the current year data table remain unchanged under the

calculations for this provision. The amount of actual change (current year minus prior year) will differ from the official data, however, the amount of improvement or performance improvement/safe harbor needed is unchanged under this provision.

- *Exceptions Provision.* Under the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision, the recalculated state student group performance could have an effect on the use of exceptions. No additional exceptions will be charged and no exceptions will be removed due to the application of this provision. If a higher rating is achieved through the use of one or more exceptions that were not used prior to the provision, the higher rating will be awarded and no additional exception(s) will be charged. If the use of the provision results in the same rating outcome but eliminates the need for one or more exceptions to obtain the same rating, the use of the exception(s) will not be withdrawn. Reuse of exceptions is not an issue in 2012 since no state ratings will be assigned that year.
- *Appeals.* Given districts and campuses will have the benefit of rating evaluations calculated under two student group options, state and federal appeals related to the race/ethnicity student groups for the assessment indicators will not be considered in 2011. See *Chapter 15* of this manual or the *2011 AYP Guide* for more details.

## SAFEGUARDS

In order to monitor possible manipulation of the race/ethnicity data for accountability purposes, the agency plans to conduct analyses to identify districts and campuses with significant discrepancies between the percent of students who are classified as Two or More Races on the spring 2011 assessment documents and the fall 2010 PEIMS enrollment files.

## TOOLS TO ASSIST DISTRICTS

To assist districts interested in seeing which students' results were subject to the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision, new products will be available at the TEA Secure Environment (TEASE).

For each accountability system, student-level information of the affected students is provided that shows the students selected for redistribution into the African American and White student groups. Only students selected for redistribution are identified on each of the accountability products (AYP, state standard, and state AEA).

For state accountability ratings, the student level information will be available on July 19, 2011 concurrent with the release of the Preview Data Tables. For AYP, the student level information will be available on July 27, 2011 concurrent with the release of the Preliminary AYP Data Tables.

## Helpful Links

---

See *Appendix F* of the *2011-2012 PEIMS Data Standards* at:

<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/WorkArea/linkit.aspx?LinkIdentifier=id&ItemID=2147497826&li bID=2147497823>.

A copy of the final guidance published in the Federal Register can be found at <http://www2.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/other/2007-4/101907c.pdf>.

This reporting standard was used during the 2000 Census.

## PUBLICATION ORDER FORM

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Remitter Name \_\_\_\_\_

Send to (name, if different) \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

To place an order for a publication, fill out the information below and make check or money order payable to: Texas Education Agency

Quantity	Title of documents requested	Publication No.	Cost	TOTAL
	2011 Accountability Manual	GE11-602-02	\$14.00	
<i>Price includes postage, handling, and state tax.</i>				

### FOR TAX EXEMPT ORDERS ONLY

Make check or money order payable to: Texas Education Agency Purchase orders are accepted only from Texas educational institutions and government agencies.

Quantity	Title of documents requested	Publication No.	Cost	TOTAL
	2011 Accountability Manual	GE11-602-02	\$12.00	

**IF YOU ARE MAILING A PURCHASE ORDER\* OR NEED INFORMATION, MAIL TO:**

Texas Education Agency  
Publications Distribution  
1701 North Congress Avenue  
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

**\*Purchase orders are accepted ONLY from Texas Funded Educational Institutions and Texas Government Agencies**

**IF YOU ARE MAILING A CHECK OR MONEY ORDER, REMIT THIS FORM WITH PAYMENT TO:**

Texas Education Agency  
Publications Distribution  
P.O. Box 13817  
Austin, Texas 78711-3817

**Make check or money order payable to: Texas Education Agency.**