

## Accountability System for 2011 – Standard Procedures Educator Focus Group Proposal

### Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) Indicators

1. Use of Commended Performance. In 2011, districts and campuses will be required to meet a Commended Performance (CP) standard in order to achieve the *Recognized* or *Exemplary* ratings. The CP indicator will be defined as the percent of students achieving the commended level. The CP indicator will include the same test results as the TAKS % Met Standard indicator. This means in 2011, commended performance will be evaluated for TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-Modified (TAKS-M), and TAKS-Alternate (TAKS-Alt).

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

The CP indicator standards are 15% for *Recognized* and 25% for *Exemplary*. No additional features will be applied to this indicator—not Required Improvement (RI), not the Exceptions Provision, and not the Texas Projection Measure (TPM). TPM was originally planned to be used with the CP indicator; however, evaluations conducted to date of the accuracy of the commended projections do not yield the same levels of accuracy as projections to met standard. In order to use projections to commended for high stakes accountability, the accuracy of the commended projections must be greater than the data currently support.

Even though CP is evaluated as a base indicator, Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPAs) for all five subject-area commended performance indicators will still be awarded at a standard of 30%. The GPA commended indicators evaluate All Students and the four additional student groups (African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged).

2. Use of Texas Projection Measure (TPM). On July 8, 2010, the commissioner sent a letter to all district superintendents that presented several options for use of TPM in 2011 to ensure student performance is acknowledged and the state accountability system remains transparent. Options to be considered included:
  - Suspension of the use of TPM for accountability ratings.
  - Continued use of TPM in state accountability, but only for districts that elect to use it.
  - Modifications to the calculation of TPM and / or its use to include additional safeguards such as:
    - applying performance floors,
    - counting each student who fails but is projected to pass as a fraction of a passer,
    - prohibiting TPM to be used for the same measure in a subsequent year,
    - limiting the number of measures for which TPM can be used in a given year, and
    - limiting which rating categories can use it.

Eight options that focused on these TPM variations were presented for Educator Focus Group consideration. The options ranged from the 2011 base model which assumed no change to the use of TPM as a feature, to the option of removing TPM from the accountability system.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Maintain the use of the TPM feature in the 2011 rating system as it was used in 2010 and 2009. Include TPM for TAKS-M and the student growth measure for TAKS-Alt.

*Rationale:* The addition of the Commended Performance and the English Language Learners (ELL) Progress indicators in the final year of the current accountability system will have a significant impact on the number of districts and campuses that achieve the *Recognized* and *Exemplary* ratings. It

should also be noted that TPM will not be applied to the Commended Performance indicators, as previously planned. Further, the rigor of the TAKS base indicator is increasing in 2011 due to the inclusion of all TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt results, and increases in the *Academically Acceptable* standards for mathematics and science. Use of the TPM also aligns with the use of a growth measure which will be a required feature in the state rating system under House Bill (HB) 3. And, use of the TPM in state accountability aligns with the AYP system, which incorporates TPM and is sanctioned by the USDE.

3. Standards. Standards for 2011 were published in the *2010 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule to provide districts and campuses with advance notice before the 2010-11 school year began. In 2011, the mathematics and science standards for TAKS % Met Standard increase by five percentage points each. The 2011 *Recognized* standard for TAKS % Commended is 15% and the *Exemplary* standard for TAKS % Commended is 25%.

TAKS State Accountability Standards			
	2010 Used	2011 Adopted	
	% Met Standard	% Met Standard	% Commended
<b>Exemplary</b>	90%	90%	<b>25%</b>
<b>Recognized</b>	<b>80%</b>	80%	<b>15%</b>
<b>Academically Acceptable</b>			
<b>Reading/ELA</b>	70%	70%	n/a
<b>Writing, Social Studies</b>	70%	70%	n/a
<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>65%</b>	n/a
<b>Science</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>60%</b>	n/a

4. Required Improvement (RI). Use of this feature is discussed separately in the Race / Ethnicity section.
5. Exceptions Provision. After both RI and TPM have been evaluated, the Exceptions Provision is evaluated next to see if exceptions can be used to elevate a rating to the next higher rating only. The use of the Exceptions Provision will continue to be based on meeting the minimum performance floor using the percent of students who pass the tests. Students who are not passers but meet the TPM cannot contribute toward meeting the exceptions floor.

Given the increase in *Academically Acceptable* standards for mathematics and science, the floor requirement for these two subjects will increase by five points each—to 55% for science and 60% for mathematics.

The Exceptions Provision is not available for use with the CP indicator.

The ELL Progress indicator is added beginning with the 2011 accountability ratings. Specifics regarding the ELL Progress Indicator and the Exceptions Provision are discussed separately, below. However, note that the number of exceptions allowed and the measures counted to determine the number allowed will not change from prior use.

6. Race / Ethnicity. In 2010-11, PEIMS collected race / ethnicity information using the new federal definitions only. The assessment answer documents will collect race / ethnicity information using the new definitions only (pre-coded from PEIMS). Therefore, state accountability, federal accountability, and Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) and related reports will use the new definitions for all the current year (2010-11) indicators. See the separate topic of Race / Ethnicity for details about how the student groups based on race / ethnicity will be used for 2011 accountability.

## Completion Rate Indicator

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

Beginning with the class of 2009 (2010 accountability) all years of the cohort use the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition.

For 2010 accountability, districts and campuses that served grade 9 and grades 11 or 12 in the first and fifth years of the cohort were evaluated for Completion Rate I. High schools that did not meet this requirement were not evaluated on this indicator in 2010.

Federal regulations require states to hold any high school or district that serves grade 12 accountable for meeting the adequate yearly progress (AYP) graduation rate goal or targets. In order to satisfy the federal requirement that all high schools serving grade 12 be accountable for graduation rates, the methodology for calculating campus longitudinal rates for federal and state accountability purposes will be expanded beginning with the class of 2010. The expanded methodology will create completion rates for campuses with grade 9 and either grade 11 or 12 in both year 1 and year 5 **OR** campuses with grade 12 in both year 1 and year 5. This will capture all campuses that would be included under the current rules for state and federal accountability plus those that meet the grade 12 criterion.

1. District Completion Rates Assigned to Campuses. Even with a change in methodology which would create completion rates for more campuses, a significant number of secondary campuses are not evaluated on completion rates. This is because either they do not meet the minimum size criteria, or because, even with the expanded methodology described above, the campus does not meet all of the criteria to have a completion rate calculated for the campus.

To address this issue, in the accountability system from 2004 through 2007, district completion rates were assigned to campuses that served students in any of the grades 9 through 12 but did not have their own completion data. The use of district assigned completion rates was suspended beginning with 2008 ratings due to the phase-in of the more rigorous NCES dropout definition. As stated in the *2010 Accountability Manual*, the use of the district rate for secondary campuses without their own rate was planned to resume in 2011.

Some deficiencies in the previously used methodology were apparent between 2004 and 2007, but these were largely resolved through the appeals process. For example, a few appeals were received that asserted district rates were substituted inappropriately for some campuses (e.g., early college high schools). Other appeals asserted that campus rates were calculated for some schools that did not fit the criteria (e.g., schools only serving students in special education in the secondary grades). More recent concerns have been expressed regarding new campuses that are phasing in additional grades and will ultimately be evaluated on their own data, but for which in the meantime, the district rate is perceived to be inappropriate.

Several options that focused on the use of district substituted completion rate values were presented for Educator Focus Group consideration. The options ranged from variations on the previous methodology to the option of not resuming the use of district substituted completion rate values.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Do not resume the use of District Substituted Values (DSV) in the 2011 accountability system.

*Rationale:* The change in the completion rate calculation methodology means that more campuses will have their own rates calculated, lessening the need for DSV. Also, revisiting the issue of how to appropriately hold secondary campuses accountable for students' completion options during

development of the 2013 system is preferable to reintroducing this mechanism the last year of the current rating system. Under AYP procedures, campuses without their own data are not evaluated on the graduation rate indicator, so not applying DSV in state accountability would be consistent with the treatment of this similar situation under AYP.

2. Race / Ethnicity and Student Groups. Unlike the TAKS and Annual Dropout Rate indicators, the race / ethnicity definitions for the longitudinal completion rate for the class of 2010 (2011 accountability) will use the former definitions. For the completion rate indicator, a student's ethnicity is determined from the year of final status. For class of 2010 most students will have a final status from years 1-4 (2006-07 through 2009-10.) Only the continuers (students with a final status in year 5) will use race / ethnicity reported from the new collection. 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.

For 2011 accountability, the Required Improvement (RI) feature will be applied as usual. The former student group ethnicities for the class of 2010 will be compared to the former student group defined ethnicities for the class of 2009.

3. Appeals. A January 5, 2011, letter was sent to district superintendents in which the commissioner strongly encouraged careful review of verification reports to ensure that accurate Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data were submitted prior to the January 20, 2011, PEIMS resubmission deadline. The commissioner emphasized that the leaver records submitted by this deadline will be used to produce the 2009-10 completion, graduation, and dropout rate results that will be evaluated in the 2011 state and federal accountability systems and used to fulfill 2011 state and federal monitoring requirements.

To reduce the amount of district and agency resources expended on unsuccessful completion rate appeals, the appeal chapter of the *2011 Accountability Manual* will more clearly delineate the types of appeals that will not be considered for the leaver-related indicators.

The *Manual* will also reiterate, as in 2009 and 2010, appeals requesting that HB 3 exclusions be applied to the 2011 state ratings will not be considered.

### **Grade 7-8 Annual Dropout Rate Indicator**

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

1. Standards. In 2008, the grade 7-8 annual dropout rate standard was reset to 2.0% for all rating levels, with a multi-year phase-in process for ultimately achieving a rate of 1.0%. Doubling the standard from 1.0% to 2.0% that year made it comparable to the standard used to evaluate rates under the prior definition. For 2011, the Annual Dropout Rate standard is 1.6% as published in the *2010 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule. This is a decrease of 0.2% from the 2010 standard of 1.8%, making the indicator more rigorous in the last year of the current rating system.
2. Race / Ethnicity and Student Groups. The 2009-10 annual dropout rates (to be used in 2011 accountability) are calculated from enrollment and attendance data submitted in 2009-10 (denominator) and leaver data submitted in 2010-11 (numerator). Because the leaver data

(numerator) is only available with the new ethnicity designations, the race / ethnicity student groups for the 2011 Annual Dropout Rate indicator can only be created using the new ethnicity definitions.

<b>Annual Dropout Rate Ethnicity Transition</b>		
<b>Accountability Year</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
<b>Dropout Year</b>	<b>2008-09</b>	<b>2009-10</b>
Enrollment and Attendance Data (Denominator)		
Data Collection Year	2007-08	2009-10
Available Ethnic Data	Former only	Former and New
Leaver Data (Numerator)		
Data Collection Year	2009-10	2010-11
Available Ethnic Data	Former and New	New only
Dropout Rate (Numerator/Denominator) Ethnicity	Former	New

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Use the newly-defined race / ethnicity groups for the Annual Dropout Rate in a manner that is consistent with the use of these new student groups with the TAKS base indicator, as described in the Race / Ethnicity section below. This means do not attribute students who select any combination of two or more races to either Black/African American or White student groups. Students who indicate their ethnicity is not Hispanic/Latino and who select the single racial category of Black/African American will be counted in the African American student group, and students who indicate their ethnicity is not Hispanic/Latino and who select the single racial category of White will be counted in the white student group.

*Rationale:* Although students who are categorized as Two or More Races under the new definition will not be part of any student group, their dropout status will be evaluated as part of the All Students results.

3. Required Improvement (RI). The race / ethnicity student groups between 2008-09 (2010 accountability) and 2009-10 (2011 accountability) are based on different definitions, and it is not possible to recalculate either year to create matching definitions.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Although the student groups based on race / ethnicity have different definitions between 2008-09 (2010 accountability) and 2009-10 (2011 accountability), it is recommended that RI be used in 2011.

*Rationale:* Despite the different definitions for race / ethnicity student groups across the two years, the race / ethnicity student groups chosen for use in 2011 will be very similar to the three ethnic groups used in 2010. Also, the use of RI was continued with the longitudinal completion rate indicator during the years that the change in the dropout definition was being phased in, so there is a precedent for using RI when the data are not perfectly comparable; particularly when this feature can only help. Also, only the three ethnic student groups have new definitions. RI based on All Students and economically disadvantaged should not be prevented due to the definitional differences of the other student groups.

4. Appeals. A January 5, 2011, letter was sent to district superintendents in which the commissioner strongly encouraged careful review of verification reports to ensure that accurate PEIMS data were submitted prior to the January 20, 2011, PEIMS resubmission deadline. The commissioner emphasized that the leaver records submitted by this deadline will be used to produce the 2009-10 completion, graduation, and dropout rate results that will be evaluated in the 2011 state and federal accountability systems and used to fulfill 2011 state and federal monitoring requirements.

To reduce the amount of district and agency resources expended on unsuccessful dropout rate appeals, the appeal chapter of the *2011 Accountability Manual* will more clearly delineate the types of appeals that will not be considered for the leaver-related indicators.

The *Manual* will also reiterate that, as in 2009 and 2010, appeals requesting that HB 3 exclusions be applied to the 2011 state ratings will not be considered.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Allow appeals for the Annual Dropout Rate indicator based on race / ethnicity of grade 7-8 dropouts who are Two or More Races in 2011. Certain limitations will apply and will be specified in the *2011 Manual*.

*Rationale:* No special provision will be applied to the Annual Dropout Rate indicator to distribute grade 7-8 students categorized as Two or More Races into either the African American or White groups based on 2009-10 reporting of these same students under the former definitions. Therefore, allow the appeals process to accommodate districts that may find the omission of grade 7-8 students who are Two or More Races adversely affects their ratings.

### **English Language Learners Progress Indicator**

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

The ELL Progress indicator was reported on the 2008-09 and 2009-10 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) reports as a preview indicator for the 2011 accountability system. The ELL Progress indicator shows the percent of current and former (monitored) limited English proficient (LEP) students who:

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

Results from the TAKS tests in Spanish are not included because this indicator measures progress towards English language attainment. Only TELPAS *reading* results are included. TELPAS measures of English acquisition in listening, speaking, and writing are not included. Note that the indicator reported on the 2009-10 AEIS report as a preview of the 2011 accountability indicator did not include results from the Texas Projection Measure (TPM).

Beginning with the 2011 ratings, the ELL Progress Indicator will be incorporated into the rating system as a separate indicator. Campuses and districts must meet a standard of 60% on the ELL Progress Indicator in order to attain a *Recognized* or *Exemplary* rating.

The indicator includes ELL students who are current and monitored LEP students. There must be at least 30 current and monitored limited English proficient (LEP) students tested in order for the indicator to be evaluated. Individual race / ethnicity student groups and the economically disadvantaged student group are not evaluated.

RI is available for the ELL Progress Indicator in a manner that parallels the use of RI with the TAKS base indicator. A district or campus can achieve a higher rating if improvement on this indicator is sufficient to meet the target in two years. No floor is required to be able to use RI for the ELL Progress Indicator.

1. Use of TPM with the ELL Progress Indicator. As stated above, the ELL Progress Indicator reported on the 2008-09 and 2009-10 AEIS reports as the 2011 preview did not include TPM results. The ELL Progress Indicator was built and reported in AEIS to specifically exclude TPM. The option of including TPM results with this indicator was considered by the 2011 Educator Focus Group.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Do not include TPM results in the ELL Progress Indicator.

*Rationale:* The indicator evaluates progress towards English language proficiency and not general academic achievement in reading. Therefore, it is not recommended that TPM be included in the ELL Progress Indicator used for 2011 state accountability, regardless of the decision to use TPM with the TAKS Met Standard indicator.

2. Use of the Exceptions Provision with ELL Progress Indicator. At the present time, the Exceptions Provision is only available for use with the TAKS Met Standard indicator. It is applied after the use of Required Improvement and TPM. In order to attain a higher rating, campuses or districts may use an exception for any of the 25 TAKS Met Standard measures (5 subjects multiplied by 5 groups: All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged). The Exceptions Provision does not apply to the Completion Rate I, the Annual Dropout Rate, or the Commended Performance indicators. Campuses and districts must meet minimum performance floors to be eligible to use this provision and other safeguards are applied. In the current system, all 25 TAKS measures are eligible for the Exceptions Provision in order to attain a rating of *Academically Acceptable, Recognized, or Exemplary*.

The following table provides a review of the exceptions table as applied in the 2010 accountability system. Floor requirements were five points below the standard for all subjects and all rating categories.

**Exceptions Provision Look-up Table**

<b>Exceptions for moving to <i>Academically Acceptable or Recognized</i></b>		<b>Exceptions for moving to <i>Exemplary</i></b>	
Number of Assessment Measures Evaluated	Maximum Number of Exceptions Allowed	Number of Assessment Measures Evaluated	Maximum Number of Exceptions Allowed
1 – 4	0 exceptions	1 - 9	0 exceptions
5 – 8	1 exception		
9 – 11	2 exceptions	10 or more	1 exception
12 – 15	3 exceptions		
16 or more	4 exceptions		

The *2010 Accountability Manual, Chapter 18 - Preview of 2011 and Beyond*, described that a campus or district would be able to use the Exceptions Provision with this indicator in 2011. The application of the Exceptions Provision to an indicator that only applies to the *Recognized* and *Exemplary* rating categories presents new challenges. Additional details regarding the application of this provision to this indicator were presented and the 2011 Educator Focus Group was asked to revisit their recommendation to use this feature with this indicator.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Apply the Exceptions Provision to the ELL Progress indicator as previously recommended. Do not alter either the “look-up” table or the number of exceptions allowed. Continue to use the number of TAKS Met Standard measures evaluated to determine the number of exceptions allowed. Impose a floor of 55% (five points below the 60% standard). In order to use an exception for the ELL Progress indicator, there must be at least one allowable unused exception left after applying exceptions to the TAKS indicators.

*Rationale:* Exceptions are intended to apply to new assessment measures, especially during their first year of use. For example, the Exceptions Provision was applied to the SDAA II indicator when it was evaluated as a separate indicator in the state accountability system. While preview data predict that most campuses and districts evaluated on this indicator will meet the 60% standard, the indicator can be more challenging for some school types depending on the instructional model they offer to their limited English proficient students. This provision provides a safe harbor to schools that might

otherwise feel pressure to abandon or alter their programs. The ELL Progress indicator will not contribute to the count of the number of measures evaluated to determine the maximum number of exceptions allowed given this indicator does not impact all rating levels.

**Race / Ethnicity**

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 ethnicity and race data for students and staff. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) implemented the new federal standard for the collection of ethnicity and race information beginning with PEIMS data collected for the 2009–10 school year.

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

The test answer document is the primary source for race / ethnicity information for assessment participation and performance data. The 2010-11 TAKS answer documents will be pre-coded from 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.

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), five individual race categories, and one multiple-race category, as shown in the following table.

**Race / Ethnicity Categories Under Former and New Definitions**

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

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

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

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

Under the new reporting categories, respondents who select Hispanic/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 select only one category for race, will be counted in the single racial category. Respondents who select Not Hispanic/Latino for ethnicity, and select more than one category for race, will be counted in the Two or More Races category.

The following table provides a comparison of the counts of students by the seven new ethnic categories for 2010-11 compared to 2009-10. (Note the 2010-11 data are preliminary.) Statewide, total student enrollment increased by approximately 86,000 students (1.8%) from the prior year. The Asian, Hispanic/Latino, and the Two or More Races student groups had the highest percentage increases in student enrollment, while the American Indian or Alaska Native group had the largest percentage point decline in enrollment.

### Comparison of New Race / Ethnicity Student Counts for 2009-10 and 2010-11

New Definitions	2009-10	Pct of Total	2010-11	Pct of Total	Pct Change
American Indian or Alaska Native	26,467	0.5%	23,608	0.5%	-10.8%
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific	6,201	0.1%	6,125	0.1%	-1.2%
Asian	162,032	3.3%	169,335	3.4%	+4.5%
Black or African American	632,401	13.0%	637,721	12.9%	+0.8%
Hispanic/Latino	2,398,684	49.5%	2,479,978	50.3%	+3.4%
White	1,547,693	31.9%	1,538,443	31.2%	-0.6%
Two or More Races	74,366	1.5%	78,407	1.6%	+5.4%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4,847,844</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>4,933,617</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>+1.8%</b>

*This table shows student membership in all grades (pre-kindergarten through grade 12).*

As shown in the table above, there are 78,407 students categorized as Two or More Races based on 2010-11 preliminary PEIMS data. Of these students, there were 37,180 who selected more than one race that included both Black/African American and White racial categories. Almost ninety percent (33,413 students) were classified as Black / African American and White only. The following table details all the combinations of races reported for the 37,180 students.

### Counts of Students Classified as Two or More Races Limited to Any Combination of Black/African American and White: 2010-11

	Student Count	Percent	Cumulative Student Count	Cumulative Percent
AIN/BLK/ISL/WHI	67	0.18%	67	0.18%
AIN/BLK/ISL/WHI/ASI	270	0.73%	337	0.91%
AIN/BLK/WHI	2,100	5.65%	2,437	6.55%
AIN/BLK/WHI/ASI	182	0.49%	2,619	7.04%
BLK/ISL/WHI	175	0.47%	2,794	7.51%
BLK/ISL/WHI/ASI	54	0.15%	2,848	7.66%
BLK/WHI/ASI	919	2.75%	3,767	10.13%
BLK/WHI	33,413	89.87%	37,180	100.00%

In 2011, the new race / ethnicity definitions will be used for the TAKS and Annual Dropout Rate indicators; however, the former definitions will still be used for the Completion Rate indicator. See the separate topics on these two indicators for more information.

For 2011 state accountability [standard and alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures], several issues related to student groups need decisions—the number of student groups, the definition of the race / ethnicity groups, the treatment of students reported to be Two or more Races, the guidelines for appeals of student race / ethnicity information, and the need to rebuild prior year data for purposes of improvement calculations.

1. Number of Student Groups for 2011 State Accountability. Based on the 2010-11 data, the three race / ethnicity categories (Black / African American, Hispanic / Latino, and White) remain the three most populous race/ethnicity categories at the state level under the new definitions. These correlate with the three major ethnic student groups used in prior years: African American, Hispanic, and White.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Continue to use the five student groups with the following labels for each of the 2011 base indicators:

1. All Students
2. African American
3. Hispanic
4. White
5. Economically Disadvantaged

*Rationale:* No additional student groups beyond the five listed above are proposed to be added to the 2011 accountability system because the composition of the African American, Hispanic, and White groups are similar to prior years. The change in definition does not warrant either an increase or decrease in the number of hurdles possible for the last year of the rating system. Student group stability is preferred since the selection of accountability student groups will be revisited in 2012 for implementation of the new accountability system in 2013.

2. Treatment of Two or More Races. Without changes to the overall number of student groups, the Educator Focus Group considered options to address the results of students who indicate their ethnicity is not Hispanic/Latino and select any combination of two or more races that includes both African American and White race categories. Under the former definition, most of these students would have been assigned to either the African American or White student group in prior accountability cycles. It is anticipated that the option chosen under this topic for the TAKS results used for the 2011 state accountability ratings (standard and AEA procedures) would also be applied to the TAKS results used for the 2011 federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Do not attribute students who select any combination of two or more races to either Black / African American or White students groups. However, apply a secondary process to the ratings system, for the TAKS Met Standard indicator only, where students categorized as Two or More Races are distributed into either the African American or White groups based on the information submitted on the 2009-10 TAKS answer documents for these same students under the former definitions. Only those multi-racial students reporting more than one race that includes both Black/African American and White racial categories will be distributed. If the recalculated African American and White student group performance results in a higher rating for a campus or district, the higher rating will be assigned.

*Rationale:* Although students who are categorized as Two or More Races under the new definition will not be part of any student group, their performance will be evaluated as part of the All Students results and, if applicable, economically disadvantaged student results. Race / ethnicity under the former definition will only be available 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. However, since this secondary process will only be used to help ratings, the possible benefits outweigh its deficiencies.

3. Required Improvement. In order to calculate RI, the 2011 TAKS indicators based on the new race / ethnicity definitions need to be compared to the prior year 2010 results. Given the significant impact of RI on the TAKS base indicator, no options were explored that would suspend the use of RI for the last year of the current system.

The prior year (2010) data could be rebuilt using the new race / ethnicity definition in order to compute RI for the TAKS base indicator. Alternatively, RI could be calculated by comparing 2011 data using the new race / ethnicity definitions compared to the 2010 data using the former definitions.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Do not rebuild the prior year TAKS data. Calculate RI by comparing the 2011 results using the new race / ethnicity data to the 2010 data with student groups defined using the former definitions.

*Rationale:* Rebuilding the prior year data is likely to only have a very minimal impact on rating calculations. The effect on ratings could be both positive and negative. Districts and campuses already have access to their 2010 assessment results built to preview the 2011 accountability indicator. These were published on the 2009-10 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) reports as the 2011 Preview indicator. If the 2010 data were to be rebuilt to accommodate the new student group race / ethnicity definitions, there would be no way to provide this information to districts in advance of the release of their Accountability Data Tables in mid-July 2011. The advantage of knowing the 2010 data that will be used in accountability outweighs any possible advantage of the recalculated results. Maintaining use of prior year results with student groups as previously defined aligns with the use of prior year results in the federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) system.

4. Appeals. Given districts and campuses will have the benefit of rating evaluations calculated under two student group options, state and federal accountability appeals related to the race/ethnicity student groups for the TAKS Met Standard indicator will not be considered in 2011.
5. AEIS and Other Reports. For the 2009-10 AEIS reports, the race / ethnicity categories were based on the former definitions and used the same five columns as in prior years. For 2010-11 and beyond, the new race / ethnicity definitions allow greater disaggregation than in prior years. The seven federally-defined categories are:
  1. American Indian or Alaska Native,
  2. Asian,
  3. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander,
  4. Black or African American,
  5. Hispanic/Latino,
  6. White, and
  7. Two or More Races.

Only indicators collected using the new definition of race / ethnicity can be shown in the seven reporting categories. Many indicators shown on the AEIS reports lag one year behind the current year. For example, the completion rate for the class of 2010 will be shown on the 2010-11 AEIS report, but this indicator will only be available using the former five ethnic categories that year.

The AEIS report also typically provides two years of data for comparative purposes. To the extent possible, the prior-year data will be rebuilt to use the new definitions, so that two years of comparable data can be shown. However, for data that lags one year, it is not possible to rebuild prior-year data using the new definitions. For these indicators it is anticipated that only the most current year of data will be shown.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Display the seven categories as shown above. To accommodate the additional columns in the Performance section of the AEIS report, discontinue the columns showing performance disaggregated by gender; however, continue to make the data aggregated by gender available on AEIS data download products. Annotate the reports to clarify when an indicator is using the former race / ethnicity definitions.

*Rationale:* HB 3 removed language listing gender as a required disaggregation on the performance report, so the deletion of these columns is consistent with current statute.

### **Underreported Students Indicator**

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

The underreported students' rate is calculated by dividing the number of underreported students by the total number of grade 7-12 students served in the prior year.

The counts and rates of underreported students have been used as data quality measures in the accountability system since the 2000 accountability year. Performance is evaluated for All Students only. Individual student groups are not evaluated. Districts cannot be rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized* if either the count or rate of underreported students exceeds the standards. Results are evaluated if there are at least five underreported students and an underreported rate that is equal to or greater than 1.0%. This indicator does not apply to campuses.

1. **Standards.** Standards for 2011 were published in the *2010 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule to provide districts with advance notice before the 2010-11 school year began. The 2011 standards as adopted hold the count standard steady at 150 but decrease the rate from 4.0 percent to 3.0 percent.

The underreported indicator is also used in the Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) Data Validation System. Districts that do not meet the underreported standards are subject to interventions. The interventions are graduated depending on district data results on each leaver data validation indicator, patterns across all leaver data validation indicators, and prior leaver data validation history.

Ratings will not be issued in the 2011-12 school year; however, the PBM Leaver Data Validation system will continue to evaluate this indicator in 2012.

*Focus Group Recommendation:* The 2011 Focus Group recommends the 2012 PBM Leaver Data Validation system evaluate this indicator at a standard of 2.0% for the underreported rate. The group also recommends that the count standard and minimum size criteria remain unchanged in 2012.

*Rationale:* A continued increase in the rigor of this indicator will continue to drive improvements in leaver data quality.

## **Gold Performance Acknowledgments**

1. **TAKS Changes and GPA Indicators.** Ten GPA indicators use TAKS performance: the five TAKS Commended indicators, the two Texas Success Initiative (TSI) indicators, the two Comparable Improvement (CI) indicators, and the College-Ready Graduates indicator. Beginning in 2011, the TAKS indicator used in the base rating system will include all TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt results. The TAKS-based indicators in the GPA system will be treated similarly to the extent possible. There are two exceptions. First, the TSI indicators will continue to be based on TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) performance only. The TSI indicator requires evaluation of TAKS performance at the Higher Education Readiness Component (HERC) standard. The HERC standard does not apply to either TAKS-M or TAKS-Alt since students taking these alternate assessments are not required to pass these tests in order to graduate.

Also, the CI indicators will be based on TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), and TAKS-M performance, but will not include TAKS-Alt performance. The CI indicators require comparing student improvement from one year to the next using changes in their vertical scale scores. These changes at the student level are then summed and averaged at the campus level. TAKS-Alt scores are on a completely different scale and cannot be included with vertical scale score change calculations.

2. **Commended Performance.** In 2011, districts and campuses will be required to meet a Commended Performance (CP) standard in order to achieve the *Recognized* or *Exemplary* ratings. The CP indicator will include the same test results as the TAKS base indicator. CP will be evaluated for TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, and TAKS-Alt.

Even though CP is evaluated as a base indicator, GPAs for each of the five commended indicators (reading/ELA, mathematics, science, social studies, and writing) will remain available under the GPA

system. In 2011, the GPA standard on CP is 30% for each of the five subject area indicators. The GPA commended indicators evaluate All Students and the African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged student groups. By contrast, the CP base indicator will only evaluate All Students (regardless of the number of examinees) and the Economically Disadvantaged student group (only if minimum size criteria are met). Only reading/ELA and mathematics will be evaluated. The *Exemplary* standard is 25%, five points lower than the GPA standard. The *Recognized* standard is 15%.

Campuses and districts may earn GPA acknowledgments on commended performance, yet not be rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized*. Conversely, campuses and districts may be rated either *Exemplary* or *Recognized* and not earn acknowledgments on commended performance.

3. Standards for 2011. In 2011 standards remain stable for all GPA indicators with the exception of the College-Ready Graduates indicator, which will increase by five points from 35% to 40%.
4. Race / Ethnicity and Student Groups. The following table lists each of the GPA indicators with the available options for creating race / ethnicity variables using the former, the new, or both definitions. For two of the indicators, Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment and Attendance Rate, the race / ethnicity variables can be constructed using either the former or the new definitions.

**Use of Race / Ethnicity Definitions with GPA Indicators**

	GPA Indicator	Race / Ethnicity Options	Year of Data	Race / Ethnicity to be Used
<b>Prior-Year Data</b>				
1	Adv. Course/Dual Enrollment	Both	2009-10	TBD
2	AP/IB	New	2009-10	New
3	Attendance Rate	Both	2009-10	TBD
4	College-Ready Graduates	New	Class of 2010	New
5	RHSP/DAP Graduates	New	Class of 2010	New
6	SAT/ACT	New	Class of 2010	New
<b>Current-Year Data</b>				
7-8	TSI	New	2010-11	New
9-13	TAKS Commended	New	2010-11	New
14-15	Comparable Improvement	New	2010-11	New

*Focus Group Recommendation:* Use the newly-defined race / ethnicity groups for the GPA indicators in a manner that is consistent with the use of these new student groups with the TAKS base indicator. This means do not attribute students who select any combination of two or more races to either Black / African American or White students groups. Under this option, students who indicate their ethnicity is not Hispanic / Latino and who select the single racial category of Black / African American are counted in the African American student group, and students who indicate their ethnicity is not Hispanic / Latino and who select the single racial category of White are counted in the white student group. Students who are Two or More Races will not be part of any student group, but their performance will be evaluated as part of the All Students results.

Do not apply a secondary process to the GPA system where students categorized as Two or More Races are distributed into either the African American or White groups based on 2009-10 reporting of these same students under the former definitions to determine if acknowledgment outcomes would be better using these alternate groups.

Use of new race / ethnicity definitions for Attendance Rate and Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment is preferred over use of the former definitions for these two indicators for which there is a choice.

*Rationale:* Though students categorized as Two or More Races will not be part of any student group, redistributing them into either the Black / African American or White student groups is not as critical as with the ratings system since the GPA system is independent of the rating system.

Use of new race / ethnicity definitions for all GPA indicators is preferred because a uniform definition across all indicators is less confusing. Although current plans call for the attendance rate indicator used for 2011 AYP to evaluate school year 2009-10 using the former race / ethnicity definitions, consistency among the GPA indicators is preferred over consistency between the AYP and state accountability system uses of Attendance Rate.

### 2011 Indicator Components—2010 TAKS, by test version, and TPM Performance Results Shown Separately

Subject and Student Group	2010 TAKS only (1)	2010 TAKS (Accommodated) Only (2)	2010 TAKS-Modified Only (3)	2010 TAKS-Alt Only (4)	2010 Met TPM but Did Not Meet Std (5) [Den = $\sum(1-4)$ ]	2010 Met Std OR Met TPM Num = $\sum(1-5)$ , Den = $\sum(1-4)$
<b>Reading/ELA</b>						
All Students	2,497,245 / 2,726,540 = 92%	53,288 / 96,571 = 55%	96,760 / 113,913 = 85%	22,814 / 24,586 = 93%	151,189 / 2,961,610 = 5%	2,821,296 / 2,961,610 = 95%
African American	320,115 / 361,127 = 89%	9,017 / 18,056 = 50%	21,780 / 25,689 = 85%	4,195 / 4,534 = 93%	25,723 / 409,406 = 6%	380,830 / 409,406 = 93%
Hispanic	1,135,193 / 1,286,562 = 88%	21,749 / 43,994 = 49%	47,975 / 57,472 = 83%	10,509 / 11,364 = 92%	95,796 / 1,399,392 = 7%	1,311,222 / 1,399,392 = 94%
White	928,122 / 961,033 = 97%	21,605 / 33,041 = 65%	25,516 / 28,946 = 88%	7,240 / 7,743 = 94%	26,828 / 1,030,763 = 3%	1,009,311 / 1,030,763 = 98%
Economically Disadvantaged	1,315,924 / 1,504,305 = 87%	32,250 / 64,632 = 50%	73,897 / 87,591 = 84%	14,569 / 15,674 = 93%	119,708 / 1,672,202 = 7%	1,556,348 / 1,672,202 = 93%
<b>Mathematics</b>						
All Students	2,320,310 / 2,713,998 = 85%	39,265 / 94,346 = 42%	90,952 / 121,980 = 75%	23,013 / 24,595 = 94%	188,725 / 2,954,919 = 6%	2,662,265 / 2,954,919 = 90%
African American	273,939 / 358,112 = 76%	5,085 / 16,791 = 30%	19,883 / 28,252 = 70%	4,248 / 4,538 = 94%	37,724 / 407,693 = 9%	340,879 / 407,693 = 84%
Hispanic	1,050,531 / 1,281,465 = 82%	17,133 / 43,896 = 39%	44,124 / 58,787 = 75%	10,619 / 11,366 = 93%	102,477 / 1,395,514 = 7%	1,224,884 / 1,395,514 = 88%
White	882,985 / 956,364 = 92%	16,227 / 32,166 = 50%	25,591 / 33,171 = 77%	7,275 / 7,746 = 94%	45,850 / 1,029,447 = 4%	977,928 / 1,029,447 = 95%
Economically Disadvantaged	1,202,416 / 1,497,009 = 80%	23,965 / 62,998 = 38%	67,717 / 91,427 = 74%	14,716 / 15,681 = 94%	130,844 / 1,667,115 = 8%	1,439,658 / 1,667,115 = 86%
<b>Science</b>						
All Students	962,944 / 1,135,571 = 85%	18,423 / 42,686 = 43%	29,826 / 51,137 = 58%	9,766 / 10,289 = 95%	106,942 / 1,239,683 = 9%	1,127,901 / 1,239,683 = 91%
African American	115,783 / 150,712 = 77%	2,621 / 8,148 = 32%	6,336 / 11,759 = 54%	1,860 / 1,952 = 95%	20,984 / 172,571 = 12%	147,584 / 172,571 = 86%
Hispanic	409,618 / 517,950 = 79%	6,693 / 18,378 = 36%	14,064 / 25,228 = 56%	4,352 / 4,614 = 94%	63,286 / 566,170 = 11%	498,013 / 566,170 = 88%
White	390,062 / 416,432 = 94%	8,786 / 15,511 = 57%	9,009 / 13,423 = 67%	3,186 / 3,330 = 96%	20,798 / 448,696 = 5%	431,841 / 448,696 = 96%
Economically Disadvantaged	459,328 / 588,971 = 78%	10,206 / 26,963 = 38%	21,584 / 38,329 = 56%	6,135 / 6,454 = 95%	76,016 / 660,717 = 12%	573,269 / 660,717 = 87%
<b>Social Studies</b>						
All Students	791,755 / 820,905 = 96%	25,301 / 34,717 = 73%	21,294 / 32,021 = 67%	6,906 / 7,361 = 94%	28,532 / 895,004 = 3%	873,788 / 895,004 = 98%
African American	104,051 / 109,760 = 95%	4,625 / 6,961 = 66%	4,729 / 7,474 = 63%	1,324 / 1,414 = 94%	5,852 / 125,609 = 5%	120,581 / 125,609 = 96%
Hispanic	345,124 / 363,822 = 95%	10,361 / 14,951 = 69%	10,156 / 15,774 = 64%	3,036 / 3,238 = 94%	17,496 / 397,785 = 4%	386,173 / 397,785 = 97%
White	305,699 / 310,006 = 99%	9,906 / 12,301 = 81%	6,111 / 8,336 = 73%	2,287 / 2,430 = 94%	4,826 / 333,073 = 1%	328,829 / 333,073 = 99%
Economically Disadvantaged	379,865 / 402,153 = 94%	15,085 / 21,853 = 69%	15,412 / 23,827 = 65%	4,303 / 4,563 = 94%	21,726 / 452,396 = 5%	436,391 / 452,396 = 96%
<b>Writing</b>						
All Students	588,372 / 623,997 = 94%	11,088 / 17,300 = 64%	22,859 / 28,699 = 80%	5,230 / 5,628 = 93%	22,444 / 675,624 = 3%	649,993 / 675,624 = 96%
African American	75,513 / 81,936 = 92%	1,841 / 3,097 = 59%	4,839 / 6,077 = 80%	957 / 1,026 = 93%	4,165 / 92,136 = 5%	87,315 / 92,136 = 95%
Hispanic	281,074 / 302,096 = 93%	4,936 / 7,857 = 63%	11,296 / 14,435 = 78%	2,440 / 2,646 = 92%	12,129 / 327,034 = 4%	311,875 / 327,034 = 95%
White	205,397 / 213,114 = 96%	4,092 / 6,056 = 68%	6,327 / 7,716 = 82%	1,635 / 1,745 = 94%	5,839 / 228,631 = 3%	223,290 / 228,631 = 98%
Economically Disadvantaged	333,570 / 362,097 = 92%	6,942 / 11,575 = 60%	17,272 / 22,110 = 78%	3,367 / 3,630 = 93%	17,468 / 399,412 = 4%	378,619 / 399,412 = 95%

**District Ratings With and Without Additional Features  
November 2010**

<b>Provision Used</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Recognized</b>	<b>Academically Acceptable</b>	<b>AEA: Academically Acceptable</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Met Absolute Standard</b>	72	76	201	0	349
<b>Required Improvement Only</b>	0	119	22	0	141
<b>Texas Projection Measure Only</b>	164	170	52	0	386
<b>Exceptions Only</b>	0	1	0	0	1
<b>Required Improvement and Texas Projection Measure</b>	0	228	11	0	239
<b>Texas Projection Measure and Exceptions</b>	3	0	1	0	4
<b>Required Improvement and Texas Projection Measure and Exceptions</b>	0	1	0	0	1
<b>AEA: Academically Acceptable with no Texas Projection Measure</b>	0	0	0	46	46
<b>AEA: Academically Acceptable with Texas Projection Measure</b>	0	0	0	2	2
<b>Rating Due to Special Analysis</b>	0	1	1	0	2
<b>Rating Due to Granted Appeal</b>	2	11	6	0	19
<b>Total</b>	241	607	294	48	1,190

**Campus Ratings With and Without Additional Features  
November 2010**

<b>Provision Used</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Recognized</b>	<b>Academically Acceptable</b>	<b>AEA: Academically Acceptable</b>	<b>AEA: Not Rated - Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Met Absolute Standard</b>	1,159	740	858	0	0	2,757
<b>Required Improvement Only</b>	0	405	146	0	0	551
<b>Texas Projection Measure Only</b>	1,323	1,080	331	0	0	2,734
<b>Exceptions Only</b>	22	17	5	0	0	44
<b>Required Improvement and Texas Projection Measure</b>	0	856	92	0	0	948
<b>Required Improvement and Exceptions</b>	0	7	0	0	0	7
<b>Texas Projection Measure and Exceptions</b>	125	22	3	0	0	150
<b>Required Improvement and Texas Projection Measure and Exceptions</b>	0	12	0	0	0	12
<b>AEA: Academically Acceptable with no Texas Projection Measure</b>	0	0	0	405	0	405
<b>AEA: Academically Acceptable with Texas Projection Measure</b>	0	0	0	25	0	25
<b>Rating Due to Special Analysis</b>	0	2	4	0	0	6
<b>Rating Due to Granted Appeal</b>	8	19	15	0	4	46
<b>Total</b>	2,637	3,160	1,454	430	4	7,685

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

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