

# **2004**

# **Accountability Manual**

The 2004 Accountability Rating System  
for Texas Public Schools and School Districts

Texas Education Agency  
Department of Accountability and Data Quality  
July 2004

Copies of the 2004 Accountability Manual may be purchased from:

Publications Distribution Office  
Texas Education Agency  
PO Box 13817  
Austin, TX 78711-3817  
(512) 463-9744

Please use the order form on the last page of this publication. Remit \$10.00 for each copy for a non-profit institution, or \$12.00 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://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2004/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 512-463-7004; email: [copyrights@tea.state.tx.us](mailto:copyrights@tea.state.tx.us).

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
About This Manual .....	1
System History .....	1
Educator Input .....	1
System Philosophy.....	2
Comparison of 2002 and 2004.....	2
Reports Associated with the Accountability System.....	4
<b>Section I – The Basics: Base Indicators</b> .....	7
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills.....	7
State-Developed Alternative Assessment .....	10
Accountability Subset .....	11
Completion Rate .....	14
Annual Dropout Rate .....	15
<b>Section II – The Basics: Additional Features</b> .....	17
Required Improvement.....	17
Improvement for <i>Academically Acceptable</i> .....	17
TAKS.....	17
SDAA .....	19
Completion Rate.....	19
Annual Dropout Rate.....	20
Improvement to <i>Recognized</i> .....	21
TAKS.....	21
SDAA .....	22
Exceptions .....	23
Additional Issues for Districts .....	24
<i>Academically Unacceptable</i> Campuses.....	24
Underreported Students.....	25
Additional Students in District Ratings .....	25
<b>Section III – The Basics: Determining a Rating</b> .....	27
Who is Rated? .....	27
Rating Labels.....	27
Using the Data Table to Determine a Rating .....	29
Final Data Tables.....	34
Masked Data .....	35
System Summary .....	35

<b>Section IV – Gold Performance Acknowledgments</b> .....	39
Acknowledgment Categories.....	39
Acknowledgment Indicators.....	41
Advanced Course Completion.....	41
Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate Examination Results.....	41
Attendance Rate.....	42
Commended Performance: Reading/ELA.....	43
Commended Performance: Mathematics.....	44
Commended Performance: Writing.....	45
Commended Performance: Science.....	46
Commended Performance: Social Studies.....	47
Recommended High School Program.....	48
SAT/ACT Results.....	49
TAAS/TASP Equivalency.....	50
Notification of Acknowledgment.....	51
<b>Section V – Responsibilities and Consequences</b> .....	53
Local Responsibilities.....	53
Campus Identification Numbers.....	53
Statutory Requirements.....	54
Complementary Local Accountability Systems.....	54
System Safeguards.....	55
Sanctions.....	55
General Interventions.....	55
Lowering a Rating.....	55
Data Integrity Issues.....	56
Timing.....	56
Public Education Grant Program.....	56
Rewards.....	56
Statutory Awards Programs.....	56
Excellence Exemptions.....	57
<b>Section VI – Special Issues and Circumstances</b> .....	59
Pairing.....	59
Identifying Campuses.....	59
Improvement Calculations.....	59
Pairing Process.....	59
Guidelines.....	60
Special Analysis.....	61
Identifying Campuses and Districts.....	62
Methods for Special Analysis.....	62
New Campuses.....	63
Charters.....	63
Alternative Education Campuses.....	64
Registered Alternative Education Campuses.....	64

Not Registered Alternative Education Campuses.....	64
Special Education Campuses.....	65
<b>Section VII – AYP and the Accountability System .....</b>	<b>67</b>
Systems Aligned .....	67
Comparison.....	67
<b>Section VIII – Appealing the Ratings.....</b>	<b>73</b>
Appeals Calendar .....	73
General Considerations .....	73
Appeals are not a data correction opportunity!.....	73
Changed ratings only.....	73
Situations Unfavorable for Appeal .....	74
Guidelines by Indicator.....	74
TAKS or SDAA Appeals .....	74
Dropout Appeals .....	74
Completion Appeals.....	75
Gold Performance Acknowledgment Appeals .....	75
Special Circumstance Appeals .....	76
Residential Treatment Centers.....	76
Results of Students Confined by Court Order .....	76
Detention Centers and Correctional Facilities.....	76
Underreported Students.....	76
How to Submit an Appeal .....	76
Appeal Examples .....	78
How an Appeal Will Be Processed by the Agency .....	78
Relationship to AYP .....	79
<b>Section IX – Calendar .....</b>	<b>81</b>
2003.....	81
2004.....	81
2005.....	83
<b>Section X – Preview of 2005 and Beyond.....</b>	<b>85</b>
Accountability System for 2005 .....	85
TAKS .....	85
SDAA .....	85
Completion Rate .....	86
Dropout Rate.....	86
Additional Features .....	86
Gold Performance Acknowledgments .....	86
Adequate Yearly Progress .....	86
Alternative Education Accountability Procedures.....	87
Alignment with Other Systems.....	87

Accountability System for 2006 .....	88
TAKS .....	88
SDAA .....	88
Completion Rate .....	88
Dropout Rate.....	88
Additional Features .....	88
Gold Performance Acknowledgments .....	88
Adequate Yearly Progress .....	89
Accountability System for 2007 and Beyond.....	89
TAKS .....	89
SDAA.....	89
Other Assessments .....	89
Completion Rate .....	90
Dropout Rate.....	91
Additional Features .....	91
New Minimum Size Criteria.....	91
Gold Performance Acknowledgments .....	91
Overview 2005 – 2009.....	92

<b>Appendix A – Texas Administrative Code</b> .....	93
<b>Appendix B – Texas Education Code</b> .....	95
<b>Appendix C – Data Sources</b> .....	97
<b>Appendix D – Contacts</b> .....	107
<b>Appendix E – Acknowledgments</b> .....	111

## **Tables and Exhibits**

Table 1: Comparison of 2002 and 2004.....	2
Table 2: Accountability Subset.....	12
Table 3: Rating Labels .....	28
Table 4: Sample Data Table .....	30
Table 5: Requirements for each Rating Category.....	36
Table 6: Overview of 2004 System Components.....	37
Table 7: Gold Performance Acknowledgment Standards for 2004.....	40
Sample 2004 Paired Campuses Data Entry Application.....	60
Table 8: 2004 Comparison of State Accountability System to AYP by Grade Level.....	68
Table 9: Comparison of 2004 State Accountability to Federal AYP .....	69
Table 10: Completion Rate Transition.....	90
Table 11: State Accountability Standards through 2009.....	92
Table 12: PEIMS Record Types Used in Accountability .....	97
Table 13: Assessments Used in Accountability .....	98
Table 14: Student Demographics.....	98

# Introduction

---

## ABOUT THIS MANUAL

The *Accountability Manual* is a technical resource that explains the accountability system used by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to evaluate the performance of public school districts and campuses. This *Manual* details the accountability system for 2004, including ratings, acknowledgments, responsibilities, safeguards and incentives, and special issues. All information necessary to compute 2004 ratings and acknowledgments for districts and campuses is included.

The organization and format of this edition of the *Accountability Manual* differ from *Manuals* published in the past. Most notably the sections of the *Manual* adopted by reference as Commissioner of Education administrative rule have been consolidated and published as a separate appendix. The process to adopt *Appendix A* by reference will be initiated as soon as this document is published so that the updated rule will be in effect by the ratings release date.

## 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 could be developed in Texas because the state already had the necessary supporting infrastructure in place: a pre-existing student-level data-collection system; a state-mandated curriculum; and a statewide assessment tied to the curriculum.

In developing the accountability system, 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. All collaborated on the system's design. Every year these advisory bodies assisted in modifying the system, improving the indicators, raising standards, or making other necessary adjustments. This system remained in place through the 2001-02 school year. The ratings issued in 2002 were the last under that system.

Following a statewide curriculum update in 1997, the process began to develop a new assessment, the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS). This assessment includes more subjects and grades, and is more difficult than the previous statewide assessment. With such fundamental changes, the accountability system also needed to be redesigned. As soon as results from the 2003 TAKS were available and analyzed, development of the new accountability system began in earnest.

Coincidentally, 2003 was the first year of implementation of new federal legislation related to accountability, the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001 (NCLB). Provisions of this statute required that Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status be assigned to all districts and campuses for the first time in the summer of 2003. The alignment with AYP was another element considered in developing the state accountability system for 2004.

## EDUCATOR INPUT

While it is the role of the Commissioner of Education to establish criteria and set standards, during the past year, the commissioner relied extensively on the detailed review, study, and advice of educators and many others. The result is a system that will challenge our schools to prepare all students for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. With 2004, the system begins with an assessment

program more rigorous than ever and sets forth an accountability plan to raise the standards each year for years to come.

## SYSTEM PHILOSOPHY

Over the years TEA has worked closely with public school personnel and others to develop an integrated accountability system. The 2004 system is based upon the same principles that guided the development and evolution of the previous system. These principles are:

- **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.

## COMPARISON OF 2002 AND 2004

Many fundamental features of the 2004 accountability system parallel the previous system. Though there are similarities between the new and former systems, ratings between the two cannot be compared. The following table illustrates similarities and differences.

**Table 1: Comparison of 2002 and 2004**

<b>Component</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2004</b>
Standard Rating Labels (Section III)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Exemplary</i> (district/campus)</li> <li>• <i>Recognized</i> (district/campus)</li> <li>• <i>Academically Acceptable</i> (district)</li> <li>• <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> (district)</li> <li>• <i>Acceptable</i> (campus)</li> <li>• <i>Low Performing</i> (campus)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Exemplary</i></li> <li>• <i>Recognized</i></li> <li>• <i>Academically Acceptable</i></li> <li>• <i>Academically Unacceptable</i></li> </ul>

<b>Component</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2004</b>
Evaluation of Assessment Subjects ( <i>Section I</i> )	All TAAS subjects tested except Science	All TAKS subjects tested
Evaluation of Student Groups ( <i>Section I</i> )	White, Hispanic, African American, Economically Disadvantaged, and All Students	White, Hispanic, African American, Economically Disadvantaged, and All Students
Evaluation of grades tested ( <i>Section I</i> )	Summed across all grades tested (grades 3 – 8 & 10)	Summed across all grades tested (grades 3 – 11)
Base Indicators for Determining Rating ( <i>Section I</i> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TAAS % Passing</li> <li>• Annual Dropout Rate (grades 7-12)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TAKS % Met Standard</li> <li>• SDAA % Met ARD Expectations</li> <li>• Completion Rate (grades 9-12)</li> <li>• Annual Dropout Rate (grades 7-8 only)</li> </ul>
Number of Performance Measures Used ( <i>Section I</i> )	The larger and more diverse the campus or district, the more measures apply — up to 21	The larger and more diverse the campus or district, the more measures apply — up to 36
Improvement Feature ( <i>Section II</i> )	No improvement feature	Higher rating possible by using Required Improvement
Exceptions ( <i>Section II</i> )	No exceptions feature	<i>Academically Acceptable</i> rating possible by using exceptions
Accountability Subset ( <i>Section I</i> )	Students who were mobile after the October PEIMS “as of” date and before the last TAAS administration were taken out of the district and campus subset if they moved to another district	Students who are mobile 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)
Minimum Size Criteria for All Students ( <i>Section I</i> )	All Students results were always evaluated, regardless of size	All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of size
Special Analysis ( <i>Section VI</i> )	Used for determining rating for very small campuses and districts	Used for determining rating for very small campuses and districts
Minimum Size Criteria for Student Groups (TAAS and TAKS) ( <i>Section I</i> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If fewer than 30 test takers, they were not evaluated separately</li> <li>• If 30 to 49, they were evaluated if they comprised at least 10.0% of all test takers</li> <li>• If 50 or more, they were evaluated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If fewer than 30 test takers, they are not evaluated separately</li> <li>• If 30 to 49, they are evaluated if they comprise at least 10% of all test takers</li> <li>• If 50 or more, they are evaluated</li> </ul>
Pairing ( <i>Section VI</i> )	Pairing of campuses was used for schools without TAAS data	Pairing of regular campuses is used for schools without TAKS data
Alternative Education Campuses ( <i>Section VI</i> )	Rated according to the alternative education accountability procedures	Receive a rating of <i>Not Rated: Alternative Education</i> (these campuses will be rated beginning in 2005 according to new alternative education accountability procedures)

<b>Component</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2004</b>
Charters (Section VI)	Charter operators (here referred to simply as <i>charters</i> ) were not rated and were not eligible for Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA). Only charter campuses were rated and eligible for GPA.	Charters are rated, as are their campuses. Both are eligible for GPA. Throughout this document the expression “districts and campuses” includes charters and charter campuses unless specifically noted otherwise.
New Campuses (Section VI)	New charter campuses (operating under a new charter) were not rated	If they do not meet at least <i>Academically Acceptable</i> criteria, new charters and new campuses (regular or charter) are labeled <i>Not Rated: Other</i>
Indicators for Determining Gold Performance Acknowledgment (Section IV)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advanced Course Completion</li> <li>• AP/IB Results</li> <li>• Attendance Rate</li> <li>• Comparable Improvement</li> <li>• Algebra End-of-Course Examination</li> <li>• Recommended High School Program</li> <li>• SAT/ACT Results</li> <li>• TAAS/TASP Equivalency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advanced Course Completion</li> <li>• AP/IB Results</li> <li>• Attendance Rate</li> <li>• Commended Performance: Reading/ELA</li> <li>• Commended Performance: Mathematics</li> <li>• Commended Performance: Writing</li> <li>• Commended Performance: Science</li> <li>• Commended Performance: Social Studies</li> <li>• Recommended High School Program</li> <li>• SAT/ACT Results</li> <li>• TAAS/TASP Equivalency</li> </ul>
Rounding (Section I)	Calculations for all indicators and all measures were rounded to one decimal point; for example, 79.877% was rounded to 79.9%.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Calculations for TAKS and SDAA indicators are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 79.50% is rounded to 80% and 79.49 is rounded to 79%.</li> <li>• Calculations for completion rate, dropout rate and all non-TAKS GPA indicators are rounded to one decimal point: 79.877% is rounded to 79.9%.</li> <li>• Calculations for the student group percents (to determine minimum size) are rounded to whole numbers: 9.877% is rounded to 10%.</li> </ul>

## REPORTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

*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 to show how each grade level and different populations performed. Indicators that may potentially be used in future accountability ratings are also published in the AEIS. In 2003-04 these include performance on the *Reading Proficiency Tests in English* (RPTE), TAKS performance at the *Panel Recommendation* student passing standard, and TAKS performance at the *Commended* level. The reports also show participation rates on the TAKS tests. Additionally, the AEIS reports demographic information about students and staff, program information, and financial information, all of which provides 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 TEA publication provides an overview of public education in Texas. In addition to a state-level discussion, this publication contains information for each public school district.

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

*Report Online*. All reports are available on the agency website through the Division of Performance Reporting homepage at: <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/index.html>.

*Adequate Yearly Progress*. AYP is a program mandated under the federal NCLB Act. Ratings labels for the state accountability system also show whether or not a district or campus met AYP. For more information on similarities and differences between AYP and the state accountability system, see *Section VII – AYP and the Accountability System*.



## Section I – The Basics: *Base Indicators*

---

To determine ratings, the 2004 accountability rating system for Texas public schools and districts uses four base indicators:

- spring 2004 performance on the *Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)*,
  - spring 2004 performance on the *State-Developed Alternative Assessment (SDAA)*,
  - the *Completion Rate* for the class of 2003, and
  - the 2002-03 *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 English version of the TAKS (grades 3-11) and the Spanish version (grades 3-6) 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, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, & 9; English language arts is tested in grades 10 & 11. Note that this is a combined indicator. It includes all students tested on and passing either the TAKS reading test or the TAKS English language arts test. The first two administrations of grade 3 TAKS reading results are included. See *Reading/ELA Combined* and *Grade 3 Reading in Other Information* below.
- **Writing** – Writing is tested in grades 4 & 7.
- **Social Studies** – Social Studies is tested in grades 8, 10, & 11.
- **Mathematics** – Mathematics is tested in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 & 11.
- **Science** – Science is tested in grades 5, 10, & 11.

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

- **Exemplary** – At least 90% of students tested passing for every subject.
- **Recognized** – At least 70% of students tested passing for every subject.
- **Academically Acceptable** – Varies by subject:
  - *Reading/ELA* – At least 50% of students tested passing.
  - *Writing* – At least 50% of students tested passing.
  - *Social Studies* – At least 50% of students tested passing.
  - *Mathematics* – At least 35% of students tested passing.
  - *Science* – At least 25% of students tested passing.

**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 will receive Special Analysis:
  - Districts and campuses with fewer than 10 total students tested; and
  - Districts and campuses with fewer than 30 total students tested that have an initial rating of *Academically Unacceptable*, *Recognized*, or *Exemplary*.
  - See *Section VI – 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 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 within the student group, it is evaluated.
  - Student group size is calculated subject by subject. For this reason the number of student groups evaluated will sometimes vary. For example, an elementary school with grades 3, 4, & 5 tested 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:** 2004 (Spring TAKS Administration)

**Data Source:** Pearson Educational Measurement

**Other Information:**

- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who take the TAKS is included in this measure.
- *Testing Window.* Results for students given a make-up test within the testing window are included in the accountability indicators.
- *Reading/ELA Combined.* Reading (grades 3-9) and ELA (grades 10-11) results are combined and evaluated as a single subject. This only affects districts and those campuses that offer both the 9<sup>th</sup> grade and grades 10 and/or 11. For these, counts of reading and ELA students who met the standard are summed and divided by the total number taking reading or ELA.
- *TAKS Spanish.* The TAKS tests are given in Spanish in reading and mathematics for grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; writing in grade 4; and science in grade 5. To determine a rating, performance on these tests is combined with performance on the English-language TAKS.

- *Student Passing Standards.* To determine whether the student counts as a passer, the student must meet the passing standard adopted by the State Board of Education (SBOE) for the current year. For 2004 the student passing standard is 1 standard error of measurement (SEM) below the panel recommendation (PR) for students in grades 3-10 and 2 SEM below PR for students in grade 11. The table below shows the grades and subjects assessed and the applicable student passing standard.

Subjects	Grades	2004 Student Passing Standard
Reading	3 – 9	1 SEM
ELA	10	1 SEM
ELA	11	2 SEM
Writing	4, 7	1 SEM
Mathematics	3 – 10	1 SEM
	11	2 SEM
Social Studies	8, 10	1 SEM
	11	2 SEM
Science	5, 10	1 SEM
	11	2 SEM

- *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:

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

- *Grade 3 Reading.* Third grade reading performance is the cumulative percent passing calculated by combining the March and April administrations of the TAKS. Students must be tested on the same campus for both administrations in order for the results of the April test to be used in the campus measure. Students must be tested in the same district for both administrations in order for the results of the April test to be used in the district measure. Students new to the campus or district in April are not included in this measure. See *Table 2: Accountability Subset* below, for more information.
- *Exit-level TAKS.* Grade 11 results are not restricted to first-time test takers. Students repeating the 11<sup>th</sup> grade who are re-taking the TAKS exit-level test during the spring administration are included (as long as the students are part of the accountability subset). Results for students in grades other than grade 11 who take the exit-level TAKS are not included.
- *Rounding of Met Standard Percent.* The *Met Standard* calculations are expressed as a percent, 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. For example, 9.5% is rounded to 10%.

## STATE-DEVELOPED ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT

The SDAA assesses special education students in grades 3-8 who are receiving instruction in the state's curriculum but for whom the TAKS test is an inappropriate measure of their academic progress. SDAA tests are given in the areas of reading, writing, and mathematics. Students are assessed at their appropriate instructional levels, as determined by their Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committees.

The SDAA is administered on the same schedule as TAKS and is designed to measure annual growth based on appropriate expectations for each student, as decided by the student's ARD committee.

A single performance indicator is evaluated for SDAA. The indicator sums across grades (3-8) and across subjects. This indicator is not based on the number of students tested but on the number of tests taken. It is calculated as the number of *tests* meeting ARD committee expectations divided by the number of SDAA *tests* for which ARD expectations were established. Students who take multiple SDAA tests are included multiple times (for each and every SDAA test they take).

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

### Standard:

- **Exemplary** – Results on at least 90% of tests taken meet ARD expectations.
- **Recognized** – Results on at least 70% of tests taken meet ARD expectations.
- **Academically Acceptable** – Results on at least 50% of tests taken meet ARD expectations.

**Student Groups:** Performance for the percent *Meeting ARD Expectations* is evaluated for All Students only. Student group performance is not evaluated separately.

### Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of SDAA tests meeting ARD expectations}}{\text{number of SDAA tests taken}}$$

### Minimum Size Requirements:

- SDAA performance is evaluated for districts and campuses with results from 30 or more tests (summed across grades and subjects).
- Since SDAA is administered for three subjects (reading, writing, and mathematics) and the results are summed across subjects as well as grades, the minimum size requirement of 30 tests can represent as few as 10 students.
- There is no Special Analysis done on SDAA performance.
- Student groups are not evaluated separately.

**Year of Data:** 2004 (Spring SDAA Administration)

**Data Source:** Pearson Educational Measurement

### **Other Information:**

- *Grade 3 SDAA.* Because meeting ARD expectations is based on improvement from the prior year's baseline results, grade 3 performance can only be used in cases where a prior year baseline exists, such as when a student is repeating the third grade.
- *Students Tested in both SDAA and TAKS.* In some cases, students may take both the SDAA and TAKS. For example, a grade 6 student may take the TAKS for mathematics, but the SDAA for reading. In that case, the student's performance is included in both indicators.
- *Rounding of Met ARD Expectation Percent.* The *Met ARD Expectation* calculations are expressed as a percent, 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%.

### **ACCOUNTABILITY SUBSET**

For the TAKS and SDAA indicators, only the performance of students enrolled on the PEIMS fall "as-of" date of October 31, 2003, are considered in the ratings. This is referred to as the *accountability subset* (sometimes also referred to as the "October" subset or the mobility adjustment). This adjustment is not applied to any other indicator.

An adjustment for mobility has existed in the Texas accountability system since 1994. In the past, the subset was applied at the district level; that is, mobile student results were removed from the accountability results if the student moved across district boundaries between the fall and the time of their last test.

**-NEW-** Beginning with 2004, the definition has been expanded. Students who move from campus to campus within a district are also excluded from the campus's TAKS and SDAA results. No campus is held accountable for students who move between campuses after the PEIMS as-of date and before their last test, even if they stay within the same district. Specifically, the subsets are calculated as follows:

*Campus-level accountability subset:* If a student is reported in membership at one campus on October 31, 2003 but then moves to another campus before the last TAKS or SDAA 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 in one district on October 31, 2003 but then moved to another district before the last TAKS or SDAA 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 below. Note that these apply to both SDAA and TAKS performance results.

**Table 2: 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 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 A in the fall and moves to district B 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 either campus or district. Results are reported to district B.
3. Grade 6 student is enrolled at campus Y (district A) in the fall and then moves to campus Z (district A) 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 Y or Z, but they do affect district A. Results for both tests are reported to campus Z.
4. Grade 6 student is reported in enrollment in district A at campus Z, 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 April.	Performance on both tests is reported and included in the ratings evaluation for campus Z and district A. 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.
<b>Both SDAA and TAKS</b>	
5. Grade 6 student in special education enrolls in campus A in the fall, remains for the entire school year, and is tested on campus A. The student's ARD committee has directed that she be tested in reading on the SDAA and in mathematics on the TAKS.	Performance on both tests is reported and included in the rating evaluation for campus A and the district. This student's reading results are included with the school and district's SDAA performance, and the mathematics results contribute to the TAKS results.
<b>Mobility between Writing and other tests</b>	
6. Grade 4 student enrolls in campus A in the fall and takes the TAKS writing test there in February. 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 attributed to the campus where the student tested last. The results affect the district. Results for all tests are reported to campus B.

**Table 2: Accountability Subset (continued)**

<b>Student Situation</b>	<b>In Whose Accountability Subset?</b>
7. Grade 4 student enrolls in campus A in the fall and takes the writing TAKS there in February. 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 attributed to the campus where the student tested last. Results for all tests are reported to campus B.
8. Grade 7 student is reported in enrollment in district A and takes the writing test in that district at campus Y. In March, the student transfers to district B and takes the remaining Grade 7 TAKS tests there. The answer documents submitted by district B use different name spellings than did the one submitted by district A.	To the test contractor these are two different students, not the same one. Performance on the student's writing test is reported to district A and counts toward its rating and the rating of campus Y. The student's results in reading and mathematics are reported to district B 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.
9. Grade 7 student is reported in enrollment in district A and takes the writing test in that district at campus Z. In March, the student moves out of state.	Performance on the student's writing test counts toward the rating of district A and the rating of campus Z.
<b>Grade 3 Reading</b>	
10. Grade 3 student takes reading on March 3 <sup>rd</sup> at campus A where she was enrolled in the fall, passes the test and moves to campus B (in the same district) where, in April, she takes and fails the mathematics test.	This student's results do not affect the rating of campus A or B. The reading results from the March test are reported to campus A, even though mathematics results are reported to campus B. Results from both the reading and mathematics tests affect the district.
11. Grade 3 student takes reading on March 3 <sup>rd</sup> at campus A where he was enrolled in the fall, fails the test and moves to campus B (in the same district) where he retests in April and passes.	This student's results do not affect the rating of campus A or B. The reading results from the March test are reported to campus A, even though mathematics results are reported to campus B. Results from both the reading and mathematics tests affect the district.
12. Grade 3 student takes TAKS reading in March at campus A where she was enrolled in the fall, fails the test, stays in campus A where she takes the SDAA reading and the TAKS mathematics tests in April.	This student's TAKS reading and mathematics results will affect the TAKS performance for campus A and the district. The SDAA results are only used if ARD expectations were established the prior year for this student (which is unlikely).

**Table 2: Accountability Subset (continued)**

Student Situation	In Whose Accountability Subset?
<p>13. Grade 3 student enrolls in campus A in the fall, but then moves to campus B (in the same district) in December. On March 3<sup>rd</sup> the student takes the reading test there, and passes. In early April the student moves back to campus A, where he takes and passes the mathematics test.</p>	<p>This student's reading results do not affect the rating of campus A or B, but the mathematics results affect the rating of campus A. The reading results from the March test are reported to campus B, and the mathematics results are reported to campus A. Results from both the reading and mathematics tests affect the district.</p>
<b>Spanish TAKS</b>	
<p>14. Grade 6 limited English proficient student enrolls in campus A in the fall, remains for the entire school year, and is tested on campus A. However, the student's LPAC committee has directed that she be tested in reading on the Spanish TAKS and in mathematics on the English TAKS.</p>	<p>Performance on both tests is reported and included in the rating evaluation for campus A and the district. Results on both English and Spanish versions of the TAKS contribute to the overall passing rate.</p>

**COMPLETION RATE**

This longitudinal rate shows the percent of students who first attended ninth grade in the 1999-2000 school year who completed or who are continuing their education four years later. Known as the 1999-2000 cohort, these students' progress was tracked over the four years using data provided to TEA by districts.

To count as a “completer” for the state accountability indicator, the student must have either: 1) graduated with the class of 2003 (or earlier), 2) attained a General Educational Development (GED) certificate by March 1, 2004, or 3) re-enrolled at the school in the fall of 2003.

**Who is evaluated for Completion Rate:**

- Districts and campuses that serve grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12.
- *Use of District Rate.* Completion rate is evaluated for any campus that serves students in grades 9, 10, 11, or 12. However, a completion rate is calculated only for campuses or districts that have served grades 9 through 12 (inclusive) since 1999-2000. Campuses that serve only some of those grades, and campuses that have been in existence for fewer than five years will be evaluated using their district's completion rate. For example, a senior high school that only serves grades 11 and 12 is attributed the district's completion rate because it does not have its own.

**Standard:**

- **Exemplary** – At least 95.0% Completion Rate.
- **Recognized** – At least 85.0% Completion Rate.
- **Academically Acceptable** – At least 75.0% Completion Rate.

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

**Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of completers}}{\text{number in class (original cohort)}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:**

- *All Students.* These results are evaluated if:
  - there are at least 10 students in the class *and*
  - there are at least 10 dropouts (non-completers).
- *Student Groups.* These results are evaluated if there are at least 10 dropouts (non-completers) within the student group *and*:
  - at least 30 students within the student group; or
  - 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; or
  - if there are at least 50 students within the student group, it is evaluated.

**Years of Data:** GED records 1999-2004, continued enrollment in 2003-04, graduating class of 2003, grade 11 of 2001-02, grade 10 of 2000-01, grade 9 of 1999-2000. (Results are based on the original cohort, whether the students remain on grade level or not.)

**Data Source:** PEIMS enrollment data for 1999-2000 through 2003-04; PEIMS leaver data for 1999-2000 through 2003-04; PEIMS attendance data for 1997 through 2003; and General Educational Development records as of March 1, 2004.

**Other Information:**

- *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%, not 75%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.
- *Special Education.* The completion status of special education students is included in this measure.

**ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE**

For accountability purposes, the annual dropout rate is used to evaluate campuses and districts with grades 7 and/or 8. As implied by the label, it is a one-year measure which calculates a rate, summed across the two grades.

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

**Standard:**

- *Exemplary* – An Annual Dropout Rate of 0.2% or less.
- *Recognized* – An Annual Dropout Rate of 0.7% or less.
- *Academically Acceptable* – An Annual Dropout Rate of 2.0% or less.

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

**Methodology:**

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

**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 10 dropouts.
- *Student Groups.* These results are evaluated if there are at least 10 dropouts within the student group *and*:
  - at least 30 students within the student group; or
  - 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; or
  - if there are at least 50 students within the student group, it is evaluated.

**Year of Data:** 2002-03

**Data Source:** PEIMS submission 1 (October 2003) and submission 3 (June 2003).

**Other Information:**

- *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.* 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%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.
- *Special Education.* Dropouts served in special education are included in this measure.

## Section II – The Basics: *Additional Features*

---

As shown in *Section I – 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 ratings can achieve a rating:

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

Additionally, under certain circumstances a district’s rating may be restricted to *Academically Acceptable*. These additional requirements for districts are explained in the last part of this section.

All 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

*Academically Acceptable*. Campuses or districts initially rated *Academically Unacceptable* may achieve an *Academically Acceptable* rating using the Required Improvement feature. Required Improvement can be applied to any of the base indicators, TAKS, SDAA, Completion Rate, and Annual Dropout Rate.

*Recognized*. A campus or district whose performance on TAKS or SDAA is at the high end of *Academically Acceptable* may be able to achieve a *Recognized* rating using Required Improvement. (Required Improvement is not evaluated for the *Recognized* rating if the improvement is needed in the Completion Rate or Annual Dropout Rate.)

*Exemplary*. Districts and campuses cannot achieve a rating of *Exemplary* through the use of Required Improvement.

Required Improvement depends on the comparison of 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 for the prior year. See *Minimum Size Requirements* in this section, for each indicator.

### Improvement for *Academically Acceptable*

---

**Who is evaluated for Required Improvement:** Districts and campuses whose performance is *Academically Unacceptable* for any TAKS, SDAA, Completion Rate, or Annual Dropout Rate 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 2003 to be able to meet the 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 **50%** in two years.
- *Mathematics.* Any measure below the standard must achieve enough gain to meet a standard of **35%** in two years.
- *Science.* Any measure below the standard must achieve enough gain to meet a standard of **25%** 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>
[performance in 2004] – [performance in 2003] ≥	$\frac{[\text{standard for 2004}] - [\text{performance in 2003}]}{2}$

*Example.* For 2004, an elementary campus has performance above the *Academically Acceptable* standard in all areas except for their Economically Disadvantaged student group in TAKS mathematics; only 29% met the standard. Their performance in 2003 for the same group and subject was 19%.

First calculate their *actual change*:

$$29 - 19 = 10$$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{35 - 19}{2} = 8$$

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) of at least 10 students in 2003.

### Other Information:

- Prior year percent *Met Standard* is recalculated using the current year student passing standard so that gain from the prior year to the current year uses comparable performance data for the two years. In other words, the 2003 performance of 19% for the elementary campus in the example above, is based on a student passing standard of 1 SEM so that it is comparable to performance in 2004. See *Section I – The Basics: Base Indicators* for more information on passing standards. Prior year performance is also calculated using the same mobility adjustments as are used in 2004; reading and ELA results are combined; and, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> administrations of grade 3 reading are used.

- 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%.

## SDAA

### 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 SDAA indicator since 2003 to be at **50%** 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>
[performance in 2004] – [performance in 2003]	$\frac{[50] - [\text{performance in 2003}]}{2}$
≥	

**Minimum Size Requirements:** In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have SDAA results for at least 10 tests for 2003.

### Other Information:

- Performance for the percent *Meeting ARD Expectations* is evaluated for All Students only. Student group performance is not evaluated separately.
- Prior year performance is calculated using the same mobility adjustments as are used in 2004.
- 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

### 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 measures since the class of 2002 to be at **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 2003] minus [completion rate for class of 2002]	$\frac{[75.0] - [\text{completion rate for class of 2002}]}{2}$
≥	

**Minimum Size Requirements:** In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have at least 10 students (in the same student group) in the completion rate class of 2002.

### Other Information:

- Completion Rate 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 definition includes graduates, GED recipients, and continuing students as completers.
- Campuses that serve students in grades 9, 10, 11, or 12 but do not have their own completion rate will be evaluated using their district's completion rate. Depending on the school's configuration over the years, the district rate may be used for current year, prior year, or both in determining if it met Required Improvement.
- All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 4.85% is rounded to 4.9%, not 5%.

### 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 their dropout rate to be at **2.0%** in two years.

#### Methodology:

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

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Actual Change} \\ \text{[2002-03 dropout rate]} - \text{[2001-02 dropout rate]} \leq \frac{\text{Required Improvement}}{2} \\ \frac{[2.0] - \text{[2001-02 dropout rate]}}{2} \end{array}$$

Note that this calculation measures *reductions* in rates, not gains as with TAKS, SDAA, or Completion Rate 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 change.

*Example.* In 2002-03, a middle school had a dropout rate for their Hispanic student group of 2.8%. Their annual dropout rate in 2001-02 for the same group was 4.2%.

First calculate their *actual change*:

$$2.8 - 4.2 = -1.4$$

Next we calculate the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{2.0 - 4.2}{2} = -1.1$$

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

$$-1.4 \leq -1.1$$

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 had at least 10 grade 7-8 students (in the same student group) in 2001-02.

**Other Information:**

- All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, -1.875% is rounded to -1.9%, not -2%.

**Improvement to *Recognized***

---

**Who is evaluated for Required Improvement:** Districts and campuses whose performance is *Academically Acceptable* for TAKS or SDAA. Required Improvement is not evaluated for the *Recognized* rating if the improvement is needed in completion rate or annual dropout rate.

**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 65% to 69% on the measure, and
- shown enough improvement on TAKS since 2003 to be at **70%** 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>
[performance in 2004] – [performance in 2003] ≥	$\frac{[70] - [\text{performance in 2003}]}{2}$

*Example.* For 2004, a district has performance above the *Recognized* standard in all areas except for their Economically Disadvantaged student group in TAKS science; only 66% met the standard. Their performance in 2003 for the same group and subject was 64%.

First determine if their current year performance is *at or above the floor* of 65%:

$$66 \geq 65$$

Next calculate their *actual change*:

$$66 - 64 = 2$$

Then calculate the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{70 - 64}{2} = 3$$

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

$$2 \text{ is not greater than or equal to } 3$$

Result: the district does not meet Required Improvement, so its rating remains *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) of at least 10 students in 2003.

**Other Information:**

- Prior year percent *Met Standard* is computed using the current year student passing standard so that gain from the prior year to the current year uses comparable performance data for both years. In other words, the 2003 performance of 64% for the district in the example above is based on a student passing standard of 1 SEM so that it is comparable to performance in 2004. See *Section I – The Basics: Base Indicators* for more information on passing standards. Prior year performance is also calculated using the same mobility adjustments as are used in 2004; reading and ELA results are combined; and, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> administrations of grade 3 reading are used.
- The *Recognized* standard for the TAKS indicator (70%) is the same for all subjects.
- 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, 64.5% is rounded to 65%.

**SDAA**

**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 65% to 69% on the measure, and
- shown enough improvement on SDAA since 2003 to be at **70%** in two years.

**Methodology:**

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

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Actual Change} \\ \text{[performance in 2004]} - \text{[performance in 2003]} \end{array} \geq \frac{\begin{array}{c} \text{Required Improvement} \\ \text{[70]} - \text{[performance in 2003]} \end{array}}{2}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have SDAA results for at least 10 tests for 2003.

**Other Information:**

- Performance for the percent *Meeting ARD Expectations* is evaluated for All Students only. Student group performance is not evaluated separately.
- Prior year performance is also calculated using the same mobility adjustments as are used in 2004.
- 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, 64.5% is rounded to 65%.

## EXCEPTIONS

Campuses or districts evaluated to be *Academically Unacceptable* after application of Required Improvement may be able to “gate up” to *Academically Acceptable* using up to three exceptions for TAKS and/or SDAA measures.

The number of assessment measures increased from 16 in the 2002 accountability system to 26 in the 2004 accountability system. There are also 10 measures for completion and dropout rates. The Exceptions Provision provides relief to larger campuses and districts with more diverse student populations who are evaluated on more measures.

The number of exceptions available for a campus or district is dependent on the number of assessment measures on which the campus or district is evaluated, as shown in the following table.

Number of Assessment Measures Evaluated	Maximum Number of Exceptions Allowed
1 – 5	0 exceptions
6 – 10	1 exception
11 – 15	2 exceptions
16 or more	3 exceptions

The Exceptions Provision applies to any of the 25 TAKS measures (5 subjects multiplied by 5 groups: All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged), and the SDAA measure. The Exceptions Provision does not apply to either the completion or dropout rate indicators.

### Other Information:

- *Performance Floor.* Performance on the measure to which the Exceptions Provision will be applied must be no more than five percentage points below the accountability standard for the *Academically Acceptable* rating level. In the example below, the high school qualifies to use their exceptions because both their mathematics and science performance were within five points of the standards of 35% and 25% respectively.
- *One-Time Use.* An exception will not be granted for the same measure for two consecutive years. For example, if a campus is granted an exception for white student science performance in 2004, the campus is not eligible for an exception for white student science performance in 2005. In the example below the high school will not be able to use exceptions on economically disadvantaged performance in TAKS mathematics or science in 2005.
- *Only Successful Application.* The Exceptions Provision is only applied if it will successfully move a campus or district from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*. For example, a campus may be eligible for two exceptions, but if it actually needs three exceptions in order to raise its rating to *Academically Acceptable*, then no exceptions are used; the campus remains *Academically Unacceptable*. This means that in 2005, all measures will be eligible for use as exceptions since none were used in 2004.
- *Only for Assessment.* The provision applies to assessment measures, TAKS and SDAA, not to the completion rate or dropout rate indicators. That is, if a campus or district is

*Academically Unacceptable* due to either the dropout or completion rate indicators, the Exceptions Provision is not applied.

- *Only for Academically Acceptable.* The Exceptions Provision is only applied at the *Academically Unacceptable* rating level to move the campus or district to the *Academically Acceptable* rating. It cannot be used to move a campus or district to *Recognized* or *Exemplary*.
- *Move only one level.* The Exceptions Provision cannot be used to move up more than one rating level. For example, if a campus meets the *Exemplary* criteria on all accountability measures except for one assessment 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*.
- *Campus Improvement Plan.* Any campus that uses one or more exceptions must address performance on those measures to which the exceptions are applied in its campus improvement plan.

*Example.* A large high school with a diverse population is evaluated on all its student groups for reading/ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies, for a total of 20 measures. Their performance on all indicators meets the *Academically Acceptable* standards except for their economically disadvantaged students in mathematics and science, with performance at 31% and 22%, respectively, and they did not demonstrate Required Improvement for either of these measures.

The campus is evaluated on 20 assessment measures. Both their mathematics and science performance are within five points of the standards (35% and 25% respectively). They are eligible to use up to three exceptions. Therefore, their performance in these two areas that are below the standards is not considered in their accountability evaluation.

Result: the campus rating is *Academically Acceptable*. The two exception areas must be addressed in their campus improvement plan.

Note: Because of the one-time exception rule, in 2005, the campus will not be eligible to use exceptions for either of these measures – economically disadvantaged students in mathematics and economically disadvantaged students in science.

## **ADDITIONAL ISSUES FOR DISTRICTS**

### ***Academically Unacceptable* Campuses**

---

Any district that has one or more campuses rated *Academically Unacceptable* cannot receive a rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*.

## Underreported Students

---

Districts are required to report the “leaver” status of all grade 7–12 students who were enrolled at any time in the prior year (2002-03) but who did not continue in the current year (2003-04). These students may have left the district because they graduated, transferred to another district, dropped out, or some other reason.

When districts fail to provide a leaver record for a student who is no longer in enrollment, TEA counts him or her as underreported. In order to maintain a rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*, districts must not exceed the accountability standards for underreporting 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 500.
- *Percent of Underreported Students:* Must be less than or equal to 5.0%.

**Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of underreported students}}{\text{number of returning students} + \text{leavers} + \text{underreported students}} \leq 5.0\%$$

*Numerator:* Underreported students are those 2002-03 students in grades 7–12 for whom no enrollment record or school leaver record can be matched on 2003-04 PEIMS submission 1.

*Denominator:* The denominator is an unduplicated count of students who were reported in enrollment in 2002-03 PEIMS submission 1 or in attendance in 2002-03 PEIMS submission 3. This includes returning students (enrollment record submitted), leavers (leaver record submitted), and underreported students (no record submitted).

**Minimum Size Requirements:** There are no minimum size requirements; all districts will be evaluated for underreported students. Districts with very small numbers of underreported students that cause them to exceed 5.0% will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

**Data Source and Year:** PEIMS submission 1 (October 2002, October 2003); PEIMS submission 3 (June 2003)

**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.* This calculation is rounded to one decimal place. For example, 5.05% is rounded to 5.1%, not 5%.

## Additional Students in District Ratings

---

Districts are held responsible for the performance of all their students, including those who attend campuses that do not receive a regular rating. See *Section VI – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information on these campuses.

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 2* in *Section I – The Basics: Base Indicators* for more information on the accountability subset.

## **Section III – The Basics: *Determining a Rating***

---

The previous two sections described the base indicators and the additional features of the system (Required Improvement and the Exceptions Provision). This section 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. Some campuses and districts must be evaluated using different procedures. See *Section VI – 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 2004, 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 2003-04 school year. Most districts and campuses identified to be in the universe receive a standard rating label (*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 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 standard rating labels, districts and campuses must have at least one TAKS test result in the accountability subset. An effort is made through the pairing process to supply TAKS results to regular 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 *Section VI – Special Issues and Circumstances*.

Districts and campuses that have only SDAA results, only completion rates, only dropout rates, or only combinations of these three will not receive a standard rating in 2004. To be eligible for a standard rating, TAKS results are required and *only* TAKS results are required. Districts and campuses need not have data for the SDAA, dropout, or completion indicators in order to receive a standard rating. Furthermore, performance on any one of the TAKS subjects is sufficient for a rating to be assigned (science, mathematics, reading/ELA, writing, or social studies).

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 *Section VI – Special Issues and Circumstances* for details about Special Analysis.

### **RATING LABELS**

Rating labels for districts are specified in statute. In 2004, campuses are assigned the same rating labels as districts rather than having slight differences as existed under the previous system. Thus, the campus rating label *Low Performing* is replaced with *Academically Unacceptable*.

For 2004, campuses and districts will be assigned one of the following rating labels.

**Table 3: Rating Labels**

	District/Charter Use	Campus Use
<i>Exemplary</i>	Used for districts/charters with at least one TAKS test result (in any subject) in the accountability subset. Small numbers subject to Special Analysis.	Used for campuses (regular and charter) serving grades 1-12 and with at least one TAKS test result (in any subject) in the accountability subset. Includes regular 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: Alternative Education</i>	For 2004 only, used for charters that operate one or more registered alternative education campuses. Regular school districts will not receive this rating label.	For 2004 only, used for registered alternative education campuses (regular and charter).
	Although registered alternative education campuses and charters will not be rated in 2004 based on academic performance, the commissioner of education has the authority to assign an <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> rating to address problems identified through Accountability System Safeguards, Performance-Based Monitoring, or other monitoring and compliance investigations.	
<i>Not Rated: Other</i>	Used for charters if they are new and would otherwise be rated <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> . Used for districts/charters in the unlikely event that there is insufficient data to rate due to no TAKS results in the accountability subset.	Used if the campus (regular or charter): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Has no students enrolled in grades higher than kindergarten.</li> <li>○ Is new and would otherwise be rated <i>Academically Unacceptable</i>.</li> <li>○ Has insufficient data to rate due to no TAKS results in the accountability subset.</li> <li>○ Is a designated Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP) or a designated Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP).</li> </ul>

**Table 3: Rating Labels (continued)**

<p><i>Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues</i></p>	<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 standard rating label based on the evaluation of performance. This label may be assigned temporarily at the time of the initial ratings release 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>Academically Unacceptable</i> rating. The commissioner of education also has the authority to lower a standard 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.</p> <p>See <i>Section V – Responsibilities and Consequences</i> for more information about the circumstances that trigger this rating label.</p> <p>If any campus within a district receives a rating of <i>Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues</i>, then the district’s rating will also be <i>Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues</i>. However, it is possible for a district rating to be <i>Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues</i> without any of its campuses having that rating label.</p>
--	---

Annual accountability ratings are finalized when the accountability appeals process for the year is completed in the fall following release of the ratings.

The state accountability rating and the AYP status will be aligned in 2004 in that the labels for the two systems will be conjoined. For example, an *Academically Acceptable* district that also *Meets AYP*, will receive a label of *Academically Acceptable, Meets AYP*. See *Section VII – AYP and the Accountability System* for details about the relationship between the AYP and state accountability systems.

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

In mid-September, prior to finalizing all computations necessary for accountability ratings, TEA will send districts preview data tables for the district and each campus.

These tables will *not* show a rating and will *not* provide calculations for Required Improvement or the Exceptions Provision. However, using the data on the tables and the *2004 Accountability Manual*, districts can predict 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.

A sample unmasked preview data table for a campus serving grades 7-12 is on the following pages. While not a common configuration, this grade span includes data for all accountability indicators.

**Table 4: Sample Data Table**

This preview information is *confidential*.

Preview data tables similar to this one will be sent to districts in mid-September. Final data tables will be available on September 30th.

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

09/16/2004 CONFIDENTIAL

2004 PREVIEW

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY ACCOUNTABILITY DATA TABLES

PAGE 1

DISTRICT NAME: SAMPLE ISD  
 CAMPUS NAME: SAMPLE SCHOOL  
 CAMPUS NUMBER: 99999999

Campus Rating:   
 Grade Span: 07 - 12

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

---

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS) TABLE

Performance Results	2004				2003			Required Improvement			
	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?
<b>Reading/ELA</b>											
X All Students	66	131	50%	100%	36	91	40%		10		
X African Amer	54	114	47%	87%	29	80	36%		11		
Hispanic	8	11	73%	8%	5	8	63%		10		
White	4	5	80%	4%	2	3	67%		13		
X Econ Disadv	64	127	50%	97%	12	18	67%		-17		
<b>Writing</b>											
X All Students	2	2	100%	100%	0	1	0%		100		
African Amer	1	1	100%	50%	0	1	0%		100		
Hispanic	1	1	100%	50%	0	0	-		-		
White	0	0	-	0%	0	0	-		-		
Econ Disadv	2	2	100%	100%	0	0	-		-		
<b>Social Studies</b>											
X All Students	28	50	56%	100%	31	71	44%		12		
X African Amer	25	44	57%	88%	28	62	45%		12		
Hispanic	2	4	50%	8%	2	5	40%		10		
White	1	1	100%	2%	1	4	25%		75		
X Econ Disadv	27	49	55%	98%	17	37	46%		9		
<b>Mathematics</b>											
X All Students	34	112	30%	100%	23	92	25%		5		
X African Amer	28	93	30%	83%	21	80	26%		4		
Hispanic	4	12	33%	11%	2	8	25%		8		
White	2	6	33%	5%	0	4	0%		33		
X Econ Disadv	33	111	30%	99%	12	48	25%		5		
<b>Science</b>											
X All Students	10	44	23%	100%	11	54	20%		3		
X African Amer	9	40	23%	91%	10	48	21%		2		
Hispanic	0	1	0%	2%	1	5	20%		-20		
White	0	2	0%	5%	0	1	0%		0		
X Econ Disadv	9	43	21%	98%	6	28	21%		0		

---

STATE-DEVELOPED ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT (SDAA) TABLE

SDAA Results	2004				2003			Required Improvement			
	# Tests Met ARD	# Tests	Pct Met ARD	Stu Grp %	# Tests Met ARD	# Tests	Pct Met ARD	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI
All Students	0	1	0%	100%	1	1	100%		-100		

---

EXCEPTIONS TABLE

Number Msrs Evaluated	Number Allowed	Number Needed	Floor(s) Met?	Exceptions Applied
13	2			

RI, exceptions data, and rating do not appear here. These will be on the final data table on 9/30/04.

DISTRICT NAME: SAMPLE ISD  
CAMPUS NAME: SAMPLE SCHOOL  
CAMPUS NUMBER: 999999999

Campus Rating:  
Grade Span: 07 - 12

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

COMPLETION RATE TABLE

	Class of 2003					Class of 2002			Required Improvement			
	# Com- pleters	# Non- complters	# in Class	Comp Rate	Stu Grp %	# Com- pleters	# in Class	Comp Rate	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?
X All Students	119	12	131	90.8%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
African Amer	92	7	99	92.9%	76%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	22	3	25	88.0%	19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	5	2	7	71.4%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Econ Disadv	58	2	60	96.7%	46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE TABLE

	2002-03				2001-02			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	2	33	6.1%	100%	0	31	0.0%	-	6.1	-	-
African Amer	2	27	7.4%	82%	0	27	0.0%	-	7.4	-	-
Hispanic	0	2	0.0%	6%	0	4	0.0%	-	0.0	-	-
White	0	4	0.0%	12%	0	0	-	-	-	-	-
Econ Disadv	1	9	11.1%	27%	0	13	0.0%	-	11.1	-	-

RI, exceptions data, and rating do not appear here. These will be on the final data table on 9/30/04.

*The design of both the preview and final data tables may vary slightly from the samples shown.*

**TAKS**

**Analysis Group Marker** – An ‘X’ to the left of a group label indicates that performance results for that group are used to determine an accountability rating because minimum size criteria were met. If no ‘X’ appears, then the size minimums were not met and performance results for that group are not used to determine the accountability rating. Note that ‘All Students’ results for TAKS are always evaluated.

**Percent Met Standard** – This value is the key number for TAKS: it shows what percent of the student group passed that test.

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS) TABLE

Performance Results	2004			
	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Stu Grp %
X Reading/ELA All Students	66	131	50%	100%
X African Amer	54	114	47%	87%
Hispanic	8	11	73%	8%
White	4	5	80%	4%
X Econ Disadv	64	127	50%	97%
X Writing All Students	2	2	100%	100%
African Amer	1	1	100%	50%
Hispanic	1	1	100%	50%
White	0	0	-	0%
Econ Disadv	2	2	100%	100%

**Number Met Standard** – This value is the numerator used to calculate percent met standard.

**Number Taking** – This value is the denominator used to calculate percent met standard.

## SDAA

The SDAA has only one measure: percent met ARD expectations (summed across grades and subjects; All Students only.)

----- 2004 -----				
SDAA Results	# Tests Met ARD	# Tests	Pct Met ARD	Stu Grp %
All Students	0	1	0%	100%

*Number of Tests* – This value is the denominator used to calculate the percent met ARD Expectations.

*Number of Tests that Met ARD Expectations* – This value is the numerator used to calculate the percent met ARD Expectations.

*Minimum Size* – Note that at this campus there was only one SDAA test given, well below the minimum number required (30) for the indicator to be evaluated.

## Completion Rate

----- Class of 2003 -----					
	# Completers	# Non-compltrs	# in Class	Comp Rate	Stu Grp %
X All Students	119	12	131	90.8%	100%
African Amer	92	7	99	92.9%	76%
Hispanic	22	3	25	88.0%	19%
White	5	2	7	71.4%	5%
Econ Disadv	58	2	60	96.7%	46%

To calculate the completion rate, divide the *number of completers* (in this example, 119) by the *number in the class of 2003* (131). This equals the *completion rate* (90.8%). The completion rate for this campus is well within the *Recognized* level.

*Number in Class* – This value is the denominator used to calculate the completion rate.

*Number of Completers* – This value is the numerator used to calculate the completion rate.

*Minimum Size* – The *number of non-completers* and the *number in class* are used together to determine whether there are enough students for a group to be evaluated.

## Annual Dropout Rate

----- 2002-03 -----				
	# Dropouts	# 7-8 Graders	Dropout Rate	Stu Grp %
All Students	2	33	6.1%	100%
African Amer	2	27	7.4%	82%
Hispanic	0	2	0.0%	6%
White	0	4	0.0%	12%
Econ Disadv	1	9	11.1%	27%

To calculate the annual dropout rate, divide the *number of dropouts* by the *number of 7th and 8th graders*.

*Number of 7th and 8th Graders* – This value is the denominator used to calculate the annual dropout rate.

*Number of Dropouts* – This value is the numerator used to calculate the annual dropout rate.

*Minimum Size* – Note that at this campus there were only two dropouts, well below the minimum number required (10) for the indicator to be evaluated.

## Student Group Percent

Student group percentages are shown to help explain which student groups meet the minimum size criteria for the indicator. These percents are rounded to whole numbers.

Performance Results	2004			
	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Stu Grp %
Social Studies				
X All Students	28	50	56%	100%
X African Amer	25	44	57%	88%
Hispanic	2	4	50%	8%
White	1	1	100%	2%
X Econ Disadv	27	49	55%	98%

At this campus note that while the number of African American and Economically Disadvantaged students is fewer than 50, their student group percent is much higher than the minimum size criteria of 10%. For that reason these two groups are analyzed for this subject.

## Required Improvement

Campuses or districts may achieve a higher rating using *Required Improvement*. It can be applied to any of the base indicators – TAKS, SDAA, Completion, and Annual Dropout Rate – to raise a rating from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*. It can be applied to TAKS and SDAA to raise a rating from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*. All calculations for Required Improvement will be done automatically by TEA and shown on the final data tables.

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS) TABLE

Performance Results	2004				2003			Required Improvement			
	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
Mathematics											
X All Students	34	112	30%	100%	23	92	25%	yes	5		
X African Amer	28	93	30%	83%	21	80	26%	yes	4		
Hispanic	4	12	33%	11%	2	8	25%		8		
White	2	6	33%	5%	0	4	0%		33		
X Econ Disadv	33	111	30%	99%	12	48	25%	yes	5		
Science											
X All Students	10	44	23%	100%	11	54	20%	yes	3		
X African Amer	4	40	23%	91%	10	48	21%	yes	2		
Hispanic	1	1	0%	2%	1	5	20%		-20		
White	2	2	0%	5%	0	1	0%		0		
X Econ Disadv	43	111	21%	98%	6	28	21%	yes	0		

At this campus, all performance is at the *Academically Acceptable* standard or above for all measures except TAKS mathematics and science.

To see if the rating can be raised by applying Required Improvement, first check to see if each measure meets the minimum size for the prior year (at least 10 test takers).

This campus meets the minimum size for Required Improvement.

Performance Results	2003				Required Improvement		
	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI
X All Students	23	92	25%	yes	5	5	yes
X African Amer	21	80	26%	yes	4	5	no
Hispanic	2	8	25%		8		
White	0	4	0%		33		
X Econ Disadv	12	48	25%	yes	5	5	yes
Science							
X All Students	11	54	20%	yes	3	3	yes
X African Amer	10	48	21%	yes	2	2	yes
Hispanic	1	5	20%		-20		
White	0	1	0%		0		
X Econ Disadv	6	28	21%	yes	0	2	no

Next, determine the Required Improvement: The formula is *the standard for 2004 minus the campus's performance in 2003, divided by 2*.

Finally, for each measure, see if the actual change is greater than or equal to the Required Improvement. A negative number indicates performance has declined (except in the case of dropout rate, where it means improvement).

This campus met Required Improvement for all but two measures.

## Exceptions

Campuses or districts evaluated to be *Academically Unacceptable* even after applying Required Improvement may be able to “gate up” to *Academically Acceptable* using the Exceptions Provision for the TAKS and/or SDAA measures. (Exceptions cannot be used to move a campus or district to *Recognized*.)

This campus was evaluated on 13 assessment measures, so it is allowed up to 2 exceptions.

After applying Required Improvement, this campus has 2 measures that are still at *Academically Unacceptable* (coincidentally the same number as the number of exceptions it has available).

Next, determine if the 2004 performance in the two areas meets the floor: it must be no more than 5 percentage points below the standard (at least 30% for mathematics and at least 20% for science).

EXCEPTIONS TABLE				
Number Msrs Evaluated	Number Allowed	Number Needed	Floor(s) Met?	Exceptions Applied
13	2	2	yes	<i>Mathematics - African American</i> <i>Science - Economically Disadvantaged</i>

This campus is successfully able to use their two exceptions and gate up to a rating of *Academically Acceptable*. Note that they will need to work hard to maintain this rating in 2005. This campus will not be eligible to use exceptions for these measures in 2005.

## FINAL DATA TABLES

The sample shown is of a *preview* data table. These will be mailed to districts prior to finalizing accountability ratings, for use in verifying their early calculations. Ratings will be released on September 30, 2004. Copies of the final data tables will not be mailed to districts; rather, lists of ratings will be distributed by the ESCs and masked data tables will be put online and made available to districts and the public. See *Section IX - Calendar* for other important dates.

The following items will appear on the final data tables:

*Accountability Ratings.* (A list of possible rating labels is shown in *Table 3* in this section.)

*Pairing.* Any regular campus with enrollment within grades 1-12, but no students tested on TAKS will be paired for accountability. A message will indicate the campus it is paired with.

*Messages.* These messages appear in the top section of the data table when applicable:

- (Special Analysis Used) (*campus or district*)
- Rating changed due to appeal. Data not modified. (*campus or district*)
- This campus is an open-enrollment charter campus. (*campus only*)
- This campus is not rated due to grade span. (*campus only*)
- This is a registered alternative education campus. (*campus only*)
- This is an alternative education open-enrollment charter. (*district only*)
- District has one or more campuses rated *Academically Unacceptable*. (*district only*)
- District exceeds threshold for underreported students. (*district only*)
- Rating assigned due to data integrity issues, not data shown in this table. (*campus or district*)

*Required Improvement.* The final data table shows all calculations for Required Improvement:

- Met Min Size - Met Minimum Size shows “yes” or “no.”
- RI - This shows the amount of change needed for Required Improvement to be met.
- Met RI - If Required Improvement is calculated, this shows “yes” or “no” depending on the comparison of actual change to the change needed (RI).
- *Blank* - If Required Improvement is not applicable, the columns are blank.

*Footnotes.* A footnote appears if the Required Improvement floor of 65% is not met thus preventing the use of Required Improvement to change a rating from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*.

*Exceptions.* The final data table shows all calculations for the Exceptions Provision:

- Number Needed - This shows the number of assessment measures below the *Academically Acceptable* standard that did not meet Required Improvement.
- Floor Met? - This shows “yes” or “no” depending on whether or not the performance floor was met for all the assessment measures needing exception. If any don’t meet the floor, “no” appears.
- Exceptions Applied - This shows the subject and group for which an exception is used. Up to three may be listed.
- *Blank* - If the Exceptions Provision is not applicable, the columns are blank.

### **Masked Data**

As in the past, performance on the data tables posted to the agency website is masked when there are fewer than five students in the denominator of the measure. Additionally, for the first time this year, all performance at or near 0% or 100% is also masked. It is necessary to mask data that potentially reveals the performance of every student in order to be in compliance with the federal *Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act* (FERPA).

### **System Summary**

---

Two tables follow that summarize the 2004 system. *Table 5* provides an overview of the requirements for achieving each rating level. A district or campus must meet the criteria for every applicable measure to be rated *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, or *Academically Acceptable*. If the criteria for a rating are not met for every measure, then the next lower rating is assigned.

For example, to be *Academically Acceptable*, a campus or district must satisfy all requirements shown in the *Academically Acceptable* column for each indicator evaluated. As shown, districts and campuses can meet the criteria for the *Academically Acceptable* rating by meeting either an absolute performance standard or Required Improvement for the base indicators.

In contrast, the *Recognized* column shows that Required Improvement is not an option for achieving *Recognized* status for either the dropout rate or completion rate indicators—the absolute *Recognized* standards must be met for these indicators. The table also shows that the Exceptions Provision only applies to the *Academically Acceptable* rating.

Districts must meet two additional provisions at the *Recognized* and *Exemplary* rating levels: Checks for *Academically Unacceptable* campuses and excessive underreported students.

In *Table 6*, a single-page overview provides details of the 2004 system, with the base indicators listed as columns. For example, for each of the indicators, users of this table can see brief definitions, the rounding methodology, the accountability subset methodology, the standards, minimum size criteria, subjects and student groups used, application of Required Improvement, and the Exceptions Provision.

**Table 5: Requirements for each Rating Category**

	<b>Academically Acceptable</b>	<b>Recognized</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>
<b>Assessment Indicators</b>			
<p><b>Spring 2004 TAKS</b> All students and each student group that meets minimum size criteria: African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadv.</p>	<p>meet passing standard for each subject:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reading/ELA <b>50%</b></li> <li>○ Writing <b>50%</b></li> <li>○ Social Studies <b>50%</b></li> <li>○ Mathematics <b>35%</b></li> <li>○ Science <b>25%</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b> meet Required Improvement</p>	<p>meet <b>70%</b> passing standard for each subject</p> <p><b>OR</b> meet <b>65%</b> passing standard and meet Required Improvement</p>	<p>meet <b>90%</b> passing standard for each subject</p>
<p><b>Spring 2004 SDAA</b> All students if meet minimum size criteria</p>	<p>meet <b>50%</b> passing standard (<i>Met ARD Expectations</i>) for single indicator</p> <p><b>OR</b> meet Required Improvement</p>	<p>meet <b>70%</b> passing standard (<i>Met ARD Expectations</i>) for single indicator</p> <p><b>OR</b> meet <b>65%</b> passing standard and meet Required Improvement</p>	<p>meet <b>90%</b> passing standard (<i>Met ARD Expectations</i>) for single indicator</p>
<b>Completion &amp; Dropout Indicators</b>			
<p><b>Completion Rate Class of 2003</b> All students and each student group that meets minimum size criteria: African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadv.</p>	<p>meet <b>75.0%</b> completion rate standard</p> <p><b>OR</b> meet Required Improvement</p>	<p>meet <b>85.0%</b> completion rate standard</p>	<p>meet <b>95.0%</b> completion rate standard</p>
<p><b>Annual Dropout Rate 2002-03</b> All students and each student group that meets minimum size criteria: African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadv.</p>	<p>meet <b>2.0%</b> dropout rate standard</p> <p><b>OR</b> meet Required Improvement</p>	<p>meet <b>0.7%</b> dropout rate standard</p>	<p>meet <b>0.2%</b> dropout rate standard</p>
<b>Additional Provisions</b>			
	<p><u>Exceptions Provision (variable):</u> This provision may be applied if the district or campus would be <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> solely due to not meeting the <i>Academically Acceptable</i> criteria on up to 3 assessment measures. Additional conditions must be met.</p>	<p><u>Check for Academically Unacceptable Campuses:</u> A district that has one or more campuses rated <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> cannot receive a rating of <i>Exemplary</i> or <i>Recognized</i>.</p> <p><u>Underreported Students:</u> A district that fails to meet accountability standards for underreported students cannot receive a rating of <i>Exemplary</i> or <i>Recognized</i>. 2004 standards are: no more than <b>500</b> underreported students and no more than <b>5.0%</b> underreported students.</p>	

**Table 6: Overview of 2004 System Components**

	<b>TAKS</b>	<b>SDAA</b>	<b>Completion Rate</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
<b>Definition</b>	The TAKS results (gr. 3-11) summed across grades by subject. Reading & ELA results are combined. 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> administration results of gr. 3 reading are combined. Student passing standard is 1 SEM for gr. 3-10; 2 SEM for gr. 11.	A single (gr. 3-8) indicator calculated as the number of tests meeting ARD expectations (summed across grades & subjects) divided by the number of SDAA tests.	Graduates, GED recipients, and continuers expressed as a % of total students in the class. Campuses serving any of gr. 9-12 w/out a completion rate are assigned the district completion rate.	Gr. 7 and 8 official dropouts as a percent of total gr. 7 and 8 students who were in attendance at any time during the school year.
<b>Rounding</b>	Whole Numbers	Whole Numbers	One decimal	One decimal
<b>Standards Exemplary Recognized Acceptable</b>	Ex.: All Subjects ≥ 90% Re.: All Subjects ≥ 70% Acc.: Rdg / Wr / SS ≥ 50% Mathematics ≥ 35% Science ≥ 25%	Ex.: ≥ 90% Re.: ≥ 70% Acc.: ≥ 50%	Ex.: ≥ 95.0% Re.: ≥ 85.0% Acc.: ≥ 75.0%	Ex.: ≤ 0.2% Re.: ≤ 0.7% Acc.: ≤ 2.0%
<b>Mobility Adjustment (Accountability Subset)</b>	<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	None
<b>Subjects</b>	Reading/ELA Writing Mathematics Social Studies Science	Reading Writing Mathematics n/a n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Student Groups</b>	<u>All &amp; Student Grps:</u> African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadv.	<u>All Students Only</u>	<u>All &amp; Student Grps:</u> African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadv.	<u>All &amp; Student Grps:</u> African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadv.
<b>Minimum Size Criteria</b>				
<b>All</b>	No minimum size requirement—special analysis for small numbers	30 or more tests	≥ 10 dropouts AND ≥ 10 students	≥ 10 dropouts AND ≥ 10 students
<b>Groups</b>	30/10%/50	n/a	≥ 10 dropouts AND 30/10%/50	≥ 10 dropouts AND 30/10%/50
<b>Required Improvement (RI)</b>				
<b>Actual Chg</b>	2004 minus 2003 performance (@ 2004 passing std)	2004 minus 2003 performance	Class of 2003 rate minus Class of 2002 rate	2002-03 rate minus 2001-02 rate
<b>RI</b>	Gain needed to reach subject std (70%, 50%, 35%, 25%) in 2 yrs.	Gain needed to reach std (70%, 50%) in 2 yrs.	Gain needed to reach 75.0% in 2 yrs.	Decline needed to reach 2.0% in 2 yrs.
<b>Use</b>	Gate up to <i>Acceptable</i> and <i>Recognized</i>	Gate up to <i>Acceptable</i> and <i>Recognized</i>	Gate up to <i>Acceptable</i>	Gate up to <i>Acceptable</i>
<b>Floor</b>	<i>Recognized</i> —at least 65%	<i>Recognized</i> —at least 65%	none	none
<b>Minimum Size</b>	Meets minimum size in current year and has ≥ 10 students tested in prior year.	Meets minimum size in current year and has ≥ 10 tests in prior year.	Meets minimum size in current year and has ≥ 10 students in completion class the prior year.	Meets minimum size in current year & has ≥ 10 7 <sup>th</sup> -8 <sup>th</sup> grade students the prior yr.
<b>Exceptions</b>	After application of RI, this provision may be applied if the campus or district would be <i>Unacceptable</i> solely due to not meeting the <i>Acceptable</i> criteria on up to 3 assessment measures. Applies to 26 measures – 25 TAKS (5 subjects x 5 groups) plus the SDAA measure.		n/a	n/a
<b>Use</b>	As a gate up to <i>Acceptable</i>		n/a	n/a
<b>Floor</b>	No more than 5 percentage points below <i>Acceptable</i> std.		n/a	n/a
<b>Number of Exceptions Allowed (variable)</b>	# of Assessment Measures Evaluated (at campus or district)	Maximum Exceptions Allowed	n/a	n/a
	1 – 5	0		
	6 – 10	1		
	11 – 15	2		
	16 – 26	3		



## Section IV – 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 exceptional performance on:

- Advanced Course Completion
- Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate Results
- Attendance Rate
- Commended Performance: Reading/English Language Arts
- Commended Performance: Mathematics
- Commended Performance: Writing
- Commended Performance: Science
- Commended Performance: Social Studies
- Recommended High School Program/ Distinguished Achievement Program
- SAT/ACT Results (College Admissions Tests)
- TAAS/TASP Equivalency (College Preparedness)

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT CATEGORIES

- **Acknowledged** – The campus or district is rated *Academically Acceptable* or higher, has performance results to be evaluated, and has met the acknowledgment criteria on one or more of the indicators.
- **Does Not Qualify** –
  - 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 has been initially rated *Academically Unacceptable*. (This includes those that are later granted a higher rating on appeal.)
- **Not Applicable** –
  - The campus or district does not have performance results to be evaluated for this acknowledgment.
  - The campus or district is labeled *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*.
  - The campus or charter is labeled *Not Rated: Alternative Education*.
  - The campus or district is labeled *Not Rated: Other* (for example, campuses that only serve students in pre-kindergarten/kindergarten, or campuses not rated due to insufficient data).

Districts and campuses can receive acknowledgment separately on each of the eleven indicators.

An overview of the GPA system is provided in *Table 7* below. Detailed definitions of each indicator follow.

**Table 7: Gold Performance Acknowledgment Standards for 2004**

Indicator	Description	Standard	Year Evaluated
<b>Advanced Course Completion</b>	Percent of 9 <sup>th</sup> –12 <sup>th</sup> graders completing and receiving credit for at least one Advanced Course	25.0% or more**	2002-03
<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>	2002-03
	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%	2002-03
<b>Commended Performance: Reading/ELA</b>	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the commended performance standard	20% or more**	Spring 2004
<b>Commended Performance: Mathematics</b>	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the commended performance standard	20% or more**	Spring 2004
<b>Commended Performance: Writing</b>	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the commended performance standard	20% or more**	Spring 2004
<b>Commended Performance: Science</b>	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the commended performance standard	20% or more**	Spring 2004
<b>Commended Performance: Social Studies</b>	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the commended performance standard	20% or more**	Spring 2004
<b>Recommended High School Program/DAP</b>	Percent of graduates meeting or exceeding requirements for the RHSP/Distinguished Achievement Program	50.0% or more**	Class of 2003
<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 2003
	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the criterion score (SAT 1110; ACT Composite 24)	40.0% or more at or above criterion*	
<b>TAAS / TASP Equivalency</b>	Percent of graduates meeting/exceeding the TAAS/TASP equivalency standards. (Reading TLI >= X-81; Mathematics TLI >= X-77; Writing scale score >= 1540)	80.0% or more**	Class of 2003

\* 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.

All Gold Performance Acknowledgment indicators for 2004 are available at the district and campus level, depending on grades served.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT INDICATORS:

**Advanced Course 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.

**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, 25.0% of the 2002-03 students in grades 9 through 12 must receive credit for at least one advanced academic course.

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

### Methodology:

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

**Minimum Size Requirements:** All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of students. Student groups are 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:** 2002-03

**Data Source:** PEIMS submission 3 (June 2003)

### Other information:

- Performance of special education students is included in this measure.
- 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 Examination 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 11th and 12th 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:*

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

*and*

*performance:*

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

**Minimum Size Requirements:** All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers or number of students enrolled in the 11th and 12th 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 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> graders; or
  - 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:** 2002-03 school year

**Data Source:** Educational Testing Service, a College Board contractor; The International Baccalaureate Organization; and PEIMS submission 1 (October 2002)

**Other information:**

- The criterion score is 3 or above on Advanced Placement tests and 4 or above on International Baccalaureate examinations.
- For *participation*, special education 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> graders 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.
- 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:**

$$\frac{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were present in 2002-03}}{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were in membership in 2002-03}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** For attendance, the minimum size is based on total days in membership rather than individual student counts. 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:** 2002-03

**Data Source:** PEIMS submission 3 (June 2003)

**Other information:**

- The campus type (elementary, high school, etc.) is assigned using the low and high grades taught as determined from the 2003-04 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.
- Attendance for the entire school year is used.
- This measure includes both non-special education and special education students.
- 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.

**Commended Performance: Reading/ELA - TAKS** Commended Performance is the highest performance level set by the State Board of Education 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 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 20% 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:**

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

**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:** 2004 (Spring TAKS Administration)

**Data Source:** Pearson Educational Measurement

**Other information:**

- Commended Performance is a scale score of 2400 or more on the TAKS.
- Third grade reading performance is the cumulative passing rate over the March and April administrations. This means that the results of students re-tested on the same campus in April are included in campus performance; students re-tested in the same district in April are included in district performance.
- Students who move between campuses after October 31 and before their last TAKS test are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 31 and before their last test are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 2 – Accountability Subset* in *Section I* for more information.
- All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 19.877% is rounded to 20%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.
- Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.
- Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on *Commended Performance*.

**Commended Performance: Mathematics** - TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set by the State Board of Education 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 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 20% 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:**

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

**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:** 2004 (Spring TAKS Administration)

**Data Source:** Pearson Educational Measurement

**Other information:**

- Commended Performance is a scale score of 2400 or more on the TAKS
- Students who move between campuses after October 31 and before their last TAKS test are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 31 and before their last test are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 2: Accountability Subset in Section I* for more information.
- All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 19.877% is rounded to 20%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.
- Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.
- Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on *Commended Performance*.

**Commended Performance: Writing** - TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set by the State Board of Education 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 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 20% 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:**

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

**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:** 2004 (Spring TAKS Administration)

**Data Source:** Pearson Educational Measurement

**Other information:**

- Commended Performance is a scale score of 2400 or more on the TAKS
- Students who move between campuses after October 31 and before their last TAKS test are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 31 and before their last test are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 2: Accountability Subset in Section I* for more information.
- All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 19.877% is rounded to 20%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.
- Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.
- Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on *Commended Performance*.

**Commended Performance: Science** - TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set by the State Board of Education 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 science (grades 5, 10 & 11) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 20% 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:**

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

**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:** 2004 (Spring TAKS Administration)

**Data Source:** Pearson Educational Measurement

**Other information:**

- Commended Performance is a scale score of 2400 or more on the TAKS
- Students who move between campuses after October 31 and before their last TAKS test are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 31 and before their last test are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 2: Accountability Subset in Section I* for more information.
- All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 19.877% is rounded to 20%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.
- Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.
- Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on *Commended Performance*.

**Commended Performance: Social Studies** - TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set by the State Board of Education 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 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 20% 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:**

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

**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:** 2004 (Spring TAKS Administration)

**Data Source:** Pearson Educational Measurement

**Other information:**

- Commended Performance is a scale score of 2400 or more on the TAKS
- Students who move between campuses after October 31 and before their last TAKS test are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 31 and before their last test are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Accountability Subset* in *Section I* for more information.
- All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 19.877% is rounded to 20%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.
- Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.

**Recommended High School 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 with graduates that have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, 50.0% of all 2003 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 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 2003

**Data Source:** PEIMS submission 1 (October 2003)

**Other information:**

- Measure includes both non-special education and special education graduates.
- 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.

**SAT/ACT Results** – This indicator shows the performance and participation on two college admissions tests: the College Board’s SAT and ACT, Inc.’s ACT Assessment.

**Who is eligible:** Districts and campuses with graduates 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 70.0% or more of the class of 2003 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:*

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

**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; or
  - 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 2003

**Data Source:** Educational Testing Service, a College Board contractor (SAT) and ACT, Inc. (ACT)

**Other information:**

- The criterion score is 1110 on the SAT (total) or 24 on the ACT (composite).
- Both testing companies annually provide the agency with testing 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.
- For *participation* special education graduates 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.
- 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.
- The student taking the test identifies the campus to which a score is attributed.
- 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.

**TAAS/TASP Equivalency** - This indicator shows the percent of graduates who performed well enough on the exit-level TAAS as first-time test-takers to have a 75.0% likelihood of passing the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP) test. The TASP was given to all students enrolled in publicly funded Texas institutions of higher learning until the fall of 2003. Students will continue to graduate under the TAAS graduation requirements through the class of 2004.

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

**Standard:** For acknowledgment on this indicator, 80.0% of all 2003 first-time tested graduates must meet or exceed the TAAS/TASP equivalency standards.

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

**Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of graduates meeting TAAS/TASP equivalency standards for all subjects taken on their first TAAS exit-level administration}}{\text{number of first-time tested graduates}}$$

**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 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 2003 - includes TAAS performance of 10<sup>th</sup> graders (first-time test takers) in 2001, TAAS performance of 11<sup>th</sup> graders (first-time test takers) in 2002, and TAAS performance of 12<sup>th</sup> graders (first-time test takers) in 2003.

**Data Source:** TEA Student Assessment Division and PEIMS

**Other information:**

- To be counted for this indicator a student must have achieved a TLI of X-81 or higher on the TAAS reading test, a TLI of X-77 or higher on the TAAS mathematics test, and a scale score of 1540 or higher on the TAAS writing test.
- Both non-special education and special education graduates who took the exit-level TAAS are included in the evaluation.
- All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 79.877% is rounded to 79.9%, not 80.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

**NOTIFICATION OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

Notification of Gold Performance Acknowledgment will occur in December 2004 at the same time as the 2004 ratings update that follows the resolution of all appeals. (See *Section IX – Calendar* for more details.)

Notification consists of release of the GPA data tables detailing the data used to compute the GPA indicators and listing the acknowledgments achieved. GPA certificates will not be provided by TEA to districts for 2004. Sample GPA data tables are not available for inclusion in this document at the time of publication. GPA data tables that have been masked to protect student confidentiality will be posted to the agency website in December 2004.



## Section V – 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 for the district and safeguards to the system that the state has developed. Consequences—those actions that occur as a result of the accountability system—follow. Consequences include sanctions and rewards. All statutes referenced in this section are listed in *Appendix B – Texas Education Code* with web addresses provided for the complete citations.

### Local Responsibilities

---

Districts have responsibilities associated with the state accountability system. Primarily these involve properly managing campus identification numbers, following statutory requirements, submitting accurate data, and implementing an optional local accountability system.

#### CAMPUS IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS

In a given year, districts may need to change one or more of their campus identification numbers, the unique 9-digit county-district-campus number (CDC), due to closing old schools, opening new schools, or changing the grade span or population served of an existing school. The Texas Education Agency's data system can accommodate these events; however, it does not track these organizational changes over time. 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 2003, but in 2004, 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 2003 was maintained (recycled). Therefore, in 2004, grade 6 performance on the assessments would be compared to prior year grade 7 and 8 performance. Also, any dropout data reported for the campus in 2002-03 would be subject to evaluation for the 2004 accountability ratings.

Whether or not to change a campus number is a local decision. However, districts should exercise caution in requesting new numbers and in 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.*

Alternatively, if a CDC number is retired for a campus that has received an *Academically Unacceptable* rating, TEA will follow up with the district to determine if the campus truly closed or if the number was changed to avoid TEA actions to address its poor performance.

Analyses to screen for the inappropriate use of new campus numbers are part of *System Safeguards*, below. TEA PEIMS Division can assist in establishing new, or retiring old, campus numbers. See *Appendix D – Contacts*.

## STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

*Public Discussion of Ratings.* Each campus site-based decision-making committee shall 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 [TEC §11.253 (g)]. The confidentiality of the performance results should be evaluated before considering public release of the data table. Data have been masked to protect confidentiality of individual student results on the data tables available on the TEA website.

*Academically Unacceptable.* If a district or campus is rated *Academically Unacceptable*, the board of trustees must notify property owners and parents in the district of the rating, the improvements in performance expected by the Texas Education Agency, and the sanctions that may be imposed if the performance does not improve [TEC §39.073 (d)].

Boards of trustees should attempt to comply with the statute in the most efficient ways possible. Where meetings and hearings required by various statutes can be combined, it is appropriate to do so.

## 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, further differentiation among campuses rated *Academically Acceptable* may be desired.

Yet a third approach is 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.

## 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.

These analyses include, but are not limited to, an audit of lever data; examination of assessment data including data attributed to JJAEPs and/or DAEPs; and review of the issuance of new campus identification numbers. If these or any other analyses raise cause for concern, TEA will follow up with the district.

All TEA-conducted safeguards will be incorporated into Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) core data quality initiatives. PBM is part of an overall framework for monitoring and evaluation that is being developed in response to legislation passed in 2003. New strategies for monitoring will focus on data-driven, integrated monitoring where on-site review is the intervention of last resort. As a result of system safeguard activities, sanctions may be imposed.

## Sanctions

---

Sanctions describe the consequences that can occur as a result of either:

- identifying problems through the application of system safeguards;
- having unacceptable performance; or,
- on-site investigations authorized under TEC §39.074 or special accreditation investigations authorized under §39.075.

## GENERAL INTERVENTIONS

A number of steps may be taken in response to identified concern(s) based on the nature and severity of the problem(s) identified. The Commissioner of Education has the authority to take action under TEC §39.131 and TEC §39.132, *Sanctions for Districts* and *Sanctions for Campuses*, respectively. These sections of statute list sanctions in order of severity, ranging from requiring the district to issue public notice of the deficiency to the board of trustees to appointing a management team (district) or special campus intervention team (campus).

If a district or campus receives the lowest rating for two consecutive years or more, the level of state intervention increases and includes possible closure or consolidation (district) or reconstitution (campus).

## LOWERING A RATING

Additionally, TEC §39.074 and §39.075 authorize the commissioner of education to lower a campus and/or district accountability rating. Lowering an accountability rating is typically not the first action taken in response to a problem. However, if other actions are not successful in correcting the problem, a district is unresponsive, or the severity of the problem warrants, this is an option available to the commissioner. If the commissioner determines that a change in rating is appropriate, the district is notified in writing.

Although registered alternative education campuses and charters will not be rated in 2004 based on academic performance, the commissioner of education has the authority to assign an *Academically Unacceptable* rating to address problems identified through accountability system safeguards, Performance-Based Monitoring, or other monitoring and compliance investigations.

## **DATA INTEGRITY ISSUES**

A rating can also 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 are compromised and it is not possible to assign a standard rating label based on the evaluation of performance. This label may be assigned temporarily at the time of the initial ratings release 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. The Commissioner of Education has the authority to assign an *Academically Unacceptable* rating for data quality issues, as described above in *Lowering a Rating*. All districts and campuses with a final rating label of *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* are automatically subject to desk audits the following year.

## **TIMING**

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 2004 the update is scheduled for December). A rating change resulting from an imposed sanction will stand as the final rating for the year.

## **PUBLIC EDUCATION GRANT PROGRAM**

In 1995, the Texas Legislature created the Public Education Grant (PEG) program [TEC §§29.201 - 29.205]. The PEG program permits parents with children attending campuses that are on the PEG list to transfer their children to campuses in other districts. A list of campuses identified under the PEG criteria is generated and transmitted to districts annually. Districts must notify each parent of a student in the district assigned to attend a campus on the PEG list by February 1. In December 2004 the list of 2005-06 PEG campuses will be transmitted. This list will identify campuses at which 50 percent or more of the students did not pass TAAS or TAKS in any two of the preceding three years (2002, 2003, or 2004) **or** that were rated *Low-performing* in 2002 or *Academically Unacceptable* in 2004 under the statewide accountability system.

## **Rewards**

---

### **STATUTORY AWARDS PROGRAMS**

Statute provides monetary rewards for high performance or improvement. The Texas Successful Schools Award System (TSSAS) provides monetary awards to campuses [TEC Chapter 39, Subchapter E]. In 2003, the Texas Legislature did not appropriate funds for this program for the 2004/2005 biennium.

Another statutory awards program, the Performance Incentive Program (PIP), rewards the principals of campuses demonstrating performance gains [TEC §21.357]. This program was not funded for the 2004/2005 biennium.

## **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 skills and knowledge, 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.



## Section VI – Special Issues and Circumstances

---

The vast majority of district and campus accountability ratings can be determined through the standard evaluation process detailed in *Sections I – III – 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 section describes pairing, special analysis, and the treatment of non-traditional campuses and their data in the accountability system.

### 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 TAAS data. The pairing process is continued in the new accountability system. A new pairing feature, available for the first time in 2004, is that districts also have the option to pair a campus with the district and be evaluated on the district's results.

TEA determines which campuses need to be paired for any given accountability cycle after analyzing enrollment files submitted on PEIMS Submission 1. 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 are not asked to pair any of their campuses; nor are registered alternative education campuses asked to pair.

For campuses that are paired, only TAKS data are shared. The paired campus is evaluated on any non-TAKS indicator data it may have. Similarly, the campus with which it is paired does not share any dropout, completion, or SDAA data it may have.

#### IMPROVEMENT CALCULATIONS

*Comparable Improvement.* In the past, districts were asked to pair campuses with a high grade of 3 in order to compute the TLI growth measures needed for Comparable Improvement (CI). The CI indicators do not exist in 2004, so no pairings associated with CI are required this year.

*Required Improvement.* In 2004, Required Improvement will be calculated with 2003 data based on the 2004 pairing relationships since no pairings were established in 2003. Thus if a campus is paired in 2004, that same pairing relationship is used to establish 2003 TAKS data for that campus. Similarly, if a campus is not paired in 2004, there will be no pairing relationship for it in 2003. Schools paired in 2004, but with their own 2003 data, will be evaluated on their 2003 data.

#### PAIRING PROCESS

Districts have the opportunity to reaffirm prior year pairing decisions and to provide new information by completing special data entry screens on the TEA website. (See samples that follow.) In late March districts with campuses that needed to be paired received instructions on how to access this on-line application. Pairing decisions were due by April 30, 2004.

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 2003-04 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 3rd grade.
- A new alternative, available this year for the first time, is the option of pairing a campus with the district instead of with 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 12th 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 reasonably justifiable (e.g., a change in attendance zones affecting feeder patterns).

### *Sample 2004 Paired Campuses Data Entry Application*

*Screen 1 of 3*

  

## Schools Pairing Form

The Texas Education Agency has [identified schools](#) which require pairing decisions for accountability purposes. This search will return the appropriate form for your district. Please supply the correct pairing information based on the [pairing guidelines](#).

Select the appropriate district.

Sample ISD  
Amarillo ISD  
Andrews ISD  
Aransas Pass ISD  
Athens ISD  
Atlanta ISD  
Barbers Hill ISD  
Breckenridge ISD

Please supply your name:

Please supply your area code and phone number:

**2004 ACCOUNTABILITY PAIRING FORM**

**Schools to be Paired for Accountability Purposes**

District Name: SAMPLE ISD  
 District Number: 999901  
 Region Number: 99

To Be Paired:			Paired With:
School Name	School Number	Grade Span	School Number, Name, Grade Span
SAMPLE PRIMARY	999901110	EE - 01	999901170 SAMPLE EL, 02-05
Once completed, press the button at right to SUBMIT your form.			<input type="button" value="Submit"/> <input type="button" value="Reset"/>

*This request took 0.70 seconds of real time (v9.1 build 1457).*

**THANK YOU!**

**We have received your pairing information.**

**Please print the following information for your records.**

**SAMPLE ISD updated by John Q. Educator on 04/15/04.**

To Be Paired:			Paired With:
School Name	School Number	Grade Span	School Name, Number, Grade Span
SAMPLE PRIMARY	999901110	EE - 01	999901170 SAMPLE EL, 02-05

*This request took 0.66 seconds of real time (v9.1 build 1457).*

## 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 previous sections of this manual. 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 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

A campus undergoes special analysis if:

- the campus 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 is *Academically Acceptable* or *Recognized* due to TAKS only, and the evaluation is governed by the results of fewer than four All Students tested.

The following are examples of campuses that will NOT undergo special analysis:

- Campuses rated *Exemplary*.
- Campuses that are *Not Rated*.
- Campuses that are not small (30 or more testers in all subjects).
- Campuses that have few students tested in TAKS, but whose rating of *Academically Unacceptable*, *Academically Acceptable*, or *Recognized* is due to the other indicators.

## METHODS FOR SPECIAL ANALYSIS

Campuses that undergo special analysis fall into three treatment categories: those that receive confidence interval analysis, those that receive professional review based on analysis of available performance data, and those that receive a combination of the two.

The treatment applied depends on the initial rating assigned. Campuses in the special analysis pool that are rated *Academically Unacceptable* are divided into two groups: those with at least 10 students tested in all subjects and those with fewer than 10 students tested in at least one subject. The confidence interval methodology is applied to the group with 10 or more tested. The group with fewer than 10 tested receives professional review.

Campuses in the special analysis pool that are rated *Academically Acceptable* or *Recognized* receive professional review.

*Confidence Intervals.* For each subject, a new threshold will be computed that represents the statistical equivalent of the *Academically Acceptable* standard for each unique combination of percent Met Standard and number tested. The percent Met Standard for each *Academically Unacceptable* subject is compared to the confidence interval threshold. If the campus meets the confidence interval threshold for all its *Academically Unacceptable* subjects, the rating is raised to *Academically Acceptable*. If the campus does not meet the confidence interval threshold for at least one subject, it remains *Academically Unacceptable*.

*Professional Review.* Professional review involves producing a summary of the district or campus data, analyzing the data, and arriving at a consensus decision. The summary data report includes all available indicator data for both 2003 and 2004. Trends and aggregate data are reviewed. However, because of the small numbers of test takers involved, it can be difficult to assign a rating that is considered reliable and fair. Thus, professional review can result in a *Not Rated* label for some campuses not otherwise meeting the automatic criteria for *Not Rated*.

## New Campuses

---

If a new campus (regular or charter) would receive a rating of *Academically Unacceptable* in its first year of operation, it will be labeled *Not Rated: Other*. New campuses are not rated *Academically Unacceptable* before they have prior-year data on which to calculate improvement. For 2004 ratings, a campus is determined to be new if students are reported in membership in the fall 2003 PEIMS submission 1 (for the 2003-04 school year), but the campus has no students in membership in the prior year (fall of 2002). Changes to campus numbers across years within a district or charter will be examined to identify inappropriate use of new campus numbers. See *Section V – Responsibilities and Consequences* for more information.

## Charters

---

Based on fall PEIMS data for the 2003-04 school year, there were 190 charters serving approximately 61,000 students. Most charters have only one campus (147 of the 190); however, some operate multiple campuses. In this publication the term “charter” refers to the charter operator, not an individual charter school. The term “charter campus” refers to an individual school.

By statute, charters are subject to most of the same federal and state laws as other public schools, including reporting and accountability requirements. In the previous accountability system only the campuses operated by the charter received an accountability rating. Beginning with 2004, charters as well as the campuses they operate will be rated, meaning charters will be rated under district rating criteria based on aggregate performance of the campuses operated by the charter. This means charters are also subject to the additional performance requirements applied to districts (underreported student standards and the check for *Academically Unacceptable* campuses). Because they will be rated, charters will also be eligible for *Gold Performance Acknowledgments* for the first time.

In 2004, there are some differences between the treatment of charters and traditional districts. These are:

- A charter may be labeled *Not Rated: Alternative Education*. This will occur in cases where the charter operates one or more registered alternative education campuses. A traditional district will never receive this rating.
- A charter may be labeled *Not Rated: Other*. This will occur in cases where the charter is new and would otherwise be rated *Academically Unacceptable*. In most cases, labeling first-year charters *Academically Unacceptable* would have the affect of rating the campuses operated by the charter in the first year of operation.
- Charters 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 inappropriate.

As with non-charter campuses, a charter campus that is a registered alternative education campus will be rated *Not Rated: Alternative Education*.

## Alternative Education Campuses

---

As previously stated, all campuses in the state serving grades 1–12 must receive a campus rating; however, the accountability system recognizes that some campuses offering an alternative program may need to be evaluated under different criteria than regular campuses.

In 2004, alternative education campuses (AEC) are either registered or not registered.

### REGISTERED ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION CAMPUSES

In 2004, registered AECs will be labeled *Not Rated: Alternative Education*. Campuses obtained their 2004 registration status by responding to a July 29, 2003 letter to administrators from the TEA Associate Commissioner for Quality, Compliance, and Accountability Reviews. In this letter, superintendents were informed that AECs that registered and were eligible in the 2002-03 school year would automatically be registered in 2003-04 unless the district notified the agency otherwise. Campuses not registered for 2002-03 were instructed to follow directions for new registrations. The on-line process opened July 30, 2003 and closed September 15, 2003. Under the guidelines set forth in 2002-03 and 2003-04, possible types of eligible AECs include: local district, charter school, community-based, and shared services arrangement (SSA). AECs that served students residing in residential facilities could have been any one of the four types listed above.

The performance results of students at registered AECs are included in the district's performance and are used in determining the district's rating and acknowledgments.

### NOT REGISTERED ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION CAMPUSES

Campuses providing alternative education programs that either did not seek or were not approved to be registered alternative education campuses are evaluated using the standard evaluation process. These campuses will be rated *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Academically Acceptable*, *Academically Unacceptable*, *Not Rated: Other*, or *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*.

As with other campuses, the performance results of students at these alternative education programs are included in the district's performance and are used in determining the district's rating and acknowledgments.

Two types of alternative education programs not eligible to register as AECs are: Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Programs (JJAEPs) and Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs (DAEPs).

- *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 TAKS testing guidelines.

By statute, procedures for evaluating the educational performance of JJAEPs in large counties are the responsibility of the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission. 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 will be 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 TAKS testing guidelines.

All campuses identified to be DAEPs will be labeled *Not Rated: Other*. This is a change for 2004; in prior years DAEPs with performance data were rated. Accountability data erroneously reported to a DAEP campus will be subject to further investigation.

In cases where JJAEP and/or DAEP data are appropriately attributed to a sending district and campus, the data will affect the accountability ratings of the sending district and campus.

In summary, the performance data for all campuses in a district (including any data erroneously reported to a JJAEP or DAEP) will be included in the district analysis for ratings and the GPA system, regardless of whether the alternative education campus was registered or not.

The development of indicators, standards, methods, and criteria for the evaluation of registered alternative education campuses will take place during 2004-05 and will be used to issue ratings for these campuses in 2005. The registration process and eligibility criteria will be examined as part of the development process. Development of the 2005 rating procedures for alternative education campuses is the responsibility of the Department of Accountability and Data Quality. See *Section X—Preview of 2005 and Beyond* for more information.

## **Special Education Campuses**

---

Campuses where all students are served in special education programs *and none are tested on TAKS* will be labeled *Not Rated: Other*, because they have no TAKS results on which to be evaluated. See *Section III – The Basics: Determining a Rating* for more information on the use of this rating label.



## Section VII – AYP and the Accountability System

---

The federal legislation known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requires that all schools and districts be evaluated for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Although Texas has had an academic accountability system in place since 1993, its campuses and districts must also meet the federally defined requirements of AYP in order to continue receiving essential federal funding.

The following plan for alignment of the two systems has been approved by the U.S. Department of Education. However, this alignment will not be fully implemented with the 2004 ratings, due to new federal requirements that have delayed the AYP release. For further information about AYP, refer to that website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/index.html>.

### SYSTEMS ALIGNED

The state accountability system, mandated by the Texas legislature, and the AYP procedures, mandated by the U.S. Department of Education, will be aligned in a number of ways:

- *Release Date.* The release dates for state accountability ratings and AYP status will be aligned in the future, but not in 2004.
- *Labels.* The labels for state ratings will include the AYP status. Labels will also show the reasons AYP was *not* met. These labels will appear for both Title I and non-Title I campuses and districts:
  - *Exemplary, Meets AYP*
  - *Exemplary, Missed AYP [reason]*
  - *Recognized, Meets AYP*
  - *Recognized, Missed AYP [reason]*
  - *Academically Acceptable, Meets AYP*
  - *Academically Acceptable, Missed AYP [reason]*
  - *Academically Unacceptable, Meets AYP*
  - *Academically Unacceptable, Missed AYP [reason]*

*(These labels will not be available in time for the September 30, 2004 release.)*
- *Appeals Process.* The appeals processes for state ratings and AYP status are aligned to the extent possible. See *Section VIII – Appealing the Ratings* for more information.
- *Final Ratings Release.* Post-appeals state ratings and AYP status will be released concurrently in the future, but not in 2004.

### COMPARISON

The following two tables provide an overview of how the two systems overlap. *Table 8* is oriented by grade span; a district or campus can see which indicators under each system will affect them.

*Table 9* is oriented by indicator. It contains a more detailed comparison of the indicators, restrictions, requirements, and source data for both systems.

**Table 8: 2004 Comparison of State Accountability System to Adequate Yearly Progress by Grade Level**

Grade †‡		†Reading ELA	†Math	Writing	Social Studies	Science	*SDAA	**HS Completion	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/State			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/State			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/State			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/State			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			AYP/State		State	AYP		AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State	State			AYP		State			AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP				AYP					AYP
Grade 8	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State		State		AYP/State		State	AYP		AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State		State		AYP		State			AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP				AYP					AYP
Grade 9	All Students	State	State					State				
	AA/H/W/ED*	State	State					State				
	Special Ed & LEP											
Grade 10	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State		State	State		State				AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State		State	State		State				AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP									AYP
Grade 11	All Students	State	State		State	State		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.  
 \*\* High School Completion is defined differently for AYP: Under AYP, a longitudinal Graduation rate is used, which includes only diploma recipients. Differences also exist between the two systems in the treatment of secondary schools without their own completion data.  
 ‡ Schools are paired when they do not have grades tested. Pairing circumstances differ between the two systems.  
 † Performance on TAKS reading/ELA and math include slightly different groups of students for AYP: Minimum size for student groups in AYP is 50/10%/200; for state accountability it is 30/10%/50.  
 ‡ Performance on SDAA is used differently for AYP: Under AYP, SDAA performance is combined with TAKS performance. In the state system, SDAA is evaluated as a separate indicator.

**Table 9: Comparison of 2004 State Accountability to Federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)**

State Accountability		AYP (preliminary)
<b>TAKS</b>		
Subjects & Standards	Reading/ELA* ..... Exemplary 90% / Recognized 70% / Acceptable 50% Mathematics ..... Exemplary 90% / Recognized 70% / Acceptable 35% Writing ..... Exemplary 90% / Recognized 70% / Acceptable 50% Social Studies ..... Exemplary 90% / Recognized 70% / Acceptable 50% Science ..... Exemplary 90% / Recognized 70% / Acceptable 25% <i>All values rounded to whole numbers.</i> <i>*Includes cumulative pass rate for grade 3 reading.</i>	Reading/ELA* ..... Meets AYP 47% Mathematics ..... Meets AYP 33%  <i>All values rounded to whole numbers.</i> <i>*Includes cumulative pass rate for grade 3 reading.</i>
Grades	3–11 (English); 3–6 (Spanish)	3–8, and 10 (English); 3–6 (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	<i>To Acceptable:</i> Has enough gain to meet <i>Acceptable</i> standard in 2 years. <i>To Recognized:</i> At 65% - 69% and has gain to meet 70% standard in 2 years. Minimum Size (all students and groups): At least 10 in prior year.	10% decrease in percent not passing and at least 0.1% improvement on "other measure." TAKS - no prior year minimum size; Other Measure - student groups must meet 50/10%/200 both years.
Pairing	Paired with feeder campus (or district).	Paired with feeder campus (or district).
<b>SDAA</b>		
Subjects & Standards	Reading + Mathematics + Writing <i>Exemplary 90% / Recognized 70% / Acceptable 50%</i> Number "met expectations" summed across grades and subjects. <i>Results rounded to whole numbers.</i>	SDAA (grades 3-8 only) is combined with TAKS and other assessments by subject for performance and participation. See TAKS (above) for standards, subjects, and groups.
Grades	3-8	
Student Groups	All Students only	
Minimum Size	All Students ..... At least 30 tests in denominator Student Groups ..... N/A	Note: there is a cap on the percentage of students who can be counted as <i>proficient</i> based on alternative assessment results (i.e. SDAA, and LDAA).
Improvement	<i>To Acceptable:</i> Has enough gain to meet 50% standard in 2 years. <i>To Recognized:</i> At 65% - 69% and has gain to meet 70% standard in 2 years. Minimum Size (all students only): At least 10 tests in prior year.	
Pairing	N/A: No pairing for SDAA.	

**Table 9: Comparison of 2004 State Accountability to Federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) (continued)**

State Accountability		AYP (preliminary)
<b>Other Assessment Indicators</b>		
RPTE and LEP Math	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.	Combined with TAKS and SDAA results (by subject for students not tested on TAKS or SDAA) for Performance and Participation.
LDAA		
<b>Additional Assessment Features</b>		
Mobility Adjustment	District and campus accountability subsets used.	District and campus accountability subsets used.
Exceptions	Allowed for up to 3 of the 26 TAKS and SDAA measures depending on the number of assessment measures evaluated.* * Only used to move to Acceptable; must be within 5 percentage points of Acceptable standard; other conditions apply.	N/A
<b>Attendance Rate (grades 1-8)</b>		
Standard		Met.....90.0% "Other Measure" for elementary and middle schools. All values rounded to one-tenth.
Student Groups	N/A: Used only for Gold Performance Acknowledgment (for grades 1-12).	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.
<b>Completion Rate (grades 9-12)</b>		
Standards	Grads+cont+GED .... Exemplary 95.0%/Recognized 85.0%/Acceptable 75.0% All values rounded to one-tenth.	Graduates only ..... 70.0% "Other Measure" for high schools and districts. All values rounded to one-tenth.
Student Groups	All Students African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged	All Students only
Minimum Size	All Students..... At least 10 non-completers and 10 in denominator Student Groups.. At least 10 non-completers and 30/10%/50 in denominator	All Students..... At least 40 in denominator Student Groups* ..... 50/10%/200 * Student groups used only for performance gain.
Improvement	To Acceptable: Has gain to meet 75% standard in 2 years To Recognized: n/a Minimum Size (All Students and groups): At least 10 in prior year	At least 0.1% improvement
High School w/o completion rate	District completion rate used.	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.

**Table 9: Comparison of 2004 State Accountability to Federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) (continued)**

State Accountability		AYP (preliminary)
<b>Annual Dropout Rate (grades 7-8)</b>		
Standards	Grades 7-8 ..... <i>Exemplary</i> 0.2% / <i>Recognized</i> 0.7% / <i>Acceptable</i> 2.0% <i>All values rounded to one-tenth.</i>	
Student Groups	All Students African American Hispanic White  Economically Disadvantaged	
Minimum Size	All Students ..... At least 10 dropouts and 10 in denominator Student Groups .... At least 10 dropouts and 30/10%/50 in denominator	
Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To <i>Acceptable</i>: Has decline to meet 2.0% standard in 2 years.</li> <li>To <i>Recognized</i>: n/a.</li> <li>Minimum Size (All Students and groups): At least 10 in prior year.</li> </ul>	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.
Middle School w/o dropout rate	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.	
<b>Participation Rate: Reading &amp; Mathematics</b>		
Standard		Tested at campus/district ..... 95% <i>All values rounded to whole numbers.</i>
Student Groups	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.  Data investigations may occur with excessive exemptions.	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 <i>Alternative Education</i> .	Evaluated under same criteria as regular campuses.
Charter Operators	Evaluated under same criteria as regular districts.* <i>* Charter Operators may be rated Alternative Education; if new for 2003-04, then may be Not Rated.</i>	N/A: Not evaluated.
Charter Schools	Evaluated under same criteria as regular campuses. <i>(Charter schools are not paired.)</i>	Evaluated under same criteria as regular campuses.
New Campuses	If <i>Unacceptable</i> , then <i>Not Rated</i> .	N/A: Not evaluated.
Additional District Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Must have no <i>Unacceptable</i> campuses to be <i>Exemplary</i> or <i>Recognized</i>.</li> <li>Must meet Underreported Student standards to be <i>Exemplary</i> or <i>Recognized</i>.</li> </ul>	No additional district requirements.



## Section VIII – Appealing the Ratings

---

Providing superintendents with the opportunity to appeal data used to determine accountability ratings has been a feature of the state accountability system since 1994. The opportunity to appeal is supported in the 2004 system as well. Superintendents may appeal within a defined time limit and under a specific set of circumstances.

### APPEALS CALENDAR

Late July	<i>Dropout/Completion Lists.</i> Districts receive lists of official dropouts and lists of the 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.
Mid-September	<i>Preview Data Tables.</i> Districts receive preview accountability data tables for the district and each campus showing all accountability indicator data. Campuses and districts can use these data tables to predict their accountability ratings.
September 30, 2004	<i>Ratings Release.</i> Due to the short timeline between the transmittal of the preview data tables and the ratings release date, no appeals will be resolved before the ratings release.
October 14, 2004	<i>Appeals Deadline.</i> Appeals must be postmarked no later than October 14, 2004.
December 2004	<i>Ratings Update.</i> The outcome of all appeals will be reflected in the ratings update scheduled for December 2004. At that time the TEA website will be updated.

*A more detailed calendar can be found in Section IX – Calendar.*

### General Considerations

---

#### APPEALS ARE NOT A DATA CORRECTION OPPORTUNITY!

The numbers shown on the data tables (and later on other agency products, such as the 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 the Texas Education Agency, regional education service centers, or the test contractor for the student assessment program. However, problems due to *district* errors in PEIMS data submissions or on TAKS answer sheets are considered on a case-by-case basis. Also, statute permits consideration of data reporting quality when assigning ratings.

#### CHANGED RATINGS ONLY

Only appeals that may result in a changed rating will be considered.

## SITUATIONS UNFAVORABLE FOR APPEAL

A strength of the accountability system is that the rules are applied uniformly to all campuses and districts. Petitions to make exceptions for how the rules are applied are viewed as unfavorable for appeal. Examples include:

- *Campus Mobility*. Requests to include the performance of students excluded due to the appropriate use of the new campus mobility subset criteria.
- *Grade 3 Cumulative*. Requests to alter the TEA methodology for combining the March and April grade 3 reading results.
- *Exceptions Provision*. Requests for additional exceptions or changes to the application of the Exceptions Provision.
- *Pairing*. Requests to alter pairing relationships that districts agreed to prior to April 30, 2004.
- *Rounding*. Requests to compute Required Improvement, student group percents, or indicator values using rounding methodology different from that described in this *Manual*.

## Guidelines by Indicator

---

### TAKS OR SDAA APPEALS

If a problem is identified with data received from the test contractor, the TAKS or SDAA data may be appealed. An appeal of these indicators should reflect a serious problem such as a missing grade level or campus. However, coding errors on TAKS or SDAA answer sheets will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

- If the district has requested that the writing results be re-scored, a copy of the dated request to the test contractor should be provided with the appeal.
- If other serious problems are found, copies of correspondence with the test contractor should be provided with the appeal.

### DROPOUT APPEALS

The dropout rate indicator is based on 2002-03 leaver data submitted for students in grades 7 and 8. This information was reported by districts on submission 1 of the 2003-04 PEIMS data collection. Districts and campuses are held accountable for their official dropouts. Official dropouts are those students who:

- were reported by the district with leaver codes identifying the student as a dropout; and,
- were not located in other educational settings through the TEA automated comparisons of leaver data against other state data sources. For example, students found to be enrolled in the Texas public school system or to have graduated or to have earned General Educational Development (GED) certificates are not included in the count of official dropouts.

In addition, the agency determines the appropriate *campus of accountability* (COA) for dropouts reported on campuses not permitted to have dropouts attributed to them (such as

Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program campuses). See *Appendix C – Data Sources* for a list of the leaver codes that designate students as dropouts for accountability purposes, and for more details about the COA process.

#### **Other Information:**

- As shown in the calendar, the agency will provide districts with lists of their official dropouts in late July. Only students shown as official grade 7-8 dropouts on these lists may be appealed. For the district’s information, the reported dropouts who were located through the statewide searches are also provided on these lists. An explanation of why these dropouts are not part of the official dropout list is included.
- Dropouts who have been designated as official dropouts but who are located by the district after the PEIMS deadline (January 22, 2004) cannot be appealed. Only the status of a reported leaver by the resubmission deadline *is relevant to a dropout appeal*. This policy ensures that all districts have an equal opportunity to locate leavers in grades 7 - 8.
- No more than five official grade 7-8 dropouts may be appealed for any campus or district.
- Data quality will be a consideration in evaluating dropout rate appeals.

### **COMPLETION APPEALS**

The completion rate indicator for the class of 2003 is based on the status of students who first attended 9th grade in the 1999-2000 school year. A student’s final status is determined to be either graduated, received a GED, continued in high school, or dropped out. All data used to calculate longitudinal completion rates are derived from PEIMS data submitted by districts between 1999 and 2004 and the statewide GED file. See *Appendix C – Data Sources* for details of the PEIMS records used to calculate the completion rate.

As shown in the calendar, the agency will provide districts with lists of all students in their class of 2003 completion cohort in late July. This list will accompany the dropout lists. The final status of each student in the completion cohort will be provided. For the accountability completion rate, students with a final status of graduated, received GED, and continued in high school are counted as “completers.” The denominator of the rate calculation is the sum of the students who meet this definition of completed, plus the students with a final status of “dropout.” The list also includes members of the cohort who left Texas public schools and students with identification errors. Only students shown in these lists may be appealed for the completion rate indicator.

The status of no more than five non-completers or one percent of the non-completers in the cohort (whichever is larger) may be appealed for any campus or district.

Data quality will be a consideration in evaluating completion rate appeals.

### **GOLD PERFORMANCE ACKNOWLEDGMENT APPEALS**

Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA) cannot be appealed. Note that these acknowledgments are never altered as a result of a granted appeal. Campuses or districts initially rated *Academically Unacceptable* are not eligible for GPA, even if their rating is later raised on appeal.

## Special Circumstance Appeals

---

### RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT CENTERS

If the rating of a district that has a privately operated residential treatment center within its geographic boundaries is adversely affected by the inclusion of performance results for students from outside the district who were served at that center for fewer than 85 days, then the superintendent of that district may appeal for reconsideration of the district rating [TEC 39.073(f)].

### RESULTS OF STUDENTS CONFINED BY COURT ORDER

If the rating of a district is adversely affected by the performance of students confined by court order to residential treatment facilities or a facility operated under contract with the Texas Youth Commission (TYC), then the superintendent of that district may appeal for reconsideration of the district rating [TEC 39.072(d)].

### DETENTION CENTERS AND CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

If the rating of a district that has a pre-adjudication detention center or post-adjudication correctional facility within its geographic boundaries is adversely affected by the inclusion of dropouts not regularly assigned to the district, the superintendent of the district serving students in the facility may appeal for reconsideration of the district rating [TEC 39.073(f)]. Only pre-adjudication detention centers and post-adjudication correctional facilities registered with the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission are included.

### UNDERREPORTED STUDENTS

As described in *Section III – The Basics: Determining a Rating*, a district is prevented from being rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized* if it exceeds the standards for either the number or percent of underreported students. In 2004, there is no minimum size criteria employed with respect to the number of underreported students. If a district exceeds the 5.0 percent standard for percent underreported due to a very small number of underreported students, the commissioner of education will consider a ratings appeal.

## How to Submit an Appeal

---

Superintendents appealing data used to determine an accountability rating should prepare a *written* request addressed to the commissioner of education.

The letter should include:

- A statement that the letter is an appeal of the 2004 state accountability rating;
- The name and ID number of the district and / or campuses for which the appeal is being submitted;
- The specific indicator(s) being appealed;
- The perceived error, including details of the data affected;
- If applicable, the reason(s) why the perceived error is attributable to the Texas Education Agency, a regional education service center, or the test contractor for the student assessment program;

- The reason(s) why the perceived error would change the rating of the district or campus, including calculations that show performance would have met a higher standard; and
- The superintendent's signature.

**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.
- Districts will have only one opportunity to appeal each indicator for any campus or the district.
- When student-level information is in question, supporting information must be provided for commissioner of education review, i.e., 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.
- Appeal letters should be postmarked on or before October 14, 2004.
- Appeal letters should be mailed to the following address:  
Commissioner of Education  
Texas Education Agency  
1701 North Congress Avenue  
Austin, TX 78701-1494
- To expedite the appeal, you may send a copy to Criss Cloudt, Associate Commissioner for Accountability and Data Quality at the same address provided above.

## Appeal Examples

Examples of satisfactory and unsatisfactory appeals are provided for illustration.

Satisfactory Appeals:	Unsatisfactory Appeals:
<p>Dear Commissioner Neeley,</p> <p>I have analyzed the leaver information for Elm Street Junior High and believe that one student counted as an official dropout in the statewide record reconciliation and assignment system should not have been counted. This student left Elm Street High School last spring but we did not receive a request for records until after the PEIMS resubmission date. However, I have reason to believe that this student has been enrolled at the transfer district since the beginning of the school year. Unfortunately, this student received a Z-ID during the leaver record processing, which is why I believe that this student could have been reported in current year enrollment but not matched.</p> <p>Attached is pertinent information to this appeal: Student name, student identification numbers, date of birth, and transfer documentation are provided. Assigning this record as other leaver rather than dropout should raise the school's rating to <i>Academically Acceptable</i>.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>John Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools</p> <p><i>attachments</i></p>	<p>Dear Commissioner Neeley,</p> <p>I have analyzed the leaver information for Elm Street High School and believe that one student should not have been counted as an official dropout in the statewide record reconciliation and assignment system. I have reason to believe that this student has been enrolled at the transfer district since the beginning of the school year even though a request for records was not received until February.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>John Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools</p> <p>[no attachments]</p> <hr/> <p>Dear Commissioner of Education,</p> <p>I have analyzed the dropout list for Elm Street High School and wish to appeal the status of 15 dropouts. Most of these students, I believe, are back in school as of May 2002. The remaining students are either gone from the state or have left the country. Please revise my 2002 rating in light of this information.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>J. Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools</p> <p>[no attachments]</p>

## How an Appeal Will Be Processed by the Agency

Once an appeal is received by the commissioner, a standard process for evaluating the information will be followed as outlined below:

- The commissioner of education receives an appeal and forwards it to the Department of Accountability and Data Quality for review.

- The details of the appeal are entered into a database for tracking purposes and 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.*
- **-NEW-** Staff prepare a recommendation and forward it to an independent panel for review. This review panel will provide independent oversight to the appeals process.
- The review panel examines the appeal, supporting documentation, staff research, and the staff recommendation. The panel determines its recommendation.
- 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 decision of the commissioner is final and is not subject to further negotiation at this point. The commissioner will respond in writing to each appeal received.
- *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 the 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 are free to publicize the changed rating at that time. The agency website and other accountability products will be updated after the resolution of all appeals. This update will occur in December 2004 concurrent with the release of the Gold Performance Acknowledgments. Between the time of receipt of the letter granting an appeal and the update of agency accountability products, the agency sources will not reflect the changed campus or district rating.

## **Relationship to AYP**

---

There is some overlap in the source data used for both the state and federal (AYP) accountability systems. See *Section VII – AYP and the Accountability System*. In cases where the data appealed affect both systems, an appeal of the data used for one system (AYP or state accountability) will be analyzed in relation to both systems. This check will be automatically applied by the TEA. Submitting an appeal under one system may or may not affect (either positively or negatively) the rating or status of the other system. If a state accountability appeal affects the AYP status of any district or campus, this will be clearly communicated in the commissioner's response letter to the district.



## Section IX – Calendar

Dates significant to the accountability system are listed below. Key dates for products or processes directly related to accountability are in bold. To the extent possible, descriptions of how products will be released (via mail or web-only) are provided.

Due to unforeseen circumstances, the calendar dates listed in this section may be modified at a later time.

Note that dates related to the release of AYP products are contingent upon finalizing criteria with the U.S. Department of Education (USDE).

<b>2003</b>	June 26	PEIMS Submission 3 due (2002-03 Attendance)
	July 24	Last date for districts with traditional calendars to resubmit changes and corrections to 2002-03 PEIMS Submission 3
	September 18	Last date for districts with year-round calendars to resubmit changes and corrections to 2002-03 PEIMS Submission 3
	October 31	Accountability System "as of" date for enrolled students (2003-04 PEIMS Submission 1)
	<b>November 2003 through February 2004</b>	<b>Development of 2004 state accountability system through meetings with focus groups and advisory committees</b>
	December 12	2003-04 PEIMS Submission 1 due (includes 2002-03 Leavers; 2003-04 Enrollment)
	December 22	TEA notifies districts of 2002-03 campuses identified under Public Education Grant Program (PEG) criteria (not applicable to charters)
<b>2004</b>	January 23	Last date to resubmit changes and corrections to 2003-04 PEIMS Submission 1
	February 1	Districts notify parents of students in campuses identified under PEG criteria (not applicable to charters)
	February 24	TAKS test administration: English language arts (grades 10 & 11); reading (grade 9); writing (grades 4 & 7); SDAA writing (grades 4 & 7)
	March 3	TAKS test 1st administration of grade 3 reading
	March 19	Districts receive TAKS grade 3 reading results from testing contractor
	<b>late March</b>	<b>Regular campuses are paired for accountability</b>

<b>2004</b> (cont.)	April 27-29	TAKS test administration: mathematics (grades 3-11); reading (grades 3-8), social studies (grades 8, 10, & 11); science (grades 5, 10, & 11)
	May 21	Districts receive TAKS and SDAA results for all subjects, all grades from testing contractor
	<b>Early June</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> portion of 2004 Accountability Manual published (web only)</b>
	June 24	2003-04 PEIMS Submission 3 due (2003-04 Attendance)
	<b>June/July</b>	<b>Remainder of 2004 Accountability Manual published (web and a printed version to be mailed to districts)</b>
	July 22	Last date for districts with traditional calendars to resubmit changes and corrections to 2003-04 PEIMS Submission 3
	<b>Late July</b>	<b>Districts receive confidential dropout and completion lists and rates from TEA to be used for accountability (via mail)</b>
	<b>Mid-September</b>	<b>Districts receive confidential preview data tables from TEA for both state accountability and AYP (via mail)</b>
	<b>Mid-September</b>	<b>After receipt of accountability data by districts, TEA begins accepting appeals for both state accountability and AYP</b>
	<b>September 30</b>	<b>TEA issues district and campus accountability ratings and AYP status (via mail through ESCs* and via web)</b>
	<b>October 14</b>	<b>Last day for districts to appeal 2004 ratings and AYP status</b>
	October 29	Accountability System "as of" date for enrolled students (2004-05 PEIMS Submission 1)
	<b>December</b>	<b>Final ratings release—after resolution of all appeals (via web-only)</b>
	<b>December</b>	<b>TEA issues 2004 Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA) to all districts and campuses</b>
	December	TEA notifies districts of 2003-04 campuses identified under PEG criteria (via mail) (not applicable to charters)
	December 9	2004-05 PEIMS Submission 1 due (includes 2003-04 Leavers; 2004-05 Enrollment)
	Mid-December	TEA releases 2003-04 AEIS reports to district superintendents

\* Lists of district and campus ratings will be provided to ESCs for distribution to districts. Final data tables will only be available on the web.

<b>2005</b>	January	Release of public AEIS website
	January	TEA provides the 2003-04 School Report Card for all campuses
	January 20	Last date to resubmit changes and corrections to 2004-05 PEIMS Submission 1
	February 1	Districts notify parents of students in campuses identified under PEG criteria (not applicable to charters)
	<b>January through March</b>	<b>Development of 2005 state accountability system</b>
	February 22	TAKS test administration: English language arts (grades 10 & 11); reading (grade 9); writing (grades 4 & 7); SDAA writing (grades 4 & 7)
	February 23	TAKS test administration: reading (grades 3 & 5); SDAA reading (grade 9); SDAA English language arts (grade 10)
	March 11	Districts receive TAKS reading results (grades 3 & 5) from testing contractor
	<b>late March</b>	<b>Regular campuses are paired for accountability</b>
	April 5	TAKS test 1st administration of grade 5 mathematics
	April 19-22	TAKS test administration: mathematics (grades 3 & 4, 6-11); SDAA mathematics (grades 3-10); reading (grades 3-8); SDAA reading (grades 3-8); science (grades 5, 10 & 11); social studies (grades 8, 10 & 11)
	May 6-13	Districts receive TAKS and SDAA results for all subjects, all grades from testing contractor
	May 17	TAKS test administration of grade 5 mathematics (retest)
	<b>May</b>	<b>2005 Accountability Manual published</b>
	<b>June</b>	<b>Districts receive dropout and completion lists and rates from TEA to be used for accountability</b>
	<b>July</b>	<b>Districts receive preview data tables from TEA</b>
	<b>August 1</b>	<b>Release of 2005 accountability ratings</b>
	<b>Mid-August</b>	<b>Last day for districts to appeal 2005 ratings</b>
	<b>September/October</b>	<b>Final ratings release (after resolution of all appeals)</b>
	<b>September/October</b>	<b>TEA issues 2005 Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA) to all districts and campuses</b>
	October/November	TEA releases 2004-05 AEIS reports



## **Section X – Preview of 2005 and Beyond**

---

This section provides information about future plans for the state accountability system to the extent these plans are known in the summer of 2004. The purpose is to inform educators in advance so districts and campuses can be adequately prepared for changes that will take place in 2005 and in later years.

Additions, deletions, and modifications beyond those discussed here are possible. State legislative action may also affect the accountability system ratings, reports, sanctions, and rewards. At this point in time, such action cannot be predicted.

The changes described below are by year for the years 2005 and 2006. The discussion of 2007 and beyond is grouped together. Changes described for any given year are based on a comparison to the immediately preceding year.

### **Accountability System for 2005**

---

#### **TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS)**

*Student Passing Standard.* In 2005, students in grades 3-10 will be required to meet the panel recommended (PR) standards in order to pass each test. Grade 11 students will be required to meet the standard set at one standard error of measurement (1 SEM) below the panel recommendation. *(If the calendar for phase-in of the student passing standard is changed, this schedule will be modified.)*

*SSI and Grade 5 Reading and Mathematics.* In 2005 the Student Success Initiative will go into effect for the 5<sup>th</sup> grade. These students will need to pass TAKS reading and mathematics in order to be promoted to grade 6. The tests will be administered multiple times, as has been done for grade 3 reading. Results from both the first and second administrations of 5<sup>th</sup> grade reading and mathematics will be included in the TAKS reading/ELA and mathematics indicators, respectively. Note that prior year results cannot be computed to be precisely comparable, since there were not multiple administrations of fifth grade reading in 2004 – thus, any improvement calculations will be based on multiple administrations in 2005 compared to the single administration in 2004.

*Required Improvement.* Required Improvement for 2005 (and later years) will be developed in early 2005 following analysis of actual gains made between 2003 and 2004.

*TAKS Cumulative Exit-level Passing Indicator.* An indicator that includes the performance of subsequent passing scores for exit-level students who fail the first administration of the test will be explored for use in 2005 or later years.

#### **STATE-DEVELOPED ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT (SDAA)**

*SDAA II.* Major changes are underway for state-developed alternative assessments. The SDAA II, an assessment better aligned with the TAKS, will be introduced in 2005 for grades 3-10. This extends the test to include grades 9-10 for the first time. Grade 9 tests will include mathematics and reading; grade 10 tests will include mathematics and English language arts (ELA). A new SDAA indicator based on SDAA II must be developed. Because 2005 will be

the benchmark year, it may not be possible to include the new SDAA indicator in the state accountability system in 2005.

*Accountability Standard.* The standard for meeting ARD expectations will continue to be set locally, consistent with state statute. Additionally, discussions are underway concerning the possible use of a uniform state standard or improvement standard for SDAA II performance in accountability.

## **COMPLETION RATE**

*Minimum Size.* The minimum number of non-completers required for analysis of this indicator will decrease from 10 to 5 in 2005 for All Students and each student group.

*Required Improvement.* Development of a completion rate Required Improvement standard for use at the *Recognized* level will be considered for 2005.

## **DROPOUT RATE**

*Accountability Standard.* The standard for attaining a rating of *Academically Acceptable* will become more rigorous, decreasing from 2.0% to 1.0% in 2005.

*Minimum Size.* The minimum number of dropouts required for analysis of this indicator will decrease from 10 to 5 in 2005 for All Students and each student group.

*Required Improvement.* Development of an annual dropout rate Required Improvement standard for use at the *Recognized* level will be considered for 2005.

## **ADDITIONAL FEATURES**

*Exceptions.* The Exceptions Provision will be reevaluated in 2005 to determine if measures should be added or removed, adjustments need to be made to the number of exceptions for which campuses or districts are eligible, or other aspects need to be modified.

*Underreported Students.* In 2005, the count of underreported students that can prevent a district from being rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized* will decrease from 500 to 100.

## **GOLD PERFORMANCE ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

*Acknowledgment Standards.* GPA standards for all but two of the 11 indicators will be revisited for 2005. The Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program (RHSP/DAP) indicator standard will increase from 50.0% to 60.0%. The TAAS/TASP equivalency indicator standard will remain stable at 80.0%

*Comparable Improvement.* A methodology for determining Comparable Improvement (CI) will be developed in 2005. Standards will be set and campuses will receive acknowledgment on one or more CI indicators in 2005.

## **ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS**

*Alignment with State Accountability System.* The state and federal systems will be further aligned for 2005 after design of the state accountability system is completed and amendments to the Texas AYP Plan have been approved by USDE.

## **ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY PROCEDURES**

*Accountability Procedures.* Accountability procedures for alternative education campuses will be developed and used to issue ratings for these campuses in 2005. The following guidelines will be used to develop these procedures:

- The alternative education indicators must be based on data submitted through standard data submission processes (such as PEIMS) or by the state test contractor.
- The alternative education indicators will be appropriate for evaluating alternative programs offered on these campuses. For example, GED recipients may continue to be included in the completion rate indicator for alternative education campuses, even though these students do not count as completers for regular instructional campuses and districts after 2005.
- If possible, the TAKS Growth Index (TGI) will be used when evaluating alternative education campuses.

*Registration.* The registration process and eligibility criteria will be examined as part of the development process for alternative education ratings criteria.

- Identification criteria will be re-evaluated, including consideration of adding a requirement related to the percentage of at-risk students served on the campus.
- Populations served on alternative education campuses will be examined to determine if the accountability procedures should make a distinction between campuses that students attend by choice (such as dropout recovery programs) and campuses to which students are assigned (such as juvenile detention centers and private residential treatment centers).
- Opportunities to automate and streamline the registration process will be explored.

Districts will be informed of the standards, requirements, and dates for registration as that information becomes available.

## **ALIGNMENT WITH OTHER SYSTEMS**

*Rating Releases.* Over the next few years TEA will explore the feasibility of further alignment of the different types of evaluations that are released by TEA (e.g. AYP status and School FIRST).

*System Requirements.* Over the next few years TEA will explore the feasibility of aligning the various system requirements so, for example, districts could hold one public hearing to meet the public hearing requirements under different systems.

*Sanctions.* Over the next year TEA will develop an integrated framework for administration of sanctions related to different systems such as the accountability ratings of *Academically Unacceptable*, school improvement actions under AYP, and interventions for Performance-Based Monitoring.

## Accountability System for 2006

---

### TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS)

*Student Passing Standard.* For 2006 students in all grades will be required to meet panel recommendation (PR) in order to pass the tests.

### STATE-DEVELOPED ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT (SDAA)

*Required Improvement.* Required Improvement for SDAA II will be developed following analysis of gains made between 2005 and 2006.

*System Safeguards.* SDAA system safeguard analyses will be added beginning in 2006. These will include analyses to identify excessive use of SDAA, excessive exemptions from the state assessment program, and other anomalies.

*Inclusion of SDAA Campuses.* Rating campuses that have *only* SDAA results will be considered.

### COMPLETION RATE

*GED Recipients.* Beginning with the class of 2005 (students whose cohort entered 9<sup>th</sup> grade in 2001-02), only graduates and continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year) will count in the definition of high school completer for the accountability completion rate. GED recipients from the class of 2005 will not be considered *completers*. This definitional change will increase the rigor of the indicator beginning with the 2006 accountability system.

### DROPOUT RATE

No changes are anticipated for this indicator this year.

### ADDITIONAL FEATURES

*Exceptions.* The Exceptions Provision will be reevaluated in 2006 to determine if measures should be added or removed, adjustments need to be made to the number of exceptions for which campuses or districts are eligible, or other aspects need to be modified.

*Underreported Students.* In 2006, the percent of underreported students that can prevent a district from being rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized* will decrease from 5.0% to 2.0%.

### GOLD PERFORMANCE ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

*Acknowledgment Standards.* The RHSP/DAP indicator standard increases from 60.0% to 70.0%. Standards for other GPA indicators have not been determined for 2006.

*Texas Success Initiative.* A new indicator of college readiness, the Texas Success Initiative (TSI), will be used for the GPA in 2006 for the first time. The TSI will replace the TAAS/TASP equivalency indicator.

*SAT.* Changes by the College Board to the SAT assessments will require review of this indicator's definition and standards. These changes will first affect graduates in the class of 2006. These results will be used in the 2007 accountability system.

*Incentive Program.* If a performance incentive program is funded by the Legislature, the GPA system will be aligned, as appropriate, with that program.

## **ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS**

*Alignment with State Accountability System.* A proposal for further alignment of the state and federal systems will be developed in 2006 after design of the state accountability system is completed and amendments to the Texas AYP Plan have been approved by USDE.

## **Accountability System for 2007 and Beyond**

---

### **TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS)**

*Accountability Standards.* The accountability standards will begin to increase in 2007. The standard for *Recognized* (for all subjects) will move from 70% to 75% in 2007 and then to 80% in 2008. *Exemplary* will remain the same, at 90%. In 2007, the *Academically Acceptable* standards will begin to increase incrementally over time until they reach 70% for all subjects. The timeline for increasing the standard for *Academically Acceptable* has not been determined.

*TAKS Science.* Beginning in 2008 science will be assessed in grade 8 as well as grades 5, 10, and 11. Decisions regarding the use of grade 8 science performance in the accountability system have not been determined.

*SSI and Grade 8 Reading and Mathematics.* In 2008 the Student Success Initiative will go into effect for the 8<sup>th</sup> grade. These students will need to pass TAKS reading and mathematics in order to be promoted to grade 9. The tests will be administered multiple times, as with the other SSI grades. Results from both the first and second administrations of 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading and mathematics will be included in the TAKS reading/ELA and mathematics indicators, respectively. Note that prior year results cannot be computed to be precisely comparable, since there will not be multiple administrations of 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading in 2007 – thus, any improvement calculations will be based on multiple administrations in 2008 compared to the single administration in 2007.

*TAKS Commended.* Measures that incorporate TAKS Commended Performance into the accountability ratings will be developed in 2005 and used for ratings by 2007. When this takes place, these indicators may be removed from the Gold Performance Acknowledgment system.

### **STATE-DEVELOPED ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT (SDAA)**

*Accountability Standards.* SDAA II standards for 2007 have not been determined.

### **OTHER ASSESSMENTS**

*Proficiency Measure for English Language Learners.* An indicator of English language proficiency for English language learners will be developed as a base indicator for state accountability ratings for use by 2007. The state indicator will build on the work done to define an annual measurable achievement objective (AMAO) required under Title III of NCLB, which incorporates performance on the Reading Proficiency Tests in English (RPTE). The new state accountability indicator will be reported in 2005 and accountability standards will be set following analysis of results.

## COMPLETION RATE

*Accountability Standards.* The standard will eventually increase to 85% for *Academically Acceptable* and to 90% for *Recognized*. The timeline for this change has not been determined.

*Grade 9 in 2005-06.* The class of 2009, which begins the 9<sup>th</sup> grade in 2005-06, will be the first entire four-year cohort to use the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition of a dropout in determining the denominator of the completion rate indicator. The use of this definition was mandated by the 78<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature in 2003. It is anticipated that this change will significantly increase the rigor of completion rates throughout the state. Because students participating in off-campus GED programs will be considered dropouts, a larger number of students will be in the denominator of the completion rate calculation. The resulting rate will be used for determining accountability ratings in 2010. The definition of a dropout for use in the completion rate denominator in the accountability system for 2007, 2008, and 2009 has yet to be determined due to the redesign of the leaver data collection system currently in progress. See *Table 10* below for more information.

**Table 10: Completion Rate Transition**

Accountability Year	Class of	Cohort Year	Completion Rate Methodology	
			Numerator	Denominator
2004	2003	1999-2000 2000-01 2001-02 2002-03	Graduates + Continuers+ GED Recipients	Graduates+ Continuers+ GED Recipients+ Dropouts ( <i>current state def.</i> )
2005	2004	2000-01 2001-02 2002-03 2003-04	Graduates + Continuers+ GED Recipients	Graduates+ Continuers+ GED Recipients+ Dropouts ( <i>current state def.</i> )
2006	2005	2001-02 2002-03 2003-04 2004-05	Graduates + Continuers	Graduates+ Continuers+ GED Recipients+ Dropouts ( <i>current state def.</i> )
2007	2006	2002-03 2003-04 2004-05 2005-06	Graduates + Continuers	Graduates+ Continuers+ GED Recipients+ Dropouts ( <i>definition TBD</i> )
2008	2007	2003-04 2004-05 2005-06 2006-07	Graduates + Continuers	Graduates+ Continuers+ GED Recipients+ Dropouts ( <i>definition TBD</i> )
2009	2008	2004-05 2005-06 2006-07 2007-08	Graduates + Continuers	Graduates+ Continuers+ GED Recipients+ Dropouts ( <i>definition TBD</i> )
2010	2009	2005-06 2006-07 2007-08 2008-09	Graduates + Continuers	Graduates+ Continuers+ GED Recipients+ Dropouts ( <i>NCES Definition</i> )

## **DROPOUT RATE**

*Accountability Standards.* Annual dropout rate standards for 2007 and beyond will be determined when data are available to set the standards on a dropout rate calculated under the NCES definition.

*NCES Definition.* For the 2007 accountability system, the state accountability dropout definition for 2005-06 leavers will change to the NCES dropout definition. The most significant change in the definition is that students who leave school to attend off-campus GED programs will count as dropouts. Since the dropout rate indicator used in the accountability system is for students who drop out of grades 7 and 8 only, they are less likely to be affected by attending GED programs. However, the two definitions differ in other ways that could affect the values used for this indicator.

## **ADDITIONAL FEATURES**

*Exceptions.* The Exceptions Provision will be reevaluated each year to determine if measures should be added or removed, adjustments need to be made to the number of exceptions for which campuses or districts are eligible, or other aspects need to be modified. The new English language proficiency indicator (see *Other Assessments* above) will be subject to the Exceptions Provision when it is added to the rating system. Once the assessment system is fully implemented and accountability standards stabilize, the Exceptions Provision will likely be phased out.

*Longitudinal Underreported Students Indicator.* A new longitudinal underreported students indicator linked to the completion rate calculation will be reported and may replace the current underreported students indicator in the accountability ratings process by 2009.

## **NEW MINIMUM SIZE CRITERIA**

*Student Group Minimums.* Three of the four base indicators evaluate student groups in addition to All Students (TAKS, completion rate, and dropout rate). Additionally, all 11 of the GPA indicators used in 2004 evaluate student groups. In 2004, student groups are not evaluated if they have fewer than 30 students in the group, or if there are 30 to 49 students in the group and they represent less than 10 percent of the total student population. If they have 50 or more students, the group is evaluated regardless. Whether or not to drop the “10 percent or 50” component of the student group minimum size criteria will be explored further. If dropped, the rule will be simplified to include for evaluation any group with 30 or more students. The earliest a change would be made in the minimum size criteria would be in 2007.

## **GOLD PERFORMANCE ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

*Acknowledgment Standards.* RHSP/DAP increases from 70.0% to 80.0% in 2007.

*TAKS Commended.* Measures that incorporate Commended Performance into the accountability ratings will be developed in 2005 and used for ratings by 2007. When this happens, these indicators may be removed from the Gold Performance Acknowledgment system. A replacement indicator for TAKS Commended performance on mathematics will be developed to evaluate student proficiency in algebra in middle and junior high schools.

## Overview 2005 – 2009

The phase-in schedule for the accountability standards will be reevaluated annually; any changes will be announced at least one year in advance. In the table below all known changes to standards in any given year compared to the prior year are indicated in bold.

**Table 11: State Accountability Standards through 2009**

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>TAKS Standards</b>						
<b>Exemplary</b>	≥ 90%	≥ 90%	≥ 90%	≥ 90%	≥ 90%	≥ 90%
<b>Recognized</b>	≥ 70%	≥ 70%	≥ 70%	≥ <b>75%</b>	≥ <b>80%</b>	≥ 80%
<b>Acceptable</b>				TBD	TBD	TBD
R/ELA, W, SS	≥ 50%	≥ 50%	≥ 50%			
Mathematics	≥ 35%	≥ 35%	≥ 35%			
Science	≥ 25%	≥ 25%	≥ 25%			
<b>Student Passing Standard</b>	Gr. 3-10 at 1 SEM Gr. 11 at 2 SEM	Gr. 3-10 at <b>PR</b> Gr. 11 at 1 SEM	Gr. 3-11 at PR			
<b>SDAA II Standards</b>						
<b>Exemplary</b>	≥ 90% (SDAA)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Recognized</b>	≥ 70% (SDAA)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Acceptable</b>	≥ 50% (SDAA)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Completion Rate (Grade 9-12) Standards</b>						
	Class of 2003 (9 <sup>th</sup> grade 99-00)	Class of 2004 (9 <sup>th</sup> grade 00-01)	Class of 2005 (9 <sup>th</sup> grade 01-02)	Class of 2006 (9 <sup>th</sup> grade 02-03)	Class of 2007 (9 <sup>th</sup> grade 03-04)	Class of 2008 (9 <sup>th</sup> grade 04-05)
<b>Exemplary</b>	≥ 95%	≥ 95%	≥ 95%	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Recognized</b>	≥ 85%	≥ 85%	≥ 85%	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Acceptable</b>	≥ 75%	≥ 75%	≥ 75%	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Indicator Definition</b>	Grads+GED+Cont	Grads+GED+Cont	Grads+Cont	Grads+Cont	Grads+Cont	Grads+Cont
<b>Annual Dropout Rate (Grade 7-8) Standards</b>						
	from 2002-03	from 2003-04	from 2004-05	from 2005-06	from 2006-07	from 2007-08
<b>Exemplary</b>	≤ 0.2%	≤ 0.2%	≤ 0.2%	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Recognized</b>	≤ 0.7%	≤ 0.7%	≤ 0.7%	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Acceptable</b>	≤ 2.0%	≤ <b>1.0%</b>	≤ 1.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Indicator Definition</b>	Current State Definition	Current State Definition	Current State Definition	NCES Definition	NCES Definition	NCES Definition
<b>Additional Features</b>						
<b>Required Improvement</b>	See Section II	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Exceptions</b>	See Section II	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Underreported Students</b>	≤ 500 and ≤ 5.0%	≤ <b>100</b> and ≤ 5.0%	≤ 100 and ≤ <b>2.0%</b>	TBD	TBD	TBD

## **Appendix A – Texas Administrative Code**

---

Beginning in 2000, a portion of the *Accountability Manual* has been adopted as a commissioner rule by reference. With the publication of this *Manual*, the Texas Education Agency will file a Commissioner Rule amendment to 19 *Texas Administrative Code* §97.1002, *Adoption by Reference: Standard Procedures* with the Office of the Secretary of State. This rule will adopt the *2004 Accountability Manual, Sections I–VI and VIII* by reference, thus giving legal standing to the rating process and procedures.

Allowing for a 30 day comment period, final adoption should occur in October 2004. If any changes result from this rule adoption process, then educators will be notified as soon as possible.

The proposed rule is provided below:

### **Chapter 97. Planning and Accreditation**

#### **Subchapter AA. Accountability Ratings and Acknowledgments**

##### **§97.1002. Adoption by Reference: Standard Procedures.**

(a) The standard procedures by which districts and campuses are rated and acknowledged for 2004 are described in the official Texas Education Agency (TEA) publication, *Sections I – VI and VIII* of the *2004 Accountability Manual*, dated July 2004, which is adopted by this reference as the Agency's official rule.

A copy of the *2004 Accountability Manual* is available for examination during regular office hours, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., except holidays, Saturdays, and Sundays, at the Texas Education Agency, 1701 North Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas 78701. In addition, the publication can be accessed from the Texas Education Agency official website.

(b) The commissioner of education shall amend *Sections I – VI and VIII* of the *2004 Accountability Manual* and this section adopting it by reference, as needed.



## Appendix B – Texas Education Code

---

The 2004 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 System Accountability*. Below is a table of contents of the sections in Chapter 39. The full text as well as the rest of the Texas Education Code is available on the state website at:

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/statutes/edtoc.html>

### Chapter 39. Public School System Accountability

Subchapter A. *Reserved for expansion.*

#### 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. 39.024 Satisfactory Performance
- Sec. 39.025 Exit-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

#### 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

Subchapter G. Accreditation Sanctions

- Sec. 39.131 Sanctions For Districts.
- Sec. 39.132 Sanctions For Campuses
- Sec. 39.133 Annual Review
- 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

## Appendix C – Data Sources

This appendix provides data sources for the four base indicators used in the state accountability system and the 11 indicators used in the Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) system. The information is arranged alphabetically by indicator name.

For each indicator, the *Methodology* section shows the source for the numerator and denominator. *Determining Student Traits* 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) division of TEA. Tables 12, 13, and 14 describe these data sources in detail. The terms provided in these tables are referenced with the indicators.

**Table 12: PEIMS Record Types Used in Accountability**

Record	Name	Description	Submission /Month
101	Student Demographic/ Identification Data	Demographic/identification information about each student, including the student's ethnicity, gender, date of birth, and migrant status.	1 <sup>st</sup> /October, 3 <sup>rd</sup> /June
110	Student Enrollment Data	Enrollment information about each student, including the student's grade, economically disadvantaged status, and indicators of the special programs in which the student participates.	1 <sup>st</sup> /October
203	Leaver Data	Information about all students served in grades 7-12 in 2002-03 school year who did not continue in enrollment in the same district the following fall. Leavers are students who graduated, dropped out, or left school for other non-dropout reasons, such as transferred to another public school district. This record contains last campus of enrollment, special education indicator, up to three leaver reasons, and additional information for graduates.	1 <sup>st</sup> /October
400	Basic Attendance Data	Information about each student for each of the six, 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.	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, and dual credit indicator.	3 <sup>rd</sup> /June

**Table 13: Assessment and Other Sources 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 May administration is used in creating the SAT/ACT examinations 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 a SAT test more than once, the agency receives the record for the most recent examination taken. The SAT data as of May administration is used in creating the SAT/ACT examinations 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 May administration is used in creating the AP/IB examinations indicator.
International Baccalaureate Organisation (IBO)	The International Baccalaureate Organisation provides the agency with the International Baccalaureate (IB) examination results of Texas public school students each year. The IB data as of May administration is used in creating the AP/IB examinations indicator.
Pearson Education Measurement, Inc.	Pearson Education Measurement, Inc. is the contractor for the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) and State-Developed Alternative Assessment (SDAA). After each test administration, the agency receives student-level TAKS and SDAA data from PEM.
Division of General Educational Development (GED)	A TEA data file containing information about student performance on the GED tests. Unlike the information in most other TEA data files, which is reported annually, receipt of a GED certificate is reported as soon as the test is scored as passing. Candidates take GED tests at over 200 centers located throughout the state in school districts, colleges and universities, and education service centers. Tests are given year-round, and the results are transmitted electronically to the TEA.

**Table 14: Student Traits**

Trait	Description
Economic Status	A student may be identified as economically disadvantaged by the district if he / she: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• meets eligibility requirements for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the federal free or reduced price lunch programs;</li> <li>○ Title II of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA);</li> <li>○ Food Stamp benefits;</li> <li>○ Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) or other public assistance;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• received a Pell grant or funds from other comparable state program of needs-based financial assistance; or</li> <li>• is from a family with an annual income at or below the official federal poverty line.</li> </ul>
Ethnicity	Districts assign student ethnicity from one of the following categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• American Indian or Alaskan Native (<i>not evaluated separately for accountability</i>)</li> <li>• Asian or Pacific Islander (<i>not evaluated separately for accountability</i>)</li> <li>• Black, not of Hispanic origin</li> <li>• Hispanic</li> <li>• White, not of Hispanic origin</li> </ul>

## Opportunities for Data Correction

---

### PEIMS

*General Data.* The PEIMS data collection system 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 [www.tea.state.tx.us/peims/standards/index.html](http://www.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 insure that PID updates submitted by districts are processed properly.

### ASSESSMENT DATA

*TAKS and SDAA.* Demographic and scoring status information as entered on the answer document at the time of testing is used to determine the accountability subset for campus and district ratings. After the testing dates, districts are able to provide corrections to the test contractor and request corrected reports; however, those changes are not incorporated into the TAKS or SDAA results used for determining accountability ratings or subsequent reports (e.g. AEIS and School Report Cards). That is, districts do not have the option to change student demographics, program participation, or score code status for purposes of accountability after test results are known. They have multiple opportunities to provide accurate information through their PEIMS submissions, pre-coding data files provided to the test contractor, and updates to the TAKS answer document 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 TEA. Once the testing companies finalize results for yearly summaries, subsequent corrections are not reflected in any national, state, district, or school results released.

## Indicator Data Sources

---

### ADVANCED COURSE COMPLETION

**Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of students in grades 9 through 12 who received credit for at least one advanced academic course (from PEIMS 415 record)}}{\text{number of students in grades 9 through 12 who received credit for at least one course (from PEIMS 415 record)}}$$

$$\frac{\text{number of students in grades 9 through 12 who received credit for at least one course (from PEIMS 415 record)}}{\text{number of students in grades 9 through 12 who received credit for at least one course (from PEIMS 415 record)}}$$

**Year of Data:** 2002-03

**Determining Student Traits:**

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
<b>Date</b>	October 2002	October 2002

**Other Information:**

- A list of courses designated as advanced is published each year in the AEIS Glossary.

### ADVANCED PLACEMENT/INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE EXAM RESULTS

**Methodology:**

*participation:*

$$\frac{\text{number of 11th and 12th graders taking at least one AP or IB examination (from College Board and IBO)}}{\text{total non-special education students enrolled in 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grades (from PEIMS 110 record)}}$$

*performance:*

$$\frac{\text{number of 11th and 12th graders with at least one score at or above the criterion score (from College Board and IBO)}}{\text{number of 11<sup>th</sup> and 12th graders with at least one AP or IB examination (from College Board and IBO)}}$$

**Year of Data:** 2002-03

**Determining Student Traits:**

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
<b>Source</b>	n/a	PEIMS 101 (primary) College Board and IBO (secondary)
<b>Date</b>	n/a	October 2002, May 2003

**Other Information:**

- *Primary and Secondary Sources.* Secondary sources are used when the primary source does not contain a match for the ethnicity of every student.
- *Special Education.* Those students reported as special education on the student demographic (110) record on 2002-03 PEIMS Submission 1 are removed from the count of total grade 11 and 12 enrollees used in the denominator of the percent tested calculation.

## ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE

### Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of grade 7-8 students designated as 'official' dropouts (from PEIMS 203 record)}}{\text{number of grade 7-8 students who were in attendance at any time during the school year (from PEIMS 400 record)}}$$

**Year of Data:** 2002-03

### Determining Student Traits:

#### Numerator

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
<b>Source</b>	110 (primary) 203 (secondary)	101 (primary) 203 (secondary)
<b>Date</b>	October 2002 October 2003	June 2003 October 2003

#### Denominator

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101 (primary) PEIMS 405 (secondary)
<b>Date</b>	October 2002	June 2003

### Other Information:

- *Primary and Secondary Sources.* Secondary sources are used when the primary source does not contain a match for the economic status or ethnicity of every student.
- *Economically Disadvantaged.* Those students who were NOT reported in enrollment in any district on the 2002-03 PEIMS Submission 1 cannot be coded as economically disadvantaged. If a student is economically disadvantaged at any district or campus, he/she will be deemed economically disadvantaged at all districts and campuses.
- *Underreported Leavers.* Information about students reported in either enrollment or attendance in grades 7-12 the prior year but who were not reported as either enrolled or as leavers in the current year can be found through the Edits+ reports. Previously this information was transmitted to districts in a mailing with their dropout information.
- *Leaver Codes.* Districts are required to report the status of all students who were enrolled in grades 7 - 12 in the district during the prior school year. Students either continue to be enrolled in the district or they leave the district. If students leave the district, the district reports a leaver reason for each student. Only students reported with selected PEIMS leaver codes (those indicated with an asterisk in the table, below) are defined as dropouts. Students reported with any of the other leaver codes are considered to be "other leavers".

**Table 15: Leaver Codes**

<b>Code</b>	<b>Translation</b>	<b>Category of Leaver</b>
01*	Graduated	Completed High School Program
02	Pursue Job/Job Training	Employment
03*	Died	Other
04	Join the Military	Employment
08	Pregnancy	Family
09	Marriage	Family
10	Alcohol/Other Drug Abuse Prob	Other
14	Age	Academic Performance
15	Homeless or Non-perm Resident	Family
16*	Return to Home Country	Other
19*	Failed Exit TAAS or TAKS/Met Grad Req	Completed High School Program
21*	Official Trans to Oth TX Dist	Moved to Other Educational Setting
22*	Alt Pgm-Working Toward Diploma/Certificate	Moved to Other Educational Setting
24*	College, Pursue Degree	Moved to Other Educational Setting
30*	Enter Health Care Facility	Other
31*	Completed GED	Completed High School Program
60*	Home Schooling	Moved to Other Educational Setting
61*	Incarcerated Outside District	Other
63*	Graduated-Returned-Left Again	Completed High School Program
64*	GED-Returned-Left Again	Completed High School Program
66*	Removed-Child Protective Svcs	Family
72*	Court Ordered Alternative Prog	Moved to Other Educational Setting
78*	Expelled, Cannot Return	Withdrawn by School District
79	Expelled, Can Return, Has Not	Withdrawn by School District
80*	Enroll In Other TX Public Sch	Moved to Other Educational Setting
81*	Enroll In TX Private School	Moved to Other Educational Setting
82*	Enroll In School Outside Texas	Moved to Other Educational Setting
83*	Administrative Withdrawal	Withdrawn by School District
84	Academic Performance	Academic Performance
99	Other (Unknown or Not Listed)	Other

\* Codes with asterisks are not counted as dropouts in determining the 2004 state accountability ratings.

- *Excluded Records.* TEA performs an automated check against other state data sources to locate reported dropouts in other educational settings. Districts and campuses are held accountable for their *official* dropouts, that is, those reported dropouts whose records are *not* excluded by this automated check. The automated check at the state level removes dropout records from the count if they:
  - have received a GED certificate and appear on the Agency's automated GED file as of March of the year of the PEIMS submission;
  - are found in attendance or enrollment in another public school district;
  - are ADA ineligible;
  - have graduated from a Texas public school; or
  - if they have been previously counted as a dropout.
- *Campus of Accountability.* The vast majority of leavers are assigned to the campuses they were attending when they left the Texas public school system. However, a student being served at a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP), a Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP), or a short-term Alternative Education Program (AEP) is assigned to a "campus of accountability." 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).

## ATTENDANCE RATE

### Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were present (from PEIMS 400 record)}}{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were in membership (from PEIMS 400 record)}}$$

**Year of Data:** 2002-03

### Determining Student Traits:

	<b>Economic Status</b>	<b>Ethnicity</b>
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
<b>Date</b>	October 2002	October 2002

### Other Information:

- Attendance for the entire school year is used.

## COMMENDED PERFORMANCE:

### 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:** 2003-04

**Determining Student Traits:**

	<b>Economic Status</b>	<b>Ethnicity</b>
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
<b>Date</b>	October 2003	October 2003

**Other Information:**

- Student information is pre-coded onto answer document from PEIMS (see record types, above), or pre-coded onto answer document from district-supplied data file or changes made on the answer document on the day of testing.

**COMPLETION RATE****Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of completers (from PEIMS 101, 110, 203, 400, 405 records and GED)}}{\text{number in class (original cohort) (from PEIMS 101, 110, 203, 400, 405 records and GED)}}$$

**Year of Data:** Class of 2003 (9<sup>th</sup> graders of 1999-2000, and their status in 2000-01, 2001-02, and 2002-03, and 2003-04)

**Determining Student Traits:**

	<b>Economic Status</b>	<b>Ethnicity</b>
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 110	101
<b>Date</b>	June of year of final status	June of year of final status

**Other Information:**

- Results based on the original cohort, whether the students remain on grade level or not.

**RECOMMENDED HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM****Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of graduates reported with graduation codes for Recommended High School Program or Distinguished Achievement Program (from PEIMS 203)}}{\text{number of graduates (from PEIMS 203)}}$$

**Year of Data:** Class of 2003

**Determining Student Traits:**

	<b>Economic Status</b>	<b>Ethnicity</b>
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 110 (primary) PEIMS 203 (secondary)	101
<b>Date</b>	October 2002 October 2003	October 2002

**Other Information:**

- *Primary and Secondary Sources.* Secondary sources are used when the primary source does not contain a match for the economic status of every student.

- 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). Students who complete the requirements of the two more rigorous programs receive special acknowledgment on their diplomas.

## SAT/ACT RESULTS

### Methodology:

*participation:*

$$\frac{\text{number of graduates taking either the SAT or the ACT (from CB and ACT)}}{\text{total non-special education graduates (from PEIMS 203)}}$$

*performance:*

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees at or above the criterion score (from College Board and ACT)}}{\text{number of graduates taking either the SAT or ACT (from College Board and ACT)}}$$

**Year of Data:** Class of 2003

### Determining Student Traits:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
Source	n/a	PEIMS 101 (primary) College Board and ACT (secondary)
Date	n/a	October 2002, May 2003

### Other Information:

- *Primary and Secondary Sources.* Secondary sources are used when the primary source does not contain a match for the ethnicity of every student.
- *Special Education.* Those students reported as special education in all of the six-week periods on the 2003-04 PEIMS Submission 3, or for whom the graduation type code on the 203 leaver record indicates special education, are removed from the count of total graduates used in the denominator of the participation calculation.

## STATE-DEVELOPED ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT

### Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of SDAA tests meeting ARD expectations (from Pearson)}}{\text{number of SDAA tests taken (from Pearson)}}$$

**Year of Data:** 2003-04

### Determining Student Traits:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
Date	October 2003	October 2003

**Other Information:**

- Student information is pre-coded onto answer document from PEIMS (see record types, above), or pre-coded onto answer document from district-supplied data file or changes made on the answer document on the day of testing.

**TAAS/TASP EQUIVALENCY****Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of graduates meeting TAAS/TASP equivalency standards for all subjects taken on their first TAAS exit-level administration (from Pearson)}}{\text{number of first-time tested graduates (from Pearson)}}$$

**Year of Data:** Class of 2003 (includes TAAS performance in 2001, 2002, and 2003)

**Determining Student Traits:**

	<b>Economic Status</b>	<b>Ethnicity</b>
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
<b>Date</b>	October 2003	October 2003

**Other Information:**

- Student information is pre-coded onto answer document from PEIMS (see record types, above), or pre-coded onto answer document from district-supplied data file or changes made on the answer document on the day of testing.
- TEA’s Student Assessment Division calculates which students met the TASP equivalency.
- Class of 2003 includes TAAS performance of 10<sup>th</sup> graders (first-time test takers) in 2001, TAAS performance of 11<sup>th</sup> graders (first-time test takers) in 2002, and TAAS performance of 12<sup>th</sup> graders (first-time test takers) in 2003.

**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:** 2003-04

**Determining Student Traits:**

	<b>Economic Status</b>	<b>Ethnicity</b>
<b>Source</b>	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
<b>Date</b>	October 2003	October 2003

**Other Information:**

- Student information is pre-coded onto answer document from PEIMS (see record types, above), or pre-coded onto answer document from district-supplied data file or changes made on the answer document on the day of testing.

## Appendix D – Contacts

The 2004 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 representatives are available for further assistance.

### ESC ACCOUNTABILITY CONTACTS

ESC	Name	Email Address	Phone Number
1	Mike Gonzalez Roel Pena	mgonzale@esconett.org rpena@esconett.org	(956) 984-6040 (956) 984-6603
2	Linda Villarreal	lvillarreal1@esc2.net	(361) 561-8404
3	Mary Beth Matula	mbmatula@esc3.net	(361) 573-0731 ext. 293
4	Jamie Morris Glenn Chavis	jmorris@esc4.net gchavis@esc4.net	(713) 744-6392
5	Monica Mahfouz	mmahfouz@esc5.net	(409) 951-1721
6	Mary Geiger	mgeiger@esc6.net	(936) 435-8297
7	Heather Christie	hchristie@esc7.net	(903) 988-6803
8	Judy Caskey	jcasky@reg8.net	(903) 572-8551 ext. 2603
9	Vicki Holland	vicki.holland@esc9.net	(940) 322-6928
10	Lorna Bonner Billie Chastain Gloria Key Marilyn Flinn Dora Moron	bonnerl@esc10.ednet10.net chastainb@esc10.ednet10.net keyg@esc10.ednet10.net flinnm@esc10.ednet10.net morond@esc10.ednet10.net	(972) 348-1324 (972)348 1770
11	Elizabeth Rowland	erowland@esc11.net	(817) 740-7625
12	Woodrow Brewton Jack Crain Bill Eitel Carolyn Hill Mary Ann Moody	wbrewton@esc12.net jcrain@esc12.net beitel@esc12.net chill@esc12.net mamood@esc12.net	(254) 297-1104
13	Ervin Knezek Eileen Reed	ervin.knezek@esc13.txed.net eileen.reed@esc13.txed.net	(512) 919-5306 (512) 919-5334
14	Susan Anderson	sanderson@esc14.net	(325) 675-8674 ext. 674
15	Barbara Brown Judy Lisewsky	barbara.brown@netxv.net judy.lisewsky@netxv.net	(325) 658-6571 ext. 204 (325) 658-6571 ext. 158
16	Crystal Dockery	crystal.dockery@esc16.net	(806) 677-5149
17	Holly Lee	hollylee@esc17.net	(806) 792-4000 ext. 859
18	Marie Lambert Kaye Orr	mlambert@esc18.net kayeorr@esc18.net	(432) 567-3230 (432) 567-3244
19	Barron White	bwhite@esc19.net	(915) 780-5014
20	Rick Alvarado Sheila Collazo	richard.alvarado@esc20.net sheila.collazo@esc20.net	(210) 370-5621 (210) 370-5481

## 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.*

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Contact</b>	<b>Number</b>
AEIS Reports	Performance Reporting.....	463-9704
Accountability Ratings (methodology)	Performance Reporting.....	463-9704
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	Performance Reporting.....	463-9704
Alternative Education Accountability	Performance Reporting.....	463-9704
Appeals	Performance Reporting.....	463-9704
ARD Exemptions		
SDAA	Student Assessment .....	463-9536
Other Issues	Special Education .....	463-9414
Blue Ribbon Schools	Communications .....	463-9000
Campus ID (changing)	Accountability Research.....	475-3523
Charter Schools	Charter Schools.....	463-9575
College Admissions Tests:		
SAT	College Board, Southwestern Regional Office .....	891-8400
ACT	ACT Regional Office.....	345-1949
DAEP	Chapter 37 – Safe Schools .....	463-9982
Gold Performance Acknowledgment	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
Dropouts	Accountability Research.....	475-3523
Commended Performance	Performance Reporting.....	463-9704
Completion	Accountability Research.....	475-3523
Recommended High School Program	Performance Reporting.....	463-9704
SAT/ACT Results	Accountability Research.....	475-3523
SDAA	Performance Reporting.....	463-9704
TAAS / TASP Equivalency	Performance Reporting.....	463-9704
TAKS	Performance Reporting.....	463-9704
Interventions	Interventions and Special Investigations.....	463-9290
Investigations	Interventions and Special Investigations.....	463-9290
JJAEP	Chapter 37 – Safe Schools .....	463-9374
Leavers	Accountability Research.....	475-3523
No Child Left Behind Act	NCLB Program Coordination .....	463-4090
PEIMS	PEIMS HelpLine.....	936-7346
Public Education Grant (PEG)	Field Services.....	463-9354
Public Hearings	Interventions and Special Investigations.....	463-9290
Recommended High School Program	Curriculum .....	463-9581
Retention Policy	Curriculum .....	463-9581
School Report Card	Performance Reporting.....	463-9704
SDAA	Student Assessment .....	463-9536
Special Education	Special Education .....	463-9414
Statutory (Legal) Issues	Legal Services .....	463-9720
TAKS	Student Assessment .....	463-9536
TAKS Testing Contractor	Pearson Educational Measurement.....	(800) 252-9186
Texas Success Initiative (TSI)	THECB .....	427-6525

## WEB LINKS

A great deal of information and reports can be accessed online. The following weblinks can be used to gather information supplemental to the state’s accountability system.

- Accountability Research ..... [www.tea.state.tx.us/research/index.html](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/research/index.html)  
*Provides publications on Dropouts, Retention, College Admissions, and many other topics.*
- Adequate Yearly Progress.....[www.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/index.html](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/index.html)  
*Provides data tables with AYP numbers for each campus and district, the AYP Guide, and other information related to AYP.*
- Charter School..... [www.tea.state.tx.us/charter/index.html](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/charter/index.html)  
*Provides lists of schools, contact information, and answers to frequently asked questions.*
- No Child Left Behind .....[www.tea.state.tx.us/nclb/index.html](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/nclb/index.html)  
*Provides information on Title I, II, III, IV, V, and VI programs and other aspects of NCLB.*
- PEIMS..... [www.tea.state.tx.us/peims/index.html](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/peims/index.html)  
*Provides publications such as the Data Standards, as well as the Standard Reports.*
- Performance Reporting .....[www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/index.html](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/index.html)  
*Provides data tables with all accountability data for each campus and district, AEIS reports, School Report Cards, and other publications.*
- Special Education .....[www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/index.html](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/index.html)  
*Provides extensive information about special education and the ARD process.*
- Student Assessment ..... [www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/index.html](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/index.html)  
*Provides test results for districts and campuses as well as 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) as well as extensive information on Texas public universities and community colleges.*



## **Appendix E - Acknowledgments**

---

Many people have contributed to the development of the *2004 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:**

Shirley Neeley, Commissioner of Education  
Robert Scott, Chief Deputy Commissioner  
Criss Cloudt, Associate Commissioner for Accountability and Data Quality

#### **PROJECT LEADERSHIP**

Nancy Stevens, Dep. Assoc. Commissioner for Accountability and Performance Monitoring  
Shannon Housson, Director, Division of Performance Reporting  
Cathy Long, Division of Performance Reporting  
Betty Weed, Division of Performance Reporting

#### **CONTRIBUTORS**

Suzanne Alston	Division of Performance Based Monitoring
David Anderson	TEA General Counsel
Laura Ayala	Division of Student Assessment
Susan Barnes	Associate Commissioner for Standards and Programs
Lisa Chandler	Director, Division of Student Assessment
Karen Dvorak	Director, Division of Accountability Research
John Haetinger	Division of Performance Reporting
Rachel Harrington	Director, Division of Performance Based Monitoring
Diane Hernandez	Division of Performance Reporting
Gene Lentz	Deputy Associate Commissioner for Special Education
Yvonne Liang	Division of Performance Reporting
Angie Liu	Division of Performance Reporting
Mary Perry	Director, Division of Charter Schools
Ester Regalado	Division of Performance Reporting
Nancy Rinehart	Division of Performance Reporting
Linda Roska	Division of Accountability Research
Trish Smith	Division of Performance Reporting
Laura Taylor	Director, Division of Special Education Monitoring
Tim Wilson	Division of Performance Reporting
Li-Chin Wu	Division of Performance Reporting

## **Educator Focus Group on Accountability**

---

Representatives from districts and regional service centers met in November and December 2003, and February 2004 to participate in developing the new accountability system. We appreciate these individuals — their hard work and the creative and efficient ways they resolved many of the issues facing us.

Iris Amon, Assistant Sup't for Research, Evaluation, & Testing, *San Antonio ISD, Region 20*

Mark Ayala, Principal, Desert Hills Elementary, *Clint ISD, Region 19*

Charlotte Baker, Deputy Director for Programs and Services, *Region 3*

Frank Belcher, Superintendent, *Canadian ISD, Region 16*

Della Berlanga, Coordinator of Counseling & Guidance, *Corpus Christi ISD, Region 2*

Judy Caskey, Director of Instructional Programs, *Region 8*

M. Annette Cluff, Superintendent, *The Varnett Charter School, Region 4*

Jim Cornelius, Director, *Heartland Special Education Cooperative, Region 15*

Nabor F. Cortez, Jr., Superintendent, *South San Antonio ISD, Region 20*

Jim Dickson, Superintendent, *Corsicana ISD, Region 12*

Billy Espino, Principal, *Ft. Stockton Intermediate School, Ft. Stockton ISD, Region 8*

Libby Gardner, Superintendent, *Pflugerville ISD, Region 13*

Sylvia Garza, Assistant Sup't for Teaching and Learning, *San Marcos CISD, Region 13*

Tom Harvey, Superintendent, *La Vernia ISD, Region 20*

Francine Holland, Deputy Executive Director Instructional Services, *Region 11*

Adrain Johnson, Superintendent, *La Marque ISD, Region 4*

Whitcomb Johnstone, Director of Planning, Evaluation and Research, *Irving ISD, Region 10*

Daniel King, Superintendent, *Hidalgo ISD, Region 1*

Michael Motheral, Superintendent, *Sundown ISD, Region 17*

Dawson Orr, Superintendent, *Wichita Falls ISD, Region 9*

Anne Poplin, Superintendent, *Windthorst ISD, Region 9*

Raymon Puente, Director of Residential Services, *Juvenile Justice Center*

Margaret Rohde, Deputy Director, *Harris County Juvenile Justice Charter School*

David Splittek, Superintendent, *Lackland ISD*

Mike Strozeski, Executive Director of Accountability, *Richardson ISD, Region 6*

Roberta Warner, Director of Testing and Research, *Cypress-Fairbanks ISD*

Travis Weatherspoon, Director of Testing, *La Marque ISD, Region 4*

Ledessa White, Assistant Director of Elementary Education, *Abilene ISD, Region 14*

Mary Ann Whiteker, Superintendent, *Hudson ISD, Region 7*

## 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 February 2004. We appreciate these individuals and their efforts to creatively and fairly resolve the accountability issues addressed.

### SCHOOL DISTRICT / ESC REPRESENTATIVES

Jesus Chavez	Superintendent, <i>Corpus Christi ISD</i>
Joe Farmer	Executive Director, <i>Region X Education Service Center</i>
Pat Forgione	Superintendent, <i>Austin ISD</i>
Harlan Howell	Dir. Research and Evaluation/Computer Services, <i>Harlingen CISD</i>
Tom Norris	Executive Director, <i>Region XII Education Service Center</i>
Thomas Randle	Superintendent, <i>Lamar CISD</i>
Jim Scales	Deputy Superintendent, <i>Dallas ISD</i>
David Splittek	Superintendent, <i>Lackland ISD</i>
Herman L. Smith, Jr.	Superintendent, <i>Bryan ISD</i>
Kaye Stripling	Superintendent, <i>Houston ISD</i>
Mike Strozeski	Executive Director of Accountability, <i>Richardson ISD</i>
Thomas S. Tocco	Superintendent, <i>Fort Worth ISD</i>
James R. Vasquez,	Executive Director, <i>Region XIX Education Service Center</i>

### LEGISLATIVE STAFF

Von Byer	Committee Director, <i>Senate Education Committee</i>
Harrison Keller	Special Assistant for Education, <i>Office of the Speaker of the House</i>
Louann Martinez	Chief of Staff, School Finance Studies, <i>House Public Ed. Committee</i>
Ursula Parks	Public Education Team Manager, <i>Legislative Budget Board</i>
Andrea Sheridan	Special Assistant for Education, <i>Office of the Lieutenant Governor</i>
Todd Webster	Public Education Policy Director, <i>Office of the Governor</i>

### OTHER REPRESENTATIVES

Jim Crow	Executive Director, <i>Texas Association of School Boards</i>
Bill Hammond	President & CEO, <i>Texas Association of Business</i>
Sandy Kress	Partner, <i>Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer, and Feld</i>
Don McAdams	President, <i>Center for Reform of School Systems</i>
John Stevens	Executive Director, <i>Texas Business and Education Coalition</i>
Johnny Veselka	Executive Director, <i>Texas Association of School Administrators</i>
Darv Winick	President, <i>Winick Consultants</i>

## Other Reviewers

---

### COMMISSIONER'S TASA CABINET OF SUPERINTENDENTS

Randy Albers	<i>Midway ISD, Region 12</i>
Steve Burleson	<i>Spur ISD, Region 17</i>
John Conley	<i>Bellville ISD, Region 6</i>
Jimmy Creel	<i>Port Neches-Groves ISD, Region 5</i>
Tony Daugherty	<i>Tioga ISD, Region 10</i>
Jesus Gandara	<i>Mercedes ISD, Region 1</i>
Roberto Garcia	<i>Robstown ISD, At Large</i>
Bill Graves	<i>Paint Rock ISD, Region 15</i>
Henry D. Herrera	<i>Alice ISD, Region 2</i>
Mard A. Herrick	<i>Southside ISD, Region 20</i>
Rick Howard	<i>Comanche CISD, Region 14</i>
Richard Kitchens	<i>Pewitt ISD, Region 8</i>
Willis Mackey	<i>Port Arthur ISD, At Large</i>
Ron Mayfield	<i>Reagan County ISD, Region 18</i>
Dawson Orr	<i>Wichita Falls ISD, At Large</i>
Joey Patek	<i>Hallettsville ISD, Region 3</i>
Vickie Phelps	<i>Taylor ISD, At Large</i>
Dan Powell	<i>Everman ISD, Region 11</i>
Thomas Randle	<i>Lamar CISD, Region 4</i>
Erwin Sladek, Jr	<i>LaGrange ISD, Region 13</i>
Kaye Stripling	<i>Houston ISD, At Large</i>
Danny Taylor	<i>Burkburnett ISD, Region 9</i>
James Veitenheimer	<i>Canyon ISD, Region 16</i>
Johnny Veselka	Executive Director, <i>Texas Association of School Administrators</i>
Paul Whitton	Assoc. Exec. Director, <i>Texas Association of School Administrators</i>

### SUPERINTENDENT STEERING COMMITTEE

Pete Anthony	Superintendent, <i>Southwest ISD, Region 20</i>
Larry Appel	Superintendent, <i>Dumas ISD, Region 16</i>
Vivian Baker	Superintendent, <i>Belton ISD, Region 12</i>
Christopher Barbic	Superintendent, <i>Yes College Preparatory School Region 4</i>
Frank Beleher	Superintendent, <i>Canadian ISD, Region 16</i>
Roy Benavides	Superintendent, <i>Ector County ISD, Region 18</i>
Carol Ann Bonds	Superintendent, <i>Livingston ISD, Region 6</i>
Iris B. Burnham	Superintendent, <i>Burnham Wood Charter School Region 19</i>
Heath Burns	Superintendent, <i>Anderson-Shiro CISD, Region 6</i>
Bonny Cain	Superintendent, <i>Pearland ISD, Region 4</i>

Yolanda Chapa	Acting Superintendent, <i>McAllen ISD, Region 1</i>
Jesus Chavez	Superintendent, <i>Corpus Christi ISD, Region 2</i>
Deborah Cron	Superintendent, <i>Weatherford ISD, Region 11</i>
Margaret Davis	Superintendent, <i>Pleasant Grove ISD, Region 8</i>
Roberto Duron	Superintendent, <i>Socorro ISD, Region 19</i>
John Folks	Superintendent, <i>Northside ISD, Region 20</i>
Pat Forgione	Superintendent, <i>Austin ISD, Region 13</i>
Joseph Gallegos	Superintendent, <i>Sierra Blanca ISD, Region 19</i>
Libby Gardner	Superintendent, <i>Pflugerville ISD, Region 13</i>
Greg Gibson	Superintendent, <i>Crowley ISD, Region 11</i>
Annette Griffin	Superintendent, <i>Carrollton-Farmers Branch ISD, Region 10</i>
Don Hancock	Superintendent, <i>Connally ISD, Region 12</i>
Jim Hawkins	Superintendent, <i>DeSoto ISD, Region 10</i>
Henry Herrera	Superintendent, <i>Alice ISD, Region 2</i>
Rick Howard	Superintendent, <i>Comanche ISD, Region 14</i>
Don Jones	Superintendent, <i>Ricardo ISD, Region 2</i>
Yvonne Katz	Superintendent, <i>Spring Branch ISD, Region 4</i>
Daniel King	Superintendent, <i>Hidalgo ISD, Region 1</i>
Nadine Kujawa	Superintendent, <i>Aldine ISD, Region 4</i>
Mike Lee	Superintendent, <i>Booker ISD, Region 16</i>
Willis Mackey	Superintendent, <i>Port Arthur ISD, Region 5</i>
Barbara Maddox	Superintendent, <i>Randolph Field ISD, Region 20</i>
Ken McCraw	Superintendent, <i>Lamesa ISD, Region 17</i>
Mike Motheral	Superintendent, <i>Sundown ISD, Region 17</i>
Deborah Nance	Superintendent, <i>Texas Youth Commission Region 13</i>
Larry Nichols	Superintendent, <i>Calhoun County ISD, Region 3</i>
Robert Nicks	Superintendent, <i>Midland ISD, Region 18</i>
Tom Norris	Executive Director, <i>Region 12</i>
Sylvester Perez	Superintendent, <i>San Marcos CISD, Region 13</i>
Anne Poplin	Superintendent, <i>Windthorst ISD, Region 9</i>
Cole Pugh	Superintendent, <i>San Angelo ISD, Region 15</i>
Thomas Randle	Superintendent, <i>Lamar CISD, Region 4</i>
Ron Reaves	Superintendent, <i>New Braunfels ISD, Region 13</i>
Kelly Rodgers	Superintendent, <i>Center ISD, Region 7</i>
Karen Rue	Superintendent, <i>Tuloso-Midway ISD, Region 2</i>
John Sawyer	Superintendent, <i>Harris County Department of Ed, Region 4</i>
Rod Schroder	Superintendent, <i>Amarillo ISD, Region 16</i>
David Sharp	Superintendent, <i>Lufkin ISD, Region 7</i>
Paul Smith	Superintendent, <i>Palacios ISD, Region 3</i>
Herman Smith	Superintendent, <i>Bryan ISD, Region 6</i>

Donna Smith	Superintendent, <i>Clint ISD, Region 19</i>
Paul Smithson	Superintendent, <i>Johnson City ISD, Region 13</i>
Keith Sockwell	Superintendent, <i>Northwest ISD, Region 11</i>
David Splitek	Superintendent, <i>Lackland ISD, Region 20</i>
Kaye Stripling	Superintendent, <i>Houston ISD, Region 4</i>
Charles Tafoya	Superintendent, <i>El Paso ISD, Region 19</i>
Butch Thomas	Superintendent, <i>Beaumont ISD, Region 5</i>
Thomas Tocco	Superintendent, <i>Fort Worth ISD, Region 11</i>
Kay Waggoner	Superintendent, <i>Red Oak ISD, Region 10</i>
Mary Whiteker	Superintendent, <i>Hudson ISD, Region 7</i>

## 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
1	<b><i>2004 Accountability Manual</i></b>	<b>GE04 602 02</b>	<b>\$12.00</b>	
<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
1	<b><i>2004 Accountability Manual</i></b>	<b>GE04 602 02</b>	<b>\$10.00</b>	
<i>Price includes postage and handling only.</i>				

**IF YOU ARE MAILING A PURCHASE ORDER\* OR NEED INFORMATION, SEND TO:**

Texas Education Agency  
Publications Distribution  
1701 North Congress Avenue  
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

\*Purchase orders are accepted only from Texas educational institutions and 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.

