

**Accountability System for 2005 and Beyond  
Commissioner's Accountability Advisory Committee  
Changes from the Educator Focus Group Proposal**

<b>Standard Accountability System</b>							
<b>Change from Focus Group Proposal</b>	<b>Reason for Change</b>						
<p>Increase the TAKS <i>Academically Acceptable</i> standards beginning in 2006 by 10 points for each subject, rather than by 5, as proposed by the Focus Group. Increase both the mathematics and science standards by an additional 5 points in 2007. In 2008 resume the Focus Group proposal. Indicate clearly on all preview materials that future standards are subject to change given annual review of actual performance.</p> <p>In 2006 the <i>Academically Acceptable</i> standards are recommended to be:</p> <table style="margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td>R/ELA, W, SS</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mathematics</td> <td>45%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Science</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> </table>	R/ELA, W, SS	60%	Mathematics	45%	Science	35%	<p>Student performance in 2004 exceeded expectations and very few campuses and districts had trouble meeting the 2004 <i>Academically Acceptable</i> standards. 2005 standards will remain as originally planned, with no increases over 2004 due to the increase in the student passing standard from 1 SEM to Panel Recommendation. Even though the student passing standard for grade 11 continues to phase in through 2006, CAAC advised the jump in standards was necessary to recognize expected growth in student performance. Also, the higher standards are more in line with the AYP targets for 2007.</p>
R/ELA, W, SS	60%						
Mathematics	45%						
Science	35%						
<p>Establish the SDAA II accountability standards for 2006 and beyond after results are available from the initial spring 2005 administration.</p>	<p>Since there are no SDAA II results with which to model, the CAAC recommended that the accountability standards be determined after data are available from the first administration of the SDAA II.</p>						
<p>Development of a relief mechanism when the SDAA II indicator is the only reason for achieving the next higher rating will be explored for 2005 and beyond.</p>	<p>CAAC comments recommended development of a way to evaluate SDAA II performance taking into account the percent of students tested on TAKS. Encouraging districts to test fewer special education students on the SDAA II is a long term state goal. Districts with a smaller proportion of SDAA II assessed students should be rewarded.</p>						

<b>Alternative Education Accountability Procedures</b>	
<b>Change from Focus Group Proposal</b>	<b>Reason for Change</b>
<p>All proposals were accepted as recommended by the focus group.</p>	<p>n/a</p>

<b>Other Topics</b>	
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<p>Discussions between the state and USDE continue regarding the AYP 1% cap.</p>	<p>CAAC comments expressed the need to provide districts with advance information for the 2005-06 school year about the state's policy for testing students using alternative assessments. It would be preferable for information to be sent out within the next 30 days, to coincide with ARD committee meetings that occur in the spring.</p>