

**Accountability System for 2005 and Beyond  
Educator Focus Group Proposal**

**Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)**

1. Fifth Grade Reading and Mathematics. Results from the first and second administrations of the grade 5 reading tests are incorporated into the TAKS reading/English language arts indicator. (For students enrolled on the same campus for both administrations of the grade 5 reading test, results of the second administration will be used for students who failed or were absent from the first administration. The district indicator will include students enrolled in the same district for both tests.) The same procedures will be used to incorporate the results from the first and second administrations of the grade 5 mathematics tests into the TAKS mathematics indicator. The decision to use the first and second administrations will be applied to grade 8 reading and mathematics beginning in 2008 when the promotion testing requirements under the Student Success Initiative are extended to those grade 8 subject areas.

*Rationale:* This parallels the methodology applied to the use of multiple administrations of grade 3 reading for the 2004 ratings, and implements the plan previously recommended by the 2004 focus group and commissioner's accountability advisory committee.

2. Standards. Maintain the 2004 standards for 2005. Increase all subject area *Academically Acceptable* standards by five points in 2006 (i.e., Reading/ELA, Writing, Social Studies to 55%; Mathematics to 40%; and Science to 30%). Delay the increase in the *Recognized* standard from 75% to 80% until 2009.

	<b>2005 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2006 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2007 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2008 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2009 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2010 AA/Re/Ex</b>
<b>R/ELA, W, SS</b>	50 / 70 / 90	<b>55 / 70 / 90</b>	<b>60 / 75 / 90</b>	<b>65 / 75 / 90</b>	<b>70 / 80 / 90</b>	<b>70 / 80 / 90</b>
<b>Mathematics</b>	35 / 70 / 90	<b>40 / 70 / 90</b>	<b>45 / 75 / 90</b>	<b>50 / 75 / 90</b>	<b>55 / 80 / 90</b>	<b>60 / 80 / 90</b>
<b>Science</b>	25 / 70 / 90	<b>30 / 70 / 90</b>	<b>35 / 75 / 90</b>	<b>40 / 75 / 90</b>	<b>45 / 80 / 90</b>	<b>50 / 80 / 90</b>

*Rationale:* Since 2005 marks the phase-in of the student passing standards from 1 SEM to the Panel Recommended (PR) standards for grades 3-10 and from 2 SEM to 1 SEM for grade 11, the 2005 accountability standards remain constant as recommended by the advisory committee, focus group, and commissioner in 2004. For 2006, this phase-in proposal differs from the recommendation originally made in 2004 by accelerating the increase in *Academically Acceptable* standards in all subject areas. While many other alternatives were debated (see *Attachment A*), the recommendation to increase standards in 2006 was reached after weighing concerns over the increasing rigor of the student passing standards in both 2005 and 2006 against the expected gains in actual performance over the next two years. See *Attachment B* for the phase-in schedule of the student passing standards.

The focus group also considered the targets that have been established for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for 2005 and beyond. Though the state and federal systems differ in key areas, for comparative purposes the AYP targets for Reading/ELA and Mathematics are shown below.

	<b>AYP Targets</b>					
	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Reading/ELA</b>	53	53	60	60	67	73
<b>Mathematics</b>	42	42	50	50	58	67

The increase in the *Recognized* standard from 75% to 80% is postponed until 2009 to take into account the introduction of the grade 8 science test in 2008. The state-acknowledged shortage of qualified mathematics and science teachers was cited as a factor affecting the ability of districts to meet ever-increasing expectations.

As in 2004, the TAKS accountability standards are the same for campuses and districts and for All Students and each student group. However, the standards differ for some subjects. The lower standards for mathematics and science reflect the lower performance in these subjects in 2004 compared to reading/ELA, writing, and social studies, and the greater gaps in performance between the 2004 and 2005 student passing standards. Initially setting standards that reflect a starting point and phasing in higher standards over time continues the philosophy of the prior system which led to nationally recognized gains in performance of student groups that significantly closed the performance gaps.

3. Required Improvement. Continue to use Required Improvement (RI) as defined in the 2004 system for TAKS. Maintain a floor for *Recognized* that is five points below the current year standard. RI is calculated as the amount of gain in percent *Met Standard* required to reach the current year accountability standard in two years. Prior year percent *Met Standard* will be recalculated at the current year student passing standard so that gain from the prior year to the current year is calculated using comparable performance data for the two years. RI is calculated for each TAKS subject area, for All Students, and each student group evaluated.

*Rationale:* This feature of the system was perceived to have functioned as intended by the focus group in 2004. The accountability system is designed to reward either meeting an absolute performance standard or an improvement standard. The use of the five point floor for achieving *Recognized* with RI was deemed to be an appropriate safeguard to earning this higher rating label.

4. Commended Performance. The Commissioner of Education recommended that measures be developed that incorporate TAKS Commended Performance into the accountability ratings by 2007. The focus group requested that staff prepare specific options for:
  - linking Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) results to the ratings;
  - possible improvement measures for Commended Performance; and,
  - potential performance standards and uses for a Commended Performance indicator.

*Rationale:* It is expected that Commended Performance will be incorporated in the rating system at the *Exemplary* and possibly the *Recognized* levels by 2007. However, projections using the 2004 actual results at the 2006 student passing standards indicate a small percentage of districts (0.4%) and campuses (2.7%) will meet the 90% passing rate required for the *Exemplary* rating.

The focus group recommended that Commended Performance be used as an incentive to increase student performance among students achieving well above the *Met Standard* passing level. However, the committee did not want to add more hurdles to the 36 hurdles already in place. Since the GPA system acknowledges high achievement at the Commended Performance level and on other non-TAKS performance indicators, one option to explore is linking GPA results more prominently to the final rating label. For example, a campus/district achieving the GPA standards on a certain percentage of acknowledgments evaluated would merit a supplemental label to their base rating. The focus group offered a second option that would allow a campus/district with high achievement at the commended performance level to move from *Recognized* to *Exemplary*.

## State Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II)

1. Indicator. Define the SDAA II indicator to parallel the definition of the 2004 SDAA indicator and use it in the same manner in the 2005 system as it was used in 2004. The SDAA II indicator is a single performance indicator evaluated for all SDAA II tested grades (grades 3-10 in 2005). The indicator is calculated as the number of tests meeting admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) committee expectations (summed across grades and subjects) divided by the number of SDAA II tests for which ARD expectations were established (summed across grades and subjects). The SDAA II indicator is evaluated at the All Students level only.

*Rationale:* Although the SDAA II is more similar to the TAKS than the SDAA was, the two are still different assessments, and it is appropriate to evaluate SDAA II results as a separate indicator rather than combining the results with TAKS. The SDAA II indicator treats special education students as a student group on a measure designed for that population while avoiding the disadvantages inherent in using special education as a student group throughout the system; therefore, the SDAA II indicator is evaluated at the All Students level only.

While the issue of variations in expectation setting was discussed by the focus group, the consensus was that ARD committees would and should set appropriate expectations for each student assessed in compliance with state policy and procedures. This indicator should be revisited in 2005-06 when data are available from the first administration of the SDAA II.

The focus group also discussed but did not recommend setting a minimum level of performance (for example the *Acceptable* standard) in order to be *Exemplary* or *Recognized*.

2. Minimum Size Requirements. As in 2004, SDAA II (All Students) performance will be evaluated for campuses and districts with results from 30 or more tests (summed across grades and subjects). Since SDAA II is administered for either two or three subjects (reading/ELA, writing, and mathematics) depending on the grade tested, and the results are summed across subjects as well as grades, the 30 tests minimum size requirement can represent as few as 10 students at grades 4 and 7 and as few as 15 students at grades 3, 5, 6, and 8-10. The criteria of 10 students for the SDAA II corresponds to the all students minimum size criteria of 10 students for the dropout and completion rate measures that will be used for 2005 accountability. There are no minimum size requirements for TAKS at the all students level.
3. Required Improvement. An improvement measure for the SDAA II cannot be calculated until there are two years of data are available. Use of RI for SDAA II will be introduced in 2006 once two years of data are available and actual change in performance can be researched.
4. Standards. The performance standards for the SDAA II indicator are set at the same levels as the TAKS reading/ELA tests for 2005 and beyond, as shown in the table, below:

	2005 AA/Re/Ex	2006 AA/Re/Ex	2007 AA/Re/Ex	2008 AA/Re/Ex	2009 AA/Re/Ex	2010 AA/Re/Ex
<b>SDAA II</b>	50 / 70 / 90	55 / 70 / 90	60 / 75 / 90	65 / 75 / 90	70 / 80 / 90	70 / 80 / 90

While there are no SDAA II results with which to model, the 2004 system shows that the SDAA indicator was the sole reason preventing a higher rating in 93 cases for campuses (31 limited to *Recognized*, 60 limited to *Acceptable*, and 2 limited to *Unacceptable*.) Nine districts were prevented from a higher rating due solely to the SDAA indicator (2 prevented from *Exemplary*, and 7 prevented from *Recognized*).

## Exceptions Provision

1. Exceptions Provision. Continue to use the Exceptions Provision in 2005 as it was used in 2004, and revisit the phase-out calendar in 2006. Exceptions apply to the 26 assessment measures only – 25 TAKS measures (5 subjects x 5 student groups) plus the SDAA II measure. Proceed with the previously planned policy of not allowing re-use of an exception in 2005 if it was used in 2004. This means an exception will not be granted for the same measure for two consecutive years. For example, if a campus was granted an exception for African American mathematics performance in 2004, the campus is not eligible for an exception for African American mathematics performance in 2005.

Maintain the other system safeguards created for this provision; namely, a maximum of three exceptions can be used (depending on the number of measures evaluated); and, an absolute performance floor that is no more than five points below the *Academically Acceptable* standard must be achieved.

This provision can only elevate a rating to *Academically Acceptable*. This provision does not apply to the *Recognized* or *Exemplary* rating categories. 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, but fails to meet the *Academically Acceptable* criteria on that one measure, the Exceptions Provision could only move the campus from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*.

2. Maximum Exceptions. As in 2004, the maximum number of exceptions granted is dependent on the number of assessment measures on which the campus or district is evaluated, as shown in the following table.

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

3. Annual Review. The Exceptions Provision will be reevaluated in 2006 and annually thereafter 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 provisions need to be modified.

*Rationale:* This feature of the system was perceived to have functioned as intended by the focus group in 2004. Only 61 campuses were able to avoid the *Academically Unacceptable* rating due to the exceptions provision. 52 campuses used one exception, 9 campuses used two exceptions, and no campuses used all three allowable exceptions. Three districts were rated *Academically Acceptable* due to the exceptions provision. All three districts only needed one exception. No districts used either two or three exceptions.

The Exceptions Provision provides relief to larger campuses and districts that have more diverse student populations and, therefore, are evaluated on more measures. The exceptions prevent a campus or district from receiving a lower rating based on a small number of assessment measures when they meet the higher criteria for all other measures. It is anticipated that the Exceptions Provision will be phased-out when the new assessment program is fully implemented and the accountability requirements stabilize.

## Completion Rate (Grade 9-12) Indicator

1. Minimum Size. The minimum number of non-completers required for analysis of this indicator decreases from 10 to 5 in 2005 for All Students and each student group, as previously announced.
2. Definition of a Completer. Beginning with the class of 2005 (students whose cohort entered 9th grade in 2001-02), only graduates and continuing students (students who return to school for the 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 is a significant definitional change that will increase the rigor of the indicator beginning with the 2006 accountability system.

*Rationale:* GED recipients are included in the class of 2004 completion rates because the accountability rules for that graduating class were not announced until late in the 2004 school year. Based on the recommendations of the advisory committee, focus group, and commissioner in 2004, campuses and districts knew before the beginning of the 2005 school year that students in that graduating class of 2005 and beyond who receive a GED will not be counted as completers for accountability ratings.

3. Definition of a Dropout. The completion rate indicator is calculated as the number of completers expressed as a percent of total students in the class (graduates, continuing students, GED recipients, and dropouts). Beginning in 2007, the definition of a dropout (which comprises a portion of the denominator of this indicator) will change to begin phasing-in use of the NCES definition of a dropout. In 2007, the dropouts in the denominator of the completion rate will be defined using the current state definition for the first three years of the cohort and an NCES-compliant definition for the fourth year. In 2008, the first two years will be the state definition and the last two years will be NCES-compliant. By 2010 the definition will be fully NCES-compliant. See *Attachment C* for a table describing this phase-in of the prevailing definition for each reporting year of the cohort and for a table comparing the drop-out definitions used by the TEA and NCES.

*Rationale:* Even though the completion rates for the classes of 2006, 2007, and 2008 will have a combination of dropout definitions, the advantages of this methodology outweigh this disadvantage. The phase-in option assures that the definitions of dropouts for the annual rate and the longitudinal rate are consistent in each year. The definition used for agency reporting is the same as the definition used for district data submissions. Students classified as "other leavers" when reported to the agency are classified as "other leavers" in accountability calculations.

4. Use in Reporting. The focus group requested that, as staff resources allow, the agency consider reporting one of the other options explored for the dropout definition; namely, a progression rate for the class of 2009. The progression rate measures the progress of a cohort through high school by reporting the enrollment status of cohort members each year. For example, in 2007, the status of first-time 2005-06 ninth graders as of 2006-07 is reported. In 2008, the status of the cohort as it finishes its third year is reported, etc. Though not feasible as an accountability indicator in the short-term, this new measure presents information useful to districts and campuses.
5. Required Improvement. In 2005, campuses and districts with completion rates may "gate up" to *Recognized* if the amount of gain in the completion rate would reach the 85.0% *Recognized* standard in two years. As with TAKS RI, a minimum performance floor that is five percentage points below the *Recognized* standard is required; therefore completion rate performance must be between 80.0% and 85.0% to be eligible for this feature. Maintain the use of the RI to allow campuses and districts to achieve the *Academically Acceptable* rating by demonstrating enough gain to reach the *Academically Acceptable* standard in two years. As with TAKS RI, there is no floor for using RI to gate up to *Academically Acceptable*.

*Rationale:* Even though RI use with the completion rate did not impact any ratings in the 2004 system or in the models, having it available parallels the use of RI with TAKS. Districts and campuses have a

second way to achieve a higher rating, if they can demonstrate enough improvement. This keeps an incentive in the system to focus on improving campus and district completion rates. Also, with changes to minimum size, planned increases in the rigor of the standards, and changes to the measure definition, more campuses and districts may need and be able to use this feature in the future.

6. Use of District Rate. As in 2004, use the district completion rate for the evaluation of this indicator for campuses that do not have their own completion rate (have not served grades 9-12 for the last five years). For example, a senior high school that only served grades 11 and 12 is attributed the district's completion rate because it did not have its own. Allow appeals for special circumstance high schools as was done in 2004, e.g., new high schools created to serve special populations of gifted and talented and/or early college bound students.

*Rationale:* Consistent indicators are used at campus and district levels. All Students in grades 9-12 will be included in the district completion rate even if campuses serving these students are not serving grades 9-12 inclusive for 5 years. Any campus serving grade 9, 10, 11, or 12 will be evaluated on completion rate.

7. Standards.

<b>Longitudinal Completion Rate (Grades 9-12) Accountability Standards</b>						
	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
	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	Class of 2009; 9 <sup>th</sup> grade 05-06
<b>Exemplary</b>	95.0%	95.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Recognized</b>	85.0%	85.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Academically Acceptable</b>	75.0%	75.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Completion Rate Definition</b>	Graduates + GED Recipients + Continued HS	Graduates + Continued HS	Graduates + Continued HS	Graduates + Continued HS	Graduates + Continued HS	Graduates + Continued HS
<b>Dropout Definition</b>	Current State Definition	Current State Definition	Phase-in NCES definition	Phase-in NCES definition	Phase-in NCES definition	NCES definition

*Rationale:* The standards are held constant for 2005 and 2006 while the definition of a completer is changing and becoming more rigorous (by removing GED recipients from the completion rate in 2006). Standards for 2007 and beyond are to be determined. In 2006 the issue of appropriate standards for the completion rate will be revisited.

Over time it is anticipated that the *Academically Acceptable* standard for this indicator will increase to 85.0% and the *Recognized* standard will increase to 90.0%.

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

1. Minimum Size. The minimum number of dropouts required for analysis of this indicator decreases from 10 to 5 in 2005 for All Students and each student group, as previously announced.
2. Definition of a Dropout. The annual dropout rate indicator is a one-year count of grade 7 and 8 dropouts expressed as a percent of total students enrolled in grades 7 and 8 for that school year. Change the state accountability dropout definition for 2005-06 leavers by adopting the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition and use this definition to calculate the 2005-06 annual dropout rates. This means 2007 will be the first accountability year to evaluate grade 7-8 annual dropout rates using the new definition. The new definition will also be used to create the denominator of the longitudinal completion rate beginning with the class of 2006.

3. Standards.

<b>Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-8) Accountability Standards</b>						
	<b>2005</b> from 2003-04	<b>2006</b> from 2004-05	<b>2007</b> from 2005-06	<b>2008</b> from 2006-07	<b>2009</b> from 2007-08	<b>2010</b> from 2008-09
<b>Exemplary</b>	0.2%	0.2%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Recognized</b>	0.7%	0.7%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Academically Acceptable</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	1.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Dropout Definition</b>	Current State Definition	Current State Definition	NCES Definition	NCES Definition	NCES Definition	NCES Definition

*Rationale:* The standards are held constant for 2005 and 2006. Standards for 2007 and beyond are to be determined. Annual dropout rate standards for 2007 and beyond will be determined when campus data are available to set the standards on a dropout rate calculated under the NCES definition.

4. Required Improvement. In 2005, campuses and districts with dropout rates may “gate up” to *Recognized* if the amount of improvement (decline) in the dropout rate would reach the 0.7% *Recognized* standard in two years. In 2005, a minimum performance floor of 0.9% is required; therefore dropout rate performance must be between 0.9% and 0.7% to be eligible for this feature. Maintain the use of the RI to allow campuses and districts to achieve the *Academically Acceptable* rating by demonstrating enough improvement (decline) to reach the *Academically Acceptable* standard in two years. As with TAKS RI, there is no floor for using RI to gate up to *Academically Acceptable*.

*Rationale:* Even though RI use with the dropout rate did not impact any ratings in the 2004 system or in the models, having it available parallels the use of RI with TAKS. Districts and campuses have a second way to achieve a higher rating, if they can demonstrate enough improvement. This keeps an incentive in the system to focus on improving campus and district dropout rates. Also, with changes to minimum size and the measure definition, more campuses and districts may need and be able to use this feature in the future.

**Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA)**

1. Established Indicators. The 2004 standards will be applied to all eleven established indicators for 2005 and 2006, except for the Recommended High School Program (RHSP) / Distinguished Achievement Program (DAP) indicator. The standard for the RSHP/DAP indicator increases from 50.0% in 2004 to 60.0% in 2005 to 70.0% in 2006 and to 80.0% in 2007, as previously planned. GPA indicators and standards for 2005 and beyond are shown in *Attachment D*.

*Rationale:* The current standards for the established indicators appear to have been quite stringent for a vast majority of districts and campuses. In addition, it was deemed too late in the school year to raise GPA standards for 2005 and there was a desire to publish 2006 standards well in advance of the 2005-06 school year. Recommendations for standards for 2007 and beyond will be researched and evaluated prior to convening the 2006 focus group.

The RHSP/DAP standard is increased because the recommended high school program becomes the default curriculum for students entering ninth grade beginning in the 2004-05 school year (19 Texas Administrative Code §74.51, 2004).

2. New Indicators. Standards were also recommended for four new indicators — Comparable Improvement (ELA/reading and mathematics) and College Readiness-Texas Success Initiative (ELA and mathematics). The two Comparable Improvement (CI) indicators will be implemented in 2005

and the two indicators for College Readiness-Texas Success Initiative (TSI) will be added in 2006, although reporting on this indicator began with the 2004 AEIS report.

- Comparable Improvement. This is a campus only acknowledgment. Campuses may be acknowledged separately for Comparable Improvement (CI) in reading/English Language Arts (ELA) and for CI in mathematics. Campuses with an average Texas Growth Index (TGI) within the top quartile (the top 25%) of their 40-member campus comparison group for either reading/ELA or mathematics will qualify for CI acknowledgments. The top quartile standard is in effect for 2005 and 2006. The years 2007 and beyond are to be determined. This indicator evaluates performance for all students only. Student demographics are included in the campus grouping methodology.
- College Readiness - Texas Success Initiative. Beginning with the 2006 accountability year, the TAAS/TASP Equivalency indicator will be replaced by a new indicator, College Readiness -Texas Success Initiative (TSI). Campuses and districts may be acknowledged for TSI separately for ELA and mathematics. The 2006 standards for both subjects are recommended to be 50%. All students and each student group meeting minimum size criteria are evaluated. The minimum size criteria parallel the size criteria applied to other GPA indicators.

### Additional Requirements for Districts

1. Indicators of Data Quality. Districts that fail to meet accountability standards on the annual underreported students indicator will be investigated and will be prevented from being rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized*. Subsequent investigation may prevent a district from being rated *Academically Acceptable*. In addition, data quality will be a consideration when analyzing district and campus completion rate and annual dropout rate appeals. The Person Identification Database (PID) error rate will continue to be reported and used to monitor the quality of district PEIMS data submissions. Longitudinal measures of data quality will be introduced in 2009 and may replace the annual data quality indicator in the accountability ratings process at some point in the future.
2. Underreported Students Standards. Increase the rigor of the underreported students standard each year through the 2008 accountability ratings, e.g., for 2005, any district that has more than **100** underreported students or greater than **5.0%** underreported students cannot be rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized*. See the table below for the recommended standards for 2004 through 2008.

Accountability Year	Underreported students data year	Underreported students cannot exceed:	
		Number	Percent
2004	2002-03	500	5.0
2005	2003-04	100 <sup>a</sup>	5.0
2006	2004-05	100 <sup>a</sup>	2.0
<b>2007</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1.5</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>1.0</b>

<sup>a</sup>Please note that "500" was reported in this table in the focus group materials. "100" is the previously recommended standard for 2005 and 2006 in the *2004 Accountability Manual*.

*Rationale:* Submission of accurate data is a district responsibility.

## Staff Recommendations Not Presented to 2005 Focus Group

1. New and Otherwise Academically Unacceptable Campuses. Discontinue the temporary provision allowed in 2004 to permit new and otherwise *Academically Unacceptable* campuses to be labeled *Not Rated: Other*.

*Rationale:* In 2004, a total of 19 campuses avoided the *Academically Unacceptable* rating and were assigned a rating of *Not Rated: Other* solely due to the fact that they were new campuses. New campuses were defined as campuses that were not in operation on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date in 2002-03, but did have at least one student in membership on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date in 2003-04. While this was an appropriate provision for new campuses in the first year of the new accountability system, new campuses in the 2004-05 school year have adequate notice of the requirements of the state accountability system.

**Attachment A**  
**Overview of Additional Models Discussed—Specifications and Results**

Specifications:		Model A	Model B	Model C	Model D	Model E	Model F
						Focus Group Recommendation	
TAKS/SDAA <i>Acceptable</i> Standards	R/W/SS/SDAA Math Science	50% 35% 30%	50% 40% 30%	50% 35% 35%	55% 35% 35%	55% 40% 30%	55% 40% 35%
Dropout <i>Acceptable</i> Standards		1.0%	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change
Minimum Size		5 for Dropout & Completion	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change
RI	TAKS	To current yr std in 2 yrs To <i>Acc. &amp; Rec.</i> Floor for <i>Rec.</i>	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change
	SDAA	n/a					
	Dropout	To std in 2 yrs To <i>Acc. &amp; Rec.</i> Floor for <i>Rec.</i>					
	Completion	To std in 2 yrs To <i>Acc. &amp; Rec.</i> Floor for <i>Rec.</i>					
Exceptions		In	In	In	In	In	In
Results:							
Campuses							
<i>Unacceptable</i>		713	866	920	972	915	1,100
<i>Acceptable</i>		4,466	4,313	4,259	4,207	4,264	4,079
# due to RI		464	568	655	645	558	716
# due to Exceptions		158	174	147	175	198	190
<i>Recognized</i>		1,381	1,381	1,381	1,381	1,381	1,381
# due to RI		288	288	288	288	288	288
<i>Exemplary</i>		199	199	199	199	199	199
Districts							
<i>Unacceptable</i>		199	208	249	254	214	261
<i>Acceptable</i>		911	902	862	857	896	850
# due to RI		103	128	161	160	125	169
# due to Exceptions		20	27	15	17	28	24
<i>Recognized</i>		108	108	107	107	108	107
# due to RI		41	41	41	41	41	41
<i>Exemplary</i>		5	5	5	5	5	5

**Attachment B**  
**Student Passing Standards**

The table below contains the student passing standard adopted by the State Board of Education (SBOE) for each specific year.

**Student Passing Standards**

<b>Subjects</b>	<b>Grades</b>	<b>2004 Student Met Standard</b>	<b>2005 Student Met Standard</b>	<b>2006 Student Met Standard</b>
Reading ELA *	3-9 10 11	1 SEM 1 SEM 2 SEM	Panel Recommendation Panel Recommendation 1 SEM *	Panel Recommendation
Writing	4, 7	1 SEM	Panel Recommendation	Panel Recommendation
Mathematics	3-10 11	1 SEM 2 SEM	Panel Recommendation 1 SEM	Panel Recommendation
Social Studies	8, 10 11	1 SEM 2 SEM	Panel Recommendation 1 SEM	Panel Recommendation
Science	5, 10 11	1SEM 2 SEM	Panel Recommendation 1 SEM	Panel Recommendation Panel Recommendation

\* ELA – English language arts; SEM – standard error of measurement

**Attachment C**  
**Recommended Phase-in of Dropout Rate Definition in Completion Rate Calculation for**  
**Accountability**

Accountability year	Class of	Cohort year	Dropout definition
2006	2005	2001-02	Current state accountability
		2002-03	Current state accountability
		2003-04	Current state accountability
		2004-05	Current state accountability
2007	2006	2002-03	Current state accountability
		2003-04	Current state accountability
		2004-05	Current state accountability
		2005-06	NCES compliant
2008	2007	2003-04	Current state accountability
		2004-05	Current state accountability
		2005-06	NCES compliant
		2006-07	NCES compliant
2009	2008	2004-05	Current state accountability
		2005-06	NCES compliant
		2006-07	NCES compliant
		2007-08	NCES compliant
2010	2009	2005-06	NCES compliant
		2006-07	NCES compliant
		2007-08	NCES compliant
		2008-09	NCES compliant

## "Dropouts" as Defined by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)

Texas Education Agency	National Center for Education Statistics
Definition	
TEA and NCES both define a dropout as a student who is enrolled in school at some time during the school year but either: leaves school during the school year without an approved excuse; or completes the school year and does not return the following year.	
Leavers not considered dropouts	
<p>A student who leaves school for one of the following reasons is not considered a dropout by TEA or NCES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• graduates;</li> <li>• transfers to, or withdraws with intent to transfer to, a public or private school;</li> <li>• is being home schooled;</li> <li>• enrolls in college; or</li> <li>• dies.</li> </ul> <p>A student who leaves school for one of the following reasons is not considered a dropout by TEA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• receives a General Educational Development (GED) certificate by March 1 the following year;</li> <li>• enrolls in an approved adult education GED preparation program; or</li> <li>• meets all graduation requirements but does not pass the exit-level Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS).</li> </ul> <p>A student who leaves school for one of the following reasons is not considered a dropout by NCES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• receives a GED certificate by the last Friday in October the following year.</li> </ul>	
Dropouts excluded from the dropout count	
<p>Dropouts excluded from TEA counts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• students who were previously counted as dropouts;</li> <li>• students who are not eligible for state funding; and</li> <li>• students who are reported as dropouts by more than one district and whose last districts of attendance cannot be determined.</li> </ul>	
Returning students	
Returning students are those who enroll at any time before the third week of January of the next school year.	Except for migrant students, returning students are those enrolled on the last Friday in October of the next school year.
Summer dropouts	
Summer dropouts are added to the counts of the school years and grade levels completed.	Summer dropouts are added to the counts of the school years and grade levels in which they fail to enroll.
Denominator	
Cumulative attendance is used as the denominator in dropout rate calculations.	Fall enrollment is used as the denominator in dropout rate calculations.

## GOLD PERFORMANCE ACKNOWLEDGMENT STANDARDS FOR 2005 and Beyond

<i><b>GPA Indicators</b></i>	<i><b>2005</b></i>	<i><b>2006</b></i>	<i><b>2007</b></i>
1. Advanced / Dual Enrollment Course Completion	>= 25.0%**	>= 25.0%**	<b>TBD</b>
2. Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate Results	>=15.0% and >=50.0%*	>=15.0% and >=50.0%*	<b>TBD</b>
3. Attendance Rate	>=95.0%** (high school) >=96.0%** (middle school, K-12 schools, and district) >=97.0%** (elementary)	>=95.0%** (high school) >=96.0%** (middle school, K-12 schools, and district) >=97.0%** (elementary)	<b>TBD</b>
4. Commended Performance: Reading/ English Language Arts	>=20%**	>=20%**	n/a
5. Commended Performance: Mathematics	>=20%**	>=20%**	n/a
6. Commended Performance: Writing	>=20%**	>=20%**	n/a
7. Commended Performance: Science	>=20%**	>=20%**	n/a
8. Commended Performance: Social Studies	>=20%**	>=20%**	n/a
9. Recommended High School Program/ Distinguished Achievement Program	>=60.0%**	>=70.0%**	>=80.0%
10. SAT/ACT Results (College Admissions Tests)	>=70.0% and >=40.0%*	>=70.0% and >=40.0%*	<b>TBD</b>
11. TAAS/TASP Equivalency (College Preparedness)	>=80.0%**	n/a	n/a
12. Comparable Improvement -- Reading	top quartile***	top quartile***	<b>TBD</b>
13. Comparable Improvement -- Mathematics	top quartile***	top quartile***	<b>TBD</b>
14. College Readiness / Texas Success Initiative – English Language Arts	n/a	>=50%**	<b>TBD</b>
15. College Readiness / Texas Success Initiative -- Mathematics	n/a	>=50%**	<b>TBD</b>

\* 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.

\*\*\* Indicator evaluates performance for all students only.