

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE 2005 ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

November 3, 2005

THE STATE OF TEXAS

In 2005, the State of Texas achieved *Academically Acceptable* status, with:

- ✓ TAKS passing rates of **76** percent or above for all students and all student groups for reading/ELA, writing, and social studies, **57** percent or above for all students and all student groups for mathematics, and **49** percent or above for all students and all student groups for science; and
- ✓ SDAA II percent met ARD expectations of **79** percent for all students; and
- ✓ Grade 9-12 completion rates of **93.7** percent or above for all students and all student groups; and
- ✓ Grade 7-8 dropout rates of **0.3** percent or less for all students and all student groups.

Compared to the 2004 TAKS results at the 2005 student passing standards, the 2005 statewide performance on the TAKS improved for all students and all student groups in each subject area tested. In science, the percent of students who Met Standard improved by **8** percentage points for the Economically Disadvantaged student group, and by **7** points for both the Hispanic and African American student groups. The mathematics results also improved by **7** percentage points for African American students. The reading/ELA and social studies tests both improved by **3** percentage points from 2004 for the all students group.

The completion rate improved by **1.4** percentage points for African American students in the Class of 2004 as compared to the Class of 2003. Overall, the Class of 2004 completion rate of **96.1%** was **0.6** percentage points higher than the overall completion rate for the Class of 2003.

The dropout rate for students in grades 7-8 in 2003-04 was unchanged compared to the prior year for the all students group and all of the student groups, except for Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged students who improved their dropout rate by **0.1** percentage points.

DISTRICTS

Of the **1,229** districts, **11** districts (**0.9%**) are rated *Exemplary* and **172** (**14.0%**) are rated *Recognized* in 2005. The districts rated *Exemplary* comprise **0.2%** of the total student enrollment, while the districts rated *Recognized* comprise **3.8%** of total students enrolled.

989 of the **1,229** districts achieved the *Academically Acceptable* rating and comprise **94.3%** of the total students enrolled. This includes **74** charter operators achieving the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating under AEA procedures.

52 districts are *Academically Unacceptable* representing **1.3%** of the total students enrolled. This includes **15** charter operators rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* under AEA procedures.

4 districts (all charter operators) are *Not Rated: Other*, and **1** regular district is *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*. See the topic "Not Rated Districts and Campuses" below for more information about these two rating categories.

- ✓ **9** of the **11 Exemplary** districts are very small (total enrollment less than 500), and **64%** are rural (**7** of the **11**).
- ✓ **81%** of *Recognized* districts are small, having fewer than 1,000 students enrolled. Over one-third (**35%**) of *Recognized* districts have 30% or more minority students enrolled; **54%** have 40% or more economically disadvantaged students.

CAMPUSES

Of the **7,908** campuses, **304** campuses (**3.8%**) are rated *Exemplary* and **1,909** (**24.1%**) are rated *Recognized* in 2005. The campuses rated *Exemplary* comprise **3.8%** of the total student enrollment, while campuses rated *Recognized* comprise **23.6%** of total students enrolled.

4,748 of the **7,908** campuses rated (**60.0%**) achieved the rating *Academically Acceptable* and comprise **67.9%** of the total students enrolled. This includes **392** campuses rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable* under AEA procedures.

264 of the **7,908** campuses rated (**3.3%**) are rated *Academically Unacceptable* and comprise **3.2%** of the total students enrolled. This includes **31** campuses rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* under AEA procedures.

682 campuses are *Not Rated: Other* and **1** campus is *AEA: Not Rated- Other*. See the topic “Not Rated Districts and Campuses” below, for more information about these rating categories.

A large majority (**89%**) of the **304** schools rated *Exemplary* are elementary schools (**270**), with the remainder distributed among **7** high schools, **23** middle schools and **4** multi-level schools.

The **1,909** *Recognized* schools are profiled as follows:

- 76%** are elementary;
- 14%** are middle schools;
- 8%** are high schools; and
- 3%** are multi-level schools.

Of the **264** *Academically Unacceptable* schools in 2005, **26** were *Academically Unacceptable* in 2004, **185** were *Academically Acceptable* in 2004, **9** were *Recognized* in 2004, and **1** was *Exemplary* in 2004. The remaining **43** were either rated *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*, *Not Rated: Other*, *Not Rated: Alternative Education*, or did not exist in 2004.

The **233** schools rated *Academically Unacceptable* under standard procedures are distributed among **92** elementary schools, **83** middle schools, **45** high schools, and **13** multi-level schools.

94% of *Academically Unacceptable* schools rated under standard procedures are in districts with 40% or more economically disadvantaged students.

CHARTERS

Charter Operators

2005 marks the second year that charter operators are rated.

Of **192** charter operators, **2** are *Exemplary* (**1.0%**), **10** are *Recognized* (**5.2%**), **138** are rated *Academically Acceptable* (**71.9%**), and **38** are *Academically Unacceptable* (**19.8%**).

Of the **138** *Academically Acceptable* charters, **64** achieved this rating under standard procedures and **74** achieved the rating under AEA procedures.

Of the **38** *Academically Unacceptable* charters, **23** were evaluated under standard procedures and **15** were evaluated under AEA procedures.

Charter Campuses

Of the **296** charter campuses, **3** are rated *Exemplary* (**1.0%**) and **18** are rated *Recognized* (**6.1%**). Together, the *Exemplary* and *Recognized* categories represent **10.2%** of all students enrolled in a charter school. **214** charter campuses are rated *Academically Acceptable* (**72.3%**). **47** charter campuses are rated *Academically Unacceptable* (**15.9%**).

Of the **214** *Academically Acceptable* charter campuses, **74** achieved this rating under standard procedures and **140** achieved the rating under AEA procedures.

Of the **47** *Academically Unacceptable* charter campuses, **29** were evaluated under standard procedures and **18** were evaluated under AEA procedures.

The remaining **14** charter campuses (**4.7%**) are *Not Rated: Other* and comprise **3.1%** of the total students enrolled in a charter school. See the topic "Not Rated Districts and Campuses" below for more information about this rating category.

MOVEMENT

Under certain circumstances the initial rating assigned can be changed. This can happen due to special analysis; the application of additional requirements in the system (excessive leavers and *Academically Unacceptable* campuses); or, due to the consequences of granted appeals.

Special Analysis

As a result of special analysis, **37** campuses that had very small numbers of students tested on TAKS had rating changes. **32** of the **37** campuses received the rating *Not Rated: Other* since there was not sufficient data to assign a rating. **5** campuses received the rating *Academically Acceptable* based on special analysis.

Excessive Leavers

If a district fails to provide a leaver record for a grade 7-12 student who is no longer in enrollment, TEA counts the student as underreported. In order to maintain a rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*, districts must not exceed the accountability standards for underreporting students.

2 districts were moved from a rating of *Recognized* to *Academically Acceptable* due to excessive numbers of underreported students. No districts with an *Exemplary* rating were affected.

Academically Unacceptable Campuses

On August 1, 2005, one district was prevented from achieving a *Recognized* rating due to having one *Academically Unacceptable* campus. An appeal was granted for this campus, so as of October 20, 2005, no districts are limited to *Academically Acceptable* due to this provision.

Appeals

In 2005 there were **271** appeals. Of these approximately **86%** were appeals of campus ratings. The remainders were either district rating appeals or combination of district and campus appeals. About two-thirds (**66%**) were appeals of the SDAA II indicator. The second most common appeal type was TAKS appeals. Overall, approximately two-thirds of all appeals were granted, though more of the SDAA II appeals were granted (**85%**) compared to appeals of other types (**32%**). Of the campuses with rating changes as a result of granted appeals, over half (**53%**) were elevated from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*.

ADDITIONAL FEATURES IN THE SYSTEM

Required Improvement

Under standard procedures, **353** campuses were able to demonstrate Required Improvement in order to achieve a higher rating in 2005. Of the **1,909** *Recognized* campuses, **286** campuses (**15%**) used Required Improvement to move from a rating of *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*. Of the **4,356** *Academically Acceptable* campuses under standard procedures, **67** campuses (**1.5%**) used Required Improvement to move from a rating of *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*.

Under standard procedures, **43** districts were able to demonstrate Required Improvement in order to achieve a higher rating in 2005. Of the **172** *Recognized* districts, **40** districts (**23%**) used Required Improvement to move from a rating of *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*. Of the **915** *Academically Acceptable* districts under standard procedures, **3** districts (**0.3%**) used Required Improvement to move from a rating of *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*.

Required Improvement was most often used for the mathematics and science subject areas.

Exceptions

184 campuses were able to avoid the *Academically Unacceptable* rating due to the exceptions provision. **164** campuses used one exception, **19** campuses used two exceptions and **1** campus used all three allowable exceptions.

13 districts were rated *Academically Acceptable* due to the exceptions provision. **12** districts only needed one exception to avoid the *Academically Unacceptable* rating. **1** district used two exceptions. No districts used three exceptions.

Note that districts and campuses recorded as having used an exception due to a granted appeal are not included in these totals.

At the campus level, exceptions were most often used for SDAA II, followed by the science and then the mathematics subject areas.

At the district level, exceptions were used most often for SDAA II and science.

HURDLES

Under standard procedures, there are a total of 36 possible indicators (hurdles) used to determine the accountability rating depending on the size and diversity of the campus or district. No campus is evaluated on all 36 – the greatest number of hurdles evaluated in 2005 is 30 for **1** campus. **34** campuses are evaluated on 26 hurdles.

For campuses, the accountability ratings are based on a statewide average of **13** hurdles. For elementary schools, the average number of hurdles is **12**, compared to an average of **15** hurdles for middle schools and **14** for secondary schools. Charter schools that are evaluated under standard procedures are held accountable for **8** measures on average.

For districts, the average number of hurdles statewide is **17**. The ten major urban districts are evaluated on an average of **31** hurdles, while the 418 rural districts are evaluated on an average of **13** hurdles.

Among all *Academically Unacceptable* campuses, the average number of hurdles evaluated is **13**. Among *Exemplary* campuses, the average number of hurdles is **8**.

ACADEMICALLY UNACCEPTABLE REASONS

Standard Procedures

District

Of the **37** *Academically Unacceptable* districts in 2005, **32** received this rating due to poor performance on TAKS only; **1** received the rating due to SDAA II only; **2** received the rating due to dropout rate only; and **2** received the rating due to a combination of either completion rate or dropout rate and poor performance on TAKS.

Campus

Of the **233** schools rated *Academically Unacceptable*, **184 (79%)** received this rating due to poor performance on TAKS only; **16** received the rating due to SDAA II only; **6** received the rating due to dropout rate only; and, the remaining **27** received the rating due to a combination of indicators.

Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures

District

Of the **15 AEA: Academically Unacceptable** charter operators in 2005, **5** received this rating due to poor performance on TAKS only; **1** received the ratings due to SDAA II only; **3** received the rating due to completion rate only; **3** received the rating due to dropout rate only; **2** received the rating due to a combination of either completion rate or dropout rate and poor performance on TAKS; and **1** received the rating due to completion rate and dropout rate.

Campus

Of the **31** schools rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*, **15 (48%)** received this rating due to poor performance on TAKS only; **1** received the rating due to SDAA II only; **4** received the rating due to completion rate only; **8** received the rating due to dropout rate only; **2** received the rating due to dropout rate and poor performance on TAKS; and **1** received the rating due to completion rate and dropout rate.

NOT RATED DISTRICTS AND CAMPUSES

District

4 districts (all charters) are *Not Rated: Other* either because of special analysis (**2**); or, because they had no TAKS results (**2**). **1** district is *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* due to a combination of coding errors on the SDAA II answer documents and Performance-Based Monitoring issues that need to be addressed and resolved.

Campus

682 of the **7,908** campuses (**8.6%**) are assigned the rating *Not Rated: Other* and comprise **1.5%** of the total students enrolled. These **682** campuses are *Not Rated* for the following reasons:

PK-K Only	145
Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP)	179
Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP)	177
Special Analysis	32
No TAKS results	144
Appeal Grant	5

1 campus is rated *AEA: Not-Rated - Other* due to a granted appeal.

TAKS PARTICIPATION

- The number of tested students who are included in the accountability subset of TAKS results used to determine the 2005 accountability ratings is **2,677,351** or **91.3%** of all students enrolled in grades 3-11 during the spring administration. Due to the addition of grades 9 and 10 to the SDAA II results, a higher percentage of students are included in the accountability subset of TAKS results in 2005 (**91.3%**) compared to 2004 (**89.4%**)
- The number of tested students who did not affect the August accountability ratings because they were not enrolled in the district by the end of October, 2004 is **165,923** or **5.7%** of all students enrolled in grades 3-11 during the spring administration.
- When all TAKS test takers are considered, **97.0%** of all students enrolled in grades 3-11 during the spring administration were tested, compared to **95.4%** in 2004.
- In 2005, the percent of students exempted from the TAKS was **1.8** percent (0.8 ARD, 1.0 LEP), compared to **3.3** percent (2.1 ARD, 1.2 LEP) in 2004.
- In 2005, **0.2** percent of students were absent from testing - the same percent as reported in 2004.

GOLD PERFORMANCE ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In 2001, the Texas Legislature created the Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) to publicly recognize districts and campuses for high performance on indicators that are in addition to those used to determine state accountability ratings. Districts are eligible for a maximum of 11 possible GPAs in 2005. Campuses are eligible for a maximum of 13 possible GPAs in 2005. The number of acknowledgments possible at the campus level varies by school type.

Table of Possible Acknowledgments by School Type

Indicator	Elementary	Middle / Jr. High	High School	Multi-Level	District
Advanced Course Completion			√	√	√
Advanced Placement / International Baccalaureate Results			√	√	√
Attendance Rate	√	√	√	√	√
Commended Performance on Reading/ELA	√	√	√	√	√
Commended Performance on Mathematics	√	√	√	√	√
Commended Performance on Writing	√	√		√	√
Commended Performance on Science	√		√	√	√
Commended Performance on Social Studies		√	√	√	√
Comparable Improvement in Reading/ELA	√	√	√	√	
Comparable Improvement in Mathematics	√	√	√	√	
SAT / ACT Results			√	√	√
Recommended High School Program Participation			√	√	√
TAAS/TASP Equivalency			√	√	√
Total Possible Acknowledgments	7	7	12	13	11

The two Comparable Improvement (CI) indicators are new in 2005. These are campus-only acknowledgments as they depend on comparisons of a school's performance to a group of 40 schools that are demographically similar. Districts are not grouped and so CI is not available for them.

Approximately **74%** of districts and **67%** of campuses earned one or more acknowledgments, compared to **69%** and **53%**, respectively in 2004. **Two** districts earned all 11 acknowledgments. **No** campuses earned all 13, but **one** campus earned 12, and **2** earned 11.

At the campus level, the most frequent acknowledgment earned was commended on reading/ELA (**32.2%**), followed by commended on writing (**29.1%**), attendance rate (**22.5%**), and commended on mathematics (**20.9%**). The acknowledgment earned the fewest times was the college admissions acknowledgment (SAT/ACT), with less than 1% of campuses (**40**) earning this accolade.

At the district level, the most frequent acknowledgment earned was the recommended high school program (**42.9%**), followed by commended on writing (**33.0%**), the TAAS/TASP Equivalency indicator (**30.1%**), and the attendance rate (**29.3%**). As with campuses, the acknowledgment earned the fewest times was the college admissions acknowledgment (SAT/ACT) with fewer than 2% of districts (**23**) earning this accolade.