THE STATE OF TEXAS

In 2006, the State of Texas achieved Academically Acceptable status, with:

✓ TAKS passing rates of 79 percent or above for all students and all student groups for reading/ELA, writing, and social studies, 61 percent or above for all students and all student groups for mathematics, and 54 percent or above for all students and all student groups for science; and

✓ SDAA II percent met ARD expectations of 84 percent for all students; and

✓ Grade 9-12 completion rates of 89.4 percent or above for all students and all student groups using a new indicator of completion that does not count GED recipients as completers; and

✓ Grade 7-8 dropout rates of 0.3 percent or less for all students and all student groups.

Compared to the 2005 TAKS results at the 2006 student passing standards, the 2006 statewide performance on the TAKS improved for all students and all student groups in each subject area tested with the exception of social studies where performance remained stable. In science, the percent of students who Met Standard improved by 10 percentage points for the Economically Disadvantaged student group, and by 9 points for both the Hispanic and African American student groups. Overall, science results improved by 7 points for the all students group. Both the mathematics and reading/ELA results improved by 6 percentage points for African American students.

Completion Rate I, the rate that excludes GED recipients as completers, declined for each student group except for White students, which increased by 0.3 percent. Overall, the Class of 2005 completion rate of 91.9% was the same as the overall completion rate for the Class of 2004.

The dropout rate for students in grades 7-8 in 2004-05 was unchanged compared to the prior year for the all students group and each of the individual student groups.

DISTRICTS

Of the 1,227 districts, 19 districts (1.5%) are rated Exemplary and 337 (27.5%) are rated Recognized in 2006. The districts rated Exemplary comprise 0.3% of the total student enrollment, while the districts rated Recognized comprise 17.3% of total students enrolled.

809 of the 1,227 districts achieved the Academically Acceptable rating and comprise 81.3% of the total students enrolled. This includes 76 charter operators achieving the AEA: Academically Acceptable rating under AEA procedures.

55 districts are Academically Unacceptable representing 0.8% of the total students enrolled. This includes 8 charter operators rated AEA: Academically Unacceptable under AEA procedures.

7 districts (including 3 charter operators) are Not Rated: Other. See the topic “Not Rated Districts and Campuses” below for more information about this rating category.
14 of the 19 Exemplary districts are very small (total enrollment less than 500), and 63% are rural (12 of the 19).

70% of Recognized districts are small, having fewer than 1,000 students enrolled. Approximately one-third (34%) of Recognized districts have 30% or more minority students enrolled; 59% have 40% or more economically disadvantaged students.

CAMPUSES

Of the 7,956 campuses, 564 campuses (7.1%) are rated Exemplary, and 2,826 (35.5%) are rated Recognized in 2006. The campuses rated Exemplary comprise 6.8% of the total student enrollment, while campuses rated Recognized comprise 33.9% of total students enrolled.

3,586 of the 7,956 campuses rated (45.1%) achieved the rating Academically Acceptable and comprise 53.2% of the total students enrolled. This includes 396 campuses rated AEA: Academically Acceptable under AEA procedures.

286 of the 7,956 campuses rated (3.6%) are rated Academically Unacceptable and comprise 4.2% of the total students enrolled. This includes 19 campuses rated AEA: Academically Unacceptable under AEA procedures.

Under standard procedures, 692 campuses are Not Rated: Other. An additional 2 campuses under alternative education procedures are AEA: Not Rated - Other. See the topic "Not Rated Districts and Campuses" below for more information about this rating category.

A large majority (88%) of the 564 schools rated Exemplary are elementary schools (499), with the remainder distributed among 10 high schools, 48 middle schools, and 7 multi-level schools.

The 2,826 Recognized schools are profiled as follows:
- 73% are elementary;
- 18% are middle schools;
- 6% are high schools; and
- 3% are multi-level schools.

Of the 286 Academically Unacceptable schools in 2006, 46 were Academically Unacceptable in 2005, 225 were Academically Acceptable in 2005, and 2 were Recognized in 2005. The remaining 13 were either rated Not Rated: Other, or did not exist in 2005.

The 267 schools rated Academically Unacceptable under standard procedures are distributed among 67 elementary schools, 79 middle schools, 105 high schools, and 16 multi-level schools.

96% of Academically Unacceptable schools rated under standard procedures are in districts with 40% or more economically disadvantaged students.
CHARTERS

Charter Operators

2006 marks the third year that charter operators are rated.

Of 194 charter operators, 6 are Exemplary (3.1%), 24 are Recognized (12.4%), 132 are rated Academically Acceptable (68.0%), and 29 are Academically Unacceptable (14.9%).

Of the 132 Academically Acceptable charters, 56 achieved this rating under standard procedures and 76 achieved the rating under AEA procedures.

Of the 29 Academically Unacceptable charters, 21 were evaluated under standard procedures and 8 were evaluated under AEA procedures.

Charter Campuses

Of the 313 charter campuses, 12 are rated Exemplary (3.8%) and 34 are rated Recognized (10.9%). Together, the Exemplary and Recognized categories represent 20.2% of all students enrolled in a charter school. 214 charter campuses are rated Academically Acceptable (68.4%). 37 charter campuses are rated Academically Unacceptable (11.8%).

Of the 214 Academically Acceptable charter campuses, 65 achieved this rating under standard procedures and 149 achieved the rating under AEA procedures.

Of the 37 Academically Unacceptable charter campuses, 29 were evaluated under standard procedures and 8 were evaluated under AEA procedures.

The remaining 16 charter campuses (5.1%) are Not Rated: Other and comprise 4.3% 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); the consequences of granted appeals; or, in 2006, due to the application of a special provision for the consequences of Hurricane Rita.

Special Analysis

As a result of special analysis, 50 campuses that had very small numbers of students tested on TAKS had rating changes. 34 of the 50 campuses received the rating Not Rated: Other since there was not sufficient data to assign a rating. 15 campuses received the rating Academically Acceptable based on special analysis and 1 received the rating Recognized 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.

10 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

No districts were prevented from achieving the rating of Recognized or Exemplary due to having one or more of campuses rated Academically Unacceptable.

Hurricane Rita Provision

Under the criteria for using the Hurricane Rita Provision for state accountability, 43 districts representing 196 campuses were eligible for consideration. Of the 196 eligible campuses, 19 used the Hurricane Rita Provision. Of these 19 campuses, 5 moved from Academically Acceptable to Not Rated: Other (because Academically Acceptable was a lower rating than they received the prior year). Of the remainder, 13 moved from Academically Unacceptable to Not Rated: Other, and 1 moved from Not Rated: Other to Academically Acceptable due to a granted appeal. For 11 of these, Academically Unacceptable was a lower rating than they received the prior year; but 3 were Academically Unacceptable in 2005.

Of the 43 eligible districts, 5 used the Hurricane Rita Provision. Of these 5 districts, 1 moved from Academically Acceptable to Not Rated: Other and 4 moved from Academically Unacceptable to Not Rated: Other. For 3 of these 4, Academically Unacceptable was a lower rating than they received the prior year, but 1 was Academically Unacceptable in 2005.

ADDITIONAL FEATURES IN THE SYSTEM

Required Improvement

Under standard procedures, 458 campuses were able to demonstrate Required Improvement in order to achieve a higher rating in 2006. Of the 2,826 Recognized campuses, 385 campuses (13.6%) used Required Improvement to move from a rating of Academically Acceptable to Recognized. Of the 3,190 Academically Acceptable campuses under standard procedures, 73 campuses (2.3%) used Required Improvement to move from a rating of Academically Unacceptable to Academically Acceptable.

Under standard procedures, 89 districts were able to demonstrate Required Improvement in order to achieve a higher rating in 2006. Of the 337 Recognized districts, 81 districts (24.0%) used Required Improvement to move from a rating of Academically Acceptable to Recognized. Of the 733 Academically Acceptable districts under standard procedures, 8 districts (1.1%) 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

149 campuses were able to avoid the Academically Unacceptable rating due to the exceptions provision. 125 campuses used one exception, 20 campuses used two exceptions and 4 campuses used all three allowable exceptions. Four campuses were prevented from using exceptions because the same measure was used last year.

14 districts were rated Academically Acceptable due to the exceptions provision. 9 districts only needed one exception to avoid the Academically Unacceptable rating. 4 districts used two exceptions and 1 district used three exceptions.

Note that districts and campuses recorded as having used an exception due to special analysis or granted appeals are not included in these totals for either 2005 or 2006.

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

At the district level, exceptions were used most often for science and social studies.

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 2006 is 26 for 31 campuses.

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 18. The ten major urban districts are evaluated on an average of 34 hurdles, while the 422 rural districts are evaluated on an average of 13 hurdles.

Among the 267 Academically Unacceptable campuses, the average number of hurdles evaluated is 15. Among Exemplary campuses, the average number of hurdles is 9.

ACADEMICALLY UNACCEPTABLE REASONS

Standard Procedures

District

Of the 47 Academically Unacceptable districts in 2006, 40 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; 1 received the rating due to dropout rate only; and 2 received the rating due to a combination of the base indicators.
Of the 267 schools rated Academically Unacceptable, 212 (79%) received this rating due to poor performance on TAKS only; 17 received the rating due to SDAA II only; 10 received the rating due to completion rate only; 10 received the rating due to dropout rate only; and, the remaining 18 received the rating due to a combination of indicators.

Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures

District

Of the 8 AEA: Academically Unacceptable charter operators in 2006, 3 received this rating due to completion rate only; 3 received the rating due to dropout rate only; 1 received the rating due to a combination of dropout rate and poor performance on TAKS; and 1 received the rating due to completion rate and dropout rate.

Campus

Of the 19 schools rated AEA: Academically Unacceptable, 4 (21%) received this rating due to poor performance on TAKS only; 1 received the rating due to SDAA II only; 12 (63%) received the rating due to dropout rate only; and 2 received the rating due to dropout rate and poor performance on TAKS.

NOT RATED DISTRICTS AND CAMPUS

District

7 districts are Not Rated: Other either because of special analysis (1 charter operator), a granted appeal (1), or because the Hurricane Rita provision was applied (5).

Campus

692 of the 7,956 campuses rated (8.7%) are assigned the rating Not Rated: Other and comprise 1.9% of the total students enrolled. These 692 campuses are Not Rated for the following reasons:

- PK-K Only
- Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP)
- Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP)
- Special Analysis
- No TAKS results
- Hurricane Rita Provision
- Granted Appeal

There are 2 additional campuses evaluated under AEA procedures that are assigned the rating AEA: Not Rated-Other.

TAKS PARTICIPATION

- The number of tested students who are included in the accountability subset of assessment results used to determine the 2006 accountability ratings is 2,717,013 or 90.5% of all students enrolled in grades 3-11. Due to the exclusion of students displaced due to either Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita, a lower percentage of students is included in the accountability subset in 2006 (90.5%) compared to 2005 (91.3%).
• 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, 2005 is **168,890** or 5.6% of all students enrolled in grades 3-11.

• When all test takers are considered, **97.1%** of all students enrolled in grades 3-11 were tested, compared to **97.0%** in 2005.

• In 2006, the percent of students exempted from the TAKS was **1.7** percent (0.7 ARD, 1.0 LEP), compared to **1.8** percent (0.8 ARD, 1.0 LEP) in 2005.

• In 2006, **0.2** percent of students were absent from testing - the same percent as reported in both 2005 and 2004.

• In 2006, **22,810** or **0.8** percent of all students enrolled in grades 3-11 were tested but not included in the accountability system due to the exclusion of students displaced due to either Hurricanes Katrina and/or Rita.

**RATING TRENDS – 2004 THROUGH 2006**

• The first few years of the new accountability system presented the challenges of increasing student-level passing standards on TAKS while raising system rigor in multiple other areas. Some of those changes include increasing Academically Acceptable standards on some of the base indicators; decreases in minimum size criteria for both the dropout and completion rate indicators; definitional changes to base indicators such as SDAA II and completion rate; and decreases in underreported students criteria, among others.

• From 2004 to 2006, the percent of Exemplary and Recognized campuses (combined) was **39.1%** in 2004, **27.9%** in 2005, and **42.6%** in 2006. The percent of Academically Unacceptable campuses has increased each year from **1.2%** in 2004 to **2.9%** in 2005 to **3.6%** in 2006.

• From 2004 to 2006, the percent of Exemplary and Recognized districts (combined) was **32.3%** in 2004, **14.9%** in 2005, and **29.0%** in 2006. The percent of Academically Unacceptable districts has increased each year from **2.0%** in 2004 to **3.0%** in 2005 to **4.5%** in 2006.

• The table below provides counts of districts and campuses with repeating ratings in consecutive years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exemplary each year for the past:</th>
<th>Recognized each year for the past:</th>
<th>Academically Unacceptable *each year for the past:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Districts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Campuses</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In this table, Academically Unacceptable includes AEA: Academically Unacceptable.

**The 2-year and 3-year count columns are mutually exclusive. The 2-year counts indicate campuses and districts with repeated ratings for only 2 years.
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 12 possible GPAs in 2006; campuses are eligible for a maximum of 14 possible GPAs in 2006. The number of acknowledgments possible at the campus level varies by school type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table of Possible Acknowledgments by School Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Placement / International Baccalaureate Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commended Performance on Reading/ELA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commended Performance on Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commended Performance on Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commended Performance on Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commended Performance on Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparable Improvement: Reading/English Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparable Improvement: Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT/ACT Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: English Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Possible Acknowledgments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two Texas Success Initiative (TSI) indicators are new in 2006. The TSI is a program designed to improve student success in college. The TSI requires students to be assessed in reading, writing, and mathematics prior to enrolling in college, and to be advised based on the results of that assessment. Students may be exempted from taking a test for the TSI if they have a high enough score on their exit-level TAKS tests for mathematics and English language arts. The two TSI indicators show the percentage of students who were so exempted.

Statewide in 2006, approximately 82% of the 1,136 districts evaluated for GPA and 82% of the 6,846 campuses evaluated for GPA earned one or more acknowledgments, compared to 74% and 67% respectively in 2005. One district earned all 12 district acknowledgments, four districts earned 11, and another four districts earned 10.

No campuses earned all 14 acknowledgments, but one campus earned 13, three campuses earned 12, and four campuses earned 11. A total of 1,198 campuses (18%) earned one acknowledgment, 1,251 (18%) earned two acknowledgments, and 1,159 (17%) earned three acknowledgments.
At the campus level, the most frequent acknowledgment earned was commended on reading/ELA (36.4%), followed by commended on mathematics (32.4%), and commended on writing (31.8%). The acknowledgment earned the fewest times was the college admissions acknowledgment (SAT/ACT), with less than 1% of campuses (56) earning this accolade.

At the district level, the most frequent acknowledgment earned was the commended on writing (47.3%), followed by commended on social studies (31.9%), recommended high school program (31.7%), and commended on reading/ELA (31.3%). As with the campuses, the acknowledgment earned the fewest times was the college admissions acknowledgment (SAT/ACT) with fewer than 3% of districts (32) earning this accolade.