

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE 2006 ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

November 2, 2006

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.

Campus

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 CAMPUSES

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	152
Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP)	177
Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP)	183
Special Analysis	34
No TAKS results	123
Hurricane Rita Provision	18
Granted Appeal	5

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.

	<i>Exemplary</i> each year for the past:		<i>Recognized</i> each year for the past:		<i>Academically Unacceptable</i> *each year for the past:	
	3 years	2 years**	3 years	2 years**	3 years	2 years**
Number of Districts	5	3	84	30	2	7
Number of Campuses	171	59	884	438	8	38

*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.

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 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 of Possible Acknowledgments by School Type

Indicator	Elementary	Middle / Jr. High	High School	Multi-Level	District
Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment 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: Reading/English Language Arts	√	√	√	√	
Comparable Improvement: Mathematics	√	√	√	√	
Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program			√	√	√
SAT/ACT Results			√	√	√
Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: English Language Arts			√	√	√
Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: Mathematics			√	√	√
Total Possible Acknowledgments	7	7	13	14	12

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.

