

Appendix C – Comparison of State and Federal Systems

In addition to the state accountability system, which is mandated by the Texas legislature, there is also a federal system of public school accountability. Although the state system has been in place since 1993, the accountability provisions in the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act were first applied to the Texas public schools in 2003. Campuses, districts and the state were evaluated for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for the first time in 2003

The purpose of this appendix is to provide details comparing the state accountability system to the federal (AYP) system. Though there are some similarities and elements in common between the two, there are significant differences. For complete details about the federal system, see the *2006 AYP Guide*. The *Guide* as well as other information about AYP can be found at the AYP website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/index.html>.

SYSTEMS ALIGNED

The state accountability system and the AYP procedures mandated by the U.S. Department of Education, are aligned where possible.

- *Release Date.* The release dates for the preliminary state accountability ratings and preliminary AYP status are scheduled to occur prior to the start of the 2006-07 school year.
- *Labels.* The final 2006 AYP status will include the final 2006 state accountability ratings for both standard and AEA procedures. These labels will appear for both Title I and non-Title I campuses and districts.
- *Appeals Process.* The appeals processes for state ratings and AYP status are aligned to the extent possible. See *Chapter 14 – Appealing the Ratings* of this *Manual* and the *2006 AYP Guide* for more information.

COMPARISON

The following tables provide comparisons of the state and federal systems. *Table 24* contains a side-by-side comparison of the indicators, restrictions, requirements, and source data for both systems.

Table 25 is a comparison by grade level. With this table, a campus can compare the use of various indicators by grade. For example, a grade 3-5 campus is evaluated in both the state and federal systems on TAKS reading, mathematics, and SDAA II, although AYP evaluates more student groups for each of these indicators. In a grade 3-5 campus, its AYP status also depends on attendance and participation indicators, while its state rating includes TAKS writing and science results.

Table 24: 2006 Comparison of State and Federal Accountability (AYP) by Indicator

	State Accountability (Standard Procedures)	AYP
TAKS		
Subjects & Standards	Reading/ELA* Exemplary 90% / Recognized 70% / Acceptable 60% Mathematics* Exemplary 90% / Recognized 70% / Acceptable 40% Writing Exemplary 90% / Recognized 70% / Acceptable 60% Social Studies Exemplary 90% / Recognized 70% / Acceptable 60% Science Exemplary 90% / Recognized 70% / Acceptable 35% All values rounded to whole numbers. *Includes cumulative pass rate for grades 3 and 5 reading and grade 5 mathematics.	Reading/ELA* Meets AYP 53% Mathematics* Meets AYP 42% All values rounded to whole numbers. *Includes cumulative pass rate for grades 3 and 5 reading and grade 5 mathematics.
Grades	3–11 (English); 3–6 (Spanish)	3–8, and 10 (English); 3–6 (Spanish)
Student Groups	All Students African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged	All Students African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged Special Education Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Minimum Size	All Students Any (Special Analysis if small) Student Groups 30/10%/50	All Students Any (Special Analysis if small) Student Groups 50/10%/200
Improvement	To <i>Acceptable</i> : Has enough gain to meet <i>Acceptable</i> standard in 2 years. To <i>Recognized</i> : At 65% - 69% and has gain to meet 70% standard in 2 years.	10% decrease in percent not passing and at least 0.1% improvement on "other measure."
Pairing	Paired with feeder campus (or district).	Paired with feeder campus (or district).
SDAA II		
Subjects & Standards	Reading/ELA + Mathematics + Writing Exemplary 90% / Recognized 70% / Acceptable 50% Number "met expectations" summed across grades and subjects. Results rounded to whole numbers.	SDAA II (grades 3-8 and 10 only) is combined with TAKS and other assessments by subject for performance and participation. See TAKS section (above) for standards, subjects, and groups. Note: there is a cap on the percentage of students who can be counted as <i>proficient</i> based on alternative assessment results (i.e. SDAA II and LDAA).
Grades	3-10	
Student Groups	All Students only	
Minimum Size	All Students At least 30 tests in denominator Student Groups N/A	
Improvement	To <i>Acceptable</i> : Has enough gain to meet <i>Acceptable</i> standard in 2 years. To <i>Recognized</i> : At 65% - 69% and has gain to meet 70% standard in 2 years.	
Pairing	N/A: No pairing for SDAA II.	

Table 24: 2006 Comparison of State and Federal Accountability (AYP) by Indicator (continued)

	State Accountability (Standard Procedures)	AYP
Other Assessment Indicators		
RPTE and LEP Math	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.	Combined with TAKS and SDAA II results (by subject for students not tested on TAKS or SDAA II) for Performance and Participation.
LDAA		
Additional Assessment Features		
Mobility Adjustment	District and campus accountability subsets used.	District and campus accountability subsets used.
Exceptions	Allowed for up to 3 of the 26 TAKS and SDAA II measures depending on the number of assessment measures evaluated.* * Only used to move to Acceptable; must be within 5 percentage points of Acceptable standard; other conditions apply.	N/A
Attendance Rate		
Standard	N/A: Used only for Gold Performance Acknowledgment (for grades 1-12).	Meets AYP 90.0% "Other Measure" for elementary and middle schools. All values rounded to one-tenth.
Student Groups		All Students only
Minimum Size		All Students.... 7,200 (40 students x 180 days) Student Groups*50/10%/200 * Student groups used only for performance gain.
Improvement		At least 0.1% improvement.
Completion Rate (grades 9-12)		
Standards	Grads+Continuers.... Exemplary 95.0%/Recognized 85.0%/Acceptable 75.0% All values rounded to one-tenth.	Graduate component only 70.0% "Other Measure" for high schools and districts. All values rounded to one-tenth.
Student Groups	All Students African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged	All Students only
Minimum Size	All Students At least 5 dropouts and 10 in denominator Student GroupsAt least 5 dropouts and 30/10%/50 in denominator	All Students..... At least 40 in denominator Student Groups* 50/10%/200 * Student groups used only for performance gain.
Improvement	To <i>Acceptable</i> : Has gain to meet 75.0% standard in 2 years To <i>Recognized</i> : At 80.0% - 84.9% and has gain to meet 85% standard in 2 years Minimum Size (All Students and groups): At least 10 in prior year	At least 0.1% improvement
High School w/o completion rate	District completion rate used.	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.

Table 24: 2006 Comparison of State and Federal Accountability (AYP) by Indicator (continued)

	State Accountability (Standard Procedures)	AYP
Annual Dropout Rate (grades 7-8)		
Standards	Grades 7-8 <i>Exemplary</i> 0.2% / <i>Recognized</i> 0.7% / <i>Acceptable</i> 1.0% <i>All values rounded to one-tenth.</i>	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.
Student Groups	All Students African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged	
Minimum Size	All Students At least 5 dropouts and 10 in denominator Student Groups At least 5 dropouts and 30/10%/50 in denominator	
Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To <i>Acceptable</i>: Has declined to meet 1.0% standard in 2 years. To <i>Recognized</i>: At 0.8% - 0.9% and has declined to meet 0.7% standard in 2 years. Minimum Size (All Students and groups): At least 10 in prior year. 	
Middle School w/o dropout rate	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.	
Participation Rate: Reading & Mathematics		
Standard	N/A: Indicator not evaluated. Monitoring interventions may occur with excessive exemptions.	Tested at campus/district 95% <i>All values rounded to whole numbers.</i>
Student Groups		All Students African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged Special Education Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Minimum Size		All Students At least 40 in denominator Student Groups 50/10%/200
Other Campus and District Situations		
Registered Alternative Education Campuses	Rated under Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures.	Evaluated under same criteria as regular campuses.
Charter Operators	Evaluated under same criteria as regular districts.* * <i>Charter Operators may be rated under AEA Procedures.</i>	Evaluated under same criteria as regular campuses.
Charter Schools	Evaluated under same criteria as regular campuses. <i>(Charter schools are not paired.)</i>	Evaluated under same criteria as regular campuses.
New Campuses	All campuses (established or new) are rated.	N/A: Not evaluated.
Additional District Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must have no <i>Unacceptable</i> campuses to be <i>Exemplary</i> or <i>Recognized</i>. Must meet Underreported Student standards to be <i>Exemplary</i> or <i>Recognized</i>. 	No additional district requirements.

Table 25: 2006 Grade Level Comparison of State (Standard Procedures) and Federal Accountability

		†Reading ELA	†Math	Writing	Social Studies	Science	‡SDAA II	**HS Completion	Dropout	Attendance	Participation	
											Read/ELA	Math
Grade 1†	All Students									AYP		
	AA/H/W/ED*											
	Special Ed & LEP											
Grade 2‡	All Students									AYP		
	AA/H/W/ED*											
	Special Ed & LEP											
Grade 3	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State				AYP/State			AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State				AYP				AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP				AYP				AYP	AYP
Grade 4	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State	State			AYP/State			AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State	State			AYP				AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP				AYP				AYP	AYP
Grade 5	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State			State	AYP/State			AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State			State	AYP				AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP				AYP				AYP	AYP
Grade 6	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State				AYP/State			AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State				AYP				AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP				AYP				AYP	AYP
Grade 7	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State	State			AYP/State		State	AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State	State			AYP		State		AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP				AYP				AYP	AYP
Grade 8	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State		State		AYP/State		State	AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State		State		AYP		State		AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP				AYP				AYP	AYP
Grade 9	All Students	State	State				State	State				
	AA/H/W/ED*	State	State					State				
	Special Ed & LEP											
Grade 10	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State		State	State	AYP/State	State			AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State		State	State	AYP	State			AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP				AYP				AYP	AYP
Grade 11	All Students	State	State		State	State		State				
	AA/H/W/ED*	State	State		State	State		State				
	Special Ed & LEP											
Grade 12‡	All Students						AYP/State					
	AA/H/W/ED*						State					
	Special Ed & LEP											

* AA/H/W/ED refers to the student groups African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

** High School Completion is defined differently for AYP: Under AYP, the *Graduate* component of the Completion Rate is used, which includes only diploma recipients. Differences also exist between the two systems in the treatment of secondary schools without their own completion data.

‡ Schools are paired when they do not have grades tested. The use of paired data differs between the two systems.

† Performance on TAKS reading/ELA and math include slightly different groups of students for AYP: Minimum size for student groups in AYP is 50/10%/200; for state accountability it is 30/10%/50.

‡ Performance on SDAA II is used differently for AYP: Under AYP, SDAA II performance is combined with TAKS performance. In the state system, SDAA II is evaluated as a separate indicator.

