

Chapter 4 – The Basics: *Determining a Rating*

The previous two chapters described the base indicators and the additional features of the system (Required Improvement and the Exceptions Provision). This chapter describes how to use the indicator data results with the additional features to determine campus and district ratings. The ratings for the overwhelming majority of campuses and districts can be determined this way. Some campuses and districts must be evaluated using different procedures. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for details about which campuses and districts are affected and how they are evaluated.

WHO IS RATED?

The state accountability system is required to rate all districts and campuses that serve students in grades 1 through 12. The first step is to identify the universe of districts and campuses that can be considered for a rating. For 2006, the universe is determined to be those districts and campuses that reported students in membership in any grades (early education through grade 12) in the fall of the 2005-06 school year. The universe is then divided into those campuses and districts to be evaluated under Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) procedures (see *Part 2 – Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures*) and those evaluated using standard procedures. Most districts and campuses identified for standard procedures receive one of the four primary rating labels (*Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Academically Acceptable*, or *Academically Unacceptable*). Some receive a label of *Not Rated*. Rating labels and their uses are described below.

Once the universe of standard campuses and districts is established, the next step is to determine if the district or campus has TAKS results on which it can be evaluated. In order to attain one of the four primary rating labels, districts and campuses must have at least one TAKS test result in the accountability subset. An effort is made through the pairing process to supply TAKS results to campuses (with any grades from 1 to 12) with no students in the grades tested so that they can also be evaluated. For more information on pairing see *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances*.

Districts and campuses that have only SDAA II results, only completion rates, only dropout rates, or only combinations of these three will not receive one of the four primary ratings in 2006. To be eligible to be *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Academically Acceptable*, or *Academically Unacceptable*, TAKS results are required and *only* TAKS results are required. Districts and campuses need not have data for the SDAA II, dropout, or completion indicators in order to receive a rating. Furthermore, performance on any one of the TAKS subjects is sufficient for a rating to be assigned (science, mathematics, reading/ELA, writing, or social studies).

Though at least one TAKS tester (in the accountability subset) is required to be considered for a rating, some places with very small numbers of total TAKS test results may ultimately receive a *Not Rated* label. The process of Special Analysis is employed when there are very small numbers of total test takers to determine if a rating is appropriate. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for details about Special Analysis.

STANDARD RATING LABELS

Rating labels for districts are specified in statute. For 2006, standard campuses and districts will be assigned one of the following rating labels.

Table 4: Standard Rating Labels

	District or Charter Operator Use	Campus Use (non-charter and charter)
<i>Exemplary</i>	Used for districts or charter operators with at least one TAKS test result (in any subject) in the accountability subset. Small numbers subject to Special Analysis.	Used for campuses serving grades 1-12 with at least one TAKS test result (in any subject) in the accountability subset. Includes campuses with TAKS data due to pairing. Small numbers subject to Special Analysis.
<i>Recognized</i>		
<i>Academically Acceptable</i>		
<i>Academically Unacceptable</i>		
<i>Not Rated: Other</i>	<p>Used for districts or charter operators in the unlikely event that there is insufficient data to rate due to no TAKS results in the accountability subset.</p> <p>In 2006, this rating may be assigned to districts impacted by Hurricane Rita.</p>	<p>Used if the campus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ has no students enrolled in grades higher than kindergarten; ○ has insufficient data to rate due to no TAKS results in the accountability subset; ○ has insufficient data to rate through Special Analysis due to very small numbers of TAKS results in the accountability subset; ○ is a designated Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP) or a designated Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP); or ○ was impacted by Hurricane Rita and met provisions outlined in <i>Appendix I</i>.
<i>Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues</i>	<p>Used in the rare situation where the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results are compromised and it is not possible to assign a rating label based on the evaluation of performance. This label may be assigned temporarily pending an on-site investigation or may be assigned as the final rating label for the year.</p> <p>This rating label is not equivalent to an <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> rating. The Commissioner of Education also has the authority to lower a rating or assign an <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> rating to address problems with the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results that are discovered through accountability system safeguards, Performance-Based Monitoring, or other monitoring and compliance reviews.</p> <p>Data quality is considered to be a district responsibility. It is possible for a district rating to be <i>Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues</i> without any of its campuses having that rating label. If any campus within a district receives a rating of <i>Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues</i>, then the district's rating will be affected. The district may receive a rating of <i>Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues</i>, either temporarily or permanently, or the district's rating may also be changed to <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> for data quality reasons.</p> <p>See <i>Chapter 15 – Responsibilities and Consequences</i> for more information about the circumstances that trigger this rating label.</p>	

Registered alternative education campuses will receive ratings under the AEA procedures. See *Chapter 12 – AEA Ratings* for information on the AEA rating labels.

NOTIFICATION OF RATINGS (AUGUST 1, 2006)

Notification of campus and district accountability ratings will occur on August 1, 2006. This consists of release of the campus and district data tables and the district summary reports on TEA’s website. Ratings for both standard and registered alternative education campuses (AECs) will be included.

NOTIFICATION OF RATINGS (LATE OCTOBER, 2006)

Accountability ratings are finalized when the accountability appeals process is completed. Agency web products related to state accountability (both public and secure sites) will be updated to reflect the outcome of appeals and to add the Gold Performance Acknowledgments information in late October, 2006. See *Chapter 18 – Calendar* and *Chapter 14 – Appealing the Ratings* for more information.

USING THE DATA TABLE TO DETERMINE A RATING

In late July, prior to finalizing all computations necessary for accountability ratings, TEA will provide districts with access to preview data tables for the district and each campus within the district through the TEASE website.

These tables will *not* show a rating and will *not* provide calculations for Required Improvement or the Exceptions Provision. However, using the data on the tables and the *2006 Accountability Manual*, districts can anticipate their ratings in advance of the TEA ratings release. *These preview data tables will contain unmasked data and must be treated as confidential.* That is, information that reveals the performance of an individual student may be shown.

Sample data tables (unmasked) are excerpted on the following pages to present a step-by-step explanation of how ratings are determined.

Table 5: Sample Data Table

This preview information is confidential.

Preview data tables similar to this one will be made available to districts in late July. Final data tables will be available on the public and secure websites on August 1st.

This indicates that this campus was evaluated under standard procedures. AECs will receive a different data table. See Part 2 – Alternative Education Accountability Procedures.

07/2006 CONFIDENTIAL 2006 (PREVIEW) TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY ACCOUNTABILITY DATA TABLES – STANDARD PROCEDURES PAGE 1
 DISTRICT NAME: SAMPLE CAMPUS NAME: SAMPLE SCHOOL CAMPUS NUMBER: 999999999 Campus Rating: Grade Span: 07 - 12

Analysis groups used to determine ratings are marked with an 'X'.

Ratings are not available for the preview tables; this area is blank.

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS) TABLE

Performance Results	2006				2005			Required Improvement			
	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Stu Grp %	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?
Reading/ELA											
X All Students	66	131	50%	100%	36	91	40%		10		
X African Amer	54	114	47%	87%	29	80	36%		11		
Hispanic	8	11	73%	8%	5	8	63%		10		
White	4	5	80%	4%	2	3	67%		13		
X Econ Disadv	64	127	50%	97%	12	18	67%		-17		
Writing											
X All Students	2	2	100%	100%	0	1	0%		100		
X African Amer	1	1	100%	50%	0	1	0%		100		
Hispanic	1	1	100%	50%	0	0	-		-		
White	0	0	-	0%	0	0	-		-		
Econ Disadv	2	2	100%	100%	0	0	-		-		
Social Studies											
X All Students	28	50	56%	100%	31	71	44%		12		
X African Amer	25	44	57%	88%	28	62	45%		12		
Hispanic	2	4	50%	8%	2	5	40%		10		
White	1	1	100%	2%	1	4	25%		75		
X Econ Disadv	27	49	55%	98%	17	37	46%		9		
Mathematics											
X All Students	34	112	30%	100%	23	92	25%		5		
X African Amer	28	93	30%	83%	21	80	26%		4		
Hispanic	4	12	33%	11%	2	8	25%		8		
White	2	6	33%	5%	0	4	0%		33		
X Econ Disadv	33	111	30%	99%	12	48	25%		5		
Science											
X All Students	10	44	23%	100%	11	54	20%		3		
X African Amer	9	40	23%	91%	10	48	21%		2		
Hispanic	0	1	0%	2%	1	5	20%		-20		
White	0	2	0%	5%	0	1	0%		0		
X Econ Disadv	9	43	21%	98%	6	28	21%		0		

STATE-DEVELOPED ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT II (SDAA II) TABLE

SDAA II Results	2006				2005			Required Improvement			
	# Tests Met ARD	# Tests	Pct Met ARD	Stu Grp %	# Tests Met ARD	# Tests	Pct Met ARD	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?
All Students	0	1	0%	100%	1	1	100%		-100		

EXCEPTIONS TABLE

Number Msrs Evaluated	Number Allowed	Number Needed	Floor(s) Met?	Msr Used in 2005?	Exceptions Applied
13	2				

RI, exceptions data, and rating do not appear here. These will be on the final data table on 8/1/2006.

DISTRICT NAME: SAMPLE
CAMPUS NAME: SAMPLE SCHOOL
CAMPUS NUMBER: 99999999

Campus Rating:
Grade Span: 07 - 12

Analysis groups used to determine ratings are marked with an 'X'.

COMPLETION RATE I TABLE (Gr. 9-12)

	Class of 2005					Class of 2004			Required Improvement			
	# Com- pleters	Dropouts	# in Class	Comp Rate	Stu Grp %	# Com- pleters	# in Class	Comp Rate	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?
X All Students	119	12	131	90.8%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
X African Amer	92	7	99	92.9%	76%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	22	3	25	88.0%	19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	5	2	7	71.4%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Econ Disadv	58	2	60	96.7%	46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE TABLE (Gr. 7-8)

	2004-05				2003-04			Required Improvement			
	# Official Dropouts	# 7-8 Graders	Official Dropout Rate	Stu Grp %	# Official Dropouts	# 7-8 Graders	Official Dropout Rate	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?
All Students	2	33	6.1%	100%	0	31	0.0%	-	6.1	-	-
African Amer	2	27	7.4%	82%	0	27	0.0%	-	7.4	-	-
Hispanic	0	2	0.0%	6%	0	4	0.0%	-	0.0	-	-
White	0	4	0.0%	12%	0	0	-	-	-	-	-
Econ Disadv	1	9	11.1%	27%	0	13	0.0%	-	11.1	-	-

RI, exceptions data, and rating do not appear here. These will be on the final data table on 8/1/2006.

The design of both the preview and final data tables may vary slightly from the samples shown.

TAKS

Analysis Group Marker – An 'X' to the left of a group label indicates that performance results for that group are used to determine an accountability rating because minimum size criteria were met. If no 'X' appears, then the size minimums were not met and performance results for that group are not used to determine the accountability rating. Note that 'All Students' results for TAKS are always evaluated.

Percent Met Standard – This value is the key number for TAKS: it shows what percent of the student group passed that test.

Performance Results	2006			
	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Stu Grp %
X Reading/ELA All Students	66	131	50%	100%
X Reading/ELA African Amer	54	114	47%	87%
Reading/ELA Hispanic	8	11	73%	8%
Reading/ELA White	4	5	80%	4%
X Reading/ELA Econ Disadv	64	127	50%	97%
X Writing All Students	2	2	100%	100%
X Writing African Amer	1	1	100%	50%
X Writing Hispanic	1	1	100%	50%
X Writing White	0	0	-	0%
X Writing Econ Disadv	2	2	100%	100%

Number Met Standard – This value is the numerator used to calculate percent met standard.

Number Taking – This value is the denominator used to calculate percent met standard.

SDAA II

The SDAA II has only one measure: percent met ARD expectations (summed across grades and subjects; All Students only.)

STATE-DEVELOPED ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT II (SDAA II) TABLE				
----- 2006 -----				
SDAA II Results	# Tests Met ARD	# Tests	Pct Met ARD	Stu Grp %
All Students	0	1	0%	100%

Number of Tests – This value is the denominator used to calculate the percent met ARD Expectations.

Number of Tests that Met ARD Expectations – This value is the numerator used to calculate the percent met ARD Expectations.

Minimum Size – Note that at this campus there was only one SDAA II test given, well below the minimum number required (30) for the indicator to be evaluated.

Completion Rate

COMPLETION RATE I TABLE (Gr. 9-12)					
----- Class of 2005 -----					
	# Completers	# Dropouts	# in Class	Comp Rate	Stu Grp %
X All Students	119	12	131	90.8%	100%
X African Amer	92	7	99	92.9%	76%
Hispanic	22	3	25	88.0%	19%
White	5	2	7	71.4%	5%
Econ Disadv	58	2	60	96.7%	46%

To calculate the completion rate, divide the *number of completers* (in this example, 119) by the *number in the class of 2005* (131). This equals the *completion rate* (90.8%). The completion rate for this campus is well within the *Recognized* level.

Number in Class – This value is the denominator used to calculate the completion rate. Due to space limitations, the number of GED recipients is not shown as a separate column. These students are included in the class count.

Number of Completers – This value is the numerator used to calculate the completion rate.

Minimum Size – The *number of dropouts* and the *number in class* are used together to determine whether there are enough students for a group to be evaluated.

Annual Dropout Rate

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE TABLE (Gr. 7-8)					
----- 2004-05 -----					
	# Official Dropouts	# 7-8 Graders	Official Dropout Rate	Stu Grp %	# Off Drop
All Students	2	33	6.1%	100%	
African Amer	2	27	7.4%	82%	
Hispanic	0	2	0.0%	6%	
White	0	4	0.0%	12%	
Econ Disadv	1	9	11.1%	27%	

To calculate the annual dropout rate, divide the *number of dropouts* by the *number of 7th and 8th graders*.

Number of 7th and 8th Graders – This value is the denominator used to calculate the annual dropout rate.

Number of Official Dropouts – This value is the numerator used to calculate the annual dropout rate.

Minimum Size – Note that at this campus there were only two dropouts, fewer than the minimum number required (5) for the indicator to be evaluated.

Student Group Percent

Student group percentages are shown to help explain which student groups meet the minimum size criteria for the indicator. These percents are rounded to whole numbers.

Performance Results	2006		Pct Met Std	Stu Grp %
	Number Met Std	Number Taking		
Social Studies				
X All Students	28	50	56%	100%
X African Amer	25	44	57%	88%
Hispanic	2	4	50%	8%
White	1	1	100%	2%
X Econ Disadv	27	49	55%	98%

At this campus note that while the number of African American and Economically Disadvantaged students is between 30 and 50, their student group percents are much higher than the minimum size criteria of 10%. For that reason these two groups are analyzed for this subject.

Required Improvement

Campuses and districts may achieve a higher rating using *Required Improvement*. In 2006, it can be applied to all base indicators – TAKS, SDAA II, Completion, and Annual Dropout Rate – to raise a rating from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable* or to raise a rating from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*. All calculations for Required Improvement will be done automatically by TEA and shown on the final data tables.

Performance Results	2006				2005				Required Improvement		
	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Stu Grp %	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?
Mathematics											
X All Students	265	441	60%	100%	255	426	60%	yes	0		
X African Amer	23	60	38%	14%	16	52	31%	yes	7		
X Hispanic	46	113	41%	26%	50	107	47%		-6		
X White	192	263	73%	60%	188	265	71%		2		
X Econ Disadv	61	141	43%	32%	56	125	45%		-2		
Science											
X All Students	300	477	65%	100%	192	269	71%	yes	-6		
X African Amer	47	146	32%	16%	9	27	33%	yes	-1		
X Hispanic	72	179	47%	24%	36	72	50%		-3		
X White	179	263	80%	60%	146	169	86%		-6		
X Econ Disadv	92	141	43%	31%	42	77	55%		-12		

At this campus, all performance is at the *Academically Acceptable* standard or above for all measures except TAKS mathematics and science.

To see if the rating can be raised by applying Required Improvement, first check to see if each measure meets the minimum size for the prior year (at least 10 test takers).

This campus meets the minimum size for Required Improvement.

Number Met Std	2005		Pct Met Std	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?
	Number Taking	Number Taking					
255	426	60%	yes	0	5	yes	
16	52	31%	yes	7			
50	107	47%		-6			
188	265	71%		2			
56	125	45%		-2			
192	269	71%	yes	-6	1	no	
9	27	33%		-1			
36	72	50%		-3			
146	169	86%		-6			
42	77	55%		-12			

Next, determine the Required Improvement: The formula is *the standard for 2006 minus the campus's performance in 2005, divided by 2*.

Finally, for each measure, see if the actual change is greater than or equal to the Required Improvement. A negative number indicates performance has declined (except in the case of dropout rate, where it means improvement).

This campus met Required Improvement in one measure, but not the other.

Exceptions

Campuses or districts evaluated to be *Academically Unacceptable* even after applying Required Improvement may be able to “gate up” to *Academically Acceptable* using the Exceptions Provision for the TAKS and/or SDAA II measures. (Exceptions cannot be used to move a campus or district to *Recognized* or *Exemplary*.)

This campus was evaluated on 21 assessment measures, so it is allowed up to 3 exceptions.

After applying Required Improvement, this campus has 1 measure that is still at *Academically Unacceptable*.

Next, determine if the 2006 performance in one area meets the floor: it must be no more than 5 percentage points below the standard (at least 35% for mathematics and at least 30% for science).

EXCEPTIONS TABLE							
Number Msrs Evaluated	Number Allowed	Number Needed	Floor(s) Met?	Msr(s) Used in 2005?	Exceptions Applied		
21	3	1	yes	no	Science - African American		

Finally, check to make sure this measure was not used in 2005 (*exceptions cannot be repeated for the same subject and student group in consecutive years*). This measure was not used in 2005, so this campus is able to use one of their three exceptions and gate up to a rating of *Academically Acceptable*.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON AUGUST DATA TABLES

The sample shown is of a *preview* data table. These will be made available to districts on the TEASE website in July. Data tables with rating labels will be released on August 1, 2006.

The following items are the additional information not present on the preview, but added to the August data tables or the updated tables released in October:

- *Accountability Ratings.* (A list of possible rating labels is shown in *Table 4* in this chapter.)
- *Pairing.* Any standard campus with enrollment within grades 1-12, but no students tested on TAKS will be paired for accountability. A message will indicate the campus it is paired with.
- *Messages.* These messages appear in the top section of the data table when applicable:
 - Special Analysis used. (*campus or district*)
 - Rating change due to appeal. (*campus or district*)
 - Rating is not based on data shown in the table. (*campus or district*)
 - District rating limited to *Academically Acceptable* due to having one or more *Academically Unacceptable* campuses. (*district only*)
 - District rating limited to *Academically Acceptable* due to exceeding threshold for underreported students. (*district only*)
 - Rating changed after [date] due to Data Integrity Issues. (*campus or district*)
 - Rating is not based on data shown in the table (Hurricane Rita provision used). (*campus or district*)
 - Rating is not based on data shown in the table (due to consolidation/annexation). (*campus or district*)

- *Required Improvement.* The final data table shows all calculations for Required Improvement:
 - Met Min Size - Met Minimum Size shows “yes” or “no.”
 - RI - This shows the amount of change needed for Required Improvement to be met.
 - Met RI? - If Required Improvement is calculated, this shows “yes” or “no” depending on the comparison of actual change to the change needed (RI).
 - *Blank* - If Required Improvement is not applicable, the columns are blank.
 - *Footnotes.* A footnote appears if the Required Improvement floor is not met thus preventing the use of Required Improvement to change a rating from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*.
- *Exceptions.* The final data table shows all calculations for the Exceptions Provision:
 - Number Needed - This shows the number of assessment measures below the *Academically Acceptable* standard that did not meet Required Improvement.
 - Floor(s) Met? - This shows “yes” or “no” depending on whether or not the performance floor was met for all the assessment measures needing exception. If any don’t meet the floor, “no” appears.
 - Measure(s) Used in 2005? – The same exception cannot be used in consecutive years. This shows “yes” or “no” depending on whether or not any of the exceptions needed in 2006 were used in 2005.
 - Exceptions Applied - This shows the subject and group for which an exception is used. Up to three may be listed.
 - *Blank* - If the Exceptions Provision is not applicable, only the *Number Measures Evaluated* and *Number Allowed* columns show a number, other areas are blank.

Masked Data

As in the past, performance on the data tables posted to the agency’s public website is masked when there are fewer than five students in the denominator of the measure. Additionally, all performance at or near 0% or 100% is also masked. It is necessary to mask data that potentially reveals the performance of every student in order to be in compliance with the federal *Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act* (FERPA).

SYSTEM SUMMARY

The following two tables summarize the 2006 system. *Table 6* provides an overview of the requirements for each rating level. A district or campus must meet the criteria for every applicable measure to be rated *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, or *Academically Acceptable*; otherwise the next lower rating is assigned.

The Exceptions Provision can elevate to a rating of *Academically Acceptable* but no higher.

Districts must meet two additional provisions at the *Recognized* and *Exemplary* rating levels: checks for *Academically Unacceptable* campuses and excessive underreported students.

Table 7 is a single-page overview that provides details of the 2006 system, with the base indicators listed as columns. For each of the indicators, users can see brief definitions, the rounding methodology, the accountability subset methodology, the standards, minimum size criteria, subjects and student groups used, application of Required Improvement, and the Exceptions Provision.

Table 6: Requirements for Each Rating Category

	Academically Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
Base Indicators			
<p>TAKS (2005-06)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All students <p>and each student group meeting minimum size:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadv. 	<p>meets each standard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading/ELA ... 60% Writing 60% Social Studies.. 60% Mathematics 40% Science..... 35% <p>OR meets Required Improvement</p>	<p>meets 70% standard for each subject</p> <p>OR</p> <p>meets 65% floor and Required Improvement</p>	<p>meets 90% standard for each subject</p>
<p>SDAA II (2006)</p> <p>All students (if meets minimum size criteria)</p>	<p>meets 50% standard (<i>Met ARD Expectations</i>)</p> <p>OR meets Required Improvement</p>	<p>meets 70% standard (<i>Met ARD Expectations</i>)</p> <p>OR meets 65% floor and Required Improvement</p>	<p>meets 90% standard (<i>Met ARD Expectations</i>)</p>
<p>Completion Rate I (class of 2005)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All students <p>and each student group meeting minimum size:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadv. 	<p>meets 75.0% standard</p> <p>OR</p> <p>meets Required Improvement</p>	<p>meets 85.0% standard</p> <p>OR</p> <p>meets 80.0% floor and Required Improvement</p>	<p>meets 95.0% standard</p>
<p>Annual Dropout Rate (2004-05)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All students <p>and each student group meeting minimum size:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadv. 	<p>meets 1.0% standard</p> <p>OR</p> <p>meets Required Improvement</p>	<p>meets 0.7% standard</p> <p>OR</p> <p>meets 0.9% floor and Required Improvement</p>	<p>meets 0.2% standard</p>
Additional Provisions			
Exceptions	<p>Applied if district/campus would be <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> due to not meeting the <i>Academically Acceptable</i> criteria on up to 3 test measures. (See detailed explanation.)</p>	<p>Exceptions cannot be used to move to a rating of <i>Recognized</i>.</p>	<p>Exceptions cannot be used to move to a rating of <i>Exemplary</i>.</p>
Check for Academically Unacceptable Campuses (District only)	<p>Does not apply to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> districts.</p>	<p>A district with a campus rated <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> cannot be rated <i>Recognized</i>.</p>	<p>A district with a campus rated <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> cannot be rated <i>Exemplary</i>.</p>
Underreported Students (District only)	<p>Does not apply to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> districts.</p>	<p>A district that underreports more than 100 students or more than 2.0% of its prior year students cannot be rated <i>Recognized</i>.</p>	<p>A district that underreports more than 100 students or more than 2.0% of its prior year students cannot be rated <i>Exemplary</i>.</p>

Table 7: Overview of 2006 System Components

	TAKS	SDAA II	Completion Rate I	Dropout Rate
Definition	TAKS results (gr. 3-11) summed across grades by subject. ELA & reading results are combined. Cumulative results used for first 2 admins of gr. 3 reading, gr. 5 reading & math. Student pass. std. is panel recommendation for all grades, subjects.	A single (gr. 3-10) indicator calculated as the number of tests meeting ARD expectations (summed across grades & subjects) divided by the number of SDAA II tests.	Graduates and continuers expressed as a % of total students in the class. Campuses serving any of gr. 9-12 w/out a completion rate are assigned the district completion rate.	Gr. 7 and 8 official dropouts as a percent of total gr. 7 and 8 students who were in attendance at any time during the school year.
Rounding	Whole Numbers	Whole Numbers	One Decimal	
Standards Exemplary Recognized Acceptable	Ex.: All Subjects ≥ 90% Re.: All Subjects ≥ 70% Acc.: Read/ELA/W/SS ≥ 60% Mathematics ≥ 40% Science ≥ 35%	Ex.: ≥ 90% Re.: ≥ 70% Acc.: ≥ 50%	Ex.: ≥ 95.0% Re.: ≥ 85.0% Acc.: ≥ 75.0%	Ex.: ≤ 0.2% Re.: ≤ 0.7% Acc.: ≤ 1.0%
Mobility Adjustment (Accountability Subset)	<u>District ratings</u> : results for students enrolled in the district in the fall and tested in the same district. <u>Campus ratings</u> : results for students enrolled in the campus in the fall and tested in the same campus. <u>KRI</u> : results removed for evacuees of Katrina and Rita.		None	
Subjects	Reading/ELAgr. 3-11 Writinggr. 4, 7 Mathematicsgr. 3-11 Social Studiesgr. 8, 10, 11 Sciencegr. 5, 10, 11	Reading/ELA Writing Mathematics n/a n/a	n/a	
Student Groups	<u>All & Student Grps:</u> African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadv.	<u>All Students Only</u>	<u>All & Student Grps:</u> African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadv.	
Minimum Size Criteria				
All	No minimum size requirement—special analysis for small numbers	≥ 30 tests	≥ 5 dropouts AND ≥ 10 students	
Groups	30/10%/50	n/a	≥ 5 dropouts AND 30/10%/50	
Required Improvement (RI)				
Actual Chg	2006 minus 2005 performance (@ 2006 passing std)	2006 minus 2005 performance	Class of 2005 rate minus Class of 2004 rate	2004-05 rate minus 2003-04 rate
RI	Gain needed to reach standard in 2 yrs.		Gain needed to reach standard in 2 yrs.	Decline needed to reach std. in 2 yrs.
Use	Gate up to <i>Acceptable</i> and <i>Recognized</i>		Gate up to <i>Acceptable</i> and <i>Recognized</i>	
Floor (Recognized)	≥ 65%		≥ 80.0%	≤ 0.9%
Minimum Size	Meets minimum size in current year and has ≥ 10 students tested in prior year.	Meets minimum size in current year and has ≥ 10 tests in prior year.	Meets minimum size in current year and has ≥ 10 students in completion class the prior year.	Meets minimum size in current year & has ≥ 10 7 th -8 th grade students the prior yr.
Exceptions	After application of RI, this provision may be applied if the campus or district would be <i>Unacceptable</i> solely due to not meeting the <i>Acceptable</i> criteria on up to 3 assessment measures. Applies to 26 measures – 25 TAKS (5 subjects x 5 groups) plus the SDAA II measure.		n/a	
Use	As a gate up to <i>Acceptable</i>			
Floor	No more than 5 percentage points below <i>Acceptable</i> std.			
Number of Exceptions Allowed (variable)	# of Assessment Measures Evaluated (at campus or district)	Maximum Exceptions Allowed		
	1 – 5	0		
	6 – 10	1		
	11 – 15	2		
	16 – 26	3		

