

**Accountability System for 2006 and Beyond – Standard Procedures  
Educator Focus Group Proposal**

**Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)**

1. Standards. The 2006 *Academically Acceptable* standards are 60% for Reading/ELA, Writing, and Social Studies, 40% for Mathematics, and 35% for Science. These standards represent increases of 10 percentage points for Reading/ELA, Writing, Social Studies and Science, and 5 percentage points for Mathematics over the 2005 standards. The 2006 standards were announced in April 2005, subsequently published in the *2005 Accountability Manual*, and finalized in September 2005 by the commissioner.

For 2007, the *Academically Acceptable* standards are recommended to increase by 5 percentage points for Mathematics and Science, to 45% and 40%, respectively. That same year, the standards for *Recognized* are recommended to increase to 75% for all subjects. Beginning in 2008, the *Academically Acceptable* standards increase by 5 percentage points for each subject, each year, until they reach 70%. In addition, in 2009, the *Recognized* standards increase to 80% for all subjects.

It was requested that the 2007 focus group consider the relationship between the *Academically Acceptable* standards and the AYP standards in 2010 and beyond as the AYP standard approaches first the *Recognized* and then the *Exemplary* standards in the state accountability system. That focus group will make a recommendation regarding whether the *Academically Acceptable* standards should eventually exceed 70%. (NS)

	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
	<b>AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>AA/Re/Ex</b>
<b>R/ELA, W, SS</b>	<b>60 / 70 / 90</b>	60 / <b>75</b> / 90	<b>65</b> / 75 / 90	<b>70 / 80</b> / 90	70 / 80 / 90
<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>40</b> / 70 / 90	<b>45 / 75</b> / 90	<b>50</b> / 75 / 90	<b>55 / 80</b> / 90	<b>60</b> / 80 / 90
<b>Science</b>	<b>35</b> / 70 / 90	<b>40 / 75</b> / 90	<b>45</b> / 75 / 90	<b>50 / 80</b> / 90	<b>55</b> / 80 / 90

*Rationale:* These recommendations increase standards beyond what was envisioned by the previous focus group and recommended by the Commissioner’s Accountability Advisory Committee (CAAC) in 2005 for 2007 and beyond. The accelerated increases represent the group’s acknowledgment that more students need to be performing at higher levels sooner and gaps in achievement among the student groups need to be closed more rapidly. Gains of 5 percentage points per year are more reasonable to expect than 10 points in a given year and represent a commitment on the part of educators to continuously improve. The 2007 standards should not be modified at this point in the calendar, as a full year of advance notice of the standards is very important to the districts and schools. Though statute doesn’t mandate it until 2009, grade 8 science results will be incorporated into the system in 2008, following the “report, report, use” timeline. While remaining cognizant of the AYP targets is important, the AYP targets were only one of the factors considered in recommending the state standards shown above. For comparative purposes the AYP targets for Reading/ELA and Mathematics are shown below.

	<b>AYP Targets</b>				
	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Reading/ELA</b>	53	60	60	67	73
<b>Mathematics</b>	42	50	50	58	67

The increase in the *Recognized* standard from 75% to 80% occurs in 2009; one year after the introduction of the grade 8 science test in 2008. In addition, inclusion of TAKS-I results are recommended beginning in 2008.

As in 2005, the TAKS accountability standards are the same for campuses and districts and for All Students and each student group. However, the standards differ for some subjects. The lower standards for mathematics and science reflect the lower performance in these subjects in 2005 compared to reading/ELA, writing, and social studies, and the greater gaps in performance between these subjects. The state-acknowledged shortage of qualified mathematics and science teachers is cited as a factor affecting the ability of districts to meet increasing expectations in these two subject areas. Initially setting standards that reflect a starting point and phasing in higher standards over time continues the philosophy of the prior system which led to nationally recognized gains in performance of student groups that significantly closed the performance gaps.

2. Commended Performance on TAKS. During the initial development of the new accountability system, the educator focus group and Commissioner's Accountability Advisory Committee recommended that measures be developed that incorporate TAKS commended performance into the accountability ratings by 2007. Beginning with 2007, the focus group recommends appending a label of "commended" to campus and district ratings if the campus or district also earns a GPA for at least 50% of the commended indicators on which they are evaluated. A minimum of three of the five commended indicators must be evaluated, and only campuses and districts rated *Academically Acceptable* or higher could receive this additional label. As the standards for the commended performance indicators increase in the GPA system, the increased standards will be used to evaluate this supplemental label as well. The group recommends moving to a use of commended performance that influences the determination of base ratings in the future.

*Rationale:* The focus group recommended that commended performance be used as an incentive to increase student performance among students achieving well above the *Met Standard* passing level. However, the committee did not want to add more hurdles to the 36 hurdles already in place. The committee felt use of commended performance as a component in the actual calculation of the base rating added too much complexity to the system for the relatively small benefit achieved. Using it *only* as a label would simplify its use and serve as an incentive to districts/campuses to increase commended levels of student performance. Since the GPA system already acknowledges high achievement at the commended performance level, the option to link GPA results more prominently to the final rating label was favored.

*Alternative Staff Recommendation:*

*The recommendation of the focus group (based on information provided by TEA at the time of the meeting) limited the evaluation of commended performance to only campuses and districts evaluated on at least three subject area tests. Subsequent to the meeting, staff now recommend the following variation:*

*For campuses and districts evaluated on only two TAKS subjects (such as in the case of 9<sup>th</sup> grade centers or campuses with a high grade level of 3) the supplemental label is recommended to be added if GPA is earned on both subjects (2 out of 2).*

*Rationale: This new recommendation to include 2 out of 2 acknowledgments addresses the situation of campuses that only test in two subjects and would otherwise be ineligible for this supplemental label. Based on 2005 results, an additional 57 campuses and 2 charters would receive the supplemental label compared to the option recommended by the focus group.*

3. Required Improvement. Continue to use Required Improvement (RI) as defined in the 2005 system for TAKS in 2006 and 2007. Maintain a floor for *Recognized* that is five points below the current year standard. There is no floor for gating up to *Academically Acceptable*. RI is calculated as the amount of gain in percent *Met Standard* required to reach the current year

accountability standard in two years. Prior year percent *Met Standard* will be recalculated at the current year student passing standard so that gain from the prior year to the current year is calculated using comparable performance data for the two years. RI is calculated for each TAKS subject area, for All Students, and each student group evaluated.

*Rationale:* The accountability system is designed to reward either meeting an absolute performance standard or an improvement standard. The use of the five point floor for achieving *Recognized* with RI was deemed to be an appropriate safeguard to earning this higher rating label. The RI calculation should be revisited in 2007 for possible changes in 2008 due to the significant changes to the TAKS indicator that will take place that year, including the inclusion of grade 8 science that year.

4. Minimum Size Criteria for 2007 and Beyond. Continue with the minimum size criteria of 30/10%/50 through 2008. Revisit the issue of eliminating the 10%/50 portions of the criteria during the 2007 development cycle, with the first possible use of new size criteria to begin in 2009.

*Rationale:* This recommendation maintains system stability, and does not unduly allow the performance of proportionately small student groups to affect the ratings of large schools or districts.

5. Fall 2005 and February 2006 Exit-Level Testing. Currently, only the spring testing results for 11<sup>th</sup> grade exit-level testers are included in state accountability. Expand the inclusion of exit-level results to include the fall exit level TAKS administrations of grade 11 first time testers, provided the students passed all tests during that administration and they are not represented in the April administration. Allow appeals for inclusion of the February results to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

*Rationale:* This recommendation incorporates the results of more grade 11 students. It also addresses a scholarship program that is available to students who graduate early. Including the fall results will not create a disincentive for allowing these accelerated students to test early. Test administration policy should prevent inappropriate testing of 11<sup>th</sup> graders in the fall.

### **Assessments for Students with Disabilities**

1. Use of SDAA II in 2006 and 2007. Continue to use the SDAA II indicator as it was defined in 2005. The SDAA II indicator is a single performance indicator evaluated for all SDAA II tested grades (grades 3-10). The indicator is calculated as the number of tests meeting admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) committee expectations (summed across grades and subjects) divided by the number of SDAA II tests for which ARD expectations were established (summed across grades and subjects). The SDAA II indicator is evaluated at the All Students level only.

Use the same minimum size criteria (30 tests) as was used in 2005. Include the consideration of PBM indicators to help evaluate SDAA II appeals. Add the required improvement feature, which was last used in 2004 with the SDAA indicator. Use the RI feature to allow a campus or district to gate up to either *Academically Acceptable* or *Recognized* if the gain in SDAA II performance is enough to meet the standard in two years. Require a floor of 65% for gating up to *Recognized*.

*Rationale:* The SDAA II indicator treats special education students as a student group on a measure designed for that population while avoiding the disadvantages inherent in using special education as a student group throughout the system; therefore, the SDAA II indicator is evaluated at the All Students level only.

While the issue of variations in expectation setting was discussed by the focus group, the consensus was that the system should continue to use SDAA II results through the life of this test, which is scheduled to be administered for the last time in 2007. Given the phase-in recommendation for use of the TAKS-I results beginning in 2008, continued use of the SDAA II in 2006 and 2007 ensures that some assessment results for students with disabilities who do not take the TAKS are included in the state accountability system continuously between 2006 and 2010 while the new assessments are fully phased in.

Since SDAA II is administered for either two or three subjects (reading/ELA, writing, and mathematics) depending on the grade tested, and the results are summed across subjects as well as grades, the 30 tests minimum size requirement can represent as few as 10 students at grades 4 and 7 and as few as 15 students at grades 3, 5, 6, and 8-10. The criteria of 10 students for the SDAA II corresponds to the All Students minimum size criteria of 10 students for the dropout and completion rate measures that will be used for 2006 accountability. There are no minimum size requirements for TAKS at the All Students level.

2. Standards for SDAA II. The performance standards for the SDAA II indicator for 2006 and 2007 are set at the same levels as they were in 2005, as shown in the table, below:

	2005 AA/Re/Ex	2006 AA/Re/Ex	2007 AA/Re/Ex
<b>SDAA II</b>	50 / 70 / 90	50 / 70 / 90	50 / 70 / 90

*Rationale:* Maintaining the standards previously set on this indicator provides stable targets through the life of this testing program.

3. Incorporating TAKS Inclusive (TAKS-I). New assessments are being developed that will replace the SDAA II and the Locally Determined Alternative Assessments (LDAA) beginning in 2008. A letter dated January 12, 2006, was sent from the commissioner to administrators addressing the topic of future assessments for students receiving special education services. See *Attachment A*. The letter addressed the SDAA II, the TAKS-I, the LDAA, the TAKS Alternate (TAKS-Alt), and the new “2%” assessment. See *Attachment B* for a summary of assessment choices for students receiving special education services.

- SDAA II: for students receiving special education services for whom TAKS, even with allowable accommodations, is not an appropriate assessment. Given at ARD set instructional level, not necessarily grade level.
- TAKS-I: for students receiving special education services for whom TAKS, even with allowable accommodations, is not an appropriate assessment. Students may only take TAKS-I tests at their enrolled grade level. TAKS-I is initially given at grades and subjects where SDAA II is not. After SDAA II is discontinued, TAKS-I expands to include the SDAA II tested grades and subjects. TAKS-I uses the TAKS met standard and commended student passing standards.
- LDAA: for students receiving special education services for whom TAKS, TAKS-I, and SDAA II are not appropriate. The final LDAA data collections will be in 2006-07.
- TAKS-Alt: intended to replace some LDAA tests beginning in 2007-08.
- 2% Assessment: to meet federal guidelines for the proposed 2% policy to assess certain students with disabilities based on modified achievement standards.

The focus group recommends reporting the TAKS-I results for two years beginning in 2006, and including TAKS-I results in the state accountability system for the first time in 2008 (report, report, use). The TAKS-I results will be incorporated before all TAKS-I grades/subjects are tested.

*Rationale:* The 'report, report, use' schedule gives more time to districts and campuses to prepare for inclusion of these new results. Since not All Students are tested on all subjects in the current state accountability system, there is no need to wait for all grades/subjects to be tested before the reporting of TAKS-I. Using TAKS-I as early as 2008 ensures that some assessment results for students with disabilities who do not take the TAKS are included in the state accountability system continuously between 2006 and 2010 while the new assessments are fully phased in. See *Attachment C*.

4. Incorporating TAKS Alternative (TAKS-Alt). Report the TAKS-Alt results for two years beginning with 2008. How the reporting of this indicator in the state accountability system in 2009 will occur is yet to be determined (separate reporting versus combining with TAKS results). TAKS-ALT results of all grades and subjects tested will be incorporated into the AYP system in 2008 when this assessment is first administered.

*Rationale:* Allowing for two years of reporting on this new indicator will give schools the necessary time to become familiar with this new assessment, which is given to students who are receiving special education services and who are currently tested using Locally Determined Alternative Assessments (LDAAs).

5. Incorporating the 2% Assessment. Report the 2% test results for two years beginning with 2008, and include the 2% assessment results in the state accountability system for the first time in 2010 ('report, report, use'). Results of all grades and subjects tested by the 2% test will be incorporated into the AYP system in 2008 when this assessment is first administered.

*Rationale:* The 'report, report, use' schedule gives the necessary time to schools to become familiar with this new assessment. This will be the last new assessment for students with disabilities introduced and will complete the phase-in of the new assessments for students receiving special education services.

#### **Annual Dropout Rate (Grade 7-8) Indicator**

1. Standards for 2006 and Beyond.

	<b>2006 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2007 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2008 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2009 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2010 AA/Re/Ex</b>
<b>Academically Acceptable</b>	≤ 1.0%	≤ 1.0%	≤ 1.0%	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
<b>Recognized</b>	≤ 0.7%	≤ 0.7%	≤ 0.7%	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
<b>Exemplary</b>	≤ 0.2%	≤ 0.2%	≤ 0.2%	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
<b>Dropout Definition</b>	Current State Definition	NCES Definition	NCES Definition	NCES Definition	NCES Definition

*Rationale:* The 2005-06 annual dropout rates will be the first calculated using the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition. This means 2007 will be the first accountability year to evaluate grade 7-8 annual dropout rates using the new, more rigorous definition. Using the NCES dropout definition in 2007 will affect high schools more significantly than middle schools. Given this indicator applies to students in grades 7-8 only and the impact is limited to students who return to school after the school-start window, it is recommended that the standards be held at current levels for 2007 and 2008. During the

2008 development cycle when 2005-06 data (the first year of data under NCES definition) is available, standards for 2009 and beyond will be determined.

2. Hold Harmless Provision for 2007. For 2007 only, add a Hold Harmless Provision to the system, such that if the grade 7-8 annual dropout rate is the only indicator causing a district or campus to be *Academically Unacceptable*, and the district or campus was not *Academically Unacceptable* on this indicator in 2006, then the campus or district is rated *Academically Acceptable* instead.

*Rationale:* Very small numbers of campuses and districts are evaluated on this indicator due to the very small numbers of grade 7-8 dropouts in the state. However, because the effect of the definitional change is difficult to estimate, do not allow an *Academically Unacceptable* rating to be based solely on this indicator, as long as this was not a problem area the previous year (2006).

*Alternative Staff Recommendation:*

*The recommendation of the focus group limited the application of the annual dropout rate Hold Harmless provision to only those campuses and districts that were not **Academically Unacceptable** due to this indicator in the prior year. Staff recommends omitting the check against the prior year rating:*

*Hold Harmless Provision for 2007. For 2007 only, add a Hold Harmless Provision to the system, such that if the grade 7-8 annual dropout rate is the only indicator causing a district or campus to be **Academically Unacceptable**, then the campus or district is rated **Academically Acceptable** instead.*

*Rationale:* The reasons for providing a Hold Harmless provision to this indicator are due to changes in the definition and are unrelated to the dropout data evaluated in the prior year. It would be unfair to cite campuses and districts on this indicator because of problems they had previously, when other campuses and districts will not be held accountable for similar results.

3. Required Improvement. In 2006 use the same RI methodology as was in place in 2005. In 2007 the RI feature will be unavailable. In 2008 re-instate the RI feature.

*Rationale:* 2006 is the last year of the TEA dropout definition. In 2007 RI cannot be calculated because the 2005-06 definition will differ from the 2004-05 definition. The lack of the RI feature will coincide with the one year Hold Harmless provision for this indicator. In 2008 there will be two years of comparable data using the NCES dropout definition (2006-07 and 2005-06), therefore RI can be computed. With RI, districts and campuses have a second way to achieve a higher rating, if they can demonstrate enough improvement. This keeps an incentive in the system to focus on improving campus and district dropout rates. Also, with changes to the measure definition, more campuses and districts may need and be able to use this feature in the future.

4. Minimum Size Criteria. Maintain the minimum size criteria established in 2005; namely, for All Students, a minimum of 5 grade 7-8 dropouts, and at least 10 grade 7-8 students. For student groups a minimum of 5 grade 7-8 dropouts is required and the 30/10%/50 rule applies to the total number of grade 7-8 students.

*Rationale:* Very few campuses and districts were affected by this indicator, since it applies to students in grades 7-8 only.

5. Effect of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Students displaced due to the hurricanes may have an effect on leaver data collected during the 2005-06 school year that will be used to create dropout rates in the 2007 accountability system. The focus group recommends that agency

staff develop specific recommendations for removing the impact of serving students displaced due to the hurricanes from the dropout accountability indicator. The mechanism should take place outside the appeals process. If necessary, a subcommittee of the focus group should be formed to make recommendations on this issue prior to the 2007 development cycle.

*Rationale:* As with the assessment data, districts were assured by the commissioner that serving hurricane displaced students would not have an adverse effect on accountability ratings should dropout rates be inflated for one year because of difficulties tracking or retaining these students. Because options for accomplishing this require more time to develop and discuss, the formation of a focus group subcommittee is recommended.

**Completion Rate (Grade 9-12) Indicator**

1. Completion Rate Definition in 2006. The completion rate indicator is calculated as the number of completers expressed as a percent of total students in the class (graduates, continuing students, GED recipients, and dropouts). Beginning with the class of 2005 and the ratings issued in 2006 (students whose cohort entered 9th grade in 2001-02), only graduates and continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year) will count as high school completers for the accountability completion rate under standard procedures. While GED recipients from the class of 2005 will not be considered *dropouts*, they will also not be considered *completers*; GED recipients will be in the denominator but not the numerator. GED recipients will continue to count in the definition of a completer under AEA procedures.

*Rationale:* Before the beginning of the 2005 school year districts and campuses were informed that students graduating as the class of 2005 and beyond who receive a GED will not be counted as completers for accountability ratings under standard procedures. The decision to exclude GED recipients was based on the recommendations of the advisory committee, focus group, and commissioner in 2004.

2. Standards for 2006 and Beyond. Hold the standards constant through 2007. Set standards for 2008 and beyond during the 2007 development cycle based on the work of a focus group subcommittee. Over time it is anticipated that the *Academically Acceptable* standard for this indicator will increase to 85.0% and the *Recognized* standard will increase to 90.0%.

	<b>2006 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2007 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2008 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2009 AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2010 AA/Re/Ex</b>
<b>Academically Acceptable</b>	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%	<b>TBD</b>	TBD	TBD
<b>Recognized</b>	≥ 85.0%	≥ 85.0%	<b>TBD</b>	TBD	TBD
<b>Exemplary</b>	≥ 95.0%	≥ 95.0%	<b>TBD</b>	TBD	TBD
<b>Completion Rate Definition</b>	Graduates + Continued HS	Graduates + Continued HS	Graduates + Continued HS	Graduates + Continued HS	Graduates + Continued HS
<b>Dropout Definition</b>	Current State Definition	<b>Phase-in NCES definition</b>	<b>Phase-in NCES definition</b>	<b>Phase-in NCES definition</b>	<b>NCES definition</b>

*Rationale:* Because GED recipients are no longer considered completers beginning with the class of 2005, the rigor of the system will increase in 2006, even though standards are not increased.

The 2007 accountability year (class of 2006) is the first year the NCES dropout definition is used in the denominator of the completion rate calculation. Also, because of the definitional change to the denominator, RI cannot be used. Both these factors (the definitional change and the lack of an RI feature) increase the rigor of the completion rate in 2007.

A focus group subcommittee is recommended to address completion rate issues due to the complexities of predicting completion rate values under the NCES definition.

3. Required Improvement. In 2006 use RI as it was defined in 2005. This is possible because the class of 2005 and class of 2004 completion rates are comparably defined. Use Completion Rate I (without GED recipients) for both years. In 2007 suspend the use of RI because the class of 2006 and class of 2005 do not use the same definition. The class of 2006 is the first cohort impacted by the NCES dropout definition.
4. Minimum Size Criteria. Maintain the minimum size criteria previously established; namely, at least five dropouts and at least 10 students in the grade 9-12 class; and for student groups at least five dropouts and 30/10%/50 in the class.

*Rationale:* Very few campuses and districts were affected by this indicator.

5. Use of District Rate. Maintain previous methodology for using the district's completion rate when the campus is eligible to be evaluated on the indicator but has no completion rate of its own.

*Rationale:* Issues with the use of the district rate can continue to be handled through the appeals process. This feature appears to be working as intended.

6. Effect of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Students displaced due to the hurricanes may have an effect on leaver data collected during the 2005-06 school year that will be used to create completion rates in the 2007 accountability system. The focus group recommends that agency staff develop specific recommendations for taking into account the impact of serving students displaced due to the hurricanes from the completion accountability indicator. The mechanism should take place outside the appeals process. If necessary, a subcommittee of the focus group should be formed to make recommendations on this issue prior to the 2007 development cycle.

*Rationale:* As with the assessment data, districts were assured by the commissioner that serving hurricane displaced students would not have an adverse effect on accountability ratings should completion rates be depressed because of difficulties tracking or retaining these students. Because additional time is needed to address options for accomplishing this, the formation of a subcommittee of the focus group is recommended.

## **Ratings Processes**

1. AECs rated AEA: Academically Unacceptable and district ratings. Alternative Education Campuses (AECs) rated AEA: *Academically Unacceptable* will NOT prevent a district rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*.

*Rationale:* The AEA system is working effectively and a campus rating of AEA: *Academically Unacceptable* creates community concern without the need for additional repercussions. Often these AECs are quite small and (by definition) operating under non-standard circumstances. It would not be appropriate for the district's rating to be controlled by only AEA campus performance. Allowing AEA campus ratings to limit district ratings could create the unintended consequence of inhibiting appropriate use of these facilities to meet student needs. Districts should not be inhibited from providing alternative education options for students.

2. Underreported Students Data Quality Indicator. Districts that fail to meet accountability standards on the annual underreported students indicator will be investigated and will be prevented from being rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized*. Subsequent investigation may

prevent a district from being rated *Academically Acceptable*. In addition, data quality will be a consideration when analyzing district and campus completion rate and annual dropout rate appeals. The Person Identification Database (PID) error rate will continue to be reported and used to monitor the quality of district PEIMS data submissions. Longitudinal measures of data quality will be explored and future focus groups will consider using a new longitudinal indicator to replace the current underreported indicator; or, the option of adding this indicator to the Performance-Based Monitoring Data Integrity System.

*Standards:* Increase the rigor of the underreported students standard each year through the 2008 accountability ratings. For example, for 2005 any district that had more than **100** underreported students or greater than **5.0%** underreported students could not be rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized*. See the table below for the recommended standards for 2006 through 2008.

Accountability Year	Underreported students data year	Underreported students cannot exceed:	
		Number	Percent
2006	2004-05	100	<b>2.0</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	100	<b>1.5</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>1.0</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>2007-08</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
2010	2008-09	TBD	TBD

*Rationale:* These standards were previously announced, so districts should be prepared for these more stringent criteria. Submission of accurate data is a district responsibility.

3. Exceptions Provision. Continue to use the Exceptions Provision in 2006 as it was used in 2005. As planned, do not allow a campus or district to reuse an exception for the same measure if it was applied in 2005. This provision should remain a feature until the system stabilizes, and therefore should not be considered for phasing out prior to 2009. This issue should be revisited annually.

*Rationale:* Because of the safeguard that the same exception cannot be used for two consecutive years, there will be a natural limit to the use of this provision as the accountability system ages. Because urban districts are evaluated on so many more measures on average, a mechanism that acknowledges more than 16 measures evaluated is needed. The addition of a number of new state assessments for students with disabilities scheduled to be implemented through 2008 was also a consideration.

### **Hurricanes Katrina and Rita**

1. Serving Displaced Students. The assessment results of students displaced due to either Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita will be removed from the accountability data as stated in the October 12, 2005 letter from the commissioner. The Katrina-Rita Indicator (KRI) code that is being collected on the TAKS and SDAA II answer documents will be used to determine which scores to exclude. System safeguards will be added such as comparing the KRI code to the campus of last attendance in 2005.

*Rationale:* This recommendation fairly restricts the attribution of ratings to those students impacted by the two hurricanes. The addition of system safeguards ensures compliance with the rules for using the KRI code on the answer documents and avoids or deters data manipulation. The normal accountability subset rules remain intact to ensure comparable longitudinal data reporting and ratings.

2. Districts/Campuses Directly Affected by Hurricane Rita. For districts that were directly impacted by Hurricane Rita, a commitment was made in the October 12, 2005 letter from the commissioner for the state to consider rating reprieves for those districts and campuses that were unable to open for extended periods of time. Districts eligible for special treatment must be identified. Identify districts/campuses directly impacted by Hurricane Rita as any district on the list of FEMA disaster counties or any district/campus that was closed for more than two instructional days beginning September 21, 2005 and concluding November 3, 2005.

For identified districts and schools, allow the system to generate ratings using available data. [Note: any adjustments for displaced students *served* by these districts will be applied under 'Serving Displaced Students,' above.] If the 2006 ratings are not *Academically Unacceptable* and are equivalent to or better than the rating received in 2005, TEA will issue the computed rating on August 1. For all others (meaning the 2006 rating is either *Academically Unacceptable* or lower than the rating received in 2005), TEA will issue a rating of "Not Rated: Other" on August 1. Districts may appeal the "Not Rated: Other" rating label requesting an assignment of the computed label.

Any district/campus that was not identified may still appeal under the regular appeals process, citing the impact from Rita.

For purposes of counting consecutive years of ratings, 2005 and 2007 will be considered consecutive for districts or campuses receiving a *Not Rated: Other* label in 2006 due to Hurricane-related issues.

*Rationale:* This recommendation addresses the significant impact on instruction caused by this event. By automatically issuing most ratings, the number of appeals that have to be submitted and/or processed is minimized. Districts and schools that overcame the adversity and continued to improve or maintain performance are credited with a rating. Focus group members noted that the number of days closed was not a reliable way of knowing the degree to which districts or campuses were functional when they reopened; therefore, members supported providing a low threshold for days closed as a way of mitigating this concern.

Although there is some risk of over-identifying affected districts and campuses who would be appropriately rated *Academically Unacceptable*, counting 2005 and 2007 as consecutive years of ratings will reduce the level of risk.

TEA will have to collect closure and re-opening data from ESCs to supplement and standardize the data that exists at the agency. Definitions for district opening (i.e. one school v. all schools) and separate data for campuses will need to be determined.

*Alternative Staff Recommendation:*

*As described above, the focus group recommended identifying districts and campuses directly affected by Hurricane Rita as any district on the list of FEMA disaster counties or any district/campus that was closed for more than two instructional days beginning September 21, 2005 and concluding November 3, 2005. Additional investigation of closure data indicates a very large number of districts in the state would meet these criteria, resulting in potential loss of ratings for a significant number of districts representing large numbers of students in the state. As an alternative, staff propose identifying districts and campuses as directly affected by Hurricane Rita if both of the following are true:*

- ◆ *The district is located in a county designated by FEMA as a disaster area that qualifies for public assistance due to Hurricane Rita; **and,***
- ◆ *The district was closed for 5-10+ instructional days (exact number to be determined after further review of campus/district closure data) between September 21, 2005 and November 3, 2005.*

*Rationale: TEA legal counsel advised that the decision being discussed extends beyond this particular event and sets a precedent for how future natural disasters may be handled in the accountability system. The “greater than two day” closure rule opens the door to many other natural disasters of smaller scale (such as ice storms, fires, floods) having similar influence on state ratings when, in fact, the appeals process is adequate to handle such situations. A system-wide treatment is only needed in this circumstance due to the extraordinary and widespread consequences of this event. Based on preliminary research, staff believe the more restrictive option described above will identify all districts in Education Service Center region 5, and may include certain other districts in regions 4, 6, and 7. Though this approach targets districts with greater precision and therefore reduces the number of districts that will potentially be “Not Rated,” any affected district may appeal by citing why its situation warrants similar consideration, though not identified on the TEA list. Staff are presently working to locate the data that can be used to determine district identification based on the criteria shown above.*

### Gold Performance Acknowledgment System

1. 2006 Standards. Maintain the 2005 standards for all GPA indicators in 2006, except for Recommended High School Program / Distinguished Achievement Program (RHSP/DAP). The standard for this indicator will increase by 10 percentage points, to 70.0% in 2006.

	<b>GPA Indicators</b>	<b>2006</b>
1	Advanced Course / Dual Enrollment Completion	$\geq 25.0\%$
2	Advanced Placement / International Baccalaureate Results	$\geq 15.0\%$ and $\geq 50.0\%$
3	Attendance Rate	$\geq 95.0\%$ (high school) $\geq 96.0\%$ (middle, K-12, & district) $\geq 97.0\%$ (elementary)
4 – 8	Commended Performance: Reading/English Language Arts Mathematics Writing Science Social Studies	$\geq 20\%$
9	Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program	<b><math>\geq 70.0\%</math></b>
10	SAT/ACT Results (College Admissions Tests)	$\geq 70.0\%$ and $\geq 40.0\%$
11	Texas Success Initiative: Higher Education Readiness Component -- English Language Arts	<b>50%</b>
12	Texas Success Initiative: Higher Education Readiness Component -- Mathematics	<b>50%</b>
13-14	Comparable Improvement (campus-only acknowledgments) Reading Mathematics	Top Quartile (top 25%)

*Rationale:* The current standards are quite stringent for a vast majority of districts and campuses. The RHSP/DAP standard is increased because the recommended high school

program becomes the default curriculum for students entering ninth grade beginning in the 2004-05 school year (19 Texas Administrative Code §74.51, 2004).

2. Standards for 2007 and Beyond. Keep the 2006 standards steady from 2007 to 2010 for the following indicators: Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate results, attendance rate, and comparable improvement on reading and mathematics.

For advanced/dual enrollment course completion, the acknowledgment standard will increase to 30.0% in 2009.

For commended performance, increase the standard for each subject by 5 percentage points every other year beginning in 2007.

For RHSP/DAP, increase the standard to 80.0% in 2007 and 2008, and to 85.0% in 2009 and 2010.

The standard for the SAT/ACT indicator is yet to be determined for 2009 and 2010. (See below.)

The standard for the Texas Success Initiative in English language arts and mathematics will remain at 50% in 2007 and increase by 5 percentage points each year thereafter until 2010. These proposed increases will be revisited when more empirical data are available.

GPA indicators and standards for 2007 and beyond are shown in *Attachment D*.

*Rationale:* Since the results of commended performance will be tied to rating labels in the base system starting in 2007, it seems reasonable to increase the commended performance standard from 20% to 25% in 2007. However, a 5 percentage point increase each year from 2008 to 2010 is too aggressive—every other year is more reasonable, since there will be 5 percentage point increases in the 'met standard' criteria each year from 2007-2010.

3. SAT/ACT Indicator. Keep the SAT/ACT indicator in the GPA system and maintain the current standard through 2008 (i.e., 70.0% for participation and 40.0% for performance) and use only the mathematics and critical reading scores on the new SAT. The new SAT that includes a writing component was first administered to high school students in March 2005. Most colleges will not require the new SAT for admissions purposes until fall 2006, therefore first impacting the 2006 high school graduating class. Possibly incorporate the writing component for both the SAT and ACT in 2009 and beyond, and re-evaluate the standards at that time.

*Rationale:* With P-16's focus on college readiness indicator(s) it is better to keep the SAT/ACT indicator in the GPA system than to consider leaving it out in 2007.

4. RHSP/DAP Indicator. Continue the use of RHSP/DAP indicator for now and explore the option of a separate DAP-only indicator in the future.

*Rationale:* Although the RHSP becomes the minimum required state graduation plan with the class of 2008, students can still opt out of this requirement with parental permission. Therefore, it is important to keep this indicator in the GPA system and continue reporting the data on this indicator.

5. Commended Performance Indicators. Keep the five commended performance indicators in the GPA system despite the link to the rating labels in the base system. Increase the standard from 20% in 2006 to 25% in 2007. Beginning with 2007, increase the standard by 5 percentage points every other year, resulting in an increase to 30% for 2009 and 2010.

*Rationale:* Although commended performance will be linked to the rating label in the base system beginning in 2007, the supplemental label that will be applied is based on a composite indicator of commended performance across all subjects. A campus or district's performance may vary across subjects; therefore, it is important to keep commended performance as five separate indicators in the GPA system.

6. Comparable Improvement Indicators. Allow campuses with negative TGI values to be acknowledged for now, but also allow staff the latitude to re-evaluate the magnitude of negative TGI values in the future.

*Rationale:* Negative TGI values do not mean there was no growth in student achievement. It is merely an indication that the growth is less than expected. Given the context of comparable improvement, campuses with slight negative values should be given the opportunity to be acknowledged.

### **Progress Measure for English Language Learners (ELL)**

The new measure of progress in English language proficiency for ELL students will include the performance of LEP students and monitored LEP students on the English TAKS Reading/ELA tests or the Reading Proficiency Tests in English (RPTE). Progress is measured by either meeting a student proficiency standard or demonstrating growth based on two years of test results on RPTE (scoring one level higher than the previous year). The measure will report the percentage of current and monitored LEP students who meet any of the following three criteria:

- 1) meeting the student passing standard on the TAKS English Reading/ELA test,
- 2) meeting the student proficiency level on the RPTE based on years in U.S. schools for first-time RPTE testers, or
- 3) showing progress on the RPTE from the prior year.

Since the measure for ELL students must include both proficiency and progress towards English language attainment, results from the TAKS Spanish tests are not included. In addition, use of the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) Texas Observation Protocols (TOP) results will not be included since they are based on classroom evaluations of student performance.

The ELL measure will be incorporated in the state accountability ratings system on the following schedule. The new measure will be reported for the first time in the 2005-06 AEIS reports. The 2007 Educator Focus Group will recommend standards based on the results reported in the 2005-06 AEIS reports. The results will be reported for the second time on the 2006-07 AEIS reports. The ELL measure will be incorporated in the state accountability ratings in the 2007-08 school year.

For the 2008 state ratings, the measure will include results of the current RPTE assessment and the new RPTE II assessment which will be administered for the first time in spring 2008. For the proficiency component of the measure, first-time tested students who meet the student proficiency level on the RPTE II based on years in U.S. schools will be counted as proficient. For the progress component of the measure, performance on both versions of the RPTE will be evaluated in order to give students credit for showing progress between the RPTE test given in 2006-07 and the RPTE II test given in 2007-08.

*Rationale:* The definition of the ELL measure follows the recommendations of the 2004 focus group that the measure ensure that ELL students are steadily progressing toward English in academic settings. Reporting the new measure for two years and setting standards during the 2007 development cycle will provide notification of standards to districts prior to the start of the 2007-08 school year. It is anticipated that proficiency levels set on the RPTE II will be comparable to the proficiency levels for the current RTPE test which will allow for use of the

RPTE II test results in the first year of testing. Once the RPTE II is developed and comparability of RPTE to RPTE II is determined, only consider delaying inclusion of the ELL measure in state accountability until 2008-09 if comparability is an issue.

The performance of ELL students is appropriate to evaluate in 2008, since the results for these students have been reported for districts and campuses in a variety of reports for a number of years. TAKS results for ELL students have been reported as a separate student group on the AEIS reports since 2003. The RPTE results have been reported on AEIS since 2001. In the state accountability system, the performance of ELL students are included in several base indicators, including the TAKS and SDAA II performance results and the completion rate and annual dropout rate results. In the federal accountability system, the results of ELL students have been evaluated as a separate student group for both performance and participation components of the reading/ELA and mathematics indicators as defined in AYP since 2003.

### **College Readiness Indicators**

On December 16, 2005, the Governor issued executive order RP53 (*Attachment E*) which states that the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) shall work together to create a system of college readiness indicators. The executive order RP53 does not specify the potential use of the new college readiness indicators.

TEA and THECB, working together through the P-16 council, have recently begun discussions concerning new college readiness indicators, but have not yet reached consensus on the definition of "college readiness." Once the term college readiness is defined, an indicator or indicators can be defined and a system of standards and criteria for evaluation of these indicator(s) can be developed.

The focus group raised various concerns with the development of a college readiness indicator. They stated that there is a lack of alignment between the high school and college curriculum that makes the definition of college readiness problematic. They were also concerned that an indicator based on the results from the grade 11 TAKS tests will not provide a complete picture of college readiness.

The focus group recognized that until the term "college readiness" is defined it is impossible to judge how well any indicator measures college readiness. There are a great variety of colleges in Texas and the United States that may require mastery of different knowledge and skills from high school students in order to succeed in college academic work. College-ready for one type of institution may not be college-ready for another.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

- A January 12, 2005 "To The Administrator Addressed" Letter
- B Assessment Choices for Students Receiving Special Education Services 2005-06 through 2007-08
- C Recommended Phase In of New Alternative Assessments
- D GPA Standards for 2007 through 2010
- E Executive Order RP53 - December 16, 2005

## ATTACHMENT A

ACTION REQUESTED
------------------

January 12, 2006

TO THE ADMINISTRATOR ADDRESSED:

**SUBJECT: Future Assessments for Students Receiving Special Education Services**

This letter provides important information regarding the future assessment program for students receiving special education services. Please keep in mind that the information for 2005-2006 is not different from what you have previously received.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is developing an assessment system that meets the federal requirements that students with disabilities be included in all state assessment systems. When this assessment system is fully implemented, the Texas assessment program will be in compliance with federal requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA 2004) and the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. The results of the assessments for students receiving special education services will be included in the summary statistics of the annual Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status. Both the assessment program and the federal accountability system are subject to oversight and approval of the United States Department of Education (USDE) for compliance with its statutory requirements and regulatory guidance. Without that approval, the state of Texas may stand to forfeit significant federal funding, which currently totals approximately \$4 billion per biennium.

The description of the expected future of assessments for students receiving special education services is presented below and outlined in the attached summary table. A key point to remember is that the development of the new assessments has only just begun. Detailed information about the new assessments is not available at this time but will be disseminated as it is finalized.

It is important to emphasize that the instructional decisions made by the admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) committee and documented in the individualized education program (IEP) must always guide assessment decisions for students receiving special education services. For students with disabilities working below their enrolled grade level, it is the responsibility of all of us—the state as well as the districts, campuses, and classroom teachers—to work with parents and other members of the community to understand and provide the support these students need to reach their academic potential. All students have the right to be exposed to as much of an on-grade-level curriculum as possible. The ARD committee must weigh the benefits of rigorous and challenging expectations given each student's individual strengths, needs, instruction, and accommodations. **As always, the ARD committee should first consider administering the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) when making assessment decisions.**

### State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II)

SDAA II is available to measure the academic progress of students receiving special education services for whom TAKS, even with allowable accommodations, is not an appropriate measure of academic progress. These students are receiving instruction in the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) on or near grade level or in Instructional Levels K–9 in reading, K–10 in mathematics, K–9 in writing, and 10 in English language arts (ELA). SDAA II is administered to students enrolled in grades 3–9 reading; grades 3–10 mathematics; grades 4 and 7 writing, and grade 10 ELA. *The final administration of the SDAA II tests will be in 2006-2007.*

### TAKS-Inclusive (TAKS-I)

TAKS-Inclusive (TAKS-I) meets the IDEA 2004 requirements for science, social studies, and exit level and is an assessment that may be appropriate for students who receive special education services and for whom TAKS, even with allowable accommodations, is not an appropriate assessment. TAKS-I measures the academic progress of students receiving special education services in the state-mandated TEKS curriculum on or near grade level in: exit level mathematics; exit level ELA; grades 5, 8, 10, and exit level science; grade 5 Spanish science; and grades 8, 10, and exit level social studies. *Students may only take TAKS-I tests at their enrolled grade level.* Students who receive special education services for whom TAKS-I is not appropriate will still be eligible to take a locally-determined alternate assessment (LDAA) for science, social studies, and exit level through the 2006-2007 school year. Beginning in 2007-2008, the TAKS-I assessments will be expanded to also include reading, mathematics, and writing in the grades in which TAKS tests are administered.

### Locally Determined Alternate Assessments (LDAAs)

LDAA tests may be used to measure the learning of a student receiving special education services when TAKS, TAKS-I, and SDAA II are not appropriate—either because the student is receiving an alternate curriculum or because the student requires nonallowable accommodations. These students must be given an LDAA if they are enrolled in grades where TAKS tests are administered. *The final LDAA data collections for state and federal purposes will be in 2006-2007.*

### TAKS-Alternate (TAKS-Alt)

TAKS-Alt is an assessment currently being developed to meet federal requirements for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. In 2007-2008 TAKS-Alt will replace the LDAA tests for grades 3–9 reading; grades 3–10 and exit level mathematics; grades 4 and 7 writing; grades 5, 8, 10, and exit level science; grades 8, 10, and exit level social studies; and grades 10 and exit level ELA. TAKS-Alt will measure the academic progress of students who meet eligibility requirements.

In the fall of 2006, TEA will observe classrooms and conduct pilot testing of the TAKS-Alt prototypes using a small set of volunteer districts or campuses. In spring 2007 a statewide sample of eligible students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be included in the TAKS-Alt field test.

During the development of TAKS-Alt, TEA will also be developing the training components for the new assessment. The first statewide training module will be provided in fall 2006 to education service centers. Appropriate school district and campus personnel will need to be trained in fall 2006 as well. This training will provide guidance on eligibility guidelines for placing students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the alternate assessment, alternate content standards, and access to the general curriculum. Then in fall 2007, additional statewide training will provide information on the following:

- observing student performance;
- recording anecdotal records and samples of student work;
- making fair and unbiased observations;
- time management;
- effective planning for focused classroom observation;
- evidence or data for the observation evaluation; and
- documentation of observations.

TAKS-Alt will be fully implemented and used for reporting student scores in AYP in spring 2008. Under the December 9, 2003, federal regulation, the intent is for TEA to have the flexibility, when measuring AYP, to count the proficient scores of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who take TAKS-Alt, as long as the number of those proficient scores does not exceed 1.0 percent of All Students in the grades assessed. The 1.0 percent cap does not restrict the number of students who may participate in TAKS-Alt.

### New "2%" Assessment

A new assessment will be fully implemented to meet the federal guidelines for the proposed 2% policy to assess certain students with disabilities based on modified achievement standards.

The United States Department of Education has recently released a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking permitting a limited number of students with disabilities (approximately 2 percent of the assessed student population) to take tests that are specifically geared toward their abilities through modified achievement standards. The proposed regulations can be found at <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/proprule/2005-4/121505a.pdf>. Upon careful review and analysis of these proposed regulations and then the final regulations, TEA will begin the process of defining the eligibility requirements, developing specifications, and implementing alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards. This assessment will replace the current SDAA II assessment.

I am asking you to share this communication throughout your school district with teachers, principals, curriculum directors, special education directors, and parents.

If you have questions about assessment issues, please contact the Student Assessment Division at 512-463-9536.

Sincerely,

Shirley J. Neeley

Enclosure

cc: District Test Coordinator  
District Special Education Director  
Education Service Center Executive Directors  
Education Service Center Test Coordinators  
Education Service Center Special Education Directors

**Assessments Available for Students Receiving Special Education Services  
by Year and Order of ARD Committee Consideration**

2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008 (and beyond)
<p><b><u>TAKS</u></b> Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Science, and Social Studies at the tested grades</p> <p><b><u>TAKS-I (First administration)</u></b> Science and Social Studies in grades where TAKS tests are administered and Exit Level English Language Arts and Mathematics</p> <p><b><u>SDAA II</u></b> Reading, Mathematics, and Writing at the appropriate grade level and instructional level</p> <p><b><u>LDAA</u></b> Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Science, and Social Studies in grades where TAKS tests are administered</p>	<p><b><u>TAKS</u></b> Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Science, and Social Studies at the tested grades</p> <p><b><u>TAKS-I</u></b> Science and Social Studies in grades where TAKS tests are administered and Exit Level English Language Arts and Mathematics</p> <p><b><u>SDAA II (Final administration)</u></b> Reading, Mathematics, and Writing at the appropriate grade level and instructional level</p> <p><b><u>LDAA (Final collection)</u></b> Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Science, and Social Studies in grades where TAKS tests are administered</p> <p><b><u>TAKS-Alt (Pilot and Field Test)</u></b> Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Science, and Social Studies in grades where TAKS tests are administered</p>	<p><b><u>TAKS</u></b> Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Science, and Social Studies at the tested grades</p> <p><b><u>TAKS-I (Expanded administration)</u></b> Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Science, and Social Studies in grades where TAKS tests are administered</p> <p><b><u>New Assessment for 2% Population</u></b> Content areas and grade levels to be tested will be determined after the federal regulations are reviewed by TEA.</p> <p><b><u>TAKS-Alt (First administration)</u></b> Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Science, and Social Studies in grades where TAKS tests are administered</p>

**ATTACHMENT B**  
**Assessment Choices for Students Receiving Special Education Services**  
**2005-06 through 2007-08**

		<b>TAKS*</b>	<b>TAKS-I*</b>	<b>SDAA II</b>	<b>LDAA</b>	<b>TAKS-Alt**</b>	<b>2% Assessment**</b>
<b>2005-06</b>	Mathematics	3-11	<u>11</u>	3-10	3-11	Under development	Under development
	Reading	3-9	Not applicable	3-9	3-9	Under development	Under development
	Writing	4, 7	Not applicable	4, 7	4, 7	Under development	Under development
	ELA	10, 11	<u>11</u>	10	10, 11	Under development	Under development
	Science	5, <u>8</u> , 10, 11	<u>5, 8, 10, 11</u>	Not applicable	5, 8, 10, 11	Under development	Under development
	Social Studies	8, 10, 11	<u>8, 10, 11</u>	Not applicable	8, 10, 11	Under development	Under development
<b>2006-07</b>	Mathematics	3-11	11	3-10	3-11	Under development	Under development
	Reading	3-9	Not applicable	3-9	3-9	Under development	Under development
	Writing	4, 7	Not applicable	4, 7	4, 7	Under development	Under development
	ELA	10, 11	11	10	10, 11	Under development	Under development
	Science	5, 8, 10, 11	5, 8, 10, 11	Not applicable	5, 8, 10, 11	Under development	Under development
	Social Studies	8, 10, 11	8, 10, 11	Not applicable	8, 10, 11	Under development	Under development
<b>2007-08 and Beyond</b>	Mathematics	3-11	<u>3-10</u> , 11	Not applicable	Not applicable	<u>3-11</u>	<u>3-11</u>
	Reading	3-9	<u>3-9</u>	Not applicable	Not applicable	<u>3-9</u>	<u>3-9</u>
	Writing	4, 7	<u>4, 7</u>	Not applicable	Not applicable	<u>4, 7</u>	<u>4, 7</u>
	ELA	10, 11	<u>10</u> , 11	Not applicable	Not applicable	<u>10, 11</u>	<u>10, 11</u>
	Science	5, 8, 10, 11	5, 8, 10, 11	Not applicable	Not applicable	<u>5, 8, 10, 11</u>	<u>5, 8, 10, 11</u>
	Social Studies	8, 10, 11	8, 10, 11	Not applicable	Not applicable	<u>8, 10, 11</u>	<u>8, 10, 11</u>

Bold and Underscore indicates **first-time** assessments

\* Spanish tests are administered in grades 3-6 reading and mathematics, grade 4 writing, and grade 5 science.

**ATTACHMENT C**  
**Recommended Phase In of New Alternative Assessments**

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>SDAA II</b>	<i>Use</i> (same as 2005)	<i>Use</i> (same as 2005)**	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>TAKS-I</b>	<i>Report Only*</i>  <i>First time for</i> Sci. (5, 8, 10, 11) Sci. (5 Spanish) S.S. (8, 10, 11) ELA (11) Math (11)	<i>Report Only*</i>  <i>Second time for</i> Sci. (5, 8, 10, 11) Sci. (5 Spanish) S.S. (8, 10, 11) ELA (11) Math (11)	<i>Report Only</i>  <i>First time for</i> Rdg./ELA (3-10) Rdg. (3-6 Spanish) Math (3-10) Math (3-6 Spanish) Wrt. (4, 7) Wrt. (4 Spanish)  <b>Use</b> Sci. (5, 8, 10, 11) Sci. (5 Spanish) S.S. (8, 10, 11) ELA (11) Math (11)	<i>Report Only</i>  <i>Second time for</i> Rdg./ELA (3-10) Rdg. (3-6 Spanish) Math (3-10) Math (3-6 Spanish) Wrt. (4, 7) Wrt. (4 Spanish)  <i>Use</i> Sci. (5, 8, 10, 11) Sci. (5 Spanish) S.S. (8, 10, 11) ELA (11) Math (11)	<b>Use</b>
<b>TAKS-Alt**</b>	n/a	n/a	<i>Report Only</i>  <i>First time for</i> Rdg. (3-9) ELA (10, 11) Math (3-11) Wrt. (4, 7) Sci. (5, 8, 10, 11) S.S. (8, 10, 11)	<i>Report Only</i>  <i>Second time for</i> Rdg. (3-9) ELA (10, 11) Math (3-11) Wrt. (4, 7) Sci. (5, 8, 10, 11) S.S. (8, 10, 11)	<i>TBD</i> <i>Use or Report</i> <i>Third time for</i> Rdg. (3-9) ELA (10, 11) Math (3-11) Wrt. (4, 7) Sci. (5, 8, 10, 11) S.S. (8, 10, 11)
<b>2% Test**</b>	n/a	n/a	<i>Report Only</i>  <i>First time for</i> Rdg. (3-9) ELA (10, 11) Math (3-11) Wrt. (4, 7) Sci. (5, 8, 10, 11) S.S. (8, 10, 11)	<i>Report Only</i>  <i>Second time for</i> Rdg. (3-9) ELA (10, 11) Math (3-11) Wrt. (4, 7) Sci. (5, 8, 10, 11) S.S. (8, 10, 11)	<b>Use</b>

\* Reporting options for providing TAKS-I results on the 2005-06 AEIS are in the planning stages.

\*\* These tests are currently under development. Final grades and subjects tested and the implementation schedule are still to be determined.

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**GPA Standards for 2007 through 2010**

	<b>GPA Indicators</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
1	Advanced / Dual Enrollment Course Completion	>= 25.0%	>= 25.0%	<b>&gt;= 30.0%</b>	>= 30.0%
2	Advanced Placement / International Baccalaureate Results	>=15.0% and >=50.0%	>=15.0% and >=50.0%	>=15.0% and >=50.0%	>=15.0% and >=50.0%
3	Attendance Rate	>=95.0% >=96.0% >=97.0%	>=95.0% >=96.0% >=97.0%	>=95.0% >=96.0% >=97.0%	>=95.0% >=96.0% >=97.0%
4 – 8	Commended Performance: Reading/ELA Mathematics Writing Science Social Studies	<b>&gt;=25%</b>	>=25%	<b>&gt;=30%</b>	>=30%
9	Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program	<b>&gt;=80.0%</b>	>=80.0%	<b>&gt;=85.0%</b>	>=85.0%
10	SAT/ACT Results (College Admissions Tests)	>=70.0% and >=40.0% (reading and mathematics components of the new SAT only)	>=70.0% and >=40.0% (reading and mathematics components of the new SAT only)	<b>TBD</b>	TBD
11	Texas Success Initiative: Higher Education Readiness Component -- English Language Arts	50%	<b>55%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>65%</b>
12	Texas Success Initiative: Higher Education Readiness Component -- Mathematics	50%	<b>55%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>65%</b>
13-14	Comparable Improvement (campus-only acknowledgments) Reading Mathematics	Top Quartile (top 25%)	Top Quartile (top 25%)	Top Quartile (top 25%)	Top Quartile (top 25%)

*Numbers in bold indicate a change from the prior year.*

**ATTACHMENT E**  
**Executive Order RP53 - December 16, 2005**

**Relating to the creation of college readiness standards and programs for Texas public school students.**

**BY THE**  
**GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF TEXAS**  
**Executive Department**  
**Austin, Texas**  
**December 16, 2005**

**WHEREAS**, preparation for college and other post secondary opportunities is essential for Texas students and the Texas economy; and

**WHEREAS**, the long-term economic and social benefits of a well-educated population will benefit the state of Texas; and

**WHEREAS**, the number of Texas students enrolling in institutions of higher education and completing degree programs must increase for Texas to be prosperous in the future; and

**WHEREAS**, many Texas high school graduates enrolled in institutions of higher education require remediation programs to prepare them for college-level course work; and

**WHEREAS**, Texas students need a strong foundation in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics to be successful in a competitive world economy; and

**WHEREAS**, the Commissioner of Education and the Commissioner of Higher Education have the authority to implement innovative programs to ensure students have the skills necessary to succeed in college;

**NOW THEREFORE**, I, Rick Perry, Governor of Texas, by virtue of the power and authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the State of Texas, do hereby order the following:

*Cooperation.* The Texas Education Agency and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board shall work together to enhance college-readiness standards and programs for Texas public schools.

*Information and Opportunities.* In establishing such standards and programs, each agency shall work to ensure that all Texas students are afforded information and opportunities for post-secondary education and training including the following:

- The creation of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Academies throughout the State of Texas, to improve student college readiness.

- The creation of a system of college readiness indicators, including the reporting of higher education remediation rates on public high school report cards.
- The creation of an electronic academic records system to facilitate the transfer of high school transcripts between school districts and between school districts and institutions of higher education.
- The development of a series of voluntary end-of-course assessments in Science, Mathematics, and other subjects, currently assessed by the 11th grade Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills, to measure student performance; and provide for a potential alternative to the 11th grade Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills.
- The creation of a pilot financial assistance program for economically disadvantaged students taking college entrance exams, such as the Scholastic Achievement Test (SAT) and American College Test (ACT).
- The creation of summer residential programs at Texas institutions of higher education for gifted and talented high school students to provide enhanced learning opportunities.

This executive order supersedes all previous orders in conflict or inconsistent with its terms and shall remain in effect and in full force until modified, amended, rescinded, or superseded by me or by a succeeding Governor.

Given under my hand this the 16th day of December, 2005.

**RICK PERRY(Signature)**

Governor of Texas

Attested by:

**ROGER WILLIAMS(Signature)**

Secretary of State