

## Chapter 3 – The Basics: *Additional Features*

---

As shown in *Chapter 2 – The Basics: Base Indicators*, districts and campuses can achieve a rating by meeting the absolute standards for the different indicators. However, under certain conditions, a campus or district can achieve a rating:

- by meeting *Required Improvement (RI)*; and/or
- by using the *Exceptions Provision*.

Additionally, under certain circumstances a district’s rating may be restricted to *Academically Acceptable*. These additional requirements for districts are explained in the last part of this chapter.

All additional features are applied and calculated automatically by TEA before ratings are released. Districts and campuses do not need to request the use of additional features.

### Required Improvement to *Academically Acceptable*

---

Campuses or districts initially rated *Academically Unacceptable* may achieve an *Academically Acceptable* rating using the Required Improvement feature.

**Who is evaluated for Required Improvement:** Districts and campuses whose performance is *Academically Unacceptable* for any TAKS subject, SDAA II, or Completion Rate I measure evaluated. Note that because of the change to the NCES dropout definition, no Required Improvement is possible for the Annual Dropout Rate indicator in 2007.

### TAKS

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district to *Academically Acceptable*, the campus or district must have shown enough improvement on the deficient TAKS measures since 2006 to be able to meet the current year accountability standard in two years.

There are different standards for the *Academically Acceptable* rating for TAKS:

- *Reading/ELA, Writing, and Social Studies.* Any measure below the standard must achieve enough gain to meet a standard of **65%** in two years.
- *Mathematics.* Any measure below the standard must achieve enough gain to meet a standard of **45%** in two years.
- *Science.* Any measure below the standard must achieve enough gain to meet a standard of **40%** in two years.

**Methodology:** The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Actual Change} \\ \text{[performance in 2007]} - \text{[performance in 2006]} \geq \frac{\text{Required Improvement}}{2} \\ \frac{\text{[standard for 2007]} - \text{[performance in 2006]}}{2} \end{array}$$

*Example.* For 2007, a high school campus has performance above the *Academically Acceptable* standard in all areas except for their Economically Disadvantaged student group in TAKS mathematics; only 39% met the standard. Their performance in 2006 for the same group and subject was 29%.

First calculate their *actual change*:

$$39 - 29 = 10$$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{45 - 29}{2} = 8$$

Then compare the two numbers to see if the *actual change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*:

$$10 \geq 8$$

Result: the campus meets Required Improvement, so its rating is *Academically Acceptable*.

**Minimum Size Requirements:** In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have test results (for the subject and student group) for at least 10 students in 2006.

**Other Information:**

- *Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.* The 2007 performance results of students who were displaced during the 2005-06 school year due to the hurricanes are included in the 2007 accountability data. This means that Required Improvement will be based on 2007 data that includes these students, compared with 2006 results that do not.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are done on performance rates and standards that have been rounded to whole numbers. Required Improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

**SDAA II**

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district to *Academically Acceptable*, the campus or district must have shown enough improvement on the SDAA II indicator since 2006 to be at a standard of **50%** in two years.

**Methodology:** The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

<b>Actual Change</b>	<b>Required Improvement</b>
[performance in 2007] – [performance in 2006] ≥	$\frac{[50] - [\text{performance in 2006}]}{2}$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have SDAA II results for at least 10 tests in 2006.

**Other Information:**

- *Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.* The 2007 performance results of students who were displaced during the 2005-06 school year due to the hurricanes are included in the 2007

accountability data. This means that Required Improvement will be based on 2007 data that includes these students, compared with 2006 results that do not.

- *All Students.* Performance for the percent *Meeting ARD Expectations* is evaluated for All Students only. Student group performance is not evaluated separately.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are done on performance rates and standards that have been rounded to whole numbers. Required improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

## COMPLETION RATE I

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district to *Academically Acceptable*, the campus or district must have shown enough improvement on the deficient Completion Rate I measures between the classes of 2005 and 2006 to be at a standard of **75.0%** in two years.

**Methodology:** The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{\text{Actual Change}}{\text{[completion rate for class of 2006] minus [completion rate for class of 2005]}} \geq \frac{\text{Required Improvement}}{\frac{[75.0] - [\text{completion rate for class of 2005}]}{2}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have had at least 10 students (in the same student group) in the class of 2005 completion rate.

### Other Information:

- *District Substitution.* Campuses that serve students in grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12 but do not have their own completion rate will be evaluated using their districts' completion rates. Depending on the school's configuration over the years, the district rate may be used for current year, prior year, or both in determining if it met Required Improvement.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 2.85% is rounded to 2.9%, not 3%.

## Required Improvement to *Recognized*

**Who is evaluated for Required Improvement:** Districts and campuses whose performance is at the high end of *Academically Acceptable* for any TAKS subject, SDAA II, or Completion Rate I, and who also meet the minimum "floor" for prior year performance. Note that because of the change to the NCES dropout definition, no Required Improvement is possible for the Annual Dropout Rate indicator in 2007.

## TAKS

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*, the campus or district must have:

- performance ranging from 70% to 74% on the measure, and
- shown enough improvement on TAKS since 2006 to be at **75%** in two years.

**Methodology:** The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

$$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{Actual Change} \\ \text{[performance in 2007]} - \text{[performance in 2006]} \end{array} \geq \frac{\begin{array}{c} \textbf{Required Improvement} \\ \text{[75]} - \text{[performance in 2006]} \end{array}}{2}$$

*Example.* For 2007, a district has performance above the *Recognized* standard in all areas except for their Economically Disadvantaged student group in TAKS science; only 70% met the standard. Their performance in 2006 for the same group and subject was 66%.

First determine if their current year performance is *at or above the floor* of 70%:

$$70 \geq 70$$

Next calculate their *actual change*:

$$70 - 66 = 4$$

Then calculate the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{75 - 66}{2} = 5 \text{ (4.5 rounds to 5)}$$

Finally, compare the two numbers to see if the *actual change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*:

$$4 \text{ is not greater than or equal to } 5$$

Result: the district does not meet Required Improvement, so its rating remains *Academically Acceptable*.

**Minimum Size Requirements:** For Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have test results (for the subject and student group) for at least 10 students in 2006.

#### **Other Information:**

- *Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.* The 2007 performance results of students who were displaced during the 2005-06 school year due to the hurricanes are included in the 2007 accountability data. This means that Required Improvement will be based on 2007 data that includes these students, compared with 2006 results that do not.
- *Standards.* The *Recognized* standard for the TAKS indicator (75%) is the same for all subjects.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are done on performance rates and standards that have been rounded to whole numbers. Required Improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

## **SDAA II**

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*, the campus or district must have:

- performance ranging from 65% to 69% on the measure, and

- shown enough improvement on SDAA II since 2006 to be at **70%** in two years.

**Methodology:** The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{\text{Actual Change}}{[\text{performance in 2007}] - [\text{performance in 2006}]} \geq \frac{\text{Required Improvement}}{\frac{[70] - [\text{performance in 2006}]}{2}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have at least 10 test results for SDAA II in 2006.

**Other Information:**

- *Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.* The 2007 performance results of students who were displaced during the 2005-06 school year due to the hurricanes are included in the 2007 accountability data. This means that Required Improvement will be based on 2007 data that includes these students, compared with 2006 results that do not.
- *All Students.* Performance for the percent *Meeting ARD Expectations* is evaluated for All Students only. Student group performance is not evaluated separately.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are done on performance rates and standards that have been rounded to whole numbers. Required improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

**COMPLETION RATE I**

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*, the campus or district must have:

- a completion rate ranging from 80.0% to 84.9% on the measure, and
- shown enough improvement on the deficient completion rate measures between the classes of 2005 and 2006 to be at **85.0%** in two years.

**Methodology:** The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{\text{Actual Change}}{[\text{completion rate for class of 2006}] \text{ minus } [\text{completion rate for class of 2005}]} \geq \frac{\text{Required Improvement}}{\frac{[85.0] - [\text{completion rate for class of 2005}]}{2}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have had at least 10 students (in the same student group) in the class of 2005 completion rate.

**Other Information:**

- *District Substitution.* Campuses that serve students in grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12 but do not have their own completion rate will be evaluated using their districts' completion rates. Depending on the school's configuration over the years, the district rate may be used for current year, prior year, or both in determining if it met Required Improvement.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 2.85% is rounded to 2.9%, not 3%.

## Exceptions

---

Campuses or districts evaluated as *Academically Unacceptable* after application of Required Improvement may be able to “gate up” to *Academically Acceptable* using up to three exceptions for TAKS and/or SDAA II measures.

The Exceptions Provision provides relief to larger campuses and districts with more diverse student populations who are evaluated on more measures.

The number of exceptions available for a campus or district is dependent on the number of assessment measures on which the campus or district is evaluated, as shown in the following table.

Number of Assessment Measures Evaluated	Maximum Number of Exceptions Allowed
1 – 5	0 exceptions
6 – 10	1 exception
11 – 15	2 exceptions
16 or more	3 exceptions

The Exceptions Provision applies to any of the 25 TAKS measures (5 subjects multiplied by 5 groups: All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged), and the SDAA II measure. The Exceptions Provision does not apply to either Completion Rate I or Annual Dropout Rate indicators.

### Other Information:

- *Performance Floor.* Performance on the measure to which the Exceptions Provision will be applied must be no more than five percentage points below the accountability standard for the *Academically Acceptable* rating. In the example below, the high school qualifies to use their exceptions because both their mathematics and science performance were within five points of the standards of 45% and 40%, respectively.
- *One-Time Use.* An exception will not be granted for the same measure for two consecutive years. For example, if a campus was granted an exception for white student science performance in 2006, the campus is not eligible for an exception for white student science performance in 2007. In the example below the high school will not be able to use exceptions on economically disadvantaged performance in TAKS mathematics or science in 2008.
- *Only Successful Application.* The Exceptions Provision is only applied if it will successfully move a campus or district from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*. For example, a campus may be eligible for two exceptions, but if it actually needs three exceptions in order to raise its rating to *Academically Acceptable*, then no exceptions are used; the campus remains *Academically Unacceptable*. This means that in 2008, all measures will be eligible for use as exceptions since none were used in 2007.
- *Only for Assessment.* The provision applies to assessment measures, TAKS and SDAA II, not to the Completion Rate I or Annual Dropout Rate indicators. That is, if a campus or district is *Academically Unacceptable* due to either the Completion Rate I or Annual Dropout Rate indicators, the Exceptions Provision is not applied.

*Example.* A large high school with a diverse population is evaluated on all student groups for reading/ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies, for a total of 20 measures. Their performance on all indicators meets the *Academically Acceptable* standards except for the performance of their economically disadvantaged students in mathematics (41%) and science (38%), and they did not demonstrate Required Improvement for either of these measures.

Performance on mathematics and science are within five points of the standards (45% and 40%, respectively). Because they are evaluated on 16 or more assessment measures, (20) they are eligible to use up to three exceptions. Therefore, their performance in these two areas meets the Exceptions Provision requirements.

Result: the campus rating is *Academically Acceptable*. The two exception areas must be addressed in their campus improvement plan.

Note: Because of the one-time exception rule, the campus will not be eligible to use exceptions for either of these measures (economically disadvantaged students in mathematics and economically disadvantaged students in science) in 2008.

- *Appeals.* Exceptions are automatically calculated and assigned prior to the release of ratings. There is no need to appeal for exceptions to be applied.
- *Other “Charged” Exceptions.* There are cases where a district or campus may be “charged” with an exception in the process of Special Analysis, or in granting appeals. In these cases, the campus or district is not able to use that exception in the following year. For example, districts or campuses granted an appeal in 2006 due to coding errors on the SDAA II answer documents were charged an exception and were notified that they will not be able to use an exception for SDAA II in 2007.
- *Only for Academically Acceptable.* The Exceptions Provision is only applied at the *Academically Unacceptable* rating level to move the campus or district to the *Academically Acceptable* rating. It cannot be used to move a campus or district to *Recognized* or *Exemplary*.
- *Move only one level.* The Exceptions Provision cannot be used to move up more than one rating level. For example, if a campus meets the *Exemplary* criteria on all accountability measures except for one assessment measure, and fails to meet the *Academically Acceptable* criteria on that one measure, the Exceptions Provision will only move the campus from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*.
- *Campus Improvement Plan.* Any campus that uses one or more exceptions must address performance on those measures to which the exceptions are applied in its campus improvement plan.

## **Additional Issues for Districts**

---

### **DISTRICTS WITH *ACADEMICALLY UNACCEPTABLE* CAMPUSES**

Any district that has one or more campuses rated *Academically Unacceptable* cannot receive a rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*. However, the *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating does not prevent an *Exemplary* or *Recognized* district rating.

## UNDERREPORTED STUDENTS

Beginning with the 2006-07 PEIMS data collection, there are significant differences to the procedures for collecting leaver data. Now a leaver is defined to be a student who is enrolled in Texas public school in grades 7-12 in the prior year and does not return to Texas public school during the school-start window in the following fall. A student who moves or officially transfers from one Texas public school district to another is no longer reported as a leaver, meaning districts are no longer required to report leaver reason codes for these students. This is a significant change from previous reporting requirements. The determination of whether students are movers is made by TEA by checking other districts' enrollment and attendance records.

Students without leaver records who cannot be confirmed by TEA to be returning students, movers, previous Texas graduates, or GED recipients become underreported students. See *Appendix I* for more information.

In order to maintain a rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*, districts must not exceed the accountability standards for underreporting students.

**Standard:** Because key features of the leaver reporting system are new, the underreported standards for 2007 have been changed from the standards published in the *2006 Accountability Manual*. Districts must meet the standard for both of the following measures in order to maintain a rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*:

- *Count of Underreported Students:* Must be fewer than or equal to 200 (compared to 100 previously published).
- *Percent of Underreported Students:* Must be less than or equal to 5.0% (compared to 1.5% previously published for 2007).

### Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of underreported students}}{\text{number of students served in grades 7-12 in previous school year}} \leq 5.0\%$$

*Numerator:* Underreported students are those 2005-06 students in grades 7–12 who are not accounted for by TEA as returning students, movers, previous Texas graduates or GED recipients, and for whom no school leaver record can be found.

*Denominator:* The denominator is an unduplicated count of students who were reported in enrollment in 2005-06 PEIMS submission 1 or in attendance in 2005-06 PEIMS submission 3.

**Minimum Size Requirements:** Districts with 5 or more underreported students will be evaluated.

**Data Source and Year:** PEIMS submission 1 (October 2005, October 2006); PEIMS submission 3 (June 2006)

### Other Information:

- *School Leaver Provision for 2007.* Due to a number of factors—change in the definition of a dropout, changes to the PEIMS leaver data collection, and the effect of students displaced by Hurricane Katrina on the 2005-06 dropout rate—the School Leaver



Provision has been added for 2007. This means that a district's underreported student count or rate cannot be the cause for a lowered rating.

- *System Safeguard*. Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) will continue to evaluate this indicator at the 2007 standards in its Data Validation system. This will provide a safeguard feature to the use of the School Leaver Provision for this indicator in the state rating system.
- *Unduplicated Count*. The methodology eliminates any duplicate records. For example, students are not counted twice because they appear on both attendance and enrollment records.
- *Rounding*. This calculation is rounded to one decimal place. For example, 5.46% is rounded to 5.5%, not 5%.

### **ADDITIONAL STUDENTS IN DISTRICT RATINGS**

Generally speaking, districts are held accountable for the performance of all their students, including those who attend alternative education campuses that are registered for evaluation under AEA procedures. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information on various campus situations and how they affect the district's performance data.

Additionally, districts are responsible for the performance of students who are not in any campus accountability subset because they changed campuses within the district between the October "as of" date and the date of testing. See *Table 3* in *Chapter 2 – The Basics: Base Indicators* for more information on the accountability subset.

