

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 2007, 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 2006-07 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 2007. 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 2007, 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> | 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. | Used if the campus: <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). |
| <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, 2007)

Notification of campus and district accountability ratings will occur on August 1, 2007. 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, 2007)

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, 2007. 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 *2007 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*.

July 2007
Confidential

2007 (PREVIEW) ACCOUNTABILITY DATA TABLES – STANDARD PROCEDURES

PAGE 1

DISTRICT NAME: SAMPLE
CAMPUS NAME: SAMPLE SCHOOL
CAMPUS NUMBER: 999999999

Campus Rating: 06 - 12
Grade Span:

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

Analysis groups used to determine ratings are marked with an 'X'.
Academically Acceptable standards are shown in parentheses.

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS) TABLE

| Performance Results | 2007 | | | | 2006 | | | 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 (65%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| X All Students | 137 | 209 | 66% | 100% | 144 | 214 | 67% | | -1 | | |
| X African Amer | 90 | 136 | 66% | 65% | 107 | 144 | 74% | | -8 | | |
| X Hispanic | 47 | 72 | 65% | 34% | 36 | 69 | 52% | | 13 | | |
| X White | 0 | 0 | - | 0% | 1 | 1 | 100% | | - | | |
| X Econ Disadv | 137 | 207 | 66% | 99% | 144 | 214 | 67% | | -1 | | |
| Writing (65%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| X All Students | 66 | 74 | 89% | 100% | 62 | 92 | 67% | | 22 | | |
| X African Amer | 45 | 51 | 88% | 69% | 40 | 55 | 73% | | 15 | | |
| X Hispanic | 21 | 23 | 91% | 31% | 21 | 36 | 58% | | 33 | | |
| X White | 0 | 0 | - | 0% | 1 | 1 | 100% | | - | | |
| X Econ Disadv | 65 | 73 | 89% | 99% | 62 | 92 | 67% | | 22 | | |
| Social Studies (65%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| X All Students | 50 | 75 | 67% | 100% | 61 | 88 | 69% | | -2 | | |
| X African Amer | 34 | 46 | 74% | 61% | 50 | 64 | 78% | | -4 | | |
| X Hispanic | 16 | 28 | 57% | 37% | 11 | 24 | 46% | | 11 | | |
| X White | 0 | 0 | - | 0% | 0 | 0 | - | | - | | |
| X Econ Disadv | 50 | 74 | 68% | 99% | 61 | 88 | 69% | | -1 | | |
| Mathematics (45%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| X All Students | 108 | 208 | 52% | 100% | 74 | 226 | 33% | | 19 | | |
| X African Amer | 70 | 135 | 52% | 65% | 53 | 142 | 37% | | 15 | | |
| X Hispanic | 38 | 72 | 53% | 35% | 21 | 83 | 25% | | 28 | | |
| X White | 0 | 0 | - | 0% | 0 | 1 | 0% | | - | | |
| X Econ Disadv | 108 | 206 | 52% | 99% | 74 | 226 | 33% | | 19 | | |
| Science (40%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| X All Students | 116 | 122 | 95% | 100% | 75 | 85 | 88% | | 7 | | |
| X African Amer | 13 | 15 | 87% | 12% | 12 | 16 | 75% | | 12 | | |
| X Hispanic | 30 | 33 | 91% | 27% | 7 | 10 | 70% | | 21 | | |
| X White | 63 | 64 | 98% | 52% | 51 | 54 | 94% | | 4 | | |
| X Econ Disadv | 17 | 20 | 85% | 16% | 13 | 18 | 72% | | 13 | | |

Note this new feature.

STATE-DEVELOPED ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT II (SDAA II) TABLE

| SDAA II Results (50%) | 2007 | | | | 2006 | | | 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? |
| X All Students | 165 | 171 | 96% | 100% | 127 | 164 | 77% | | 19 | | |

EXCEPTIONS TABLE

| Number Msrs Evaluated | Number Allowed | Number Needed | Floor(s) Met? | Msr(s) Used in 2006? | Exceptions Applied |
|-----------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 18 | 3 | | | | |

RI, exceptions data, and rating do not appear here. These will be on the final data table on 8/1/2007.

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

Campus Rating:
Grade Span: 06 - 12

Analysis groups used to determine ratings are marked with an 'X'.
Academically Acceptable standards are shown in parentheses.

COMPLETION RATE I TABLE (Gr. 9-12) (75.0%)

| | Class of 2006 | | | | | Class of 2005 | | | 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 | 145 | 5 | 150 | 96.7% | 100% | 158 | 160 | 98.8% | | -2.1 | | |
| African Amer | 24 | 2 | 26 | 92.3% | 17% | 22 | 22 | 100.0% | | -7.7 | | |
| Hispanic | 31 | 2 | 33 | 93.9% | 22% | 43 | 44 | 97.7% | | -3.8 | | |
| White | 89 | 1 | 90 | 98.9% | 60% | 93 | 94 | 98.9% | | 0.0 | | |
| Econ Disadv | 45 | 1 | 46 | 97.8% | 31% | 51 | 51 | 100.0% | | -2.2 | | |

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE TABLE (Gr. 7-8) (1.0%)

| | # Dropouts | # 7-8 Graders | Dropout Rate | Stu Grp % |
|--------------|------------|---------------|--------------|-----------|
| All Students | 1 | 29 | 3.4% | 100% |
| African Amer | 1 | 1 | 100.0% | 3% |
| Hispanic | 0 | 4 | 0.0% | 14% |
| White | 0 | 23 | 0.0% | 79% |
| Econ Disadv | 1 | 10 | 10.0% | 34% |

Annual Dropout Rate for the prior year is not shown on report.

Due to the definitional changes, Annual Dropout Rate Required Improvement is not calculated in 2007.

RI, exceptions data, and rating do not appear here. These will be on the final data table on 8/1/2007.

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 | 2007 | | | |
|---------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|
| | Number Met Std | Number Taking | Pct Met Std | Stu Grp % |
| Reading/ELA (65%) | | | | |
| X All Students | 137 | 209 | 66% | 100% |
| X African Amer | 90 | 136 | 66% | 65% |
| X Hispanic | 47 | 72 | 65% | 34% |
| White | 0 | 0 | - | 0% |
| X Econ Disadv | 137 | 207 | 66% | 99% |
| Writing (65%) | | | | |
| X All Students | 66 | 74 | 89% | 100% |
| X African Amer | 45 | 51 | 88% | 69% |
| Hispanic | 21 | 23 | 91% | 31% |
| White | 0 | 0 | - | 0% |
| X Econ Disadv | 65 | 73 | 89% | 99% |

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 | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---------|-------------|-----------|
| ----- 2007 ----- | | | | |
| SDAA II Results (50%) | # Tests Met ARD | # Tests | Pct Met ARD | Stu Grp % |
| X All Students | 165 | 171 | 96% | 100% |

Number of Tests – This value is the denominator used to calculate the percent met ARD Expectations. There must be at least 30 tests for SDAA II to be evaluated.

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

Completion Rate

| COMPLETION RATE I TABLE (Gr. 9-12) (75.0%) | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| ----- Class of 2006 ----- | | | | |
| | # Completers | # dropouts | # in Class | Comp Rate |
| X All Students | 145 | 5 | 150 | 96.7% |
| African Amer | 24 | 2 | 26 | 92.3% |
| Hispanic | 31 | 2 | 33 | 93.9% |
| White | 89 | 1 | 90 | 98.9% |
| Econ Disadv | 45 | 1 | 46 | 97.8% |

To calculate the completion rate, divide the *number of completers* (in this example, 145) by the *number in the class of 2006* (150). This equals the *completion rate* (96.7%). The completion rate for this campus is within the *Exemplary* 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 # in Class.

Number of Completers – This value is the numerator used to calculate the completion rate. (It does not include GED recipients.)

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) (1.0%) | | | |
|--|------------|---------------|--------------|
| ----- 2005-06 ----- | | | |
| | # Dropouts | # 7-8 Graders | Dropout Rate |
| All Students | 1 | 29 | 3.4% |
| African Amer | 1 | 1 | 100.0% |
| Hispanic | 0 | 4 | 0.0% |
| White | 0 | 23 | 0.0% |
| Econ Disadv | 1 | 10 | 10.0% |

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

Minimum Size – Note that at this campus there was only one dropout, 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.

| TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS) TABLE | | | | |
|---|----------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|
| Performance Results | 2007 | | 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%. An "X" indicates that these two groups are analyzed for this subject.

Required Improvement

Campuses and districts may achieve a higher rating using *Required Improvement*. In 2007, it can be applied to three base indicators – TAKS, SDAA II, and Completion – 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.

| TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS) TABLE | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|-------------|----------------------|---------|----|---------|
| Performance Results | 2007 | | | | 2006 | | | 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 (65%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| X All Students | 1,048 | 1,564 | 67% | 100% | 1,066 | 1,476 | 72% | | -5 | | |
| X African Amer | 494 | 753 | 66% | 48% | 465 | 686 | 68% | | -2 | | |
| X Hispanic | 238 | 395 | 60% | 25% | 219 | 348 | 63% | yes | -3 | | |
| X White | 282 | 373 | 76% | 24% | 347 | 399 | 87% | yes | -11 | | |
| X Econ Disadv | 343 | 566 | 61% | 36% | 309 | 486 | 64% | | -3 | | |
| Mathematics (45%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| X All Students | 540 | 940 | 56% | 100% | 755 | 1,436 | 53% | | 3 | | |
| X African Amer | 739 | 1,673 | 44% | 48% | 273 | 673 | 41% | | 3 | | |
| X Hispanic | 390 | 740 | 52% | 25% | 159 | 327 | 49% | yes | 3 | | |
| X White | 367 | 467 | 80% | 24% | 288 | 391 | 74% | | 6 | | |
| X Econ Disadv | 557 | 1,117 | 45% | 36% | 184 | 469 | 39% | | 6 | | |

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

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.

| Required Improvement | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|---------|----|---------|
| Number Met Std | Number Taking | Pct Met Std | Met Min Size | Act Chg | RI | Met RI? |
| | | | | | | |
| 1,066 | 1,476 | 72% | | -5 | | |
| 465 | 686 | 68% | | -2 | | |
| 219 | 348 | 63% | yes | -3 | 1 | no |
| 347 | 399 | 87% | | -11 | | |
| 309 | 486 | 64% | yes | -3 | 1 | no |
| 755 | 1,436 | 53% | | 3 | | |
| 273 | 673 | 41% | yes | 3 | 2 | yes |
| 159 | 327 | 49% | | 3 | | |
| 288 | 391 | 74% | | 6 | | |
| 184 | 469 | 39% | | 6 | | |

Next, determine the Required Improvement: The formula is *the standard for 2007 minus the campus's performance in 2006, 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.

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

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 2 measures that are still at *Academically Unacceptable*.

Next, determine if the 2007 performance in the deficient areas meets the floor: each must be no more than 5 percentage points below the standard (at least 60% for reading).

EXCEPTIONS TABLE

| Number Msrs Evaluated | Number Allowed | Number Needed | Floor(s) Met? | Msr(s) Used in 2006? | Exceptions Applied |
|-----------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------|---|
| 21 | 3 | 2 | yes | no | Reading - Hispanic Reading - Econ. Disadvantaged |

Finally, check to make sure this measure was not used in 2006 (*exceptions cannot be repeated for the same subject and student group in consecutive years*). These measures were not used in 2006, so this campus is able to use two 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 late July. Data tables with rating labels will be released on August 1, 2007.

The following items are the additional information not present on the preview, but added to the August data tables and 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*)
 - Rating changed after [date] due to Data Integrity Issues. (*campus or district*)
 - Rating is not based on data shown in the table (School Leaver Provision used). (*campus or district*)
 - Grade 8 science results are not included because they are not used in the 2007 accountability system. (*campus or district with grade 8*)
 - Special Analysis used. Exception applied for [subject - student group] (*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.
 - Msr(s) Used in 2006? – 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 2007 were used in 2006.
 - 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 Msrs Evaluated* and *Number Allowed* columns show a number; other areas are blank.

Masked Data

Performance posted to the 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 masked. It is necessary to mask data that potentially reveals the performance of every student to be in compliance with the *Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act* (FERPA).

SYSTEM SUMMARY

The following tables summarize the 2007 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 can have no *Academically Unacceptable* campuses to receive a rating of *Recognized* or *Exemplary*. They must also not have excessive underreported students; however, for 2007, the School Leaver Provision means a district’s underreported student count or rate cannot be the cause for a lowered rating.

Table 7 is a single-page overview that provides details of the 2007 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 | | | |
| TAKS (2006-07) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students <i>and each student group meeting minimum size:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv. | meets each standard: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/ELA ... 65% • Writing 65% • Social Studies.. 65% • Mathematics 45% • Science 40% OR meets Required Improvement | meets 75% standard for each subject OR meets 70% floor and Required Improvement | meets 90% standard for each subject |
| SDAA II (2007) All students (if meets minimum size criteria) | Meets 50% standard (<i>Met ARD Expectations</i>) OR meets Required Improvement | Meets 70% standard (<i>Met ARD Expectations</i>) OR meets 65% floor and Required Improvement | Meets 90% standard (<i>Met ARD Expectations</i>) |
| Completion Rate I (class of 2006) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students <i>and each student group meeting minimum size:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv. | meets 75.0% standard OR meets Required Improvement | meets 85.0% standard OR meets 80.0% floor and Required Improvement | meets 95.0% standard |
| Annual Dropout Rate (2005-06) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students <i>and each student group meeting minimum size:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv. | meets 1.0% standard | meets 0.7% standard | meets 0.2% standard |
| Additional Provisions | | | |
| Exceptions | Applied if district/campus would be <i>AU</i> due to not meeting <i>AA</i> criteria. (See <i>detailed explanation.</i>) | Exceptions cannot be used to move to a rating of <i>Recognized</i> . | Exceptions cannot be used to move to a rating of <i>Exemplary</i> . |
| Check for Academically Unacceptable Campuses (District only) | Does not apply to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> districts. | A district with a campus rated <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> cannot be rated <i>Recognized</i> . | A district with a campus rated <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> cannot be rated <i>Exemplary</i> . |
| Underreported Students (District only) | Does not apply to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> districts. | A district that underreports more than 200 students or more than 5.0% of its prior year students cannot be rated <i>Recognized</i> . | A district that underreports more than 200 students or more than 5.0% of its prior year students cannot be rated <i>Exemplary</i> . |
| School Leaver Provision for 2007 | A campus or district annual dropout rate, completion rate and/or underreported student measures cannot be the cause for a lowered rating. | | |

Table 7: Overview of 2007 System Components

| | TAKS | SDAA II | Completion Rate I | Dropout Rate |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| Definition | Results (gr. 3-11) summed across grades by subject. ELA & reading results are combined. Cumulative results used for first two administrations of gr. 3 reading, gr. 5 reading & math. | 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 dropouts as a % of total gr. 7 & 8 students who were in attendance any time during the prior school year. |
| Rounding | Whole Numbers | Whole Numbers | One Decimal | |
| Standards Exemplary Recognized Acceptable | Ex.: All Subjects ≥ 90% Re.: All Subjects ≥ 75% Acc.: Reading/ELA ≥ 65% Writ./Soc St ≥ 65% Mathematics ≥ 45% Science ≥ 40% | 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. | | None | |
| Subjects | Reading/ELA gr. 3-11 Writing gr. 4, 7 Mathematics gr. 3-11 Social Studies gr. 8, 10, 11 Science gr. 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 | 2007 minus 2006 performance | 2007 minus 2006 performance | Class of 2006 rate minus Class of 2005 rate | N/A in 2007 |
| RI | Gain needed to reach standard in 2 yrs. | | Gain needed to reach standard in 2 yrs. | N/A in 2007 |
| Use | Gate up to <i>Acceptable</i> and <i>Recognized</i> | | | N/A in 2007 |
| Floor (Recognized) | ≥ 70% | | ≥ 80.0% | N/A in 2007 |
| 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 min. size current year and has ≥ 10 in prior year class. | N/A in 2007 |
| Exceptions | This provision may be applied if the campus or district would be <i>AU</i> solely due to not meeting the <i>AA</i> criteria on up to 3 assessment measures. Applies to 26 measures. | | | 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 | | |
| School Leaver Provision for 2007 | N/A | | In 2007, campus/district rating will not be lowered due to annual dropout or completion rates. | |

