

## Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances

---

The vast majority of the standard accountability ratings can be determined through the process detailed in *Chapters 2-4: The Basics*. However, there are special circumstances that require closer examination. Accommodating all Texas campuses and districts increases the complexity of the accountability system, but it also increases the fairness of the ratings ultimately assigned. This chapter describes pairing, Special Analysis, and the treatment of non-traditional campuses and their data under the standard accountability procedures.

### Pairing

---

#### IDENTIFYING CAMPUSES

All campuses serving grades 1-12 must receive an accountability rating. Beginning in 1994, campuses with no state assessment results due to grade-span served were incorporated into the accountability system by having districts choose another campus within the same district with which to pair for accountability purposes. The campuses shared TAAS data. The pairing process was continued with the advent of the new accountability system in 2004. A new feature, begun with the 2004 system, allows districts to pair a campus with the district and be evaluated on the district's results.

TEA determines which campuses need to be paired for any given accountability cycle after analyzing enrollment files submitted on PEIMS submission 1. All districts with campuses with enrollment in grades higher than kindergarten, and solely in grades with no TAKS data, *i.e.*, grades 1, 2, or 12, receive a request for pairing. Charters and registered AECs are not asked to pair any of their campuses.

For campuses that are paired, only TAKS performance is shared. The paired campus is evaluated on any non-TAKS indicator data it may have. The campus with which it is paired does not share any dropout, completion, SDAA II, or GPA indicator data it may have.

#### ADDITIONAL FEATURES

*Required Improvement.* Paired campuses are eligible for Required Improvement (RI). Note, however, that RI is calculated with 2007 data based on the pairing relationships established in 2007. The 2006 data is based on the pairing relationships established in 2006. Campuses with pairing statuses that change between years may have improvement calculations that differ from the campuses they are paired with.

*Exceptions.* Paired campuses are eligible for exceptions, using the paired data. As with Required Improvement, Exceptions are applied and calculated automatically by TEA before ratings are released. Districts and campuses do not need to request the use of Required Improvement or Exceptions.

*Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA).* Paired data are not used for GPA indicators, including all TAKS-based GPA—Commended Performance and Comparable Improvement. For that reason, paired campuses cannot receive GPA for those indicators. They may however, receive GPA for other indicators.

## PAIRING PROCESS

Districts are given the opportunity to use the same pairing relationship they used in the prior year or to select a new relationship by completing special data entry screens on the TEA website. In late March, districts with campuses that needed to be paired received instructions on how to access this on-line application. Pairing decisions were due by April 27, 2007.

If a district fails to inform the state, pairing decisions are made by agency staff. In the case of campuses that have been paired in the past, staff will assume that prior year pairing relationships still apply. In the case of campuses identified as needing to be paired for the first time in the 2006-07 school year, pairing selections will be made based on the guidelines given in this section in conjunction with analysis of attendance and enrollment patterns using PEIMS data.

## GUIDELINES

Campuses that are paired should have a "feeder" relationship with the selected campus and the grades should be contiguous. For example, a K-2 campus should be paired with the 3-5 campus that accepts its students into 3<sup>rd</sup> grade.

Another option is to pair a campus with the district instead of with another campus. This option is suggested for cases where the campus has no clear relationship with another single campus in the district. A campus paired with the district will be evaluated using the district's TAKS results (for all grades tested in the district). Note that pairing with the district is not required in these cases. Districts have the choice of selecting another campus or selecting the district. For example, in cases where a K-2 campus feeds into several 3-5 campuses, one of the 3-5 campuses may be selected, or the district can be selected. A 12<sup>th</sup> grade center serving students from several high school campuses can select one of the high school campuses or the district may be selected. In these cases, the district should make the best choice based on local criteria.

Multiple pairings are possible: If several K-2 campuses feed the same 3-5 campus, all of the K-2 campuses may be paired with that 3-5 campus.

Districts may change pairings from year to year; however, these changes should be justifiable (*e.g.*, a change in attendance zones affecting feeder patterns).

## Special Analysis

---

Districts and campuses with small numbers of students pose a special challenge to the accountability system. There are two types of small numbers situations. One is small numbers of students within a group, *e.g.*, few African American test-takers in science. These are handled by applying the minimum size criteria described in *Chapter 2 – The Basics: Base Indicators*. The second type is small numbers of *total* students, that is, few students tested in the All Students category.

Districts and campuses with small numbers of total students raise issues regarding the stability of the data. Special analysis is used to ensure that ratings based on small numbers of TAKS results are appropriate. As a result of special analysis, a rating can remain unchanged, be elevated, or be changed to *Not Rated*. If special analysis is applied, only All Students performance is examined.

## IDENTIFYING CAMPUSES AND DISTRICTS

Campuses and districts that are eligible for special analysis fall into two categories. The first are those that have fewer than six TAKS testers in each and every subject and do not have their own leaver data of sufficient size to evaluate. These campus and district ratings are changed to *Not Rated: Other*. Beyond these that receive this automatic change, a campus or district undergoes special analysis if:

- the campus or district is *Academically Unacceptable* due to TAKS only, with fewer than 30 All Students tested in one or more of the *Academically Unacceptable* subject(s); *OR*
- the campus or district is limited to *Academically Acceptable* or *Recognized* due to TAKS only, and the evaluation is governed by the results of fewer than six All Students tested.

The following are examples of campuses and districts that will NOT undergo special analysis:

- Campuses or districts that are *Not Rated*.
- Campuses or districts that are not small (30 or more testers in all subjects).
- Campuses or districts that have few students tested in TAKS, but whose rating of *Academically Unacceptable*, *Academically Acceptable*, or *Recognized* is due to other indicators.

## METHODS FOR SPECIAL ANALYSIS

Campuses or districts that undergo special analysis receive professional review based on analysis of all available performance data. The professional review process involves producing a summary report of the district or campus data, analyzing the data, and arriving at a consensus decision among a group of TEA staff members familiar with the standard accountability procedures. The summary report includes available indicator data for all TAKS tested years (2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007). Trends and aggregate data are reviewed.

Because of the small numbers of test takers involved, it can be difficult to assign a rating that is considered reliable and fair. Thus, professional review can result in a *Not Rated* label for some campuses or districts not otherwise meeting the automatic criteria for *Not Rated*.

## New Campuses

---

All campuses—established or new—are rated. A new campus may receive a rating of *Academically Unacceptable* in its first year of operation. This can occur even though the campus does not have prior-year data on which to calculate improvement. The management of campus identification numbers across years is a district responsibility. See *Chapter 15 – Responsibilities and Consequences* for more information regarding the possible consequences of changing campuses numbers.

## Charters

---

Based on fall PEIMS data for the 2006-07 school year, there were 191 charter operators serving approximately 81,000 students. Most charter operators have only one campus (132 of the 191); however, some operate multiple campuses.

By statute, charter operators are subject to most of the same federal and state laws as other public school districts, including reporting and accountability requirements. Prior to the 2004 accountability system, only the campuses operated by the charter received an accountability rating. Beginning with 2004, charters as well as the campuses they operate are rated, meaning charter operators are rated under district rating criteria based on the aggregate performance of the campuses operated by the charter. This means charter operators are also subject to the additional performance requirements applied to districts (underreported student standards and the check for *Academically Unacceptable* campuses). Because they are rated, charter operators and their campuses are eligible for *Gold Performance Acknowledgments*.

In 2007, there are some differences between the treatment of charter operators and traditional districts. These are:

- A charter operator may be rated under the alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures. This can occur in two cases: when the charter operates only registered AECs; or, when 50% or more of the charter operator's students are enrolled at registered AECs and the operator opts to be evaluated under AEA procedures.
- A charter operator may be labeled *Not Rated: Other*. This can occur in cases where the charter operator has too little or no TAKS data on which it can be evaluated.
- Charter operators are not asked to pair any of their campuses. Charters are unique in that they either have only one campus or they have multiple campuses with no feeder relationships; therefore, pairing charter campuses is problematic.

As with non-charter campuses, a charter campus that is a registered AEC will be rated under AEA procedures.

## Alternative Education Campuses

---

As previously stated, all campuses in the state serving grades 1–12 must receive a campus rating; however, the accountability system recognizes that some campuses offering alternative education programs may need to be evaluated under different criteria than standard campuses.

In 2007, AECs meeting certain eligibility criteria may register to be evaluated under AEA procedures. See *Part 2* of this *Manual* for all details on the AEA procedures.

Other campuses providing alternative education programs may not be registered. Either they chose not to register, did not meet the ten registration criteria, or did not meet the at-risk registration criterion to be registered for evaluation under AEA procedures. These campuses are evaluated under standard procedures and will be rated *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Academically Acceptable*, *Academically Unacceptable*, *Not Rated: Other*, or *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*.

Generally speaking, districts are responsible for the performance of all their students, including those who attend AECs that are registered for evaluation under AEA procedures. That is, the performance results for students who attend campuses evaluated under AEA procedures *are included* in the district's performance and *are used* in determining the district's rating and acknowledgments. There are some exceptions to this rule. The table below lists various campus types and whether the performance data are included or excluded from the district evaluation.

**Table 9: Inclusion or Exclusion of Performance Data**

Campus Type	Attribution of Data		Statute
	Dropouts	TAKS/SDAA II	
<b>Residential Treatment Centers (RTCs)</b>	Dropout data is attributed to sending campus and district for students meeting criteria.*	Results are included in the evaluation of RTC and the district (accountability subset).	39.073(f)
<b>Detention Centers and Correctional Facilities</b>	Dropout data is attributed to sending campus and district for students meeting criteria.*	Results are included in the evaluation of center/facility and the district (accountability subset).	39.073(f)
<b>Students Confined to TYC Facilities</b>	Dropout data included for the <i>campus</i> , but excluded from <i>district</i> results.	Results included for the <i>campus</i> , but excluded from <i>district</i> results.	39.072(d)
<b>JJAEPs</b>	Dropout data is attributed to non-JJAEP campus using PEIMS attendance data or district-supplied campus of accountability. Students who cannot be attributed to a non-JJAEP campus will remain dropouts at the JJAEP campus.	No assessment data should be reported to the JJAEP, but if it is mistakenly reported to the JJAEP, it will be included in the district results.	37.011(h)
<b>DAEPs</b>	Dropout data is attributed to non-DAEP campus using PEIMS attendance data or district-supplied campus of accountability. Students who cannot be attributed to a non-DAEP campus will remain dropouts at the DAEP campus.	No assessment data should be reported to the DAEP, but if it is mistakenly reported to the DAEP, it will be included in the district results.	n/a

\* Students who cannot be attributed back to a sending district will be attributed to the district where the center or facility is located.

## RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT CENTERS

A district that has a privately operated residential treatment center (RTC) within its geographic boundaries is not held accountable for students who drop out if they are from outside the district and were served at the center for fewer than 85 days. With student attribution codes and attendance data collected through PEIMS, TEA is able to attribute the majority of these dropouts to the appropriate sending campus and district. Students who cannot be attributed back to a sending district will be attributed to the district where the center is located.

## DETENTION CENTERS AND CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

A district that has a registered pre-adjudication detention center or post-adjudication correctional facility within its geographic boundaries is not held accountable for students who drop out if they are from outside the district. With student attribution codes and attendance data collected through PEIMS, TEA is able to attribute the majority of these dropouts to the appropriate sending campus and district. Students who cannot be attributed back to a sending district will be attributed to the district where the facility is located. Only dropout records for students served in pre-adjudication detention centers and post-

adjudication correctional facilities registered with the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC) are subject to this process.

## **STUDENTS CONFINED TO TEXAS YOUTH COMMISSION FACILITIES WITHIN TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS**

The performance results (TAKS/SDAA II, completion, and dropout) of students confined by court order in a residential treatment program or facility operated by or under contract with the Texas Youth Commission (TYC) are not included in the district results for the district where the TYC is located. The district's TYC campuses are evaluated, either under standard or AEA procedures, but the district rating is not affected by the performance data reported on these campuses.

## **JUVENILE JUSTICE ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND DISCIPLINARY ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Programs (JJAEPs) and Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs (DAEPs) are two types of campuses that are not rated under either standard or AEA procedures.

*JJAEPs.* Statute prohibits the attribution of performance results to JJAEPs. For counties with a population of 125,000 or more, Texas Education Code §37.011(h) requires that a student enrolled at a JJAEP be reported as if the student were attending and being tested at his or her “sending” campus. Each district that sends students to a JJAEP is responsible for properly attributing all performance data according to the PEIMS Data Standards and the testing guidelines.

By statute, procedures for evaluating the educational performance of JJAEPs in large counties are the responsibility of the TJPC. In the state accountability system, campuses identified to be JJAEPs will be labeled *Not Rated: Other*. Any accountability data erroneously reported to a JJAEP campus are subject to further investigation.

*DAEPs.* Statutory intent prohibits the attribution of performance results to a DAEP. Each district that sends students to a DAEP is responsible for properly attributing all performance data according to the PEIMS Data Standards and the testing guidelines.

All campuses identified to be DAEPs will be labeled *Not Rated: Other*. Accountability data erroneously reported to a DAEP campus are subject to further investigation.

## **SPECIAL EDUCATION CAMPUSES**

Campuses where all students are served in special education programs *and none are tested on TAKS* will be labeled *Not Rated: Other*, because they have no TAKS results on which to be evaluated. See *Chapter 4 – The Basics: Determining a Rating* for more information on the use of this rating label.