

2007

Accountability Manual

The 2007 Accountability Rating System
for Texas Public Schools and School Districts

Texas Education Agency
Department of Assessment, Accountability, and Data Quality
Division of Performance Reporting
May 2007

Copies of the *2007 Accountability Manual* may be purchased from:

Publications Distribution Office
Texas Education Agency
PO Box 13817
Austin, TX 78711-3817
pubsdist@tea.state.tx.us

Please use the order form on the last page of this publication. Remit \$12.00 for each copy for a non-profit institution, or \$14.00 for all others. These amounts include mailing and handling charges. Inventory of this publication is not guaranteed.

This publication can also be accessed and downloaded from the Texas Education Agency internet site at:

<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2007/manual/index.html>

Copyright © Notice The materials are copyrighted © and trademarked ™ as the property of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and may not be reproduced without the express written permission of TEA, except under the following conditions:

- 1) Texas public school districts, charter schools, and Education Service Centers may reproduce and use copies of the Materials and Related Materials for the districts' and schools' educational use without obtaining permission from TEA.
- 2) Residents of the state of Texas may reproduce and use copies of the Materials and Related Materials for individual personal use only without obtaining written permission of TEA.
- 3) Any portion reproduced must be reproduced in its entirety and remain unedited, unaltered and unchanged in any way.
- 4) No monetary charge can be made for the reproduced materials or any document containing them; however, a reasonable charge to cover only the cost of reproduction and distribution may be charged.

Private entities or persons located in Texas that are **not** Texas public school districts, Texas Education Service Centers, or Texas charter schools **or** any entity, whether public or private, educational or non-educational, located **outside the state of Texas** *MUST* obtain written approval from TEA and will be required to enter into a license agreement that may involve the payment of a licensing fee or a royalty.

For information contact: Office of Copyrights, Trademarks, License Agreements, and Royalties, Texas Education Agency, 1701 N. Congress Ave., Austin, TX 78701-1494; phone 512-463-9270; email: copyrights@tea.state.tx.us.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
About The 2007 Accountability System	1
About This Manual.....	1
Educator Input.....	1
System Philosophy	1
Reports Associated with the Accountability System	2
Part 1 – Standard Procedures	
Chapter 1 – Overview	7
System History.....	7
Comparison of 2006 and 2007	7
Chapter 2 – The Basics: <i>Base Indicators</i>	11
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills	11
State-Developed Alternative Assessment II	14
Accountability Subset.....	15
Completion Rate I	19
Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-8)	21
Chapter 3 – The Basics: <i>Additional Features</i>	23
Required Improvement to <i>Academically Acceptable</i>	23
TAKS.....	23
SDAA II.....	24
Completion Rate I	25
Required Improvement to <i>Recognized</i>	25
TAKS.....	25
SDAA II.....	26
Completion Rate I	27
Exceptions	28
Additional Issues for Districts	29
Districts with <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> Campuses	29
Underreported Students	30
Additional Students in District Ratings	31
Chapter 4 – The Basics: <i>Determining a Rating</i>	33
Who is Rated?	33
Standard Rating Labels.....	34
Notification of Ratings (August 1, 2007)	35
Notification of Ratings (Late October, 2007)	35
Using the Data Table to Determine a Rating.....	35
Additional Information on August Data Tables.....	40
System Summary.....	41

Chapter 5 – Gold Performance Acknowledgments	45
Acknowledgment Categories	45
Acknowledgment Indicators	47
Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion	47
Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate Results	47
Attendance Rate	49
Commended Performance: Reading/ELA	50
Commended Performance: Mathematics	51
Commended Performance: Writing	52
Commended Performance: Science	53
Commended Performance: Social Studies	54
Comparable Improvement: Reading/ELA	55
Comparable Improvement: Mathematics	56
Recommended High School Program/DAP	57
SAT/ACT Results	58
TSI – Higher Education Readiness Component: English Language Arts	59
TSI – Higher Education Readiness Component: Mathematics	60
Notification of Acknowledgment	61
Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances	63
Pairing	63
Identifying Campuses	63
Additional Features	63
Pairing Process	64
Guidelines	64
Special Analysis	64
Identifying Campuses and Districts	65
Methods for Special Analysis	65
New Campuses	65
Charters	65
Alternative Education Campuses	66
Residential Treatment Centers	67
Detention Centers and Correctional Facilities	67
Students Confined to Texas Youth Commission Facilities within Texas Public School Districts	68
JJAEP and DAEP	68
Special Education Campuses	68

Part 2 – Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures

Chapter 7 – Overview of AEA	71
About Part 2 of This <i>Manual</i>	71
Educator Input.....	71
History of AEA.....	71
Philosophy of AEA	73
Overall Design of AEA Procedures	74
Chapter 8 – AEA Registration Criteria and Requirements	75
Alternative Education Campuses (AECs)	75
AEC Eligibility.....	75
AEA Campus Registration Process.....	76
AEC Registration Criteria.....	76
At-Risk Registration Criterion.....	77
Charters	78
Charters Evaluated Under AEA Procedures.....	78
AEC Enrollment Criterion for Charters.....	78
Chapter 9 – Attribution of AEC Data	79
Background	79
Attribution of Data	80
Chapter 10 – AEA Base Indicators	81
TAKS Progress Indicator.....	81
SDAA II Indicator.....	84
Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12) Indicator.....	85
Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12) Indicator	88
Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA	91
Required Improvement	91
TAKS Progress Indicator.....	91
SDAA II Indicator.....	92
Completion Rate II Indicator	93
Annual Dropout Rate Indicator.....	94
Use of District At-Risk Data	94
TAKS Progress Indicator.....	95
Completion Rate II Indicator	95
Additional Requirements for Charters	96
AECs Rated <i>AEA: Academically Unacceptable</i>	96

Chapter 12 – AEA Ratings	97
Who is Rated?	97
AEA Rating Labels	97
Using the Data Table to Determine an AEA Rating	98
Final Data Tables	104
Masked Data	105
AEA Summary	105
Chapter 13 – AEA Glossary and Index	109
Part 3 – Items Common to Standard and AEA Procedures	
Chapter 14 – Appealing the Ratings	115
Appeals Calendar	115
General Considerations	115
Appeals are not a data correction opportunity!	115
Changed Ratings Only	116
No Guaranteed Outcomes	116
Situations NOT Favorable for Appeal	116
Guidelines	117
TAKS Appeals	117
SDAA II Appeals	117
School Leaver Provision	117
Gold Performance Acknowledgment Appeals	118
Special Circumstance Appeals	118
Grade 11 Results	118
Hurricanes Katrina and Rita	118
Early College High Schools	118
How to Submit an Appeal	119
How an Appeal Will Be Processed by the Agency	122
Chapter 15 – Responsibilities and Consequences	123
Local Responsibilities	123
Statutory Compliance	123
Accurate Data	124
Campus Identification Numbers	124
Complementary Local Accountability Systems	125
State Responsibilities	126
System Safeguards	126
District Accreditation Status	127
Public Education Grant Program Campus Lists	127
Interventions	128
Excellence Exemptions	129

Chapter 16 – Accountability Standards for 2008	131
Chapter 17 – Preview of 2008 and Beyond	133
Standard Procedures for 2008	133
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)	133
State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II)	134
Completion Rate I	134
Annual Dropout Rate (Gr. 7-8)	135
Additional Features	135
Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA)	135
Report-Only Indicators	136
AEA Procedures for 2008	136
AEA Campus Registration Process	136
At-Risk Registration Criterion	136
TAKS Progress	136
Annual Dropout Rate (Gr. 7-12)	137
Completion Rate II	137
AEA Accountability Development Topics	137
Standard Procedures for 2009	137
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)	137
Completion Rate I	138
Annual Dropout Rate (Gr. 7-8)	138
New Base Indicator	138
Additional Features	138
Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA)	138
Report-Only Indicators	138
AEA Procedures for 2009	139
AEA Campus Registration Process	139
TAKS Progress	139
Annual Dropout Rate (Gr. 7-12)	139
Completion Rate II	139
Standard Procedures for 2010	139
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)	139
Completion Rate I	140
Annual Dropout Rate (Gr. 7-8)	140
Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA)	140
AEA Procedures for 2010	140
TAKS Progress	140
Overview 2007 – 2010	140
Chapter 18 – Calendar	145

Appendices

Appendix A – Commissioner of Education Rule	151
Appendix B – Texas Education Code	153
Appendix C – Comparison of State and Federal Systems	155
Appendix D – Data Sources	161
Appendix E – Texas Growth Index	175
Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group	181
Appendix G – Contacts	183
Appendix H – Acknowledgments	187
Appendix I – NCEs Dropout Definition	191

Tables

Table 1: Definitions of Terms.....	3
Table 2: Comparison of 2006 and 2007	8
Table 3: Accountability Subset.....	16
Table 4: Standard Rating Labels.....	34
Table 5: Sample Data Table	36
Table 6: Requirements for Each Rating Category	42
Table 7: Overview of 2007 System Components.....	43
Table 8: Gold Performance Acknowledgment Standards for 2007	46
Table 9: Inclusion or Exclusion of Performance Data	67
Table 10: TAKS Progress Indicator.....	82
Table 11: Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12) Indicator	86
Table 12: Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12) Indicator.....	88
Table 13: Use of TAKS Data of At-Risk Students in the District.....	95
Table 14: Use of Completion Rate II Data of At-Risk Students in the District.....	96
Table 15: AEA Rating Labels.....	98
Table 16: Sample AEA Data Table.....	99
Table 17: Requirements for 2007 <i>AEA: Academically Acceptable</i> Rating	106
Table 18: Overview of 2007 AEA Procedures	107
Table 19: Standards for 2008 Ratings - Standard Procedures	131
Table 20: Standards for 2008 Ratings - AEA Procedures	132
Table 21: Use of TAKS-I in Accountability Ratings.....	134
Table 22: Completion Rate Transition	135
Table 23: Standards through 2010 – Standard Procedures.....	141
Table 24: Standards through 2010 – AEA Procedures.....	142
Table 25: Gold Performance Acknowledgment Standards through 2010.....	143
Table 26: 2007 Comparison of State and Federal Accountability (AYP) by Indicator ..	156
Table 27: 2007 Grade Level Comparison of State (Standard Procedures) and Federal Accountability	159

Table 28: Assessments Used in Accountability	161
Table 29: PEIMS Record Types Used in Accountability	162
Table 30: Student Demographics	163
Table 31: Leaver Codes	167
Table 32: Accountability Subset for SSI - Grades 3 & 5 TAKS Reading.....	173
Table 33: Accountability Subset for SSI - Grade 5 TAKS Math.....	173
Table 34: Accountability Subset for Non-SSI Grades and Subjects.....	173
Table 35: TGI Growth Equation Parameters – Mathematics and Science	176
Table 36: TGI Growth Equation Parameters – Reading, ELA, and Social Studies.....	176
Table 37: Sample TGI Calculation.....	177
Table 38: Changes in PEIMS Leaver Codes between 2005-06 and 2006-07.....	192

Introduction

ABOUT THE 2007 ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

The state accountability system is an integrated system of standard and alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures. In 2007, two significant changes that affect both sets of procedures are the change to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition of a dropout and the introduction of the School Leaver Provision. The School Leaver Provision applies to the Annual Dropout Rate and Completion Rate indicators (AEA and standard) and the Underreported indicator (standard only).

With respect to standard procedures, the change that will likely have the greatest impact on ratings is the increase in TAKS standards for achieving the *Academically Acceptable* and *Recognized* ratings. Significant to the AEA procedures are the increase in standards for the TAKS Progress and SDAA II indicators.

ABOUT THIS MANUAL

This *Accountability Manual* is a technical resource that explains the accountability system used by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to evaluate the performance of public school districts and campuses. This includes registered alternative education campuses and charter operators and their campuses. This *Manual* provides details of the accountability system for 2007, including ratings, acknowledgments, responsibilities and consequences, and special issues. Information necessary for determining 2007 ratings (standard and AEA) and acknowledgments is included.

As with previous editions of the *Manual*, selected chapters are adopted by reference as Commissioner of Education administrative rule. *Appendix A* provides the text of the rule, proposed at the time of publication, to adopt portions of this *Manual* by reference. The final adopted rule will be effective in July 2007.

EDUCATOR INPUT

For the review of the procedures adopted in 2006 and proposed in 2007, TEA staff invited the assistance and advice of educators, school board members, business and community representatives, professional organizations, and legislative representatives from across the state. The commissioner considered all proposals and made final decisions which are reflected in this publication. The annual use of these advisory bodies will continue. With their assistance, the system can be modified, indicators improved, standards reevaluated, and other necessary adjustments made. The result is a carefully deliberated system that will challenge our schools to prepare all students for the 21st century.

SYSTEM PHILOSOPHY

Over the years TEA has worked closely with public school personnel and others to develop an integrated accountability system. The standard and AEA procedures of the 2007 system are based upon these guiding principles:

- **STUDENT PERFORMANCE**
The system is first and foremost designed to improve student performance;

- **RECOGNITION OF DIVERSITY**
The system is fair and recognizes diversity among campuses and students;
- **SYSTEM STABILITY**
The system is stable and provides a realistic, practical timeline for measurement, data collection, planning, staff development, and reporting;
- **STATUTORY COMPLIANCE**
The system is designed to comply with statutory requirements;
- **APPROPRIATE CONSEQUENCES**
The system sets reasonable standards for adequacy, identifies and publicly recognizes high levels of performance and performance improvement, and identifies campuses with inadequate performance and provides assistance;
- **LOCAL PROGRAM FLEXIBILITY**
The system allows for flexibility in the design of programs to meet the individual needs of students;
- **LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY**
The system relies on local school districts to develop and implement local accountability systems that complement the state system; and
- **PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW**
The system supports the public's right to know levels of student performance in each school district and on each campus.

REPORTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS). The AEIS is a comprehensive reporting system defined in state statute. Since 1990-91, campus and district AEIS reports have been generated and published annually for all campuses and districts in the state. Local districts share responsibility for disseminating the AEIS reports, including holding hearings for public discussion of the AEIS report content. All indicators used for accountability are reported in the AEIS, with additional disaggregations depicting how each grade level and different populations performed. Indicators that will potentially be used in future accountability ratings are also published in the AEIS when possible. The reports also show participation rates on the state-administered tests. Additionally, the AEIS shows demographic information about students and staff, program information, and financial information, all of which provide context for interpreting accountability results.

School Report Card (SRC). Also required by state statute, this agency-generated report provides a subset of the information found on the AEIS report and is produced at the campus level only. Campuses must provide the SRC to each student's family.

Snapshot: School District Profiles. This TEA publication provides a state and district-level overview of public education in Texas. Though no longer available as a printed publication, the most current *District Detail* section of *Snapshot*—nearly 90 items of information for each public school district—is available on the agency website.

Pocket Edition. This brochure provides a quick overview of state-level statistics on performance, demographics, campus and district ratings, personnel, and finances.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). AYP is a federal accountability program mandated under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. For more information on similarities and differences between the federal and state accountability systems, see *Appendix C – Comparison of State and Federal Systems*.

Online Reports. All of the reports cited above are available on the agency website through the Division of Performance Reporting homepage at www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/index.html.

Table 1: Definitions of Terms

Throughout this *Manual*, the terms listed below are defined as shown, unless specifically noted otherwise. See *Chapter 13 – AEA Glossary and Index* for definitions of terms specific to the AEA procedures.

<i>Charter Operator</i>	A charter operator is treated like a district in the accountability system. The charter operator is identified with a unique six-digit number as are districts. The campus or campuses administered by a charter are identified with unique nine-digit number(s). The charter operator may administer instruction at one or more campuses.
<i>Districts</i>	This term includes charter operators as well as traditional independent school districts.
<i>Campuses</i>	This term includes charter campuses as well as campuses administered by traditional independent school districts.
<i>Superintendent</i>	The educational leader and administrative manager of the district or charter operator. This term includes other titles that may apply to charter operators, such as chief executive officer, president, and chief administrative officer.
<i>Standard Campus</i>	A campus evaluated under standard accountability procedures. This includes campuses that serve students in alternative education settings, but that are not registered to be evaluated under the AEA procedures.
<i>Registered Alternative Education Campus (AEC)</i>	A campus registered for evaluation under AEA procedures and meets the at-risk registration criterion. This term includes AECs of Choice as well as Residential Facilities.

**The 2007 Accountability Rating System
for Texas Public Schools and School Districts**

Part 1

Standard Procedures

In Part 1:

Chapter 1 – Overview..... 7

Chapter 2 – The Basics:
Base Indicators 11

Chapter 3 – The Basics:
Additional Features 23

Chapter 4 – The Basics:
Determining a Rating 33

Chapter 5 – Gold
Performance
Acknowledgments 45

Chapter 6 – Special Issues
and Circumstances..... 63

Chapter 1 – Overview

SYSTEM HISTORY

In 1993, the Texas Legislature enacted statutes that mandated the creation of the Texas public school accountability system to rate school districts and evaluate campuses. A viable and effective accountability system was able to be developed in Texas because the state already had the necessary supporting infrastructure in place: a pre-existing student-level data-collection system; a state-mandated curriculum; and a statewide assessment tied to the curriculum.

The system initiated with the 1993 legislative session remained in place through the 2001-02 school year. The ratings issued in 2002 were the last under that system. Beginning in 2003, a new assessment, the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), was administered. This assessment includes more subjects and grades, and is more difficult than the previous statewide assessment. With such fundamental changes, the accountability system needed to be redesigned. As soon as results from the 2003 TAKS were available and analyzed, development of the new accountability system began in earnest. Ratings established using the newly designed system were first issued in the fall of 2004.

COMPARISON OF 2006 AND 2007

The ratings issued in 2007 mark the fourth year of the new system. Many components of the 2007 system are the same as those that were in effect in 2006. However, there are a few differences between 2006 and 2007. These include:

- an increase in the rigor of the TAKS passing standards for all grades and subjects in order to achieve or maintain a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or *Recognized*.
- a new definition for *dropout*, based on U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) criteria. (See *Appendix I* for detailed information.)
- a change in the standards for underreported students from fewer than or equal to 100 students and less than or equal to 2.0%, to fewer than or equal to 200 students and less than or equal to 5%. The new standard accommodates changes in the processing of leaver records and the new dropout definition.
- a School Leaver Provision added for 2007 only, such that the leaver indicators (either alone or in combination) cannot be the cause for a lowered campus or district rating. This provision has been created primarily to accommodate the change in the definition of a dropout. The provision affects the following indicators:
 - the Underreported Students Indicator;
 - the Annual Dropout Rate (grades 7–8); and
 - Completion Rate I (grades 9–12).
- for the Annual Dropout Rate (grades 7-8) indicator, Required Improvement is not available to campuses or districts in 2007 as a means to move to the next higher rating.

The following table provides details on these and other changes between the 2006 and 2007 systems. Components that are unchanged are provided as well.

Table 2: Comparison of 2006 and 2007

Component	2006				2007			
Base Indicators for Determining Rating (Chapter 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TAKS % Met Standard SDAA II % Met ARD Expectations Completion Rate I Annual Dropout Rate 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TAKS.....No Change SDAA II.....No Change Completion Rate I.....No Change* Annual Dropout Rate.....No Change* <p>* School Leaver Provision applies</p>			
Rating Standards (Chapter 2)		Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary		Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
	TAKS	35%/40%/60%	70%	90%	TAKS	40%/45%/65%	75%	90%
	SDAA II	50%	70%	90%	SDAA II	No Change		
	Completion	75.0%	85.0%	95.0%	Completion			
Dropout	1.0%	0.7%	0.2%	Dropout				
Evaluation of Student Groups (Chapter 2)	White, Hispanic, African American, Economically Disadvantaged, and All Students				No Change			
Number of Performance Measures Used (Chapter 2)	The larger and more diverse the campus or district, the more measures apply — up to 36				No Change			
TAKS Subjects Evaluated (Chapter 2)	All TAKS subjects individually (TAKS science for gr. 8 is assessed and reported, but not used for accountability)				No Change			
TAKS Student Success Initiative (Chapter 2)	Gr. 3 & 5 reading and Gr. 5 mathematics, cumulative results used				No Change			
TAKS Grades Tested (Chapter 2)	Summed across all grades tested (grades 3-11)				No Change			
TAKS Student Passing Standard (Chapter 2)	Panel Recommendation for all subjects, all grades				No Change			
TAKS Minimum Size for All Students (Chapter 2)	All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of size				No Change			
TAKS Minimum Size for Student Groups (Chapter 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If fewer than 30 test takers, not evaluated separately If 30 to 49, evaluated if they comprise at least 10% of all test takers If 50 or more, evaluated 				No Change			
TAKS Special Analysis (Chapter 6)	Used for determining rating for very small campuses and districts				No Change			
SDAA II Subjects Evaluated (Chapter 2)	Summed across all SDAA II subjects: reading/ELA, writing, mathematics				No Change			
SDAA II Grades tested (Chapter 2)	Summed across all grades tested (grades 3-10)				No Change (2007 is last year for SDAA II)			
SDAA II Minimum Size (Chapter 2)	Results are always evaluated if there are 30 or more tests (summed across grades and subjects)				No Change			

Table 2: Comparison of 2006 and 2007 (continued)

Component	2006	2007
Accountability Subset (TAKS & SDAA II only) (<i>Chapter 2</i>)	Students who are mobile after the October PEIMS “as of” date and before the last TAKS/SDAA II administration are taken out of the subset for a district if they move to another district; students are taken out of the campus subset if they move to another campus (whether it is in the same district or not)	No Change
Student performance included for rating (<i>Appendix I</i>)	Performance of all students (in the Accountability Subset) tested on the TAKS or SDAA II is included in ratings calculation—except for students with KRI (Katrina-Rita Indicator) codes.	Same as 2006— except that Katrina-Rita exclusion no longer applies
Completion Rate & Annual Dropout Rate Minimum Size for All Students (<i>Chapter 2</i>)	At least 5 dropouts and at least 10 students in denominator.	No Change
Completion Rate & Annual Dropout Rate Minimum Size for Student Groups (<i>Chapter 2</i>)	At least 5 dropouts AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If fewer than 30 in group, not evaluated separately • If 30 to 49, evaluated if they comprise at least 10% of all students • If 50 or more, evaluated 	No Change
Dropout Definition (<i>Appendix I</i>)	State Definition	NCES Definition
Required Improvement (<i>Chapter 3</i>)	• TAKS: RI to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> and <i>Recognized</i> possible	• TAKS: No Change
	• SDAA II: RI to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> and <i>Recognized</i> possible	• SDAA II: No Change
	• Completion Rate I: RI to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> and <i>Recognized</i> possible	• Completion Rate I: Still applicable, though class of 2006 uses new dropout definition.
	• Annual Dropout Rate: RI to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> and <i>Recognized</i> possible	• Annual Dropout Rate: RI will not be available in 2007 because of definition change
Exceptions (<i>Chapter 3</i>)	<i>Academically Acceptable</i> rating possible by using exceptions	No Change (<i>Exceptions applied in 2006 cannot be re-used in 2007</i>)
Pairing (<i>Chapter 6</i>)	Standard campuses without TAKS data are paired; paired data not used for GPA	No Change
Charters (<i>Chapter 6</i>)	Charter operators are rated, as are their campuses. Both are eligible for GPA.	No Change
New Campuses (<i>Chapter 6</i>)	All campuses (established or new) are rated	No Change

Table 2: Comparison of 2006 and 2007 (continued)

Component	2006	2007
Gold Performance Acknowledgment Indicators (Chapter 5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion • AP/IB Results • Attendance Rate • Commended Performance: Reading/ELA • Commended Performance: Mathematics • Commended Performance: Writing • Commended Performance: Science • Commended Performance: Social Studies • Comparable Improvement: Reading/ELA • Comparable Improvement: Mathematics • Recommended High School Program/ Distinguished Achievement Program (RHSP/DAP) • SAT/ACT Results • TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component for English Language Arts • TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component for Mathematics 	No Change
Standards for GPA (Chapter 5)	Vary by indicator; see Chapter 5.	Same as 2006, except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Commended Performance</i> subjects all increase from 20% to 25%, and • <i>RHSP/DAP</i> increases from 70.0% to 80.0%.
Underreported Students (Chapter 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No more than 100 underreported students; and, • No more than 2.0% underreported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No more than 200 underreported students; and • No more than 5.0% underreported.* * <i>School Leaver Provision applies</i>
School Leaver Provision (Chapter 6, and Appendix I)	Not Applicable	For 2007 only, the leaver indicators cannot be the cause for a lowered rating . The leaver indicators include Annual Dropout Rate, Completion Rate, and Underreported Students.
Hurricane Rita (Appendix I in the 2006 Accountability Manual)	Schools and districts closed for ten or more days may receive a rating of <i>Not Rated: Other</i> .	Does not apply in 2007.

Chapter 2 – The Basics: *Base Indicators*

To determine ratings under the standard accountability procedures, the 2007 accountability rating system for Texas public schools and districts uses four base indicators:

- spring 2007 performance on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS),
 - spring 2007 performance on the State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II),
 - the Completion Rate I for the class of 2006, and
 - the 2005-06 Annual Dropout Rate for grades 7 and 8.
-

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

The TAKS indicator is the percent of students who scored high enough to meet the standard to pass the test. This is calculated as the number of students who met the TAKS student passing standard divided by the number tested. Results for the English version of the TAKS (grades 3-11) and the Spanish version (grades 3-6) are summed across grades for each subject. Results for each subject tested are evaluated separately to determine ratings.

Who is evaluated for TAKS: Districts and campuses that test students on any TAKS subject:

- **Reading/ELA** – Reading is tested in grades 3-9; English language arts (ELA) is tested in grades 10 & 11. Note that this is a combined indicator. It includes all students tested on and passing either the TAKS reading test or the TAKS English language arts test. The first two administrations of grade 3 and grade 5 TAKS reading results are included. See *Reading/ELA Combined* and *Student Success Initiative* in *Other Information* below.
- **Writing** – Writing is tested in grades 4 & 7.
- **Social Studies** – Social Studies is tested in grades 8, 10, & 11.
- **Mathematics** – Mathematics is tested in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, & 11. The first two administrations of grade 5 TAKS mathematics results are included. See *Student Success Initiative* in *Other Information* below.
- **Science** – Science is tested in grades 5, 8, 10, & 11. (*Performance on the grade 8 science test will not be used for accountability purposes until 2008.*)

Standard: The *Academically Acceptable* standard varies by subject, while the *Recognized* and *Exemplary* standards are the same for all subjects:

- **Exemplary** – For every subject, at least 90% of the tested students pass the test.
- **Recognized** – For every subject, at least 75% of the tested students pass the test.
- **Academically Acceptable** – Varies by subject:
 - *Reading/ELA* – At least 65% of the tested students pass the test.
 - *Writing* – At least 65% of the tested students pass the test.
 - *Social Studies* – At least 65% of the tested students pass the test.
 - *Mathematics* – At least 45% of the tested students pass the test.
 - *Science* – At least 40% of the tested students pass the test.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of students passing [TAKS subject]}}{\text{number of students tested in [TAKS subject]}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- *All Students.* These results are always evaluated regardless of the number of examinees. However, districts and campuses with a small number of total students tested on TAKS will receive Special Analysis. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more detailed information about Special Analysis.
- *Student Groups.*
 - Any student group with fewer than 30 students tested is not evaluated.
 - If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
 - If there are at least 50 students within the student group, it is evaluated.
 - Student group size is calculated subject by subject. For this reason the number of student groups evaluated will sometimes vary. For example, an elementary school with grades 3, 4, & 5 tested may have enough Hispanic students to be evaluated on reading and mathematics, but not enough to be evaluated on writing (tested in grade 4 only) or science (tested in grade 5 only).

Year of Data: 2006-07

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other Information:

- *TAKS Grade 8 Science.* In 2006, grade 8 students were assessed for the first time in TAKS science. Performance on this assessment will not be used in determining accountability ratings for 2007. However both the 2006 and 2007 science results will be shown on the AEIS reports released in the fall of 2007. See *Chapter 17 – Preview of 2008 and Beyond.*
- *Student Success Initiative.* For grades 3 and 5 reading and grade 5 mathematics performance, a cumulative percent passing is calculated by combining the first and second administrations of the TAKS. The results include performance on the Spanish versions of these tests.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who take the TAKS is included in the TAKS indicator.
- *Testing Window.* Results for students given a make-up test within the testing window are included in the accountability indicators.
- *Reading/ELA Combined.* Reading (grades 3-9) and ELA (grades 10 & 11) results are combined and evaluated as a single subject. This affects districts and campuses that offer both grade 9 and grades 10 and/or 11. In these cases, counts of reading and ELA students who met the standard are summed and divided by the total number taking reading or ELA.

- *TAKS Spanish.* The TAKS tests are given in Spanish in reading and mathematics for grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; writing in grade 4; and science in grade 5. Performance on these tests is combined with performance on the English-language TAKS for the same subject to determine a rating.
- *Student Passing Standards.* To determine whether the student counts as a passer, the student must meet the passing standard adopted by the State Board of Education (SBOE) for the current year. Please note the following:
 - For 2007, the student passing standard is panel recommendation (PR) for students in all grades and all subjects, except grade 8 science.
 - The TAKS grade 8 science passing standard for 2007 is lower while it is phased in. Performance on this test will not be part of the accountability system until 2008.
 - Some 11th graders who have repeated a grade may have a passing standard other than PR, depending on which standard was in place when they first entered 10th grade.
- *Sum of All Grades Tested.* Results for each subject are summed across grades. This refers to the grades tested at the particular campus or district. For example, the percent passing for TAKS reading in an elementary school with a grade span of K-5 is calculated as:

$$\frac{\text{number of students who passed the reading test in grades 3, 4, \& 5}}{\text{number of students who took the reading test in grades 3, 4, \& 5}}$$
- *Exit-level TAKS.* The performance of all juniors tested for the first time during the primary spring administration (ELA in February; mathematics, science, and social studies in April) is included in determining accountability ratings.
- *October 2006 administration.* Some juniors eligible for early graduation took the TAKS in October 2006. The performance of these students is included with the performance of other juniors taking the exit-level test if:
 - they were juniors at the time of testing;
 - they were taking the exit-level TAKS for the first time in October 2006; and
 - they passed all four assessments at that time.
 Students tested in October who failed any of the tests in October could retest in the spring; however, in the event of a retest, neither performance — from October *or* from the spring retest — is included in the accountability calculations. If October results are used, they are not adjusted for mobility.
- *Students Tested.* Only answer documents marked “Score” are included; answer documents coded “Absent,” “Exempt,” or “Other” are excluded. For example, results for limited English proficient students taking a linguistically accommodated TAKS or SDAA II reading or mathematics tests are not included in the state accountability system.
- *Rounding of Met Standard Percent.* The *Met Standard* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%; 79.4999% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.
- *Rounding of Student Group Percent.* The *Student Group* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 9.5% is rounded to 10%.

STATE-DEVELOPED ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT II

This test assesses special education students in grades 3-10 who are receiving instruction in the state's curriculum but for whom the TAKS test is not an appropriate measure of their academic progress. Tests are given in the areas of reading/ELA, writing, and mathematics, on the same schedule as TAKS.

A single performance indicator is evaluated for SDAA II. The indicator sums across grades tested (3-10) and across subjects. This indicator is not based on the number of students tested but on the number of tests taken. It is calculated as the number of *tests* meeting ARD committee expectations divided by the number of SDAA II *tests* for which ARD expectations were established. Students who take multiple SDAA II tests are included multiple times (for each and every SDAA II test they take).

This year, 2007, is the last year the SDAA II will be administered. See *Chapter 17 – Preview of 2008 and Beyond* for information on future alternate assessments for students with disabilities.

Who is evaluated for SDAA II: Districts and campuses that test students on any SDAA II subject.

Standard:

- **Exemplary** – Results on at least 90% of tests taken meet ARD expectations.
- **Recognized** – Results on at least 70% of tests taken meet ARD expectations.
- **Academically Acceptable** – Results on at least 50% of tests taken meet ARD expectations.

Student Groups: Performance for the percent *Meeting ARD Expectations* is evaluated for All Students only. Student group performance is not evaluated separately.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of SDAA II tests meeting ARD expectations}}{\text{number of SDAA II tests taken}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- SDAA II performance is evaluated for districts and campuses with results from 30 or more tests (summed across grades and subjects). Depending on grade level, an individual student might be counted as many as three times if he or she takes SDAA II tests in reading, writing, and mathematics. In this case, the minimum size requirement of 30 tests could represent as few as 10 students.
- There is no Special Analysis done on SDAA II performance.

Year of Data: 2007 (Spring SDAA II Administration)

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other Information:

- **TAKS-I.** Since 2006, students served in special education have been able to take the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills Inclusive (TAKS-I) in subjects and grades

where the SDAA II is not available. TAKS-I performance will not be used in determining accountability ratings for 2007. However, 2006 and 2007 performance on this indicator will be shown on the AEIS reports released in the fall of 2007. See *Chapter 17 – Preview of 2008 and Beyond*.

- *Students Tested on both SDAA II and TAKS.* In some cases, students may take both the SDAA II and TAKS. For example, a grade 6 student may take the TAKS for mathematics, and the SDAA II for reading. In this case, the student's TAKS performance is included with the TAKS indicators and the SDAA II performance is included with the SDAA II indicator.
- *Rounding of Met ARD Expectation Percent.* The *Met ARD Expectation* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%; 79.4999% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.

ACCOUNTABILITY SUBSET

For the TAKS and SDAA II indicators, only the performance of students enrolled on the PEIMS fall "as-of" date of October 27, 2006, are considered in the ratings. This is referred to as the *accountability subset* (sometimes also referred to as the *October subset* or the mobility adjustment). This adjustment is not applied to any other base indicator.

Students who move from district to district are excluded from the campus and district's TAKS and SDAA II results. Further, students who move from campus to campus within a district are kept in the district's results but are excluded from the campus's TAKS and SDAA II results. No campus is held accountable for students who move between campuses after the PEIMS "as-of" date and before the date of testing, even if they stay within the same district. The subsets are determined as follows:

Campus-level accountability subset: If a student was reported in membership at one campus on October 27, 2006, but moves to another campus before the TAKS or SDAA II test, that student's performance is removed from the accountability results for both campuses, whether the campuses are in the same district or different districts. Campuses are held accountable only for those students reported to be enrolled in the campus in the fall and tested in the same campus in the second semester.

District-level accountability subset: If a student was in one district on October 27, 2006, but moved to another district before the TAKS or SDAA II test, that student's performance is taken out of the accountability subset for both districts. However, if the student moved from campus to campus within the district, his or her performance is included in that district's results, even though it does not count for either campus. This means that district performance results do not match the sum of the campus performance results.

Examples of how the accountability subset criteria are applied are provided in the following table. Note that these apply to both SDAA II and TAKS performance results. For more information, see *Tables 30, 31, and 32* in *Appendix D – Data Sources*.

Table 3: Accountability Subset

Student Situation	In Whose Accountability Subset?
General	
1. Grade 9 student is enrolled at campus A in the fall and tests there on TAKS reading in February and mathematics in April.	This student's results affect the rating of both campus A and the district.
2. Grade 6 student is enrolled in district A in the fall and moves to district B at the semester break. The student is tested on TAKS reading and mathematics in April.	This student's results do not affect the rating of any campus or district. Results are reported to district B.
3. Grade 6 student is enrolled at campus Y (district A) in the fall and then moves to campus Z (district A) at the semester break. The student is tested on TAKS reading and mathematics in April.	This student's results do not affect the rating of campus Y or Z, but they do affect district A. Results for both tests are reported to campus Z.
4. Grade 6 student is reported in enrollment in district A at campus Z, but is withdrawn for home schooling on November 10 th . Parents re-enroll the student at the same campus on April 1. The student is tested in TAKS reading and mathematics in April.	Performance on both tests is reported and included in the ratings evaluation for campus Z and district A. The fact that the student was enrolled on the "as of" date and tested in the same campus and district are the criteria for determining the accountability subset.
5. A 12 th grade student moves to a district from another state at the beginning of the school year. She takes the exit-level tests in October and fails; she takes them again during the spring. Will her performance affect the district or campus?	No. The performance of 12 th graders is not used for accountability purposes.
Mobility between Writing/ELA and other tests	
6. Grade 4 student enrolls in campus A in the fall and takes the TAKS writing test there in February. The student then transfers to campus B in the same district and tests on TAKS reading and mathematics in April.	This student's results do not affect the rating of campus A or B. Although writing was assessed at the same campus where the student was enrolled in the fall, the writing results are reported to campus B, where the student tested last. The results affect the district rating. Results for all tests are reported to campus B.
7. Grade 4 student enrolls in campus A in the fall and takes the writing TAKS there in February. The student then transfers to campus B in a different district and tests on TAKS reading and mathematics in April.	This student's results do not affect the rating of either campus or district. Test results are reported to the campus where the student tested last. Results for all tests are reported to campus B.

Table 3: Accountability Subset (continued)

Student Situation	In Whose Accountability Subset?
8. A first-time 11th grade student is enrolled in district A in the fall and takes the TAKS ELA in February. He then moves to district B, where he takes the last three tests.	This student's results do not affect the rating of either campus or district. Results for all tests are reported to the campus where the student tested last in district B.
9. A first-time 11th grade student is enrolled in district A in the fall and takes the TAKS ELA in February. She then moves out of state. She does not take the last three tests.	This student's results on ELA will be used in determining both campus and district A ratings.
10. A first-time 11th grade student is enrolled in high school Y, district A in the fall and takes the TAKS ELA in February. He then is sent to a "boot camp" (disciplinary campus) for the rest of the year, where he takes the rest of the TAKS tests. Will the student's performance count toward the sending campus?	<p>If the disciplinary campus is a JJAEP or DAEP, the student's performance must be coded back to the sending campus, and it will be used in determining both campus and district ratings.</p> <p>If the disciplinary campus is operated by the Texas Youth Commission (TYC), the performance will not count toward either the sending campus or district rating.</p> <p>If the disciplinary campus is not a JJAEP, DAEP, or TYC campus, but is in district A, the performance will be used in determining the district rating, but not the campus rating.</p>
11. Grade 7 student is reported in enrollment in district A and takes the writing test in that district at campus Y. In March, the student transfers to district B and takes the remaining Grade 7 TAKS tests there. The answer documents submitted by district B use different name spellings than did the one submitted by district A.	To the test contractor these are two different students. Performance on the student's writing test is reported to district A and counts toward its rating and the rating of campus Y. The student's results in reading and mathematics are reported to district B but do not contribute to the rating of either the district or the campus where the student tested because the student was not there in the fall.
<p>Grades 3 and 5 Reading; Grade 5 Mathematics (Student Success Initiative) <i>(See Tables 30 and 31 in Appendix D – Data Sources for further information.)</i></p>	
12. Grade 3 student takes reading in February at campus A where she was enrolled in the fall, passes the test and moves to campus B (in the same district) where, in April, she takes and fails the mathematics test.	This student's results do not affect the rating of campus A or B. The reading results from the February test are reported to campus A and the mathematics results are reported to campus B. Results from both tests affect the district.

Table 3: Accountability Subset (continued)

Student Situation	In Whose Accountability Subset?
<p>13. Grade 3 student enrolls in campus A in the fall, but then moves to campus B (in the same district) in December. In February the student takes the reading test there, and passes. In early April the student moves back to campus A, where he takes and passes the mathematics test.</p>	<p>This student's reading results do not affect the rating of campus A or B, but the math results affect the rating of campus A. The reading results from the February test are reported to campus B, and the math results are reported to campus A. Results from both reading and mathematics tests affect the district.</p>
<p>14. Grade 5 student takes reading in February at campus A where he was enrolled in the fall, and fails the test. In March he moves to campus B (in the same district) where he retakes in April and passes reading, mathematics, and science.</p>	<p>This student's results do not affect the rating of campus A or B. The February reading results are reported to campus A, even though math, science and the 2nd reading results are reported to campus B. Results from reading, science, and mathematics tests affect the district.</p>
<p>15. Grade 3 student takes TAKS reading in February at the campus where she was enrolled in the fall. She fails the test. In March, the student moves out of state. She does not take TAKS mathematics.</p>	<p>This student's TAKS reading results do not affect the rating for the campus or district.</p>
<p>16. Grade 5 student takes TAKS reading in February at the campus where she was enrolled in the fall, and passes the test. In April she takes the TAKS mathematics test but fails. The student then moves to another district, where she takes TAKS science and retakes in mathematics and fails again.</p>	<p>This student's TAKS reading, mathematics, and science results do not affect the rating for any campus or district.</p>
<p>17. Grade 5 student takes TAKS reading in February at the campus where she was enrolled in the fall, and passes the test. In April she takes the TAKS mathematics test but fails. The student and her family then move out of state. She does not take TAKS science or retest in mathematics.</p>	<p>The three subjects are handled differently: <i>Science:</i> She did not test in science at all, so there are no results to attribute. <i>Reading:</i> She did not need to retest in reading; however, the fact that she did not take the science test in mid-April establishes her as mobile, so her reading results are taken out of the accountability subset. <i>Mathematics:</i> There are no results available for her in May, nor are there answer documents for any of the mathematics passers, as there is no other TAKS test given at that time. For this reason, the April performance on mathematics is retained and will affect the rating of this campus and district.</p>

Table 3: Accountability Subset (continued)

Student Situation	In Whose Accountability Subset?
Spanish TAKS	
18. A grade 6 student’s LPAC committee directs that she be tested in reading on the Spanish TAKS and in mathematics on the English TAKS. She remains at the same campus the entire year.	Performance on both tests is reported and included in the rating evaluation for the campus and district. Results on both English and Spanish versions of the TAKS contribute to the overall passing rate.
Both SDAA II and TAKS	
19. The ARD committee for a grade 6 student in special education directs that she be tested in reading on the SDAA II and in mathematics on the TAKS. She remains at the same campus the entire year.	Performance on both tests is reported and included in the rating evaluation for the campus and district. This student’s reading results are included with the SDAA II performance, and the mathematics results contribute to the TAKS results.
20. Grade 3 student takes TAKS reading in February and fails the test. Her ARD committee decides she should take the SDAA II reading in April, on which she meets ARD expectations. She also takes TAKS mathematics and passes. She remains at the same campus the entire year.	This student’s TAKS reading (failure) and mathematics (passing) results will affect the TAKS performance for the campus and the district. The SDAA II reading results (passing) will affect the SDAA II indicator for the campus and district.

COMPLETION RATE I

This longitudinal rate shows the percent of students who first attended ninth grade in the 2002-03 school year and have completed or are continuing their education four years later. Known as the 2002-03 cohort, these students were tracked over the four years using data provided to TEA by districts and data available in the statewide General Educational Development (GED) database.

To count as a "completer" for standard accountability procedures, a student must have received a high school diploma with his/her class (or earlier) or have re-enrolled in the fall of 2006 as a continuing student.

Who is evaluated for Completion Rate I:

- Districts and campuses that serve grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12.
- *Use of District Rate.* A completion rate is evaluated for any campus that served students in grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12 in the fall of the 2006-07 school year. However, a completion rate is calculated only for campuses or districts that offered grades 9 through 12 since 2002-03. When a campus serves only some of those grades—for example, a senior high school that only serves grades 11 and 12—the district’s completion rate is attributed to that campus because it does not have its own completion rate. Campuses that

have been in existence for fewer than five years will also be evaluated using their districts' completion rates.

Standard:

- **Exemplary** – Completion Rate I of 95.0% or more.
- **Recognized** – Completion Rate I of 85.0% or more.
- **Academically Acceptable** – Completion Rate I of 75.0% or more.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of completers}}{\text{number in class}^*}$$

*See *Appendix D* for the definition of *number in class*.

Minimum Size Requirements:

- *All Students.* These results are evaluated if:
 - there are at least 10 students in the class *and*
 - there are at least 5 dropouts.
- *Student Groups.* These results are evaluated if there are at least 5 dropouts within the student group *and*:
 - there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students; or
 - there are at least 50 students within the student group.

Years of Data: 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-06, and 2006-07.

Data Source: PEIMS submission 1 enrollment data, 2002-03 through 2006-07; PEIMS submission 1 leaver data, 2003-04 through 2006-07; PEIMS submission 3 attendance data, 2002-03 through 2005-06; and General Educational Development records as of August 31, 2006.

Other Information:

- *NCES Dropout Definition.* As of the 2007 accountability rating cycle, the definition of a dropout has changed to be aligned with the NCES definition. See *Appendix I – NCES Dropout Definition* for more information.
- *School Leaver Provision for 2007.* In 2007, a campus or district completion rate cannot be the cause for a lowered rating. As a safeguard to this provision, districts are subject to identification and intervention by Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) for dropout rates and leaver reporting. Additionally, campuses that avoid being rated *Academically Unacceptable* because of this provision will be subject to technical assistance team (TAT) intervention requirements in the 2007-08 school year.
- *Additions and Deletions.* Any student who joins the cohort is added to it, and any student who leaves the cohort is subtracted from it. For example, a student new to Texas who

moves to a district as an 11th grader would be added to the cohort that began when he was first in 9th grade.

- *Retained Students.* Students who repeat a year are kept with their original cohort.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 74.875% is rounded to 74.9%, not 75%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.
- *Special Education.* The completion status of special education students is included in this measure.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE (GRADES 7-8)

For accountability purposes, the annual dropout rate is used to evaluate campuses and districts with students in grades 7 and/or 8. This is a one-year measure, calculated by summing the number of dropouts across the two grades.

This year for the first time, TEA will use the more rigorous NCES dropout definition. See *Appendix I – NCES Dropout Definition* for a detailed explanation.

Who is evaluated for Annual Dropout Rate: Districts and campuses that serve students in grades 7 and/or 8.

Standard:

- *Exemplary* – An Annual Dropout Rate of 0.2% or less.
- *Recognized* – An Annual Dropout Rate of 0.7% or less.
- *Academically Acceptable* – An Annual Dropout Rate of 1.0% or less.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of grade 7-8 dropouts}}{\text{number of grade 7-8 students who were in attendance at any time during the school year}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- *All Students.* These results are evaluated if:
 - there are at least 10 students in grades 7-8 *and*
 - there are at least 5 dropouts.
- *Student Groups.* These results are evaluated if there are at least 5 dropouts within the student group *and*:
 - there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students; or
 - there are at least 50 students within the student group.

Year of Data: 2005-06

Data Source: PEIMS submission 1 enrollment data 2005-06; PEIMS submission 1 leaver data, 2006-07; PEIMS submission 3 attendance data, 2005-06.

Other Information:

- *School Leaver Provision for 2007.* In 2007, a campus or district dropout rate cannot be the cause for a lowered rating. As a safeguard to this provision, districts are subject to identification and intervention by Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) for dropout rates and leaver reporting. Additionally, campuses that avoid being rated *Academically Unacceptable* due to this provision will be subject to technical assistance team (TAT) intervention requirements in the 2007-08 school year.
- *Cumulative Attendance.* A cumulative count of students is used in the denominator. This method for calculating the dropout rate neutralizes the effects of mobility by including in the denominator every student ever reported in attendance at the campus or district throughout the school year, regardless of length of stay.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 2.49% is rounded to 2.5%, and 0.25% is rounded to 0.3%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.
- *Special Education.* Dropouts served in special education programs are included in this measure.

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*:

Actual Change	Required Improvement
[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*:

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

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*:

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

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*:

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

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.

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.

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.

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	540	56%	100%	755	1,436	53%		3		
X African Amer	739	739	44%	48%	273	673	41%		3		
X Hispanic	390	390	52%	25%	159	327	49%	yes	3		
X White	367	367	80%	24%	288	391	74%		6		
X Econ Disadv	557	557	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.

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 and each student group meeting minimum size: • 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 (Met ARD Expectations) OR meets Required Improvement	Meets 70% standard (Met ARD Expectations) OR meets 65% floor and Required Improvement	Meets 90% standard (Met ARD Expectations)
Completion Rate I (class of 2006) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students and each student group meeting minimum size: • 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 and each student group meeting minimum size: • 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 detailed explanation.)	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.	

Chapter 5 – Gold Performance Acknowledgments

The Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) system acknowledges districts and campuses for high performance on indicators other than those used to determine accountability ratings. These indicators are in statute (*Texas Education Code*) or determined by the Commissioner of Education. Acknowledgment is given for high performance on:

- Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion
- Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate Results
- Attendance Rate
- Commended Performance: Reading/English Language Arts
- Commended Performance: Mathematics
- Commended Performance: Writing
- Commended Performance: Science
- Commended Performance: Social Studies
- Comparable Improvement: Reading/English Language Arts
- Comparable Improvement: Mathematics
- Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program
- SAT/ACT Results (College Admissions Tests)
- Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: English Language Arts
- Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: Mathematics

Acknowledgment Categories

Acknowledged. The campus or district is rated *Academically Acceptable* or higher, has results to be evaluated, and has met the acknowledgment criteria on one or more of the indicators. Acknowledgments are awarded separately on each of the 14 indicators.

Does Not Qualify. Either of the following:

- The campus or district has performance results to be evaluated but did not meet the acknowledgment criteria.
- The campus or district has performance results to be evaluated but is rated *Academically Unacceptable*. (Those that are later granted a higher rating on appeal are eligible to be evaluated and may earn acknowledgments.)

Not Applicable. Any of the following:

- The campus or district does not have results to be evaluated for the acknowledgment.
- The campus or charter is evaluated under alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures.
- The campus or district is labeled *Not Rated: Other* (for example, campuses that only serve students in Pre-K/K, or campuses not rated due to insufficient data).
- The campus or district is labeled *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*.
- The campus is paired. Campuses are not awarded acknowledgments for indicators that use paired data. Paired campuses may be acknowledged on their non-paired indicators.

Table 8: Gold Performance Acknowledgment Standards for 2007

Indicator	Description	Standard (changes for 2007 in bold)	Year of Data
Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion	Percent of 9 th –12 th graders completing and receiving credit for at least one Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course	25.0% or more**	2005-06
AP / IB Results	Percent of 11 th and 12 th graders taking at least one AP or IB examination <i>AND</i>	15.0% or more <i>AND</i>	2005-06
	Percent of 11 th and 12 th grade examinees scoring at or above the criterion on at least one examination (3 and above for AP; 4 and above for IB)	50.0% or more*	
Attendance Rate	Attendance Rate for students in grades 1-12, the total number of days present divided by the total number of days in membership	District: 96.0%** Multi-Level: 96.0%** High School: 95.0%** Middle/Jr High: 96.0%** Elementary: 97.0%**	2005-06
Commended Performance: Reading/ELA	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard (scale score of 2400 with a 2 or higher on the essay)	25% or more**	Spring 2007
Commended Performance: Mathematics	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard (scale score of 2400)	25% or more**	Spring 2007
Commended Performance: Writing	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard (scale score of 2400 with a 3 or higher on the essay)	25% or more**	Spring 2007
Commended Performance: Science	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard (scale score of 2400)	25% or more**	Spring 2007
Commended Performance: Social Studies	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard (scale score of 2400)	25% or more**	Spring 2007
Comparable Improvement: Reading/ELA	Average Texas Growth Index (TGI) in TAKS Reading/ELA	Top Quartile (top 25%)***	Spring 2007
Comparable Improvement: Mathematics	Average Texas Growth Index (TGI) in TAKS Mathematics	Top Quartile (top 25%)***	Spring 2007
Recommended High School Program/DAP	Percent of graduates meeting or exceeding requirements for the RHSP/Distinguished Achievement Program	80.0% or more**	Class of 2006
SAT/ACT Results	Percent of graduates taking either the SAT or ACT <i>AND</i>	At least 70.0% of graduates <i>AND</i>	Class of 2006
	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the criterion score (SAT 1110; ACT Composite 24)	40.0% or more at or above criterion*	
TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component: English Language Arts	Percent of grade 11 examinees with a scale score of 2200 or more and a score of 3 or higher on the essay	50% or more**	Spring 2007
TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component: Mathematics	Percent of grade 11 examinees with a scale score of 2200 or more	50% or more**	Spring 2007

* Indicator evaluates performance for All Students & the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, and White. Economically Disadvantaged status is not available from the testing results.

** Indicator evaluates performance for All Students & the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

*** Acknowledgment for Comparable Improvement is available to campuses only. It is evaluated for All Students only.

Acknowledgment Indicators

ADVANCED COURSE/DUAL ENROLLMENT COMPLETION

This indicator is based on a count of students who complete and receive credit for at least one advanced course in grades 9-12. Advanced courses include dual enrollment courses. Dual enrollment courses are those for which a student gets both high school and college credit. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for a link to a list of advanced courses.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses with grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12 that have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, at least 25.0% of the 2005-06 students in grades 9 through 12 must receive credit for at least one advanced course.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of students in grades 9 through 12 who received credit for at least one advanced course}}{\text{number of students in grades 9 through 12 who completed at least one course}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of students. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 students in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2005-06

Data Source: PEIMS submission 3 (June 2006)

Other information:

- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 24.879% is rounded to 24.9%, not 25.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

ADVANCED PLACEMENT/INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE RESULTS

This refers to the results of the College Board Advanced Placement (AP) examinations and the International Baccalaureate (IB) examinations taken by Texas public school students in a given school year. High school students may take these examinations, ideally upon completion of AP or IB courses, and may receive advanced placement or credit, or both, upon entering college. Generally, colleges will award credit or advanced placement for scores of 3, 4, or 5 on AP examinations and scores of 4, 5, 6, or 7 on IB examinations. Requirements vary by college and by subject tested.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses with grades 11 and/or 12 that have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must meet both a participation and a performance standard. It must:

- have 15.0% or more of its non-special education 11th and 12th graders taking at least one AP or IB examination; *and* of those tested,
- have 50.0 % or more scoring at or above the criterion score on at least one examination.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, and White.

Methodology:

Participation:

$$\frac{\text{number of 11th and 12th graders taking at least one AP or IB examination}}{\text{total non-special education students enrolled in 11th and 12th grades}}$$

and

Performance:

$$\frac{\text{number of 11th and 12th graders with at least one score at or above the criterion score}}{\text{number of 11th and 12th graders with at least one AP or IB examination}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers or number of non-special education students enrolled in the 11th and 12th grades. To be included in the evaluation for GPA, a student group must have:

- in the numerator of the participation measure: at least 10 test takers; and,
- in the denominator of the participation measure: at least 30 non-special education 11th and 12th graders;
 - if there are 30 to 49 students and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated; or
 - if the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2005-06 school year

Data Source: The College Board; The International Baccalaureate Organization; and PEIMS submission 1 (October 2005)

Other information:

- *Criterion Score.* The criterion score is 3 or above on Advanced Placement tests and 4 or above on International Baccalaureate examinations.
- *Special Education.* For *participation*, special education 11th and 12th graders who take an AP or IB examination are included in the numerator, but not the denominator. This may have a slight positive effect on the percent reported.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 49.9%, not 50.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

ATTENDANCE RATE

Attendance rates are based on student attendance for the entire school year for students in grades 1-12.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses whose grade span is within grades 1-12 and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: (Variable)

- District/Multi-Level campuses.... At least 96.0%
- Middle School/Junior High At least 96.0%
- High School At least 95.0%
- Elementary At least 97.0%

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were present in 2005-06}}{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were in membership in 2005-06}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: For attendance, the minimum size is based on total days in membership rather than individual student counts. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 5,400 total days in membership (30 students x 180 school days) for the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 5,400 to 8,999 total days in membership and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students total days in membership, it is evaluated.
- If there are at least 9,000 total days in membership (50 students x 180 school days) for the student group, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2005-06

Data Source: PEIMS submission 3 (June 2006)

Other information:

- *Campus Type.* The campus type (elementary, high school, etc.) is assigned using the low and high grades taught as determined from the 2006-07 PEIMS submission 1 enrollment records. Multi-level campuses are those that provide instruction in both the elementary and secondary grade level categories. Examples are K-12, K-8, and 6-12 campuses.
- *Time Span.* Attendance for the entire school year is used.
- *Special Education.* This measure includes both non-special education and special education students.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 95.877% is rounded to 95.9%, not 96.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: READING/ELA

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set by the State Board of Education on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS reading (grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, & 9) or English language arts (grades 10 & 11) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 25% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of test takers achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on reading or ELA}}{\text{total number of test takers in reading or ELA}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2006-07

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other information:

- *Scale Score.* For reading, Commended Performance is a scale score of 2400 or more. For ELA, a scale score of 2400 or more with a score of 2 or higher on the essay is required to be Commended.
- *Student Success Initiative.* Students who meet the Commended Performance standard in either the February or April administrations of TAKS reading are included.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on *Commended Performance*.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.

- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: MATHEMATICS

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set by the State Board of Education on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS mathematics (grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, & 11) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 25% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on mathematics}}{\text{total number of examinees in mathematics}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2006-07

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other information:

- *Scale Score.* Commended Performance is a scale score of 2400 or more on the TAKS.
- *Student Success Initiative.* Students who meet the Commended Performance standard in either the April or May administrations of TAKS mathematics are included.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on *Commended Performance*.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.

- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: WRITING

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set by the State Board of Education on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS writing (grades 4 & 7) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 25% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on writing}}{\text{total number of examinees in writing}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2006-07

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other information:

- *Scale Score.* Commended Performance is a scale score of 2400 or more with a score of 3 or higher on the essay.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on *Commended Performance*.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.

- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: SCIENCE

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set by the State Board of Education on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS science (grades 5, 10, & 11) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher. Because grade 8 TAKS science is not part of the accountability system in 2007, the grade 8 science results are not included in the GPA commended indicator for science.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 25% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on science}}{\text{total number of examinees in science}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2006-07

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other information:

- *Scale Score.* Commended Performance is a scale score of 2400 or more on the TAKS.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on *Commended Performance*.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.

- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: SOCIAL STUDIES

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set by the State Board of Education on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS social studies (grades 8, 10, & 11) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 25% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on social studies}}{\text{total number of examinees in social studies}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2006-07

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other information:

- *Scale Score.* Commended Performance is a scale score of 2400 or more on the TAKS.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on *Commended Performance*.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.

- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

COMPARABLE IMPROVEMENT: READING/ELA

Comparable Improvement (CI) is a measure that calculates how student performance on the TAKS test has changed (or grown) from one year to the next, and compares the change to that of the 40 schools that are demographically most similar to the target school.

Who is eligible: Campuses that test students on TAKS reading or English language arts in grades 4 - 11 and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher. Districts are not eligible because CI is not calculated at the district level.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus must have an average Texas Growth Index (TGI) within the top quartile (the top 25%) of their 40-member campus comparison group for reading/ELA.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students only.

Methodology: First, determine the campus's average Texas Growth Index:

$$\frac{\text{sum of matched student TGI values for reading/ELA}}{\text{total number of matched students in reading/ELA}}$$

Then, determine which quartile the campus is in within its 40-member campus comparison group. See *Appendix E – Texas Growth Index* and *Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group* for a complete explanation of the methodology for this measure.

Minimum Size Requirements: Students must be matched to the spring 2006 TAKS administration—anywhere in the state—to find their prior year scale score for reading or ELA. Any campus with fewer than 10 matched students for a subject will not be assigned a quartile position.

Year of Data: 2007 and 2006 (Spring TAKS Administrations)

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other information:

- *Grade 3.* Growth is not calculated for third grade test takers since that is their first TAKS test. For this reason, campuses with a high grade of 3 are not eligible for acknowledgment on CI.
- *Student Success Initiative.*
 - For grade 5 students who take TAKS reading in both February and April, the performance used is the score they achieved in the February administration. That student will be matched to their single grade 4 administration from 2006 to determine their TGI.
 - For grade 4 students who—as third graders in 2006—took TAKS reading in both February and April 2006, the TGI is determined by matching the score they achieved on their single grade 4 administration from 2007 to the score they achieved on their February administration in 2006.

- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on CI.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All TGI calculations are rounded to two decimal points. For example, 1.877 is rounded to 1.88, not 2. Demographic values for the 40 members of the comparison group are rounded to one decimal point. For example, 69.877% is rounded to 69.9%. Average scale scores are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 2243.44 is rounded to 2243.

COMPARABLE IMPROVEMENT: MATHEMATICS

Comparable Improvement (CI) is a measure that calculates how student performance on the TAKS test has changed (or grown) from one year to the next, and compares the change to that of the 40 schools that are demographically most similar to the target school.

Who is eligible: Campuses that test students on TAKS mathematics in grades 4 – 11 and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher. Districts are not eligible because CI is not calculated at the district level.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus must have an average Texas Growth Index (TGI) within the top quartile (the top 25%) of their 40-member campus comparison group for mathematics.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students only.

Methodology: First, determine the campus’s average Texas Growth Index:

$$\frac{\text{sum of matched student TGI values for mathematics}}{\text{total number of matched students in mathematics}}$$

Then determine which quartile the campus is in within its 40-member campus comparison group. See *Appendix E – Texas Growth Index* and *Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group* for a complete explanation of the methodology for this measure.

Minimum Size Requirements: Students must be matched to the spring 2006 TAKS administration—anywhere in the state—to find their prior year scale score for mathematics. Any campus with fewer than 10 matched students for a subject will not be assigned a quartile position.

Year of Data: 2007 and 2006 (Spring TAKS Administrations)

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other information:

- *Grade 3.* Growth is not calculated for third grade test takers since that is their first TAKS test. For this reason, campuses with a high grade of 3 are not eligible for acknowledgment on CI.
- *Student Success Initiative.* For grade 5 students who take TAKS mathematics in both April and May, the performance used is the score they achieved in the April administration. That student will be matched to their single grade 4 administration from 2006 to determine their TGI.

- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on CI.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All TGI calculations are rounded to two decimal points. For example, 1.877 is rounded to 1.88, not 2. Demographic values for the 40 members of the comparison group are rounded to one decimal point. For example, 69.877% is rounded to 69.9%. Average scale scores are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 2243.44 is rounded to 2243.

RECOMMENDED HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM/DAP

This indicator shows the percent of graduates who were reported as having satisfied the course requirements for the Texas State Board of Education Recommended High School Program or Distinguished Achievement Program.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that have graduates and that are rated *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, 80.0% of all 2006 graduates reported must meet or exceed the requirements for the Recommended High School Program or Distinguished Achievement Program.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of graduates reported with graduation codes for Recommended High School Program or Distinguished Achievement Program}}{\text{number of graduates}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of graduates. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 graduates in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 graduates within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: Class of 2006

Data Source: PEIMS submission 1 (October 2006)

Other information:

- *Special Education.* This measure includes both non-special education and special education graduates.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 79.877% is rounded to 79.9%, not 80.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

SAT/ACT RESULTS

This indicator shows the performance and participation on two college admissions tests: the College Board's SAT Reasoning Test and ACT, Inc.'s ACT Assessment.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that have graduates and that are rated *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must meet both a participation and a performance standard. It must:

- have 70.0% or more of the class of 2006 non-special education graduates taking either the ACT or the SAT; *and* of those examinees
- have 40.0% or more scoring at or above the criterion score on at least one examination.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, and White.

Methodology:

Participation:

$$\frac{\text{number of graduates taking either the SAT or the ACT}}{\text{total non-special education graduates}}$$

and

Performance:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees at or above the criterion score}}{\text{number of graduates taking either the SAT or the ACT}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers or graduates. To be included in the evaluation for GPA, a student group must have:

- in the numerator of the participation measure: at least 10 test takers; and,
- in the denominator of the participation measure: at least 30 non-special education graduates;
 - if there are 30 to 49 students and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated; or
 - if the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: Class of 2006

Data Source: The College Board (SAT) and ACT, Inc. (ACT)

Other information:

- *SAT Reasoning Test.* This is the first year the new SAT will be used in determining GPA. It differs somewhat from the former SAT, although scores are still comparable between the two tests. The new test includes a writing assessment, but performance on writing is not used for determining GPA. The writing component may be incorporated into this GPA indicator in the future.

- *Criterion.* The criterion score is 1110 on the SAT (the sum of the critical reading and mathematics scores) or 24 on the ACT (composite).
- *Most Recent Test.* Both testing companies annually provide the agency with information on the most recent test participation and performance of graduating seniors from all Texas public schools. Only one record is sent per student. If a student takes an ACT or SAT test more than once, the agency receives the record for the most recent examination taken, not necessarily the examination with the highest score.
- *Both Tests Taken.* If a student takes both the SAT and the ACT, the information is combined so that an unduplicated count of students is used. If the student scored above the criterion on either the SAT or ACT, that student is counted as having scored above the criterion.
- *Campus ID.* The student taking the test identifies the campus to which a score is attributed.
- *Special Education.* For *participation* special education graduates who take the ACT or SAT are included in the numerator, but not the denominator. This may have a slight positive effect on the percent reported.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 69.877% is rounded to 69.9%, not 70.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

TEXAS SUCCESS INITIATIVE (TSI) – HIGHER EDUCATION READINESS COMPONENT: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS (ELA)

This indicator shows the percent of grade 11 students who are considered ready to begin college-level work, based on their performance on the TAKS exit-level examination.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test grade 11 students on the exit-level TAKS English language arts and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator the campus or district must have 50% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the TSI standard. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board set the standard of college readiness on the exit-level TAKS at a scale score of 2200 for ELA and a score of 3 or higher on the essay.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of grade 11 test takers with a scale score of 2200} \\ \text{and a score of 3 or higher on the essay of the ELA test}}{\text{total number of grade 11 students taking ELA}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.

- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2006-07

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other information:

- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on TSI.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

**TEXAS SUCCESS INITIATIVE (TSI) – HIGHER EDUCATION READINESS
COMPONENT: MATHEMATICS**

This indicator shows the percent of grade 11 students who are considered ready to begin college-level work, based on their performance on the TAKS exit-level examination.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test grade 11 students on the exit-level TAKS mathematics and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator the campus or district must have 50% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the TSI standard. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board set the standard of college readiness on the exit-level TAKS at a scale score of 2200 for mathematics.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of test takers with a scale score of 2200 on mathematics}}{\text{total number of grade 11 test takers in mathematics}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.

- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2006-07

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other information:

- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 27, 2006 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on TSI.
- *Special Education.* Performance of special education students who took the TAKS is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

NOTIFICATION OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Notification of Gold Performance Acknowledgment will occur in late October 2007 at the same time as the 2007 ratings update that follows the resolution of all appeals. (See *Chapter 18 – Calendar* for more details.) At that time, the district lists and data tables on the TEA website will be updated to show the acknowledgments earned.

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 3rd 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 12th 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	
Residential Treatment Centers (RTCs)	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)
Detention Centers and Correctional Facilities	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)
Students Confined to TYC Facilities	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)
JJAEPs	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)
DAEPs	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.

**The 2007 Accountability Rating System
for Texas Public Schools and School Districts**

Part 2

**Alternative Education
Accountability (AEA)
Procedures**

In Part 2:

Chapter 7 – Overview of
AEA..... 71

Chapter 8 – AEA
Registration Criteria and
Requirements 75

Chapter 9 – Attribution of
AEC Data..... 79

Chapter 10 – AEA Base
Indicators 81

Chapter 11 – Additional
Features of AEA..... 91

Chapter 12 – AEA
Ratings..... 97

Chapter 13 – AEA Glossary
and Index 109

Chapter 7 - Overview of AEA

ABOUT PART 2 OF THIS *MANUAL*

Part 2 of this *Manual* is a technical resource to explain the criteria and procedures applied by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) in evaluating the performance of alternative education campuses (AECs) including charters and charter campuses that:

- are dedicated to serving students at risk of dropping out of school;
- are eligible to receive an alternative education accountability (AEA) rating; and
- register annually for evaluation under AEA procedures.

Registered AECs and charters rated under AEA procedures are subject to all the terms and provisions of this *Manual*.

EDUCATOR INPUT

While it was the role of the Commissioner of Education to develop AEA procedures, the commissioner relied extensively on the detailed review, study, and advice of educators and other education stakeholders. The resulting procedures contain appropriate indicators for AECs and charters with increased rigor phased in over time.

HISTORY OF AEA

Enacted by the Texas legislature in 1993, accountability legislation mandated the creation of an accountability system for all Texas schools. This accountability system integrated the statewide curriculum; the state criterion-referenced assessment system; district and campus accountability; district and campus recognition for high performance and significant increases in performance; sanctions for poor performance; and school, district, and state reports.

A set of alternative performance measures for campuses serving at-risk students was developed in late 1994 and implemented in the 1995-96 school year. In order for a campus to qualify as alternative, it was required to serve one or more of the following student populations: students at risk of dropping out; recovered dropouts; pregnant or parenting students; adjudicated students; students with severe discipline problems; or expelled students.

For the 1995-96 school year, alternative accountability ratings were based on state-approved district proposals that included student performance indicators, current-year data, and comparisons of pre- and post-assessment results. Following a review of campus data by the local board of trustees, each district made an initial determination of the campus rating. This initial determination was then forwarded to the TEA where it was reviewed by a panel of peer reviewers who sent a recommendation to the commissioner.

From the 1995-96 to 2001-02 school years, revisions were made to the ratings criteria and procedures determined by an *ad hoc* Alternative Education Advisory Committee:

- Minimum performance levels for an *Acceptable* rating were established in 1996-97.
- Beginning in 1996-97, school districts were required to select campus-based performance indicators from a menu of state-established indicators.
- In 1997-98, TEA staff assumed responsibility for the review and analysis of campus performance data.
- In 1999-00, TEA required that the rating for each AEC be determined on three base indicators: Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) passing rates for reading and mathematics, dropout rates, and attendance rates.
- In 1999-00, disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs) and juvenile justice alternative education programs (JJAEPs) were no longer permitted to register for AEA. Instead, the performance of students served in these programs was attributed to the campuses where these students would otherwise have attended.
- In 2000-01, campuses were required to serve “students at risk of dropping out of school” as defined in Texas Education Code (TEC) §29.081 in order to be eligible to receive an accountability rating under AEA procedures.

House Bill 6, enacted by the 77th Texas Legislature, called for a pilot program to examine issues surrounding accountability of alternative education programs. The purposes of this pilot were to analyze the existing status of AECs and to make recommendations regarding the methods of evaluating the performance of these campuses. In order to achieve these purposes, the following activities were undertaken in 2002:

- a set of surveys for principals, teachers/counselors, parents, and students at AECs was administered;
- a more detailed survey was administered and follow-up telephone calls were made to a small sample of AECs;
- an analysis of existing Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data was undertaken; and
- individual student data from a small sample of AECs were compiled and analyzed.

Results of the pilot program are published in the *Report on the Alternative Education Accountability Pilot* (Texas Education Agency, December 1, 2002).

While these pilot activities were conducted, the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), Public Law 107-110, was signed into law. This federal legislation was considered as part of the pilot project report. Accountability provisions of NCLB require that all campuses, including AECs, be evaluated annually for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

The 2003 Educator Focus Group on Accountability made a recommendation to develop new AEA procedures for 2005 and beyond. The new AEA procedures are based on the following guidelines:

- The AEA indicators are based on data submitted through standard data submission processes such as PEIMS or by the state testing contractor.
- The AEA measures are appropriate for alternative education programs offered on AECs rather than just setting lower standards on the same measures used in the standard accountability procedures. Furthermore, these measures ensure that all students demonstrate proficiency on the state assessments in order to graduate.
- The Texas Growth Index (TGI) and other improvement indicators are evaluated as base indicators for AEC ratings.
- Additional AEA criteria are included. For example, AECs must have a minimum percentage of at-risk students (based on PEIMS data reported on current-year fall enrollment records) to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

Also, in 2003, ratings for all campuses were suspended for one year while the new Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) assessments were implemented for the first time and the new state accountability system was developed. In 2004, registered AECs received a rating of *Not Rated: Alternative Education* while new AEA procedures were developed.

In 2005, registered AECs were evaluated for the first time under the newly developed, redesigned AEA procedures.

PHILOSOPHY OF AEA

AEA procedures are based on the following principles:

- Procedures apply to AECs, not programs.
- Procedures apply to AECs and charters dedicated to serving students at risk of dropping out of school.
- Procedures apply only to those AECs that qualify and register for evaluation under AEA procedures.
- Procedures do not apply to DAEPs or JJAEPs. Statute or interpretation of statutory intent requires that DAEP and JJAEP data are attributed to the student's home campus.
- Procedures do not apply to standard campuses, even if the campus primarily serves at-risk students.

The following issues affect many components of the accountability system.

- Small numbers of test results and mobility – AECs are smaller on average than standard campuses and have high mobility rates.
- Attribution of data – High mobility also affects attribution of data and complicates evaluation of AEC data.

- Residential Facilities – Education services are provided to students in residential programs and facilities operated under contract with the Texas Youth Commission (TYC), students in detention centers and correctional facilities that are registered with the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC), and students in private residential treatment centers.

OVERALL DESIGN OF AEA PROCEDURES

The overall design of the AEA procedures is an improvement model. In 2005 and beyond, AECs and charters can meet either an absolute performance standard or an improvement standard for each accountability measure.

The AEA procedures include these major components:

- Rating labels – *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*, and *AEA: Not Rated – Other*;
- AEC registration criteria and requirements including an at-risk registration criterion;
- Base Indicators – TAKS Progress, State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II), Completion Rate II, and Annual Dropout Rate; and
- Additional Features – Required Improvement and use of district at-risk data.

Chapter 8 - AEA Registration Criteria and Requirements

Registration criteria restrict use of alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures to:

- campuses that offer nontraditional programs rather than programs within a standard campus,
- campuses that meet the at-risk registration criterion,
- charters that operate only alternative education campuses (AECs), and
- charters that meet the AEC enrollment criterion.

Alternative Education Campuses (AECs)

AECs including charter AECs must serve students “at risk of dropping out of school” as defined in Texas Education Code (TEC) §29.081(d) and provide accelerated instructional services to these students. Each AEC registered for evaluation under AEA procedures is designated as an AEC of Choice or Residential Facility.

AEC of Choice. At-risk students enroll at AECs of Choice to expedite progress toward performing at grade level and high school completion.

Residential Facility. Education services are provided to students in residential programs and facilities operated under contract with the Texas Youth Commission (TYC), students in detention centers and correctional facilities that are registered with the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC), and students in private residential treatment centers.

In this *Manual* the terms “AEC” and “registered AEC” refer collectively to AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that are registered for evaluation under AEA procedures and meet the at-risk registration criterion.

AEC ELIGIBILITY

AECs have the option to be rated under AEA procedures and indicators. Campuses that choose not to register are evaluated under standard accountability procedures. The performance results of students at registered AECs are included in the district’s performance and used in determining the district’s accountability rating and for acknowledgments under the standard accountability procedures.

The following types of campuses have the option to register for evaluation under AEA procedures:

- AEC of Choice and
- Residential Facility.

The following types of campuses are ineligible for evaluation under AEA procedures. Data for these campuses are attributed to the home campus:

- disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs);
- juvenile justice alternative education programs (JJAEPs); and

- stand-alone General Educational Development (GED) programs.

See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information on DAEPs and JJAEPs.

AEA CAMPUS REGISTRATION PROCESS

AECs rated under 2006 AEA procedures were re-registered automatically in 2007. A rescission letter was required from AECs not wishing to remain registered for AEA. A *2006-07 AEA Campus Registration Form* was required for each AEC not already on the list of registered AECs that wished to be evaluated under 2006-07 AEA procedures. AECs for which 2006 AEA registration was rescinded due to not meeting the at-risk registration criterion were required to submit a *2006-07 AEA Campus Registration Form* if the AEC wished to request AEA campus registration in 2007. The 2007 registration process occurred September 11–22, 2006. The list of registered AECs is available on the AEA website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/aea>.

AEA REGISTRATION CRITERIA

Ten criteria are required for campuses to be registered for AEA. However, the requirements in criteria (6)-(10) may not apply to charter campuses (depending on the terms of the charter) or for community-based dropout recovery campuses established in accordance with TEC §29.081(e). The requirements in criterion (9) apply to Residential Facilities only if students are placed in the facility by the district.

- (1) The AEC must have its own county-district-campus (CDC) number to which Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data are submitted and test answer documents are coded. A program operated within or supported by another campus does not qualify.
- (2) The AEC must be identified in AskTED (Texas School Directory database) as an alternative campus.
- (3) The AEC must be dedicated to serving “students at risk of dropping out of school” as defined in TEC §29.081(d).
- (4) The AEC must operate on its own campus budget.
- (5) The AEC must offer nontraditional settings and methods of instructional delivery designed to meet the needs of the students served on the AEC.
- (6) The AEC must have an appropriately certified, full-time administrator whose primary duty is the administration of the AEC.
- (7) The AEC must have appropriately certified teachers assigned in all areas including special education, bilingual education, and/or English as a second language (ESL) to serve students eligible for such services.
- (8) The AEC must provide each student the opportunity to attend a 7-hour school day as defined in TEC §25.082(a), according to the needs of each student.
- (9) If the campus serves students with disabilities, the students must be placed at the AEC by their Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committee.

- (10) Students with disabilities must receive all services outlined in their current individualized education programs (IEPs). Limited English proficient (LEP) students must receive all services outlined by the language proficiency assessment committee (LPAC). Students with disabilities and LEP students must be served by appropriately certified teachers.

AT-RISK REGISTRATION CRITERION

Beginning in 2006, an at-risk registration criterion was implemented under AEA procedures. Each registered AEC must have a minimum percentage of at-risk students enrolled on the AEC verified through current-year PEIMS fall enrollment data in order to remain registered and be evaluated under AEA procedures. The at-risk criterion began at 65% in 2006 and will increase by five percentage points annually until it reaches 75% in 2008, where it is expected to remain.

- 2007 – 70% or higher at-risk student enrollment at the registered AEC
- 2008 – 75% or higher at-risk student enrollment at the registered AEC

An at-risk registration criterion accomplishes two goals. It restricts use of AEA procedures to AECs that serve large populations of at-risk students and enhances at-risk data quality.

The following safeguards are incorporated for AECs not meeting the at-risk registration criterion. The Prior-Year PEIMS At-Risk Data and New Campus safeguards are permanent and apply in 2006 and beyond.

Prior-Year PEIMS At-Risk Data Safeguard. If a registered AEC does not meet the at-risk criterion in the current year, then it remains under AEA if the AEC meets the at-risk criterion in the prior year. For example, an AEC with an at-risk enrollment below 70% in 2007 and at least 70% in 2006 remains registered in 2007.

New Campus Safeguard. If a new campus is registered for evaluation under AEA procedures, then the AEC is not required to meet the at-risk criterion in its first year of operation. This safeguard provides an accommodation for new campuses with no prior-year data.

Due to timing between AEC registration, PEIMS fall enrollment submission, and PEIMS fall data availability in the spring, the at-risk registration criterion cannot be applied until early April. The 2007 AEA campus registration is rescinded for AECs not meeting the at-risk registration criterion or utilizing the safeguards. As a result, the AEC does not qualify for evaluation under AEA procedures and will receive a 2007 rating under standard accountability procedures. The AECs that shifted from AEA to standard accountability received a letter from TEA in April to notify them that the AEC would be evaluated under the standard accountability procedures.

The final list of 2007 registered AECs was posted on the AEA website in May 2007. Additionally, an email was sent to all superintendents when the list was available.

The at-risk registration criterion will be evaluated annually to determine whether adjustments are necessary.

Charters

In this publication the term “charter” refers to the charter operator, not an individual charter campus. The terms “charter campus” and “charter AEC” refer to an individual campus.

CHARTERS EVALUATED UNDER AEA PROCEDURES

Under AEA and standard accountability procedures, charter ratings are based on aggregate performance of the campuses operated by the charter. Performance results of all students in the charter are included in the charter’s performance and used in determining the charter’s rating.

Charters receiving ratings under AEA procedures are evaluated on the same indicators as registered AECs:

- performance on the *Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)*,
- performance on the *State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II)*,
- *Completion Rate II*, and
- *Annual Dropout Rate* for grades 7–12.

Charters that operate only registered AECs. Charters that operate only registered AECs will be evaluated under AEA procedures. Charters that operate only registered Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.

Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs. Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs have the option to be evaluated under AEA procedures if the AEC enrollment criterion described below is met. TEA will contact each charter to obtain their preference. If a preference cannot be obtained, then the charter will be evaluated under standard accountability procedures.

Charters that operate only standard campuses. Charters that operate only standard campuses, either because the campuses choose not to register for evaluation under AEA or the campuses do not meet the at-risk registration criterion, will be evaluated under standard accountability procedures.

AEC ENROLLMENT CRITERION FOR CHARTERS

In order for a charter that operates both standard campuses and registered AECs to be eligible for evaluation under AEA procedures, the charter must meet the AEC enrollment criterion. At least 50% of the charter’s students must be enrolled at registered AECs. AEC enrollment is verified through current-year PEIMS fall enrollment data.

Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs will be evaluated under standard accountability procedures if fewer than 50% of the charter’s students are enrolled at registered AECs. Charters that operate only standard campuses will be evaluated under standard accountability procedures.

Chapter 9 - Attribution of AEC Data

BACKGROUND

From 1999-00 to 2004-05, student data (attendance, completion/dropout, and performance) were attributed to alternative education campuses (AECs) registered for evaluation under alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures only when the student attended the registered AEC for 85 days or more. Under the previous AEA procedures, the AEC accountability rating was based on performance of students enrolled on the campus for 85 days or more. The 85-day rule was implemented before the campus accountability subset was incorporated in the state accountability system.

In 2004, the campus accountability subset was applied for the first time in the state accountability system. Under the campus accountability subset, only test results for students enrolled on the same campus on the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date are included in the campus performance measure.

In 2005, both the campus accountability subset and the 85-day rule were applied. AECs evaluated under AEA procedures were accountable for test results for students enrolled on the AEC on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date and on the testing date if the student had been enrolled on the AEC for 85 days or more. Campus accountability subset does not apply to exit-level retests. 2003-04 leaver data were attributed to the AEC if the student had been enrolled on the AEC for 85 days or more and the AEC was registered for evaluation under AEA procedures in 2004.

For data collected through PEIMS, attribution of attendance and leaver records to the home campus was automated for most students based on attendance data reported for the student. A CAMPUS-ID-OF-ACCOUNTABILITY data element was required when a student's only campus of enrollment was a registered AEC that the student attended for less than 85 days, and/or a disciplinary alternative education program (DAEP), and/or a juvenile justice alternative education program (JJAEP). For assessment data, the test answer document was physically submitted with the answer documents for the student's home campus.

Student data and test documents were only reattributed within the same school district. For this reason, charter campus data were not reattributed. For students who had not attended a standard campus in the district, local policy determined to which campus the short-term AEC student data were attributed.

A comparison of 2003-04 attendance reattribution and test answer documents indicated that reattribution was not always conducted consistently for PEIMS data (an automated process conducted by the state) and test results (a local process). Often, test answer documents for students enrolled on the AEC for fewer than 85 days were not sent back to the student's home campus.

In 2006, the campus accountability subset determined attribution of AEC test data. 2004-05 leaver data were attributed according to the 85-day rule for AECs that were registered for evaluation under AEA procedures in 2005. 2004-05 leaver data were attributed to the last campus of attendance for AECs that were not registered for evaluation under AEA procedures in 2005, but were registered in 2006.

ATTRIBUTION OF DATA

AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities. Campus accountability subset determines attribution of AEC test data. Only test results for students enrolled on the same campus on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date are included in the campus performance measure. Accountability subset does not apply to exit-level retests. School leaver data are attributed to the campus that the student last attended. The 85-day rule is phased out completely for accountability in 2007 and beyond.

DAEPs and JJAEPs. As required in statute, DAEP and JJAEP student data are attributed to the student's home campus.

Chapter 10 - AEA Base Indicators

To determine ratings, the alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures use four base indicators:

- performance on the *Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)*,
- performance on the *State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II)*,
- *Completion Rate II* for the Class of 2006, and
- *2005-06 Annual Dropout Rate* for grades 7–12.

TAKS PROGRESS INDICATOR

A single performance indicator is evaluated for TAKS. The TAKS Progress indicator sums performance results across grades (3-12) and across subjects to determine alternative education campus (AEC) and charter ratings under AEA procedures. This indicator is not based on the number of students tested but on the number of tests taken. Students who take multiple TAKS tests are included multiple times (for every TAKS test taken). Students who take multiple TAKS exit-level retests are included only when the passing standard is met.

The TAKS Progress indicator numerator is calculated as the number of tests meeting the student passing standard **or** having a Texas Growth Index (TGI) score that meets the student growth standard of 0 (zero) or higher **and** TAKS exit-level retests meeting the student passing standard at the February and April administrations or in the previous October or July. The denominator is the number of TAKS tests taken **and** the number of TAKS exit-level retests meeting the student passing standard at the February and April administrations or in the previous October or July.

The TAKS Progress indicator includes the following results:

- TAKS grades 3-11 Spring 2007 primary administration:
 - Panel Recommendation student passing standard
 - TGI: 2006 to 2007, growth of 0 (zero) or higher
 - Campus accountability subset
- TAKS grade 12 April 2007, February 2007, October 2006, and July 2006 administrations:
 - Actual student passing standard
 - Tests meeting passing standard
 - No accountability subset
- TAKS grade 11 April 2007, February 2007, October 2006, and July 2006 administrations:
 - Retests only
 - Actual student passing standard
 - Tests meeting passing standard
 - No accountability subset

Who is evaluated for the TAKS Progress Indicator:

- AECs that test students on any TAKS subject.
- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities.
- *Use of District At-Risk Data.* If the AEC does not meet the accountability standard based on results for fewer than 10 tests, or if there are no TAKS results for the AEC, then the AEC is evaluated on the district performance of at-risk students. See *Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA*. If there are results for fewer than 10 at-risk tests in the district, then Special Analysis is conducted. See *Chapter 12 – AEA Ratings*.
- Charters that operate only registered AECs.
- Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

Table 10: TAKS Progress Indicator

	2007	2008	2009	2010
<i>AEA: Academically Acceptable</i>	45%	45%	50%	50%
TAKS Progress Indicator	TAKS + TGI + Exit-Level Retests			
Accountability Subset	District and Campus Accountability Subset; Accountability Subset does not apply to exit-level retests			

Standard:

- *AEA: Academically Acceptable* – At least 45%.
- The TAKS Progress standard will be reviewed annually and is subject to change.

Student Groups: TAKS performance is always evaluated for All Students. The following student groups that meet minimum size requirements are evaluated: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of TAKS tests that meet the standard } \mathbf{or} \text{ have a TGI } \geq 0 \mathbf{ and} \text{ number of TAKS exit-level retests that meet the standard}}{\text{number of TAKS tests taken } \mathbf{and} \text{ number of TAKS exit-level retests that meet the standard}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- *All Students.* All Students performance is always evaluated.
- *Student Groups.* Student groups are evaluated if there are:
 - 30 to 49 tests for the student group and the student group represents at least 10% of All Students tests; *or*
 - at least 50 tests for the student group even if these tests represent less than 10% of All Students tests.

Accountability Subset:

- *Campus Accountability Subset.* AECs are accountable for TAKS results for students enrolled on the AEC on the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date.
- *District Accountability Subset.* Charters are accountable for TAKS results for students enrolled at the charter on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date and on the testing date.
- Accountability subset does not apply to TAKS exit-level results.

Years of Data:

- Spring 2007 grades 3-11 TAKS results (primary administration)
- April 2007, February 2007, October 2006, and July 2006 grade 11 exit-level retest results
- April 2007, February 2007, October 2006, and July 2006 grade 12 exit-level results

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other Information:

- *Grades and Subjects.* The TAKS results for English (grades 3-11) and Spanish (grades 3-6) are summed across grades and subjects and are evaluated for All Students and each student group that meets minimum size requirements. Second administration results of grades 3 and 5 reading and grade 5 mathematics are included.
- *Testing Window.* Results for students given a make-up test within the testing window are included in the accountability measures.
- *Student Passing Standard.* The TAKS Progress indicator is calculated as percent *Met Standard* using the student passing standard adopted by the State Board of Education (SBOE) for the current year. See *Chapter 2 – The Basics: Base Indicators*.
- *Rounding.* The TAKS Progress indicator percent *Met Standard* calculations are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%; 79.4999% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.
- *TGI.* The TGI has been developed for accountability purposes to evaluate individual student growth from one year to the next on the TAKS. The TGI compares how students taking a TAKS subject test in one year perform on the same TAKS subject test in the next higher grade the following year. An individual TGI score indicates the amount of growth for each student in relation to the average growth of all students who performed at the same level in the base year. The TGI score of zero (0) indicates that the year-to-year change in scale score is equal to the average change. The TGI measures growth for a student who passes as well as a student who does not pass the TAKS.

The TGI calculation is limited to students who have test results in the same subject for two consecutive years, in consecutive grades:

Reading/ELA – grades 4–11
Mathematics – grades 4–11
Social Studies – grade 11
Science – grade 11

Detailed TGI information can be found in *Appendix E – Texas Growth Index*.

SDAA II INDICATOR

The SDAA II assesses students with disabilities in grades 3-10 who receive instruction in the state's curriculum but for whom the TAKS test is not an appropriate measure of their academic progress. SDAA II tests are given in the areas of reading, English language arts (ELA), writing, and mathematics. Students are assessed at their appropriate instructional levels, as determined by their Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committees.

The SDAA II is administered on the same schedule as TAKS and designed to measure annual growth based on appropriate expectations for each student, as decided by the student's ARD committee.

A single performance indicator is evaluated for SDAA II. Performance results are summed across grades (3-10) and across subjects. This indicator is not based on the number of students tested but on the number of tests taken. The SDAA II indicator is calculated as the number of *tests* meeting ARD committee expectations divided by the number of SDAA II *tests* for which ARD expectations were established. Students who take multiple SDAA II tests are included multiple times (for every SDAA II test taken).

2007 is the last year the SDAA II will be administered. See *Chapter 17 – Preview of 2008 and Beyond* for information on future alternate assessments for students with disabilities.

Who is evaluated for SDAA II:

- AECs that test students on any SDAA II subject.
- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities.
- Charters that operate only registered AECs.
- Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

Standard: *AEA: Academically Acceptable* – At least 45% of SDAA II tests taken must meet ARD expectations.

Student Groups:

- Performance for the percent *Meeting ARD Expectations* is evaluated for All Students only.
- Student group performance is not evaluated separately.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of SDAA II tests Meeting ARD Expectations}}{\text{number of SDAA II tests taken}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- SDAA II performance is evaluated for AECs and charters with results from 30 or more tests (summed across grades and subjects).
- Special Analysis is not conducted on SDAA II performance.

- Student groups are not evaluated separately.

Accountability Subset:

- *Campus Accountability Subset.* AECs are accountable for SDAA II results for students enrolled on the AEC on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date.
- *District Accountability Subset.* Charters are accountable for SDAA II results for students enrolled at the charter on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date and on the testing date.

Year of Data: Spring 2007 grades 3-10 SDAA II results

Data Source: Pearson Educational Measurement

Other Information:

- *Students Tested in both SDAA II and TAKS.* In some cases, students may take both the SDAA II and TAKS. For example, a grade 6 student may take the TAKS for mathematics, but the SDAA II for reading. In this case, the student’s performance is included in both indicators.
- *TAKS-I.* Beginning in 2006, students served in special education may take the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills Inclusive (TAKS-I) in subjects and grades where the SDAA II is not available. TAKS-I performance is not used in determining the accountability ratings in 2007, but will be shown on the AEIS reports released in the fall.
- *Rounding.* The *Met ARD Expectation* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%; 79.4999% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.

COMPLETION RATE II (GRADES 9-12) INDICATOR

This longitudinal rate shows the percent of students who first attended grade 9 in the 2002-03 school year who graduated, received a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, or who are continuing their education four years later. Known as the 2002-03 cohort, these students’ progress was tracked over the four years using data provided to TEA by districts and charters and data available in the statewide GED database.

Completion Rate II includes graduates, continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year), and GED recipients in the definition of Completion Rate II for AECs of Choice and charters evaluated under AEA procedures.

Beginning with 2007 accountability, the definition of a dropout changes to comply with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition. The transition to the NCES dropout definition also impacts the Completion Rate II indicator. Beginning with 2007 accountability, the dropout component of the Completion Rate denominator changes. In 2007, only one of the four years in the cohort is affected. In 2008, two years of the cohort are affected, and so on, until 2010 when the Completion Rate denominator uses the NCES dropout definition for all four years of the cohort. See *Appendix I – NCES Dropout Definition* for detailed information on the NCES dropout definition.

Who is evaluated for Completion Rate II:

- AECs of Choice that have served students in grades 9, 10, 11, and 12 for the last five years.
- Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.
- If the AEC of Choice does not serve students in any of grades 9-12 in the 2006-07 school year, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II.
- *Use of District At-Risk Rate.* If the AEC of Choice does not meet the accountability standard, does not meet minimum size requirements for All Students, or if the AEC of Choice has students in any of grades 9-12 but does not have a Completion Rate II, then the AEC of Choice is evaluated on Completion Rate II (including GED recipients) of at-risk students in the district. If at-risk students in the district do not meet minimum size requirements for All Students, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II. See *Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA.*
- Charters that operate only registered AECs.
- Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

Table 11: Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12) Indicator

	2007 Class of 2006; 9th grade 02-03	2008 Class of 2007; 9th grade 03-04	2009 Class of 2008; 9th grade 04-05	2010 Class of 2009; 9th grade 05-06
<i>AEA: Academically Acceptable</i>	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%
Completion Rate II	Graduates + Continuing Students + GED Recipients			
Dropout Definition	Phase in NCES definition			NCES definition
Accountability Subset	School Leaver data are attributed to the last campus of attendance			

Standard:

- *AEA: Academically Acceptable* – At least 75.0% Completion Rate II.
- The Completion Rate II standard will be reviewed annually and is subject to change.

Student Groups: Completion Rate II is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups that meet minimum size requirements: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of completers (graduates + continuing students + GED recipients)}}{\text{number of students in class}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- *All Students.* These results are evaluated if there are:
 - at least 5 dropouts (non-completers), **and**
 - at least 10 students in the AEC of Choice or charter Completion Rate II class.

- *Student Groups.* These results are evaluated if there are:
 - at least 5 dropouts (non-completers) within the student group, **and**;
 - 30 to 49 students in the student group and the student group represents at least 10% of All Students in the class; **or**
 - at least 50 students in the group even if they represent less than 10% of All Students in the class.
- Special Analysis is not conducted on Completion Rate II.

Accountability Subset:

- Completion data are attributed to the student's last campus of attendance.
- The 85-day rule is phased out completely.

Years of Data:

- Graduating Class of 2006 (results are based on the original 2002-03 cohort, whether the students remain on grade level or not)
- Continued enrollment in 2006-07
- GED records as of August 31, 2006

Data Sources:

- PEIMS Submission 1 enrollment data for 2002-03 through 2006-07
- PEIMS Submission 1 leaver data for 2003-04 through 2006-07
- PEIMS Submission 3 attendance data for 2002-03 through 2005-06
- GED records as of August 31, 2006

Other Information:

- *School Leaver Provision for 2007.* For 2007 AEA ratings, if the Completion Rate II and/or Annual Dropout Rate indicator(s) are the only cause for an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* label. As a safeguard to this provision, districts are subject to identification and intervention by Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) for dropout rates and leaver reporting. Additionally, campuses that avoid being rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* due to this provision will be subject to technical assistance team (TAT) intervention requirements in the 2007-08 school year. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information on the School Leaver Provision.
- *Transfers.* Any student who transfers into the cohort is added to it, and any student who transfers out of the cohort is subtracted from it.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 74.875% is rounded to 74.9%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.
- *Students with Disabilities.* The completion status of students with disabilities is included in this measure.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE (GRADES 7-12) INDICATOR

The Annual Dropout Rate indicator is grade 7-12 dropouts as a percent of total students enrolled at the AEC or charter in grades 7-12 in a single school year.

Beginning with 2007 accountability, the more rigorous NCES definition will be used. See *Appendix I – NCES Dropout Definition* for detailed information on the NCES dropout definition.

Who is evaluated for Annual Dropout Rate:

- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that serve students in any of grades 7-12.
- Charters that operate only registered AECs.
- Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

Table 12: Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12) Indicator

	2007 from 2005-06	2008 from 2006-07	2009 from 2007-08	2010 from 2008-09
<i>AEA: Academically Acceptable</i>	10.0%	10.0%	TBD	TBD
Dropout Definition	NCES definition			
Accountability Subset	School Leaver data are attributed to the last campus of attendance			

Standard:

- *AEA: Academically Acceptable* – An Annual Dropout Rate of 10.0% or less.
- The Annual Dropout Rate standard will be reviewed annually and is subject to change.

Student Groups: Annual Dropout Rate is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups that meet minimum size requirements: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of grade 7-12 students designated as 'official' dropouts}}{\text{number of grade 7-12 students in attendance at any time during the school year}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- *All Students.* These results are evaluated if there are:
 - at least 5 dropouts, **and**
 - at least 10 students in grades 7-12.
- *Student Groups.* These results are evaluated if there are:
 - at least 5 dropouts within the student group, **and;**
 - 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group represents at least 10% of All Students in grades 7-12; **or**
 - 50 students within the student group even if they represent less than 10% of All Students in grades 7-12.
- Special Analysis is not conducted on Annual Dropout Rate.

- If the AEC or charter does not meet the minimum size requirements for All Students, then the AEC or charter is not evaluated on Annual Dropout Rate.

Accountability Subset:

- Dropout data are attributed to the student’s last campus of attendance.
- The 85-day rule is phased out completely.

Year of Data: 2005-06

Data Sources:

- PEIMS Submission 1 data for 2005-06 and 2006-07
- PEIMS Submission 1 leaver data for 2006-07
- PEIMS Submission 3 attendance data for 2005-06

Other Information:

- *School Leaver Provision for 2007.* For 2007 AEA ratings, if the Completion Rate II and/or Annual Dropout Rate indicator(s) are the only cause for an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* label. As a safeguard to this provision, districts are subject to identification and intervention by PBM for dropout rates and leaver reporting. Additionally, campuses that avoid being rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* due to this provision will be subject to TAT intervention requirements in the 2007-08 school year. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information on the School Leaver Provision.
- *Cumulative Attendance.* A cumulative count of students is used in the denominator. This method for calculating the dropout rate neutralizes the effects of mobility by including in the denominator every student reported in attendance at the AEC or charter throughout the school year, regardless of length of stay.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 2.49% is rounded to 2.5%, and 0.25% is rounded to 0.3%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.
- *Students with Disabilities.* Students with disabilities who drop out of school are included in this measure.

This page is intentionally blank.

Chapter 11 - Additional Features of AEA

As shown in *Chapter 10 – AEA Base Indicators*, alternative education campuses (AECs) can achieve a rating by meeting the absolute standards for the different indicators. However, under certain conditions, AECs can achieve a rating by:

- meeting Required Improvement; and/or
- using the accountability data for at-risk students in the district.

All additional features are applied and calculated automatically by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) before ratings are released. AECs do not need to request the use of additional features.

Additional requirements for charters are explained later in this chapter.

Required Improvement

AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities can achieve an *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating by meeting the absolute standards for the alternative education accountability (AEA) indicators or by demonstrating Required Improvement. AECs initially rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* may achieve an *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating using the Required Improvement feature. Required Improvement can be applied to three of the base indicators: Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) Progress, State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II), and Completion Rate II. Annual Dropout Rate Required Improvement will not be calculated in 2007 due to changes to the dropout definition which prevent comparisons of rates used in 2006 and 2007.

Required Improvement compares prior-year performance to current-year performance. In order to qualify for this comparison, the target group (All Students or any student group) must meet a minimum size requirement for the prior year. See *Minimum Size Requirements* in this chapter for each indicator.

Who is evaluated for Required Improvement:

- AECs of Choice whose performance is *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* for any TAKS Progress, SDAA II, or Completion Rate II measure.
- Residential Facilities whose performance is *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* for any TAKS Progress or SDAA II measure. (Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.)
- Charters evaluated under AEA procedures whose performance is *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* for any TAKS Progress, SDAA II, or Completion Rate II measure.

TAKS PROGRESS INDICATOR

Improvement Standard: In order for Required Improvement to move an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, the AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient improvement on the deficient TAKS measures to meet a standard of **45%** within two years.

Methodology:

The *Actual Change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*.

Actual Change is the difference between performance in 2007 and 2006.

Required Improvement is the result of the 2007 standard minus performance in 2006 divided by 2.

Example:

In 2007, an AEC has performance above the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* standard in all student groups except for Economically Disadvantaged; only 38% meet the standard. Performance in 2006 for the same group is 20%.

First calculate the *Actual Change*: $38 - 20 = 18$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*: $(45 - 20) / 2 = 13$ (12.5 rounds to 13)

Then compare *Actual Change* to *Required Improvement* to determine if *Actual Change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*: $18 \geq 13$

The AEC meets *Required Improvement*, so its rating is *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

Minimum Size Requirements: Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has less than 10 test results (for the student group) in 2006.

Other Information:

- *Performance in 2006.* Prior-year performance includes Spring 2006 grades 3-11 TAKS results (primary administration); Texas Growth Index (TGI) for 2005 to 2006, growth of 0 (zero) or higher; April and February 2006, and December, October, July, and June 2005 grade 11 TAKS retests meeting the passing standard; and April and February 2006, and December, October, July, and June 2005 grade 12 results meeting the student passing standard.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations of performance rates and standards are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

SDAA II INDICATOR

Improvement Standard: In order for Required Improvement to move an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, the AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient improvement on the SDAA II indicator to meet a standard of **45%** within two years.

Methodology:

The *Actual Change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*.

Actual Change is the difference between performance in 2007 and 2006.

Required Improvement is the result of the 2007 standard minus performance in 2006 divided by 2.

Example:

In 2007, an AEC has performance below the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* standard; only 28% of All Students meet the standard. Performance in 2006 is 11%.

First calculate the *Actual Change*: $28 - 11 = 17$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*: $(45 - 11) / 2 = 17$

Then compare *Actual Change* to *Required Improvement* to determine if *Actual Change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*: $17 \geq 17$

The AEC meets *Required Improvement*, so its rating is *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

Minimum Size Requirements: Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has less than 10 test results in 2006.

Other Information: All improvement calculations of performance rates and standards are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

COMPLETION RATE II INDICATOR

Improvement Standard: In order for Required Improvement to move an AEC of Choice or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, the AEC of Choice or charter must demonstrate sufficient improvement on the deficient Completion Rate II measures for the Class of 2005 to meet a standard of **75.0%** within two years.

Methodology:

The *Actual Change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*.

Actual Change is the difference between the Completion Rate II for the Class of 2006 and the Class of 2005.

Required Improvement is the result of the 2007 standard minus the Completion Rate II for the Class of 2005 divided by 2.

Example:

An AEC of Choice has a Class of 2006 Completion Rate II of 72.3% for the White student group. The Class of 2005 Completion Rate II for this same group is 63.8%.

First calculate the *Actual Change*: $72.3 - 63.8 = 8.5$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*: $(75.0 - 63.8) / 2 = 5.6$

Then compare *Actual Change* to *Required Improvement* to determine if *Actual Change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*: $8.5 \geq 5.6$

The AEC of Choice meets *Required Improvement*, so its rating is *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

Minimum Size Requirements: Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC of Choice or charter has less than 10 students (in the same student group) in the Completion Rate II Class of 2005.

Other Information:

- *Completion Rate II Definition.* Completion Rate II for the prior year is computed using the same definition as the current year so that gain from the prior year to the current year uses comparable data for both years. Specifically, the Completion Rate II definition includes graduates, General Educational Development (GED) recipients, and continuing students as completers.

- *NCES Definition.* Beginning with 2007 accountability, the definition of a dropout changes to comply with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition. This transition to the NCES dropout definition impacts the Completion Rate II indicator. Beginning with 2007 accountability, the dropout component of the Completion Rate denominator changes. In 2007, only one of the four years in the cohort is affected. In 2008, two years of the cohort are affected, and so on, until 2010 when the Completion Rate denominator uses the NCES dropout definition for all four years of the cohort. See *Appendix I – NCES Dropout Definition* for detailed information on the NCES dropout definition.
- *School Leaver Provision for 2007.* For 2007 AEA ratings, if the Completion Rate II and/or Annual Dropout Rate indicator(s) are the only cause for an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* label. As a safeguard to this provision, districts are subject to identification and intervention by Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) for dropout rates and leaver reporting. Additionally, campuses that avoid being rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* due to this provision will be subject to technical assistance team (TAT) intervention requirements in the 2007-08 school year. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information on the School Leaver Provision.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 4.85% is rounded to 4.9%.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE INDICATOR

Changes to the dropout definition prevent comparisons of rates used in 2006 and 2007; therefore, Annual Dropout Rate Required Improvement will not be calculated in 2007.

Other Information:

- *School Leaver Provision for 2007.* For 2007 AEA ratings, if the Completion Rate II and/or Annual Dropout Rate indicator(s) are the only cause for an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* label. As a safeguard to this provision, districts are subject to identification and intervention by PBM for dropout rates and leaver reporting. Additionally, campuses that avoid being rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* due to this provision will be subject to TAT intervention requirements in the 2007-08 school year. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information on the School Leaver Provision.

Use of District At-Risk Data

In limited circumstances, data for at-risk students in the district are used to evaluate registered AECs. Use of data for at-risk students in the district acknowledges that AECs are part of the overall district strategy for education of students at risk of dropping out of school.

AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities may be evaluated on the TAKS Progress indicator using data for at-risk students in the district. AECs of Choice may be evaluated on Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district.

TAKS PROGRESS INDICATOR

Who is evaluated for the TAKS Progress Indicator using performance data of at-risk students in the district:

- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that do not meet the 45% standard, do not demonstrate Required Improvement, and have results for fewer than 10 tests in the current year.
- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities with no TAKS results.

Table 13: Use of TAKS Data of At-Risk Students in the District

Number of TAKS tests at the AEC	Does the AEC meet the performance standard on its own data?	Does the AEC demonstrate Required Improvement (RI) on its own data?	Does the AEC meet the performance standard using district performance data of at-risk students?
10 or more	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A
	No	Yes – assign rating	N/A
		No – assign rating	
Less than 10	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A
	No	Yes – assign rating	N/A
		No	Yes – assign rating
None	N/A	N/A	No – calculate district RI
			Yes – assign rating

Required Improvement: If the AEC does not meet the performance standard based on district performance data of at-risk students, then Required Improvement is calculated using district performance data of at-risk students.

Minimum Size Requirements: If there are less than 10 at-risk TAKS test results in the district, then Special Analysis is conducted.

Special Analysis: Special Analysis consists of analyzing current and past performance data to determine if the initial rating assigned under the automated evaluation process is an aberration or an indication of consistent performance. Methods of Special Analysis are discussed in *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances*.

COMPLETION RATE II INDICATOR

Who is evaluated for Completion Rate II using data of at-risk students in the district:

- AECs of Choice that do not meet the 75.0% accountability standard or demonstrate Required Improvement.
- AECs of Choice that have completion data, but do not meet minimum size requirements for All Students.
- AECs of Choice that serve students in any of grades 9-12, but do not have a Completion Rate II.

- If the AEC of Choice does not serve students in any of grades 9-12 in the 2006-07 school year, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II.

Table 14: Use of Completion Rate II Data of At-Risk Students in the District

Does the AEC of Choice serve students in grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12 in 2006-07?	Does the AEC of Choice have a Completion Rate II and meet minimum size requirements in 2005-06?	Does the AEC of Choice meet the accountability standard on its own data?	Does the AEC of Choice demonstrate Required Improvement (RI) on its own data?	Do at-risk students in the district meet minimum size requirements?	Does the AEC of Choice meet the accountability standard using Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district?
Yes	Yes	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A	N/A
		No	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A
			No	Yes	Yes – assign rating
				No	No – calculate district RI
	No	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes – assign rating
				No	No – calculate district RI
	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Required Improvement: If the AEC of Choice does not meet the accountability standard based on at-risk students in the district then Required Improvement is calculated using Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district.

Minimum Size Requirements:

- Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district is evaluated if there are:
 - at least 5 at-risk dropouts (non-completers), **and**
 - at least 10 students in the district at-risk Completion Rate II class.
- If at-risk students in the district do not meet minimum size requirements, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II.

Additional Requirements for Charters

Underreported Students: Charters evaluated under AEA procedures are subject to underreported student standards as described in *Chapter 3 – The Basics: Additional Features*. Although the charter AEA rating is not affected, PBM will continue to evaluate this indicator at the 2007 standards in its Data Validation system.

Additional Students in Charter Ratings: Charters evaluated under AEA procedures are responsible for the performance of all students, including those who attend campuses that receive a rating of *AEA: Not Rated – Other*.

AECs Rated AEA: Academically Unacceptable

Registered AECs rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* do not prevent a district rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*.

Chapter 12 - AEA Ratings

This chapter illustrates how to apply the alternative education accountability (AEA) indicator data results and the additional features of AEA to determine ratings for registered alternative education campuses (AECs) and charters evaluated under AEA procedures.

WHO IS RATED?

The state accountability system is required to rate all districts and campuses serving students in grades 1-12. Under the new AEA procedures, the first step in determining AEA ratings is to identify the universe of AECs and charters. The AEA universe consists of:

- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that meet the registration criteria, register as an AEC, and meet the at-risk registration criterion;
- charters that operate only registered AECs; and
- charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

The next step is to determine whether the AEC or charter has TAKS results on which it can be evaluated. In order to attain an *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating, AECs and charters must have at least one Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) test result. Furthermore, performance on any one of the TAKS subjects is sufficient for a rating to be assigned. AECs with no TAKS test results are evaluated using district at-risk performance results. Information on use of district at-risk data is in *Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA*. AECs and charters need not have data for the State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II), Completion Rate II, and Annual Dropout Rate indicators to receive an AEA rating. Charters that have only SDAA II results, Completion Rate II, and/or Annual Dropout Rate will not receive an AEA rating.

AECs and charters with very small numbers of TAKS test results in the accountability subset may ultimately receive an *AEA: Not Rated – Other* label. Special Analysis is employed when very small numbers of total tests determine whether a rating is appropriate. AECs undergo Special Analysis when the AEC is evaluated on district at-risk data and there are fewer than 10 at-risk TAKS tests in the district. Charters are rated on the aggregate performance of all students in the charter. Charters with TAKS results for fewer than 10 tests will receive Special Analysis under circumstances similar to those used in the standard accountability procedures. Special Analysis consists of analyzing current and past performance data to determine if the initial rating assigned under the evaluation process is an aberration or an indication of consistent performance. Additional details on Special Analysis are in *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances*.

AEA RATING LABELS

Accountability rating labels for districts are specified in statute. Beginning in 2004, campuses are assigned the same labels as districts under the standard accountability procedures. Registered AECs and charters rated under AEA procedures are assigned three rating labels:

- *AEA: Academically Acceptable*

- *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*
- *AEA: Not Rated – Other*

Table 15: AEA Rating Labels

	AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities	Charters
<i>AEA: Academically Acceptable</i>	Assigned to registered AECs with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ at least one TAKS test (summed across grades and subjects); or ○ no TAKS test results and are evaluated using district at-risk performance results. 	Assigned to charters with at least one TAKS test (summed across grades and subjects). Charters with fewer than 10 TAKS test results receive Special Analysis.
<i>AEA: Academically Unacceptable</i>		
<i>AEA: Not Rated – Other</i>	Assigned to registered AECs with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ no students enrolled in grades tested; or ○ no TAKS data in the accountability subset or exit-level data on which to rate. 	Assigned to charters with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ no students enrolled in grades tested; or ○ no TAKS data in the accountability subset or exit-level data on which to rate.

Accountability ratings are final when the accountability appeals process for the year is completed in the fall following release of the ratings in August.

USING THE DATA TABLE TO DETERMINE AN AEA RATING

On June 21, completion/dropout data from the Texas Education Agency (TEA) will be released to districts and campuses in the TEA Secure Environment (TEASE). On July 20, prior to finalizing all computations necessary for accountability ratings, preview data tables will be available in TEASE for the district and each campus.

These tables will *not* show a rating and will *not* provide calculations for Required Improvement. However, by using the preview data tables and the *2007 Accountability Manual*, districts can anticipate their ratings in advance of the TEA ratings release on August 1. *The preview data tables will contain unmasked data and must be treated as confidential.* The performance of individual students may be shown.

A sample unmasked preview data table for a campus serving grades 9-12 follows. This grade span includes data for all AEA indicators.

Table 16: Sample AEA Data Table

July 2007

Texas Education Agency
CONFIDENTIAL

Page 1 of 2

1

2007 Preview Accountability Data Table
Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures

3

District Name: SAMPLE ISD
Campus Name: SAMPLE ALTERNATIVE LEARNING CENTER
Campus Number: 999999999
Campus Type: AEC of Choice

Grade Span: 09 – 12
% At-Risk: 75%

2

4

Rating:

5

District at-risk TAKS data used.
SDAA II not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data.
District at-risk Completion Rate II used.

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

6

	District At-Risk	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ Disadv
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) (Grades 3-12)						
Analysis Groups Evaluated	X	X				
2006-07 Progress Measure						
# Tests Met Standard	33,197	2	0	2	0	2
# Tests	46,756	8	0	8	0	8
% Met Standard	71%	25%	0%	25%	0%	25%
Student Group %	n/a	100%	0%	100%	0%	100%
2005-06 Progress Measure						
# Tests Met Standard	26,881	3	0	3	0	3
# Tests	44,067	9	0	9	0	9
% Met Standard	61%	33%	0%	33%	0%	33%
Required Improvement						
Actual Change	10	-8	0	-8	0	-8

7

	District At-Risk	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ Disadv
State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II) (Grades 3-10)						
Analysis Groups Evaluated						
2006-07 SDAA II Results						
# Tests Met ARD Expectations	n/a	18	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
# Tests	n/a	26	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Met ARD Expectations	n/a	69%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2005-06 SDAA II Results						
# Tests Met ARD Expectations	n/a	13	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
# Tests	n/a	20	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Met ARD Expectations	n/a	65%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Required Improvement						
Actual Change	n/a	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

'n/a' indicates that the data are not applicable.
(-) indicates that data are not available.

Table 16: Sample AEA Data Table (continued)

July 2007

Texas Education Agency
CONFIDENTIAL

Page 2 of 2

2007 Preview Accountability Data Table
Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures

District Name: SAMPLE ISD
Campus Name: SAMPLE ALTERNATIVE LEARNING CENTER
Campus Number: 999999999
Campus Type: AEC of Choice

Grade Span: 09 – 12
% At-Risk: 75%

Rating:

District at-risk TAKS data used.
SDAA II not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data.
District at-risk Completion Rate II used.

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

	District At-Risk	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ Disadv
8 Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12)						
Analysis Groups Evaluated	X	X		X		
Class of 2006						
# Completers	1,824	29	2	22	5	20
# Non-completers	181	16	3	13	0	9
# in Class	2,005	45	5	35	5	29
Completion Rate	91.0%	64.4%	40.0%	62.9%	100%	69.0%
Student Group %	n/a	100%	11%	78%	11%	64%
Class of 2005						
# Completers	1,661	25	2	19	4	19
# in Class	1,992	43	4	34	5	28
Completion Rate	83.4%	58.1%	50.0%	55.9%	80.0%	67.9%
Required Improvement						
Actual Change	7.6	6.3	-10.0	7.0	20.0	1.1

9 Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12)						
Analysis Groups Evaluated		X		X		X
2005-06						
# Dropouts	n/a	10	1	9	0	8
# Students in Grades 7-12	n/a	83	7	68	8	81
Dropout Rate	n/a	12.0%	14.3%	13.2%	0.0%	9.9%
Student Group %	n/a	100%	8%	82%	10%	98%

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

'n/a' indicates that the data are not applicable.
(-) indicates that data are not available.

The sample preview data table above illustrates the types of information provided. See *Chapter 10 – AEA Base Indicators* for more information about each measure. The final AEA data table released in August may include minor modifications. An explanation of each numbered topic follows.

1. **Confidential:** Performance data are unmasked on the AEA data tables posted in TEASE. For this reason, personal student information may be shown. To be compliant with the federal *Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act* (FERPA), all unmasked data must be treated as confidential.

Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures: This indicates that the AEC or charter is rated under AEA procedures. Campuses not registered for evaluation under AEA procedures are evaluated under standard accountability procedures.

2. **% At-Risk:** All registered AECs must meet the at-risk registration criterion or the applicable safeguards in order to remain registered and be evaluated under AEA procedures.
3. **Campus Type:** Each AEC registered for evaluation under AEA procedures is designated as an AEC of Choice or Residential Facility.
4. **Rating:** AEA rating labels are not available for the preview data tables.
5. **Messages:** A complete list of messages that may appear on AEA data tables is provided later in this chapter.

District at-risk TAKS data used: If an AEC has no TAKS results or does not meet the 45% TAKS Progress standard based on results for fewer than 10 tests, then the AEC is evaluated on performance of at-risk students in the district.

If the AEC does not meet the performance standard based on district performance data of at-risk students, then Required Improvement is calculated using district performance data of at-risk students.

SDAA II not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data: If the AEC or charter does not serve students in grades 3-10 or has fewer than 30 SDAA II test results in the accountability subset, then the AEC or charter is not evaluated on SDAA II.

District at-risk Completion Rate II used: If the AEC of Choice does not meet the 75.0% Completion Rate II standard or demonstrate Required Improvement, does not meet minimum size requirements for All Students, or if the AEC of Choice serves students in any of grades 9-12 but does not have a Completion Rate II, then the AEC of Choice is evaluated on the Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district.

If the AEC of Choice does not meet the accountability standard based on at-risk students in the district, then Required Improvement is calculated using Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district.

6. **Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) (Grades 3-12):** One of the four AEA base indicators on which AECs and charters are evaluated. The TAKS Progress indicator evaluates test results across grades and subjects.

Analysis Groups Evaluated: Analysis groups used to determine AEA ratings are marked with an ‘X.’

Tests Met Standard: The numerator used to calculate *% Met Standard* – TAKS tests meeting the standard or having a TGI score of 0 (zero) or higher and exit-level retests meeting the standard at the spring administrations or in the previous fall or summer.

Tests: The denominator used to calculate *% Met Standard* – TAKS tests taken and exit-level retests meeting the standard at the spring administrations or in the previous fall or summer.

% Met Standard: The percent of tests that met the TAKS Progress standard.

Student Group %: Used to identify which student groups meet minimum size requirements for the indicator. TAKS performance is always evaluated for All Students and the following student groups meeting minimum size requirements: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

TAKS Required Improvement: Moves an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable* if the AEC or charter demonstrates sufficient improvement on the deficient TAKS measures to meet a standard of 45% within two years. Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has fewer than 10 test results (for the student group) in 2006.

Actual Change: The difference between performance in 2007 and 2006. *Actual Change* is always shown when two years of data are available.

- 7. State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II) (Grades 3-10):** One of the four AEA base indicators on which AECs and charters are evaluated. SDAA II assesses grades 3-10 students with disabilities who receive instruction in the state's curriculum but for whom the TAKS test is inappropriate.

Analysis Groups Evaluated: Analysis groups used to determine AEA ratings are marked with an 'X.'

SDAA II performance is evaluated for All Students only. Student groups are not evaluated.

Tests Met ARD Expectations: The numerator used to calculate *% Met ARD Expectations* – SDAA II tests *Meeting ARD Expectations*.

Tests: The denominator used to calculate *% Met ARD Expectations* – SDAA II tests taken.

% Met ARD Expectations: The percent of tests that *Met ARD Expectations*.

SDAA II Required Improvement: Moves an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable* if the AEC or charter demonstrates sufficient improvement to meet a standard of 45% within two years. Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has fewer than 10 test results in 2006.

Actual Change: The difference between performance in 2007 and 2006. *Actual Change* is always shown when two years of data are available.

- 8. Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12):** One of the four AEA base indicators on which AECs of Choice and charters are evaluated. Completion Rate II counts graduates, continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year), and General Educational Development (GED) recipients as completers. This longitudinal rate shows the percent of students who first attended grade 9 in the 2002-03 school year who completed or are continuing their education four years later. Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.

Analysis Groups Evaluated: Analysis groups used to determine AEA ratings are marked with an ‘X.’

Completers: The numerator used to calculate Completion Rate II – number of completers.

Non-completers: Used together with *# in Class* to determine if minimum size requirements are met for a group to be evaluated.

in Class: The denominator used to calculate Completion Rate II – number of students in the class.

Completion Rate II: The percent of the student group that completed high school – *# Completers* divided by *# in Class*.

Student Group %: Used to identify which student groups meet minimum size requirements for the indicator. All Students and the following student groups meeting minimum size requirements are evaluated: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12) Required Improvement: Moves an AEC of Choice or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable* if the AEC of Choice or charter demonstrates sufficient improvement on the deficient Completion Rate II measures for the Class of 2005 to meet a standard of 75.0% within two years.

Actual Change: The difference between the Completion Rate II for the Classes of 2006 and 2005. *Actual Change* must be equal to or greater than the *Improvement Required*. *Actual Change* is always shown when two years of data are available.

In this example, Required Improvement will be calculated; therefore, *Met Minimum Size Requirements?*, *Improvement Required*, and *Met Required Improvement?* will be shown on the final data table for the analysis groups evaluated.

9. **Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12):** One of the four AEA base indicators on which AECs and charters are evaluated. This annual rate is grade 7-12 dropouts as a percent of all students enrolled at the AEC or charter in grades 7-12 in a single school year.

Analysis Groups Evaluated: Analysis groups used to determine AEA ratings are marked with an ‘X.’

Dropouts: The numerator used to calculate Annual Dropout Rate – number of grade 7-12 students designated as official dropouts.

Students in Grades 7-12: The denominator used to calculate Annual Dropout Rate – number of grade 7-12 students in attendance at any time during the school year.

Dropout Rate: The percent of the student group that dropped out of school – *# Dropouts* divided by *# Students in Grades 7-12*.

Student Group %: Used to identify which student groups meet minimum size requirements for the indicator. All Students and the following student groups meeting minimum size requirements are evaluated: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged. If the AEC does not meet the minimum size requirements for All Students, then the AEC is not evaluated on Annual Dropout Rate.

Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12) Required Improvement: Due to the definitional changes, Annual Dropout Rate Required Improvement is not calculated in 2007.

FINAL DATA TABLES

Preview data tables will be available only via TEASE prior to finalizing accountability ratings. Ratings will be released on August 1, 2007. Final data tables that include masked data will be online and available to districts and the public on August 1. See *Chapter 18 – Calendar* for other important dates.

The following will appear on the final data tables:

Accountability Ratings. AEA rating labels are:

- *AEA: Academically Acceptable,*
- *AEA: Academically Unacceptable, or*
- *AEA: Not Rated – Other.*

Messages. When applicable, these messages appear in the top section of the data table after the rating label:

- District at-risk TAKS data used. (AEC only)
- District at-risk Completion Rate II used. (AEC of Choice only)
- Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II. (Residential Facility only)
- This campus is not rated due to grade span. (AEC only)
- Charter operates only Residential Facilities. (charter only)
- Charter exceeds threshold for underreported students. (charter only)
- Special Analysis conducted. (AEC or charter)
- SDAA II not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data. (AEC or charter)
- Completion Rate II not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data. (AEC of Choice or charter)
- Annual Dropout Rate not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data. (AEC or charter)
- Rating is not based on data shown in the table (School Leaver Provision used). (AEC or charter)
- Rating changed due to an appeal. Data not modified. (AEC or charter)

Required Improvement. The final data table shows all calculations for Required Improvement when calculated:

- *Met Minimum Size Requirements?* – “Y” or “N” is shown.
- *Actual Change* – The difference between current-year and prior-year data.

- *Improvement Required* – The amount of change needed for Required Improvement to be met.
- *Met Required Improvement?* – If Required Improvement is calculated, “Y” or “N” is shown depending on the comparison of *Actual Change* to the *Improvement Required*.

MASKED DATA

As in the past, performance on the data tables posted to the agency website is masked when there are very small numbers of tests or 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 a student in order to be in compliance with *FERPA*.

AEA SUMMARY

Two tables follow that summarize the 2007 AEA procedures. *Table 17* provides an overview of the requirements for achieving the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating label. An AEC or charter must meet the criteria for every applicable measure to be rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*. If the criteria are not met for every measure, then *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* is assigned.

For example, to be rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, an AEC or charter must satisfy all requirements for each indicator evaluated. As shown, AECs and charters can meet the criteria for the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating by either meeting an absolute performance standard or demonstrating Required Improvement for the indicators.

Table 18 provides a detailed overview of the 2007 AEA procedures, with the base indicators listed as columns. For example, for each of the indicators, *Table 18* provides a brief definition, use of district at-risk data, the rounding methodology, the standards, the accountability subset methodology, subjects, student groups, minimum size criteria, and application of Required Improvement.

Table 17: Requirements for 2007 AEA: Academically Acceptable Rating

Indicators/Features	AECs of Choice	Residential Facilities	Charters
Assessment Indicators			
TAKS Progress All Students and each student group that meets minimum size criteria: African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged	Meets 45% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement (RI) or Meets 45% Standard Using District At-Risk Data or Demonstrates RI Using District At-Risk Data		Meets 45% Standard or Demonstrates RI
SDAA II All Students if minimum size criteria are met	Meets 45% Standard or Demonstrates RI		
Completion/Dropout Indicators			
Completion Rate II All Students and each student group that meets minimum size criteria: African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged	Meets 75.0% Standard or Demonstrates RI or Meets 75.0% Standard Using District At-Risk Data or Demonstrates RI Using District At-Risk Data	Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.	Meets 75.0% Standard or Demonstrates RI
Annual Dropout Rate All Students and each student group that meets minimum size criteria: African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged	Meets 10.0% Standard		
Additional Features			
Required Improvement (RI)	RI is calculated for the TAKS Progress, SDAA II, and Completion Rate II indicators when the standards are not met and when prior year minimum size requirements are met.		
Use of District At-Risk Data	TAKS data of at-risk students in the district are used when the 45% standard and RI are not met based on fewer than 10 tests or when there are no TAKS tests.	Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.	Performance results of all students in the accountability subset are used in determining the charter rating. The charter rating is not limited to evaluation of at-risk students.
	Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district is used when the 75.0% standard and RI are not met or when students in any grades 9-12 are served but there is no Completion Rate II.		
Special Analysis	Special Analysis is conducted when there are fewer than 10 at-risk TAKS tests in the district or charter.	Special Analysis is conducted when there are fewer than 10 TAKS tests in the charter.	
Data Integrity	None		Charters are subject to underreported student standards, although the charter AEA rating is not affected.
School Leaver Provision	If the Completion Rate II and/or Annual Dropout Rate indicator(s) are the only cause for an AEA: <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the AEA: <i>Academically Acceptable</i> label.		

Table 18: Overview of 2007 AEA Procedures

	TAKS Progress Grades 3-12	SDAA II Grades 3-10	Completion Rate II Grades 9-12	Annual Dropout Rate Grades 7-12
Use/Definition	<p>TAKS tests meeting the student passing standard or having a TGI score of 0 (zero) or higher and TAKS exit-level retest results meeting the student passing standard at the spring administrations or in the previous fall or summer divided by total TAKS tests taken and TAKS exit-level retests meeting the standard.</p> <p>Results are summed across grades and subjects. Spanish results are included. Second administration results of grades 3 and 5 reading and grade 5 mathematics are included. Make-up tests taken within testing window are included.</p>	<p>The number of SDAA II tests meeting ARD expectations summed across grades and subjects divided by the total number of SDAA II tests for which ARD expectations were established.</p>	<p>A prior year indicator that evaluates graduates, continuing students, and GED recipients, expressed as a percent of total students in the Completion Rate II class.</p> <p>AECs of Choice that do not serve students in any of grades 9-12 are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.</p> <p>Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.</p>	<p>A prior year indicator that evaluates the number of grade 7-12 students designated as official dropouts divided by the number of grade 7-12 students in attendance at any time during the school year.</p> <p>If minimum size requirements for All Students are not met, then do not evaluate Annual Dropout Rate.</p>
District At-Risk Data	<p>The AEC is evaluated on performance of at-risk students in the district if the AEC does not meet the standard or demonstrate RI based on fewer than 10 tests or if the AEC has no TAKS results.</p>	N/A	<p>The AEC of Choice is evaluated on Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district if the AEC of Choice does not meet the standard or demonstrate RI or if the AEC of Choice serves students in any of grades 9-12 but does not have a Completion Rate II.</p>	N/A
Rounding	Whole Numbers		One Decimal	
Standards	45%		75.0%	10.0%
Accountability Subset	<p>Campus accountability subset holds the AEC accountable for students enrolled at the AEC on the fall snapshot and testing dates, but does not apply to exit-level retests.</p> <p>District accountability subset holds the charter accountable for students enrolled at the charter on the fall snapshot and testing dates, but does not apply to exit-level retests.</p>		<p>Completion/Dropout data are attributed to the student's last campus of attendance.</p>	
Subjects	<p>Reading/ELA Writing Mathematics Social Studies Science</p>	<p>Reading/ELA Writing Mathematics</p>	N/A	
Student Groups	<p>All Students and African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged</p>	All Students only	<p>All Students and African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged</p>	<p>All Students and African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged</p>
Minimum Size Criteria				
All Students	All Students tests are always evaluated	30 or more tests summed across grades and subjects	<p>≥ 5 dropouts (non-completers) and ≥ 10 students</p>	<p>≥ 5 dropouts and ≥ 10 students</p>
Student Groups	<p>30-49 tests for the student group and the student group represents at least 10% of All Students tests or at least 50 tests</p>	N/A	<p>≥ 5 dropouts (non-completers) and 30/10%/50</p>	<p>≥ 5 dropouts and 30/10%/50</p>

Table 18: Overview of 2007 AEA Procedures (continued)

	TAKS Progress Grades 3-12	SDAA II Grades 3-10	Completion Rate II Grades 9-12	Annual Dropout Rate Grades 7-12
Required Improvement (RI) – A gate up to AEA: Academically Acceptable				
Use/Definition	The AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient gain in TAKS Progress to be at 45% within 2 years.	The AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient gain in SDAA II to be at 45% within 2 years.	The AEC of Choice or charter must demonstrate sufficient gain in Completion Rate II to be at 75.0% within 2 years. Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.	Changes to the dropout definition prevent comparisons of rates used in 2006 and 2007; therefore, Annual Dropout Rate Required Improvement will not be calculated in 2007.
Actual Change	2007 performance minus 2006 performance	2007 performance minus 2006 performance	Class of 2006 rate minus Class of 2005 rate	n/a in 2007
Improvement Required	Gain needed to reach 45% standard in 2 years	Gain needed to reach 45% standard in 2 years	Gain needed to reach 75.0% standard in 2 years	n/a in 2007
Minimum Size	Meets minimum size in current year and has at least 10 tests in prior year	Meets minimum size in current year and has at least 10 tests in prior year	Meets minimum size in current year and has at least 10 students in Completion Rate II class in prior year	n/a in 2007
Rounding	Whole Numbers		One Decimal	

Chapter 13 - AEA Glossary and Index

Alternative Education Campus (AEC) of Choice: Alternative education programs provide accelerated instructional services to students at risk of dropping out of school. At-risk students enroll at AECs of Choice to expedite progress toward performing at grade level and high school completion.

Annual Dropout Rate: Grade 7-12 dropouts as a percent of total students enrolled at the AEC in grades 7-12 in a single school year. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Dropout Definition is later in this chapter.

At-Risk: In accordance with Texas Education Code (TEC) §29.081(d), a "student at risk of dropping out of school" includes each student who is under 21 years of age and who:

- (1) was not advanced from one grade level to the next for one or more school years;
- (2) if the student is in grade 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, or 12, did not maintain an average equivalent to 70 on a scale of 100 in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum during a semester in the preceding or current school year or is not maintaining such an average in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum in the current semester;
- (3) did not perform satisfactorily on an assessment instrument administered to the student under TEC Subchapter B, Chapter 39, and who has not in the previous or current school year subsequently performed on that instrument or another appropriate instrument at a level equal to at least 110 percent of the level of satisfactory performance on that instrument;
- (4) if the student is in prekindergarten, kindergarten, or grade 1, 2, or 3, did not perform satisfactorily on a readiness test or assessment instrument administered during the current school year;
- (5) is pregnant or is a parent;
- (6) has been placed in an alternative education program in accordance with TEC §37.006 during the preceding or current school year;
- (7) has been expelled in accordance with TEC §37.007 during the preceding or current school year;
- (8) is currently on parole, probation, deferred prosecution, or other conditional release;
- (9) was previously reported through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) to have dropped out of school;
- (10) is a student of limited English proficiency, as defined by TEC §29.052;
- (11) is in the custody or care of the Department of Protective and Regulatory Services or has, during the current school year, been referred to the department by a school official, officer of the juvenile court, or law enforcement official;
- (12) is homeless, as defined by 42 U.S.C. Section 11302, and its subsequent amendments; or
- (13) resided in the preceding school year or resides in the current school year in a residential placement facility in the district, including a detention facility, substance abuse treatment facility, emergency shelter, psychiatric hospital, halfway house, or foster group home.

Campus Accountability Subset: Only test results for students enrolled on the same campus on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date are included in the campus performance measure.

Completion Rate II: Longitudinal rate that shows the percent of students who first attended grade 9 in the 2002-03 school year who graduated, received a General Educational Development

(GED) certificate, or who are continuing their education four years later. Known as the 2002-03 cohort, these students' progress was tracked over the four years using data provided to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) by districts and charters and data available in the statewide GED database. Graduates, continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year), and GED recipients are counted as completers in the calculation of Completion Rate II.

District Accountability Subset: Only test results for students enrolled in the same charter on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date are included in the charter performance measure.

NCES Dropout Definition: Under this definition, a dropout is a student who is enrolled in Texas public school in grade 7-12, does not return to Texas public school the following fall, is not expelled, and does not graduate, receive a GED certificate, continue high school outside the Texas public school system or begin college, or die. See *Appendix I – NCES Dropout Definition* for more information.

Registered AEC: Term used to refer collectively to AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that are registered for evaluation under alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures and meet the at-risk registration criterion.

Required Improvement: Compares prior year performance to current year performance. In order to qualify for this comparison, the target group (All Students or any student group) must meet a minimum size requirement for the prior year.

Residential Facility: Education services are provided to students in residential programs and facilities operated under contract with the Texas Youth Commission (TYC), students in detention centers and correctional facilities that are registered with the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC), and students in private residential treatment centers.

School Leaver Provision for 2007: For 2007 AEA ratings, if the Completion Rate II and/or Annual Dropout Rate indicator(s) are the only cause for an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* label. As a safeguard to this provision, districts are subject to identification and intervention by Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) for dropout rates and leaver reporting. Additionally, campuses that avoid being rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* due to this provision will be subject to technical assistance team (TAT) intervention requirements in the 2007-08 school year. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information on the School Leaver Provision.

Special Analysis: Ensures that ratings based on small numbers of tests are assigned appropriately. Special Analysis consists of analyzing current and past performance data to determine if the initial rating assigned under the automated evaluation process is an aberration or an indication of consistent performance. Special analysis is conducted at the AEC level when there are fewer than 10 at-risk TAKS tests in the district or charter. Special analysis is conducted at the charter level when there are fewer than 10 TAKS tests in the charter.

State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II): Assesses students with disabilities in grades 3-10 who receive instruction in the state's curriculum but for whom the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) test is not an appropriate measure of their academic progress. SDAA II tests are given in reading, English language arts (ELA), writing, and mathematics.

Students are assessed at their appropriate instructional levels, as determined by their Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committees.

TAKS Progress Indicator: The TAKS Progress indicator includes TAKS tests meeting the student passing standard *or* having a Texas Growth Index (TGI) score that meets the student growth standard of 0 (zero) or higher *and* TAKS exit-level retests meeting the student passing standard at the spring administrations (April and February) or in the previous fall or summer (October and July).

Texas Growth Index (TGI): Developed for accountability purposes to evaluate individual student growth from one year to the next on the TAKS. The TGI compares how students taking a TAKS subject test in one year perform on the same TAKS subject test in the next higher grade the following year. An individual TGI score indicates the amount of growth for each student in relation to the average growth of all students who performed at the same level in the base year. The TGI score of zero (0) indicates that the year-to-year change in scale score is equal to the average change. The TGI measures growth for a student who passes as well as a student who does not pass the TAKS.

AEA Index

AEC Enrollment Criterion	78
AEC of Choice	109
Annual Dropout Rate	74, 78, 81, 87, 88, 89, 91, 94, 97, 100, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108,109, 110
At-Risk	77, 86, 95, 96, 99, 100, 101, 106, 107, 109
Campus Accountability Subset	82, 83, 85, 109
Completion Rate II	74, 78, 81, 85, 86, 87, 89, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102,103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110
DAEP	73, 79, 80
District Accountability Subset	83, 85, 110
JJAEP	73, 79, 80
National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)	85, 94, 109
Registered AEC	71, 96, 97, 110
Required Improvement	74, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105,106, 108, 110
Residential Facility	75, 101, 104, 110
School Leaver Provision	87, 89, 94, 104, 106, 110
SDAA II	74, 78, 81, 91, 97, 99, 102, 110
Special Analysis	82, 84, 87, 88, 95, 97, 98, 104, 106, 110
Student Groups	82, 84, 86, 87, 88, 107
TAKS Progress Indicator	81, 82, 91, 95, 111
Texas Growth Index (TGI)	73, 81, 92, 111
Use of District At-Risk Data	82, 94, 106

**The 2007 Accountability Rating System
for Texas Public Schools and School Districts**

Part 3

**Items Common to
Standard and AEA Procedures**

In Part 3:

Chapter 14 – Appealing the
Ratings..... 115

Chapter 15 –
Responsibilities and
Consequences..... 123

Chapter 16 – Accountability
Standards for 2008 131

Chapter 17 – Preview of
2008 and Beyond..... 133

Chapter 18 – Calendar . 145

Chapter 14 – Appealing the Ratings

Providing superintendents with the opportunity to appeal accountability ratings has been a feature of the state accountability system since 1994. The opportunity to appeal is supported in the 2007 system as well.

Superintendents may appeal the state accountability ratings for both standard and alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures, by following the guidelines provided in this chapter. Below are the dates for appealing ratings. **These deadlines are final. To maintain a fair appeals process, no late appeals will be considered.**

APPEALS CALENDAR

June 21, 2007	<i>Dropout/Completion Lists.</i> Superintendents are given access to confidential lists of dropouts and lists of completion cohort membership. These reports provide a preview of the data that will be used to calculate the Annual Dropout Rate and Completion Rate base indicators for the state accountability ratings.
July 20, 2007	<i>Preview Data Tables.</i> Superintendents are given access to confidential preview accountability data tables for their district and campuses showing all state accountability indicator data. Principals and superintendents can use these data tables to anticipate their campus and district accountability ratings. Appeals may be submitted <i>by the superintendent</i> after receipt of the preview data tables.
August 1, 2007	<i>Ratings Release.</i> Due to the short timeline between the transmittal of the preview data tables and the ratings release date, no appeals will be resolved before the ratings release.
August 17, 2007	<i>Appeals Deadline.</i> Appeals must be postmarked no later than August 17, 2007 in order to be considered.
Late October, 2007	<i>Ratings Update.</i> The outcome of all appeals will be reflected in the ratings update scheduled for October, 2007. At that time the TEA website will be updated.

A more detailed calendar can be found in *Chapter 18 – Calendar*.

General Considerations

APPEALS ARE NOT A DATA CORRECTION OPPORTUNITY!

The numbers shown on the data tables (and later on other agency products, such as the AEIS reports) are final and cannot be changed, even if an appeal is granted.

Appeals should be based upon a data or calculation error attributable to the Texas Education Agency, regional education service centers, or the test contractor for the student assessment program. However, problems due to district errors in PEIMS data submissions or on TAKS answer sheets are considered on a case-by-case basis. Also, statute permits consideration of data reporting quality in evaluating the merits of an appeal. Poor data quality is not a valid reason to appeal.

CHANGED RATINGS ONLY

Only appeals that would result in a changed rating will be considered.

NO GUARANTEED OUTCOMES

Appeals that follow these guidelines are not guaranteed to be granted. Each appeal is evaluated based on the details of its unique situation. Well-written appeals that follow the guidelines are more easily processed, but they are not necessarily granted.

SITUATIONS NOT FAVORABLE FOR APPEAL

One strength of the state accountability system is that the rules are applied uniformly to all campuses and districts. Therefore, a request to make exceptions for how the rules are applied to a single campus or district is viewed unfavorably and will most likely be denied. Examples of some appeals seeking inconsistent rule application follow. Because some examples apply to both standard and AEA procedures and some are unique to one set of procedures or the other, the examples are subdivided accordingly:

Examples applicable to both standard and AEA procedures:

- *Campus Mobility.* A request to include the performance of students who were excluded due to the appropriate use of the campus mobility subset criteria would likely be denied.
- *Grade 3 and Grade 5 Cumulative.* A request to alter the TEA methodology for combining the first and second administrations of grade 3 reading results, or for the first and second administrations of grade 5 reading and mathematics results would likely be denied.
- *Rounding.* A request to compute Required Improvement, student group percentages, or indicator values differently from the method described in this *Manual* would likely be denied.
- *Minimum Size Criteria.* A request to evaluate student groups using minimum size criteria different from those described in this *Manual* would likely be denied.

Examples applicable to standard procedures:

- *Exceptions Provision.* Exceptions are automatically applied; a request for additional exceptions or changes to the application of the Exceptions Provision would likely be denied.
- *Pairing.* A request to alter pairing relationships that districts had the opportunity to determine by April 27, 2007 would likely be denied.
- *New and Academically Unacceptable.* A request to assign the *Not Rated: Other* label to campuses that are *Academically Unacceptable* in their first year of operation would likely be denied.
- *Floors.* A request to waive the floor requirements when applying either the Exceptions Provision or Required Improvement would likely be denied.

Examples applicable to AEA procedures:

- *Late Registration Requests.* A request submitted after September 22, 2006 to be registered as an alternative education campus (AEC) in order to be evaluated under AEA procedures would likely be denied.
- *At-risk Criterion.* A request by AECs or charter operators to be evaluated under AEA procedures when they did not meet the at-risk criterion or applicable safeguards in 2006-07 would likely be denied.

Guidelines

TAKS APPEALS

If a problem is identified with data received from the test contractor, the TAKS data may be appealed. An appeal of the TAKS indicators should reflect a serious problem such as a missing grade level or campus. However, coding errors on TAKS answer sheets will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

- If the district has requested that writing results be rescored, a copy of the dated request to the test contractor and the outcome of the rescored tests should be provided with the appeal. If the rescored results impact the rating, these appeals are necessary since rescored results may not be processed in time to include in the assessment data used to determine the accountability ratings released on August 1.
- If other serious problems are found, copies of correspondence with the test contractor should be provided with the appeal.
- Coding errors related to student demographic or program participation fields on the TAKS answer documents will be evaluated by reviewing the student's history in PEIMS.

SDAA II APPEALS

As with TAKS appeals, an appeal of the SDAA II indicator should include copies of any correspondence with the test contractor. Other information available to the agency about special education students will be used in evaluating SDAA II appeals; for example, Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) indicators pertaining to SDAA II will be examined in concert with the supporting documentation provided by the district. Any SDAA II appeals that result in raising a rating from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable* will incur the use of an exception. For that reason, if an SDAA II exception was used in 2006, no SDAA II appeal can be granted in 2007, as the same exception cannot be used in two consecutive years.

SCHOOL LEAVER PROVISION

Due to a number of factors—change in the definition of a dropout, changes to the PEIMS leaver data collection, the effect of students displaced by Hurricane Katrina on the 2005-06 dropout rate, and the absence of Required Improvement for the Annual Dropout Rate this year—the School Leaver Provision has been added for 2007. This means that leaver indicators (either alone or in combination) cannot cause a lowered campus or district rating. The School Leaver Provision applies to Completion Rates I and II, both Annual Dropout Rates (for grades 7-8 and grades 7-12), and Underreported Students.

The School Leaver Provision will be automatically applied. There is no need to appeal any of the leaver indicators, as none of them will cause a lowered rating.

Campuses that avoid being rated *Academically Unacceptable* in 2007 due to the application of the School Leaver Provision will be subject to technical assistance team (TAT) intervention requirements in the 2007-08 school year. Additionally, districts will be subject to identification and intervention under Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) for dropout rates and leaver reporting.

For more information on the dropout definition changes, see *Appendix I: NCES Dropout Definition*. For more information on technical assistance teams, see *Chapter 15: Responsibilities and Consequences*.

GOLD PERFORMANCE ACKNOWLEDGMENT APPEALS

Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA) cannot be appealed. Campuses or districts that appeal an *Academically Unacceptable* rating will automatically receive any GPA earned if their appeal is granted and their rating is raised to *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Special Circumstance Appeals

GRADE 11 RESULTS

Grade 11 assessments are administered multiple times during the school year. For accountability purposes, the performance of all juniors tested for the first time during the primary spring administration and some juniors testing for the first time during the October administration are included. (See *Chapter 2*.) A district may appeal to include additional grade 11 results for first-time tested students as part of the TAKS base indicator. These appeals will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. As with all appeals, no changes will be made to the data shown on the reports.

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 results that include these students, compared with 2006 results that do not.

A district may appeal to include the prior year performance of students who were excluded from assessment results in 2006, for purposes of meeting Required Improvement. Districts must provide evidence that inclusion of these students' results in 2006 will have an impact on the campus and/or district rating.

In evaluating the appeal, TEA will consider the performance of *all* students coded KRI in 2006, not a subset of these students.

These appeals will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. As with all appeals, no changes will be made to the data shown on the reports.

EARLY COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOLS

High schools created to serve special populations of gifted and talented and/or early college bound students may appeal the use of the district completion rate when the use of this district

value is the sole reason for not achieving the next higher rating. Early college high schools are designed to produce graduates who earn both a high school diploma and a college degree. The appeal must provide justification for why the use of the district completion rate is not an appropriate substitute.

How to Submit an Appeal

Superintendents appealing an accountability rating must transmit a letter prior to the appeal deadline that includes the following:

- A statement that the letter is an appeal of the 2007 state accountability rating;
- The name and ID number of the district and/or campuses for which the appeal is being submitted;
- The specific indicator(s) appealed;
- The problem, including details of the data affected and what caused the problem;
- If applicable, the reason(s) why the cause of the problem is attributable to the Texas Education Agency, a regional education service center, or the test contractor;
- The reason(s) why the change would result in a different rating, including calculations that support the different outcome;
- A statement that all information included in the appeal is true and correct to the superintendent's best knowledge and belief; and,
- The superintendent's signature on official district letterhead.

Other Information:

- Appeals for more than one campus within a district may be included in the same letter.
- Appeals for more than one indicator may be included in the same letter.
- Appeals of ratings issued under both standard and AEA procedures may be included in the same letter.
- Districts have only one opportunity to appeal each indicator for any campus or the district.
- When student-level information is in question, supporting information must be provided for review, i.e., a list of the students in question by name and identification number. It is not sufficient to claim data are in error without providing information with which the appeal can be researched and evaluated. *Confidential student-level documentation included in the appeal packet will be processed and stored in a secure location and will be accessible only by TEA staff authorized to view confidential student results.*
- It is the district's responsibility to ensure all relevant information is included in the appeal as districts will not be prompted for additional materials.

- Envelope should be addressed to the Division of Performance Reporting as follows:

Your ISD Your address City, TX zip	Division of Performance Reporting Texas Education Agency 1701 Congress Avenue Austin, TX 78701-1494	<i>stamp</i>
<u>Attn: Accountability Ratings Appeal</u>		

- Appeal letter should be addressed to Dr. Shirley Neeley, Commissioner of Education (see letter examples, below).
- Appeal letter must be postmarked on or before August 17, 2007. Appeals postmarked after this date will not be considered. Appeals delivered directly to TEA by district staff must be time-stamped in the Division of Performance Reporting by 5:00 p.m. on August 17, 2007.
- **Only send one copy of the appeal letter and/or supporting documentation.**
- Districts are encouraged to obtain delivery confirmation services from their mail courier.

Examples of satisfactory and unsatisfactory appeals are provided on the following page for illustration.

Appeal Letter Examples

Satisfactory Appeal:	Unsatisfactory Appeals:
<p>Dear Commissioner Neeley,</p> <p>This is an appeal of the 2007 state accountability rating issued for Elm Street Elementary School (ID 123456789) in Elm ISD.</p> <p>Specifically, I am appealing TAKS mathematics for the Hispanic student group. This is the only indicator keeping Elm Street Elementary from achieving a rating of <i>Academically Acceptable</i>.</p> <p>My analysis shows a coding change made to one student's ethnicity on the answer document at the time of testing was in error. One 5th grade Hispanic student was miscoded as White on the answer document. Had this student, who passed the mathematics test, been included in the Hispanic student group, the percent passing for this group would have met the <i>Academically Acceptable</i> standard. Removing this student from the White student group does not cause the White student group performance to fall below the <i>Acceptable</i> standard.</p> <p>Attached is the student's identification information as well as the PEIMS data for this student for the last six years (kindergarten through 5th grade) showing we have consistently reported this student as Hispanic.</p> <p>The second attachment shows the recalculated mathematics percent passing statistics for both the White and Hispanic student groups for Elm Elementary.</p> <p>We recognize the importance of accurate data coding, and have put new procedures in place to prevent this from occurring in the future.</p> <p>By my signature below, I certify that all information included in this appeal is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>J. Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools</p> <p><i>attachments</i></p>	<p>Dear Commissioner Neeley,</p> <p>I have analyzed the percentage passing for the economically disadvantaged mathematics students. The campus is allowed two exceptions. The floor for using the exception table is 40% for mathematics. The campus has 39%. Therefore, the campus was not able to use both exceptions. I am seeking consideration for the 39% in mathematics for the economically disadvantaged student group. If granted, the school's rating would become <i>Academically Acceptable</i>. Attached is a copy of the preliminary accountability data table.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>J. Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools</p> <p><i>attachment</i></p> <hr/> <p>Dear Commissioner Neeley,</p> <p>Maple ISD feels that its rating should be <i>Exemplary</i>. The discrepancy occurs because TEA shows that the performance for Hispanic Writing is 89%.</p> <p>We have sent two compositions back for scoring, and are confident they will be changed to passing.</p> <p>If you have questions, do not hesitate to contact us, at 701-555-1234.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>J. Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools</p> <p><i>(no attachments)</i></p>

How an Appeal Will Be Processed by the Agency

Once an appeal is received by the Division of Performance Reporting, the process for evaluating the information will be followed as outlined below:

- The details of the appeal are entered into a database for tracking purposes.
- Researchers evaluate the request using agency data sources to validate the statements made to the extent possible. The agency examines all relevant data, *not just the results for the students specifically named in the correspondence.*
- Researchers analyze the effect that granting a campus appeal may have on other campuses in the district (such as paired campuses), whether they are specifically named in the appeal or not. Similarly, the effect that granting a campus appeal may have on the district is evaluated, whether the district is named in the appeal or not. In single-campus districts, both the campus and the district are evaluated, whether the district submits the appeal as a campus or district appeal.
- Staff prepares a recommendation and forwards it to an external panel for review. Legislation passed in 2006 requires use of an appeals panel to ensure independent oversight of the appeals process. The use of an external, independent, three-member panel has been a feature of the state accountability system since 2004.
- The review panel examines the appeal, supporting documentation, staff research, and the staff recommendation. The panel determines its recommendation.
- The panel's recommendation is forwarded to the commissioner.
- The commissioner makes a final decision.
- The superintendent is notified in writing of the commissioner's decision and the rationale upon which the decision was made. The decision of the commissioner is final and is not subject to further negotiation at this point. The commissioner will respond in writing to each appeal received.
- *If an appeal is granted, the data upon which the appeal was based will not be modified.* Accountability and AEIS reports, as well as all other publications reflecting accountability data, must report the data as they are submitted to the TEA. Accountability data are subject to scrutiny by the Office of the State Auditor.

When a rating is changed due to a granted appeal, the letter from the commissioner serves as notification of the official rating for the district or campus. Districts may publicize the changed rating at that time. The agency website and other state accountability products will be updated after the resolution of all appeals. This update will occur in October 2007 concurrent with the release of the Gold Performance Acknowledgments. Note that the update will reflect only the changed *rating*; the values shown on the report, such as percent met standard, are never modified. Between the time of receipt of the letter granting an appeal and the update of agency state accountability products, the agency sources will not reflect the changed campus or district rating.

Chapter 15 – Responsibilities and Consequences

This section describes the responsibilities the various entities involved in public education have with respect to the state accountability system. These include statutory requirements as well as other responsibilities that are not mandated in statute. Many responsibilities are shared between the Texas Education Agency and local districts. Due to the passage of House Bill 1 during the Third Called Session of the 79th Legislature in 2006, there are many new requirements for both districts and the state. This chapter describes these to the extent they are known at the time of publication.

Consequences—those actions that occur as a result of the accountability system—are also described. Consequences include interventions and rewards. All statutes referenced in this section are listed in *Appendix B – Texas Education Code* which provides the web address for the complete citations.

Local Responsibilities

Districts have responsibilities associated with the state accountability system. Primarily these involve following statutory requirements, collecting and submitting accurate data, properly managing campus identification numbers, and implementing an optional local accountability system.

STATUTORY COMPLIANCE

A number of state statutes direct local districts and/or campuses to perform certain tasks or duties in response to the annual issuance of the state accountability ratings. Key statutes are discussed below.

Public Discussion of Ratings (TEC §11.253 (g)). Each campus site-based decision-making committee must hold at least one public meeting annually after the receipt of the annual campus accountability rating for the purpose of discussing the performance of the campus and the campus performance objectives. The confidentiality of the performance results should be ensured before public release of the data table. The data tables available on the TEA public website have been masked to protect confidentiality of individual student results.

Notice in Student Report Card and on Website (TEC §39.251 and TEC §39.252). Districts are required to publish accountability ratings on their websites and include the rating in the student report cards. These statutes require districts:

1. by the 10th day of the new school year to have posted on the district website the most current accountability ratings, Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) reports, and School Report Cards (SRC); and,
2. to include the most current campus performance rating with the first student report card each year, along with an explanation of the rating.

A document addressing frequently asked questions regarding these requirements is available on the agency website at: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/3297_faq.html.

Public Education Grant Program (TEC §§29.201 - 29.205). In 1995, the Texas Legislature created the Public Education Grant (PEG) program. The PEG program permits parents with

children attending campuses that are on the PEG list to request that their children be transferred to another campus within the same district or to another district. If a transfer is granted to another district, funding is provided to the receiving district. A list of campuses identified under the PEG criteria is generated and transmitted to districts annually. By February 1 following the release of the list, districts must notify each parent of a student assigned to attend a campus on the PEG list. For more information on the PEG program, please refer to *PEG Frequently Asked Questions*, available at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/peg_faq.html.

Actions Required Due to Low Ratings or Low Accreditation Statuses (TEC §§39.076, 39.131-39.132, 39.1322-39.1324, 39.1327, 39.1331, 39.133-39.136, 39.302). As mentioned previously, House Bill 1 significantly amended TEC Chapter 39. Districts with *Academically Unacceptable* ratings (campus or district) or *Accredited Probation/Accredited Warned* accreditation statuses will be required to follow directives from the Commissioner designed to remedy the issues of concern. Requirements will vary depending on the circumstances for each district affected. At the time of this manual's publication, Commissioner of Education rules have been proposed to define the implementation details of these statutory changes. Further information on these rules will be available on the TEA website or on the website for the TEA Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions, at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/pmi/>.

ACCURATE DATA

Accurate data is critical to the success of the ratings system. The bulk of the responsibility for the quality of the indicators used in establishing campus and district ratings rests with local districts. Though the state shares responsibility for ensuring the quality of the data used, the system depends on the responsible collection and submission of assessment and Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) information by local school districts.

CAMPUS IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS

In a given year, districts may need to change, delete, or add one or more of their campus identification numbers, the unique 9-digit county-district-campus number (CDC), due to closing old schools, opening new schools, or changing the grade span or population served by an existing school. Unintended consequences can occur when districts "recycle" campus ID numbers. Because two-year performance changes are a component of the accountability system, and merging prior year files with current year files is driven by campus identification numbers, comparisons may be inappropriate when a campus configuration has changed. The following example illustrates this situation:

Example: A campus served grades 7 and 8 in 2006, but in 2007, serves as a 6th grade center. The district did not request a new campus number for the new configuration. Instead, the same identifying number used in 2006 was maintained (recycled). Therefore, in 2006, grade 6 performance on the assessments would be compared to prior year grade 7 and 8 performance. Also, any dropouts reported for the campus for 2005-06 would be subject to evaluation for the 2007 accountability rating for the 6th grade center.

Whether or not to change a campus number is, in most cases, a local decision. However, districts should exercise caution in requesting new numbers and in continuing to use existing numbers when the student population or the grades offered change significantly. Districts are

strongly encouraged to request new campus numbers when school organizational configurations change dramatically.

New TEA policy requires school districts and charters to request campus number changes of existing campuses for the current school year by October 1 to ensure time for processing before the PEIMS fall snapshot date in late October. Changes for a subsequent school year will not be processed before November 1. This policy does not apply to new active campuses opening mid-year or to campuses under construction.

School districts and charters must receive TEA approval to change the campus number of a campus rated *Academically Unacceptable* or *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*. The determination of whether or not accountability ratings histories will be linked to new campus numbers will be made at the time the new numbers are approved so that districts are aware of the accountability consequences of changing campus numbers.

Although the ratings history may be linked across campus numbers for purposes of determining consecutive years of *Academically Unacceptable* ratings, data will not be linked across campus numbers. This includes PEIMS data, assessment data, and accountability indicators that draw on those data. Campuses with new campus numbers cannot take advantage of Required Improvement provisions of the accountability system to gate up to higher ratings the first year under a new number. Therefore, changing a campus number under these circumstances can be to the disadvantage of an *Academically Unacceptable* campus, which should be considered by districts and charters when requesting campus number changes for *Academically Unacceptable* campuses. In the rare circumstance where a charter district receives a new district number, the ratings history is also linked while the data are not linked across the district numbers.

Analyses to screen for the inappropriate use of campus numbers are part of *System Safeguards*, described below. TEA's PEIMS Division can assist in establishing new or retiring old campus numbers. For TEA contact information, see *Appendix G – Contacts*.

COMPLEMENTARY LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS

Although the statewide accountability system has been designed to address the guiding principles articulated in the *Introduction*, it is not a comprehensive system of performance evaluation. Communities across Texas have varied needs and goals for the school districts educating their students. Local systems of accountability can best address those priorities.

Districts are encouraged to develop their own complementary local accountability systems to plan for continued student performance improvement. Such systems are entirely voluntary and for local use only. Performance on locally-defined indicators does not affect the ratings determined through the statewide system.

Examples of locally-defined indicators include:

- level of parent participation;
- progress on locally administered assessments;
- progress on goals identified by campus improvement plans;
- progress compared to other campuses in the district;
- progress on professional development goals; and

- school safety measures.

As a different approach, districts may choose to expand the state-designated accountability ratings. For example, they may wish to further differentiate among campuses rated *Academically Acceptable* or *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

A third approach might be to examine those base indicators, both currently in use and planned for implementation, that fall short of local expectations. Additional performance measures could be constructed to track efforts to improve performance in those areas.

Regardless of the strategy chosen, local accountability systems should be designed to serve the needs of the local community and to improve performance for all students.

State Responsibilities

The Texas Education Agency also has responsibilities associated with the state accountability system. As is true for districts, TEA must follow statutory requirements related to the implementation of the accountability system. In addition, TEA applies a variety of system safeguards to ensure the integrity of the system. Finally, TEA is charged with taking actions to intervene when conditions warrant. The agency may also offer certain exemptions to districts when excellent performance is attained.

SYSTEM SAFEGUARDS

System safeguards are those activities conducted by TEA to ensure the integrity of the system. These help protect the system from purposeful manipulation as well as from the use of data of such poor quality—whether intentional or not—that no reliable rating can be determined.

Campus Number Tracking. *Academically Unacceptable* ratings received under two different campus numbers may be considered to be consecutive years of *Academically Unacceptable* ratings for accountability interventions and sanctions for an *Academically Unacceptable* campus whose campus number changes. Furthermore, in determining consecutive years of *Academically Unacceptable* ratings for purposes of accountability interventions and sanctions, only years that the campus is assigned an accountability rating of *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Academically Acceptable*, *Academically Unacceptable*, *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*, or equivalent ratings in previous years, will be considered. That is, the consecutive years of AU ratings could be separated by more than one year of temporary closure or *Not Rated* ratings. This policy applies to districts and charters as well as campuses when *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* and *Not Rated: Other* ratings are assigned. However, the policy does not apply to districts (charters) or campuses that receive a rating of *AEA: Not Rated – Other* under the Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Residential Facility procedures.

School Leaver Provision Safeguards. Campuses that avoid being rated *Academically Unacceptable* in 2007 due to the application of the School Leaver Provision will be subject to technical assistance team (TAT) intervention requirements in the 2007-08 school year. This is because campuses rated *Academically Acceptable* in 2007 are identified for technical assistance teams (TATs) if their 2007 accountability results do not meet the 2008 accountability standards. Since the 2008 dropout/completion standards are identical to those waived in 2007 through the application of the School Leaver Provision, these campuses are

automatically subject to the requirements for TAT campuses and are not eligible to receive a waiver from the commissioner.

Districts that avoid being rated *Academically Unacceptable* in 2007 due to the application of the School Leaver Provision will be subject to identification and intervention under Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) for dropout rates and leaver reporting.

Data Validation. Analyses designed to identify questionable data include, but are not limited to, audits of leaver data and examination of assessment data including data attributed to JJAEPs and/or DAEPs. Also, TEA-conducted data quality analyses are incorporated into the data validation monitoring component of the PBM system. For more information, see the PBM website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/pbm/>.

Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues. A rating can also be changed to *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*. This rating is used in the rare situation where the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results have been compromised and it is not possible to assign a rating 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. This rating label is not equivalent to an *Academically Unacceptable* rating, though the Commissioner of Education has the authority to assign an *Academically Unacceptable* rating due to data quality issues. All districts and campuses with a final rating label of *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* are automatically subject to desk audits the following year.

System safeguard activities can occur either before or after the ratings release. Sanctions can be imposed at any time. To the extent possible, ratings for the year are finalized when updated ratings are released following the resolution of appeals (in 2007 the update is scheduled for late October 2007). A rating change resulting from an imposed sanction will stand as the final rating for the year.

DISTRICT ACCREDITATION STATUS

Amendments to TEC §39.071 require the Commissioner of Education to determine an accreditation status for districts and charters. This new accreditation status is to be assigned beginning in 2007. In determining accreditation status and sanctions, TEA is to take into account the district's state accountability rating and its financial accountability rating. As with other changes to Chapter 39 resulting from HB 1, rules have been proposed that will define the procedures for determining a district's accreditation status. These rules will be available on the TEA website or on the website for the TEA Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions, at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/pmi/>.

PUBLIC EDUCATION GRANT PROGRAM CAMPUS LISTS

TEA is responsible for annually producing the list of campuses identified under the PEG criteria. In December 2007 the list of 2008-09 PEG campuses will be transmitted. This list will identify campuses at which 50 percent or more of the students did not pass TAKS in any two of the preceding three years (2005, 2006, or 2007) **or** that were rated *Academically Unacceptable* in any one of the preceding three years (2005, 2006, or 2007). At the time of publication for this manual, the Texas Legislature is considering at least one bill that would significantly alter the PEG program criteria. If any PEG-related legislation passes, districts will be notified as soon as possible.

For more information on the PEG program, please refer to *PEG Frequently Asked Questions*, available at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/peg_faq.html.

INTERVENTIONS

Interventions are those activities conducted by TEA to follow-up with districts and campuses either at-risk of a future low rating, or already assigned a low rating. Interventions are more aggressive when multiple years of low ratings are involved.

Identification of Technical Assistance Team Campuses. Texas Education Code §39.1322 requires the assignment of a technical assistance team (TAT) to a campus rated *Academically Acceptable* if that campus would be rated *Academically Unacceptable* using the accountability standards for the subsequent year. The purpose of the TAT identification is to serve as an early warning system and, therefore, provide interventions that may prevent the campus from being rated *Academically Unacceptable* in the subsequent year.

TAT schools were first identified for the 2006-07 school year, but technical assistance teams will not be fully implemented until the 2007-08 school year. TEA will provide the 2007-08 list of TAT campuses to affected districts by November 1, 2007, following the release of the final 2007 accountability ratings.

For the 2007-08 school year, campuses rated *Academically Acceptable* in 2007 under either standard or alternative education accountability procedures are identified for technical assistance teams if their 2006-07 performance does not meet the accountability standards established for the 2008 school year.

Campuses identified for technical assistance teams that demonstrate improvement over the preceding three years are eligible to receive a waiver from the Commissioner. A campus must be evaluated under the same accountability procedures, either standard or alternative education accountability, in each of the preceding three years in order to be eligible for the waiver. Campuses meet the TAT required improvement if the sum of actual change averaged across the three prior years is equal to or greater than the improvement needed to achieve each standard established for the subsequent school year. The improvement needed is the difference between the standard established for the subsequent school year and actual performance in the current school year.

Questions regarding the methodology used to identify the TAT campuses should be directed to the Division of Performance Reporting at performance.reporting@tea.state.tx.us or (512) 463-9704. Questions regarding interventions for TAT campuses should be directed to the Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions at pmdivision@tea.state.tx.us or (512) 463-9414.

Academically Unacceptable Campus/District Ratings and Accredited Warned/Accredited Probation District Accreditation Statuses. The Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions handles all inquiries regarding the interventions that take place when a campus or district is rated *Academically Unacceptable* or *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* or when a district accreditation status is accredited-warned or accredited-probation. For more information, contact this division at pmdivision@tea.state.tx.us or (512) 463-9414.

EXCELLENCE EXEMPTIONS

Texas Education Code §39.112 automatically exempts districts and campuses rated *Exemplary* from some statutes and rules. The exemptions remain in effect until the Commissioner of Education determines that achievement levels of the district or campus have declined, or the district or campus rating changes.

Statute lists a number of areas in law and regulation to which the exemption does not apply. These include criminal behavior, due process, federal and state program requirements, the curriculum essential knowledge and skills, public school accountability, extracurricular activities, and employee rights and benefits. (See TEC §39.112 for a complete list.) Under specific circumstances the Commissioner may exempt a campus from class size limits for elementary grades.

Chapter 16 – Accountability Standards for 2008

This chapter provides information about the commissioner’s final decisions for 2008 accountability standards. The purpose of this chapter is to inform educators about this key component of the system well in advance of the 2008 accountability year. Given this advance information, districts and campuses can better prepare for changes to the base indicator standards that will take place in 2008.

Other components of the 2008 system will be reevaluated during the annual development process that will begin for the next cycle in early 2008. See *Chapter 17: Preview of 2008 and Beyond* for details as they are currently planned for all components of the 2008 year as well as 2009 and 2010.

The tables below show 2008 standards for standard and AEA procedures, respectively.

Table 19: Standards for 2008 Ratings - Standard Procedures

Indicators/Features	Academically Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
Assessment Indicator (<i>Certain TAKS-I assessments are combined with TAKS in 2008*</i>)			
TAKS (2007-08)* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students and each student group meeting minimum size: • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv. 	Meets each standard: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/ELA.... 70% • Writing 65% • Social Studies .. 65% • Mathematics..... 50% • Science..... 45% OR Meets Required Improvement	Meets 75% standard for each subject or Meets floor criteria and Required Improvement	Meets 90% standard for each subject
* The 2008 TAKS indicator will include Grade 8 Science and the following TAKS-I results: Science (English) for grades 5, 8, 10, 11; Science (Spanish) for grade 5; Social Studies for grades 8, 10, & 11; ELA for grade 11; Mathematics for grade 11			
Completion/Dropout Indicators			
Completion Rate I (class of 2007) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students and each student group meeting minimum size: • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv. 	Meets 75.0% standard or Meets Required Improvement	Meets 85.0% standard or Meets floor criteria and Required Improvement	Meets 95.0% standard
Annual Dropout Rate Grades 7-8 (2006-07) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students and each student group meeting minimum size: • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv. 	Meets 1.0% standard or Meets Required Improvement	Meets 0.7% standard or Meets floor criteria and Required Improvement	Meets 0.2% standard

Table 19: Standards for 2008 Ratings - Standard Procedures (cont.)

Indicators/Features	Academically Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
Additional Provisions			
Underreported Students (District only)	Does not apply to Academically Acceptable 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> .
<i>Districts with fewer than 5 underreported students will not be subject to this provision.</i>			

Table 20: Standards for 2008 Ratings - AEA Procedures

Indicators/Features	AECs of Choice	Residential Facilities	Charters
Assessment Indicator (Certain TAKS-I assessments are combined with TAKS in 2008**)			
TAKS Progress (2007-08)** <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Students and each student group meeting minimum size: • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv. 	Meets 45% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement or Meets 45% Standard Using District At-Risk Data or Demonstrates Required Improvement Using District At-Risk Data		Meets 45% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement
<i>** The 2008 TAKS Progress indicator will include grade 8 Science and the following TAKS-I results: Science (English) for grades 5, 8, 10, 11; Science (Spanish) for grade 5; Social Studies for grades 8, 10, 11; ELA for grade 11; Mathematics for grade 11.</i>			
Completion/Dropout Indicators			
Completion Rate II (Class of 2007) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Students and each student group meeting minimum size: • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv. 	Meets 75.0% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement or Meets 75.0% Standard Using District At-Risk Data or Demonstrates Required Improvement Using District At-Risk Data	Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II	Meets 75.0% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement
Annual Dropout Rate—Grades 7-12 (2006-07) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Students and each student group meeting minimum size: • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv. 	Meets 10.0% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement		

Chapter 17 – Preview of 2008 and Beyond

This section provides information about future plans for the standard and alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures of the state accountability system, to the extent these plans are known in the spring of 2007. The purpose is to inform educators in advance so districts and campuses can adequately prepare for changes that will take place in 2008 and later years. The phase-in schedule for the accountability standards is reevaluated annually; any changes to the information provided here will be announced with as much advance notice as possible.

Deletions, additions, and modifications beyond those discussed here are possible. State legislative action may also affect the accountability system ratings, reports, sanctions, and rewards. At this point, such action cannot be predicted.

Additionally, on April 9, 2007, the U.S. Department of Education released the final regulations and non-regulatory guidance for the assessment of students with disabilities using modified academic achievement standards. TEA is currently analyzing these new No Child Left Behind regulations and guidance to make decisions about how to implement and integrate alternate assessments into the Texas assessment program.

The changes described below begin with standard procedures and are followed by AEA procedures, presented for the years 2008, 2009, and 2010. Changes described for each year are based on a comparison to the immediately preceding year.

Standard Procedures for 2008

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS)

Accountability Standards. In 2008, the *Academically Acceptable* standards will increase from 40% to 45% for science, from 45% to 50% for mathematics, and from 65% to 70% for reading/ELA. Writing and social studies will remain at the previous year's standard of 65%. The standard for *Recognized* and *Exemplary* (for all subjects) will remain the same, at 75% and 90% respectively.

SSI and Grade 8 Reading and Mathematics. In 2008 the Student Success Initiative will go into effect for grade 8. These students will need to pass TAKS reading and mathematics in order to be promoted to grade 9. The tests will be administered multiple times, as with the other SSI grades. The cumulative result of the first and second administrations of 8th grade reading and mathematics will be used in determining accountability ratings, in the same way they are for 5th grade. Note that prior year results cannot be computed to be precisely comparable, since there are no multiple administrations of 8th grade reading and mathematics in 2007. Any improvement calculations will be based on multiple administrations in 2008 compared to one administration in 2007.

TAKS Science. The results of the grade 8 science assessment will be included in the accountability system beginning in 2008. The student standard for this assessment will be at panel recommendation (scale score of 2100).

TAKS-Inclusive (TAKS-I). Beginning in 2008, results of the TAKS-I in science (grades 5, 8, 10, and 11 *English*; grade 5 *Spanish*), social studies (grades 8, 10, & 11), ELA (grade 11), and

mathematics (grade 11) will be combined with TAKS results to determine accountability ratings. The student standard for these assessments will be at panel recommendation (scale score of 2100).

The following table shows the TAKS-I test administration schedule, with the subjects and grades identified as they will be used in the accountability system.

Table 21: Use of TAKS-I in Accountability Ratings

	2008	2009	2010
Science (grades 5, 8, 10, & 11) Science (grade 5 Spanish) Social Studies (grades 8, 10, & 11) English Language Arts (grade 11) Mathematics (grade 11)	Use	Use	Use
Reading/ELA (3 – 10) Reading (grades 3 – 6 Spanish) Mathematics (grades 3 – 10) Mathematics (grades 3 – 6 Spanish) Writing (grades 4 & 7) Writing (grade 4 Spanish)	Report Only	Report Only	Use

TAKS Commended. Beginning with ratings released in 2008, a label of “commended” will be appended to the ratings of certain campuses and districts that qualify.

Required Improvement (RI). To allow for accurate comparison, prior year assessment results will be recalculated to include both grade 8 science results and TAKS-I results in the selected grades and subjects. This will make 2007 and 2008 performance comparable and enable the continued use of RI as a feature in the system for 2008.

Minimum Size Requirements. Maintain the same student group minimum size criteria (30/10%/50) used in 2007.

STATE-DEVELOPED ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT II (SDAA II)

There will be no SDAA II in 2008. The last year for that assessment was 2007.

COMPLETION RATE I

Accountability Standards. There are no changes to the standards for Completion Rate I for 2008.

School Leaver Provision. In 2008 this provision will no longer apply. Completion rate can be the cause for lower district and campus ratings.

Required Improvement (RI). RI will be available for completion rate in 2008.

Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Students from the class of 2007 who were displaced because of either of the 2005 hurricanes and who received a final status of “dropout” during 2005-06 (the year of the hurricanes) will be considered favorable for appeal.

Dropout Definition. 2008 is the second year for using the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition of a dropout. The following table shows the progression of use of the NCES definition. See *Appendix I: NCES Dropout Definition* for a detailed explanation.

Table 22: Completion Rate Transition

Accountability Year	Class of	Cohort Years	Dropout Definition	Completion Rate Methodology	
				Numerator	Denominator
2007	2006	2002-03 2003-04 2004-05 2005-06	TEA TEA TEA NCES	Graduates + Continuers	Graduates+ Continuers+ GED Recipients+ Dropouts
2008	2007	2003-04 2004-05 2005-06 2006-07	TEA TEA NCES NCES	Graduates + Continuers	Graduates+ Continuers+ GED Recipients+ Dropouts
2009	2008	2004-05 2005-06 2006-07 2007-08	TEA NCES NCES NCES	Graduates + Continuers	Graduates+ Continuers+ GED Recipients+ Dropouts
2010	2009	2005-06 2006-07 2007-08 2008-09	NCES NCES NCES NCES	Graduates + Continuers	Graduates+ Continuers+ GED Recipients+ Dropouts

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE (GR. 7-8)

Accountability Standards. There are no changes to the standards for the Annual Dropout Rate for 2008.

School Leaver Provision. In 2008 this provision will no longer apply. Annual dropout rate can be the cause for lower district and campus ratings.

Required Improvement. Required Improvement for the Annual Dropout Rate will be reinstated in 2008 when two years of dropout rates using the NCES definition are available.

ADDITIONAL FEATURES

Exceptions. The Exceptions Provision will be reevaluated to determine if measures should be added or removed, adjustments need to be made to the number of exceptions for which campuses or districts are eligible, or other aspects need to be modified.

Underreported Students. In 2008, the percent of underreported students that can prevent a district from being rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized* will remain at greater than 5.0%, or greater than 200 students. Districts with fewer than 5 underreported students will not be evaluated on this indicator. The School Leaver Provision will no longer apply. The underreported students measures can prevent a district from achieving *Exemplary* or *Recognized* ratings.

GOLD PERFORMANCE ACKNOWLEDGMENTS (GPA)

Commended Performance. The standard for the five TAKS commended indicators will remain the same in 2008. However, in 2008, performance on certain TAKS-I assessments will be combined with TAKS results to determine Commended Performance.

Comparable Improvement. The standard for the two CI indicators will remain the same in 2008. However, in 2008, performance on certain TAKS-I assessments will be combined with TAKS results to determine Comparable Improvement.

Texas Success Initiative. The standard for both subjects will increase from 50% to 55% in 2008. Note also that performance on the exit-level TAKS-I assessments will be combined with exit-level TAKS results to determine TSI.

REPORT-ONLY INDICATORS

These indicators will not be used in determining accountability ratings in 2008, and will not be on the Accountability Data Tables released in 2008, but they will be reported in other products, such as the AEIS reports.

Progress Measure for English Language Learners (ELL). Performance on this indicator will be reported on the 2007-08 AEIS reports. The ELL measure was first reported on the 2005-06 AEIS reports.

TAKS-I. Performance on TAKS-I reading/ELA, writing, and mathematics for grades 3-10 will be reported on the 2007-08 AEIS reports for the first time. See *Table 21*.

TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt. Performance on these alternate assessments for students with disabilities will be reported on the 2007-08 AEIS reports for the first time.

AEA Procedures for 2008

AEA CAMPUS REGISTRATION PROCESS

Beginning in 2008, the AEA campus registration process will be conducted online using the Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE) Accountability website. The 2007-08 AEA campus registration process opens September 10, 2007. An email notification will be sent to all superintendents stating that alternative education campuses (AECs) rated under 2007 AEA procedures will be re-registered automatically in 2008 subject to the at-risk registration criterion.

AECs wishing to rescind AEA registration must complete an electronic *2007-08 AEA Campus Rescission Form*. AECs requesting AEA registration must complete an electronic *2007-08 AEA Campus Registration Form*. AECs for which 2007 AEA registration was rescinded due to not meeting the at-risk registration criterion must submit a *2007-08 AEA Campus Registration Form* if the AEC wishes to request AEA campus registration in 2008. It is imperative that rescission and registration forms submitted via TEASE Accountability be printed and maintained locally as official documentation of AEA campus registration requests.

The 2007-08 AEA registration process closes September 21, 2007, at 5:00 p.m. C.D.T. AEA rescissions and registrations will not be processed after this time. When finalized, the list of 2008 registered AECs will be available on the AEA website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/aea>.

AT-RISK REGISTRATION CRITERION

In 2008 and beyond, each AEC must have at least 75% at-risk student enrollment or be eligible to use the Prior-Year PEIMS At-Risk Data or New Campus safeguards to remain registered and be evaluated under AEA procedures.

TAKS PROGRESS

Accountability Standards. The TAKS Progress standard remains at 45%.

TAKS Science. The results of the grade 8 science assessment will be included in the accountability system beginning in 2008. The student passing standard for this assessment will be at panel recommendation (scale score of 2100).

TAKS-I. In 2008, results for TAKS-I science (grades 5, 8, & 10), social studies (grades 8 & 10), and exit-level (all subjects) will be included in the accountability system. The student passing standard for TAKS-I will be the same as for TAKS. Results for TAKS-I reading/ELA, writing, and mathematics for grades 3-10 will not be used in 2008.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE (GR. 7-12)

Accountability Standards. The Annual Dropout Rate standard remains at 10.0%.

School Leaver Provision in 2008. For 2008 AEA ratings, if the Annual Dropout Rate indicator is the only cause for an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* label. As a safeguard to this provision, districts will be subject to identification and intervention through Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) for dropout rates and leaver reporting. Additionally, campuses that avoid being rated *Academically Unacceptable* due to this provision may be subject to technical assistance team (TAT) intervention requirements in the 2008-09 school year.

COMPLETION RATE II

Accountability Standards. The Completion Rate II standard remains at 75.0%.

AEA ACCOUNTABILITY DEVELOPMENT TOPICS

AEA Rating Labels. The guidelines, principles, and issues described in Chapter 7 of the *Manual* resulted in AEA procedures that are designed as pass/fail and acknowledge performance at two levels: acceptable and unacceptable. In 2008, when three years of AEA data are available, the AEA rating labels will be reviewed during the 2008 accountability development process. Also, revisions to the AEA procedures will be made to incorporate new legislation that affects the assessment program.

AEA Acknowledgments. The 2008 accountability development process will consider GPA for AEA campuses and charters. The 2006-07 performance results for registered AECs and charters will be evaluated against the 2008 standards for the existing GPA indicators. Also, a GPA-type commendation that would recognize the efforts taken to recover dropouts including the identification and accountability for recovered dropouts will be examined.

Standard Procedures for 2009

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS)

Accountability Standards. In 2009, the *Academically Acceptable* standards will remain at 70% for reading/ELA, and increase by five points for all other subjects: to 70% for writing and social studies; to 55% for mathematics; and to 50% for science. Also in 2009, the standard for *Recognized* (for all subjects) will increase to 80%. These standards will be reviewed in 2008 and are subject to change.

Minimum Size Criteria. For 2009, minimum size may be modified to include all groups with 30 or more students. If this change is made, groups of 30 to 49 would be included even if they represent less than 10% of the tested population.

COMPLETION RATE I

Accountability Standards. The standards for 2009 are recommended to remain the same as for 2008.

Dropout Definition. In 2009, results for three of the four cohort years (2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08) will be calculated using the NCES definition. See *Table 22*.

Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Students from the class of 2008 who were displaced because of either of the 2005 hurricanes and who received a final status of “dropout” during 2005-06 (the year of the hurricanes) will be considered favorable for appeal.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE (GR. 7-8)

Accountability Standards. The standards for 2009 have not been determined.

NEW BASE INDICATOR

Progress Measure for English Language Learners (ELL). Decisions regarding the ELL indicator will be made during the 2008 accountability cycle for first possible use in the 2009 accountability ratings.

ADDITIONAL FEATURES

Exceptions. The Exceptions Provision will be reevaluated to determine if measures should be added or removed, adjustments need to be made to the number of exceptions for which campuses or districts are eligible, or other aspects need to be modified.

Underreported Students. A new longitudinal indicator may replace the current underreported students indicator in the accountability ratings process for 2009, or may be added to the PBM Data Validation System.

GOLD PERFORMANCE ACKNOWLEDGMENTS (GPA)

Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course Completion. The standard for this indicator will increase from 25.0% to 30.0% in 2009.

Commended Performance. The standard for this indicator will increase for each subject from 25% to 30% in 2009.

Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program. The standard increases from 80.0% to 85.0% in 2009. RHSP/DAP will be reevaluated during the 2008 accountability development process, to explore the option of a DAP-only acknowledgment in 2009.

SAT/ACT. The SAT/ACT acknowledgment will be reevaluated during the 2008 accountability development process, for the possible inclusion of the new SAT writing assessment.

Texas Success Initiative. The standard for this indicator will increase for both subjects from 55% to 60% in 2009.

REPORT-ONLY INDICATORS

These indicators will not be used in determining accountability ratings in 2009, and will not be on the Accountability Data Tables released in 2009, but they will be reported in other products, such as the AEIS reports.

TAKS-I. Performance on TAKS-I reading/ELA, writing, and mathematics for grades 3-10 will be reported on the 2008-09 AEIS reports for the second time. See *Table 21*.

TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt. Performance on these alternate assessments for students with disabilities will be reported on the 2008-09 AEIS reports for the second time.

AEA Procedures for 2009

AEA CAMPUS REGISTRATION PROCESS

In 2009 and beyond, the AEA campus registration process will continue to be conducted online using the TEASE Accountability website.

TAKS PROGRESS

Accountability Standards. The TAKS Progress standard increases to 50%.

TAKS-I. In 2009, the TAKS-I performance used in the accountability system will be the same as for 2008 (science – grades 5, 8, & 10; social studies – grades 8 & 10; and exit-level – all subjects).

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE (GR. 7-12)

Accountability Standards. The Annual Dropout Rate standards for 2009 and beyond have not been determined.

COMPLETION RATE II

Accountability Standards. The Completion Rate II standard remains at 75.0% in 2009 and beyond.

Standard Procedures for 2010

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS)

Accountability Standards. In 2010, the *Academically Acceptable* standards will remain at 70% for reading/ELA, writing, and social studies. The standards will increase to 60% for mathematics, and to 55% for science. The standard for *Recognized* (for all subjects) will remain at 80%. In 2007, the Commissioner's Accountability Advisory Committee (CAAC) considered raising the reading/ELA *Academically Acceptable* standard to 75% for 2010. If that standard is raised, the *Recognized* standard will also be reconsidered.

TAKS-I. In 2010, performance on *all* TAKS-I subjects and grades will be used in the accountability system. The student passing standard for TAKS-I will be the same as for TAKS. See *Table 21*.

TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt. Decisions regarding inclusion of these alternate assessments for students with disabilities will be made during the 2009 accountability development cycle for first possible use in the accountability system beginning in 2010.

Required Improvement (RI). To allow for accurate comparison, prior year assessment results will be recalculated to include TAKS-I results in the additional grades and subjects. This will make 2009 and 2010 performance comparable and enable the continued use of RI as a feature in the system for 2010.

COMPLETION RATE I

Accountability Standards. The standards for 2010 are recommended to remain the same as for 2009.

Dropout Definition. In 2010, the transition will be complete and all four years of the cohort will be calculated using the NCES definition. See *Table 22*.

Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Students from the class of 2009 who were displaced because of either of the 2005 hurricanes and who received a final status of “dropout” during 2005-06 (the year of the hurricanes) will be considered favorable for appeal.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE (GR. 7-8)

Accountability Standards. The standards for 2010 have not been determined.

GOLD PERFORMANCE ACKNOWLEDGMENTS (GPA)

Texas Success Initiative. The standard for this indicator will increase for both subjects from 60% in 2009 to 65% in 2010.

AEA Procedures for 2010

TAKS PROGRESS

Accountability Standards. The TAKS Progress standard for 2010 remains at 50% and has not been determined beyond 2010.

TAKS-I. In 2010, performance on *all* TAKS-I subjects and grades will be used in the accountability system.

Overview 2007 – 2010

The phase-in schedule for the accountability standards will be reevaluated annually; any changes will be announced with as much advance notice as possible. In the tables on the following pages, all known changes to standards are shown. Changes for any given year compared to the prior year are indicated in bold.

Table 23: Standards through 2010 – Standard Procedures

	2007	2008*	2009**	2010**
TAKS Standards***				
Exemplary	≥ 90%	≥ 90%	≥ 90%	≥ 90%
Recognized	≥ 75%	≥ 75%	≥ 80%	≥ 80%****
Acceptable				
Reading/ELA	≥ 65%	≥ 70%	≥ 70%	≥ 70%****
Writing, Social Studies	≥ 65%	≥ 65%	≥ 70%	≥ 70%
Mathematics	≥ 45%	≥ 50%	≥ 55%	≥ 60%
Science	≥ 40%	≥ 45%	≥ 50%	≥ 55%
TAKS – I (Same standards as TAKS)	N/A	Sci. (5, 8, 10, 11); Soc.St. (8, 10, 11); ELA (11); Math (11)	Sci. (5, 8, 10, 11); Soc.St. (8, 10, 11); ELA (11); Math (11)	All grades and subjects
TAKS – M	N/A	N/A	N/A	TBD
TAKS – Alt	N/A	N/A	N/A	TBD
SDAA II Standards				
Exemplary	≥ 90%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Recognized	≥ 70%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Acceptable	≥ 50%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Completion Rate I (Grade 9-12) Standards				
	Class of 2006 (9 th grade 02-03)	Class of 2007 (9 th grade 03-04)	Class of 2008 (9 th grade 04-05)	Class of 2009 (9 th grade 05-06)
Exemplary	≥ 95.0%	≥ 95.0%	≥ 95.0%	≥ 95.0%
Recognized	≥ 85.0%	≥ 85.0%	≥ 85.0%	≥ 85.0%
Acceptable	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%
Dropout Definition	State Definition three years NCES Definition one year	State Definition two years NCES Definition two years	State Definition one year NCES Definition three years	NCES Definition all four years
Annual Dropout Rate (Grade 7-8) Standards				
	from 2005-06	from 2006-07	from 2007-08	from 2008-09
Exemplary	≤ 0.2%	≤ 0.2%	TBD	TBD
Recognized	≤ 0.7%	≤ 0.7%	TBD	TBD
Acceptable	≤ 1.0%	≤ 1.0%	TBD	TBD
Indicator Definition	NCES Definition (See Appendix I for detailed explanation.)			
Additional Features				
Required Improvement	See Chapter 3	TBD	TBD	TBD
Exceptions	See Chapter 3	TBD	TBD	TBD
Underreported Students	≤ 200 and ≤ 5.0%	≤ 200 and ≤ 5.0%	TBD	TBD
School Leaver Provision	Leaver Indicators don't lower rating	Not Applicable		

* Details about the 2008 accountability standards are presented in Chapter 16.

** Standards for 2009 and beyond will be reviewed annually and are subject to change.

*** Student passing standards are at Panel Recommendation (PR) for all TAKS subjects and grades, with the exception of grade 8 science in 2007. It will not be part of the accountability system until 2008, at PR.

****A Reading/ELA Academically Acceptable standard of 75% in 2010 will be considered during future development cycles. If altered, the Recognized standard will also be reconsidered.

Table 24: Standards through 2010 – AEA Procedures

	2007	2008*	2009	2010
TAKS Progress Standard				
AEA: Academically Acceptable	≥ 45%	≥ 45%	≥ 50%	≥ 50%
SDAA II Standard				
AEA: Academically Acceptable	≥ 45%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Completion Rate II (Grade 9-12) Standard				
	Class of 2006 (9 th grade 02-03)	Class of 2007 (9 th grade 03-04)	Class of 2008 (9 th grade 04-05)	Class of 2009 (9 th grade 05-06)
AEA: Academically Acceptable	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%
Completer II Definition	Graduates + Continuing Students + GED Recipients			
Dropout Definition	Phase in NCES definition			NCES Definition
Annual Dropout Rate (Grade 7-12) Standard				
	from 2005-06	from 2006-07	from 2007-08	from 2008-09
AEA: Academically Acceptable	≤ 10.0%	≤ 10.0%	TBD	TBD
Dropout Definition	NCES Definition			
Additional Features				
Required Improvement	See Chapter 11	TBD	TBD	TBD
Use of District At-Risk Data	See Chapter 11	TBD	TBD	TBD
School Leaver Provision (SLP)	Leaver Indicators don't lower rating	SLP applies to dropout rate; does not apply to completion rate	Not Applicable	

* Details about the 2008 accountability standards are presented in Chapter 16: Accountability Standards for 2008.

Table 25: Gold Performance Acknowledgment Standards through 2010

Indicator		2007	2008	2009	2010
Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion**		≥ 25.0%	≥ 25.0%	≥ 30.0%	≥ 30.0%
AP / IB Results*	% taking at least one AP or IB test <i>AND</i>	≥ 15.0%	≥ 15.0%	≥ 15.0%	≥ 15.0%
	% at or above criterion	≥ 50.0%	≥ 50.0%	≥ 50.0%	≥ 50.0%
Attendance Rate**	District	96.0%	96.0%	96.0%	96.0%
	Multi-Level	96.0%	96.0%	96.0%	96.0%
	High School	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
	Middle/Jr. High	96.0%	96.0%	96.0%	96.0%
	Elementary	97.0%	97.0%	97.0%	97.0%
Commended Performance: Reading/ELA**		≥ 25%	≥ 25%	≥ 30%	≥ 30%
Commended Performance: Mathematics**		≥ 25%	≥ 25%	≥ 30%	≥ 30%
Commended Performance: Writing**		≥ 25%	≥ 25%	≥ 30%	≥ 30%
Commended Performance: Science**		≥ 25%	≥ 25%	≥ 30%	≥ 30%
Commended Performance: Social Studies**		≥ 25%	≥ 25%	≥ 30%	≥ 30%
Comparable Improvement: Reading/ELA***		Top Quartile (top 25%)			
Comparable Improvement: Mathematics***		Top Quartile (top 25%)			
Recommended High School Program/DAP**		≥ 80.0%	≥ 80%	≥ 85%	≥ 85%
SAT/ACT Results*	% graduates taking at least one test <i>AND</i>	≥ 70.0%	≥ 70%	TBD	TBD
	% at or above criterion	≥ 40.0%	≥ 40%		
TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component: English Language Arts**		≥ 50%	≥ 55%	≥ 60%	≥ 65%
TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component: Mathematics**		≥ 50%	≥ 55%	≥ 60%	≥ 65%

* Indicator evaluates performance for All Students & the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, and White. Economically Disadvantaged status is not available from the testing results.

** Indicator evaluates performance for All Students & the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

*** Acknowledgment for Comparable Improvement is available to campuses only. It is evaluated for All Students only.

Chapter 18 – Calendar

Dates significant to the accountability system are listed below. Key dates directly related to accountability are bold. To the extent possible, descriptions of how products will be released (via mail, secure web, or public web) are provided. The fourth column shows whether the date applies to standard procedures, AEA procedures, or both.

Due to unforeseen circumstances, the calendar dates listed in this chapter may be modified at a later time.

Year	Date	Activity	Standard or AEA
2006	June 22	PEIMS submission 3 due (2005-06 Attendance)	Both
	July 20	Last date for districts with traditional calendars to resubmit changes and corrections to 2005-06 PEIMS submission 3	Both
	September 8	Last date for districts with year-round calendars to resubmit changes and corrections to 2005-06 PEIMS submission 3	Both
	September 11 – 22	2007 AEA registration process occurs	AEA
	October 17 – 20	TAKS exit-level English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies administered	Both
	October 27	Snapshot date for enrolled students (2006-07 PEIMS submission 1)	Both
	December 7	2006-07 PEIMS submission 1 due (includes 2005-06 Leavers; 2006-07 Enrollment)	Both
	December 12	TEA notifies districts of campuses identified under Public Education Grant (PEG) Program criteria effective for the 2007-08 school year (not applicable to charters or registered AECs)	Standard
2007	January – March	Development of 2007 state accountability system	Both
	January 18	Last date to resubmit changes and corrections to 2006-07 PEIMS submission 1	Both
	February 1	Districts notify parents of students in campuses identified under PEG criteria that they are eligible for transfer in 2007-08 (not applicable to charters or registered AECs)	Standard
	February 20 – 21	TAKS reading, writing and ELA, TAKS-I ELA, SDAA II reading, writing, and ELA administered	Both
	March 9	Districts receive TAKS reading results (grades 3 & 5)	Both
	March 30 – April 27	Pairing relationships requested for identified campuses	Standard
	April 3	TAKS mathematics (grade 5) administered	Both

Year	Date	Activity	Standard or AEA
2007 (cont.)	April 6	Commissioner's final decisions for 2007 accountability system are posted online	Both
	April 17 – 20	TAKS mathematics, reading, science, and social studies; TAKS-I mathematics, science, social studies; SDAA II mathematics, reading administered	Both
	April	TEA contacts alternative education campuses (AECs) that do not meet the 2007 at-risk registration criterion	AEA
	April	TEA contacts charters that have the option to be evaluated under 2007 AEA procedures	AEA
	May 10	Due date for responses from charters that have the option to be evaluated under 2007 AEA procedures	AEA
	May 11	Districts receive TAKS & SDAA II results for all subjects, all grades	Both
	May 15	TAKS mathematics (grade 5) retest	Both
	Mid-May	2007 Accountability Manual published (public web only)	Both
	June 21	Districts receive confidential dropout and completion lists and rates from TEA (secure web only)	Both
	June 21	2006-07 PEIMS submission 3 due (2006-07 Attendance)	Both
	July 19	Last date for districts with traditional calendars to resubmit changes and corrections to 2006-07 PEIMS submission 3	Both
	July 20	Districts receive confidential preview data tables from TEA (secure web only)	Both
	July 20	TEA begins accepting ratings appeals	Both
	August 1*	TEA issues 2007 district and campus accountability ratings	Both
	August 17	Last day to appeal 2007 state accountability ratings	Both
	August/September	Districts must post current accountability rating, AEIS report, and SRC on district website	Both
	September 6	Last date for districts with TEA-approved year-round calendars to resubmit 2006-07 PEIMS submission 3	Both
September 10-21	2008 AEA campus registration process occurs (secure web only)	AEA	

* The public release of district and campus ratings will be posted online during the afternoon of August 1st. Districts will have access to their list of district and campus ratings on the TEA Secure Environment (TEASE) Accountability site earlier that day. ESCs will receive a listing showing the district and campus ratings for the districts in their region. Final masked data tables will be available on the TEA public website.

Year	Date	Activity	Standard or AEA
2007 (cont.)	September/October	Districts must include accountability ratings on first student report cards.	Both
	Late October	Final ratings release—after resolution of all appeals (secure and public web)	Both
	Late October	TEA issues 2007 Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA)	Standard
	October 26	Snapshot date for enrolled students (2007-08 PEIMS submission 1)	Both
	October 16-19	TAKS exit-level English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies administered	Both
	November 1	TEA releases 2007-08 list of Technical Assistance Team (TAT) campuses	Both
	Early November	TEA releases 2006-07 AEIS reports to district superintendents (secure web only)	Both
	Late November	Release of 2006-07 AEIS reports on public website	Both
	December 6	2007-08 PEIMS submission 1 due (includes 2006-07 Leavers and 2007-08 Enrollment)	Both
	Mid–December	TEA notifies districts of campuses identified under PEG criteria effective for the 2008-09 school year (via mail) (not applicable to charters or registered AECs)	Standard
	Mid–December	TEA releases 2006-07 School Report Cards	Both
2008	January – March	Development of 2008 state accountability system	Both
	February 1	Districts notify parents of students in campuses identified under PEG criteria that they are eligible for transfer in 2008-09 (not applicable to charters or registered AECs)	Standard
	January 17	Last date to resubmit changes and corrections to 2007-08 PEIMS submission 1	Both
	February 19	TAKS & TAKS-I reading, writing, and English language arts (ELA) administered	Both
	March 7	Districts receive grades 3, 5, & 8 reading results	Both
	Late March	Campus pairing process begins	Standard
	April	TEA contacts AECs that do not meet the 2008 at-risk registration criterion	AEA
	April	Charters that have the option to be evaluated under 2008 AEA procedures are contacted	AEA
	April 8	TAKS & TAKS-I mathematics (grades 5 & 8) administered	Both
	April 22 – 25	TAKS & TAKS-I mathematics, reading, science, and social studies	Both

Year	Date	Activity	Standard or AEA
2008 (cont.)	April 25	Districts receive grades 5 & 8 mathematics results	Both
	Late April	Campus pairing process closes	Standard
	May 9-16	Districts receive TAKS & TAKS-I results for all subjects, all grades	Both
	Early May	Due date for responses from charters that have the option to be evaluated under 2008 AEA procedures	AEA
	May 13	TAKS & TAKS-I mathematics (grades 5 & 8) retest	Both
	May	2008 Accountability Manual published	Both
	June	Districts receive confidential dropout and completion lists and rates from TEA (secure web only)	Both
	June 19	2007-08 PEIMS submission 3 due (2007-08 Attendance)	Both
	July 17	Last date for districts with traditional calendars to resubmit changes and corrections to 2007-08 PEIMS submission 3	Both
	Mid-July	Districts receive confidential preview data tables from TEA (secure web only)	Both
	August 1	Release of 2008 accountability ratings	Both
	August	2008 state accountability ratings appeals process (Date for appeals deadline TBD)	Both
	August/September	Districts must post current accountability rating, AEIS report, and SRC on district website.	Both
	August 28	Last date for districts with TEA-approved year-round calendars to resubmit 2007-08 PEIMS submission 3	Both
	September	2009 AEA campus registration process	AEA
	September/October	Districts must include the most current campus accountability rating with the first student report card	Both
	October	Final ratings release—after resolution of all appeals	Both
	October	TEA issues 2008 Gold Performance Acknowledgments	Standard
	November 1	TEA releases 2008-09 list of Technical Assistance Team (TAT) campuses	Both
	October/November	TEA releases 2007-08 AEIS reports	Both
November/December	TEA notifies districts of campuses identified under PEG criteria effective for 2009-10 school year (not applicable to charters or registered AECs)	Standard	
November/December	TEA releases 2007-08 School Report Cards	Both	

**The 2007 Accountability Rating System
for Texas Public Schools and School Districts**

Appendices

Appendices:

Appendix A –
Commissioner of Education
Rule 151

Appendix B – Texas
Education Code 153

Appendix C – Comparison
of State and Federal
Systems 155

Appendix D –
Data Sources 161

Appendix E –
Texas Growth Index ... 175

Appendix F – Campus
Comparison Group 181

Appendix G –
Contacts 183

Appendix H –
Acknowledgments 187

Appendix I – NCES
Dropout Definition 191

Appendix A – Commissioner of Education Rule

Beginning in 2000, a portion of the *Accountability Manual* has been adopted on an annual basis as a Commissioner of Education rule. With the publication of this *Manual*, the Texas Education Agency will file a Commissioner’s Rule amendment to 19 *Texas Administrative Code* §97.1001, *Accountability Rating System*, with the Office of the Secretary of State. This rule will adopt the *2007 Accountability Manual, Chapters 2-6, 8, 10-12, and 14-16*, thus giving legal standing to the rating process and procedures.

Allowing for a 30-day comment period, final adoption should occur by July 31, 2007. Once the rule is adopted, it may be accessed online at:

<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter097/ch097aa.html>

Chapter 97. Planning and Accountability

Subchapter AA. Accountability and Performance Monitoring

§97.1001. Accountability Rating System.

Appendix B – Texas Education Code

The 2007 Accountability Rating System for Texas Public Schools and School Districts was developed based on statutory mandates of the Texas Legislature. The majority of the relevant legislation is contained in *TEC Chapter 39. Public School System Accountability*. Below is a table of contents of the sections in Chapter 39. The full text as well as the rest of the Texas Education Code is available on the state website at:

<http://tlo2.tlc.state.tx.us/statutes/ed.toc.htm>

Chapter 39. Public School System Accountability

Subchapter B. Assessment of Academic Skills

- Sec. 39.021 Essential Skills and Knowledge
- Sec. 39.022 Assessment Program
- Sec. 39.023 Adoption and Administration of Instruments
- Sec. 39.0231 Reporting of Results of Certain Assessments
- Sec. 39.0232 Use of End-of-Course Instrument as Placement Instrument
- Sec. 39.024 Satisfactory Performance
- Sec. 39.025 Exit-Level Performance Required
- Sec. 39.026 Local Option
- Sec. 39.027 Exemption
- Sec. 39.028 Comparison of State Results to National Results
- Sec. 39.029 Migratory Children
- Sec. 39.030 Confidentiality; Performance Reports
- Sec. 39.031 Cost
- Sec. 39.032 Assessment Instrument Standards; Civil Penalty
- Sec. 39.033 Voluntary Assessment of Private School Students
- Sec. 39.034 Measure of Annual Improvement in Student Achievement

Subchapter C. Performance Indicators

- Sec. 39.051 Academic Excellence Indicators
- Sec. 39.052 Campus Report Card
- Sec. 39.053 Performance Report
- Sec. 39.054 Uses of Performance Report
- Sec. 39.055 Annual Audit of Dropout Records; Report

Subchapter D. Accreditation Status

- Sec. 39.071 Accreditation
- Sec. 39.072 Accreditation Standards
- Sec. 39.0721 Gold Performance Rating Program
- Sec. 39.073 Determining Accreditation Status
- Sec. 39.074 On-Site Investigations
- Sec. 39.075 Special Accreditation Investigations
- Sec. 39.076 Conduct of Investigations

Subchapter E. Successful School Awards

- Sec. 39.091 Creation of System
- Sec. 39.092 Types of Awards

- Sec. 39.093 Awards
- Sec. 39.094 Use of Awards
- Sec. 39.095 Funding
- Sec. 39.096 Confidentiality

Subchapter F. Additional Rewards

- Sec. 39.111 Recognition and Rewards
- Sec. 39.112 Excellence Exemptions
- Sec. 39.113 Recognition of High School Completion and Success and College Readiness Programs
- Sec. 39.114 High School Allotment

Subchapter G. Accreditation Sanctions

- Sec. 39.131 Sanctions For Districts
- Sec. 39.132 Sanctions For Academically Unacceptable and Certain Other Campuses
- Sec. 39.1321 Sanctions for Charter Schools
- Sec. 39.1322 Technical Assistance and Campus Intervention Teams
- Sec. 39.1323 Campus Intervention Team Procedures
- Sec. 39.1324 Mandatory Sanctions
- Sec. 39.1326 Transitional Sanctions Provisions
- Sec. 39.1327 Management of Certain Academically Unacceptable Campuses
- Sec. 39.133 Annual Review
- Sec. 39.1331 Acquisition of Professional Services
- Sec. 39.134 Costs Paid By District
- Sec. 39.135 Conservator Or Management Team
- Sec. 39.136 Board of Managers
- Sec. 39.137 Special Campus Intervention Team
- Sec. 39.138 Immunity From Civil Liability

Subchapter H. Reports By Texas Education Agency

- Sec. 39.181 General Requirements
- Sec. 39.182 Comprehensive Annual Report
- Sec. 39.183 Regional and District Level Report
- Sec. 39.184 Technology Report
- Sec. 39.185 Interim Report

Subchapter I. Financial Accountability

- Sec. 39.201 Definitions
- Sec. 39.202 Development and Implementation
- Sec. 39.203 Reporting
- Sec. 39.204 Rules

Subchapter J. Notice of Performance

- Sec. 39.251 Notice in Student Grade Report
- Sec. 39.252 Notice on District Website

Subchapter K. Procedures for Challenge of Accountability Rating or Sanction

- Sec. 39.301 Review by Commissioner: Accountability Ratings
- Sec. 39.302 Review by State Office of Administrative Hearings: Sanctions

Appendix C – Comparison of State and Federal Systems

In addition to the state accountability system, which is mandated by the Texas legislature, there is also a federal system of public school accountability. Although the state system has been in place since 1993, the accountability provisions in the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act were first applied to the Texas public schools in 2003. Campuses, districts and the state were evaluated for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for the first time in 2003.

The purpose of this appendix is to provide details comparing the state accountability system to the federal (AYP) system. Though there are some similarities and elements in common between the two, there are significant differences. For complete details about the federal system, see the *2007 AYP Guide*. The *Guide* as well as other information about AYP can be found at the AYP website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/index.html>.

SYSTEMS ALIGNED

The state accountability system and the AYP procedures mandated by the U.S. Department of Education, are aligned where possible.

- *Release Date*. The release dates for the state accountability ratings and preliminary AYP status are scheduled to occur prior to the start of the 2007-08 school year.
- *Labels*. The final 2007 AYP status will include the 2007 state accountability ratings for both standard and AEA procedures. These labels will appear for both Title I and non-Title I campuses and districts.
- *Appeals Process*. The appeals processes for state ratings and AYP status are aligned to the extent possible. See *Chapter 14 – Appealing the Ratings* of this *Manual* and the *2007 AYP Guide* for more information.

COMPARISON

The following tables provide comparisons of the state and federal systems. *Table 24* contains a side-by-side comparison of the indicators, restrictions, requirements, and source data for both systems.

Table 25 is a comparison by grade level. With this table, a campus can compare the use of various indicators by grade. For example, a grade 3-5 campus is evaluated in both the state and federal systems on TAKS reading, mathematics, and SDAA II reading, mathematics, although AYP evaluates more student groups for each of these indicators. In a grade 3-5 campus, its AYP status also depends on attendance and participation indicators, while its state rating includes TAKS writing and science results.

Table 26: 2007 Comparison of State and Federal Accountability (AYP) by Indicator

State Accountability (Standard Procedures)		AYP
TAKS		
Subjects & Standards	Reading/ELA* Exemplary 90% / Recognized 75% / Acceptable 65% Mathematics* Exemplary 90% / Recognized 75% / Acceptable 45% Writing Exemplary 90% / Recognized 75% / Acceptable 65% Social Studies Exemplary 90% / Recognized 75% / Acceptable 65% Science Exemplary 90% / Recognized 75% / Acceptable 40% All values rounded to the nearest whole number. *Includes cumulative pass rate for grades 3 and 5 reading and grade 5 mathematics.	Reading/ELA* Meets AYP 60% Mathematics* Meets AYP 50%
Grades	3–11 (English); 3–6 (Spanish)	3–8, and 10 (English); 3–6 (Spanish)
Student Groups	All Students African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged	All Students African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged Special Education Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Minimum Size	All Students..... Any (Special Analysis if small) Student Groups..... 30/10%/50	All StudentsAny (Special Analysis if small) Student Groups 50/10%/200
Improvement	To Acceptable: Has enough gain to meet Acceptable standard in 2 years. To Recognized: At 70% – 74% and has gain to meet 75% standard in 2 years.	10% decrease in percent not passing and at least 0.1% improvement on "other measure."
Pairing	Paired with feeder campus (or district).	Paired with feeder campus (or district) in certain conditions.
SDAA II		
Subjects & Standards	Reading/ELA + Mathematics + Writing Exemplary 90% / Recognized 70% / Acceptable 50% Number "met expectations" summed across grades and subjects. Results rounded to whole numbers.	SDAA II (grades 3-8 and 10 only) is combined with TAKS and other assessments by subject for performance and participation. See TAKS section (above) for standards, subjects, and groups.
Grades	3-10	
Student Groups	All Students only	
Minimum Size	All Students.....At least 30 tests in denominator Student Groups.....N/A	Note: there is a cap on the percentage of students who can be counted as <i>proficient</i> based on SDAA II results for students tested below enrolled grade level.
Improvement	To Acceptable: Has enough gain to meet Acceptable standard in 2 years. To Recognized: At 65% – 69% and has gain to meet 70% standard in 2 years.	
Pairing	N/A: No pairing for SDAA II.	

Table 26: 2007 Comparison of State and Federal Accountability (AYP) by Indicator (continued)

State Accountability (Standard Procedures)		AYP
Other Assessment Indicators		
RPTE & LAT Reading	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.	Combined with TAKS and SDAA II results (by subject for students not tested on TAKS or SDAA II) for Performance and Participation.
LAT Mathematics		
Additional Assessment Features		
Mobility Adjustment	District and campus accountability subsets used.	District and campus accountability subsets used.
Exceptions	Allowed for up to 3 of the 26 TAKS and SDAA II measures depending on the number of assessment measures evaluated.* * Only used to move to Acceptable; must be within 5 percentage points of Acceptable standard; other conditions apply.	N/A
Attendance Rate		
Standard	N/A: Used only for Gold Performance Acknowledgment (for grades 1-12).	Meets AYP 90.0% "Other Measure" for elementary and middle schools. All values rounded to nearest one-tenth of a percent.
Student Groups		All Students only
Minimum Size		All Students.... 7,200 (40 students x 180 days) Student Groups* 50/10%/200 * Student groups used only for performance gain.
Improvement		At least 0.1% improvement.
Completion Rate (grades 9-12)		
Standards	Grads+Continuers Exemplary 95.0%/Recognized 85.0%/Acceptable 75.0% All values rounded to nearest one-tenth of a percent.	Graduate component only 70.0% "Other Measure" for high schools and districts. All values rounded to nearest one-tenth of a percent.
Student Groups	All Students African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged	All Students only
Minimum Size	All Students At least 5 dropouts and 10 in denominator Student Groups At least 5 dropouts and 30/10%/50 in denominator	All Students At least 40 in denominator Student Groups* 50/10%/200 * Student groups used only for performance gain.
Improvement	To Acceptable: Has gain to meet 75.0% standard in 2 years To Recognized: At 80.0% - 84.9% and has gain to meet 85% standard in 2 years Minimum Size (All Students and groups): At least 10 in prior year	At least 0.1% improvement
High School w/o completion rate	District completion rate used.	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.

Table 26: 2007 Comparison of State and Federal Accountability (AYP) by Indicator (continued)

State Accountability (Standard Procedures)		AYP
Annual Dropout Rate (grades 7-8)	Grades 7-8Exemplary 0.2% / Recognized 0.7% / Acceptable 1.0% <i>All values rounded to one-tenth.</i>	
Student Groups	All Students African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged	
Minimum Size	All StudentsAt least 5 dropouts and 10 in denominator Student GroupsAt least 5 dropouts and 30/10%/50 in denominator	
Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To <i>Acceptable</i>: Has declined to meet 1.0% standard in 2 years. To <i>Recognized</i>: At 0.8% - 0.9% and has declined to meet 0.7% standard in 2 years. Minimum Size (All Students and groups): At least 10 in prior year. 	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.
Middle School w/o dropout rate	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.	
Participation Rate: Reading/ELA & Mathematics		
Standard		Tested at campus/district 95% <i>All values rounded to nearest whole number.</i>
Student Groups	N/A: Indicator not evaluated. Monitoring interventions may occur with excessive exemptions.	All Students African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged Special Education Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Minimum Size		All StudentsAt least 40 in denominator Student Groups50/10%/200
Other Campus and District Situations		
Registered Alternative Education Campuses	Rated under Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures.	Evaluated under same criteria as regular campuses.
Charter Operators	Evaluated under same criteria as regular districts.* * <i>Charter Operators may be rated under AEA Procedures.</i>	Evaluated under same criteria as regular districts.
Charter Schools	Evaluated under same criteria as regular campuses. <i>(Charter schools are not paired.)</i>	Evaluated under same criteria as regular campuses.
New Campuses	All campuses (established or new) are rated.	New campuses are not evaluated.
Additional District Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must have no <i>Unacceptable</i> campuses to be <i>Exemplary</i> or <i>Recognized</i>. Must meet Underreported Student standards to be <i>Exemplary</i> or <i>Recognized</i>. 	No additional district requirements.

Table 27: 2007 Grade Level Comparison of State (Standard Procedures) and Federal Accountability

Grade †		†Reading ELA	†Math	Writing	Social Studies	Science	*SDAA II	**HS Completion	Annual Dropout	Attendance	Participation	
											Read/ELA	Math
Grade 1*	All Students									AYP		
	AA/H/W/ED*											
	Special Ed & LEP											
Grade 2*	All Students									AYP		
	AA/H/W/ED*											
	Special Ed & LEP											
Grade 3	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State				AYP/State			AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State				AYP				AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP				AYP				AYP	AYP
Grade 4	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State	State			AYP/State			AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State	State			AYP				AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP				AYP				AYP	AYP
Grade 5	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State			State	AYP/State			AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State			State	AYP				AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP				AYP				AYP	AYP
Grade 6	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State				AYP/State			AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State				AYP				AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP				AYP				AYP	AYP
Grade 7	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State	State			AYP/State		State	AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State	State			AYP		State		AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP				AYP				AYP	AYP
Grade 8	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State		State		AYP/State		State	AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State		State		AYP		State		AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP				AYP				AYP	AYP
Grade 9	All Students	State	State				State	State				
	AA/H/W/ED*	State	State					State				
	Special Ed & LEP											
Grade 10	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State		State	State	AYP/State	State			AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State		State	State	AYP	State			AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP				AYP				AYP	AYP
Grade 11	All Students	State	State		State	State		State				
	AA/H/W/ED*	State	State		State	State		State				
	Special Ed & LEP											
Grade 12*	All Students							AYP/State				
	AA/H/W/ED*							State				
	Special Ed & LEP											

* AA/H/W/ED refers to the student groups African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.
 ** High School Completion is defined differently for AYP: Under AYP, the Graduate component of the Completion Rate is used, which includes only diploma recipients. Differences also exist between the two systems in the treatment of secondary schools without their own completion data.
 † Schools are paired when they do not have grades tested. The use of paired data differs between the two systems.
 ‡ Performance on TAKS reading/ELA and math include slightly different groups of students for AYP: Minimum size for student groups in AYP is 50/10%/200; for state accountability it is 30/10%/50.
 †† Performance on SDAA II is used differently for AYP: Under AYP, SDAA II performance is combined with TAKS performance. In the state system, SDAA II is evaluated as a separate indicator.

Appendix D – Data Sources

This appendix provides data sources for the indicators used in the state accountability system, including those used to assign Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA). The information is arranged alphabetically by indicator name.

For each indicator, the *Methodology* section shows the source for the numerator and denominator. *Student Demographics* shows the sources for the demographics used to disaggregate the "All Students" totals into the various student groups used in the accountability system. *Other Information* presents unique topics affecting each indicator.

The primary sources for all data used in the state accountability system are the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data collection, the various assessment companies, and the General Educational Development (GED) data file. *Tables 26, 27, and 28* describe these data sources in detail. The terms provided in these tables are referenced within the indicator discussion.

Table 28: Assessments Used in Accountability

Organization Name	Description
ACT, Inc.	The ACT, Inc. annually provides the agency with the ACT participation and performance data of graduating seniors from Texas public schools. Only one record is sent per student. If a student takes an ACT test more than once, the agency receives the record for the most recent examination taken. The ACT data as of the June administration is used in creating the SAT/ACT indicator.
College Board	The College Board annually provides the agency with the SAT participation and performance data of graduating seniors from Texas public schools. Only one record is sent per student. If a student takes a SAT test more than once, the agency receives the record for the most recent examination taken. The SAT data as of the June administration is used in creating the SAT/ACT indicator. In addition, the College Board provides the agency with the Advanced Placement (AP) examination results of Texas public school students each year. The AP data as of the May administration is used in creating the AP/IB indicator.
International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO)	The International Baccalaureate Organization provides the agency with the International Baccalaureate (IB) examination results of Texas public school students each year. The IB data as of the May administration is used in creating the AP/IB indicator.
Pearson Educational Measurement	Pearson Educational Measurement is the contractor for the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) and State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II). After each test administration, the TEA Student Assessment Division receives student-level TAKS and SDAA II data from Pearson.
TEA GED Database	A TEA database containing information about examinee performance on the GED tests is maintained by the Division of Student Support. Unlike the information in most other TEA data files, which is reported annually, receipt of a GED test(s) is reported as soon as the test is scored. A certificate is mailed once the examinee has passed all five tests, and the information is stored in a database. Candidates take GED tests at centers throughout the state in school districts, colleges and universities, education service centers, and correctional facilities. Tests are given year-round, and the results are transmitted electronically to the TEA from the University of Texas Scoring Center after they have graded the tests.

Table 29: PEIMS Record Types Used in Accountability

Record	Name	Description	Submission /Month
101	Student Demographic/ Identification Data	Demographic/identification information about each student, including the student's ethnicity, gender, date of birth, migrant status, as-of-status, campus of accountability, and demographic revision confirmation code.	1 st /October, 3 rd /June
110	Student Enrollment Data	Enrollment information about each student, including the student's grade, ADA eligibility, economically disadvantaged status, at-risk status, and indicators of the special programs in which the student participates.	1 st /October
203	Leaver Data	Information about students served in grades 7-12 in the prior school year (2005-06) who did not continue in enrollment the following fall, and who did not move to another Texas public school district, graduate before 2005-06 school year, or receive a GED by August 31, 2006. 2005-06 leavers are students who graduated in that school year, dropped out, or left school for non-dropout reasons (e.g., enrolled in school outside the Texas public school system, or returned to home country). This record contains last campus of enrollment, special education indicator, the leaver reason, and additional information for graduates.	1 st /October
400	Basic Attendance Data	Information about each student for each of the six, six-week attendance reporting periods in the year. For each student, for each six-week period, districts report grade level, number of days taught, days absent, and total eligible and ineligible days present and selected special program information.	3 rd /June
405	Special Education Attendance Data	Information about each student served through the special education program. For each student, for each six-week period, districts report grade-level and also instructional-setting codes.	3 rd /June
415	Course Completion Data	Information about each student who was in membership in grades 9-12 and who completed at least one state-approved course during the school year. This record contains campus of enrollment, course sequence, pass/fail credit indicator, and dual credit indicator.	3 rd /June

Table 30: Student Demographics

Trait	Description
Economic Status	<p>A student may be identified as economically disadvantaged by the district if he or she:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meets eligibility requirements for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the federal free or reduced price lunch programs; ○ Title II of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA); ○ Food Stamp benefits; ○ Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) or other public assistance; • received a Pell grant or funds from other comparable state program of needs-based financial assistance; or • is from a family with an annual income at or below the official federal poverty line.
Ethnicity	<p>Districts assign student ethnicity from one of the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • American Indian or Alaskan Native (<i>not evaluated separately for accountability</i>) • Asian or Pacific Islander (<i>not evaluated separately for accountability</i>) • Black, not of Hispanic origin • Hispanic • White, not of Hispanic origin
At Risk	<p>A student is identified as at risk of dropping out of school based on state-defined criteria (TEC §29.081(d).) The statutory criteria for at risk status include each student who is under 21 years of age and who:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) was not advanced from one grade level to the next for one or more school years; 2) is in grades 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, or 12 and did not maintain an average equivalent to 70 on a scale of 100 in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum during a semester in the preceding or current school year or is not maintaining such an average in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum in the current semester; 3) did not perform satisfactorily on an assessment instrument administered to the student under TEC Subchapter B, Chapter 39, and who has not in the previous or current school year subsequently performed on that instrument or another appropriate instrument at a level equal to at least 110 percent of the level of satisfactory performance on that instrument; 4) is in prekindergarten, kindergarten or grades 1, 2, or 3 and did not perform satisfactorily on a readiness test or assessment instrument administered during the current school year; 5) is pregnant or is a parent; 6) has been placed in an alternative education program in accordance with TEC §37.006 during the preceding or current school year; 7) has been expelled in accordance with TEC §37.007 during the preceding or current school year; 8) is currently on parole, probation, deferred prosecution, or other conditional release; 9) was previously reported through the PEIMS to have dropped out of school; 10) is a student of limited English proficiency, as defined by TEC §29.052; 11) is in the custody or care of the Department of Protective and Regulatory Services or has, during the current school year, been referred to the department by a school official, officer of the juvenile court, or law enforcement official; 12) is homeless, as defined by 42 U.S.C. Section 11302 and its subsequent amendments; 13) resided in the preceding school year or resides in the current school year in a residential placement facility in the district, including a detention facility, substance abuse treatment facility, emergency shelter, psychiatric hospital, halfway house, or foster group home.
Special Education Status	<p>Special education status indicates the student is participating in a special education instructional and related services program or a general education program using special education support services, supplementary aids, or other special arrangements.</p>

Opportunities for Data Correction

PEIMS

General Data. The PEIMS data collection has a prescribed process and calendar for correcting errors or omissions discovered after the original submission. *The accuracy of all reports, whether they show ratings, acknowledgments, or recognitions is wholly dependent on the accuracy of the information submitted.* Districts are responsible for the accuracy of all their PEIMS data. Several mechanisms are in place to facilitate the collection of accurate data. First, all submitted data must pass an editor program before being accepted. In addition, districts can access various summary reports through the *EDIT+* application to assist them in verifying the accuracy of their data prior to submission deadlines. For each submission, a resubmission window is provided so that districts have an opportunity to resubmit information if an error is detected. See the *PEIMS Data Standards* (available at www.tea.state.tx.us/peims/standards/index.html) for the appropriate year for more details about the correction windows and submission deadlines.

Person Identification Database (PID) Updates. PID changes have profound ramifications throughout the Texas public education data system. Year-to-year and collection-to-collection matching are dependent upon stable PID records. *PEIMS Data Standards* should be followed to ensure that PID updates submitted by districts are processed properly. For information please see the edit process for PID, online at www.tea.state.tx.us/peims/pid/index.html.

ASSESSMENT DATA

TAKS and SDAA II. Student identification, demographic, and scoring status information as entered on the answer document at the time of testing is used to determine the accountability subset for campus and district ratings. After the testing dates, districts are able to provide corrections to the test contractor and request corrected reports; however, those changes are not incorporated into the TAKS or SDAA II results used for determining accountability ratings or subsequent reports (e.g. AEIS and School Report Cards). That is, districts do not have the option to change student identification, demographics, program participation, ARD decision coding, or score code status for purposes of accountability after test results are known. They have multiple opportunities to provide accurate information through their PEIMS submissions, pre-coded data files provided to the test contractor, and updates to the TAKS or SDAA II answer documents at the time of testing.

SAT, ACT, AP, and IB. The student taking the SAT, ACT, AP, or IB test identifies the school to which scores are attributed. Schools are encouraged to verify campus summary information on these tests immediately upon receipt. Discrepancies should be reported to the testing companies, not TEA. Once the testing companies finalize results for yearly summaries, subsequent corrections are not reflected in any national, state, district, or school results released.

Indicator Data Sources

ADVANCED COURSE/DUAL ENROLLMENT COMPLETION

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of students in grades 9 through 12 who received credit for at least one advanced course (from PEIMS 415)}}{\text{number of students in grades 9 through 12 who completed at least one course (from PEIMS 415)}}$$

Year of Data: 2005-06

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
Date	October 2005	June 2006

Other Information:

- A list of courses designated as advanced is published each year in the *AEIS Glossary*. The most current list can be accessed online at <http://wwwdev.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis/2007/glossary.html#appendc>

ADVANCED PLACEMENT/INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE EXAM RESULTS

Methodology:

Participation:

$$\frac{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ graders taking at least one AP or IB examination (from College Board and IBO)}}{\text{total non-special education students enrolled in 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ grades (from PEIMS 110)}}$$

Performance:

$$\frac{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ graders with at least one score at or above the criterion score (from College Board and IBO)}}{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ graders with at least one AP or IB examination (from College Board and IBO)}}$$

Year of Data: 2005-06

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity	Special Education Status
Source	n/a	PEIMS 101 (primary) College Board (secondary)	PEIMS 110
Date	n/a	October 2005 (primary) May 2006 (secondary)	October 2005

Other Information:

- Primary and Secondary Sources.* Secondary sources are used when the primary source does not contain ethnicity for a given student.

- *Special Education.* Those students reported as special education are removed from the count of grade 11 & 12 enrollees used in the denominator of the participation calculation.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE

Methodology for Grade 7-8 Annual Dropout Rate:

$$\frac{\text{number of dropouts (from PEIMS 203)}}{\text{number of students served during the school year, including ADA ineligible students (from PEIMS 110 and 400)}}$$

where students in grades 7 and 8 (numerator and denominator) are used in determining ratings under standard procedures.

Methodology for Grade 7-12 Annual Dropout Rate:

$$\frac{\text{number of dropouts (from PEIMS 203)}}{\text{number of students served during the school year, including ADA ineligible students (from PEIMS 110 and 400)}}$$

where students in grades 7-12 (numerator and denominator) are used in determining ratings under AEA procedures.

Year of Data: 2005-06

Student Demographics:

Numerator

	Economic Status	Ethnicity	Grade
Source	PEIMS 110 (primary) PEIMS 203 (secondary)	PEIMS 101 (primary & secondary)	PEIMS 400 (primary) PEIMS 101 (secondary)
Date	October 2005 (primary) October 2006 (secondary)	June 2006 (primary) October 2006 (secondary)	June 2006 (primary) October 2006 (secondary)

Denominator

	Economic Status	Ethnicity	Grade
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101	PEIMS 110 PEIMS 400
Date	October 2005	October 2005 June 2006	October 2005 June 2006

Other Information:

- *Dropout Definition.* This year for the first time, TEA will use the more rigorous NCES dropout definition. See *Appendix I – NCES Dropout Definition* for a detailed explanation.
- *Leaver Codes.* Leaver codes have changed in accordance with the change in dropout definition. Because of the change this year, districts no longer report the status of grade 7-12 students if they moved to another Texas public school district, graduated in a previous school year (before 2005-06), or received a GED by August 31, 2006. The district must code all other grade 7-12 students who leave with one of the codes shown on

Table 29. Students who leave due to reasons identified with an asterisk are not counted as dropouts. Only students reported with leaver code 98 are defined as dropouts.

- *Economically Disadvantaged.* For the denominator of the dropout rate calculation, those students who were NOT reported in enrollment in any district on the 2005-06 PEIMS Submission 1 cannot be coded as economically disadvantaged. If a student is economically disadvantaged at any district or campus, he/she is deemed economically disadvantaged at all districts and campuses.
- *Underreported Students.* Information about students reported in either enrollment or attendance in grades 7-12 the prior year but who were not accounted for as movers, previous Texas graduates, or GED recipients and who were not reported as either enrolled or as leavers in the current year are identified as underreported students. Lists of these students can be found on the *EDIT+* reports.

Table 31: Leaver Codes

Code	Translation
01*	Graduated
03*	Died
16*	Return to Home Country
24*	College, Pursue Degree
60*	Home Schooling
66*	Removed-Child Protective Svcs
78*	Expelled, Cannot Return
81*	Enroll In TX Private School
82*	Enroll In School Outside Texas
83*	Administrative Withdrawal
85*	Graduated outside Texas-Returned-Left Again
86*	GED outside Texas
98	Other

* Codes with asterisks are not counted as dropouts in determining the 2007 state accountability ratings.

- *Excluded Records.* Because of the changes to the reporting and processing of leaver data, the check for reported dropouts in other educational settings is now conducted prior to the PEIMS resubmission deadline, and excluded records no longer exist as part of leaver reporting.
- *Campus of Accountability.* Leavers are assigned to the campuses they were attending when they left the Texas public school system. A student served at a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP) and/or a Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP) is assigned to a "campus of accountability" based on the campus he or she last attended when one can be identified. Campus of accountability may be reported by the district or may be determined by the agency based on PEIMS attendance records

reported for the prior year. A detailed table showing assignment in specific situations may be found in the section of the *PEIMS Data Standards* describing the student demographic data (Record Type 101).

- *District of Accountability.* In two cases, TEA attributes dropouts across district boundaries to a district different from the reporting district:
 - 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.
 - 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 another Texas school district, and they can be attributed to that district.

Beginning with the 2007 accountability cycle, students who cannot be attributed back to a sending district will be attributed to the district in which the RTC or correctional facility is located. In most cases, TEA is able to attribute the dropouts to the appropriate sending campus and district by using student attribution codes and attendance data collected through PEIMS.

- *Primary and Secondary Sources.* Secondary sources are used when the primary source does not contain a match for the economic status, grade or ethnicity of every student.

ATTENDANCE RATE

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were present (from PEIMS 400)}}{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were in membership (from PEIMS 400)}}$$

Year of Data: 2005-06

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
Date	October 2005	June 2006

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE:

READING/ELA, MATHEMATICS, WRITING, SCIENCE, SOCIAL STUDIES

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of test takers achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on TAKS (by subject) (from Pearson)}}{\text{total number TAKS test takers (by subject) (from Pearson)}}$$

Year of Data: 2006-07

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
Date	October 2006	October 2006

Other Information:

- *Student Information.* The testing contractor, Pearson Educational Measurement, pre-codes student information onto the answer documents from PEIMS data (see record types, above), or from district-supplied data files. The answer documents may also be coded by district staff on the day of testing.

**COMPARABLE IMPROVEMENT:
READING/ELA, MATHEMATICS**

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{sum of matched student TGI values (by subject) (from Pearson)}}{\text{total number of matched TAKS test takers (by subject) (from Pearson)}}$$

Years of Data: 2007 and 2006 (Spring TAKS Administrations)

Student Demographics: Comparable Improvement is not disaggregated by ethnicity or economic status.

Other Information:

- *Texas Growth Index (TGI).* The TGI is an estimate of a student’s academic growth on the TAKS from one year to the next. See *Appendix E – Texas Growth Index* for a detailed explanation.
- *Group.* Each campus has a unique comparison group of 40 campuses which closely match that campus on six demographic characteristics, including percent of African American students, Hispanic students, White students, economically disadvantaged students, limited English proficient students, and mobile students. See *Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group* for a detailed explanation.
- *Quartiles.* Within each 40 member campus comparison group, campus average TGI values are arranged from highest to lowest. Campuses with average TGI values within the top quartile (the top 25%) of their group qualify for CI acknowledgment.

COMPLETION RATE

Methodology for Completion Rate I:

$$\frac{\text{number of completers (from PEIMS 101, 110, and 203 records)}}{\text{number in class (from PEIMS 101, 110, 203, 400 records and GED)}}$$

where “completers” = graduates plus continuers

Methodology for Completion Rate II:

$$\frac{\text{number of completers (from PEIMS 101, 110, 203 records, and GED)}}{\text{number in class (from PEIMS 101, 110, 203, 400 records and GED)}}$$

where “completers” = graduates plus continuers plus GED recipients

Years of Data: PEIMS submission 1 leaver data, 2003-04 through 2006-07; PEIMS submission 3 attendance data, 2002-03 through 2005-06; and General Educational Development records as of August 31, 2006.

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity	At Risk
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101	PEIMS 110
Date	October of year of final status	June of year of final status or October of year of final status for continuers	October of year of final status

Other Information:

- *Dropout Definition.* This year for the first time, TEA will use the more rigorous NCES dropout definition. Students who dropped out of the cohort in 2005-06 are defined using this definition; dropouts from the previous three years are defined with the previous definition. See *Appendix I – Change to NCES Dropout Definition* for a detailed explanation.
- *Class vs. Cohort.* The denominator of the Completion Rate calculation is defined as the “class.” The class is the sum of students from the original cohort who have a final status of “graduated,” “continued,” “received GED,” or “dropped out.” There are other students who are members of the original cohort but whose final status does not affect the completion rate calculation. These are:
 - students with a final status that is not considered to be either a completer or a dropout. Examples include students who left public school to be home schooled or students who returned to home country; and,
 - students whose final status could not be determined because data errors prevented records from being matched.

Students in the cohort but not in the class do not affect the completion rate calculation at all—they are neither in the numerator or the denominator. All rates are based on members of the class.

- *Cohort Members.* Students stay with their original cohort, whether they are retained or promoted. Students are members of one and only one cohort.
- *Standard and AEA Procedures.* The definition of a completer differs between standard and AEA procedures in that GED recipients are not considered to be completers under standard procedures, but are considered completers under AEA procedures. Completion Rate I is used for standard procedures. Completion Rate II is used for AEA procedures. Another difference between AEA and standard procedures is that under certain circumstances, completion rates for at-risk students are evaluated under AEA procedures. At-risk completion rates are not used under standard procedures.

RECOMMENDED HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM/DISTINGUISHED ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of graduates reported with graduation codes for } \textit{Recommended High School Program} \textit{ or } \textit{Distinguished Achievement Program (from PEIMS 203)}}{\text{number of graduates (from PEIMS 203)}}$$

Year of Data: Class of 2006

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
Source	PEIMS 110 (primary) PEIMS 203 (secondary)	PEIMS 101
Date	June 2006 (primary) October 2006 (secondary)	October 2006

Other Information:

- *Graduation Requirements.* The State Board of Education has by rule defined the graduation requirements for Texas public school students. The rule delineates specific requirements for three levels: minimum requirements, the Recommended High School Program (RHSP), and the Distinguished Achievement Program (DAP).
- *Graduation Types.* RHSP graduates are students with type codes of 10, 14, 15, 19, 22, or 25; DAP graduates are students with type codes of 09, 16, 17, 20, 23, or 26. See the *PEIMS Data Standards* for more information.
- *Primary and Secondary Sources.* Secondary sources are used when the primary source does not contain a match for the economic status of every student.

SAT/ACT RESULTS

Methodology:

Participation:

$$\frac{\text{number of graduates taking either the SAT or the ACT (from College Board and ACT)}}{\text{total non-special education graduates (from PEIMS 203)}}$$

Performance:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees at or above the criterion score (from College Board and ACT)}}{\text{number of graduates taking either the SAT or ACT (from College Board and ACT)}}$$

Year of Data: Class of 2006

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity	Special Education Status
Source	n/a	PEIMS 101 (primary) College Board and ACT (secondary)	PEIMS 405 PEIMS 203
Date	n/a	October 2004 (primary) September 2006 (secondary)	June 2006, October 2006

Other Information:

- *Primary and Secondary Sources.* Secondary sources are used when the primary source does not contain ethnicity for a given student.
- *Special Education.* Those students reported as special education in all six of the six-week attendance periods, or for whom the graduation type code on the 203 leaver record

indicates special education (graduation type codes 04, 05, 06, or 07) are removed from the count of total graduates used in the denominator of the participation calculation.

STATE-DEVELOPED ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT II

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of SDAA II tests meeting ARD expectations (from Pearson)}}{\text{number of SDAA II tests taken (from Pearson)}}$$

Year of Data: 2007 (Spring SDAA II Administration)

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
Date	October 2006	October 2006

Other Information:

- *Student Information.* The testing contractor, Pearson Educational Measurement, pre-codes student information onto the answer documents from PEIMS data (see record types, above), or from district-supplied data files. The answer documents may also be coded by district staff on the day of testing.

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of students passing TAKS (by subject) (from Pearson)}}{\text{total number TAKS test takers (by subject) (from Pearson)}}$$

Year of Data: 2006-07

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
Date	October 2006	October 2006

Other Information:

- *Student Information.* The testing contractor, Pearson Educational Measurement, pre-codes student information onto the answer documents from PEIMS data (see record types, above), or from district-supplied data files. The answer documents may also be coded by district staff on the day of testing.
- *SSI Mobility Subset.*
 - Mobility between administrations of the TAKS for Student Success Initiative presents a special challenge for excluding mobile students. Tables 30, 31, and 32 below show different scenarios for inclusion and exclusion of mobile students in the campus accountability subset.
 - If discrepancies in student demographics are found between test administrations, the information on the first administration is used.

Table 32: Accountability Subset for SSI - Grades 3 & 5 TAKS Reading

	Was the student on your campus on Oct. 27th (snapshot date)?	Did the student take (or have an answer document submitted for) the Feb 20th TAKS Reading on your campus?	Did the student take (or have an answer document submitted for) any TAKS on April 17-20 on your campus?	Student is in your accountability subset for TAKS
Scenario 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Scenario 2	Yes	Yes	No	No
Scenario 3	Yes	No	Yes	No
Scenario 4	No	Yes	Yes	No
Scenario 5	No	Yes	No	No
Scenario 6	No	No	No	No

Table 33: Accountability Subset for SSI - Grade 5 TAKS Math

	Was the student on your campus on Oct. 27th (snapshot date)?	Did the student take (or have an answer document submitted for) the April 3rd TAKS Math on your campus?	Did the student take (or have an answer document submitted for) the May 15th TAKS Math on your campus?	Student is in your accountability subset for TAKS
Scenario 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Scenario 2	Yes	Yes	No (passed test on April 3 rd or moved but cannot be found on another campus)	Yes
Scenario 3	Yes	Yes	No (moved within Texas and tested on other campus)	No
Scenario 4	Yes	No	Yes	No
Scenario 5	No	Yes	Yes	No
Scenario 6	No	Yes	No	No
Scenario 7	No	No	No	No

Table 34: Accountability Subset for Non-SSI Grades and Subjects

	Was the student on your campus on Oct. 27th (snapshot date)?	Is the student on your campus (or have an answer document submitted) for the day of testing ?	Student is in your accountability subset for TAKS
Scenario 1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Scenario 2	Yes	No	No
Scenario 3	No	Yes	No
Scenario 4	No	No	No

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS – PROGRESS INDICATOR (AEA procedures only)

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of TAKS tests that meet the standard or have a } TGI \geq 0 \text{ and number of TAKS exit-level retests that meet the standard (from Pearson)}}{\text{number TAKS tests taken and number of TAKS exit-level retests that meet the standard (from Pearson)}}$$

Years of Data: 2007 and 2006

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
Date	October 2006, October 2005	October 2006, October 2005

Other Information:

- *Texas Growth Index (TGI).* The TGI is an estimate of a student’s growth on the TAKS from one year to the next. See *Appendix E – Texas Growth Index* for a detailed explanation.
- *Matched Demographics.* If discrepancies in student demographics are found between test administrations, the information on the first administration is used.
- *Student Information.* The testing contractor, Pearson Educational Measurement, pre-codes student information onto the answer documents from PEIMS data (see record types, above), or from district-supplied data files. The answer documents may also be coded by district staff on the day of testing.

**TEXAS SUCCESS INITIATIVE (TSI) – HIGHER EDUCATION READINESS
COMPONENT: ELA, MATHEMATICS**

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of test takers achieving TSI standard (by subject) (from Pearson)}}{\text{number of grade 11 test takers (by subject) (from Pearson)}}$$

Year of Data: 2006-07

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
Date	October 2006	October 2006

Other Information:

- *TSI Standard.* The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board sets the standard that students must achieve on the exit-level TAKS to be considered college ready.
- *Student Information.* The testing contractor, Pearson Educational Measurement, pre-codes student information onto the answer documents from PEIMS data (see record types, above), or from district-supplied data files. The answer documents may also be coded by district staff on the day of testing.

Appendix E – Texas Growth Index

WHAT IS TGI

The Texas Growth Index (TGI) is an estimate of a student’s academic growth on the TAKS tests, over two consecutive years (in consecutive grades).

For the state accountability system, it is used in two ways:

- to calculate Gold Performance Acknowledgments for Comparable Improvement in Reading/ELA and Mathematics; and
- to calculate the TAKS Progress Indicator under the alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures.

The parameters used to determine TGI (shown in the tables below) were developed using the empirical data from the base comparison years — spring 2003 to spring 2004.

CALCULATING TGI

The following steps are used to determine student-level TGI. Student growth is estimated as a line with an intercept (or starting point) and slope (or increase).

- Step 1: Find the starting point for an individual student in the row of the table below that matches that student's grade and subject.
- Step 2: Take the student's scale score in 2006.
- Step 3: Find the increase for that student in the row of the table below that matches that student's grade and subject.
- Step 4: Multiply the student's scale score from 2006 by the increase.
- Step 5: Add the amount from Step 1 and the total from Step 4. This is the expected student scale score for 2007.
- Step 6: Take the student's scale score from 2007 and subtract the expected student score from it. This number is the difference in expectation.
- Step 7: Calculate Adjusted TGI by dividing the result from Step 6 by the Adjustment factor shown on the tables below. Round to the second decimal place.
- Step 8: If the difference in expectation is positive, that student's performance grew more than expected. If the difference in expectation is negative, that student's performance grew less than expected.

A TGI of zero means that the year-to-year change in average scale score is equal to the average predicted change as calculated in the 2003 to 2004 base comparison years. A positive TGI means the group demonstrated growth that is larger than the expected growth for that group. A negative TGI indicates the group grew less than expected.

Table 35: TGI Growth Equation Parameters – Mathematics and Science

Growth Grades	Subject	Starting Point	Increase	Adjustment
3-4	Math	-3.38	1.006	138.07
3-4 (Spanish)	Math	-903.49	1.44	190.11
4-5	Math	-530.83	1.258	160.01
4-5 (Spanish)	Math	-32.22	1.03	160.29
5-6	Math	-167.96	1.085	152.94
5-6 (Spanish)	Math	-11.10	1.04	173.12
6-7	Math	612.26	0.705	95.40
7-8	Math	-544.89	1.269	118.89
8-9	Math	-775.75	1.378	136.19
9-10	Math	480.79	0.773	95.47
10-11	Math	-138.428	1.092	104.38
10-11	Science	410.23	0.832	75.94

Table 36: TGI Growth Equation Parameters – Reading, ELA, and Social Studies

Growth Grades	Subject	Starting Point	Increase	Adjustment
3-4	Reading	-12.89	0.993	135.97
3-4 (Spanish)	Reading	-158.07	1.03	158.44
4-5	Reading	-520.23	1.235	149.93
4-5 (Spanish)	Reading	-480.94	1.24	159.13
5-6	Reading	-66.29	1.066	151.85
5-6 (Spanish)	Reading	109.69	.99	143.36
6-7	Reading	372.28	0.827	126.53
7-8	Reading	-87.53	1.065	128.61
8-9	Reading	712.12	0.663	101.31
9-10	Reading/ELA	535.21	0.762	91.11
10-11	ELA	128.38	0.962	96.41
10-11	Social Studies	464.43	0.810	93.98

TGI growth equation parameters were calculated over the 2003 to 2004 base comparison years. These base calculations will be applied in measuring growth across subsequent years.

Table 37: Sample TGI Calculation

Suppose you wish to examine a student's mathematics growth from Grade 10 to Grade 11. Suppose that student had a scale score of 2188 in Grade 10 and a scale score of 2161 in Grade 11.

	STEPS	EXAMPLE VALUES
Step 1	Find the starting point for that student in the row of the table that matches that student's grade and subject.	-138.428
Step 2	Take the student's scale score in the first year.	2188
Step 3	Find the increase for that student in the row of the table that matches that student's grade and subject.	1.092
Step 4	Multiply student's scale score from the first year by the increase.	$2188 \times 1.092 = 2389.296$
Step 5	Add the amount from Step 1 and the total from Step 4. This is the expected student scale score for the second year .	$-138.428 + 2389.296 = 2250.868$
Step 6	Take the student's scale score from the second year and subtract the expected student score from it. This number is the difference in expectation .	$2161 - 2250.868 = -89.868$
Step 7	Calculate Adjusted TGI by dividing the result from Step 6 by the Adjustment factor shown on the tables below. Round to the second decimal place.	$-89.868 / 104.38 = -0.86$
Step 8	If the difference in expectation is positive, that student grew more than expected. If the difference in expectation is negative, that student grew less than expected.	Since -0.86 is negative, the student grew less than expected.

APPROPRIATE USE OF THE TEXAS GROWTH INDEX

The TGI was primarily designed for use in accountability. It was designed to be used at the campus and district level. It is not intended for use for individual students. In addition, the TGI is based on TAKS scale score changes between spring 2003 and spring 2004. The analyses establishing the TGI did not include retesting students. Therefore, it should not be calculated for students retesting on either the Exit TAKS or TAKS retest administrations at the SSI grades. Finally, the TGI was not designed to compare the growth of different classrooms within a school and therefore should not be used to evaluate teachers.

HOW TGI IS USED IN DETERMINING COMPARABLE IMPROVEMENT

Comparable Improvement (CI) is calculated separately for TAKS reading/ELA and TAKS mathematics. The student-level TGI values are aggregated to the campus level to create an average TGI for each campus.

Who is included:

Students included in a school's CI calculation are those who:

- took the spring 2007 TAKS reading/ELA and/or mathematics tests, in grades 4 - 11
- are part of the 2007 *Accountability Subset* (see *Chapter 2 – The Basics: Base Indicators*);
- can be matched to the spring 2006 TAKS administration—anywhere in the state—to find their prior year TAKS performance for reading/ELA, and/or mathematics; and,
- have been promoted to one higher grade than in 2006.

Calculating Average TGI:

$$\text{average TGI(reading/ELA)} = \frac{\text{sum of individual student TGI values for reading/ELA}}{\text{total number of students with TGI in reading/ELA}}$$

$$\text{average TGI(mathematics)} = \frac{\text{sum of individual student TGI values for mathematics}}{\text{total number of students with TGI in mathematics}}$$

Once the average TGI is determined, it is listed with the other 40 average TGIs of the school's comparison group. The schools are arranged from highest to lowest average TGI. If the target school falls in the top quartile and all other eligibility criteria are met, it is awarded a Gold Performance Acknowledgment for Comparable Improvement. This is calculated separately by subject.

Other information:

- *Retesters.* The analyses establishing the TGI did not include the retest administrations, that is, it is calculated from the first administration for grade 11 exit-level students, and for the first administration in the SSI grades — grade 3 reading and grade 5 reading and mathematics.
- *Quartile Size.* Because there are 40 schools in a comparison group, there are usually 10 schools in each quartile (with the target school being the 11th school in its quartile). Exceptions to this occur when a group has tied average TGI values at the border between quartiles, or when a school in a group has too few “matched students,” and is therefore not assigned an average TGI value or a quartile. This will cause the number of schools in each quartile to vary.
- *Quartile Rank.* High growth values do not necessarily imply that more students are passing the TAKS. It simply evaluates the performance growth of all students regardless of whether they passed or failed.
- *Quartile Position Across Subjects.* A school's quartile position can vary by subject. For instance, a school may be Q1 in reading, but it may be Q2 in mathematics. Quartile position is relative to the performance of the other schools in the group.

- *Quartile Position Across Groups.* A school may be Q1 for its own group and Q4 as a member of another school's group. (However, the quartile value evaluated for a particular school is the one determined for the school's own group.)
- *Minimum Size.* Any school with fewer than 10 matched students for a subject will not have average TGI values calculated and will not be assigned a quartile position.
- *Number of Matched Students.* The number of matched students for reading may differ from the number of matched students for mathematics.
- *TGI Uses.* The TGI is not intended for use with individual students, nor is it intended for comparing the growth of different classrooms within a school to evaluate teachers.
- *Negative TGI Values.* The TGI is a statistic with a mean of zero; negative values for students indicate the growth is less than expected. A negative TGI does not mean that performance of students declined from the prior year. Campuses with negative TGI values are not prohibited from earning CI acknowledgments.

For a more detailed explanation of *Gold Performance Acknowledgment*, see the *Chapter 5 – Gold Performance Acknowledgments*.

HOW TGI IS USED IN DETERMINING THE TAKS PROGRESS MEASURE

The TAKS Progress Measure is used in evaluating registered alternative education campuses (AECs). For an explanation of how TGI is used in the Progress Measure, see *Chapter 10 – AEA Base Measures*.

Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group

Each campus is in a unique comparison group of 40 other public schools (from anywhere in the state), that closely matches that school on six characteristics. Comparison groups are provided so that schools can compare their performance—shown on AEIS reports—to that of other schools with whom they are demographically similar. Comparison groups are also used for determining Comparable Improvement (See *Chapter 5 – Gold Performance Acknowledgments* and *Appendix E – Texas Growth Index*).

The demographic characteristics used to construct the campus comparison groups include those defined in statute as well as others found to be statistically related to performance.

They are:

- the percent of African American students enrolled for 2006-07;
- the percent of Hispanic students enrolled for 2006-07;
- the percent of White students enrolled for 2006-07;
- the percent of economically disadvantaged students enrolled for 2006-07;
- the percent of limited English proficient (LEP) students enrolled for 2006-07; and
- the percent of mobile students as determined from 2005-06 cumulative attendance.

All schools are first grouped by type (elementary, middle, high school, or multi-level). Then the group is determined on the basis of the most predominant features at the target school. Assume that Sample High School has the following percentages for the six groups:

- 7.6% African American,
- 36.8% Hispanic,
- 53.9% White,
- 28.2% economically disadvantaged,
- 10.7% limited English proficient, and
- 23.7% mobile students.

Of these features, the most predominant (*i.e.*, the largest) is the percent of White students, followed by the percent of Hispanic students, the percent of economically disadvantaged students, the percent of mobile students, the percent of limited English proficient students, and finally, the percent of African American students. The following steps illustrate how the group is determined from the pool of all high schools:

- Step 1: 100 high school campuses having percentages closest to 53.9% White students are identified;
- Step 2: 10 schools from the initial group of 100 are eliminated on the basis of being most distant from the value of 36.8% Hispanic;
- Step 3: 10 of the remaining 90 schools which are most distant from 28.2% economically disadvantaged students are eliminated;

- Step 4: 10 of the remaining 80 schools which are most distant from 23.7% mobile students are eliminated;
- Step 5: 10 of the remaining 70 schools which are most distant from 10.7% limited English proficient students are eliminated;
- Step 6: 10 of the remaining 60 schools which are most distant from 7.6% African American students are eliminated; and
- Step 7: 10 of the remaining 50 schools which are most distant from 7.6% African American and/or 28.2% economically disadvantaged students are eliminated. (This last reduction step is based on the least predominant characteristics among the four student groups evaluated in the accountability system: African American, Hispanic, White, and economically disadvantaged.)

The final group size is 40 schools. This methodology creates a unique comparison group for every campus.

Other Information:

- Comparison groups are recreated each year to account for changes in demographics that may occur.
- With this methodology, the number of times a school appears as a member of other groups will vary.
- In cases where the campus has a missing mobility value, the district's average mobility is used as a proxy. This will happen for schools in their first year of operation, since mobility is based on prior year data.
- Districts are not grouped.

Appendix G – Contacts

The *2007 Accountability Manual* contains detailed information about all aspects of the accountability system for Texas public schools and districts. However, if questions remain, your Education Service Center (ESC) representatives are available for further assistance.

ESC ACCOUNTABILITY CONTACTS

ESC	Name	Email Address	Phone Number
1	Lisa Conner	lconner@esconett.org	(956) 984-6027
2	Sonia A. Perez	sonia.perez@esc2.us	(361) 561-8407
3	Christina Salazar Charlotte Baker	csalazar@esc3.net cbaker@esc3.net	(361) 573-0731 ext. 252 (361) 573-0731 ext. 204
4	Dorothy White Brian Malechuk	dwhite@esc4.net bmalechuk@esc4.net	(713) 744-6358 (713) 744-6384
5	Monica Mahfouz	mmahfouz@esc5.net	(409) 923-5411
6	Sandra Sherman	ssherman@esc6.net	(936) 435-8303
7	Sheron Darragh	sdarragh@esc7.net	(903) 988-6824
8	Cynthia Bayuk	cbayuk@reg8.net	(903) 572-8551 ext. 2626
9	Vicki Holland	Vicki.Holland@esc9.net	(940) 322-6928
10	Lorna Bonner	loma.bonner@region10.net	(972) 348-1324
11	Elizabeth Rowland	erowland@esc11.net	(817) 740-7625
12	Bill Eitel Jack Crain Judy Hicks John Giebler	beitel@esc12.net jcrain@esc12.net jhicks@esc12.net jgiebler@esc12.net	(254) 297-1103 (254) 297-1104 (254) 297-1154 (254) 297-1111
13	Ervin Knezek John Fessenden	ervin.knezek@esc13.txed.net John.Fessenden@esc13.txed.net	(512) 919-5306 (512) 919-5485
14	Susan Anderson	sanderson@esc14.net	(325) 675-8674 ext. 674
15	Barbara Brown Judy Lisewsky	barbara.brown@netxv.net judy.lisewsky@netxv.net	(325) 658-6571 ext. 204 (325) 658-6571 ext. 158
16	Shirley Clark	shirley.clark@esc16.net	(806) 677-5130
17	Linda Rowntree	lrowntree@esc17.net	(806) 281-5892
18	Bill Kingston Kaye Orr Sue Watkins	bkingsto@esc18.net kayeorr@esc18.net scwatkins@esc18.net	(432) 561-4385 (432) 567-3244 (432) 561-4357
19	Fred Liner	fliner@esc19.net	(915) 780-5088
20	Steve Peterson	steve.peterson@esc20.net	(210) 370-5420

OTHER CONTACTS

Questions related to indicators, programs, and policies not covered in the *Manual* should be directed to the appropriate contact listed below. *All telephone numbers are in the (512) area code unless otherwise indicated.*

Subject	Contact	Number
AEIS Reports	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Accountability Ratings (methodology)	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Alternative Education Accountability	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Appeals	Performance Reporting	463-9704
ARD Exemptions		
SDAA II	Student Assessment	463-9536
Other Issues	Special Education	463-9414
Blue Ribbon Schools	Communications	463-9103
Campus ID (changing)	PEIMS	463-9229
Charter Schools	Charter Schools	463-9575
College Admissions Tests:		
SAT	College Board, Southwestern Regional Office	721-1800
ACT	ACT Regional Office	345-1949
DAEP	Chapter 37 – Safe Schools	463-9982
Gold Performance Acknowledgments	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Indicator Methodology:		
Advanced Course Completion	Performance Reporting	463-9704
AP/IB Results	Accountability Research	475-3523
Attendance Rate	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Dropouts	Accountability Research	475-3523
Commended Performance	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Comparable Improvement	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Completion	Accountability Research	475-3523
Recommended High School Program	Performance Reporting	463-9704
SAT/ACT Results	Accountability Research	475-3523
SDAA II	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Texas Success Initiative	Performance Reporting	463-9704
TAKS	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Interventions	Program Monitoring and Interventions	463-9414
Investigations	Program Monitoring and Interventions	463-9414
JJAEP	Chapter 37 – Safe Schools	463-9982
Leavers	Accountability Research	475-3523
No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act	NCLB Program Coordination	463-9374
PEIMS	PEIMS HelpLine	936-7346
Public Education Grant (PEG)	Field Services	463-5899
Public Hearings	Program Monitoring and Interventions	463-9414
Recommended High School Program	Curriculum	463-9581
Retention Policy	Curriculum	463-9581
School Report Card	Performance Reporting	463-9704
SDAA II	Student Assessment	463-9536
Special Education	Special Education	463-9414
Statutory (Legal) Issues	Legal Services	463-9720
TAKS	Student Assessment	463-9536
TAKS Testing Contractor	Pearson Educational Measurement	800-252-9186
Technical Assistance Team (TAT) (Methodology for List)	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Technical Assistance Team (TAT) (Implementation of Team)	Program Monitoring and Interventions	463-9414
Texas Success Initiative (TSI)	Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board	427-6100

WEB LINKS

A great deal of information and reports related to accountability can be accessed online. The following web links can be used to gather supplemental information.

- Accountability Research www.tea.state.tx.us/research/index.html
Provides publications on Dropouts, Retention, College Admissions, and many other topics.
- Adequate Yearly Progress www.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/index.html
Provides data tables with AYP results for each campus and district, the AYP Guide, and other information related to AYP.
- Alternative Education Accountability www.tea.state.tx.us/aea/index.html
Provides extensive information on Alternative Education Accountability.
- Charter School www.tea.state.tx.us/charter/index.html
Provides lists of schools, contact information, and answers to frequently asked questions.
- No Child Left Behind www.tea.state.tx.us/nclb/index.html
Provides information on Title I, II, III, IV, V, and VI programs and other aspects of NCLB.
- PEIMS www.tea.state.tx.us/peims/index.html
Provides publications such as the Data Standards, as well as the Standard Reports.
- Performance-Based Monitoring www.tea.state.tx.us/pbm/index.html
Provides Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS) reports and information related to data integrity issues.
- Performance Reporting www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/index.html
Provides data tables with all accountability data for each campus and district, AEIS reports, School Report Cards, and other publications.
- Program Monitoring and Interventions www.tea.state.tx.us/pmi/index.html
Provides information about accreditation monitoring, intervention for Academically Unacceptable campuses and districts, PBM interventions, Technical Assistance Teams (TAT), School Improvement Plans, and Campus Improvement Teams (CIT).
- Special Education www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/index.html
Provides extensive information about special education and the ARD process.
- Student Assessment www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/index.html
Provides extensive information on the statewide assessment program.
- Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board www.theceb.state.tx.us
Provides information on the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) as well as extensive information on Texas public universities and community colleges.

Appendix H – Acknowledgments

Many people have contributed to the development of the *2007 Accountability Manual*. The project staff wish to thank these individuals for their expert advice and prompt review of our materials. Their comments greatly enhanced the accuracy and format of the document.

TEA Staff

EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

Shirley Neeley, Commissioner of Education
Robert Scott, Chief Deputy Commissioner
Criss Cloudt, Associate Commissioner for Assessment, Accountability, and Data Quality

PROJECT LEADERSHIP

Shannon Housson, Director, Division of Performance Reporting
Cathy Long, Division of Performance Reporting
Nancy Rinehart, Division of Performance Reporting
Betty Weed, Division of Performance Reporting

CONTRIBUTORS

David Anderson	TEA General Counsel
Laura Ayala	Division of Student Assessment
Susan Barnes	Associate Commissioner for Standards and Programs
Hal Brignole	Division of Performance Reporting
Cynthia Carrasquillo	Division of Performance Reporting
Karen Dvorak	Director, Division of Accountability Research
Felicia Schubert	Division of Performance Reporting
Donna Gross	Division of Performance Reporting
John Haetinger	Division of Performance Reporting
Rachel Harrington	Director, Division of Performance-Based Monitoring
Diane J. Hernandez	Division of Performance Reporting
Gene Lenz	Deputy Associate Commissioner for Special Programs, Monitoring, and Interventions
Yvonne Liang	Division of Performance Reporting
Ed Miller	Division of Student Assessment
Mary Perry	Director, Division of Charter Schools
Bret Phillips	Division of Performance Reporting
Ester Regalado	Division of Performance Reporting
Linda Roska	Division of Accountability Research
Trish Smith	Division of Performance Reporting
Laura Taylor	Senior Director, Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions
Melinda Torres	Division of Performance Reporting
Mariana Vassileva	Division of Student Assessment
Tim Wilson	Division of Performance Reporting

Educator Focus Group on Accountability

Representatives from districts and regional service centers met in February 2007 to make recommendations that address major policy and design issues for accountability for the year 2007 and beyond.

Jana Anderson, Director of Special Programs, *San Angelo ISD, Region 15*

Mark Ayala, Clint High School, Principal, *Clint ISD, Region 19*

Charlotte Baker, Deputy Director for Programs and Services, *Region 3*

Frank Belcher, Superintendent, *Canadian ISD, Region 16*

M. Annette Cluff, Superintendent, The Varnett Charter School, *Region 4*

Nabor F. Cortez, Jr., Executive Director, Secondary Division, *Edgewood ISD, Region 20*

Anthony Edwards, Principal, Community Education Partners, *Region 4*

Sylvia Garza, Assistant Supt. for Teaching and Learning, *San Marcos CISD, Region 13*

Tom Harvey, Superintendent, *La Vernia ISD, Region 20*

Benny P. Hernandez, Principal, Iraan-Sheffield High School, *Iraan-Sheffield ISD, Region 18*

Roland Hernandez, Superintendent, *Waco ISD, Region 12*

Francine Holland, Deputy Executive Director for Instructional Services, *Region 11*

Janice Jackson, Director of Special Services, *Paris ISD, Region 8*

Whitcomb Johnstone, Director of Planning, Evaluation and Research, *Irving ISD, Region 10*

Daniel King, Superintendent, *Hidalgo ISD, Region 1*

Suzanne Mondey, Director of Special Programs, Prekindergarten/PPCD Program,
Port Neches-Groves ISD, Region 5

Michael Motheral, Superintendent, *Sundown ISD, Region 17*

Dawson Orr, Superintendent, *Wichita Falls ISD, Region 9*

Anne Poplin, Executive Director, *ESC Region 9*

Raymon Puente, Director of Residential Services, *Juvenile Justice Center, Region 6*

Margaret Rohde, Deputy Director, Education Services,
Harris County Juvenile Justice Charter School, Region 4

Diana Silvas, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Operations, *Robstown ISD, Region 2*

David Splittek, Superintendent, *Lackland Independent School District, Region 20*

Mike Strozeski, Assistant Superintendent, Accountability and Technology,
Richardson ISD, Region 10

Travis Weatherspoon, Director of Testing, *La Marque ISD, Region 4*

Nola Wellman, Superintendent, *Eanes ISD, Region 13*

Ledessa White, Assistant Director of Elementary Education, *Abilene ISD, Region 14*

Mary Ann Whiteker, Superintendent, *Hudson ISD, Region 7*

Commissioner's Accountability Advisory Committee

Representatives from legislative offices, school districts, and the business community were invited to participate in resolving issues critical to the accountability system. The Commissioner's Accountability Advisory Committee met in March 2007 to review the recommendations made by the Educator Focus Group. The Advisory Committee either endorsed the Focus Group's proposals or recommended alternative proposals which were forwarded to the commissioner.

SCHOOL DISTRICT / ESC REPRESENTATIVES

Cathy Bryce	Superintendent, <i>Highland Park ISD</i>
Jesus Chavez	Superintendent, <i>Round Rock ISD</i>
Ralph H. Draper	Superintendent, <i>Spring ISD</i>
Pat Forgione	Superintendent, <i>Austin ISD</i>
Michael Hinojosa	Superintendent, <i>Dallas ISD</i>
Harlan Howell	Director of Research and Evaluation / Computer Services, <i>Harlingen CISD</i>
Nadine Kujawa	Superintendent, <i>Aldine ISD</i>
Mike D. Motheral	Superintendent, <i>Sundown ISD</i>
Tom Norris	Executive Director, <i>Region XII Education Service Center</i>
Jill Shugart	Executive Director, <i>Region X Education Service Center</i>
David Splitek	Superintendent, <i>Lackland ISD</i>
Mike Strozeski	Assistant Superintendent, Accountability and Technology, <i>Richardson ISD</i>
James R. Vasquez	Executive Director, <i>Region XIX Education Service Center</i>

LEGISLATIVE STAFF

Von Byer	Committee Director, <i>Senate Education Committee</i>
Harrison Keller	Special Assistant for Education, <i>Office of the Speaker of the House</i>
Melissa Oehler	Governor's Advisor, Public Education, <i>Office of Governor Perry</i>
Ursula Parks	Public Education Team Manager, <i>Legislative Budget Board</i>
Andrea Sheridan	Special Assistant for Education, <i>Office of the Lieutenant Governor</i>
Jenna Watts	Legislative Policy Analyst, <i>House Public Education</i>

OTHER REPRESENTATIVES

Jim Crow	Executive Director, <i>Texas Association of School Boards</i>
Bill Hammond	President & CEO, <i>Texas Association of Business</i>
Sandy Kress	Partner, <i>Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer, and Feld</i>
Don McAdams	President, <i>Center for Reform of School Systems</i>
John Stevens	Executive Director, <i>Texas Business and Education Coalition</i>
Jeri Stone	Exec. Director/Gen. Counsel, <i>Texas Classroom Teachers Association</i>
Johnny Veselka	Executive Director, <i>Texas Association of School Administrators</i>
Darv Winick	President, <i>Winick Consultants</i>

Commissioner's TASA Cabinet of Superintendents

David G. Anthony	Cypress-Fairbanks ISD, Region 4
Jerry Baird	Iowa Park Cons ISD, Region 9
Mike Bergman	Brazos ISD, Region 6
Paul Clore	Gregory-Portland ISD, Region 2
Jose Franco	Fort Hancock ISD, Region 19
Scot Goen	Ballinger ISD, Region 15
Kevin Houchin	McGregor ISD, Region 12
Melody A. Johnson	Fort Worth ISD, Region 11
John Lemons	Bushland ISD, Region 16
Dana Marable	Longview ISD, Region 7
Ron Mayfield	Fort Stockton ISD, Region 18
Willard Murrey	Medina Valley ISD, Region 20
Darrell Myers	Bridge City ISD, Region 5
Dawson R. Orr	Wichita Falls ISD, Region 9
Carolyn Pierel	Argyle ISD, Region 11
Henry Scott	Denison ISD, Region 10
Paul Smith	Palacios ISD, Region 3
Marian Strauss	Wimberley ISD, Region 13
Paul Trull	Paris ISD, Region 8
Linda Wade	Harlingen ISD, Region 1
Kay Waggoner	Grapevine-Colleyville ISD, Region 11
Jim Waller	Idalou ISD, Region 17
Jim White	Colorado ISD, Region 14
Mary Ann Whiteker	Hudson ISD, Region 7
Leland Williams	Dickinson ISD, Region 4

Appendix I – NCES Dropout Definition

In 2003, the Texas Legislature amended the Texas Education Code (TEC) to define dropouts for state accountability according to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition. Specifically, statute now states that the Academic Excellence Indicators (TEC §39.051) include:

(b)(2) dropout rates, including dropout rates and district completion rates for grade levels 9 through 12, computed in accordance with standards and definitions adopted by the National Center for Education Statistics of the United States Department of Education;

Students who dropped out during the 2005-06 school year were the first to be reported according to the new definition. This appendix describes the changes that apply to state accountability.

DEFINITIONS

Leaver. A leaver may be any one of the following: a student who graduates, receives a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, continues high school outside the Texas public school system, or begins college, is expelled, dies, or drops out.

Movers. A mover is a student who moves from one public school district to another, within Texas. A leaver record is not required for a mover.

Dropout. A dropout is a student who was enrolled in 2005-06 in a Texas public school in grades 7 – 12, but did not return to a Texas public school the following fall within the school-start window, was not expelled, did not graduate, receive a GED, continue high school outside the Texas public school system, or begin college, or die.

School-Start Window. The school-start window is between the first day of school and the last Friday in September.

ITEMS THAT CHANGED

Leaver Reason Codes. These codes were modified in the 2006-07 *Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) Data Standards* to be in compliance with the NCES definition. Some codes were deleted, some were consolidated, and some were changed from “non-dropout” to dropout reason codes.

The following table provides an overview of the 2005-06 leaver codes compared to the codes available in 2006-07. Codes that are the same in both years are shown in **bold**. In the *Dropout?* column, each leaver code is noted as *Yes* or *No*.

Please note that this table is not a substitute for the detailed information and instructions available in the *PEIMS Data Standards*. PEIMS managers should consult the data standards for precise information on coding leavers.

Table 38: Changes in PEIMS Leaver Codes between 2005-06 and 2006-07

2005-06 Data Standards			2006-07 Data Standards		
Code	Description	Dropout?	Code	Description	Dropout?
01	Graduated	No	01	Graduated	No
02	Pursue Job/Job Training	Yes	98	Other	Yes
03	Died	No	03	Died	No
04	Join the Military	Yes	98	Other	Yes
08	Pregnancy	Yes	98	Other	Yes
09	Marriage	Yes	98	Other	Yes
10	Alcohol/Other drug abuse problem	Yes	98	Other	Yes
14	Age	Yes	98	Other	Yes
15	Homeless or non-permanent resident	Yes	98	Other	Yes
16	Return to home country	No	16	Return to home country	No
19	Failed exit TAAS/TAKS, met grad. req.	No	98	Other	Yes
21	Official transfer to other Texas district	No	--	No code if found to be "mover"	No
22	Alternative program, working toward diploma or certificate	No	98	Other	Yes
24	College, pursue degree	No	24	College, pursue degree	No
30	Enter health-care facility	No	*	Deleted, see footnote*	*
31	Completed GED	No	**	Deleted; see footnote**	**
60	Home schooling	No	60	Home schooling	No
61	Incarcerated outside district	No	*	Deleted, see footnote*	*
63	Graduated, returned, left again	No	--	No code if found to be graduate	No
64	GED, returned, left again	No	**	Deleted; see footnote**	**
66	Removed by Child Protect. Srv.	No	66	Removed by Child Protect. Srv.	No
72	Court-ordered alternative program	No	98	Other	Yes
78	Expelled, cannot return	No	78	Expelled, cannot return	No
79	Expelled, can return, has not	Yes	98	Other	Yes
80	Enrolled in another Texas public school	No	--	No code if found to be "mover"	No
81	Enrolled in Texas private school	No	81	Enroll in Texas private school	No
82	Enrolled in school outside Texas	No	82	Enroll in school outside Texas	No
83	Administrative withdrawal	No	83	Administrative withdrawal	No
84	Academic performance	Yes	98	Other	Yes
n/a	not available in 2005-06	n/a	85	Graduated outside Texas, returned, left again	No
n/a	not available in 2005-06	n/a	86	GED Outside Texas	No
n/a	not available in 2005-06	n/a	98	Other	Yes
99	Other (unknown or not listed)	Yes	n/a	Deleted	n/a

* If the student moves to a facility served by a Texas public school district, no code is necessary. For other situations, see the *PEIMS Data Standards*.

** If a GED was earned prior to September 1, 2006, student is not a dropout and no code is necessary. For other situations, see the *PEIMS Data Standards*.

GED. Under the NCES definition, students who leave school district to attend GED programs are counted as dropouts unless they receive their GED certificates by August 31st. That is, students who left during the 2005-06 school year but earned their GEDs by August 31, 2006 were not counted as dropouts.

Movers. Students who move from one Texas public school district to another are no longer reported using leaver reason codes. School districts may confirm that students have moved to other Texas public school districts by searching the PID Enrollment Tracking (PET) application; nevertheless, the final determination of whether students have moved will be made by TEA.

Dropouts No Longer Removed. In order to be in compliance with the NCES definition, three categories of dropouts that were removed from the state accountability dropout count in the past are no longer removed:

- *Previous Dropouts.* Students who dropped out, then returned and dropped out again are counted as dropouts in each year they drop out.
- *Duplicate Records.* If more than one district reports a student as a dropout, and the last district of attendance cannot be determined, the student will be counted as a dropout for both districts.
- *ADA Ineligible Students.* All students are now included in the dropout calculation, regardless of their Average Daily Attendance (ADA) eligibility code. They count in both the numerator and denominator. That is, students who are served but are not in the district's or campus's membership are no longer excluded from the methodology.

School-Start Window. Students must return during the period of time between the first day of school and the last Friday in September (September 29, 2006) to be counted as having returned to school and not be counted as leavers from the prior year.

PEIMS Reporting. Student enrollment status is now reported for three dates during the school year: the school-start window, the fall "as of" (October snapshot) date, and the final day of school. Enrollment status previously collected only in PEIMS submission 1, is now collected in both PEIMS submissions 1 and 3.

ITEMS THAT REMAINED THE SAME

Cumulative Enrollment. The state dropout rate calculation will continue to use cumulative enrollment for the school year in the denominator. Cumulative enrollment is a count of all students for whom attendance or enrollment is reported during the school year.

Summer Dropouts. For state accountability purposes, summer dropouts are attributed to the school year just completed, based on the campus of enrollment on the final day of the previous school year.

Migrant Students. Migrant students who return after the school-start window are still not counted as dropouts.

