

## Accountability System for 2008 and Beyond – Standard Procedures Educator Focus Group Proposal

### State Assessment Indicators

1. TAKS Indicator Definition. Beginning in 2008, the TAKS indicator will include the performance of grade 8 science at the *Panel Recommendation* (PR) student passing standard. Also beginning in 2008, the TAKS indicator will include the performance of TAKS (Accommodated) test results for science and social studies (all grades) and for grade 11 (all subjects). The grade 8 science and TAKS (Accommodated) results will be combined with the other TAKS results into a single indicator.

The TAKS (Accommodated) is for students served in special education who receive instruction on grade level, but need an accommodated version of the TAKS, with, for example, more white space, larger font size, and no embedded field-test questions.

In 2008 and 2009, the TAKS (Accommodated) results that will be combined with the TAKS results will be for the following grades and subjects **only**:

- Science (grades 5, 8, 10, & 11—English; grade 5—Spanish)
- Social Studies (grades 8, 10, & 11)
- English Language Arts (ELA) (grade 11)
- Mathematics (grade 11)

Beginning in 2010, the TAKS indicator will include these additional TAKS (Accommodated)-tested grades and subjects:

- Reading/ELA (grades 3 through 10—English; grades 3 through 6—Spanish)
- Mathematics (grades 3 through 10—English; grades 3 through 6—Spanish)
- Writing (grades 4 and 7—English; grade 4—Spanish)

*Rationale:* Although state statute does not require the use of grade 8 science in the accountability system until 2009, this proposal is in alignment with previous Focus Group recommendations to incorporate it in the rating system beginning in 2008. Beginning with the 2005-06 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS), a preview indicator showing total science performance including grade 8 results at the PR standard was reported. Therefore, using the grade 8 science results in 2008 follows the 'report, report, use' phase-in of additional assessment results.

Combining the TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) results into a single indicator is appropriate for several reasons. TAKS (Accommodated) is an on-grade-level assessment designed for students with disabilities. Special education students tested on TAKS (Accommodated) are assessed on the same test questions given to all students, including special education students, assessed on the regular TAKS. Both TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) have the same *Met Standard* and *Commended Performance* student passing standards. The inclusion of TAKS results for special education students is not new. Students served in special education taking the regular state assessment tests on grade level have been included in the state rating system since 1998-99.

Since the State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II) is no longer administered, using TAKS (Accommodated) results in 2008 ensures that some assessment results for students with disabilities who do not take the regular TAKS are included in the state accountability system continuously between 2006 and 2010, while new assessments for students with disabilities are fully phased in.

Combining TAKS (Accommodated) and TAKS results maintains the same number of measures in the state accountability system. Also, inclusion of TAKS (Accommodated) with TAKS parallels the use of

the combined TAKS/TAKS (Accommodated) results in the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) system beginning in 2007-08.

2. 2008 TAKS Standards. The 2008 *Academically Acceptable* standards are 70% for reading/English language arts (ELA), 65 % for writing and social studies, 50% for mathematics, and 45% for science. These standards represent increases of 5 percentage points to the *Academically Acceptable* standards for reading/ ELA, mathematics, and science. The 2008 *Recognized* standard of 75%, which applies to all subjects, is unchanged from the prior year. The 2008 standards were announced in April 2007, subsequently published in the *2007 Accountability Manual*, and adopted as commissioner rule by July 26, 2007. The 2008 standards are shown below, compared to 2007.

	<b>2007</b> <b>AA/Re/Ex</b>	<b>2008</b> <b>AA/Re/Ex</b>
<b>Reading/ELA</b>	<b>65 / 75 / 90</b>	<b>70 / 75 / 90</b>
<b>Writing</b>	<b>65 / 75 / 90</b>	65 / 75 / 90
<b>Social Studies</b>	<b>65 / 75 / 90</b>	65 / 75 / 90
<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>45 / 75 / 90</b>	<b>50 / 75 / 90</b>
<b>Science</b>	<b>40 / 75 / 90</b>	<b>45 / 75 / 90</b>

*Numbers in bold indicate an increase from the prior year.*

3. Required Improvement (RI). TAKS RI will be used in 2008 as it was defined in the 2007 system. RI is calculated as the amount of gain in percent *Met Standard* required to reach the current year accountability standard in two years. RI is calculated for each TAKS subject area, for All Students, and each student group evaluated. RI can be used to elevate a rating from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable* or from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*. A condition of using RI to achieve *Recognized* is a minimum performance floor that is five points below the current year standard. In 2008 the floor will be 70% as it was in 2007. There is no floor for using RI to gate up to *Academically Acceptable*.

For purposes of calculating RI in 2008, the prior year assessment results will be rebuilt to include both the grade 8 science results and the TAKS (Accommodated) 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 this indicator in 2008.

4. Exceptions Provision. Three changes to the Exceptions Provision are recommended for 2008 and beyond. First, the maximum number of exceptions allowed is expanded to four. Second, use of the provision is permitted to allow campuses and districts to achieve the *Recognized* rating as well as the *Academically Acceptable* rating. Third, the minimum performance floor required for a campus or district to be eligible to use an exception to avoid an *Academically Unacceptable* rating is increased from five points below the *Academically Acceptable* standard to ten points below the standard. The minimum performance floor to be eligible to achieve a *Recognized* rating is set at 70%; five points below the *Recognized* standard.

The Exceptions Provision will continue to be applied to any of the 25 TAKS measures only (5 subjects multiplied by 5 groups: All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged). The Exceptions Provision will not be applicable to either Completion Rate I or Annual Dropout Rate indicators.

The table below illustrates the expansion to allow up to a maximum of four possible exceptions instead of three. Further, the ranges for the number of measures evaluated in order to earn an exception are altered. The current (2007) table is included for comparison.

Current Exceptions Provision Table		Recommended Exceptions Provision Table	
Number of Assessment Measures Evaluated	Maximum Number of Exceptions Allowed	Number of Assessment Measures Evaluated	Maximum Number of Exceptions Allowed
1 – 5	0 exceptions	1 – 4	0 exceptions
6 – 10	1 exception	5 – 8	1 exception
11 – 15	2 exceptions	9 – 11	2 exceptions
16 or more	3 exceptions	12 – 15	3 exceptions
n/a	n/a	16 or more	4 exceptions

Districts and campuses will be eligible to receive four possible exceptions in order to achieve the *Academically Acceptable* rating or four possible exceptions in order to achieve the *Recognized* rating. In addition to the safeguard of a minimum performance floor, there are other safeguards currently used that will be applied to the use of this provision for both rating categories. These are:

- that a rating cannot be elevated more than one rating category,
- that an exception cannot be used for the same measure for two consecutive years, and
- that a campus that uses exception(s) to raise its rating must address those measure(s) in its campus improvement plan.

*Rationale:* The original rationale for this provision was to provide a mechanism for avoiding the *Academically Unacceptable* rating due to new indicators or indicators that were being phased-in to the system. It was also designed to provide greater relief for larger campuses and districts serving more diverse student populations that are evaluated on more measures. With the inclusion of additional students [students with disabilities tested on TAKS (Accommodated)] and an additional assessment (grade 8 science) in 2008, the recommended changes to the Exceptions Provision are aligned with the original purpose of the Exceptions Provision. In addition, permitting the provision to be applied to *Academically Acceptable* campuses and districts makes the *Recognized* rating more accessible to campuses and districts that are large and have diverse student populations, or whose student populations are predominantly economically disadvantaged or at risk. Analysis of the use of Exceptions Provision over the past four years indicate that the provision is working as intended and that the safeguards appropriately prevent its abuse.

In 2007, the Exceptions Provision helped 31 districts and 210 campuses avoid the *Academically Unacceptable* rating. Since its implementation, very few campuses and districts have been limited by the safeguard that prevents the reuse of an exception for the same measure in consecutive years. For example, in 2007 only seven campuses could not use exceptions because the same measure was used in 2006. This indicates that campuses and districts are attending to the needs of the deficient student group(s) during the year of the exception.

Number of Exceptions Used	2004		2005		2006		2007	
	Campus	District	Campus	District	Campus	District	Campus	District
1	52	3	164	12	152	18	173	30
2	9	0	19	1	21	4	34	1
3	0	0	1	0	4	1	3	0
<b>Total</b>	61	3	184	13	177	23	210	31

Expanding the number of exceptions allowed provides for more distinctions among larger and/or more diverse campuses and districts by splitting the number of assessment measures evaluated into groups with narrower ranges.

Allowing for an additional exception addresses the additional hurdles that will be faced by districts and campuses because the additional tests added to the base indicator increase the number of student groups meeting minimum size criteria. Including grade 8 science and the TAKS (Accommodated) results increases the average number of campus hurdles by one, from 11 to 12. However, the impact on middle schools is greater—the average increases from 14 to 17. This analysis is based on the TAKS (Accommodated) grades and subjects that will be first used in 2008. In 2009 and 2010 when all grades and subjects are used, the impact may be greater and felt across more campus types.

5. Commended Label. Appending a commended label to the base rating label is recommended to be deferred at least another year. The original plan was to append a label of “Commended” to campus and district ratings if the campus or district also earned a Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) for at least 50% of the TAKS Commended indicators on which they were evaluated. During this development cycle, a second option was considered that would have appended a suffix to the rating label based on campus or district performance on all GPA indicators.

*Rationale:* During the initial development of the new accountability system, the Educator Focus Group and Commissioner’s Accountability Advisory Committee (CAAC) recommended that measures be developed to incorporate TAKS commended performance into the accountability ratings. Use of such a label provides a more comprehensive picture of a campus or district and helps distinguish among large numbers of campuses and districts with the same ratings. However, given the impending work of the Select Committee on Accountability and the upcoming legislative session in January 2009, delay of the introduction of a new label into the system is recommended until more is known of the future plans for the accountability system. The addition of another label increases complexity; and, if added in 2008, may prove to be only a temporary feature of the system.

Additionally, several of the proposals recommended for 2008 provide other ways to allow greater discrimination among high performing campuses. In the meantime, to provide districts and campuses with an overall summary of their GPA results, the agency will explore options for reporting the number of GPA indicators earned compared to the number of indicators evaluated when the GPA results are released in fall 2008.

6. SDAA II. As of the 2008 accountability year, the State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II) indicator is no longer in the system because the 2006-07 school year was the last time this test was administered. Students previously tested on the SDAA II who take the regular TAKS test or TAKS (Accommodated) in the grades and subjects described above, will be included in the ratings evaluation. Students previously tested on SDAA II who take either the TAKS-M or TAKS-Alt in 2008 will not be included in the 2008 state accountability system. However, a recommendation addressing the phase-in of these two new assessments into the state accountability system is described in #10 below.
7. TAKS Standards—2009 and 2010. The standards for writing, social studies, mathematics, and science are recommended to increase by five points in 2009 to 70%, 70%, 55%, and 50%, respectively. In 2010, mathematics and science are recommended to increase by an additional five points each, to 60% and 55%, respectively. These recommendations are shown in the following table. The 2007 and 2008 standards are presented for comparison.

	2007 (Used)	2008 (Adopted in Commissioner Rule)	2009	2010*
			(Recommended)	(Proposed)
<b>Exemplary</b>	≥ 90%	≥ 90%	≥ 90%	≥ 90%
<b>Recognized</b>	≥ 75%	≥ 75%	≥ 75%	≥ 75%
<b>Acceptable</b>				
<b>R/ELA</b>	≥ 65%	≥ 70%	≥ 70%	≥ 70%
<b>Writing</b>	≥ 65%	≥ 65%	≥ 70%	≥ 70%
<b>Social Studies</b>	≥ 65%	≥ 65%	≥ 70%	≥ 70%
<b>Mathematics</b>	≥ 45%	≥ 50%	≥ 55%	≥ 60%
<b>Science</b>	≥ 40%	≥ 45%	≥ 50%	≥ 55%

\*Standards for 2010 will be reviewed in 2009 and are subject to change.  
Numbers in bold indicate an increase from the prior year.

The 2009 and 2010 standards for the *Academically Acceptable* rating are the same standards recommended by the Focus Group and the CAAC last year; however, they differ from proposals made for the *Recognized* standard by the 2007 CAAC and published in the preview chapter of the *2007 Accountability Manual*. The difference is that the *Recognized* standard remains at 75% instead of increasing to 80% in 2009.

*Rationale:* Both the *Exemplary* and *Recognized* standards are a significant challenge to achieve, especially for campuses and districts with a large and diverse student population, or a student population that is predominantly economically disadvantaged or at risk. Beginning in 2008, the challenge to maintain a 75% standard increases with the inclusion of TAKS (Accommodated) and grade 8 science (at the PR student passing standard). In 2010, the number of TAKS (Accommodated) results used will increase again even more significantly due to the use of reading, mathematics, and writing results for TAKS (Accommodated) test takers.

Maintaining a greater spread between the *Recognized* and *Exemplary* standards (15 percentage points) also allows for greater discrimination among high performing campuses and districts. A *Recognized* standard of 75% also enables a group of high performing *Academically Acceptable* campuses and districts to achieve *Recognized* and makes the *Recognized* rating more accessible to campuses and districts that are large and have diverse student populations.

8. **TAKS Student Growth Measure.** A method for measuring annual student improvement on the TAKS tests will be selected during the fall of 2008. Student growth reporting for individual students is scheduled to begin with the 2008-09 school year. Also, student growth (contingent upon United States Department of Education (USDE) approval) is planned to be used in the AYP system beginning with the release of the 2009 AYP statuses. Student growth is recommended to be used in the state accountability system as soon as possible, which could be as early as the 2009 accountability cycle. The 2009 Educator Focus Group will determine the method for incorporating growth and will review 2009 TAKS standards in relation to the growth decisions. If student growth is incorporated beginning in 2009, other components of the system such as Required Improvement, Comparable Improvement, and the Exceptions Provision will also be subject to review during the 2009 development cycle.

One option considered for including student growth in the accountability system is to modify the current TAKS base indicator to be defined as the percent of students who *either* meet the TAKS student passing standard *or* meet the growth standard. This option and other alternatives will be explored during the 2009 development cycle using growth measure results from the 2008 assessments.

9. Vertical Scale. To meet new statutory requirements, a vertical scale will be implemented in grades 3-8 for TAKS mathematics and reading starting with the 2008-09 school year. A vertical scale is a scale score system that allows comparison of student test scores across grade levels within a subject. With vertical scaling, scores that measure content in the same subject but at different grade levels are placed onto a common scale.

One implication a vertical scale has for TAKS is that a review of current student passing standards may need to be considered. Should changes to the TAKS student passing standards occur, a reconsideration of accountability standards for the affected subject(s) would be necessary.

10. Incorporating TAKS-Alternate (TAKS-Alt) and TAKS-Modified (TAKS-M). The TAKS-Alt is an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities. It is designed to meet the federal requirements mandated under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). TAKS-Alt was field tested in spring 2007 and will be administered for the first time in spring 2008. The TAKS-Alt results will be reported beginning with 2008.

The TAKS-M is an alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards designed for students who receive modified instruction in the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS), but for whom neither the TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), nor TAKS-Alt are an appropriate measure of their academic progress. It is designed to meet the federal requirements mandated under NCLB. TAKS-M will be administered for the first time in the spring of 2008, but only to selected grades and subjects. The 2008-09 school year will be the first year TAKS-M is administered to all grades and subjects.

Following the 'report, report, use' schedule, 2010 is the first year TAKS-Alt results could possibly be used and 2011 is the first year TAKS-M results could possibly be used in the state accountability system. However, the recommendation is to delay incorporation of TAKS-Alt at least until TAKS-M can be incorporated in 2011.

*Rationale:* The use of TAKS (Accommodated) results will not be fully phased-in until the 2010 school year. It is not recommended to also add TAKS-Alt results that same year. The earliest both TAKS-Alt and TAKS-M could be added is 2011. It is recommended that the decision to incorporate and the methodology used to incorporate these two remaining alternate assessments for students with disabilities be coordinated. Further analysis of the TAKS-Alt and TAKS-M results will be possible during the 2009 development cycle based on the results of the first administration of these assessments in 2008.

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

1. Standards. With the release of the *2007 Accountability Manual*, the 2008 standards for the grade 7-8 Annual Dropout Rate indicator were published to be the same in 2008 as they were in 2007—1.0%, 0.7%, and 0.2% for *Academically Acceptable*, *Recognized*, and *Exemplary*, respectively. However, these standards are recommended to be reset to a 2.0% standard for all rating categories—*Academically Acceptable*, *Recognized*, and *Exemplary*.

A phase-in process for achieving the goal of a 1.0% rate in a future year will begin with 2008.

The 2008 standards as previously published are shown in the table below, along with the proposal for 2008 through 2012.

	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Standard</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Academically Acceptable</b>	Prior Definition	Original	≤ 1.0%	≤ 1.0%	≤ 1.0%	≤ 1.0%	≤ 1.0%
	NCES Definition	Reset	≤ 2.0%	≤ 2.0%	≤ 1.8%	≤ 1.6%	≤ 1.4%
<b>Recognized</b>	Prior Definition	Original	≤ 0.7%	≤ 0.7%	≤ 0.7%	≤ 0.7%	≤ 0.7%
	NCES Definition	Reset	≤ 2.0%	≤ 2.0%	≤ 1.8%	≤ 1.6%	≤ 1.4%
<b>Exemplary</b>	Prior Definition	Original	≤ 0.2%	≤ 0.2%	≤ 0.2%	≤ 0.2%	≤ 0.2%
	NCES Definition	Reset	≤ 2.0%	≤ 2.0%	≤ 1.8%	≤ 1.6%	≤ 1.4%

*Rationale:* The Annual Dropout Rate in effect in 2008 is actually a *new* indicator because the definition of *dropout* changed from the last year (2006) that the Annual Dropout Rate affected accountability. Students dropping out of school during the 2005-06 school year were the first to be reported in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition. Under the new definition, the average grade 7-8 dropout rate doubled, not due to an increase in dropouts but due to a reclassification of students previously not considered to be dropouts. Doubling the standard from 1.0% to 2.0% makes it comparable to the standard used to evaluate rates under the prior definition.

When standards were set for 2008 during the 2007 development cycle, data using the new definition were not available to analyze. The impact of the definitional change on campus and district ratings could not be predicted. Also, although 2006-07 dropouts will be the second reporting year under the new definition, 2008 will be the first year campuses and districts will be held accountable under the new definition because the School Leaver Provision protected ratings from being adversely affected by dropout rates in 2007. That provision is not available beginning with 2008 for districts and campuses evaluated under standard accountability procedures.

Further, the dramatic increase in the number of dropouts due to the definition change means many more campuses and districts will be evaluated on this indicator and many more student groups will meet the minimum size criteria and be evaluated. There is no Exception Provision for the dropout rate indicator, so any single rate (meeting minimum size criteria) that misses the standard will result in a lower rating for the campus or district.

The minimum size criteria in place for the grade 7-8 annual dropout rate under the previous dropout definition is recommended to remain unchanged under the new definition for 2008 and beyond. For “All Students”, a campus or district must have a minimum of 5 grade 7-8 dropouts, and at least 10 grade 7-8 students. For the individual student groups a minimum of 5 grade 7-8 dropouts is required and the 30/10%/50 rule applies to the total number of grade 7-8 students.

Due to increases in the number of students identified as dropouts because of the definition change, in the 2007 accountability year many more campuses and districts met the minimum size criteria and were evaluated on dropouts than in the past. Using grade 7-8 dropouts only, 190 campuses were evaluated on “All Students” compared to 54 in 2006. There were 108 districts evaluated on “All Students” compared to 53 in the prior year. See the table below for details by student group.

<i>Number of Campuses Evaluated by Student Groups (Grades 7-8)</i>					
Year	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Economically Disadvantaged
2005-06	190	51	95	11	100
2004-05	54	9	28	1	33
2003-04	67	5	35	2	33
2002-03	23	1	14	0	9
<i>Number of Districts Evaluated by Student Groups (Grades 7-8)</i>					
2005-06	108	31	70	28	71
2004-05	53	11	32	6	35
2003-04	54	8	34	10	30
2002-03	30	5	17	4	15

The revised standard may also permit more campuses and districts to demonstrate Required Improvement (RI), a feature of the system that has had little effect for the dropout rate indicator. For those not able to meet the absolute standard, the amount of improvement needed in order to demonstrate RI will be easier to achieve.

Additionally, the adjusted rate of 2.0% should apply uniformly to *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, and *Academically Acceptable* ratings. The rationale for the single standard across rating categories is that the previous differential standards were very narrowly defined with fractions of rates accounting for the difference between a *Recognized* or *Exemplary* rating. A rate difference this small could be attributed to very small numbers of dropouts. Such small differences do not warrant the rating label distinctions they cause.

2. **Required Improvement.** Districts and campuses will be able to meet the Annual Dropout Rate criteria by either meeting the absolute standard or by demonstrating RI. With a single dropout rate standard for all rating categories, the same RI calculation will be applied to each rating. Campuses and districts that demonstrate enough improvement in their rates to reach the standard in two years will be considered to have met the annual dropout rate criteria. A campus or district cannot be prevented from a rating of *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, or *Academically Acceptable* if it has either met the absolute dropout rate standard or demonstrated dropout rate RI.

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

1. **Standards.** The 2008 standards for the grade 9-12 completion rate are 75.0% for *Academically Acceptable*, 85.0% for *Recognized*, and 95.0% for *Exemplary*. These standards were adopted in rule as part of the *2007 Accountability Manual*. These standards are recommended to be held constant through 2010.

	2008	2009	2010*
<b>Academically Acceptable</b>	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%
<b>Recognized</b>	≥ 85.0%	≥ 85.0%	≥ 85.0%
<b>Exemplary</b>	≥ 95.0%	≥ 95.0%	≥ 95.0%
<b>Completion Rate I Definition of a “Completer”</b>	Graduates + Continued HS		
<b>Dropout Definition (used in denominator)</b>	Phase-in NCES definition	NCES definition	

\*Standards for 2010 will be reviewed in 2009 and are subject to change.

*Rationale:* The rigor of the indicator is increasing incrementally each year until the NCES definition of a dropout is fully phased-in in 2010. This means that although the standards are constant, it is harder each year to continue to achieve those standards. In addition, the School Leaver Provision (SLP) is

not available beginning in 2008 for campuses and districts evaluated on Completion Rate I under standard accountability procedures.

Also, the changes to graduation requirements to comply with attainment of the “4 x 4” curriculum (beginning with 2007-08 ninth graders) and the TAKS exit-level test have contributed toward more rigorous graduation requirements for students. (The class of 2007 was the first required to graduate under TAKS exit-level tests that were all at the full phased-in panel recommended student passing standards. The class of 2011 will be the first to graduate having completed four years of study in each of four core academic areas.)

Due to increases in the dropout counts, many more campuses and districts meet the minimum size criteria and will be evaluated on completion rates. In 2007, a total of 894 campuses were evaluated for Completion Rate I for “All Students” compared to 666 the year before. An additional 136 districts were evaluated for “All Students” (435 compared to 299 the year before). See the table below for details by student group.

<i>Number of Campuses Evaluated by Student Groups</i>						
<i>Accountability Year</i>	<i>Class Year</i>	<i>All Students</i>	<i>African American</i>	<i>Hispanic</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Economically disadvantaged</i>
2007	Class of 2006	894	294	606	416	669
2006	Class of 2005	666	168	440	252	465
2005	Class of 2004	668	180	436	254	434
2004*	Class of 2003	501	118	305	136	273
<i>Number of Districts Evaluated by Student Groups</i>						
2007	Class of 2006	435	122	268	219	311
2006	Class of 2005	299	69	184	130	200
2005	Class of 2004	291	69	174	125	180
2004*	Class of 2003	196	36	111	62	104

\* Minimum size criteria required at least 10 dropouts. Beginning with 2005 ratings this was reduced to a minimum of 5.

2. **Required Improvement.** The floor needed to be eligible to use RI to achieve the *Recognized* rating is changed to be the *Academically Acceptable* standard. This would decrease the floor value from 80.0% to 75.0%. Should the *Academically Acceptable* standard increase the floor for *Recognized* would automatically increase as well.

*Rationale:* This could improve the viability of this feature of the system, which has proven to be largely unattainable using the current formula. Also, the use of Completion Rate I in the system is becoming more rigorous due to the continued phase-in of the dropout definition, and due to the discontinuation of the SLP. Though demonstration of improved completion rates will be unusual, should improvement occur, this change in eligibility will allow more campuses and districts a chance at meeting the required degree of improvement.

3. **Use of District Rate.** Secondary campuses that serve students in grades 9-12 are evaluated using their district’s completion rate when a completion rate cannot be calculated using their campus data. The use of district assigned rates will be suspended until the NCES dropout definition is fully phased in.

*Rationale:* Issues with the use of the district assigned values have arisen each year and have been handled on a case-by-case basis through the appeals process. With implementation of the NCES dropout definition, completion rates have dropped significantly; and without use of the SLP, a number of campuses are expected to experience adverse rating consequences due to this indicator alone. Had the SLP not been in place in 2007, the completion rate indicator would have been the sole reason for 53 campuses and 40 districts to be rated *Academically Unacceptable*. Of the 53 campuses that would have been *Academically Unacceptable* solely due to completion rate, 15 (28%) were evaluated on their district assigned rates.

Without the SLP and without any other mechanism to accommodate the increasing rigor of this indicator, campuses with ratings adversely affected solely due to their district's completion rate are likely to appeal. In 2008 this could be a significant number, and these appeals are anticipated to be difficult to evaluate. Suspension of the use of district assigned rates will reduce the burden of appeals for both districts and the agency and will ameliorate some of the negative effects of the extended phase-in of changes to this indicator in 2008.

4. Hurricane Displaced Students. The class of 2007 completion rates used for 2008 accountability may be negatively affected by students displaced by Hurricanes Katrina or Rita during 2005-06. Specific guidelines will be published in the *2008 Accountability Manual* to aid districts in appealing the Completion Rate indicator when the campus or district rating is limited from the next higher rating due to displaced students with a non-completion status. Only students with a final status of "dropout" during 2005-06 (the year of the hurricane) would be considered favorable for appeal. This special circumstance appeal would be permitted through the 2010 accountability cycle, the last year students with a final status during 2005-06 are part of a cohort used for accountability. Each year only students in the completion cohort with a "dropout" status assigned during 2005-06 could be appealed. The district would be required to supply appropriate documentation that the student was displaced due to the hurricane. This would apply to both standard and AEA procedures. As with all granted appeals, no changes will be made to the data shown on the reports.

*Rationale:* The appeals process provides a way to handle special circumstances that cannot be accommodated through the evaluation of existing data. The use of specific guidelines should simplify the evaluation of the appeal and permit consistent recommendations from the appeals panel.

### **Underreported Students Data Quality Indicator**

1. Standards. Hold the underreported standards constant in 2008, but begin increasing these standards in 2009 and continue each year at least through the 2012 accountability cycle. Discontinue use of the SLP for this indicator beginning in 2008.

In 2008, any district that has more than 200 underreported students or an underreported student rate greater than 5.0% cannot be rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized*. If the underreported student rate exceeds the threshold (5.0%), but is based on fewer than five underreported students, then the district rating is unaffected. In 2009, the standard for the underreported count decreases to 150 but the rate remains at 5.0%. See the table below for the recommended standards for 2010 through 2012.

### Underreported Standards: 2007 through 2012

Accountability Year	Underreported students data year	Underreported students cannot exceed:		Minimum Size
		Count	Rate	
2007 (Used)	2005-06	200	5.0	5 or more
2008 (Adopted in Commissioner Rule)	2006-07	200	5.0	5 or more
Proposed	2009	<b>150</b>	5.0	5 or more
	2010*	<b>100</b>	<b>4.5</b>	5 or more
	2011*	100	<b>4.0</b>	5 or more
	2012*	100	<b>3.0</b>	5 or more
	2013*	TBD	TBD	TBD

Numbers in bold indicate a change from the prior year.

\* Standards for 2010 and beyond are subject to annual review.

The underreported indicator has also been used in the Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) Data Validation System since 2004. Both PBM and the state accountability systems used the same standards for underreported student counts and rates for 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007. Districts that did not meet the underreported standards were subject to interventions. The interventions are graduated depending on district data results on each leaver data validation indicator, patterns across all leaver data validation indicators, and prior leaver data validation history. The standards proposed will be applied to the PBM Data Validation System for 2008 and beyond.

*Rationale:* The PEIMS data collection experienced significant changes with the 2005-06 collection of leaver data. The collection of 2006-07 leaver data, data that will be used to construct the underreported counts and rates for 2008 accountability, marks the second year under the new collection processes. Use of the SLP for the underreported indicator in 2007 protected district ratings from adverse consequences due to problems with leaver reporting, but that feature is discontinued with the 2008 cycle. Resuming the evaluation of this indicator provides an effective incentive for districts to improve leaver data quality.

The underreported measures provide important safeguards to the dropout rate and completion rate indicators, as students who might otherwise be dropouts or non-completers cannot go unreported. Also, the quality of any longitudinal data depends heavily on the accuracy of student tracking over time.

### English Language Learner Progress Measure

1. Indicator Definition. The English Language Learner (ELL) progress measure as reported on the current Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) reports combines the results from the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) English reading/ELA tests and the Reading Proficiency Tests in English (RPTE).

The indicator reported on the 2005-06 and the 2006-07 AEIS reports shows the percent of current and former (monitored) limited English proficient (LEP) students who:

- met the student passing standard on the TAKS English reading/ELA test, **or**
- met their proficiency level on the RPTE, **or**
- showed progress on the RPTE from the prior year.

In 2008, the RPTE was expanded and re-named Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) Reading. The new test is similar to its predecessor RPTE except that it:

- assesses to a greater extent the ability to read academic English in mathematics and science contexts,
- contains more items at the advanced high English language proficiency level,
- is administered in six rather than four grade clusters,
- adds a grade 2 assessment that replaces the previous holistically rated assessment.

2. Timeline for Inclusion of ELL Measure in State Accountability. In summer 2008, the student proficiency level cut-points for the new TELPAS Reading tests for grades 2–12 will be established using spring 2008 student performance results. Given the differences between RPTE and TELPAS Reading summarized above, for state accountability purposes, it is recommended that progress on the ELL measure be based on comparisons of two years of TELPAS Reading results, instead of comparisons between the new TELPAS Reading and the former RPTE tests.

The following chart outlines the timelines required to report and evaluate the TELPAS Reading results based on two years of TELPAS Reading data. As shown below, two years of TELPAS Reading data for calculating progress and setting standards will be first available in 2010. Based on these timelines, the first use of this ELL Measure in state accountability is recommended to be 2011.

Accountability Year	Test	Two Years Available for Focus Group Review?	Two Years Available to Report in AEIS?	Two Years Available to Use as Indicator?	Comments
2006	RPTE	No	Yes	No	First year ELL progress measure reported in AEIS.
2007	RPTE	Yes	Yes	No	Last administration of RPTE assessment.
2008	TELPAS Reading	No	No	No	First administration of TELPAS Reading.
2009	TELPAS Reading	No	Yes	No	TELPAS reading results for 2009 are not available for focus group review and recommendations in 2010.
2010	TELPAS Reading	Yes	Yes	No	TELPAS Reading results for 2008 and 2009 are available for focus group review.
2011	TELPAS Reading	Yes	Yes	Yes	ELL Progress Measure available as indicator for 2011.

3. Methodology for Inclusion of ELL Measure in State Accountability. This indicator will be revisited during the 2010 development cycle. At that time decisions will be made on its use in the accountability system, including:

- whether to use it as a base indicator or a Gold Performance Acknowledgment in 2011;
- the development of standards;
- the determination of minimum size criteria; and
- use of required improvement and/or exceptions.

*Rationale:* The performance of ELL students is not available for use in accountability before 2011, since two years of TELPAS Reading results are needed to use in order to set standards and determine other criteria. When multiple years of TELPAS Reading results are available, research will be conducted to present options for adding this indicator to either the GPA or base rating system.

When the ELL measure is integrated into the state accountability system, a number of students will be evaluated in the system who have formerly not been included due to exemptions from the TAKS assessments. For example, students who are served by district LEP programs and LEP-exempt from the TAKS test and assessed on TELPAS Reading only will be included in the state accountability system for the first time. Until then, although ELL students are not evaluated on a separate indicator or as a separate student group, the overwhelming majority of ELL students will continue to be included in the state accountability system through the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) tests in English and Spanish in selected subjects and grades and in the completion and dropout rate indicators. In the federal accountability system, the ELL students have been evaluated as a separate student group for both performance and participation components of the reading/ELA and mathematics indicators as defined in AYP since 2003.

### Gold Performance Acknowledgment System

1. Standards—2008 through 2010. Maintain the 2007 standards for all GPA indicators in 2008, except for Texas Success Initiative: Higher Education Readiness Component for English Language Arts and Mathematics, which both increase by five percentage points. The standards for these two indicators are proposed to increase again in 2009 to 60.0% and again in 2010 to 65.0%. Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Course Completion will increase from 25.0% to 30.0% in 2009 and remain at 30.0% in 2010. Commended Performance will increase for each subject from 25.0% to 30.0% in 2009 and remain at 30.0% in 2010. The Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program standard will increase from 80.0% to 85.0% in 2009 and will remain at 85.0% in 2010. Standards for the SAT/ACT for 2010 are to be determined during the 2009 accountability development process. Comparable Improvement for 2010 must be revisited during the 2009 development cycle when more is known about a new student growth measure.

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

12	Texas Success Initiative: Higher Education Readiness Component -- Mathematics	<b>55%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>65%</b>
13-14	Comparable Improvement (campus-only acknowledgments) Reading/ELA Mathematics	Top Quartile (top 25%)	Top Quartile (top 25%)	<b>TBD</b>

Numbers in bold indicate a change from the prior year.

2. Use of TAKS (Accommodated) with GPA Indicators. Beginning in 2008, the five TAKS Commended indicators, the two Texas Success Initiative (TSI) indicators, and the two Comparable Improvement (CI) indicators will use TAKS (Accommodated) results combined with TAKS results. In 2008, the TAKS (Accommodated) results that will be combined with TAKS results are for these grades and subjects only:

<b>TAKS (Accommodated) Grades and Subjects Included</b>	<b>GPA Indicators Affected</b>
Science (grades 5, 8, 10, & 11—English; grade 5—Spanish)	TAKS Commended (Science)
Social Studies (grades 8, 10, & 11)	TAKS Commended (Social Studies)
ELA (grade 11)	TAKS Commended (Reading/ELA); TSI: ELA; CI: Reading/ELA
Mathematics (grade 11)	TAKS Commended (Mathematics); TSI: Mathematics; CI: Mathematics

Beginning in 2008, the Commended Science indicator will also be affected by the inclusion of all grade 8 science results for the first time, not just the grade 8 TAKS (Accommodated) science results.

In 2009, the same TAKS (Accommodated) grades and subjects will be included as shown above; but, in 2010, all TAKS (Accommodated) grades and subjects will be included.

3. SAT/ACT Indicator. For 2009, the SAT/ACT indicator will continue to use only the mathematics and critical reading scores on the SAT. Agency staff recommend incorporating the SAT writing component in the future. Staff will research options for including the writing component during the 2008 calendar year for consideration by the 2009 Focus Group. In addition, reporting the writing results beginning with the 2008-09 AEIS will be pursued. The first possible use of the writing component as part of this GPA indicator would be the 2010 accountability year.

*Rationale:* Delayed use of the SAT writing component is recommended because a delay:

- allows for multiple years of writing results to be analyzed and inform decision-making;
- provides time for agency experts from the Division of Accountability Research to be involved in the development of indicator options;
- enables results to be reported prior to use in the acknowledgment system; and,
- provides time for other policy groups working on indicators of college readiness to define measures that use SAT and ACT data.

4. RHSP/DAP Indicator. For 2009 and 2010, the RHSP/DAP indicator will remain a combined indicator as previously defined and will be evaluated using the standards previously published. Counts of DAP graduates may be reported separately from RHSP graduates on future AEIS reports.

*Rationale:* Even though the vast majority of students are to graduate under the RHSP plan, the increases in standards and decreases in number acknowledged prove this to still be a rigorous

indicator. Also, changes in curriculum and exit-testing requirements (*i.e.*, the 4x4 requirements that began with the 9<sup>th</sup> grade class of 2007-08 and TAKS exit-level tests) make achievement of the RHSP more challenging. More campuses and districts have data to evaluate using the combined graduation programs than if the DAP was used alone. Also, the combined indicator allows for more student groups to be evaluated, which encourages districts to graduate students of all characteristics under one of these two plans. If DAP-only were evaluated, the "All Students" category would more often be the only group held to the standard.

5. Comparable Improvement Indicator. Comparable Improvement will be calculated based on the Texas Growth Index (TGI) through the 2009 ratings cycle. During the 2009 calendar year, research on a new means of rank ordering campuses within comparison groups will be conducted using 2009 performance on the new vertical scale compared to realigned prior year performance. Options will be presented to advisory groups during the 2010 development process for first possible use in either the 2010 or 2011 ratings cycle. For these reasons, no standards for the CI indicators beyond 2009 can be published at this time.

## 2007 TAKS and TAKS-I Performance Results

Subject and Student Group	2007 Accountability (TAKS Only)	* 2007 Science (PR) All Grades (TAKS Only)	2007 TAKS-I Only (partial grades and subjects)	** Accountability Modeling (TAKS and TAKS-I combined)	
<b>Reading/ELA</b>					
All Students	2,271,424 / 2,566,430 = 89%		Gr. 11	1,308 / 5,128 = 26%	2,272,732 / 2,571,558 = 88%
African American	291,007 / 348,320 = 84%			169 / 1,193 = 14%	291,176 / 349,513 = 83%
Hispanic	954,325 / 1,137,170 = 84%			403 / 2,070 = 19%	954,728 / 1,139,240 = 84%
White	932,606 / 982,261 = 95%			721 / 1,813 = 40%	933,327 / 984,074 = 95%
Economically Disadvantaged	1,077,978 / 1,299,599 = 83%			598 / 3,036 = 20%	1,078,576 / 1,302,635 = 83%
<b>Mathematics</b>					
All Students	1,974,964 / 2,561,398 = 77%		Gr. 11	579 / 5,490 = 11%	1,975,543 / 2,566,888 = 77%
African American	221,883 / 346,497 = 64%			49 / 1,271 = 4%	221,932 / 347,768 = 64%
Hispanic	808,140 / 1,135,755 = 71%			180 / 2,180 = 8%	808,320 / 1,137,935 = 71%
White	854,102 / 980,040 = 87%			340 / 1,968 = 17%	854,442 / 982,008 = 87%
Economically Disadvantaged	900,323 / 1,297,855 = 69%			264 / 3,164 = 8%	900,587 / 1,301,019 = 69%
<b>Science</b>					
	Excludes grade 8	Includes grade 8			
All Students	562,214 / 787,751 = 71%	734,782 / 1,071,909 = 69%	Gr. 5,8,10,11	7,711 / 56,217 = 14%	742,493 / 1,128,126 = 66%
African American	59,621 / 105,774 = 56%	76,434 / 145,570 = 53%		820 / 11,849 = 7%	77,254 / 157,419 = 49%
Hispanic	201,274 / 329,539 = 61%	260,686 / 453,060 = 58%		2,495 / 25,553 = 10%	263,181 / 478,613 = 55%
White	273,626 / 320,425 = 85%	361,219 / 430,563 = 84%		4,281 / 18,108 = 24%	365,500 / 448,671 = 81%
Economically Disadvantaged	214,812 / 360,105 = 60%	279,955 / 502,568 = 56%		4,043 / 38,118 = 11%	283,998 / 540,686 = 53%
<b>Social Studies</b>					
All Students	698,960 / 783,134 = 89%		Gr. 8,10,11	11,949 / 35,979 = 33%	710,909 / 819,113 = 87%
African American	89,829 / 107,308 = 84%			1,901 / 7,790 = 24%	91,730 / 115,098 = 80%
Hispanic	268,091 / 318,781 = 84%			4,255 / 15,971 = 27%	272,346 / 334,752 = 81%
White	310,860 / 325,569 = 95%			5,619 / 11,781 = 48%	316,479 / 337,350 = 94%
Economically Disadvantaged	284,690 / 343,109 = 83%			6,605 / 23,748 = 28%	291,295 / 366,857 = 79%
<b>Writing</b>					
All Students	522,255 / 566,013 = 92%			522,255 / 566,013 = 92%	
African American	68,034 / 76,448 = 89%			68,034 / 76,448 = 89%	
Hispanic	235,496 / 259,906 = 91%			235,496 / 259,906 = 91%	
White	197,502 / 207,778 = 95%			197,502 / 207,778 = 95%	
Economically Disadvantaged	273,575 / 306,155 = 89%			273,575 / 306,155 = 89%	

\* Since grade 8 science is shown at Panel Recommendation, this column does not reflect the 2007 passing rate for grade 8 science, which was at 1 SEM.

\*\* For all subjects except Science, this column is the aggregate of 2007 TAKS performance results used in 2007 Accountability plus 2007 TAKS-I results. For Science, this column is the aggregate of TAKS performance results for all grades at the Panel Recommended student passing standard plus 2007 TAKS-I results.

## 2006 TAKS and TAKS-I Performance Results

Subject and Student Group	2006 Accountability (TAKS Only)	* 2006 Science (PR) All Grades (TAKS Only)	2006 TAKS-I Only (partial grades and subjects)	** Accountability Modeling (TAKS and TAKS-I combined)
<b>Reading/ELA</b>				
All Students	2,167,885 / 2,489,697 = 87%		673 / 2,240 = 30%	2,168,558 / 2,491,937 = 87%
African American	270,190 / 331,251 = 82%		107 / 481 = 22%	270,297 / 331,732 = 81%
Hispanic	881,177 / 1,079,673 = 82%		207 / 834 = 25%	881,384 / 1,080,507 = 82%
White	929,373 / 985,952 = 94%		350 / 899 = 39%	929,723 / 986,851 = 94%
Economically Disadvantaged	1,008,077 / 1,248,271 = 81%		305 / 1,215 = 25%	1,008,382 / 1,249,486 = 81%
<b>Mathematics</b>				
All Students	1,860,051 / 2,487,221 = 75%		321 / 2,500 = 13%	1,860,372 / 2,489,721 = 75%
African American	199,562 / 329,217 = 61%		16 / 501 = 3%	199,578 / 329,718 = 61%
Hispanic	735,019 / 1,081,851 = 68%		96 / 948 = 10%	735,115 / 1,082,799 = 68%
White	841,025 / 982,909 = 86%		208 / 1,030 = 20%	841,233 / 983,939 = 85%
Economically Disadvantaged	828,474 / 1,249,802 = 66%		127 / 1,352 = 9%	828,601 / 1,251,154 = 66%
<b>Science</b>				
	Excludes grade 8	Includes grade 8		
All Students	540,861 / 768,063 = 70%	689,119 / 1,047,969 = 66%	6,903 / 34,077 = 20%	696,022 / 1,082,046 = 64%
African American	54,936 / 101,153 = 54%	67,661 / 139,282 = 49%	713 / 6,605 = 11%	68,374 / 145,887 = 47%
Hispanic	185,197 / 314,286 = 59%	231,726 / 433,239 = 53%	2,181 / 14,698 = 15%	233,907 / 447,937 = 52%
White	274,986 / 322,277 = 85%	356,518 / 435,078 = 82%	3,879 / 12,295 = 32%	360,397 / 447,373 = 81%
Economically Disadvantaged	199,926 / 347,401 = 58%	251,665 / 486,210 = 52%	3,563 / 22,398 = 16%	255,228 / 508,608 = 50%
<b>Social Studies</b>				
All Students	665,331 / 764,786 = 87%		6,109 / 19,644 = 31%	671,440 / 784,430 = 86%
African American	82,670 / 101,783 = 81%		903 / 3,908 = 23%	83,573 / 105,691 = 79%
Hispanic	243,509 / 302,744 = 80%		1,949 / 8,215 = 24%	245,458 / 310,959 = 79%
White	310,701 / 330,268 = 94%		3,156 / 7,268 = 43%	313,857 / 337,536 = 93%
Economically Disadvantaged	260,706 / 328,821 = 79%		3,198 / 12,506 = 26%	263,904 / 341,327 = 77%
<b>Writing</b>				
All Students	507,327 / 554,810 = 91%			507,327 / 554,810 = 91%
African American	65,201 / 73,602 = 89%			65,201 / 73,602 = 89%
Hispanic	221,842 / 250,414 = 89%			221,842 / 250,414 = 89%
White	200,367 / 210,254 = 95%			200,367 / 210,254 = 95%
Economically Disadvantaged	262,607 / 298,948 = 88%			262,607 / 298,948 = 88%

\* Since grade 8 science is shown at Panel Recommendation, this column does not reflect the 2006 passing rate for grade 8 science, which was at 2 SEM.

\*\* For all subjects except Science, this column is the aggregate of 2006 TAKS performance results used in 2006 Accountability plus 2006 TAKS-I results. For Science, this column is the aggregate of TAKS performance results for all grades at the Panel Recommended student passing standard plus 2006 TAKS-I results.

Analysis of 2007 Accountability Ratings  
Counts and Percentages of Campuses and Districts that Missed the Next Higher Rating  
Due to a Single Student Group on a Single Indicator

Missed <i>Exemplary</i> due to:	Number of Campuses	Percent of Campuses	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
All Students - Mathematics	16	5.8	6	25.0
All Students - Reading	1	0.4	1	4.2
All Students - Science	61	22.2	8	33.3
All Students - SDAA II	17	6.2		
All Students - Social Studies	1	0.4		
All Students - Writing	9	3.3	4	16.7
African American - Mathematics	18	6.5		
African American - Reading	5	1.8		
African American - Science	3	1.1		
Econ. Disadvantaged - Mathematics	75	27.3	1	4.2
Econ. Disadvantaged - Reading	14	5.1		
Econ. Disadvantaged - Science	6	2.2	1	4.2
Econ. Disadvantaged - Writing	2	0.7		
Hispanic - Mathematics	25	9.1	3	12.5
Hispanic - Reading	4	1.5		
Hispanic - Science	8	2.9		
White - Mathematics	4	1.5		
White - Science	4	1.5		
White - Writing	2	0.7		
Total	275	100.0	24	100.0

Missed <i>Recognized</i> due to:	Number of Campuses	Percent of Campuses	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
All Students - Mathematics	13	1.9	4	2.8
All Students - Reading	1	0.1		
All Students - Science	136	20.1	32	22.4
All Students - SDAA II	18	2.7	2	1.4
All Students - Social Studies	1	0.1	2	1.4
All Students - Writing	10	1.5	1	0.7
African American - Mathematics	92	13.6	12	8.4
African American - Reading	5	0.7		
African American - Science	20	2.9	4	2.8
African American - Social Studies	1	0.1		
African American - Writing	2	0.3		
Econ. Disadvantaged - Mathematics	154	22.7	22	15.4
Econ. Disadvantaged - Reading	4	0.6		
Econ. Disadvantaged - Science	120	17.7	31	21.7
Econ. Disadvantaged - Social Studies	2	0.3		
Econ. Disadvantaged - Writing	7	1		
Hispanic - Mathematics	37	5.5	9	6.3
Hispanic - Reading	4	0.6		
Hispanic - Science	44	6.5	24	16.8
Hispanic - Social Studies	2	0.3		
Hispanic - Writing	1	0.1		
White - Mathematics	3	0.4		
White - Science	1	0.1		
Total	678	100.0	143	100.0

Analysis of 2007 Accountability Ratings  
 Counts and Percentages of Campuses and Districts that Missed the Next Higher Rating  
 Due to a Single Student Group on a Single Indicator

Missed <i>Academically Acceptable</i> due to:	Number of Campuses	Percent of Campuses	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
All Students - Science	8	10.5	2	15.4
All Students - SDAA II	2	2.6		
All Students - Social Studies	1	1.3		
All Students - Writing	2	2.6	2	15.4
African American - Mathematics	22	28.9	3	23.1
African American - Reading	4	5.3	1	7.7
African American - Science	13	17.1	3	23.1
African American - Writing	1	1.3		
African American - Social Studies			1	7.7
Econ. Disadvantaged - Mathematics	9	11.8		
Econ. Disadvantaged - Science	4	5.3		
Econ. Disadvantaged - Social Studies	2	2.6		
Econ. Disadvantaged - Writing	2	2.6		
Hispanic - Mathematics	1	1.3		
Hispanic - Reading	2	2.6		
Hispanic - Science	1	1.3	1	7.7
Hispanic - Social Studies	2	2.6		
Total	76	100.0	13	100.0