

## HIGHLIGHTS OF THE 2009 ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

November 2009

### THE STATE OF TEXAS

---

In 2009, the State of Texas achieved *Academically Acceptable* status, with:

- ✓ TAKS passing rates of **87** percent or above for all students and all student groups for reading/ELA, writing, and social studies, **71** percent or above for all students and all student groups for mathematics, and **66** percent or above for all students and all student groups for science; and
- ✓ Grade 9-12 completion rates of **82.7** percent or above for all students and all student groups; and
- ✓ Grade 7-8 dropout rates of **0.5** percent or less for all students and all student groups.

Compared to the 2008 TAKS results, the 2009 statewide performance on the TAKS was equal to or improved for all students and all student groups in each subject area tested.

Completion Rate I, the rate that excludes GED recipients as completers, improved for all students and for each student group between the class of 2008 and the class of 2007. Decreases in completion rates had been observed in recent years due to significant changes in the dropout definition that began with the 2005-06 school year. The class of 2008 demonstrated the first gains in completion rates since the class of 2003.

The dropout rate for students in grades 7-8 in 2007-08 varies across the all students group and each of the individual student groups from a low of **0.1%** for White students to a high of **0.5%** for African American students. The overall grade 7-8 dropout rate improved from **0.4%** to **0.3%**.

### DISTRICTS

---

Of the **1,235** districts, **117** districts (**9.5%**) are rated *Exemplary* and **464** (**37.6%**) are rated *Recognized* in 2009. The districts rated *Exemplary* comprise **1.8%** of the total student enrollment, while the districts rated *Recognized* comprise **32.0%** of total students enrolled.

**570** of the **1,235** districts achieved the *Academically Acceptable* rating and comprise **60.1%** of the total students enrolled. This includes **52** charter operators achieving the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating under AEA procedures.

**73** districts are *Academically Unacceptable* representing **5.9%** of the total students enrolled. This includes **17** charter operators rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* under AEA procedures.

**11** districts are *Not Rated: Other*. See the topic "Not Rated Districts and Campuses" below for more information about this rating category.

- ✓ **77** of the **117** *Exemplary* districts are very small (total enrollment less than 500), and **56%** are rural (**65** of the **117**).
- ✓ **39%** of *Recognized* districts are very small, having fewer than 500 students enrolled. Approximately **50%** of *Recognized* districts have 30% or more non-white students enrolled; **67%** have 40% or more economically disadvantaged students.
- ✓ In 2009, **31** of the *Recognized* districts (**6.7%**) are large (10,000 or more students enrolled) compared to **19** districts of this size earning *Recognized* in 2008 (**5.9%**). In 2004, **13** of the *Recognized* districts (**3.4%**) had 10,000 or more students in enrollment.
- ✓ The percent of *Recognized* or *Exemplary* districts with 60% or more Economically Disadvantaged students increased from **16.8%** in 2004 to **24.4%** in 2009.

## CAMPUSES

---

Of the **8,322** campuses, **2,158** campuses (**25.9%**) are rated *Exemplary* and **2,943** (**35.4%**) are rated *Recognized* in 2009. The campuses rated *Exemplary* comprise **25.0%** of the total student enrollment, while campuses rated *Recognized* comprise **39.2%** of total students enrolled.

**2,316** of the **8,322** campuses (**27.8%**) achieved the rating *Academically Acceptable* and comprise **30.6%** of the total students enrolled. This includes **405** campuses rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable* under AEA procedures.

**245** of the **8,322** campuses (**2.9%**) are rated *Academically Unacceptable* and comprise **3.5%** of the total students enrolled. This includes **37** campuses rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* under AEA procedures.

**659** campuses are *Not Rated: Other* and **1** campus is rated *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*. See the topic "Not Rated Districts and Campuses" below for more information about this rating category.

A large majority (**84.8%**) of the **2,158** schools rated *Exemplary* are elementary schools (**1,831**), with the remainder distributed among **135** high schools, **148** middle schools, and **44** multi-level schools.

The **2,943** *Recognized* schools are profiled as follows:

- 61%** are elementary;
- 18%** are middle schools;
- 18%** are high schools; and
- 3%** are multi-level schools.

The percent of *Recognized* or *Exemplary* campuses with high percentages of Economically Disadvantaged students (over 85%) increased from **11.9%** in 2004 to **16.6%** in 2009.

Of the **208** *Academically Unacceptable* schools under standard procedures in 2009, their ratings were as follows in 2008:

- **41** were *Academically Unacceptable*.
- **0** were *Exemplary*.
- **2** were *Recognized*.
- **157** were *Academically Acceptable*.
- **2** were *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.
- **0** were *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*.
- **1** was *Not Rated: Other*.
- The remaining **5** did not exist in 2008.

The **208** schools rated *Academically Unacceptable* under standard procedures are distributed among **31** elementary schools, **93** middle schools, **74** high schools, and **10** multi-level schools.

## CHARTERS

---

### Charter Operators

Of **205** charter operators, **32** are *Exemplary* (**15.6%**), **43** are *Recognized* (**21.0%**), **94** are rated *Academically Acceptable* (**45.9%**), and **27** are *Academically Unacceptable* (**13.2%**).

Of the **94** *Academically Acceptable* charters, **42** achieved this rating under standard procedures and **52** achieved the rating under AEA procedures.

Of the **27** *Academically Unacceptable* charters, **10** were evaluated under standard procedures and **17** were evaluated under AEA procedures.

### Charter Campuses

Of the **437** charter campuses, **69** are rated *Exemplary* (**15.8%**) and **76** are rated *Recognized* (**17.4%**). Together, the *Exemplary* and *Recognized* categories represent **44.2%** of all students enrolled in a charter school. **214** charter campuses are rated *Academically Acceptable* (**49.0%**). **46** charter campuses are rated *Academically Unacceptable* (**10.5%**).

Of the **214** *Academically Acceptable* charter campuses, **62** achieved this rating under standard procedures and **152** achieved the rating under AEA procedures.

Of the **46** *Academically Unacceptable* charter campuses, **15** were evaluated under standard procedures and **31** were evaluated under AEA procedures.

The remaining **32** charter campuses (**7.3%**) are *Not Rated: Other* and comprise **3.7%** of the total students enrolled in a charter school. See the topic "Not Rated Districts and Campuses" below for more information about this rating category.

## MOVEMENT

---

Under certain circumstances the initial rating assigned can be changed. Reasons for a rating change include the following: small numbers requiring special analysis; additional requirements in the system (such as district rating consequences of having one or more *Academically Unacceptable* campuses or excessive leavers); the consequences of granted appeals; or, in 2009, the application of the Hurricane Ike Provision.

### Special Analysis, Districts

As a result of special analysis, **2** districts that had very small numbers of students tested on TAKS had rating changes. **1** district moved from *Recognized* to *Not Rated: Other* and **1** district moved from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*.

### Special Analysis, Campuses

As a result of special analysis, **32** campuses that had very small numbers of students tested on TAKS had rating changes. **25** of the **32** campuses received the rating *Not Rated: Other* since there was not sufficient data to assign a rating. **6** campuses received the rating *Academically Acceptable* based on special analysis and **1** received the rating *Exemplary* based on special analysis.

## Excessive Leavers

If a district fails to provide a leaver record for a grade 7-12 student who is no longer in enrollment, TEA counts the student as underreported. In order to maintain a rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*, districts must not exceed the accountability standards for underreporting students.

7 districts were moved from a rating of *Recognized* to *Academically Acceptable* due to excessive numbers of underreported students. No districts with an *Exemplary* rating were affected.

## Academically Unacceptable Campuses

**One** district was prevented from achieving the rating of *Recognized* due to having one or more of campuses rated *Academically Unacceptable*.

## Hurricane Ike Provision

Under the criteria for using the Hurricane Ike Provision for state accountability, **49** districts and all of their **465** campuses were eligible for consideration. In addition, **97** other campuses were eligible even though their districts were not. Of the **562** eligible campuses, **21** used the Hurricane Ike Provision. Of these **21** campuses, **1** moved from *Recognized* to *Not Rated: Other* (because *Recognized* was a lower rating than they received the prior year). An additional **8** moved from *Academically Acceptable* to *Not Rated: Other* (because *Academically Acceptable* was a lower rating than they received the previous year). The remaining **12** either moved from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Not Rated: Other* (**11**) or from *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* to *AEA: Not Rated – Other* (**1**). For **5** of these, *Academically Unacceptable* was a lower rating than they received the prior year; but **6** were *Academically Unacceptable* in 2008. The one *AEA* campus did not exist in 2008.

Of the **49** eligible districts, **3** used the Hurricane Ike Provision. Of these **3** districts, **1** moved from *Academically Acceptable* to *Not Rated: Other* and **2** moved from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Not Rated: Other*. For **1** of these **2**, *Academically Unacceptable* was a lower rating than they received the prior year, but **1** was *Academically Unacceptable* in 2008.

## ADDITIONAL FEATURES IN THE SYSTEM

---

There are three additional features in the system: Required Improvement, the Texas Projection Measure (TPM), and the Exceptions Provision. Only one feature can be applied to any single measure, however, different features can be used for different measures. Each section below describes counts of campuses and districts using the feature described for one or more measures. Some portion of these districts and campuses may have used other features for other measures.

### Required Improvement

Required Improvement can be used to elevate campus and district ratings from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable* or from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*. Required Improvement is not available to elevate ratings to *Exemplary*. Required Improvement is available for all base indicators – TAKS, Annual Dropout Rate, and the Completion Rate.

Under standard procedures, **756** campuses were able to demonstrate Required Improvement for the TAKS indicator in order to achieve a higher rating in 2009. Of the **2,943** *Recognized* campuses, **607** campuses (**20.6%**) used Required Improvement to move from a rating of *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*. Of the **1,911** *Academically Acceptable* campuses under standard procedures, **149**

campuses (7.8%) used Required Improvement to move from a rating of *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*.

Under standard procedures, 144 districts were able to demonstrate Required Improvement for the TAKS indicator in order to achieve a higher rating in 2009. Of the 464 *Recognized* districts, 128 districts (27.6%) used Required Improvement to move from a rating of *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*. Of the 518 *Academically Acceptable* districts under standard procedures, 16 districts (3.1%) used Required Improvement to move from a rating of *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*.

#### Texas Projection Measure (TPM)

Unlike the Required Improvement feature, TPM can be used to elevate ratings to any rating category, including Exemplary. However, a rating may only be elevated one rating level from the initial rating. TPM only applies to the TAKS base indicator. In 2009, the first year for the use of this feature, 331 districts used TPM. Of these, 79 used it to achieve *Academically Acceptable*, 179 used it to achieve *Recognized*, and 73 used it to achieve *Exemplary*. TPM was used most frequently by districts for science (201 times) then for mathematics (164 times).

In 2009, 2,560 campuses used TPM. Of these, 358 used it to achieve *Academically Acceptable*, 1,088 used it to achieve *Recognized*, and 1,114 used it to achieve *Exemplary*. As is true for districts, campuses used TPM most frequently for mathematics and science, though the order is reversed. At the campus-level, TPM was used 1,668 times for mathematics and 1,029 times for science.

Among the campuses and districts using the TPM feature, the percentage of students passing the test is very high, relative to the rating level achieved. For example, the average percent of students passing the test among the 1,114 campuses using TPM to achieve *Exemplary* is at least 90% for all subjects. See the tables below.

Campus Accountability Rating	Number of Campuses in Category	Reading	Mathematics	Writing	Social Studies	Science	Completion Rate
<i>Acad. Acceptable</i>	358	84%	66%	83%	89%	65%	88%
<i>Recognized</i>	1,088	91%	80%	90%	95%	80%	94%
<i>Exemplary</i>	1,114	95%	92%	94%	99%	92%	98%

District Accountability Rating	Number of Districts in Category	Reading	Mathematics	Writing	Social Studies	Science	Completion Rate
<i>Acad. Acceptable</i>	79	87%	72%	89%	87%	64%	91%
<i>Recognized</i>	179	93%	83%	94%	94%	80%	93%
<i>Exemplary</i>	73	97%	92%	97%	98%	91%	97%

## Exceptions

The Exceptions Provision can be used to elevate ratings to any rating category, including *Exemplary*. Like the TPM, this feature only applies to the TAKS base indicator. **17** districts used one or more exceptions. One (**1**) used exceptions to achieve a rating of *Academically Acceptable*, **8** used exceptions to achieve *Recognized*, and **8** used exceptions to achieve *Exemplary*.

Of the **17** districts using exceptions, **16** used one exception, **1** used two exceptions, and none used three or four exceptions.

**319** campuses used exceptions. There were **72** that used exceptions to achieve a rating of *Academically Acceptable*, **96** that used exceptions to achieve *Recognized*, and **151** that used exceptions to achieve *Exemplary*.

Of the **319** campuses using exceptions, **263** used one exception, **37** used two, and **19** used three. None used all four exceptions.

Sometimes additional exceptions are charged as a result of special analysis or granted appeals. These additional exceptions are not included in the totals discussed above.

## HURDLES

---

Under standard procedures, there are a total of 35 possible measures (hurdles) used to determine the accountability rating depending on the size and diversity of the campus or district. For campuses, the accountability ratings are based on a statewide average of **13** hurdles. For elementary schools, the average number of hurdles is **12**, compared to an average of **17** hurdles for middle schools and **14** for secondary schools. Charter schools that are evaluated under standard procedures are held accountable for **9** measures on average.

For districts, the average number of hurdles statewide is **18**. The ten major urban districts are evaluated on an average of **34** hurdles, while the **432** rural districts are evaluated on an average of **13** hurdles.

## ACADEMICALLY UNACCEPTABLE REASONS

---

### Standard Procedures

#### District

Of the **56** *Academically Unacceptable* districts in 2009, **14** received this rating due to poor performance on TAKS only, **38** due to Completion Rate only, **2** due to Dropout Rate only, and **2** due to a combination of the base indicators.

#### Campus

Of the **208** schools rated *Academically Unacceptable*, **142 (68%)** received this rating due to poor performance on TAKS only; **50** due to Completion Rate only, **3** due to Dropout Rate only, and **13** due to a combination of the base indicators.

## Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures

### District

Of the **17** AEA: *Academically Unacceptable* charter operators in 2009, **2** received the rating due to poor performance on TAKS only, **5** due to Completion Rate II only, **5** due to Dropout Rate only, and **5** due to completion and dropout rates.

### Campus

Of the **37** schools rated AEA: *Academically Unacceptable*, **8 (22%)** received this rating due to poor performance on TAKS only; **12** due to Completion Rate II only, **12** due to Dropout Rate only, and **5** due to completion and dropout rates.

## NOT RATED DISTRICTS AND CAMPUSES

---

### District

**11** districts are *Not Rated: Other*. Of these, **1** was assigned this label through the process of special analysis when it was determined there was not sufficient data upon which to base a rating. **3** had rating changes to *Not Rated: Other* due to application of the Hurricane Ike provision. **4** are AEA *Not Rated: Other* and due to no TAKS scores and **3** are *Not Rated: Other* due to no TAKS scores.

### Campus

**660** of the **8,322** campuses rated (**7.9%**) are assigned a *Not Rated* rating. These campuses comprise **1.7%** of the total students enrolled. Under standard procedures, **651** campuses are *Not Rated: Other* for the following reasons:

PK-K Only	<b>160</b>
Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP)	<b>161</b>
Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP)	<b>172</b>
Special Analysis	<b>25</b>
No TAKS results	<b>113</b>
Hurricane Ike Provision	<b>20</b>

**One** additional campus is *Not Rated* due to data integrity issues. **8** other campuses evaluated under AEA procedures are AEA: *Not Rated – Other*.

## TAKS PARTICIPATION

---

- The number of tested students who are included in the accountability subset of assessment results used to determine the 2009 accountability ratings is **2,733,129** or **87.3%** of all students enrolled in grades 3-11.
- The number of tested students who did not affect the August accountability ratings because they were not enrolled in the district by the end of October, 2008 is **147,223** or **4.7%** of all students enrolled in grades 3-11.
- When all test takers are considered, **98.5%** of all students enrolled in grades 3-11 were tested, compared to **98.4%** in 2008.
- In 2009, the percent of students exempted from the TAKS due to Limited English Proficiency (LEP) was **0.9** percent, the same percentage as in 2008.

- In 2009, **0.1** percent of students were absent from testing, down from 0.2 percent reported from through 2008.

*RATING TRENDS – 2004 THROUGH 2009*

---

- The first few years of the new accountability system presented the dual challenge of increasing student-level passing standards on TAKS combined with other increases in rigor to the system: increasing accountability standards; decreases in minimum size criteria for both the dropout and completion rate indicators; and definitional changes to base indicators such as completion rate, and annual dropout rate.
- From 2004 to 2009, the percent of *Exemplary* and *Recognized* campuses (combined) was **39.1%** in 2004, **27.9%** in 2005, **42.6%** in 2006, **37.2%** in 2007, and **46.6%** in 2008 and **61.3%** in 2009. The percent of *Academically Unacceptable* campuses has fluctuated from **1.2%** in 2004, to **2.9%** in 2005, to **3.4%** in 2006, to **3.3%** in 2007, to **2.3%** in 2008 and **2.5%** in 2009.
- From 2004 to 2009, the percent of *Exemplary* and *Recognized* districts (combined) was **32.3%** in 2004, **14.9%** in 2005, **29.0%** in 2006, **20.0%** in 2007, **30.3%** in 2008, and **47.0%** in 2009. The percent of *Academically Unacceptable* districts has fluctuated from **2.0%** in 2004, to **3.0%** in 2005, to **3.8%** in 2006, to **4.4%** in 2007, to **2.4%** in 2008, and **4.5%** in 2009.
- The table below provides counts of districts and campuses with repeating ratings in consecutive years.

	<i>Exemplary</i> each year for the past:			<i>Recognized</i> each year for the past:			<i>Academically Unacceptable</i> * each year for the past:		
	4 or more years	3 years	2 years	4 or more years	3 years	2 years	4 or more years	3 years	2 years
Number of Districts	6	10	18	61	22	135	3	1	4
Number of Campuses	323	144	421	483	228	792	11	10	23

\*In this table, *Academically Unacceptable* includes AEA: *Academically Unacceptable*. Also, *Academically Unacceptable* ratings separated by one or more years of *Not Rated* are considered consecutive.

The columns in this table are mutually exclusive. For example, the 2-year counts indicate campuses and districts with repeated ratings for exactly 2 years. The 2-year counts do not include those who also have repeated ratings for 3 years or 4 or more years.

**GOLD PERFORMANCE ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

Charter districts and alternative education campuses (AECs) rated under Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) procedures are eligible to earn Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPAs). All GPA statistics presented below include GPA's earned by campuses and districts evaluated under AEA or standard procedures.

**2009 Gold Performance Acknowledgments**  
Table of Possible Acknowledgments by School Type

Indicator	Elementary	Middle / Jr. High	High School	Multi-Level	District
Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion			√	√	√
Advanced Placement / International Baccalaureate Results			√	√	√
Attendance Rate	√	√	√	√	√
College-Ready Graduates			√	√	√
Commended Performance on Reading/ELA	√	√	√	√	√
Commended Performance on Mathematics	√	√	√	√	√
Commended Performance on Writing	√	√		√	√
Commended Performance on Science	√	√	√	√	√
Commended Performance on Social Studies		√	√	√	√
Comparable Improvement: Reading/English Language Arts*	√	√	√	√	
Comparable Improvement: Mathematics*	√	√	√	√	
Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program			√	√	√
SAT/ACT Results			√	√	√
Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: English Language Arts			√	√	√
Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: Mathematics			√	√	√
<b>Total Possible Acknowledgments (15 maximum)</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>

\* Comparable Improvement GPA is not applicable for campuses evaluated under Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) procedures.

Statewide in 2009, approximately **78%** of the 1,224 districts evaluated for GPA and **79%** of the 7,650 campuses evaluated for GPA earned one or more acknowledgments, compared to 80% and 81% respectively in 2008. Among the 72 charter operators, **25** earned one or more acknowledgments. Among the 448 AECs, **196** earned one or more acknowledgments.

Two districts earned all 13 district acknowledgments, three districts earned 12, three earned 11, and another ten districts earned 10. A total of 185 districts (**15%**) earned 1 acknowledgment, 169 (**14%**) earned 2 acknowledgments, and 174 (**14%**) earned 3 acknowledgments.

No campuses earned all 15 acknowledgments, and no campuses earned 14. Five campuses earned 13, five campuses earned 12, and nine campuses earned 11. A total of 1,394 campuses (**18%**) earned 1 acknowledgment, 1,289 (**17%**) earned 2 acknowledgments, and 1,139 (**15%**) earned 3 acknowledgments.

At the campus level, the most frequent acknowledgment earned was commended on mathematics (**30.2%**), followed by commended on reading/ELA (**29.1%**), and commended on science (**28.5%**). The acknowledgment earned the fewest times was the college admissions acknowledgment (SAT/ACT), with less than 1% of campuses (**38**) earning this accolade.

At the district level, the most frequent acknowledgment earned was commended on social studies (**40.6%**), followed by the new College-Ready Graduates indicator (**38.8%**), the Texas Success Initiative in ELA (**34.7%**), and the Texas Success Initiative in mathematics (**33.2%**). As with the campuses, the acknowledgment earned the fewest times was the college admissions acknowledgment (SAT/ACT) with **1.6%** of districts (**20**) earning this accolade.

Among AEA charter operators, the GPA's earned most often were attendance rate and RHSP/DAP with **17%** each. Among AECs, the GPA earned most often was attendance rate (**22.7%**).

