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.
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.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Average TAKS Passing Rates and Completion Rates for Campuses that used TPM to Achieve Next Higher Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Accountability Rating</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad. Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Average TAKS Passing Rates and Completion Rates for Districts that used TPM to Achieve Next Higher Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Accountability Rating</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad. Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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: 160
- Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP): 161
- Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP): 172
- Special Analysis: 25
- No TAKS results: 113
- Hurricane Ike Provision: 20

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary each year for the past:</th>
<th>Recognized each year for the past:</th>
<th>Academically Unacceptable* each year for the past:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 or more years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Districts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Campuses</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

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

* 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%).