THE STATE OF TEXAS

In 2010, the State of Texas achieved Academically Acceptable status, with:

- TAKS passing rates of 86 percent or above for all students and all student groups for reading/ELA, writing, and social studies, 74 percent or above for all students and all student groups for mathematics, and 75 percent or above for all students and all student groups for science; and
- Grade 9-12 completion rates of 84.1 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 2009 TAKS results using the 2010 indicator definition, the 2010 statewide performance on the TAKS 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 2009 and the class of 2008.

The dropout rate for students in grades 7-8 in 2008-09 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 remained at 0.3% between 2009 and 2010.

DISTRICTS

Of the 1,237 districts, 241 districts (19.5%) are rated Exemplary and 607 (49.1%) are rated Recognized in 2010. The districts rated Exemplary comprise 8.6% of the total student enrollment, while the districts rated Recognized comprise 55.6% of total students enrolled.

342 of the 1,237 districts achieved the Academically Acceptable rating and comprise 32.8% of the total students enrolled. This includes 48 charter operators achieving the AEA: Academically Acceptable rating under AEA procedures.

37 districts are Academically Unacceptable representing 2.9% of the total students enrolled. This includes 15 charter operators rated AEA: Academically Unacceptable under AEA procedures.

10 districts are Not Rated: Other. See the topic “Not Rated Districts and Campuses” below for more information about this rating category.

- 137 of the 241 Exemplary districts are very small (total enrollment less than 500), and 48% are rural (115 of the 241).
- 29% of Recognized districts are very small, having fewer than 500 students enrolled. Approximately 60% of Recognized districts have 30% or more minority students enrolled; 77% have 40% or more economically disadvantaged students.
- In 2010, 57 of the Recognized districts (9.4%) are large (10,000 or more students enrolled) compared to 31 districts of this size earning Recognized in 2009 (6.7%). 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 31.1% in 2010.
Of the 8,435 campuses, 2,637 campuses (31.3%) are rated Exemplary and 3,160 (37.5%) are rated Recognized in 2010. The campuses rated Exemplary comprise 30.9% of the total student enrollment, while campuses rated Recognized comprise 44.9% of total students enrolled.

1,884 of the 8,435 campuses (22.3%) achieved the rating Academically Acceptable and comprise 21.3% of the total students enrolled. This includes 430 campuses rated AEA: Academically Acceptable under AEA procedures.

104 of the 8,435 campuses (1.2%) are rated Academically Unacceptable and comprise 1.3% of the total students enrolled. This includes 20 campuses rated AEA: Academically Unacceptable under AEA procedures.

650 campuses are Not Rated: Other. See the topic “Not Rated Districts and Campuses” below for more information about this rating category.

A large majority (77%) of the 2,637 schools rated Exemplary are elementary schools (2,019), with the remainder distributed among 204 high schools, 337 middle schools, and 77 multi-level schools.

The 3,160 Recognized schools are profiled as follows:
- 50% are elementary;
- 27% are middle schools;
- 20% are high schools; and
- 3% are multi-level schools.

The percent of Recognized or Exemplary campuses with high percentages of Economically Disadvantaged students (over 80%) is 17.4% in 2010.

Of the 84 Academically Unacceptable schools under standard procedures in 2010, their ratings were as follows in 2009:
- 22 were Academically Unacceptable.
- 4 were Exemplary.
- 8 were Recognized.
- 41 were Academically Acceptable.
- 0 were AEA: Academically Acceptable.
- 1 was AEA: Academically Unacceptable.
- 3 were Not Rated: Other.
- The remaining 5 did not exist in 2009.

The 84 schools rated Academically Unacceptable under standard procedures are distributed among 35 elementary schools, 13 middle schools, 30 high schools, and 6 multi-level schools.
Charter Operators

Of 207 charter operators, 50 are Exemplary (24.2%), 40 are Recognized (19.3%), 84 are rated Academically Acceptable (40.6%), and 23 are Academically Unacceptable (11.1%).

Of the 84 Academically Acceptable charters, 36 achieved this rating under standard procedures and 48 achieved the rating under AEA procedures.

Of the 23 Academically Unacceptable charters, 8 were evaluated under standard procedures and 15 were evaluated under AEA procedures.

Charter Campuses

Of the 463 charter campuses, 109 are rated Exemplary (23.5%) and 77 are rated Recognized (16.6%). Together, the Exemplary and Recognized categories represent 55.1% of all students enrolled in a charter school. 218 charter campuses are rated Academically Acceptable (47.1%). 27 charter campuses are rated Academically Unacceptable (5.8%).

Of the 218 Academically Acceptable charter campuses, 58 achieved this rating under standard procedures and 160 achieved the rating under AEA procedures.

Of the 27 Academically Unacceptable charter campuses, 8 were evaluated under standard procedures and 19 were evaluated under AEA procedures.

The remaining 32 charter campuses (6.9%) are Not Rated: Other and comprise 4.2% 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); or, the consequences of granted appeals.

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 Academically Acceptable to Recognized and 1 district moved from Academically Unacceptable to Academically Acceptable.

Special Analysis, Campuses

As a result of special analysis, 35 campuses that had very small numbers of students tested on TAKS had rating changes. 28 of the 35 campuses received the rating Not Rated: Other since there was not sufficient data to assign a rating. 4 campuses received the rating Academically Acceptable based on special analysis and 2 received the rating Recognized 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.

5 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

7 districts were prevented from achieving the rating of Recognized due to having one or more of campuses rated Academically Unacceptable.

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.

Under standard procedures, 1,518 campuses were able to demonstrate Required Improvement in order to achieve a higher rating in 2010. Of the 3,160 Recognized campuses, 1,280 campuses (40.5%) used Required Improvement to move from a rating of Academically Acceptable to Recognized. Of the 1,454 Academically Acceptable campuses under standard procedures, 238 campuses (16.4%) used Required Improvement to move from a rating of Academically Unacceptable to Academically Acceptable.

Under standard procedures, 381 districts were able to demonstrate Required Improvement in order to achieve a higher rating in 2010. Of the 607 Recognized districts, 348 districts (57.3%) used Required Improvement to move from a rating of Academically Acceptable to Recognized. Of the 294 Academically Acceptable districts under standard procedures, 33 districts (11.2%) used Required Improvement to move from a rating of Academically Unacceptable to Academically Acceptable.

Texas Projection Measure (TPM)

The TPM can be used to elevate ratings to any rating category. However, a rating may only be elevated one rating level from the initial rating. In 2010, the second year for the use of this feature, 632 districts used TPM. Of these, 64 used it to achieve Academically Acceptable, 399 used it to achieve Recognized, 167 used it to achieve Exemplary, and 2 used it to achieve AEA: Academically Acceptable. TPM was used most frequently by districts for mathematics (435 times) and science (434 times).
In 2010, 3,869 campuses used TPM. Of these, 426 used it to achieve Academically Acceptable, 1,970 used it to achieve Recognized, 1,448 used it to achieve Exemplary, and 25 used it to achieve AEA: Academically Acceptable. As is true for districts, campuses used TPM most frequently for mathematics and science. At the campus-level, TPM was used 2,390 times for mathematics and 1,764 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 1,448 campuses using TPM to achieve Exemplary is at 90% or above for all subjects. See the tables below.

### 2010 Average TAKS Passing Rates and Completion Rates for Campuses that used TPM to Achieve Next Higher Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Accountability Rating</th>
<th>Number of Campuses in Category</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Completion Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acad. Acceptable</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2010 Average TAKS Passing Rates and Completion Rates for Districts that used TPM to Achieve Next Higher Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Accountability Rating</th>
<th>Number of Districts in Category</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Completion Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acad. Acceptable</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Exceptions

6 districts applied exceptions to increase their district’s rating. One (1) used exceptions to achieve a rating of Academically Acceptable, 2 used exceptions to achieve Recognized, and 3 used exceptions to achieve Exemplary.

Of the 6 districts using exceptions, all 6 used one exception. No district used two or more exceptions.

213 campuses used exceptions. There were 8 that used exceptions to achieve a rating of Academically Acceptable, 58 that used exceptions to achieve Recognized, and 147 that used exceptions to achieve Exemplary.

Of the 213 campuses using exceptions, 197 used one exception, 7 used two, and 9 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 14 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 10 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 427 rural districts are evaluated on an average of 13 hurdles.

ACADEMICALLY UNACCEPTABLE REASONS

Standard Procedures

District
Of the 22 Academically Unacceptable districts in 2010, 3 received this rating due to poor performance on TAKS only, 10 due to Completion Rate only, 3 due to Dropout Rate only, and 6 due to a combination of the base indicators.

Campus
Of the 84 schools rated Academically Unacceptable, 44 (52%) received this rating due to poor performance on TAKS only, 25 due to Completion Rate only, 8 due to Dropout Rate only, and 2 due to a combination of the base indicators. Based on findings reported to the TEA by school districts, an additional 5 campuses were assigned the Academically Unacceptable rating as a result of known data irregularities.

Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures

District
Of the 15 AEA: Academically Unacceptable charter operators in 2010, 2 received the rating due to poor performance on TAKS only, 5 due to Completion Rate II only, 3 due to Dropout Rate only, and 5 due to completion and dropout rates.

Campus
Of the 20 schools rated AEA: Academically Unacceptable, 6 (30%) received this rating due to poor performance on TAKS only; 4 due to Completion Rate II only, 5 due to Dropout Rate only, and 5 due to completion and dropout rates.

NOT RATED DISTRICTS AND CAMPUSES
District

10 districts (all charter operators) are Not Rated: Other. 5 are AEA Not Rated: Other due to no TAKS scores and 5 are Not Rated: Other due to no TAKS scores.

Campus

650 of the 8,435 campuses rated (7.7%) are assigned a Not Rated rating. These campuses comprise 1.6% of the total students enrolled. Under standard procedures, 640 campuses are Not Rated: Other for the following reasons:

PK-K Only 176
Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP) 162
Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP) 173
Special Analysis 28
No TAKS results 101

10 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 2010 accountability ratings is 2,858,402 or 90% of all students enrolled in grades 3-11.
- The number of tested students who did not affect accountability ratings because they were not enrolled in the district by the end of October, 2009 is 138,651 or 4.4% of all students enrolled in grades 3-11.
- When all test takers are considered, 98.6% of all students enrolled in grades 3-11 were tested, compared to 98.5% in 2009.
- In 2010, the percent of students exempted from the TAKS due to Limited English Proficiency (LEP) was 0.9 percent, the same percentage as in 2009.
- In 2010, 0.1 percent of students were absent from testing, the same percentage as in 2009.

RATING TRENDS – 2004 THROUGH 2010

- 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 2010, 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, 46.6% in 2008, 61.3% in 2009, and 68.7% in 2010. The percent of Academically Unacceptable and AEA: Academically Unacceptable
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, 47.1% in 2009, and 68.6% in 2010. The percent of Academically Unacceptable and AEA: Academically Unacceptable districts has fluctuated from 2.0% in 2004, to 4.2% in 2005, to 4.5% in 2006, to 4.6% in 2007, to 2.6% in 2008, to 5.9% in 2009, and 3.0% in 2010.

The table below provides counts of districts and campuses with repeating ratings in consecutive years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<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></td>
<td>4 or more years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 or more years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 or more years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Districts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Campuses</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>357</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</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.

### 2010 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**</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><strong>Total Possible Acknowledgments (15 maximum)</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</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.

**Beginning in 2010, Comparable Improvement for reading is based on vertical scale score growth for grades 4-8 only. Therefore, high schools are no longer eligible to be awarded CI for English language arts, since ELA results (grade 10) are no longer evaluated for this indicator.

Statewide in 2010, approximately 82% of the 1,227 districts evaluated for GPA and 79% of the 7,780 campuses evaluated for GPA earned one or more acknowledgments, compared to 78% and 79% respectively in 2009. Among the charter operators, 29 earned one or more acknowledgments. Among the AECs, 240 earned one or more acknowledgments.

Two districts earned all 13 district acknowledgments, two districts earned 12, four earned 11, and another fourteen districts earned 10. A total of 226 districts (18%) earned 1 acknowledgment, 211 (17%) earned 2 acknowledgments, and 178 (15%) earned 3 acknowledgments.

No campuses earned all 15 acknowledgments, and no campuses earned 14. Two campuses earned 13, eight campuses earned 12, and eleven campuses earned 11. A total of 1,660 campuses (21%)
earned 1 acknowledgment, 1,387 (18%) earned 2 acknowledgments, and 1,119 (15%) earned 3 acknowledgments.

At the campus level, the most frequent acknowledgment earned was commended on science (32.5%), followed by commended on writing (24.1%), and commended on reading/ELA (23.8%). The acknowledgment earned the fewest times was the college admissions acknowledgment (SAT/ACT), with less than 1% of campuses (48) earning this accolade.

At the district level, the most frequent acknowledgment earned was commended on college-ready graduates (46.2%), followed by commended on social studies (46.0%), the Texas Success Initiative in Mathematics (33.8%), and the attendance rate (30.2%). As with the campuses, the acknowledgment earned the fewest times was the SAT/ACT acknowledgment with 2.3% of districts (29) earning this accolade.

Among AEA charter operators, the GPA’s earned most often were RHSP/DAP (16.1%) and attendance rate (13.2%). Among AECs, the GPA earned most often was attendance rate (23.2%).
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