

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE 2010 ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

November 3, 2010

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.

CAMPUSES

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.

CHARTERS

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

2010 Average TAKS Passing Rates and Completion Rates for Districts that used TPM to Achieve Next Higher Rating							
District Accountability Rating	Number of Districts in Category	Reading	Mathematics	Writing	Social Studies	Science	Completion Rate
<i>Acad. Acceptable</i>	64	83%	71%	86%	91%	71%	90%
<i>Recognized</i>	399	89%	82%	93%	95%	81%	93%
<i>Exemplary</i>	167	95%	92%	97%	98%	92%	97%

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*

campuses has fluctuated from **1.2%** in 2004, to **3.3%** in 2005, to **3.6%** in 2006, to **3.4%** in 2007, to **2.5%** in 2008, to **2.9%** in 2009, and **1.2%** in 2010.

- From 2004 to 2010, 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.

	<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	15	14	62	41	84	167	0	2	10
Number of Campuses	443	368	882	357	471	862	6	3	22

*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

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**	√	√		√	
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			√	√	√
Total Possible Acknowledgments (15 maximum)	7	8	12	15	13

* 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%**).

