

## Chapter 3 – The Basics: *Additional Features*

---

As shown in *Chapter 2 – The Basics: Base Indicators*, districts and campuses can achieve a rating by meeting the absolute standards for the different indicators. However, under certain conditions, a campus or district can raise their rating one level:

- by meeting *Required Improvement*;
- by including students who did not pass the TAKS test but met the *Texas Projection Measure (TPM)* improvement standard; and/or,
- by using the *Exceptions Provision*.

Additionally, under certain circumstances a district’s rating may be restricted to *Academically Acceptable*. These additional requirements for districts are explained in the last part of this chapter.

All additional features are applied and calculated automatically by TEA before ratings are released. Districts and campuses do not need to request the use of additional features.

Required Improvement is available for all three base indicators: TAKS, the Annual Dropout Rate, and the Completion Rate I. Required Improvement can elevate ratings from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable* and from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*. Required Improvement is not available to elevate ratings to *Exemplary*. The use of Required Improvement with the Annual Dropout Rate is special since there is only one standard for this indicator. See page 28 for more details.

### Required Improvement to *Academically Acceptable*

---

Campuses or districts initially rated *Academically Unacceptable* may achieve an *Academically Acceptable* rating using the Required Improvement feature.

**Who is evaluated for Required Improvement:** Districts and campuses whose performance is *Academically Unacceptable* for any TAKS subject, Annual Dropout Rate, or Completion Rate I measure evaluated.

### TAKS

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district to *Academically Acceptable*, the campus or district must have shown enough improvement on the deficient TAKS measures since 2009 to be able to meet the current year accountability standard in two years.

There are different standards for the *Academically Acceptable* rating for TAKS:

- *Reading/ELA, Writing, and Social Studies*. Any measure below the standard must achieve enough gain to meet a standard of **70%** in two years.
- *Mathematics*. Any measure below the standard must achieve enough gain to meet a standard of **60%** in two years.
- *Science*. Any measure below the standard must achieve enough gain to meet a standard of **55%** in two years.

**Methodology:** The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

<b>Actual Change</b>	<b>Required Improvement</b>
[performance in 2010] – [performance in 2009]	$\frac{[\text{standard for 2010}] - [\text{performance in 2009}]}{2}$

≥

*Example:* For 2010, a high school campus has performance above the *Academically Acceptable* standard in all areas except for their Economically Disadvantaged student group in TAKS mathematics; only 54% met the standard. Their performance in 2009 for the same group and subject was 44%.

First calculate their *actual change*:

$$54 - 44 = 10$$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{60 - 44}{2} = 8$$

Then compare the two numbers to see if the *actual change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*:

$$10 \geq 8$$

Result: the campus meets Required Improvement, so its rating is *Academically Acceptable*.

**Minimum Size Requirements:** In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have test results (for the subject and student group) for at least 10 students in 2009.

**Other Information:**

- *Improvement Calculations.* These are based on the percent of students who passed the TAKS. The improvement calculations do not include those who failed the TAKS but are projected to meet the standard with TPM.
- *Recalculation of Prior Year Results.* For purposes of calculating RI, the prior year (spring 2009) assessment results have been rebuilt:
  - to include TAKS (Accommodated) results for all subjects and grades,
  - to use only first administration results for grade 3 reading, and
  - to use the new vertical scale for grades 3-8 reading and mathematics.
- *Additional Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) Requirements.* All campuses rated *Academically Acceptable* in 2010 may be required to revise and submit portions of the CIP developed under TEC §11.253 that are relevant to those areas for which the campus would not satisfy performance requirements if their 2010 performance does not meet the accountability criteria established for the 2011 accountability system. Some schools that attain a 2010 rating of *Academically Acceptable* through Required Improvement may be subject to these requirements. See *Chapter 16 – Responsibilities and Consequences* for more information.

- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are done on performance rates and standards that have been rounded to whole numbers. Required Improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

## COMPLETION RATE I [GRADUATES AND CONTINUERS]

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district to *Academically Acceptable*, the campus or district must have shown enough improvement on the deficient Completion Rate I measures between the classes of 2008 and 2009 to be at a standard of **75.0%** in two years.

**Methodology:** The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{\text{Actual Change}}{\text{[completion rate for class of 2009] minus [completion rate for class of 2008]}} \geq \frac{\text{Required Improvement}}{\frac{[75.0] - [\text{completion rate for class of 2008}]}{2}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have had at least 10 students (in the same student group) in the class of 2008 completion rate.

### Other Information:

- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 2.85% is rounded to 2.9%, not 3%.

## ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district to *Academically Acceptable*, the campus or district must have shown enough decline in its dropout rate to be at **1.8%** in two years.

**Methodology:** The *actual change* must be equal to or less than the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{\text{Actual Change}}{\text{[2008-09 dropout rate] - [2007-08 dropout rate]}} \leq \frac{\text{Required Improvement}}{\frac{[1.8] - [\text{2007-08 dropout rate}]}{2}}$$

This calculation measures *reductions* in rates, not gains as with TAKS or Completion Rate I results. The actual change in the dropout rate needs to be *less than or equal to* the Required Improvement for the standard to be met, and will involve negative numbers. Stated another way, the actual change needs to be a larger negative number than the Required Improvement number.

**Minimum Size Requirements:** In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have had at least 10 grade 7-8 students (in the same student group) in 2007-08.

### Other Information:

- *Additional Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) Requirements.* All campuses rated *Academically Acceptable* in 2010 may be required to revise and submit portions of the CIP developed under TEC §11.253 that are relevant to those areas for which the campus would not satisfy performance requirements if their 2010 performance does not meet the

accountability criteria established for the 2011 accountability system. Some schools that attain a 2010 rating of *Academically Acceptable* through Required Improvement may be subject to these requirements. See *Chapter 16 – Responsibilities and Consequences* for more information.

- *Floor.* No floor is required to be able to use Required Improvement for the Annual Dropout Rate, either for moving to *Academically Acceptable*, *Recognized*, or *Exemplary*.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, -1.675% is rounded to -1.7%.

*Example:* In 2008-09, a middle school had performance at the *Academically Acceptable* level for all TAKS subjects. The middle school was not evaluated on completion rate. However, the dropout rate for their Hispanic student group was 2.0%. Their Annual Dropout Rate in 2007-08 for the same group was 2.8%.

First calculate their *actual change*:

$$2.0 - 2.8 = -0.8$$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{1.8 - 2.8}{2} = -0.5$$

Then compare the two numbers to see if the *actual change* is less than or equal to the *Required Improvement*:

$$-0.8 \leq -0.5$$

Result: the campus meets Required Improvement, so its rating is *Academically Acceptable*.

## Required Improvement to *Recognized*

**Who is evaluated for Required Improvement:** Districts and campuses whose performance is at the high end of *Academically Acceptable* for any TAKS subject or Completion Rate I, and who also meet the minimum “floor” for current year performance. Campuses or districts that do not meet the 1.8% Annual Dropout Rate standard may also use Required Improvement to achieve a *Recognized* or *Exemplary* rating. See Annual Dropout Rate (below) for details.

### TAKS

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*, the campus or district must have:

- performance ranging from 75% to 79% on the measure, and
- shown enough improvement on TAKS since 2009 to be at **80%** in two years.

**Methodology:** The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

<b>Actual Change</b>		<b>Required Improvement</b>
[performance in 2010] – [performance in 2009]	≥	$\frac{[80] - [\text{performance in 2009}]}{2}$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** For Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have test results (for the subject and student group) for at least 10 students in 2009.

**Other Information:**

- *Standards.* The *Recognized* standard for the TAKS indicator (80%) is the same for all subjects.
- *Improvement Calculations.* These are based on the percent of students who passed the TAKS. The improvement calculations do not include those who failed the TAKS but are projected to meet the standard with TPM.
- *Recalculation of Prior Year Results.* For purposes of calculating RI, the prior year (spring 2009) assessment results have been rebuilt:
  - to include TAKS (Accommodated) results for all subjects and grades,
  - to use only first administration results for grade 3 reading, and
  - to use the new vertical scale for grades 3-8 reading and mathematics.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are done on performance rates and standards that have been rounded to whole numbers. Required Improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

*Example:* For 2010, a district has performance above the *Recognized* standard in all areas except for their Economically Disadvantaged student group in TAKS science; only 75% met the standard. Their performance in 2009 for the same group and subject was 71%.

First determine if their current year performance is *at or above the floor* of 75%:

$$75 \geq 75$$

Next calculate their *actual change*:

$$75 - 71 = 4$$

Then calculate the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{80 - 71}{2} = 5 \text{ (4.5 rounds to 5)}$$

Finally, compare the two numbers to see if the *actual change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*:

4 is not greater than or equal to 5

Result: the district does not meet Required Improvement, so its rating cannot be elevated above *Academically Acceptable* due to Required Improvement. However, use of the TPM or the Exceptions Provision may apply.

## COMPLETION RATE I [GRADUATES AND CONTINUERS]

**Improvement Standard:** In order for Required Improvement to move a campus or district from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*, the campus or district must have:

- a completion rate ranging from 75.0% to 84.9% on the measure, and
- shown enough improvement on the deficient completion rate measures between the classes of 2008 and 2009 to be at **85.0%** in two years.

**Methodology:** The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*:

$$\frac{\text{Actual Change}}{\text{[completion rate for class of 2009] minus [completion rate for class of 2008]}} \geq \frac{\text{Required Improvement}}{\frac{[85.0] - \text{[completion rate for class of 2008]}}{2}}$$

**Minimum Size Requirements:** In order for Required Improvement to be an option, the district or campus must have had at least 10 students (in the same student group) in the class of 2008 completion rate.

### Other Information:

- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 2.85% is rounded to 2.9%, not 3%.

## ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE

A campus or district cannot be prevented from a rating of *Academically Acceptable*, *Recognized*, or *Exemplary* if it has either met the absolute dropout rate standard or demonstrated dropout rate Required Improvement.

Because there is only one standard (1.8%) to meet for the Annual Dropout Rate, the same Required Improvement calculation is applied whether the campus or district is initially *Academically Unacceptable*, *Academically Acceptable*, or *Recognized*. This means that no performance floor is imposed when using Required Improvement for the dropout rate to achieve *Recognized* or *Exemplary*. See page 25 for the methodology and other details.

## Texas Projection Measure

---

The TPM is an estimate of whether a student is likely to pass a TAKS test in a future grade. After Required Improvement has been evaluated, the TPM is applied to determine if the campus or district can achieve a higher rating. For a more complete explanation of TPM, see *Appendix E – Student Growth Measures*.

**Who is evaluated for TPM:** Districts or campuses rated *Academically Unacceptable*, *Academically Acceptable*, or *Recognized* may achieve a higher rating by comparing the “Percent Meeting the TAKS Standard with TPM” to the accountability standards.

**Methodology:** The “Percent Meeting the TAKS Standard with TPM” defines passers to be students who either met the passing standard or are projected to meet the passing standard in a future grade.

$$\frac{\text{number of students passing [TAKS subject]} + \text{number of students failing [TAKS subject] but meeting TPM}}{\text{number of students tested in [TAKS subject]}}$$

## Other Information:

- *TPM by Grade and Subject.* The TPM is available in mathematics, reading, English language arts, science, social studies, and writing. However, grade 7 writing does not have a TPM, nor does any subject in grade 11. A TPM is available for grade 8 science for the first time in 2010.
- *TPM by Student.* Not every student will have a TPM value. If a student does not have a TPM for a test, that student is included in the methodology shown above based on his or her pass/fail status on the current year test.
- *TPM and TAKS-M.* See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for details regarding the use of TPM values when students take different versions of the TAKS assessments.
- *Explanation of Texas Projection Measure.* See *Appendix E – Student Growth Measures* for more information regarding how TPM values are calculated for individual students.
- *Move only one level.* For any TAKS measure not meeting the standard for the next higher rating, Required Improvement, TPM, or the Exceptions Provision can elevate the status of the measure one level, and **only one level**. Combinations of Required Improvement, TPM, and the Exceptions Provision cannot be used together for one measure. However, these features can be used independently for different TAKS measures.
- *Relationship to Required Improvement and the Exceptions Provision.* For every TAKS measure evaluated at a given campus or district, the “Percent Meeting the TAKS Standard with TPM” is examined after the application of Required Improvement when Required Improvement is either not met or not applicable. After Required Improvement and TPM have been evaluated for every measure, use of the Exceptions Provision is determined.

Example: A large and diverse middle school is rated on 16 indicators. The TAKS base indicator shows many measures at the *Recognized* and *Academically Acceptable* levels. The school’s lowest performance, however, is for Economically Disadvantaged students in both mathematics and social studies. The performance is 54% and 69%, respectively. The initial status on these would mean the campus would be rated *Academically Unacceptable*.

Required Improvement moves other measures that were *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized* but Required Improvement is not met for the two lowest areas. After applying TPM, the passing percentages improve to over 80% for both of the two lowest areas.

Although with TPM the passing percentages are at the *Recognized* level, the rating for this school will be held to *Academically Acceptable*. This is because the initial status for these two measures was *Academically Unacceptable*; the use of the TPM can only elevate the rating one level.

- *Additional Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) Requirements.* All campuses rated *Academically Acceptable* in 2010 may be required to revise and submit portions of the CIP developed under TEC §11.253 that are relevant to those areas for which the campus would not satisfy performance requirements if their 2010 performance does not meet the accountability criteria established for the 2011 accountability system. Some schools that attain a 2010 rating of *Academically Acceptable* by including students who met the TPM improvement standard may be subject to these requirements. See *Chapter 16 – Responsibilities and Consequences* for more information.

## Exceptions Provision

---

The Exceptions Provision provides relief to larger campuses and districts with more diverse student populations who are evaluated on more measures. After application of Required Improvement and TPM, campuses or districts may still “gate up” to a higher rating by using exceptions. The Exceptions Provision can be applied to any of the 25 TAKS measures (5 subjects multiplied by 5 groups: All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged). The Exceptions Provision does not apply to either Completion Rate I or Annual Dropout Rate indicators. To be eligible to use this provision, minimum performance floors must be met and other safeguards are applied.

### Other Information:

- *Exceptions Applied Automatically.* There is no need for a district or campus to request that the Exceptions Provision be applied. Exceptions are automatically calculated and assigned prior to the release of ratings, but only if use of the provision will successfully move a campus or district to a higher rating. For example, if a campus is eligible for two exceptions, but it actually needs three in order to raise its rating to *Academically Acceptable*, then no exceptions are used, and the campus remains *Academically Unacceptable*. This preserves a campus’s or district’s ability to use exceptions in the future. If the provision successfully moves a campus or district to a higher rating, the provision will be used. A campus or district cannot request that exceptions not be used.
- *Only for Assessment.* This provision only applies to the TAKS indicator. If a rating is due to either Completion Rate I or the Annual Dropout Rate, the provision is not applied.
- *Notification.* The accountability data table released with the ratings serves as notification of which exceptions, if any, have been used. See *Chapter 4 – The Basics: Determining a Rating* for details. Exceptions charged as a result of Special Analysis or granted appeals will be cited in a message at the top of the data table. Exceptions charged due to granted appeals are also noted in the commissioner’s response letter to the appeal.

### USING EXCEPTIONS TO MOVE TO *ACADEMICALLY ACCEPTABLE* OR *RECOGNIZED*

A campus or district may use up to four exceptions in order to achieve a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or up to four exceptions in order to achieve a rating of *Recognized*. To be eligible to use any exceptions, the campus or district must be evaluated on at least five TAKS measures and must meet the appropriate performance floor(s).

The number of exceptions allowed is dependent on the number of assessment measures evaluated, as shown in the following table:

<b>Exceptions for moving to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> or <i>Recognized</i></b>	
<b>Number of Assessment Measures Evaluated</b>	<b>Maximum Number of Exceptions Allowed</b>
1 – 4	0 exceptions
5 – 8	1 exception
9 – 11	2 exceptions
12 – 15	3 exceptions
16 or more	4 exceptions

**Performance Floor:**

Performance on the measure to which the Exceptions Provision will be applied must be no more than five percentage points below the standard for the subject. See the table below for the minimum performance needed in 2010 for each subject.

The floor must be met by the TAKS base indicator; the percent of student passing the test. The “Percent Meeting the TAKS Standard with TPM” is not used to determine if the floor requirement has been met.

<b>Floors</b>			
<i>Academically Acceptable</i>		<i>Recognized</i>	
Mathematics	55%	All subjects	75%
Science	50%		
Reading/ELA, Writing & Social Studies	65%		

**USING EXCEPTIONS TO MOVE TO *EXEMPLARY***

A campus or district may use one exception to gate up to a rating of *Exemplary*. To be eligible for this one exception, the campus or district must be evaluated on at least ten TAKS measures and meet the performance floor.

**Performance Floor:** Performance on the measure to which the Exceptions Provision will be applied must be no more than five percentage points below the *Exemplary* standard for all subjects, meaning performance must range from 85% to 89% on the measure. The floor must be met by the TAKS base indicator; the percent of students passing the test. The “Percent Meeting the TAKS Standard with TPM” is not used to determine if the floor requirement has been met.

<b>Exceptions for moving to <i>Exemplary</i></b>	
<b>Number of Assessment Measures Evaluated</b>	<b>Maximum Number of Exceptions Allowed</b>
1 – 9	0 exceptions
10 or more	1 exception

**PROVISION SAFEGUARDS**

- *One-Time Use.* An exception will not be granted for the same measure for two consecutive years. For example, if a campus was granted an exception for White student

science performance in 2009, the campus is not eligible for an exception for White student science performance in 2010. This safeguard applies regardless of the rating achieved when the exception was used. In the example below, the high school will not be able to use exceptions for Economically Disadvantaged performance in TAKS mathematics or science in 2011, even if the school needs the exceptions that year to achieve a *Recognized* rating.

- *Other “Charged” Exceptions.* There are cases where a district or campus may be “charged” with an exception in the process of Special Analysis or in granting appeals. In these cases, the campus or district is not able to use that exception in the following year.
- *Move only one level.* The Exceptions Provision cannot be used to move up more than one rating level. For example, if a campus meets the *Exemplary* criteria on all accountability measures except for one assessment measure, and fails to meet the *Academically Acceptable* criteria on that one measure, the Exceptions Provision will only move the campus from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*.

Further, combinations of Required Improvement, TPM, and the Exceptions Provision cannot be used together for one measure to elevate a rating more than one level. Different features can be used for different measures to successfully elevate a rating, but multiple features cannot be used for any one measure.

- *Campus and District Improvement Plans.* Any campus or district that uses one or more exceptions must address performance on those measures to which the exceptions are applied in its campus or district improvement plan.

*Example.* A large high school with a diverse population is evaluated on all student groups for reading/ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies, for a total of 20 measures. The percent passing on all indicators meets the *Academically Acceptable* standards except for the performance of their Economically Disadvantaged students in mathematics (56%) and science (53%). They did not demonstrate Required Improvement for either of these measures, nor did they have enough additional students projected to pass to enable use of the TPM feature.

The percent of students passing mathematics and science are within five points of the *Academically Acceptable* standards (60% and 55%, respectively). Because they are evaluated on 16 or more assessment measures, (20) they are eligible to use up to four exceptions. Assuming they did not take an exception for either of these measures in the prior year, they meet the Exceptions Provision requirements.

Result: the campus rating is *Academically Acceptable* and the campus is charged with use of an exception for Economically Disadvantaged students in mathematics and Economically Disadvantaged students in science. The two exception areas must be addressed in their campus improvement plan.

Note: Because of the one-time exception rule, the campus will not be eligible to use exceptions for either of these measures in 2011.

- *Additional Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) Requirements.* All campuses rated *Academically Acceptable* in 2010 may be required to revise and submit portions of the CIP developed under TEC §11.253 that are relevant to those areas for which the campus would not satisfy performance requirements if their 2010 performance does not meet the accountability criteria established for the 2011 accountability system. Some schools that attain a 2010 rating of *Academically Acceptable* through the Exceptions Provision may be subject to these requirements. See *Chapter 16 – Responsibilities and Consequences* for more information.

## **Additional Issues for Districts**

---

### **DISTRICTS WITH *ACADEMICALLY UNACCEPTABLE* CAMPUSES**

Any district that has one or more campuses rated *Academically Unacceptable* cannot receive a rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*. There are two exceptions to this rule. First, an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating for a campus does not prevent an *Exemplary* or *Recognized* district rating.

Second, some campuses are identified within the accountability system as Texas Youth Commission (TYC) campuses or Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC) campuses. A rating of *Academically Unacceptable* on these campuses does not prevent an *Exemplary* or *Recognized* district rating. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information about these campus types.

### **UNDERREPORTED STUDENTS**

TEA must have leaver statuses on all grade 7-12 students who were enrolled at any time in the prior year (2008-09) but who did not continue in the current year (2009-10). These students may have left the district because they graduated, transferred to another district, dropped out, or for some other reason. Districts must report a leaver code for all leavers except those who moved (transferred) to another Texas public school district, earned a GED by August 31, or graduated in a prior school year. The determination of whether students are movers is made by TEA by checking other districts' enrollment and attendance records. (Districts may obtain preliminary information about whether students have moved to another district by searching the Person Identification Database (PID) Enrollment Tracking (PET) application.)

Students without leaver records who cannot be confirmed by TEA to be returning students, movers, previous Texas graduates, or GED recipients become underreported students.

In order to maintain a rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*, districts must not exceed the accountability standards for underreported students.

**Standard:** Districts must meet the standard for both of the following measures in order to maintain a rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*:

- *Count of Underreported Students:* Must be fewer than or equal to 150.
- *Percent of Underreported Students:* Must be less than or equal to 4.0%.

## Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of underreported students}}{\text{number of students served in grades 7-12 in previous school year}} \leq 4.0\%$$

*Numerator:* Underreported students are those 2008-09 students in grades 7–12 who are not accounted for by TEA as returning students, movers, previous Texas graduates or GED recipients, and for whom no school leaver record can be found.

*Denominator:* The denominator is an unduplicated count of students reported in enrollment in 2008-09 PEIMS submission 1 or in attendance in 2008-09 PEIMS submission 3.

**Minimum Size Requirements:** Districts with fewer than 5 underreported students will not be evaluated. Beginning in 2010, districts with an underreported rate less than 1.0% will not be evaluated. Stated another way, to be evaluated on this indicator, districts must have 5 or more underreported students and an underreported rate that is equal to or greater than 1.0%.

**Data Source and Year:** PEIMS submission 1 (October 2008, October 2009); PEIMS submission 3 (June 2009)

## Other Information:

- *Unduplicated Count.* The methodology eliminates any duplicate records. For example, students are not counted twice because they appear on both attendance and enrollment records.
- *Rounding.* The rate calculation is rounded to one decimal place. For example, 4.46% is rounded to 4.5%, not 4.0%.

## ADDITIONAL STUDENTS IN DISTRICT RATINGS

Generally, districts are held accountable for the performance of all their students, including those who attend campuses that receive a rating of *Not Rated – Other* and those who attend alternative education campuses (AECs) that are registered for evaluation under AEA procedures. In districts with campuses that are rated under both AEA and standard accountability procedures, the AEC performance is aggregated with the traditional campus performance and the district is evaluated using standard procedure indicators and criteria. Using the completion rate indicator as an example, the same students considered to be completers at the AEC campus by virtue of having received a GED will be counted as non-completers in the district-level Completion Rate I indicator. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information on alternative campuses and how they affect a district’s performance data.

Additionally, districts are responsible for the performance of students who are not in any campus accountability subset because they changed campuses within the district between the October “as of” date and the date of testing. See *Table 4 in Chapter 2 – The Basics: Base Indicators* for more information on the accountability subset.