

2010

Accountability Manual

The 2010 Accountability Rating System
for Texas Public Schools and School Districts

Texas Education Agency
Department of Assessment, Accountability, and Data Quality
Division of Performance Reporting
May 2010

Copies of the *2010 Accountability Manual* may be purchased from:

Publications Distribution Office
Texas Education Agency
PO Box 13817
Austin, TX 78711-3817
pubsdist@tea.state.tx.us

Please use the order form on the last page of this publication. Remit \$12.00 for each copy for a non-profit institution, or \$14.00 for all others. These amounts include mailing and handling charges. Inventory of this publication is not guaranteed.

This publication can also be accessed and downloaded from the Texas Education Agency internet site at:

<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2010/manual/index.html>

Copyright © Notice The materials are copyrighted © and trademarked ™ as the property of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and may not be reproduced without the express written permission of TEA, except under the following conditions:

- 1) Texas public school districts, charter schools, and Education Service Centers may reproduce and use copies of the Materials and Related Materials for the districts' and schools' educational use without obtaining permission from TEA.
- 2) Residents of the state of Texas may reproduce and use copies of the Materials and Related Materials for individual personal use only without obtaining written permission of TEA.
- 3) Any portion reproduced must be reproduced in its entirety and remain unedited, unaltered and unchanged in any way.
- 4) No monetary charge can be made for the reproduced materials or any document containing them; however, a reasonable charge to cover only the cost of reproduction and distribution may be charged.

Private entities or persons located in Texas that are **not** Texas public school districts, Texas Education Service Centers, or Texas charter schools **or** any entity, whether public or private, educational or non-educational, located **outside the state of Texas** *MUST* obtain written approval from TEA and will be required to enter into a license agreement that may involve the payment of a licensing fee or a royalty.

For information contact: Office of Copyrights, Trademarks, License Agreements, and Royalties, Texas Education Agency, 1701 N. Congress Ave., Austin, TX 78701-1494; phone 512-463-9270; email: copyrights@tea.state.tx.us.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
About the Accountability System	1
About This Manual.....	1
Advisory Groups	1
Guiding Principles.....	2
Reports Associated with the Accountability System	2
Part 1 – Standard Procedures	
Chapter 1 – Overview	7
System History.....	7
Comparison of 2009 and 2010 Standard Procedures	7
Chapter 2 – The Basics: <i>Base Indicators</i>	11
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills	11
Accountability Subset.....	14
Completion Rate I [Graduates and Continuers].....	19
Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-8).....	21
Chapter 3 – The Basics: <i>Additional Features</i>	23
Required Improvement to <i>Academically Acceptable</i>	23
TAKS.....	23
Completion Rate I [Graduates and Continuers].....	25
Annual Dropout Rate.....	25
Required Improvement to <i>Recognized</i>	26
TAKS.....	26
Completion Rate I [Graduates and Continuers].....	28
Annual Dropout Rate.....	28
Texas Projection Measure	28
Exceptions Provision	30
Using Exceptions to move to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> or <i>Recognized</i>	30
Using Exceptions to move to <i>Exemplary</i>	31
Provision Safeguards.....	31
Additional Issues for Districts	33
Districts with <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> Campuses	33
Underreported Students	33
Additional Students in District Ratings.....	34
Chapter 4 – The Basics: <i>Determining a Rating</i>	35
Who is Rated?	35
Standard Rating Labels.....	36
Notification of Ratings (July 30, 2010).....	37

Notification of Ratings (Late October, 2010).....	37
Using the Data Table to Determine a Rating.....	37
Additional Information on Data Tables.....	43
Masked Data	43
System Summary.....	43
Chapter 5 – Gold Performance Acknowledgments	47
Acknowledgment Categories	47
Acknowledgment Indicators	49
Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion	49
Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate Results.....	49
Attendance Rate	51
College-Ready Graduates	52
Commended Performance: Reading/ELA	53
Commended Performance: Mathematics.....	54
Commended Performance: Writing.....	55
Commended Performance: Science.....	56
Commended Performance: Social Studies.....	57
Comparable Improvement: Reading	58
Comparable Improvement: Mathematics	59
Recommended High School Program/DAP	60
SAT/ACT Results	61
Texas Success Initiative (TSI) – Higher Education Readiness Component: ELA	63
Texas Success Initiative (TSI) – Higher Education Readiness Component:	
Mathematics	64
Notification of Acknowledgment.....	65
Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances	67
Pairing	67
Identifying Campuses.....	67
Additional Features	67
Pairing Process.....	68
Guidelines	68
Special Analysis	68
Identifying Campuses and Districts	69
Methods for Special Analysis	69
New Campuses	69
Charters	70
Alternative Education Campuses	70
Residential Treatment Facilities.....	71
Texas Juvenile Probation Commission Campuses.....	71
Texas Youth Commission Facilities Within Texas Public School Districts	71
Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Programs and	
Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs.....	72

Special Education Campuses	72
----------------------------------	----

Part 2 – Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures

Chapter 7 – Overview of AEA	77
About Part 2 of This <i>Manual</i>	77
Educator Input.....	77
History of AEA	77
Philosophy of AEA	79
Overall Design of AEA Procedures	80
Comparison of 2009 and 2010 AEA Procedures	80
Chapter 8 – AEA Registration Criteria and Requirements	83
Alternative Education Campuses (AECs)	83
AEC Eligibility.....	83
AEA Campus Registration Process.....	84
AEC Registration Criteria.....	84
At-Risk Registration Criterion.....	85
Charters	86
Charters Evaluated Under AEA Procedures.....	86
AEC Enrollment Criterion for Charters.....	86
Chapter 9 – Attribution of AEC Data	87
Background.....	87
Attribution of Data	88
Chapter 10 – AEA Base Indicators	89
TAKS Progress Indicator.....	89
Completion Rate II Indicator [Graduates, Continuers, and GED Recipients].....	92
Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12) Indicator	94
Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA	97
Required Improvement	97
TAKS Progress Indicator.....	97
Completion Rate II Indicator [Graduates, Continuers, and GED Recipients].....	98
Annual Dropout Rate Indicator.....	99
Use of District At-Risk Data	100
TAKS Progress Indicator.....	100
Completion Rate II Indicator [Graduates, Continuers, and GED Recipients].....	101
Annual Dropout Rate Indicator.....	102
Additional Requirements for Charters	103
AECs Rated <i>AEA: Academically Unacceptable</i>	103
Chapter 12 – AEA Ratings	105
Who is Rated?	105

AEA Rating Labels	105
Using the Data Table to Determine an AEA Rating	106
Final Data Tables	111
Masked Data	112
AEA Summary	112
Chapter 13 – AEA Gold Performance Acknowledgments	117
Acknowledgement Categories	117
AEA GPA Indicators	118
Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion	118
Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate (AP/IB) Results	119
Attendance Rate	120
College-Ready Graduates	120
Commended Performance Indicators: Reading/ELA, Mathematics, Writing, Science and Social Studies	121
Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program (RHSP/DAP)	122
SAT/ACT Results	123
Texas Success Initiative (TSI) – Higher Education Readiness Component Indicators: ELA and Mathematics	124
Notification of Acknowledgment	124
Chapter 14 – AEA Glossary and Index	125
Part 3 – Items Common to Standard and AEA Procedures	
Chapter 15 – Appealing the Ratings	131
Appeals Calendar	131
General Considerations	132
Appeals are not a data correction opportunity!	132
Changed Ratings Only	132
No Guaranteed Outcomes	132
Situations NOT Favorable for Appeal	132
Guidelines	133
TAKS Appeals	133
Annual Dropout Rate Appeals	134
Completion Rate Appeals	134
Gold Performance Acknowledgment Appeals	135
Additional Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) Requirements Appeals	135
Not Rated Appeals	135
Special Circumstance Appeals	135
Hurricanes	135
Missing Texas Projection Measure Values	136
How to Appeal	136

How an Appeal Will Be Processed by the Agency	139
Chapter 16 – Responsibilities and Consequences	141
Local Responsibilities	141
Statutory Compliance	141
Accurate Data.....	142
Campus Identification Numbers	142
Complementary Local Accountability Systems.....	143
State Responsibilities	144
System Safeguards	144
Public Education Grant Program Campus Lists	145
District Accreditation Status.....	145
Consequences	145
Interventions	145
Excellence Exemptions.....	146
Chapter 17 – Indicators and Standards for 2011	149
Chapter 18 – Preview of 2011 and Beyond	153
Standard Procedures for 2011	153
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)	153
TAKS Commended Performance (Reading/ELA and Mathematics).....	153
English Language Learners Progress Indication.....	154
Completion Rate I [Graduates and Continuers].....	154
Annual Dropout Rate (Gr. 7-8)	154
Additional Features	155
Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA)	155
Data Exclusions.....	156
AEA Procedures for 2011	156
AEA Campus Registration Process.....	156
At-Risk Registration Criterion.....	156
TAKS Progress	156
ELL Progress Indication.....	157
Completion Rate II [Graduates, Continuers, and GED Recipients].....	157
Annual Dropout Rate (Gr. 7-12).....	157
AEA GPA	157
Data Exclusions.....	157
Standard and AEA Procedures for 2012 and Beyond	158
Overview 2010 and 2011	159
Chapter 19 – Calendar	163

Appendices

Appendix A – Commissioner of Education Rule	171
Appendix B – Texas Education Code	173
Appendix C – Comparison of State and Federal Systems	175
Appendix D – Data Sources	181
Appendix E – Student Growth Measures	201
Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group	207
Appendix G – Contacts	209
Appendix H – Acknowledgments	213
Appendix I – TEA Secure Environment (TEASE)	217

Tables

Table 1: Definitions of Terms.....	4
Table 2: Comparison of 2009 and 2010 – Standard Procedures.....	8
Table 3: Accountability Subset.....	15
Table 4: Standard Rating Labels.....	36
Table 5: Sample Data Table.....	38
Table 6: Requirements for Each Rating Category.....	45
Table 7: Overview of 2010 System Components.....	46
Table 8: Gold Performance Acknowledgment Standards for 2010.....	48
Table 9: Inclusion or Exclusion of Performance Data.....	73
Table 10: Comparison of 2009 and 2010 – AEA Procedures.....	81
Table 11: TAKS Progress Indicator.....	90
Table 12: Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12) Indicator.....	94
Table 13: Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12) Indicator.....	95
Table 14: Use of TAKS Data of At-Risk Students in the District.....	101
Table 15: Use of Completion Rate II Data of At-Risk Students in the District.....	102
Table 16: Use of Annual Dropout Data of At-Risk Students in the District.....	102
Table 17: AEA Rating Labels.....	106
Table 18: Sample AEA Data Table.....	107
Table 19: Requirements for 2010 <i>AEA: Academically Acceptable</i> Rating.....	113
Table 20: Overview of 2010 AEA Procedures.....	114
Table 21: AEA GPA Standards for 2010.....	118
Table 22: Indicators and Standards for 2011 Ratings - Standard Procedures.....	149
Table 23: Indicators and Standards for 2011 Ratings - AEA Procedures.....	151
Table 24: Transition to Use of New Race/Ethnicity Categories by Indicator.....	155
Table 25: State Accountability Transition Timeline.....	158
Table 26: 2010 and 2011 Standards – Standard Procedures.....	159
Table 27: 2010 and 2011 Standards – AEA Procedures.....	160

Table 28: Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) Standards through 2011.....	161
Table 29: 2010 Comparison of State and Federal Accountability (AYP) by Indicator ..	176
Table 30: 2010 Grade Level Comparison of State (Standard Procedures) and Federal Accountability.....	179
Table 31: Assessments Used in Accountability.....	181
Table 32: PEIMS Record Types Used in Accountability.....	182
Table 33: Student Demographics.....	183
Table 34: Leaver Codes.....	189
Table 35: Accountability Subset Rules.....	195
Table 36: Accountability Subset for SSI - Grades 5 & 8 TAKS Reading and Mathematics.....	196
Table 37: Student Attribution Codes.....	197
Table 38: TGI Growth Equation Parameters – Grade 11.....	202
Table 39: Sample TGI Calculation.....	202
Table 40: Student Growth Measures and 2010 Accountability.....	205

Introduction

ABOUT THE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

The state accountability system assigns ratings to every campus and district in the Texas public education system each year. In most cases the system assigns one of four rating labels—ranging from lowest to highest—*Academically Unacceptable*, *Academically Acceptable*, *Recognized*, and *Exemplary*. To determine the rating label, the system evaluates indicators of performance, including assessment results on the state standardized assessment instruments as well as longitudinal completion rates and annual dropout rates. Generally, campuses and districts earn ratings by having performance that meets absolute standards or by demonstrating sufficient improvement toward the standard. In addition to evaluating performance for all students, the performance of individual groups of students is held to the rating criteria. The student groups are defined to be the major ethnic groups and the group of students designated as economically disadvantaged. All of the evaluated groups must meet the criteria for a given rating category in order to earn that label.

There are two sets of procedures within the state accountability system: one that evaluates standard campuses and districts and another that evaluates alternative education campuses (AECs) and charter operators that primarily serve students identified as at risk of dropping out of school. The indicators and criteria differ between the alternative education accountability (AEA) and standard procedures but the overall designs are similar.

The purpose of the state accountability system is first and foremost to improve student performance. The system sets reasonable standards for adequacy and identifies and publicly recognizes high levels of performance and performance improvement. The system provides information about levels of student performance in each school district and on each campus, and it identifies schools and districts with inadequate performance and provides assistance.

ABOUT THIS MANUAL

The *Accountability Manual* is a technical resource that explains how districts and campuses are evaluated. Part 1 pertains to standard procedures and Part 2 pertains to registered AECs as well as charter operators evaluated under AEA procedures. Part 3 pertains to areas covered by both standard and AEA procedures. The *Manual* includes the information necessary for determining 2010 ratings and acknowledgments.

As with previous editions, selected chapters are adopted by reference as Commissioner of Education administrative rule. *Appendix A* describes the rule which will be effective in July 2010.

ADVISORY GROUPS

For the purpose of reviewing the accountability procedures, TEA staff invited the assistance and advice of educators, school board members, business and community representatives, professional organizations, and legislative representatives from across the state. The commissioner considered all proposals and made final decisions which are reflected in this publication.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Over the years TEA has worked closely with public school personnel and others to develop an integrated accountability system. The standard and AEA procedures of the 2010 system are based upon these guiding principles:

- **STUDENT PERFORMANCE**
The system is first and foremost designed to improve student performance;
- **RECOGNITION OF DIVERSITY**
The system is fair and recognizes diversity among campuses and students;
- **SYSTEM STABILITY**
The system is stable and provides a realistic, practical timeline for measurement, data collection, planning, staff development, and reporting;
- **STATUTORY COMPLIANCE**
The system is designed to comply with statutory requirements;
- **APPROPRIATE CONSEQUENCES**
The system sets reasonable standards for adequacy, identifies and publicly recognizes high levels of performance and performance improvement, and identifies campuses with inadequate performance and provides assistance;
- **LOCAL PROGRAM FLEXIBILITY**
The system allows for flexibility in the design of programs to meet the individual needs of students;
- **LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY**
The system relies on local school districts to develop and implement local accountability systems that complement the state system; and
- **PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW**
The system supports the public's right to know levels of student performance in each school district and on each campus.

REPORTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

Accountability Data Tables. Tables showing the performance used for determining accountability ratings are made public at the time of the ratings release, on or before the first of August each year. These tables provide the data necessary to understand a campus or district rating. Samples of these tables are shown in *Chapter 4* (for standard procedures) and *Chapter 12* (for AEA procedures).

Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS). The AEIS is a comprehensive reporting system defined in state statute. Since 1990-91, campus and district AEIS reports have been generated and published annually for all campuses and districts in the state. Local districts share responsibility for disseminating the AEIS reports, including holding hearings for public discussion of the AEIS report content. All indicators used for accountability are reported in the AEIS, with additional disaggregations depicting how each grade level and different populations performed. Indicators that will potentially be used in future accountability ratings are also published in the AEIS when possible. The reports also show participation rates on

the state-administered tests. Additionally, the AEIS shows demographic information about students and staff, program information, and financial information, all of which provide context for interpreting accountability results.

School Report Card (SRC). Also required by state statute, this agency-generated report provides a subset of the information found on the AEIS report and is produced at the campus level only. Campuses must provide the SRC to each student's family.

Snapshot: School District Profiles. This online TEA publication provides a state- and district-level overview of public education in Texas. Though no longer available as a printed publication, the most current *District Detail* section of *Snapshot*—up to 90 items of information for each public school district—is available on the agency website.

Pocket Edition. This brochure provides a quick overview of state-level statistics on performance, demographics, campus and district ratings, personnel, and finances.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). AYP is a federal accountability program mandated under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). For information on similarities and differences between the federal and state accountability systems, see *Appendix C – Comparison of State and Federal Systems*.

NCLB Report Card (NCLB RC). Section 1111(h)(1) and (2) of the NCLB Act describes the requirements for the annual reporting of student achievement and AYP information for the state, local educational agency, and school. TEA uses a web-based reporting system that generates the annual NCLB RC at the state-level and for each district and campus. The NCLB RC is available online at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=4638&menu_id=798.

Online Reports. Except for the NCLB RC, all of the reports cited above are available on the agency website through the Division of Performance Reporting home page at ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/index.html.

Table 1: Definitions of Terms

Throughout this *Manual*, the terms listed below are defined as shown, unless specifically noted otherwise. See *Chapter 14 – AEA Glossary and Index* for definitions of terms specific to the AEA procedures.

<i>District</i>	This term includes charter operators as well as traditional independent school districts.
<i>Charter Operator</i>	A charter operator is treated like a district in the accountability system. The charter operator is identified with a unique six-digit number as are districts. The campus or campuses administered by a charter are identified with unique nine-digit number(s). The charter operator may administer instruction at one or more campuses.
<i>Superintendent</i>	The educational leader and administrative manager of the district or charter operator. This term includes other titles that may apply to charter operators, such as chief executive officer, president, and chief administrative officer.
<i>Campus</i>	This term includes charter campuses as well as campuses administered by traditional independent school districts.
<i>Standard Campus</i>	A campus evaluated under standard accountability procedures. This includes campuses that serve students in alternative education settings, but that are not registered to be evaluated under the AEA procedures.
<i>Registered Alternative Education Campus (AEC)</i>	A campus registered for evaluation under AEA procedures that also meets the at-risk registration criterion. This term includes AECs of Choice as well as Residential Facilities.
<i>TAKS Test Results</i>	This phrase refers to TAKS assessments including the TAKS (Accommodated) assessments that are part of the accountability calculations for 2010.
<i>Data Integrity</i>	Data integrity refers to the quality of the data used to determine an accountability rating. The integrity of data can be compromised either through purposeful manipulation or through unintentional errors made through the data reporting process. In either case, if data integrity is in question, it may not be possible to determine a reliable rating. When possible, data shown on accountability reports is annotated if the integrity of the data is in question.
<i>Measures, Hurdles, Analysis Groups</i>	Under standard accountability procedures, a campus or district can be evaluated on as many as 35 measures (five for each of the five TAKS subjects, plus five each for the dropout and completion rates.) The five for each indicator are All Students and the four student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged. The measures that meet minimum size criteria and are evaluated for a campus or district are sometimes referred to as hurdles. They are identified on the data tables as Analysis Groups, and have an “X” next to each.

**The 2010 Accountability Rating System
for Texas Public Schools and School Districts**

Part 1

Standard Procedures

In Part 1:

Chapter 1 – Overview..... 7

Chapter 2 – The Basics:
Base Indicators 11

Chapter 3 – The Basics:
Additional Features 23

Chapter 4 – The Basics:
Determining a Rating 35

Chapter 5 – Gold
Performance
Acknowledgments..... 47

Chapter 6 – Special Issues
and Circumstances..... 67

Chapter 1 – Overview

SYSTEM HISTORY

In 1993, the Texas Legislature enacted statutes that mandated the creation of the Texas public school accountability system to rate school districts and evaluate campuses. A viable and effective accountability system was able to be achieved in Texas because the state already had the necessary supporting infrastructure in place: a pre-existing student-level data collection system; a state-mandated curriculum; and a statewide assessment tied to the curriculum.

The system initiated with the 1993 legislative session remained in place through the 2001-02 school year. The ratings issued in 2002 were the last under that system. Beginning in 2003, a new assessment, the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), was administered. This assessment includes more subjects and grades, and is more difficult than the previous statewide assessment. A new rating system based on the TAKS was developed during 2003. Ratings established using the newly designed system were first issued in the fall of 2004.

COMPARISON OF 2009 AND 2010 STANDARD PROCEDURES

The ratings issued in 2010 mark the seventh year of the current system. Many components of the 2010 system are the same as those that were in effect in 2009. However, there are several differences between 2009 and 2010:

- The TAKS base indicator includes the performance of TAKS (Accommodated) results for all grades and subjects. For the first time, this includes reading and mathematics (grades 3-10) and writing (grades 4 and 7), including the Spanish versions for these grades and subject areas. Also, new vertical scale cut points for grades 3-8 for reading and mathematics are used; and the performance of students identified as refugees or asylees is excluded. In 2010, there is only one administration of grade 3 reading and grade 6 Spanish assessments are no longer administered.
- The TAKS indicator standards for *Academically Acceptable* increase for mathematics and science by five points each.
- The TAKS indicator standard for *Recognized* increases by five points to 80% for all five subject areas.
- The minimum performance floor required to be able to use TAKS Required Improvement (RI) for *Recognized* increases to 75% (because the floor is five points below the standard and the standard is increasing to 80%).
- The minimum performance floor required to be able to apply the Exceptions Provision remains at five points below the standard. The minimum changes, however, whenever there are changes to the standard. Therefore, the floor to use exceptions for *Academically Acceptable* increases by five points for mathematics and science. The floor to use exceptions for *Recognized* increases by five points.
- The standard for the grade 7-8 Annual Dropout Rate indicator increases in rigor by decreasing from 2.0% to 1.8%.

- The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition of a dropout is fully phased in for the Completion Rate indicator. All four years of the 2009 cohort are based on the new dropout definition.
- The standard for the Underreported Students data quality indicator is changed from a rate of less than or equal to 5.0% to less than or equal to 4.0%. The count standard remains no more than 150 students. A minimum size criterion of 1.0% is added to the rate component of this indicator. Districts with underreported rates that are less than 1.0% will not be evaluated.
- Standards for two of the Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA) increase. The two Texas Success Initiative (TSI) indicators increase by five points each.

The following table provides details on these and other changes between the 2009 and 2010 systems. Items in **bold** indicate a change for 2010.

Table 2: Comparison of 2009 and 2010 – Standard Procedures

Component	2009				2010			
Base Indicators for Determining Rating (<i>Chapter 2</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAKS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Selected TAKS (Accommodated) included ○ Refugee and asylee performance included ○ Gr. 6 Spanish included ○ 2nd administration of Gr. 3 reading included ○ Horizontal scale used for all grades and subjects • Completion Rate I - used 3 years of NCES dropout definition • Annual Dropout Rate 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAKS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All TAKS (Accommodated) included ○ Refugee and asylee performance excluded ○ No Gr. 6 Spanish results available ○ Only one administration of Gr. 3 reading available ○ Vertical scale used (Gr. 3-8 reading and mathematics) • Completion Rate I - used 4 years of NCES dropout definition (now fully phased in) • Annual Dropout Rate 			
Rating Standards (<i>Chapter 2</i>)		Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary		Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
	TAKS	50/55/70/70	75%	90%	TAKS	55/60/70/70	80%	90%
	Completion	75.0%	85.0%	95.0%	Completion	No Change		
	Dropout	2.0%			Dropout	1.8%		
Evaluation of Student Groups (<i>Chapter 2</i>)	White, Hispanic, African American, Economically Disadvantaged, and All Students				No Change			
Number of Performance Measures Used (<i>Chapter 2</i>)	The larger and more diverse the campus or district, the more measures apply — up to 35				No Change			
TAKS Subjects Evaluated (<i>Chapter 2</i>)	All TAKS subjects individually				No Change			
TAKS Student Success Initiative (<i>Chapter 2</i>)	Gr. 3, 5, & 8 reading and Gr. 5 & 8 mathematics, cumulative results used				Gr. 5 & 8 reading and mathematics, cumulative results used			
TAKS Grades Tested (<i>Chapter 2</i>)	Summed across all grades tested (grades 3-11)				No Change			

Table 2: Comparison of 2009 and 2010 – Standard Procedures (continued)

Component	2009	2010
TAKS Minimum Size for All Students (Chapter 2)	All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of size	No Change
TAKS Minimum Size for Student Groups (Chapter 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If fewer than 30 test takers, not evaluated separately • If 30 to 49, evaluated if they comprise at least 10% of all test takers • If 50 or more, evaluated 	No Change
TAKS Special Analysis (Chapter 6)	Used for determining rating for very small campuses and districts	No Change
TAKS (Accommodated) Subjects & Grades Evaluated (Chapter 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELAGr. 11 • MathematicsGr. 11 • Social Studies.....Gr. 8, 10, & 11 • Science Gr. 5, 8, 10, & 11 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/ELA..... Gr. 3-10, & 11 • Mathematics Gr. 3-10, & 11 • WritingGr. 4 & 7 • Social Studiesno change • Science.....no change
Accountability Subset (TAKS only) (Chapter 2)	Students who are mobile after the October PEIMS “as of” date and before the last TAKS administration are taken out of the subset for a district if they move to another district; students are taken out of the campus subset if they move to another campus (whether it is in the same district or not); additionally, performance of students with a PEIMS Crisis Code indicating they were displaced due to Hurricane Ike is excluded from ratings calculation	Same as 2009; except performance of students displaced due to Hurricane Ike is not excluded. Performance of students identified as refugees or asylees is excluded from ratings calculation
Pairing (Chapter 6)	Standard campuses without TAKS data are paired; paired data not used for GPA	No Change
Texas Projection Measure (TPM) (Chapter 3)	For any TAKS measure not meeting the standard for the next higher rating, RI, TPM, or the Exceptions Provision can elevate the rating one level, and only one level.	No Change
Exceptions (Chapter 3)	<i>Academically Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary</i> rating possible by using exceptions	No Change
	Maximum of four for <i>Academically Acceptable</i> and <i>Recognized</i> ; One only for <i>Exemplary</i>	No Change
	Minimum performance floor is five points below the standard for all subjects.	No Change <i>(when standards increase so do floors to stay within five points)</i>
Completion Rate I (Chapter 2)	Use of district assigned completion rates remains suspended	No Change
Completion Rate I (Chapter 2)	Includes three years of NCEs dropout definition (2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	All four years of the cohort uses NCEs dropout definition (2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)

Table 2: Comparison of 2009 and 2010 – Standard Procedures (continued)

Component	2009	2010
Required Improvement (Chapter 3)	TAKS: RI to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> and <i>Recognized</i> possible	Same as 2009, except floor for <i>Recognized</i> is 75%
	Annual Dropout Rate: RI to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> , <i>Recognized</i> , and <i>Exemplary</i> possible	No Change
	Completion Rate I: RI to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> and <i>Recognized</i> possible; Floor for <i>Recognized</i> is 75.0%	No Change
Gold Performance Acknowledgment Indicators (Chapter 5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion</i> • <i>AP/IB Results</i> • <i>Attendance Rate</i> • <i>College-Ready Graduates</i> • <i>Commended Performance: Reading/ELA</i> • <i>Commended Performance: Mathematics</i> • <i>Commended Performance: Writing</i> • <i>Commended Performance: Science</i> • <i>Commended Performance: Social Studies</i> • <i>Comparable Improvement: Reading/ELA</i> • <i>Comparable Improvement: Mathematics</i> • <i>Recommended High School Program/ Distinguished Achievement Program (RHSP/DAP)</i> • <i>SAT/ACT Results</i> • <i>TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component for English Language Arts</i> • <i>TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component for Mathematics</i> 	No new or deleted indicators but Comparable Improvement (CI) is based on the vertical scale instead of the Texas Growth Index (TGI). Since the vertical scale is not available above grade 8, high schools are no longer eligible to earn CI acknowledgment. The same definitional changes made to the TAKS base indicator are made to the GPA indicators that use TAKS performance.
Standards for GPA (Chapter 5)	Vary by indicator; see Chapter 5.	Same as 2009, except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component (ELA and mathematics) increase by five points to 65%</i>
Underreported Students (Chapter 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No more than 150 underreported students; and • No more than 5.0% underreported. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No more than 150 underreported students; and • No more than 4.0% underreported. • A minimum size of 1.0% is added to the rate component. Districts with underreported rates less than 1.0% will not be evaluated.

Chapter 2 – The Basics: *Base Indicators*

To determine ratings under the standard accountability procedures, the 2010 accountability rating system for Texas public schools and districts uses three base indicators:

- spring 2010 performance on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS),
 - the Completion Rate I for the class of 2009, and
 - the 2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate for grades 7 and 8.
-

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

The TAKS indicator is the percent of students who scored high enough to meet the standard to pass the test. This is calculated as the number of students who met the TAKS student passing standard divided by the number tested. Results for the TAKS (grades 3-11) are summed across grades for each subject. Results for each subject tested are evaluated separately to determine ratings.

Who is evaluated for TAKS: Districts and campuses that test students on any TAKS subject:

- **Reading/ELA** – Reading is tested in grades 3-9; English language arts (ELA) is tested in grades 10 and 11. Note also:
 - TAKS (Accommodated) reading and ELA results for all grades are included.
 - This is a combined indicator. It includes all students tested on and passing either the TAKS reading test or the TAKS English language arts test.
 - The cumulative percent passing from the first two administrations of TAKS reading in grades 5 and 8 is used.
 - Results for the Spanish version of TAKS reading (grades 3-5) are included.
- **Writing** – Writing is tested in grades 4 and 7. Note also:
 - TAKS (Accommodated) writing results for all grades are included.
 - Results for the Spanish version of TAKS writing (grade 4) are included.
- **Social Studies** – Social studies is tested in grades 8, 10, and 11. TAKS (Accommodated) social studies results for all grades are also included.
- **Mathematics** – Mathematics is tested in grades 3-11. Note also:
 - TAKS (Accommodated) mathematics results for all grades are included.
 - The cumulative percent passing from the first two administrations of TAKS mathematics in grades 5 and 8 is used.
 - Results for the Spanish version of TAKS mathematics (grades 3-5) are included.
- **Science** – Science is tested in grades 5, 8, 10, and 11. Note also:
 - TAKS (Accommodated) science results for all grades are included.
 - Results for the Spanish version of TAKS science (grade 5) are included.

For further details, see *TAKS (Accommodated)*, *Reading/ELA Combined*, and *Student Success Initiative* in *Other Information* below.

Standard: The *Academically Acceptable* standard varies by subject, while the *Recognized* and *Exemplary* standards are the same for all subjects:

- **Exemplary** – For every subject, at least 90% of the tested students pass the test.
- **Recognized** – For every subject, at least 80% of the tested students pass the test.
- **Academically Acceptable** – Varies by subject:
 - *Reading/ELA* – At least 70% of the tested students pass the test.
 - *Writing* – At least 70% of the tested students pass the test.
 - *Social Studies* – At least 70% of the tested students pass the test.
 - *Mathematics* – At least 60% of the tested students pass the test.
 - *Science* – At least 55% of the tested students pass the test.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of students passing [TAKS subject]}}{\text{number of students tested in [TAKS subject]}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- *All Students.* These results are always evaluated regardless of the number of examinees. However, districts and campuses with a small number of total students tested on TAKS receive Special Analysis. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more detailed information about Special Analysis.
- *Student Groups.*
 - Any student group with fewer than 30 students tested is not evaluated.
 - If there are 30 to 49 students tested within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
 - If there are at least 50 students tested within the student group, it is evaluated.
 - Student group size is calculated subject by subject. For this reason the number of student groups evaluated sometimes varies. For example, an elementary school with grades 3, 4, and 5 may have enough Hispanic students to be evaluated on reading and mathematics, but not enough to be evaluated on writing (tested in grade 4 only) or science (tested in grade 5 only).

Year of Data: 2009-10

Data Source: Pearson

Other Information:

- *TAKS Vertical Scale.* The 2010 student passing standards for TAKS reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 (and Spanish 3-5) are based on a vertical scale for these grades and subjects. With the vertical scale, a student’s scale score in one grade can be compared to that student’s scale score in another grade. It provides information about student growth compared to prior years. As a result, the scale score for *Met Standard* for these grades and subjects is no longer the value 2100. For more information on the vertical scale, see *Appendix E – Student Growth Measures*.
- *TAKS (Accommodated).* The phase-in of the TAKS (Accommodated) assessments is complete this year with the addition of TAKS (Accommodated) results for reading and mathematics (grades 3-10) and writing (grades 4 and 7), including the Spanish versions

for these grades and subject areas. TAKS (Accommodated) assessments for all grades and subjects are included in determining the 2010 accountability ratings.

- *Texas Projection Measure.* The Texas Projection Measure (TPM) is used as part of the methodology for determining state accountability ratings. For 2010, grade 8 TAKS science also has TPM values. See *Chapter 3 – The Basics: Additional Features*.
- *Student Success Initiative (SSI).* In determining accountability ratings, a cumulative percent passing is calculated by combining the first and second administrations of the TAKS in grades 5 and 8 reading and mathematics performance. Results include performance on the Spanish versions of these tests, as well as TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-Modified (TAKS-M) and TAKS-Alternate (TAKS-Alt) results are not included in the cumulative percent passing calculations in 2010. Grade 3 is no longer an SSI grade, therefore only one administration of grade 3 reading results are available for use.
- *TAKS Spanish.* The TAKS tests are given in Spanish in reading and mathematics for grades 3, 4, and 5; writing in grade 4; and science in grade 5. Performance on these tests is combined with performance on the English-language TAKS for the same subject to determine a rating. Note that the TAKS test is no longer available in Spanish for grade 6.
- *Special Education.* In addition to performance on the TAKS (Accommodated) assessments, the performance of students with disabilities who take the regular TAKS is included in the TAKS indicator.
- *TAKS-Modified and TAKS-Alternate.* Performance on these tests is not used in determining ratings for 2010.
- *Reading/ELA Combined.* Reading (grades 3-9) and ELA (grades 10 and 11) results are combined and evaluated as a single subject. This affects districts and campuses that offer both grade 9 and grades 10 and/or 11. In these cases, counts of reading and ELA students who met the standard are summed and divided by the total number taking reading or ELA.
- *Testing Window.* Results for students given a make-up test within the testing window are included in the accountability indicators.
- *Exit-level TAKS.* The performance of all juniors tested for the first time during the primary spring administration (ELA in March; mathematics, science, and social studies in April) is included in determining accountability ratings. The performance of exit-level TAKS retesters is not included.
- *October 2009 administration.* Some juniors eligible for early graduation took the TAKS in October 2009. The performance of these students is included with the performance of other juniors taking the exit-level test if:
 - they were juniors at the time of testing;
 - they were taking the exit-level TAKS for the first time in October 2009; and
 - they passed all four assessments at that time.

Students tested in October who failed any tests in October could retest in the spring. However, in the event of a retest, neither performance — from October *or* from the spring retest — is included in the accountability calculations. If October results are used, they are not adjusted for mobility. This means that if an 11th grader took and passed all the tests in October, then withdrew from school before the spring, that student's results

would count in determining the school’s accountability ratings. Conversely, if an 11th grader took but did not pass all the tests in October, and then withdrew from school before the spring, those student’s results would not count in determining the school’s accountability ratings.

- *Sum of All Grades Tested.* Results for each subject are summed across grades. This refers to the grades tested at the particular campus or district. For example, the percent passing for TAKS reading in an elementary school with a grade span of K-5 is calculated as:

$$\frac{\text{number of students who passed the reading test in grades 3, 4, \& 5}}{\text{number of students who took the reading test in grades 3, 4, \& 5}}$$

- *Excluded Students.* Only answer documents marked “Score” are included. Answer documents coded “Absent,” “Exempt,” or “Other” are excluded.
- *Refugees and Asylees.* Results of students coded as refugees and/or asylees on the TAKS answer documents are not used in determining ratings. This is new for 2010. For more information, see *Appendix D – Data Sources.*
- *Linguistically Accommodated Testing (LAT).* Results for limited English proficient students taking linguistically accommodated TAKS tests are not included in the state accountability system.
- *Rounding of Met Standard Percent.* The *Met Standard* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 59.877% is rounded to 60%; 79.4999% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.
- *Rounding of Student Group Percent.* The *Student Group* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. When determining if a student group is at least 10%, the rounded value is used. For example, 40 students in a group out of a total of 421 students is 9.5011876%. Because this rounds to the whole number 10, this student group is evaluated.

ACCOUNTABILITY SUBSET

For the TAKS, only the performance of students enrolled on the PEIMS fall “as-of” date of October 30, 2009, are considered in the ratings. This is referred to as the *accountability subset* (sometimes referred to as the *October subset* or the *mobility adjustment*). This adjustment is not applied to any other base indicator.

Students who move from district to district are excluded from the campus and district TAKS results. Further, students who move from campus to campus within a district are kept in the district’s results but are excluded from the campus’s TAKS results. No campus is held accountable for students who move between campuses after the PEIMS “as-of” date and before the date of testing, even if they stay within the same district. The subsets are determined as follows:

Campus-level accountability subset: If a student was reported in membership at one campus on October 30, 2009, but moves to another campus before the TAKS test, that student’s performance is removed from the accountability results for both campuses, whether the campuses are in the same district or different districts. Campuses are held accountable only

for those students reported to be enrolled in the campus in the fall and tested in the same campus in the second semester.

District-level accountability subset: If a student was in one district on October 30, 2009, but moved to another district before the TAKS test, that student’s performance is taken out of the accountability subset for both districts. However, if the student moved from campus to campus within the district, his or her performance is included in that district’s results, even though it does not count for either campus. This means that district performance results do not match the sum of the campus performance results.

Examples of how the accountability subset criteria are applied are provided in the following table. Note that these apply to TAKS performance results. For more information, see *Tables 34 and 35 in Appendix D – Data Sources.*

Table 3: Accountability Subset

Student Situation	In Whose Accountability Subset?
General	
1. Grade 9 student is enrolled at campus A in the fall and tests there on TAKS reading in March and mathematics in April.	This student’s results affect the rating of both campus A and the district.
2. Grade 6 student is enrolled in district Y in the fall and moves to district Z at the semester break. The student is tested on TAKS reading and mathematics in April.	These results do not affect the rating of any campus or district. Results are reported to district Z.
3. Grade 6 student is enrolled at campus A in the fall and then moves to campus B in the same district at the semester break. The student is tested on TAKS reading and mathematics in April.	This student’s results do not affect the rating of campus A or B, but they do affect the district. Results for both tests are reported to campus B.
4. Grade 6 student is reported in enrollment at a campus, but is withdrawn for home schooling on November 10 th . Parents re-enroll the student at the same campus on April 1. The student is tested in TAKS reading and mathematics in late April.	Performance on both tests is reported and included in the ratings evaluation for the campus. The fact that the student was enrolled on the “as of” date and tested in the same campus and district are the criteria for determining the accountability subset.
5. A 12 th grade student moves to a district from another state at the beginning of the school year. She takes the exit-level tests in October and fails; she takes them again during the spring. Does her performance affect the district or campus?	No. The performance of 12 th graders is not used for accountability purposes.

Table 3: Accountability Subset (continued)

Student Situation	In Whose Accountability Subset?
Mobility between Writing/ELA and other tests	
6. Grade 4 student enrolls in campus A in the fall and takes the TAKS writing test there in March. The student then transfers to campus B in the same district and tests on TAKS reading and mathematics in April.	This student’s results do not affect the rating of campus A or B. Although writing was assessed at the same campus where the student was enrolled in the fall, the writing results are reported to campus B, where the student tested last. The results affect the district rating. Results for all tests are reported to campus B.
7. Grade 4 student enrolls in campus A in the fall and takes the writing TAKS there in March. The student then transfers to campus B in a different district and tests on TAKS reading and mathematics in April.	This student’s results do not affect the rating of either campus or district. Test results are reported to the campus where the student tested last, in this case, campus B.
8. A first-time 11 th grade student is enrolled in district Y in the fall and takes the TAKS ELA in March. He then moves to district Z, where he takes the last three tests.	This student’s results do not affect the rating of either campus or district. Results for all tests are reported to the campus where the student tested last in district Z.
9. A first-time 11 th grade student is enrolled in district Y in the fall and takes the TAKS ELA in March. She then moves out of state. She does not take the last three tests.	This student’s results on ELA is used in determining both campus and district Y ratings.
10. Grade 7 student is reported in enrollment in district Y and takes the writing test in that district at campus A. In early April, the student transfers to district Z and takes the remaining grade 7 TAKS tests there. The answer documents submitted by district Z use different name spellings than did the one submitted by district Y.	To the test contractor these are two different students. Performance on the student’s writing test is reported to district Y and counts toward its rating and the rating of campus A. The student’s results in reading and mathematics are reported to district Z but do not contribute to the rating of either the district or the campus where the student tested because the student was not there in the fall.

Table 3: Accountability Subset (continued)

Student Situation	In Whose Accountability Subset?
<p>11. A first-time 11th grade student is enrolled in high school A, district Z in the fall and takes the TAKS ELA in March. He then is sent to a disciplinary campus for the rest of the year, where he takes the rest of the TAKS tests.</p>	<p>If the disciplinary campus is a JJAEP or DAEP, the student’s performance must be coded back to the sending campus, and it is used in determining both campus and district ratings.</p> <p>If the disciplinary campus is operated by the Texas Youth Commission (TYC) or the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC), the performance does not count toward either the sending campus or district rating.</p> <p>If the disciplinary campus is none of the above but is in district Z, the performance is used in determining the district rating, but not the campus rating.</p>
<p>Grades 5 and 8 Reading and Mathematics (Student Success Initiative) <i>(See Tables 34 and 35 in Appendix D – Data Sources for further information.)</i></p> <p><i>Beginning in 2010, the treatment of reading and mathematics results differs from prior years in certain circumstances when students are mobile between the first and second administrations of reading and mathematics. Scenarios with changes are noted below and in Tables 34 and 35.</i></p>	
<p>12. Grade 5 student takes mathematics and reading in April at campus A where he was enrolled in the fall, and fails both tests. He then moves to campus B (in the same district) where he takes science and retests in reading and mathematics. He passes all tests.</p>	<p>This student’s results do not affect the rating of campus A or B. The April reading and mathematics results are reported to campus A, even though the other results are reported to campus B. The final results from all tests affect the district.</p>
<p>13. Grade 8 student takes TAKS reading and mathematics in early April at the campus where she was enrolled in the fall. She fails the mathematics test. The student then moves out of state. She does not take the other TAKS tests.</p>	<p>This student’s TAKS results do affect the rating for both the campus and district. This is a change to the treatment of reading results from prior years.</p>

Table 3: Accountability Subset (continued)

Student Situation	In Whose Accountability Subset?
14. Grade 5 student takes TAKS reading and mathematics in early April at the campus where she was enrolled in the fall, and fails both tests. The student then moves to another district, where she takes TAKS science and retests in May and fails again.	This student’s TAKS reading, mathematics, and science results do not affect the rating for any campus or district.
15. Grade 8 student takes TAKS (Accommodated) reading and mathematics in early April at the campus where he was enrolled in the fall, and fails both tests. His ARD committee decides he needs to retest with TAKS-M for both tests. He passes both.	For 2010, TAKS-M is not used in determining ratings. In this case, the TAKS (Accommodated) results for reading and math (failures on both) will be used in determining the ratings for this campus and district.
16. Grade 5 student takes TAKS reading and mathematics in early April at campus A in district A where she was enrolled in the fall. She fails mathematics. The student then moves to campus B (in another district) where she takes science. She does not take the mathematics retest in May.	<p><i>Science:</i> Her science results do not affect the rating of any campus or district.</p> <p><i>Reading:</i> Her April reading results do affect the rating of campus A and district A. This is a change to the treatment of reading results from prior years.</p> <p><i>Mathematics:</i> The April performance on mathematics is retained and does affect the rating of campus A and district A.</p>
Spanish TAKS	
17. A grade 3 student’s LPAC committee directs that she be tested in reading on the Spanish TAKS and in mathematics on the English TAKS. She remains at the same campus the entire year.	Performance on both tests is reported and included in the rating evaluation for the campus and district. Results on both English and Spanish versions of the TAKS contribute to the overall passing rate.
Both TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated)	
18. A grade 8 student takes the TAKS mathematics test in April and passes it. She takes TAKS reading and fails the test. Her ARD committee decides she should take the TAKS (Accommodated) reading during the 2nd administration in May, which she passes. She has remained at the same campus the entire year.	This student’s TAKS (Accommodated) reading passing results and TAKS math passing results are included in the TAKS performance for the campus and the district. Performance on all grades and subjects of TAKS (Accommodated) are used in the accountability system for 2010.

Table 3: Accountability Subset (continued)

Student Situation	In Whose Accountability Subset?
19. The ARD committee for a grade 6 student directs that she be tested in reading on the TAKS (Accommodated) and in mathematics on the TAKS. She remains at the same campus the entire year.	Performance on both tests is reported and included in the rating evaluation for the campus and district. Performance on all grades and subjects of TAKS (Accommodated) are used in the accountability system for 2010.
TAKS-Modified and TAKS-Alternate	
20. The ARD committee for a grade 8 student directs that she be tested in all subjects on the TAKS-Alt. She remains at the same campus the entire year.	Performance on TAKS-Alt is not used in determining accountability ratings in 2010.
21. The ARD committee for a grade 6 student directs that he be tested in all subjects on the TAKS-M. He remains at the same campus the entire year.	Performance on TAKS-M is not used in determining accountability ratings in 2010.

COMPLETION RATE I [GRADUATES AND CONTINUERS]

This longitudinal rate shows the percent of students who first attended grade 9 in the 2005-06 school year and have graduated or are continuing their education four years later. Known as the 2005-06 cohort, these students were tracked over the four years using data provided to TEA by districts and data available in the statewide General Educational Development (GED) database.

To count as a “completer” for standard accountability procedures, a student must have received a high school diploma with his/her class (or earlier) or have re-enrolled in the fall of 2009 as a continuing student.

Who is evaluated for Completion Rate I: Districts and campuses that have served grades 9 and 11 or 12 in the first (2005-06) and fifth (2009-10) years of the cohort. High schools that do not meet this requirement are not evaluated on this indicator in 2010. See *Other Information* below.

Standard:

- **Exemplary** – Completion Rate I of 95.0% or more.
- **Recognized** – Completion Rate I of 85.0% or more.
- **Academically Acceptable** – Completion Rate I of 75.0% or more.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of completers}}{\text{number in class*}}$$

*See *Appendix D* for the definition of *number in class*.

Minimum Size Requirements:

- *All Students.* These results are evaluated if:
 - there are at least 10 students in the class; *and*
 - there are at least 5 dropouts.
- *Student Groups.* These results are evaluated if there are at least 5 dropouts within the student group *and*:
 - there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students; or
 - there are at least 50 students within the student group.

Years of Data: 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10.

Data Source: PEIMS submission 1 enrollment data, 2005-06 through 2009-10; PEIMS submission 1 leaver data, 2006-07 through 2009-10; PEIMS submission 3 attendance data, 2005-06 through 2008-09; and General Educational Development records as of August 31, 2009.

Other Information:

- *Economically Disadvantaged Status.* Beginning in 2010 with the class of 2009, the economic status of a student is based on the economic disadvantage information reported by the accountable district in the student's final year of the cohort. In the past, a student's economic status was based on the information reported by the accountable district in the student's final year of cohort; if the information was missing in the final year, the most recent non-missing economic disadvantage information was used.
- *No Use of District Rate for High Schools.* In Texas, a typical public high school serves grades 9-12. High schools that serve only some of those grades—for example, a senior high school that only serves grades 11 and 12—do not have their own completion rate. In the past, the district rate would be attributed to such schools. The attribution of the district rate for high schools continues to be suspended through the 2010 accountability year, as the new definition of a dropout is phased in.
- *Transfers in.* Students can be added to a district's cohort in one of two ways: 1) A student identified as part of the grade 9 2005-06 cohort is added to a district's cohort when the student moves from one Texas public school district to another. The student is removed from the sending district's cohort. 2) A student who is new to Texas public schools and enrolls in a district in the expected grade level of the cohort is added to the district's cohort. For example, a student who enrolls in grade 10 in 2006-07 when on-grade members of the cohort are in grade 10 is added to the district's cohort.
- *Retained Students.* Students who repeat a year are kept with their original cohort.
- *Rounding of Completion Rate.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 74.875% is rounded to 74.9%, not 75%.
- *Rounding of Student Group Percent (Minimum Size Requirements).* The *Student Group* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. When determining if a student group is at least 10%, the rounded value is used. For example, 40 students in a group out of a total of 421 students is 9.5011876%. Because this rounds to the whole number 10, this student group is evaluated.

- *Special Education.* The completion status of students with disabilities is included in this measure.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE (GRADES 7-8)

For accountability purposes, the annual dropout rate is used to evaluate campuses and districts with students in grades 7 and/or 8. This is a one-year measure, calculated by summing the number of dropouts across the two grades.

Who is evaluated for Annual Dropout Rate: Districts and campuses that serve students in grades 7 and/or 8.

Standard: The standard for the Annual Dropout Rate is 1.8% or less for all rating categories. Any district or campus with a rate higher than 1.8% that does not demonstrate Required Improvement is rated *Academically Unacceptable*.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of grade 7-8 dropouts}}{\text{number of grade 7-8 students who were in attendance at any time during the school year}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- *All Students.* These results are evaluated if:
 - there are at least 10 students in grades 7-8; *and*
 - there are at least 5 dropouts.
- *Student Groups.* These results are evaluated if there are at least 5 dropouts within the student group *and*:
 - there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students; or
 - there are at least 50 students within the student group.

Year of Data: 2008-09

Data Source: PEIMS submission 1 enrollment data 2008-09; PEIMS submission 1 leaver data, 2009-10; PEIMS submission 3 attendance data, 2008-09.

Other Information:

- *Economically Disadvantaged Status.* Beginning in 2010, the economic status of a student is based on the economic disadvantage information reported by the accountable district. In the past, a student was considered economically disadvantaged if any district reported the student as economically disadvantaged in the fall.
- *Dropout Definition.* Since the 2007 rating cycle, the definition of a dropout has been aligned with the federal definition of a dropout.
- *Cumulative Attendance.* A cumulative count of students is used in the denominator. This method for calculating the dropout rate neutralizes the effects of mobility by including in the denominator every student ever reported in attendance at the campus or district throughout the school year, regardless of length of stay.

- *Rounding of Dropout Rate.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 1.85% is rounded to 1.9%.
- *Rounding of Student Group Percent (Minimum Size Requirements).* The *Student Group* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. When determining if a student group is at least 10%, the rounded value is used. For example, 40 students in a group out of a total of 421 students is 9.5011876%. Because this rounds to the whole number 10, this student group is evaluated.
- *Special Education.* Dropouts served by special education are included in this measure.

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*:

Actual Change	Required Improvement
[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*:

Actual Change		Required Improvement
[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*:

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

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:

Exceptions for moving to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> or <i>Recognized</i>	
Number of Assessment Measures Evaluated	Maximum Number of Exceptions Allowed
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.

Floors			
<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.

Exceptions for moving to <i>Exemplary</i>	
Number of Assessment Measures Evaluated	Maximum Number of Exceptions Allowed
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.

Chapter 4 – The Basics: *Determining a Rating*

The previous two chapters described the base indicators and the additional features of the system (Required Improvement, Texas Projection Measure, and the Exceptions Provision). This chapter describes how to use the indicator data results with the additional features to determine campus and district ratings. The ratings for the overwhelming majority of campuses and districts can be determined this way. Some campuses and districts must be evaluated using different procedures. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for details about which campuses and districts are affected and how they are evaluated.

WHO IS RATED?

The state accountability system is required to rate all districts and campuses that serve students in grades 1 through 12. The first step is to identify the universe of districts and campuses that can be considered for a rating. For 2010, the universe is determined to be those districts and campuses that reported students in membership in any grades (early education through grade 12) in the fall of the 2009-10 school year. The universe is then divided into those campuses and districts to be evaluated under Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) procedures (see *Part 2 – Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures*) and those evaluated using standard procedures. Most districts and campuses identified for standard procedures receive one of the four primary rating labels (*Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Academically Acceptable*, or *Academically Unacceptable*). Some receive a label of *Not Rated*. Rating labels and their uses are described below.

Once the universe of standard campuses and districts is established, the next step is to determine if the district or campus has TAKS results on which it can be evaluated. In order to attain one of the four primary rating labels, districts and campuses must have at least one TAKS test result in the accountability subset. The phrase “TAKS test results” refers to TAKS assessments. For the 2010 accountability cycle, this includes results of all TAKS (Accommodated) assessments.

An effort is made through the pairing process to supply TAKS results to campuses (with any grades from 1 to 12) with no students in the grades tested so that they can also be evaluated. For more information on pairing see *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances*.

Districts and campuses that have only completion rates, only dropout rates, or only combinations of these two will not receive one of the four primary ratings in 2010. To be eligible to be *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Academically Acceptable*, or *Academically Unacceptable*, TAKS results are required and *only* TAKS results are required. Districts and campuses need not have data for dropout or completion indicators in order to receive a rating. Performance on any one of the TAKS subjects is sufficient for a rating to be assigned, even if only TAKS (Accommodated) results are available.

Though at least one TAKS tester (in the accountability subset) is required to be considered for a rating, some places with very small numbers of total TAKS test results may ultimately receive a *Not Rated* label. The process of Special Analysis is employed when there are very small numbers of total test takers to determine if a rating is appropriate. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for details about Special Analysis.

Campuses and districts that close in the summer of 2010 subsequent to the end of the school year but prior to the July ratings release will receive a 2010 accountability rating assuming they meet the criteria outlined above (they reported students in membership for the 2009-10 school year and had at least one TAKS test result in the accountability subset.)

STANDARD RATING LABELS

Rating labels for districts are specified in statute. For 2010, standard campuses and districts will be assigned one of the following rating labels.

Table 4: Standard Rating Labels

	District or Charter Operator Use	Campus Use (non-charter and charter)
<i>Exemplary</i>	Used for districts or charter operators with at least one TAKS test result (in any subject) in the accountability subset. Small numbers subject to Special Analysis.	Used for campuses serving grades 1-12 with at least one TAKS test result (in any subject) in the accountability subset. Includes campuses with TAKS data due to pairing. Small numbers subject to Special Analysis.
<i>Recognized</i>		
<i>Academically Acceptable</i>		
<i>Academically Unacceptable</i>		
<i>Not Rated: Other</i>	Used for districts or charter operators in the unlikely event that there is insufficient data to rate due to no TAKS results in the accountability subset, or due to other highly unusual circumstances.	Used if the campus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ has no students enrolled in grades higher than kindergarten; ○ has insufficient data to rate due to no TAKS results in the accountability subset; ○ has insufficient data to rate through Special Analysis due to very small numbers of TAKS results in the accountability subset; ○ is a designated Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP) or a designated Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP).
<i>Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues</i>	<p>Used in the rare situation where the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results are compromised and it is not possible to assign a rating label based on the evaluation of performance. This label may be assigned temporarily pending an on-site investigation or may be assigned as the final rating label for the year.</p> <p>This rating label is not equivalent to an <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> rating. The Commissioner of Education also has the authority to lower a rating or assign an <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> rating to address problems with the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results that are discovered through accountability system safeguards, Performance-Based Monitoring, or other monitoring and compliance reviews. The accreditation status of a district may also be lowered due to data integrity issues.</p> <p>The district or a campus may receive a rating of <i>Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues</i>, either temporarily or permanently, or the campus or district rating may be lowered due to data integrity problems.</p> <p>See <i>Chapter 16 – Responsibilities and Consequences</i> for more information about the circumstances that trigger this rating label.</p>	

Registered alternative education campuses (AECs) and some charter operators will receive ratings under the AEA procedures. See *Chapter 12 – AEA Ratings* for information on the AEA rating labels.

NOTIFICATION OF RATINGS (JULY 30, 2010)

Notification of campus and district accountability ratings will occur on July 30, 2010. This consists of release of the campus and district data tables and the district summary reports on TEA’s website. Ratings for both standard and AEA procedures will be released simultaneously on this date.

NOTIFICATION OF RATINGS (LATE OCTOBER, 2010)

Accountability ratings are finalized when the accountability appeals process is completed. Agency web products related to state accountability (both public and secure sites) will be updated to reflect the outcome of appeals and to add the Gold Performance Acknowledgment information in late October, 2010. See *Chapter 19 – Calendar* and *Chapter 15 – Appealing the Ratings* for more information.

USING THE DATA TABLE TO DETERMINE A RATING

In mid-July, prior to finalizing all computations necessary for accountability ratings, TEA will provide districts with access to preview data tables for the district and each campus within the district through the Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE) website.

These tables will *not* show a rating. However, using the data on the tables and the *2010 Accountability Manual*, districts can anticipate their ratings in advance of the TEA ratings release. *These preview data tables will contain unmasked data and must be treated as confidential.* That is, information that reveals the performance of an individual student may be shown.

Sample data tables (unmasked) are excerpted on the following pages to present a step-by-step explanation of how ratings are determined. The design of both the preview and final data tables may vary from the samples shown.

Table 5: Sample Data Table

July 2010 Confidential

This preview information is confidential.

Preview data tables similar to this one will be made available to districts in mid-July. Final data tables will be available on the public and secure websites on July 30th.

This indicates that this campus was evaluated under standard procedures. AECs will receive a different data table. See Part 2 – Alternative Education Accountability Procedures.

Status by Measure shows the level attained for each measure: meeting the standard, RI, TPM, and Exceptions. The *** column shows the final summary.

DISTRICT NAME: Sample District
 CAMPUS NAME: Sample School
 CAMPUS NUMBER: 255901001

2010 (PREVIEW) CAMPUS ACCOUNTABILITY DATA TABLES - STANDARD PROCEDURES

Campus Rating: 06 - 12
 Grade Span:

Analysis groups used to determine ratings are marked with an 'X'.
 Accountability standards are shown in parentheses.

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS) TABLE

Performance Results	2010				2009				Required Improvement			2010 TPM			Status by Measure					
	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Stu Grp %	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?	Number Met w/TPM	Std	Number Taking	Pct Met w/TPM	STD	RI	TPM	EXCP	***
Reading/ELA (70%/80%/90%)																				
X All Students	135	14				118	96%		-5			143		149	96%	EX	-	-	-	EX
African Amer	7	1				8	88%		-24			8		11	73%	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	3					4	100%		-25					4	100%	-	-	-	-	-
X White	124	13				105	96%		-3					133	98%	EX	-	-	-	EX
X Econ Disadv	42	5				49	92%		-8					50	94%	RE	RE	EX	-	EX
Writing (70%/80%/90%)																				
X All Students	17	19	89%	100%	13	16	81%		8					19	89%	RE	-	-	-	RE
African Amer	1	2	50%	11%	1	1	100%		-50					2	50%	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	1	1	100%	5%	1	1	100%		0					1	100%	-	-	-	-	-
White	15	16	94%	84%	11	14	79%		15					15	94%	-	-	-	-	-
Econ Disadv	5	6	83%	32%	5	7	71%		12					5	83%	-	-	-	-	-
Social Studies (70%/80%/90%)																				
X All Students	68	80	85%	100%	56	64	88%		-3			77		80	96%	RE	RE	EX	-	EX
African Amer	4	7	57%	9%	5	7	71%		-14			5		7	71%	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	0	1	0%	1%	1	1	100%		-100			1		1	100%	-	-	-	-	-
X White	63	71	89%	89%	49	55	89%		0			70		71	99%	RE	RE	EX	-	EX
Econ Disadv	21	29	72%	36%	25	31	81%		-9			26		29	90%	-	-	-	-	-
Mathematics (60%/80%/90%)																				
X All Students	112	144	78%	100%	92	114	81%	Yes	-3	-1	No	125		144	87%	AA	AA	RE	-	RE
African Amer	6	11	55%	8%	4	7	57%		-2			8		11	73%	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	2	4	50%	3%	3	4	75%		-25			3		4	75%	-	-	-	-	-
X White	103	128	80%	89%	84	102	82%		-2			113		128	88%	RE	-	-	-	RE
X Econ Disadv	33	46	72%	32%	38	47	81%	Yes	-9	**	No	39		46	85%	AA	AA	RE	-	RE
Science (55%/80%/90%)																				
X All Students	55	81	68%	100%	40	63	63%	Yes	5	**	No	60		81	74%	AA	-	-	-	AA
African Amer	1	7	14%	9%	3	7	43%		-29			1		7	14%	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	0	1	0%	1%	1	1	100%		-100			0		1	0%	-	-	-	-	-
X White	53	72	74%	89%	35	54	65%	Yes	9	**	No	58		72	81%	AA	AA	RE	-	RE
Econ Disadv	12	29	41%	36%	18	30	60%		-19			14		29	48%	-	-	-	-	-

Accountability Standards are shown for each subject.

Ratings are not available on the preview tables; this area is blank.

** Met the minimum size requirement, but did not meet the 75% floor for Recognized.
 *** Summary column: Note that RI, TPM, and EXCP may elevate the rating one level, but only one level.

EXCEPTIONS TABLE

Number Msrs Evaluated	Number Allowed	Number Needed	Floor(s) Met?	Msr(s) Used in 2009?	Exceptions Applied
11	2	1	No	N/A	No

July 2010

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
2010 PREVIEW CAMPUS ACCOUNTABILITY DATA TABLES – STANDARD PROCEDURES

PAGE 2

DISTRICT NAME: SAMPLE DISTRICT
CAMPUS NAME: SAMPLE SCHOOL
CAMPUS NUMBER: 255901001

Campus Rating:
Grade Span: 06 - 12

Analysis groups used to determine ratings are marked with an 'X'.
Accountability standards are shown in parentheses.

COMPLETION I RATE TABLE (Gr. 9-12) (75.0%/85.0%/95.0%)

	Class of 2009					Class of 2008					Required Improvement	
	# Completers	# Dropouts	# in Class	Comp Rate	Stu Grp %	# Completers	# in Class	Comp Rate	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?
All Students	41	1	42	97.6%	100%	29	29	100.0%	-	-2.4		
African Amer	0	0	0	-	0%	0	0	-	-	-		
Hispanic	8	0	8	100.0%	19%	7	7	100.0%	-	0.0		
White	33	1	34	97.1%	81%	20	20	100.0%	-	-2.9		
Econ Disadv	12	1	13	92.3%	31%	5	5	100.0%	-	-7.7		

Decreases in completion rates may be due to significant changes in the dropout definition beginning with the 2005-06 school year. Completion data not evaluated for your accountability rating due to grade span, small numbers, or no data.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE TABLE (Gr. 7-8) (1.8%)

	2008-09				2007-08				Required Improvement		
	# Dropouts	# 7-8 Graders	Dropout Rate	Stu Grp %	# Dropouts	# 7-8 Graders	Dropout Rate	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?
All Students	0	62	0.0%	100%	0	71	0.0%	-	0.0		
African Amer	0	6	0.0%	10%	0	7	0.0%	-	0.0		
Hispanic	0	3	0.0%	5%	0	2	0.0%	-	0.0		
White	0	53	0.0%	85%	0	62	0.0%	-	0.0		
Econ Disadv	0	31	0.0%	50%	0	44	0.0%	-	0.0		

Dropout data not evaluated for your accountability rating due to grade span, small numbers, or no data.

Annual Dropout Rate

Number of Dropouts – This value is the numerator used to calculate the annual dropout rate.

Minimum Size – Note that at this campus there was only one dropout, fewer than the minimum number required (5) for the indicator to be evaluated.

	ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE TABLE (Gr. 7-8) (1.8%)				
	2008-09				
	# Dropouts	# 7-8 Graders	Dropout Rate	Stu Grp %	# 7 Drop
All Students	1	128	0.8%	100%	-
African Amer	1	29	3.4%	23%	-
Hispanic	0	11	0.0%	9%	-
White	0	87	0.0%	68%	-
Econ Disadv	1	71	1.4%	55%	-

To calculate the annual dropout rate, divide the *number of dropouts* by the *number of 7th and 8th graders*.

Number of 7th and 8th Graders – This value is the denominator used to calculate the annual dropout rate.

Completion Rate

To calculate the completion rate, divide the *number of completers* (in this example, 41) by the *number in the class of 2009* (42). This equals the *completion rate* (97.6%). The completion rate for this campus is within the *Exemplary* level.

Number of Completers – This value is the numerator used to calculate the completion rate. Completers are graduates and continuing students. GED recipients are *not* included as completers.

COMPLETION RATE TABLE (Gr. 9-12) (75.0%/85.0%/95.0%)

----- Class of 2009 -----

	# Completers	# dropouts	# in Class	Comp Rate	Stu Grp %	# pl
All Students	41	1	42	97.6%	100%	
African Amer	0	0	0	-	0%	
Hispanic	8	0	8	100.0%	19%	
White	33	1	34	97.1%	81%	
Econ Disadv	12	1	13	92.3%	31%	

Number in Class – This value is the denominator used to calculate the completion rate. Due to space limitations, the number of GED recipients is not shown as a separate column. These students are included in the # in Class.

Minimum Size – The *number of dropouts* and the *number in class* are used together to determine whether there are enough students for a group to be evaluated.

TAKS

Number Met Standard – This value is the numerator used to calculate percent met standard.

Number Taking – This value is the denominator used to calculate percent met standard.

Percent Met Standard – This value is the key number for TAKS: it shows what percent of the student group passed that test.

Analysis Group Marker – An ‘X’ to the left of a group label indicates that performance results for that group are used to determine an accountability rating because minimum size criteria were met. If no ‘X’ appears, then the size minimums were not met and performance results for that group are not used to determine the accountability rating. Note that ‘All Students’ results for TAKS are always evaluated.

Accountability standards for all levels are shown in parentheses.

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS) TABLE

----- 2010 -----

Performance Results	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Stu Grp %
Reading/ELA (70%/80%/90%)				
X All Students	135	149	91%	100%
African Amer	7	11	64%	7%
Hispanic	3	4	75%	3%
X White	124	133	93%	89%
X Econ Disadv	42	50	84%	34%
Writing (70%/80%/90%)				
X All Students	17	19	89%	100%
African Amer	1	2	50%	11%
Hispanic	1	1	100%	5%
White	15	16	94%	84%
Econ Disadv	5	6	83%	32%

Student group percentages are shown to help explain which student groups meet the minimum size criteria for the indicator.

At this campus note that the number of African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged students taking the writing test is fewer than 30. Only those groups with an ‘X’ are analyzed for this subject. *All Students* is always evaluated if any students are tested.

Required Improvement

Campuses and districts may achieve a higher rating using *Required Improvement*. It can be applied to three base indicators: TAKS, Completion, and Dropout Rate – to raise a rating from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable* or from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*. All calculations for Required Improvement are done automatically by TEA, as shown below.

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS) TABLE

Performance Results	2010				2009				Required Improvement		
	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Stu Grp %	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?
Social Studies (70%/80%/90%)											
X All Students	253	309	82%	100%	231	293	79%		3		
X African Amer	127	151	84%	49%	134	167	80%		4		
X Hispanic	124	156	79%	50%	95	123	77%	Yes	2	2	Yes
White	2	2	100%	1%	2	3	67%		33		
X Econ Disadv	227	278	82%	90%	215	276	78%		4		

(4) This campus met Required Improvement on this measure.

(3) Finally, for each measure, the *actual change* must be greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*. A negative number indicates performance has declined (except in the case of the Annual Dropout Rate, where it means improvement).

At this campus, all performance is at the *Recognized* standard or above for all measures except TAKS social studies.

(1) Required Improvement was applied to see if this measure could be raised to *Recognized*. First a check is made to see if the measure meets the minimum size for the prior year (at least 10 test takers). It did.

(2) Next, determine the Required Improvement: The formula is *the standard for 2010 minus the campus's performance in 2009, divided by 2*.

Texas Projection Measure

After Required Improvement has been evaluated, the Texas Projection Measure (TPM) is applied.

Performance Results	2010				2009				Required Improvement			2010 TPM		
	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Stu Grp %	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?	Met Std w/TPM	Number Taking	Number Met w/TPM
Social Studies (70%/80%/90%)														
X All Students	90	100	90%	100%	100	122	82%		8			97	100	97%
X African Amer	46	51	90%	51%	62	78	79%		11			49	51	96%
X Hispanic	44	49	90%	49%	36	42	86%		4			48	49	98%
White	0	0	-	0%	2	2	100%		-			0	0	-
X Econ Disadv	76	86	88%	86%	89	109	82%		6			83	86	97%

In this sample report, the school is at the *Exemplary* level for all measures except for the 88% in TAKS social studies.

The Required Improvement feature cannot be used to move to *Exemplary*.

However, after applying TPM, 97% are projected to pass. This puts them at the *Exemplary* level.

Exceptions

Campuses or districts may also be able to “gate up” to the next higher rating, even after being evaluated under Required Improvement and TPM, as long as they qualify for the Exceptions Provision. Exceptions can only be used for the TAKS indicator.

In this example, the campus was evaluated on 12 assessment measures, and is therefore allowed up to 3 exceptions to move from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*. (Note that only one exception is allowed to move from *Recognized* to *Exemplary*, regardless of the number of measures evaluated.)

EXCEPTIONS TABLE

Number Msrs Evaluated	Number Allowed	Number Needed	Floor(s) Met?	Msr(s) Used in 2009?	Exceptions Applied
12	3	1	Yes	No	Science - Economically Disadvantaged

After applying both Required Improvement and TPM, 11 measures are at the *Recognized* level, but one measure is still at the *Academically Acceptable* level. If *Pct Met Std* for that measure meets the floor, and if an exception was not used for it in 2009, the campus can use one of the 3 exceptions allowed.

The exception is applied and the campus is rated *Recognized*.

Status by Measure

Status by Measure shows the status of each evaluated TAKS measure, beginning with Met Standard, then after applying Required Improvement, TPM, and Exceptions.

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS) TABLE

Performance Results	2010				2009				Required Improvement			2010 TPM		Status by Measure					
	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Stu Grp %	Number Met Std	Number Taking	Pct Met Std	Met Min Size	Act Chg	RI	Met RI?	Number Met Std w/TPM	Number Taking	Pct Met w/TPM	STD	RI	TPM	EXCP	***
Reading/ELA (70%/80%/90%)																			
X All Students	253	309	82%	100%	231	293	79%		3			287	309	93%	RE	RE	EX	-	EX
X African Amer	127	151	84%	49%	134	167	80%		4			141	151	93%	RE	RE	EX	-	EX
X Hispanic	124	156	79%	50%	95	123	77%	Yes	2	2	Yes	144	156	92%	AA	RE	-	-	RE
White	2	2	100%	1%	2	3	67%		33			2	2	100%	-	-	-	-	-
X Econ Disadv	227	278	82%	90%	215	276	78%		4			258	278	93%	RE	RE	EX	-	EX

In this example, performance is split between *Academically Acceptable* and *Recognized*. Status by Measure shows *RE* and *AA* under the STD column.

After application of RI, the status for one measure is changed to *Recognized*. Status by Measure shows *RE* under the RI column.

With TPM the outcomes improve to *Exemplary* for all measures.

However, this measure is held to *Recognized*, since it began at *AA*, and the additional features may elevate the rating one level only.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON DATA TABLES

The sample shown is for a *preview* data table. These will be made available to districts on the TEASE website in mid-July. Data tables with rating labels will be released on July 30, 2010.

When applicable, messages appear on the data tables to help explain the rating or the data shown. The preview data tables will include messages regarding the following:

- *Pairing*. Any standard campus with enrollment within grades 1-12, but no students tested on TAKS will be paired for accountability. A message will indicate the campus with which it is paired.
- *Special Analysis*. Campuses and districts with small numbers of total students tested may be subjected to Special Analysis to determine the rating. A message will state if Special Analysis was used. This message does not necessarily mean a rating will be changed from the outcome indicated by the data. See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for details.

The following are additional items not present on the preview that will be added to the data tables on July 30th or to the updated tables released in October.

- *Accountability Ratings*. (A list of possible rating labels is shown in *Table 4* in this chapter.)
- *Additional Messages*. These messages appear in the top section of the data table when applicable:
 - Rating Change due to Appeal. (*campus or district*)
 - Rating is not based on data shown in the table. (*campus or district*)
 - District rating limited to *Academically Acceptable* due to having one or more *Academically Unacceptable* campuses. (*district only*)
 - District rating limited to *Academically Acceptable* due to exceeding threshold for underreported students. (*district only*)
 - Rating changed after [*date*] due to Data Integrity Issues. (*campus or district*)
 - Special Analysis used. Exception applied for [*subject - student group*] (*campus or district*)

MASKED DATA

Performance posted to the public website is masked when there are fewer than five students in the denominator of the measure. Additionally, all performance at or near 0% or 100% is masked. It is necessary to mask data that potentially reveals the performance of every student to be in compliance with the *Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)*.

SYSTEM SUMMARY

The following tables summarize the 2010 system. *Table 6* provides an overview of the requirements for each rating level. A district or campus must meet the criteria for every applicable measure to be rated *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, or *Academically Acceptable*; otherwise the next lower rating is assigned.

To receive a rating of *Recognized* or *Exemplary*, districts cannot have any *Academically Unacceptable* campuses. In addition, *Recognized* and *Exemplary* districts must not have excessive underreported students. See *Chapter 3* for details.

Table 7 is a single-page overview that provides details of the 2010 system, with the base indicators listed as columns. For each of the indicators, users can see brief definitions, the rounding methodology, the accountability subset methodology, the standards, minimum size criteria, subjects and student groups used, application of Required Improvement, the Texas Projection Measure and the Exceptions Provision.

Table 6: Requirements for Each Rating Category

	Academically Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
Base Indicators			
<p>TAKS (2009-10)*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Students <p>and each student group meeting minimum size:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadvantaged <p>* TAKS (Accommodated) included for all grades and subjects.</p>	<p>Meets each standard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading/ELA ... 70% Writing 70% Social Studies.. 70% Mathematics 60% Science..... 55% <p>OR Meets Required Improvement</p> <p>OR Meets standard with TPM</p>	<p>Meets 80% standard for each subject</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Meets 75% floor and Required Improvement</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Meets standard with TPM</p>	<p>Meets 90% standard for each subject</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Meets standard with TPM</p>
<p>Completion Rate I (Class of 2009) (if meets minimum size)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Students African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadvantaged 	<p>Meets 75.0% standard</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Meets Required Improvement</p>	<p>Meets 85.0% standard</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Meets floor of 75.0% and Required Improvement</p>	<p>Meets 95.0% standard</p>
<p>Annual Dropout Rate (2008-09) (if meets minimum size)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Students African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadvantaged 	<p>Meets 1.8% standard</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Meets Required Improvement</p>	<p>Meets 1.8% standard</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Meets Required Improvement</p>	<p>Meets 1.8% standard</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Meets Required Improvement</p>
Additional Provisions			
<p>Exceptions (See Chapter 3 for more details.)</p>	<p>May be applied if district/campus would be <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> due to not meeting <i>Academically Acceptable</i> criteria.</p>	<p>May be applied if district/campus would be <i>Academically Acceptable</i> due to not meeting <i>Recognized</i> criteria.</p>	<p>May be applied if district/campus would be <i>Recognized</i> due to not meeting <i>Exemplary</i> criteria.</p>
<p>Check for Academically Unacceptable Campuses (District only)</p>	<p>Does not apply to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> districts.</p>	<p>A district with a campus rated <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> cannot be rated <i>Recognized</i>.</p>	<p>A district with a campus rated <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> cannot be rated <i>Exemplary</i>.</p>
<p>Check for Underreported Students (District only)</p>	<p>Does not apply to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> districts.</p>	<p>A district that underreports more than 150 students or more than 4.0% of its prior year students cannot be rated <i>Recognized</i>.</p>	<p>A district that underreports more than 150 students or more than 4.0% of its prior year students cannot be rated <i>Exemplary</i>.</p>

Table 7: Overview of 2010 System Components

	TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated)		Completion Rate I	Dropout Rate
Definition	Results (gr. 3-11) for TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) summed across grades by subject. ELA & reading results are combined. Cumulative results used for first two administrations of grades 5 & 8 reading and mathematics.		Graduates and continuers expressed as a % of total students in the class.	Gr. 7 and 8 dropouts as a % of students who were in attendance any time during the prior school year.
Rounding	Whole Numbers		One Decimal	
Standards	<i>Exemplary:</i>All Subjects ≥ 90% <i>Recognized:</i>All Subjects ≥ 80% <i>Acceptable:</i>Reading/ELA/Writ/Soc St. ≥ 70% Mathematics ≥ 60% Science ≥ 55%		EX: ≥ 95.0% RE: ≥ 85.0% AA: ≥ 75.0%	EX: ≤ 1.8% RE: ≤ 1.8% AA: ≤ 1.8%
Mobility Adjustment (Accountability Subset)	<u>District ratings:</u> results for students enrolled in the district in the fall and tested in the same district. <u>Campus ratings:</u> results for students enrolled in the campus in the fall and tested in the same campus.		None	
Subjects	Reading/ELA gr. 3-11 Writing gr. 4, 7 Mathematics gr. 3-11 Social Studies gr. 8, 10, 11 Science gr. 5, 8, 10, 11		N/A	
Student Groups	<u>All Students & Student Groups:</u> African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadvantaged		<u>All Students & Student Groups:</u> African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadvantaged	
Minimum Size Criteria for All Students	No minimum size requirement—special analysis for small numbers		≥ 5 dropouts AND ≥ 10 students	
Minimum Size Criteria for Groups	30/10%/50		≥ 5 dropouts AND 30/10%/50	
Required Improvement (RI)				
Actual Chg	2010 minus 2009 performance		Class of 2009 rate minus Class of 2008 rate	2008-09 rate minus 2007-08 rate
RI	Gain needed to reach standard in 2 years			
Use	As a gate up to <i>Academically Acceptable</i> or <i>Recognized</i>			
Floor	≥ 75% for <i>Recognized</i> , no floor for <i>Academically Acceptable</i>		≥ 75.0% for <i>Recognized</i>	No floor
Minimum Size	Meets minimum size in current year and has ≥ 10 students tested in prior year		Meets min. size current year and has ≥ 10 in prior year class.	Meets min. size current year and has ≥ 10 7 th – 8 th grade students the prior year.
TPM Applies to TAKS measures only				
Definition	Estimate of whether a student is likely to pass a TAKS test in a future grade. “% Passing w/ TPM” includes those projected to pass as passers.		TPM is Not Applicable to Completion Rate or Dropout Rate	
Subjects	All except: gr. 7 Writing; gr. 11 All Subjects			
Use	As a gate up to <i>Acceptable</i> , <i>Recognized</i> , or <i>Exemplary</i>			
Exceptions Applies to TAKS measures only				
Use	As a gate up to <i>Acceptable</i> , <i>Recognized</i> , or <i>Exemplary</i>			
Floor	<i>Academically Acceptable</i>	<i>Recognized</i>	<i>Exemplary</i>	
R/ELA/W/SS	65%	75%	85%	
M/Sc	55% / 50%	75%	85%	
Number of Exceptions Allowed	1 – 4 measures evaluated..... 0 allowed 5 – 8 measures evaluated..... 1 allowed 9 – 11 measures evaluated..... 2 allowed 12 – 15 measures evaluated..... 3 allowed 16+ measures evaluated..... 4 allowed		If 10 or more measures, one exception allowed	
Exceptions are Not Applicable to Completion Rate or Dropout Rate				

Chapter 5 – Gold Performance Acknowledgments

The Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) system acknowledges districts and campuses for high performance on indicators other than those used to determine accountability ratings. These indicators are in statute (*Texas Education Code*) or determined by the Commissioner of Education. Acknowledgment is given for high performance on:

- Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion
- Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate Results
- Attendance Rate
- College-Ready Graduates
- Commended Performance: Reading/English Language Arts
- Commended Performance: Mathematics
- Commended Performance: Writing
- Commended Performance: Science
- Commended Performance: Social Studies
- Comparable Improvement: Reading
- Comparable Improvement: Mathematics
- Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program
- SAT/ACT Results (College Admissions Tests)
- Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: English Language Arts
- Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: Mathematics

Campuses and charters evaluated under alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures are eligible to earn GPAs. For details on the procedures for these campuses and charters see *Chapter 13 – AEA Gold Performance Acknowledgments*.

Acknowledgment Categories

Acknowledged. The campus or district is rated *Academically Acceptable* or higher, has results to be evaluated, and has met the acknowledgment criteria on one or more of the indicators. Acknowledgments are awarded separately on each of the 15 indicators.

Does Not Qualify. Either of the following:

- The campus or district has performance results to be evaluated but did not meet the acknowledgment criteria.
- The campus or district has performance results to be evaluated but is rated *Academically Unacceptable*. (Those that are later granted a higher rating on appeal are eligible to be evaluated and may earn acknowledgments.)

Not Applicable. Any of the following:

- The campus or district does not have results to be evaluated for the acknowledgment.
- The campus or district is labeled *Not Rated: Other* (for example, campuses that only serve students in Pre-K/K, or campuses not rated due to insufficient data).
- The campus or district is labeled *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*.
- The campus is paired. Campuses are not awarded acknowledgments for indicators that use paired data. Paired campuses may be acknowledged on their non-paired indicators.

Table 8: Gold Performance Acknowledgment Standards for 2010

Indicator	Description	Standard (changes for 2010 in bold)	Year of Data
Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion	Percent of 9 th –12 th graders completing and receiving credit for at least one Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course	30.0% or more**	2008-09
AP / IB Results	Percent of 11 th and 12 th graders taking at least one AP or IB examination <i>AND</i>	15.0% or more <i>AND</i>	2008-09
	Percent of 11 th and 12 th grade examinees scoring at or above the criterion on at least one examination (3 and above for AP; 4 and above for IB)	50.0% or more*	
Attendance Rate	Attendance Rate for students in grades 1-12, the total number of days present divided by the total number of days in membership	District: 96.0%** Multi-Level: 96.0%** High School: 95.0%** Middle/Jr High: 96.0%** Elementary: 97.0%**	2008-09
College-Ready Graduates	Number of graduates who scored at or above the college-ready criteria on both ELA and mathematics, divided by the number of graduates with results in both subjects to evaluate.	35% or more**	Class of 2009
Commended Performance: Reading/ELA	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard	30% or more**	Spring 2010
Commended Performance: Mathematics	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard	30% or more**	Spring 2010
Commended Performance: Writing	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard	30% or more**	Spring 2010
Commended Performance: Science	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard	30% or more**	Spring 2010
Commended Performance: Social Studies	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard	30% or more**	Spring 2010
Comparable Improvement: Reading	Average vertical scale score growth in TAKS Reading	Top Quartile (top 25%)***	Spring 2010
Comparable Improvement: Mathematics	Average vertical scale score growth in TAKS Mathematics	Top Quartile (top 25%)***	Spring 2010
Recommended High School Program/DAP	Percent of graduates meeting or exceeding requirements for the RHSP/Distinguished Achievement Program	85.0% or more**	Class of 2009
SAT/ACT Results	Percent of graduates taking either the SAT or ACT <i>AND</i>	At least 70.0% of graduates <i>AND</i>	Class of 2009
	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the criterion score (SAT 1110; ACT Composite 24)	40.0% or more at or above criterion*	
TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component: English Language Arts	Percent of grade 11 examinees with a scale score of 2200 or more and a score of 3 or higher on the essay	65% or more**	Spring 2010
TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component: Mathematics	Percent of grade 11 examinees with a scale score of 2200 or more	65% or more**	Spring 2010

* Indicator evaluates performance for All Students & the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, and White. Economically Disadvantaged status is not available from the testing results.

** Indicator evaluates performance for All Students & the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

*** Acknowledgment for Comparable Improvement is available to campuses that serve grades 4-8 only. It is evaluated for All Students only.

Acknowledgment Indicators

ADVANCED COURSE/DUAL ENROLLMENT COMPLETION

This indicator is based on a count of students who complete and receive credit for at least one advanced course in grades 9-12. Advanced courses include dual enrollment courses. Dual enrollment courses are those for which a student gets both high school and college credit. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for a link to a list of advanced courses.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses with grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12 that have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, at least 30.0% of the 2008-09 students in grades 9 through 12 must receive credit for at least one advanced course.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of students in grades 9 through 12 who received credit for at least one advanced course}}{\text{number of students in grades 9 through 12 who completed at least one course}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of students. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 students in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2008-09

Data Source: PEIMS submission 3 (June 2009)

Other Information:

- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 24.879% is rounded to 24.9%, not 25.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

ADVANCED PLACEMENT/INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE RESULTS

This refers to the results of the College Board Advanced Placement (AP) examinations and the International Baccalaureate (IB) examinations taken by Texas public school students in a given school year. High school students may take these examinations, ideally upon completion of AP or IB courses, and may receive advanced placement or credit, or both, upon entering college. Generally, colleges will award credit or advanced placement for scores of 3, 4, or 5 on AP examinations and scores of 4, 5, 6, or 7 on IB examinations. Requirements vary by college and by subject tested.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses with grades 11 and/or 12 that have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must meet both a participation and a performance standard. It must:

- have 15.0% or more of its non-special education 11th and 12th graders taking at least one AP or IB examination; *and* of those tested,
- have 50.0% or more scoring at or above the criterion score on at least one examination.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, and White.

Methodology:

Participation:

$$\frac{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ graders taking at least one AP or IB examination}}{\text{total non-special education students enrolled in 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ grades}}$$

and

Performance:

$$\frac{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ graders with at least one score at or above the criterion score}}{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ graders with at least one AP or IB examination}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers or number of non-special education students enrolled in the 11th and 12th grades. To be included in the evaluation for GPA, a student group must have:

- in the numerator of the participation measure: at least 10 test takers; and,
- in the denominator of the participation measure: at least 30 non-special education 11th and 12th graders;
 - if there are 30 to 49 students and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated; or
 - if the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2008-09

Data Source: The College Board; The International Baccalaureate Organization; and PEIMS submission 1 (October 2008)

Other Information:

- *Criterion Score.* The criterion score is 3 or above on Advanced Placement tests and 4 or above on International Baccalaureate examinations.
- *Special Education.* For *participation*, 11th and 12th graders served by special education who take an AP or IB examination are included in the numerator, but not the denominator. This may have a slight positive effect on the percent reported.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 49.9%, not 50.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

ATTENDANCE RATE

Attendance rates are based on student attendance for the entire school year for students in grades 1-12.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses whose grade span is within grades 1-12 and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: (Variable)

- District/Multi-Level campuses.....At least 96.0%
- Middle School/Junior HighAt least 96.0%
- High SchoolAt least 95.0%
- ElementaryAt least 97.0%

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were present in 2008-09}}{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were in membership in 2008-09}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: For attendance, the minimum size is based on total days in membership rather than individual student counts. All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of total days in membership. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 5,400 total days in membership (30 students x 180 school days) for the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 5,400 to 8,999 total days in membership and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students total days in membership, it is evaluated.
- If there are at least 9,000 total days in membership (50 students x 180 school days) for the student group, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2008-09

Data Source: PEIMS submission 3 (June 2009)

Other Information:

- *Campus Type.* The campus type (elementary, high school, etc.) is assigned using the low and high grades taught as determined from the 2009-10 PEIMS submission 1 enrollment records. Multi-level campuses are those that provide instruction in both the elementary and secondary grade level categories. Examples are K-12, K-8, and 6-12 campuses.
- *Time Span.* Attendance for the entire school year is used.
- *Special Education.* This measure includes students served by special education.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 95.877% is rounded to 95.9%, not 96.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

COLLEGE-READY GRADUATES

To be considered college-ready as defined by this indicator, a graduate must have met or exceeded the college-ready criteria on the TAKS exit-level test, or the SAT test, or the ACT test. College-Ready Graduates was added as a GPA indicator beginning with the 2009 accountability cycle.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses with graduates in the class of 2009 that have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, at least 35% of the class of 2009 graduates must have scored at or above the college-ready criteria for both ELA and mathematics.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of graduates who scored at or above the college-ready criteria on both ELA \& mathematics}}{\text{number of graduates (class of 2009) with results in both subjects to evaluate}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: Class of 2009

Data Source: Pearson; the College Board; ACT Inc.; and PEIMS submission 1 (October 2009)

Other Information:

- *Criteria Scores.* The table below details the criteria scores by subject that must be met for a graduate to be considered college-ready on this indicator.

Subject	Exit-Level TAKS		SAT		ACT
ELA	≥ 2200 scale score AND a “3” or higher on essay	OR	≥ 500 on Critical Reading AND ≥ 1070 Total*	OR	≥ 19 on English AND ≥ 23 Composite
Mathematics	≥ 2200 scale score	OR	≥ 500 on Mathematics AND ≥ 1070 Total*	OR	≥ 19 on Mathematics AND ≥ 23 Composite

* “Total” is the sum of Critical Reading and Mathematics. It does not include Writing.

- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on College-Ready Graduates.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure.

- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 34.877% is rounded to 35%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: READING/ELA

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS reading (grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, & 9) or English language arts (grades 10 & 11) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 30% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on reading or ELA}}{\text{total number of examinees in reading or ELA}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2009-10

Data Source: Pearson

Other Information:

- *Scale Score.* For grades 3-8 reading, the standard for Commended Performance is on the vertical scale and will vary by grade level. For grade 9 reading, the standard for Commended Performance is a scale score of 2400 or more. For grades 10 and 11 ELA, a scale score of 2400 or more with a score of 2 or higher on the essay is required. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for commended performance standards by grade on the vertical scale.
- *Student Success Initiative.* Students who meet the Commended Performance standard in either of the first two administrations of TAKS reading for grades 5 and 8 are included.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 30, 2009 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 30, 2009 and before the date of testing are not included in

the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.

- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on Commended Performance.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: MATHEMATICS

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS mathematics (grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, & 11) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 30% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \textit{ on mathematics}}{\text{total number of examinees in mathematics}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2009-10

Data Source: Pearson

Other Information:

- *Scale Score.* For grades 3-8 mathematics, the Commended Performance standard is on the vertical scale and will vary by grade level. For grades 9-11, the Commended Performance standard is a scale score of 2400 or more. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for commended performance standards by grade on the vertical scale.

- *Student Success Initiative.* Students who meet the Commended Performance standard in either of the first two administrations of TAKS mathematics for grades 5 and 8 are included.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 30, 2009 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 30, 2009 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on Commended Performance.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: WRITING

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS writing (grades 4 & 7) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 30% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \textit{ on writing}}{\text{total number of examinees in writing}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2009-10

Data Source: Pearson

Other Information:

- *Scale Score.* Commended Performance is a scale score of 2400 or more with a score of 3 or higher on the essay.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 30, 2009 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 30, 2009 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on Commended Performance.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: SCIENCE

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS science (grades 5, 8, 10, & 11) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 30% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on science}}{\text{total number of examinees in science}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2009-10

Data Source: Pearson

Other Information:

- *Scale Score.* Commended Performance is a scale score of 2400 or more.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 30, 2009 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 30, 2009 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on Commended Performance.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE: SOCIAL STUDIES

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test students on TAKS social studies (grades 8, 10, & 11) and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must have 30% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on social studies}}{\text{total number of examinees in social studies}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2009-10

Data Source: Pearson

Other Information:

- *Scale Score.* Commended Performance is a scale score of 2400 or more.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 30, 2009 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 30, 2009 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on Commended Performance.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

COMPARABLE IMPROVEMENT: READING

Comparable Improvement (CI) is a measure that calculates how student performance on the TAKS test has changed (or grown) from one year to the next, and compares the change to that of the 40 schools that are demographically most similar to the target school. For 2010, the Texas Growth Index (TGI) values will be replaced with TAKS vertical scale scores for campuses that serve grades 4-8.

Who is eligible: Campuses that test students on TAKS reading in grades 4-8 and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher. Districts are not eligible because CI is not calculated at the district level. Beginning in 2010, high schools are not eligible for this acknowledgment because vertical scale scores are not available above grade 8.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus must have average vertical scale score growth within the top quartile (the top 25%) of their 40-member campus comparison group for reading.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students only.

Methodology: First, determine the campus's vertical scale score growth by finding the difference between the current and prior year average scale scores:

$$\begin{array}{r} 2010 \text{ average campus scale score in reading} \\ \textit{minus} \\ 2009 \text{ average campus scale score in reading} \end{array}$$

Sort the differences for the 40 campuses in the comparison group from high to low. Then, determine which quartile the campus is in within its 40-member campus comparison group. See *Appendix E – Student Growth Measures* and *Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group* for a complete explanation of the methodology for this measure.

Minimum Size Requirements: Students must be matched to the spring 2009 TAKS administration—anywhere in the state—to find their prior year scale score for reading. Any campus with fewer than 10 matched students for a subject will not be assigned a quartile position.

Year of Data: 2010 and 2009 (Spring TAKS Administrations)

Data Source: Pearson

Other Information:

- *Student Success Initiative.*
 - For grade 5 and grade 8 students who take both the first and second administrations of TAKS reading, the performance used is the score they achieved from the first administration. That student will be matched to their single grade 4 or grade 7 administration from 2009 to determine their scale score growth.
 - For grade 4 students who—as third graders in 2009—took TAKS reading in both March and April 2009, scale score growth is determined by subtracting the score they achieved on their single grade 4 administration in 2010 from the score they achieved on their March administration in 2009. The same methodology applies to grade 6 students tested as grade 5 students in 2009.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on CI.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* Demographic values for the 40 members of the comparison group are rounded to one decimal point. For example, 69.877% is rounded to 69.9%. Average scale scores are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 651.44 is rounded to 651.

COMPARABLE IMPROVEMENT: MATHEMATICS

Comparable Improvement (CI) is a measure that calculates how student performance on the TAKS test has changed (or grown) from one year to the next, and compares the change to that of the 40 schools that are demographically most similar to the target school. For 2010, the Texas Growth Index (TGI) values will be replaced with TAKS vertical scale score statistics for campuses that serve grades 4-8.

Who is eligible: Campuses that test students on TAKS mathematics in grades 4-8 and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher. Districts are not eligible because CI is not calculated at the district level. Beginning in 2010, high schools are not eligible for this acknowledgment because vertical scale scores are not available above grade 8.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus must have average vertical scale score growth within the top quartile (the top 25%) of their 40-member campus comparison group for mathematics.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students only.

Methodology: First, determine the campus’s vertical scale score growth by finding the difference between the current and prior year average scale scores:

$$\begin{array}{r} 2010 \text{ average campus scale score in mathematics} \\ \text{minus} \\ 2009 \text{ average campus scale score in mathematics} \end{array}$$

Sort the differences for the 40 campuses in the comparison group from high to low. Then, determine which quartile the campus is in within its 40-member campus comparison group. See *Appendix E – Student Growth Measures* and *Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group* for a complete explanation of the methodology for this measure.

Minimum Size Requirements: Students must be matched to the spring 2009 TAKS administration—anywhere in the state—to find their prior year scale score for mathematics. Any campus with fewer than 10 matched students for a subject will not be assigned a quartile position.

Year of Data: 2010 and 2009 (Spring TAKS Administrations)

Data Source: Pearson

Other Information:

- *Student Success Initiative.*
 - For grade 5 and grade 8 students who take both the first and second administrations of TAKS mathematics, the performance used is the score they achieved from the first administration. That student will be matched to their single grade 4 or grade 7 administration from 2009 to determine their scale score growth.
 - For grade 6 students who—as fifth graders in 2009—took TAKS mathematics in both April and May 2009, scale score growth is determined by subtracting the score they achieved on their single grade 6 administration in 2010 from the score they achieved on their April administration in 2009.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on CI.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* Demographic values for the 40 members of the comparison group are rounded to one decimal point. For example, 69.877% is rounded to 69.9%. Average scale scores are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 651.44 is rounded to 651.

RECOMMENDED HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM/DISTINGUISHED ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM

This indicator shows the percent of graduates who were reported as having satisfied the course requirements for the Texas State Board of Education Recommended High School Program or Distinguished Achievement Program.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that have graduates and that are rated *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, 85.0% of all 2009 graduates reported must meet or exceed the requirements for the Recommended High School Program or Distinguished Achievement Program.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of graduates reported with graduation codes for} \\ \text{Recommended High School Program or Distinguished Achievement Program}}{\text{number of graduates}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of graduates. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 graduates in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 graduates within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: Class of 2009

Data Source: PEIMS submission 1 (October 2009)

Other Information:

- *Special Education.* This measure includes graduates served by special education.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 84.877% is rounded to 84.9%, not 85.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

SAT/ACT RESULTS

This indicator shows the performance and participation on two college admissions tests: the College Board’s SAT Reasoning Test and ACT, Inc.’s ACT Assessment.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that have graduates and that are rated *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus or district must meet both a participation and a performance standard. It must:

- have 70.0% or more of the class of 2009 non-special education graduates taking either the ACT or the SAT; *and* of those examinees
- have 40.0% or more scoring at or above the criterion score on at least one examination.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, and White.

Methodology:

Participation:

$$\frac{\text{number of graduates taking either the SAT or the ACT}}{\text{total non-special education graduates}}$$

and

Performance:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees at or above the criterion score}}{\text{number of graduates taking either the SAT or the ACT}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers or graduates. To be included in the evaluation for GPA, a student group must have:

- in the numerator of the participation measure: at least 10 test takers; and,
- in the denominator of the participation measure: at least 30 non-special education graduates;
 - if there are 30 to 49 students and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated; or
 - if the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: Class of 2009

Data Source: The College Board (SAT) and ACT, Inc. (ACT)

Other Information:

- *SAT Reasoning Test.* Although the SAT now includes a writing assessment, performance on writing is not used for determining GPA.
- *Criterion.* The criterion score is 1110 on the SAT (the sum of the critical reading and mathematics scores) or 24 on the ACT (composite).
- *Most Recent Test.* Both testing companies annually provide the agency with information on the most recent test participation and performance of graduating seniors from all Texas public schools. Only one record is sent per student. If a student takes an ACT or SAT test more than once, the agency receives the record for the most recent examination taken, not necessarily the examination with the highest score.
- *Both Tests Taken.* If a student takes both the SAT and the ACT, the information is combined so that an unduplicated count of students is used. If the student scored above the criterion on either the SAT or ACT, that student is counted as having scored above the criterion.
- *Campus ID.* The student taking the test identifies the campus to which a score is attributed.
- *Special Education.* For *participation*, graduates served by special education who take the ACT or SAT are included in the numerator, but not the denominator. This may have a slight positive effect on the percent reported.

- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 69.877% is rounded to 69.9%, not 70.0%. However, student group percents (minimum size requirements) are always rounded to whole numbers.

**TEXAS SUCCESS INITIATIVE (TSI) – HIGHER EDUCATION READINESS
COMPONENT: ELA**

This indicator shows the percent of grade 11 students who are considered ready to begin college-level work, based on their performance on the TAKS exit-level examination.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test grade 11 students on the exit-level TAKS ELA and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator the campus or district must have 65% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the TSI standard. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board set the standard of college readiness on the exit-level TAKS at a scale score of 2200 for ELA with a score of 3 or higher on the essay.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of grade 11 test takers with a scale score of 2200} \\ \text{and a score of 3 or higher on the essay of the ELA test}}{\text{total number of grade 11 students taking ELA}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2009-10

Data Source: Pearson

Other Information:

- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 30, 2009 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 30, 2009 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on TSI.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure.

- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 64.877% is rounded to 65%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

**TEXAS SUCCESS INITIATIVE (TSI) – HIGHER EDUCATION READINESS
COMPONENT: MATHEMATICS**

This indicator shows the percent of grade 11 students who are considered ready to begin college-level work, based on their performance on the TAKS exit-level examination.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that test grade 11 students on the exit-level TAKS mathematics and have a rating of *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator the campus or district must have 65% or more of its examinees scoring at or above the TSI standard. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board set the standard of college readiness on the exit-level TAKS at a scale score of 2200 for mathematics.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of test takers with a scale score of 2200 on mathematics}}{\text{total number of grade 11 test takers in mathematics}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements: All Students results are always evaluated, regardless of the number of test takers. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size:

- If there are fewer than 30 test takers in the student group, it is not evaluated separately.
- If there are 30 to 49 students within the student group and the student group comprises at least 10% of All Students, it is evaluated.
- If the student group has at least 50 students, it is evaluated.

Year of Data: 2009-10

Data Source: Pearson

Other Information:

- *Mobility.* Students who move between campuses after October 30, 2009 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between districts after October 30, 2009 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset* in *Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Pairing.* Campuses that are paired because they do not have their own TAKS data are not eligible for acknowledgment on TSI.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure.

- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 64.877% is rounded to 65%. Student group percents (minimum size requirements) are also rounded to whole numbers.

NOTIFICATION OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Notification of Gold Performance Acknowledgment will occur in late October 2010 at the same time as the 2010 ratings update that follows the resolution of all appeals. (See *Chapter 19 – Calendar* for more details.) At that time, the district lists and data tables on the TEA website will be updated to show the acknowledgments earned.

Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances

The vast majority of the standard accountability ratings can be determined through the process detailed in *Chapters 2-4: The Basics*. However, there are special circumstances that require closer examination. Accommodating all Texas campuses and districts increases the complexity of the accountability system, but it also increases the fairness of the ratings ultimately assigned. This chapter describes pairing, Special Analysis, and the treatment of non-traditional campuses and their data under the standard accountability procedures.

Pairing

IDENTIFYING CAMPUSES

All campuses serving grades 1-12 must receive an accountability rating. Beginning in 1994, campuses with no state assessment results due to grade span served were incorporated into the accountability system by having districts choose another campus within the same district with which to pair for accountability purposes. The campuses shared assessment data. Beginning with the 2004 system, districts may also choose to pair a campus with the district and be evaluated on the district's results.

TEA determines which campuses need to be paired for any given accountability cycle after analyzing enrollment files submitted on PEIMS submission 1. All districts with campuses with enrollment in grades higher than kindergarten, and solely in grades with no TAKS data, *i.e.*, grades 1, 2, or 12, receive a request for pairing. Charters and registered alternative education campuses (AECs) are not asked to pair any of their campuses.

For campuses that are paired, only TAKS performance is shared. The paired campus is evaluated on its own non-TAKS indicator data should it have any. The campus with which it is paired does not share any dropout, completion, or Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) indicator data it may have.

ADDITIONAL FEATURES

Required Improvement. Paired campuses are eligible for Required Improvement. Note, however, that Required Improvement is calculated with 2010 data based on the pairing relationships established in 2010. The 2009 data is based on the pairing relationships established in 2009. Campuses with pairing statuses that change between years may have improvement calculations that differ from the campuses they are paired with.

Exceptions. Paired campuses are eligible for exceptions, using the paired data. However, as with Required Improvement, campuses with pairing statuses that change between years may have exceptions calculations that differ from the campuses they are paired with.

GPA. Paired data are not used for GPA indicators. This means that paired campuses cannot earn GPAs for the Commended Performance, Comparable Improvement, or Texas Success Initiative (TSI) indicators. They may, however, receive GPAs for other indicators based on their own data.

PAIRING PROCESS

Districts are given the opportunity to use the same pairing relationship they used in the prior year or to select a new relationship by completing special data entry screens on the secure TEA website. In early April, districts with campuses that needed to be paired received instructions on how to access this on-line application. Pairing decisions were due by April 23, 2010.

If a district fails to inform the state, pairing decisions are made by agency staff. In the case of campuses that have been paired in the past, staff will assume that prior year pairing relationships still apply. In the case of campuses identified as needing to be paired for the first time in the 2009-10 school year, pairing selections will be made based on the guidelines given in this section in conjunction with analysis of attendance and enrollment patterns using PEIMS data.

GUIDELINES

Campuses that are paired should have a “feeder” relationship with the selected campus and the grades should be contiguous. For example, a K-2 campus should be paired with the 3-5 campus that accepts its students into 3rd grade.

Another option is to pair a campus with the district instead of another campus. This option is suggested for cases where the campus has no clear relationship with another single campus in the district. A campus paired with the district will be evaluated using the district’s TAKS results (for all grades tested in the district). Note that pairing with the district is not required in these cases. Districts have the choice of selecting another campus or selecting the district. For example, in cases where a K-2 campus feeds into several 3-5 campuses, one of the 3-5 campuses may be selected, or the district can be selected. A 12th grade center serving students from several high school campuses can select one of the high school campuses or the district may be selected. In these cases, the district should make the best choice based on local criteria.

Multiple pairings are possible: If several K-2 campuses feed the same 3-5 campus, all of the K-2 campuses may be paired with that 3-5 campus.

Districts may change pairings from year to year; however, these changes should be justifiable (*e.g.*, a change in attendance zones affecting feeder patterns).

Special Analysis

Districts and campuses with small numbers of students pose a special challenge to the accountability system. There are two types of small numbers situations. One is small numbers of students within a group, *e.g.*, few African American test-takers in science. These are handled by applying the minimum size criteria described in *Chapter 2 – The Basics: Base Indicators*. The second type is small numbers of *total* students, that is, few students tested in the All Students category.

Districts and campuses with small numbers of total students raise issues regarding the stability of the data. Special Analysis is used to ensure that ratings based on small numbers of TAKS results are appropriate. As a result of Special Analysis, a rating can remain

unchanged, be elevated, or be changed to *Not Rated*. If Special Analysis is applied, only All Students performance is examined.

IDENTIFYING CAMPUSES AND DISTRICTS

Campuses and districts that are eligible for Special Analysis fall into two categories. The first are those that have fewer than six TAKS testers in each and every subject and do not have their own leaver data of sufficient size to evaluate. These campus and district ratings are changed to *Not Rated: Other*. Beyond these that receive this automatic change, a campus or district undergoes Special Analysis if:

- the campus or district is *Academically Unacceptable* due to TAKS only, with fewer than 30 All Students tested in one or more of the *Academically Unacceptable* subject(s); *OR*
- the campus or district is limited to *Academically Acceptable* or *Recognized* due to TAKS only, and the evaluation is governed by the results of fewer than six All Students tested.

The following are examples of campuses and districts that will NOT undergo Special Analysis:

- Campuses or districts that are *Not Rated*.
- Campuses or districts that are not small (30 or more testers in all subjects).
- Campuses or districts that have few students tested in TAKS, but whose rating of *Academically Unacceptable*, *Academically Acceptable*, or *Recognized* is due to other indicators.

METHODS FOR SPECIAL ANALYSIS

Campuses or districts that undergo Special Analysis receive professional review based on analysis of all available performance data. The professional review process involves producing a summary report of the district or campus data, analyzing the data, and arriving at a consensus decision among a group of TEA staff members familiar with the standard accountability procedures. The summary report includes available indicator data for all TAKS tested years (2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010). Trends and aggregate data are reviewed. When available, results that include the Texas Projection Measure (TPM) are considered.

Because of the small numbers of test takers involved, professional review can also result in a *Not Rated* label for some campuses or districts not otherwise meeting the automatic criteria for *Not Rated*.

New Campuses

All campuses—established or new—are rated. A new campus is defined to be a campus with at least one student in membership in the current school year that did not have any students in membership in the immediately preceding school year. A new campus may receive a rating of *Academically Unacceptable* in its first year of operation. This can occur even though the campus does not have prior-year data on which to calculate improvement. The management of campus identification numbers across years is a district responsibility. See *Chapter 16 – Responsibilities and Consequences* for more information regarding the possible consequences of changing campuses numbers.

Charters

Based on fall PEIMS data for the 2009-10 school year, there were 207 charter operators serving approximately 119,000 students. Most charter operators have only one campus (116 of the 207); however, about 44 percent operate multiple campuses.

By statute, charter operators are subject to most of the same federal and state laws as other public school districts, including reporting and accountability requirements. Prior to the 2004 accountability system, only the campuses operated by the charter received an accountability rating. Beginning with 2004, charters as well as the campuses they operate are rated, meaning charter operators are rated using district rating criteria based on the aggregate performance of the campuses operated by the charter. This means charter operators are also subject to the additional performance requirements applied to districts (underreported student standards and the check for *Academically Unacceptable* campuses). Because they are rated, charter operators and their campuses are eligible for Gold Performance Acknowledgments.

In 2010, there are some differences between the treatment of charter operators and traditional districts. These are:

- A charter operator may be rated under the alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures. This can occur in two cases: when the charter operates only registered AECs; or, when 50% or more of the charter operator's students are enrolled at registered AECs and the operator opts to be evaluated under AEA procedures.
- A charter operator may be labeled *Not Rated: Other*. This can occur in cases where the charter operator has too little or no TAKS data on which it can be evaluated.
- Charter operators are not asked to pair any of their campuses. Charters are unique in that they either have only one campus, or they have multiple campuses with no feeder relationships; therefore, pairing charter campuses is problematic.

As with non-charter campuses, a charter campus that is a registered AEC will be rated under AEA procedures.

Alternative Education Campuses

As previously stated, all campuses in the state serving grades 1–12 must receive a campus rating; however, the accountability system recognizes that some campuses offering alternative education programs may need to be evaluated under different criteria than standard campuses.

In 2010, AECs meeting certain eligibility criteria may register to be evaluated under AEA procedures. See *Part 2* of this *Manual* for all details on the AEA procedures.

Other campuses providing alternative education programs may not be registered for evaluation under AEA procedures: Either they chose not to register, did not meet the registration criteria, or did not meet the at-risk registration criterion to be registered for evaluation under AEA procedures. These campuses are evaluated under standard procedures and will be rated *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Academically Acceptable*, *Academically Unacceptable*, *Not Rated: Other*, or *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*.

Generally speaking, districts are responsible for the performance of all their students, including those who attend AECs that are registered for evaluation under AEA procedures. That is, the performance results for students who attend campuses evaluated under AEA procedures *are included* in the district's performance and *are used* in determining the district's rating and acknowledgments. However, certain state statutes mandate some exceptions to this rule. In particular, Texas Education Code (TEC) in effect for the 2010 accountability year stipulates that the performance of students served in certain campuses cannot be used in evaluating the district where the campus is located. Three campus types that are specifically addressed in statute are Residential Treatment Facility campuses, Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC) campuses, and Texas Youth Commission (TYC) campuses. *See note* at the end of this chapter regarding statutory citations.*

RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT FACILITIES

A district that has a privately operated residential treatment facility (RTF) within its geographic boundaries is not held accountable for students who drop out if they are from outside the district and were served at the facility. For dropouts reported through PEIMS with the appropriate student attribution codes, TEA identifies and removes these dropouts from the serving district and campus rates. (See TEC §39.073(f)*.)

TEXAS JUVENILE PROBATION COMMISSION CAMPUSES

A district with a registered pre-adjudication detention center or post-adjudication correctional facility within its geographic boundaries is not held accountable for students who drop out if they are from outside the district. For dropouts reported through PEIMS with the appropriate student attribution codes, TEA identifies and removes these dropouts from the serving district and the non-TJPC campus rates. Only dropout records for students served in correctional facilities registered with the TJPC and validated by TEA are subject to this process.

In addition, any performance data (TAKS, completion, or dropout) reported on campuses designated as TJPC campuses are not included in the district results for the district where the TJPC campus is located. The TJPC campus will be rated (either under standard or AEA procedures) on the data assigned to it. The district rating is not affected by the performance data reported on these campuses. (See TEC §39.072(d)* and §39.073(f)*.)

Furthermore, a rating of *Academically Unacceptable* on a TJPC campus does not prevent an *Exemplary* or *Recognized* district rating in the district where the TJPC campus is located. (See *Chapter 3 – The Basics: Additional Features.*)

TEXAS YOUTH COMMISSION FACILITIES WITHIN TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS

A district that has a TYC facility within its geographic boundaries is not held accountable for students who drop out if they are from outside the district. For dropouts reported through PEIMS with the appropriate student attribution codes, TEA identifies and removes these dropouts from the serving district and the non-TYC campus rates. Only dropout records for students served in TYC campuses that are validated by TEA are subject to this process.

In addition, any performance data (TAKS, completion, and dropout) reported on campuses designated and validated by TEA as TYC campuses are not included in the district results for the district where the TYC campus is located. The district's TYC campus will be rated (either

under standard or AEA procedures) on the data assigned to it. The district rating is not affected by the performance data reported on these campuses. (See TEC §39.072(d)*.)

Furthermore, a rating of *Academically Unacceptable* on a TYC campus does not prevent an *Exemplary* or *Recognized* district rating in the district where the TYC campus is located. (See *Chapter 3 – The Basics: Additional Features.*)

JUVENILE JUSTICE ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND DISCIPLINARY ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Programs (JJAEPs) and Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs (DAEPs) are two types of campuses that are not rated under either standard or AEA procedures.

JJAEPs. Statute prohibits the attribution of performance results to JJAEPs. For counties with a population of 125,000 or more, Texas Education Code §37.011(h) requires that a student enrolled at a JJAEP be reported as if the student were attending and being tested at his or her “sending” campus. Each district that sends students to a JJAEP is responsible for properly attributing all performance data according to the *PEIMS Data Standards* and the testing guidelines.

By statute, procedures for evaluating the educational performance of JJAEPs in large counties are the responsibility of the TJPC. In the state accountability system, campuses identified to be JJAEPs will be labeled *Not Rated: Other*. Any accountability data erroneously reported to a JJAEP campus are subject to further investigation.

DAEPs. Statutory intent prohibits the attribution of performance results to a DAEP. Each district that sends students to a DAEP is responsible for properly attributing all performance data according to the *PEIMS Data Standards* and the testing guidelines.

All campuses identified to be DAEPs will be labeled *Not Rated: Other*. Accountability data erroneously reported to a DAEP campus are subject to further investigation.

Table 9 on the following page lists various campus types discussed above and indicates whether the performance data are included or excluded from the district evaluation.

SPECIAL EDUCATION CAMPUSES

Campuses where all students are served in special education programs *and none are tested on TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated)* will be labeled *Not Rated: Other*, because they have no TAKS results on which to be evaluated. See *Chapter 4 – The Basics: Determining a Rating* for more information on the use of this rating label.

* These statutory citations reference TEC as it existed prior to the changes made by the 81st legislative session in 2009. The citations are in effect through the 2010-2011 accountability year.

Table 9: Inclusion or Exclusion of Performance Data

Campus Type	Student-level Processing	
	Dropouts (2008-09)	TAKS (2009-10)
RTF	<p>PEIMS student attribution code 09 is used to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove individual dropouts from serving district results. Remove individual dropouts from serving campus results. 	<p>PEIMS student attribution codes 21 and 22 are used to remove individual results from serving district results.</p>
TJPC	<p>PEIMS student attribution code 08 is used to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove individual dropouts from serving district results. Remove individual dropouts from serving campus results if the campus is a regular campus. 	<p>PEIMS student attribution codes 13 and 14 are used to remove individual results from serving district results.</p>
TYC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No student-level processing occurs. 	<p>PEIMS student attribution codes 17 and 18 are used to remove individual results from serving district results.</p>
JJAEP	<p>Dropout data are attributed to non-JJAEP campus using PEIMS attendance data or district-supplied campus of accountability. Students who cannot be attributed to a non-JJAEP campus remain dropouts at the JJAEP campus. Dropouts at the JJAEP campus will be included in the district results.</p>	<p>No assessment data should be reported to the JJAEP, but if it is mistakenly reported to the JJAEP, it will be included in the district results.</p>
DAEP	<p>Dropout data are attributed to non-DAEP campus using PEIMS attendance data or district-supplied campus of accountability. Students who cannot be attributed to a non-DAEP campus remain dropouts at the DAEP campus. Dropouts at the DAEP campus will be included in the district results.</p>	<p>No assessment data should be reported to the DAEP, but if it is mistakenly reported to the DAEP, it will be included in the district results.</p>
Campus Type	Campus-level Processing	
	Dropout (2008-09) & Completion (Class of 2009)	TAKS (2009-10)
RTF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data remaining after student-level processing are included in the evaluation of the RTF campus. The RTF campus is included in the district results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results are included in the evaluation of the RTF campus (accountability subset rules apply). The RTF campus is included in the district results (accountability subset rules apply).
TJPC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TJPC campus is excluded from the district results. The TJPC campus is evaluated on the data it has. 	
TYC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TYC campus is excluded from the district results. The TYC campus is evaluated on the data it has. 	
JJAEP	<p>No dropout, completion, or assessment data should be reported to the JJAEP, but if it is mistakenly reported to the JJAEP, it will be included in the district results.</p>	
DAEP	<p>No dropout, completion, or assessment data should be reported to the DAEP, but if it is mistakenly reported to the DAEP, it will be included in the district results.</p>	

**The 2010 Accountability Rating System
for Texas Public Schools and School Districts**

Part 2

**Alternative Education
Accountability (AEA)
Procedures**

In Part 2:

Chapter 7 – Overview of
AEA..... 77

Chapter 8 – AEA
Registration Criteria and
Requirements 83

Chapter 9 – Attribution of
AEC Data..... 87

Chapter 10 – AEA Base
Indicators 89

Chapter 11 – Additional
Features of AEA..... 97

Chapter 12 – AEA
Ratings 105

Chapter 13 – AEA Gold
Performance
Acknowledgments..... 117

Chapter 14 – AEA Glossary
and Index 125

Chapter 7 – Overview of AEA

ABOUT PART 2 OF THIS *MANUAL*

Part 2 of this *Manual* is a technical resource to explain the criteria and procedures applied by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) in evaluating the performance of alternative education campuses (AECs) including charters and charter campuses that:

- are dedicated to serving students at risk of dropping out of school;
- are eligible to receive an alternative education accountability (AEA) rating; and
- register annually for evaluation under AEA procedures.

Registered AECs and charters rated under AEA procedures are subject to all the terms and provisions of this *Manual*.

EDUCATOR INPUT

While it was the role of the Commissioner of Education to develop AEA procedures, the commissioner relied extensively on the detailed review, study, and advice of educators and other education stakeholders. The resulting procedures contain appropriate indicators for AECs and charters with increased rigor phased in over time.

HISTORY OF AEA

Enacted by the Texas legislature in 1993, accountability legislation mandated the creation of an accountability system for all Texas schools. This accountability system integrated the statewide curriculum; the state criterion-referenced assessment system; district and campus accountability; district and campus recognition for high performance and significant increases in performance; sanctions for poor performance; and school, district, and state reports.

A set of alternative performance measures for campuses serving at-risk students was developed in late 1994 and implemented in the 1995-96 school year. In order for a campus to qualify as alternative, it was required to serve one or more of the following student populations: students at risk of dropping out; recovered dropouts; pregnant or parenting students; adjudicated students; students with severe discipline problems; or expelled students.

For the 1995-96 school year, alternative accountability ratings were based on state-approved district proposals that included student performance indicators, current-year data, and comparisons of pre- and post-assessment results. Following a review of campus data by the local board of trustees, each district made an initial determination of the campus rating. This initial determination was then forwarded to the TEA where it was reviewed by a panel of peer reviewers who sent a recommendation to the commissioner.

From the 1995-96 to 2001-02 school years, revisions were made to the ratings criteria and procedures determined by an *ad hoc* Alternative Education Advisory Committee:

- Minimum performance levels for an *Acceptable* rating were established in 1996-97.
- Beginning in 1996-97, school districts were required to select campus-based performance indicators from a menu of state-established indicators.

- In 1997-98, TEA staff assumed responsibility for the review and analysis of campus performance data.
- In 1999-00, TEA required that the rating for each AEC be determined on three base indicators: Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) passing rates for reading and mathematics, dropout rates, and attendance rates.
- In 1999-00, disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs) and juvenile justice alternative education programs (JJAEPs) were no longer permitted to register for AEA. Instead, the performance of students served in these programs was attributed to the campuses where these students would otherwise have attended.
- In 2000-01, campuses were required to serve “students at risk of dropping out of school” as defined in Texas Education Code (TEC) §29.081(d) in order to be eligible to receive an accountability rating under AEA procedures.

House Bill 6, enacted by the 77th Texas Legislature, called for a pilot program to examine issues surrounding accountability of alternative education programs. The purposes of this pilot were to analyze the existing status of AECs and to make recommendations regarding the methods of evaluating the performance of these campuses. In order to achieve these purposes, the following activities were undertaken in 2002:

- a set of surveys for principals, teachers/counselors, parents, and students at AECs was administered;
- a more detailed survey was administered and follow-up telephone calls were made to a small sample of AECs;
- an analysis of existing Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data was undertaken; and
- individual student data from a small sample of AECs were compiled and analyzed.

Results of the pilot program are published in the *Report on the Alternative Education Accountability Pilot* (Texas Education Agency, December 1, 2002).

While these pilot activities were conducted, the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), Public Law 107-110, was signed into law. This federal legislation was considered as part of the pilot project report. Accountability provisions of NCLB require that all campuses, including AECs, be evaluated annually for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

The 2003 Educator Focus Group on Accountability made a recommendation to develop new AEA procedures for 2005 and beyond. The new AEA procedures are based on the following guidelines:

- The AEA indicators are based on data submitted through standard data submission processes such as PEIMS or by the state testing contractor.
- The AEA measures are appropriate for alternative education programs offered on AECs rather than just setting lower standards on the same measures used in the standard accountability procedures. Furthermore, these measures ensure that all students demonstrate proficiency on the state assessments in order to graduate.

- The Texas Growth Index (TGI) and other improvement indicators are evaluated as base indicators for AEC ratings.
- Additional AEA criteria are included. For example, AECs must have a minimum percentage of at-risk students (based on PEIMS data reported on current-year fall enrollment records) to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

Also, in 2003, ratings for all campuses were suspended for one year while the new Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) assessments were implemented for the first time and the new state accountability system was developed. In 2004, registered AECs received a rating of *Not Rated: Alternative Education* while new AEA procedures were developed.

In 2005, registered AECs were evaluated for the first time under the newly developed, redesigned AEA procedures. From 2006 to 2009, the amendments below were made to the AEA procedures.

- The at-risk registration criterion began at 65% in 2006 and increased by five percentage points annually until it reached 75% in 2008, where it remains.
- Beginning in 2008, AEA campuses and charters are evaluated on Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) indicators.
- Beginning in 2009, the Texas Projection Measure (TPM) is used in the TAKS Progress indicator.

PHILOSOPHY OF AEA

AEA procedures are based on the following principles:

- Procedures apply to AECs, not programs.
- Procedures apply to AECs and charters dedicated to serving students at risk of dropping out of school.
- Procedures apply only to those AECs that qualify and register for evaluation under AEA procedures.
- Procedures do not apply to DAEPs or JJAEPs. Statute or interpretation of statutory intent requires that DAEP and JJAEP data are attributed to the student's home campus.
- Procedures do not apply to standard campuses, even if the campus primarily serves at-risk students.

The following issues affect many components of the accountability system.

- Small numbers of test results and mobility – AECs are smaller on average than standard campuses and have high mobility rates.
- Attribution of data – High mobility also affects attribution of data and complicates evaluation of AEC data.
- Residential Facilities – Education services are provided to students in residential programs and facilities operated under contract with the Texas Youth Commission (TYC), students in detention centers and correctional facilities that are registered with

the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC), and students in private residential treatment centers.

OVERALL DESIGN OF AEA PROCEDURES

The overall design of the AEA procedures is an improvement model that allows AECs and charters to meet either an absolute performance standard or an improvement standard for each accountability measure.

The AEA procedures include these major components:

- Rating labels – *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*, *AEA: Not Rated – Other*, and *AEA: Not Rated – Data Integrity Issues*;
- AEC registration criteria and requirements including an at-risk registration criterion;
- Base Indicators – TAKS Progress, Completion Rate II, and Annual Dropout Rate;
- Additional Features – Required Improvement and use of district at-risk data; and
- AEA GPA recognize high performance on indicators other than those used to determine AEA ratings and are reported for AECs and charters rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

COMPARISON OF 2009 AND 2010 AEA PROCEDURES

The AEA ratings issued in 2010 mark the sixth year of the current procedures. Many components of the 2010 system are the same as those that were in effect in 2009. However, there are several significant differences between 2009 and 2010:

- In 2010, the phase-in of the TAKS (Accommodated) assessments is complete. TAKS (Accommodated) results for all grades and subjects are evaluated for 2010 ratings.
- The phase-in of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition of a dropout is complete for the Completion Rate II indicator. All four years of the 2009 cohort are based on the NCES dropout definition.
- The standard for the AEA GPA TSI indicators increases by five points to 65.0%.

The following table provides details on changes between the 2009 and 2010 systems. Components that are unchanged are provided as well.

Table 10: Comparison of 2009 and 2010 – AEA Procedures

Component	2009	2010		
Base Indicators for Determining Rating (Chapter 10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAKS Progress • Completion Rate II • Annual Dropout Rate for grades 7–12 	No Change		
Rating Standards (Chapter 10)	TAKS Progress	50%	TAKS Progress	No Change
	Completion Rate II	60.0%	Completion Rate II	No Change
	Dropout	20.0%	Dropout	No Change
TAKS Progress (Chapter 10 unless noted otherwise)				
Grades Tested	Performance results are summed across grades and subjects	No Change		
TAKS (Accommodated) Subjects & Grades Evaluated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELA (grade 11) • Mathematics (grade 11) • Science (grades 5, 8, 10, 11; grade 5 Spanish) • Social Studies (grades 8, 10, 11) 	All subjects and grades evaluated		
TPM	TAKS grade 3-10 tests meeting TPM are included in the TAKS Progress numerator.	No Change		
TGI	TAKS grade 11 tests meeting TGI are included in the TAKS Progress numerator.	No Change		
Accountability Subset	Campus and district accountability subset rules are applied. However, the performance of students displaced by Hurricane Ike who are tested in Texas school districts in 2008-09 is not included in the TAKS Progress indicator used for 2009 accountability ratings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Campus Accountability Subset</i> – AECs are accountable for TAKS results for students enrolled on the AEC on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date and on the testing date. • <i>District Accountability Subset</i> – Charters are accountable for TAKS results for students enrolled at the charter on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date and on the testing date. 		
Evaluation of Student Groups	All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged	No Change		
Minimum Size Criteria for All Students	All Students performance is always evaluated.	No Change		
Minimum Size Criteria for Student Groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 to 49 tests for the student group and the student group represents at least 10% of All Students tests; or • at least 50 tests for the student group even if these tests represent less than 10% of All Student tests. 	No Change		
District At-Risk Data	The AEC is evaluated on performance of at-risk students in the district if the AEC does not meet the standard or demonstrate RI based on fewer than 10 tests or if the AEC has no TAKS results.	No Change		
Special Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Analysis is conducted for the charter when there are fewer than 10 TAKS tests in the charter. • Special Analysis is conducted for the AEC when there are fewer than 10 at-risk TAKS tests in the district/charter. 	No Change		
Hurricane Ike	Charters and campuses closed for ten or more days may receive a rating of AEA: <i>Not Rated – Other</i> .	None		

Table 10: Comparison of 2009 and 2010 – AEA Procedures (continued)

Component	2009	2010
Completion Rate II (Chapter 10 unless noted otherwise)		
Dropout Definition	Includes three years of NCES dropout definition (2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	Includes four years of NCES dropout definition (2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)
Evaluation of Student Groups	All Students (if minimum size criteria are met); Student groups are not evaluated.	No Change
District At-Risk Data	The AEC of Choice is evaluated on Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district if the AEC of Choice does not meet the standard or demonstrate RI or if the AEC of Choice serves students in any of grades 9-12 but does not have a Completion Rate II.	No Change
Annual Dropout Rate (Chapter 10 unless noted otherwise)		
Evaluation of Student Groups	All Students (if minimum size criteria are met); Student groups are not evaluated.	No Change
District At-Risk Data	The AEC is evaluated on Annual Dropout Rate of at-risk students in the district if the AEC does not meet the standard or demonstrate RI.	No Change
Required Improvement (RI) and AEA GPA		
Required Improvement (Chapter 11)	RI is calculated for the TAKS Progress, Completion Rate II, and Annual Dropout Rate indicators when the standards are not met and when prior year minimum size requirements are met.	No Change
AEA GPA Indicators and Standards (Chapter 13)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment $\geq 30.0\%$ • AP/IB Results $\geq 15\%$ and $\geq 50\%$ • Attendance Rate $\geq 95.0\%$ • Commended Performance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reading/ELA $\geq 30.0\%$ ○ Mathematics $\geq 30.0\%$ ○ Writing $\geq 30.0\%$ ○ Science $\geq 30\%$ ○ Social Studies $\geq 30.0\%$ • RHSP/DAP $\geq 85.0\%$ • SAT/ACT Results $\geq 70\%$ and $\geq 40\%$ • TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ELA $\geq 60.0\%$ ○ Mathematics $\geq 60.0\%$ • College-Ready Graduates $\geq 35\%$ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ELA $\geq 65.0\%$ ○ Mathematics $\geq 65.0\%$

Chapter 8 – AEA Registration Criteria and Requirements

Registration criteria restrict use of alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures to:

- campuses that offer nontraditional programs rather than programs within a standard campus,
- campuses that meet the at-risk registration criterion,
- charters that operate only alternative education campuses (AECs), and
- charters that meet the AEC enrollment criterion.

Alternative Education Campuses (AECs)

AECs including charter AECs must serve students “at risk of dropping out of school” as defined in Texas Education Code (TEC) §29.081(d) and provide accelerated instructional services to these students. Each AEC registered for evaluation under AEA procedures is designated as an AEC of Choice or Residential Facility.

AEC of Choice. At-risk students enroll at AECs of Choice to expedite progress toward performing at grade level and high school completion.

Residential Facility. Education services are provided to students in residential programs and facilities operated under contract with the Texas Youth Commission (TYC), students in detention centers and correctional facilities that are registered with the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC), and students in private residential treatment centers.

In this *Manual* the terms “AEC” and “registered AEC” refer collectively to AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that are registered for evaluation under AEA procedures and meet the at-risk registration criterion.

AEC ELIGIBILITY

AECs have the option to be rated under AEA procedures and indicators. Campuses that choose not to register are evaluated under standard accountability procedures. The performance results of students at registered AECs are included in the district’s performance and used in determining the district’s accountability rating and for acknowledgments.

The following types of campuses have the option to register for evaluation under AEA procedures:

- AEC of Choice and
- Residential Facility.

The following types of campuses are ineligible for evaluation under AEA procedures. Data for these campuses are attributed to the home campus:

- disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs);
- juvenile justice alternative education programs (JJAEPs); and
- stand-alone General Educational Development (GED) programs.

See *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information on DAEPs and JJAEPs.

AEA CAMPUS REGISTRATION PROCESS

The AEA campus registration process is conducted online using the Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE) Accountability website. AECs rated under 2009 AEA procedures were re-registered automatically in 2010. An *AEA Campus Rescission Form* was required from AECs not wishing to remain registered for AEA. An *AEA Campus Registration Form* was required for each AEC not already on the list of registered AECs that wished to be evaluated under 2009-10 AEA procedures. AECs for which 2009 AEA registration was rescinded due to not meeting the at-risk registration criterion were required to submit a *2009-10 AEA Campus Registration Form* if the AEC wished to request AEA campus registration in 2010. The 2010 registration process occurred September 9–23, 2009. The list of registered AECs is available on the AEA website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/aea>.

AEA REGISTRATION CRITERIA

Ten criteria are required for campuses to be registered for AEA. However, the requirements in criteria (6)-(10) may not apply to charter campuses (depending on the terms of the charter) or for community-based dropout recovery campuses established in accordance with TEC §29.081(e). The requirements in criterion (9) apply to Residential Facilities only if students are placed in the facility by the district.

- (1) The AEC must have its own county-district-campus (CDC) number to which Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data are submitted and test answer documents are coded. A program operated within or supported by another campus does not qualify.
- (2) The AEC must be identified in AskTED (Texas School Directory database) as an alternative campus.
- (3) The AEC must be dedicated to serving “students at risk of dropping out of school” as defined in TEC §29.081(d).
- (4) The AEC must operate on its own campus budget.
- (5) The AEC must offer nontraditional settings and methods of instructional delivery designed to meet the needs of the students served on the AEC.
- (6) The AEC must have an appropriately certified, full-time administrator whose primary duty is the administration of the AEC.
- (7) The AEC must have appropriately certified teachers assigned in all areas including special education, bilingual education, and/or English as a second language (ESL) to serve students eligible for such services.
- (8) The AEC must provide each student the opportunity to attend a 7-hour school day as defined in TEC §25.082(a), according to the needs of each student.
- (9) If the campus serves students with disabilities, the students must be placed at the AEC by their Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committee.

- (10) Students with disabilities must receive all services outlined in their current individualized education programs (IEPs). Limited English proficient (LEP) students must receive all services outlined by the language proficiency assessment committee (LPAC). Students with disabilities and LEP students must be served by appropriately certified teachers.

AT-RISK REGISTRATION CRITERION

An at-risk registration criterion was implemented under 2006 AEA procedures. Each registered AEC must have a minimum percentage of at-risk students enrolled on the AEC verified through current-year PEIMS fall enrollment data in order to remain registered and be evaluated under AEA procedures. The at-risk criterion began at 65% in 2006 and increased by five percentage points annually until it reached 75% in 2008, where it remains.

An at-risk registration criterion accomplishes two goals. It restricts use of AEA procedures to AECs that serve large populations of at-risk students and enhances at-risk data quality.

The following safeguards are incorporated for AECs not meeting the at-risk registration criterion.

Prior-Year PEIMS At-Risk Data Safeguard. If a registered AEC does not meet the at-risk criterion in the current year, then it remains under AEA if the AEC meets the at-risk criterion in the prior year. For example, an AEC with an at-risk enrollment below 75% in 2010 and at least 75% in 2009 remains registered in 2010.

New Campus Safeguard. If a new campus is registered for evaluation under AEA procedures, then the AEC is not required to meet the at-risk criterion in its first year of operation. This safeguard provides an accommodation for new campuses with no prior-year data.

Due to timing between AEC registration, PEIMS fall enrollment submission, and PEIMS fall data availability in the spring, the at-risk registration criterion cannot be applied until April. The 2010 AEA campus registration is rescinded for AECs not meeting the at-risk registration criterion or utilizing the safeguards. As a result, the AEC does not qualify for evaluation under AEA procedures and will receive a 2010 rating under standard accountability procedures. The AECs that shifted from AEA to standard accountability received a letter from TEA in May to notify them that the AEC would be evaluated under the standard accountability procedures.

The final list of 2010 registered AECs was posted on the TEASE Accountability and public AEA websites in May 2010. Additionally, an email was sent to all superintendents when the list was available.

The at-risk registration criterion will be evaluated annually to determine whether adjustments are necessary.

Charters

In this publication the term “charter” refers to the charter operator, not an individual charter campus. The terms “charter campus” and “charter AEC” refer to an individual campus.

CHARTERS EVALUATED UNDER AEA PROCEDURES

Under AEA and standard accountability procedures, charter ratings are based on aggregate performance of the campuses operated by the charter. Performance results of all students in the charter are included in the charter’s performance and used in determining the charter’s accountability rating and for acknowledgments.

Charters receiving ratings under AEA procedures are evaluated on the same indicators as registered AECs:

- performance on the *Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)*,
- *Completion Rate II*, and
- *Annual Dropout Rate* for grades 7–12.

Charters that operate only registered AECs. Charters that operate only registered AECs will be evaluated under AEA procedures. Charters that operate only registered Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.

Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs. Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs have the option to be evaluated under AEA procedures if the AEC enrollment criterion described below is met. TEA contacts each charter to obtain their preference. Charters submit their preference online using the TEASE Accountability website. If a preference cannot be obtained, then the charter will be evaluated under standard accountability procedures.

Charters that operate only standard campuses. Charters that operate only standard campuses, either because the campuses choose not to register for evaluation under AEA or the campuses do not meet the at-risk registration criterion, will be evaluated under standard accountability procedures.

AEA ENROLLMENT CRITERION FOR CHARTERS

In order for a charter that operates both standard campuses and registered AECs to be eligible for evaluation under AEA procedures, the charter must meet the AEC enrollment criterion. At least 50% of the charter’s students must be enrolled at registered AECs. AEC enrollment is verified through current-year PEIMS fall enrollment data.

Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs will be evaluated under standard accountability procedures if fewer than 50% of the charter’s students are enrolled at registered AECs. Charters that operate only standard campuses will be evaluated under standard accountability procedures.

Chapter 9 – Attribution of AEC Data

BACKGROUND

From 1999-00 to 2004-05, student data (attendance, completion/dropout, and performance) were attributed to alternative education campuses (AECs) registered for evaluation under alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures only when the student attended the registered AEC for 85 days or more. Under the previous AEA procedures, the AEC accountability rating was based on performance of students enrolled on the campus for 85 days or more. The 85-day rule was implemented before the campus accountability subset was incorporated in the state accountability system.

In 2004, the campus accountability subset was applied for the first time in the state accountability system. Under the campus accountability subset, only test results for students enrolled on the same campus on the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date are included in the campus performance measure.

In 2005, both the campus accountability subset and the 85-day rule were applied. AECs evaluated under AEA procedures were accountable for test results for students enrolled on the AEC on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date and on the testing date if the student had been enrolled on the AEC for 85 days or more. Campus accountability subset does not apply to exit-level retests. 2003-04 leaver data were attributed to the AEC if the student had been enrolled on the AEC for 85 days or more and the AEC was registered for evaluation under AEA procedures in 2004.

For data collected through PEIMS, attribution of attendance and leaver records to the home campus was automated for most students based on attendance data reported for the student. A CAMPUS-ID-OF-ACCOUNTABILITY data element was required when a student's only campus of enrollment was a registered AEC that the student attended for less than 85 days, and/or a disciplinary alternative education program (DAEP), and/or a juvenile justice alternative education program (JJAEP). For assessment data, the test answer document was physically submitted with the answer documents for the student's home campus.

Student data and test documents were only reattributed within the same school district. For this reason, charter campus data were not reattributed. For students who had not attended a standard campus in the district, local policy determined to which campus the short-term AEC student data were attributed.

A comparison of 2003-04 attendance reattribution and test answer documents indicated that reattribution was not always conducted consistently for PEIMS data (an automated process conducted by the state) and test results (a local process). Often, test answer documents for students enrolled on the AEC for fewer than 85 days were not sent back to the student's home campus.

In 2006, the campus accountability subset determined attribution of AEC test data. 2004-05 leaver data were attributed according to the 85-day rule for AECs that were registered for evaluation under AEA procedures in 2005. 2004-05 leaver data were attributed to the last campus of attendance for AECs that were not registered for evaluation under AEA procedures in 2005, but were registered in 2006.

ATTRIBUTION OF DATA

AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities. Campus accountability subset determines attribution of AEC test data. Only test results for students enrolled on the same campus on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date are included in the campus performance measure. Accountability subset does not apply to exit-level retests. School leaver data are attributed to the campus that the student last attended. The 85-day rule is phased out completely for accountability in 2007 and beyond.

DAEPs and JJAEPs. As required in statute, DAEP and JJAEP student data are attributed to the student's home campus.

Chapter 10 – AEA Base Indicators

To determine ratings, the alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures use three base indicators:

- performance on the *Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)*,
- *Completion Rate II* for the Class of 2009, and
- *2008-09 Annual Dropout Rate* for grades 7–12.

TAKS PROGRESS INDICATOR

A single performance indicator is evaluated for TAKS. The TAKS Progress indicator sums performance results across grades (3-12) and across subjects to determine alternative education campus (AEC) and charter ratings under AEA procedures. This indicator is based on the number of tests taken, not on the number of students tested. Students who take multiple TAKS tests are included multiple times (for every TAKS test taken). Students who take multiple TAKS exit-level retests are included only when the passing standard is met.

The TAKS Progress indicator numerator is calculated as the number of TAKS grades 3-10 tests meeting the student passing standard *or* projected to meet the student passing standard based on the Texas Projection Measure (TPM) *and* TAKS grade 11 tests meeting the student passing standard *or* having a Texas Growth Index (TGI) score that meets the student growth standard of 0 (zero) or higher *and* TAKS exit-level retests meeting the student passing standard at the March and April/May administrations or in the previous October or July. The denominator is the number of TAKS tests taken *and* the number of TAKS exit-level retests meeting the student passing standard at the March and April/May administrations or in the previous October or July.

The TAKS Progress indicator includes the following results:

- TAKS grades 3-11 Spring 2010 primary administration:
 - Tests meeting passing standard
 - TPM for grades 3-10 and TGI for grade 11
 - Campus accountability subset
- TAKS grade 12 April/May 2010, March 2010, October 2009, and July 2009 administrations:
 - Tests meeting passing standard
 - No accountability subset
- TAKS grade 11 April/May 2010, March 2010, October 2009, and July 2009 administrations:
 - Retests only
 - Tests meeting passing standard
 - No accountability subset

Who is evaluated for the TAKS Progress Indicator:

- AECs that test students on any TAKS subject.
- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities.
- *Use of District At-Risk Data.* If the AEC does not meet the accountability standard based on results for fewer than 10 tests, or if there are no TAKS results for the AEC, then the AEC is evaluated on the district performance of at-risk students. See *Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA*. If there are results for fewer than 10 at-risk tests in the district, then Special Analysis is conducted. See *Chapter 12 – AEA Ratings*.
- Charters that operate only registered AECs.
- Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

Table 11: TAKS Progress Indicator

	2009	2010	2011
AEA: Academically Acceptable	50%	50%	55%
TAKS Progress Indicator	TAKS + TPM (grades 3-10) + TGI (grade 11) + Exit-Level Retests		
Accountability Subset	District and Campus Accountability Subset; Accountability Subset does not apply to exit-level retests		

Standard: *AEA: Academically Acceptable* – At least 50%.

Student Groups: TAKS performance is always evaluated for All Students. The following student groups that meet minimum size requirements are evaluated: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of TAKS tests that meet the standard } \mathbf{or} \text{ meet TPM (grades 3-10) or meet TGI (grade 11)} \\ \mathbf{and} \\ \text{number of TAKS exit-level retests that meet the standard}}{\text{number of TAKS tests taken } \mathbf{and} \\ \text{number of TAKS exit-level retests that meet the standard}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- *All Students.* All Students performance is always evaluated.
- *Student Groups.* Student groups are evaluated if there are:
 - 30 to 49 tests for the student group and the student group represents at least 10% of All Students tests; *or*
 - at least 50 tests for the student group even if these tests represent less than 10% of All Students tests.

Accountability Subset:

- *Campus Accountability Subset.* AECs are accountable for TAKS results for students enrolled on the AEC on the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date.

- *District Accountability Subset.* Charters are accountable for TAKS results for students enrolled at the charter on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date and on the testing date.
- Accountability subset does not apply to TAKS exit-level results.

Years of Data:

- Spring 2010 grades 3-11 TAKS results (primary administration)
- April/May 2010, March 2010, October 2009, and July 2009 grade 11 exit-level retest results
- April/May 2010, March 2010, October 2009, and July 2009 grade 12 exit-level results

Data Source: Pearson

Other Information:

- *Grades and Subjects.* The TAKS results for English (grades 3-11) and Spanish (grades 3-5) are summed across grades and subjects and are evaluated for All Students and each student group that meets minimum size requirements. Second administration results of grades 5 and 8 reading and mathematics are included.
- *TAKS (Accommodated).* Results for all TAKS (Accommodated) subjects and grades are included in the TAKS Progress indicator beginning in 2010.
- *TAKS-Modified and TAKS-Alternate.* Performance on these tests will not be used in determining ratings for 2010.
- *TAKS Vertical Scale.* The 2010 student passing standards for TAKS reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 (and Spanish grades 3-5) are based on a vertical scale. With the vertical scale, a student's scale score in one grade can be compared to that student's scale score in another grade. It provides information about student growth compared to prior years. As a result, the scale score for *Met Standard* for these grades and subjects is no longer 2100. For more information on the vertical scale, see *Appendix E – Student Growth Measures*.
- *Testing Window.* Results for students given a make-up test within the testing window are included in the accountability measures.
- *Refugees and Asylees.* Beginning in 2010, results of students coded as refugees and/or asylees on the TAKS answer documents will not be used in determining ratings. See *Appendix D – Data Sources*.
- *Rounding of Met Standard Percent.* The TAKS Progress indicator percent *Met Standard* calculations are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%; 79.4999% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.
- *Rounding of Student Group Percent.* The *Student Group* calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. When determining if a student group is at least 10%, the rounded value is used. For example, 40 students in a group out of a total of 421 students is 9.5011876%. Because this rounds to the whole number 10, this student group will be evaluated.

- *TPM.* The TPM was developed for accountability purposes to measure annual student improvement. TPM is a multi-level regression-based model that predicts student performance by subject in the next high-stakes grade (5, 8, and 11). A student projected to be at or above proficiency in the next high stakes grade is determined to have met the improvement standard.

TAKS grades 3-10 tests meeting the student passing standard or projected to meet the student passing standard based on TPM are included in the numerator of the TAKS Progress indicator.

Detailed TPM information can be found in *Appendix E – Student Growth Measures*.

- *TGI.* The TGI was developed for accountability purposes to evaluate individual student growth from one year to the next on the TAKS. The TGI compares how students taking a TAKS subject test in one year perform on the same TAKS subject test in the next higher grade the following year. An individual TGI score indicates the amount of growth for each student in relation to the average growth of all students who performed at the same level in the base year. The TGI score of zero (0) indicates that the year-to-year change in scale score is equal to the average change. The TGI measures growth for a student who passes as well as a student who does not pass the TAKS. The TGI calculation is limited to students who have TAKS test results in the same subject for two consecutive years, in consecutive grades.

Since TPM results are not available at grade 11, TAKS grade 11 tests having a TGI score of zero (0) or higher are included in the numerator of the TAKS Progress indicator.

Detailed TGI information can be found in *Appendix E – Student Growth Measures*.

COMPLETION RATE II INDICATOR [GRADUATES, CONTINUERS, AND GED RECIPIENTS]

This longitudinal rate shows the percent of students who first attended grade 9 in the 2005-06 school year who graduated, received a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, or who are continuing their education four years later. Known as the 2005-06 cohort, these students' progress was tracked over the four years using data provided to TEA by districts and charters and data available in the statewide GED database.

Completion Rate II includes graduates, continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year), and GED recipients in the definition of Completion Rate II for AECs of Choice and charters evaluated under AEA procedures.

Beginning with 2007 accountability, the definition of a dropout changed to comply with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition. The transition to the NCES dropout definition also impacts the Completion Rate II indicator. Beginning with 2007 accountability, the dropout component of the Completion Rate denominator changes. In 2007, only one of the four years in the cohort is affected. In 2008, two years of the cohort are affected, and so on, until 2010 when the Completion Rate denominator uses the NCES dropout definition for all four years of the cohort. See *Appendix I* for detailed information on the NCES dropout definition.

Who is evaluated for Completion Rate II:

- AECs of Choice that have served students in grades 9 and 11 or 12 in the first (2005-06) and fifth (2009-10) years of the cohort.
- Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.
- If the AEC of Choice does not serve students in any of grades 9-12 in the 2009-10 school year, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II.
- *Use of District At-Risk Rate.* If the AEC of Choice does not meet the accountability standard, does not meet minimum size requirements for All Students, or if the AEC of Choice has students in any of grades 9-12 but does not have a Completion Rate II, then the AEC of Choice is evaluated on Completion Rate II (including GED recipients) of at-risk students in the district. If at-risk students in the district do not meet minimum size requirements for All Students, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II. See *Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA.*
- Charters that operate only registered AECs.
- Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

Table 12: Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12) Indicator

	2009 Class of 2008; 9th grade 04-05	2010 Class of 2009; 9th grade 05-06	2011 Class of 2010; 9th grade 06-07
AEA: Academically Acceptable	60.0%	60.0%	60.0%
Completion Rate II	Graduates + Continuers + GED Recipients		
Dropout Definition	Phase in NCES definition	NCES definition	
Accountability Subset	School Leaver data are attributed to the last campus of attendance		

Standard: *AEA: Academically Acceptable* – At least 60.0% Completion Rate II.

Student Groups: Completion Rate II is evaluated for All Students. Student groups are not evaluated separately.

Methodology:

number of completers (graduates + continuers + GED recipients)

number of students in class

Minimum Size Requirements:

All Students. These results are evaluated if there are:

- at least 10 dropouts (non-completers), *and*
- at least 10 students in the AEC of Choice or charter Completion Rate II class.

Accountability Subset: Completion data are attributed to the student’s last campus of attendance.

Years of Data:

- Graduating Class of 2009 (results are based on the original 2005-06 cohort, whether the students remain on grade level or not)
- Continued enrollment in 2009-10
- GED records as of August 31, 2009

Data Sources:

- PEIMS Submission 1 enrollment data for 2005-06 through 2009-10
- PEIMS Submission 1 leaver data for 2006-07 through 2009-10
- PEIMS Submission 3 attendance data for 2005-06 through 2008-09
- GED records as of August 31, 2009

Other Information:

- *Transfers.* Any student who transfers into the cohort is added to it, and any student who transfers out of the cohort is subtracted from it.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 74.875% is rounded to 74.9%.
- *Students with Disabilities.* The completion status of students with disabilities is included in this measure.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE (GRADES 7-12) INDICATOR

The Annual Dropout Rate indicator is grade 7-12 dropouts as a percent of total students enrolled at the AEC or charter in grades 7-12 in a single school year.

Beginning with 2007 accountability, the more rigorous NCES dropout definition is used. See *Appendix I* for detailed information on the NCES dropout definition.

Who is evaluated for Annual Dropout Rate:

- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that serve students in any of grades 7-12.
- *Use of District At-Risk Rate.* If the AEC does not meet the accountability standard or demonstrate Required Improvement, then the AEC is evaluated on the Annual Dropout Rate of at-risk students in the district. See *Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA.*
- Charters that operate only registered AECs.
- Charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

Table 13: Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12) Indicator

	2009 from 2007-08	2010 from 2008-09	2011 from 2009-10
AEA: Academically Acceptable	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%
Dropout Definition	NCES definition		
Accountability Subset	School Leaver data are attributed to the last campus of attendance		

Standard: *AEA: Academically Acceptable* – An Annual Dropout Rate of 20.0% or less.

Student Groups: Annual Dropout Rate is evaluated for All Students. Student groups are not evaluated separately.

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of grade 7-12 students designated as 'official' dropouts}}{\text{number of grade 7-12 students in attendance at any time during the school year}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- *All Students.* These results are evaluated if there are:
 - at least 10 dropouts, *and*
 - at least 10 students in grades 7-12.
- If the AEC or charter does not meet the minimum size requirements for All Students, then the AEC or charter is not evaluated on Annual Dropout Rate.

Accountability Subset: Dropout data are attributed to the student's last campus of attendance.

Year of Data: 2008-09

Data Sources:

- PEIMS Submission 1 enrollment data for 2008-09 and 2009-10
- PEIMS Submission 1 leaver data for 2009-10
- PEIMS Submission 3 attendance data for 2008-09

Other Information:

- *Cumulative Attendance.* A cumulative count of students is used in the denominator. This method for calculating the dropout rate neutralizes the effects of mobility by including in the denominator every student reported in attendance at the AEC or charter throughout the school year, regardless of length of stay.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 2.49% is rounded to 2.5%, and 0.25% is rounded to 0.3%.
- *Students with Disabilities.* Students with disabilities who drop out of school are included in this measure.

This page is intentionally blank.

Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA

As shown in *Chapter 10 – AEA Base Indicators*, alternative education campuses (AECs) can achieve a rating by meeting the absolute standards for the different indicators. However, under certain conditions, AECs can achieve a rating by:

- meeting Required Improvement; and/or
- using the accountability data for at-risk students in the district.

All additional features are applied and calculated automatically by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) before ratings are released. AECs do not need to request the use of additional features.

Additional requirements for charters are explained later in this chapter.

Required Improvement

AECs and charters initially rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* may achieve an *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating using the Required Improvement feature. Required Improvement can be applied to all three base indicators: Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) Progress, Completion Rate II, and Annual Dropout Rate.

Required Improvement compares prior-year performance to current-year performance. In order to qualify for this comparison, the target group (All Students or any student group) must meet a minimum size requirement for the prior year. See *Minimum Size Requirements* in this chapter for each indicator.

Who is evaluated for Required Improvement:

- AECs of Choice whose performance is *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* for any TAKS Progress, Completion Rate II, or Annual Dropout Rate measure.
- Residential Facilities whose performance is *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* for any TAKS Progress or Annual Dropout Rate measure. (Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.)
- Charters evaluated under AEA procedures whose performance is *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* for any TAKS Progress, Completion Rate II, or Annual Dropout Rate measure.

TAKS PROGRESS INDICATOR

Improvement Standard: In order for Required Improvement to move an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, the AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient improvement on the deficient TAKS measures to meet a standard of **50%** within two years.

Methodology:

The *Actual Change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*.

Actual Change is the difference between performance in 2010 and 2009.

Required Improvement is the result of the 2010 standard minus performance in 2009 divided by 2.

Example:

In 2010, an AEC has performance above the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* standard in all student groups except for Economically Disadvantaged; only 38% meet the standard. Performance in 2009 for the same group is 21%.

First calculate the *Actual Change*: $38 - 21 = 17$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*: $(50 - 21) / 2 = 15$ (14.5 rounds to 15)

Then compare *Actual Change* to *Required Improvement* to determine if *Actual Change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*: $17 \geq 15$

The AEC meets *Required Improvement*, so its rating is *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

Minimum Size Requirements: Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has less than 10 test results (for the student group) in 2009.

Other Information:

- *Recalculation of Prior Year Results.* For purposes of calculating RI, 2009 assessment results will be rebuilt to:
 - include TAKS (Accommodated) results for all subjects and grades,
 - use only first administration results for grade 3 reading, and
 - use the new vertical scale for grades 3-8 reading and mathematics.
- *Rounding.* All improvement calculations of performance rates and standards are rounded to whole numbers. For example, 4.5% is rounded to 5%.

COMPLETION RATE II INDICATOR [GRADUATES, CONTINUERS, AND GED RECIPIENTS]

Improvement Standard: In order for Required Improvement to move an AEC of Choice or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, the AEC of Choice or charter must demonstrate sufficient improvement in the Completion Rate II to meet a standard of **60.0%** within two years.

Methodology:

The *Actual Change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement*.

Actual Change is the difference between the Completion Rate II for the Class of 2009 and the Class of 2008.

Required Improvement is the result of the 2010 standard minus the Completion Rate II for the Class of 2008 divided by 2.

Example:

An AEC of Choice has a Class of 2009 Completion Rate II of 57.3% for All Students. The Class of 2008 Completion Rate II for All Students is 48.8%.

First calculate the *Actual Change*: $57.3 - 48.8 = 8.5$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*: $(60.0 - 48.8) / 2 = 5.6$

Then compare *Actual Change* to *Required Improvement* to determine if *Actual Change* is greater than or equal to the *Required Improvement*: $8.5 \geq 5.6$

The AEC of Choice meets *Required Improvement*, so its rating is *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

Minimum Size Requirements: Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC of Choice or charter has less than 10 students in the Completion Rate II Class of 2008.

Other Information:

- *Completion Rate II Definition.* Completion Rate II for the prior year is computed using the same definition as the current year so that gain from the prior year to the current year uses comparable data for both years. Specifically, the Completion Rate II definition includes graduates, General Educational Development (GED) recipients, and continuing students as completers.
- *NCES Dropout Definition.* Beginning with 2007 accountability, the definition of a dropout changes to comply with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition. This transition to the NCES dropout definition impacts the Completion Rate II indicator. Beginning with 2007 accountability, the dropout component of the Completion Rate denominator changes. In 2007, only one of the four years in the cohort is affected. In 2008, two years of the cohort are affected, and so on, until 2010 when the Completion Rate denominator uses the NCES dropout definition for all four years of the cohort. See *Appendix I* for detailed information on the NCES dropout definition.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 4.85% is rounded to 4.9%.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE INDICATOR

Improvement Standard: In order for Required Improvement to move an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, the AEC or charter must demonstrate a decline in the Annual Dropout Rate to be at **20.0%** within two years.

Methodology:

The *Actual Change* must be equal to or less than the *Required Improvement*.

Actual Change is the difference between the 2008-09 and 2007-08 Annual Dropout Rates.

Required Improvement is the result of the 2010 standard minus the 2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate divided by 2.

This calculation measures declines in rates. The *Actual Change* in the Annual Dropout Rate must be less than or equal to the *Required Improvement* for the standard to be met and will

contain negative numbers. The *Actual Change* needs to be a larger negative number than the required change.

Example:

In 2008-09, an AEC had an Annual Dropout Rate for All Students of 22.8%. The Annual Dropout Rate in 2007-08 for All Students was 34.2%.

First calculate the *Actual Change*: $22.8 - 34.2 = -11.4$

Next calculate the *Required Improvement*: $(20.0 - 34.2) / 2 = -7.1$

Then compare *Actual Change* to *Required Improvement* to determine if the *Actual Change* is less than or equal to the *Required Improvement*: $-11.4 \leq -7.1$

The AEC meets *Required Improvement*, so its rating is *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

Minimum Size Requirements: Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has less than 10 grade 7-12 students in 2007-08.

Other Information:

- *NCES Dropout Definition.* Beginning with 2007 accountability, the definition of a dropout changed to comply with the NCES definition. See *Appendix I* for detailed information on the NCES dropout definition.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, -1.875% is rounded to -1.9%.

Use of District At-Risk Data

In limited circumstances, data for at-risk students in the district are used to evaluate registered AECs. Use of data for at-risk students in the district acknowledges that AECs are part of the overall district strategy for education of students at risk of dropping out of school.

AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities may be evaluated on the TAKS Progress and Annual Dropout Rate indicators using data for at-risk students in the district. AECs of Choice may be evaluated on Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district.

TAKS PROGRESS INDICATOR

Who is evaluated for the TAKS Progress Indicator using performance data of at-risk students in the district:

- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that do not meet the 50% standard, do not demonstrate Required Improvement, and have results for fewer than 10 tests in the current year.
- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities with no TAKS results.

Required Improvement: If the AEC does not meet the performance standard based on district performance data of at-risk students, then Required Improvement is calculated using district performance data of at-risk students.

Minimum Size Requirements: If there are less than 10 at-risk TAKS test results in the district, then Special Analysis is conducted.

Special Analysis: Special Analysis consists of analyzing current and past performance data to determine if the initial rating assigned under the automated evaluation process is an aberration or an indication of consistent performance. Methods of Special Analysis are discussed in *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances*.

Table 14: Use of TAKS Data of At-Risk Students in the District

Number of TAKS tests at the AEC	Does the AEC meet the performance standard on its own data?	Does the AEC demonstrate Required Improvement (RI) on its own data?	Does the AEC meet the performance standard using district performance data of at-risk students?
10 or more	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A
	No	Yes – assign rating	N/A
		No – assign rating	
Less than 10	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A
	No	Yes – assign rating	N/A
		No	Yes – assign rating
			No – calculate district RI; assign rating
None	N/A	N/A	Yes – assign rating
			No – calculate district RI; assign rating

COMPLETION RATE II INDICATOR [GRADUATES, CONTINUERS, AND GED RECIPIENTS]

Who is evaluated for Completion Rate II using data of at-risk students in the district:

- AECs of Choice that do not meet the 60.0% accountability standard or demonstrate Required Improvement.
- AECs of Choice that have completion data, but do not meet minimum size requirements for All Students.
- AECs of Choice that serve students in any of grades 9-12, but do not have a Completion Rate II.
- If the AEC of Choice does not serve students in any of grades 9-12 in the 2009-10 school year, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II.

Required Improvement: If the AEC of Choice does not meet the accountability standard based on at-risk students in the district, then Required Improvement is calculated using Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district.

Minimum Size Requirements:

- Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district is evaluated if there are:
 - at least 10 at-risk dropouts (non-completers), **and**
 - at least 10 students in the district at-risk Completion Rate II class.
- If at-risk students in the district do not meet minimum size requirements, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II.

Table 15: Use of Completion Rate II Data of At-Risk Students in the District

Does the AEC of Choice serve students in grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12 in 2009-10?	Does the AEC of Choice have a Completion Rate II and meet minimum size requirements in 2008-09?	Does the AEC of Choice meet the accountability standard on its own data?	Does the AEC of Choice demonstrate Required Improvement (RI) on its own data?	Do at-risk students in the district meet minimum size requirements?	Does the AEC of Choice meet the accountability standard using Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district?	
Yes	Yes	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A	N/A	
		No	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A	
			No	Yes	Yes – assign rating	
				No – calculate district RI; assign rating		
	No	N/A				
	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes – assign rating
					No – calculate district RI; assign rating	
					No	N/A
No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE INDICATOR

Who is evaluated for Annual Dropout Rate using data of at-risk students in the district:

AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that do not meet the 20.0% standard or demonstrate Required Improvement.

Required Improvement: If the AEC does not meet the accountability standard based on at-risk students in the district, then Required Improvement is calculated using Annual Dropout Rate of at-risk students in the district.

Minimum Size Requirements: Annual Dropout Rate of at-risk students in the district is evaluated if there are:

- at least 10 at-risk dropouts (non-completers), *and*
- at least 10 at-risk students in the district in grades 7-12.

Table 16: Use of Annual Dropout Data of At-Risk Students in the District

Number of Dropouts	Does the AEC meet the accountability standard on its own data?	Does the AEC demonstrate Required Improvement (RI) on its own data?	Does the AEC meet the accountability standard using Annual Dropout Rate of at-risk students in the district?
10 or more	Yes – assign rating	N/A	N/A
	No	Yes – assign rating	N/A
		No	Yes – assign rating
			No – calculate district RI; assign rating
0 - 9	N/A	N/A	N/A

Additional Requirements for Charters

Underreported Students: Charters evaluated under AEA procedures are subject to underreported student standards as described in *Chapter 3 – The Basics: Additional Features*. Although the charter AEA rating is not affected, Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) will continue to evaluate this indicator at the 2010 standards in its Data Validation system.

Additional Students in Charter Ratings: Charters evaluated under AEA procedures are responsible for the performance of all students, including those who attend campuses that receive a rating of *AEA: Not Rated – Other*.

AECs Rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*

Registered AECs rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* do not prevent a district rating of *Exemplary* or *Recognized*.

This page is intentionally blank.

Chapter 12 – AEA Ratings

This chapter illustrates how to apply the alternative education accountability (AEA) indicator data results and the additional features of AEA to determine ratings for registered alternative education campuses (AECs) and charters evaluated under AEA procedures.

WHO IS RATED?

The state accountability system is required to rate all districts and campuses serving students in grades 1-12. Under the AEA procedures, the first step in determining AEA ratings is to identify the universe of AECs and charters. The AEA universe consists of:

- AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that meet the registration criteria, register as an AEC, and meet the at-risk registration criterion;
- charters that operate only registered AECs; and
- charters that operate both standard campuses and registered AECs, meet the AEC enrollment criterion, and opt to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

The next step is to determine whether the AEC or charter has Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) results on which it can be evaluated. In order to attain an *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating, AECs and charters must have at least one TAKS test result. The term "TAKS test result" includes TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) results used in TAKS Progress indicator calculations. In addition, performance on only the TAKS (Accommodated) assessments that are included in the TAKS Progress indicator is sufficient for a rating to be assigned. Furthermore, performance on any one of the TAKS subjects is sufficient for a rating to be assigned. AECs with no TAKS test results are evaluated using district at-risk performance results. Information on use of district at-risk data is in *Chapter 11 – Additional Features of AEA*. AECs and charters need not have data for the Completion Rate II and Annual Dropout Rate indicators to receive an AEA rating. Charters that have only Completion Rate II and/or Annual Dropout Rate will not receive an AEA rating.

AECs and charters with very small numbers of TAKS test results in the accountability subset may ultimately receive an *AEA: Not Rated – Other* label. Special Analysis is employed when very small numbers of total tests determine whether a rating is appropriate. AECs undergo Special Analysis when the AEC is evaluated on district at-risk data and there are fewer than 10 at-risk TAKS tests in the district accountability subset. Charters are rated on the aggregate performance of all students in the charter. Charters with TAKS results for fewer than 10 tests will receive Special Analysis under circumstances similar to those used in the standard accountability procedures. Special Analysis consists of analyzing current and past performance data to determine if the initial rating assigned under the evaluation process is an aberration or an indication of consistent performance. Additional details on Special Analysis are in *Chapter 6 – Special Issues and Circumstances*.

AEA RATING LABELS

Accountability rating labels for districts are specified in statute. Beginning in 2004, campuses are assigned the same labels as districts under the standard accountability procedures. Registered AECs and charters rated under AEA procedures are assigned one of the following four rating labels.

Table 17: AEA Rating Labels

	Registered AECs	Charters
<i>AEA: Academically Acceptable</i>	Assigned to registered AECs with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ at least one TAKS test (summed across grades and subjects); or ○ no TAKS test results and are evaluated using district at-risk performance results. 	Assigned to charters with at least one TAKS test (summed across grades and subjects). Charters with fewer than 10 TAKS test results receive Special Analysis.
<i>AEA: Academically Unacceptable</i>		
<i>AEA: Not Rated – Other</i>	Assigned to registered AECs and charters with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ no students enrolled in grades tested; or ○ no TAKS data in the accountability subset or exit-level data on which to rate. 	
<i>AEA: Not Rated – Data Integrity Issues</i>	<p>Used in the rare situation where the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results are compromised and it is not possible to assign a rating label based on the evaluation of performance. This label may be assigned temporarily pending an on-site investigation or may be assigned as the final rating label for the year.</p> <p>This rating label is not equivalent to an <i>AEA: Academically Unacceptable</i> rating. The Commissioner of Education also has the authority to lower a rating or assign an <i>AEA: Academically Unacceptable</i> rating to address problems with the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results that are discovered through accountability system safeguards, Performance-Based Monitoring, or other monitoring and compliance reviews. The accreditation status of a district may also be lowered due to data integrity issues.</p> <p>The district or a campus may receive a rating of <i>AEA: Not Rated – Data Integrity Issues</i>, either temporarily or permanently, or the campus or district rating may be lowered due to data integrity problems.</p> <p>See <i>Chapter 16 – Responsibilities and Consequences</i> for more information about the circumstances that trigger this rating label.</p>	

Accountability ratings are final when the accountability appeals process for the year is completed in the fall following release of the ratings in July/August.

USING THE DATA TABLE TO DETERMINE AN AEA RATING

In late June, completion/dropout data will be released to districts and campuses in the Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE). In late July, prior to finalizing all computations necessary for accountability ratings, preview data tables will be available for districts and campuses in TEASE.

These tables will *not* show a rating and will *not* provide calculations for Required Improvement. However, by using the preview data tables and the *2010 Accountability Manual*, districts can anticipate their ratings in advance of the TEA ratings release on July 30. *The preview data tables will contain unmasked data and must be treated as confidential.* The performance of individual students may be shown.

A sample unmasked preview data table for a campus serving grades 9-12 follows. This grade span includes data for all AEA indicators.

Table 18: Sample AEA Data Table

July 2010

Texas Education Agency
CONFIDENTIAL

Page 1 of 2

1

2010 Preview Accountability Data Table
Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures

3

District Name: SAMPLE ISD
Campus Name: SAMPLE ALTERNATIVE LEARNING CENTER
Campus Number: 999999999
Campus Type: AEC of Choice

Grade Span: 09 – 12
% At-Risk: 75%

2

4

Rating:

5

District at-risk TAKS data used.
District at-risk Completion Rate II used.

Analysis groups used to determine ratings are marked with an 'X.'

6

	District At-Risk	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ Disadv
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) (Grades 3-12)						
Analysis Groups Evaluated	X	X				
2009-10 Progress Measure						
# Tests Met Standard	33,197	2	0	2	0	2
# Tests	46,756	8	0	8	0	8
% Met Standard	71%	25%	0%	25%	0%	25%
Student Group %	n/a	100%	0%	100%	0%	100%
2008-09 Progress Measure						
# Tests Met Standard	26,881	3	0	3	0	3
# Tests	44,067	9	0	9	0	9
% Met Standard	61%	33%	0%	33%	0%	33%
Required Improvement						
Actual Change	10	-8	0	-8	0	-8

'n/a' indicates that the data are not applicable.
(-) indicates that data are not available.

Table 18: Sample AEA Data Table (continued)

July 2010

Texas Education Agency
CONFIDENTIAL

Page 2 of 2

2010 Preview Accountability Data Table
Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures

District Name: SAMPLE ISD
Campus Name: SAMPLE ALTERNATIVE LEARNING CENTER
Campus Number: 999999999
Campus Type: AEC of Choice

Grade Span: 09 – 12
% At-Risk: 75%

Rating:

District at-risk TAKS data used.
District at-risk Completion Rate II used.

Analysis groups used to determine ratings are marked with an 'X.'

	District At-Risk	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ Disadv
7 Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12)						
Analysis Groups Evaluated	X	X				
Class of 2009						
# Completers	1,824	29	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
# Non-completers	181	24	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
# in Class	2,005	53	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Completion Rate	91.0%	54.7%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Class of 2008						
# Completers	1,661	25	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
# in Class	1,992	52	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Completion Rate	83.4%	48.1%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Required Improvement						
Actual Change	7.6	6.6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
8 Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12)						
Analysis Groups Evaluated		X				
2008-09						
# Dropouts	190	20	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
# Students in Grades 7-12	2,405	208	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Dropout Rate	7.9%	9.6%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2007-08						
# Dropouts	31	6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
# Students in Grades 7-12	1,464	94	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Dropout Rate	2.1%	6.4%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Required Improvement						
Actual Change	5.8	3.2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

'n/a' indicates that the data are not applicable.
(-) indicates that data are not available.

The sample preview data table illustrates the types of information provided. *Chapter 10 – AEA Base Indicators* contains detailed information about each measure. The final AEA data table released in July may include minor modifications. An explanation of each numbered topic follows.

1. **Confidential:** Performance data are unmasked on the AEA data tables posted in TEASE. For this reason, personal student information may be shown. To be compliant with the federal *Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act* (FERPA), all unmasked data must be treated as confidential.

Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures: This indicates that the AEC or charter is rated under AEA procedures. Campuses not registered for evaluation under AEA procedures are evaluated under standard accountability procedures.

2. **% At-Risk:** All registered AECs must meet the at-risk registration criterion or the applicable safeguards in order to remain registered and be evaluated under AEA procedures.
3. **Campus Type:** Each AEC registered for evaluation under AEA procedures is designated as an AEC of Choice or Residential Facility.
4. **Rating:** AEA rating labels are not available for the preview data tables.
5. **Messages:** A complete list of messages that may appear on AEA data tables is provided later in this chapter.

District at-risk TAKS data used: If an AEC has no TAKS results or does not meet the 50% TAKS Progress standard based on results for fewer than 10 tests, then the AEC is evaluated on performance of at-risk students in the district.

If the AEC does not meet the performance standard based on district performance data of at-risk students, then Required Improvement is calculated using district performance data of at-risk students.

District at-risk Completion Rate II used: If the AEC of Choice does not meet the 60.0% Completion Rate II standard or demonstrate Required Improvement, does not meet minimum size requirements for All Students, or if the AEC of Choice serves students in any of grades 9-12 but does not have a Completion Rate II, then the AEC of Choice is evaluated on the Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district.

If the AEC of Choice does not meet the accountability standard based on at-risk students in the district, then Required Improvement is calculated using Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district.

6. **Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) (Grades 3-12):** One of the three AEA base indicators on which AECs and charters are evaluated. The TAKS Progress indicator evaluates test results across grades and subjects.

Analysis Groups Evaluated: Analysis groups used to determine AEA ratings are marked with an ‘X.’

Tests Met Standard: The numerator used to calculate *% Met Standard* – TAKS grades 3-10 tests meeting the standard or projected to meet based on TPM and TAKS grade 11 tests meeting the standard or having a TGI score that meets the student growth standard of 0 (zero)

or higher and exit-level retests meeting the standard at the spring administrations or in the previous fall or summer.

Tests: The denominator used to calculate *% Met Standard* – TAKS tests taken and exit-level retests meeting the standard at the spring administrations or in the previous fall or summer.

% Met Standard: The percent of tests that met the TAKS Progress standard.

Student Group %: Used to identify which student groups meet minimum size requirements for the indicator. TAKS performance is always evaluated for All Students and the following student groups meeting minimum size requirements: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

TAKS Required Improvement: Moves an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable* if the AEC or charter demonstrates sufficient improvement on the deficient TAKS measures to meet a standard of 50% within two years. Required Improvement is not calculated if the AEC or charter has fewer than 10 test results (for the student group) in 2009.

Actual Change: The difference between performance in 2010 and 2009. *Actual Change* is always shown when two years of data are available.

- 7. Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12):** One of the three AEA base indicators on which AECs of Choice and charters are evaluated. Completion Rate II counts graduates, continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year), and General Educational Development (GED) recipients as completers. This longitudinal rate shows the percent of students who first attended grade 9 in the 2005-06 school year who completed or are continuing their education four years later. Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.

Analysis Groups Evaluated: Analysis groups used to determine AEA ratings are marked with an ‘X.’

Completers: The numerator used to calculate Completion Rate II – number of completers.

Non-completers: Number of grade 9-12 students designated as official dropouts.

in Class: The denominator used to calculate Completion Rate II – number of students in the class.

Completion Rate II: The percent of students that completed high school – *# Completers* divided by *# in Class*.

Completion Rate II (Grades 9-12) Required Improvement: Moves an AEC of Choice or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable* if the AEC of Choice or charter demonstrates sufficient improvement on the Completion Rate II to meet a standard of 60.0% within two years.

Actual Change: The difference between the Completion Rate II for the Classes of 2009 and 2008. *Actual Change* must be equal to or greater than the *Improvement Required*. *Actual Change* is always shown when two years of data are available.

In this example, Required Improvement will be calculated; therefore, *Met Minimum Size Requirements?*, *Improvement Required*, and *Met Required Improvement?* will be shown on the final data table.

8. **Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12):** One of the three AEA base indicators on which AECs and charters are evaluated. This annual rate is grade 7-12 dropouts as a percent of all students enrolled at the AEC or charter in grades 7-12 in a single school year.

Analysis Groups Evaluated: Analysis groups used to determine AEA ratings are marked with an 'X.'

Dropouts: The numerator used to calculate Annual Dropout Rate – number of grade 7-12 students designated as official dropouts.

Students in Grades 7-12: The denominator used to calculate Annual Dropout Rate – number of grade 7-12 students in attendance at any time during the school year.

Dropout Rate: The percent of students that dropped out of school – # *Dropouts* divided by # *Students in Grades 7-12*.

Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12) Required Improvement: Moves an AEC or charter to *AEA: Academically Acceptable* if the AEC or charter demonstrates a sufficient decline in the Annual Dropout Rate to be at 20.0% in two years.

Actual Change: The difference between the 2008-09 and 2007-08 Annual Dropout Rates. *Actual Change* is always shown when two years of data are available.

FINAL DATA TABLES

Preview data tables will be available only via TEASE prior to finalizing accountability ratings. Ratings will be released on July 30, 2010. Final data tables that include masked data will be online and available to districts and the public on July 30. See *Chapter 19 – Calendar* for other important dates.

The following will appear on the final data tables:

Accountability Ratings. AEA rating labels are:

- *AEA: Academically Acceptable,*
- *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*
- *AEA: Not Rated – Other, or*
- *AEA: Not Rated – Data Integrity Issues.*

Messages. When applicable, these messages appear in the top section of the data table after the rating label:

- District at-risk TAKS data used. (AEC only)
- District at-risk Completion Rate II used. (AEC of Choice only)
- District at-risk Annual Dropout Rate used. (AEC only)
- Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II. (Residential Facility only)
- This campus is not rated due to grade span. (AEC only)
- Charter operates only Residential Facilities. (charter only)

- Charter exceeds threshold for underreported students. (charter only)
- Special Analysis conducted. (AEC or charter)
- Completion Rate II not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data. (AEC of Choice or charter)
- Annual Dropout Rate not evaluated due to grade span, small numbers, or no data. (AEC or charter)
- Campus data excluded from district rating calculation due to TEC §39.072(d). (AEC only)
- This charter is not rated. All campus data are excluded from the district rating calculation due to TEC §39.072(d). (charter only)
- Rating changed due to an appeal. Data not modified. (AEC or charter)
- Rating changed after [*date*] due to data integrity issues. (AEC or charter)

Required Improvement. The final data table shows all calculations for Required Improvement when calculated:

- *Met Minimum Size Requirements?* – “Y” or “N” is shown.
- *Actual Change* – The difference between current-year and prior-year data.
- *Improvement Required* – The amount of change needed for Required Improvement to be met.
- *Met Required Improvement?* – If Required Improvement is calculated, “Y” or “N” is shown depending on the comparison of *Actual Change* to the *Improvement Required*.

MASKED DATA

Performance on the data tables posted to the agency website is masked when there are very small numbers of tests or students in the denominator of the measure. Additionally, all performance at or near 0% or 100% is masked. It is necessary to mask data that potentially reveals the performance of a student in order to be in compliance with *FERPA*.

AEA SUMMARY

Two tables follow that summarize the 2010 AEA procedures. *Table 19* provides an overview of the requirements for achieving the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating label. An AEC or charter must meet the criteria for every applicable measure to be rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*. If the criteria are not met for every measure, then *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* is assigned.

For example, to be rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, an AEC or charter must satisfy all requirements for each indicator evaluated. As shown, AECs and charters can meet the criteria for the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating by either meeting an absolute performance standard or demonstrating Required Improvement for the indicators.

Table 20 provides a detailed overview of the 2010 AEA procedures. For each of the indicators, *Table 20* provides a brief definition, use of district at-risk data, the rounding methodology, the standards, the accountability subset methodology, subjects, student groups, minimum size criteria, and application of Required Improvement.

Table 19: Requirements for 2010 AEA: Academically Acceptable Rating

Indicators/Features	AECs of Choice	Residential Facilities	Charters
Assessment Indicator			
TAKS Progress All Students and each student group that meets minimum size criteria: African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadv.	Meets 50% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement (RI) or Meets 50% Standard Using District At-Risk Data or Demonstrates RI Using District At-Risk Data		Meets 50% Standard or Demonstrates RI
Completion/Dropout Indicators			
Completion Rate II All Students only (if minimum size criteria are met)	Meets 60.0% Standard or Demonstrates RI or Meets 60.0% Standard Using District At-Risk Data or Demonstrates RI Using District At-Risk Data	Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.	Meets 60.0% Standard or Demonstrates RI
Annual Dropout Rate All Students only (if minimum size criteria are met)	Meets 20.0% Standard or Demonstrates RI or Meets 20.0% Standard Using District At-Risk Data or Demonstrates RI Using District At-Risk Data		Meets 20.0% Standard or Demonstrates RI
Additional Features			
Required Improvement (RI)	RI is calculated for the TAKS Progress, Completion Rate II, and Annual Dropout Rate indicators when the standards are not met and when prior year minimum size requirements are met.		
Use of District At-Risk Data	TAKS data of at-risk students in the district are used when the 50% standard and RI are not met based on fewer than 10 tests or when there are no TAKS tests.		Performance results of all students in the accountability subset are used in determining the charter rating. The charter rating is not limited to evaluation of at-risk students.
	Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district is used when the 60.0% standard and RI are not met or when students in any grades 9-12 are served but there is no Completion Rate II.	Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.	
	Annual Dropout Rate of at-risk students in the district is used when the 20.0% standard and RI are not met.		
Special Analysis	Special Analysis is conducted when there are fewer than 10 at-risk TAKS tests in the district or charter.		Special Analysis is conducted when there are fewer than 10 TAKS tests in the charter.
Data Integrity	None		Charters are subject to underreported student standards, although the charter AEA rating is not affected.

Table 20: Overview of 2010 AEA Procedures

	TAKS Progress Grades 3-12	Completion Rate II Grades 9-12	Annual Dropout Rate Grades 7-12
Use/Definition	<p>TAKS tests meeting the student passing standard or meeting TPM (grades 3-10) or meeting TGI (grade 11) and TAKS exit-level retests meeting the student passing standard at the spring administrations or in the previous fall or summer divided by total TAKS tests taken and TAKS exit-level retests meeting the standard.</p> <p>Results are summed across grades and subjects. Spanish results are included. Second administration results of grades 5 and 8 reading and mathematics are included. Make-up tests taken within testing window are included. All TAKS (Accommodated) results are included.</p>	<p>A prior year indicator that evaluates graduates, continuers, and GED recipients, expressed as a percent of total students in the Completion Rate II class.</p> <p>AECs of Choice that do not serve students in any of grades 9-12 are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.</p> <p>Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.</p>	<p>A prior year indicator that evaluates the number of grade 7-12 students designated as official dropouts divided by the number of grade 7-12 students in attendance at any time during the school year.</p> <p>If minimum size requirements for All Students are not met, then do not evaluate Annual Dropout Rate.</p>
District At-Risk Data	The AEC is evaluated on performance of at-risk students in the district if the AEC does not meet the standard or demonstrate RI based on fewer than 10 tests or if the AEC has no TAKS results.	The AEC of Choice is evaluated on Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district if the AEC of Choice does not meet the standard or demonstrate RI or if the AEC of Choice serves students in any of grades 9-12 but does not have a Completion Rate II.	The AEC is evaluated on Annual Dropout Rate of at-risk students in the district if the AEC does not meet the standard or demonstrate RI.
Rounding	Whole Numbers	One Decimal	
Standards	50%	60.0%	20.0%
Accountability Subset	<p>Campus accountability subset holds the AEC accountable for students enrolled at the AEC on the fall snapshot and testing dates, but does not apply to exit-level retests.</p> <p>District accountability subset holds the charter accountable for students enrolled at the charter on the fall snapshot and testing dates, but does not apply to exit-level retests.</p>	Completion/Dropout data are attributed to the student's last campus of attendance.	
Subjects	Mathematics, Reading/ELA, Social Studies, Science, Writing	N/A	
Student Groups	All Students and African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged	All Students	All Students
Minimum Size Criteria			
All Students	All Students tests are always evaluated	≥ 10 dropouts (non-completers) and ≥ 10 students	≥ 10 dropouts and ≥ 10 students
Student Groups	30-49 tests for the student group and the student group represents at least 10% of All Students tests or at least 50 tests	N/A	N/A

Table 20: Overview of 2010 AEA Procedures (continued)

	TAKS Progress Grades 3-12	Completion Rate II Grades 9-12	Annual Dropout Rate Grades 7-12
Required Improvement (RI) – A gate up to AEA: <i>Academically Acceptable</i>			
Use/Definition	The AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient gain in TAKS Progress to be at 50% within 2 years.	The AEC of Choice or charter must demonstrate sufficient gain in Completion Rate II to be at 60.0% within 2 years. Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.	The AEC or charter must demonstrate sufficient decline in Annual Dropout Rate to be at 20.0% within 2 years. Improvement will appear as a negative number to demonstrate decline in the dropout rate.
Actual Change	2010 performance minus 2009 performance	Class of 2009 rate minus Class of 2008 rate	2008-09 rate minus 2007-08 rate
Improvement Required	Gain needed to reach 50% standard in 2 years	Gain needed to reach 60.0% standard in 2 years	Decline needed to reach 20.0% standard in 2 years
Minimum Size	Meets minimum size in current year and has at least 10 tests in prior year	Meets minimum size in current year and has at least 10 students in Completion Rate II class in prior year	Meets minimum size in current year and has at least 10 students in grades 7-12 in the prior year
Rounding	Whole Numbers	One Decimal	

This page is intentionally blank.

Chapter 13 – AEA Gold Performance Acknowledgments

The alternative education accountability (AEA) Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) system acknowledges alternative education campuses (AECs) and charters for high performance on indicators other than those used to determine accountability ratings.

There are significant differences between the AEA GPA indicators and the GPA indicators used under standard accountability procedures as described in *Chapter 5*.

- There are 13 AEA GPA indicators. The two Comparable Improvement indicators are inappropriate for AECs and charters and are not evaluated for AEA GPA.
- An Attendance Rate standard of 95.0% is applied to all AECs and charters under AEA GPA.
- Performance is evaluated for All Students only. Student groups are not evaluated separately.

The GPA indicators are in statute (*Texas Education Code*) or determined by the Commissioner of Education. Acknowledgment is given for high performance on the indicators below.

- Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion
- Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate (AP/IB) Results
- Attendance Rate
- College-Ready Graduates
- Commended Performance: Reading/English Language Arts (ELA)
- Commended Performance: Mathematics
- Commended Performance: Writing
- Commended Performance: Science
- Commended Performance: Social Studies
- Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program (RHSP/DAP)
- SAT/ACT Results (College Admissions Tests)
- Texas Success Initiative (TSI) – Higher Education Readiness Component: ELA
- Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: Mathematics

Acknowledgment Categories

Acknowledgments are awarded separately on each of the 13 AEA GPA indicators.

Acknowledged. Assigned to AECs and charters with:

- a rating of *AEA: Academically Acceptable*; and
- performance results that meet the standard on the AEA GPA indicator(s).

Does Not Qualify. Assigned to AECs and charters with performance results to evaluate but:

- the performance results do not meet the standard; or
- the AEC or charter is rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*. (Those that are later granted a higher rating on appeal are eligible to be evaluated and may earn acknowledgments.)

Not Applicable. Assigned to AECs and charters with:

- no performance results to evaluate; or
- a rating of *AEA: Not Rated – Other* (due to insufficient data or no students enrolled in grades tested) or *AEA: Not Rated – Data Integrity Issues*.

Table 21: AEA GPA Standards for 2010

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Standard</i>	<i>Year of Data</i>
Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion	Percent of 9 th –12 th graders completing and receiving credit for at least one Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course	≥30.0%	2008-09
AP/IB Results	Percent of 11 th and 12 th graders taking at least one AP or IB examination <i>AND</i>	≥15.0% <i>AND</i>	2008-09
	Percent of 11 th and 12 th grade examinees scoring at or above the criterion on at least one examination (3 and above for AP; 4 and above for IB)	≥50.0%	
Attendance Rate	Attendance Rate for students in grades 1-12, the total number of days present divided by the total number of days in membership	95.0% (all AECs and charters)	2008-09
College-Ready Graduates	Percent of graduates who scored at or above the criterion score on both the TAKS exit-level, SAT, or ACT ELA and mathematics tests	≥35%	Class of 2009
Commended Performance: Reading/ELA Mathematics Writing Science Social Studies	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the TAKS commended performance standard	≥30%	Spring 2010
RHSP/DAP	Percent of graduates meeting or exceeding requirements for the RHSP/DAP	≥85.0%	Class of 2009
SAT/ACT Results	Percent of graduates taking either the SAT or ACT <i>AND</i>	≥70.0% of graduates <i>AND</i>	Class of 2009
	Percent of examinees scoring at or above the criterion score (SAT 1110; ACT Composite 24)	≥40.0% at or above criterion	
TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component: ELA Mathematics	Percent of grade 11 examinees with a scale score of 2200 or more and a score of 3 or higher on the ELA essay	≥65%	Spring 2010

AEA GPA Indicators

ADVANCED COURSE/DUAL ENROLLMENT COMPLETION

This indicator is based on a count of students who complete and receive credit for at least one advanced course in grades 9-12. Advanced courses include dual enrollment courses. Dual enrollment courses are those for which a student gets both high school and college credit. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for a link to a list of advanced courses.

Who is eligible: AECs and charters with grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12 that are rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, at least 30.0% of the 2008-09 students in grades 9-12 must receive credit for at least one advanced course.

Methodology:
$$\frac{\text{number of students in grades 9-12 who received credit for at least one advanced course}}{\text{number of students in grades 9-12 who completed at least one course}}$$

Year of Data: 2008-09

Data Source: PEIMS Submission 3 (June 2009)

Other information:

- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 24.879% is rounded to 24.9%.

ADVANCED PLACEMENT/INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE (AP/IB) RESULTS

This refers to the results of the College Board AP examinations and the IB examinations taken by Texas public school students in a given school year. High school students may take these examinations, ideally upon completion of AP or IB courses, and may receive advanced placement or credit, or both, upon entering college. Generally, colleges will award credit or advanced placement for scores of 3, 4, or 5 on AP examinations and scores of 4, 5, 6, or 7 on IB examinations. Requirements vary by college and by subject tested.

Who is eligible: AECs and charters with grades 11 and/or 12 that are rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the AEC or charter must meet both participation and performance standards.

- At least 15.0% of the non-special education 11th and 12th graders must be taking at least one AP or IB examination; *and*
- At least 50.0 % of those tested must score at or above the criterion score on at least one AP or IB examination.

Methodology:

Participation:
$$\frac{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ graders taking at least one AP or IB examination}}{\text{total non-special education students enrolled in 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ grades}}$$

Performance:
$$\frac{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ graders with at least one score at or above the criterion score}}{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and } 12^{\text{th}} \text{ graders with at least one AP or IB examination}}$$

Year of Data: 2008-09 school year

Data Source: The College Board; The International Baccalaureate Organization; and PEIMS Submission 1 (October 2008)

Other information:

- *Criterion Score.* The criterion score is 3 or above on AP tests and 4 or above on IB examinations.
- *Special Education.* For *participation*, 11th and 12th graders served by special education who take an AP or IB examination are included in the numerator, but not the denominator. This may have a slight positive effect on the percent reported.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 49.9%.

ATTENDANCE RATE

Attendance rates are based on student attendance for the entire school year for students in grades 1-12.

Who is eligible: AECs and charters whose grade span is within grades 1-12 that are rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the AEC or charter must have at least 95.0% attendance rate.

Methodology:
$$\frac{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were present in 2008-09}}{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were in membership in 2008-09}}$$

Year of Data: 2008-09

Data Source: PEIMS Submission 3 (June 2009)

Other information:

- *Time Span.* Attendance for the entire school year is used.
- *Special Education.* This measure includes students served by special education.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 95.877% is rounded to 95.9%.

COLLEGE-READY GRADUATES

This indicator measures the progress toward preparation for post-secondary success and shows the percent of graduates who scored at or above the criterion score on both the TAKS exit-level, SAT, or ACT ELA and mathematics tests.

A single College-Ready Graduates indicator combining ELA and mathematics is evaluated.

Who is eligible: AECs and charters with graduates that are rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, at least 35% of all 2009 graduates meet or exceed the criterion score on both the TAKS exit-level, SAT, or ACT ELA and mathematics tests.

Methodology:
$$\frac{\text{number of graduates who scored at or above the college-ready criteria on ELA and mathematics}}{\text{number of graduates with results in ELA and mathematics to evaluate}}$$

Year of Data: Class of 2009

Data Source: PEIMS Submission 1 (October 2009); Pearson; The College Board (SAT); and ACT, Inc. (ACT)

Other Information:

- *Criteria Scores.* The table below details the criteria scores by subject that must be met for a graduate to be considered college-ready on this indicator.

Subject	Exit-Level TAKS		SAT		ACT
ELA	≥ 2200 scale score on ELA test and a "3" or higher on essay	or	≥ 500 on Critical Reading and ≥ 1070 Total *	or	≥ 19 on English and ≥ 23 Composite
Math	≥ 2200 scale score	or	≥ 500 on Math and ≥ 1070 Total *	or	≥ 19 on Math and ≥ 23 Composite

* Total is the sum of Critical Reading and Mathematics. It does not include Writing.

- *TAKS (Accommodated).* The TAKS (Accommodated) ELA and mathematics results are included in this indicator.
- *Special Education.* This measure includes graduates served by special education.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%.

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE INDICATORS: READING/ELA, MATHEMATICS, WRITING, SCIENCE, AND SOCIAL STUDIES

TAKS Commended Performance is the highest performance level set on the TAKS. Students who achieve Commended Performance have performed at a level that is considerably above the state passing standard and have shown a thorough understanding of the knowledge and skills at the grade level tested.

A Commended Performance indicator is evaluated for each of the following TAKS subjects: reading/ELA, mathematics, writing, science, and social studies.

Who is eligible: AECs and charters that are rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable* and test students in any of the TAKS subjects below:

- reading (grades 3-9) or ELA (grades 10 and 11),
- mathematics (grades 3-11),
- writing (grades 4 and 7),
- science (grades 5, 8, 10, and 11), or
- social studies (grades 8, 10, and 11).

Standard: For acknowledgment on these indicators, the AEC or charter must have at least 30% of its examinees scoring at or above the Commended Performance standard.

Methodology:
$$\frac{\text{number of test takers achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on reading/ELA, mathematics, writing, science, or social studies}}{\text{total number of test takers in reading/ELA, mathematics, writing, science, or social studies}}$$

Year of Data: 2009-10

Data Source: Pearson

Other information:

- *Scale Scores.* For grades 3-8 reading and mathematics, the Commended Performance standard on the vertical scale will vary by grade level. For grade 9 reading and grades 9-11 mathematics, the Commended Performance standard is a scale score of 2400 or higher. For grades 10 and 11 ELA, a scale score of at least 2400 with a score of 2 or higher on the essay is required. For writing, Commended Performance is a scale score of at least 2400 with a score of 3 or higher on the essay. For science and social studies, Commended Performance is a scale score of at least 2400.
- *Student Success Initiative.* Students who meet the Commended Performance standard in either of the first two administrations of TAKS reading or mathematics are included.
- *Mobility.* Students who move between AECs after October 30, 2009 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of campuses; students who move between charters after October 30, 2009 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of charters. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset in Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 24.877% is rounded to 25%.

RECOMMENDED HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM/DISTINGUISHED ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (RHSP/DAP)

This indicator shows the percent of graduates who were reported as having satisfied the course requirements for the Texas SBOE RHSP or DAP.

Who is eligible: AECs or charters with graduates that are rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, at least 85.0% of all 2009 graduates reported must meet or exceed the requirements for the RHSP or DAP.

Methodology:
$$\frac{\text{number of graduates reported with graduation codes for RHSP or DAP}}{\text{number of graduates}}$$

Year of Data: Class of 2009

Data Source: PEIMS Submission 1 (October 2009)

Other information:

- *Special Education.* This measure includes graduates served by special education.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 79.877% is rounded to 79.9%.

SAT/ACT RESULTS

This indicator shows the performance and participation on two college admissions tests: the College Board's SAT Reasoning Test and ACT, Inc.'s ACT Assessment.

Who is eligible: AECs and charters with graduates that are rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator, the AEC or charter must meet both participation and performance standards.

- At least 70.0% of the class of 2009 non-special education graduates must take either the ACT or the SAT; *and*
- At least 40.0% of those examinees must score at or above the criterion score on at least one examination.

Methodology:

Participation:
$$\frac{\text{number of graduates taking either the SAT or the ACT}}{\text{total non-special education graduates}}$$

Performance:
$$\frac{\text{number of examinees at or above the criterion score}}{\text{number of graduates taking either the SAT or the ACT}}$$

Year of Data: Class of 2009

Data Source: The College Board (SAT) and ACT, Inc. (ACT)

Other information:

- *SAT Reasoning Test.* Although the SAT now includes a writing assessment, performance on writing is not used for determining GPA. The writing component may be incorporated into this GPA indicator in the future.
- *Criterion.* The criterion score is 1110 on the SAT (the sum of the critical reading and mathematics scores) or 24 on the ACT (composite).
- *Most Recent Test.* Annually, both testing companies provide the agency with information on the most recent test participation and performance of graduating seniors from all Texas public schools. Only one record is sent per student. If a student takes an ACT or SAT test more than once, the agency receives the record for the most recent examination taken, not necessarily the examination with the highest score.
- *Both Tests Taken.* If a student takes both the SAT and the ACT, the information is combined so that an unduplicated count of students is used. If the student scored above the criterion on either the SAT or ACT, that student is counted as having scored above the criterion.
- *Campus ID.* The student taking the test identifies the campus to which a score is attributed.
- *Special Education.* For *participation*, graduates served by special education who take the ACT or SAT are included in the numerator, but not the denominator. This may have a slight positive effect on the percent reported.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to one decimal point. For example, 69.877% is rounded to 69.9%.

TEXAS SUCCESS INITIATIVE (TSI) – HIGHER EDUCATION READINESS COMPONENT INDICATORS: ELA AND MATHEMATICS

These indicators show the percent of grade 11 students who are considered ready to begin college-level work, based on their performance on the TAKS exit-level examination.

A TSI – Higher Education Readiness Component indicator is evaluated for each of the following TAKS subjects: ELA and mathematics.

Who is eligible: AECs and charters that test grade 11 students on the exit-level TAKS ELA or mathematics that are rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

Standard: For acknowledgment on this indicator the AEC or charter must have at least 65% of its examinees scoring at or above the TSI standard. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board set the standard of college readiness on the exit-level TAKS at a scale score of 2200 for mathematics and ELA with a score of 3 or higher on the ELA essay.

Methodology:
$$\frac{\text{number of grade 11 test takers with a scale score of 2200 on mathematics or 2200 and a score of 3 or higher on the essay of the ELA test}}{\text{total number of grade 11 students taking mathematics or ELA}}$$

Year of Data: 2009-10

Data Source: Pearson

Other information:

- *Mobility.* Students who move between AECs after October 30, 2009 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of AECs; students who move between charters after October 30, 2009 and before the date of testing are not included in the evaluation of districts. See *Table 3 – Accountability Subset in Chapter 2* for more information.
- *Special Education.* Performance of students served by special education who took the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) is included in this measure.
- *Rounding.* All calculations are expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 49.877% is rounded to 50%.

NOTIFICATION OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Notification of AEA GPA will occur in late October 2010 at the same time as the 2010 ratings update that follows the resolution of all appeals. (See *Chapter 19 – Calendar* for more details.) At that time, the district lists and data tables on the TEA website will be updated to show the acknowledgments earned.

Chapter 14 – AEA Glossary and Index

Alternative Education Accountability Gold Performance Acknowledgment (AEA GPA):

Recognizes charters and campuses rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable* for high performance on indicators other than those used to determine accountability ratings. Acknowledgment is given for high performance on:

- Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion
- Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate (AP/IB) Results
- Attendance Rate
- College-Ready Graduates
- Commended Performance: Reading/English Language Arts (ELA); Mathematics; Writing; Science; and Social Studies
- Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program (RHSP/DAP)
- SAT/ACT Results (College Admissions Tests)
- Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: ELA and Mathematics

See *Chapter 13 – AEA GPA* for detailed information.

Alternative Education Campus (AEC) of Choice: Alternative education programs provide accelerated instructional services to students at risk of dropping out of school. At-risk students enroll at AECs of Choice to expedite progress toward performing at grade level and high school completion.

Annual Dropout Rate: Grade 7-12 dropouts as a percent of total students enrolled at the AEC in grades 7-12 in a single school year. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Dropout Definition is later in this chapter.

At-Risk: In accordance with Texas Education Code (TEC) §29.081(d), a "student at risk of dropping out of school" includes each student who is under 21 years of age and who:

- (1) was not advanced from one grade level to the next for one or more school years;
- (2) if the student is in grade 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, or 12, did not maintain an average equivalent to 70 on a scale of 100 in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum during a semester in the preceding or current school year or is not maintaining such an average in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum in the current semester;
- (3) did not perform satisfactorily on an assessment instrument administered to the student under TEC Subchapter B, Chapter 39, and who has not in the previous or current school year subsequently performed on that instrument or another appropriate instrument at a level equal to at least 110 percent of the level of satisfactory performance on that instrument;
- (4) if the student is in prekindergarten, kindergarten, or grade 1, 2, or 3, did not perform satisfactorily on a readiness test or assessment instrument administered during the current school year;
- (5) is pregnant or is a parent;
- (6) has been placed in an alternative education program in accordance with TEC §37.006 during the preceding or current school year;

- (7) has been expelled in accordance with TEC §37.007 during the preceding or current school year;
- (8) is currently on parole, probation, deferred prosecution, or other conditional release;
- (9) was previously reported through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) to have dropped out of school;
- (10) is a student of limited English proficiency, as defined by TEC §29.052;
- (11) is in the custody or care of the Department of Protective and Regulatory Services or has, during the current school year, been referred to the department by a school official, officer of the juvenile court, or law enforcement official;
- (12) is homeless, as defined by 42 U.S.C. Section 11302, and its subsequent amendments; or
- (13) resided in the preceding school year or resides in the current school year in a residential placement facility in the district, including a detention facility, substance abuse treatment facility, emergency shelter, psychiatric hospital, halfway house, or foster group home.

Campus Accountability Subset: Only test results for students enrolled on the same campus on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date are included in the campus performance measure.

Completion Rate II Indicator: Longitudinal rate that shows the percent of students who graduate, receive a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, or who are continuing their education four years after first attending grade 9. These students' progress is tracked over the four years using data provided to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) by districts and charters and data available in the statewide GED database. Graduates, continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year), and GED recipients are counted as completers in the calculation of Completion Rate II.

District Accountability Subset: Only test results for students enrolled in the same charter on the PEIMS enrollment snapshot date (the last Friday in October) and on the testing date are included in the charter performance measure.

NCES Dropout Definition: Under this definition, a dropout is a student who is enrolled in Texas public school in grade 7-12, does not return to Texas public school the following fall, is not expelled, and does not graduate, receive a GED certificate, continue high school outside the Texas public school system or begin college, or die. See *Appendix I* for more information.

Registered AEC: Term used to refer collectively to AECs of Choice and Residential Facilities that are registered for evaluation under AEA procedures and meet the at-risk registration criterion.

Required Improvement: Compares prior-year performance to current-year performance. In order to qualify for this comparison, the target group (All Students or any student group) must meet a minimum size requirement for the prior year.

Residential Facility: Education services are provided to students in residential programs and facilities operated under contract with the Texas Youth Commission (TYC), students in detention centers and correctional facilities that are registered with the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC), and students in private residential treatment centers.

Special Analysis: Ensures that ratings based on small numbers of tests are assigned appropriately. Special Analysis consists of analyzing current and past performance data to determine if the initial rating assigned under the automated evaluation process is an aberration or

an indication of consistent performance. Special analysis is conducted at the AEC level when there are fewer than 10 at-risk TAKS tests in the district or charter. Special analysis is conducted at the charter level when there are fewer than 10 TAKS tests in the charter.

TAKS (Accommodated): This assessment has the same questions as the TAKS, but allows certain accommodations for students with disabilities. Performance on these tests is being phased into the accountability system over three years. In 2008 and 2009, partial TAKS (Accommodated) results are included in the TAKS Progress indicator. In 2010 and 2011, performance on all TAKS (Accommodated) tests are used in the accountability system.

TAKS Progress Indicator: The TAKS Progress indicator includes TAKS tests meeting the student passing standard *or* meeting the Texas Projection Measure (TPM) at grades 3-10 *or* meeting the Texas Growth Index (TGI) at grade 11 *and* TAKS exit-level retests meeting the student passing standard at the spring administrations (April/May and March) or in the previous fall or summer (October and July).

Texas Growth Index (TGI): Developed for accountability purposes to evaluate individual student growth from one year to the next on the TAKS. The TGI compares how students taking a TAKS subject test in one year perform on the same TAKS subject test in the next higher grade the following year. An individual TGI score indicates the amount of growth for each student in relation to the average growth of all students who performed at the same level in the base year. The TGI score of zero (0) indicates that the year-to-year change in scale score is equal to the average change. The TGI measures growth for a student who passes as well as a student who does not pass the TAKS.

Texas Projection Measure (TPM): TPM is a multi-level regression-based model that predicts student performance by subject in the next high-stakes grade (5, 8, and 11). A student projected to be at or above proficiency in the next high stakes grade is determined to have met the improvement standard.

AEA Index

AEA GPA	80, 82, 117, 118, 125
AEC Enrollment Criterion	86
AEC of Choice	83, 125
Annual Dropout Rate	80, 81, 82, 86, 89, 94, 95, 97, 99, 100, 102, 103, 105, 108, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 125
At-Risk	81, 82, 85, 90, 93, 94, 100, 101, 102, 103, 107, 108, 109, 113, 114, 125
At-Risk Registration Criterion	85
Campus Accountability Subset	81, 90, 91, 114, 126
Completion Rate II	80, 81, 82, 86, 89, 92, 93, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 105, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 126
DAEP	79, 83, 87, 88
District Accountability Subset	81, 91, 114, 126
GED	83, 92, 93, 94, 99, 110, 114, 126
JJAEP	79, 83, 87, 88
National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)	80, 82, 92, 99, 126
Registered AEC	77, 103, 106, 126
Required Improvement	80, 82, 94, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 126
Residential Facility	83, 86, 109, 111, 126
Special Analysis	81, 90, 93, 95, 101, 105, 106, 112, 113, 127
Student Groups	81, 82, 90, 93, 95, 114
TAKS (Accommodated)	81, 91, 105, 114, 121, 122, 124, 127
TAKS Progress Indicator	81, 89, 90, 97, 100, 127
TEASE Accountability	84, 85, 86, 106, 109
TGI	79, 81, 90, 92, 98, 109, 114, 127
TJPC	79, 83, 126
TPM	80, 89, 127
TYC	79, 83, 126
Use of District At-Risk Data	81, 82, 90, 93, 94, 100, 113

**The 2010 Accountability Rating System
for Texas Public Schools and School Districts**

Part 3

**Items Common to
Standard and AEA Procedures**

In Part 3:

Chapter 15 – Appealing the
Ratings 131

Chapter 16 –
Responsibilities and
Consequences 141

Chapter 17 – Accountability
Standards for 2011 149

Chapter 18 – Preview of
2011 and Beyond 153

Chapter 19 – Calendar . 163

Chapter 15 – Appealing the Ratings

Providing superintendents with the opportunity to appeal accountability ratings has been a feature of the state accountability system since 1994. Superintendents may appeal the state accountability ratings for both standard and alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures by following the guidelines provided in this chapter.

NEW!! Beginning with 2010 state accountability ratings, the appeals process has two steps. Districts should register their district and campus rating appeals using the Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE) Accountability website. This new TEASE appeals registration system provides a mechanism for tracking all state accountability rating appeals and allows districts to monitor the status of their appeals. After registering, districts must then submit their appeal via the mail as has been done in the past.

Below are the dates for appealing ratings. **These deadlines are final. To maintain a fair appeals process, no late appeals will be considered.**

APPEALS CALENDAR

June 18, 2010	<i>Dropout/Completion Lists.</i> Superintendents are given access to confidential lists of dropouts and lists of completion cohort membership. These reports provide a preview of the data that will be used to calculate the Annual Dropout Rate and Completion Rate base indicators for the state accountability ratings.
July 20, 2010	<i>Preview Data Tables.</i> Superintendents are given access to confidential preview accountability data tables for their district and campuses showing all state accountability indicator data. Principals and superintendents can use these data tables to anticipate their campus and district accountability ratings.
July 20 through August 13, 2010	<i>2010 Appeals Window.</i> Appeals may be submitted <i>by the superintendent</i> after receipt of the preview data tables. Districts register their district and campus appeals using the TEASE Accountability website then submit the appeal with supporting documentation via the mail. See “How to Appeal” later in this chapter for more details.
July 30, 2010	<i>Ratings Release.</i> Due to the short timeline between the transmittal of the preview data tables and the ratings release date, no appeals will be resolved before the ratings release.
August 13, 2010	<i>Appeals Deadline.</i> Appeals must be postmarked or hand delivered no later than August 13, 2010 in order to be considered.
Mid-October, 2010	<i>Decisions Released.</i> Commissioner’s decisions are mailed in the form of response letters to each appellant. Letters are posted to the TEASE site.
Late October, 2010	<i>Ratings Update.</i> The outcome of all appeals will be reflected in the ratings update scheduled for October, 2010. At that time the Texas Education Agency (TEA) website will be updated. (TEASE and public sites)

A more detailed calendar can be found in *Chapter 19 – Calendar*.

General Considerations

APPEALS ARE NOT A DATA CORRECTION OPPORTUNITY!

The numbers shown on the data tables (and later on other agency products, such as the AEIS reports) are final and cannot be changed, even if an appeal is granted.

Appeals should be based upon a data or calculation error attributable to TEA, regional education service centers, or the test contractor for the student assessment program.

However, problems due to district errors in PEIMS data submissions or on TAKS answer sheets are considered on a case-by-case basis. Statute permits consideration of data reporting quality in evaluating the merits of an appeal. Poor data quality is not a valid reason to appeal.

CHANGED RATINGS ONLY

Only appeals that would result in a changed rating will be considered.

NO GUARANTEED OUTCOMES

Appeals that follow these guidelines are not guaranteed to be granted. Each appeal is evaluated based on the details of its unique situation. Well-written appeals that follow the guidelines are more easily processed, but they are not necessarily granted.

SITUATIONS NOT FAVORABLE FOR APPEAL

Districts may appeal for any reason they choose. However, one strength of the state accountability system is that the rules are applied uniformly to all campuses and districts. Therefore, a request to make exceptions for how the rules are applied to a single campus or district is viewed unfavorably and will most likely be denied. Examples of some appeals seeking inconsistent rule application follow. Because some examples apply to both standard and AEA procedures and some are unique to one set of procedures or the other, the examples are subdivided accordingly:

Examples applicable to both standard and AEA procedures:

- *Campus Mobility.* A request to include the performance of students who were excluded due to the appropriate use of the campus mobility subset criteria will likely be denied.
- *Rounding.* A request to calculate Required Improvement, student group percentages, or indicator values differently from the method described in this *Manual* will likely be denied.
- *Minimum Size Criteria.* A request to evaluate student groups using minimum size criteria different from those described in this *Manual* will likely be denied.
- *Campus Configuration Changes.* A request for re-calculation of prior year results due to changes in campus configurations will likely be denied.
- *New Race/Ethnicity Definition.* A request to use a student's race or ethnicity based on the new federal definition will likely be denied.

Examples applicable to standard procedures:

- *Exceptions Provision.* Exceptions are automatically applied; a request for additional exceptions or to defer use of an exception to a future year will likely be denied.

- *Pairing.* A request to alter pairing relationships that districts had the opportunity to determine by April 23, 2010 will likely be denied.
- *New and Academically Unacceptable.* A request to assign the *Not Rated: Other* label to campuses that are *Academically Unacceptable* in their first year of operation will likely be denied.
- *Floors.* A request to waive the floor requirements when applying either the Exceptions Provision or Required Improvement will likely be denied.

Examples applicable to AEA procedures:

- *Late Registration Requests.* A request submitted after September 23, 2009 to be registered as an alternative education campus (AEC) in order to be evaluated under AEA procedures will likely be denied.
- *At-risk Criterion.* A request by AECs or charter operators to be evaluated under AEA procedures when they did not meet the at-risk criterion or applicable safeguards for 2010 ratings will likely be denied.
- *Late Requests by Charters with the Option to be Evaluated under AEA Procedures.* A request submitted after May 14, 2010 for a charter operator to be evaluated under AEA procedures will likely be denied.

Guidelines

TAKS APPEALS

If a problem is identified with data received from the test contractor, the TAKS data may be appealed. An appeal of the TAKS indicators should reflect a serious problem such as a missing grade level or campus. However, coding errors on TAKS answer sheets will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Please note the following:

- If the district has requested that writing results be rescored, a copy of the dated request to the test contractor and the outcome of the rescored tests should be provided with the appeal. If the rescored results impact the rating, these appeals are necessary since rescored results may not be processed in time to be included in the assessment data used to determine the accountability ratings released by July 30.
- If other serious problems are found, copies of correspondence with the test contractor should be provided with the appeal.
- Coding errors related to student demographic or program participation fields on the TAKS answer documents will be evaluated by reviewing the student's history in PEIMS.
- A request to alter the TEA methodology for combining the first and second administrations of grade 5 and 8 reading and mathematics results will likely be denied.
- A request to alter the formulas, equations, or campus mean values for calculating a TPM outcome for a student will likely be denied. Appeals to substitute local projections for state-generated projections will likely be denied. Appeals to use TPM values that do not meet state accountability mobility subset rules will likely be denied. Appeals to substitute TPM values based on current year equations for the TPM values that were reported based

on two-year equations will likely be denied. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for more detail on the selection of TPM values for use in state accountability.

Spring 2010 TAKS Corrections Window: TEA offers districts the opportunity to correct the TEST TAKEN INFO field. This correction opportunity is available only for the primary administrations in the spring.

Changes to the TEST TAKEN INFO field submitted within the correction window will be included in the TAKS data files used in determining the 2010 accountability ratings. Appeals from districts that missed this corrections window will likely be denied. Corrections to fields other than the TEST TAKEN INFO field will not be used in determining accountability ratings. For accountability purposes, student identification information, demographic or program participation, and score code status will be based on the information provided on the answer document at the time of testing.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE APPEALS

Districts are responsible for providing accurate information to TEA, including the data used to determine the grade 7-8 and grade 7-12 annual dropout rate accountability indicators. Appeals of the Annual Dropout Rate indicator are handled on a case-by-case basis. Please note the following:

- As shown in *Chapter 19 – Calendar*, in June the agency provides superintendents access to lists of their dropouts as well as summary tables of the annual dropout rates. Only students shown as dropouts on these lists may be appealed. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for more information about the processing of dropout data.
- Appeals from districts that located students after the last day of the school start window will likely be denied. This policy ensures that all districts have an equal opportunity to locate dropouts.
- No more than ten dropouts may be appealed for any campus or district.
- Data quality will be a consideration in evaluating the merits of a dropout rate appeal. Poor data quality is not a valid reason to appeal.

COMPLETION RATE APPEALS

Districts are responsible for providing accurate information to TEA, including the data used to determine the longitudinal completion rate accountability indicators. Appeals of the Completion Rate indicators are handled on a case-by-case basis. Please note the following:

- For 2010, the use of the district Completion Rate I for secondary campuses without their own data continues to be suspended. These secondary schools are not evaluated on the Completion Rate I indicator in 2010.
- As shown in *Chapter 19 – Calendar*, the agency provides superintendents access to longitudinal completion information in June. This includes lists showing the final status of students in the 2009 cohort and summary tables of the longitudinal completion rates that will be used for accountability. Only students shown on these lists may be appealed. See *Appendix D – Data Sources* for more information completion data processing.

- The status of no more than ten non-completers or one percent of the non-completers in the cohort (whichever is larger) may be appealed for any campus or district.
- Data quality will be a consideration in evaluating the merits of a completion rate appeal. Poor data quality is not a valid reason to appeal.

GOLD PERFORMANCE ACKNOWLEDGMENT APPEALS

Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA) cannot be appealed. Campuses or districts that appeal an *Academically Unacceptable* rating will automatically receive any GPA earned if their appeal is granted and their rating is raised to *Academically Acceptable* or higher.

ADDITIONAL CAMPUS IMPROVEMENT PLAN (CIP) REQUIREMENTS APPEALS

Campuses rated *Academically Acceptable* in 2010 under either standard or AEA procedures 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. The identification of a campus that is subject to these requirements cannot be appealed. The identification occurs after the resolution of all appeals; therefore, campuses rated *Academically Acceptable* as a result of a granted appeal are considered for identification. Data are never changed as a result of granted appeals, so the data used for possible identification may include data with documented quality problems. Identification occurs in November 2010 prior to final determination of all 2011 accountability system decisions. Should the commissioner’s final decisions for 2011 alter the outcomes for any identified campuses; the list of identified campuses will not be reconstructed.

NOT RATED APPEALS

Districts rated *Not Rated: Other* are responsible for appealing this rating by the scheduled appeal deadline if the basis for this rating was a result of errors made by the district in their submission of PEIMS data, assessment data, or other data collections used to determine accountability ratings. If the agency determines that the *Not Rated: Other* rating was assigned due to district error, the agency can assign an updated rating based on the correct data.

Special Circumstance Appeals

HURRICANES

The class of 2009 completion rates may be negatively affected by students displaced by Hurricanes Katrina or Rita during 2005-06, or Hurricane Ike during 2008-09. A district may appeal the Completion Rate indicator when the campus or district rating is limited from the next higher rating due to a displaced student with a non-completion status. For Katrina- or Rita-displaced students, only students with a final status of “dropout” during 2005-06 (the year of these two hurricanes) will be considered favorable for appeal. The 2010 accountability cycle is the last year this special circumstance appeal is permitted for these hurricanes, as this is the last year students with a final status during 2005-06 are part of a cohort used for accountability.

For Hurricane Ike-displaced students, only students with a final status of “dropout” during 2008-09 (the year of the hurricane) will be considered favorable for appeal. This special circumstance appeal will be permitted through the 2013 accountability cycle, the last year students with a final status during 2008-09 are part of a cohort used for accountability.

For these special circumstance appeals, the district is required to supply appropriate documentation that the student was displaced due to a hurricane, and for Ike-displaced students, use of the PEIMS Crisis Code for appealed students will be researched. This appeal category applies to both standard and AEA procedures. As with all granted appeals, no changes will be made to the data shown on the reports.

MISSING TEXAS PROJECTION MEASURE VALUES

If a Texas Projection Measure (TPM) value could not be calculated due to non-matching identification information, districts may appeal to use TPM values based on the TPM Calculator that is available online from the Student Assessment website. All supporting performance results for these students must be included.

How to Appeal

NEW!! A district wishing to appeal a school or district rating should register their intention to appeal on the TEA Secure Environment (TEASE) Accountability website. To register an appeal:

- Log on to TEASE at <https://seguin.tea.state.tx.us/apps/logon.asp>
- Click on **ACCT – Accountability**.
- From the Welcome page, click on the **Appeals Registration** link and follow the instructions.
- The Appeals Registration site will be available during the appeals window, from July 20 through 5:00 p.m. CDT on August 13.
- The status of the appeal, *e.g.* receipt of registration and receipt of documentation, will be available on the TEASE Accountability website.

Superintendents who do not have TEASE access must request access at the TEASE Applications Reference Page at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=2684>

Once the appeal is registered, districts have until August 13, 2010 to submit their appeal to TEA. As in past years, the submitted appeal must include:

- A statement that the letter is an appeal of the 2010 state accountability rating;
- The name and ID number of the district and/or campuses to which the appeal applies;
- The specific indicator(s) appealed;
- The problem, including details of the data affected and what caused the problem;
- If applicable, the reason(s) why the cause of the problem is attributable to TEA, a regional education service center, or the test contractor;
- The reason(s) why the change would result in a different rating, including calculations that support the different outcome;
- A statement that all information included in the appeal is true and correct to the superintendent's best knowledge and belief; and,
- The superintendent's signature on official district letterhead.

Other Information:

- The appeal should be addressed to the Division of Performance Reporting as follows:

Your ISD Your address City, TX zip	Division of Performance Reporting Texas Education Agency 1701 Congress Avenue Austin, TX 78701-1494	<i>postage</i>
<u>Attn: Accountability Ratings Appeal</u>		

- The appeal letter should be addressed to Mr. Robert Scott, Commissioner of Education (see letter examples, below).
- Appeals for more than one campus within a district may be included in the same letter.
- Appeals for more than one indicator may be included in the same letter.
- Appeals of ratings issued under both standard and AEA procedures may be included in the same letter.
- Districts have only one opportunity to appeal each indicator for any campus or the district.
- If the campus appeal will impact the rating of a paired campus, that must be noted.
- If the campus appeal will impact the rating of the district, that must be noted.
- When student-level information is in question, supporting information must be provided for review, *i.e.*, a list of the students in question by name and identification number. It is not sufficient to claim data are in error without providing information with which the appeal can be researched and evaluated. *Confidential student-level documentation included in the appeal packet will be processed and stored in a secure location and will be accessible only by TEA staff authorized to view confidential student results.*
- It is the district's responsibility to ensure all relevant information is included in the appeal as districts will not be prompted for additional materials.
- Appeal letters must be postmarked on or before August 13, 2010. Appeals postmarked after this date will not be considered. Appeals delivered to TEA in person must be time-stamped in the Division of Performance Reporting by 5:00 p.m. CDT on August 13, 2010. Overnight courier tickets or tracking documentation must indicate package pickup on or before August 13.
- **Only send one copy of the appeal letter and/or supporting documentation.**
- Districts are encouraged to obtain delivery confirmation services from their mail courier.
- Examples of satisfactory and unsatisfactory appeals are provided on the next page for illustration.

Appeal Letter Examples

Satisfactory Appeal:	Unsatisfactory Appeals:
<p>Dear Commissioner Scott,</p> <p>This is an appeal of the 2010 state accountability rating issued for Elm Street Elementary School (ID 123456789) in Elm ISD.</p> <p>Specifically, I am appealing TAKS mathematics for the Hispanic student group. This is the only indicator keeping Elm Street Elementary from achieving a rating of <i>Academically Acceptable</i>.</p> <p>My analysis shows a coding change made to one student’s ethnicity on the answer document at the time of testing was in error. One 5th grade Hispanic student was miscoded as White on the answer document. Had this student, who passed the mathematics test, been included in the Hispanic student group, the percent passing for this group would have met the <i>Academically Acceptable</i> standard. Removing this student from the White student group does not cause the White student group performance to fall below the <i>Acceptable</i> standard.</p> <p>Attached is the student’s identification information as well as the PEIMS data for this student for the last six years (kindergarten through 5th grade) showing we have consistently reported this student as Hispanic.</p> <p>The second attachment shows the recalculated mathematics percent passing statistics for both the White and Hispanic student groups for Elm Elementary.</p> <p>We recognize the importance of accurate data coding, and have put new procedures in place to prevent this from occurring in the future.</p> <p>By my signature below, I certify that all information included in this appeal is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.</p> <p>Sincerely, J. Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools <i>attachments</i></p>	<p>Dear Commissioner Scott,</p> <p>I have analyzed the percentage passing for the Economically Disadvantaged mathematics students. The campus is allowed two exceptions. The floor for using the exception table is 55% for mathematics. The campus has 54%. Therefore, the campus was not able to use both exceptions. I am seeking consideration for the 54% in mathematics for the Economically Disadvantaged student group. If granted, the school’s rating would become <i>Academically Acceptable</i>. Attached is a copy of the preliminary accountability data table.</p> <p>Sincerely, J. Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools <i>attachment</i></p> <hr/> <p>Dear Commissioner Scott,</p> <p>Maple ISD feels that its rating should be <i>Exemplary</i>. The discrepancy occurs because TEA shows that the performance for Hispanic Writing is 89%.</p> <p>We have sent two compositions back for scoring, and are confident they will be changed to passing.</p> <p>If you have questions, do not hesitate to contact us, at 701-555-1234.</p> <p>Sincerely, J. Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools <i>(no attachments)</i></p>

How an Appeal Will Be Processed by the Agency

Once an appeal is received by the Division of Performance Reporting, the process for evaluating the information will be followed as outlined below:

- The TEASE Accountability website is updated to indicate when each appeal is received. Districts may monitor the status of their appeal(s) using the TEASE Accountability website. This website will include the postmark date for each appeal and the date on which each appeal packet is received by the agency.
- Researchers evaluate the request using agency data sources to validate the statements made to the extent possible. The agency examines all relevant data, *not just the results for the students specifically named in the correspondence*.
- Researchers analyze the effect that granting a campus appeal may have on other campuses in the district (such as paired campuses), whether they are specifically named in the appeal or not. Similarly, the effect that granting a campus appeal may have on the district is evaluated, whether the district is named in the appeal or not. In single-campus districts, both the campus and the district are evaluated, whether the district submits the appeal as a campus or district appeal.
- Staff prepares a recommendation and forwards it to an external panel for review. Legislation passed in 2006 requires use of an appeals panel to ensure independent oversight of the appeals process. The use of an external, independent, three-member panel has been a feature of the state accountability system since 2004.
- The review panel examines the appeal, supporting documentation, staff research, and the staff recommendation. The panel determines its recommendation.
- The panel's recommendation is forwarded to the commissioner.
- The commissioner makes a final decision.
- The superintendent is notified in writing of the commissioner's decision and the rationale upon which the decision was made. The decision of the commissioner is final and is not subject to further negotiation. The commissioner will respond in writing to each appeal received. The commissioner's response letters are posted to the TEASE site at the same time the letters are mailed. Superintendents are notified via email that the appeal decisions are available on TEASE.
- *If an appeal is granted, the data upon which the appeal was based will not be modified.* Accountability and AEIS reports, as well as all other publications reflecting accountability data, must report the data as they are submitted to the TEA. Accountability data are subject to scrutiny by the Office of the State Auditor.

When a rating is changed due to a granted appeal, the letter from the commissioner serves as notification of the official rating for the district or campus. Districts may publicize the changed rating at that time. The agency website and other state accountability products will be updated after the resolution of all appeals. This update will occur in October 2010 concurrent with the release of the GPAs. Note that the update will reflect only the changed

rating; the values shown on the report, such as percent met standard, are never modified. Between the time of receipt of the commissioner's letter granting an appeal and the update of agency state accountability products, the agency sources will not reflect the changed campus or district rating.

Chapter 16 – Responsibilities and Consequences

This section describes the responsibilities the various entities involved in public education have with respect to the state accountability system. These include statutory requirements as well as other responsibilities that are not mandated in statute. Many responsibilities are shared between the Texas Education Agency and local districts.

Consequences—those actions that occur as a result of the accountability system—are also described. Consequences include interventions and rewards. All statutes referenced in this section are listed in *Appendix B – Texas Education Code*.

Local Responsibilities

Districts have responsibilities associated with the state accountability system. Primarily these involve following statutory requirements, collecting and submitting accurate data, properly managing campus identification numbers, and implementing an optional local accountability system.

STATUTORY COMPLIANCE

A number of state statutes direct local districts and/or campuses to perform certain tasks or duties in response to the annual issuance of the state accountability ratings. Key statutes are discussed below. *See note* at the end of this chapter regarding statutory citations.*

Public Discussion of Ratings (TEC §11.253 (g)). Each campus site-based decision-making committee must hold at least one public meeting annually after the receipt of the annual campus accountability rating for the purpose of discussing the performance of the campus and the campus performance objectives. The confidentiality of the performance results must be ensured before public release. The accountability data tables available on the TEA public website have been masked to protect confidentiality of individual student results.

Notice in Student Report Card and on Website (TEC §39.251 and TEC §39.252).* Districts are required to publish accountability ratings on their websites and include the rating in the student report cards. These statutes require districts:

1. by the 10th day of the new school year to have posted on the district website the most current accountability ratings, Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) reports, and School Report Cards (SRC); and,
2. to include the most current campus performance rating with the first student report card each year, along with an explanation of the rating.

A document addressing frequently asked questions regarding these requirements is available on the agency website at: http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/3297_faq.html.

Public Education Grant Program (TEC §§29.201 - 29.205). In 1995, the Texas Legislature created the Public Education Grant (PEG) program. The PEG program permits parents with children attending campuses that are on the PEG list to request that their children be transferred to another campus within the same district or to another district. If a transfer is granted to another district, funding is provided to the receiving district. A list of campuses identified under the PEG criteria is generated and transmitted to districts annually. By

February 1 following the release of the list, districts must notify each parent of a student assigned to attend a campus on the PEG list. For more information on the PEG program, please refer to *PEG Frequently Asked Questions*, available at http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/peg_faq.html.

Actions Required Due to Low Ratings or Low Accreditation Statuses. Districts with *Academically Unacceptable* ratings (campus or district) or *Accredited Probation/Accredited Warned* accreditation statuses will be required to follow directives from the commissioner designed to remedy the identified concerns. Requirements will vary depending on the circumstances for each individual district. Commissioner of Education rules that define the implementation details of these statutes are available on the website for the TEA Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions, at <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/pmi/>, and on the TEA Accreditation Status website at <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/accredstatus/>.

ACCURATE DATA

Accurate data is critical to the credibility of the ratings system. Responsibility for the quality of data used for the indicators that determine campus and district ratings rests with local districts. The system depends on the responsible submission and collection of assessment and Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) information by local school districts. Procedures for assuring test security have long been in place; however, beginning with spring 2008 testing, additional requirements were implemented that district personnel must fulfill.

CAMPUS IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS

In a given year, districts may need to change, delete, or add one or more of their campus identification numbers, the unique 9-digit county-district-campus number (CDC), due to closing old schools, opening new schools, or changing the grades or populations served by an existing school. Unintended consequences can occur when districts "recycle" campus ID numbers. Because two-year performance changes are a component of the accountability system, and merging prior year files with current year files is driven by campus identification numbers, comparisons may be inappropriate when a campus configuration has changed. The following example illustrates this situation:

Example: A campus served grades 7 and 8 in 2009, but in 2010, serves as a 6th grade center. The district did not request a new campus number for the new configuration. Instead, the same identifying number used in 2009 was maintained (recycled). Therefore, in 2010, grade 6 performance on the assessments will be compared to prior year grade 7 and 8 performance. Also, any dropouts reported for the campus for 2008-09 will be subject to evaluation for the 2010 accountability rating for the 6th grade center.

Whether or not to change a campus number is, in most cases, a local decision. However, districts should exercise caution when either requesting new numbers or continuing to use existing numbers when the student population or the grades offered change significantly. Districts are strongly encouraged to request new campus numbers when school organizational configurations change dramatically.

TEA policy requires school districts and charters to request campus number changes of existing campuses for the current school year by October 1 to ensure time for processing before the PEIMS fall snapshot date in late October. Changes for a subsequent school year

will not be processed before November 1. This policy does not apply to new active campuses opening mid-year or campuses under construction.

School districts and charters must receive TEA approval to change the campus number of a campus rated *Academically Unacceptable* or *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*. The determination of whether or not accountability ratings histories will be linked to new campus numbers will be made at the time the new numbers are approved so that districts are aware of the accountability consequences of changing campus numbers.

Although the ratings history may be linked across campus numbers for purposes of determining consecutive years of *Academically Unacceptable* ratings, data will not be linked across campus numbers. This includes PEIMS data, assessment data, and accountability indicators that draw on those data. Campuses with new campus numbers cannot take advantage of Required Improvement provisions of the accountability system to gate up to higher ratings the first year under a new number. Therefore, changing a campus number under these circumstances can be to the disadvantage of an *Academically Unacceptable* campus. This should be considered by districts and charters when requesting campus number changes for *Academically Unacceptable* campuses. In the rare circumstance where a charter district receives a new district number, the ratings history is also linked while the data are not linked across the district numbers.

Analysis to screen for the inappropriate use of campus numbers is part of *System Safeguards*, described below. TEA can assist in establishing new or retiring old campus numbers. For TEA contact information, see *Appendix G – Contacts*.

COMPLEMENTARY LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS

Although the statewide accountability system has been designed to address the guiding principles articulated in the *Introduction*, it is not a comprehensive system of performance evaluation. Communities across Texas have varied needs and goals for the school districts educating their students. Local systems of accountability can best address those priorities.

Districts are encouraged to develop their own complementary local accountability systems to plan for continued student performance improvement. Such systems are entirely voluntary and for local use only. Performance on locally-defined indicators does not affect the ratings determined through the statewide system.

Examples of locally-defined indicators include:

- level of parent participation;
- progress on locally administered assessments;
- progress on goals identified by campus improvement plans;
- progress compared to other campuses in the district;
- progress on professional development goals; and
- school safety measures.

As a different approach, districts may choose to expand the state-designated accountability ratings. For example, they may wish to further differentiate among campuses rated *Academically Acceptable* or *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.

A third approach might be to examine those base indicators, both currently in use and planned for implementation, that fall short of local expectations. Additional performance measures could be constructed to track efforts to improve performance in those areas.

Regardless of the strategy chosen, local accountability systems should be designed to serve the needs of the local community and to improve performance for all students.

State Responsibilities

The Texas Education Agency also has responsibilities associated with the state accountability system. As is true for districts, TEA must follow statutory requirements related to the implementation of the accountability system. In addition, TEA applies a variety of system safeguards to ensure the integrity of the system. Finally, TEA is charged with taking actions to intervene when conditions warrant. The agency may also offer certain exemptions to districts when excellent performance is attained.

SYSTEM SAFEGUARDS

System safeguards are those activities conducted by TEA to ensure the integrity of the system. These help protect the system from purposeful manipulation as well as from the use of data of such poor quality—whether intentional or not—that no reliable rating can be determined.

Campus Number Tracking. Academically Unacceptable ratings received for the same campus under two different campus numbers may be considered to be consecutive years of Academically Unacceptable ratings for accountability interventions and sanctions.

Data Validation. The Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) system is a comprehensive system designed to improve student performance and program effectiveness. The PBM system, like the state accountability rating system, is data-driven; therefore, the integrity of the data used is critical. To ensure data integrity, the PBM system includes annual data validation analyses. Data validation analyses use several different indicators to examine district leaver and dropout data, student assessment data, and discipline data. The process districts must engage in to either validate the accuracy of their data or determine that erroneous data were collected and/or submitted is fundamental to the integrity of all the agency's evaluation systems. For more information, see the Data Validation Manuals on the PBM website at <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/pbm/DIManuals.html/>.

Test Security. As part of ongoing efforts to improve security measures surrounding the assessment program, TEA has a comprehensive 14-point plan to assure parents, students, and the public that test results are meaningful and valid. Several aspects of the plan were implemented with the spring 2008 administrations and additional measures were instituted in 2009 and 2010. Among other measures, districts are required to implement seating charts during all administrations; students testing in grades 9, 10, and exit level are required to sign an honor statement immediately prior to taking TAKS; and, districts are required to maintain test security materials for five years.

Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues. A rating can be changed to *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*. This rating is used in the rare situation where the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results have been compromised, and it is not possible to assign a rating based on the evaluation of performance. This label may be assigned temporarily pending an on-site

investigation, or may be assigned as the final rating label for the year. This rating label is not equivalent to an *Academically Unacceptable* rating, though the Commissioner of Education has the authority to lower a rating or assign an *Academically Unacceptable* rating due to data quality issues. All districts and campuses with a final rating label of *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* are automatically subject to desk audits the following year.

System safeguard activities can occur either before or after the ratings release. Sanctions can be imposed at any time. To the extent possible, ratings for the year are finalized when updated ratings are released following the resolution of appeals (in 2010 the update is scheduled for late October 2010). A rating change resulting from an imposed sanction will stand as the final rating for the year.

PUBLIC EDUCATION GRANT PROGRAM CAMPUS LISTS

TEA is responsible for annually producing the list of campuses identified under the PEG criteria. By early December 2010 the list of 2011-12 PEG campuses will be transmitted. This list will identify campuses at which 50 percent or more of the students did not pass TAKS in any two of the preceding three years (2008, 2009, or 2010) **or** that were rated *Academically Unacceptable* in any one of the preceding three years (2008, 2009, or 2010).

For more information on the PEG program, please refer to *PEG Frequently Asked Questions*, available at http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/peg_faq.html.

DISTRICT ACCREDITATION STATUS

State statute requires the Commissioner of Education to determine an accreditation status for districts and charters. Accreditation statuses were first assigned to districts under this statute in 2007. To determine accreditation status and sanctions, TEA takes into account the district's state accountability rating and its financial accountability rating. There are other factors that may be considered in the determination of accreditation status. These include, but are not limited to, the integrity of assessment or financial data used to measure performance, the reporting of PEIMS data, and serious or persistent deficiencies in programs monitored in the Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System. Accreditation status can also be lowered as a result of data integrity issues or as a result of special accreditation investigations. The four possible accreditation statuses are: *Accredited*, *Accredited-Warned*, *Accredited-Probation*, and *Not Accredited-Revoked*.

Rules that define the procedures for determining a district's accreditation status are available on the TEA website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/rules/home/> or on the TEA Accreditation Status website. The 2009-10 accreditation statuses for all districts and charters in Texas were issued in March 2010 and are posted at the TEA Accreditation Status website at <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/accredstatus/>.

Consequences

Actions that occur as a result of the accountability system are described in this section. They include interventions and rewards.

INTERVENTIONS

Interventions pertain to activities that result from the issuance of ratings under the state accountability system. State accountability-related interventions are those activities

conducted by TEA to follow up with districts and campuses either at risk of a future low rating, or already assigned a low rating. Intervention activities reflect an emphasis on increased student performance, focused improvement planning, data analysis, and data integrity. Required levels of intervention are determined based on the requirements of TEC, Chapter 39. See the Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions website at: <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/pmi/accmon/2010/index.html> for more information.

Determination of Multiple-year Academically Unacceptable Status. In determining consecutive years of *Academically Unacceptable* ratings for purposes of accountability interventions and sanctions, only years that a campus is assigned an accountability rating of *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Academically Acceptable*, *Academically Unacceptable*, *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*, or equivalent ratings in previous years, will be considered. That is, the consecutive years of *Academically Unacceptable* ratings may be separated by one or more years of temporary closure or *Not Rated* ratings. This policy applies to districts and charters as well as campuses when *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* and *Not Rated: Other* ratings are assigned. In 2004, no alternative education ratings were issued; instead the label *Not Rated: Alternative Education* was used. *Academically Unacceptable* ratings separated by the 2004 *Not Rated: Alternative Education* label are considered consecutive. No state accountability ratings were issued in 2003; therefore, 2002 and 2004 are considered consecutive. An exception applies to districts (charters) or campuses that receive a rating of *AEA: Not Rated – Other* under the Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Residential Facility procedures. For these residential facilities, *Academically Unacceptable* ratings separated by *AEA: Not Rated – Other* are not considered consecutive.

Identification of Campuses with Additional Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) Requirements. The commissioner may require additional CIP requirements of a campus rated *Academically Acceptable* if that campus would be rated *Academically Unacceptable* using the accountability standards for the subsequent year. Identified campuses 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 the subsequent year performance requirements. The purpose of the identification is to serve as an early warning system and, therefore, provide interventions that may prevent the campus from being rated *Academically Unacceptable* in the subsequent year.

For the 2010-11 school year, campuses rated *Academically Acceptable* in 2010 under either standard or alternative education accountability procedures will be identified if their 2010 performance does not meet the accountability criteria established for the 2011 school year.

Questions regarding the methodology used to identify the campuses subject to these requirements should be directed to the Division of Performance Reporting at performance.reporting@tea.state.tx.us or (512) 463-9704. Questions regarding intervention requirements for these campuses should be directed to the Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions at pmidivision@tea.state.tx.us or (512) 463-5226.

EXCELLENCE EXEMPTIONS

Texas Education Code §39.112* automatically exempts districts and campuses rated *Exemplary* from some statutes and rules. The exemptions remain in effect until the

Commissioner of Education determines that achievement levels of the district or campus have declined, or the district or campus rating changes.

Statute lists a number of areas in law and regulation to which the exemption does not apply. These include criminal behavior, due process, federal and state program requirements, the curriculum essential knowledge and skills, public school accountability, extracurricular activities, and employee rights and benefits. (See TEC §39.112* for a complete list.) Under specific circumstances the commissioner may exempt a campus from class size limits for elementary grades.

* These statutory citations reference TEC as it existed prior to the changes made by the 81st legislative session in 2009. The citations are in effect through the 2010-11 accountability year.

Chapter 17 – Indicators and Standards for 2011

This chapter provides information about the commissioner’s final decisions for 2011 accountability standards and indicators. The purpose of this chapter is to inform educators about these key components of the system well in advance of the 2011 accountability year. Given this advance information, districts and campuses can better prepare for changes to the base indicators and standards that will take place in 2011.

Other components of the 2011 system will be reevaluated during the annual development process that will begin for the next cycle in early 2011. See *Chapter 18: Preview of 2011* for current plans for all components of the 2011 accountability system.

The tables below show 2011 standards for the base indicators for standard and AEA procedures, respectively. Indicator definitions and the use of additional features are also described.

Table 22: Indicators and Standards for 2011 Ratings - Standard Procedures

Indicators/Features	Academically Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
Assessment Indicators			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All TAKS–Modified and TAKS–Alternate results are combined with TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) results and used for ratings in 2011. Commended performance is an additional TAKS base indicator for Recognized and Exemplary ratings. The ELL Progress indicator is a separate indicator for Recognized and Exemplary. 			
<p>TAKS – Met Standard Level (2010-11)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Students and each student group meeting minimum size: African American Hispanic White Econ. Disadvantaged 	<p>Meets each Standard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading/ELA.... 70% Writing 70% Social Studies .. 70% Mathematics..... 65% Science..... 60% <p>or</p> <p>Meets Required Improvement</p> <p>or</p> <p>Meets Standard with TPM</p> <p>or</p> <p>Meets criteria for use of Exception Provision</p>	<p>Meets 80% Standard for each Subject</p> <p>or</p> <p>Meets floor and Required Improvement</p> <p>or</p> <p>Meets Standard with TPM</p> <p>or</p> <p>Meets criteria for use of Exception Provision</p>	<p>Meets 90% Standard for each Subject</p> <p>or</p> <p>Meets Standard with TPM</p> <p>or</p> <p>Meets criteria for use of Exception Provision</p>
<p>TAKS – Commended Performance Level (2010-11)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Students and, if meets minimum size: Econ. Disadvantaged 	N/A	<p>Meets 15% Standard in Reading/ELA and Mathematics for Commended Performance</p> <p>or</p> <p>Commended Performance with TPM</p>	<p>Meets 25% Standard in Reading/ELA and Mathematics for Commended Performance</p> <p>or</p> <p>Commended Performance with TPM</p>
<p>English Language Learners (ELL) Progress (2010-11) *</p> <p>(if meets minimum size)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Students 	N/A	<p>Meets 60% Standard</p> <p>or</p> <p>Meets Required Improvement criteria</p> <p>or</p> <p>Meets criteria for use of Exception Provision</p>	

Table 22: Indicators and Standards for 2011 Ratings - Standard Procedures (cont.)

Indicators/Features	Academically Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
Completion/Dropout Indicators			
Completion Rate I (Class of 2010) <i>(if meets minimum size)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Students • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadvantaged 	Meets 75.0% Standard or Meets Required Improvement	Meets 85.0% Standard or Meets floor of 75.0% and Required Improvement	Meets 95.0% Standard
Annual Dropout Rate Grades 7-8 (2009-10) <i>(if meets minimum size)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Students • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadvantaged 	Meets 1.6% Standard or Meets Required Improvement		
Additional Provisions			
Underreported Students (2009-10) <i>(District only)</i> <i>(if meets minimum size)</i> All Students	N/A	A district that underreports more than 150 students or more than 3.0% of its prior year students cannot be rated <i>Recognized</i> or <i>Exemplary</i> .	

* Options for the inclusion of TPM in this measure will be explored during the 2011 development cycle.

Table 23: Indicators and Standards for 2011 Ratings - AEA Procedures

Indicators/Features	AECs of Choice	Residential Facilities	Charters
Assessment Indicators			
TAKS Progress (2010-11) All TAKS–Modified and TAKS–Alternate results are combined with TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) results and used for AEA ratings in 2011.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Students and each student group meeting minimum size: • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadvantaged 	Meets 55% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement or Meets 55% Standard Using District At-Risk Data or Demonstrates Required Improvement Using District At-Risk Data		Meets 55% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement
ELL Progress (2010-11)* All Students (if minimum size requirements are met)	Meets 55% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement		
Completion/Dropout Indicators			
Completion Rate II (Class of 2010) All Students (if minimum size requirements are met)	Meets 60.0% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement or Meets 60.0% Standard Using District At-Risk Data or Demonstrates Required Improvement Using District At-Risk Data	Residential Facilities are not evaluated on Completion Rate II.	Meets 60.0% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement
Annual Dropout Rate Grades 7-12 (2009-10) All Students (if minimum size requirements are met)	Meets 20.0% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement or Meets 20.0% Standard Using District At-Risk Data or Demonstrates Required Improvement Using District At-Risk Data		Meets 20.0% Standard or Demonstrates Required Improvement
Additional Provision			
AEA Registration (AEC only)	AECs must meet the AEA campus registration requirements and 75% at-risk registration criterion.		Does not apply to charter operators.

* This indicator cannot be the sole reason for the AEA: *Academically Unacceptable* rating.

Chapter 18 – Preview of 2011 and Beyond

This section provides information about future plans for the standard and alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures of the state accountability system, to the extent these plans are known in the spring of 2010. The purpose is to inform educators in advance, so districts and campuses can adequately prepare for changes that will take place in 2011 and beyond.

State legislative action resulting from the 81st legislative session will affect future accountability system ratings, reports, sanctions, and rewards. Plans for implementing statutory changes are yet to be finalized. However, decisions that affect 2011 and beyond to the extent they are known are presented in this chapter. Deletions, additions, and modifications beyond those discussed here are possible.

The changes described below begin with standard procedures and are followed by AEA procedures, presented for 2011 and beyond. Changes described are based on a comparison to the immediately preceding year.

Standard Procedures for 2011

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TAKS)

Accountability Standards. In 2011, the *Academically Acceptable* standards will increase from 55% to 60% for science and from 60% to 65% for mathematics. Reading/ELA, writing, and social studies will remain at 70%. The standard for *Recognized* (for all subjects) will remain at 80% and the standard for *Exemplary* (for all subjects) will remain at 90%.

TAKS (Accommodated). The performance on all TAKS (Accommodated) tests will again be combined with TAKS results to determine ratings.

TAKS-Modified and TAKS-Alternate. In 2011, performance on all TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt tests will be combined with TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) results to determine ratings.

Race/Ethnicity Change. The new categories of race and ethnicity will apply to the TAKS indicator beginning with the 2011 accountability year. See *Table 24*. Decisions regarding the application of Required Improvement to this indicator in 2011 will be made during the 2011 development cycle.

TAKS COMMENDED PERFORMANCE (READING/ELA AND MATHEMATICS)

Beginning with the 2011 ratings, Commended Performance on TAKS reading/ELA and mathematics will be incorporated into the rating system as an additional indicator.

Accountability Standards. At least 15% of students tested must attain or be projected to attain a commended score on TAKS reading/ELA and mathematics to be *Recognized*, and at least 25% to be *Exemplary*. The methodology is:

$$\frac{\text{\# of students whose performance on reading/ELA is commended (or commended w/TPM)}}{\text{\# of students tested in reading/ELA}}$$

and

$$\frac{\text{\# of students whose performance on mathematics is commended (or commended w/TPM)}}{\text{\# of students tested in mathematics}}$$

Student Groups. The standard must be met by *All Students* and the *Economically Disadvantaged* group for both assessments. Each measure will be evaluated for *All Students* regardless of the number of examinees. The *Economically Disadvantaged* group will be evaluated if minimum size criteria—the same as those used for the TAKS base indicator—are met.

Required Improvement and Exceptions. Neither RI nor Exceptions can be used with TAKS Commended Performance to attain a higher rating.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS PROGRESS INDICATOR

Beginning with the 2011 accountability ratings, the English Language Learners (ELL) Progress Indicator will be incorporated into the rating system as an additional indicator.

Accountability Standard. At least 60% of ELL students tested must meet the standard or the progress criteria on their assessment in order for the campus or district to be rated *Recognized* or *Exemplary*.

Indicator Definition. The indicator includes current and monitored LEP students who are enrolled in at least their second year in U.S. schools, and who took at least one of the reading assessments [TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, or TELPAS].

Student Groups. Performance is summed across grades for the All Students group only. A minimum size of 30 students is applied.

Required Improvement and Exceptions. A campus or district may use RI or Exceptions with the ELL Progress Indicator to attain a higher rating.

COMPLETION RATE I [GRADUATES AND CONTINUERS]

Accountability Standards. The standards for Completion Rate I will remain the same for 2011 as in 2010: 75.0% or greater for *Academically Acceptable*, 85.0% or greater for *Recognized*, and 95.0% or greater for *Exemplary*. The completion rate used will be for the class of 2010.

Completion Rate for all High Schools. Since 2008, secondary schools that did not meet the criteria for having a completion rate calculated were not evaluated on the Completion Rate indicator. Beginning in 2011, a modified methodology will be used to create a campus completion rate for any high school that serves grade 12. This will allow more campuses to have completion rates calculated than was the case under the former methodology. Secondary schools (such as grade 9-10 or 9-11 campuses) for whom the new methodology is not appropriate will be evaluated on the district's Completion Rate I data.

Race/Ethnicity Change. The former categories of race and ethnicity will apply to the Completion Rate indicator in the 2011 accountability year (Class of 2010). See *Table 24*.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE (GR. 7-8)

Accountability Standards. The Annual Dropout Rate standard for 2011 will increase in rigor when it decreases to less than or equal to 1.6% for all rating categories. The dropout rate used will be from the 2009-10 school year.

Race/Ethnicity Change. The new categories of race and ethnicity will apply to the Annual Dropout Rate indicator beginning with the 2011 accountability year (2009-10 dropouts). See *Table 24*. Decisions regarding the application of Required Improvement to this indicator in 2011 will be made during the 2011 development cycle.

Table 24: Transition to Use of New Race/Ethnicity Categories by Indicator

Accountability Year	2010	2011	2012*
TAKS and TAKS Progress Measure			
Data Collection Year	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Available Ethnic Data	Old and New	New only	New only
Ethnicity Used	Old	New	New
TAKS Commended Performance			
Data Collection Year	N/A	2010-11	2011-12
Available Ethnic Data	N/A	New only	New only
Ethnicity Used	N/A	New	New
Annual Dropout Rate			
<i>Enrollment and Attendance Data (Denominator)</i>			
Data Collection Year	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Available Ethnic Data	Old only	Old and New	New only
<i>Leaver Data (Numerator)</i>			
Data Collection Year	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Available Ethnic Data	Old and New	New only	New only
Ethnicity Used	Old	New	New
Completion Rate (I & II)			
Available Ethnic Data	Class of 2009	Class of 2010	Class of 2011
old	2005-06		
old	2006-07	2006-07	
old	2007-08	2007-08	2007-08
old	2008-09	2008-09	2008-09
old, new	2009-10	2009-10	2009-10
new		2010-11	2010-11
new			2011-12
Ethnicity Used	Old	Old	New

* No state accountability ratings will be issued in 2012.

ADDITIONAL FEATURES

Texas Projection Measure (TPM). TPM will be available for some grades and subjects of TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt in time for 2011 accountability. It will be used for those assessments where it is available. The use of TPM with the ELL Progress indicator will be decided during the 2011 development cycle.

Underreported Students. A district that underreports greater than 3.0% or more than 150 students cannot be rated *Recognized* or *Exemplary*.

GOLD PERFORMANCE ACKNOWLEDGMENTS (GPA)

Commended. Schools and districts will continue to be acknowledged for commended performance on all five subjects, even though commended performance on reading/ELA and mathematics will be a new base indicator.

TAKS-Based GPA Indicators. The same definitional changes made to the TAKS base indicator in 2011 will be made to the TAKS-based GPA indicators where appropriate. This means performance on all TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt subjects and grades will be used in these GPA indicators. Decisions regarding the assessments used in the Comparable Improvement indicators will be made during the 2011 development cycle.

College-Ready Graduates. The standard will increase five points, from 35% to 40%.

DATA EXCLUSIONS

Regarding TEC from the 80th Legislature (2007). To implement TEC §39.072(d) and §39.073(f), TAKS data will be excluded from district ratings using Student Attribution Codes 13, 14, 17, 18, 21, and 22. This differs from prior years when results for entire campuses were excluded based on the campus type (Texas Youth Commission, Texas Juvenile Probation Commission, and Residential Treatment facilities). Exclusion of dropout and completion data is unchanged.

Regarding TEC from the 81st Legislature (2009). Additional dropout exclusions in House Bill 3 will not affect the Annual Dropout Rate or Completion Rate used in determining the 2011 ratings. These exclusions will be applied to the 2010-11 dropouts reported in the 2011-12 school year.

AEA Procedures for 2011

AEA CAMPUS REGISTRATION PROCESS

The AEA campus registration process will be conducted online using the Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE) Accountability website. The 2010-11 AEA campus registration process opens September 8, 2010. An email notification will be sent to all superintendents stating that alternative education campuses (AECs) rated under 2010 AEA procedures will be re-registered automatically in 2011 subject to the at-risk registration criterion.

AECs wishing to rescind AEA registration must complete an electronic *AEA Campus Rescission Form*. AECs requesting AEA registration must complete an electronic *AEA Campus Registration Form*. AECs for which 2010 AEA registration was rescinded due to not meeting the at-risk registration criterion must submit a *2010-11 AEA Campus Registration Form* if the AEC wishes to request AEA campus registration in 2011. It is imperative that rescission and registration forms submitted via TEASE Accountability be printed and maintained locally as official documentation of AEA campus registration requests.

The 2010-11 AEA registration process closes September 22, 2010, at 1:00 p.m. C.D.T. The AEA rescissions and registrations will not be processed after this time. When finalized, the list of 2011 registered AECs will be available on the AEA website at <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/aea>.

AT-RISK REGISTRATION CRITERION

Each AEC must have at least 75% at-risk student enrollment or be eligible to use the Prior-Year PEIMS At-Risk Data or New Campus safeguards to remain registered and be evaluated under AEA procedures.

TAKS PROGRESS

Accountability Standard. The TAKS Progress standard increases from 50% to 55%.

TAKS-Modified and TAKS-Alternate. In 2011, all TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt results will be combined with TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) results to determine AEA ratings.

ELL PROGRESS INDICATOR

Beginning with 2011 accountability ratings, a new ELL Progress Indicator is incorporated into the AEA procedures as a separate indicator.

Indicator Definition. The indicator includes current and monitored LEP students who are enrolled in at least their second year in U.S. schools, and who took at least one of the reading assessments [TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, or TELPAS].

Accountability Standard. The new ELL Progress indicator standard is 55%.

Required Improvement. The ELL Progress indicator RI calculation parallels the calculation used with the TAKS Progress indicator – the amount of gain in percent *Met Standard* required to reach the current-year standard in two years.

Student Groups and Minimum Size. Performance is summed across grades for the All Students group only. A minimum size of 30 students is applied.

AEA ELL Progress Provision. For 2011 AEA ratings, if the ELL Progress Indicator is the only cause for an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* label. The AEA ELL Progress Provision applies only to the ELL Progress Indicator under AEA procedures in 2011.

COMPLETION RATE II [GRADUATES, CONTINUERS, AND GED RECIPIENTS]

Accountability Standard. The Completion Rate II standard remains 60.0%.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE (GR. 7-12)

Accountability Standard. The Annual Dropout Rate standard remains 20.0%.

AEA GPA

TAKS-Based GPA Indicators. The same definitional changes made to the TAKS Progress indicator in 2011 will be made to the two TSI indicators, five commended indicators, and the College-Ready Graduates indicator under AEA GPA.

College-Ready Graduates. The standard increases from 35% to 40%.

DATA EXCLUSIONS

Regarding TEC from the 80th Legislature (2007). To implement TEC §§39.072(d) and 39.073(f), TAKS data will be excluded from district ratings using Student Attribution Codes 13, 14, 17, 18, 21, and 22. This differs from prior years when results for entire campuses were excluded based on the campus type (Texas Youth Commission, Texas Juvenile Probation Commission, and Residential Treatment facilities). Exclusion of dropout and completion data is unchanged.

Regarding TEC from the 81st Legislature (2009). Additional dropout exclusions in House Bill 3 will not affect the Annual Dropout Rate or Completion Rate used in determining the 2011 ratings. These exclusions will be applied to the 2010-11 dropouts reported in the 2011-12 school year.

Standard and AEA Procedures for 2012 and Beyond

During the 81st legislative session, the development of a new accountability system was mandated under House Bill (HB) 3. Significant changes include:

- the use of both a proficient and college-ready standard on the assessments;
- the use of end-of-course assessments;
- the exclusion of certain students from the dropout rate;
- the introduction of distinction designations, awarded in academic achievement, fine arts, physical education, 21st century workforce development, and second language acquisition; and
- the elimination of the Gold Performance Acknowledgments system.

The next generation of student tests will be called the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness or STAAR. STAAR will replace the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), which is the criterion-reference assessment program that has been in place since 2003.

STAAR will be used for the twelve end-of-course assessments mandated by SB 1031 in 2007 and the new grade 3-8 assessments mandated by HB 3 in 2009. The new tests will be administered beginning in the 2011-2012 school year.

The following table provides a state accountability transition timeline for standard and AEA procedures.

Table 25: State Accountability Transition Timeline

December 1, 2010	TEA delivers to the governor, lieutenant governor, and leaders of the Texas legislature a transition plan to implement HB 3 provisions.
By August 1, 2011	2011 ratings are the last ratings issued under the current accountability system.
2011-12 School Year	Assignment of performance ratings are suspended for 2012. A new accountability system is developed with input from educator advisory groups. Districts will be informed of decisions as they are available.
By August 8, 2013	District and campus performance ratings are issued for the first time under the new accountability system. Ratings will be based on the percent proficient indicators. The percent college-ready indicators will be “report” only. Distinction designations will be issued to districts and campuses with acceptable performance concurrent with the release of performance ratings. Performance ratings issued in 2010-11 and 2012-13 school years will be considered consecutive.
By August 8, 2014	District and campus performance ratings will be issued for the second time. Ratings will be based on both percent proficient and percent college-ready indicators. Distinction designations will be issued to districts and campuses with acceptable performance concurrent with the release of performance ratings.

Overview 2010 and 2011

Any changes will be announced with as much advance notice as possible. In the tables that follow, all known changes are shown. Changes from the previous year are indicated in bold.

Table 26: 2010 and 2011 Standards – Standard Procedures

	2010	2011*
TAKS % Met (All Students, White, Hispanic, African American, & Economically Disadvantaged)		
	% Met	% Met
Exemplary (All Subjects)	≥ 90%	≥ 90%
Recognized (All Subjects)	≥ 80%	≥ 80%
Academically Acceptable		
Reading/ELA, Writing, Social Studies	≥ 70%	≥ 70%
Mathematics	≥ 60%	≥ 65%
Science	≥ 55%	≥ 60%
TAKS (Accommodated)	All grades & subjects	All grades & subjects
TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt	N/A	All grades & subjects
TAKS Commended Performance (All Students & Economically Disadvantaged)		
		% Commended (with TPM)
Exemplary (Reading/ELA, Math)	N/A	≥ 25%**
Recognized (Reading/ELA, Math)		≥ 15%**
Academically Acceptable		N/A
ELL Progress Indicator (All Students only)***		
Exemplary	N/A	≥ 60%
Recognized		≥ 60%
Academically Acceptable		N/A
Completion Rate I (Gr. 9-12) (All Students, White, Hispanic, African American, & Econ. Disadvantaged)		
	Class of 2009 (9 th grade 05-06)	Class of 2010 (9 th grade 06-07)
Exemplary	≥ 95.0%	≥ 95.0%
Recognized	≥ 85.0%	≥ 85.0%
Academically Acceptable	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%
Annual Dropout Rate (Gr. 7-8) (All Students, White, Hispanic, African American, & Econ. Disadvantaged)		
	2008-09 Dropouts	2009-10 Dropouts
Exemplary, Recognized, & Academically Acceptable	≤ 1.8%	≤ 1.6%
Additional Features		
Required Improvement	Use	Use**
Texas Projection Measure	Use	Use***
Exceptions	Use	Use**
Underreported Students	≤ 150 and ≤ 4.0%	≤ 150 and ≤ 3.0%

New Accountability System will be in place beginning in the 2012-13 school year. No Ratings in 2012

* Details about the 2011 standards are presented in Chapter 17 – Indicators and Standards for 2011.

** RI and Exceptions are not available for use with the Commended Indicator.

*** Decisions about the use of TPM with the ELL Progress Indicator will be made during the 2011 development cycle.

Table 27: 2010 and 2011 – AEA Procedures

	2010	2011*	2012	
TAKS Progress Standard				
AEA: Academically Acceptable	≥ 50%	≥ 55%	No Ratings in 2012 New Accountability System will be in place beginning in 2012-13	
TAKS (Accommodated)	All grades and subjects	All grades and subjects		
TAKS-M	N/A	All grades and subjects		
TAKS-Alt	N/A	All grades and subjects**		
Completion Rate II (Grade 9-12) Standard				
Year of Data	Class of 2009 (9 th grade 05-06)	Class of 2010 (9 th grade 06-07)		
AEA: Academically Acceptable	≥ 60.0%	≥ 60.0%		
Completer II Definition	Graduates + Continuing Students + GED Recipients			
Dropout Definition	NCES Definition	NCES Definition		
Annual Dropout Rate (Grade 7-12) Standard				
Year of Data	2008-09	2009-10		
AEA: Academically Acceptable	≤ 20.0%	≤ 20.0%		
Dropout Definition	NCES Definition	NCES Definition		
English Language Learners (ELL) Progress				
	N/A	55%***		
Additional Features				
Texas Projection Measure	See Chapter 10 and Appendix E			
Required Improvement	See Chapter 11			
Use of District At-Risk Data	See Chapter 11			
At-Risk Registration Criterion	≥ 75%	≥ 75%		

* Details about the 2011 standards are presented in Chapter 17 – Indicators and Standards for 2011.

** TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt will be included in TAKS Progress in 2011. Performance will be summed across all grades and subjects, evaluated for All Students only.

*** Decisions about the use of TPM with the ELL Progress Indicator will be made during the 2011 development cycle.

Table 28: Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) Standards through 2011

Indicator		2010	2011	2012
Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion**		≥ 30.0%	≥ 30.0%	No Gold Performance Acknowledgments after 2011
AP / IB Results*	% taking at least one AP or IB test <i>AND</i>	≥ 15.0%	≥ 15.0%	
	% at or above criterion	≥ 50.0%	≥ 50.0%	
Attendance Rate**	District	≥ 96.0%	≥ 96.0%	
	Multi-Level	≥ 96.0%	≥ 96.0%	
	High School	≥ 95.0%	≥ 95.0%	
	Middle/Jr. High	≥ 96.0%	≥ 96.0%	
	Elementary	≥ 97.0%	≥ 97.0%	
	AEA campuses and charters	≥ 95.0%	≥ 95.0%	
Commended Performance: Reading/ELA**		≥ 30%	≥ 30%	
Commended Performance: Mathematics**		≥ 30%	≥ 30%	
Commended Performance: Writing**		≥ 30%	≥ 30%	
Commended Performance: Science**		≥ 30%	≥ 30%	
Commended Performance: Social Studies**		≥ 30%	≥ 30%	
Comparable Improvement (CI): Reading***		Top Quartile (top 25%)	Top Quartile (top 25%)	
Comparable Improvement (CI): Mathematics***		Top Quartile (top 25%)	Top Quartile (top 25%)	
Recommended High School Program/DAP**		≥ 85.0%	≥ 85.0%	
SAT/ACT Results*	% graduates taking at least one test <i>AND</i>	≥ 70.0%	≥ 70.0%	
	% at or above criterion	≥ 40.0%	≥ 40.0%	
TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component: English Language Arts**		≥ 65%	≥ 65%	
TSI - Higher Education Readiness Component: Mathematics**		≥ 65%	≥ 65%	
College-Ready Graduates		≥ 35%	≥ 40.0%	

* Indicator evaluates performance for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, and White. Economically Disadvantaged status is not available from the testing results.

** Indicator evaluates performance for All Students and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

*** Acknowledgment for CI is available to campuses only. It is evaluated for All Students only. CI will be applied to only those campuses that serve grades 4 – 8 only since the vertical scale scores are only available for grades 3 – 8. Therefore, high schools will be unable to earn a CI acknowledgment in 2010 and 2011. CI is not evaluated for campuses evaluated under AEA procedures.

Chapter 19 – Calendar

Dates significant to the accountability system are listed below. Key dates directly related to accountability are bold. To the extent possible, descriptions of how products will be released (via mail, secure web, or public web) are provided. The fourth column shows whether the date applies to standard procedures, AEA procedures, or both.

Due to unforeseen circumstances, the calendar dates listed in this chapter may be modified at a later time.

Year	Date	Activity	Standard or AEA
2009	June 25	2008-09 PEIMS submission 3 due (2008-09 Attendance)	Both
	July 16	Last date for districts with traditional calendars to resubmit changes and corrections to 2008-09 PEIMS submission 3	Both
	August 27	Last date for districts with TEA-approved year-round calendars to resubmit 2008-09 PEIMS submission 3	Both
	September 9 – 23	2010 AEA campus registration process (secure web only)	AEA
	September 25	School-Start Window closed for reporting dropouts	Both
	October 20 – 23	TAKS exit-level retests in ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies administered	Both
	October 30	Snapshot date for enrolled students (2009-10 PEIMS submission 1)	Both
	November 17	TEA releases 2009-10 list of Technical Assistance Team (TAT) campuses (secure website)	Both
	November 19	TEA releases preliminary longitudinal cohorts to districts (secure web only)	Both
	November 20	TEA releases 2009-10 list of Technical Assistance Team (TAT) campuses (on the <i>To the Administrator Addressed</i> (TAA) on public web).	Both
	December 3	2009-10 PEIMS submission 1 due (includes 2008-09 Leavers; 2009-10 Enrollment)	Both
	December 8	TEA notifies districts of campuses identified under Public Education Grant (PEG) Program criteria effective for the 2010-11 school year (not applicable to charters or registered AECs)	Standard
	December 15	Public Education Grant (PEG) list available on the <i>To the Administrator Addressed</i> (TAA) page with attachments (on public web)	Standard

Year	Date	Activity	Standard or AEA
2010	January – March	Development of 2010 state accountability system	Both
	January 21	Last date to resubmit changes and corrections to 2009-10 PEIMS submission 1	Both
	February 1	Districts notify parents of students in campuses identified under PEG criteria that they are eligible for transfer in 2010-11 (not applicable to charters or registered AECs)	Standard
	March 3	TAKS administered: grades 4 and 7 writing, grade 9 reading, grades 10 and 11 ELA	Both
	April 5	Campus pairing process (e-mail notification)	Standard
	April 6 – 7	TAKS grades 5 & 8 reading and mathematics administered	Both
	April 21	Commissioner’s final decisions standard and alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures for 2010 accountability system posted on public website	Both
	April 27 – 30	TAKS administered: grades 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, & 11 mathematics; grades 3, 4, 6, & 7 reading; grade 5, 8, 10, & 11 science; grades 8, 10, & 11 social studies	Both
	May 6	Charters that have the option to be evaluated under 2010 AEA procedures are contacted	AEA
	May 14	Due date for responses from charters that have the option to be evaluated under 2010 AEA procedures (secure web only)	AEA
	May 18 – 19	TAKS grades 5 & 8 reading and mathematics retest	Both
	May 19 – 26	Districts receive TAKS results for all subjects, all grades	Both
	May 19	Final 2010 Registered Alternative Education Campuses and Final List of Charter Operators Evaluated Under 2010 Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures (on public web)	AEA
	May 19	Key chapters of the 2010 Accountability Manual posted on public web	Both
	Mid-June	Entire 2010 Accountability Manual on public website	Both
June 18	Districts receive confidential dropout and completion lists and rates from TEA (secure web only)	Both	

Year	Date	Activity	Standard or AEA
2010 (cont.)	June 24	2009-10 PEIMS submission 3 due (2009-10 Attendance)	Both
	July 15	Last date for districts with traditional calendars to resubmit changes and corrections to 2009-10 PEIMS submission 3	Both
	July 20	Districts receive confidential preview data tables from TEA (secure web only)	Both
	July 20	TEA begins accepting ratings appeals	Both
	July 29*	TEA issues 2010 district and campus accountability ratings (on secure web only)	Both
	July 30*	TEA issues 2010 district and campus accountability ratings (on public web)	Both
	August 13	Last day to appeal 2010 state accountability ratings	Both
	August/September	Districts must post current accountability rating, AEIS report, and SRC on district website	Both
	August 26	Last date for districts with TEA-approved year-round calendars to resubmit 2009-10 PEIMS submission 3	Both
	September 8 – 22	2011 AEA campus registration process (secure web only)	AEA
	September/October	Districts must include the most current campus accountability rating with the first student report card	Both
	September 24	School-Start Window closed for reporting dropouts	Both
	Early October	Appeal decisions mailed to districts (and posted on secure web)	Both
	Late October	Ratings update and 2010 Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA) release (on secure and public website)	Both
	Late October – Early November	TEA releases 2010-11 list of Technical Assistance Team (TAT) campuses	Both
	Early November	TEA releases 2009-10 AEIS reports to district superintendents (secure web only)	Both
Late November	Release of 2009-10 AEIS reports (on public website)	Both	

* The public release of district and campus ratings will be posted online on July 30th. Districts will have access to their list of district and campus ratings on the TEA Secure Environment (TEASE) Accountability site the afternoon of July 29th. ESC's will receive a listing via email on July 30st showing the district and campus ratings for the districts in their region. Final masked data tables will be available on the TEA public website.

Year	Date	Activity	Standard or AEA
2010 (cont.)	November-December	TEA releases preliminary longitudinal cohorts to districts (secure web only)	Both
	December 2	2010-11 PEIMS submission 1 due (includes 2009-10 Leavers and 2010-11 Enrollment)	Both
	Early December	TEA notifies districts of campuses identified under PEG criteria effective for the 2011–12 school year (not applicable to charters or registered AECs)	Standard
	Early December	TEA releases 2009-10 School Report Cards	Both
	Early December	PEG list e-mailed to districts and posted to the <i>To the Administrator Addressed</i> public webpage	Both
2011	January – March	Development of 2011 state accountability system	Both
	January 20	Last date to resubmit changes and corrections to 2010-11 PEIMS submission 1	Both
	February 1	Districts notify parents of students in campuses identified under PEG criteria that they are eligible for transfer in 2011-12 (not applicable to charters or registered AECs)	Standard
	March 1	TAKS administered: grades 4 and 7 writing, grade 9 reading, grades 10 and 11 ELA	Both
	April	Campus pairing process (secure web only)	Standard
	April	TEA contacts AECs that do not meet the 2011 at-risk registration criterion	AEA
	April 4 – 5	TAKS grade 5 & 8 reading and mathematics administered	Both
	April 26 – 29	TAKS administered: grades 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, & 11 mathematics; grades 4, 6, & 7 reading; grades 5, 8, 10, & 11 science; grades 8, 10, & 11 social studies	Both
	May	Charters that have the option to be evaluated under 2011 AEA procedures are contacted	AEA
	Mid-May	Districts receive TAKS results for all subjects, all grades	Both
	May 17 – 18	TAKS grades 5 & 8 reading and mathematics retest	Both
	Mid-May	Due date for responses from charters that have the option to be evaluated under 2011 AEA procedures (secure web only)	AEA
	Mid-May	Key chapters of the 2011 Accountability Manual posted on public web	Both

Year	Date	Activity	Standard or AEA
2011 (cont.)	Mid-June	Entire 2011 Accountability Manual posted on public website	Both
	June	Districts receive confidential dropout and completion lists and rates from TEA (secure web only)	Both
	June 24	2010-11 PEIMS submission 3 due (2010-11 Attendance)	Both
	July 15	Last date for districts with traditional school year calendars to resubmit changes and corrections to 2010-11 PEIMS submission 3	Both
	Mid-July	Districts receive confidential preview data tables from TEA (secure web only)	Both
	July 29	Release of 2011 accountability ratings	Both
	August	2011 state accountability ratings appeals process (Date for appeals deadline TBD)	Both
	August/September	Districts must post current accountability rating, AEIS report, and SRC on district website	Both
	August 26	Last date for districts with TEA-approved year-round calendars to resubmit 2010-11 PEIMS submission 3	Both
	September/October	Districts must include the most current campus accountability rating with the first student report card	Both
	October	Appeal decisions mailed to districts (and posted on secure web)	Both
	October	Final ratings release—after resolution of all appeals	Both
	October	TEA issues 2011 Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA)	Both
	October/November	TEA releases 2010-11 AEIS reports	Both
	November-December	TEA releases preliminary longitudinal cohorts to districts (secure web only)	Both
	November/December	TEA notifies districts of campuses identified under PEG criteria effective for 2012-13 school year (not applicable to charters or registered AECs)	Standard
November/December	TEA releases 2010-11 School Report Cards	Both	

**The 2010 Accountability Rating System
for Texas Public Schools and School Districts**

Appendices

Appendices:

Appendix A –
Commissioner of Education
Rule 171

Appendix B – Texas
Education Code 173

Appendix C – Comparison
of State and Federal
Systems 175

Appendix D –
Data Sources 181

Appendix E –
Texas Growth Index
and Texas Projection
Measure 201

Appendix F – Campus
Comparison Group 207

Appendix G –
Contacts 209

Appendix H –
Acknowledgments 213

Appendix I – TEA Secure
Environment 217

Appendix A – Commissioner of Education Rule

Beginning in 2000, a portion of the *Accountability Manual* has been adopted on an annual basis as a Commissioner of Education rule. With the publication of this *Manual*, the Texas Education Agency will file a Commissioner’s Rule amendment to 19 *Texas Administrative Code* §97.1001, *Accountability Rating System*, with the Office of the Secretary of State. This rule will adopt the *2010 Accountability Manual, Chapters 2-6, 8, 10-13, and 15-17*, thus giving legal standing to the rating process and procedures.

Allowing for a 30-day comment period, final adoption should take effect by July 28, 2010. Once the rule becomes effective, it may be accessed online at:

<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter097/ch097aa.html>

Chapter 97. Planning and Accountability

Subchapter AA. Accountability and Performance Monitoring

§97.1001. Accountability Rating System.

Appendix B – Texas Education Code

The 2010 Accountability Rating System for Texas Public Schools and School Districts was developed based on statutory mandates of the Texas Legislature. The majority of the relevant legislation is contained in *TEC Chapter 39. Public School Accountability*. The following table of contents references statute in TEC as it existed prior to the changes made by the 81st legislative session in 2009. This statute is in effect through the 2010-2011 school year. The full text of Chapter 39 from the 80th Legislature is available at:

http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2010/manual/TEC_CH_39_80th.pdf

Chapter 39. Public School System Accountability

Subchapter B. Assessment of Academic Skills

- Sec. 39.021 Essential Skills and Knowledge
- Sec. 39.022 Assessment Program
- Sec. 39.023 Adoption and Administration of Instruments
- Sec. 39.0231 Reporting of Results of Certain Assessments
- Sec. 39.0232 Use of End-of-Course Instrument as Placement Instrument
- Sec. 39.024 Satisfactory Performance
- Sec. 39.025 Secondary-Level Performance Required
- Sec. 39.026 Local Option
- Sec. 39.027 Exemption
- Sec. 39.028 Comparison of State Results to National Results
- Sec. 39.029 Migratory Children
- Sec. 39.030 Confidentiality; Performance Reports
- Sec. 39.031 Cost
- Sec. 39.032 Assessment Instrument Standards; Civil Penalty
- Sec. 39.033 Voluntary Assessment of Private School Students
- Sec. 39.034 Measure of Annual Improvement in Student Achievement

Subchapter C. Performance Indicators

- Sec. 39.051 Academic Excellence Indicators
- Sec. 39.052 Campus Report Card
- Sec. 39.053 Performance Report
- Sec. 39.054 Uses of Performance Report
- Sec. 39.055 Annual Audit of Dropout Records; Report

Subchapter D. Accreditation Status

- Sec. 39.071 Accreditation
- Sec. 39.072 Accreditation Standards
- Sec. 39.0721 Gold Performance Rating Program
- Sec. 39.073 Determining Accreditation Status
- Sec. 39.074 On-Site Investigations
- Sec. 39.075 Special Accreditation Investigations
- Sec. 39.076 Conduct of Investigations

Subchapter E. Successful School Awards

- Sec. 39.091 Creation of System
- Sec. 39.092 Types of Awards

- Sec. 39.093 Awards
- Sec. 39.094 Use of Awards
- Sec. 39.095 Funding
- Sec. 39.096 Confidentiality

Subchapter F. Additional Rewards

- Sec. 39.111 Recognition and Rewards
- Sec. 39.112 Excellence Exemptions
- Sec. 39.113 Recognition of High School Completion and Success and College Readiness Programs
- Sec. 39.114 High School Allotment

Subchapter G. Accreditation Sanctions

- Sec. 39.131 Sanctions For Districts
- Sec. 39.132 Sanctions For Academically Unacceptable and Certain Other Campuses
- Sec. 39.1321 Sanctions for Charter Schools
- Sec. 39.1322 Technical Assistance and Campus Intervention Teams
- Sec. 39.1323 Campus Intervention Team Procedures
- Sec. 39.1324 Mandatory Sanctions
- Sec. 39.1326 Transitional Sanctions Provisions
- Sec. 39.1327 Management of Certain Academically Unacceptable Campuses
- Sec. 39.133 Annual Review
- Sec. 39.1331 Acquisition of Professional Services
- Sec. 39.134 Costs Paid By District
- Sec. 39.135 Conservator Or Management Team
- Sec. 39.136 Board of Managers
- Sec. 39.137 Special Campus Intervention Team
- Sec. 39.138 Immunity From Civil Liability

Subchapter H. Reports By Texas Education Agency

- Sec. 39.181 General Requirements
- Sec. 39.182 Comprehensive Annual Report
- Sec. 39.183 Regional and District Level Report
- Sec. 39.184 Technology Report
- Sec. 39.185 Interim Report

Subchapter I. Financial Accountability

- Sec. 39.201 Definitions
- Sec. 39.202 Development and Implementation
- Sec. 39.203 Reporting
- Sec. 39.204 Rules

Subchapter J. Notice of Performance

- Sec. 39.251 Notice in Student Grade Report
- Sec. 39.252 Notice on District Website

Subchapter K. Procedures for Challenge of Accountability Rating or Sanction

- Sec. 39.301 Review by Commissioner: Accountability Ratings
- Sec. 39.302 Review by State Office of Administrative Hearings: Sanctions

Appendix C – Comparison of State and Federal Systems

In addition to the state accountability system, which is mandated by the Texas legislature, there is also a federal system of public school accountability. Although the state system has been in place since 1993, the accountability provisions in the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act were first applied to the Texas public schools in 2003. Campuses, districts and the state were evaluated for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for the first time in 2003.

The purpose of this appendix is to provide details comparing the state accountability system to the federal (AYP) system. Though there are some similarities and elements in common between the two, there are significant differences. For complete details about the federal system, see the *AYP Guide*. The *Guide* as well as other information about AYP can be found at the AYP website at <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/index.html>.

COMPARISON

The following tables provide comparisons of the state and federal systems. *Table 29* contains a side-by-side comparison of the indicators, restrictions, requirements, and source data for both systems.

Table 30 is a comparison by grade level. With this table, a campus can compare the use of various indicators by grade. For example, a grade 3-5 campus is evaluated in both the state and federal systems on TAKS reading and mathematics, although AYP evaluates more student groups for each of these indicators. In a grade 3-5 campus, its AYP status also depends on attendance and participation indicators, while its state rating includes TAKS writing and science results.

Table 29: 2010 Comparison of State and Federal Accountability (AYP) by Indicator

	State Accountability (Standard Procedures)	AYP
TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated)		
Subjects & Standards	Reading/ELA* <i>Exemplary</i> 90% / <i>Recognized</i> 80% / <i>Acceptable</i> 70% Mathematics* <i>Exemplary</i> 90% / <i>Recognized</i> 80% / <i>Acceptable</i> 60% Writing <i>Exemplary</i> 90% / <i>Recognized</i> 80% / <i>Acceptable</i> 70% Social Studies <i>Exemplary</i> 90% / <i>Recognized</i> 80% / <i>Acceptable</i> 70% Science <i>Exemplary</i> 90% / <i>Recognized</i> 80% / <i>Acceptable</i> 55% All values rounded to the nearest whole number. *Includes cumulative pass rate for grades 5 and 8 in reading and mathematics.	Reading/ELA* <i>Meets AYP</i> 73% Mathematics* <i>Meets AYP</i> 67% All values rounded to nearest whole number. * Includes cumulative pass rate for grades 5 and 8 in reading and mathematics
Grades	3–11 (English); 3–5 (Spanish)	3–8, and 10 (English); 3–5 (Spanish)
Student Groups	All Students African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged	All Students African American Hispanic White Economically Disadvantaged Special Education Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Minimum Size	All Students..... Any (Special Analysis if small) Student Groups..... 30/10%/50	All StudentsAny (Special Analysis if small) Student Groups 50/10%/200
Improvement	To <i>Acceptable</i> : Has enough gain to meet <i>Acceptable</i> standard in 2 years. To <i>Recognized</i> : At 74% – 79% and has gain to meet 80% standard in 2 years. Note: TPM is not included in calculations	10% decrease in percent <i>not passing</i> AND the relevant other measure requirements for the student group
Texas Projection Measure (TPM)	Percent Meeting the TAKS Standard with TPM is evaluated to move to <i>Acceptable</i> , <i>Recognized</i> , or <i>Exemplary</i> . May move only one level.	AYP Proficiency Rate with Growth includes student results that did not meet the passing standard but are projected to meet the standard based on TPM.
Mobility Adjustment	District and campus accountability subsets used.	District and campus accountability subsets used.
Pairing	Paired with feeder campus (or district).	Paired with feeder campus (or district) in certain conditions.

Table 29: 2010 Comparison of State and Federal Accountability (AYP) by Indicator (continued)

	State Accountability (Standard Procedures)	AYP
Other Assessments		
TELPAS Reading	N/A: Assessment not included for determining ratings.	Combined with TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) results by subject for students not tested on TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) for Performance and Participation. Note: For each of these assessments, except TELPAS, AYP Proficiency Rate with Growth includes student results that do not meet the passing standard but are on track to meet the standard based on the TPM or the TAKS-Alt growth measure.
TAKS LAT		
TAKS-Modified		
TAKS-Modified LAT		
TAKS-Alternate		
Additional Assessment Features		
Exceptions to the Standard	Up to 4 TAKS exceptions allowed to move to <i>Acceptable</i> or <i>Recognized</i> . One exception allowed to move to <i>Exemplary</i> . Number of assessment measures evaluated, minimum performance floors, and prior use determine eligibility. TPM not included in floor.	N/A
Cap on Alternate Assessments	N/A	Cap on number of students counted as <i>proficient</i> or <i>met growth</i> on TAKS-Alt and TAKS-M.
Attendance Rate		
Standard	N/A: Used only for Gold Performance Acknowledgment	Meets AYP 90.0% "Other Measure" for elementary and middle schools. All values rounded to nearest one-tenth of a percent.
Student Groups		All Students only
Minimum Size		All Students.... 7,200 (40 students x 180 days) Student Groups* 50/10%/200 * Student groups used only for performance gain.
Improvement		At least 0.1% improvement.
Annual Dropout Rate (grades 7 8)		
Standards	Grades 7-8... <i>Exemplary, Recognized, & Acceptable</i> ≤ 1.8% All values rounded to one-tenth.	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.
Student Groups	All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged	
Minimum Size	All StudentsAt least 5 dropouts and 10 in denominator Student GroupsAt least 5 dropouts and 30/10%/50 in denominator	
Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To <i>Acceptable, Recognized</i> or <i>Exemplary</i> : If rate has declined enough to meet the 1.8% standard in 2 years. Minimum Size (All Students and groups): At least 10 in prior year. 	
Middle School w/o dropout rate	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.	

Table 29: 2010 Comparison of State and Federal Accountability (AYP) by Indicator (continued)

	State Accountability (Standard Procedures)	AYP
Completion Rate (grades 9-12)		
Standards	Graduates+Continuers • Exemplary95.0% • Recognized85.0% • Acceptable75.0% <i>All values rounded to nearest one-tenth of a percent.</i>	Graduates only 75.0% (statewide goal 90%) "Other Measure" for high schools and districts. All values rounded to nearest one-tenth of a percent.
Student Groups	All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged	All Students only
Minimum Size	All Students At least 5 dropouts and 10 in denominator Student GroupsAt least 5 dropouts and 30/10%/50 in denominator	All StudentsAt least 40 in denominator Student Groups* 50/10%/200 * Student groups used only for safe harbor.
Improvement	• To <i>Acceptable</i> : Has enough gain to meet 75.0% standard in 2 years • To <i>Recognized</i> : 75.0% - 84.9% and has enough gain to meet 85.0% standard in 2 yrs <i>Minimum Size (All Students and groups): At least 10 in prior year</i>	• 4-year Graduation Rate alternatives: ○ Safe Harbor Target – a 10.0% decrease in difference between the prior 4-year graduation rate and the 90.0% statewide goal. ○ Improvement Target – a 1.0% increase from the prior year 4-year graduation rate. • 80% 5-year Graduation Rate.
High School w/o completion rate	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.	N/A: Indicator not evaluated.
Participation Rate: Reading/ELA & Mathematics		
Standard	N/A: Indicator not evaluated. Monitoring interventions may occur with excessive absences.	Tested at campus/district 95% All values rounded to nearest whole number.
Student Groups		All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged, Special Education, Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Minimum Size		All StudentsAt least 40 in denominator Student Groups50/10%/200
Other Campus and District Situations		
Registered Alternative Education Campuses	Rated under Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures.	Evaluated under same criteria as regular campuses.
Charter Operators	Evaluated under same criteria as regular districts.* *Charter Operators may be rated under AEA Procedures.	Evaluated under same criteria as regular districts.
Charter Schools	Evaluated under same criteria as regular campuses. (Charter schools are not paired.)	Evaluated under same criteria as regular campuses.
New Campuses	All campuses (established or new) are rated.	New campuses are not evaluated.
Additional District Requirements	• Must have no <i>Unacceptable</i> campuses to be <i>Exemplary</i> or <i>Recognized</i> . • Must meet Underreported Student standards to be <i>Exemplary</i> or <i>Recognized</i> .	No additional district requirements.

Table 30: 2010 Grade Level Comparison of State (Standard Procedures) and Federal Accountability

Grade	Student Group	†Reading ELA	†Math	Writing	Social Studies	Science	**HS Completion	Annual Dropout	Attendance	Participation	
										Read/ELA	Math
Grade 1#	All Students								AYP		
	AA/H/W/ED*										
	Special Ed & LEP										
Grade 2#	All Students								AYP		
	AA/H/W/ED*										
	Special Ed & LEP										
Grade 3	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State						AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State							AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP							AYP	AYP
Grade 4	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State	State					AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State	State						AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP							AYP	AYP
Grade 5	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State			State			AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State			State				AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP							AYP	AYP
Grade 6	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State						AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State							AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP							AYP	AYP
Grade 7	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State	State				State	AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State	State				State		AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP							AYP	AYP
Grade 8	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State		State	State		State	AYP	AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State		State	State		State		AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP							AYP	AYP
Grade 9	All Students	State	State				AYP/State				
	AA/H/W/ED*	State	State				State				
	Special Ed & LEP										
Grade 10	All Students	AYP/State	AYP/State		State	State	AYP/State			AYP	AYP
	AA/H/W/ED*	AYP/State	AYP/State		State	State	State			AYP	AYP
	Special Ed & LEP	AYP	AYP							AYP	AYP
Grade 11	All Students	State	State		State	State	AYP/State				
	AA/H/W/ED*	State	State		State	State	State				
	Special Ed & LEP										
Grade 12#	All Students						AYP/State				
	AA/H/W/ED*						State				
	Special Ed & LEP										

* AA/H/W/ED refers to the student groups African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged.

** High School Completion is defined differently for AYP: Under AYP, only the *Graduates* component of the longitudinal Completion Rate is used, including 4-year and 5-year diploma recipients.

Schools are paired when they do not have grades tested. The use of paired data differs between the two systems.

† Performance on TAKS reading/ELA and math include slightly different groups of students for AYP: Minimum size for student groups in AYP is 50/10%/200; for state accountability it is 30/10%/50. Also AYP includes TAKS-M and TAKS-AIT results and all LAT results for reading/ELA and math while state accountability does not.

Appendix D – Data Sources

This appendix provides data sources for the indicators used in the state accountability system, including those used to assign Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA). The information is arranged alphabetically by indicator name.

For each indicator, the *Methodology* section shows the source for the numerator and denominator. *Student Demographics* shows the sources for the demographics used to disaggregate the "All Students" totals into the various student groups used in the accountability system. *Other Information* presents unique topics affecting each indicator.

The primary sources for all data used in the state accountability system are the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data collection, the various assessment companies, and the General Educational Development (GED) data file. *Tables 31, 32, and 33* describe these data sources in detail. The terms provided in these tables are referenced within the indicator discussion.

Table 31: Assessments Used in Accountability

Organization Name	Description
ACT, Inc.	The ACT, Inc. annually provides the agency with the ACT participation and performance data of graduating seniors from Texas public schools. Only one record is sent per student. If a student takes an ACT test more than once, the agency receives the record for the most recent examination taken. The ACT data as of the June administration is used in creating the SAT/ACT indicator.
College Board	The College Board annually provides the agency with the SAT participation and performance data of graduating seniors from Texas public schools. Only one record is sent per student. If a student takes an SAT test more than once, the agency receives the record for the most recent examination taken. The SAT data as of the June administration is used in creating the SAT/ACT indicator. In addition, the College Board provides the agency with the Advanced Placement (AP) examination results of Texas public school students each year. The AP data as of the May administration is used in creating the AP/IB indicator.
International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO)	The International Baccalaureate Organization provides the agency with the International Baccalaureate (IB) examination results of Texas public school students each year. The IB data as of the May administration is used in creating the AP/IB indicator.
Pearson	Pearson is the contractor for the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS). After each test administration, the TEA Student Assessment Division receives student-level TAKS data from Pearson.
TEA GED Database	A TEA database containing information about examinee performance on the GED tests is maintained by the TEA GED Unit. Unlike the information in most other TEA data files, which is reported annually, receipt of a GED test(s) is reported as soon as the test is scored. A certificate is mailed once the examinee has passed all five tests, and the information is stored in a database. Candidates take GED tests at centers throughout the state in school districts, colleges and universities, education service centers, and correctional facilities. Tests are given year-round, and the results are transmitted electronically to TEA from the University of Texas Scoring Center.

Table 32: PEIMS Record Types Used in Accountability

Record	Name	Description	Submission/ Month
101	Student Demographic Data	Demographic information about each student, including the student's ethnicity, sex, date of birth, migrant status, as-of-status, campus of accountability, demographic revision confirmation code, and student attribution code.	1 st /October, 3 rd /June
110	Student Enrollment Data	Enrollment information about each student, including the student's grade, Average Daily Attendance (ADA) eligibility, economically disadvantaged status, at-risk status, and indicators of the special programs in which the student participates.	1 st /October
203	Leaver Data	Information about students served in grades 7-12 in the prior school year (2008-09) who did not continue in enrollment the following fall, and who did not move to another Texas public school district, graduate before the 2008-09 school year, or receive a GED by August 31, 2009. 2008-09 leavers are students who graduated in that school year, dropped out, or left school for non-dropout reasons (e.g., enrolled in school outside the Texas public school system, or returned to home country). This record contains the last campus of enrollment, the leaver reason, and additional information for graduates.	1 st /October
400	Basic Attendance Data	Information about each student for each of the 6 six-week attendance reporting periods in the year. For each student, for each six-week period, districts report grade level, number of days taught, days absent, and total eligible and ineligible days present and selected special program information.	3 rd /June
405	Special Education Attendance Data	Information about each student served in a special education program. For each student, for each six-week period, districts report grade-level and also instructional-setting codes.	3 rd /June
415	Course Completion Data	Information about each student who was in membership in grades 9-12 and who completed at least one state-approved course during the school year. This record contains campus of enrollment, course sequence, pass/fail credit indicator, distance learning indicator, and dual credit indicator.	3 rd /June

Table 33: Student Demographics

Trait	Description
At Risk	<p>A student is identified as at risk of dropping out of school based on state-defined criteria only (TEC §29.081). The statutory criteria for at-risk status include each student who is under 21 years of age and who:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) was not advanced from one grade level to the next for one or more school years; 2) is in grade 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, or 12 and did not maintain an average equivalent to 70 on a scale of 100 in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum during a semester in the preceding or current school year or is not maintaining such an average in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum in the current semester; 3) did not perform satisfactorily on an assessment instrument administered to the student under TEC Subchapter B, Chapter 39, and who has not in the previous or current school year subsequently performed on that instrument or another appropriate instrument at a level equal to at least 110 percent of the level of satisfactory performance on that instrument; 4) is in prekindergarten, kindergarten or grade 1, 2, or 3 and did not perform satisfactorily on a readiness test or assessment instrument administered during the current school year; 5) is pregnant or is a parent; 6) has been placed in an alternative education program in accordance with TEC §37.006 during the preceding or current school year; 7) has been expelled in accordance with TEC §37.007 during the preceding or current school year; 8) is currently on parole, probation, deferred prosecution, or other conditional release; 9) was previously reported through the PEIMS to have dropped out of school; 10) is a student of limited English proficiency, as defined by TEC §29.052; 11) is in the custody or care of the Department of Protective and Regulatory Services or has, during the current school year, been referred to the department by a school official, officer of the juvenile court, or law enforcement official; 12) is homeless, as defined NCLB Title X, Part C, Section 725(2), the term “homeless children and youths,” and its subsequent amendments; or 13) resided in the preceding school year or resides in the current school year in a residential placement facility in the district, including a detention facility, substance abuse treatment facility, emergency shelter, psychiatric hospital, halfway house, or foster group home.
Economic Status	<p>A student may be identified as economically disadvantaged by the district if he or she:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meets eligibility requirements for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Program; ○ programs assisted under Title II of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA); ○ Food Stamp benefits; ○ Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) or other public assistance; • received a Pell grant or comparable state program of need-based financial assistance; or • is from a family with an annual income at or below the official federal poverty line.
Special Education Status	<p>Special education status indicates the student is participating in a special education instructional and related services program or a general education program using special education support services, supplementary aids, or other special arrangements.</p>

Table 33: Student Demographics (continued)

Trait	Description
Ethnicity	<p>For the 2009-10 school year, districts reported race/ethnicity two ways for each student. Districts reported one of five ethnic codes for each student based on definitions in place in the <i>PEIMS Data Standards</i> for the data collection years through 2009-10. Districts also reported both race and ethnicity for each student using new codes based on the federal definitions for race and ethnicity. The collection of both sets of codes was implemented in PEIMS and also on the TAKS answer documents. For all accountability indicators, the 2010 system uses the ethnic codes collected under the former definition. The five student ethnicities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • American Indian or Alaskan Native (<i>not evaluated separately for accountability</i>) • Asian or Pacific Islander (<i>not evaluated separately for accountability</i>) • Black, not of Hispanic origin • Hispanic • White, not of Hispanic origin

Opportunities for Data Correction

PEIMS

General Data. The PEIMS data collection has a prescribed process and calendar for correcting errors or omissions discovered after the original submission. *The accuracy of all reports, whether they show ratings, acknowledgments, or recognitions is wholly dependent on the accuracy of the information submitted.* Districts are responsible for the accuracy of all their PEIMS data. Several mechanisms are in place to facilitate the collection of accurate data. First, all submitted data must pass an editor program before being accepted. In addition, districts can access various summary reports through the *EDIT+* application to assist them in verifying the accuracy of their data prior to submission deadlines. For each submission, a resubmission window is provided so that districts have an opportunity to resubmit information if an error is detected. See the *PEIMS Data Standards* (available at ritter.tea.state.tx.us/peims/standards/index.html) for the appropriate year for more details about the correction windows and submission deadlines.

Person Identification Database (PID) Updates. PID changes have profound ramifications throughout the Texas public education data system. Year-to-year and collection-to-collection matching are dependent upon stable PID records. *PEIMS Data Standards* should be followed to ensure that PID updates submitted by districts are processed properly. For information please see the edit process for PID, online at ritter.tea.state.tx.us/peims/pid/index.html.

ASSESSMENT DATA

TAKS. Student identification, demographic data, and scoring status information as entered on the answer document at the time of testing are used to determine the accountability subset and student groups for campus and district ratings. After the testing dates, districts are able to provide corrections to the test contractor and request corrected reports; however, only a portion of the changes made after testing are incorporated into the TAKS results used for determining accountability ratings or subsequent reports (e.g. AEIS and School Report Cards). For the files used for accountability, districts do not have the option to change student demographics, program participation, or score code status after test results are known.

Districts do have the opportunity to correct the TEST TAKEN INFO field for the tests taken during the primary administrations in the spring. Changes to this field that are submitted within the correction window will be included in the TAKS data files used in determining the 2010 accountability ratings.

Districts also have the opportunity to update the TAKS history file with the correct student ID information through the “*Online Viewing of Student History*” system. This is important because some students may not have Texas Projection Measure (TPM) results solely for the reason the student’s ID information does not match information previously submitted by the district that was loaded in the TAKS history file. If history updates were made by June 4, 2010, the TPM calculations for these students will be included in the final statewide results used for accountability purposes.

Districts have multiple opportunities to provide accurate information through their PEIMS submissions, pre-coded data files provided to the test contractor, and updates to the TAKS answer documents at the time of testing.

SAT, ACT, AP, and IB. The student taking the SAT, ACT, AP, or IB test identifies the school to which scores are attributed. Schools are encouraged to verify campus summary information on these tests immediately upon receipt. Discrepancies should be reported to the testing companies, not to TEA. Once the testing companies finalize results for yearly summaries, subsequent corrections are not reflected in any national, state, district, or school results released.

TREATMENT OF KNOWN COMPROMISED DATA

In cases where it has been confirmed that accountability data are compromised, the following actions will occur. Rating consequences are determined by the commissioner as described in *Chapter 4: The Basics – Determining a Rating*. The compromised data may be reported but will be annotated to indicate the irregularities and that the data could not be used for rating evaluations. In the year following the data irregularity, the school may not be able to use additional features, including Required Improvement, Texas Projection Measure (TPM), and the Exceptions Provision, to achieve a higher rating since the prior year results were compromised. When possible, the testing contractor may be asked to invalidate the assessment results used for accountability if district findings are known in time. Annotations on reports may appear on both campus and district reports and may continue into future years if the compromised data affects longitudinal indicators. Also, annotations may be required in future years to explain the lack of data for improvement calculations.

Indicator Data Sources

ADVANCED COURSE/DUAL ENROLLMENT COMPLETION

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of students in grades 9 through 12} \\ \text{who received credit for at least one advanced course (from PEIMS 415)}}{\text{number of students in grades 9 through 12} \\ \text{who completed at least one course (from PEIMS 415)}}$$

Year of Data: 2008-09

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
Date	October 2008	June 2009

Other Information:

- A list of courses designated as advanced is published each year in the *AEIS Glossary*. The most current list can be accessed online at ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis/2010/glossary.html#appendc.

ADVANCED PLACEMENT/INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE EXAM RESULTS**Methodology:***Participation:*

$$\frac{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and 12}^{\text{th}} \text{ graders taking at least one AP or IB examination (from College Board and IBO)}}{\text{total non-special education students enrolled in 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and 12}^{\text{th}} \text{ grades (from PEIMS 110)}}$$

Performance:

$$\frac{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and 12}^{\text{th}} \text{ graders with at least one score at or above the criterion score (from College Board and IBO)}}{\text{number of 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ and 12}^{\text{th}} \text{ graders with at least one AP or IB examination (from College Board and IBO)}}$$

Year of Data: 2008-09**Student Demographics:**

	Economic Status	Ethnicity	Special Education Status
Source	n/a	PEIMS 101 (primary) College Board and IBO (secondary)	PEIMS 110
Date	n/a	October 2008 (primary) May 2009 (secondary)	October 2008

Other Information:

- *Primary and Secondary Sources.* Secondary sources are used when the primary source does not contain ethnicity for a given student.
- *Special Education.* Those students reported as receiving special education services are removed from the count of grade 11 & 12 enrollees used in the denominator of the participation calculation.

ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE**Methodology for Grade 7-8 Annual Dropout Rate (Standard Procedures):**

$$\frac{\text{number of grade 7-8 dropouts (from PEIMS 203)}}{\text{number of grade 7-8 students served during the school year, including ADA ineligible students and students in the Optional Flexible School Day Program (from PEIMS 110, 400, and 500)}}$$

Methodology for Grade 7-12 Annual Dropout Rate (AEA Procedures):

number of grade 7-12 dropouts (*from PEIMS 203*)

number of grade 7-12 students served during the school year, including ADA ineligible students and students in the Optional Flexible School Day Program (*from PEIMS 110, 400, and 500*)

Year of Data: 2008-09

Student Demographics:

Numerator

	Economic Status	Ethnicity	Grade
Source	PEIMS 110 (primary)	PEIMS 101 (primary & secondary)	PEIMS 110 (primary) PEIMS 400 (primary) PEIMS 500 (primary) PEIMS 101 (secondary)
Date	October 2008 (primary)	October 2008 (primary) June 2009 (primary) October 2009 (secondary)	October 2008 (primary) June 2009 (primary) October 2009 (secondary)

Denominator

	Economic Status	Ethnicity	Grade
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101	PEIMS 110 PEIMS 400 PEIMS 500
Date	October 2008	October 2008 June 2009	October 2008 June 2009

Other Information:

- *Leaver Codes.* Districts are not required to report the status of grade 7-12 students if they moved to and enrolled another Texas public school district, graduated in a previous school year (before 2008-09), or received a GED in Texas by August 31, 2009. The district must code all other grade 7-12 students who leave with one of the codes shown on *Table 34*. Students who leave due to reasons identified with an asterisk are not counted as dropouts. Only students reported with leaver code 98 are defined as dropouts.
- *Underreported Students.* Information about students reported in either enrollment or attendance in grades 7-12 the prior year but who were not accounted for as movers, previous Texas graduates, or GED recipients and who were not reported as either enrolled or as leavers in the current year are identified as underreported students. Lists of these students can be found on the *EDIT+* reports.
- *School-Start Window.* This is the period of time between the first day of school and the last Friday in September. The end of the school-start window is the day that students served in the prior year must return to school to not be considered leavers. For the current ratings cycle the end of the school start window was September 25, 2009.
- *Economically Disadvantaged.* Beginning in 2010, the economic status of a student is based on the economically disadvantaged information reported by the accountable district. In the past, a student was considered economically disadvantaged if any district reported the student as economically disadvantaged in the fall.

- *Cumulative Denominator.* A cumulative count of students is used in the denominator with all annual dropout rate calculations. This method for calculating the dropout rate neutralizes the effects of mobility by including in the denominator every student ever reported in attendance at the campus or district throughout the school year, regardless of length of stay.
- *Campus of Accountability.* Leavers are assigned to the campuses they were attending when they left the Texas public school system. A student served at a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP) and/or a Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP) is assigned to a "campus of accountability" based on the campus he or she last attended when one can be identified. Campus of accountability may be reported by the district or may be determined by the agency based on PEIMS attendance records reported for the prior year. A detailed table showing assignment in specific situations may be found in the section of the *PEIMS Data Standards* describing the student demographic data (Record Type 101).
- *HB 3092 Campuses.* House Bill 3092, passed during the 80th legislative session in 2007, amended TEC §39.072(d) by adding the underlined portion shown below:

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this code, for purposes of determining the performance of a school district under this chapter, including the accreditation status of the district, a student confined by court order in a residential program or facility operated by or under contract with the Texas Youth Commission, Texas Juvenile Probation Commission, or any other governmental entity, including a juvenile board, is not considered to be a student of the school district in which the program or facility is physically located. The performance of such a student on an assessment instrument or other academic excellence indicator adopted under Section 39.051 shall be determined, reported, and considered separately from the performance of students attending a school of the district in which the program or facility is physically located.

The base indicators (completion rates, dropout rates, and assessment results) and other performance indicators reported on the AEIS reports are processed in a manner to comply with this statute. See *Chapter 6* and Table 9 within that chapter for details about the inclusion or exclusion of performance data for these alternative education campuses.

- *Migrant Students.* Migrant students who return after the school-start window are not counted as dropouts.
- *Summer Dropouts.* For state accountability purposes, summer dropouts are attributed to the school year just completed, based on the last campus the student attended the previous school year.
- *Primary and Secondary Sources.* Secondary sources are used when the primary source does not contain a match for the economic status, grade or ethnicity of every student.
- *Exclusions to the NCES Dropout Definition.* House Bill 3 as passed by the 81st Texas Legislature in 2009 defined certain exclusions when evaluating dropout and completion rates for accreditation and performance ratings. However, the statute explicitly requires use of the current NCES dropout definition until the 2011-12 school year. The 2008-09

dropouts collected in the 2009-10 year (for the 2010 ratings) will be processed using current definitions with no new exclusions applied.

Table 34: Leaver Codes

Code	Translation
01*	Graduated from a Campus in this District or Charter
03*	Died
16*	Return to Home Country
24*	College, Pursue Associate's or Bachelor's Degree
60*	Home Schooling
66*	Removed-Child Protective Svcs
78*	Expelled for criminal behavior under TEC §37.007, Cannot Return
81*	Enroll In TX Private School
82*	Enroll In School Outside Texas
83*	Withdrawn for nonresidence at time of enrollment, falsification of enrollment, or failure to provide proof of identification or immunization records
85*	Graduated outside Texas before entering Texas public school, then left Texas public school
86*	GED outside Texas
87*	Enroll in University High School Diploma Program
98	Other

* Codes with asterisks are not counted as dropouts in determining the 2010 state accountability ratings.

ATTENDANCE RATE

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were present (from PEIMS 400)}}{\text{total number of days students in grades 1-12 were in membership (from PEIMS 400)}}$$

Year of Data: 2008-09

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
Date	October 2008	June 2009

COLLEGE-READY GRADUATES

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of graduates who scored at or above the college-ready criteria on both ELA \& mathematics (from Pearson, College Board, and ACT)}}{\text{number of graduates with results in both subjects to evaluate (from PEIMS 203)}}$$

Year of Data: Class of 2009

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101 (primary) College Board and ACT (secondary)
Date	October 2009	October 2009 (primary) June 2009 (secondary)

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE:**READING/ELA, MATHEMATICS, WRITING, SCIENCE, SOCIAL STUDIES****Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{number of test takers achieving } \textit{Commended Performance} \text{ on TAKS (by subject) (from Pearson)}}{\text{total number TAKS test takers (by subject) (from Pearson)}}$$

Year of Data: 2009-10**Student Demographics:**

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
Date	October 2009	October 2009

Other Information:

- *Student Information.* The testing contractor, Pearson, pre-codes student information onto the answer documents from PEIMS data (see record types, above), or from district-supplied data files. The answer documents may also be coded by district staff on the day of testing.

COMPARABLE IMPROVEMENT: READING/ELA, MATHEMATICS**Methodology:**

$$\frac{\text{sum of matched student vertical scale growth (by subject) (from Pearson)}}{\text{total number of students with vertical scale growth (by subject) (from Pearson)}}$$

Years of Data: 2010 and 2009 (Spring TAKS Administrations)**Student Demographics:** Comparable Improvement is not disaggregated by ethnicity or economic status.**Other Information:**

- *Vertical Scale Growth.* The Texas Growth Index (TGI) is no longer available for grades 3-8 in reading or mathematics beginning with the 2009-10 assessment results. For those grades and subjects, results are reported on a vertical scale. Growth is defined as a student's vertical scale score in the current year minus that student's vertical scale score from the prior year in the same subject and language. To create a campus average, the amount of vertical scale growth for each student is summed for all the students at a campus and divided by the number of students. Because the vertical scale is only used for grades 3-8, only campuses serving students in grades 4-8 are eligible for

acknowledgment on CI using this new methodology. See *Appendix E – Student Growth Measures* for more details.

- *Group.* Each campus has a unique comparison group of 40 campuses which closely match that campus on six demographic characteristics, including percent of African American students, Hispanic students, White students, economically disadvantaged students, limited English proficient students, and mobile students. See *Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group* for a detailed explanation.
- *Quartiles.* Within each 40-member campus comparison group, campus average vertical scale growth values are arranged from highest to lowest. Campuses with average growth within the top quartile (the top 25%) of their group qualify for CI acknowledgment.

COMPLETION RATE

Methodology for Completion Rate I:

$$\frac{\text{number of completers (from PEIMS 101, 110, and 203 records)}}{\text{number in class (from PEIMS 101, 110, 203, 400, and 500 records and GED)}}$$

where “completers” = graduates plus continuers

Methodology for Completion Rate II:

$$\frac{\text{number of completers (from PEIMS 101, 110, 203 records, and GED)}}{\text{number in class (from PEIMS 101, 110, 203, 400, and 500 records and GED)}}$$

where “completers” = graduates plus continuers plus GED recipients

Years of Data: PEIMS submission 1 leaver data, 2006-07 through 2009-10; PEIMS submission 3 attendance data, 2005-06 through 2008-09; PEIMS submission 1 enrollment data, 2009-10, and General Educational Development records as of August 31, 2009.

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity	At Risk
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101	PEIMS 110
Date	October of year of final status by accountable district	June of year of final status or October of year of final status for continuers	October of year of final status

Other Information:

- *Dropout Definition.* As of the 2010 ratings cycle, the completion rate methodology uses the NCES dropout definition for all years of the cohort (2005-06 through 2008-09).
- *Economically Disadvantaged.* Beginning in 2010 with the class of 2009, the economic status of a student is based on the economic disadvantage information reported by the accountable district in the student’s final year of the cohort. In the past, a student’s economic status was based on the information reported by the accountable district in the student’s final year of cohort; if the information was missing in the final year, the most recent non-missing economic disadvantage information from a previous year in the cohort was used.
- *Class vs. Cohort.* The denominator of the Completion Rate calculation is defined as the “class.” The class is the sum of students from the original cohort who have a final status

of “graduated,” “continued,” “received GED,” or “dropped out.” There are other students who are members of the original cohort but whose final status does not affect the completion rate calculation. These are:

- students with a final status that is not considered to be either a completer, GED recipient, or a dropout. Examples include students who left public school to be home schooled or students who returned to home country;
- students whose final status could not be determined because data errors prevented records from being matched or because final status records were not submitted; and,
- dropouts who are excluded from accountability ratings due to statute.

Students in the cohort but not in the class do not affect the completion rate calculation at all—they are neither in the numerator or the denominator. All rates are based on members of the class.

- *Cohort Members.* Students stay with their original cohort, whether they are retained or promoted. Students are members of one and only one cohort.
- *Standard and AEA Procedures.* The definition of a completer differs between standard and AEA procedures in that GED recipients are not considered to be completers under standard procedures, but are considered completers under AEA procedures. Completion Rate I is used for standard procedures. Completion Rate II is used for AEA procedures. Another difference between AEA and standard procedures is that under certain circumstances, completion rates for at-risk students are evaluated under AEA procedures. At-risk completion rates are not used under standard procedures.

RECOMMENDED HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM/DISTINGUISHED ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM

Methodology:

number of graduates reported with graduation codes for *Recommended High School Program*
or *Distinguished Achievement Program* (from PEIMS 203)

number of graduates (from PEIMS 203)

Year of Data: Class of 2009

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
Date	October 2009	October 2009

Other Information:

- *Graduation Requirements.* The State Board of Education has by rule defined the graduation requirements for Texas public school students. The rule delineates specific requirements for three levels: minimum requirements, the Recommended High School Program (RHSP), and the Distinguished Achievement Program (DAP).
- *Graduation Types.* RHSP graduates are students with type codes of 15, 19, 22, 25, or 28; DAP graduates are students with type codes of 17, 20, 23, 26, or 29. See the *PEIMS Data Standards* for more information.

- *Primary and Secondary Sources.* Secondary sources are used when the primary source does not contain a match for the economic status of every student.

SAT/ACT RESULTS

Methodology:

Participation:

$$\frac{\text{number of graduates taking either the SAT or the ACT (from College Board and ACT)}}{\text{total non-special education graduates (from PEIMS 203)}}$$

Performance:

$$\frac{\text{number of examinees at or above the criterion score (from College Board and ACT)}}{\text{number of examinees taking either the SAT or ACT (from College Board and ACT)}}$$

Year of Data: Class of 2009

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity	Special Education Status
Source	n/a	PEIMS 101 (primary) College Board and ACT (secondary)	PEIMS 405
Date	n/a	October 2008 (primary) June 2009 (secondary)	June 2009, October 2009

Other Information:

- *Primary and Secondary Sources.* Secondary sources are used when the primary source does not contain ethnicity for a given student.
- *Special Education.* Those students reported as receiving special education services in all six of the six-week attendance periods, or for whom the graduation type code on the 203 leaver record indicates special education (graduation type codes 04, 05, 06, 07, 18, 19, or 20) are removed from the count of total graduates used in the denominator of the participation calculation.

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of students passing TAKS (by subject) (from Pearson)}}{\text{total number TAKS test takers (by subject) (from Pearson)}}$$

Year of Data: 2009-10

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
Date	October 2009	October 2009

Other Information:

- *Student Information.* The testing contractor, Pearson, pre-codes student information onto the answer documents from PEIMS data (see record types, above), or from district-

supplied data files. The answer documents may also be coded by district staff on the day of testing.

- *Prior Year Results.* For purposes of calculating RI, the prior year assessment results have been rebuilt to:
 - include all TAKS (Accommodated) results,
 - use only first administration results for grade 3 reading, and
 - use the new vertical scale for grades 3-8 reading and mathematics.

This makes 2009 and 2010 performance comparable and enables the use of RI for the TAKS indicator in 2010.

A 2010 preview indicator showing the rebuilt 2009 results was included on the 2008-09 AEIS reports. The preview indicator was based on the horizontal scale scores corresponding to the vertical scale score cuts that were established in January 2009. Following the spring 2009 TAKS administration, the horizontal scale scores corresponding to the vertical scale score cuts shifted for grades 6 and 8 reading (English version) and grades 3, 4, and 6 mathematics (Spanish version). Due to this discrepancy, the 2010 Preview Indicator shown on the 2008-09 AEIS reports may not exactly match the prior year data used for 2010 accountability. The 2009 data reported on the 2010 accountability data tables is based on the 2010 vertical scale standards.

- *Refugee/Asylee Exclusions.* A student is classified as a Refugee/Asylee if:
 - The student is coded as participating in a state-approved bilingual or ESL program; and,
 - The student is coded as LEP; and,
 - For each tested subject, the following is true:
 - For LAT grades and subjects, the LAT FORM and LAT Info areas must be filled in; and,
 - For all grades and subjects, column A of the Agency Use field must be filled in.For more information, see Appendix H of the *2010 Texas Student Assessment Program Coordinator Manual* at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index3.aspx?id=3679&menu_id=793.
- *Accountability Subset Rules.* Table 35 illustrates the conditions under which a test result will be used for state accountability. For purposes of this table, students are assumed to be enrolled in the campus or district on the PEIMS October snapshot date.

Although the table reflects a campus perspective, the conditions shown also apply to districts. Substitute “district” for “campus” throughout this table in order to use it to determine district assessment results.

The left half of the table shows the testing dates for each subject and grade. The right half shows the conditions that must be met for a test result to be used.

Example: The results for a grade 5 student who took the second TAKS reading administration (R2) will count for the campus if the student had an answer document submitted for the first administration of reading (R1) or mathematics (M1) or for the science administration at the same campus. If this is not true, the second TAKS reading result will not count for the campus.

Example: The results for a grade 9 student who took TAKS reading will NOT count at the campus if the student’s TAKS mathematics results were found at another campus.

Table 35: Accountability Subset Rules

(In this table, students are assumed to be enrolled at the campus for the October snapshot date.)

When TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated)* Test GIVEN										When Test COUNTS for Accountability Rating		
2009-10 Testing Calendar										This test will be used ...	IF this test was taken at my campus—√...	AND these other conditions apply (if any).
	Mar	April						May				
	3	6	7	27	28	29	30	18	19			
3				M	R					M	√.	
										R	√.	
4	W			M	R					W	√ or anywhere else and...	if M or R at my campus.
										W	√ and...	if no M or R anywhere.
										M	√.	
										R	√.	
5		M1	R1			SC		M2	R2	R1	√ and...	if no R2 or M2 anywhere.**
										M1	√ and...	if no R2 or M2 anywhere.**
										R2	√ and...	if R1 or M1 or SC at my campus.**
										SC	√.	
										M2	√ and...	if M1 or R1 or SC at my campus.**
6				M	R					Same as grade 3.		
7	W			M	R					Same as grade 4.		
8		M1	R1			SC	SS	M2	R2	R1	√ and...	if no R2 or M2 anywhere.**
										M1	√ and...	if no R2 or M2 anywhere.**
										R2	√ and...	if R1 or M1 or SC or SS at my campus.**
										SC	√.	
										SS	√.	
										M2	√ and...	if M1 or R1 or SC or SS at my campus.**
9	R					M				R	√ or anywhere else and...	if M at my campus.
										R	√ and...	if no M anywhere.
										M	√.	
10	EL A			M		SC		SS		ELA	√ or anywhere else and...	if M, SC, or SS at my campus.
										ELA	√ and...	if no M, SC, or SS anywhere.
										M	√.	
										SC	√.	
										SS	√.	
11	EL A			M	S C		SS			Same as grade 10.		

* For accountability purposes, either a TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) result is sufficient to meet the condition.

** Conditions for using these results have changed this year due to changes in the test administration calendar.

LEGEND:

R = reading; R1 = 1st administration of reading; R2 = 2nd administration of reading

M = mathematics; M1 = 1st administration of mathematics; M2 = 2nd administration of mathematics

W = writing

SC = science

SS = social studies

ELA = English Language Arts

- *Student Success Initiative (SSI) Mobility Subset.* Mobility between administrations of the TAKS for students in SSI grades (grades 5 and 8) presents a special challenge for excluding mobile students. Table 36 shows different scenarios for inclusion and exclusion of students in the campus accountability subset in the SSI grades. If discrepancies in student demographics are found between test administrations in these grades, the information from the first administration is used.

**Table 36: Accountability Subset for SSI -
Grades 5 & 8 TAKS Reading and Mathematics**

	Was the student on your campus on Oct. 30 th (snapshot date)?	Did the student take (or have answer documents submitted for) the April 6 & 7 TAKS Math and Reading on your campus?	Did the student have an answer document submitted for any TAKS April 28 th or 29 th on your campus?	Did the student take (or have answer documents submitted for) the May 18 & 19 TAKS Math and Reading on your campus?	Student is in your accountability subset for TAKS
Scenario 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Scenario 2	Yes	Yes	Yes	No (answer documents for May 18 & 19 found at another campus)	No
Scenario 3	Yes	Yes	Yes	No (answer documents for May 18 & 19 cannot be found on another campus)	Yes
Scenario 4	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes (reading & math only)
Scenario 5	Yes	Yes	No	No (answer documents for May 18 & 19 found at another campus)	No
Scenario 6	Yes	Yes	No	No (answer documents for May 18 & 19 cannot be found on another campus)	Yes (reading & math only)
Scenario 7	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Scenario 8	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes (science & soc. st. only)
Scenario 9	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Scenario 10	Yes	No	No	No	No
Scenario 11	No	Yes or No	Yes or No	Yes or No	No

- *Source of Student Demographics across Test Administrations.* For students in grades other than the Student Success Initiative (SSI) grades, the source for demographic information is the primary April administration. This means that the demographics for students who take writing (grades 4 and 7) reading (grade 9) or ELA (grades 10 and 11) will be taken from their April answer documents. Demographics include ethnicity and economic status.

- *Student Attribution Codes.* The TAKS performance for some campuses and some students with certain attributes is excluded from district aggregate data due to statutory requirements. Three campus types that are specifically addressed in statute are Residential Treatment Facility campuses, Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC) campuses, and Texas Youth Commission (TYC) campuses. For 2010 accountability, data is excluded two ways: by excluding results for entire campuses for certain campus types and by excluding specific student results. Student results are excluded by using new PEIMS student attribution codes of 13, 14, 17, 18, 21, and 22. This is new for 2010. See Table 9 in *Chapter 6—Special Issues and Circumstances* for more information.

Table 37: Student Attribution Codes

Student Attribution Codes	
13	Texas Juvenile Probation Commission facility—by court order, not regularly assigned to the district
14	Texas Juvenile Probation Commission facility—by court order, regularly assigned to the district
17	Texas Youth Commission facility—by court order, not regularly assigned to the district
18	Texas Youth Commission facility—by court order, regularly assigned to the district
21	Residential treatment facility—by court order, not regularly assigned to the district
22	Residential treatment facility—by court order, regularly assigned to the district

TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS – PROGRESS INDICATOR
(*AEA procedures only*)

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of TAKS tests that meet the standard or meet TPM (grades 3-10) or meet TGI (grade 11) and number of TAKS exit-level retests that meet the standard (from Pearson)}}{\text{number TAKS tests taken and number of TAKS exit-level retests that meet the standard (from Pearson)}}$$

Years of Data: 2010 and 2009

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
Date	October 2009, October 2008	October 2009, October 2008

Other Information:

- *Texas Growth Index (TGI) and Texas Project Measure (TPM).* Detailed TGI and TPM information is in *Appendix E – Student Growth Measures*.
- *Matched Demographics.* If discrepancies in student demographics are found between test administrations in the SSI grades, the information on the first administration is used. For students in grades other than the SSI grades, the source for demographic information is the primary April administration.

- *Student Information.* The testing contractor, Pearson, pre-codes student information onto the answer documents from PEIMS data (see record types, above), or from district-supplied data files. The answer documents may also be coded by district staff on the day of testing.

TEXAS PROJECTION MEASURE (TPM)

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of students passing TAKS} + \text{number failing TAKS but meeting TPM (by subject)} \text{ (from Pearson)}}{\text{total number TAKS test takers (by subject)} \text{ (from Pearson)}}$$

Year of Data: 2009-10

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
Date	October 2009	October 2009

Other Information:

- *TPM Based on Two Years of Data.* If test scores for the previous year are available for reading and mathematics, then a two-year projection will be provided for these subjects. In this case, the language (either English or Spanish) has to be the same for all the tests used for the calculation. If all test scores necessary for a two-year projection in the same language are not available, a single-year projection will be provided. For all other subjects, a single-year projection is provided if the student has tested in all subjects needed for the calculation.
- *Cross Language TPM Calculations.* Cross language TPM calculations projecting to reading, mathematics, or writing are only available for single-year calculations in which the mathematics test is in English and the reading test is in Spanish, and, if applicable, the writing test is also in Spanish.
- *TPM Based on a Combination of Forms.* A general form, Accommodated form, and/or linguistically accommodated test form can be combined for a TPM calculation. If a student tested with TAKS–M in one or more of those subjects, the TPM cannot be calculated.
- *TPM and the Student Success Initiative (SSI) Grades.* Whenever a student takes a retest, projections are made again in **all** subjects. However, for accountability, processing will use the best TPM value.
- *No TPM Information.* Some students do not have TPM results even though they tested in all subjects needed for the calculation. This may happen because a student’s ID information (e.g., PEIMS ID, name, and date of birth) does not match information previously submitted by the district that was loaded in the TAKS history file. Districts can resolve non-matching situations by updating the TAKS history file with the correct student ID information through the “*Online Viewing of Student History*” system. If

history updates were made by June 4, 2010, the TPM calculations are included in the final statewide results used for accountability purposes.

**TEXAS SUCCESS INITIATIVE (TSI) – HIGHER EDUCATION READINESS
COMPONENT: ELA, MATHEMATICS**

Methodology:

$$\frac{\text{number of test takers achieving TSI standard (by subject) (from Pearson)}}{\text{number of grade 11 test takers (by subject) (from Pearson)}}$$

Year of Data: 2009-10

Student Demographics:

	Economic Status	Ethnicity
Source	PEIMS 110	PEIMS 101
Date	October 2009	October 2009

Other Information:

- *TSI Standard.* The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board sets the standard that students must achieve on the exit-level TAKS to be considered college ready.
- *Student Information.* The testing contractor, Pearson, pre-codes student information onto the answer documents from PEIMS data (see record types, above), or from district-supplied data files. The answer documents may also be coded by district staff on the day of testing.

Appendix E – Student Growth Measures

When the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) testing program was implemented in 2003, a new growth measure, the Texas Growth Index (TGI), was introduced. The TGI provides an estimate of a student's academic growth on the TAKS tests, over two consecutive years and in two consecutive grades. Between 2004 and 2009, the TGI was calculated for students in grades 4-11 for reading and mathematics. The TGI for science and social studies was calculated only for grade 11 because grades 10 and 11 were the only consecutive tested grades for these two subjects.

The TGI did not meet the requirements for growth-based accountability for the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) growth pilot. Therefore, when the USDE pilot growth program was announced and student growth legislation in Texas was passed, Texas began researching alternatives for growth measures that would satisfy both federal and state requirements. Ultimately, the Texas Projection Measure (TPM) was selected as the best option. The TPM was implemented in 2009. In 2010 the TPM is available for all grades and subjects except writing in grade 7 and all subjects in grade 11.

Due to new state legislative requirements, vertical scales were also developed in 2009 for TAKS reading and mathematics tests in grades 3–8 (including Spanish reading and mathematics in grades 3-6). Vertical scales are not reported for TAKS writing (grades 4 and 7), science (grades 5, 8, 10, and exit level), social studies (grades 8, 10, and exit level), reading and mathematics at grade 9, and English language arts and mathematics at grade 10 and exit level. Student performance results on these assessments continue to have a scale score of 2100 for Met Standard and 2400 for Commended Performance. In the grades and subjects with vertical scales, the TGI cannot be calculated. With a vertical scale, a student's scale score in one grade can be compared to the student's scale score in another grade as long as the scores are in the same language and subject. The growth in vertical scale scores will be referred to as Vertical Scale Growth (VSG).

Both the TPM and vertical scale score growth provide information about student progress through the Texas educational system. The TPM focuses on future performance and vertical scale score growth focuses on past performance. The TPM is a projection; vertical scale score changes are actual changes in performance. An advantage to the vertical scale is that it enables the progress of students who have different initial proficiency levels to be compared.

For the 2009-10 school year, TGI, VSG, and TPM values were calculated. This appendix describes the use of these three growth measures in the 2010 state accountability system.

TGI METHODOLOGY

With TGI, a student's growth is defined as the student's score in Year 2 minus the student's projected score for Year 2. A student's projected score for Year 2 is the score in the distribution at Year 2 that corresponds to the student's Year 1 score. If the student's score is above the expected score, the student is considered to have grown. If the student's score is below the expected (projected) score, the student is considered to have regressed. Expected growth is defined as maintaining location in the distribution year to year.

To determine the TGI for an individual student, growth equation parameters are needed for each subject and grade. The parameters used to determine TGI, shown in the *Table 38*, below

were developed using the empirical data from the base comparison years — spring 2003 to spring 2004.

Steps for determining a TGI value for a sample student are shown in *Table 39*.

Table 38: TGI Growth Equation Parameters – Grade 11

Growth Grades	Subject	Starting Point	Increase	Adjustment
10-11	Math	-138.428	1.092	104.38
10-11	Science	410.23	0.832	75.94
10-11	ELA	128.38	0.962	96.41
10-11	Social Studies	464.43	0.810	93.98

TGI growth equation parameters were calculated based on TAKS scale score changes between spring 2003 and spring 2004. These base calculations have been applied in each subsequent year.

Table 39: Sample TGI Calculation

In this example, a student’s mathematics growth from grade 10 to grade 11 is examined. The student had a scale score of 2188 in grade 10 and a scale score of 2161 in grade 11.

	STEPS	EXAMPLE VALUES
Step 1	Find the starting point for that student in the row of the table that matches that student’s grade and subject.	-138.428
Step 2	Take the student’s scale score in the first year.	2188
Step 3	Find the increase for that student in the row of the <i>Table 37</i> that matches that student’s grade and subject.	1.092
Step 4	Multiply student’s scale score from the first year by the increase.	$2188 \times 1.092 = 2389.296$
Step 5	Add the amount from Step 1 and the total from Step 4. This is the expected student scale score for the second year .	$-138.428 + 2389.296 = 2250.868$
Step 6	Take the student’s scale score from the second year and subtract the expected student score from it. This number is the difference in expectation .	$2161 - 2250.868 = -89.868$
Step 7	Calculate Adjusted TGI by dividing the result from Step 6 by the Adjustment factor shown on the appropriate row of the table. Round to the second decimal place.	$-89.868 / 104.38 = -0.86$
Step 8	If the difference in expectation is positive, that student grew more than expected. If the difference in expectation is negative, that student grew less than expected.	Since -0.86 is negative; the student grew less than expected.

TPM METHODOLOGY

The TPM estimates whether a student is likely to pass TAKS assessments in the next high-stakes grade (grade 5, 7 [writing only], 8, or 11).

The TPM is reported in mathematics, reading, ELA, science, social studies, and writing.

Projections for each student are made separately for each subject. When projections are made

to a future grade, the result is a projected score. To determine if a student is projected to meet the standard or not in the projected grade, the projected score is compared with the Met Standard cut point in the projected grade and subject.

Resources related to the TPM are available at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index3.aspx?id=8351&menu_id=793

Resources at this site include the following:

- Online TPM Calculator
- Step-by-step procedures for calculating the TPM
- A listing of district and campus subject means
- Procedures for developing the TPM equations
- TPM Frequently Asked Questions documents

Additional information on the TPM is posted at this website as it becomes available.

VERTICAL SCALE SCORE GROWTH METHODOLOGY

Vertical Scale Growth (VSG) is defined as a student's vertical scale score in Year 2 minus the student's vertical scale score in Year 1. Vertical scale scores can be compared across years as long as the comparison is for the same subject area and language version.

USES OF STUDENT GROWTH MEASURES IN 2010 STATE ACCOUNTABILITY

TGI:

In 2010, the TGI continues to be used as a component of the TAKS Progress Indicator under the alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures; however, its use is limited to grade 11 students only. For other grades, the TPM is used. See *Chapter 10 – AEA Base Indicators* for details on the use of TGI and TPM in the calculation of the TAKS Progress Indicator under AEA procedures.

VSG:

Prior to 2010, the TGI was used to calculate Comparable Improvement (CI), an acknowledgment awarded under the Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) system for campuses evaluated under standard procedures. CI is awarded separately for reading and mathematics. With the transition to the use of a vertical scale for reading and mathematics in grades 3-8, the TGI is no longer available for CI for these grades and subjects. Instead, beginning in 2010, VSG will be used to determine CI.

An average VSG value for each campus is determined by aggregating the student-level VSG values to the campus level.

Who are included:

Students are included in a school's CI calculation if they:

- took the spring 2010 TAKS reading and/or mathematics tests, in grades 4 – 8.
- are part of the 2010 *Accountability Subset* (see *Chapter 2*);

- can be matched to the spring 2009 TAKS administration—anywhere in the state—to find their prior year performance for reading, and/or mathematics; and,
- have been promoted to one higher grade than in 2009.

Calculating Average VSG*:

$$\text{average VSG(reading)} = \frac{\text{sum of individual student VSG values for reading}}{\text{total number of students with VSG in reading}}$$

$$\text{average VSG(mathematics)} = \frac{\text{sum of individual student VSG values for mathematics}}{\text{total number of students with VSG in mathematics}}$$

*Note: In *Chapter 5 – Gold Performance Acknowledgments*, the formula for calculating the campus average VSG was expressed differently; however, mathematically the results are the same.

Once the average VSG is determined, it is listed with the other 40 average VSGs of the school’s comparison group. The schools are arranged from highest to lowest average VSG. If the target school falls in the top quartile and all other eligibility criteria are met, it is awarded a GPA for CI. This is calculated separately by subject.

Other information:

- *Retesters.* For students who take TAKS retest administrations in the SSI grades—grades 5 and 8 reading and mathematics—the VSG is determined using the scale score from the first administration. This is true for both Year 2 and Year 1.
- *Quartile Size.* Because there are 40 schools in a comparison group, there are usually 10 schools in each quartile (with the target school being the 11th school in its quartile). Exceptions to this occur when a group has tied average VSG values at the border between quartiles, or when a school in a group has too few “matched students,” and is therefore not assigned an average VSG value or a quartile. This will cause the number of schools in each quartile to vary.
- *Quartile Rank.* High growth values do not necessarily imply that more students are passing the TAKS. It simply evaluates the performance growth of all students regardless of whether they passed or failed.
- *Quartile Position Across Subjects.* A school’s quartile position can vary by subject. For instance, a school may be Q1 in reading, but it may be Q2 in mathematics. Quartile position is relative to the performance of the other schools in the group.
- *Quartile Position Across Groups.* A school may be Q1 for its own group and Q4 as a member of another school’s group. (However, the quartile value evaluated for a particular school is the one determined for the school’s own group.)
- *Minimum Size.* Any school with fewer than 10 matched students for a subject will not have average VSG values calculated and will not be assigned a quartile position.
- *Number of Matched Students.* The number of matched students for reading may differ from the number of matched students for mathematics.
- *Range of Vertical Scale Scores Across Grades.* The distance in vertical scale score points between the Met Standard performance levels varies across adjacent grades. Collapsing

vertical scale growth across grade spans (as is done with the new CI methodology) requires the assumption that students have an equal opportunity for growth as they move from grade to grade. Additional study will be conducted prior to the 2011 development cycle to determine if adjustments to the use of vertical scales with CI are advisable. Because CI comparison groups are based on campus type (elementary, middle, high school, multi-level), the grade spans of schools compared for CI acknowledgment in 2010 will be similar.

For a more detailed explanation of *Gold Performance Acknowledgment*, see the *Chapter 5 – Gold Performance Acknowledgments*.

USES OF TPM IN 2010 STATE ACCOUNTABILITY

As explained above, the TPM is used under AEA procedures as a component of the TAKS Progress Indicator. Under standard procedures the TPM is used as an additional feature of the system as a means of elevating a campus or district rating when neither the “Percent Meeting the Standard” nor Required Improvement is sufficient to achieve the next higher rating. The TPM offers an alternative approach to demonstrating achievement that meets state goals. See *Chapter 3 – The Basics: Additional Features* and *Appendix D – Data Sources* for more information about how the TPM is used in determining standard accountability ratings.

Table 40: Student Growth Measures and 2010 Accountability

Measure	Description	Grades and Subjects	Years in Use	Use in Accountability
TGI	Estimate of growth	Consecutive years in consecutive grades	2004 – 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CI–GPA • TAKS Progress Measure–AEA
			2010	TAKS Progress Measure–AEA
TPM	Projection of future performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects to high stakes grades (5, 7 [writing only], 8, and 11) • N/A for grade 7 writing • N/A for grade 11 	2009 and 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional Feature–Standard Procedures • TAKS Progress Measure–AEA
VSG	Actual change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4-8 reading and mathematics 	2010	CI–GPA

Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group

Each campus is assigned to a unique comparison group of 40 other public schools (from anywhere in the state), that closely matches that school on six characteristics. Comparison groups are provided so that schools can compare their performance—shown on AEIS reports—to that of other schools with whom they are demographically similar. Comparison groups are also used for determining Comparable Improvement (See *Chapter 5 – Gold Performance Acknowledgments* and *Appendix E – Student Growth Measures*).

The demographic characteristics used to construct the campus comparison groups include those defined in statute as well as others found to be statistically related to performance. They are:

- the percent of African American students enrolled for 2009-10;
- the percent of Hispanic students enrolled for 2009-10;
- the percent of White students enrolled for 2009-10;
- the percent of economically disadvantaged students enrolled for 2009-10;
- the percent of limited English proficient (LEP) students enrolled for 2009-10; and
- the percent of mobile students as determined from 2008-09 cumulative attendance.

All schools are first grouped by type (elementary, middle, high school, or multi-level). Then the group is determined on the basis of the most predominant features at the target school. Assume that Sample High School has the following percentages for the six groups:

- 7.6% African American,
- 36.8% Hispanic,
- 53.9% White,
- 28.2% economically disadvantaged,
- 10.7% limited English proficient, and
- 23.7% mobile students.

Of these features, the most predominant (*i.e.*, the largest) is the percent of White students, followed by the percent of Hispanic students, the percent of economically disadvantaged students, the percent of mobile students, the percent of limited English proficient students, and finally, the percent of African American students. The following steps illustrate how the group is determined from the pool of all high schools:

- Step 1: 100 high school campuses with percentages closest to 53.9% White students are identified;
- Step 2: 10 schools from the initial group of 100 are eliminated on the basis of being most distant from the value of 36.8% Hispanic;
- Step 3: 10 of the remaining 90 schools which are most distant from 28.2% economically disadvantaged students are eliminated;

- Step 4: 10 of the remaining 80 schools which are most distant from 23.7% mobile students are eliminated;
- Step 5: 10 of the remaining 70 schools which are most distant from 10.7% limited English proficient students are eliminated;
- Step 6: 10 of the remaining 60 schools which are most distant from 7.6% African American students are eliminated; and
- Step 7: 10 of the remaining 50 schools which are most distant from 7.6% African American and/or 28.2% economically disadvantaged students are eliminated. (This last reduction step is based on the least predominant characteristics among the four student groups evaluated in the accountability system: African American, Hispanic, White, and economically disadvantaged.)

The final group size is 40 schools. This methodology creates a unique comparison group for every campus.

Other Information:

- Comparison groups are recreated each year to account for changes in demographics that may occur.
- With this methodology, the number of times a school appears as a member of other groups will vary.
- In cases where the campus has a missing mobility value, the district's average mobility is used as a proxy. This will happen for schools in their first year of operation, since mobility is based on prior year data.
- Districts are not grouped.

Appendix G – Contacts

The *2010 Accountability Manual* contains detailed information about all aspects of the accountability system for Texas public schools and districts. However, if questions remain, your Education Service Center (ESC) representatives are available for further assistance.

ESC ACCOUNTABILITY CONTACTS

ESC	Name	Email Address	Phone Number
1	Lisa Conner	lconner@esc1.net	(956) 984-6027
2	Sonia A. Perez Dawn Schuenemann Linda P. Villarreal	sonia.perez@esc2.us dawn.schuenemann@esc2.us linda.villarreal@esc2.us	(361) 561-8407 (361) 561-8551 (361) 561-8404
3	Charlotte Baker Dina Rogers Nancy Sandlin	cbaker@esc3.net drogers@esc3.net nsandlin@esc3.net	(361) 573-0731 ext. 204 (361) 573-0731 ext. 237 (361) 573-0731 ext. 252
4	Liselotte Thompson	lthompson@esc4.net	(713) 744-6357
5	Monica Mahfouz	mmahfouz@esc5.net	(409) 923-5411
6	Mark Kroschel Melinda Perzan	mkroschel@esc6.net mperzan@esc6.net	(936) 435-8300 (936) 435-8224
7	Jane Silvey	jsilvey@esc7.net	(903) 988-6796
8	Karla Coker Sheryl Pappa	kcoker@reg8.net spappa@reg8.net	(903) 572-8551 ext. 2731 (903) 572-8551 ext. 2781
9	Jean Ashton Rhonda Cavett Wes Pierce	jean.ashton@esc9.net rhonda.cavett@esc9.net wes.pierce@esc9.net	(940) 322-6928
10	Lorna Bonner Kerry Gain	lorna.bonner@region10.org kerry.gain@region10.org	(972) 348-1324 (972) 348-1480
11	Kathy Wright-Chapman	kwc@esc11.net	(817) 740-7546
12	Jack Crain Phil Gerik Johnny Giebler Stephanie Kucera Rudy Lopez Charlene Simpson	jcrain@esc12.net pgerik@esc12.net jgiebler@esc12.net skucera@esc12.net rlopez@esc12.net csimpson@esc12.net	(254) 297-1104 (254) 297-1103 (254) 297-1111 (254) 297-1154 (254) 297-1110 (254) 297-1106
13	Ed Zara	ed.zara@esc13.txed.net	(512) 919-5313
14	Karen E. Turner	keturner@esc14.net	(325) 675-8620
15	Judy Lisewsky Dean Munn	judy.lisewsky@netxv.net dean.munn@netxv.net	(325) 658-6571 ext. 158 (325) 481-4026
16	Shirley Clark	shirley.clark@esc16.net	(806) 677-5130
17	Ty Duncan	tduncan@esc17.net	(806) 281-5832
18	Debbie Bynum Kaye Orr	dbynum@esc18.net kayeorr@esc18.net	(432) 567-3218 (432) 567-3244
19	Anthony Fraga Rebecca Ontiveros	afraga@esc19.net rontiveros@esc19.net	(915) 780-6553 (915) 780-5093
20	Sheila Collazo	sheila.collazo@esc20.net	(210) 370-5481

This information is current as of July 2010. It is subject to change at any time.

OTHER CONTACTS

Questions related to indicators, programs, and policies not covered in the *Manual* should be directed to the appropriate contact listed below. *All telephone numbers are in the (512) area code unless otherwise indicated.*

Subject	Contact	Number
Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) Reports	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Accountability Ratings (methodology)	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Alternative Education Accountability (AEA)	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Appeals	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Blue Ribbon Schools	Communications	463-9000
Campus ID (numbers)	Accountability Research (AskTED)	463-9809
Charter Schools	Charter Schools	463-9575
College Admissions Tests:		
Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)	College Board, SWRN Regional Office	(866) 392-3017
ACT	ACT Regional Office	345-1949
Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP)	Chapter 37 – Safe Schools	463-9982
Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA)	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Indicator Methodology:		
Advanced Course Completion	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Advanced Placement (AP) / International Baccalaureate (IB) Results	Accountability Research	475-3523
Attendance Rate	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Dropouts	Accountability Research	475-3523
College-Ready Graduates	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Commended Performance	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Comparable Improvement (CI)	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Completion	Accountability Research	475-3523
Recommended High School Program (RHSP)	Performance Reporting	463-9704
SAT/ACT Results	Accountability Research	475-3523
Texas Success Initiative (TSI)	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Interventions	Program Monitoring and Interventions	463-5226
Investigations	Program Monitoring and Interventions	463-5226
Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP)	Chapter 37 – Safe Schools	463-9982
Leavers (Dropouts, Completers)	Accountability Research	475-3523
No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act	NCLB Program Coordination	463-9374
Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS)	PEIMS HelpLine	936-7346
Public Education Grant (PEG)	Parent Complaints/Concerns	463-9290
Public Hearings	Program Monitoring and Interventions	463-5226
Recommended High School Program (RHSP)	Curriculum	463-9581
Retention Policy	Curriculum	463-9581
School Report Card	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Special Education	Special Education	463-5226
Statutory (Legal) Issues	Legal Services	463-9720
TAKS	Student Assessment	463-9536
TAKS Testing Contractor	Pearson	800-252-9186
Technical Assistance Team (TAT) (List Methodology)	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Technical Assistance Team (TAT) (Implementation)	Program Monitoring and Interventions	463-5226
Testing Decisions		
TAKS-Modified / TAKS-Alternate	Student Assessment	463-9536
Other Issues	Special Education	463-5226
Texas Projection Measure (TPM) (calculation)	Student Assessment	463-9536
TPM (use in accountability)	Performance Reporting	463-9704
Texas Success Initiative (TSI)	Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB)	427-6100

WEB LINKS

The following web links can be used to gather supplemental information from online sources.

- Accountability Research ritter.tea.state.tx.us/research/index.html
Provides publications on Dropouts, Retention, College Admissions, and many other topics.
- Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)..... ritter.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/index.html
Provides AYP results for each campus and district, the AYP Guide, and other information related to AYP.
- Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) ritter.tea.state.tx.us/aea/index.html
Provides extensive information on AEA.
- Charter School ritter.tea.state.tx.us/charter/index.html
Provides information and resources for charter school personnel, parents, students, potential charter applicants, and the general public as well as contact information, and answers to frequently asked questions.
- No Child Left Behind (NCLB)..... ritter.tea.state.tx.us/nclb/index.html
Provides information on Title I, II, III, IV, V, and VI programs and other aspects of NCLB.
- Pearson Education..... www.pearsonaccess.com/cs/Satellite?pagename=Pearson/QuickLink/tx
Testing contractor for Texas. Provides assessment results and other information for administrators, educators, and families.
- PEIMS ritter.tea.state.tx.us/peims/index.html
The Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) database provides publications such as the Data Standards and information on EDIT+, PID, and other topics related to data collection.
- Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM)..... ritter.tea.state.tx.us/pbm/index.html
Provides PBM Analysis System (PBMA) reports and information on data integrity issues.
- Performance Reporting ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/index.html
Provides accountability data for each campus and district, AEIS reports, School Report Cards, and other publications.
- Program Monitoring and Interventions..... ritter.tea.state.tx.us/pmi/index.html
Provides information about accreditation monitoring, interventions, Technical Assistance Teams (TAT), School Improvement Plans, and Campus Improvement Teams (CIT).
- Special Education ritter.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/index.html
Provides extensive information about special education and the ARD process.
- Student Assessment www.tea.state.tx.us/index3.aspx?id=3534&menu_id3=793
Provides extensive information on the statewide assessment program.
- Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board www.thecb.state.tx.us
Provides information on the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) and information on Texas public universities and community colleges.
- University Interscholastic League (UIL) <http://www.uil.utexas.edu/>
Provides information about UIL organized and supervised educational extracurricular academic, athletic, and music contests for Texas public schools.

Appendix H – Acknowledgments

Many people have contributed to the development of the *2010 Accountability Manual*. The project staff wish to thank these individuals for their expert advice and prompt review of our materials. Their comments greatly enhanced the accuracy and format of the document.

TEA Staff

EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

Robert Scott, Commissioner of Education
Lizzette Reynolds, Deputy Commissioner, Statewide Policy and Programs
Criss Cloudt, Associate Commissioner for Assessment, Accountability, and Data Quality
Laura Taylor, Associate Commissioner for Accreditation

PROJECT LEADERSHIP

Shannon Housson, Director, Division of Performance Reporting
Cathy Long, Division of Performance Reporting
Nancy Rinehart, Division of Performance Reporting
Betty Weed, Division of Performance Reporting

CONTRIBUTORS

David Anderson	TEA General Counsel
Jonathan Delgado	Division of Performance Reporting
Cynthia Carrasquillo	Division of Performance Reporting
John Haetinger	Division of Performance Reporting
Rachel Harrington	Director, Division of Performance-Based Monitoring
Diane J. Hernandez	Division of Performance Reporting
Gene Lenz	Deputy Associate Commissioner for Special Programs
Stacy McDonald	Division of Performance Reporting
Mary Perry	Director, Division of Charter School Administration
Ester Regalado	Division of Performance Reporting
Linda Roska	Director, Division of Accountability Research
Chris Schmitt	Division of Performance Reporting
Mariana Vassileva	Division of Student Assessment
Gloria Zyskowski	Deputy Associate Commissioner, Student Assessment

Educator Focus Group on Accountability

Representatives from districts and regional service centers met in March 2010 to make recommendations that address major policy and design issues for accountability for the year 2010 and beyond.

Nabor F. Cortez, Jr., Superintendent, *La Feria ISD, Region 1*

Daniel King, Superintendent, *Pharr-San Juan-Alamo ISD, Region 1*

Audra Ude, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, *Flour Bluff ISD, Region 2*

Charlotte Baker, Deputy Director for Programs and Services, *Region 3*

M. Annette Cluff, Superintendent, *The Varnett Charter School, Region 4*

Keith Haffey, Executive Director for Accountability and Research,
Spring Branch ISD, Region 4

Janelle James, Superintendent, *Southwest Schools, Region 4*

Dru Mushlian, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, *Hardin-Jefferson ISD, Region 5*

Jason Puente, Assistant Principal, Jane Long Middle School, *Bryan ISD, Region 6*

Sarah Dildine, Director of Curriculum, Technology, and Special Programs,
Hughes Springs ISD, Region 8

Tim Powers, Assistant Superintendent, Instructional Services, *Wichita Falls ISD, Region 9*

Whitcomb Johnstone*, Director of Planning, Evaluation, and Research, *Irving ISD, Region 10*

Francine Holland*, Executive Deputy Director of Instructional Services, *Region 11*

Roland Hernandez, Superintendent, *Waco ISD, Region 12*

Ervin Knezek, Deputy Executive Director, *Region XIII Education Service Center, Region 13*

Nola Wellman, Superintendent, *Eanes ISD, Region 13*

Doyleen Terrell, Principal, Nancy Smith Elementary, *Albany ISD, Region 14*

Jana Anderson, Director of Special Education, *San Angelo ISD, Region 15*

Kelli Moulton, Superintendent, *Hereford ISD, Region 16*

Michael Motheral, Superintendent, *Sundown ISD, Region 17*

Benny P. Hernandez, Principal, Iraan-Sheffield High School, *Iraan-Sheffield ISD, Region 18*

Joseph Lopez, Associate Superintendent, Curriculum and Instruction, *El Paso ISD, Region 19*

Tom Harvey, Superintendent, *La Vernia ISD, Region 20*

Liza Rosenthal, Coordinator of Accountability and Compliance, *San Antonio ISD, Region 20*

* Liaisons to the Commissioner's Accountability Advisory Committee

Commissioner's Accountability Advisory Committee

Representatives from legislative offices, school districts, and the business community were invited to participate in resolving issues critical to the accountability system. The Commissioner's Accountability Advisory Committee met in March 2010 to review the recommendations made by the Educator Focus Group. The Advisory Committee either endorsed the Focus Group's proposals or recommended alternative proposals which were forwarded to the commissioner.

LEGISLATIVE STAFF

Von Byer	Committee Director, <i>Senate Education Committee</i>
Julie Harker	Public Education Advisor, <i>Office of Governor Perry</i>
Caasi Lamb	Education Policy Analyst, <i>Office of the Lieutenant Governor</i>
John McGeady	Public Education Team Manager, <i>Legislative Budget Board</i>
Andrea Sheridan	Senior Education Advisor, <i>Office of the Speaker of the House</i>
Jenna Watts	Policy Director, <i>House Public Education Committee</i>

SCHOOL DISTRICT / ESC REPRESENTATIVES

Elizabeth Abernethy	Executive Director, <i>Region 7</i>
Bret Champion	Superintendent, <i>Leander ISD</i>
Jesus Chavez	Superintendent, <i>Round Rock ISD</i>
Ralph H. Draper	Superintendent, <i>Spring ISD</i>
Michael Hinojosa	Superintendent, <i>Dallas ISD</i>
Francine Holland*	Executive Deputy Director of Instructional Services, <i>Region 11</i>
Harlan Howell	Director of Research and Evaluation/Computer Services, <i>Harlingen CISD</i>
Whitcomb Johnstone*	Director of Planning, Evaluation, and Research, <i>Irving ISD</i>
Mike D. Motheral	Superintendent, <i>Sundown ISD</i>

OTHER REPRESENTATIVES

Jim Crow	Executive Director, <i>Texas Association of School Boards</i>
David Dunn	Executive Director, <i>Texas Charter Schools Association</i>
Andrew Erben	President, <i>Texas Institute for Education Reform</i>
John Fitzpatrick	Executive Director, <i>Texas High Schools Project/Communities Foundation of Texas</i>
Bill Hammond	President and CEO, <i>Texas Association of Business</i>
Justin Keener	Vice President of Policy and Communications, <i>Texas Public Policy Foundation</i>
Sandy Kress	Partner, <i>Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer, and Feld</i>
Don McAdams	President, <i>Center for Reform of School Systems</i>
Jeri Stone	Executive Director/General Counsel, <i>Texas Classroom Teachers Association</i>
Johnny Veselka	Executive Director, <i>Texas Association of School Administrators</i>
Darv Winick	<i>Winick Consultants</i>

*Liaisons to Educator Focus Group on Accountability

Commissioner's TASA Cabinet of Superintendents

David G. Anthony	Cypress-Fairbanks ISD, <i>Region 4</i>
Jeff Black	Ganado ISD, <i>Region 3</i>
Reece Blincoe	Brownwood ISD, <i>Region 15</i>
Julie A. Carbajal	Flour Bluff ISD, <i>Region 2</i>
Jesus H. Chavez	Round Rock ISD, <i>Region 13</i>
L. Curti Culwell	Garland ISD, <i>Region 10</i>
Xavier De La Torre	Socorro ISD, <i>Region 19</i>
John M. Folks	Northside ISD, <i>Region 20</i>
Jose Franco	Fort Hancock ISD, <i>Region 19</i>
Tena Gray	Rankin ISD, <i>Region 18</i>
Randy Hancock	Royse City ISD, <i>Region 10</i>
Dee W. Hartt	Tatum ISD, <i>Region 7</i>
Mard A. Herrick	Dripping Springs ISD, <i>Region 13</i>
Shannon J. Holmes	Hardin-Jefferson ISD, <i>Region 5</i>
Melody A. Johnson	Fort Worth ISD, <i>Region 11</i>
Brad Lancaster	Midway ISD, <i>Region 12</i>
Mike Lee	Booker ISD, <i>Region 16</i>
Jeff A. McClure	Henrietta ISD, <i>Region 9</i>
Dawson R. Orr	Highland Park ISD, <i>Region 10</i>
Thomas Price	Splendora ISD, <i>Region 6</i>
Romeo Rodriguez, Jr.	Zapata County ISD, <i>Region 1</i>
Karen G. Rue	Northwest ISD, <i>Region 11</i>
Rod Schroder	Amarillo ISD, <i>Region 16</i>
Michelle Carrol Smith	Lytle ISD, <i>Region 20</i>
James V. Taliaferro	Slaton ISD, <i>Region 17</i>
Paul M. Trull	Paris ISD, <i>Region 8</i>
Jim White	Colorado ISD, <i>Region 14</i>
Mary Ann Whiteker	Hudson ISD, <i>Region 7</i>

Appendix I – TEA Secure Environment (TEASE)

The Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE) is an authentication portal through which an authorized user can access sensitive or confidential TEA information resources. The TEASE portal includes several web applications that are relevant to administrators in school districts and education service centers. One such application is the *ACCT–Accountability* application. This provides authorized users with state accountability products (standard and alternative education), federal accountability products, Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS) products, and accountability research products pertaining to completion, dropout, and longitudinal cohort lists.

Additionally, the *ACCT–Accountability* application is the location for first access to the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) reports, listings of schools identified under the Public Education Grant (PEG) program, and other information specific to Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

District and education service center administrators are encouraged to apply for access to the TEASE portal. They may also designate others in their district to have access.

Gaining Access to TEASE

The gateway to TEASE is located at:

<https://seguin.tea.state.tx.us/apps/logon.asp>

To access any TEASE application, district staff need to obtain a TEASE account. To request a TEASE account for the *ACCT–Accountability* application, district administrators must complete a form online, obtain the required signatures, and follow instructions for mailing or faxing the form.

The “Request for Access to Accountability” form can be downloaded at:

<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/forms/tease/accountability.htm>

There are specific registration forms for each TEASE web application. Forms for all available applications can be downloaded from the TEASE Applications Reference page at:

<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=2684>

Depending on the volume of requests, it may take several days for a request to be processed. Requestors will receive an email from TEA Security once the application(s) has/have been added to their TEASE accounts.

MULTIPLE DISTRICT ACCESS

Certain charter operators and Education Service Center (ESC) staff may need access to the secure information for multiple school districts and/or schools. To gain access to TEASE Accountability information, multiple-district users must obtain the superintendent’s signature for each district to which the user requests access (one request form per district/charter). Multiple district login accounts do not provide access to all districts in any single ESC region, only to those districts that have granted access for the user. For information about

multiple-district TEASE user accounts for the Accountability application, please contact the Division of Performance Reporting via email at performance.reporting@tea.state.tx.us.

Confidentiality

Data on many of the reports available through TEASE are NOT masked to protect individual student confidentiality. Remember that individual student information is confidential under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). The TEASE site is intended for district use or ESC use with district permission only.

Most Current Products Only

The TEASE *ACCT–Accountability* site is not an archive of information; it is intended to contain only the most recent products released. When a reporting cycle begins for a new year, the prior year’s final products are taken off the site. Districts are encouraged to save the products provided on this site to a local secured location.

Typical State Accountability Products Available

The following list shows the state accountability releases for a typical reporting cycle in the order they are released. See *Chapter 19 – Calendar* for specific dates in 2010 and 2011.

- Pairing Application (Data Collection)
- AEA Charter Choice (Data Collection)
- AEA At-Risk Registration Criterion
- Completion and Dropout Data Posted
- Preview Accountability Data Tables without Ratings Posted (Standard and AEA)
- Ratings Appeal Application (new for 2010)
- Unmasked Accountability Data Tables with Ratings Posted (Standard and AEA)
- AEA Campus Registration Process (Data Collection)
- Appeals Response Letters Posted
- Ratings Update and Gold Performance Acknowledgments Posted (Standard and AEA)
- Technical Assistance Team (TAT) list Posted
- Updated Preliminary Longitudinal Cohorts Posted
- AEIS Reports Posted

Registration of Appeals on TEASE

This year, for the first time, a district wishing to appeal a school or district accountability rating should register their intention to appeal using a new application on the TEASE Accountability website. The 2010 State Accountability Ratings Appeals Registration Process allows districts to track the status of their state accountability rating appeal(s). The Appeal Registration Process is open from July 20 through August 13, 2010.

The link to appeal a state accountability ratings is located on the ACCT page. Simply click on the ACCT tab at the top of any page, then scroll to the bottom of that page, under **Appeal of Rating**.

To register an appeal, districts must: 1) confirm or correct their district mailing address; and, 2) submit an appeal registration form. See the sample form on next page.

Submitting a 2010 State Accountability Appeals Registration Form informs TEA of your intention to appeal one or more 2010 state accountability ratings; however, submission of this form does not constitute an appeal. Districts must also mail an appeal packet that includes all relevant information necessary for TEA to process the appeal.

After registering, districts are encouraged to check the status of their appeal using the Appeal Status Report. This report provides a summary of the appeal registration and will also indicate the date the mailed appeal packet was received by the Division of Performance Reporting.

Automated email notifications will be sent to districts when the electronic appeal registration form is submitted, when the mailed appeal packet arrives at TEA, and when the TEA response letter has been mailed to the district superintendent. The automated emails will be sent to the district superintendent and the person who submitted the appeal registration form in TEASE.

Appeals will be evaluated based on the required documentation submitted in the mailed appeal packet as described in *Chapter 15 – Appealing the Ratings* of this *Manual*. All appeals must meet the requirements outlined in Chapter 15.

The following graphic provides a screen shot of the Appeals Registration Form. Note that the design of this form may be revised slightly prior to July 20, 2010.

Sample TEASE Appeals Registration Form

2010 State Accountability Appeals Registration

Your district and each campus within your district are listed below. Campuses are in alphabetical order by campus name. Register your district and/or campus appeals by using the dropdown boxes to select the indicator that is the reason for the appeal.

Select "Multiple Indicators" if more than one indicator is being appealed. Select "Other" if your appeal is not specific to any of the indicators.

In order to successfully submit a registration form, at least one appeal must be selected and all contact information at the bottom of this form must be provided.

No Appeal	SAMPLE ISD, 999999
No Appeal	SAMPLE EL, 999999101
No Appeal	SAMPLE H S, 999999001
No Appeal	SAMPLE M S, 999999041

The dropout box contains the following choices:

- No Appeal
- No Appeal
- TAKS Only
- Completion Only
- Dropout Only
- Multiple Indicators
- Other

Enter your name:

Enter your email address:

For verification purposes, please re-enter your email address:

The information above is entered at the instruction of my superintendent. The information above has been reviewed carefully to ensure its accuracy.

Corresponding information and supporting documentation for each appeal will be mailed to TEA and postmarked by August 13, 2010.

PUBLICATION ORDER FORM

Date _____

Remitter Name _____

Send to (name, if different) _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

To place an order for a publication, fill out the information below and make check or money order payable to: Texas Education Agency

Quantity	Title of documents requested	Publication No.	Cost	TOTAL
1	2010 Accountability Manual	GE10-602-02	\$14.00	
<i>Price includes postage, handling, and state tax.</i>				

FOR TAX EXEMPT ORDERS ONLY				
Make check or money order payable to: Texas Education Agency Purchase orders are accepted only from Texas educational institutions and government agencies.				
Quantity	Title of documents requested	Publication No.	Cost	TOTAL
1	2010 Accountability Manual	GE10-602-02	\$12.00	

IF YOU ARE MAILING A PURCHASE ORDER* OR NEED INFORMATION, MAIL TO:

Texas Education Agency
Publications Distribution
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

***Purchase orders are accepted ONLY from Texas Funded Educational Institutions and Texas Government Agencies**

IF YOU ARE MAILING A CHECK OR MONEY ORDER, REMIT THIS FORM WITH PAYMENT TO:

Texas Education Agency
Publications Distribution
P.O. Box 13817
Austin, Texas 78711-3817

Make check or money order payable to: Texas Education Agency.