

2012 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Guide

For Texas Public School Districts and Campuses

**Texas Education Agency
Department of Assessment and Accountability
Division of Performance Reporting**

June 2012

Copies of the 2012 Adequate Yearly Progress Guide may be purchased from:

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

Please use the order form on the last page of this publication. Remit \$9.00 for each copy for a non-profit institution, or \$11.00 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 free of charge from the Texas Education Agency Internet site at:

<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/2012/index.html>

Copyright © Notice The Materials are copyrighted © and trademarked ™ as the property of the Texas Education Agency and may not be reproduced without the express written permission of the Texas Education Agency, 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 the Texas Education Agency;
- 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 the Texas Education Agency;
- 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 the Texas Education Agency 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

Section I: Introduction	11
Amendments to the 2012 AYP Workbook	11
Texas NCLB Report	12
Section II: System Overview	13
Key Dates Related to the 2012 AYP Process	13
Comparison of 2011 and 2012 AYP Systems	15
Districts and Campuses Evaluated.....	15
Districts	15
Campuses	15
Agreement for Linked Campus Identification Numbers	16
2012 AYP Status.....	16
Treatment of Known Compromised Data.....	17
2012 AYP Status Labels	18
Exhibit 1: 2012 AYP Indicators.....	19
Section III: Indicators, Components, Measures, and Standards	20
Indicators.....	20
Assessments Used for Reading/ELA and Mathematics Indicators.....	20
TAKS Assessment Program for Grade 10:.....	20
TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated).....	20
TAKS–Modified (TAKS–M).....	20
TAKS Linguistically Accommodated Testing (LAT) for ELA and Mathematics	21
STAAR Alternate for Grades 3–8 and 10.....	21
STAAR Assessment Program for Grades 3–8:.....	21
STAAR Modified.....	21
STAAR L.....	22
Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) Reading	22
State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness Bridge Study for AYP.....	22
Data used for the Other Indicator.....	23
Graduation Rate	23
Attendance Rate	23

Exhibit 2: Relationships Among AYP Indicators, Components, Measures, and Standards.....	24
Components of the Reading/ELA and Mathematics Indicators	25
Overview of Participation and Performance.....	25
Selecting Assessment Results.....	25
Students Tested on a Single Assessment	26
Students Tested on More than One Assessment.....	26
TELPAS Reading.....	26
Exhibit 3: Assessments Included in 2012 AYP Calculations	27
Participation	29
Calculating Participation Measures	29
Participation Count of Students Enrolled at the Time of Testing.....	30
Identification of Participants.....	30
STAAR (English and Spanish versions), STAAR L, and STAAR Modified	30
STAAR Alternate.....	30
LAT for TAKS and TAKS–M.....	30
TELPAS Reading.....	31
Exhibit 4: Assessments for Recent Immigrant ELL / LEP Students Included in 2012 AYP Calculations	32
Participation Student Groups Evaluated	35
All Students.....	35
Minimum Size Requirements	35
Student Groups.....	35
Minimum Size Requirements	35
Special Education.....	35
LEP	35
Participation Target.....	36
95% Standard	36
Average Participation Rate	36
Performance	36
Calculating Performance Measures	37
Performance Count of Total Students Tested.....	37
Performance Full Academic Year.....	37
Districts.....	37
Campuses	37

Identification of Proficient Students	38
STAAR and TAKS General Assessments	38
STAAR Modified and TAKS–M.....	38
SSI Requirements.....	38
STAAR Alternate.....	38
Linguistically Accommodated Testing: STAAR L, TAKS LAT, and TAKS-M LAT	39
TELPAS Reading.....	39
Exhibit 5: Assessment and Student Passing Standards for 2012 AYP Evaluations	40
Federal Cap on Alternate Assessments (TAKS–M, STAAR Modified and STAAR Alternate)	40
General Guidelines Related to the Federal Cap.....	41
How to calculate the 1% and 2% Federal Cap Limit.....	41
1% Cap on STAAR Alternate.....	42
Exceptions Applied Prior to the Preliminary Release.....	42
Federal Cap Recapture	43
2% Cap on STAAR Modified/TAKS–M.....	43
Campus Rankings	43
Student Selection Process	44
Stages of student selection	45
Exhibit 6: AYP 2% Federal Cap Scenarios	46
Final Federal Cap Recapture.....	48
Performance Student Groups Evaluated	48
All Students.....	48
Student Groups.....	48
Special Education.....	48
LEP	49
Minimum Size Requirements	49
Performance Target.....	50
Reading and Mathematics Standards	50
Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor	50
Calculating Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor.....	50
Minimum Size Requirements	51
District Level Performance Results	52
The Other Indicator.....	52

Graduation Rate	52
Calculating Graduation Rate Measures	52
Graduation Rate Goal	53
Annual Targets for Graduation Rate.....	53
2012 Four-year Graduation Rate Target	54
Four-year Graduation Rate Alternative Targets	54
Five-year Graduation Rate Target	55
Graduation Rate Student Groups Evaluated	55
All Students.....	55
Student Groups.....	56
Minimum Size Requirements	56
Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor	57
Special Provision for Residential Treatment Facilities (RTF).....	57
Attendance Rate	58
Calculating Attendance Rate Measures	58
Attendance Rate Standard.....	58
Attendance Rate Improvement Standard	58
Attendance Rate Minimum Size Requirement	58
All Students.....	59
Student Groups.....	59
Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor	59
All Students.....	59
Student Groups.....	59
Rounding.....	60
Performance	60
Participation	60
Federal Cap.....	60
Other Indicator	61
Student Groups for all Indicators	61
Special Circumstances	61
Small Districts and Campuses	62
Reading and Mathematics Indicators.....	62
Performance	62

Uniform Averaging.....	62
Pairing.....	62
AYP Special Analysis.....	62
Participation.....	63
Other Indicators.....	63
AYP Status for Small Districts and Campuses.....	63
Districts and Campuses with No Students in Grades Evaluated For AYP.....	63
Districts.....	63
Campuses.....	64
Prekindergarten and Kindergarten (PK/K) Campuses.....	64
Performance.....	64
Participation.....	64
Other Indicators.....	64
Section IV: Exceptions.....	65
Exception to the 1% Federal Cap on STAAR Alternate.....	65
Exception Applications Prior to Preliminary Release.....	65
Exception Process.....	66
Unused slots from the 1% cap on STAAR Alternate.....	66
Federal Cap.....	67
Other Circumstance Exceptions.....	67
Other Circumstance Exceptions Application Process.....	67
Evaluation of Other Circumstance Exceptions to the Federal 1% Cap.....	68
Justification for Other Circumstance Exceptions.....	68
Federal Cap Extension for Other Circumstance Exceptions.....	68
Approval of Exception Does Not Necessarily Change AYP Status.....	69
Section V: Appeals.....	71
Calendar.....	71
Districts and Campuses Subject to Title I School Improvement Requirements.....	71
Limitations on 2012 AYP Appeals.....	71
General Considerations for Appeals.....	71
Data Relevant to the 2012 AYP Result.....	71
Appeals Are Not a Data Correction Opportunity!.....	72
Enrolled Grade Level.....	72

Allowable Appeals.....	72
Determination of AYP Status	73
Guidelines by Indicator for Appeals.....	73
Performance Results for Reading/ELA and Mathematics	73
Limitations on Performance Appeals.....	73
Data Quality	73
Student Attribution Codes.....	74
2012 Bridge Study	74
Other Indicator Appeals and Safe Harbor.....	74
Participation	74
Limitations on Participation Rate Appeals	74
Extreme Medical Emergencies	75
TELPAS Reading Testing Window.....	75
Grade 10 TAKS Linguistically Accommodated Testing (LAT) for Reading/ELA and Mathematics.....	75
Graduation Rate	75
Graduation Rate Calculation.....	75
Limitations on Graduation Rate Appeals.....	77
Graduation Rate Appeals from Alternative Education Campuses.....	77
School District Appeals	77
Charter District or Campus Appeals	77
Recalculated Graduation Rate.....	78
Attendance Rate	78
Current Year Attendance	78
Special Circumstance Appeals.....	79
Appeal of Reported Race or Ethnicity Identification	79
Crisis Code Related to 2011 Central Texas Wildfires	79
Appeal of the USDE approved Texas AYP Workbook requirements.....	79
Appeals Related to the Federal Cap and Campus Rankings.....	80
Spring 2012 STAAR and TAKS Corrections Window	80
Title I Targeted Assistance Campuses	81
Grades 9 and 11 STAAR	81
How to Submit an Appeal Application.....	81
How an Appeal Application Is Processed by the Agency	83

Relationship Between AYP and PBMAS	84
Exhibit 7: Sample AYP Request Cover Letter	85
Exhibit 8: Sample AYP Appeal Request Form.....	86
Exhibit 9: Suggested Packing Order for Appeal Request.....	87
Exhibit 10: Sample AYP Decision Notification Letter.....	88
Section VI: AYP Products Available Online Through TEASE Accountability.....	89
AYP Release Schedule	89
Gaining Access to TEASE Accountability	90
Multiple District Access	90
AYP Products Available.....	90
AYP Appeal Form and Registration.....	91
Most Recent AYP Products Only	92
Section VII: Future Considerations	93
2013 AYP.....	93
Science	94
Performance Standards	94
Exhibit 11: AYP Performance Standards	94
Section VIII: Appendices.....	95
Appendix A: Texas Administrative Code.....	95
Appendix B: Title I School Improvement	96
General Guidelines for Title I School Improvement	96
Existing and Remaining SIP Identified Campuses	97
Potential SIP Identified Campuses.....	97
Exiting SIP Identification	97
Detailed Requirements for SIP Identified Campuses	97
Parent Notification Letter (PNL)	97
Fiscal Implications – Title I SIP Application for Funding for 2012-13	97
School Choice	98
Supplemental Educational Services (SES) – Stages 2--5	98
Related Issues for SIP Identified Districts and Campuses.....	99
District and Campus Identification Numbers	99
School Transfers	99
Waivers for the First Day of Instruction.....	100

Title I Campuses and Districts Not Subject to Final School Improvement in 2011–12.....	101
Title I Campuses and Districts Subject to Final Stage 1 School Improvement in 2011–12	102
Title I Campuses and Districts Subject to Final Stage 2 School Improvement in 2011–12.....	103
Title I Campuses and Districts Subject to Final Stage 3 School Improvement in 2011–12.....	104
Title I Campuses Subject to Final Stage 4 School Improvement in 2011–12	105
Title I Campuses Subject to Final Stage 5 School Improvement in 2011–12	106
Appendix C: Sample AYP Products	107
AYP Unmasked Data Table.....	107
Sample AYP Source Data Table.....	118
Sample District Federal Cap Calculation.....	121
AYP Student Data Listings and Student Categories.....	122
Appendix D: Calculating 2012 AYP Results for Sample School.....	125
AYP Data Table Results	125
Performance: Reading/English Language Arts.....	126
Performance: Mathematics	128
Participation: Reading/English Language Arts.....	130
Participation: Mathematics	131
Other Indicator	132
AYP Explanation Table	135
Reconciling Student Level Data	136
Reading/English Language Arts Performance.....	136
How to Calculate the 1% and 2% Federal Cap Limits	139
Reading/English Language Arts	140
Appendix E: NCLB Report Card Preview.....	142
Appendix F: Grade Ranges Included in Each Campus Type	144
Appendix G: Regional Education Service Center (ESC) Contacts	145
Appendix H: TEA Contacts.....	147
Appendix I: Inclusion or Exclusion of Performance Data.....	148
Section IX: Index	150

Section I: Introduction

The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB) (Public Law 107-110), reauthorizes and amends federal programs established under the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (ESEA). Under NCLB, accountability provisions that formerly applied only to districts and campuses receiving Title I, Part A funds now apply to all districts and campuses. All public school districts, campuses, and the state are evaluated annually for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

Amendments to the 2012 AYP Workbook

The United States Department of Education (USDE) requires a Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook (Texas AYP Workbook) that describes the current Texas AYP calculations. The 2012 Texas AYP Workbook amendments clarify the continued use of the 2011 graduation rate targets and calculations for 2012 AYP. The table below provides a summary of the amendment request for assessments used in the 2012 AYP evaluations.

Assessments for 2012 AYP Evaluations	
Enrolled Grades	AYP Assessments
Grade 3-8	STAAR (English & Spanish) reading and mathematics *
	STAAR Modified reading and mathematics
	STAAR Alternate reading and mathematics
	STAAR EOC English I reading and Algebra I *
	STAAR Modified EOC English I reading and Algebra I
	STAAR EOC English II reading, Geometry and Algebra II *
	TELPAS Reading
Grade 10	TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) ELA and mathematics *
	TAKS-M ELA and mathematics *
	STAAR Alternate EOC English I and Algebra I
	STAAR Alternate EOC English II and Geometry
	TELPAS Reading

* Includes linguistically accommodated assessments, where applicable

Throughout the *AYP Guide*, the term “STAAR” refers collectively to all assessments administered to students in Grades 3–8 and 10, unless specifically noted otherwise.

The Texas AYP Workbook, approved by the USDE in June 2012, meets the requirements of NCLB and provides a mechanism for evaluating district and campus AYP in 2012. The AYP requirements in NCLB are based on the following principles:

All Schools: A single statewide definition of AYP applies to all districts and campuses, including Title I and non-Title I districts and campuses, alternative education campuses, and open-enrollment charter schools.

All Students: All students in Grades 3–8 and 10 must be tested and all results must be included in the AYP calculation. Assessments evaluated for AYP are described in the table below.

Standards: Baseline performance standards for Reading/English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics measures are determined using the methodology required in NCLB. The standards must increase over time to reach 100 percent by 2013–14.

Performance and Participation: Districts and campuses must meet test participation standards as well as performance standards for students tested.

Student Groups: All students, and African American, Hispanic, White, economically disadvantaged, special education, and limited English proficient (LEP) student groups must meet the same performance and participation standards. States individually develop minimum size requirements for evaluation of student groups.

Other Measures: High schools must meet a Graduation Rate standard set by the state. States individually identify an additional measure for elementary and middle/junior high schools.

Texas NCLB Report

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 required NCLB Report Cards (NCLB RC) which are available at the state, district, and campus level for easy dissemination by school districts. The 2012 NCLB report cards will be available in January, 2013.

The student achievement information required for the NCLB RC is a summary of all STAAR/TAKS tests and grades. The relationship between the student achievement information and AYP performance results, both of which are reported on the NCLB RC, are described in *Appendix E*. For more information on the distribution requirements of the Texas NCLB Report Card, please contact the Division of Federal and State Education Policy at (512) 463-9414.

Section II: System Overview

Under the accountability provisions in the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), all districts, campuses, and the state are evaluated for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Following is an overview of the process for determining district and campus 2012 AYP Status.

Key Dates Related to the 2012 AYP Process

September, 2011 – June, 2012	Exception to the 1% Federal Cap via RF Tracker Districts with residential treatment facilities (RF) and group foster homes apply for an exception to the federal cap by registering with the Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions' RF Tracker Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE) application.
February, 2012	TEA Requests for Amendments TEA submits requests for amendments to the Texas AYP Workbook.
May 22, 2012	Campus Priority List for the 2% Federal Cap available online TEASE Accountability application available for school districts to view and/or modify their 2012 Campus Priority List for the 2% Federal Cap.
June, 2012	AYP Calculations Approved Expected USDE approval of requested amendments to the Texas AYP Workbook related to the 2012 AYP calculations.
June/July, 2012	AYP Guide Released
July 10, 2012	Deadline for Campus Priority List for the 2% Federal Cap Changes to the Campus Priority List for the 2% Federal Cap must be submitted by July 10, 2012. School districts that have not provided campus ranking changes by 5:00 p.m. on July 10 th agree to accept the TEA Default Campus Ranking for 2012 AYP.

July 31, 2012	<p>Release of 2012 Preliminary Data Tables to Campuses and Districts TEA provides 2012 AYP preliminary data tables to school districts on TEASE for Title I and non-Title I districts and campuses, alternative education campuses, and open-enrollment charter schools.</p> <p>Appeals Begin Student-level data for submission of appeals are available to districts electronically. Appeal letters for district and campus AYP results are accepted.</p> <p>Open Other Circumstance Exceptions Application Districts may submit applications for Other Circumstance Exceptions online via TEASE.</p>
August 8, 2012	<p>Public Release of 2012 Preliminary Data Tables TEA releases preliminary 2012 AYP masked data tables, including preliminary AYP status, electronically on public website.</p>
September 7, 2012	<p>Appeals Deadline Appeals of district and campus preliminary 2012 AYP Status must be submitted in writing under the signature of the superintendent by Friday, September 7, 2012.</p> <p>Exceptions Deadline Online application process for submission of Other Circumstance Exceptions closes.</p>
November/December, 2012	<p>Final 2012 AYP Status TEA releases final 2012 AYP masked data tables with final AYP Status electronically on public website.</p>
January, 2013	<p>2012 NCLB Report Card available on public website</p>

Comparison of 2011 and 2012 AYP Systems

The following changes to specific components of the AYP system will be incorporated in 2012. *Section III* provides more details on the following areas:

- AYP will evaluate results from the new assessment program, the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR™), for students enrolled in Grades 3–8; TAKS results for students enrolled in Grade 10;
- STAAR end-of-course (EOC) assessments are used in AYP for middle school students enrolled in Grade 8 or below taking high school level courses;
- Student passing standards for certain STAAR assessments are based on the USDE approved bridge study conducted to map the existing TAKS *Met Standard* performance standard to the new assessment;
- The Student Success Initiative (SSI) for Grades 5 and 8 is suspended while STAAR performance standards are being set, therefore only one test administration is available for 2012 AYP;
- An increase in AYP Reading/English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics performance standards for 2012 to 87% for Reading/ELA and 83% for Mathematics;
- For districts and campuses evaluated for Graduation Rate, each student group is evaluated for 2012 AYP.

Districts and Campuses Evaluated

Districts

Regular foundation school program (FSP) districts and special statutory districts are evaluated for AYP. State-administered school districts are not evaluated for AYP. State-administered districts include Texas School for the Blind and Visually Impaired, Texas School for the Deaf, Texas Youth Commission, and Windham School District. Beginning in 2005, charter operators are evaluated for AYP based on aggregate results for the campuses operated by the charter. New districts, including new charter districts, are not evaluated for AYP the first year they report fall enrollment. Districts with no students enrolled in Grades 3–8 and 10 are not evaluated for AYP.

Campuses

All Title I and non-Title I public school campuses, alternative education campuses, and open-enrollment charter schools are evaluated for AYP with the following exceptions:

New Campuses: New campuses and new open-enrollment charter schools are not evaluated for AYP the first year they report fall enrollment. These campuses will be incorporated automatically the second year they report fall enrollment.

Campuses that Close Mid-Year: Campuses that close before the relevant assessment testing date are not evaluated for AYP. Performance measures for which data exist on campuses that close are included in the district AYP evaluation. Campuses that close after the end of the school year are evaluated for AYP for that school year.

Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP) and Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP) Campuses: State statute and statutory intent prohibit the attribution of student performance results to JJAEPs and DAEPs. Attendance and performance data for students served in JJAEPs and DAEPs are attributed to the home campuses.

Short-Term Campuses: Campuses that serve students in the grades evaluated for AYP (Grades 3–8 and 10) and have no students meeting the full academic year (or accountability subset) definition are not evaluated for AYP. This includes alternative education campuses (AECs) with short-term placements. However, these campuses *will be* evaluated if any number of students are included in the accountability subset, and may also be evaluated for graduation rate.

Charter Campuses with No Students in Grades 3–8 and 10: Open-enrollment charter schools that do not serve students enrolled in Grades 3–8 or 10 are not evaluated for AYP.

Districts and Campuses with Students Enrolled in Grades 3–8 or 10 but have No Test Results: Districts and campuses with students enrolled in Grades 3–8 or 10 but with no test results in the accountability subset are not evaluated for AYP.

Agreement for Linked Campus Identification Numbers

If a school district enters into a legal agreement with TEA that requires new district or campus numbers, the AYP Status history will be linked to the previous district or campus number. In this case, both the district and campus will be evaluated for AYP the first year under the new number. Data for districts and campuses in these circumstances will not be linked. This includes Public Education Information Managements System (PEIMS) data, assessment data, and AYP indicators that draw on those data. Districts or campuses under a legal agreement with TEA cannot take advantage of Required Improvement/Safe Harbor provisions of AYP in order to meet AYP the first year under a new district or campus number.

2012 AYP Status

Following is an overview of the 2012 AYP indicators. Additional information about each AYP measure is provided in *Section III*. A sample AYP calculation is provided in *Appendix D*.

Districts, campuses, and the state are evaluated on three indicators for AYP: Reading/ELA, Mathematics, and one Other Indicator. Exhibit 1 summarizes the indicators. For Reading/ELA and Mathematics (Grades 3–8 and 10, summed across grades), for all students and each student group that meets minimum size requirements, districts and campuses must meet the performance target or

performance improvement/safe harbor, and the participation target. The performance target is based on test results for students enrolled for the full academic year. The participation target is based on participation in the assessment program of all students enrolled on the day of testing.

In addition to Reading/ELA and Mathematics, districts and campuses are required to meet the AYP standard on one Other Indicator—either Graduation Rate or Attendance Rate. The Other Indicator evaluated for a district or campus is based on the grades offered. *Appendix F* shows the grade ranges included in each campus type.

- Graduation Rate is the Other Indicator for high schools, combined elementary/secondary campuses offering Grade 12, and districts offering Grade 12.
- Attendance Rate is the Other Indicator for elementary schools, middle/junior high schools, combined elementary/secondary schools not offering Grade 12, and districts not offering Grade 12.

Districts and campuses must meet the Graduation Rate or Attendance Rate standard *or* meet the relevant improvement requirement.

Performance on the Other Indicator is also part of performance improvement/safe harbor for the Reading/ELA and Mathematics performance measures. If any student group (or all students) does not meet the performance target for Reading/ELA or Mathematics, that student group must show both: 1) a 10 percent decrease in the percent counted as not proficient from the prior year **and** 2) meet the absolute target or meet the relevant improvement criteria on the Other Indicator. Each student group *may* be required to either meet the target or show improvement on the Graduation Rate or Attendance Rate to meet the performance improvement/safe harbor criteria.

A district or campus may be evaluated on as few as two or as many as 35 measures to determine 2012 AYP Status. See *Section III* for a discussion of the relationships between indicators and measures.

Treatment of Known Compromised Data

Federal regulations (34 CFR 200.3 and 200.19 *et seq.*) require states to ensure that its academic assessment program and other academic indicators are valid and reliable for the evaluation of AYP. In order to address this requirement, the commissioner of education will determine the AYP outcome of districts and campuses when the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results have been compromised and rendered invalid. Academic assessment or other indicators that have been rendered invalid may be reported on AYP data tables, but will be annotated to indicate the irregularities and that the data could not be used for AYP evaluations. For example, the testing contractor may be asked to invalidate the assessment results used for AYP if district findings are known in time.

Annotations on AYP or other federal reports 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 AYP improvement calculations.

2012 AYP Status Labels

Each district and campus is assigned one of the following 2012 AYP Status labels:

Meets AYP: Designates a district or campus that meets AYP standards on all indicators for which it is evaluated.

Missed AYP – [reason]: Designates a district or campus that does not meet AYP standards on one or more indicator components and which of those components were not met. The *Missed AYP* label may be assigned to a district or campus in the rare situation where the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results have been compromised.

Not Evaluated AYP: Designates a district or campus that is not evaluated for AYP for one of the following reasons:

- the district or campus is new;
- the campus closed mid-year;
- the campus does not have students in attendance for the full academic year;
- JJAEP and DAEP campuses;
- unusual circumstances (district with no students in grades tested; campus test answer documents lost in shipping); or
- the charter campus does not have students enrolled in the grades tested.

Each year, the State Accountability Ratings for the standard and Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) procedures are reported along with the final AYP Status for each campus and district. Due to the implementation of the new STAAR testing program, there are no 2012 state rating results.

Exhibit 1: 2012 AYP Indicators

<p>Reading/English Language Arts 2011–12 tests (STAAR/TAKS*, STAAR Modified, STAAR Alternate, and TELPAS Reading**)) All students and each student group that meets minimum size requirements: African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged, Special Education, Limited English Proficient</p>	<p>Performance Standard: 87% % counted as proficient on test for students enrolled the full academic year subject to the federal cap***</p>	<p>Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor: 10% decrease in percent not proficient on test and meet the standard <i>or</i> meet the improvement requirement for the relevant other measure (Graduation Rate <i>or</i> Attendance Rate)</p>
	<p>Participation Standard: 95% Participation in the assessment program for students enrolled on the date of testing</p>	<p>Average Participation Rate: 95% participation based on combined 2010-11 and 2011-12 assessment data</p>
<p>Mathematics 2011–12 tests (STAAR/TAKS*, STAAR Modified, STAAR Alternate) All students and each student group that meets minimum size requirements (see above)</p>	<p>Performance Standard: 83% % counted as proficient on test for students enrolled the full academic year subject to the federal cap***</p>	<p>Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor: 10% decrease in percent not proficient on test and meet the standard <i>or</i> meet the improvement requirement for the relevant other measure (Graduation Rate <i>or</i> Attendance Rate)</p>
	<p>Participation Standard: 95% Participation in the assessment program for students enrolled on the date of testing</p>	<p>Average Participation Rate: 95% participation based on combined 2010-11 and 2011-12 assessment data</p>
<p>Other Indicator***** Graduation Rate All students and each student group that meets minimum size requirements (see above) Class of 2011 (4-year rate) Class of 2010 (5-year rate) Attendance Rate All students</p>	<p>4-yr Graduation Rate Goal: 90.0% <u>or</u> 4-yr Graduation Rate Target: 75.0 <u>or</u> Safe harbor graduation rate Target***** <u>or</u> Improvement of 1.0 % <u>or more</u> <u>or</u> 5-yr Graduation Rate Target: 80.0% Graduation Rate for high schools, combined elementary/secondary schools offering Grade 12 and districts offering Grade 12</p>	<p>Attendance Rate Standard: 90.0% <u>or any improvement</u> Attendance Rate for elementary schools, middle/junior high schools, combined elementary/secondary schools not offering Grade 12, and districts not offering Grade 12</p>

* Grades 3–8 STAAR includes linguistically accommodated assessments, where applicable; and Grade 10 TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), and TAKS-M.

** See Performance and Participation in *Section III* for information on the use of TELPAS Reading in AYP.

*** No more than 3% of students in the district’s participation denominator can be counted as *proficient* on STAAR Modified/TAKS–M (2%) and STAAR Alternate (1%).

**** Safe harbor graduation rate target is defined as a 10.0 percent decrease in difference between the prior year 4-year Graduation Rate and the 90.0 percent statewide goal.

***** Student groups are not required to meet the Attendance Rate standards; however, they may be required to meet the standard or meet the improvement requirement on the Attendance Rate as part of performance improvement/safe harbor for Reading/ELA or Mathematics.

Section III: Indicators, Components, Measures, and Standards

Data used to determine the 2012 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Status is organized into indicators, components, measures, and standards. Exhibit 2 provides a summary of the relationships among AYP indicators, components, measures, and standards.

Indicators

There are three areas that serve as indicators on which a district or campus may be evaluated for AYP: Reading/English Language Arts (ELA), Mathematics, and one of the Other Indicators (either Graduation Rate or Attendance Rate). For Title I districts and campuses, missing AYP on the same indicator two consecutive years triggers Title I School Improvement Program (SIP) requirements; a district or campus must meet AYP on the indicator that triggered SIP for two consecutive years to exit the Title I SIP requirements.

Assessments Used for Reading/ELA and Mathematics Indicators

TAKS Assessment Program for Grade 10:

TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated)

Assessment results evaluated are the Reading/ELA and Mathematics administration of the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) for students in Grade 10. Student performance at or above the Met Standard level adopted by the State Board of Education (SBOE) for the 2011-12 school year is considered proficient for TAKS results.

TAKS includes a test form called TAKS (Accommodated) for students served by special education who meet the eligibility requirements for certain specific accommodations. The TAKS (Accommodated) form includes format accommodations (larger font, fewer items per page, etc.) and contains no embedded field-test items. The decision to administer TAKS (Accommodated) to a student must be made by the student's Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committee.

TAKS-Modified (TAKS-M)

The TAKS-Modified (TAKS-M) is an alternate assessment based on modified academic achievement standards and is designed for students served by special education who meet participation requirements. TAKS-M covers the same grade-level content as TAKS but TAKS-M tests have been modified in format (larger format, fewer items per page, etc.) and test design (fewer answer choices, simpler vocabulary and sentence structure, etc.). The decision to administer TAKS-M to a student

must be made by the student's ARD committee; it cannot be based solely on disability category or placement setting, nor can it be determined administratively for accountability purposes. TAKS–M is not available in Spanish.

TAKS Linguistically Accommodated Testing (LAT) for ELA and Mathematics

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation requires that states assess all limited English proficient (LEP) students in Reading/ELA and Mathematics for the calculation of AYP. Linguistically Accommodated Testing (LAT) in ELA and Mathematics are available for LEP-exempt students in grade 10. The Language Proficiency Assessment Committee (LPAC) makes LEP exemption decisions for LEP students on an individual student basis in accordance with the procedures outlined in the *LPAC Decision-Making Process for the Texas Assessment Program* manual.

STAAR Alternate for Grades 3–8 and 10

The STAAR Alternate is an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards that is designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities who meet the participation requirements. STAAR Alternate is not a traditional paper or multiple-choice test. Instead, the assessment involves teachers observing students as they complete standardized assessment tasks that link to the grade-level Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) curriculum. Teachers then score student performance using the STAAR Alternate scoring rubric and submit the results and evidence through an online instrument.

STAAR Assessment Program for Grades 3–8:

Assessment results for Grades 3–8 evaluated are the Reading/ELA and Mathematics administrations of the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR). This includes STAAR results for both the English and Spanish versions of the test. Student performance at or above Met Standard level is considered proficient for 2012 AYP calculations as determined by the STAAR bridge study which will map performance standards for 2012 STAAR assessments to their respective 2011 subject and grade level Met Standard level on TAKS.

STAAR Modified

The State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness Modified (STAAR Modified) replaces the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills–Modified (TAKS–M) beginning with the 2011–2012 school year for students in Grades 3–8. STAAR Modified also includes end-of-course (EOC) assessments.

STAAR Modified is an alternate assessment based on modified academic achievement standards and is intended for a small number of students receiving special education services who meet specific participation requirements. As with TAKS–M, the decision to administer STAAR Modified to a student must be made by the student's ARD committee; it cannot be based solely

on disability category or placement setting, nor can it be determined administratively for accountability purposes. STAAR Modified is not available in Spanish.

Student Success Initiative (SSI) for Grades 5 and 8 Reading and Mathematics

Current federal regulations implementing NCLB permit both the first and second administration of the STAAR or STAAR Modified Grade 5 Reading and Grade 5 Mathematics, and Grade 8 Reading and Grade 8 Mathematics tests to be included in the AYP calculation for performance and participation. Because there will be no performance standards in place for grades 3–8 in the 2011–2012 school year, students cannot be subject to SSI for that year. Therefore, there are no SSI requirements for the 2011–2012 school year, and only one administration for these grades and subjects will be used in AYP.

STAAR L

English language learner (ELL) participation requirements for the new STAAR assessment program underwent substantial changes in comparison with the previous assessment program known as TAKS. All students taking STAAR assessments are allowed to use appropriate linguistic accommodations as determined by their LPACs. In addition to accommodations, linguistically accommodated versions of STAAR, called STAAR L are available for Mathematics to eligible ELLs as determined by their LPAC on the basis of limited English proficiency.

STAAR Spanish is provided for ELLs in Grades 3–5 for Mathematics and Reading who meet specific participation requirements for a Spanish-version assessment.

Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) Reading

NCLB legislation requires that states assess all students in Reading/ELA including LEP students. TELPAS Reading results are used in lieu of STAAR results for first-year recent immigrants. The LPAC makes assessment administration decisions on an individual student basis in accordance with the procedures outlined in the *LPAC Decision-Making Process for the Texas Assessment Program* manual.

State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness Bridge Study for AYP

To facilitate the evaluation of AYP in 2012, Texas is conducting a bridge study that will identify the existing TAKS *Met Standard* performance standard used for AYP evaluations on the STAAR assessments. Since STAAR performance standards will not be available for the majority of the tests until late fall 2012, performance standards used with the TAKS assessments will be carried over to the STAAR program for the 2012 AYP evaluations that will be released in early August 2012. Detailed information is accessible in Student Assessment's Bridge Study for AYP Report available online at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/reports/>.

Data used for the Other Indicator

Graduation Rate


The Graduation Rate is the *graduates* component of the longitudinal secondary school completion rate. A longitudinal completion rate is the percentage of students from a class of beginning ninth graders who complete their high school education by their anticipated graduation date. The completion class has four components: percent graduating (either on time or early); percent continuing in public high schools after the expected graduation year; percent receiving General Educational Development (GED) certificates; and percent dropping out. The graduation rate component of the four-year longitudinal completion rates has been used to determine district and campus AYP status since 2003.

In April, 2010, the USDE approved the Texas graduation rate goal, annual targets, and use of the five-year extended longitudinal cohort graduation rate for AYP evaluations. The Class of 2011 four-year graduation rate and the Class of 2010 five-year graduation rate will be used to evaluate 2012 AYP. TEA calculates the four-year and five-year longitudinal completion rates using information provided by school districts through Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS). The methodology used to calculate five-year rates is identical to the methodology used to calculate four-year rates, with the exception that students are tracked for an additional year. For more information on the longitudinal secondary school graduation rates, see the annual report of *Secondary School Completion and Dropouts in Texas Public Schools* (<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=4080>) and other technical documents at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=4080#documentation>

Attendance Rate

All public school districts are required to submit student attendance and contact hours at the student detail level, for the entire school year, through PEIMS. The Attendance Rate is based on attendance of all students in Grades 1–12 for the entire school year, and is the same rate reported for the Texas Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) Reports. School districts follow the official attendance accounting rules and regulations for all public school districts in Texas as outlined in the *Student Attendance Accounting Handbook (Handbook)*.

Exhibit 2: Relationships Among AYP Indicators, Components, Measures, and Standards



* Student groups may be evaluated for Attendance as part of performance improvement/safe harbor for Reading/ELA or Mathematics.

Components of the Reading/ELA and Mathematics Indicators

Overview of Participation and Performance

The Reading/ELA and Mathematics indicators are each comprised of two components: performance and participation. Districts and campuses must meet *both* the performance (or performance improvement/safe harbor) *and* participation component for Reading/ELA and Mathematics. If a district or campus misses the performance component on an indicator in one year and the next year meets the performance component but misses the participation component on the same indicator, the district or campus would be considered to have missed AYP for that indicator two consecutive years, potentially triggering Title I SIP requirements for the district or campus. The opposite also holds: the district/campus could miss participation on an indicator the first year and meet participation but miss performance the next year for the same indicator, and the district/campus would be considered to have missed AYP for that indicator two consecutive years.

Performance and participation components of the Reading/ELA and Mathematics indicators are determined from the same set of assessment information for each school district.

Selecting Assessment Results

All test results in Reading/ELA and Mathematics for every student in Grades 3–8 and 10 are processed for the calculation of AYP. Processing decisions are made to determine the single test result that will be used for the AYP subject indicators. The general steps in determining a student’s test results for the AYP calculation include: (1) review all test answer documents for each test subject submitted during Spring 2012, regardless of score code, (2) identify the single test result that will be used in the AYP calculation for Reading/ELA, (3) identify the single test result for Mathematics, and (4) include the single test result in the AYP Reading/ELA and Mathematics calculations.

The single test result for each student is included in the following AYP data table categories.

- Count of students enrolled on the day of testing, or the **Participation** count of **Total Students** (participation denominator),
- If participant in an assessment, include in Participation calculation of **Number Participating** (participation numerator),
- If a valid, scored test result meets the Full Academic Year (accountability subset) definition, include in **Performance** calculation of **Number Tested** (performance denominator),
- For general assessments, if the student passing standard for the test is met;
or
for alternate assessments, if the student passing standard for the test is met *and* the test result is selected for inclusion

under the federal cap, then include in Performance calculation of **Met Standard** (performance numerator).

The AYP student listings provided to school districts include the student status as reported in AYP. The AYP student status is helpful for determining in which of the AYP data table categories students appear. See *Appendix C* for more information available to school districts that help identify student categories and statuses and explain their use in the AYP calculation.

Students Tested on a Single Assessment

For students taking only one assessment in reading (or mathematics), the single assessment result is used to evaluate AYP. For example, a student may take STAAR and no other test. The AYP result will be based on information provided in the STAAR answer document, such as demographic information and grade level. Please note that the number of school years of enrollment in U.S. schools is only indicated on the TELPAS Reading answer document.

Students Tested on More than One Assessment

A number of students in grades 3-8 who are also enrolled in a high school course may be tested on more than one subject assessment. In these cases a hierarchy of assessments is applied to produce a single test result for AYP.

For example, if local district policies required students in grades 3-8 enrolled in a high school course with STAAR EOC assessments to take the corresponding STAAR grade-level assessment, each of the assessments are included in AYP processing. The assessment results are combined for each student by subject area to determine the passing assessment result that will be used for AYP calculations. Once selected, the single assessment identified for each student is evaluated for both participation and performance components for that subject area.

Finally, the single test result used for calculating AYP is the result used in every student group of which the student is a member.

TELPAS Reading

A student may take the TELPAS Reading and STAAR Reading assessments, and both may be appropriately coded scored documents. The scored STAAR assessment result is used in the AYP Reading calculation for this student; the TELPAS Reading result is not used. If a student takes the TELPAS Reading and any other assessment, the student identifying information on both answer documents must match in order for the AYP results to be accurately processed.

Assessments Included in 2012 AYP Calculations

The Exhibits on the following two pages show all tests included in 2012 AYP calculations by grade level, subject, and assessment.

Exhibit 3: Assessments Included in 2012 AYP Calculations

<i>Grades 3–8 Reading and Mathematics Assessments</i>					
	Participation			Performance (ACCOUNTABILITY SUBSET)	
	Total Students	Number Participating	→	Number Tested	Met Standard
STAAR Grade Level/ STAAR EOC*	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If AYP bridge study standard is met
STAAR Modified	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If AYP bridge study standard is met (subject to 2% cap)
STAAR Modified EOC	Yes	If participant	→	<i>Not Included</i>	<i>N/A</i>
STAAR Alternate	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If AYP bridge study standard is met (subject to 1% cap)
STAAR L Mathematics	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If AYP bridge study standard is met
TELPAS Reading	Yes	Non-Participant	<i>N/A</i>	<i>Not Included</i>	<i>N/A</i>

Students in their first year in U. S. schools who are tested on any of the tests above are counted as participants, but excluded from the performance calculation.

* STAAR EOC English II reading, Geometry, and Algebra II tests must meet the STAAR phase-in standard.

Exhibit 3 (continued): Assessments Included in 2012 AYP Calculations

<i>Grade 10 ELA and Mathematics Assessments</i>					
	Participation			Performance (ACCOUNTABILITY SUBSET)	
	Total Students	Number Participating	→	Number Tested	Met Standard
TAKS	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If standard is met
TAKS (Accommodated)	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If standard is met
TAKS–M / LAT TAKS–M	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If standard is met (subject to 2% cap)
STAAR Alternate	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If standard is met (subject to 1% cap)
LAT version of TAKS	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If standard is met
TELPAS Reading	Yes	Non-Participant	N/A	<i>Not Included</i>	<i>N/A</i>

Students in their first year in U. S. schools who are tested on any of the tests above are counted as participants, but excluded from the performance calculation.

Participation

The participation component of the Reading/ELA and Mathematics indicators is required for all districts and campuses to meet AYP. As stated earlier, the performance and participation components are determined from the same set of assessment information for each district and campus. Likewise, the single assessment result determined for each student is used on both the performance and participation components for that subject area. All test results begin in the first AYP data table category, and only if certain criteria are met will the test proceed to the next category. More information on AYP Data Table categories is provided in *Appendix C*. This section describes the first two categories:

- Count of students enrolled on the day of testing, or the **Participation** count of **Total Students** (participation denominator),
- If participant in an assessment, include in Participation calculation of **Number Participating** (participation numerator).

Calculating Participation Measures

Districts are required to submit test answer documents for every student enrolled in the grades tested on the test date. Students are counted as participants (numerator of the participation rate) if they were tested on any of the following assessments. Participants also include students who were tested but the test answer document was not scored for other reasons.

STAAR and TAKS General Assessments;

TAKS (Accommodated) for students in 10th grade only served by special education who meet the eligibility requirements for certain specific accommodations;

STAAR Modified or TAKS–M for students served by special education who meet participation requirements for a modified assessment and for whom the general assessment is not appropriate;

STAAR Alternate for students served by special education with significant cognitive disabilities who meet the participation requirements;

TELPAS (for Reading only) for recent immigrant LEP students in their first school year of enrollment in U.S. schools; or

STAAR L (for Mathematics only) or TAKS LAT for recent immigrant LEP students.

The participation measures are calculated as the number of students participating divided by the Participation count of students enrolled at the time of testing. Counts are summed across grades for Grades 3–8 and 10 for each subject (Reading/ELA and Mathematics). Participation measures are calculated for all students and each student group. All calculations are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Participation Count of Students Enrolled at the Time of Testing

Participation measures are based on all students enrolled at the time of testing defined as the total number of assessment documents submitted by each school district (denominator of the participation rate). The calculation is *not* limited to students enrolled for the full academic year. Participation counts normally include students with answer documents submitted from the first and second administrations of Grade 5 Reading, Grade 5 Mathematics, Grade 8 Reading, and Grade 8 Mathematics. However, that will not be the case this year since there are currently no performance standards in place for the new STAAR assessments. Students who were administered a make-up test within the testing window are also included in the participation rate calculation. School districts provide student test answer documents for all eligible students enrolled, and are required by oath to follow prescribed testing procedures as described in the *2012 District and Campus Coordinator Manual*. The answer documents are coded to show which test is administered to each student and whether the test is scored.

Identification of Participants

Student test results included as participants are based on the approved amendments to the 2012 Texas AYP Workbook. The test document score code is used to determine whether a student is counted as a participant after determining the single assessment result used for AYP. Students coded as absent on the test answer document are not counted as participants and are therefore not included in the participation numerator. Other situations exist that may cause student test results to be excluded from the participation numerator. Below is a summary of each assessment and unique situations that may cause student test results to be counted as a non-participant and excluded from the participation numerator.

STAAR (English and Spanish versions), STAAR L, and STAAR Modified

Students coded as absent on the test answer document are not counted as participants and are therefore not included in the participation numerator.

STAAR Alternate

Student results for the Reading and Mathematics STAAR Alternate online submission are used in AYP. Students in the STAAR Alternate submission who have a STAAR Alternate assessment category of “Not Assessed” are not counted as participants. However, STAAR Alternate student results with an assessment category of “Complete Score”, “Partial Score”, or “No Response Observed” are counted as participants and included in the participation numerator.

LAT for TAKS and TAKS–M

AYP will use student results from TAKS and TAKS–M LAT administrations for eligible recent immigrant LEP students in Grade 10 who have been granted an exemption to the state assessments by the LPAC on the basis of limited English proficiency. Eligible Grade 10 students LEP-exempt from the Reading or Mathematics TAKS or TAKS–M

assessment are considered participants for AYP if they were tested with linguistic accommodations and their test answer document indicates such testing.

In order for Grade 10 TAKS or TAKS–M LAT results to be included in the participation numerator, one of the following must occur:

- Column B of the LAT INFO section of the TAKS answer document must not indicate that the student was absent,
- Column B indicates that the test was incomplete, or
- At least one bubble is gridded in Column A of the LAT INFO section.

TELPAS Reading

Federal regulations allow recent immigrant students in their first school year of enrollment in U.S. schools to be counted as participants in AYP through TELPAS Reading. In order to remain compliant with the ESEA/NCLB standards and assessment requirements, Texas is not allowed to use TELPAS Reading for recent immigrant students in their second or third year of enrollment in U.S. schools for AYP purposes. Recent immigrant students enrolled in their second or third school year in U.S. schools will not be counted as participants in AYP if TELPAS Reading is the only test taken. Any other assessments taken along with TELPAS Reading will be subject to AYP assessments processing rules. The use of other assessments in AYP for recent immigrant students is based on matching student identification information on both test answer documents.

Students coded as absent on the test answer document are not counted as participants and are therefore not included in the participation numerator.

The following Exhibit shows how the TELPAS Reading results are required to be included in the 2012 AYP calculations.

Exhibit 4: Assessments for Recent Immigrant ELL / LEP Students Included in 2012 AYP Calculations

Grades 3–8 Reading Assessments						
		Participation 95% Standard			Performance/Accountability Subset 87% Standard	
Year in U.S. Schools	Assessment	Total Students	Number Participating	→	Number Tested	Met Standard
First year of enrollment in U.S. schools	STAAR or STAAR EOC	Yes	If participant	→	Not Included	N/A
	STAAR Modified					
	STAAR Modified EOC					
	STAAR Alternate					
	TELPAS Reading *					
Second or Third year (or more) of enrollment in U.S. schools	STAAR or STAAR EOC	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If AYP bridge study standard is met
	STAAR Modified	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If AYP bridge study standard is met (subject to 2% cap)
	STAAR Modified EOC	Yes	If participant	→	Not Included	N/A
	STAAR Alternate	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If AYP bridge study standard is met (subject to 1% cap)
	TELPAS Reading *	Yes	Non-Participant	N/A	Not Included	N/A

* Students in their first year in U. S. schools are counted as participants, but excluded from the performance calculation.

**Exhibit 4 (continued):
Assessments for Recent Immigrant ELL / LEP Students Included in 2012 AYP Calculations**

Grades 3–8 Math Assessments						
		Participation 95% Standard			Performance/Accountability Subset 83% Standard	
Year in U.S. Schools	Assessment	Total Students	Number Participating	→	Number Tested	Met Standard
First year of enrollment in U.S. schools	STAAR or STAAR EOC	Yes	If participant	→	Not Included	N/A
	STAAR L					
	STAAR Modified					
	STAAR Modified EOC					
	STAAR Alternate					
Second or Third year (or more) of enrollment in U.S. schools	STAAR or STAAR EOC	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If AYP bridge study standard is met
	STAAR L	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If AYP bridge study standard is met
	STAAR Modified	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If AYP bridge study standard is met (subject to 2% cap)
	STAAR Modified EOC	Yes	If participant	→	Not Included	N/A
	STAAR Alternate	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If AYP bridge study standard is met (subject to 1% cap)

Exhibit 4 (continued):

Assessments for Recent Immigrant ELL / LEP Students Included in 2012 AYP Calculations

Grade 10 Reading and Mathematics Assessments						
		Participation 95% Standard			Performance/Accountability Subset 87% Standard for Reading 83% Standard for Math	
Year in U.S. Schools	Assessment	Total Students	Number Participating	→	Number Tested	Met Standard
First year of enrollment in U.S. schools	TAKS	Yes	If participant	→	Not Included	N/A
	TAKS (Accommodated)					
	TAKS–M / LAT TAKS–M					
	STAAR Alternate					
	LAT version of TAKS					
	TELPAS Reading *					
Second or Third year (or more) of enrollment in U.S. schools	TAKS	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If standard is met
	TAKS (Accommodated)	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If standard is met
	TAKS–M / LAT TAKS–M	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If standard is met (subject to 2% cap)
	STAAR Alternate	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If standard is met (subject to 1% cap)
	LAT version of TAKS	Yes	If participant	→	If in the Accountability subset	If standard is met
	TELPAS Reading *	Yes	Non-Participant	N/A	Not Included	N/A

* Students in their first year in U. S. schools are counted as participants, but excluded from the performance calculation.

Participation Student Groups Evaluated

In addition to all students, the student groups for which AYP participation measures are calculated are African American, Hispanic, White, economically disadvantaged, special education, and LEP students. Student information coded on the test answer documents is used to assign students to groups. Student groups are presented as a percentage of all students on AYP data tables rounded to the nearest whole percent.

All Students

Minimum Size Requirements

For the participation measure to be included in the AYP calculation at the all students level, the district or campus must have at least 40 students enrolled at the time of testing. Districts and campuses with fewer than 40 students enrolled at the time of testing are not required to meet the participation rate measures.

Student Groups

Minimum Size Requirements

For student groups' participation measures to be evaluated for AYP, a district or campus must have:

- 50 or more students in the group enrolled on the test date (summed across Grades 3–8 and 10) for the subject, and the student group must comprise at least 10 percent of all students enrolled on the test date; *or*
- 200 or more students in the group enrolled on the test date, even if that group represents less than 10 percent of all students enrolled on the test date.

Special Education

If a test document for STAAR Alternate, STAAR Modified, TAKS–M, TAKS (Accommodated), or LAT TAKS–M is submitted for a student in the Reading/ELA and Mathematics subjects, the student is included in the special education student group for both subjects. If a student is identified as a special education student on *any* version of the Grade 3–8 and 10 assessments for Reading/ELA or Mathematics, the student is included in the special education student group for both subjects.

LEP

Only students identified as LEP in 2011-12 are included in the LEP group for participation. If a student is identified as a current year LEP student on Grades 3–8 or Grade 10 test answer documents for either Reading/ELA or Mathematics,

the student is included in the LEP group for both subjects. If a TELPAS test document is submitted for any TELPAS component, the student is included in the LEP student group for both subjects. If a TELPAS test document is not submitted and the LEP field is blank on both the Reading/ELA and Mathematics answer documents, the student is assumed to be non-LEP.

Participation Target

95% Standard

For each district and campus, measures meeting the minimum size requirement for students enrolled on the test date must have **95 percent** of students participating for Reading/ELA and Mathematics.

Average Participation Rate

For each district and campus, measures meeting minimum size requirements for students enrolled on the test date that do not meet the 95 percent participation standard will be reevaluated using the aggregate participation results for two years.

Reading/ELA and Mathematics participation results for 2011-12 will be combined with the 2010-11 participation results. The numerators of both school years are summed and the denominators of both school years are summed and the resulting totals are divided to get the average participation rate for two years.

Performance

Like participation, the performance component of the Reading/ELA and Mathematics indicators is required for all districts and campuses to meet AYP. The performance and participation components are determined from the same set of assessment information for each district and campus, therefore, the single assessment result determined for each student is used on both the performance and participation components for that subject area. The previous Participation section described the first two AYP data table categories that make up the participation component of AYP. Test results included as participants (in the participation numerator) are the only results considered for the performance component. This section describes the next two categories:

- If a valid, scored test result meets the Full Academic Year (accountability subset) definition, include in **Performance** calculation of **Number Tested** (performance denominator),
- For general assessments (STAAR, STAAR L, TAKS, or TAKS LAT), if the test met standard;
or
for alternate assessments (STAAR Modified, STAAR Alternate, TAKS–M, or TAKS–M LAT), if the test met

standard *and* is selected for inclusion under the federal cap, **then** include in **Performance** calculation of **Met Standard** (performance numerator).

Calculating Performance Measures

In order to meet the AYP performance component of the Reading/ELA and Mathematics indicators, all districts and campuses must meet the performance standard for percent proficient or the performance improvement/safe harbor provision for all students and each student group meeting minimum size requirements.

The Reading/ELA and Mathematics performance measures are defined as the percent of students counted as proficient for AYP. The measure is calculated as the number of students counted as proficient divided by the performance count of total students tested, by subject. All calculations are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Performance Count of Total Students Tested

Performance measures are based on the number of student test results included as participants for AYP (in the participation numerator). The count of the total number of students tested include valid, scored test results for AYP participants who meet the definition of full academic year, or accountability subset.

Performance Full Academic Year

Only participating students enrolled in the district or on the campus for the full academic year are included in the performance measure. TELPAS Reading assessment results are excluded from performance measure calculations (refer to the Assessments Included in 2012 AYP Calculations chart for more information). Foreign exchange students with scored test results on the Reading or Mathematics or other assessments are not excluded from the performance measure.

Districts Test results are included in the district-level measure for students enrolled in the district on the PEIMS fall enrollment snapshot date. For 2011-12, the snapshot date was October 28, 2011.

Campuses Test results are included in the campus-level measure for students enrolled on the campus on the PEIMS fall enrollment snapshot date.

Identification of Proficient Students

STAAR and TAKS General Assessments

The student passing standard for STAAR assessments for students in Grades 3–8 will not be determined in time for 2012 AYP evaluations. The passing standard used for the 2012 AYP calculation for students tested on STAAR in Grades 3–8 will be based upon the results of the STAAR bridge study, and for Grade 10 students, the TAKS *Met Standard* level (scale score of 2100). Student test results included as participants for AYP (in the participation numerator) are the only results considered for the performance component.

STAAR Modified and TAKS–M

The student passing standard for STAAR Modified, like all other STAAR assessments for students in Grades 3–8, will not be determined in time for 2012 AYP evaluations. The *Met Standard* student passing level for student tests on STAAR Modified in Grades 3–8 will be based upon the results of the STAAR bridge study. The student passing standard for TAKS–M that was determined in August 2008 will continue to be used for Grade 10 students. STAAR Modified and TAKS–M student test results included as participants for AYP (in the participation numerator) are the only results considered for the performance component.

STAAR Modified and TAKS–M student passing results are subject to the 2% Federal Cap and are included in the performance numerator only after the federal cap process determines that the result can be counted for AYP.

SSI Requirements

Students taking STAAR or STAAR Modified during the 2011-12 school year are not subject to SSI requirements since there are currently no performance standards in place for the new STAAR assessments.

STAAR Alternate

Student results from the Reading and Mathematics STAAR Alternate online submission with a STAAR Alternate assessment category of “Complete Score” and “Partial Score” are included in the performance measure. For 2012 AYP, the met standard student passing standard for STAAR Alternate will be based on the STAAR bridge study. STAAR Alternate student test results included as participants for AYP (in the participation numerator) are the only results considered for the performance component. STAAR Alternate student results with an assessment category of “No Response Observed” are counted as participants but are not considered scored tests; the results are not included in the performance measure (denominator of the performance rate).

STAAR Alternate student passing results are subject to the 1% Federal Cap and are included in the performance numerator only after the federal cap process determines the result can be counted for AYP.

Linguistically Accommodated Testing: STAAR L, TAKS LAT, and TAKS-MLAT

Linguistically accommodated administrations for Reading/ELA and Mathematics are available to recent immigrant LEP students in specific grade levels. For 2012 AYP, student test results for grades 3–8 will only include STAAR L mathematics, since there are no linguistic accommodations for STAAR reading tests. Grade 10 TAKS and TAKS-M LAT in Reading or Mathematics are included in 2012 AYP. When available, linguistically accommodated Reading/ELA and Mathematics results are used for AYP performance for students in their second or third year of enrollment in U.S. schools.

Federal regulations allow the exclusion of test results for recent immigrant students in their first year in U.S. schools. Due to substantial changes to the STAAR participation requirements for ELL students, Reading/ELA and Mathematics tests results for students in their first year in U.S. schools are not included in the performance measure calculation for 2012 AYP. Student information on the number of school years of enrollment in U.S. schools is found on the TELPAS Reading answer document. In order for a student’s STAAR or TAKS result to be excluded from the AYP performance measure based on the number of years of enrollment in U.S. schools, the student identification information on the TELPAS Reading answer document must match the STAAR or TAKS answer document. The only results excluded from AYP performance measures are those with matching TELPAS Reading answer documents with Years in U.S. Schools values indicating “Enrolled in 1st semester” or “Enrolled in 2nd semester” of the 2011-12 school year.

Student linguistically accommodated test results included as participants for AYP (in the participation numerator) are the only results considered for the performance component. See the Participation discussion in this section for more information on determining the participation status of students tested with linguistic accommodations.

TELPAS Reading

Federal regulations allow recent immigrant students in their first school year of enrollment in U.S. schools to be counted as participants in AYP through TELPAS Reading, and excluded from the performance measures. However, Texas is not allowed to use TELPAS Reading for recent immigrant students in their second or third year of enrollment in U.S. schools for AYP purposes; therefore, if this is the student’s only test, the student will be considered a non-participant. As in previous years, the TELPAS Reading assessment results for students in their first school year of enrollment in U.S. schools will be counted appropriately for participation and will not be included in the *performance*

component. See the Participation discussion in this section for more information on determining the participation status of students with TELPAS Reading results.

The table below provides a summary of the assessments and student passing standards for 2012 AYP.

Exhibit 5: Assessment and Student Passing Standards for 2012 AYP Evaluations

Enrolled Grades	Assessment	Performance Standard for 2012 AYP Calculations
Grade 3-8	STAAR (English & Spanish) reading and mathematics*	Bridged to TAKS <i>Met Standard</i>
	STAAR Modified reading and mathematics	Bridged to TAKS-M <i>Met Standard</i>
	STAAR Alternate reading and mathematics	Bridged to TAKS-Alt <i>Met Standard</i>
	STAAR EOC English I reading and Algebra I*	Bridged to TAKS <i>Met Standard</i> for grade 9 reading and mathematics
	STAAR Modified EOC English I reading and Algebra I	<i>No Standard Available</i> – performance results not included in AYP. Students counted as participants only.
	STAAR EOC English II reading, Geometry and Algebra II*	<i>STAAR Phase-in Standard**</i>
	STAAR Modified EOC English II reading and Geometry	Not operational / results not included in AYP
Grade 10	TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) ELA and mathematics*	TAKS <i>Met Standard</i>
	TAKS-M ELA and mathematics*	TAKS-M <i>Met Standard</i>
	STAAR Alternate EOC English I and Algebra I	Bridged to TAKS-Alt <i>Met Standard</i> for grade 9 reading and mathematics
	STAAR Alternate EOC English II and Geometry	Bridged to TAKS-Alt <i>Met Standard</i> for grade 10 reading and mathematics

* Includes linguistically accommodated assessments, where applicable.

** A small number of students in middle school grades enrolled in high school courses are required to meet the STAAR phase-in standard to satisfy their EOC testing requirements for graduation.

Federal Cap on Alternate Assessments (TAKS–M, STAAR Modified and STAAR Alternate)

NCLB regulations limit the number of proficient assessment results from alternate assessments that may be counted as such in evaluating AYP. The limit on proficient alternate assessment results is referred to as the AYP federal cap. The federal cap is applied to two types of assessment results: alternate assessments based on modified academic achievement standards that are subject to a 2% cap, and alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities that are subject to a 1% cap. In the following section, the term “proficient” is defined as alternate assessments used for AYP evaluations that have been included in the federal cap limit. Results that “exceed the cap” are those that are not included within the limit by the federal cap process.

General Guidelines Related to the Federal Cap

USDE final federal regulations issued on April 9, 2007, require two separate caps for including the results of students taking alternate assessments. The number of proficient students taking alternate assessments based on *alternate achievement standards* may not exceed 1% of each district's total participation. The number of students taking alternate assessments based on *modified achievement standards* and counted as proficient for AYP may not exceed 2% of each district's total participation plus any unfilled 1% cap slots.

For Texas, the alternate assessments with modified achievement standards are the STAAR Modified and TAKS–Modified (TAKS–M). The STAAR Alternate assessment is for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The federal cap limit is calculated for each school district and applies to results on STAAR Alternate, STAAR Modified, and TAKS–M only. If the number of STAAR Alternate student passing results in a school district falls below the 1% cap, the unfilled slots may be used by student passing results from STAAR Modified and TAKS–M. The STAAR Modified/TAKS–M 2% cap limit is calculated as 2% plus any unused slots from STAAR Alternate. The overall federal limit on student passing results from both STAAR Alternate and STAAR Modified/TAKS–M must be no more than 3%. The district limit on STAAR Alternate student passing results must not exceed the 1% cap and unfilled slots below the 2% cap may not be added to the 1% cap.

After the federal cap process is completed, the student passing results over the district federal cap limit are reclassified as *non-proficient* and reported as such in AYP performance results in the AYP campus, district, and state levels data tables. Texas school districts with results from STAAR Alternate and STAAR Modified/TAKS–M that do not exceed the district limit are not affected by the cap and all results remain unchanged. Maintaining the federal cap limits is not required in order to Meet AYP. School districts with student passing results from STAAR Alternate and STAAR Modified/ TAKS–M that exceed the district limit may meet AYP based on their performance on all other assessments. Even with reclassified students included as non-proficient, a district or campus may still have sufficient performance results to meet the standards and receive a designation of *Meets AYP*.

How to calculate the 1% and 2% Federal Cap Limit

A school district's federal cap limit is based on the total number of students enrolled in the district in Grades 3 – 8 and 10 on the day of testing, reported as the AYP District Participation denominator by subject. The participation denominator can be found in the participation section of the school district AYP data table (Total Students in All Students column; see *Appendix C*). The federal cap limit is calculated by subject area for Reading/ ELA and Mathematics and each subject may have a different participation denominator. The federal cap limits are calculated for each type of alternate assessment, as shown below.

District Participation Denominator x .01 = STAAR Alternate Federal Cap Limit

District Participation Denominator x .02 = STAAR Modified/TAKS–M Federal Cap Limit

Note that the federal cap does not limit the number of students with disabilities who can take alternate assessments. Decisions regarding the appropriate assessment for students with disabilities should be made based on state policies and procedures outlined in the *Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) Committee Decision-Making Process for the Texas Assessment Program*. Also note that student passing results that exceed the cap limits are reclassified to non-proficient for use in AYP proficiency rates that are used to evaluate AYP status. There is no effect on the AYP participation calculations. Other state performance results and state accountability ratings are not affected by the federal cap. There are no student level consequences (for graduation or other assessment requirements) for exceeding the cap limit.

It should be emphasized that the federal cap relates to counting students as proficient for AYP purposes only and **does not** provide direction to ARD committees regarding how students with disabilities should be assessed. **It is important that local school districts ensure that appropriate assessments are selected and administered to students with disabilities.**

1% Cap on STAAR Alternate

Selection of Students: Random Selection of STAAR Alternate results

The STAAR Alternate student passing results are limited to the federal cap level by applying a random assignment of results to be included in the 1% cap. School district STAAR Alternate met standard results are given priority and are randomly selected until the 1% limit is reached. Selecting students for the 1% federal cap is not dependent on whether the campus or district will meet AYP. Therefore, district STAAR Alternate passing results are selected up to the 1% federal cap limit and are counted as proficient for AYP. Student results that remain unselected are considered over the federal cap limit and reclassified as non-proficient. Note that the random assignment of proficient results for AYP makes it impossible for districts to project the outcome of this selection process. After determining the number of students in each campus included in the 1% federal cap, TEA begins the cap processing for the 2% cap.

Exceptions Applied Prior to the Preliminary Release

Before preliminary release of 2012 AYP information, exceptions to the 1% cap will be processed for districts who registered facilities through the TEA Residential Facilities (RF) Monitoring system, using the application known as RF Tracker. Exceptions to the 1% cap will also include districts identified and included in the *2011-2012 Directory for*

Services for the Deaf in Texas, Regional Day School Programs for the Deaf (RDSPD). This directory includes school districts that serve students who are referred to the RDSPD in their school district.

Districts identified through RF Tracker or the RDSPD Directory will be initially granted an exception to the 1% cap, which will increase the district's cap by the total number of STAAR Alternate students passing and that exceed the 1% cap limit. Federal regulation allows school districts to exceed the overall 3% federal cap only if granted an exception to the 1% cap and only by the amount of the exception. Therefore, districts that are granted an exception prior to the preliminary release must be limited to the 2% federal cap on STAAR Modified/TAKS–M proficient results. The overall district cap on both the STAAR Alternate, STAAR Modified/TAKS–M proficient results may exceed 3% only by the amount of the exception to the 1% cap.

Please see *Section IV: Exceptions* for more information on the exception process applied prior to the preliminary release of AYP.

Federal Cap Recapture

Federal regulations clearly indicate that the state as a whole cannot exceed the 1% cap under any circumstances. Therefore, a statewide comparison of the number of students counted as proficient in AYP must be conducted before the federal cap process is concluded.

2% Cap on STAAR Modified/TAKS–M

The 2% federal cap on STAAR Modified/TAKS–M student passing results requires two steps: 1) a campus priority or ranking, and 2) the selection of students from each campus only to the extent needed for the campus to meet AYP. School districts have the opportunity to review and modify the campus priority that will direct the selection of students. Once the list is finalized, the process begins with the campuses assigned the highest priority. Student results are selected in order to maximize the number of campuses that Meet AYP.

Campus Rankings

The campus priority or ranking list is originally developed by TEA and provided to school districts for review and modification. The TEA campus ranking prioritizes campuses by grades served and proportion of students with disabilities enrolled. The TEA campus ranking order is specifically sorted by the following Fall 2011-12 PEIMS information for each campus.

- 1st Sort: School Type
(sort order: Secondary, Both, Middle, Elementary)
- 2nd Sort: Highest Grade Served on the Campus
(as shown by the grade span value, with sort order: highest to lowest)
- 3rd Sort: Student Enrollment in Special Education Program
(percent special education, sort order: highest to lowest)

The TEA campus ranking is provided to school districts in late May, 2012, through the Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE) Accountability website. School districts have the opportunity to review and modify the campus ranking using any method they wish without justification provided to TEA. Instructions are provided to school districts on the TEASE Accountability Campus Ranking application. The school district deadline for providing modified campus rankings for 2012 AYP evaluations to TEA is July 10, 2012. **School districts that have not provided any campus ranking changes by the July 10, 2012 deadline agree to accept the TEA campus ranking.** After July 10, 2012, there are no further opportunities to change the campus priority rankings that are used to select students to be included in the 2% federal cap.

Student Selection Process

The 2012 AYP federal cap process is designed to maximize the number of campuses in the district that Meet AYP and include the maximum number of STAAR Modified/TAKS–M student passing results in the allowable cap limit for each school district. The 2% federal cap process begins after completion of the 1% cap process in which STAAR Alternate results have been assigned to the campuses and school districts. School districts have either provided their campus rankings or have chosen to accept the TEA default ranking.

For each school district, STAAR Modified/TAKS–M student passing results form a ‘pool’ from which students’ results are selected to be included in the 2% cap. If the total pool count is less than or equal to the district cap limit, then all STAAR Modified/TAKS–M student passing results will be classified as proficient for AYP. If the total pool count is larger than the cap, then some student passing results will have to be reclassified as non-proficient or exceeding the cap for AYP, while the student results that can be included up to the 2% limit are classified as proficient. The student passing results from STAAR Modified/TAKS–M, referred to as the “pool” of proficient results, are the only student results considered for inclusion in the 2% federal cap. The student selection process is conducted by subject. The process to select students from each campus within a school district is conducted in three stages. Student results selected at each stage that are included in the federal cap will increase the AYP proficiency rates of both the campus and district. For each of the stages described below, students are only selected up to the federal cap limit. Once the cap limit is reached, the process ends and the 2012 AYP results are determined for the campus and school district.

Stages of student selection

- I. Students are selected beginning with the first campus in the campus ranking to the extent needed for the campus to Meet AYP.
- II. If additional students can be included under the federal cap, students are selected to the extent needed for the district to Meet AYP.
- III. If additional students can be included under the federal cap, students are selected randomly up to the federal cap limit.

Stage I: Students are selected beginning with the first campus in the campus ranking to the extent needed for the campus to Meet AYP.

The federal cap student selection process will select STAAR Modified/TAKS–M student passing results in campus ranking priority order only to the extent needed for the campus to meet AYP. To optimize the space available in the cap, students from the STAAR Modified/TAKS–M pool are selected only when doing so will make a difference in whether or not the campus meets AYP for the subject. The decision to select student results from a given campus is determined by a comparison of two AYP outcome scenarios.

AYP Scenarios

Scenario 1 treats all STAAR Modified/TAKS–M results as *non-proficient (exceeders)*; Scenario 2 treats all STAAR Modified/TAKS–M results as proficient originally reported to the district. The table below describes how these two AYP scenarios provide information on the extent to which the school district and each campus will Meet AYP through the assignment of STAAR Modified/TAKS–M results within the federal cap. Campuses identified in Group B in the table below are campuses for whom STAAR Modified/TAKS–M results will make the difference in whether or not the campus meets AYP for the subject. The first stage of the student selection process will only select students from these campuses and will only select STAAR Modified/TAKS–M results that are necessary for the campus to Meet AYP. Group A includes campuses that meet AYP for the subject even if all STAAR Modified/TAKS–M results are counted as non-proficient—they do not need any STAAR Modified/TAKS–M results in order to meet AYP for the subject. Group C includes campuses that will not meet AYP for the subject even if all STAAR Modified/TAKS–M passers are counted as proficient—STAAR Modified/TAKS–M proficient results will not help these campuses meet AYP for the subject.

Exhibit 6: AYP 2% Federal Cap Scenarios

AYP Outcome Comparison			
	Scenario 1: All STAAR Modified/ TAKS–M passers assigned <i>non-proficient exceeders</i>	Scenario 2: All STAAR Modified/ TAKS–M passers remain <i>proficient (passing)</i>	Priority Given to Campus or District for student selection within the federal cap
Group A	Subject meets AYP	Subject meets AYP or Subject missed AYP	Students are not selected
Group B	Subject missed AYP	Subject meets AYP	Students are selected
Group C	Subject missed AYP	Subject missed AYP	Students are not selected

Within each Group B campus, students are sorted in an order that prioritizes students based on the number of students and student groups needed for the subject to meet AYP. Students are selected until the campus meets AYP for the subject, or the district cap limit is reached.

In order to maximize the space available in the cap, campuses will not initially be assigned proficient students (in Stage I) if:

- the campus fails participation for the subject,
- the campus misses AYP for the subject even if all its STAAR Modified/TAKS–M results are counted as proficient,
- the campus meets AYP for the subject without any of its STAAR Modified/TAKS–M results counted as proficient, or
- the campus is not evaluated.

If meeting AYP through performance improvement/safe harbor requires fewer students to be selected than meeting the standard, safe harbor will be employed. The processes described above optimize the use of the cap to positively affect the most campuses in the district.

*Stage II: If additional proficient students can be included under the federal cap, students are selected to the extent needed for the **district** to Meet AYP.*

The student selection process for both the campus and school district stages are similar. The AYP outcome comparison is conducted for the school district to determine whether the district benefits from the use of STAAR Modified/TAKS–M results. Only school districts in AYP outcome comparison Group B (see table above) will have students selected at this stage. Students are not selected for a school district that may have the same conditions described above:

- the district fails participation for the subject,
- the district misses AYP for the subject even if all its STAAR Modified/TAKS–M results are counted as proficient,
- the district meets AYP for the subject without any of its STAAR Modified/TAKS–M results counted as proficient, or
- the district is not evaluated.

As in Stage I, if meeting AYP through performance improvement/safe harbor requires fewer students to be selected than meeting the standard, safe harbor will be used.

All previously unselected STAAR Modified/TAKS–M results are sorted in an order that prioritizes students based on the number of students and student groups needed for the district to meet AYP for the subject. However, once the cap limit is reached, the student selection process ends and the 2012 AYP results are determined for the school district. If student passing results are selected for the federal cap, the STAAR Modified/TAKS–M results are considered proficient for AYP for both the campus and district. Each student result is only selected once for the federal cap, so any remaining previously unselected student passing results in the “pool” of STAAR Modified/TAKS–M tests are available for selection in the final stage of the selection process.

*Stage III: Students are selected randomly **up to the federal cap limit**.*

The final stage of the student selection process will occur only for school districts that have not yet reached the federal cap limit. Of the remaining previously unselected student results in the pool of STAAR Modified/TAKS–M tests, student results are selected randomly up to the 2% federal cap limit. Once the cap limit is reached, the student selection process ends. Student results that remain unselected at this final stage are considered over the federal cap limit and reclassified as *non-proficient* for AYP.

At the completion of the student selection process for the 2% cap, student results for the federal cap processes are reported as assigned in AYP performance rates for the AYP campus, district, and state levels data tables.

Final Federal Cap Recapture

The final statewide results are evaluated to determine if the state as a whole exceeds the 3% cap limit on STAAR Alternate and STAAR Modified/TAKS–M proficient results. If it is determined that the state exceeds the 3% cap, a recapture process will be initiated. Recapture to meet the 3% cap limit will identify STAAR Modified/TAKS–M proficient student results that were selected in the final stage of the student selection process. Stage III STAAR Modified/TAKS–M proficient results are selected randomly and removed from the federal cap until the statewide 3% cap is reached. Results selected during the recapture process will be counted as non-proficient (exceeding the cap) in all AYP calculations for campus, district, and state level results. If the number of proficient scores in the state is less than the statewide cap, all results within the district cap remain unchanged. The recapture process is necessary to ensure that the state will not exceed the 3% cap on proficient results.

Performance Student Groups Evaluated

In addition to all students, performance measures are calculated for the African American, Hispanic, White, economically disadvantaged, special education, and LEP student groups. Student information coded on the test answer documents is used to assign students to groups. Student groups are reported as a percentage of all students, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

The Texas federal cap process limits the number of proficient alternate assessments that may be counted as such in evaluating AYP, and the assignment of proficient or non-proficient for STAAR Alternate and STAAR Modified/TAKS–M is the same result used in every student group of which the student is a member. Similarly, for students tested on general assessments who meet the passing standard and are therefore included in the AYP performance numerator, the student is included in the numerator for every student group for which the student is a member.

All Students

Small districts and campuses, even those with very few students tested in Grades 3–8 and 10, are evaluated based on their own assessment results to the greatest extent possible.

Student Groups

Special Education

If a student is tested on STAAR Modified, TAKS–M, TAKS–M LAT, or STAAR Alternate for any subject Reading or Mathematics, the student is included in the special education student group for both subjects. If a student is identified

as a special education student on *any* test document, including the STAAR general assessment, for Reading or Mathematics, the student is included in the special education student group for both subjects.

LEP

If a student is identified as a current year LEP student on the test answer documents for either Reading/ELA or Mathematics, the student is considered current year LEP for both subjects. If the student is tested on TELPAS Reading, the student is considered current year LEP for both subjects. If the student is not tested on TELPAS Reading and the LEP field is blank on the Reading/ELA and Mathematics answer documents, the student is assumed to be non-LEP.

In addition, students remain in the LEP student group for two years after they enter a regular, all-English instructional program. For all students included in the AYP Reading/ELA and Mathematics performance measures for 2012, performance is included in the LEP student group if the student has been identified as a current or monitored LEP student and has been appropriately coded on the assessment answer document.

Students are coded as either 1) a currently identified LEP student (“C”), or 2) the student has met the criteria for bilingual/ESL program exit, is no longer classified as LEP in PEIMS and is in the first or second year of monitoring as required by statute (“M1” or “M2”).

Minimum Size Requirements

For student groups to be included in the AYP performance calculation, a district or campus must have:

- Test results for 50 or more students in the student group (summed across Grades 3–8 and 10) for the subject, and the student group must comprise at least 10 percent of all test takers in the subject, *or*
- Test results for 200 or more students in the student group, even if that group represents less than 10 percent of all test takers in the subject.

For the LEP student group, minimum size is evaluated based on students currently identified as LEP in 2011–12 only. If the LEP student group meets the minimum size requirement based on current-year identification, the performance evaluated will include additional students who were identified as LEP in the prior two years as described above.

Performance Target

Reading and Mathematics Standards

For each district and campus, performance measures for all students and each student group meeting the minimum size requirement for students enrolled the full academic year must meet the following performance standards for Reading/ELA and Mathematics.

- Reading/ELA: **87** percent of students counted as proficient
- Mathematics: **83** percent of students counted as proficient

Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor

For Reading/ELA and Mathematics, performance measures for all students and each student group must meet *either* the performance standard *or* performance improvement/safe harbor. For measures that meet the performance standard, it is not necessary for these measures to also demonstrate performance improvement/safe harbor. For this reason, performance improvement/safe harbor is considered a “safe harbor” for measures that do not meet the performance standard. The safe harbor requires 1) that measures show performance improvement/safe harbor for the student group on which they do not meet the standard (Reading/ELA or Mathematics) and 2) the relevant other measure requirement for the student group. In 2008, the USDE approved an amendment to the requirement of the other measure in Safe Harbor for AYP that allows districts and campuses to meet the absolute standard for the other measure in order to satisfy performance improvement/safe harbor.

Calculating Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor

Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor for the measure is met if there is:

- a 10 percent decrease from the prior year in percentage of students counted as not proficient in the subject (Reading/ELA or Mathematics), *and*
- meet the absolute goal or standard for the pertinent other measure
or
achieve the required improvement for the relevant indicator. Required student group improvement for Graduation Rate means meeting or exceeding the graduation rate goal, annual targets, or alternatives (see the Graduation Rate discussion in this section for more information). Required student group improvement for the Attendance Rate is at least one-tenth of a percent (0.1).

The performance improvement portion of the Safe Harbor calculation requires the calculation of Actual Change, defined as:

$$\frac{\text{2012 AYP Proficiency Rate}}{\text{Total Number of Students Tested}} - \frac{\text{2011 AYP Proficiency Rate}}{\text{Total Number of Students Tested}}$$

2012 AYP Proficiency Rate *2011 AYP Proficiency Rate*
 Students who Met the Passing Standard Students who Met the Passing Standard
 (subject to the 1% and 2% caps) (subject to the 1% and 2% caps)

The actual change must be equal to or greater than the minimum Required Improvement needed to reach a standard of 100 percent over a ten-year period. In this case, the methodology may be illustrated as the following:

$$[\text{current year proficiency}] - [\text{prior year proficiency}] \geq \frac{[\text{standard of 100 \%}] - [\text{prior year proficiency}]}{10}$$

Actual Change *AYP Required Improvement*

Minimum Size Requirements

Performance improvement/safe harbor is calculated even if the performance measure does not meet the minimum size requirement the prior year. However, performance improvement/safe harbor cannot be calculated if there are no prior-year test results for the measure. If performance improvement/safe harbor cannot be calculated due to lack of prior-year results, the campus or district cannot use safe harbor to meet the performance requirement and receives an AYP status of *Missed AYP* for that measure.

The minimum size criteria for both graduation and attendance rate are similar. If the other measure does not meet the minimum size requirement for the Graduation Rate or Attendance Rate for the current year alone, the other measure requirement is not evaluated. The other measure requirement is calculated even if the measure does not meet the minimum size requirement the prior year. However, improvement calculations cannot be conducted if there are no prior-year results for the measure. Note that for 2012 AYP evaluations, the Graduation Rate is evaluated for every student group, unlike the other Attendance Rate measure that is calculated at the student group level for the purpose of applying performance improvement/safe harbor only.

District Level Performance Results

By state statute, the performance of students served in certain campuses cannot be used in evaluating the district where the campus is located. Texas statute TEC §39.054(f) and §39.055 require that performance data reported on any campuses designated as TYC or Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC) campuses not be included in the district results for the district where the campus is located. As approved by the USDE, the district evaluation of AYP results allows the exclusion of performance data reported on campuses designated as TYC or TJPC campuses from the district results in the same manner as required for state accountability results. For more information, see *Appendix I, Inclusion or Exclusion of Performance Data*.

For 2012 AYP evaluations, the exclusion of 2012 performance data from a school district occurs after the evaluation of the federal cap process. The federal cap process will continue to include the results of all campuses located within the school district boundaries.

The Other Indicator

In addition to Reading/ELA and Mathematics, each district and campus is required to meet AYP standards on one additional Other Indicator—Graduation Rate or Attendance Rate. The Other Indicator evaluated for a district or campus is based on the grades offered. The Graduation Rate is the Other Indicator used in AYP for high schools, combined elementary/secondary campuses offering Grade 12, and districts offering Grade 12. Attendance Rate is the Other Indicator for elementary schools, middle/junior high schools, combined elementary/secondary schools not offering Grade 12, and districts not offering Grade 12. Due to federal requirements, the graduation rate indicator is evaluated for every student group beginning with 2012 AYP.

Graduation Rate

Calculating Graduation Rate Measures

Title I Regulations issued in October, 2008, required states to develop a statewide graduation rate goal and annual targets of improvement. States were required to identify annual targets that districts and campuses must meet in order to demonstrate continuous and substantial improvement from the prior year toward meeting or exceeding the state's goal. Title I regulations also allow states to use a five-year graduation rate for evaluation in AYP. These regulations also require that 2012 AYP evaluate the graduation rate for every student group.

In April, 2010, the USDE concluded a peer review of the Texas longitudinal completion rates which were found to meet the federal definition of the adjusted cohort graduation rate. The approved AYP criteria for graduation rate will include the evaluation of the four-year graduation and a five-year longitudinal graduation rate.

The high school Graduation Rate is the *graduates* component of the longitudinal completion rate. For more information about the longitudinal completion rate calculation, see *Secondary School Completion and Dropouts in Texas Public Schools* at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=4080>. Due to the timing of the availability of data, the longitudinal completion rate is a prior-year measure. For example, the Graduation Rate evaluated as part of the 2012 AYP calculations is the rate for the class of 2011. In accordance with federal regulations, the five-year longitudinal Graduation Rate used for the 2012 AYP calculations is based on the class of 2010. Information on the five-year longitudinal Graduate Rates for the class of 2010 may also be found in the report referenced above.

The graduation rate criteria approved by the USDE applies to both the Graduation Rate and the Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor calculation if graduation rate is used as the other measure. Districts and campuses that do not meet the 90.0% goal may meet any one of the alternative graduation rate targets in order to meet the AYP standards. Note that the four-year and five-year Graduation Rates are rounded to one decimal place before comparison to the statewide goal or annual targets, and before calculating actual change or improvement. For more information, see the Rounding discussion in this section.

The Graduation Rate criteria for the additional Other Indicator and the Performance Safe Harbor other measure are shown below.

Graduation Rate Goal

A Graduation Rate goal of **90.0** percent represents the four-year graduation rate expected of all high schools and districts in Texas. The Graduation Rate is defined as the graduates component of the longitudinal completion as a percent of all four components (graduates, continuers, GED recipients, dropouts) of the class of 2011. Graduation Rates are rounded to one decimal place before comparison to the goal. Districts and campuses that meet the 90.0% goal on the four-year Graduation Rate are not required to meet the alternative targets for graduation rate.

Annual Targets for Graduation Rate

Federal regulations allow states to define interim annual targets or performance gains which are designed to demonstrate continuous improvement from the prior year. District and campuses that did not meet the statewide goal may demonstrate continuous improvement through any one of the following alternative graduation rate targets.

- four-year 2012 Annual Graduation Rate Target of 75%
- four-year Graduation Rate Alternatives:
 - Safe Harbor Target of a 10% decrease in difference from the prior year rate and the Goal
 - Improvement Target of 1.0 percent from the prior year four-year Graduation Rate
- five-year Annual Graduation Rate Target of 80%

2012 Four-year Graduation Rate Target

Districts and campuses may meet the target of **75.0** percent of students classified as four-year graduates for the class of 2011.

Four-year Graduation Rate Alternative Targets

For districts and campuses that did not meet the four-year Graduation Rate target, the AYP criteria for Graduation Rate may be met by alternative targets based on the Actual Change in the four-year Graduation Rate from the prior year.

Calculating Graduation Rate Actual Change

For 2012 AYP evaluations, the Actual Change in Graduation Rate is defined as:

$$\frac{\text{Class of 2011 4-year Graduation Rate Graduates}}{\text{Total in Class of 2011}} - \frac{\text{Class of 2010 4-year Graduation Rate Graduates}}{\text{Total in Class of 2010}}$$

Calculating Graduation Rate Alternative Safe Harbor Target

Districts and campuses may meet the Graduation Rate Alternative Safe Harbor Target if there is a 10.0 percent decrease in difference between the prior year four-year Graduation Rate and the 90.0 percent statewide goal, illustrated as the following:

$$\frac{[\text{current 4-year Graduation Rate} - \text{prior 4-year Graduation Rate}] \geq [\text{Goal of 90 \%} - \text{prior 4-year Graduation Rate}]}{10}$$

Calculating Graduation Rate Alternative Improvement Target

For districts and campuses not meeting the four-year Graduation Rate goal, target, or safe harbor target, the AYP criteria for Graduation Rate is met if there is a 1.0 percent improvement from the prior year on the four-year Graduation Rate. The district or campus meets the 1.0 percent improvement on the Graduation Rate if the class of 2011 four-year Graduation Rate is 1.0 percentage points or greater than the class of 2010 Graduation Rate, as shown below:

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} & \textit{Actual Change in Graduation Rate} & & & \textit{AYP Graduation Rate} \\ & & & & \textit{Improvement Target} \\ [\text{current 4-year} & & \text{prior 4-year} & & \\ \text{Graduation Rate} & - & \text{Graduation Rate}] & \geq & 1.0 \end{array}$$

Five-year Graduation Rate Target

As a final alternative for districts and campuses that did not meet the alternative targets for the four-year Graduation Rate, the 2012 AYP criteria for Graduation Rate is met if the five-year Graduation Rate meets a target of **80.0** percent of students classified as graduates from the class of 2010.

Graduation Rate Student Groups Evaluated

Beginning in 2012, districts and campuses are required to meet the Graduation Rate standard for each student group for the additional Other Indicator. In addition to all students, the student groups for which AYP Graduation Rate measures are calculated are African American, Hispanic, White, economically disadvantaged, special education, and LEP students. Where student groups are reported as a percentage of all students for Graduation Rate, the percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

All Students

Minimum Size Requirements

For the Graduation Rate to be evaluated as the additional Other Indicator for AYP at the all students level, the district or campus must have at least 40 students in the four-year longitudinal completion total in class for the most recent year. Districts and campuses with fewer than 40 students in the longitudinal completion rate class are not required to meet the AYP Graduation Rate measures. If a district or campus meets the minimum size requirement for the four-year

Graduation Rate, the statewide goal, four-year annual target, and five-year annual target may be used to meet AYP graduation rate criteria.

If a district or campus meets the minimum size requirement for the four-year Graduation Rate for the most recent year, improvement from the prior year is calculated even if the district or campus does not meet the minimum size requirement on the Graduation Rate for the prior year. Improvement is *not* calculated if the district or campus *does not* have a Graduation Rate for the prior year. If Graduation Rate Improvement cannot be calculated due to lack of prior year results, the district or campus cannot use the alternative safe harbor or improvement targets to meet the Other Indicator requirement.

Student Groups

Minimum Size Requirements

Student group identifications are based on student characteristics and program participation used to report the longitudinal secondary school completion rates for the state.

For student groups' graduation rate measures to be evaluated for AYP, a district or campus must have:

- 50 or more students in the student group in the longitudinal completion rate class, and the student group must comprise at least 10 percent of all students in the longitudinal completion rate class; *or*
- 200 or more students in the student group in the longitudinal completion rate class, even if that group represents less than 10 percent of all students in the longitudinal completion rate class.

Special Education

The longitudinal rate calculation requires linking individual student records from multiple sources across five or seven years. Student characteristics and program participation statuses are assigned based on a student's final record in the cohort. If a student is identified as participating in a Special Education program in the final record in the cohort, the student is included in the Special Education graduation rate student group.

LEP

If a student is identified as LEP at any time while attending Grades 9–12 in Texas public schools, the student is included in the LEP student group for evaluation of graduation rate. The LEP student group is determined in this manner for the four-year longitudinal graduation rate of the class of 2011, the four-year longitudinal graduation rate of

the class of 2010, and the five-year longitudinal graduation rate of the class of 2010.

Minimum size criteria for the graduation rate LEP student group is based on the number of students identified as LEP in the four-year longitudinal graduation/completion total in class for the class of 2011. Student characteristic and participation statuses are assigned based on a student's final record in the cohort. If the number of LEP students in the four-year longitudinal graduation/completion total in class for the class of 2011 meets the minimum size requirement, the LEP student group graduation rate evaluated will include additional students who were identified as LEP at any time while attending Grades 9–12 in Texas public schools. The graduation rate is calculated to include students who were identified as LEP students based on PEIMS attendance information.

Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor

The same minimum size criteria applied to the Other Indicator is used for Reading/ELA and Mathematics performance improvement/safe harbor. The district or campus is not required to show improvement on the Graduation Rate unless minimum size requirements are met for the most recent year alone. If a district or campus meets the minimum size requirement for the four-year Graduation Rate for the most recent year, the performance improvement/safe harbor other measure criteria is evaluated, which includes the statewide goal, four-year annual target, four-year alternatives, and five-year annual target.

Special Provision for Residential Treatment Facilities (RTF)

The USDE approved amendment to the 2010 AYP evaluation simplified the federal accountability system for a small number of districts and campuses serving students in residential facilities. Beginning with the 2010 AYP evaluation, residential facilities serving secondary grades in alternative settings are not evaluated on graduation rate as the additional indicator. The AYP Graduation Rate for the additional Other Indicator and the Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor other measure is not evaluated for districts and campuses that 1) are identified as residential facilities, and 2) have 75% or more of its enrolled students classified as at-risk as verified through current-year PEIMS fall enrollment data.

Since there are no state accountability ratings in 2012, the alternative education accountability (AEA) campus registration process was not conducted. However, TEA identified districts and campuses eligible for this provision for 2012 AYP. Campuses on the Final 2011 Registered AEC List that reported at least 75% at-risk students in their 2011 PEIMS fall enrollment data are eligible for this provision in 2012 AYP. Districts with at least 50% of their students enrolled at alternative education campuses (AECs), based on this campus identification process, are eligible for this provision in 2012 AYP.

Attendance Rate

Calculating Attendance Rate Measures

The Attendance Rate is based on attendance of all students in Grades 1–12 for the entire school year. Due to the timing of the availability of data, the Attendance Rate is a prior-year measure. For example, the Attendance Rate evaluated as part of the 2012 AYP calculation is the 2010–11 Attendance Rate. The Attendance Rate is calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Total number of days students were present in 2010–11}}{\text{Total number of days students were in membership in 2010–11}} \times 100$$

The primary source of student group identification for the Attendance Rate is the demographic record submitted with the PEIMS attendance record. Student race/ethnicity is reported for each student as part of the attendance data submission. Students are included in the special education student group if they have special education attendance reported for any six-week reporting period. Students are included in the LEP student group if they are identified as LEP for any six-week reporting period. Students are included in the economically disadvantaged student group if they have a matching fall enrollment record coded as economically disadvantaged. Attendance rates will not be calculated for PK/K campuses.

Attendance Rate Standard

The standard for Attendance Rate is an average attendance rate of **90.0** percent. Districts and campuses are required to meet the 90.0 percent standard at the all students level only. Student group Attendance Rates are not evaluated for the additional Other Indicator.

Attendance Rate Improvement Standard

For districts and campuses that do not meet the Attendance Rate standard at the all students level, the AYP requirements for Attendance Rate are met if there is improvement from the prior year on the Attendance Rate. The district or campus shows improvement on the Attendance Rate if the 2010–11 Attendance Rate is higher than the 2009–10 Attendance Rate at the all students level. Attendance rates are rounded to one decimal place before improvement is calculated. Therefore, 0.1 is the minimum improvement required. Improvement on the Attendance Rate is not required for districts and campuses that meet the 90.0% standard.

Attendance Rate Minimum Size Requirement

The minimum size requirements for Attendance Rates are based on total days in membership rather than individual student counts.

All Students

For the Attendance Rate to be evaluated as the additional Other Indicator for AYP at the all students level, the district or campus must have at least 7,200 total days in membership (40 students x 180 school days). Districts and campuses with fewer than 7,200 total days in membership are not required to meet the Attendance Rate standard. If a district or campus meets the minimum size requirement for the Attendance Rate for the current year, improvement from the prior year is calculated even if the district or campus does not meet the minimum size requirement on the Attendance Rate for the prior year. Improvement is not calculated if the district or campus does not have an Attendance Rate for the prior year. If Attendance Rate Improvement cannot be calculated due to lack of prior year results, the district or campus cannot use the improvement standard to meet the Other Indicator requirement and receives an AYP status of *Missed AYP* for that measure.

Student Groups

Districts and campuses are not required to meet the Attendance Rate standard for student groups for the additional Other Indicator. Attendance Rates for student groups are only included in the AYP calculation in the event they are evaluated as part of performance improvement/safe harbor.

Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor

For Reading/ELA and Mathematics performance improvement/safe harbor, the district or campus is not required to show improvement on the Attendance Rate for all students unless minimum size requirements are met for the current year alone. If a district or campus meets the minimum size requirement for the Attendance Rate for the current year, the performance improvement/safe harbor other measure criteria is evaluated. The prior year minimum size is not required.

All Students

For the Attendance Rate to be included in the AYP calculation at the all students level for performance improvement/safe harbor the district or campus must have at least 7200 total days in membership (40 students x 180 days).

Student Groups

Student group identifications are based on student characteristics and program participation used to report attendance rates for the state. Where student groups are reported as a percentage of all students for Attendance Rate, the percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

For student groups' attendance rate measure to be evaluated for AYP, a district or campus must have:

- 9,000 or more total days in membership (50 students x 180 school days), and the student group must comprise at least 10 percent of total days in membership for all students; *or*
- 36,000 or more total days in membership (200 students x 180 school days), even if the group represents less than 10 percent of total days in membership for all students.

Rounding

The rules for rounding measures are delineated below.

Performance

Performance-related measures are rounded to the nearest whole percent. For example, a school obtaining a 59.5% on Reading/ELA will have its performance rounded up to 60%. On the other hand, another school obtaining a 59.4% on the same measure will have its performance rounded down to 59%. It is the rounded performance number that is compared to performance standards.

Performance improvement/safe harbor calculations are performed *after* rounding each year's performance. For example, a school obtaining 32.4% on a Mathematics Performance measure in 2012 and 28.5% on the same measure in 2011 would achieve a performance improvement of 3% (32% in 2012 minus 29% in 2011; note that if the subtraction was performed before the rounding, we would get $32.4 - 28.5 = 3.9\%$, which rounds to a performance improvement of 4%).

Participation

As with performance, participation-related measures are rounded to the nearest whole percent. For example, a school obtaining a 94.5% on Mathematics participation will have its participation rounded up to 95%, while another school obtaining a 94.4% on the same measure will have its participation rounded down to 94%. The participation measure is compared to the participation standard after rounding.

The average participation is calculated based on the total number of students in the combined results of both years. The total number of students participating is divided by the total number of students in the participation measure for both 2010-11 and 2011-12 combined. The resulting rate is rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Federal Cap

Since 2004, the federal cap calculation has been based on the percentage of total students enrolled on the day of testing in Grades 3–8 and 10 for Reading/ELA and Mathematics rounded up to the next whole number for any decimal value.

Other Indicator

Unlike performance and participation, measures related to the Other Indicator are rounded to the nearest one-tenth of a percent.

Graduation Rate

The Graduation Rate is rounded to the nearest one-tenth of a percent. For example, a high school with a Graduation Rate of 74.95% would have its other measure rounded up to 75.0%, while another high school with a Graduation Rate of 74.94% would have its other measure rounded down to 74.9%. The other measure is compared to the goal or target *after* rounding. Also note that actual change or improvement calculations are made after rounding.

Attendance Rate

The Attendance Rate is rounded to the nearest one-tenth of a percent. For example, an elementary school obtaining a 90.95% Attendance Rate in 2011 and having a 90.94% Attendance Rate in 2010 would achieve an Attendance Rate improvement of 0.1% (91.0% minus 90.9%; note that if the subtraction was performed before rounding, we would get $90.95 - 90.94 = 0.01\%$, which rounds to an improvement of 0.0%).

Student Groups for all Indicators

Student group percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent for all measures prior to determining whether the student group meets the minimum size requirement. The *Student Group* percentage is calculated as the number of students in the student group measure divided by the number of students in the All Students measure, then rounded to the nearest whole percent. For example, to determine the rounded whole percent of 40 students in a group out of a total of 421 students, 40 is divided by 421 ($40 / 421 = 0.09501$), then multiplied by 100 to determine the percentage ($0.09501 \times 100 = 9.501$). Rounding is then applied to the nearest whole percent, in this case 9.501 rounds to the whole percent 10 and therefore the student group will be evaluated.

Special Circumstances

Under the NCLB accountability provisions, all districts, campuses, and the state are evaluated for AYP. Each district or campus is evaluated based on its own data to the greatest extent possible. However, special circumstances exist that may require additional analysis or rules in order to determine an AYP outcome, and they are described in the following section.

Small Districts and Campuses

Reading and Mathematics Indicators

Performance

Small districts and campuses, those with fewer than 50 total students tested in Grades 3–8 and 10, are evaluated based on their own assessment results to the greatest extent possible. Small districts and campuses are evaluated first against the same standards (performance standard or performance improvement/safe harbor) as larger districts and campuses. If a small district or campus meets AYP under either the performance standard or performance improvement/safe harbor, the district or campus is rated as *Meets AYP* and no further special analyses are employed. On the other hand, if a small district or campus misses AYP under both the performance standard and performance improvement/safe harbor, additional special analyses are employed.

For 2012 AYP, additional analysis for campuses is conducted through the application of uniform averaging and pairing. Note that small district performance results are not included nor modified in the pairing process.

Uniform Averaging

For small districts and campuses, uniform averaging involves combining the 2011-12 AYP results for the district or campus with its 2010-11 AYP results and determining AYP status using data aggregated over the two years.

Pairing

Campuses that miss AYP with fewer than 50 total students tested in Grades 3–8 and 10 are evaluated based on the all students performance results of an assigned pairing relationship for the subject if available. Campuses that have a pairing relationship established with another campus or the district will use that pairing relationship for AYP. Results at the all students level will be applied to the paired campus. Campuses that do not have a pairing relationship will have their district's performance (again, at the all students level) applied to the campus. If the district or campus with which it is paired is not evaluated for AYP, the paired campus receives a 2012 AYP Status of *Not Evaluated*.

AYP Special Analysis

Small districts with fewer than 50 total students tested in Grades 3–8 and 10 that miss AYP under both the performance standard and performance improvement/safe harbor and campuses that miss AYP as a result of pairing undergo AYP special analysis. AYP special analysis consists of a professional review of historical performance data to determine if the AYP performance measure outcome is an indication of consistent performance. TEA professional staff review the data from 2003

to the current year on AYP performance measures both with and without the federal cap, AYP and SIP statuses, and other statistical information. AYP special analysis provides an AYP outcome for the Reading/ELA or Mathematics performance measure alone.

Participation

Districts and campuses with fewer than 40 total students enrolled in the grades evaluated for AYP (summed across Grades 3–8 and 10) on the test date are not required to meet the test participation standard. The AYP status for these districts and campuses is based on meeting the performance standards for the Reading/ELA and Mathematics measures and for the Graduation Rate or Attendance Rate measures if minimum size requirements for those measures are met.

Districts and campuses with at least 40 total students enrolled in Grades 3–8 and 10 on the test date are required to meet the participation standard.

Other Indicators

Small districts and campuses are required to meet AYP for the Other Indicator (Graduation Rate or Attendance Rate) if they meet the minimum size requirement for the all students measure. Districts and campuses not meeting the minimum size requirement for the all students measure are not evaluated on the Other Indicator. AYP Status for these campuses is based on the Reading/ELA and Mathematics Indicators.

AYP Status for Small Districts and Campuses

As required by federal regulation, the AYP status for districts and campuses is based primarily on the Reading/ELA and Mathematics Indicators. Therefore, if the performance measures cannot be evaluated due to small numbers of students for a district or campus resulting in Reading/ELA and Mathematics Performance of *Not Evaluated*, the overall AYP status is *Not Evaluated*.

Districts and Campuses with No Students in Grades Evaluated For AYP

Districts

Districts with no students in grades evaluated for AYP (Grades 3–8 and 10) receive a 2012 AYP Status of *Not Evaluated*.

Campuses

Prekindergarten and Kindergarten (PK/K) Campuses

As a result of the USDE review of the Title I program, Texas provides AYP evaluations for prekindergarten and kindergarten (PK/K) campuses. To meet this requirement, the accountability pairing application available for 2012 requests campus pairing assignments for PK/K campuses for federal accountability AYP purposes only. TEA will assign pairing relationships for PK/K campuses in school districts that did not provide campus pairing decisions through the TEASE pairing application. The pairing assignments are based on the pairing guidelines provided to school districts in conjunction with analysis of attendance and enrollment patterns using PEIMS data.

Performance

Campuses with students in Grades 1–12 but no students in the grades evaluated for AYP (Grades 3–8 and 10) are evaluated based on the all students performance results of an assigned pairing relationship for the subject. Campuses that have a pairing relationship established with another campus or the district will use that pairing relationship for AYP. For campuses that are paired (including PK/K campuses), only the all students performance results are shared. If the district or campus with which it is paired meets the performance standard or performance improvement/safe harbor at the all students level, the paired campus is considered to have met the performance standard for the subject. In order to ensure that all campuses that are paired (including PK/K campuses) receive a 2012 AYP evaluation, if the all students performance results of the campus with which it is paired cannot be evaluated for AYP, the campus will have their district's performance results applied to the campus. If the all students performance results of the district cannot be evaluated for AYP, the paired campus receives a 2012 AYP Status of *Not Evaluated*.

Participation

Campuses with no students in Grades 3–8 and 10 are not required to meet the AYP participation standard for 2012.

Other Indicators

Campuses with no students in Grades 3–8 and 10 are required to meet AYP for the Other Indicator (Graduation Rate or Attendance Rate) if they meet the minimum size requirement for the all students measure. Campuses with no data or those not meeting the minimum size requirement for the all students measure are not evaluated on the Other Indicator. AYP Status for these campuses is based on the Reading/ELA and Mathematics Indicators.

Section IV: Exceptions

Federal regulations issued in December, 2003 (34 CFR 200.13 *et seq.*) requiring the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to apply a cap to proficient alternative assessment results also allow each state to permit an exception in limited circumstances to school districts that may exceed this cap. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) exceptions to the federal cap continue to be processed in two stages: before the preliminary AYP Status release and during the appeals window.

Exception to the 1% Federal Cap on STAAR Alternate

Federal regulations governing exceptions to the cap on proficient results that may be included in AYP determinations apply only to the 1% cap on STAAR Alternate results. The federal regulation allows school districts with a granted exception to exceed the 1% cap. Districts must maintain a 2% cap on STAAR Modified and TAKS–M proficient results; however, if the state does not fully use the 1% cap, then the district may exceed the 2% cap up to a total of 3% on STAAR Alternate, STAAR Modified, and TAKS–M. Each school district may only exceed the overall 3% cap on STAAR Alternate, STAAR Modified, and TAKS–M proficient results by the amount of the exception to the 1% cap.

At the state level, Texas cannot exceed the 1% cap on STAAR Alternate proficient results; however, if the state does not fully use the 1% cap, then the state may exceed the 2% cap up to a total of 3% on STAAR Alternate, STAAR Modified, and TAKS–M. These state limits must be maintained even with school district exceptions to the 1% cap.

Exception Applications Prior to Preliminary Release

Districts with residential treatment facilities (including group foster homes that serve students with disabilities) in their attendance zones must register those facilities with the Division of Program Monitoring and Intervention’s residential facilities data collection application (called “RF Tracker”) on the Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE) website. RF Tracker was available to districts to complete this registration from September, 2011 through early June, 2012. A district that registered facilities on RF Tracker is automatically assumed to be applying for an exception to the 1% cap for AYP purposes. No separate exception application needs to be filled out for districts registered through RF Tracker.

TEA recognizes that the existence of a Regional Day School Program for the Deaf (RDSPD) within school district boundaries requires districts to provide educational services for higher numbers of students with auditory impairments or other areas of disability. Therefore, in addition to school districts registered in the RF Tracker system, school districts with RDSPD that are included in the 2011-2012 Directory for Services for the Deaf in Texas automatically apply for an exception. A district that provides deaf services in Texas through a RDSPD recognized by the Division of Individuals With Disabilities Education Act-IDEA Coordination, is

automatically assumed to be applying for an exception to the 1% cap for AYP purposes. No separate exception application needs to be filled out for districts included in the 2011-2012 Directory for Services for the Deaf in Texas.

Exception Process

School districts identified through RF Tracker or the RDSPD Directory will be initially granted an exception to the 1% cap, which will increase the district's federal cap by the total number of STAAR Alternate students passing results that exceed the 1% cap limit. Student data reported through the RF Tracker system are not used to determine the extent of the school district's exception to the 1% cap. Before the preliminary release of AYP information on July 31, exceptions will be processed for districts who registered facilities through RF Tracker or the RDSPD Directory, and the results of the exceptions will be applied to the preliminary AYP results.

Unused slots from the 1% cap on STAAR Alternate

As discussed in *Section III: Indicators, Components, Measures, and Standards*, if the number of STAAR Alternate student passing results in a school district falls below the 1% cap, the unfilled slots may be used by STAAR Modified and TAKS–M student passing results. STAAR Modified and TAKS–M proficient results may “spill over” to unused slots from the 1% cap on STAAR Alternate only if unused slots exist. This is allowed only if the number of proficient results from STAAR Alternate was below the 1% federal cap limit. Exceptions to the 1% cap are not needed for districts with a total number of proficient results from STAAR Alternate below the 1% federal cap limit. The table below provides a summary of the relationship between Exceptions and the allowance for spill over from the 2% cap onto unused slots from the 1% cap.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXCEPTION TO THE 1% CAP AND SPILL OVER FROM THE 2% CAP		
Possible 1% Federal Cap Limits	Are Exceptions to the 1% Cap applied?	Are STAAR Modified/TAKS–M results allowed to spill over to the 1% cap?
The number of STAAR Alternate passing results exceeds the 1% Federal Cap Limit.	Yes, exceptions are applied which will increase the district's federal cap by the total number of passing results from STAAR Alternate that exceed the 1% cap limit.	No, spill over from the 2% cap is not possible since the 1% cap was exceeded by number of STAAR Alternate passing results.
The number of STAAR Alternate passing results does not exceed the 1% Federal Cap Limit.	No, an exception is not necessary since there is no need to increase the district's federal cap for STAAR Alternate passing results that exceed the 1% cap limit.	Yes, spill over from the 2% cap can occur since the 1% cap was not reached by the number of STAAR Alternate passing results.
The number of STAAR Alternate passing results is equal to the 1% Federal Cap Limit.	No, an exception is not necessary .	No, spill over from the 2% cap is not possible .

Federal Cap

Federal regulations require that the state as a whole not exceed the 1% cap under any circumstances. As with the original process for each school district, the statewide participation denominator for each subject area is used to determine the 1% cap on proficient results. To determine if recapture is necessary, after exceptions are processed the total number of proficient student results on STAAR Alternate across the state is divided by the statewide AYP participation denominator. If proficient results exceed the statewide 1% cap for either subject, a statewide recapture process will be performed. STAAR Alternate student passing results will be randomly excluded from the cap and reclassified to non-proficient until the 1% statewide cap limit is satisfied.

Proficient results selected during recapture will be counted as non-proficient in all AYP calculations for campus, district, and state level results. If the number of proficient scores in the state is less than the statewide cap, all results within the district cap remain unchanged and recapture is not used.

Other Circumstance Exceptions

USDE regulations allow exceptions to the federal cap for circumstances other than serving students in residential treatment facilities or RDSPDs. However, other exceptions are limited by federal regulation to address unique circumstances where a district or campus serves a disproportionate number of students with significant cognitive disabilities assessed on STAAR Alternate. Districts who did not qualify for an exception prior to preliminary release will be allowed to apply for an exception based on other circumstances during the appeals window. **Districts should check the TEASE Accountability website after the preliminary release on July 31 to see whether other circumstance exceptions will be allowed based on available space in the statewide 1% cap.**

Other Circumstance Exceptions Application Process

Applications for Other Circumstance Exceptions may be submitted online via the TEASE Accountability website (see *Section VI*) by school districts from July 31st through September 7th. Districts that submit Other Circumstance Exceptions applications online will also need to submit an appeal letter with a request for other circumstance exception during the appeals process window. Districts appealing for other reasons can include the exception request along with the letter detailing their other appeals. Districts should also include a copy of the exception application confirmation page that will appear when the online exception application is submitted. Districts should be sure to include the rationale for the exception request and any documentation necessary to support the request. It is not necessary to submit any other student level data to support the exception request. As with exceptions processed prior to the preliminary results, a recapture process may be employed to ensure that the state as a whole does not exceed the 1% cap after all exception requests have been evaluated. *Section V* has further information about the needed steps for submitting the required appeal letter.

Evaluation of Other Circumstance Exceptions to the Federal 1% Cap

Exception requests to the 1% cap based upon a higher than normal district population of students with disabilities should include documentation to support the reason for the request. The following is a general guideline for exception requests.

Reasons favorable for granting the exception include, but are not limited to:

1. Community or health programs in the district attendance boundaries draw families of students with disabilities.
2. There are special arrangements with surrounding districts to serve special education students from outside the district boundaries.
3. Special programs offered by the district for students with certain disabilities draw families of students with disabilities.
4. Quality of the special education program in the district draws families of students with disabilities.

Reasons not favorable for granting the exception include, but are not limited to:

1. Appropriate testing of students under state assessment policy.
2. Factors such as student race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, or mobility putting students at a disadvantage academically.
3. Reasons related to distribution of students with disabilities among campuses within a district such as cluster arrangements or special purpose campuses.

Justification for Other Circumstance Exceptions

If the district is claiming that it serves an unusual number of students with a certain disability, it is expected that should be reflected in the data. It may be difficult to compile evidence that a special education program is effective and draws students from surrounding areas. If a district is making this claim, the data should minimally reflect a special education program that is not subject to any monitoring and meets the highest standards in the Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS). If the district is claiming that there are unusual numbers of students with disabilities in individual family foster homes, student lists with identifying information should be provided with the exception request.

Federal Cap Extension for Other Circumstance Exceptions

The approval of school district requests for exceptions to the federal cap is based on the availability of statewide slots within the cap that allow the state to maintain a 1% cap limit on proficient results from STAAR Alternate. The federal cap applied to proficient

STAAR Alternate results will be extended to include an additional number of students up to the statewide 1% cap limit. In order to maintain that limit, TEA may employ a process in which only students who received instruction in the following instructional settings and disability categories are added to the district cap limit. The 2011-12 Fall Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) submission of special education student disability and instructional arrangement information is used to identify student categories for processing Other Circumstance exceptions.

Instructional Setting Categories:

1. Self-Contained, Mild/Moderate/Severe, Regular Campus – More than 60% (Instructional Setting Code 44)
2. State Supported Living Centers (Instructional Setting Code 30)
3. Texas School for the Blind and Visually Impaired (Instructional Setting Code 70)
4. Texas School for the Deaf (Instructional Setting Code 71)

Disability Categories:

1. Multiple disabilities
2. Auditory impairment (Disability Code 03)
3. Autism (Disability Code 10)
4. Deaf/Blind (Disability Code 05)
5. Developmental Delay (Disability Code 12)
6. Emotional disturbance (Disability Code 07)
7. Learning disability (Disability Code 08)
8. Intellectual disability (Disability Code 06)
9. Orthopedic impairment (Disability Code 01)
10. Other health impairment (Disability Code 02)
11. Speech impairment (Disability Code 09)
12. Traumatic brain injury (Disability Code 13)
13. Visual impairment (Disability Code 04)

Approval of Exception Does Not Necessarily Change AYP Status

Note that an approved exception for a district or campus who missed AYP solely due to the 1% cap may not result in that district or campus meeting AYP since there still may not be enough proficient students to meet AYP criteria. In addition, if after applying exceptions the state as a whole exceeds the 1% cap and the federal cap recapture process is initiated, there may not be

enough students counted as proficient in the school district AYP performance results to Meet AYP. Due to the required statewide federal caps, appeals are not considered solely on the basis that the district's exception was approved.

Section V: Appeals

Superintendents (or the equivalent for charter operators) are provided the opportunity to appeal data used to determine 2012 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Status under a limited set of circumstances and within a defined time limit. The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB) requires that state educational agencies provide local school districts an opportunity to review the data, including academic assessment data, on which the AYP and School Improvement Program (SIP) identifications are based. The act also calls for the state agency to consider supporting evidence provided by any local educational agency that believes that the preliminary identification is in error for statistical or other substantive reasons before making a final determination.

Calendar

Once the AYP data are available to districts on July 31, 2012, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) will begin accepting appeals. Confidential unmasked data tables will be available to all campuses and districts on July 31 through the Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE) Accountability website. Superintendents may submit a letter of request for appeal to the Texas Commissioner of Education through Friday, September 7, 2012. All letters must be postmarked no later than September 7, 2012. For districts and campuses that could be subject to Title I SIP requirements, some additional information is provided below.

Districts and Campuses Subject to Title I School Improvement Requirements

The requirements for Title I districts and campuses for the 2012–13 school year are determined by the district or campus preliminary 2012 AYP results, the final 2011 AYP status, and the SIP status in the 2011-12 school year. For information regarding districts and campuses that may be subject to or may exit Title I SIP requirements, see *Appendix B: Title I School Improvement*.

Limitations on 2012 AYP Appeals

School districts will have approximately five weeks to submit an appeal to the preliminary AYP status. TEA must limit the number of appeals requiring extensive student level research that can be considered in order to thoroughly evaluate all appeals prior to the release of the final AYP status in December. The limitation on the number of student records that can be submitted for appeal is discussed in the *Guidelines by Indicator for Appeals* section below.

General Considerations for Appeals

Data Relevant to the 2012 AYP Result

Appeals are considered for the 2012 AYP status based on data relevant to the 2012 evaluation. Appeals are not considered for data

reported in the prior year for Performance and Participation measures, regardless of whether the prior year AYP results or status may impact the outcome of the current year AYP status. Appeals are not considered for data reported for Graduation Rate results in the year following the school year relevant to AYP evaluations.

Appeals Are Not a Data Correction Opportunity!

Appeals should be based upon a data or calculation error attributable to TEA, regional education service centers (ESCs), or the test contractor for the student assessment program. Problems due to district errors on Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data submissions or on test answer documents may be considered on a case-by-case basis. However, repeated patterns of district errors on PEIMS data submissions or test answer documents are not favorable for appeal. TEA will review districts' previous history of submitting district data error appeals.

Enrolled Grade Level

Appeals related to incorrect grade level codes on assessment documents or fields will not be considered. Districts are responsible for ensuring that grade level information is accurately reported.

Allowable Appeals

Appeals are allowed for all districts and campuses.

- Appeals are not considered for any indicators, components, or measures on which the district or campus does not miss AYP. For example, an appeal to reevaluate campus Reading/English Language Arts (ELA) Performance or Participation is not considered for a campus that does not miss AYP for Reading/ELA. These appeals are considered invalid.
- Appeals **are** allowed in circumstances that would result in the district or campus continuing to miss AYP for 2012. For example, an appeal to reevaluate campus Reading/ELA Performance is considered for a campus that does not meet AYP for both Reading/ELA Performance and Mathematics Performance, even though this appeal alone would not result in the campus meeting AYP for 2012. These appeals are allowed because even though granting them results in the district or campus continuing to miss AYP, they *would* potentially have an effect on the Title I SIP requirements.
- Appeals for only one component of an indicator that would continue to miss AYP for that indicator are not considered. Title I SIP indicators Reading/ELA and Mathematics combine both the Performance and Participation components for the subject area outcome. For example, an appeal to reevaluate campus Mathematics Performance alone from a campus that also missed the AYP Mathematics Participation component would continue to result in missing AYP for the Mathematics indicator. Appeals for one component of an indicator that would not result in a change to the indicator are not considered.

Determination of AYP Status

AYP appeals for each indicator are determined independently. Appeals to one indicator will not negatively or positively affect another indicator meeting AYP standards. For example, students included as participants based on an appeal will not result in reevaluating performance to include these students. Likewise, an attendance rate appeal will not result in performance improvement/safe harbor being recalculated unless the performance measure is also appealed.

Guidelines by Indicator for Appeals

The following guidelines describe the circumstances under which AYP data may be appealed and the documentation required in support of the appeal. Appeals applications submitted under these guidelines are not guaranteed to be granted. Each appeal will be evaluated based on the documentation provided and other information available at TEA.

Performance Results for Reading/ELA and Mathematics

If a problem is identified with data received from the test contractor, the assessment data may be appealed. An appeal of these measures should reflect a serious problem such as a missing grade level or campus. Coding errors on STAAR or any other assessment will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

- If the district has requested that the writing portion of the ELA test be rescored, the outcome of the rescore and a copy of the dated request to the test contractor should be provided with the appeal. If the rescored results impact the AYP status, an appeal is necessary since rescored results may not be processed in time to be included in the assessment data used to determine AYP.
- If other serious problems are involved in the appeal, copies of correspondence with the test contractor should be provided with the appeal.

Limitations on Performance Appeals

A district or campus appeal to the performance component based on test results of more than **10** students will not be favorable for consideration. Appeals based on more than 10 students will only be considered in rare situations where extenuating circumstances can be documented to justify the inclusion of additional students in the appeal.

Data Quality

For all appeals, data quality will continue to be a consideration in evaluating the merits of an appeal. Districts are responsible for providing accurate information to TEA, including information provided on student answer documents or submitted via online testing systems. Districts that submit appeal requests based on coding or submission errors that have repeated patterns of district coding errors should be prepared to submit a data improvement plan or other required monitoring intervention activities to address potential

concerns related to data integrity. Clearly documented student identifying information is critical in the evaluation of performance rate appeals.

Student Attribution Codes

Student attribution codes were submitted in PEIMS by districts with Residential Treatment Facility (RTF) campuses, Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC) campuses, or Texas Youth Commission (TYC) campuses. Appeal requests to reconsider district or campus performance results based on the inaccurate student attribution coding on test answer documents will likely be denied. *Appendix I* describes the impact of student attribution codes on performance data.

2012 Bridge Study

All appeal requests related to the USDE approved 2012 AYP Bridge Study methodology will not be considered. This includes appeals requests for an alternate methodology or standard derived from the bridge study between STAAR and TAKS, or appeals based on the method applied to particular grade or test versions.

Other Indicator Appeals and Safe Harbor

A successful appeal of the Other Indicator (either Attendance Rate or Graduation Rate) may have an impact on the district or campus ability to meet the performance improvement/safe harbor standard on Reading and/or Mathematics Performance. However, Safe Harbor is *not* recalculated unless the performance measure is also appealed. Please refer to performance improvement/safe harbor in *Section III* for further information.

Participation

Limitations on Participation Rate Appeals

A district or campus appeal to the participation rate based on test results of more than 10 students will be viewed unfavorably. Appeals based on more than **10** students will only be considered in rare situations where extenuating circumstances can be documented to justify the inclusion of additional students in the appeal.

For all appeals, data quality will continue to be a consideration in evaluating the merits of the appeal. Districts are responsible for providing accurate information to TEA, including information provided on student answer documents. Clearly documented student identifying information is critical in the evaluation of participation rate appeals.

Extreme Medical Emergencies

If the district or any campus did not meet the 95% standard for the Participation Component of the Reading/ELA or Mathematics Indicators because of students who were not tested due to extreme medical emergencies, the appeal must include documentation (such as a note signed by a doctor or parent) showing that the student was unable to participate in the assessment at any time during the testing window due to medical reasons. NOTE: State assessment policy requires testing of medically fragile students who receive instruction in homebound or hospital settings unless they are unable to participate in the assessment at any time during the testing window.

TELPAS Reading Testing Window

An appeal may be submitted for a district or any campus that did not meet the Participation Component of the Reading Indicators due to students counted as non-participants because they were not enrolled in the district or campus during the TELPAS Reading testing window. Commissioner rules for testing and classification of English Language Learner (ELL) students state that school districts must administer the required oral language proficiency test within 20 school days of their enrollment. The appeal must include documentation showing a student's 1) date of initial enrollment; 2) Language Proficiency Assessment Committee (LPAC) documentation identifying the student as limited English proficient (LEP); and 3) LPAC documentation indicating the number of years enrolled in U.S. schools.

Grade 10 TAKS Linguistically Accommodated Testing (LAT) for Reading/ELA and Mathematics

If a problem is identified as miscoding of LAT info on test answer documents for Linguistically Accommodated tests administered to eligible students LEP-exempt from the TAKS Reading/ELA or Mathematics tests, the assessment data may be appealed. District appeals to the performance or participation status of students tested on the LAT tests must include proper documentation of a LAT administration or validation that the tested student was either a current or monitored LEP student during the time of testing.

Graduation Rate

Graduation Rate Calculation

In June, each school district was provided with lists of all students in their class of 2011 four-year longitudinal completion cohort and their class of 2010 five-year longitudinal completion cohort. The lists included the final status of each student in that cohort. For the Graduation Rate, only students with a final status of "graduate" are counted in the numerator of the rate calculation. The denominator of the rate calculation is the sum of the students with a final status of "graduate", "continue in school", "GED", or "dropout". Note that the list also includes members of the cohort who left Texas public schools and students with identification errors. Only students shown in these lists may be appealed for the graduation rate indicator.

The four-year and five-year longitudinal cohort student statuses are considered final. TEA must maintain compliance with the federal requirements for adjusted cohort graduation rates and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition. In order to ensure that all districts have an equal opportunity to locate graduates, requests for changes to the final student statuses are not favorable for appeal. Appeals requesting a change in the final leaver status of the students based on information that was not known until after the PEIMS resubmission deadline cannot be considered. Appeals to count continuing students or GED recipients as graduates will not be considered.

Accuracy of leaver data submitted to TEA by the district is a factor considered in evaluation of the merits of Graduation Rate appeals.

- If the district or any campus did not meet the AYP graduation rate indicator because of students with disabilities shown with a final status of “continue in school”, an appeal may be submitted based on students with individualized education programs (IEPs) containing needed transition services, indicating graduation plans that exceed the longitudinal (four or five year) cohort period. These students will then be excluded from the Graduation Rate calculation.

Sufficient documentation for students developed in their earliest years of inclusion in the class of 2011 cohort should be included. Students served in special education programs with IEPs developed during their last year in the longitudinal (four or five year) cohort will not be favorable for appeal.

- If the district or any campus did not meet the AYP graduation rate indicator because of recent immigrant students with limited English proficiency in U.S. schools for one year or less, the appeal should include documentation showing the students’ recent immigrant LEP status. These students will then be excluded from the Graduation Rate calculation.

LPAC documentation of the student’s LEP status during the students’ first year of enrollment should be included with each appeal.

- Appeal requests for Graduation Rate recalculations for the exclusion of special education or LEP students outlined above are based on the longitudinal cohort (four or five year) status of students as reported by the PEIMS resubmission deadline.

Graduation rate appeals will also be considered for districts and campuses that do not initially meet the AYP performance criteria for Reading/ELA and/or Mathematics for all students or any student group because they do not meet the Graduation Rate criteria required as part of the performance improvement/safe harbor standard. If an appeal is not made for the performance measure that might meet Safe Harbor consequent to a successful appeal for the Other Indicator (graduation rate), the status of the performance measure will remain unchanged.

Limitations on Graduation Rate Appeals

Federal accountability appeals to the Graduation Rate are evaluated on a case-by-case basis and limited by the number of students in question and scope of the appeal. A district or campus may not appeal the graduation rate calculation on the basis of more than **10** non-graduates (“GED”, “continue in school”, or “dropout”) **or** one percent of the number of non-graduates in the cohort of the longitudinal completion rate, whichever is larger.

Districts are responsible for providing accurate information to TEA, including the data used to determine the graduates component of the longitudinal secondary school completion rates. Therefore, federal accountability appeals to the graduation rate cohort determination or longitudinal completion rates calculations are not considered.

For all appeals, data quality will continue to be a consideration in evaluating the merits of an appeal. Poor data quality is not a valid reason to appeal the graduation rate. Other indicators of leaver data quality will be considered in concert with graduation appeals, such as excessive counts or rates of underreported students.

Graduation Rate Appeals from Alternative Education Campuses

There are some additional considerations for alternative education campuses (AEC) and appeals related to Graduation Rate. TEA recognizes the unique students served by these campuses and the need for consideration in regard to the graduation rate used in AYP. However, there is a limit of **10** students that can be included in an appeal to the graduation rate for AECs. Appeals based on more than **10** students will only be considered in rare situations where extenuating circumstances can be documented to justify the inclusion of additional students in the appeal.

School District Appeals

School district appeal requests for a recalculation of the district graduation rate based on allowable appeals for AECs are not considered except for charter districts that would have been eligible for evaluation under the former state accountability system alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures.

Charter District or Campus Appeals

Appeals for review of the Graduation Rate from AECs require that the campus provide evidence of serving “students at risk of dropping out of school.” This may be done by showing that they would have been eligible for evaluation under the 2011 state accountability system AEA procedures.

- Eligible charter districts or campuses may request the calculation of Graduation Rate for an AEC using an alternative methodology that excludes the following students:

- Students who received a GED certificate,
 - Continuing students, or
 - Continuing students who transferred to campus in the fall following their expected graduation date.
- Eligible charter districts or campuses may request that the Graduation Rate not be evaluated if the AEC did not have students enrolled in Grade 12 in the 2011-12 school year.

Recalculated Graduation Rate

The recalculated graduation rate must meet the 2012 AYP graduation rate requirements, or reduce the denominator below the minimum size criteria for the student group. Graduation rates for the four-year longitudinal graduation rate and the five-year longitudinal graduation rate will be recalculated then evaluated on 2012 AYP criteria. The prior year graduation rate for the specific student group is also recalculated to exclude GED and/or continuing students for a consistent measure of improvement in the graduation rate.

Attendance Rate

Current Year Attendance

As described in *Section III*, the 2012 AYP Status is based on 2010–11 Attendance Rates for districts and campuses that have Attendance Rates as their Other Indicator. Districts can appeal to have their 2012 AYP Status reevaluated using 2011–12 Attendance Rates for districts and campuses not meeting one or more of the 2012 AYP measures due to Attendance Rates. Eligible districts and campuses include the following:

- those that do not initially meet the Attendance Rate standard or improvement on the Attendance Rate for all students; and
- those that do not initially meet the AYP performance criteria for Reading/ELA and/or Mathematics for all students or any student group because they do not meet the standard or show the required level of improvement on the Attendance Rate required as part of the performance improvement/safe harbor standard, even though a 10% decrease in percent of students not meeting the performance standard is achieved. If an appeal is not made for the performance measure that might meet Safe Harbor consequent to a successful appeal for the Other Indicator (attendance rate), the status of the performance measure will remain unchanged.

Since the 2012 appeals process will occur before 2011-12 attendance rates can be calculated from PEIMS submission 3, districts will be required to supply the current year attendance data with their appeals. A notarized copy of 2011-12 attendance rates must be submitted as part of the appeal. Copies of each of the six-week totals as well as the yearly total must be included.

Attendance Rate for all students (90.0% standard) will be reevaluated using 2011–12 attendance data provided by the district. Improvement on the Attendance Rate for all students and student groups will be reevaluated using 2011–12 Attendance Rates compared to 2010–11 Attendance Rates. If attendance measures are reevaluated using current year attendance data, all measures based on attendance will be reevaluated. A district or campus cannot meet some 2012 AYP criteria using 2010–11 Attendance Rates and meet other criteria using 2011–12 Attendance Rates.

Special Circumstance Appeals

Appeal of Reported Race or Ethnicity Identification

New revised standards for the collection of data on race and ethnicity were published by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the United States Department of Education (USDE) that required all states to change collect information on the race and ethnicity of public school students. In 2009-10, TEA began collecting data on student race and ethnicity in compliance with the new federal standards. Longitudinal graduation rates for the class of 2010 were reported using the old racial/ethnic categories. However, the class of 2011 longitudinal graduation data will include graduates, GED recipients, dropouts, or continuers with final statuses based on years of data collected using the old and new racial/ethnic categories. The transition to the new data collection requirements will affect longitudinal graduation rates used to evaluate AYP for a number of years. Due to the application of federally required data collection methods, appeals related to the reported race and ethnicity categories on district reported PEIMS data will not be considered. Appeal requests to reconsider AYP results based on students' race and ethnicity reporting in any combination of multiple or single racial categories will also not be considered.

Crisis Code Related to 2011 Central Texas Wildfires

Districts that feel they were adversely impacted by the 2011 wildfires in Central Texas may appeal their AYP Status. For this special circumstance appeal, the district is required to supply appropriate documentation that the student's displacement was due to one of the Central Texas wildfires and that this displacement resulted in a negative impact. Use of the PEIMS Crisis Code for appealed students will be researched. See TEA correspondence dated October 5, 2011 at <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/taa/comm100511.html>.

Appeal of the USDE approved Texas AYP Workbook requirements

Appeals to the performance or participation indicators based on the results of STAAR or TAKS testing programs, or TELPAS Reading as required by the USDE approved 2012 Texas AYP Workbook, are not considered. Appeals related to assessment results

from the prior year that are used to calculate safe harbor in 2012 are not considered. Texas is required to maintain federal requirements and processes for the evaluation of AYP, therefore, appeal requests to apply state legislative accountability rules for an AYP outcome are not considered.

Appeals Related to the Federal Cap and Campus Rankings

Appeals to the performance results due to the federal caps are not considered.

Appeals to the campus ranking submitted by school districts for the 2% federal cap are also not considered. For example, appeals requesting a campus ranking that differs from the campus ranking chosen by the district by the July 10, 2012, deadline are not considered. In addition, an appeal based solely on the basis that the district's exception was approved will not be considered. Please refer to *Section IV* for information on reconsideration of performance results due to the application of the federal cap.

STAAR Testing Requirements

Appeals requesting consideration for AYP outcomes due to the test administration requirements of STAAR will not be considered. Appeals based on changes in the time limit requirements, test calendar, and/or other test administration requirements that may have affected the 2012 AYP result cannot be considered.

Spring 2012 STAAR and TAKS Corrections Window

As in previous years, in 2012 TEA offered districts the opportunity to correct the TEST TAKEN INFO field on test answer documents. This correction opportunity was 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 STAAR and TAKS data files used in determining the 2012 AYP status. Appeals from districts to the TEST TAKEN INFO field that missed this corrections window would likely be denied. Corrections to fields other than the TEST TAKEN INFO field will not be used in determining AYP results. For federal 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.

Pairing Assignments of Prekindergarten or Kindergarten (PK/K) Campuses

Appeals pertaining to pairing relationships of prekindergarten or kindergarten campuses that districts had the opportunity to determine by April 27, 2012, will not be considered.

Title I Targeted Assistance Campuses

All students were included in the calculations for Title I campuses with targeted assistance programs. Districts can appeal to have the 2012 AYP Status of any targeted assistance campuses recalculated based on the results of only Title I students if test answer documents in both Reading/ELA and Mathematics were submitted for at least 50 Title I students on the targeted assistance campus.

Grades 9 and 11 STAAR

The AYP Reading/ELA and Mathematics indicators are based on test results for Grades 3–8 and 10. Campuses with no students in Grades 3-11 are evaluated on the test results for the campus with which they are paired for accountability ratings. Campuses with no students in Grades 3–8 or 10 that are not paired for accountability ratings are evaluated for 2012 AYP Status based on the test results of the district at the all students level. If a campus with no students in Grades 3–8 or 10 that has students tested in Grade 11 does not meet AYP on the Performance components of the Reading/ELA or Mathematics indicators, the district may appeal to have the campus evaluated based on its own test results. Due to the changes in the testing program, campuses in this situation may only be evaluated on students tested in Grade 11. The Reading/ELA and Mathematics indicators are evaluated for all students and for each student group meeting the minimum size requirement based on all campus test results in Grade 11. The Other Indicator is also evaluated if the campus meets the minimum size requirement for all students.

How to Submit an Appeal Application

Districts and campuses must submit written appeals on official district letterhead and under the signature of the district superintendent. See instructions that follow for submitting appeals. For any district or campus, only one opportunity to appeal is permitted on any single measure.

Superintendents must prepare a written request (see Exhibit 7 for an example of an acceptable appeal) addressed to the commissioner of education that includes:

- A statement that the letter is an appeal for the 2012 AYP results.
- If an Other Circumstance exception was applied for, send the printed exception application confirmation.
- The 2012 AYP Appeal Request Form must be included with the letter for appeals applications. Now automated, completing the AYP Appeal Request Form will automatically register your appeal in the TEASE AYP Appeal Form and Registration System. This system provides a mechanism for tracking all AYP appeals and allows districts to monitor the status of their appeals. Exhibit 8 provides an example of the required form that will be available to districts on the TEASE website (see *Section VI: AYP Products Available Online Through TEASE Accountability for more information regarding registration of appeals*).

- Specification in the letter of the district and each campus for which the appeal is being submitted (including county-district-campus numbers for each campus). It is not necessary to have a separate letter for the district and each campus. However, it should not be assumed that a letter appealing the status of a district will also apply to any campuses within that district or vice versa, even if the district has only one campus.
- For the district and each campus, list ALL indicators, components, or measures for which the district/campus is being appealed. It is not necessary to have a separate letter for each indicator being appealed.
- For each indicator, component, or measure being appealed, the appeal must specify the perceived error (or reason why it is being appealed). If applicable, the reason the perceived error is attributable to the TEA, a regional ESC, or the test contractor for the student assessment program and the reason the perceived error resulted in the district and/or campuses not meeting the AYP standard for the measure must be included.
- The superintendent must certify that all information included in the letter is true and correct to the best of the superintendent's knowledge and belief.

It is insufficient to claim data are in error without providing information with which the appeal can be evaluated. 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. Lists of students included in the AYP participation and performance measures will be available on the TEASE website at the time the AYP data tables are made available to school districts on July 31. *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 information. TEA staff will adhere to federal FERPA requirements intended to protect individual student confidentiality; therefore, additional staff release forms are not necessary.*

Appeal letters and all supporting documentation should be shipped to the following address:

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

Letters of appeal postmarked after the September 7 deadline will not be considered. These deadlines are final. To maintain a fair appeals process, no late appeals will be considered. Superintendents are encouraged to obtain delivery confirmation services from their courier and to retain confirmation of delivery until final 2012 AYP Status is released. Superintendents are encouraged to double-check that they have included all relevant supporting information with their letter prior to shipment. Exhibit 9 provides a suggested order for packing AYP letters for shipment. Appeals delivered directly to TEA by district staff must be time-stamped in the Division of Performance Reporting by 5:00 p.m. on September 7, 2012. Overnight courier tickets or tracking documentation must indicate package pickup on or before September 7.

The AYP Appeal Form and Registration System will allow districts to monitor the status of their appeal. TEA will not contact districts to acquire missing documentation or to discuss information provided in their request for appeal or exception. Appeals are evaluated on the circumstances described in their request on the basis of information provided by the district and research conducted by staff to validate the circumstances described.

How an Appeal Application Is Processed by the Agency

All appeals will be resolved by December and the results will be reflected in the final 2012 AYP Status. If the district or campus receives a final 2012 AYP Status of *Meets AYP* based on their request, the status will be annotated with a comment. Prior to the release of final 2012 AYP Status, superintendents will be sent a letter from the commissioner notifying them of the results (see Exhibit 10 below). The notification letter will also be made available on the TEASE Accountability website.

The details of the request are entered into a database for tracking purposes and researchers evaluate the request using relevant agency data sources to validate the statements made to the extent possible. The agency examines all relevant data, not just the results for any students specifically named in the correspondence.

- Guidelines to be used to evaluate AYP appeals will be reviewed by an advisory panel for Title I program implementation.
- Staff conducts research and prepares a recommendation that is forwarded to the commissioner.
- The commissioner of education 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.
- Data are never modified, even when the AYP results are changed.

Relationship Between AYP and PBMAS

AYP staff will consider indicators from the Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS) when making findings on AYP appeals, as well as other district data submitted through PEIMS or the state assessment contractor. In addition, the Program Monitoring and Interventions Division will consider school districts' repeated patterns of AYP appeals based on district coding errors when conducting monitoring intervention activities to address potential concerns related to data integrity.

Exhibit 7: Sample AYP Request Cover Letter

September 7, 2012

Commissioner of Education
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, TX 78701-1494

Dear Commissioner,

This letter is to appeal the 2012 AYP status for the Sample Independent School District and campuses named below.

District/Campus	Indicators Appealed	Reason
Sample ISD (999999)	Reading and Math Performance	Request for exception to the federal cap
Sample H S (999999001)	Math Participation	Absences on test dates due to medical emergencies
Sample J H (999999041)	Reading Participation	LEP-Exempt students enrolled after the TELPAS testing window
Sample Elementary School (999999101)	Attendance Rate	Campus would like to be evaluated on current year's attendance rate

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.

Sincerely,
[signature]
John Q. Educator
Superintendent
Sample Independent School District

Documentation Attached

This is an example of an acceptable format for the cover letter. Districts should provide as much detail as they need to explain their appeals. At a minimum, the letter should include the information below.

Statement that this is an appeal of 2012 AYP Status.

Specification of which district/campuses are being appealed, for which indicators/components/measures, and why.

Certification that all information is true and correct to the best of superintendent's knowledge.

Superintendent must sign!

Exhibit 8: Sample AYP Appeal Request Form

**Texas Education Agency
2012 AYP Appeal Form and Registration System
District: SAMPLE ISD**

AYP APPEAL FORM AND REGISTRATION DIRECTIONS

The TEASE Accountability website will include detailed instructions on accessing, entering, and printing the AYP Appeal Form. This will automatically register your appeal in the TEASE AYP Appeal Form and Registration System.

District or Campus Number	District or Campus Name	Reading/ELA Performance	Mathematics Performance	Reading/ELA Participation	Mathematics Participation	Graduation Rate	Attendance Rate
999999	Sample ISD	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	-----	-----	-----	-----
999999001	Sample HS	-----	-----	-----	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	-----	-----
999999041	Sample JH	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
999999101	Sample Elementary School	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	-----	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	-----	-----	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes

The TEA AYP APPEAL FORM AND REGISTRATION SYSTEM is used to indicate the district intends to submit an appeal for the district and any campuses in your school district that missed AYP. In order to print your form and enter the registration system, at least one appeal must be selected.

- Step 1) For each district or campus, enter the indicator(s) you wish to appeal.
- Step 2) After you have made your selection, click the *Continue* button to review your AYP Appeal Form.

Exhibit 9: Suggested Packing Order for Appeal Request




Exhibit 10: Sample AYP Decision Notification Letter

Mr. John Q. Educator, Superintendent
 Sample ISD
 1001 Sample Road
 Sampleville, Texas 77777

Dear Mr. Educator:

Thank you for your letter regarding preliminary 2012 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) results. Agency staff reviewed the supporting documentation you provided, examined other relevant data available at the Texas Education Agency (TEA), and conducted research related to the circumstances described in your appeal letter. A detailed description of our findings related to the appeals your district requested by district/campus and by indicator is provided below.

DISTRICT/CAMPUS NUMBER	NAME	RESULT OF REQUEST
999999	Sample ISD	<i>Meets AYP</i>
999999001	Sample H S	<i>Missed AYP</i>
999999041	Sample J H	<i>Meets AYP</i>
999999101	Sample Elementary School	<i>Missed AYP</i>

Exceptions to the Federal Cap

The U.S. Department of Education (USDE) regulations allow Texas to grant exceptions to the federal cap only in limited circumstances. Given that Texas did not reach its federally mandated federal cap on proficient results even with all exceptions approved prior to the preliminary release, and based on your district's unique circumstances, an additional number of students were allowed to exceed the federal cap and count as proficient in your district. Note that a granted exception application does not guarantee that your district or any campuses meet AYP. Please see the detailed results below for the final status of your district/campuses.

Sample ISD (999999)

As stated above, the exception request for Sample ISD was approved and an additional number of students were allowed to exceed the federal cap and count as proficient in your district. The performance measure for this campus was recalculated to include additional proficient student(s) and the AYP standard was met. The 2012 AYP status for Sample ISD is *Meets AYP*.

Sample H S (999999001)

Your appeal for mathematics has been denied since it did not include documentation for a sufficient number of students in order to meet the AYP participation standards in the appealed student group. The appeal for Mathematics Participation was denied. The 2012 AYP status for Sample H S is *Missed AYP*.

Sample J H (999999041)

Your appeal for Reading/English Language Arts Participation was not considered because Sample J H met AYP on this measure. The 2012 AYP status for Sample J H is *Meets AYP*.

Sample Elementary School (999999101)

Your appeal for Attendance Rate based upon current year data has been approved. The AYP results for Attendance Rate have been changed. The 2012 AYP status for Sample Elementary School is *Missed AYP*. Please note that the following measure(s) will be removed from the reasons Sample Elementary School missed AYP: Attendance Rate.

Although my decisions are final, any clarifying questions regarding this notification may be directed to the Division of Performance Reporting at (512) 463-9704.

Sincerely,

Commissioner of Education

Section VI: AYP Products Available Online Through TEASE Accountability

Since 2004, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) products have become available to districts through the Accountability application on the Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE), a secure website available only to authorized users. The gateway to TEASE is located at: <https://seguin.tea.state.tx.us/apps/logon.asp>

AYP Release Schedule

In an effort to provide information to school districts via the TEASE site prior to the public release of 2012 preliminary data tables, districts will have access to confidential preview preliminary data tables that will not include AYP status labels or the Title I School Improvement Program (SIP) Requirement status label. On July 31st, districts will receive confidential preliminary data tables prior to the public release from the secure TEASE Accountability website. The following week, on August 7th, the preliminary data tables on TEASE will be updated to include AYP status labels and Title I SIP Requirement status label information. The public, masked preliminary data tables will be available on the TEA public website on the following day, August 8th.

A summary of the AYP release schedule is shown below.

July 31, 2012

Release of 2012 Preliminary Data Tables to Campuses and Districts

Confidential unmasked preliminary data tables available on the TEASE site *will not include the preliminary AYP and SIP status labels*. The AYP Explanation Table will be included on these tables.

Appeals Begin

Open Other Circumstance Exceptions Application

August 7, 2012

Update 2012 Preliminary Data Tables on TEASE

Confidential unmasked preliminary data tables are updated on the TEASE site to *include the preliminary AYP and SIP status labels*.

August 8, 2012

Public Release of 2012 Preliminary Data Tables

Masked preliminary data tables released electronically on the TEA public website *will include preliminary AYP and SIP status labels.*

Gaining Access to TEASE Accountability

District staff need a TEASE account to access any TEASE application. Even if approved district personnel currently have access to other TEASE applications (e.g., PEIMS Edit+, eGrants, etc.), they may still need to have the Accountability application added to their TEASE accounts. If a staff member needs to have access to TEASE Accountability, he or she must complete the following form:

<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/forms/tease/accountability.htm>

The form must be printed, completed, signed by the district superintendent (or equivalent for charter operators), and mailed or faxed to the contact information provided on the form. Depending on the volume of requests, it may take several days for a request to be processed (if the request was mailed, several more days should be allowed for the request to reach TEA). Staff will receive an email from TEA Security once Accountability has been added to their TEASE accounts.

Multiple District Access

Certain charter operators and Education Service Center (ESC) staff have the unique situation of requiring access to multiple school district or charter operator information. 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. In some cases, it may not be possible to obtain a single login with access to multiple school district or charter information since some applications do not support multiple-district users. For information about new single or multiple-district TEASE user accounts, please contact the Division of Performance Reporting at (512) 463-9704.

AYP Products Available

The Accountability application is designed to contain products for districts produced by several divisions in the Department of Assessment and Accountability. Once TEASE has been logged into and the Accountability application selected from the list of authorized applications, the main Accountability index screen will appear. This screen lists the types of products available from the site and may also contain recent announcements to districts related to Accountability. Therefore, users must always be sure to read the main screen carefully for updated announcements and products.

IMPORTANT: Data on the TEASE Accountability application are NOT masked to protect individual student confidentiality. Remember that individual student information is confidential under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). This site is intended for DISTRICT USE OR ESC USE WITH DISTRICT PERMISSION ONLY. The Texas Education Agency also takes the position that the tables at this stage of the accountability review process constitute “agency audit workpapers” and are not required to be disclosed under the Texas Public Information Act.

From the main page, find the link to Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Results and click the link to access online AYP products. Products available will change depending on whether a preliminary release or a final release has occurred. During the preliminary release of AYP information, districts will be able to access the following products:

- unmasked preliminary data tables
- Appeal Request Form and Registration System
- application for other circumstance exception
- student listings including AYP calculation status information

During the final release of AYP information, districts will be able to access final unmasked data tables and unofficial copies of appeal decision notification letters. Student listings will also remain available during the final release.

AYP Appeal Form and Registration

Superintendents must prepare a written letter requesting an appeal of their Preliminary AYP status addressed to the commissioner of education which includes their district’s AYP Appeal Request Form. AYP appeal letters must be submitted to TEA by the AYP appeal deadline of September 7, 2012. **To maintain a fair appeals process, no late appeals will be considered.** District staff must enter the automated TEASE Appeal Request Form and Registration System to access the AYP Appeal Form, enter the AYP indicators they wish to appeal, and print the form. Entering and printing the AYP Appeal Form will automatically register the district’s intention to appeal. After initial registration, district staff may access the AYP Appeal Request Form and Registration System to monitor the receipt of registration and documentation for their appeal.

Once the appeal is registered, districts have until September 7, 2012 to submit their written appeal to TEA. The AYP Appeal Request Form and Registration System will be available during the AYP appeal window, from July 31 through 5:00 p.m. CDT on September 7. After that time, the AYP Appeal website will be accessible for district staff to monitor the status of their appeal and receive other information updates. AYP Appeal Forms and registration of a district’s intent to appeal are not available through TEASE after the appeal deadline.

Appeals will be evaluated based upon the required documentation submitted in the mailed packet as described in *Section V: Appeals*. All appeals must meet the requirements outlined in Section V.

IMPORTANT NOTE: Superintendents who do not have TEASE access must request access in order to register, print the Appeal Form, or monitor the status of their appeal. Please see the section above, *Gaining Access to TEASE Accountability*, for more information.

Most Recent AYP Products Only

The TEASE Accountability site is not intended to be an archive of AYP information. The site is intended to contain only the most recent AYP products released. When final AYP products are released, that year's preliminary products will be taken off the site. Also, when a new year's preliminary AYP products are released, the prior year's final products will be taken off the site.

Section VII: Future Considerations

Although the Texas Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook (Texas AYP Workbook) provides the basic framework for determining Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for Texas public school districts and campuses, the system is expected to change. Since its inception, the federal accountability system is designed to increase in rigor as districts and campuses are held to higher standards over time.

2013 AYP

The intent of the accountability development process is to design a new accountability system aligned with the provisions of House Bill (HB) 3 (81st Texas Legislature, Regular Session). Development of a new state accountability system presents an opportunity to align the state and federal accountability requirements of Texas school districts and campuses. The state accountability system must meet state statutory requirements of Texas Education Code, Chapter 39, Public School Accountability System. Texas public school districts and campuses must also meet federal for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) accountability provisions of Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) must continue to meet federal AYP accountability provisions of the ESEA during the transition to the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) and the new state accountability system. Currently under consideration are plans for the development of a state accountability system that could potentially meet federal requirements. With this approach, the following options for submission of the 2013 Texas AYP Workbook are possible:

- Request the use of the new state accountability system for federal AYP evaluations.
- If denied, augment the proposed state accountability system to meet federal requirements.
- If denied, use components (Reading and Mathematics) of the proposed performance index developed for state accountability to meet federal requirements.

By January, 2013, TEA will submit the 2013 Texas AYP Workbook for U.S. Department of Education (USDE) approval that will include a proposal for AYP determinations for 2013 and beyond under the new STAAR assessment program. The workbook will also include a request to reset the AYP performance targets beginning with the 2013 AYP evaluations, since that will be the first year of AYP evaluations based on the new STAAR testing program.

Science

Under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, all states are required to assess students in science during the school year. However, the statute does not require that the science assessment results be used for calculating AYP. Any such changes would require an amendment to the statute which could possibly occur after final reauthorization of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (ESEA).

Performance Standards

The AYP definition is based on expectations for growth in student achievement. The standards must increase over time until they reach 100 percent in 2013–14. For the first six years, the standards were held constant for two years at a time, with increases occurring at the end of the second year. The first increase took place in 2004–05. The second increase occurred 2006–07. Exhibit 11 shows the standards for 2002–03 to 2013–14. Note that beginning in 2008–09 the standards increase annually. Standards are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Exhibit 11: AYP Performance Standards

	AYP Performance Standards for 2002-03 – 2013-14								
School Year	2002-03 2003-04	2004-05 2005-06	2006-07 2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Reading/English Language Arts	47%	53%	60%	67%	73%	80%	87%	93%	100%
Mathematics	33%	42%	50%	58%	67%	75%	83%	92%	100%

Section VIII: Appendices

Appendix A: Texas Administrative Code

Since 2004, a portion of the *Adequate Yearly Progress Guide* has been adopted as a commissioner's rule by figure. With the publication of this Guide, the Texas Education Agency will file a Commissioner Rule amendment to 19 *Texas Administrative Code* §97.1004, *Adequate Yearly Progress* with the Office of the Secretary of State. This rule will adopt the *2012 Adequate Yearly Progress Guide* as a figure, thus giving legal standing to the AYP status process and procedures. Allowing for a 30-day comment period, final adoption of the 2012 AYP Guide should occur in early September 2012. If any changes result from this rule adoption process, then educators will be notified as soon as possible. Once the rule is adopted, it may be accessed online at:

<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter097/ch097aa.html>

Chapter 97. Planning and Accountability

Subchapter AA. Accountability and Performance Monitoring

§97.1004. Adequate Yearly Progress.

Appendix B: Title I School Improvement

If a district or campus receives Title I, Part A funds and does not meet the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) standard for the same indicator for two or more consecutive years, that district or campus is subject to certain Title I School Improvement requirements, such as offering school choice and supplemental education services. Title I School Improvement requirements are implemented in progressive stages based on the number of years the campus or district does not meet the AYP standard for the same measure. The requirements for Title I districts and campuses for the 2012–13 school year are determined not only by the district or campus 2013 AYP Status, but also by the AYP status in the prior year, and the School Improvement status in the prior year.

The following appendix is a compilation of information provided by the School Improvement and Support Division. For further information on any of the items detailed below, please contact the School Improvement and Support Division at (512) 463-7582, or see the website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=4459&menu_id=798.

General Guidelines for Title I School Improvement

- Districts and campuses receiving Title I, Part A funds are subject to School Improvement requirements if they do not meet the AYP standard for the same indicator (Reading/English Language Arts, Mathematics, Graduation or Attendance) for two or more consecutive years.
- Title I districts and campuses identified as subject to School Improvement requirements must implement the requirements in the following school year.
- The requirements increase each additional year Title I districts and campuses do not meet the AYP standard for the same indicator. Stage 1 designates the first year of Title I School Improvement.
- Title I districts and campuses are no longer subject to School Improvement when they meet the AYP standard for two consecutive years for the same indicator that originally triggered School Improvement. The first year a district or campus subject to School Improvement meets the AYP standard for the same measure, the requirements remain the same as the prior year. The second year the district or campus meets the AYP standard for the same measure, the district or campus is no longer subject to School Improvement. If a district or campus subject to School Improvement meets the AYP standard for the same measure one year but does not meet the AYP standard for the measure the second year, School Improvement increases to the next stage.
- Title I districts and campuses may be subject to School Improvement for more than one indicator. The requirements will reflect the highest stage applicable. Districts and campuses are subject to School Improvement until they have met the AYP standard for two consecutive years for each indicator that originally identified the district or campus for School Improvement.

- If a district or campus no longer receives Title I funds, it is no longer subject to School Improvement.

Existing and Remaining SIP Identified Campuses

The USDE requires that campuses that were subject to final School Improvement requirements in 2011-12 and will remain subject to School Improvement requirements in 2012-13 due to the 2012 AYP results must continue to implement those requirements. School districts must notify parents about school choice options by August 13, 2012.

Potential SIP Identified Campuses

If a campus is identified as subject to improvement requirements in the August 8th release for the first time, they must begin implementing requirements (including school choice provisions) immediately. School districts with a campus that is identified as subject to improvement requirements in the August 8th release for the first time, must notify parents about school choice options by August 13, 2012.

Exiting SIP Identification

School districts with campuses that exit school improvement status on August 8, 2012, are no longer required to implement the school improvement provisions. Guidance has been provided in a letter to these districts from TEA.

Detailed Requirements for SIP Identified Campuses

Guidance has been provided by TEA to notify school districts that campuses must begin the school year in the current stage of school improvement and must implement all required Title I SIP intervention activities. Campuses that could potentially exit school improvement status were also provided a guidance letter from TEA. The following information summarizes the requirements included in the guidance letters.

Parent Notification Letter (PNL)

- All campuses identified in SIP at the August release will be required to send the School Choice PNL to parents on or before August 13, 2012.

Fiscal Implications – Title I SIP Application for Funding for 2012-13

- The SIP application will open in the *eGrants* system on September 10, 2012.
- Existing SIP campuses will receive a limited preliminary allocation, plus any roll-forward from the 2011-12 grant, which may be expended for allowable SIP expenditures until September 30, 2013.
- Any roll forward funds from the 2011-12 grant must be expended before the 2012-13 allocation.

- In the event that an existing campus exits SIP status on August 8, 2012, the campus is no longer eligible to receive or expend SIP funds as of that date.
- If the campus remains in the current stage of improvement or advances to the next stage of school improvement on August 8, 2012, the campus will receive an adjusted SIP entitlement and be allowed to expend the full entitlement, plus any roll-forward from the 2011-12 grant, during the 2012-13 school year.
- Title I campuses that miss AYP for the second consecutive year and enter school improvement status on August 8, 2012, will receive a SIP entitlement and be allowed to expend the full entitlement during the 2012-13 school year. The application closes on October 25, 2012.
- In the event that the campus exits SIP status on appeal in December 2012, the campus is no longer eligible to receive or expend SIP funds as of the date the appeal is granted.

School Choice

- In the event that the campus exits SIP status on August 8, 2012, the campus must continue to allow students who have taken advantage of the school choice provision under SIP to continue to attend the school of choice through the highest grade level offered at the school of choice. Whether or not to continue to provide transportation through the end of the 2012-13 school year is at the discretion of the regular school district. Regardless, Title I, Part A and Title I SIP funds may not be expended for school choice after August 8, 2012.
- If the campus remains in the current stage of improvement or advances to the next stage of school improvement on August 8, 2012, the campus will continue to implement the school choice provision and provide transportation as required by Title I statute.
- Title I campuses that miss AYP for the second consecutive year and enter school improvement status on August 8, 2012, must notify parents of school choice by August 13, 2012, and begin implementation of the school choice option immediately.
- In the event that the campus exits SIP status on appeal in December 2012, the campus must continue to allow students who have taken advantage of the school choice provision under SIP to continue to attend the school of choice through the highest grade level offered at the school of choice. Whether or not to continue to provide transportation through the end of the 2012-13 school year is at the discretion of the regular school district.

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) – Stages 2--5

- The campus is required, as notified by the agency, to notify parents of eligible students of their option for Supplemental Educational Services (SES) by August 27, 2012.
- The campus must offer parents a minimum of 60 calendar days in which to select SES for their eligible student.
- The regular or charter school district must process all requests for SES and be prepared to begin services within thirty days for those campuses expecting to remain in school improvement status.

- Campuses that were in Stage 1 in 2011-2012, and advance to Stage 2 when the preliminary AYP results are released in August 2012 must send the SES parent notification packets out by August 27, 2012.
- If the campus remains in the current stage of improvement or advances to the next stage of school improvement on August 8, 2012, the regular or charter school district and campus must begin SES services immediately.
- In the event that the campus exits SIP status or returns to Stage 1 on appeal in December 2012, the campus must notify parents and providers that the campus has exited school improvement status, or is no longer in Stage 2 or above and SES services are no longer available.

Related Issues for SIP Identified Districts and Campuses

District and Campus Identification Numbers

TEA policy requires school districts and charters to request campus number changes of existing campuses 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, however, this policy does not apply to new active campuses opening mid-year or to campuses under construction.

In certain circumstances, school districts and charters must receive TEA approval to change the campus number of a campus with a state accountability rating of *Academically Unacceptable*. Although the state accountability ratings are suspended for the school year 2011-12, for the purposes of determining multiple years of unacceptable performance and required district and campus interventions and sanctions, the performance ratings and accreditation statuses issued in the 2010–2011 and 2012–2013 school years shall be considered consecutive (i.e., 2011 and 2013 ratings).

For campuses that require prior approval to change the campus number, the ratings history may be linked across campus numbers for purposes of determining consecutive years of *Academically Unacceptable* ratings. If the new campus number is determined by TEA to include linking of the accountability history results, the accountability histories of both the state accountability rating and the SIP status will be linked across campus numbers. Data for districts and campuses in these circumstances will not be linked. The data reported in the AYP data table in the previous year will not be linked or compared to the current year data. This includes PEIMS data, assessment data, and AYP indicators that draw on those data. Campuses with new numbers cannot take advantage of Required Improvement/Safe Harbor provisions of AYP in order to meet AYP the first year under a new number.

School Transfers

If an eligible student exercises the option to transfer to another public school campus, the school district must permit the student to remain in that campus until he or she has completed the highest grade in the campus. However, the district is no longer obligated to provide transportation for the student after the student's campus of origin is no longer identified for school improvement, corrective

action, or restructuring.

In addition, there is no requirement for students who change campuses to remain in their new campus through the highest grade of the school. To the extent feasible, those students should have the opportunity to return to the original campus if their parents decide that would be in their educational interest.

Waivers for the First Day of Instruction

As required by state legislation, school districts are not allowed to begin instruction for the school year before the fourth Monday in August unless the district operates a year-round school system. For the 2012-13 school year, the effect of this statute is that districts may not begin instruction prior to August 27, 2012. School districts requests for waivers to the first day of instruction are not allowed.

School districts will be responsible for notification to parents about school choice options after the annual AYP results are available.


Title I School Improvement Stages

Title I districts and campuses must implement certain requirements after not meeting AYP for two or more consecutive years, based on the number of years the campus or district does not make AYP. Non-Title I schools that do not make AYP for two consecutive years will be required to amend their school improvement plan to address the deficit areas. However, non-Title I campuses and school districts will not be subject to other school improvement activities, supplemental services, and corrective actions.


The following six decision trees show how the guidelines are applied to Title I districts and campuses to determine the stage of School Improvement for the 2012-13 school year. Note that the decision trees consider only one indicator at a time. If a campus or district is in School Improvement for multiple indicators, School Improvement Status can be determined by applying the decision trees for each indicator to determine the campus's or district's stage of School Improvement on that indicator. The highest resulting stage will be the stage of Title I School Improvement assigned to the campus or district. For example, if a campus determines that it is in Stage 1 for Reading/English Language Arts, Stage 2 for Mathematics, and Stage 3 for the Other Indicator, the campus is considered to be in Stage 3 of Title I School Improvement.

For further information on any of the information included in this Appendix, please contact the School Improvement and Support Division at (512) 463-7582 or see the website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=4459&menu_id=798.


**Determining the 2012–13 Title I School Improvement Status
for
Title I Campuses and Districts Not Subject to Final School Improvement in 2011–12**




**Determining the 2012–13 Title I School Improvement Status
for
Title I Campuses and Districts Subject to Final Stage 1 School Improvement in 2011–12**




**Determining the 2012–13 Title I School Improvement Status
for
Title I Campuses and Districts Subject to Final Stage 2 School Improvement in 2011–12**




**Determining the 2012–13 Title I School Improvement Status
for
Title I Campuses and Districts Subject to Final Stage 3 School Improvement in 2011–12**



**Determining the 2012–13 Title I School Improvement Status
for
Title I Campuses Subject to Final Stage 4 School Improvement in 2011–12**



**Determining the 2012–13 Title I School Improvement Status
for
Title I Campuses Subject to Final Stage 5 School Improvement in 2011–12**



Appendix C: Sample AYP Products

The following sample 2012 AYP data table illustrates the AYP products provided to school districts. See *Section III*, for more information about each measure. The final AYP products may include minor modifications that are not shown in this section.

This appendix has been updated to include the following information:

AYP Unmasked Data Table	Page 107
AYP Source Data Table	Page 118
Sample District and Federal Cap Calculation	Page 121
AYP Student Data Listings and Student Categories	Page 122

AYP Unmasked Data Table

TEA will provide preliminary 2012 AYP confidential unmasked data tables to school districts via TEASE on July 31, 2012, that *will not include the preliminary AYP and SIP status labels*. The AYP Explanation Table will be included on these tables. On August 7, 2012, the TEASE website will be updated to include the preliminary AYP and SIP status labels. On August 8, the TEA public website will provide public, masked, AYP data tables and all status labels.

Each data table includes the 2012 AYP Status and reasons for missing AYP for each of the following 35 measures.

Seven Reading Performance Measures:

All Students
African American
Hispanic
White
Economically Disadvantaged
Special Education
Limited English Proficient

Seven Reading Participation Measures:

All Students
African American
Hispanic
White
Economically Disadvantaged
Special Education
Limited English Proficient

Seven Mathematics Performance Measures:

All Students
African American
Hispanic
White
Economically Disadvantaged
Special Education
Limited English Proficient

Seven Mathematics Participation Measures:

All Students
African American
Hispanic
White
Economically Disadvantaged
Special Education
Limited English Proficient

One Other Indicator (Graduation Rate or Attendance Rate) Measure:

All Students
African American
Hispanic
White
Economically Disadvantaged
Special Education
Limited English Proficient

Preliminary AYP Status is provided on August 8, 2012.

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
Adequate Yearly Progress Campus Data Table

Preliminary 2012 AYP Results

Campus Name:▼ Sample School (999999999) Sample ISD
Status: Missed AYP - Reading, Mathematics, and Graduation Rate

2012 - 13 School Improvement Program Requirement: Stage 1 Reading

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ. Disadv.	Special Education	LEP (Measure: Current & Monitored)	LEP (Students)
Performance: Reading/English Language Arts (ELA) (AYP Target: 87%)								
AYP Proficiency Rate								
2011-12 Assessments								
Met Standard	284	20	65	182	84	4	45	n/a
Number Tested	316	23	73	198	107	16	56	35
% Met Standard	90%	87%	89%	92%	79%	25%	80%	n/a
Student Group %	100%	7%	23%	63%	34%	5%	n/a	11%
Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor								
2010-11 Assessments								
Met Standard	241	16	50	175	80	8	16	n/a
Number Tested	282	18	65	194	103	21	24	20
% Met Standard	85%	89%	77%	90%	78%	38%	67%	n/a
Change in % Met Standard Improvement Required	5	-2	12	2	1	-13	13	

Special formats ('*', >99%, <1%) are used to protect student confidentiality
n/a indicates that the data are not available or applicable
A dash (-) indicates there were no students in that group or the calculation is not applicable

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
Adequate Yearly Progress Campus Data Table

Preliminary 2012 AYP Results

Campus Name: Sample School (999999999) Sample ISD
Status: Missed AYP - Reading, Mathematics, and Graduation Rate

Title I School Improvement Program Requirement label is provided on **August 8, 2012**, and only on reports for Title I districts and campuses.

2012 - 13 School Improvement Program Requirement: Stage 1 Reading ←

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ. Disadv.	Special Education	LEP (Measure: Current & Monitored)	LEP (Students)
Performance: Mathematics (AYP Target: 83%)								
AYP Proficiency Rate								
2011-12 Assessments								
Met Standard	280	20	63	171	86	14	40	n/a
Number Tested	318	23	74	198	112	20	53	50
% Met Standard	88%	87%	85%	86%	77%	70%	75%	n/a
Student Group %	100%	7%	23%	62%	35%	6%	n/a	16%
Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor								
2010-11 Assessments								
Met Standard	257	18	55	184	82	20	21	n/a
Number Tested	291	19	65	202	108	28	30	21
% Met Standard	88%	95%	85%	91%	76%	71%	70%	n/a
Change in % Met Standard	0	-8	0	-5	1	-1	5	
Improvement Required					2		3	

Special formats ('*', >99%, <1%) are used to protect student confidentiality
n/a indicates that the data are not available or applicable
A dash (-) indicates there were no students in that group or the calculation is not applicable

T E X A S E D U C A T I O N A G E N C Y
Adequate Yearly Progress Campus Data Table

Preliminary 2012 AYP Results

Campus Name: Sample School (999999999) Sample ISD
Status: Missed AYP - Reading, Mathematics, and Graduation Rate

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ. Disadv.	Special Education	LEP (Measure)	LEP (Students)
Participation: Reading/ELA (AYP Target: 95%)								
2011-12 Assessments								
Number Participating	357	27	93	207	114	30		43
Total Students	371	30	97	220	121	39		47
Participation Rate	96%	90%	96%	94%	94%	77%		91%
Student Group %	100%	8%	26%	59%	33%	11%		13%
2010-11 Assessments								
Number Participating	341	25	94	215	98	29		31
Total Students	370	26	98	224	108	39		34
Participation Rate	92%	96%	96%	96%	91%	74%		91%
Average Two-Year								
Participation Rate				95%	93%			
Participation: Mathematics (AYP Target: 95%)								
2011-12 Assessments								
Number Participating	352	24	90	206	117	22		55
Total Students	370	26	100	215	123	39		58
Participation Rate	95%	92%	90%	96%	95%	56%		95%
Student Group %	100%	7%	27%	58%	33%	11%		16%
2010-11 Assessments								
Number Participating	341	24	90	217	115	21		34
Total Students	370	26	98	223	127	39		37
Participation Rate	92%	92%	92%	97%	91%	54%		92%
Average Two-Year								
Participation Rate			91%					

Special formats ('*', >99%, <1%) are used to protect student confidentiality
n/a indicates that the data are not available or applicable
A dash (-) indicates there were no students in that group or the calculation is not applicable

T E X A S E D U C A T I O N A G E N C Y
Adequate Yearly Progress Campus Data Table

Page 4 of 5

Preliminary 2012 AYP Results

Campus Name: Sample School (999999999) Sample ISD
Status: Missed AYP - Reading, Mathematics, and Graduation Rate

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ. Disadv.	Special Education	LEP (Measure: Ever HS)	LEP (Students)
Four-Year Longitudinal Cohort								
Graduation Rate Class of 2011 (AYP Target: 75%)								
Graduates	237	11	14	212	98	31	8	8
Number in Class	326	15	33	278	147	41	13	13
Graduation Rate	72.7%	73.3%	42.4%	76.3%	66.7%	75.6%	61.5%	61.5%
Student Group %	100%	5%	10%	85%	45%	13%	n/a	4%

Graduation Rate Class of 2010 (Safe Harbor or Improvement of 1.0)

Graduates	280	15	27	238	127	29	8	5
Number in Class	355	20	44	291	171	36	10	9
Graduation Rate	78.9%	75.0%	61.4%	81.8%	74.3%	80.6%	80.0%	55.6%

Change 2010 to 2011	-6.2	-1.7	-19.0	-5.5	-7.6	-5.0	-18.5	
Safe Harbor Target	1.1	-	-	0.8	1.6	-	-	

Five-Year Longitudinal Cohort (AYP Target: 80%)

Class of 2010 Five-Year Graduation Rate

Graduates	252	11	22	219	110	36	10	12
Number in Class	314	15	27	272	139	42	15	14
Graduation Rate	80.3%	73.3%	81.5%	80.5%	79.1%	85.7%	66.7%	85.7%

Special formats ('*', >99%, <1%) are used to protect student confidentiality

n/a indicates that the data are not available or applicable

A dash (-) indicates there were no students in that group or the calculation is not applicable

T E X A S E D U C A T I O N A G E N C Y
Adequate Yearly Progress Campus Data Table

Preliminary 2012 AYP Results

Campus Name: Sample School (999999999) Sample ISD
Status: Missed AYP - Reading, Mathematics, and Graduation Rate

The explanation table is provided via TEASE on July 31st and summarizes the areas a district or campus missed AYP, and why.

2012 AYP Explanation Table

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ. Disadv.	Special Education	LEP
Performance: Reading/ELA	+	-	+	+	%	-	-
Performance: Math	+	-	+	+	X	-	+
Participation: Reading/ELA	+	-	+	+	X	-	-
Participation: Math	+	-	X	+	+	-	+
Other: Graduation Rate	+	-	-	+	X	-	-
Other: Attendance Rate	-						

- + Meets AYP
- Not Evaluated for AYP due to not meeting minimum size criteria or the measure is not applicable
- % Missed AYP for this performance measure due to 2% and/or the 1% federal caps
- X Missed AYP for this measure

Performance: Reading/English Language Arts and Mathematics

LEP (Measure): Includes students tested in 2011-12 with assessment documents coded as 1) a currently identified LEP student, or 2) a monitored LEP student.

LEP (Students): Used to determine minimum size – includes only students tested in 2011-12 coded as currently identified LEP students.

The number *Met Standard*, *Number Tested*, and *Percent Met Standard* for Reading/ELA and Mathematics: Results are summed across Grades 3-8 and 10 for the grades tested at the campus or district and provided for 2011-12 and 2010-11.

Met Standard: This value is the numerator used to calculate the % Met standard. It is derived from the number of proficient students after the 1% and 2% federal caps are applied.

Student Group: The percent of total represented by each group is provided to assist in determining if minimum size has been met. The calculation is based on the denominator for the rate (except for LEP).

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ. Disadv.	Special Education	LEP (Measure: Current & Monitored)	LEP (Students)
Performance: Reading/English Language Arts (ELA) (AYP Target: 87%)								
AYP Proficiency Rate								
2011-12 Assessments								
Met Standard	284	20	65	182	84	4	45	n/a
Number Tested	316	23	73	198	107	16	56	35
% Met Standard	90%	87%	89%	92%	79%	25%	80%	n/a
Student Group %	100%	7%	23%	63%	34%	5%	n/a	11%
Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor								
2010-11 Assessments								
Met Standard	241	16	50	175	80	8	16	n/a
Number Tested	282	18	65	194	103	21	24	20
% Met Standard	85%	89%	77%	90%	78%	38%	67%	n/a
Change in % Met Standard	5	-2	12	2	1	-13	13	
Improvement Required					2			

Change in % Met Standard: the difference between the rates for the two years shown on the data tables. These calculations are used to determine if the district or campus met performance improvement in Reading/ELA and Mathematics from 2011 to 2012, or when shown on other pages, if the campus met the improvement requirement on the Attendance Rate or Graduation Rate from 2010 to 2011.

Improvement Required: If any student group (or all students) meets minimum size but does not meet the performance standard, the improvement required to meet AYP through safe harbor is shown. This information is not calculated for the Attendance Indicator because required improvement is always 0.1 percentage points.

Participation: Reading/English Language Arts and Mathematics

The *Number Participating*, *Total Students*, and *Participation Rate* for Reading/ELA and Mathematics: Results are summed across Grades 3-8 and 10 for the grades tested at the campus or district and are provided for 2011-12 and 2010-11.

Total Students under All Students is the number used as the basis for calculating the 1% and 2% federal cap.

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ. Disadv.	Special Education	LEP (Measure)	LEP (Students)
Participation: Reading/English Language Arts (AYP Target: 95%)								
2011-12 Assessments								
Number Participating	357	27	93	207	114	30		43
Total Students	371	30	97	220	121	39		47
Participation Rate	96%	90%	96%	94%	94%	77%		91%
Student Group %	100%	8%	26%	59%	33%	11%		13%
2010-11 Assessments								
Number Participating	341	25	94	215	98	29		31
Total Students	370	26	98	224	108	39		34
Participation Rate	92%	96%	96%	96%	91%	74%		91%
Average Two-Year Participation Rate								
				95%	93%			

Average Two-Year Participation Rate: If any student group (or all students) meets minimum size but does not meet the participation standard, average participation rate across two years is calculated.

Total Students: Total students enrolled on the day of testing are shown here and are used to calculate the participation rate.

Number Participating: Total test participants is the numerator used to calculate the participation rate.

Other Measure: Only one other measure is used in the AYP calculation for each district and campus—Attendance Rate or Graduation Rate. This block of the data table shows the data used for calculation of the applicable measure.

Attendance Rate (not shown on example): The *Days Present* (numerator), *Days Membership* (denominator), and calculated *Attendance Rate* are provided for 2010-11 and 2009-10.

Graduation Rate: The *Graduates* (numerator), *Number in Class* (denominator), and calculated *Graduation Rate* are provided for the four-year rates for the Class of 2011 and Class of 2010, and the five-year rate for the Class of 2010. Beginning in 2012, each AYP student group is evaluated for Graduation Rate.

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ. Disadv.	Special Education	LEP (Measure: Ever HS)	LEP (Students)
Four-Year Longitudinal Cohort								
Graduation Rate Class of 2011 (AYP Target: 75%)								
Graduates	237	11	14	212	98	31	8	8
Number in Class	326	15	33	278	147	41	13	13
Graduation Rate	72.7%	73.3%	42.4%	76.3%	66.7%	75.6%	61.5%	61.5%
Student Group %	100%	5%	10%	85%	45%	13%	n/a	4%
Graduation Rate Class of 2010 (Safe Harbor or Improvement of 1.0)								
Graduates	280	15	27	238	127	29	8	5
Number in Class	355	20	44	291	171	36	10	9
Graduation Rate	78.9%	75.0%	61.4%	81.8%	74.3%	80.6%	80.0%	55.6%
Change 2010 to 2011	-6.2	-1.7	-19.0	-5.5	-7.6	-5.0	-18.5	
Safe Harbor Target	1.1	-	-	0.8	1.6	-		
Five-Year Longitudinal Cohort (AYP Target: 80%)								
Class of 2010 Five-Year Graduation Rate								
Graduates	252	11	22	219	110	36		
Number in Class	314	15	27	272	139	42		
Graduation Rate	80.3%	73.3%	81.5%	80.5%	79.1%	85.7%		

Safe Harbor Target or Improvement of 1.0: If the all students group (any student group for performance improvement/safe harbor) meets minimum size but does not meet the four-year target of 75%, the improvement from the prior year and the safe harbor target is shown.

Explanation Table: At the end of the AYP Data Table is a small explanatory table that shows AYP performance across all measures. Symbols are displayed for each measure to indicate AYP results.

+ *Met AYP on this measure:*
This measure met the minimum size criteria **and** the AYP requirement was met.

% *Missed AYP for this performance measure due to federal caps:*
The sole reason this measure did not meet AYP was due to the application of the federal cap.

2012 AYP Explanation Table

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ. Disadv.	Special Education	LEP
Performance: Reading	+	-	+	+	%	-	-
Performance: Math	+	-	+	+	X	-	+
Participation: Reading	+	-	+	+	X	-	-
Participation: Math	+	-	X	+	+	-	+
Other: Graduation Rate	+	-	-	+	X	-	-
Other: Attendance Rate	-						

- + Meets AYP
- Not Evaluated for AYP due to not meeting minimum size criteria or the measure is not applicable
- % Missed AYP for this performance measure due to the 2% and/or the 1% federal caps
- X Missed AYP for this measure

- *Not Evaluated on this measure:*
Either the measure did not meet minimum size criteria or the measure was not applicable for AYP results.

X *Missed AYP for this measure:*
For Performance measures, an X means the measure was missed for reasons other than the federal cap. For Participation and Other measures, an X means the AYP requirement was not met.

Sample AYP Source Data Table

The confidential unmasked Source Data Table shows the 2012 AYP results for a district or campus *without* the application of the 1% and 2% federal caps. For all AYP results, the number of students passing STAAR Modified, TAKS–M, and STAAR Alternate combined cannot exceed 3% of the number of students enrolled in the district at the time of testing determined by the district’s participation denominator for the subject area. The AYP Data Tables report students exceeding the federal cap as non-proficient, or failers, in the subject area performance measure, regardless of actual performance.

The AYP Source Data Table is provided for information purposes to inform a district, charter, or campus of their performance without the application of the federally required 1% and 2% federal caps. All AYP processing rules are applied, including the use of students meeting the full academic year definition (accountability subset). A sample of the AYP Source Data Table is shown on the next page.

C O N F I D E N T I A L

T E X A S E D U C A T I O N A G E N C Y
Adequate Yearly Progress Campus Data Table

2012 AYP Source Data Table
(Does not apply the 1% or 2% cap to the 2011-12 Assessments)

Campus Name: Sample School (999999999) Sample ISD

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ. Disadv.	Special Education	LEP (Measure)	LEP (Students)
Performance: Reading/English Language Arts (AYP Target: 87%)								
AYP Proficiency Rate								
2011-12 Assessments								
Met Standard	294	21	69	184	88	14	51	n/a
Number Tested	316	23	73	198	107	16	56	35
% Met Standard	93%	91%	95%	93%	82%	88%	91%	n/a
Student Group %	100%	7%	23%	63%	34%	5%	n/a	11%
Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor								
2010-11 Assessments								
Met Standard	245	17	52	176	82	17	21	n/a
Number Tested	282	18	65	194	103	21	24	20
% Met Standard	87%	94%	80%	91%	80%	81%	88%	n/a
Change in % Met Standard	6	-3	15	2	2	7	3	
Improvement Required					2			

The preliminary data tables are not masked to protect individual student confidentiality. Individual student information (including aggregate counts of less than 5) in the tables is confidential under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). The agency additionally takes the position that the tables at this stage of the accountability review process constitute "agency audit workpapers" not required to be disclosed under the Texas Public Information Act.

n/a indicates that the data are not available or applicable
A dash (-) indicates there were no students in that group or the calculation is not applicable

C O N F I D E N T I A L

T E X A S E D U C A T I O N A G E N C Y
Adequate Yearly Progress Campus Data Table

2012 AYP Source Data Table
(Does not apply the 1% or 2% cap to the 2011-12 Assessments)

Campus Name: Sample School (999999999) Sample ISD

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ. Disadv.	Special Education	LEP (Measure)	LEP (Students)
Performance: Mathematics (AYP Target: 83%)								
AYP Proficiency Rate								
2011-12 Assessments								
Met Standard	281	20	64	171	86	15	40	n/a
Number Tested	318	23	74	198	112	20	53	50
% Met Standard	88%	87%	86%	86%	77%	75%	75%	n/a
Student Group %	100%	7%	23%	62%	35%	6%	n/a	16%
Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor								
2010-11 Assessments								
Met Standard	258	18	55	185	83	27	25	n/a
Number Tested	291	19	65	202	108	28	30	21
% Met Standard	89%	95%	85%	92%	77%	96%	83%	n/a
Change in % Met Standard	-1	-8	1	-6	0	-21	-8	
Improvement Required					2		2	

The preliminary data tables are not masked to protect individual student confidentiality. Individual student information (including aggregate counts of less than 5) in the tables is confidential under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). The agency additionally takes the position that the tables at this stage of the accountability review process constitute "agency audit workpapers" not required to be disclosed under the Texas Public Information Act.

n/a indicates that the data are not available or applicable

A dash (-) indicates there were no students in that group or the calculation is not applicable

Sample District Federal Cap Calculation

The following table illustrates the district federal cap limit for the sample shown in this appendix. In this example, Sample ISD includes only one campus shown in the AYP Unmasked Data Table. See *Appendix D* for more information on How to Calculate the 1% and 2% Federal Cap Limit.

Page 3 of 5

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
Adequate Yearly Progress District Data Table
Preliminary 2012 AYP Results

Participation: Reading/Language Arts

2011-12 Assessments
Number Participating
Total Students 371
Participation Rate
Student Group %

2010-11 Assessments
Number Participating
Total Students
Participation Rate

Average Two-Year
Participation Rate


Participation: Mathematics

2011-12 Assessments
Number Participating
Total Students
Participation Rate
Student Group %

The 3% Federal Cap for Reading/English Language Arts for this district is:
 $2\% \times 371 = 7.42$, the federal cap is rounded up to 8
 $1\% \times 371 = 3.71$, the federal cap is rounded up to 4
 3% cap = $8 + 4 = 12$

District assessment proficiency rate for Reading/English Language Arts is $294/316 = 93\%$

District AYP Proficiency Rate for Reading/English Language Arts is $284/316 = 90\%$



Assessments (met passing standard)	Total Students	Number Tested	Met Standard	AYP Calculation	
STAAR or TAKS *	287	245	240	240	
TAKS (Accommodated)	28	24	25	25	
STAAR L or LAT TAKS	10	8	7	7	
STAAR Modified and TAKS-M (subject to 2% cap)	22	19	9	cap 8	4 Exceed
LAT TAKS-M (subject to 2% cap)	5	4	3		
STAAR Alternate (subject to 1% cap)	19	16	10	cap 4	6 Exceed
Total	371	316	294	284	

* Grades 3-8 STAAR includes linguistically accommodated assessments, where applicable; and Grade 10 TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), and TAKS-M.

AYP Student Data Listings and Student Categories

Lists of student information are available to school districts that show how all students were used in the AYP results. As in previous years, student data is provided for Reading/English Language Arts and Mathematics with separate lists for students included in the campus calculation or the district calculation. School districts may also download the student lists as a data file. Additional information is included as columns on the listing to help districts and campuses identify each student. The column headings listed below are shown in the order in which they may appear on the student lists, however, this information may differ slightly from the actual student listings released to school districts in July 2012.

Econ Disadv: whether the student belongs to the Economically Disadvantaged student group

LEP Measure: whether the student was identified as LEP in the current year or either of the previous two years (appears in LEP Measure column of AYP data table for the Performance and Participation indicators)

LEP Current Year: whether the student was identified as LEP in the current year (appears in LEP Students column of AYP data table for the Performance and Participation indicators)

Special Ed: whether the student participates in a Special Education program

Grade: student's enrolled grade level

Score Code: indicates whether a student's test should be scored

Assessment: identifies the type of assessment taken by the student

Title I Program: whether the student currently participates in a Title I, Part A program

Years In U.S. School: (current-year LEP students only) how many years the student has been in U.S. schools

Mobile: whether the student was mobile and therefore not included in the performance calculation

AYP Student Listing Categories

Also included in each of the student data listings is a student category field, or Status value, that indicates how a student was counted in the AYP results:

EXCEEDED 1% CAP – MET STANDARD: Tested on STAAR Alternate, Met the passing standard, Not selected for the federal cap, Participant Counted as Not Proficient due to Federal Cap

EXCEEDED 2% CAP – MET STANDARD: Tested on STAAR Modified or TAKS–M, Met the passing standard, Not selected for the federal cap, Participant Counted as Not Proficient due to Federal Cap

NON-PROFICIENT: Participant Counted as Not Proficient, Did Not Meet Standard on Test

PROFICIENT-MET STANDARD: Participant Counted as Proficient, Met Standard on Test

PARTICIPANT: Participant Only, Not included in Performance

NON-PARTICIPANT: Absent, Not Counted as a Participant

A sample of the student data listings is shown on the following page.

AYP Student Data Listings – Reading/English Language Arts

CONFIDENTIAL
 TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
 Adequate Yearly Progress Campus Student Listing
 - indicates data is unknown or not applicable

District Name: SAMPLE ISD (999999)
 Subject: Reading/English Language Arts
 Campus Name: SAMPLE H S (999999001)

	Econ Disadv	LEP Measure	LEP Current Year	Special Ed	Grade	Score Code	Assessment	Title I Program	Years In U.S. School	Mobile
Status: EXCEEDED 1% CAP - MET STANDARD										
...										
1 STUDENT A										
2 STUDENT B										
...										
6 STUDENT F										
Status: EXCEEDED 2% CAP - MET STANDARD										
1 STUDENT G										
2 STUDENT H										
3 STUDENT I										
4 STUDENT J										
Status: NON-PROFICIENT										
1 STUDENT K										
2 STUDENT L										
...										
22 STUDENT XX										
Status: PROFICIENT-MET STANDARD										
...										
284 STUDENT XX										
Status: PARTICIPANT										
...										
41 STUDENT XX										
Status: NON-PARTICIPANT										
...										
14 STUDENT XX										
Total = 371										

Appendix D: Calculating 2012 AYP Results for Sample School

Following is a step-by-step description of the 2012 AYP Status calculation for Sample School. This example illustrates a hypothetical Title I campus receiving a preliminary 2012 AYP Status of *Missed AYP* whose sample data table is shown in *Appendix C*. The sample has been designed to maximize illustration of the information that can be provided on the data table and the types of calculations that will be performed before the preliminary release. The samples described in this section include:

AYP Data Table Results	Page 125
AYP Explanation Table	Page 135
Reconciling Student Level Data	Page 136
How to Calculate the 1% and 2% Federal Cap Limit.	Page 139

AYP Data Table Results

The 2012 AYP Data Table provides results for the following indicators. Please refer to the Sample AYP Unmasked Data Table shown in *Appendix C*.

<u>Reading/English Language Arts</u>	<u>Mathematics</u>
Performance	Performance
AYP Proficiency Rate Steps 1 – 7	AYP Proficiency Rate Steps 9 – 15
Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor Step 8	Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor Steps 16 – 17
Participation Steps 18 – 26	Participation Steps 27 – 34
Other Indicator Steps 35 – 41	

Performance: Reading/English Language Arts

AYP Proficiency Rate

All Students: Sample School tested 316 total students (students enrolled on the campus for the full academic year) in Reading/English Language Arts. Therefore, no special conditions for small campuses apply.

Step 1. All Students: 90% *Met Standard* exceeds the 87% performance standard

Student Groups: Performance minimum size requirements for the student groups is 50 students **and** the student group must also represent at least 10 percent of all students; **or** the student group is at least 200 students.

Step 2. African American: not evaluated (only 23 students tested)

Step 3. Hispanic: 89% *Met Standard* exceeds the 87% performance standard
There are 73 students who represent 23 percent of students tested, therefore minimum size criteria is met.

Step 4. White: 92% *Met Standard* exceeds the 87% performance standard
There are 198 students who represent 63 percent of students tested, therefore minimum size criteria is met.

Step 5. Economically Disadvantaged: 79% *Met Standard* does not meet the 87% performance standard – go to the improvement calculation in Step 8.
There are 107 students who represent 34 percent of students tested, therefore minimum size criteria is met.

Step 6. Special Education: not evaluated (only 16 students tested)

Step 7. LEP: not evaluated (only 35 students tested)
(Although there were only 35 LEP students tested in 2011–12, there were 56 students identified in the LEP performance measure. See *Section III* for more information.)

Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor

Improvement is calculated for any student group (or all students) that does not meet the performance standard for Reading/English Language Arts or Mathematics. The Economically Disadvantaged student group did not meet the Reading/English Language Arts performance standard. If this student group met performance improvement/safe harbor for the respective measures, they will be considered to have met the AYP performance standard. To meet performance improvement/safe harbor, students must show: 1) a 10 percent decrease from the prior year in the percent of students not passing the subject area test **and** 2) meet the absolute standard **or** meet improvement criteria on the Graduation Rate, if minimum size requirements on the Graduation Rate are met for the current year.

Calculating Improvement Required for Reading/English Language Arts

Step 8. Reading/English Language Arts performance requirement for Economically Disadvantaged student group

(1) *a 10 percent decrease from the prior year in the percent of students not passing the subject area test*

Based on Reading/English Language Arts Economically Disadvantaged students, performance improvement is determined by:
100% - 78% Met Standard in 2010-11 = 22% of students not passing the Reading/English Language Arts test in 2010-11

22% x 10% decrease = 2.2% (this rounds down to 2%, see *Section III* for rounding rules) decrease in students not passing **or**
2% increase in students Met Standard is required

Note: This calculation is the equivalent of improvement required to reach a standard of 100% in ten years.

100% - 78% Met Standard in 2010-11 = 22% improvement required to reach a standard of 100%

22% divided by 10 years = 2.2% (rounds down to 2%) improvement required over a one year period **or** 2% increase in students Met Standard is required

For the Sample School Reading/English Language Arts performance results for the Economically Disadvantaged student group, 79% Met Standard in 2011-12 **minus** 78% in 2010-11 = 1% increase, which does not meet the 2% improvement required;

and

(2) meet the Graduation Rate criteria *if minimum size requirements on the Graduation Rate are met for the current year alone.*

Graduation Rate minimum size requirements for the student groups in the current year of 50 students, **and** the student group must also represent at least 10 percent of all students; **or** the student group is at least 200 students. This school must then meet the 2012 AYP Graduation Rate criteria (see step 37, other indicator, for more information).

However, due to lack of required improvement, the Reading/English Language Arts performance requirement for Economically Disadvantaged students is not met.

The Reading/English Language Arts Performance requirement is not met due to the Economically Disadvantaged student group.

Performance: Mathematics

AYP Proficiency Rate

All Students: Sample School tested 318 total students (students enrolled on the campus for the full academic year) in Mathematics. Therefore, no special conditions for small campuses apply.

Step 9. All Students: 88% *Met Standard* exceeds the 83% performance standard

Student Groups: Performance minimum size requirements for the student groups is 50 students **and** the student group must also represent at least 10 percent of all students; **or** the student group is at least 200 students.

Step 10. African American: not evaluated (only 23 students tested)

Step 11. Hispanic: 85% *Met Standard* exceeds the 83% performance standard
There are 74 students who represent 23 percent of students tested, therefore minimum size criteria is met.

Step 12. White: 86% *Met Standard* exceeds the 83% performance standard
There are 198 students who represent 62 percent of students tested, therefore minimum size criteria is met.

Step 13. Economically Disadvantaged: 77% *Met Standard* does not meet the 83% performance standard - go to performance improvement/safe harbor calculation in Step 16
There are 112 students who represent 35 percent of students tested, therefore minimum size criteria is met.

Step 14. Special Education: not evaluated (only 20 students tested)

Step 15. LEP: 75% *Met Standard* - does not meet the 83% performance standard - go to performance improvement/safe harbor calculation in Step 17

There are 50 LEP students who represent 16 percent of students tested in 2011-12, therefore minimum size criteria is met. The percent *Met Standard* is based on the performance results of 53 students identified in the LEP performance measure. (See *Section III* for more information.)

Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor

Step 16. The Economically Disadvantaged student group in Sample School did not meet the Mathematics performance standard.

Improvement Required:

100% - 76% *Met Standard* in 2010-11 = 24% improvement required to reach a standard of 100%

24% divided by 10 years = 2.4% (this rounds down to 2%, see *Section III* for rounding rules) improvement required over a one year period or 2% increase in students *Met Standard* is required

For the Sample School Mathematics performance results for the Economically Disadvantaged student group, 77% *Met Standard* in 2011-12 minus 76% in 2010-11 = 1% increase, which does not meet the 2% gain required

However, regardless of the outcome of the other measure, the Mathematics performance requirement for Economically Disadvantaged students is not met due to lack of required improvement.

Step 17. The LEP student group in Sample School did not meet the **Mathematics** performance standard.

Improvement Required:

100% - 70% *Met Standard* in 2010-11 = 30% improvement required to reach a standard of 100%

30% divided by 10 years = 3% improvement required over a one year period **or** 3% increase in students *Met Standard* is required

For the Sample School Mathematics performance results for the LEP student group, 75% *Met Standard* in 2011-12 **minus** 70% in 2010-11 = 5% increase, which meets the 3% gain required;

and

Graduation Rate minimum size requirements for student groups in current year of 50 students and the student group represents at least 10 percent of all students are not met. Minimum size criteria for the graduation rate LEP student group is based on the number of students identified as LEP in the four-year longitudinal graduation/completion total in class for the class of 2011. The Class of 2011 four-year longitudinal cohort Number in Class of 13 students does not meet the minimum size requirement – meeting the Graduation Rate criteria is not required.

The Mathematics performance requirement for LEP students is met.

Participation: Reading/English Language Arts

All Students: All Students participation rate is evaluated if at least 40 students are enrolled on the day of testing.

Step 18. All Students: 96% participation – exceeds the 95% participation standard
There are 371 students enrolled on the test date; minimum size criteria are met.

Student Groups: Participation minimum size requirements for the student groups is 50 students, **and** the student group must also represent at least 10 percent of all students; **or** the student group is at least 200 students.

Step 19. African American: not evaluated (only 30 students enrolled on the test date)

Step 20. Hispanic: 96% participation – exceeds 95% participation standard
There are 97 students who represent 26 percent of students enrolled on the test date, therefore minimum size criteria is met.

Step 21. White: 94% participation – does not meet 95% standard – use the average participation rate (below).
There are 220 students enrolled on the test date, which is greater than the 200 student minimum size requirement.

Step 22. White Average Two-Year Participation Rate: 95% participation – meets the 95% participation standard.

The total number participating for 2011-12 is 207, and for 2010-11, 215. The total participants for both years is 422. The total number of students for 2011-12 of 220, combined with the total for 2010-11 of 224 is 444. The average participation rate is $422 / 444 = 95\%$.

Step 23. Economically Disadvantaged: 94% participation – does not meet 95% standard – use the average participation rate. There are 121 students who represent 33 percent of students enrolled on the test date; minimum size criteria are met.

Step 24. Economically Disadvantaged Average Two-Year Participation Rate: 93% participation – does not meet 95% participation standard

The total number participating for 2011-12 and 2010-11 is $114 + 98 = 212$. The total number of students for 2011-12 and 2010-11 is $121 + 108 = 229$. The average participation rate is $212 / 229 = 93\%$.

Step 25. Special Education: not evaluated (only 39 students enrolled on the test date)

Step 26. LEP: not evaluated (only 47 students enrolled on the test date)

Participation: Mathematics

All Students: All Students participation rate is evaluated if at least 40 students are enrolled on the day of testing.

Step 27. All Students: 95% participation – meets the 95% participation standard
There are 370 students enrolled on the test date.

Student Groups: Participation minimum size requirements for the student groups is 50 students, **and** the student group must also represent at least 10 percent of all students; **or** the student group is at least 200 students.

Step 28. African American: not evaluated (only 26 students enrolled on the test date)

Step 29. Hispanic: 90% participation – does not meet 95% participation standard – use the average two-year participation rate. There are 100 students who represent 27 percent of students enrolled on the test date.

Step 30. Hispanic Average Two-Year Participation Rate: 91% participation – does not meet 95% participation standard
The average participation rate is the total number participating for 2011-12 and 2010-11 ($90 + 90 = 180$) divided by the total number of students for 2011-12 and 2010-11 ($100 + 98 = 198$), or 91%.

- Step 31. White: 96% participation – exceeds 95% participation standard
There are 215 students enrolled on the test date, which is greater than the 200 student minimum size requirement.
- Step 32. Economically Disadvantaged: 95% participation – meets the 95% participation standard
There are 123 students who represent 33 percent of students enrolled on the test date.
- Step 33. Special Education: not evaluated (only 39 students enrolled on the test date)
- Step 34. LEP: 95% participation – meets the 95% participation standard
There are 58 students who represent 16 percent of students enrolled on the test date.

Other Indicator

Graduation Rate is the Other Indicator for Sample School.

Beginning in 2012, districts and campuses are required to meet the Graduation Rate standard for each student group for the additional Other Indicator.

All Students: All Students Graduation Rate is evaluated if the Number in Class is at least 40 students. The 2012 AYP Graduation Rate goal and alternative targets are evaluated when the minimum size criteria are met.

Step 35. Evaluate the 2012 AYP Graduation Rate criteria.

All Students: there are 326 students in the total Number in Class which meets the minimum size criteria. The graduation rate criteria are evaluated including the goal, targets, and each alternative.

Four-year Longitudinal Graduation Rates

(1) Graduation Rate Statewide Goal of 90%

The Class of 2011 four-year Graduation Rate of 72.7% does not meet the goal.

(2) 2011 Annual Graduation Rate Target of 75%

Since the goal was not met, the annual target is measured. The Class of 2011 four-year Graduation Rate of 72.7% does not meet the annual target.

Graduation Rate Alternative Targets:

- (3) *Safe Harbor Target defined as a 10% decrease in difference between the prior year rate and the Goal*
Since the annual target was not met, the safe harbor target is measured. The safe harbor target is determined by the goal 90.0% - 78.9% the Class of 2010 four-year Graduation Rate = 11.1% difference,

11.1% x 10% decrease = 1.1% safe harbor target required.

The 72.7% Class of 2011 Graduation Rate *minus* the 78.9% Class of 2010 four-year Graduation Rate = - 6.2 improvement, which does not meet the safe harbor target.

- (4) *Improvement Target of 1.0 percent increase from the prior year*
Since the safe harbor target was not met, the improvement is measured. 72.7% Graduation Rate minus the Class of 2010 four-year Graduation Rate 78.9% = - 6.2 improvement shown. This does not meet the 1.0% improvement requirement.

Five-year longitudinal Graduation Rate Target of 80%

The final alternative is the five-year graduation rate. The Class of 2010 five-year Graduation Rate of 80.3% meets the five-year annual target.

The Graduation Rate for All Students is met.

Continue to evaluate each student group for Graduation Rate.

Student Groups: Graduation Rate minimum size requirements for the student groups is 50 students, **and** the student group must also represent at least 10 percent of all students; **or** the student group is at least 200 students.

Step 36. African American: not evaluated (only 15 students in the four-year longitudinal completion total.)

Step 37. Hispanic: not evaluated (only 33 students in the four-year longitudinal completion total.)

Step 38. White: there are 278 students in the four-year longitudinal completion total. The graduation rate criteria are evaluated including the goal, targets, and each alternative.

Four-year Longitudinal Graduation Rates

(1) Graduation Rate Statewide Goal of 90%

The white student group 2011 four-year Graduation Rate of 76.3% does not meet the goal.

(2) 2011 Annual Graduation Rate Target of 75%

Since the goal was not met, the annual target is measured. The white student group 2011 four-year Graduation Rate of 76.3% meets the annual target.

Step 39. Economically Disadvantaged: there are 147 students in the four-year longitudinal completion total who represent 45 percent of the total Number in Class which meets the minimum size criteria. The graduation rate criteria are evaluated including the goal, targets, and each alternative.

Four-year Longitudinal Graduation Rates

(1) Graduation Rate Statewide Goal of 90%

The Economically Disadvantaged student group 2011 four-year Graduation Rate of 66.7% does not meet the goal.

(2) 2011 Annual Graduation Rate Target of 75%

Since the goal was not met, the annual target is measured. The Economically Disadvantaged student group 2011 four-year Graduation Rate of 66.7% does not meet the annual target.

Graduation Rate Alternative Targets:

(3) Safe Harbor Target defined as a 10% decrease in difference between the prior year rate and the Goal

Since the annual target was not met, the safe harbor target is measured. The safe harbor target is determined by the goal 90.0% - 74.3% the Class of 2010 four-year Graduation Rate = 15.7% difference,

15.7% x 10% decrease = 1.6% safe harbor target required.

The 66.7% Class of 2011 Graduation Rate *minus* the 74.3% Class of 2010 four-year Graduation Rate = - 7.6 improvement, which does not meet the safe harbor target.

(4) Improvement Target of 1.0 percent increase from the prior year

Since the safe harbor target was not met, the improvement is measured. 66.7% Graduation Rate minus the Class of 2010 four-year Graduation Rate 74.3% = - 7.6 improvement shown. This does not meet the 1.0% improvement requirement.

Five-year longitudinal Graduation Rate Target of 80%

The final alternative is the five-year graduation rate. The Class of 2010 five-year Graduation Rate of 79.1% does not meet the five-year annual target.

The Economically Disadvantaged student group Graduation Rate requirement is not met.

Step 40. Special Education: not evaluated (only 41 students in the four-year longitudinal completion total.)

Step 41. LEP: not evaluated (only 13 students in the four-year longitudinal completion total.)

AYP Explanation Table

Sample School does not meet the AYP requirement in five measures:

- Reading/English Language Arts performance requirement due to the economically disadvantaged student group (Step 8 of this example), the explanation table shows that this student group did not meet the standard because of the federal cap. The symbol “%” appears in the appropriate column.
- Mathematics performance requirement due to the economically disadvantaged student group (Step 16 of this example), the explanation table shows that this measure missed AYP. The symbol “X” appears in the appropriate column for this measure.
- Reading/English Language Arts participation requirement due to the economically disadvantaged student group (Steps 23 and 24 of this example), the symbol “X” appears in the explanation table for this measure.
- Mathematics participation requirement due to the Hispanic student group (Steps 29 and 30 of this example), the symbol “X” appears in the explanation table for this measure.
- Other indicator requirement (Graduation Rate) due to the Economically Disadvantaged student group (Step 39 of this example), the symbol “X” appears in the explanation table for this measure.

The campus will receive a 2012 AYP Status of *Missed AYP*.

Performance Measure failure due to the Federal Cap

The symbol “%” in the explanation table for the economically disadvantaged student group indicates that without the application of the 1% and 2% federal caps, this student group would have met the AYP performance requirement. Page 1 of the 2012 AYP Source Data Table (see page 119) indicates that the economically disadvantaged student group would have met the performance improvement/safe harbor calculation had the federal cap not been applied.

Reconciling Student Level Data

Since 2004, school districts have received AYP student listings in order to identify how students were processed for the AYP campus or district results and to identify the number of students who exceed the cap.

Refer to the sample AYP Unmasked Data Table and sample AYP Source Data Table. The AYP Explanation Table shown on page 113 indicates that the same five AYP measures were not met as described above.

Reading/English Language Arts Performance

The AYP Data Table categories are shown on the student data listing and may be reconciled or matched to the data table total for each district and campus. The following steps help describe how the AYP Reading/English Language Arts student listings match the AYP data table for the sample school shown in *Appendix C*.

AYP Student List, Total Students “TOTAL =”

Step 1. Page 3 of the 2012 AYP Unmasked Data Table (see page 111).

Participation: Reading/English Language Arts 2011-12 Assessments

All Students group, number of *Total Students*: 371

Step 2. 2012 AYP Student Data Listings for subject: **Reading/English Language Arts** (see page 124). Begin at the bottom of the listing.

Total = 371

AYP Student List category labeled “NON-PARTICIPANT”

Step 1. Page 3 of the 2012 AYP Unmasked Data Table

All Students group, number of *Total Students*: 371

All Students group, total *Number Participating*: 357

Difference in the numerator: $371 - 357 = 14$

Step 2. 2012 AYP Student Data Listings for the same subject.

The AYP Student Listing category labeled “NON-PARTICIPANT” shows 14 students. These were not included in the *Number Participating*.

Step 3. The 2012 AYP Unmasked Data Table, **Explanation Table** (see page 113) that indicates the economically disadvantaged student group *Missed AYP* due to the Participation rate.

Page 3 of the 2012 AYP Unmasked Data Table shows (see page 111.)

Economically disadvantaged student group, *Number Participating*: 114

Economically disadvantaged student group, *Total Students*: 121

Difference in the numerator: $121 - 114 = 7$

Step 4. 2012 AYP Student Data Listings for the same subject.

The AYP Student Listing category labeled “NON-PARTICIPANT” shows 14 students. Seven of the students shown (not shown in the example student listing) will indicate they are included in the economically disadvantaged student group.

AYP Student List category labeled “PARTICIPANT”

Step 1. Page 3 of the 2012 AYP Unmasked Data Table
All Students group, total *Number Participating*: 357

Step 2. Page 1 of the 2012 AYP Unmasked Data Table (see page 109.)

Performance: Reading/English Language Arts
2011-12 Assessments

All Students group, total *Number Tested*: 316
Difference: $357 - 316 = 41$

Step 3. 2012 AYP Student Data Listings for the same subject

The AYP Student Listing category labeled “PARTICIPANT” shows 41 students. These were not included in the performance measure, *Number Tested*.

AYP Student List category labeled “PROFICIENT-MET STANDARD”

Step 1. Page 1 of the 2012 AYP Unmasked Data Table

All Students group, total that *Met Standard*: 284

Step 2. 2012 AYP Student Data Listings for the same subject.

The AYP Student Listing category labeled “PROFICIENT” shows 284 students. This category includes student test results that met the passing standard that were selected for inclusion in the 1% and 2% federal caps.

AYP Student List category labels “EXCEEDED 1% CAP” and “EXCEEDED 2% CAP”

Step 1. Page 1 of the 2012 AYP Unmasked Data Table

All Students group, total *Met Standard*: 284

Step 2. Page 1 of the 2012 AYP Source Data Table (see page 119)

Performance: Reading/English Language Arts
2011-12 Assessments

All Students group, total *Met Standard*: 294

Difference: $294 - 284 = 10$

Step 3. The 2012 AYP Unmasked Data Table, **Explanation Table** (see page 113) that indicates the economically disadvantaged student group failed to *Meet AYP* due to the federal caps.

Page 1 of the 2012 AYP Unmasked Data Table shows

Economically disadvantaged student group, number that *Met Standard*: 84

Step 4. Page 1 of the 2012 AYP Source Data Table

Economically disadvantaged student group, number that *Met Standard*: 88

Difference: $88 - 84 = 4$

Step 5. 2012 AYP Student Data Listings for the same subject.

The AYP Student Listing categories labeled “EXCEEDED” show a total of 10 students. Four of the students shown (not shown in the example student listing) will indicate they are included in the economically disadvantaged student group.

How to Calculate the 1% and 2% Federal Cap Limits

The following steps describe the Sample District Federal Cap Calculation shown in *Appendix C* for the subject Reading/English Language Arts only. *Section III* of the AYP Guide describes the calculation for a school district’s federal cap limit.

Reading/English Language Arts

Step 1. **AYP participation denominator:** The number of students enrolled in Sample ISD in Grades 3 – 8 and 10 on the day of testing, is reported as the AYP District Participation denominator by subject.

The third page of the 2012 AYP Unmasked Data Table (see page 111)

Performance: Reading/English Language Arts

2011-12 Assessments

All Students group, number of *Total Students*: 371

Step 2. **Calculate the Cap Limits:** The federal cap limits are calculated for STAAR Modified, TAKS–M, and STAAR Alternate separately.

STAAR Modified and TAKS–M 2% federal cap limit is $371 \times .02 = 7.42$. The percentage is rounded up to the next whole number for any decimal value, so the 2% limit is 8.

STAAR Alternate 1% federal cap limit is $371 \times .01 = 3.71$. The percentage is rounded up to the next whole number for any decimal value, so the 1% limit is 4.

The overall 3% federal cap on both STAAR Modified, TAKS–M, and STAAR Alternate is $8 + 4 = 12$.

Step 3. **Identify the overall Performance results:** The sample federal cap calculation includes a table of possible assessment results submitted from Sample ISD. The sample Source data table shows

Total, *Met Standard*: 294

Total, *Number Tested*: 316

District assessment proficiency rate: $294 / 316 = 93\%$

Step 4. **AYP Proficiency Rate:** The sample federal cap assessment table shows

Total, *AYP Calculation*: 284

Total, *Number Tested*: 316

District AYP performance rate: $284 / 316 = 90\%$

Identify the number of students that exceed the cap

Step 5. **STAAR Modified and TAKS–M results:** The sample federal cap assessment table on page 121 shows 12 students met the STAAR Modified and TAKS–M student passing standard. The federal cap determines the number of students that exceed the cap limit and reclassifies those students to non-proficient for AYP purposes.

STAAR Modified and TAKS–M, *Met Standard:* 9

LAT TAKS–M, *Met Standard:* 3

Total: 12

STAAR Modified and TAKS–M, *AYP Calculation:* 8

(The 2% federal cap limit on STAAR Modified and TAKS–M)

Number of students that exceed the 2% cap limit: $12 - 8 = 4$

Step 6. **STAAR Alternate results:** The sample federal cap assessment table shows 10 students met the STAAR Alternate student passing standard. The number of STAAR Alternate student results that exceed the cap limit is calculated below.

STAAR Alternate, *Met Standard:* 10

STAAR Alternate, *AYP Calculation:* 4

(The 1% federal cap limit on STAAR Alternate)

Number of students that exceed the cap limit on STAAR Alternate: $10 - 4 = 6$

Step 7. 2012 AYP Student Data Listings for the same subject.

The AYP Student Listing category labeled “EXCEEDED 1% CAP” and “EXCEEDED 2% CAP” shows a total of 10 students, which include students that were not selected for the 1% and 2% federal caps tested on either STAAR Modified, TAKS–M, or STAAR Alternate. Four of the students will be displayed with a STAAR Modified or TAKS–M assessment, and six will be shown with STAAR Alternate.

Appendix E: NCLB Report Card Preview

The NCLB Report Card (RC) is issued annually by states as required by federal regulation in order to report student achievement and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) information for the state, local educational agency (school district), and school or campus. The Texas NCLB Report Card is presented in five parts and provides 1) Assessment Data, 2) Accountability Data, 3) AYP and School Improvement Program (SIP) data, 4) Teacher Quality Data, and 5) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) information. The NCLB RC report may be accessed at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=2147493710>.

In January, 2013, TEA will release the 2012 NCLB RC including Part I: Student Achievement results. Part I contains student participation and performance data that differs substantially from AYP. NCLB RC Part I data is reported by grade, and includes percent of students by achievement level, such as Percent Not Meeting Standard (Basic), Percent Met Standard (Proficient), and Percent Commended (Advanced). In addition, Science assessment information is reported, along with twelve federally required Student Groups.

The major calculation differences between AYP and NCLB RC are outlined below:

- NCLB RC includes all students, including those that do not meet the criteria for full academic year, and
- NCLB RC does not apply the federal caps (the 1% or 2% caps), therefore students exceeding the cap in AYP are considered proficient in NCLB RC results.

In order to assist districts in understanding NCLB RC Part I data, TEA will provide a confidential unmasked NCLB RC Preview Report to school districts via TEASE in November/December, 2012. The 2012 AYP Student Data Download may be used to reconcile the results for student groups reported in AYP that are also reported in the NCLB RC results.

For more information on the NCLB RC Preview Report or the assessment results reported on the NCLB RC provided in January, 2013, contact the Division of Performance Reporting. For more information on the distribution requirements of the NCLB Report Card, please contact Division of Federal and State Education Policy at (512) 463-9414.

A sample of the NCLB RC Preview Report Card is shown below.

C O N F I D E N T I A L
 T E X A S E D U C A T I O N A G E N C Y
 2012 NCLB Report Card Preview

Campus Name: Sample School (999999999) Sample ISD

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Econ. Disadv.	Special Education	LEP (Measure)	LEP (Students)
2011-12 NCLB RC Part I: Student Achievement Rate (Includes All Students)								
Reading/ELA grades 3 - 8 & 10								
Met Standard	314	22	75	185	85	13		45
Number Tested	352	26	88	202	109	18		54
% Met Standard	89%	85%	85%	92%	78%	72%		83%
% Not Meeting Standard	11%	15%	15%	8%	22%	28%		17%
Mathematics grades 3 - 8 & 10								
Met Standard	304	21	77	173	86	16		40
Number Tested	347	24	90	201	112	22		53
% Met Standard	88%	88%	86%	86%	77%	73%		75%
% Not Meeting Standard	12%	12%	14%	14%	23%	27%		25%

Appendix G: Regional Education Service Center (ESC) Contacts

Representatives from each of the ESCs will receive updates on AYP. If you have questions about this topic, please call your ESC. The trained ESC contact may be able to respond more quickly to your concerns than will Texas Education Agency staff.

Region	Location	Contact	Telephone	E-mail	Fax
1	Edinburg	Omar Chavez Belinda Gorena	(956) 984-6240 (956) 984-6173	ochavez@esc1.net bgorena@esc1.net	(956) 984-7655 (956) 984-7655
2	Corpus Christi	Andi Kuyatt Dr. Sonia Perez Dawn Schuenemann Joel Trudeau	(361) 561-8516 (361) 561-8407 (361) 561-8551 (361) 561-8504	andi.kuyatt@esc2.us sonia.perez@esc2.us dawn.schuenemann@esc2.us joel.trudeau@esc2.us	(361) 561-8535 (361) 883-3442 (361) 883-3442 (361) 561-8535
3	Victoria	Linda Easterling Brenda O'Bannon Dina Rogers Nancy Sandlin	(361) 576-4804 x242 (361) 576-4804 x212 (361) 576-4804 x237 (361) 576-4804 x252	leasterling@esc3.net bobannon@esc3.net drogers@esc3.net nsandlin@esc3.net	(361) 576-4804
4	Houston	Donna Azodi Sherri McCord Liselotte Thompson	(713) 744-7865 (713) 744-6596 (713) 744-6357	dazodi@esc4.net smccord@esc4.net lthompson@esc4.net	(713) 744-2731 (713) 744-0697 (713) 744-2731
5	Beaumont	David Hicks Monica Mahfouz	(409) 923-5401 (409) 923-5411	dhicks@esc5.net mmahfouz@esc5.net	(409) 923-5471 (409) 923-5470
6	Huntsville	Mark Kroschel Jayne Tavenner Carol Williams	(936) 435-8300 (936) 435-8242 (936) 435-8355	mkroschel@esc6.net jtavenner@esc6.net cwilliams2@esc6.net	(936) 293-3773 (936) 435-8484 (936) 435-8480
7	Kilgore	Cinda Farrell Toni Martin Diana McBurnett Glenda Weddle	(903) 988-6822 (903) 988-6763 (903) 988-6909 (903) 988-6837	cfarrell@esc7.net tmartin@esc7.net dmcburnett@esc7.net gweddle@esc7.net	(903) 988-6860
8	Mt Pleasant	Karla Coker Karen Thompson	(903) 575-2731 (903) 575-2616	kcoker@reg8.net karen.thompson@reg8.net	(903) 575-2634 (903) 575-2611
9	Wichita Falls	Jean Ashton Christie Walker	(940) 322-6928 (940) 322-6928 x3227	jean.ashton@esc9.net christie.walker@esc9.net	(940) 767-3836
10	Richardson	Cathy Gray Jan Moberley	(972) 348-1438 (972) 348-1426	cathy.gray@region10.org jan.moberley@region10.org	(972) 348-1439 (972) 231-3642

Region	Location	Contact	Telephone	E-mail	Fax
11	Fort Worth	Laura Hill	(817) 740-7544	lhill@esc11.net	(817) 740-3622
12	Waco	Barbara Agee Carie Downes Stephanie Kucera	(254) 297-1238 (254) 297-1252 (254) 297-1154	bagee@esc12.net cdownes@esc12.net skucera@esc12.net	(254) 666-0823
13	Austin	Kimberly Berry Craig Henderson Sigi Huerta Mark Kemp Erin Monge	(512) 919-5179 (512) 919-5390 (512) 919-5324 (512) 919-5253 (512) 919-5303	kim.berry@esc13.txed.net craig.henderson@esc13.txed.net sigi.huerta@esc13.txed.net mark.kemp@esc13.txed.net erin.monge@esc13.txed.net	(512) 919-5215 (512) 919-5390 (512) 919-5430 (512) 919-5430 (512) 919-5215
14	Abilene	Rose Burks Randy Deming Emilia Moreno Lucy Smith Karen Turner	(325) 675-8659 (325) 675-8643 (325) 675-8674 (325) 675-8641 (325) 675-8645	rburks@esc14.net rdeming@esc14.net emoreno@esc14.net lmsmith@esc14.net keturner@esc14.net	(325) 675-8659
15	San Angelo	Dean Munn Joyce Sprott Laura Strube	(325) 658-6571	dean.munn@netxv.net joyce.sprott@netxv.net laura.strube@netxv.net	(325) 655-4823
16	Amarillo	Vickie Ansley Becky Book Shirley Clark Carolyn Mulanax	(806) 677-5134 (806) 677-5127 (806) 677-5130 (806) 677-5133	vickie.ansley@esc16.net becky.book@esc16.net shirley.clark@esc16.net carolyn.mulanax@esc16.net	(806) 677-5001
17	Lubbock	DeAnn Drake Francisco Rodriguez Linda Rowntree Marilyn Stone Larry Williams	(806) 281-5819 (806) 281-5890 (806) 281-5892 (806) 281-5831 (806) 281-5808	deann@esc17.net frodriguez@esc17.net lrowntree@esc17.net mstone@esc17.net lwilliams@esc17.net	(806) 799-7953
18	Midland	Kelli Crain Kim Sexton Frank Gomez Kaye Orr John Petree Cheree Smith Jamy Swinford	(432) 567-3217 (432) 537-3268 (432) 567-3226 (432) 567-3244 (432) 561-4385 (432) 567-3288 (432) 561-4350	kcrain@esc18.net ksexton@esc18.net frgomez@esc18.net kayeorr@esc18.net jpetree@esc18.net csmith@esc18.net jswinfor@esc18.net	(432) 567-3290
19	El Paso	Anthony Fraga Rebecca Ontiveros	(915) 780-6553 (915) 780-5093	afraga@esc19.net rontiveros@esc19.net	(915) 780-5033
20	San Antonio	Sheila Collazo	(210) 370-5481	sheila.collazo@esc20.net	(210) 370-5755

Appendix H: TEA Contacts

For questions related to AYP, contact the Division of Performance Reporting by calling the number listed below, writing to this division at: Texas Education Agency, 1701 N. Congress Ave., Austin, Texas 78701-1494, or e-mailing the division at performance.reporting@tea.state.tx.us. The website for Adequate Yearly Progress is <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/>.

Subject	Division Name and Website	Telephone
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	Performance Reporting http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/	(512) 463-9704
Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD)	Division of Federal and State Education Policy http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/	(512) 463-9414
Charter Schools	Charter Schools http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/charter/	(512) 463-9575
Communications	Communications and State Board of Education Support Communications Website	(512) 463-9000
<i>No Child Left Behind Act</i> (NCLB)	Division of NCLB Program Coordination NCLB Program Coordination Website	(512) 463-9414
Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System	Performance-Based Monitoring Performance-Based Monitoring	(512) 936-6426
	Program Monitoring and Interventions Program Monitoring and Interventions	(512) 463-9414
Residential Facilities Tracking System	Program Monitoring and Interventions http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/pmi/rfmon/	(512) 463-9414
State Accountability Ratings	Performance Reporting http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/	(512) 463-9704
State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) and other Assessment/Testing	Student Assessment Student Assessment Website Pearson Pearson Texas Assessment Website	(512) 463-9536
Title I School Improvement Program (SIP)	School Improvement and Support Division Title I, Part A - School Improvement	(512) 463-7582

Appendix I: Inclusion or Exclusion of Performance Data

Campus Type	Campus-Level and Student-Level Processing	
	Four-Year Graduation (Class of 2011)	STAAR / TAKS (2011-12)
TJJD-TJPC	<p>PEIMS student attribution codes 08, 13, 14, and 15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove students from serving district results. Remove students from serving campus results if the campus is a regular campus. <p>Data remaining after student-level processing are included in the evaluation of the TJPC campus.</p> <p>The TJPC campus is excluded from the district results for cohort years 1-3.</p>	<p>PEIMS student attribution codes 13 and 14 remove results from serving district results.</p>
TJJD-TYC	<p>PEIMS student attribution codes 17, 18, and 19:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove students from serving district results. Remove students from serving campus results if the campus is a regular campus. <p>Data remaining after student-level processing are included in the evaluation of the TYC campus.</p> <p>The TYC campus is excluded from the district results for cohort years 1-3.</p>	<p>PEIMS student attribution codes 17 and 18 remove results from serving district results.</p>
RTF	<p>PEIMS student attribution codes 09, 21, 22, and 23:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove students from serving district results. Remove students from serving campus results. <p>Data remaining after student-level processing are included in the evaluation of the RTF campus.</p>	<p>PEIMS student attribution codes 21 and 22 remove results from serving district results.</p>
JJAEP / DAEP	<p>Longitudinal data are attributed to non-JJAEP/DAEP campuses using PEIMS attendance data or district-supplied campus of accountability. Students who cannot be attributed to a non-JJAEP/DAEP campus remain attributed to the JJAEP/DAEP campus. Students attributed to the JJAEP/DAEP campus will be included in the district results.</p>	<p>No assessment data should be reported to JJAEP or DAEP campuses. Data reported mistakenly to JJAEP or DAEP campuses will be included in the district results.</p>

Appendix I: Inclusion or Exclusion of Performance Data (continued)

Campus Type	Campus-Level and Student-Level Processing
	Five-Year Graduation (Class of 2010)
TJJD-TJPC	<p>PEIMS student attribution codes 08, 13, 14, and 15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove students from serving district results. • Remove dropouts from serving campus results if the campus is a regular campus. <p>Data remaining after student-level processing are included in the evaluation of the TJPC campus.</p> <p>The TJPC campus is excluded from the district results for cohort years 1-4.</p>
TJJD-TYC	<p>PEIMS student attribution codes 17, 18, and 19:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove students from serving district results. • Remove dropouts from serving campus results if the campus is a regular campus. <p>Data remaining after student-level processing are included in the evaluation of the TYC campus.</p> <p>The TYC campus is excluded from the district results for cohort years 1-4.</p>
RTF	<p>PEIMS student attribution codes 09, 21, 22, and 23:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove students from serving district results. • Remove dropouts from serving campus results. <p>Data remaining after student-level processing are included in the evaluation of the RTF campus.</p>
JJAEP / DAEP	<p>Longitudinal data are attributed to non-JJAEP/DAEP campuses using PEIMS attendance data or district-supplied campus of accountability. Students who cannot be attributed to a non-JJAEP/DAEP campus remain attributed to the JJAEP/DAEP campus. Students attributed to the JJAEP/DAEP campus will be included in the district results.</p>

Section IX: Index

A

- Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)
 - districts and campuses evaluated, 15
- Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) Committee, 147
- Alternative Education (AEC) Campuses, 15
 - Graduation rate appeals, 75
- Appeals, 14, 71, 72, 76, 81, 83, 96
 - allowable, 72
 - current year attendance, 78
 - date begin accepting, 71
 - deadline, 14
 - Graduation rate, 75
 - participation, 74
 - reading and mathematics, 73
 - special circumstances, 79, 81, 84
 - STAAR testing requirements, 80
 - student attribution codes, 74
 - submitting written, 81
 - TEASE automated online appeal request form, 81, 83
- Assessment and Student Passing Standards for 2012 AYP Evaluations, 40
- Assessments Included in AYP Calculations, 26
- Attendance Rate, 17, 19, 23, 51, 52, 58, 59, 61, 63, 64, 76, 78, 79
 - improvement standard, 58
 - minimum size requirement, 58
 - standard, 58
- AYP Calculations Approved, 13
- AYP Calendar, 13
- AYP Status, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 62, 63, 64, 71, 78, 81, 83, 96, 125, 135
 - Appeals, 73
 - Calculation of, 125
 - Determination of, 20
 - Meets AYP, 18, 62
 - Missed AYP, 18, 51, 125
 - Not Evaluated, 63
 - special circumstances, 61
 - student level data, 136

C

- Charter Schools, 12, 15, 16, 90, 147
 - New, 15
- Comparison of 2011 and 2012 AYP Systems, 15
- Components
 - Participation, 29
 - Performance, 36
- Crisis Code Related to 2011 Central Texas Wildfires, 79

D

- Data Table Categories, 25
- Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP), 16, 18, 148, 149

E

- Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), 11, 31, 93, 94
- Exceptions, 65, 69
 - deadline, 14
 - Federal Cap, 13

F

- Federal Cap, 13, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 65, 121, 139
 - 1% State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness Alternate (STAAR Alternate), 65, 67, 69, 70
 - 2% State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness Modified (STAAR Modified), 40, 41, 43, 44, 65
 - campus priority list, 13, 43
 - campus ranking, 43, 80
- Federal Cap Recapture Process, 43, 48, 67, 69
- Federal Race and Ethnicity Reporting, 89
- Future Considerations, 93

G

Grade 10 ELA and Mathematics Assessments, 11, 20, 28, 75
Grades 3–8 and 10, 15, 16, 20, 29, 35, 48, 49, 62, 63, 64, 81
Grades 3–8 Reading and Mathematics Assessments, 11, 21, 27
Graduation Rate, 12, 17, 19, 23, 51, 52, 53, 55, 57, 61, 63, 64, 76, 127, 128, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135
 five-year longitudinal graduation rate, 23, 55, 75, 78, 133, 135
 four-year longitudinal graduation rate, 23, 75, 78, 132, 134
 goals and targets, 19, 53, 54, 132, 134
 improvement requirement, 53, 54, 55, 133, 135
 minimum size requirement, 55
 safe harbor, 54, 133, 134
 Special Provision for Residential Treatment Facilities, 57
 student groups, 15, 19, 56

I

Indicators, 19, 20, 25, 63, 64, 75, 81

J

Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP), 16, 18, 148, 149

L

Language Proficiency Assessment Committee (LPAC), 21, 22, 29, 30, 75, 76
Limited English proficient (LEP), 12, 22, 29, 35, 48, 49, 56, 57, 76, 126, 129, 130, 131, 132
Linguistically Accommodated Testing (LAT), 21, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 39, 48, 75, 121, 141

M

Mathematics, 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, 25, 29, 36, 37, 48, 49, 50, 52, 57, 59, 60, 63, 64, 72, 76, 78, 81, 96, 127, 128, 130, 131, 135
Minimum size requirements, 12, 16, 19, 36, 57, 58, 59, 63, 127, 128, 130
 Attendance Rate, 58
 Graduation Rate, 55
 Participation, 35
 Performance, 49

N

New
 Campuses, 15
 District or Campus Numbers and AYP, 16
 Districts, 15
New Features of the AYP System, 15
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), 11, 12, 13, 22, 31, 40, 61, 71, 94, 142
Not Evaluated, 15, 18, 51, 58, 62, 64, 126, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135
 campuses that close mid-year, 16
 charter campuses with no students in Grades 3–8 and 10, 16
 JJAEP and DAEP campuses, 16
 new campuses, 15

O

Other Circumstance Exceptions, 67
 Appeals, 14
Other Indicator, 16, 17, 19, 23, 52, 61, 63, 64, 78, 81, 100, 132, 135
 Appeals and Safe Harbor, 74
 Attendance Rate, 58
 Graduation Rate, 52

P

Pairing, 62
 Prekindergarten and kindergarten (PK/K) campuses, 64, 80
Participation
 Average participation rate, 19, 36
 calculating participation measures, 29
 student groups evaluated, 35
Participation standard, 17, 19, 36, 60, 63, 64, 130, 131, 132
Performance improvement, 17, 19, 50, 51, 57, 59, 60, 62, 76, 78, 127, 129
 calculation, 50, 51, 127, 129
Performance Measures
 calculating performance measures, 37
 count of total students tested, 37
 student groups evaluated, 48
 uniform averaging, 62
Performance standard, 16, 17, 19, 50, 62, 64, 76, 78, 126, 127, 128
 2002-03 to 2013-14 Annual Measurable Objectives Chart, 94
 Full Academic Year, 17, 37
Prekindergarten and Kindergarten (PK/K) Campuses, 64, 80
Prior Year Measures

Attendance rate, 58
Graduation rate, 53

R

Reading/English Language Arts, 12, 16, 17, 19, 25, 29, 36, 37, 49, 50, 52, 57, 59,
60, 63, 64, 72, 76, 78, 81, 96, 126, 127, 128, 129, 135, 140
Regional Day School Program for the Deaf, 43, 65, 66, 67
Residential Treatment Facilities
 special provision, 57
RF Tracker, 13, 42, 65
 Residential Facilities TEASE Application, 13
Rounding, 60

S

Safe Harbor
 graduation rate, 19, 54
 performance improvement, 19, 50, 127, 129
School Improvement (SIP) Requirements, 97, 99
 school transfers, 99
 stages, 100
Science, 93, 94
Small districts and campuses, 48, 62
Source data table, 118
Special Provision for Residential Treatment Facilities, 57
STAAR Bridge Study for AYP, 15, 21, 22, 74
State Accountability Ratings, 18, 147
State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR), 11, 15, 29, 30, 38
State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness Alternate (STAAR Alternate,
21, 29, 38, 40, 48, 65
State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness end-of-course (STAAR EOC),
11, 15
State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness Linguistically accommodated
(STAAR L), 22, 29, 39
State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness Modified (STAAR Modified),
11, 21, 22, 29, 38, 65
State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness Spanish (STAAR Spanish), 11,
22
Student data listings, 122
Student groups

African-American, 12, 19, 35, 48, 126, 128, 130, 131, 133
all students, 12, 19, 81
attendance rate, 58
economically disadvantaged, 12, 19, 35, 48, 126, 128, 131, 132, 134
graduation rate, 15, 19, 56
Hispanic, 12, 19, 35, 48, 126, 128, 130, 131, 133
limited English proficient, 19
participation, 35
performance, 48
special education, 12, 19, 35, 48, 126, 129, 131, 132, 135, 147
White, 12, 19, 35, 48, 126, 128, 130, 132, 133
Student Success Initiative (SSI), 15, 22, 38
Students Tested on a Single Assessment, 26
Students Tested on More Than One Assessment, 26

T

Texas Administrative Code, 95
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), 17, 20, 29, 49, 63, 81
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills-Accommodated (TAKS-
Accommodated), 20
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills-Modified (TAKS-M), 20
Texas AYP Workbook
 Amendments, 11, 13
Texas Education Agency Secure Website (TEASE), 71, 82, 83, 89, 90, 91, 92
 applying for access, 90
 ESC Multiple District Access, 90
Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS), 22, 26, 29, 31,
39, 49
Texas NCLB Report Card, 12, 14, 142
Title I School Improvement, 71, 96, 97, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 147
Title I Targeted Assistance Campuses, 81
Treatment of Known Compromised Data, 17
TYC or TJPC Campuses and AYP District Performance Calculations, 52, 74, 148,
149

U

Uniform Averaging, 62
United States Department of Education (USDE), 12, 62
Unmasked data tables, 14, 107

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
	<i>2012 AYP Guide</i>	GE12 602 03	\$11.00	\$
<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
	<i>2012 AYP Guide</i>	GE12 602 03	\$9.00	\$
<i>Price includes postage and handling only.</i>				

IF YOU ARE MAILING A PURCHASE ORDER* OR NEED INFORMATION, SEND TO:

Texas Education Agency
Publications Distribution
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

*Purchase orders are accepted only from Texas educational institutions and 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.



Texas Education Agency
GE12 602 03