Accountability System for 2011 – Standard Procedures
Commissioner of Education Final Decisions
April 2011

Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) Indicators

1. Use of Texas Projection Measure. In 2009 and 2010, the Texas Projection Measure (TPM) was used as an additional feature to determine state accountability ratings. The TPM was evaluated as a means of elevating a campus or district rating in cases where neither the TAKS Met Standard indicator nor Required Improvement (RI) were sufficient to allow a campus or district to earn the next higher rating.

   In 2011 use of the TPM in the state and federal accountability rating systems will be discontinued. Specifically, the TPM for TAKS and TAKS-M will not be available as an additional feature for any indicators for any state accountability rating category. In addition, the TAKS-Alt growth measure will not be included in the TAKS base indicator in 2011. Similarly, the TPM for both TAKS and TAKS-M and the TAKS-Alt growth measure will not be included in the performance results used to calculate the 2011 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) statuses.

   Rationale: On July 8, 2010, the commissioner sent a letter to all district superintendents that presented several options for use of the TPM in 2011 to ensure student performance is acknowledged and the state accountability system remains transparent. One of the options specified was suspension of the use of the TPM for 2011 state accountability ratings. The commissioner's decision is to discontinue use of the TPM in state and federal accountability for 2011.

   The commissioner has determined that the use of the TPM in the 2011 state and federal accountability systems will be discontinued based on the lack of public support for the continued use of the measure as well as the unanimous vote against the use of test score projections during recent floor debate of the Texas House of Representatives on House Bill 500. In 2010, performance on the TAKS tests improved in every subject for every student group and an overwhelming majority of the class of 2011 passed the exit-level assessments for graduation. These test results demonstrate the hard work of students and educators in the state. Unfortunately, this hard work is overshadowed by criticism of the use of the TPM, including an assertion made on the floor of the Texas House of Representatives during debate on House Bill 500 that school ratings in 2010 went up without demonstrations of increases in performance. The commissioner does not want the TPM to continue to detract from the achievements of students and educators.

2. Inclusion of TAKS-Modified and TAKS Alternate Assessments. In 2011 the TAKS Met Standard indicator will include all TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) results as it did in 2010; but, in 2011, it will also include TAKS-Modified (TAKS-M) and TAKS-Alternate (TAKS-Alt) results for the first time. TAKS-M results will be included for all tested grades and subjects, including the second administration of TAKS-M results for grades 5 and 8. TAKS-Alt results will also include all tested grades and subjects. These assessments will also be included in the Commended Performance indicator, as described below.

   Rationale: The inclusion of the TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt results completes the inclusion of all special education students into the TAKS indicators used for state accountability. This approach is similar to use of TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt results in the federal accountability system, except the proficient results of these alternate assessments are subject to the federal caps in the AYP calculations.

3. Commended Performance (CP). Beginning with the 2011 ratings, a new indicator—Commended Performance—will be incorporated in the rating system. Districts and campuses will be required to meet the CP standard in order to achieve the *Recognized* or *Exemplary* ratings. This indicator will be defined as the percent of students achieving the commended level on TAKS. The CP indicator will

include the same test results as the TAKS Met Standard indicator. This means in 2011 CP will be evaluated for TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS-M, and TAKS-Alt.

CP will be evaluated only for the subject areas of reading/ELA and mathematics and only for two student groups—All Students and Economically Disadvantaged, given minimum size criteria are met. The minimum size criteria are the same as those used for the TAKS Met Standard indicator.

CP standards will be 15% for *Recognized* and 25% for *Exemplary*. No additional features are available for use with this indicator: not Required Improvement (RI), not TPM, and not the Exception Provision. The absolute standards must be met by both student groups (if applicable) for both subjects.

Rationale: House Bill (HB) 3 made significant changes to the accountability system by changing the focus from meeting proficiency standards on the state assessments to meeting both proficiency and college-ready standards on new assessments that are linked to postsecondary readiness. In anticipation of the more rigorous HB 3 requirements, districts and campuses will need to demonstrate performance at a higher level than Met Standard in order to achieve the *Recognized* or *Exemplary* ratings. Since student performance on the end-of-course and the new grades 3–8 State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) tests are unknown at this time, the best proxy available on the current assessment is the commended performance standard.

Evaluation of CP in 2011 will serve as an early warning for the use of college readiness standards that will be incorporated in the new accountability system in 2014. Evaluation of CP for the two highest rating categories provides an incentive for campuses and districts to focus on the performance of higher performing students, in addition to those not passing the test. Reading and mathematics are targeted because these are the two subjects that will have college ready standards set and evaluated in 2014 under the new accountability system.

The All Students and Economically Disadvantaged student groups are evaluated on the CP indicator to encourage districts to continue to set high expectations for all students regardless of economic status while limiting the additional hurdles to two student groups initially as a phase-in to using additional student groups in 2014 under the new accountability system.

4. TAKS Standards. Standards for 2011 were published in the *2010 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule to provide districts and campuses with advance notice before the 2010-11 school year began. For the TAKS % Met Standard indicator, the 2011 *Academically Acceptable* standards are 70% for reading/ ELA, writing, and social studies; 65% for mathematics; and 60% for science. These standards represent increases of five percentage points to the *Academically Acceptable* standards for two of the five subjects (mathematics and science). For the CP indicator, the 2011 *Recognized* standard is 15% and the *Exemplary* standard is 25%.

   Rationale: Standards for 2011 will remain as previously published due to the increased rigor of the TAKS base indicator this year due to the inclusion of TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt, the addition of the ELL Progress indicator as a separate indicator, and due to the inclusion of commended performance as an additional indicator in 2011.

   By the 2010-11 school year, 13 of the 15 standards will have attained the recommended goals of 70%, 80%, and 90% for *Academically Acceptable, Recognized*, and *Exemplary*, respectively, for all subject areas. Only mathematics and science have not yet attained the goal of a 70% *Academically Acceptable* standard, but standards for both of these subjects continue to increase by five points per year through 2011, the last year of the current system. Though science and mathematics will not be at the 70% standard, these two subjects continue to be the primary reason that districts and campuses are prevented from achieving the next higher rating.

TAKS State Accountability Standards			
	2010 Used	**2011 Adopted**	
	% Met Standard	% Met Standard	% Commended
Exemplary			
Reading/ELA	90%	90%	**25%**
Writing	90%	90%	n/a
Social Studies	90%	90%	n/a
Mathematics	90%	90%	**25%**
Science	90%	90%	n/a
Recognized			
Reading/ELA	**80%**	80%	**15%**
Writing	**80%**	80%	n/a
Social Studies	**80%**	80%	n/a
Mathematics	**80%**	80%	**15%**
Science	**80%**	80%	n/a
Academically Acceptable			
Reading/ELA	70%	70%	n/a
Writing	70%	70%	n/a
Social Studies	70%	70%	n/a
Mathematics	**60%**	**65%**	n/a
Science	**55%**	**60%**	n/a

*Numbers in **bold** indicate an increase from the prior year.*

5. Race/Ethnicity and Student Groups. State accountability, federal accountability, and the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) and related reports will use the federal definitions of race and ethnicity for all current year (2010-11) indicators.

   The student groups that will be evaluated under the state rating system will continue to be the five with the following labels:

   1. All Students
   2. African American *(new, federal definition)*
   3. Hispanic *(new, federal definition)*
   4. White *(new, federal definition)*
   5. Economically Disadvantaged

   Rationale: No additional student groups beyond the five listed above are proposed to be added to the 2011 accountability system because the composition of the African American, Hispanic, and White groups are similar to prior years. The change in definition does not warrant either an increase or decrease in the number of hurdles possible for the last year of the rating system. Student group stability is preferred since the selection of accountability student groups will be revisited in 2012 for implementation of the new accountability system in 2013.

6. Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision. Under the federal definitions of race and ethnicity, there is now a group of students who are categorized as Two or More Races. Without changes to the overall number of student groups, the results for students who indicate they are Two or More Races will be

evaluated in the "All Students" student group only and not among any of the individual racial student groups. In prior years, at least a portion of these students would have been evaluated in either the African American or White student groups.

For 2011 accountability, a new provision, the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision, will be employed. This provision will apply to the TAKS Met Standard indicator only and will exist for 2011 only. Under this provision, students who indicate their ethnicity is not Hispanic/Latino and who select multiple races that include both the Black/African American and White racial categories will be distributed into either the African American or White groups based on the information submitted on the 2009-10 TAKS answer documents for these same students under the former definitions. Only those multiracial students reporting more than one race that includes both Black/African American and White racial categories will be distributed. If the recalculated African American and White student group performance results in a higher rating for a campus or district, the higher rating will be assigned.

A message will appear on any campus or district accountability data table indicating the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision was used; however, the assessment results will not be changed. The official accountability data for the TAKS Met Standard indicator will be the data that does not include the multiracial students in the separate student groups. Further details about the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision will be outlined in the *2011 Accountability Manual*.

In order to monitor possible manipulation of the race/ethnicity data for accountability purposes, the agency plans to conduct analyses to identify districts and campuses with significant discrepancies between the percent of students who are classified as Two or More Races on the spring 2011 assessment documents and the fall 2010 PEIMS enrollment files.

No appeals related to the new race and ethnicity definitions will be considered for any indicator in 2011.

Rationale: Race/ethnicity under the former definition will only be available for students that can be matched in the prior year. No prior-year information will be available for some students, such as grade 3 students or students who moved to the state during the 2010-11 school year. However, since this provision will only be used to help ratings, the possible benefits outweigh its deficiencies.

Application of the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision aligns with similar plans for the federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) system.

Given districts and campuses will have the benefit of rating evaluations calculated under two student group options, appeals related to the race/ethnicity student groups for the TAKS Met Standard indicator will not be considered in 2011.

7. Required Improvement. In the 2011 system, RI will be calculated by comparing the 2011 results using the new race/ethnicity data to the 2010 data with student groups defined using the former definitions. The 2010 data will be rebuilt to include the TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt test results.

   Rationale: Rebuilding the prior-year data with the new race and ethnicity definitions is likely to only have a very minimal impact on rating calculations. The effect on ratings could be both positive and negative. Districts and campuses already have access to their 2010 assessment results built to preview the 2011 accountability indicator. These were published on the 2009-10 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) reports as the 2011 Preview indicator. If the 2010 data were to be rebuilt to accommodate the new student group race/ethnicity definitions, there would be no way to provide this information to districts in advance of the release of their Accountability Data Tables in mid-July 2011. The advantage of knowing the 2010 data that will be used in accountability outweighs any possible advantage of the recalculated results. Maintaining use of prior-year results with student groups as previously defined aligns with the use of prior-year results in the federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) system.

8. Exceptions Provision. After RI, the Exceptions Provision is evaluated to see if exceptions can be used to elevate a rating to the next higher rating. Use of the Exceptions Provision depends, in part, on meeting a minimum performance floor using the percent of students who pass the tests. Because of the increase in *Academically Acceptable* standards for mathematics and science, the floor requirement for these two subjects will increase by five points each—to 55% for science and 60% for mathematics.

   The Exceptions Provision is not available for use with the CP indicator, but will be expanded in 2011 to include the ELL Progress indicator.

English Language Learners (ELL) Progress Indicator

1. Criteria. Beginning with the 2011 ratings, a new indicator—the ELL Progress Indicator—will be incorporated into the rating system. Campuses and districts must meet a standard of 60% on the ELL Progress Indicator in order to attain a *Recognized* or *Exemplary* rating.

   The indicator includes ELL students who are current and monitored LEP students. There must be at least 30 current and monitored limited English proficient (LEP) students tested in order for the indicator to be evaluated. Individual race/ethnicity student groups and the Economically Disadvantaged student group are not evaluated.

2. Additional Features. RI is available for the ELL Progress Indicator in a manner that parallels the use of RI with the TAKS base indicator. A district or campus can achieve a higher rating if improvement on this indicator is sufficient to meet the target in two years. No floor is required to be able to use RI for the ELL Progress Indicator.

   The ELL Progress Indicator reported on the 2008-09 and 2009-10 AEIS reports as the 2011 preview did not include TPM results. TPM results will not be included in the 2011 ELL Progress indicator evaluated for 2011 state ratings.

   In 2011, the use of the Exceptions Provision will be expanded to also apply to the ELL Progress indicator. Neither the "look-up" table nor the number of exceptions allowed will be changed. The number of TAKS Met Standard measures evaluated will continue to be used to determine the number of exceptions allowed. A floor of 55% (five points below the 60% standard) will be required in order to use an exception for the ELL Progress indicator.

   Rationale: Exceptions are intended to apply to new assessment measures, especially during their first year of use. While preview data predict that most campuses and districts evaluated on this indicator will meet the 60% standard, the indicator can be more challenging for some school types depending on the instructional model they offer to their LEP students. This provision provides a safe harbor to schools that might otherwise feel pressure to abandon or alter their programs that are designed to demonstrate success over a longer timeframe. The ELL Progress indicator will not contribute to the count of the number of measures evaluated to determine the maximum number of exceptions allowed given this indicator does not impact all rating levels.

Completion Rate Indicator

Under standard accountability procedures, graduates and continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year) count as high school completers (Completion Rate I). Under alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures, alternative education campuses and charters are evaluated using Completion Rate II, which also includes General Educational Development (GED) recipients as completers.

Beginning with the class of 2009 (2010 accountability) all years of the cohort use the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition.

1. Completion Rate I Standards. Standards for 2011 were published in the *2010 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule to provide districts and campuses with advance notice before the 2010-11 school year began. The 2011 standards are 75.0% for *Academically Acceptable*, 85.0% for *Recognized*, and 95.0% for *Exemplary*.

Completion Rate I Accountability Standards		
	Used	**Adopted**
	2010	**2011**
Academically Acceptable	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%
Recognized	≥ 85.0%	≥ 85.0%
Exemplary	≥ 95.0%	≥ 95.0%
Dropout Definition (by Cohort Years)	2005-06 – NCES 2006-07 – NCES 2007-08 – NCES **2008-09 – NCES**	Full Use of NCES definition

*Text in **bold** indicates a change from the prior year.*

2. Change in Calculation Methodology. The methodology for calculating campus longitudinal rates for federal and state accountability purposes will be expanded beginning with the class of 2010. The expanded methodology will create completion rates for campuses with grade 9 and either grade 11 or 12 in both year 1 and year 5 **OR** campuses with grade 12 in both year 1 and year 5.

   Rationale: Federal regulations require states to hold any high school or district that serves grade 12 accountable for meeting the adequate yearly progress (AYP) graduation rate goal or targets. The change in calculation methodology will capture all campuses that would be included under the current rules for state and federal accountability plus those that meet the grade 12 criterion.

3. District Completion Rates Assigned to Campuses. The use of district assigned completion rates to secondary campuses without their own was suspended beginning with 2008 ratings. The use of the district rate for secondary campuses without their own rate was planned to resume in 2011. However, the use of District Substituted Values (DSV) in the 2011 accountability system will not be reinstated.

   Rationale: The change in the completion rate calculation methodology means that more campuses will have their own rates calculated, lessening the need for DSV. Also, revisiting the issue of how to appropriately hold secondary campuses accountable for students' completion options during development of the 2013 system is preferable to reintroducing this mechanism in the last year of the current rating system. Under AYP procedures, campuses without their own data are not evaluated on the graduation rate indicator, so not applying DSV in state accountability would be consistent with the treatment of this similar situation under AYP.

4. Race/Ethnicity and Student Groups. Unlike the TAKS and Annual Dropout Rate indicators, the race/ethnicity definitions for the longitudinal completion rate for the class of 2010 (2011 accountability) will use the former definitions. For the completion rate indicator, a student's ethnicity is determined from the year of final status. For class of 2010 most students will have a final status from years 1-4 (2006-07 through 2009-10.) Only the continuers (students with a final status in year 5) will use race/ethnicity reported from the new collection. Students reported as Two or More Races in year 5 will be matched back to the prior year to obtain their former (previously reported) ethnicities.

   For 2011 accountability, the Required Improvement (RI) feature will be applied as usual. The former student group ethnicities for the class of 2010 will be compared to the former student group defined ethnicities for the class of 2009.

5. Appeals. To reduce the amount of district and agency resources expended on unsuccessful completion rate appeals, the appeal chapter of the *2011 Accountability Manual* will more clearly delineate the types of appeals that will not be considered for the leaver-related indicators.

   The *Manual* will also reiterate, as in 2009 and 2010, appeals requesting that HB 3 exclusions be applied to the 2011 state ratings will not be considered.

   Rationale: A January 5, 2011, letter was sent to district superintendents in which the commissioner strongly encouraged careful review of verification reports to ensure that accurate Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data were submitted prior to the January 20, 2011, PEIMS resubmission deadline. The commissioner emphasized that the leaver records submitted by this deadline will be used to produce the 2009-10 completion, graduation, and dropout rate results that will be evaluated in the 2011 state and federal accountability systems and used to fulfill 2011 state and federal monitoring requirements.

   Statutorily-required exclusions that the TEA must make when evaluating dropout and completion rates for state accreditation and performance ratings will not be implemented until the 2010-11 dropouts collected in the 2011-12 school year. Therefore, these exclusions will not apply to ratings issued in 2011.

Grade 7-8 Annual Dropout Rate Indicator

The methodology for this indicator is the number of grade 7-8 students identified as dropouts divided by the number of grade 7-8 students who were in attendance at any time during the school year.

1. Standards. For 2011, the Annual Dropout Rate standard is 1.6% as published in the *2010 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule. This is a decrease of 0.2% from the 2010 standard of 1.8%, making the indicator more rigorous in the last year of the current rating system.

2. Race/Ethnicity and Student Groups. The 2009-10 annual dropout rates (to be used in 2011 accountability) are calculated from enrollment and attendance data submitted in 2009-10 (denominator) and leaver data submitted in 2010-11 (numerator). Because the leaver data (numerator) is only available with the federal race/ethnicity designations, the race/ethnicity student groups for the 2011 Annual Dropout Rate indicator can only be created using the federal ethnicity definitions.

   As with the TAKS Met Standard indicator, the student groups that will be evaluated for the Annual Dropout Rate indicator will continue to be the five with the following labels:

   1. All Students
   2. African American *(new, federal definition)*
   3. Hispanic *(new, federal definition)*
   4. White *(new, federal definition)*
   5. Economically Disadvantaged

   Under the federal definitions of race and ethnicity there is now a group of students who are categorized as Two or More Races. Without changes to the overall number of student groups, the results for students who indicate they are Two or More Races will be evaluated in the "All Students" student group only and not among any of the individual racial student groups. In prior years, at least a portion of these students would have been evaluated in either the African American or White student groups.

   For the Annual Dropout Rate indicator, the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision will not be employed. This provision will apply to the TAKS Met Standard indicator only.

Rationale: No additional student groups beyond the five listed above are proposed to be added to the 2011 accountability system because the composition of the African American, Hispanic, and White groups are similar to prior years. The change in definition does not warrant either an increase or decrease in the number of hurdles possible for the last year of the rating system. Student group stability is preferred since the selection of accountability student groups will be revisited in 2012 for implementation of the new accountability system in 2013.

Although students who are categorized as Two or More Races under the new definition will not be part of any student group, their dropout status will be evaluated as part of the All Students results.

3. Required Improvement (RI). Although the student groups based on race/ethnicity have different definitions between 2008-09 (2010 accountability) and 2009-10 (2011 accountability), it is recommended that RI be used with this indicator in 2011.

   Rationale: It is not possible to recalculate either year to create matching definitions; however, despite the different definitions for race/ethnicity student groups across the two years, the race/ethnicity student groups chosen for use in 2011 will be very similar to the three ethnic groups used in 2010. Also, the use of RI was continued with the longitudinal completion rate indicator during the years that the change in the dropout definition was being phased in, so there is a precedent for using RI when the data are not perfectly comparable; particularly when this feature can only help. Also, only the three ethnic student groups have new definitions. RI based on All Students and Economically Disadvantaged should not be prevented due to the definitional differences of the other student groups.

4. Appeals. To reduce the amount of district and agency resources expended on unsuccessful dropout rate appeals, the appeal chapter of the *2011 Accountability Manual* will more clearly delineate the types of appeals that will not be considered for the leaver-related indicators.

   The *Manual* will also reiterate that, as in 2009 and 2010, appeals requesting that HB 3 exclusions be applied to the 2011 state ratings will not be considered.

   Appeals for the Annual Dropout Rate indicator based on race/ethnicity of grade 7-8 dropouts who are Two or More Races in 2011 will be permitted. Certain limitations will apply and will be specified in the *2011 Manual*.

   Rationale: A January 5, 2011, letter was sent to district superintendents in which the commissioner strongly encouraged careful review of verification reports to ensure that accurate PEIMS data were submitted prior to the January 20, 2011, PEIMS resubmission deadline. The commissioner emphasized that the leaver records submitted by this deadline will be used to produce the 2009-10 completion, graduation, and dropout rate results that will be evaluated in the 2011 state and federal accountability systems and used to fulfill 2011 state and federal monitoring requirements.

   Statutorily-required exclusions that the TEA must make when evaluating dropout and completion rates for state accreditation and performance ratings will not be implemented until the 2010-11 dropouts collected in the 2011-12 school year. Therefore, these exclusions will not apply to ratings issued in 2011.

   Because the Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision will not be applied to the Annual Dropout Rate indicator to distribute grade 7-8 students categorized as Two or More Races into either the African American or White, the appeals process will be used on a limited basis with districts that may find the omission of grade 7-8 students who are Two or More Races adversely affects their ratings.

Underreported Students

An underreported student is a student in grades 7-12 reported in enrollment or attendance in one school year that has not been accounted for through district records or TEA processing the next school year. Districts account for students by reporting that students re-enrolled in school or withdrew from school. TEA accounts for students by determining that students either moved from one district into another, received General Educational Development (GED) certificates, or graduated in a previous school year. The underreported students' rate is calculated by dividing the number of underreported students by the total number of grade 7-12 students served in the prior year.

The counts and rates of underreported students have been used as data quality measures in the accountability system since the 2000 accountability year. Performance is evaluated for All Students only. Individual student groups are not evaluated. Districts cannot be rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized* if either the count or rate of underreported students exceeds the standards. Results are evaluated if there are at least five underreported students and an underreported rate that is equal to or greater than 1.0%. This indicator does not apply to campuses.

1. Standards. Standards for 2011 were published in the *2010 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule to provide districts with advance notice before the 2010-11 school year began. The 2011 standards as adopted hold the count standard steady at 150 but decrease the rate from 4.0 percent to 3.0 percent.

   The Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) Leaver Data Validation system will evaluate this indicator at a standard of 2.0% for the underreported rate in 2012. The count standard (150) and minimum size criteria (5 and 1.0%) remain unchanged in 2012.

   Rationale: The underreported indicator is also used in the PBM Data Validation System. Districts that do not meet the underreported standards are subject to interventions. The interventions are graduated depending on district data results on each leaver data validation indicator, patterns across all leaver data validation indicators, and prior leaver data validation history. Although state accountability ratings will not be issued in 2012, the PBM Leaver Data Validation system will continue to evaluate this indicator that year.

   The decreases in the rate standard accelerate progress toward previous standards that were in place prior to processing changes associated with implementation of the NCES dropout definition.

   The underreported measure provides important safeguards to the dropout rate and completion rate indicators, as students who might otherwise be dropouts or non-completers cannot go unreported. Also, the quality of any longitudinal data depends heavily on the accuracy of student tracking over time.

Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA)

1. Standards for 2011. In 2011 standards remain stable for all GPA indicators with the exception of the College-Ready Graduates indicator, which will increase by five points from 35% to 40%.

2. TAKS Changes and GPA Indicators. Ten GPA indicators use TAKS performance: the five TAKS Commended indicators, the two Texas Success Initiative (TSI) indicators, the two Comparable Improvement (CI) indicators, and the College-Ready Graduates indicator. Beginning in 2011, the TAKS indicator used in the base rating system will include all TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt results. The TAKS-based indicators in the GPA system will be treated similarly to the extent possible. There are two exceptions. First, the TSI indicators will continue to be based on TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) performance only. Also, the CI indicators will be based on TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), and TAKS-M performance, but will not include TAKS-Alt performance.

Rationale: The TSI indicator requires evaluation of TAKS performance at the Higher Education Readiness Component (HERC) standard. The HERC standard does not apply to either TAKS-M or TAKS-Alt since students taking these alternate assessments are not required to pass these tests in order to graduate.

The CI indicators require comparing student improvement from one year to the next using changes in their vertical scale scores. These changes at the student level are then summed and averaged at the campus level. TAKS-Alt scores are on a completely different scale and cannot be included with vertical scale score change calculations.

3. Commended Performance. Even though CP is evaluated as a base indicator, GPAs for each of the five commended indicators (reading/ELA, mathematics, science, social studies, and writing) will remain available under the GPA system. In 2011, the GPA standard on CP is 30% for each of the five subject area indicators. The GPA commended indicators evaluate All Students and the African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged student groups.

   Rationale: The GPA system applies more rigorous criteria to CP and evaluates more subjects than the base rating system; therefore, earning an acknowledgment on commended performance is qualitatively different than meeting the CP criteria to be *Recognized* or *Exemplary*. The CP base indicator evaluates a maximum possible two student groups rather than five under the GPA system. The CP base indicator only evaluates two subjects rather than five under the GPA system. The CP base indicator standards (15% and 25%) are lower than the 30% standard under the GPA system.

4. Race/Ethnicity and Student Groups. For all 15 of the GPA indicators, the new federal definitions for race/ethnicity will be used.

   The Federal Race/Ethnicity Provision will not be applied to the GPA indicators. The performance of multiracial students will not be attributed to either Black/African American or White students groups. Students who indicate their ethnicity is not Hispanic/Latino and who select the single racial category of Black/African American are counted in the African American student group, and students who indicate their ethnicity is not Hispanic/Latino and who select the single racial category of White are counted in the white student group. Students who are Two or More Races will not be part of any student group, but their performance will be evaluated as part of the All Students results.

Use of Race/Ethnicity Definitions with GPA Indicators

	GPA Indicator	Year of Data	Race/Ethnicity to be Used
Prior-Year Data			
1	Adv. Course/Dual Enrollment	2009-10	New*
2	AP/IB	2009-10	New
3	Attendance Rate	2009-10	New*
4	College-Ready Graduates	Class of 2010	New
5	RHSP/DAP Graduates	Class of 2010	New
6	SAT/ACT	Class of 2010	New
Current-Year Data			
7-8	TSI	2010-11	New
9-13	TAKS Commended	2010-11	New
14-15	Comparable Improvement	2010-11	New

* *For these indicators race/ethnicity student groups could be constructed using either the former or the new definitions.*

Rationale: Though students categorized as Two or More Races will not be part of any student group, redistributing them into either the Black/African American or White student groups is not as critical as with the ratings system since the GPA system does not impact the assignment of a rating.

Use of new race/ethnicity definitions for all GPA indicators is preferred because a uniform definition across all indicators is less confusing. Although current plans call for the Attendance Rate indicator used for 2011 AYP to evaluate school year 2009-10 using the former race/ethnicity definitions, consistency among the GPA indicators is preferred over consistency between the AYP and state accountability system uses of the Attendance Rate indicator.