

RESEARCH

**ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS
ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM
HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
2005 FINAL RESULTS
DECEMBER 2005**



Introduction	1
Findings	6
2005 AYP School Ratings by Region	13
2005 HISD AYP Accountability System Matrix	24
2004 HISD AYP Accountability System Matrix	25
2003 HISD AYP Accountability System Matrix	26

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Final Results 2004–05 School Year December 2005

Introduction

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)* is a landmark education reform bill designed to improve student achievement and change the culture of America's schools. With passage of NCLB on January 8, 2002, Congress re-authorized, amended, and renamed the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*—the principal federal law affecting education from kindergarten through high school. The resulting law represents a sweeping overhaul of federal efforts to support elementary and secondary education in the United States. NCLB is built on four common-sense pillars: accountability for results; an emphasis on using proven, scientifically-based research; expanded parental options; and expanded local control and flexibility.

Accountability is a key component of the NCLB. Each state is required to develop and implement a statewide accountability system that is effective in ensuring that all districts and schools make adequate yearly progress, and in holding accountable those that do not. Schools that do not make adequate yearly progress will be identified for increasingly rigorous sanctions designed to bring about meaningful change in instruction and performance. Further, students in low-performing schools will have the option to transfer to other public schools or to obtain supplemental educational services. Finally, the law mandates the fundamental restructuring of any school that fails to improve over an extended period of time.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Under NCLB, states are required to establish a definition of adequate yearly progress that each district and school is expected to meet. Annual targets are set by the state to measure progress of schools and districts toward the goal that all students—including low-income students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency—reach 100 percent proficiency in reading and math by 2013–14. In addition to academic performance, schools must test at least 95 percent of their students in each of the above student groups in reading and math and meet an approved target on one other non-academic measure. In Texas, the non-academic indicator is the four-year longitudinal graduation rate for high schools and the attendance rate for elementary and middle schools. All HISD schools with the exception of new campuses, Disciplinary Alternative Education Program campuses, and early childhood centers are included in the AYP evaluation of district and school performance. The AYP system of accountability is in addition to the Texas Education Agency's system of accountability.

The three AYP indicators are reading/English language arts, mathematics, and high school graduation rate/elementary and middle school attendance rate. Both the reading/English language arts and mathematics indicators have two components: student

performance and participation. The criteria must be achieved on both components for the indicator to be considered met. **Table 1** shows the key facets of AYP under the NCLB Act for Texas districts and schools, 2004–05.

Table 1: Key Facets of the Adequate Yearly Progress Under the No Child Left Behind Act for Texas Districts and Schools, 2004–05	
Standard Rating Labels	Met AYP Missed AYP
Assessment of Student Performance	Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) English and Spanish for reading and mathematics in grades 3–8 and 10; for multiple administrations, the first two administrations are used State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II) in reading and math for students receiving Special Education services Locally-Developed Alternative Assessment (LDAA) in reading and math for students receiving Special Education services Reading Proficiency Test in English (RPTE) for limited English proficient students exempted from TAKS Linguistically Accommodated Testing for Mathematics (LAT) for limited English proficient students exempted from TAKS
Base Indicators for Determining Rating	Reading performance and participation Math performance and participation Graduation rate for high schools Attendance rate for elementary and middle schools
Accountability Subgroup of Students	All students tested on the campus who were enrolled in the <u>campus</u> as of the PEIMS fall enrollment date, grades 3–8 and 10
Student Groups	All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged, Special Education, and Limited English Proficient
Size Requirements for Student Groups	Performance Reading/Language Arts and Math: <i>All Students:</i> ≥ 50 tested <i>Each Student Group:</i> ≥ 50 students tested in the group for the subject and group comprises at least 10% of all test takers in the subject or ≥ 200 students tested in the group for the subject Participation Reading/Language Arts and Math: <i>All Students:</i> ≥ 40 students enrolled in grades tested <i>Each Student Group:</i> ≥ 50 students enrolled in the group for the subject and group comprises at least 10% of all students enrolled on test date or ≥ 200 students in the group enrolled on test date
Size Requirements for Student Groups	Other Performance Measure <u>District and High School Graduation Rate</u> <i>All Students:</i> ≥ 40 students in the ninth-grade cohort <i>Each Student Group:</i> ≥ 50 students in the group in the ninth-grade cohort and the group comprises at least 10% of all students in the cohort OR ≥ 200 students in the group in the cohort <u>Elementary and Middle Schools Attendance Rate</u> <i>All Students:</i> ≥ 7,200 total days in membership <i>Each Student Group:</i> ≥ 9,000 total days in membership and the group comprises at least 10% of days in membership for all students OR ≥ 36,000 total days in membership

Standards for Indicators	<p>Met AYP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ≥ 53% proficient in reading/English Language Arts for all students and each student group ≥ 42% proficient in math for all students and each student group ≥ 95% participation in reading assessments for all students and each student group ≥ 95% participation in math assessments for all students and each student group ≥ 70% graduation rate for high schools for all students ≥ 90% attendance rate for elementary and middle schools for all students <p>Missed AYP:</p> <p>School/district is classified as Missed AYP if it does not meet the standard for every student group for each indicator.</p>
Improvement Standards	<p>A school/district that does not meet the standard for a particular indicator can still make AYP if the improvement standards for that indicator are met.</p> <p>Performance</p> <p>For each group not meeting performance standards, there must be a 10% decrease from the prior year in the percent failing AND improvement on “other” measure for the group.</p> <p>Participation</p> <p>For each group not meeting participation standards, participation rates will be averaged across the current and previous year. This average must meet the 95% standard.</p> <p>Other Performance Measure (Graduation/Attendance)</p> <p>If the graduation rate or attendance rate standard for all students is not met, it must show improvement of at least .1% from the previous year.</p>

Major Assumptions of AYP

All Schools

Under NCLB, states are required to establish a single definition of adequate yearly progress that applies to all districts and schools, including Title I and non-Title I schools, alternative education campuses, and open-enrollment charter schools. The only schools not rated are new campuses during their first year of operation, Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP) campuses, and early childhood centers.

All Students

All students must be tested and the results must be included in AYP calculations. For Texas, this means that performance calculations include the results for students in grades 3–8 and 10 from the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS); the State-Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II) for Special Education students; the Locally-Developed Alternative Assessments (LDAA) for students exempted from the TAKS and SDAA; and the Reading Proficiency Tests in English (RPTE) and the Linguistically Accommodated Test (LAT) mathematics exam for limited English proficient (LEP) students exempted from the TAKS.

Performance Standards

Annual targets are set by the state to measure progress of schools and districts toward the NCLB requirement that all students reach 100 percent proficiency in reading and math

by 2013–14. **Table 2** presents the annual targets for Texas schools and districts.

Table 2: AYP Performance Targets

	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	47	53	60	67	73	80	87	93	100
Math	33	42	50	58	67	75	83	92	100

Participation Standards

In addition to performance standards in reading and math, districts and campuses must meet test participation standards of 95 percent in both subjects. The participation rates are calculated as the number of students tested on any of the eligible tests (TAKS, SDAA, LDAA, RPTE) divided by an unduplicated count of answer documents submitted for these tests (enrollment).

Student Groups

All students and each student group (African American, Hispanic, White, economically disadvantaged, Special Education, and LEP) must meet the same performance and participation standards in reading and in math. Minimum size requirements determine whether or not the student group is evaluated.

Other Measures

NCLB requires that high schools must meet a graduation rate standard set by the state and an additional measure for elementary and middle schools, which, in Texas, is the attendance rate. The graduation rate is calculated as the number of graduates after four years divided by the total number of students in the ninth-grade cohort from four years earlier (plus transfers in, minus transfers out).

The attendance rate is calculated at the school level for all students in grades 1–8, as the total number of days students were present divided by the total number of days students were in membership.

Five-Percent Rule

Students who were tested on the SDAA II for Special Education students on grade level will be counted as testers in the participation calculations and, if they met ARD expectations, they will be counted as proficient in the performance calculations.

Students who were tested on the SDAA II off grade level or on a locally-developed alternative assessment (LDAA) will be counted as testers in the participation calculations, and if they met ARD expectations, they will be counted as proficient in the performance calculations **up to a district 5% cap**. After the cap has been reached, the remainder of the students will be counted as **artificial failures**. The state will determine who is counted in the 5% cap based on the following priority.

Students who were enrolled the full academic year in the same campus:

- LDAA functional test;
- LDAA Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS)-based test;
- SDAA II tested 10 grades below enrolled grade level by percent of correct answers

- from lowest to highest;
- SDAA II tested nine grades below enrolled grade level by percent of correct answers from lowest to highest;
- And so on to SDAA II tested one grade below enrolled grade level.

Students who were enrolled the full academic year in the same district but not the same campus:

- LDAA functional test;
- LDAA Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS)-based test;
- SDAA II tested 10 grades below enrolled grade level by percent of correct answers from lowest to highest;
- SDAA II tested nine grades below enrolled grade level by percent of correct answers from lowest to highest;
- And so on to SDAA II tested one grade below enrolled grade level.

The 5% cap is applied at the district level. Students taking the off-grade-level SDAA II or LDAA are eligible to be counted as passing for the campus performance rating, if they are designated in the 5% cap at the district level. For the 2005–06 school year, the cap for Special Education students could be lowered to 3%, pending federal decision.

Sanctions

Under NCLB, accountability provisions that formerly applied only to district and campuses receiving Title I, Part A funds now apply to all districts and campuses. Sanctions however, still apply only to districts and campuses receiving Title I funds. If a district or campus that receives Title I, Part A funds does not meet the AYP standard for the same measure for two or more consecutive years, that district or campus is subject to certain Title I School Improvement requirements which increase in severity each year. In order to be released from the sanctions, the district or campus must meet the standards for the measure that caused them to go into School Improvement for two consecutive years, remembering that the performance standards will continue to increase over time. Non-Title 1 schools that do not meet the AYP standard for the same measure for two or more consecutive years are required to revise their School Improvement Plan to address the deficit. The requirements for each stage of the sanctions are described below.

The Title 1 School Improvement **Stage 1** requirements are as follows:

- The school must develop/revise a two-year school improvement campus plan.
- The school must notify parents of campus school improvement status.
- The school district must offer school choice, and transportation must be provided.
- The school district must establish a peer review process to provide assistance to the campus.

The Title 1 School Improvement **Stage 2** requirements are as follows:

- Stage 1 campus and district improvement activities continue.
- Supplemental Education Services must be offered to eligible students on the campus.

The Title 1 School Improvement **Stage 3** requirements are as follows:

- Stage 2 Improvement activities continue.
- The school district must implement one of the following corrective actions:
 1. Replace the school staff relevant to not meeting AYP,
 2. Implement curricular and staff development activities,
 3. Significantly decrease management authority at the campus,
 4. Appoint an outside expert adviser to the campus,
 5. Extend the school year or school day of the campus, or
 6. Restructure the organization of the campus.
- The school district must publish and disseminate information regarding corrective action.

The Title 1 School Improvement **Stage 4** requirements are as follows:

- The school district must continue to offer school choice, technical assistance, and supplemental education services to eligible students.
- The school district must prepare a plan and make necessary arrangements to implement one of the following options:
 1. Reopen the school as a charter school,
 2. Replace principal and staff,
 3. Contract with a private management company,
 4. State takeover, or
 5. Other major restructuring of campus governance.

Findings

This report supersedes the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Preliminary Results 2004–05 School Year that was produced in August 2005. This revision reflects the results of appeals submitted to the state regarding the ratings of several schools. Specifically, appeals were submitted on behalf of 19 campuses. The state granted three of the appeals. The rating for Fleming Middle School was changed from Missed AYP to Meets AYP after appeal. Two schools, Yates High School and Contemporary Learning Center High School, will still receive ratings of Missed AYP, although the appeals to remove an indicator were granted. These schools missed AYP on several indicators.

Tables detailing results for the Houston Independent School District (HISD) are provided below and are organized by district, school level, and region. Also provided is a table of schools that missed AYP along with the indicators and the relevant student groups, which determined each school's 2005 rating.

District-Level Rating

HISD was rated Met AYP for the last three school years. **Table 3** provides a count of the schools that met or missed the AYP standards in the last three years. The results are disaggregated by academic level and presented in **Table 4**.

Table 3: AYP Ratings of HISD Schools

Rating	2003	2004	2005
Met AYP	251	260	230
Missed AYP	32	26	50
Not Evaluated	21	21	22
Total	304	307	302

- In 2005, 280 of HISD's 302 campuses were evaluated under the AYP guidelines. Expressly 93% of HISD schools were held accountable under NCLB guidelines. There were six less schools evaluated than in 2004.
- The majority of HISD campuses evaluated, 230 or 82%, met AYP standards. Of the 280 schools evaluated, 50 or 18%, did not meet the AYP standards.

Table 4: AYP Ratings of HISD Schools by Level

Rating	Elementary	Middle	High	Mixed	Total
Met AYP	186	31	12	1	230
Missed AYP	7	18	25	0	50
Total	193	49	37	1	280

- Of the 193 elementary schools that were evaluated on AYP, 186 or 96%, met the AYP standards.
- Of the 49 middle schools that were evaluated on AYP, 31 or 63, met the AYP standards.
- Of the 37 high schools that were evaluated on AYP, 12 or 32%, met the AYP standards.
- A disproportionate number of high schools missed AYP when compared to the rating at the elementary and middle school levels. Specifically, while high schools accounted for 13% of the schools evaluated under AYP, they comprised 50% of HISD schools that missed AYP in 2005.

Results by Region or Office

The results of the AYP system of accountability for campuses were examined by region or office. HISD schools are organized in either one of five regions or in one of two offices. The five regions are geographical: Central, East, North, South, or West. The two offices are based on function, either Special Education or Alternative/Charter. The number and percent of schools that met or missed AYP for each region or office are presented in **Table 5**.

Table 5: AYP Ratings of HISD Schools by Region

Region	Number of Schools Rated	Met AYP	Percent Met AYP	Missed AYP	Percent Missed AYP
Alternative/Charter	17	11	65	6	35
Central	58	51	88	7	12
East	41	34	83	7	17
North	64	52	81	12	19
South	37	25	68	12	32
Special Ed.	1	1	100	0	0
West	62	56	90	6	10

- The number of schools rated in each region varied greatly. The range was from 37 schools in the South Region to 64 schools in the North Region.
- Of the five regions, four had at least 80% of their schools rated as Met AYP. The West Region had the highest percentage of schools meeting AYP with 90%. The South had the highest percentage of schools missing AYP with 32%
- Of the 17 schools served by the Alternative/Charter Office that were evaluated on AYP, 65% met AYP, while 35% missed AYP.

Campuses Rated as Missed AYP

Under the first year of the AYP system in 2003, eight HISD Title I schools failed to meet AYP standards (**Table 6**). Of these schools, four failed to meet AYP for the same indicator in 2004: Kay On-Going HS, Lee High School, Marshall Middle School, and Wheatley High School. These schools fell under Title I School Improvement Stage 1 Requirements for 2004–05. In 2005, three of these schools, Kay On-Going, Lee, and Marshall failed again to meet AYP for the same indicator and will be placed on Title I School Improvement Stage 2 Requirements for 2005–06. Wheatley High School met AYP for the first time in 2005, and therefore will not be placed on Stage 2 sanctions in alignment with AYP guidelines, but will remain at Stage 1 sanctions until it meets AYP for two consecutive years.

Based on the AYP performance of Title I schools in 2004 and the final results from 2005, there are 16 additional schools that will be on Title I School Improvement Stage 1 Requirements for 2005–06.

Table 6: Schools Failing to Meet AYP, Title I Status and Sanction Status: 2003 to 2005

School	2003			2004			2005		
	Title I	Missed AYP	Sanctions	Title I	Missed AYP	Sanctions	Title I	Missed AYP	Sanctions
ALTA HS		x		x	x		x	x	S1
Attucks MS	x	x					x	x	
Austin HS				x	x		x	x	S1
Bellaire HS		x							
Carter Career Ctr.		x		x	x				
Chavez HS		x		x	x		x	x	S1
CLC HS		x		x	x		x	x	S1
CLC MS				x	x		x	x	S1
Davis HS		x		x	x		x	x	S1
Deady MS							x	x	
Dowling MS							x	x	
DRAW Charter*				x	x				
E. O. Smith MS	x	x					x	x	
Edison MS							x	x	
Energ for Excell HS*				x	x				
Field ES							x	x	
Fondren MS							x	x	
Furr HS	x	x		x	x	NSI	x	x	NSI
Gregory-Lincoln ES				x	x				
Gregory-Lincoln MS							x	x	
Grimes ES							x	x	
Hogg MS							x	x	
Holland MS							x	x	
Houston Drop Back In		x					x	x	
Houston HS		x		x	x		x	x	S1
Houston Night HS		x					x	x	
Jones HS		x		x	x		x	x	S1
Jordan HS		x							
Kashmere HS		x		x	x		x	x	S1
Kay On-going HS	x	x		x	x	S1	x	x	S2
Key MS							x	x	
Lamar HS		x							
Lee HS	x	x		x	x	S1	x	x	S2
Long MS							x	x	
Looscan ES							x	x	
M.C.T.C. HS							x	x	
Madison HS		x					x	x	
Marshall MS	x	x		x	x	S1	x	x	S2
McReynolds MS				x	x		x	x	S1
Milby HS		x					x	x	

S1 = Stage 1 Sanctions for School Improvement
S2 = Stage 2 Sanctions for School Improvement
NSI = Not the Same Indicator, No Sanctions Given
* Campus Closed for 2004-05

Table 6: Schools Failing to Meet AYP, Title I Status and Sanction Status: 2003 to 2005 (cont)

School	2003			2004			2005		
	Title I	Missed AYP	Sanctions	Title I	Missed AYP	Sanctions	Title I	Missed AYP	Sanctions
Provision				x	x				
Reagan HS				x	x		x	x	S1
Rhoads ES							x	x	
Ryan ES							x	x	
Ryan MS	x	x							
Sanderson ES							x	x	
Scarborough HS		x					x	x	
Sharpstown HS		x		x	x		x	x	S1
Sharpstown MS							x	x	
Sterling HS		x					x	x	
Thomas MS				x	x		x	x	S1
Waltrip HS		x					x	x	
Washington HS		x					x	x	
Westbury HS		x		x	x		x	x	S1
Westside HS		x							
Wheatley HS	x	x		x	x	S1	x		S1
Williams MS							x	x	
Woodson ES							x	x	
Woodson MS							x	x	
Worthing HS		x		x	x		x	x	S1
Yates HS		x		x	x		x	x	S1

S1 = Stage 1 Sanctions for School Improvement

S2 = Stage 2 Sanctions for School Improvement

NSI = Not the Same Indicator, No Sanctions Given

* Campus Closed for 2004-05

The specific details of the AYP results for campuses that missed AYP in 2005 were analyzed. **Table 7** presents the results for campuses that were rated Missed AYP along with the reason. The table also shows whether or not the campus has been placed under Title I School Improvement sanctions. To receive sanctions, the school has to have received Title I funding and missed AYP on the same indicator for two or more consecutive years.

2005 AYP Accountability Ratings by Region

Central Region			Reading		Math			
School	2004 Rating	2005 Rating	Perf	Part	Perf	Part	Grad/Att	Sch Impr
Benbrook ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Blackshear ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Brock ES	Met AYP	Not Evaluated PK-K						
Browning ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Crockett ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Dodson ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Douglass ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Durham ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Field ES	Met AYP	Missed AYP	L					
Foster ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Garden Oaks ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Gregory-Lincoln ES	Missed AYP	Met AYP						
Hartsfield ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Harvard ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Helms ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Jones, J. Will ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Lockhart ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Love ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
MacArthur ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
MacGregor ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Memorial ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Oak Forest ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Peck ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Poe ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Rice School ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
River Oaks ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Roberts ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Rogers, W. ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Sinclair ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Smith, K. ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Stevens ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						

Legend for Codes and Standards

Student Groups Identified T = Total for All Students A = African American H - Hispanic W = White
 E = Economically Disadvantaged S = Special Education L = Limited English Proficient

Other Abbreviations S 1 = Stage 1 Sanctions for School Improvement
 S2 = Stage 2 Sanctions for School Improvement
 NSI = Not the Same Indicator, No Sanctions Given

2005 AYP Accountability Ratings by Region

Central Region			Reading		Math			
School	2004 Rating	2005 Rating	Perf	Part	Perf	Part	Grad/Att	Sch Impr
Stevenson ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
St. John's Academy	Not Rated	Not Evaluated PK-K						
Thompson ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Travis ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
TSU/HISD Lab School	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Turner ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Twain ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Wainwright ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
West University ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Wharton ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Whidby ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Wilson ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Black MS	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Clifton MS	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Cullen MS	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Gregory-Lincoln MS	Met AYP	Missed AYP			TAHE			
Hamilton MS	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Hogg MS	Met AYP	Missed AYP			THESL			
Lanier MS	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Rice School MS	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Ryan MS	Met AYP	Met AYP						
DeBakey HSHP	Met AYP	Met AYP						
HSLECJ	Met AYP	Met AYP						
HSPVA	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Lamar HS	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Reagan HS	Missed AYP	Missed AYP	THE		THE			S1
Scarborough HS	Met AYP	Missed AYP	THE		THE			
Waltrip HS	Met AYP	Missed AYP	H		HE			
Yates HS	Missed AYP	Missed AYP	TAE					S1

Legend for Codes and Standards

Student Groups Identified T = Total for All Students A = African American H = Hispanic W = White
 E = Economically Disadvantaged S = Special Education L = Limited English Proficient

Other Abbreviations S 1 = Stage 1 Sanctions for School Improvement
 S2 = Stage 2 Sanctions for School Improvement
 NSI = Not the Same Indicator, No Sanctions Given

2005 AYP Accountability Ratings by Region

East Region School	2004 Rating	2005 Rating	Reading		Math		Grad/Att	Sch Impr
			Perf	Part	Perf	Part		
Bellfort Academy	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Bonner ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Briscoe ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Burnet ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Cage ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Carrillo ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Clinton Park ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Crespo ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Davila ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
De Zavala ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Franklin ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Gallegos ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Harris, J. R. ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Harris, R. P. ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Henderson, J. P. ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Lantrip ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Laurenzo EC	Not Rated	Not Evaluated PK-K						
Lewis ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Oates ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Park Place ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Patterson ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Pleasantville ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Port Houston ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Robinson ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Rucker ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Rusk School	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Sánchez ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Southmayd ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Tijerina ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Whittier ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Deady MS	Met AYP	Missed AYP	L		THEL	L		
Edison MS	Met AYP	Missed AYP			L			

Legend for Codes and Standards

Student Groups Identified T = Total for All Students A = African American H = Hispanic W = White
 E = Economically Disadvantaged S = Special Education L = Limited English Proficient

Other Abbreviations S 1 = Stage 1 Sanctions for School Improvement
 S2 = Stage 2 Sanctions for School Improvement
 NSI = Not the Same Indicator, No Sanctions Given

2005 AYP Accountability Ratings by Region

East Region School	2004 Rating	2005 Rating	Reading		Math		Grad/Att	Sch Impr
			Perf	Part	Perf	Part		
Holland MS	Met AYP	Missed AYP			TAHEL			
Jackson MS	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Ortiz MS	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Project Chrysalis MS	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Stevenson MS	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Austin HS	Missed AYP	Missed AYP	L		L		T	S1
Chavez HS	Missed AYP	Missed AYP	THE		L			S1
Eastwood Academy	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Furr HS	Missed AYP	Missed AYP			THE			
Milby	Met AYP	Missed AYP			L			

Legend for Codes and Standards

Student Groups Identified T = Total for All Students A = African American H - Hispanic W = White
 E = Economically Disadvantaged S = Special Education L = Limited English Proficient

Other Abbreviations S 1 = Stage 1 Sanctions for School Improvement
 S2 = Stage 2 Sanctions for School Improvement
 NSI = Not the Same Indicator, No Sanctions Given

2005 AYP Accountability Ratings by Region

North Region			Reading		Math			
School	2004 Rating	2005 Rating	Perf	Part	Perf	Part	Grad/Att	Sch Impr
McDade ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
North Alt ES	Not Rated	Not Evaluated Other						
Northline ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Osborne ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Pugh ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Roosevelt ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Ross ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Ryan ES	Met AYP	Missed AYP	HL					
Sanderson ES	Met AYP	Missed AYP			A			
Scarborough ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Scott ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Scroggins ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Sherman ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Smith, E. O. ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Three "D" Academy	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Wesley ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Wheatley Child Dev.	Not Rated	Not Evaluated PK-K						
Burbank MS	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Fleming MS	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Fonville MS	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Henry MS	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Key MS	Met AYP	Missed AYP			TAHE			
Marshall MS	Missed AYP	Missed AYP			THEL			S2
McReynolds MS	Missed AYP	Missed AYP			THEL			S1
North Alt MS	Not Rated	Not Evaluated Other						
Smith, E. O. MS	Met AYP	Missed AYP			H			
Williams MS	Met AYP	Missed AYP			A			
Davis HS	Missed AYP	Missed AYP	THEL		THE		T	S1
Sam Houston HS	Missed AYP	Missed AYP	THE		THEL			S1
Jordan, Barbara HS	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Kashmere HS	Missed AYP	Missed AYP		TA		TE		S1
Washington HS	Met AYP	Missed AYP			A			
Wheatley HS	Missed AYP	Met AYP						S1

Legend for Codes and Standards

Student Groups Identified T = Total for All Students A = African American H = Hispanic W = White
 E = Economically Disadvantaged S = Special Education L = Limited English Proficient

Other Abbreviations S 1 = Stage 1 Sanctions for School Improvement
 S2 = Stage 2 Sanctions for School Improvement
 NSI = Not the Same Indicator, No Sanctions Given

2005 AYP Accountability Ratings by Region

West Region	2004 Rating	2005 Rating	Reading		Math		Grad/Att	Sch Impr
			Perf	Part	Perf	Part		
Anderson ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Argyle ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Ashford ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Askew ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Bell ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Benavidez ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Bonham ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Braeburn ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Briargrove ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Briarmeadow ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Bush ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Condit ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Cunningham ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Elrod ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Emerson ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Foerster ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Fondren ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Gordon ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Gross ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Halpin Center EC	Met AYP	Not Evaluated PK-K						
Herod ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Horn ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Kolter ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Las Americas EC	Not Rated	Not Evaluated PK-K						
Longfellow ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Lovett ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
McNamara ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Milne ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Neff ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Parker ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Pilgrim ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Piney Point ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Red ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						
Rodriguez ES	Met AYP	Met AYP						

Legend for Codes and Standards

Student Groups Identified	T = Total for All Students	A = African American	H = Hispanic	W = White
	E = Economically Disadvantaged	S = Special Education	L = Limited English Proficient	
Other Abbreviations	S 1 = Stage 1 Sanctions for School Improvement			
	S2 = Stage 2 Sanctions for School Improvement			
	NSI = Not the Same Indicator, No Sanctions Given			

2005 AYP Accountability Ratings by Region

West Region				Reading		Math			
School	2004 Rating	2005 Rating	Perf	Part	Perf	Part	Grad/Att	Sch Impr	
Rogers, T. H. ES	Met AYP	Met AYP							
Sands Point ES	Met AYP	Met AYP							
School at Post Oak	Met AYP	Met AYP							
Shadowbriar School	Met AYP	Met AYP							
Shearn ES	Met AYP	Met AYP							
Sugar Grove ES	Met AYP	Met AYP							
Sutton ES	Met AYP	Met AYP							
Tinsley ES	Met AYP	Met AYP							
Valley West ES	Met AYP	Met AYP							
Walnut Bend ES	Met AYP	Met AYP							
White ES	Met AYP	Met AYP							
Briarmeadow MS	Met AYP	Met AYP							
Fondren MS	Met AYP	Missed AYP	S						
Grady MS	Met AYP	Met AYP							
Johnston MS	Met AYP	Met AYP							
Kaleidoscope School	Met AYP	Met AYP							
Las Americas MS	Not Rated	Not Evaluated Other							
Long MS	Met AYP	Missed AYP			THEL				
Pershing MS	Met AYP	Met AYP							
Pin Oak MS	Met AYP	Met AYP							
Revere MS	Met AYP	Met AYP							
Rogers, T. H. MS	Met AYP	Met AYP							
Sharpstown MS	Met AYP	Missed AYP			S				
Welch MS	Met AYP	Met AYP							
West Briar MS	Met AYP	Met AYP							
Bellaire HS	Met AYP	Met AYP							
Challenge HS	Not Rated	Met AYP							
Lee HS	Missed AYP	Missed AYP	THEL		THEL		T	S2	
Sharpstown HS	Missed AYP	Missed AYP	TAHE	L	TAHEL	A		S1	
Westbury HS	Missed AYP	Missed AYP	THE	L		L		S1	
Westside HS	Met AYP	Met AYP							

Legend for Codes and Standards

Student Groups Identified T = Total for All Students A = African American H - Hispanic W = White
 E = Economically Disadvantaged S = Special Education L = Limited English Proficient

Other Abbreviations S 1 = Stage 1 Sanctions for School Improvement
 S2 = Stage 2 Sanctions for School Improvement
 NSI = Not the Same Indicator, No Sanctions Given

