2023 Leaver Records Data Validation Manual

Texas Education Agency

Office of School Programs
Office of Analytics, Assessment, and Reporting
Division of Performance Reporting

Performance- Based Monitoring Data Validation

The Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) system, which was developed in response to state and federal statutes, is a comprehensive system designed to improve student performance and program effectiveness. The PBM system is a data-driven system that relies on data submitted by local education agencies (LEAs); therefore, the integrity of LEAs' data is critical. To ensure data integrity, the PBM system includes annual data validation analyses that examine LEAs' leaver and dropout, student assessment, and discipline data. Additional data analyses, including random audits, are conducted as necessary to ensure the data submitted to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) are accurate and reliable.

Differences Between Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators and Other PBM   Indicators

There are key differences between the leaver records data validation indicators used as part of the PBM Data Validation System and the performance indicators used in the performance-based monitoring systems such as Results Driven Accountability (RDA). A performance indicator yields a **definitive** result, e.g., 85% of a particular cohort graduated with a high school diploma in four years. A leaver records data validation indicator typically **suggests** an anomaly that may require a local review to determine whether the anomalous data is accurate. For example, an LEA may report all of its leavers as intending to enroll in a private school. This single use of a leaver reason code for all leavers within a given year suggests a potential data anomaly. However, the LEA may determine, after a local review and verification process, the exclusive use of one particular leaver reason code can be validated.

Another difference between performance indicators and PBM leaver records data validation indicators is the criteria used to evaluate LEAs. In performance-based monitoring, performance indicators include **a range of established cut points** used to evaluate LEAs, while leaver records data validation indicators typically require an **annual review of data** to identify what data may be anomalous or what trends can be observed over time. Evaluation criteria on individual leaver records data validation indicators generally are not, and cannot be, established in advance, although there are some exceptions (e.g., underreported students) where an established standard is used.

The required response by the LEA is also different depending upon whether the LEA is identified under a performance indicator or a PBM leaver records data validation indicator. LEAs identified with a performance indicator concern are generally expected to (a) improve performance; or (b) if the identification of a performance indicator concern occurred because of inaccurate data, improve local data collection and submission procedures. LEAs identified as a result of a leaver records data validation indicator are generally expected to (a) validate and document their data are, in fact, correct; and (b) if correct data reflect a program implementation concern, address that concern; or (c) if the LEA's identification occurred because of incorrect data, improve local data collection and submission procedures.

Differences Between Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators and Performance-   Based Monitoring System   RDA Indicators

Indicator Type	Result	Evaluation Criteria	LEA Response
Leaver Records Data Validation	Suggests an anomaly	Based on annual review of data to identify anomalous data and trends observed over time	Validate accuracy of data locally and, as necessary, improve local data collection and submission procedures or address program implementation concerns
Performance-based monitoring system such as RDA	Yields a definitive result	Based on cut points established in advance	Improve performance or program effectiveness, or if identification occurred because of inaccurate data, improve data collection and submission procedures

3. Use of Leaver Reason Codes by LEAs with No Dropouts
4. Use of One or More Leaver Reason Codes
5. Use of Certain Leaver Reason Dropout Codes
6. Missing UID[1] Enrollment Tracking Submission (First day of school through September 8, 2023)
7. Missing UID Enrollment Tracking Submissions (2022-2023 Reporting Year)
8. Continuing Students' Dropout Rate (Class of 2021), as of Fall 2022

Data Sources

The Texas Student Data System (TSDS) is a statewide system for collecting and reporting education data. TSDS is a major TEA initiative that expanded on the former Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS). As specified by TEC §48.008, LEAs are required to submit data on student demographics, academic performance, personnel, and LEA finances. These data are submitted through the TSDS PEIMS application and used by TEA annually to process leaver records data validation indicators.

The data source for Indicators #1-5 and #8 is the TSDS PEIMS 40203 Subcategory.[2] (See Appendix A for a list of the leaver reason codes used in these indicators.) This data is part of LEAs' annual fall TSDS PEIMS submission and reflects the 2021-2022 leaver data submitted by LEAs in the fall of 2022. Indicators #1 and #8 also include TSDS PEIMS data submitted by LEAs in the fall of 2021; additionally, Indicator #1 includes TSDS PEIMS data submitted by LEAs in the fall of 2020. The data source for Indicators #6 and #7 is UID Enrollment Tracking reports.

Data Validation Reports

LEA-level reports and certain student-level data[3] will be generated for each LEA identified on one or more of the 2023 leaver records data validation indicators. These

Sample Report

Texas Education Agency
2023 PBM Data Validation District Report
Leaver Records

County-District Number: xxxxxx   Region ZZ
District Name: Example ISD
District Type: Non-Metropolitan: Stable

DATA SOURCES:
     INDICATOR 1 = TSDS PEIMS FALL SUBMISSION 2020, 2021 and 2022 (40203 Subcategory)
     INDICATORS 2-5 = TSDS PEIMS FALL SUBMISSION 2022 (40203 Subcategory)
     INDICATORS 6-7 = UID ENROLLMENT TRACKING 8/1/22-9/8/23
     INDICATOR 8 = TSDS PEIMS FALL SUBMISSION 2021 and 2022 (40203 Subcategory)

INDICATOR 1. LEAVER DATA ANALYSIS

	2021 NUMERATOR	2021 DENOMINATOR	2021 PERCENT	2022 NUMERATOR	2022 DENOMINATOR	2022 PERCENT	2-YEAR CHANGE
▇▇▇▇	137	994	13.8	42	1,012	▇▇▇▇▇	-9.-

This report contains confidential information and data that are not masked to protect individual student confidentiality. Unauthorized disclosure of confidential student information is illegal as provided in the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA) and implementing federal regulations found in 34 CFR, Part 99.

For detailed information on each of the indicators above, see the 2023 Leaver Records Data Validation Manual

The data in the sample report above can be interpreted as follows:

The LEA's dropout rate decreased 9.6 percentage points between 2021 and 2022. This decrease in dropout rates may be the result of accurate reporting of leaver data by the LEA. Validation of accurate data is a critical safeguard that helps ensure the integrity of the overall PBM system. The components this LEA should analyze and validate include total leavers, graduates, other leavers, dropouts, and underreported students – particularly the change from 2021 to

Section II:
2023 Leaver Data Records Validation Indicators

This indicator evaluates the change in LEAs' dropout rates in relation to several components of interrelated data, including dropouts, graduates, other leavers, and underreported students.

Calculation

Dropout rates are affected by a variety of interrelated data, and a comprehensive analysis of those data is an effective way to evaluate the different factors that may have contributed to an LEA's change in dropout rates over time.

While not exhaustive, the list below identifies key components analyzed under this indicator.

a.

b.

c.

d.

LEAs with dropout rate decreases accompanied primarily by increases in other leavers, underreported students, or other anomalous data may be identified by this indicator. LEAs with reported increases in other leavers during the time periods evaluated should carefully analyze, and be able to validate, their use of leaver reason codes 16, 60, 81, and 82 in particular. However, depending on the specific LEA's data, other leaver reason codes may also be relevant for analysis and validation. (See Appendix A for a complete list of leaver reason codes.)

Minimum Size Requirements

x   Minimum of 20 Grade 7-12 students in attendance anytime during each school year evaluated.
x   Number of Grade 7-12 students designated as dropouts during each school year evaluated.

Notes

x   The change in dropout rates of LEAs identified by this indicator may be the result of accurate reporting of leaver data. Validation of accurate data is a critical safeguard that helps ensure the integrity of the overall PBM system.
x   LEA type is considered in this indicator. (See Appendix B).
x   See the sample LEA report in Section I of the manual for more detailed information about key data components evaluated in this indicator.
x   See Indicator #2 for additional information about underreported students.

This indicator identifies LEAs exceeding the state standard for the count of or percent of underreported students.

Calculation

1. LEA count of underreported students:

2. LEA percent of underreported students:

Minimum Size Requirements

x E µ u Œ š } Œ H ñ µ v Œ Œ ‰ } Œ š   • š µ   v (state) ~ } µ v š • v   š o • š ì X ó 9

Notes

x

This indicator identifies LEAs with no dropouts and a potentially anomalous use of certain leaver reason codes.

Calculation

This indicator identifies LEAs with a potentially anomalous use of one or more leaver reason codes.

Calculation

Minimum Size Requirements
x v } u] v š }] O E H
x E µ u Œ š } Œ Œ H 5

This indicator identifies LEAs that did not complete at least one UID Enrollment Tracking submission between the first day of school through September 8, 2023.

Calculation

Minimum Size Requirements
x   Not Applicable

Notes

For additional information on UID Enrollment Tracking, see Section 9 (with Enrollment) of TEDS available at TEDS Section 9 Unique ID Specifications.

Section III: Appendices

Appendix: A –   List of Leaver Reason Codes

A list of leaver reason codes can be found on the TSDS Web-Enabled Data Standards (TWEDS) web page.

Appendix: B – Brief Descriptions of District Type Classifications, 2021-2022

Brief descriptions of district type classifications can be found on the [District Type](#) web page.

Type	Descriptions
Major Urban	A district is classified as major urban if: (a) it is located in a county with a population of at least 1,125,000; (enrollment is the largest in the county or at least 70 percent of the largest district enrollment in the county; a 35 percent of enrolled students are economically disadvantaged. A student is reported as economically disa he or she is eligible for free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Pr Example: Austin ISD (227901).
Major Suburban	A district is classified as major suburban if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification as major urban; contiguous to a major urban district; and (c) its enrollment is at least 3 percent that of the largest contiguous distict or at least 4,500 students. A district also is classified as major suburban if: (a) it does not meet the cr classification as major urban; (b) it is not contiguous to a major urban district; (c) it is located in the same co major urban district; and (d) its enrollment is at least 15 percent that of the largest major urban district in the least 4,500 students. Examples: Castleberry ISD (220917) and Goose Creek CISD (101911).
Other Central City	A district is classified as other central city if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification in either of the subcategories; (b) it is not contiguous to a major urban district; (c) it is located in a county with a population 100,000 and 1,124,999; and (d) its enrollment is the largest in the county or at least 70 percent of the larges enrollment in the county. Examples: Brownsville ISD (031901) and La Joya ISD (108912).
Other Central City Suburban	A district is classified as other central city suburban if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification in an previous subcategories; (b) it is located in a county with a population of between 100,000 and 1,124,999; a enrollment is at least 15 percent of the largest district enrollment in the county. A district also is other centra if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification in any of the previous subcategories; (b) it is contiguous central city district; (c) its enrollment is at least 3 percent that of the largest contiguous other central city dis enrollment is equal to or greater than the median district enrollment for the state of Examples: Harlingen CISD (031903) and Port Arthur ISD (123907).
Independent Town	A district is classified as independent town if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification in any of the p subcategories; (b) it is located in a county with a population of 25,000 to 99,999; and (c) its enrollment is the county or is at least 70 percent of the largest district enrollment in the county. Examples: Victoria ISD (2359 Winnsboro ISD (250907).
Non-Metropolitan: Fast Growing	A district is classified as non-metropolitan: fast growing if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification in any previous subcategories; (b) it has an enrollment of at least 300 students; and (c) its enrollment has increase 20 percent over the past five years. Example: Celina ISD (043903) (0
Non-Metropolitan: Stable	A district is classified as non-metropolitan: stable if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification in any of the subcategories; and (b) its enrollment is equal to or greater than the median district enrollment for the state. Snyder ISD (208902).
Rural	A district is classified as rural if it does not meet the criteria for classification in any of the previous subcateg district has either: (a) an enrollment of between 300 and the median district enrollment for the state and an growth rate over the past five years of less than 20 percent; or (b) an enrollment of less than 300 students. l

Appendix: C – ESC Contacts

ESC Results Driven Accountability Contacts that assist with data validation can be found on the [AskTED](#) web page, using the Search RESCs function.

Full Name	Region	City	Phone	Email Address
Tammie Garcia	1	Edinburg	(956) 984-6173	tgarcia@esc1.net
Cristina Sandoval	2	Corpus Christi	(361) 568-8454	cristina.sandoval@esc2.us
Missy Klimitchek	3	Victoria	(361) 573-0731 ext:115	mklimitchek@esc3.net
Kenda Matson	3	Victoria	(361) 573-0731 ext:321	KMatson@esc3.net
Jamie Schrade	3	Victoria	(361) 573-0731 ext:1119	jschrade@esc3.net
Angel Lozano	4	Houston	(713) 744-6596	angel.lozano@esc4.net
Danette Thornton	4	Houston	(713) 744-6578	danette.thornton@esc4.net
Monica Mahfouz	5	Beaumont	(409) 951-1702	mmahfouz@esc5.net
Sandy Cammarata Garcia	6	Huntsville	(936) 435-8235	sgarcia@esc6.net
Laura Brinkley	6	Huntsville	(936) 435-8253	lbrinkley iP <</MCID 88 > >>BDC 69.9 513.3

Full Name	Region	City	Phone	Email Address
Jael Chac	10	Richardson	(972) 348-6500	jael.chac@region10.org
Beth Garcia	10	Richardson	(972) 348-6526	beth.garcia@region10.org
Evan Heckmann	10	Richardson	(972) 348-3770	evan.heckmann@region10.org
Kevin Alaniz	10	Richardson	(972) 348-6592	kevin.alaniz@region10.org
Sonia Rhykerd	10	Richardson	(972) 348-6552	sonia.rhykerd@region10.org

Elizabeth Schrader/6.221   -   -

The Performance-Based Monitoring contact information for this appendix is provided by each ESC. If contact information is missing, call the ESC main number listed at Education Service Centers for assistance.

Appendix: D – Comments and Questions

25

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators

Performance-Based Monitoring
Phone: (512) 463-9704
Email: pbm@tea.texas.gov

Data Reporting Compliance Reviews

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