

2008 Leaver Records Data Validation Manual

Performance-Based Monitoring System

Texas Education Agency
Department of Assessment, Accountability, and Data Quality
Division of Performance-Based Monitoring

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

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

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

For information contact:

Office of Copyrights, Trademarks, License Agreements, and Royalties
Texas Education Agency
1701 N. Congress Ave.
Austin, TX 78701-1494
Phone: (512) 463-9270
Email: copyrights@tea.state.tx.us

Table of Contents
2008 Leaver Records Data Validation Manual

Section I: Introduction

Performance-Based Monitoring Data Validation2

Differences Between Leaver Data Validation Indicators and Other PBM Indicators2

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators: Background4

List of 2008 Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators5

Data Sources6

Data Validation Reports.....6

Sample Report.....7

Data Validation Requirements8

Leaver Reason Codes and Documentation Requirements9

Additional Resources9

Section II: 2008 Data Validation Indicators

#1—Dropout Trend Analysis.....12

#2—Underreported Students13

#3—Zero Dropouts and High Use of Other Exit Leaver Codes14

#4—High Use of One or More Leaver Codes15

#5—Missing PET Submission (September 2007)16

#6—Missing PET Submission (2007-2008 Reporting Year)17

Section III: Appendix

A. List of Leaver Codes18

B. Brief Descriptions of District Type Classifications, 2006-200719

Section IV: Comments and Questions

Comments on the Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators.....21

This page intentionally left blank

Performance-Based Monitoring Data Validation

The Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) system, which was developed in 2003 in response to state and federal statute, is a comprehensive system designed to improve student performance and program effectiveness. The PBM system is a data-driven system that uses performance and program effectiveness data submitted to the state by local education agencies (LEAs); therefore, the integrity of these data is critical. To ensure data integrity, the PBM system includes annual data validation analyses that use several different indicators to examine district leaver and dropout data, student assessment data, and discipline data. Additional data analyses are conducted as necessary to ensure the data submitted to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) are accurate and reliable.

Differences Between Leaver Data Validation Indicators and Other PBM Indicators

As shown in the table on page 3, there are key differences between the leaver data validation indicators used as part of the PBM Data Validation System and the performance indicators used in the Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS). A PBMAS performance indicator yields a **definitive** result, e.g., 100% of an LEA's graduates completed the Recommended High School Program. A leaver data validation indicator typically **suggests** an anomaly that a local review may ultimately determine to be verifiable and 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 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, that the exclusive use of one particular leaver code can be validated.

Because a PBMAS performance indicator yields a definitive result, an LEA's performance on PBMAS indicators is made **public**. Because a leaver data validation indicator typically yields a result that is suggestive but may not be definitive, an LEA's initial results on these indicators are **not made public**. Results of the leaver data validation indicators are only released on the Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE).

Another difference between PBMAS performance indicators and PBM leaver data validation indicators is the use of standards. A PBMAS performance indicator is based on a **standard** that is made public with as much advance notice as possible and that all LEAs can achieve over time. The goal for LEAs on PBMAS performance indicators is progress toward the standard over time. A leaver data validation indicator is typically based on an **annual review of data** in an attempt to identify what data may be anomalous or what trends can be observed over time. Standards on individual leaver data validation indicators generally are not, and generally cannot be, made public in advance, although there are some exceptions (e.g., underreported students). The goal for LEAs on PBM leaver data validation indicators is to report accurate data each year.

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

Differences between Leaver Data Validation Indicators and other PBM Indicators				
Indicator Type	Result	Publicly Released	Standards	LEA Response
Leaver Data Validation	Suggests an anomaly	No	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
PBMAS	Yields a definitive result	Yes	Based on standards established in advance	Improve performance or program effectiveness or if identification occurred because of inaccurate data, improve data collection and submission procedures

By their very nature and purpose, leaver data validation indicators may identify some LEAs that are collecting and reporting data that are entirely accurate. **Confirming the accuracy of data is a critical part of the process that is necessary to validate and safeguard the integrity of the overall PBM system.** As such, the process LEAs engage in to either validate the accuracy of their data or determine that erroneous data were collected or submitted is fundamental to the integrity of the entire system.

Many districts initially identified through a leaver data validation indicator will be able to confirm the accuracy of their data. This is expected and should be handled by those districts as a routine data confirmation that is documented locally and, in some cases, communicated back to the agency. Other districts identified through a leaver data validation indicator will find their anomalous data to be the result of an isolated reporting error that can be addressed through better training, improved quality control of local data collection and submission processes, or other targeted local response. For some districts identified

through a leaver data validation indicator, it will be determined that the anomalous data reflect a systemic issue within one data collection (e.g., leaver data in general) or a pervasive issue (i.e., across data systems). In these less typical occurrences, a district's response will be more extensive, including more involvement by the agency and the application of sanctions as necessary and appropriate.

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators: Background

Since 1997-1998, the integrity of leaver records has been evaluated annually by TEA through various indicators and data analyses. Statutory requirements have also guided TEA's leaver records data validation efforts. During the 78th Legislature Regular Session (2003), Texas Education Code (§39.055) was amended to require an annual electronic audit of dropout records and a report based on the findings of the audit:

TEC §39.055. Annual Audit of Dropout Records; Report. (a) The commissioner shall develop a process for auditing school district dropout records electronically. The commissioner shall also develop a system and standards for review of the audit or use systems already available at the agency. The system must be designed to identify districts that are at high risk of having inaccurate dropout records and that, as a result, require on-site monitoring of dropout records. If the electronic audit of a district's dropout records indicates that a district is not at high risk of having inaccurate dropout records, the district may not be subject to on-site monitoring under this subsection. If the risk-based system indicates that a district is at high risk of having inaccurate dropout records, the district is entitled to an opportunity to respond to the commissioner's determination before on-site monitoring may be conducted. The district must respond not later than the 30th day after the date the commissioner notifies the district of the commissioner's determination. If the district's response does not change the commissioner's determination that the district is at high risk of having inaccurate dropout records or if the district does not respond in a timely manner, the commissioner shall order agency staff to conduct on-site monitoring of the district's dropout records.

(b) to (d) Repealed by Acts 2003, 78th Leg., ch. 201, § 61(1); Acts 2003, 78th Leg., ch. 903, § 4.

...

(e) The commissioner shall notify the board of trustees of a school district of any objection the commissioner has to the district's dropout data, any violation of sound accounting practices or of a law or rule revealed by the data, or any recommendation by the commissioner concerning the data. If the data reflect that a penal law has been violated, the commissioner shall notify the county attorney, district attorney, or criminal district attorney, as appropriate, and the attorney general. The commissioner is entitled to access to all district records the commissioner considers necessary or appropriate for the review, analysis, or approval of district dropout data.

List of 2008 Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators

Six data validation indicators have been developed to meet the statutory requirements described above. Detailed information on all of these indicators is provided in the next section of this manual.

1. Dropout Trend Analysis
2. Underreported Students
3. Zero Dropouts and High Use of Other Exit Leaver Codes
4. High Use of One or More Leaver Codes
5. Missing PET¹ Submission (September 2007) [Report Only]
6. Missing PET Submission (2007-2008 Reporting Year) [Report Only]

¹ PET is the Person Identification Database (PID) Enrollment Tracking (PET) extension that opened with the 2005-2006 Fall/Mid-Year release of PEIMS EDIT+ on September 26, 2005.

Data Sources

The data source for the first four leaver data validation indicators is the PEIMS 203 Record. (See Appendix A for a list of the leaver codes from the PEIMS 203 record used in these indicators.) These data are part of districts' annual fall PEIMS submission and reflect the 2006-2007 leaver data submitted by districts in the fall of 2007. (Indicator #1 also includes PEIMS 203 Record data submitted by districts in the fall of 2006.) The data source for the last two indicators is PID Enrollment Tracking reports for September 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

Data Validation Reports

District-level reports and certain student-level data² have been generated for each district identified for further validation on one or more of the 2008 leaver data validation indicators. These reports and student-level data are available via the TEASE application. Districts not identified for further validation will receive the following message if they attempt to access the report on TEASE: *“Your district was not identified in the 2008 leaver data validation analysis, and therefore no report will be generated.”*

If a district has been identified for further validation on an indicator, this is referred to as “triggering” an indicator. The district count of the number of leavers with a certain leaver code, the total number of leavers, and the percent of leavers with a certain leaver code will be noted on each district's report. Only the indicators a district triggers will be listed on the report. For example, in the sample report below, four of the six indicators are listed because those are the four indicators the sample district triggered.

² Student-level data are not applicable to Indicator #1, Indicator #5, and Indicator #6. Student-level data are not provided for Indicator #2 because the data (underreported students) are readily available in the PEIMS EDIT+ application. The EDIT+ report lists presumed underreported students and may vary slightly from the final lists.

SAMPLE REPORT
CONFIDENTIAL
Texas Education Agency
2008 Data Validation Report
Leaver Records

Example ISD
District Type: 7-Non-Metropolitan: Stable

Region ZZ

DATA SOURCE:

INDICATOR 1 = PEIMS FALL SUBMISSION 2006 and 2007 (203 Record)
INDICATORS 2-4 = PEIMS FALL SUBMISSION 2007 (203 Record)
INDICATORS 5-6 = PID ENROLLMENT TRACKING 09/01/07-06/30/08

INDICATOR

1. DROPOUT TREND ANALYSIS
2006-2007

<u>2006 DROPOUT RATE</u>	<u>2007 DROPOUT RATE</u>	<u>CHANGE 2006 TO 2007</u>
10.0	1.0	-9.0

2. UNDERREPORTED STUDENTS

<u>NUMBER OF UNDERREPORTED</u>	<u>TOTAL REPORTED AND UNDERREPORTED</u>	<u>PERCENT OF UNDERREPORTED</u>
525	7000	7.5

4. HIGH USE OF ONE OR MORE LEAVER CODES

<u>LEAVER CODE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF CODE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF LEAVERS</u>	<u>PERCENT OF CODE</u>
60	23	115	20.0

5. MISSING PET SUBMISSION (SEPTEMBER 2007)
(REPORT ONLY)

<u>REPORT DATE RANGE</u>
09/01/07-09/20/07

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 2008 Leaver Records Data Validation Manual available at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/pbm/DIManuals.html> .

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

DROPOUT TREND ANALYSIS: The district's dropout rate decreased 9 percentage points between 2006 and 2007, a trend that is appreciably different from the decrease in dropout rates of other similar districts. ***This decrease in dropout rates may be the result of accurate reporting of leaver data by the district. Validation of accurate reporting of data is a critical part of the process that is necessary to validate and safeguard the integrity of the overall PBM system.***

UNDERREPORTED STUDENTS: Both the district's total number of underreported students (525) and the district's underreported percent (7.5%) exceed the state standards of 200 (count) and 5% (percent). (A district can trigger this indicator for not meeting one or both of the state standards.) The standards for underreporting students are outlined in Part 1 (Chapter 3) of the *2008 Accountability Manual*, available at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2008/manual/index.html>.

HIGH USE OF LEAVER CODES: The district's percent of leavers coded 60 (intent to home school) is appreciably higher than other districts' percent of leavers coded 60. ***This high use may be the result of accurate reporting of leaver data by the district. Validation of accurate reporting of data is a critical part of the process that is necessary to validate and safeguard the integrity of the overall PBM system.***

MISSING PET SUBMISSION (SEPTEMBER 2007): A required PET Submission was not received by the agency during the date range of September 1, 2007 through September 20, 2007. This is a Report Only indicator for 2008.

Data Validation Requirements

Districts will be notified by the Program Monitoring and Interventions Division of any required data validation activities and the timelines for completing those activities. Guidance and resource documents that pertain specifically to the performance-based monitoring data validation indicators are available at: <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/pmi/datamon/>. These documents have been developed to support districts in reviewing their current data reporting and programmatic practices related to leaver and dropout data.

Leaver Reason Codes and Documentation Requirements

Appendix D of the 2007-2008 PEIMS Data Standards provides an expanded definition and specific guidelines on acceptable documentation for each of the leaver reason codes. This appendix can be accessed at the following web address: <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/peims/standards/0708/appd.doc>.

Additional Resources

There are several PEIMS EDIT+ reports districts may find helpful as part of a local review of leaver coding. These reports are based on data reported by districts.

- PRF8D002: School Leaver Roster
- PRF8D003: School Leaver Summary
- PRF8D004: Non-Dropout Non-Graduate Leaver Roster
- PRF6D002: Dropout Roster
- PRF0B032: Presumed Underreported Students List

In addition, the annual report, *Secondary School Completion and Dropouts in Texas Public Schools*, is a comprehensive report that includes summary information about both high school completion and non-completion. The district supplement to this report (available at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/research/reports.html>) contains data tables and listings of secondary school completion and dropout data at the district level. District-by-district listings of annual dropout rates and completion rates are presented, and a district listing of year-to-year reporting of students is also included. Other helpful tools and datasets can be found by accessing the Data Search menu at the following web site address: <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/acctres/entry.html>.

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators

This page intentionally left blank

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicator #1: Dropout Trend Analysis

This indicator identifies districts that reported a decrease in dropout rates over two years that was significantly greater than the reported decreases of other similar districts during that same time.

INDICATOR CALCULATION

A district's two-year change in dropout rates is calculated as follows:

$$\text{District 2007 dropout rate} = \frac{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 who dropped out of school in the 2006-2007 school year}}{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 in attendance at any time during the 2006-2007 school year}}$$

MINUS

$$\text{District 2006 dropout rate} = \frac{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 who dropped out of school in the 2005-2006 school year}}{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 in attendance at any time during the 2005-2006 school year}}$$

MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENTS	NOTES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 10 Grade 7-12 students in attendance anytime during each school year evaluated <u>and</u> at least 5 Grade 7-12 students designated as dropouts during each school year evaluated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A district is identified under this indicator if its two-year decrease in the Grade 7-12 dropout rates is appreciably different from the two-year decrease in the Grade 7-12 dropout rate for districts of the same type. <i>This change may be the result of accurate reporting of dropout data by the district. Validation of accurate data is a critical part of the process that is necessary to validate and safeguard the integrity of the overall PBM system.</i> District type is considered in this indicator. (See Appendix B). For additional information on the methodology for calculating the annual dropout rate, see the <i>Secondary School Completion and Dropouts in Texas Public Schools</i> report available at the following web address: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/research/.

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicator #2: Underreported Students

This indicator identifies districts not meeting the state standard for the count and/or percent of underreported students.

INDICATOR CALCULATION

District count of underreported students = *District number of students in Grades 7-12 for whom one of the following statuses does not apply: graduate, previous graduate, returned on time, returned late migrant student, mover, other leaver, GED recipient, or dropout*

District percent of underreported students = $\frac{\text{District count of underreported students (see above)}}{\text{District number of 2006-2007 students in Grades 7-12 who are returning students, leavers, and underreported students}}$

MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENTS

- At least 5 underreported students.

NOTES

- A district is identified under this indicator if it does not meet the standard for one or both of the following measures:
 - ◆ Count of underreported students: Must be fewer than or equal to 200.
 - ◆ Percent of underreported students: Must be less than or equal to 5.0%.

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicator #3: Zero Dropouts and High Use of Other Exit Leaver Codes

This indicator identifies districts with zero dropouts and an unusually high use of leavers with intent codes.

INDICATOR CALCULATION

$$\text{District percent leaver intent code usage} = \frac{\text{District number of 2006-2007 students in Grades 7-12 reported with Leaver Codes 16, 24, 60, 81, and 82}}{\text{District number of 2006-2007 students in Grades 7-12 reported with any non-graduate, non-dropout Leaver Code}}$$

MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENTS

- A minimum of **10** leavers.

NOTES

- A district with zero dropouts is identified under this indicator if its percentage of leavers with certain leaver codes is among the highest for all districts. ***This high use of leaver intent codes may be the result of accurate reporting of leaver data by the district. Validation of accurate reporting of data is a critical part of the process that is necessary to validate and safeguard the integrity of the overall PBM system.***

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicator #4: High Use of One or More Leaver Codes

This indicator identifies districts with an unusually high use of one or more leaver codes.

INDICATOR CALCULATION

$$\text{District percent leaver code usage} = \frac{\text{District number of 2006-2007 students in Grades 7-12 reported with a Leaver Code from the list below}}{\text{District number of 2006-2007 students in Grades 7-12 reported with any non-graduate, non-dropout Leaver Code}}$$

MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENTS AND LEAVER CODES

- A minimum of **10** leavers.
- The percent leaver code usage is calculated for each of the following Leaver Codes individually: 03, 16, 24, 60, 66, 78, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, and 87.

NOTES

- The district's number of leavers reported with each code listed is divided by the district's total number of non-graduate, non-dropout leavers, and the usage rate for each code is compared to that of other districts. A district is identified under this indicator if its usage of one or more leaver codes is among the highest for all districts. ***This high use may be the result of accurate reporting of leaver data by the district. Validation of accurate reporting of data is a critical part of the process that is necessary to validate and safeguard the integrity of the overall PBM system.***

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicator #5: Missing PET Submission (September 2007) [Report Only]

This indicator identifies districts that did not complete at least one PET submission by mid-September 2007.

INDICATOR CALCULATION

PID Enrollment Tracking queries are used to identify districts with no PET submissions during the period of September 1, 2007 through September 20, 2007.

MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENTS AND LEAVER CODES

NOTES

Not applicable.

This indicator is reported for district information and planning purposes only.

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicator #6: Missing PET Submission (2007-2008 Reporting Year) [Report Only]
This indicator identifies districts that did not complete one or more PET submissions on time during the 2007-2008 reporting year.

INDICATOR CALCULATION

PID Enrollment Tracking queries are used to identify districts with no PET Submissions during the period of September 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENTS AND LEAVER CODES

NOTES

Not applicable.

This indicator is reported for district information and planning purposes only.

Appendix A:

List of Leaver Codes

- 03 = Student died while enrolled in school or during the summer break after completing the prior school year
- 16 = Student withdrew from/left school to return to family's home country
- 24 = Student withdrew from/left school to enter college and is working towards an Associate's or Bachelor's degree
- 60 = Student withdrew from/left school for home schooling
- 66 = Student was removed by Child Protective Services and the district has not been informed of the student's current status or enrollment
- 78 = Student was expelled under the provisions of TEC §37.007 and cannot return to school
- 81 = Student withdrew from/left school to enroll in a private school in Texas
- 82 = Student withdrew from/left school to enroll in a public or private school outside Texas
- 83 = Student was withdrawn from school by the district when the district discovered that the student was not a resident at the time of enrollment or had falsified enrollment information, proof of identification was not provided, or immunization records were not provided
- 85 = Student graduated outside Texas, returned to school, and left again
- 86 = Student received a GED outside Texas, returned to school to work toward the completion of a high school diploma, and then left; or student earned GED outside Texas after leaving Texas public schools
- 87 = Student withdrew from/left school to enroll in the Texas Tech University ISD High School Diploma Program or the University of Texas at Austin High School Diploma Program

Appendix B:

Brief Descriptions of District Type Classifications, 2006-2007

1. Major Urban — A district is classified as major urban if: (a) it is located in a county with a population of at least 725,000; (b) its enrollment is the largest in the county or at least 75 percent of the largest district enrollment in the county; and (c) at least 35 percent of enrolled students are economically disadvantaged. Example: Austin ISD (227901).
2. Major Suburban — A district is classified as major suburban if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification as major urban; (b) it is contiguous to a major urban district; and (c) its enrollment is at least 3 percent that of the contiguous major urban district or at least 4,500 students. A district also is classified as major suburban if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification as major urban; (b) it is not contiguous to a major urban district; (c) is located in the same county as a major urban district; and (d) its enrollment is at least 15 percent that of the nearest major urban district in the county or at least 4,500 students. Examples: Goose Creek ISD (101911) and Castleberry ISD (220917).
3. 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 previous subcategories; (b) it is not contiguous to a major urban district; (c) it is located in a county with a population of between 100,000 and 724,999; and (d) its enrollment is the largest in the county or at least 75 percent of the largest district enrollment in the county. Examples: Brownsville ISD (031901) and McAllen ISD (108906).
4. Other Central City Suburban — A district is classified as other central city suburban if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification in any of the previous subcategories; (b) it is located in a county with a population of between 100,000 and 724,999; and (c) its enrollment is at least 15 percent of the largest district enrollment in the county. A district also is other central city suburban if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification in any of the previous subcategories; (b) it is contiguous to another central city district; (c) its enrollment is greater than 3 percent that of the contiguous other central city district; and (d) its enrollment exceeds the median district enrollment of 743 students for the state. Examples: Port Arthur ISD (123907) and Harlingen CISD (031903).
5. Independent Town — A district is classified as independent town if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification in any of the previous subcategories; (b) it is located in a county with a population of 25,000 to 99,999; and (c) its enrollment is the largest in the county or greater than 75 percent of the largest district enrollment in the county. Examples: Victoria ISD (235902) and Winnsboro ISD (250907).

6. 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 of the previous subcategories; (b) it has an enrollment of at least 300 students; and (c) its enrollment has increased by at least 20 percent over the past five years. Example: China Spring ISD (161920).
7. 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 previous subcategories; and (b) its enrollment exceeds the median district enrollment for the state. Example: Snyder ISD (208902).
8. Rural — A district is classified as rural if it does not meet the criteria for classification in any of the previous subcategories. A rural district has either: (a) an enrollment of between 300 and the median district enrollment for the state and an enrollment growth rate over the past five years of less than 20 percent; or (b) an enrollment of less than 300 students. Example: Dew ISD (081906).
9. Charter School Districts — Open-enrollment charter schools operating within a facility of a nonprofit or government entity or an institution of higher education.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:

Questions about the 2008 Leaver Records Data Validation Manual should be addressed to:

Address: **Division of Performance-Based Monitoring**
 Texas Education Agency
 1701 North Congress Avenue
 Austin, Texas 78701-1494

Phone: **(512) 936-6426**

Fax: **(512) 475-3880**

Email: pbm@tea.state.tx.us

Comments on the Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators:

Comments on the 2008 Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators are welcome and will assist the agency in its evaluation and future development efforts. Comments may be submitted to **Rachel Harrington, Division Director, Division of Performance-Based Monitoring, Texas Education Agency, 1701 North Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas 78701-1494** or sent via e-mail to pbm@tea.state.tx.us. Comments should be provided no later than March 15, 2009, in order to allow sufficient time for consideration in the 2009 data validation development cycle.

This page intentionally left blank



**Division of Performance-Based Monitoring
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494**