2014 Leaver Records Data Validation Manual

Texas Education Agency

Table of Contents

Section I:
Introduction

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 relies on data submitted by districts; therefore, the integrity of districts' data is critical. To ensure data integrity, the PBM system includes annual data validation analyses that examine districts' leaver and dropout data, student assessment data, 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 Analysis System (PBMAS). A PBMAS performance indicator yields a *definitive* result, e.g., 85% of a district's graduates completed the Recommended High School Program. A leaver records data validation indicator typically *suggests* an anomaly that may require a local review to determine whether the anomalous data are accurate. For example, a district 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 district may determine, after a local review and verification process, that the exclusive use of one particular leaver reason code can be validated.

Another difference between PBMAS performance indicators and PBM leaver records 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 districts can achieve over time. The goal for districts on PBMAS performance indicators is progress toward the standard. A leaver records 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 records 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 districts on PBM leaver records data validation indicators is to report accurate data each year.

The required response by the district is also different depending on whether the district is identified under a PBMAS performance indicator or a PBM leaver records data validation indicator. Districts 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 local data collection and submission procedures. Districts identified as a result of a leaver records data validation indicator are generally expected to (a) validate and document 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 Records Data Validation Indicators and PBMAS Indicators			
Indicator Type	**Result**	**Standards**	**District 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
PBMAS	Yields a definitive result	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, some leaver records data validation indicators may identify one or more districts that are collecting and reporting accurate data. **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 districts engage in to either validate the accuracy of their data or determine that erroneous data were submitted is fundamental to the integrity of the entire system.

Many districts initially identified through a leaver records 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 records 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 records data validation indicator, it will be determined that the anomalous data reflect a systemic issue within one data collection (e.g., leaver records data in general) or a pervasive issue (i.e., across data systems). In these less typical occurrences, the 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 was amended to require an annual electronic audit of dropout records and a report based on the findings of the audit. House Bill 3, passed during the 81st Legislature Regular Session (2009), maintained this requirement in TEC, §39.308:

> TEC §39.308. 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.
>
> (b) If the electronic audit of a school 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.
>
> (c) If the risk-based system indicates that a school 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.
>
> (d) 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.
>
> (e) 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 2014 Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators

Eight 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. Leaver Data Analysis
2. Underreported Students
3. Use of Leaver Reason Codes by Districts with No Dropouts
4. Use of One or More Leaver Reason Codes
5. Use of Certain Leaver Reason Dropout Codes

6. Missing PET[1] Submission (August 18, 2014 - September 19, 2014)
7. Missing PET Submission (2013-2014 Reporting Year)
8. Continuing Students' Dropout Rate (Class of 2012), as of Fall 2013

Data Sources

The data source for Indicators #1-5 and #8 is the PEIMS 203 Record.[2] (See Appendix A for a list of the leaver reason codes from the PEIMS 203 Record used in these indicators.) These data are part of districts' annual fall PEIMS submission and reflect the 2012-2013 leaver data submitted by districts in the fall of 2013. Indicators #1 and #8 also include PEIMS 203 Record data submitted by districts in the fall of 2012; additionally, Indicator #1 includes PEIMS 203 Record data submitted by districts in the fall of 2011. The data source for Indicators #6 and #7 is PID Enrollment Tracking reports for August 19, 2013 through September 19, 2014.

Data Validation Reports

District-level reports and certain student-level data[3] will be generated for each district identified on one or more of the 2014 leaver records data validation indicators. These reports and student-level data are made available via the Accountability application on TEASE. Districts not identified will receive the following message if they attempt to access the report on TEASE: *"A PBM Leaver Records Data Validation Report is not available for your district (number: xxx) due to one of the following reasons: your district did not trigger any indicators in the PBM Data Validation System for Leaver Records; or your district did not report any fall enrollment data for the previous school year and therefore was not evaluated in the PBM Data Validation System for Leaver Records."*

If a district has been identified on an indicator, relevant information such as the district number of leavers with a certain leaver reason code, the total number of leavers, and the percent of leavers with a certain leaver reason 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 that follows, only certain indicators are listed because the sample district only triggered the three specific indicators shown.

---

[1] PET is the Person Identification Database (PID) Enrollment Tracking (PET) extension.

[2] Based on the attendance and enrollment records of all districts, the records of Texas graduates for the last several years, and the GED certificate records, TEA identifies students for whom districts do not need to submit leaver records: movers, previous graduates, and GED recipients.

[3] Student-level data are not applicable to Indicator #1, Indicator #6, and Indicator #7. Student-level data are not provided for Indicator #2 because the data (underreported students) are readily available in the PEIMS EDIT+ application (Report PRF0B032). The EDIT+ report lists presumed underreported students and may vary slightly from the final lists. Student-level data are not provided for Indicator #8 because the list of student continuers who dropped out is readily available through the secure Accountability TEASE application (RES tab).

Sample Report

Example ISD   Region ZZ
District Type: Non-Metropolitan: Stable

DATA SOURCES:

INDICATOR 1 = PEIMS FALL SUBMISSION 2011, 2012, and 2013 (203 Record)
INDICATORS 2-5 = PEIMS FALL SUBMISSION 2013 (203 Record)
INDICATORS 6-7 = PID ENROLLMENT TRACKING 08/19/13-09/19/14
INDICATOR 8 = PEIMS FALL SUBMISSION 2012 and 2013 (203 Record)

****

INDICATOR

1. LEAVER DATA ANALYSIS	|------------ 2012 ------------|		|------------ 2013 ------------|		CHANGE 2012 TO 2013
	NUM	DEN	PCT	NUM	DEN	PCT	
DROPOUTS	137	994	13.8	42	1,012	4.2	-9.6

COMPONENTS FOR ANALYSIS							
i) TOTAL LEAVERS	309	994	31.1	351	1,012	34.7	3.6
GRADUATES	72	309	23.3	80	351	22.8	-0.5
OTHER LEAVERS	100	309	32.4	229	351	65.2	32.8
DROPOUTS	137	309	44.3	42	351	12.0	-32.3
ii) UNDERREPORTED STUDENTS	35	1,622	2.2	62	1,920	3.2	1.0

|--------------------------------- 2 0 1 3 --------------------------------- |

4. USE OF ONE OR MORE LEAVER REASON CODES	LEAVER REASON CODE	NUMBER OF LEAVER REASON CODE	NUMBER OF LEAVERS	PERCENT OF LEAVER REASON CODE
	60	23	115	20.0

8. CONTINUING STUDENTS' DROPOUT RATE (CLASS OF 2012), AS OF FALL 2013

STANDARD	CONTINUING STUDENTS' DROPOUT RATE	TOTAL CLASS OF 2012 CONTINUERS WHO DROPPED OUT AS OF FALL 2013	TOTAL CLASS OF 2012 CONTINUERS
35.0	56.3	45	80

For detailed information on each of the indicators above, see the 2014 Leaver Records Data Validation Manual available at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/pbm/DVManuals.aspx.

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

LEAVER DATA ANALYSIS: The district's dropout rate decreased 9.6 percentage points between 2012 and 2013. This decrease in dropout rates may be the result of accurate reporting of leaver data by the district. Validation of accurate data is a critical safeguard that helps ensure the integrity of the overall PBM system. The components this district should analyze and validate include total leavers, graduates, other leavers, dropouts, and underreported students – particularly the change from 2012 to 2013 in these various components and the extent to which each contributed to the reported decrease in dropout rates.

USE OF ONE OR MORE LEAVER REASON CODES: The district's percent of leavers coded with leaver reason code 60 is 20 percent. This leaver reason code use may be the result of accurate reporting of leaver data by the district. Validation of accurate data is a critical safeguard that helps ensure the integrity of the overall PBM system.

CONTINUING STUDENTS' DROPOUT RATE (CLASS OF 2012), AS OF FALL 2013: Of all the district's students in the graduating class of 2012, a total of 80 students continued to a fifth year. One year later, in the fall of 2013, 45 of those 80 students had dropped out, resulting in a 56.3% continuing students' dropout rate for the district from the fall of 2012 to the fall of 2013. This dropout rate exceeds the established standard of 35%.

Data Validation Requirements for Districts

The Program Monitoring and Interventions (PMI) Division will notify each district selected for a PBM leaver records data validation intervention via the Intervention Stage and Activity Manager (ISAM) application on TEASE. The PMI Division will inform districts that intervention stages have been posted to ISAM by posting a "To the Administrator Addressed" letter on the TEA web page for correspondence or sending a "To the Administrator Addressed" letter via electronic mail or first-class mail. It is the district's obligation to access the correspondence from the PMI Division by subscribing to the listserv for "To the Administrator Addressed" correspondence; and accessing the ISAM system as directed to retrieve intervention instructions and information. Questions about performance-based monitoring **interventions** should be directed to the Program Monitoring and Interventions Division at PMIdivision@tea.state.tx.us or (512) 463-5226.

Leaver Reason Codes and Documentation Requirements

Appendix D of the *2013-2014 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.

Additional Resources

Performance-based monitoring contacts at each education service center are available to provide districts with technical assistance concerning the 2014 leaver records data validation indicators (See Appendix C). In addition, the *PEIMS Data Standards*, which describe the PEIMS data reporting requirements and provide descriptions of data elements and the codes used to report them, as well as PEIMS EDIT+ reports, are available as additional resources for districts.

There are five PEIMS EDIT+ reports in particular that 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/acctres/dropcomp_index.html) contains listings of longitudinal cohort data and year-to-year reporting of students at the district level. 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/dropcomp/years.html.

Finally, district personnel with authorized access to the TEASE Accountability application can retrieve a variety of graduation and dropout information made available each year by the Research and Analysis Division. This information includes student-level listings as well as campus and district aggregates. It can be accessed via the RES tab on the TEASE Accountability application. Planning tools and detailed explanation documents to assist districts are also available.

Section II:
2014 Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicator #1: Leaver Data Analysis

This indicator evaluates the change in districts' 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 a district's change in dropout rates over time.

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

1. **Each district's change in Grades 7-12 annual dropout rates from 2011 to 2013 and from 2012 to 2013 is evaluated.**

2. **For the same time periods:**
   a. **Each district's change in total leavers (i.e., dropouts, graduates, and other leavers) in relation to total Grades 7-12 attendance is evaluated.**
   b. **Each district's change in the numbers and rates of graduates in relation to total leavers is evaluated.**
   c. **Each district's change in the numbers and rates of other leavers in relation to total leavers is evaluated.**
   d. **Each district's change in the numbers and rates of dropouts in relation to total leavers is evaluated.**

3. **Each district's change in the numbers and rates of underreported students is evaluated for the same time periods.**

Districts with dropout rate decreases that are accompanied primarily by increases in other leavers, underreported students, or other anomalous data may be identified by this indicator. Districts 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 district'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:

- Denominator ≥ 10 Grades 7-12 students in attendance anytime during each school year evaluated
- Numerator ≥ 5 Grades 7-12 students designated as dropouts during each school year evaluated

Notes

- The change in dropout rates of districts 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.
- District type is considered in this indicator. (See Appendix B).
- See the sample district report in Section I of the manual for more detailed information about key data components evaluated in this indicator.
- See Indicator #2 for additional information about underreported students.

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicator #2: Underreported Students

This indicator identifies districts exceeding the state standard for the count and/or percent of underreported students.

Calculation

1. District count of underreported students:

number of 2012-2013 students in Grades 7-12 for whom none of the following statuses apply:
graduate, previous graduate, returned on time, returned late migrant student, mover, other leaver, GED recipient, or dropout

2. District percent of underreported students:

$$\frac{\text{count of underreported students (see above)}}{\text{number of 2012-2013 students in Grades 7-12 who are returning students, leavers, and underreported students}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements
*   Numerator ≥ 5 underreported students (count) and at least 0.7% (rate) *(New!)*

Notes
*   A district is identified under this indicator if it exceeds one or both of the following standards:
    o   Count of underreported students: 100. *(New!)*
    o   Percent of underreported students: 1.7%. *(New!)*

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicator #3: Use of Leaver Reason Codes by Districts with No Dropouts

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

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{number of 2012-2013 students in Grades 7-12 reported with leaver reason codes 16, 24, 60, 81, and 82}}{\text{number of 2012-2013 students in Grades 7-12 reported with any non-graduate, non-dropout leaver reason code}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements
- Denominator ≥ 10

Notes
- The percent leaver code usage is calculated collectively across the following leaver reason codes: 16, 24, 60, 81, and 82.
- Use of these leaver reason codes may be the result of accurate reporting of leaver data by districts identified by this indicator. Validation of accurate data is a critical safeguard that helps ensure the integrity of the overall PBM system.

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

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

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{number of 2012-2013 students in Grades 7-12 reported with a leaver reason code from the list below}}{\text{number of 2012-2013 students in Grades 7-12 reported with any non-graduate, non-dropout leaver reason code}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements
- Denominator ≥ 10

Notes
- The percent leaver reason code usage is calculated individually for each of the following leaver reason codes: 03, 16, 24, 60, 66, 78, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, and 90.
- Use of one or more leaver reason codes may be the result of accurate reporting of leaver data by districts identified by this indicator. Validation of accurate data is a critical safeguard that helps ensure the integrity of the overall PBM system.

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicator #5: Use of Certain Leaver Reason Dropout Codes

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

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{number of 2012-2013 students in Grades 7-12 reported with a leaver reason dropout code listed below}}{\text{number of 2012-2013 students in Grades 7-12 reported with any leaver reason dropout code}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements
- Numerator ≥ 5

Notes
- The percent leaver reason dropout code usage is calculated individually for leaver reason dropout code 88 and 89.
- Use of one or more leaver reason dropout codes may be the result of accurate reporting of leaver data by districts identified by this indicator. Validation of accurate data is a critical safeguard that helps ensure the integrity of the overall PBM system.

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicator #6: Missing PET Submission (August 18, 2014 – September 19, 2014)

This indicator identifies districts that did not complete at least one PET submission between August 18, 2014 and September 19, 2014.

Calculation

PID Enrollment Tracking queries are used to identify districts with no PET submissions during the period of August 18, 2014 through September 19, 2014.

Minimum Size Requirements

- Not Applicable

Notes

For additional information on PET, see Appendix G of the *2013-2014 PEIMS Data Standards* available at the following web address: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/peims.

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicator #7: Missing PET Submission (2013–2014 Reporting Year)

This indicator identifies districts that did not complete at least one PET submission during the 2013-2014 reporting year.

Calculation

PID Enrollment Tracking queries are used to identify districts with no PET Submissions during the period of August 19, 2013 through June 30, 2014.

Minimum Size Requirements

- Not Applicable

Notes

- For additional information on PET, see Appendix G of the *2013-2014 PEIMS Data Standards* available at the following web address: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/peims.

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicator #8: Continuing Students' Dropout Rate (Class of 2012), as of Fall 2013

This indicator identifies districts with a continuing students' dropout rate that exceeds the state standard.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{number of continuers who had dropped out by the fall of 2013}}{\text{number of students from the class of 2012 who continued ("continuers")}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements
- Denominator ≥ 30
- Numerator ≥ 5

Notes
- A district is identified under this indicator if its continuing students' dropout rate is 35% or higher.
- The list of student continuers from the Class of 2012 who dropped out by the fall of 2013 is available to districts through the secure Accountability TEASE application (RES tab).
- For additional information on the methodology for calculating the annual dropout, completion, and graduation rates, see the *Secondary School Completion and Dropouts in Texas Public Schools* report available at the following web address: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/acctres/dropcomp_index.html.

Section III:
Appendices

Appendix: A – List of Leaver Reason Codes

List of Leaver Reason Codes	
Codes	**Leaver Reason**
01	Student graduated from a campus in this district or charter
03	Student died while enrolled in school or during the summer break after completing the prior school year
16	Student returned to family's home country
24	Student entered college and is working towards an Associate's or Bachelor's degree
60	Student is home schooled
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 enrolled in a private school in Texas
82	Student enrolled in a public or private school outside Texas
83	Student was attending and was withdrawn from school by the district when the district discovered that the student was not entitled to enrollment in the district because a) the student was not a resident of the district, b) was not entitled under other provisions of TEC §25.001 or as a transfer student, or c) was not entitled to public school enrollment under TEC §38.001 or a corresponding rule of the Texas Department of State Health Services because the student was not immunized
85	Student graduated outside Texas before entering a Texas public school, entered a Texas public school, and left again
86	Student completed the GED outside Texas
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
88	Student was ordered by a court to attend a GED program and has not earned a GED certificate
89	Student is incarcerated in a state jail or federal penitentiary as an adult or as a person certified to stand trial as an adult
90	Student graduated from another state under provisions of the Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children
98	Student was not enrolled within the school-start window for a reason not listed, student dropped out, or reason for leaving is unknown

Appendix: B – Brief Descriptions of District Type Classifications, 2012-2013

Brief Descriptions of District Type Classifications	
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 840,000; (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. A student is reported as economically disadvantaged if he or she is eligible for free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Program. 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; (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) it 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).
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 839,999; 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).
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 839,999; 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 an other 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 817 students for the state. Examples: Port Arthur ISD (123907) and Harlingen CISD (031903).
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).
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: Jarrell ISD (246907).
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).
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: Valley View ISD (049903).
Charter School Districts	Charter school districts are open-enrollment school districts chartered by the State Board of Education. Example: George I. Sanchez Charter School (101804).

Appendix: C – ESC Performance-Based Monitoring Contacts

Latest updates to the ESC Performance Based Monitoring Contacts can be found at
http://mansfield.tea.state.tx.us/tea.askted.web/Forms/Home.aspx, using the Search RESCs function.

Full Name	Region	City	Phone	Email Address
DAN BAEN	2	CORPUS CHRISTI	(361) 561-8415	dan.baen@esc2.us
GEOFFREY RICKERHAUSER	2	CORPUS CHRISTI	(361) 561-8422	geoffrey.rickerhauser@esc2.us
NORMA TORRES-MARTINEZ	2	CORPUS CHRISTI	(361) 561-8407	norma.torres-martinez@esc2.us
BRENDA O'BANNION	3	VICTORIA	(361) 573-0731 ext:212	bobannion@esc3.net
DINA ROGERS	3	VICTORIA	(361) 573-0731 ext:252	drogers@esc3.net
CHERYL SHAMBURGER	3	VICTORIA	(361) 573-0731 ext:297	cshamburger@esc3.net
SHARON BENKA	4	HOUSTON	(713) 744-6358	sbenka@esc4.net
RICHARD BLAIR	4	HOUSTON	(713) 744-6596	richard.blair@esc4.net
KELLY INGRAM	4	HOUSTON	(713) 744-6358	kingram@esc4.net
JERRY KLEKOTTA	4	HOUSTON	(713) 744-6393	gklekotta@esc4.net
MONICA MAHFOUZ	5	BEAUMONT	(409) 951-1702	mmahfouz@esc5.net
TERESA ANDERSON	6	HUNTSVILLE	(936) 435-8250	tanderson@esc6.net
SANDY CAMMARATA-GARCIA	6	HUNTSVILLE	(936) 435-8235	sgarcia@esc6.net
JAYNE TAVENNER	6	HUNTSVILLE	(936) 435-8242	jtavenner@esc6.net
CAROL WILLIAMS	6	HUNTSVILLE	(936) 435-8355	cwilliams@esc6.net
HENRYETT LOVELY WATSON	7	KILGORE	(903) 988-6854	hlovelywatson@esc7.net
MS PAM ALBRITTON	8	MT PLEASANT	(903) 572-8551 ext:2762	palbritton@reg8.net
MR LEONARD BELES	8	MT PLEASANT	(903) 572-8551 ext:2740	lbeles@reg8.net
MS KERRI BOWLES	8	MT PLEASANT	(903) 572-8551 ext:2720	kbowles@reg8.net
MS CAROL CARTER	8	MT PLEASANT	(903) 572-8551 ext:2647	ccarter@reg8.net
MS KELLY CORDRAY	8	MT PLEASANT	(903) 572-8551 ext:2713	kcordray@reg8.net
MS KAREN J THOMPSON	8	MT PLEASANT	(903) 572-8551 ext:2616	karen.thompson@reg8.net
DARREN FRANCIS	9	WICHITA FALLS	(940) 322-6928 ext:302	darren.francis@esc9.net
JILL LANDRUM	9	WICHITA FALLS	(940) 322-6928	jill.landrum@esc9.net
KENNY MILLER	9	WICHITA FALLS	(940) 322-6928	kenny.miller@esc9.net
PAT PAGE	9	WICHITA FALLS	(940) 322-6928 ext:370	pat.page@esc9.net
WES PIERCE	9	WICHITA FALLS	(940) 322-6928	wes.pierce@esc9.net
ROSEMARY MANGES	10	RICHARDSON	(972) 348-1586	rosemary.manges@region10.org
JAN MOBERLEY	10	RICHARDSON	(972) 348-1426	jan.moberley@region10.org
BRANDON NEELEY	11	FORT WORTH	(817) 740-7579	bneeley@esc11.net
CARIE DOWNES	12	WACO	(254) 297-1252	cdownes@esc12.net
CHRISTINE HOLECEK	12	WACO	(254) 297-1284	cholecek@esc12.net
STEPHANIE KUCERA	12	WACO	(254) 297-1154	skucera@esc12.net
BILL TARLETON	12	WACO	(254) 297-1158	btarleton@esc12.net
JENNIFER WOMACK	13	AUSTIN	(512) 919-5308	jennifer.womack@esc13.txed.net
TAMARA MCGAUGHEY	14	ABILENE	(325) 675-8616	tmcgaughey@esc14.net
EMILIA MORENO	14	ABILENE	(325) 675-8644	emoreno@esc14.net
LAURA STRUBE	15	SAN ANGELO	(325) 658-6571 ext:4065	laura.strube@esc15.net
SHIRLEY CLARK	16	AMARILLO	(806) 677-5130	shirley.clark@esc16.net
JENNIFER DE LEON	17	LUBBOCK	(806) 281-5889	jdeleon@esc17.net
CYNTHIA BAYUK-BISHOP	18	MIDLAND	(432) 561-4305	cbayuk@esc18.net
LEE LENTZ-EDWARDS	18	MIDLAND	(432) 563-2380	llentz@esc18.net
INDHIRA SALAZAR	18	MIDLAND	(432) 567-3275	isalazar@esc18.net
PATRICK SHAFFER	18	MIDLAND	(432) 561-4323	pcshaffer@ESC18.NET
JAMYE SWINFORD	18	MIDLAND	(432) 561-4350	jswinfor@esc18.net
DR MARIA LUISA NIESTAS	19	EL PASO	(915) 780-6551	mlniestas@esc19.net
REBECCA ONTIVEROS	19	EL PASO	(915) 780-5093	rontiveros@esc19.net
DAWN WHITE	20	SAN ANTONIO	(210) 370-5402	dawn.white@esc20.net

Appendix: D – Comments and Questions

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS	
Questions about the *2014 Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators* should be addressed to:	Questions about *Interventions*, including ISAM inquiries should be addressed to:
Performance-Based Monitoring Phone: (512) 936-6426 Email: pbm@tea.state.tx.us	Program Monitoring and Interventions Phone: (512) 463-5226 Email: PMIdivision@tea.state.tx.us
Comments on the 2014 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, Director, 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 February 13, 2015, in order to allow sufficient time for consideration in the 2015 data validation development cycle.	

Texas Education Agency

Performance-Based Monitoring

1701 North Congress Avenue

Austin, Texas 78701-1494