
2015 Discipline Data Validation Manual

Texas Education Agency

Department of Assessment and Accountability
Division of Performance Reporting

Copyright © Notice The materials are copyrighted © and trademarked TM 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.texas.gov

Table of Contents

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Performance-Based Monitoring Data Validation.....	3
Differences Between Discipline Data Validation Indicators and Other PBM Indicators	3
Discipline Data Validation Indicators: Background	4
List of 2015 Discipline Data Validation Indicators	5
Data Sources	5
Data Validation Reports.....	5
Sample Report.....	7
Data Validation Requirements for Districts.....	8
Additional Resources	8
SECTION II: 2015 DISCIPLINE DATA VALIDATION INDICATORS.....	9
Discipline Data Validation Indicator #1: Length of Out-Of-School Suspension.....	11
Discipline Data Validation Indicator #2: Unauthorized Expulsion-Students Age 10 and Older	12
Discipline Data Validation Indicator #3: Unauthorized Expulsion-Students under Age 10	13
Discipline Data Validation Indicator #4: Unauthorized DAEP Placement-Students under Age 6	14
Discipline Data Validation Indicator #5: High Number of Discretionary DAEP Placements	15
Discipline Data Validation Indicator #6: African American (Not Hispanic/Latino) Discretionary DAEP Placements	16
Discipline Data Validation Indicator #7: Hispanic Discretionary DAEP Placements	17
Discipline Data Validation Indicator #8: No Mandatory Expellable Incidents Reported for Multiple Years	18
SECTION III: APPENDICES.....	19
Appendix: A – Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record	21
Appendix: B – Applicable Disciplinary Reason Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record.....	22
Appendix: C – ESC Performance-Based Monitoring Contacts	24
Appendix: D – Comments and Questions	26

Section I: Introduction

Performance-Based Monitoring Data Validation

The Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) system, which was developed 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 Discipline Data Validation Indicators and Other PBM Indicators

There are key differences between the discipline 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 certain cohort graduated with a high school diploma in four years. A discipline 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 it expelled a student for three unexcused absences. This unauthorized expulsion will appear as a data anomaly. The district will need to determine, after a local review and verification process, whether the reported expulsion was a coding error or a failure to comply with discipline requirements. Depending on the indicator, the local review may also conclude the district's data are accurate and verifiable.

Another difference between PBMAS performance indicators and PBM discipline data validation indicators is the criteria used to evaluate districts. In PBMAS, performance indicators include a *range of established cut points* used to evaluate districts, while discipline 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 discipline data validation indicators generally are not, and generally cannot be, made public in advance, although there are some exceptions (e.g., Indicators #5 - #7 described in Section II of this manual) where an established standard is used.

The required response by the district is also different depending on whether the district is identified under a PBMAS performance indicator or a PBM discipline 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 discipline 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 district's identification occurred because of incorrect data, improve local data collection and submission procedures.

Differences between Discipline Data Validation Indicators and PBMAS Indicators			
Indicator Type	Result	Evaluation Criteria	District Response
Discipline 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 cut points 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 discipline 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 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 discipline 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 discipline 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 discipline data validation indicator, it will be determined the anomalous data reflect a systemic issue within one data collection (e.g., discipline 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.

Discipline Data Validation Indicators: Background

In 1995, the 74th Texas Legislature enacted the Safe Schools Act, which created Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs (DAEPs) and Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Programs (JJAEPs) to serve students who had committed disciplinary offenses. To evaluate districts’ use of DAEPs and JJAEPs and to review the documentation of district-reported discipline information, TEA developed a process for collecting and evaluating discipline data. A record (425 Disciplinary Action Data—Student) was added to the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) to obtain the data necessary for these analyses. This record collected both Disciplinary Action *Reason* Codes and Disciplinary *Action* Codes in order to capture both the student’s conduct and the district’s subsequent response.

The Texas Education Code (TEC) provides specific authority for TEA to monitor PEIMS data integrity:

§7.028. Limitation on Compliance Monitoring. (a) Except as provided by Section 29.001(5), 29.010(a), 39.056, or 39.057, the agency may monitor compliance with requirements applicable to a process or program provided by a school district, campus, program, or school granted charters under Chapter 12, including the process described by Subchapter F, Chapter 11, or a program described by Subchapter B, C, D, E, F, H, or I, Chapter 29, Subchapter A, Chapter 37, or Section 38.003, and the use of funds provided for such a program under Subchapter C, Chapter 42, only as necessary to ensure:

...

- (3) data integrity for purposes of:
 - (A) the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS); and
 - (B) accountability under Chapter 39.

...

(b) The board of trustees of a school district or the governing body of an open-enrollment charter school has primary responsibility for ensuring that the district or school complies with all applicable requirements of state educational programs.

In addition, TEC §37.008, requires an electronic evaluation of discipline data:

TEC §37.008. Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs. (m-1) The commissioner shall develop a process for evaluating a school district disciplinary alternative education program electronically. The commissioner shall also develop a system and standards for review of the evaluation or use systems already available at the agency. The system must be designed to identify districts that are at high risk of having inaccurate disciplinary alternative education program data or of failing to comply with disciplinary alternative education program requirements. The commissioner shall notify the board of trustees of a district of any objection the commissioner has to the district's disciplinary alternative education program data or of a violation of a law or rule revealed by the data, including any violation of disciplinary alternative education program requirements, or of 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 disciplinary alternative education program data.

Finally, TEC §39.057 authorizes the commissioner to conduct special accreditation investigations:

(5) when extraordinary numbers of student placements in disciplinary alternative education programs, other than placements under Sections 37.006 and 37.007, are determined.

List of 2015 Discipline Data Validation Indicators

The statutory requirements described above, as well as other requirements, are met through eight discipline data validation indicators. Detailed information on these indicators is provided in the next section of this manual.

1. Length of Out-of-School Suspension
2. Unauthorized Expulsion-Students Age 10 and Older
3. Unauthorized Expulsion-Students under Age 10
4. Unauthorized DAEP Placement-Students under Age 6
5. High Number of Discretionary DAEP Placements
6. African American (Not Hispanic/Latino) Discretionary DAEP Placements
7. Hispanic Discretionary DAEP Placements
8. No Mandatory Expellable Incidents Reported for Multiple Years

Data Sources

The 2015 discipline data validation analysis for the indicators listed above is based on discipline data from the 2014-2015 school year which were submitted by districts in June 2015. Indicator #8 also includes an analysis of discipline data from the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 school years. (See Appendix A for a full description of the disciplinary action codes and Appendix B for a list of the disciplinary reason codes used in these indicators.)

Data Validation Reports

District-level reports and certain student-level data¹ will be generated for each district identified on one or more of the 2015 discipline data validation indicators. These reports and student-level data are made available via the Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE) Accountability application. Districts not identified will receive the following message if they attempt to access the report: *“A PBM Discipline Data Validation Report is not available for your district (number: xxx) due to any of the following reasons: (a) your district did not trigger any indicators in the PBM Discipline Data Validation System; (b) your district did not meet minimum size requirements for evaluation under certain indicators; or (c) your district did not report any discipline data for the previous school year and therefore was not evaluated in the PBM Discipline Data Validation System.”*

¹ Student-level data are not applicable to Indicators #5 - #8. Campus-level data are provided for Indicator #8.

If a district has been identified on an indicator, relevant information such as the number of instances where specific coding was identified 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, only certain indicators are listed because the sample district only triggered the specific indicators shown.

Sample Report

CONFIDENTIAL
Texas Education Agency
2015 PBM Data Validation District Report
Discipline Data

Example ISD

Region ZZ

DATA SOURCES:

INDICATORS 1-7 = PEIMS SUMMER SUBMISSION 2015 (425 Record)
INDICATOR 8 = PEIMS SUMMER SUBMISSION 2013, 2014, AND 2015 (425 Record)

<u>INDICATOR</u>	<u>DISTRICT COUNT</u>
2. UNAUTHORIZED EXPULSION-STUDENTS AGE 10 AND OLDER	4
3. UNAUTHORIZED EXPULSION-STUDENTS UNDER AGE 10	3

	<u>STANDARD</u>	<u>DISTRICT RATE</u>	<u>NUMERATOR</u>	<u>DENOMINATOR</u>
5. HIGH NUMBER OF DISCRETIONARY DAEP PLACEMENTS	4.0	6.0	359	5,982
7. HISPANIC DISCRETIONARY DAEP PLACEMENTS	<u>STANDARD</u>	<u>DISTRICT RATE</u>	<u>NUMERATOR</u>	<u>DENOMINATOR</u>
HISPANIC DAEP PLACEMENTS		12.5	160	1,277
ALL DAEP PLACEMENTS		6.0	359	5,982
DISPROPORTIONALITY RATE	<100	108.3	6.5	6.0

The district's discretionary DAEP placement rate for Hispanic students is 108.3% higher than its all students' rate. This rate is calculated by dividing the difference between the two rates by the all students' rate.

ADDITIONAL COMPONENTS FOR ANALYSIS

HISPANIC ATTENDANCE VS. ALL ATTENDANCE	21.3	1,277	5,982
HISPANIC DAEP VS. ALL DAEP	44.6	160	359

While Hispanics represent 21.3% of the district's attendance, they comprise 44.6% of the district's discretionary DAEP placements.

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 2015 Discipline Data Validation Manual available at <http://tea.texas.gov/pbm/DVManuals.aspx>.

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

UNAUTHORIZED EXPULSION-STUDENTS AGE 10 AND OLDER: The district reported 4 instances of unauthorized expulsion of one or more students age 10 and older.

UNAUTHORIZED EXPULSION-STUDENTS UNDER AGE 10: The district reported 3 instances of unauthorized expulsion of one or more students under age 10.

HIGH NUMBER OF DISCRETIONARY DAEP PLACEMENTS: The district reported 359 discretionary DAEP placements and 5,982 students in attendance, resulting in a discretionary DAEP placement rate of 6.0. That rate exceeds the standard of 4.0.

HISPANIC DISCRETIONARY DAEP PLACEMENTS: The district reported 160 discretionary DAEP placements of Hispanic students based on 1,277 Hispanic students in attendance, resulting in a discretionary DAEP placement rate for Hispanic students of 12.5. The rate of disproportionality is 108.3% higher than the rate reported for all students (6.0) and exceeds the standard of <100%. Additional data components for analysis are also presented for this indicator.

Data Validation Requirements for Districts

The Program Monitoring and Interventions (PMI) Division will notify each district selected for a PBM discipline data validation intervention via the Intervention Stage and Activity Manager (ISAM) application located within 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 (a) subscribing to the listserv for “To the Administrator Addressed” correspondence; and (b) accessing the ISAM system as directed to retrieve intervention instructions and information. Superintendents should ensure that appropriate discipline program contacts have access to TEASE and know how to sign up for “To the Administrator Addressed” updates in order to receive pertinent communications. Questions about performance-based monitoring **interventions** should be directed to the Program Monitoring and Interventions Division at PMIdivision@tea.texas.gov or (512) 463-5226.

Additional Resources

Performance-based monitoring contacts at each education service center are available to provide districts with technical assistance concerning the 2015 discipline data validation indicators (See Appendix C). The *PEIMS Data Standards* (including Appendix E), 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 that present student rosters listed by both Reason and Action Codes, are available as additional resources for districts. Districts should ensure that discipline program contacts have access to PEIMS EDIT+ reports, which may require additional approval to access.

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

- PRF7D012: Student Disciplinary Action Detail Report by Reason
- PRF7D013: Student Disciplinary Action Detail Report by Action
- PRF7D014: Student Disciplinary Action Summary
- PRF7D029: Student Disciplinary Action with Campus of Disciplinary Responsibility
- PRF0A001: Data Element Summary Report
- PRF5D003: Student Roster (may be helpful for identifying students with two or more races)

These reports, along with other data and reports available locally to districts, can be used to identify and analyze the specific instances that caused a district to trigger one or more of the 2015 discipline data validation indicators.

Section II: 2015 Discipline Data Validation Indicators

Discipline Data Validation Indicator #1: Length of Out-Of-School Suspension

This indicator identifies districts with one or more students reported as suspended out-of-school (OSS) for more than three school days (regular districts) or more than 10 school days (charters).

Minimum Size Requirements

- Not Applicable

Notes

- Charters are included in this indicator.
- Disciplinary Reason Codes are not considered in this indicator.
- If a student receives out-of-school suspension for a partial school day (even if for one class period), that partial day is considered one of the total out-of-school suspension days.

Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record

- Out-of-school suspensions are calculated based on Disciplinary Action Codes 05 and 25. The Official Length of Disciplinary Assignment and the Actual Length of Disciplinary Assignment are calculated for either Action Code 05 or 25, or cumulatively if both codes are used for the same incident.

Discipline Data Validation Indicator #2: Unauthorized Expulsion-Students Age 10 and Older

This indicator identifies districts with one or more students reported as expelled from their regular education setting for an unauthorized disciplinary reason.

Minimum Size Requirements

- Not Applicable

Notes

- Charters are **not** included in this indicator.
- A district will trigger this indicator if it reports any combination of the Action and Reason Codes that follow. For example, a district that reports expelling a student without placement in another education setting as a result of a formal expulsion hearing (Action Code 01) for fighting/mutual combat (Reason Code 41) will trigger this indicator for the unauthorized expulsion.

Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record

- Codes 01, 02, 03, 04, 09, 11, 12, 15, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, and 61.

Applicable Disciplinary Reason Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record

- Codes 01, 02, 21, 28, 33, 34, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, and 56.

Discipline Data Validation Indicator #3: Unauthorized Expulsion-Students under Age 10

This indicator identifies districts that reported expelling one or more students under age 10 for a disciplinary reason other than expelling a student to a DAEP for bringing a firearm to school.

Minimum Size Requirements

- Not Applicable

Notes

- Charters are **not** included in this indicator.
- Reason Code 11 (*Used, exhibited, or possessed a firearm—TEC §§37.007(a)(1)(A) and 37.007(e) and/or brought a firearm to school – TEC §37.007(e)*) is **not** considered in this indicator.
- A district will trigger this indicator if it reports any of the following Action Codes for a student under age 10 for any Reason Code other than Reason Code 11. For example, a district that reports expelling a nine-year old student with placement in a JJAEP as a result of a formal expulsion hearing (Action Code 02) for violation of the student code of conduct (Reason Code 21) will trigger the indicator for the unauthorized expulsion.

Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record

- Codes 01, 02, 03, 04, 09, 11, 12, 15, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, and 61.

Discipline Data Validation Indicator #4: Unauthorized DAEP Placement-Students under Age 6

This indicator identifies districts that reported a DAEP placement of one or more students under age 6 for a disciplinary reason other than expelling a student to a DAEP for bringing a firearm to school.

Minimum Size Requirements

- Not Applicable

Notes

- Charters are included in this indicator.
- Reason Code 11 (*Used, exhibited, or possessed a firearm—TEC §§37.007(a)(1)(A) and 37.007(e) and/or brought a firearm to school – TEC §37.007(e)*) is **not** considered in this indicator.
- A district will trigger this indicator if it reports any of the following Action Codes for a student under age six for any Reason Code other than Reason Code 11. For example, a district that reports placing a five-year old student in an on-campus or off-campus DAEP as a result of a conference, rather than a formal hearing as required for expulsion (Action Code 07) for violating the local code of conduct (Reason Code 21) will trigger the indicator for the unauthorized DAEP placement.

Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record

- Codes 07, 08, 10, 14, 54, 55, and 57.

Discipline Data Validation Indicator #5: High Number of Discretionary DAEP Placements

This indicator identifies districts with a high number of discretionary DAEP placements for all students.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{number of discretionary DAEP placements of all students}}{\text{number of all students in attendance}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- Denominator ≥ 30
- Numerator ≥ 10

Notes

- Charters are included in this indicator.
- A district will trigger this indicator if its discretionary DAEP placement rate is 4.0 or higher.
- Only one action per incident number is counted under this indicator.
- *New!* Districts should anticipate a change in the standard for this indicator beginning in 2016. At that time, the standard will decrease to 3.5.

Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record

- Codes 07, 08, and 10.

Applicable Disciplinary Reason Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record

- Codes 01, 02² 10, 21, 23, 33, 34, 41, 49, 50, and 56.

² If reported with Behavior Location Code 04 (Off campus, and further than 300 feet from the campus boundary; not while in attendance at a school-sponsored or school-related activity) or 05 (On campus of another school district, or while in attendance at a school-sponsored or school-related activity of another school district).

Discipline Data Validation Indicator #6: African American (Not Hispanic/Latino) Discretionary DAEP Placements

This indicator identifies districts with a higher rate of African American discretionary DAEP placements compared to the rate of discretionary DAEP placements for all students.

Calculation

1. Discretionary DAEP placement rate for African American students:

$$\frac{\text{number of discretionary DAEP placements of African American students}}{\text{number of African American students in attendance}}$$

2. Discretionary DAEP placement rate for all students:

$$\frac{\text{number of discretionary DAEP placements of all students}}{\text{number of all students in attendance}}$$

3. Percentage point difference:

$$\text{African American discretionary DAEP placement rate} - \text{all students' discretionary DAEP placement rate}$$

4. Disproportionality Rate:

$$\frac{\text{percentage point difference}}{\text{all students' discretionary DAEP placement rate}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- Denominator ≥ 30
- Numerator ≥ 10

Notes

- The minimum size requirements for this indicator are evaluated at the first step of the indicator's calculation.
- Charters are included in this indicator.
- An African American student for purposes of this indicator is a student who is not reported as Hispanic/Latino and is reported (with one or more races) as Black or African American.
- A district will trigger this indicator if its discretionary DAEP placement rate for African American students is double or more (i.e., 100% or higher) than its discretionary DAEP placement rate for all students, as shown in the district's disproportionality rate.
- Only one action per incident number is counted under this indicator.

Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record

- Codes 07, 08, and 10.

Applicable Disciplinary Reason Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record

- Codes 01, 02³, 10, 21, 23, 33, 34, 41, 49, 50, and 56.

³ If reported with Behavior Location Code 04 (Off campus, and further than 300 feet from the campus boundary; not while in attendance at a school-sponsored or school-related activity) or 05 (On campus of another school district, or while in attendance at a school-sponsored or school-related activity of another school district).

Discipline Data Validation Indicator #7: Hispanic Discretionary DAEP Placements

This indicator identifies districts with a higher rate of Hispanic discretionary DAEP placements compared to the rate of discretionary DAEP placements for all students.

Calculation

1. Discretionary DAEP placement rate for Hispanic students:

$$\frac{\text{number of discretionary DAEP placements of Hispanic students}}{\text{number of Hispanic students in attendance}}$$

2. Discretionary DAEP placement rate for all students:

$$\frac{\text{number of discretionary DAEP placements of all students}}{\text{number of all students in attendance}}$$

3. Percentage point difference:

$$\text{Hispanic discretionary DAEP placement rate} - \text{all students' discretionary DAEP placement rate}$$

4. Disproportionality Rate:

$$\frac{\text{percentage point difference}}{\text{all students' discretionary DAEP placement rate}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements:

- Denominator ≥ 30
- Numerator ≥ 10

Notes

- The minimum size requirements for this indicator are evaluated at the first step of the indicator's calculation.
- Charters are included in this indicator.
- A Hispanic student for purposes of this indicator is a student who is reported as Hispanic\Latino regardless of the student's reported race(s).
- A district will trigger this indicator if its discretionary DAEP placement rate for Hispanic students is double or more (i.e., 100% or higher) than its discretionary DAEP placement rate for all students, as shown in the district's disproportionality rate.
- Only one action per incident number is counted under this indicator.

Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record

- Codes 07, 08, and 10.

Applicable Disciplinary Reason Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record

- Codes 01, 02⁴, 10, 21, 23, 33, 34, 41, 49, 50, and 56.

⁴ If reported with Behavior Location Code 04 (Off campus, and further than 300 feet from the campus boundary; not while in attendance at a school-sponsored or school-related activity) or 05 (On campus of another school district, or while in attendance at a school-sponsored or school-related activity of another school district).

Discipline Data Validation Indicator #8: No Mandatory Expellable Incidents Reported for Multiple Years

This indicator identifies districts that have one or more campuses with no mandatory expellable incidents reported for three consecutive years.

Minimum Size Requirements

- Only campuses with enrollment equal or greater than 30 students in all three years (2012-2013, 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 school years) are included.

Notes

- Charters are **not** included in this indicator.
- Campuses where the highest grade level reported in PEIMS for attendance, extended year, or leavers is Early Education (EE), Pre-Kindergarten (PK), or Kindergarten (KG) are **not** included in this indicator.
- Only regular instructional campuses are included.
- For all of the Reason Codes listed below (except Reason Code 29), those reported with Behavior Location Codes 02 (Off campus, but within 300 feet of campus property line), 04 (Off campus, and further than 300 feet from the campus boundary; not while in attendance at a school-sponsored or school-related activity), or 05 (On campus of another school district, or while in attendance at a school-sponsored or school-related activity of another school district) are not included in the calculation of this indicator.

Applicable Disciplinary Reason Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record

- Codes 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 29, 30, 31, 32, 36, 37, 46, 47, and 48.

Section III: Appendices

Appendix: A – Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record

Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record	
Codes	Disciplinary Action
01	Expulsion (TEC §37.007) without placement in another educational setting as a result of a formal expulsion hearing [TEC §37.009(f)]
02	Expulsion (TEC §37.007) with placement in a JJAEP as a result of a formal expulsion hearing [TEC §37.009(f)]
03	Expulsion (TEC §37.007) with placement in an on-campus DAEP as a result of a formal expulsion hearing [TEC §37.009(f)]
04	Expulsion (TEC §37.007) with placement in an off-campus DAEP as a result of a formal expulsion hearing [TEC §37.009(f)]
05	Out-of-school suspension
07	Placement in an on-campus or off-campus DAEP (TEC §37.008) as a result of a conference [TEC §37.009(a)], rather than a formal hearing as required for expulsion
08	Continuation of other district's DAEP placement
09	Continuation of other district's expulsion order
10	Continuation of the district's DAEP placement from the prior school year
11	Continuation of the district's expulsion order from the prior school year
12	Continuation of the district's expulsion with placement to a JJAEP from the prior school year
14	Placement in a DAEP by court order
15	Continuation of other district's expulsion with placement to a JJAEP
26	Partial day in-school suspension
50	Expulsion without placement in another educational setting as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
51	Expulsion with placement to a JJAEP as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
52	Expulsion with placement to an on-campus DAEP as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
53	Expulsion with placement to an off-campus DAEP as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
54	Placement in an alternative education program established under TEC §37.008 as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
55	Continuation of other district's DAEP placement as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
56	Continuation of other district's expulsion order as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
57	Continuation of the district's DAEP placement from the prior school year as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
58	Continuation of the district's expulsion order from the prior school year as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
59	Continuation of the district's expulsion with placement to a JJAEP from the prior school year as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
61	Continuation of other district's expulsion with placement to a JJAEP as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)

Appendix: B – Applicable Disciplinary Reason Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record

Applicable Disciplinary Reason Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record	
Codes	Disciplinary Reason
01	Permanent removal by a teacher from class – TEC §37.002(b)
02	Conduct punishable as a felony – TEC §37.006(a)(2)(A)
10	Based on conduct occurring off campus and while the student is not in attendance at a school-sponsored or school-related activity for felony offenses not in Title 5, Penal Code – TEC §37.006(d) and TEC §37.007(b)(4)
11	Used, exhibited, or possessed a firearm – TEC §§37.007(a)(1)(A) and 37.007(e) and/or brought a firearm to school – TEC §37.007(e)
12	Used, exhibited, or possessed an illegal knife – TEC §37.007(a)(1)(B) (Illegal knife blade longer than 5.5 inches)
13	Used, exhibited, or possessed a club – TEC §37.007(a)(1)(C)
14	Used, exhibited, or possessed a prohibited weapon under Penal Code §46.05 – TEC §37.007(a)(1)(D)
16	Arson – TEC §37.007(a)(2)(B)
17	Murder, capital murder, criminal attempt to commit murder, or capital murder – TEC §37.007(a)(2)(C)
18	Indecency with a child – TEC §37.007(a)(2)(D)
19	Aggravated kidnapping – TEC §37.007(a)(2)(E)
21	Violation of student code of conduct not included under TEC §§37.002(b), 37.006, or 37.007 (does not include student code of conduct violations covered in reason codes 33 and 34)
23	Emergency placement/expulsion – TEC §37.019
28	Assault under Penal Code §22.01(a)(1) against someone other than a school district employee or volunteer – TEC §37.006(a)(2)(B)
29	Aggravated assault under Penal Code §22.02 against a school district employee or volunteer – TEC §37.007(d)
30	Aggravated assault under Penal Code §22.02 against someone other than a school district employee or volunteer – TEC §37.007(a)(2)(A)
31	Sexual assault under Penal Code §22.011 or aggravated sexual assault under Penal Code §22.021 against a school district employee or volunteer – TEC §37.007(d)
32	Sexual assault under Penal Code §22.011 or aggravated sexual assault under Penal Code §22.021 against someone other than a school district employee or volunteer – TEC §37.007(a)(2)(A)
33	Possessed, purchased, used, or accepted a cigarette or tobacco product as defined in the Health and Safety Code, Section 3.01, Chapter 161.252
34	School-related gang violence – Action by three or more persons having a common identifying sign or symbol, or an identifiable sign or symbol, or an identifiable leadership who associate in the commission of criminal activities under Penal Code §71.01
36	Felony controlled substance violation – TEC §37.007(a)(3)
37	Felony alcohol violation – TEC §37.007(a)(3)
41	Fighting/Mutual combat – Excludes all offenses under Penal Code §22.01
42	Truancy (failure to attend school) – Parent contributing to truancy – TEC §25.093(a)
43	Truancy (failure to attend school) – Student is at least 12 years old with at least 3 unexcused absences – TEC §25.094
44	Truancy (failure to attend school) – Student is at least 12 years old with 10 unexcused absences – TEC §25.094

Applicable Disciplinary Reason Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record (continued)

Codes	Disciplinary Reason
45	Truancy (failure to attend school) – Student failure to enroll in school – TEC §25.085
46	Aggravated robbery – TEC §37.007(a)(2)(F), TEC §37.006(C)-(D) (HB 9680)
47	Manslaughter – TEC §37.007(a)(2)(G)
48	Criminally negligent homicide – TEC §37.007(a)(2)(H)
49	Engages in deadly conduct – TEC §37.007(b)(3)
50	Used, exhibited, or possessed a non-illegal knife as defined by student code of conduct and as allowed under TEC §37.007. (Knife blade equal to or less than 5.5 inches)
56	Registered sex offender, not under court supervision – TEC §37.305

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
DR TINA MCINTYRE	1	EDINBURG	(956) 984-6027	tmcintyre@esc1.net
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
RICHARD BLAIR	4	HOUSTON	(713) 744-6596	richard.blair@esc4.net
DR EDNA FORTE	4	HOUSTON	(713) 744-6358	edna.forte@esc4.net
DR LINDA HALL	4	HOUSTON	(713) 744-6399	lhall@esc4.net
JERRY KLEKOTTA	4	HOUSTON	(713) 744-6393	gklekotta@esc4.net
DANETTE THORNTON	4	HOUSTON	(713) 744-6578	danette.thornton@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
JESSICA HASSELL	6	HUNTSVILLE	(936) 435-8355	JHASSELL@ESC6.NET
JAYNE TAVENNER	6	HUNTSVILLE	(936) 435-8242	jtavenner@esc6.net
BEVERLY BERAN	7	KILGORE	(903) 988-6910	bberan@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 DEBBIE DREW	8	MT PLEASANT	(903) 575-2713	ddrew@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
KENNY MILLER	9	WICHITA FALLS	(940) 322-6928	kenny.miller@esc9.net
CINDY MOSES	9	WICHITA FALLS	(940) 322-6928	cindy.moses@esc9.net
MICKI WESLEY	9	WICHITA FALLS	(940) 322-6928	micki.wesley@esc9.net
JOHN DAVID	10	RICHARDSON	(972) 348-1522	john.david@region10.org
ROSEMARY MANGES	10	RICHARDSON	(972) 348-1586	rosemary.manges@region10.org
MRS MYRA SCRABECK	10	RICHARDSON	(972) 348-1340	Myra.scrabeck@region10.org
BRANDON NEELEY	11	WHITE SETTLEMENT	(817) 740-7579	bneeley@esc11.net
CARIE DOWNES	12	WACO	(254) 297-1252	cdownes@esc12.net
CHRIS GRIFFIN	12	WACO	(254) 297-1163	cgriffin@esc12.net
ELLEN HOGAN	12	WACO	(254) 297-1195	ehogan@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

Full Name	Region	City	Phone	Email Address
DR MARIA LUISA NIESTAS	19	EL PASO	(915) 780-6551	mniestas@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 <i>2015 Discipline Data Validation Indicators</i> should be addressed to:	Questions about <i>Interventions</i> , including ISAM inquiries should be addressed to:
Performance-Based Monitoring Phone: (512) 936-6426 Email: pbm@tea.texas.gov	Program Monitoring and Interventions Phone: (512) 463-5226 Email: PMdivision@tea.texas.gov
Comments on the 2015 Discipline 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.texas.gov . Comments should be provided no later than March 11, 2016, in order to allow sufficient time for consideration in the 2016 data validation development cycle.	



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