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During the 78th Legislature Regular Session (2003), The Texas Education Code was amended to **require an annual electronic audit** and report to the Legislature based on the audit findings.

House Bill 3 passed during the 81st Legislature Regular Session and maintained this requirement in Texas Education Code (TEC) §7.028, §39.057. §39.308 and §37.008
Data Validation

Texas Education Agency’s *Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions* implements the data validation monitoring system.

**Data used in the following:**

- ✔ States Academic Accountability Rating System
- ✔ Performance Based Monitoring System
- ✔ State Performance Plan

**Evaluates:**

- ✔ Student Performance
- ✔ Program Effectiveness

Data Validation Manual, 2015, p.3
Annual Data Validation Purpose

To maintain data integrity and ensure that data submitted to the Texas Education Agency are accurate and reliable.

Examines an LEAs

1. **Leaver and Dropout Data (DVM-L)** - 8 indicators

2. **Discipline Data (DMD-D)** - 8 indicators

3. **Student Assessment Data (DVM-SA)** – 15 indicators

*Note: Random audits are conducted*
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### Differences between Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators and PBMAS Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Type</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>District Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaver Records Data Validation</td>
<td>Suggests an anomaly</td>
<td>Based on annual review of data to identify anomalous data and trends observed over time</td>
<td>Validate accuracy of data locally and, as necessary, improve local data collection and submission procedures or address program implementation concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBMAS</td>
<td>Yields a definitive result</td>
<td>Based on standards established in advance</td>
<td>Improve performance or program effectiveness or if identification occurred because of inaccurate data, improve data collection and submission procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Validation</th>
<th>DVM-Leaver (8)</th>
<th>DVM-Discipline (8)</th>
<th>DVM-Assessment (15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Source</strong></td>
<td>PEIMS 203 Records</td>
<td>PEIMS 425 Records</td>
<td>PEIMS 101 Records PEIMS 415 Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2013-2014</strong></td>
<td>#1 &amp; 8 Fall 2013 #1-5 &amp; 8 Fall 2014</td>
<td>Indicator #8 2013-2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2012-2013</strong></td>
<td>#1 – Fall 2012</td>
<td>Indicator #8 2012-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Reports Posted</strong></td>
<td>October 30, 2015</td>
<td>November 20, 2015</td>
<td>December 18, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staging</strong></td>
<td>January 15, 2016</td>
<td>March/Early April</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention Activities Submission Deadlines</strong></td>
<td>February 19, 2016</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2015 Leaver Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Leaver Data Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Underreported Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Use of Leaver Reason Codes by District with No Dropouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Use of One or More Leaver Reason Codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Use of Certain Leaver Reason Dropout Codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Missing PET Submission (August 17, 2015 - September 18, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Missing PET Submission (2014-2015 Reporting Year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Continuing Students’ Dropout Rate (Class of 2013), as of Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary of DVM Leaver Indicators
Region One  Comparison 2013-2015

Number of Districts

DVM Leaver Indicators

- #1 Leaver Data Analysis
- #2 Underreported
- #4 Leaver Code 16
- #4 Leaver Code 24
- #4 Leaver code 60
- #4 Leaver Code 78
- #4 Leaver Code 81
- #4 Leaver Code 82
- #5 Leaver Code 83
- #5 Leaver Code 88
- #6 Missing PET Fall 2015
- #8 Continuing Student Dropout

2014  2015
## Data Reports

Reports and student-level data available via Accountability application on TEASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts Not Identified</th>
<th>Districts Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Message posted: A PBM Leaver Report is not available for your district; reasons will be listed</td>
<td>District number of leavers w/reason code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of leavers w/reason code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List of specific indicators triggered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sample Report

#### Data Sources:
- **Indicator 1**: PEIMS Fall Submission 2012, 2013, and 2014 (203 Record)
- **Indicators 2-9**: PEIMS Fall Submission 2014 (203 Record)
- **Indicators K-12**: PS Enrollment Tracking 08/18/14-06/18/15
- **Indicator 8**: PEIMS Fall Submission 2013 and 2014 (203 Record)

#### Indicators

1. **Leaver Data Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Dem</td>
<td>Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DROPOUTS</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Components for Analysis**

1. **Total Leavers**
   - 309
   - 351
   - 34.7
   - 3.8
2. **Graduates**
   - 70
   - 80
   - 33.3
   - -0.5
3. **Other Leavers**
   - 100
   - 220
   - 65.2
   - 32.8
4. **DROPOUTS**
   - 137
   - 42
   - 12.0
   - -32.3
5. **Underreported Students**
   - 35
   - 52
   - 32.2
   - 1.0

#### Use of One or More Leaver Reason Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaver Reason Code</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Continuing Students/ Drop Out Rate (Class of 2013, as of Fall 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Continuation Rate</th>
<th>Continuation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Leaver Records Data Validation Manual available at [http://tea.texas.gov/dpm/DivManuals.aspx](http://tea.texas.gov/dpm/DivManuals.aspx)

---

Indicators missed will be listed.
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Since 1997-98, the integrity of leaver records have been evaluated annually by TEA through indicators and data analysis.

- Annual audit of dropout records
- Statutory requirements have also guided data validation efforts
Impact of DVM Leaver
2015 State Accountability

**Annual Dropout Rate**

\[
\text{number of students who dropped out during the school year} \quad \frac{\text{number of students enrolled during the school year}}{}
\]

**Graduation Rate**

\[
\text{graduates} \quad \frac{\text{graduates + continuers + GED recipients + dropouts}}{}
\]

**Graduation, continuation or GED Certificate Rate**

\[
\text{Graduates + continuers + GED recipients} \quad \frac{\text{Graduates + continuers + GED recipients + dropouts}}{}
\]

*Secondary School Completion and Dropouts, 2013-2014 p. 9*
**Class of 2014 Four Year Longitudinal Summary Report (TEASE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District or campus</th>
<th>Student group</th>
<th>Graduated</th>
<th>Continued</th>
<th>Rcvd. GED</th>
<th>Dropped out</th>
<th>Grad., cont., or rcvd. GED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afr. Amer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amer. Ind.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pac. Isl.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At risk</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTE</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Econ. disadv.</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ever ELL in HS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spec. ed.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title 1</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Used in System Safeguard Report**

**Used in Index 4 Graduation Rate**
# Definitions and Calculations for Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>State Exclusions</strong></th>
<th><strong>Federal Exclusions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A student who is ordered by a court to attend a high school equivalency certificate program but has not earned a high school equivalency certificate;</td>
<td>A student in a Texas Juvenile Justice Department facility or residential treatment facility served by a Texas public school district is excluded from campus and district graduation rate calculations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A student previously reported to the state as a dropout;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a student in attendance but who is not in membership for purposes of average daily attendance (i.e., students for whom school districts are not receiving state Foundation School Program [FSP] funds)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A student whose initial enrollment in a school in the United States in Grades 7 through 12 was as an unschooled refugee or asylee as defined by TEC §39.027(a-1);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A student who is in the district exclusively as a function of having been detained at a county detention facility but is otherwise not a student of the district in which the facility is located; or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A student who is incarcerated in a state jail or federal penitentiary as an adult or as a person certified to stand trial as an adult.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dropout record for a student who fails to enroll in school after leaving a residential treatment facility or a pre- or post-adjudication facility is not attributed to the district serving the facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A student in a Texas Juvenile Justice Department facility served by a Texas public school district is not counted in campus or district rates if the student was in the facility as a result of a court order. Statute was amended in 2013 to exclude, as well, any student in a residential treatment facility served by a Texas public school district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Secondary School Completion and Dropouts, 2013-2014</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>83.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>81.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Accounting for Students
by the Texas Education Agency

1. GED Recipients

2. Previous Graduates

3. Movers

Secondary School Completion and Dropouts, 2013-2014
A district is **required to submit** a leaver record for any student in Grades 7-12 the previous year, **unless the student:**

-Received a GED by August 31;
-Is a previous Texas public school graduate;
-Is a *school year mover* or a *summertime mover* *(during school start window)* from the district or
-Returned to the district on time, or by the last Friday in September.

*Secondary School Completion and Dropouts, 2013-2014*
Processing Leaver Records

*Attended Grade 7-12 in 2013-2014*

- Previous Graduates
- Returned on time in 2014-2015
- Unknown or Underreported
- Received a GED by August 31, 2014
- Other Leavers
- Dropped Out

*Secondary School Completion and Dropouts, 2013-2014 p. 34*
Where are the students in the 2014 cohort who did not graduate? (impact 2015 accountability)

Where are the students in the 2015 cohort who did not graduate? (impact 2016 accountability)
A dropout is a student who is enrolled in public school in grades 7-12,

1. Does not return to public school the following fall,

2. Is not expelled

3. And does not: graduate, receive a GED, continue school outside the public school system, begin college or die.

(TEC 39.051, 2004)
The student is classified as a graduate in the year in which he or she is reported in PEIMS as a graduate from the Texas public school system.

- For a student to be counted as a graduate in the class of 2014 four-year rates, a student may have graduated in 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13 or 2013-14.

- Students who graduated in 2013-2014 must have graduated by August 31, 2014.

Secondary School Completion and Dropouts, 2013-2014 p. 5
A student is classified as a continuer if he or she is not a graduate and is reported as enrolled in the Texas public school system in the fall after his or her anticipated graduation or later.

For a student to be counted as a continuer in the class of 2014 four-year rates, he or she must have been enrolled in the fall of 2014.

Secondary School Completion and Dropouts, 2013-2014 p. 5
A student in the class of 2014 is assigned a final status of GED certificate recipient if he or she is not a graduate, is not a continuer, and had received a certificate by August 31, 2014.
• A student is **classified as a dropout** if dropout is the final status recorded for the student.

• A student is assigned the final status of dropout **if the student dropped out during one of the years that the cohort was in school and did not:**

  - subsequently return and graduate,
  - continue in school,
  - receive a GED certificate, or
  - leave for one of the 13 non-dropout, non-graduate leaver reasons

*Secondary School Completion and Dropouts, 2013-2014 p. 6*
DVM Leaver Indicators
Leaver Indicator # 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAVER DATA ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDICATOR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENT (MSR)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>METHODOLOGY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leaver Data Analysis

Change in Numbers and Rate

- Change in Annual Dropout Rates 2012-2014, 2013-2014
- Attendance Total Leavers
- Graduation Total Leavers
- Dropout Rates Total Leavers
- Other Leavers Total Leavers
- Underreported Students
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### Region One District Types

**Appendix: B – Brief Descriptions of District Type Classifications, 2013-2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Urban</td>
<td>A district is classified as major urban if: (a) it is located in a county with a population of at least 870,000; (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 50 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 Programs. Example: Austin ISD (2013-14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Suburban</td>
<td>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 75 percent of the enrollment in the major urban district. 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 of the enrollment in the largest major urban district in the county or at least 500 students. Examples: Goose Creek ISD (2013-14) and Connelly ISD (2013-14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Central City</td>
<td>A district is classified as other central city if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification in any 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 400,000; 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 (2013-14) and McAllen ISD (2013-14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Central City Suburban</td>
<td>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 400,000; and (c) its enrollment is at least 10 percent of the largest district enrollment in the county. A district does not meet the criteria for classification in any of the previous subcategories 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 at least 10 percent of the enrollment in the other central city district; and (d) its enrollment exceeds the median district enrollment of 250 students for the state. Examples: Brownsville ISD (2013-14) and McAllen ISD (2013-14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Town</td>
<td>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 between 100,000 and 400,000; and (c) its enrollment is the largest in the county or at least 75 percent of the largest district enrollment in the county. Examples: Victoria ISD (2013-14) and Mission ISD (2013-14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Metropolitan, Fast Growing</td>
<td>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 50 percent over the past five years. Example: James ISD (2013-14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Metropolitan, Stable</td>
<td>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 (2013-14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuali</td>
<td>A district is classified as kuali 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 200 and the median district enrollment for the state and an enrollment growth rate of over the past five years of less than 20 percent; or (b) an enrollment of less than 300 students. Example: Valley View ISD (2013-14).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District Types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BROWNSVILLE ISD</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Other Central City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONNA ISD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Other Central City Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDGAR-O-ZSA ISD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Other Central City Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDINBURG CSD</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Other Central City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCELLENCE IN LEADERSHIP ACADEMY</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Charter School Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATEWAY ACADEMY CHARTER DISTRICT</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Charter School Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARLINGEN CSD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Other Central City Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARMONY SCIENCE ACADEMY - BROWNSVILLE</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Charter School Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOFLAND CSD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Other Central City Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDSA PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Charter School Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGNITE PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Charter School Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM HOGG COUNTY ISD</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Non-Metropolitan Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA FERIA ISD</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Non-Metropolitan Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA JOYA ISD</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Other Central City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA VILLA ISD</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAREDO ISD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Other Central City Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASARA ISD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Non-Metropolitan Fast Growing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS FRESNO CSD</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Other Metropolitan Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYFORD CSD</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Other Metropolitan Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCALEN CSD</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Other Central City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERCEDES ISD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Other Central City Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSION VALLEY ACADEMY CHARTER DISTRICT</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Charter School Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISION CSD</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Other Metropolitan Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTE ALTO ISD</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Other Metropolitan Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHARR-CAN JUAN-ALAMO ISD</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Other Central City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POINT IVAN ISD</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Other Central City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRESO ISD</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Other Metropolitan Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMONDVILLE ISD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Other Central City Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIO GRANDE CITY CSD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Other Central City Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIO HONDO CSD</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Other Metropolitan Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMA ISD</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Independent Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN BENITO CSD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Other Central City Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN BENITO CSD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Other Central City Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN PEDRO ISD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA ISD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA ROSA ISD</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Non-Metropolitan Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARYLAND ISD</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Non-Metropolitan Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH TEXAS EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Charter School Districts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Leaver Indicator # 2

**UNDERREPORTED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>Identifies districts exceeding the state standard for the count and/or percent of underreported students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENT (MSR)</td>
<td>Numerator ≥ 5 underreported students (count) and at least .7% (rate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| METHODOLOGY | Districts are identified if it does not meet the standard for one or both of the following measures:  
- count of underreported students: ≤ 100  *(increase in 2016 ≤ 75)*  
- percent of underreported students: ≤ 1.7%  *(increase in 2016 ≤ 1.5%)*  

  count of underreported students  (see page 12)  

  number of 2013-2014 students in Grades 7-12 who are returning students, leavers, and underreported students |
Underreported Students

Students from the previous year who are not accounted for or for whom a record cannot be matched are considered underreported.

Count of underreported students

number of 2013-2014 students served in Grades 7-12 who are returning students, leavers, and underreported students

Standard:
- 100 underreported students or
- Underreported rate greater than 1.7 percent

Data Validation Manual-Leavers p. 12
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In grades 7-12 in 2013-2014, considered **Underreported** if none of the following statuses apply:

- Graduate
- Previous graduate
- Returned on time
- Returned late migrant student
- Mover
- Other leaver
- GED recipient
- Dropout
### Leaver Indicator # 3

**USE OF LEAVER REASON CODES BY DISTRICTS WITH NO DROPOUTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>Identifies districts with no dropouts and a potentially anomalous use of certain leaver reason codes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENT (MSR) | Denominator $\geq 10$ leavers  
**Numerator $\geq 5$ (New!)** |
| METHODOLOGY | The percent leaver code usage is calculated collectively across the following leaver reason codes: 16, 24, 60, 81, and 82.  
number of 2013-2014 students in Grades 7-12 reported with leaver reason codes 16, 24, 60, 81, and 82  
---  
number of 2013-2014 students in Grades 7-12 reported with any non-graduate, non-dropout leaver reason code |
# Leaver Indicator # 4

## Use of One or More Leaver Reason Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Identifies districts with potentially anomalous use of one or more reason codes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Minimum Size Requirement (MSR) | Denominator ≥ 10 leavers  
Numerator ≥ 5 (New!) |
| Methodology | The percent leaver reason code usage is calculated individually for each leaver reason code (03, 16, 24, 60, 66, 78, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, and 90)  
number of 2013-2014 students in Grades 7-12 reported with a leaver reason code from the list below  
number of 2013-2014 students in Grades 7-12 reported with any non-graduate, non-dropout leaver reason code |
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# Leaver Indicator # 5

## USE OF CERTAIN LEAVER REASON DROPOUT CODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>Identifies districts with potentially anomalous use of one or more leaver reason dropout codes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENT (MSR) | Denominator ≥ 10 (New!)  
Numerator ≥ 5 |
| METHODOLOGY | The percent leaver reason dropout code usage is calculated individually for leaver reason dropout codes 88 and 89. |

\[
\text{number of 2013-2014 students in Grades 7-12 reported with a leaver reason dropout code 88 & 89} \div \text{number of 2013-2014 students in Grades 7-12 reported with any leaver reason dropout code}
\]
# Leaver Indicator # 6

## MISSING PET SUBMISSION (AUGUST 17, 2015 – SEPTEMBER 18, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>Identifies districts that did not complete at least one PET submission between dates above.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENT (MSR)</strong></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODOLOGY</td>
<td>PID Enrollment Tracking queries are used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More information in: Appendix G of the 2014-2015 PEIMS Data Standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leaver Indicator # 7


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>Identifies districts that did not complete at least one PET submission during the 2014-2015 reporting year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENT (MSR)</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODOLOGY</td>
<td>PID Enrollment Tracking queries are used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More information in:
Appendix G of the 2014-2015 PEIMS Data Standards
# Leaver Indicator # 8

## CONTINUING STUDENTS’ DROPOUT RATE (CLASS OF 2013), AS OF FALL 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>INDICATOR</strong></th>
<th>Identifies districts with a continuing students’ dropout rate that exceeds the state standard (35% or higher)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENT (MSR)** | Denominator $\geq 30$ “continuers”  
Numerator $\geq 5$ |
| **METHODOLOGY** | Districts are identified if its continuing students’ dropout rate is 35% or higher *(lower standard in 2016 = 30%)*

\[
\frac{\text{number of continuers who had dropped out by the fall of 2014}}{\text{number of students from the class of 2013 who continued ("continuers")}}
\]
Guidelines and Procedures

DVM Leaver
Guidelines and Procedures

Data Sources

- Texas Education Code §39.308
- PEIMS Data Standards Section 2
- Secondary School Completion and Dropouts in Texas Public Schools 2013-2014
APPENDIX D

Leaver Reason Codes and Documentation Requirements

The attached table provides definitions and specific documentation guidelines for each of the leaver reason codes listed in Code Table C1502 of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) PEIMS Data Standards. The table is organized into the following broad categories of leavers:

- completed high school or General Educational Development (GED) program
- moved to other educational setting
- withdrawn by school district
- other

Leaver records are not submitted for students who enroll in other Texas public school districts or charters, and students who gain GED certificates at Texas examination sites by August 91. Students who move to other Texas public school districts are considered movers, not leavers. Documentation as described in Appendix D is not required for movers; districts may wish to develop local documentation to support the documentation of movers. The Person Identification Database (PID) Enrollment Tracking (PET) may be used to establish tentative local documentation that students are movers. The final determination of whether students are movers will be made by TEA.

Local policy in this appendix refers to a district’s or charter’s leaver policies and procedures.

General Documentation Requirements

Districts must document the withdrawal of students and maintain on file the appropriate paperwork associated with student withdrawals. Documentation is required for all leaver reason codes. Documentation requirements for leaver codes are provided in the Documentation Requirements by LEAVER REASON CODE section. Documentation supporting use of each leaver reason code must exist in the district at the time the leaver data are submitted, i.e., no later than the PEIMS Submission 1 January resubmission date.

Timeline for establishing leaver reasons and obtaining documentation:

Students who leave during the school year:
- For students who leave during the school year, leaver reasons apply at the time of withdrawal and documentation should be obtained at that time. For example, for students who are withdrawn by Child Protective Services (CPS), LEAVER-REASON-CODE 06 documentation would be obtained when the student is removed.

Students who fail to return in the fall:
- For students who fail to return the following fall, leaver reasons apply on the first day of school or its approximation, the schoolstart window. The schoolstart window is the period of time between the last day of school and the last Friday in September. Districts should use the LEAVER-REASON-CODE that most appropriately describes the students who withdraw during the schoolstart window. For example, for students who are withdrawn from school before school begins, a district would establish that a student was being home schooled at home prior to the schoolstart window. The district would establish the documentation to support the leaver code at any time up until the PEIMS Submission 1 resubmission date.

Students who were attending and were withdrawn under LEAVER-REASON-CODE 83 when the district discovered that the student was not entitled to public school enrollment in the district:
- LEAVER-REASON-CODE 83, not entitled to public school enrollment in the district, applies to students who are attending and are withdrawn by the district because the district discovers, when verifying enrollment information, that the student was not entitled to enroll in the district.

Signatures on documentation:

Documentation must be signed and dated by an authorized representative of the district. The district should have a written policy stating who can act as an authorized representative for purposes of signing withdrawal forms and other leaver reason documentation.

Withdrawal documentation should also be signed for the student by:
- parent, or
- guardian, or
- responsible adult as noted in school records, such as a foster parent or a guardian, or
- qualified student. A qualified student is one who, at the time of the stop attending school, is a minor, is less than 18 years old, or has established a residence separate and apart from the student’s parent, guardian, or other person having lawful control of the student.

An original signature is not required on withdrawal forms received in the district by fax. Withdrawal forms received by email do not need to be signed by the guardian, parent, or qualified student. Written documentation of all statements made in person or by telephone by the parent, guardian, or qualified student is acceptable documentation in some situations. It is signed and dated by the district representative.

Evaluation of documentation:

Merts of leaver documentation are assessed at the time the documentation is requested during a data inquiry investigation. Determination of the acceptability of documentation is made by the professional who conducts the investigation. These guidelines describe the most common types of documentation that the investigator would expect to find supporting use of each leaver reason code. Other documentation that represents good business practice and shows a good faith effort on the part of the district to properly report these events will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Completeness of documentation:

Withdrawal documentation shall be considered incomplete without a date, signature(s), and destination. Documentation will not be deemed insufficient when information is missing because the parent or guardian refuses to provide information requested by the district. A district should document at the time of the conversation that the information was requested, and the parent refused to provide it. Appropriate documentation of a parent refusal to provide information includes the date, content of conversation, name of person with whom the conversation was conducted, and the signature of the school official verifying the conversation.

Changing LEAVER-REASON-CODE:

Once a district meets the documentation standard that supports the leaver reason code used, the district is not required to obtain additional information on the student. Local policy will determine if an existing leaver reason code is updated for a student when additional information is received. The policy should be clearly stated in the district's published guidelines on leaver procedures. For example, if a district assigns LEAVER-REASON-CODE 06 student withdrew from/leave school for home schooling for a...
General Documentation Requirements

District must:

- document withdrawal of students
- document all withdrawals by leaver code
- publish guidelines on leaver procedures
- reason code must exist in district at the time data are submitted, no later than PEIMS Submission 1 in January resubmission date
- maintain the appropriate paperwork
  
  ✓ *Left during the year*: reasons apply at time of withdrawal
  ✓ *Fail to return*: reasons apply during the school start window

Review 2015-2016 for New Requirements
Leaver Reason Codes

Four Categories:

1. Graduated or received an out-of-state GED
2. Moved to other educational setting
3. Withdrawn by the district
4. Other Reasons


* Included in calculation of dropouts for federal accountability.
* Included in calculation of dropouts for both state and federal accountability.
Data Submission

- **September**
  - Weekly Enrollment Submissions

- **December**
  - Final Submission

- **January**
  - Resubmission
Data Quality: Leavers

Indicator Description

Indicator 1-8

Reason for Coding Documentation Discrepancy

No Issues | Wrong Documents | Failed to Meet School Start Window | No Documentation | Incomplete Documentation for Leaver Code | Other Discrepancy

Root Cause

Procedures | Monitoring of Procedures | Training | Timeline | Other
General Documentation Requirements
Evaluation of Documentation

• Merits of leaver documentation are assessed at the time the documentation is requested during a data inquiry investigation.

• Determination of the acceptability of documentation is made by the professional staff conducting the investigation.

2015-2016 PEIMS Data Standards Appendix D p.2
Completeness of Documentation

- Withdrawal documentation shall be considered incomplete without a date, signature(s), and destination.

- Documentation will not be deemed insufficient when information is missing because the parent or parents refuse to provide information requested by the district.
  - A district should document at the time of the conversation that the information was requested, and the parent refused to provide it.
  - Appropriate documentation of a parent refusal to provide information includes the date, content conversation, name of person with whom the conversation was conducted, and the signature of the school official verifying the conversation.

2015-2016 PEIMS Data Standards Appendix D p.2
Changing Leaver Codes

• Once a district meets the documentation standard that supports the leaver reason code used, the district is not required to obtain additional information on the student.

• Local policy will determine if an existing leaver reason code is updated for a student when additional information is received.

• The policy should be clearly stated in the district's published guidelines on leaver procedures.
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2015-2016 PEIMS Data Standards Appendix D p.2
TEA uses the Person Identification Database (PID) to store and manage identifying information on students reported to the agency through PEIMS.

- Student’s social security number or alternative identification number
- Last name
- First name
- Date of birth

When a student record matches an existing record on some, but not all, of the four items, a PID error occurs.
Additional Resources

PEIMS Edit+ Reports

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

Additional Reports and Tools

- *Secondary school Completion and Dropouts in Texas Public Schools; available at*
  [http://www.tea.state.tx.us/acctres/dropcomp_index.html](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/acctres/dropcomp_index.html)
- Data Search menu
  [http://www.tea.state.tx.us/acctres/dropcomp/years.html](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/acctres/dropcomp/years.html)
- TEASE Accountability Application

Data Validation Manual 2015, p. 7-8
Data Validation Process

District Monitoring
Internal Audits

Statutes
PEIMS
Appendix D

Process Procedures

Campus Monitoring
Data Review

District Campus
Training
# DVM-Leaver Data Validation Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Key Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Statutes/Rules/Guidelines                    | - Texas Education Code §39.308  
- PEIMS Student Accounting Handbook  
- PEIMS Data Standards-Appendix D  
- PEIMS Data Standards Section 2          |
| Process & Procedures                         | - Written district policy on leaver records  
- Written district policy/procedure handbook  
- Effective Procedures  
- Consistent implementation of Procedures  
- Meet timeline for ten day rule for record transfers  
- Meet timeline for school start window  
- Adequate staffing  
- Other                                       |
| Data Quality Leaver Code Determination       | - Correct leaver code assignment  
- Free of clerical errors  
- Documentation supports leaver code         |
| Data Quality Incomplete Documentation        | - Supporting documentation  
- Due process                                  |
| Data Quality No Documentation                | - Include dated signatures  
- Include destination, leaver code, date of attendance, withdrawal dates, and complete due process  
- Other                                         |
| Data Quality Avoiding Incorrect Documentation| - Document supports assigned leaver code  
- Document supports a non-dropout leaver code  
- Other                                          |
| Data Quality Unacceptable Documentation      | - Inappropriate use of white out  
- Inappropriate strikeouts  
- Initials missing  
- Missing date of change  
- Wrong signatures  
- Inconsistent information  
- Other                                               |
| Staff Training                               | - Knowledge of PEIMS Data Standards-Appendix D (C/A/P)  
- Knowledge of leaver documentation procedures (C/A/P)  
- Knowledge of Student Attendance Accounting Handbook (C/A/P)  
- Knowledge of Chapter 37 (A/P)  
- Personnel evaluation linked to data quality (P) |
| Clerical Administration                      | - Provide multiple reviews of coding accuracy (checks and balances)  
- Sufficient Clerical Supervision               |
| PEIMS Coordinator                            | - Ongoing monitoring of random leaver records  
- Conduct an internal audit  
- PET submission August 19, 2013-September 20, 2013  
- PET submission 2012-2013 reporting year     |
| Campus Staff Monitor                         |                                                                             |
| District Staff Monitor                       |                                                                             |

Source: Texas Education Agency. 2013 DVM Leaver Corrective Action and Improvement Activity
DVM Leaver Staging
Date: January 5, 2016

TO THE ADMINISTRATOR ADDRESSED:

Subject: 2015-2016 Data Validation Monitoring Leaver Records Staging

The purpose of this letter is to provide districts, including charter schools, with 2015-2016 intervention staging information for data validation monitoring of leaver records (DVM-L).

District-level reports of the 2015 leaver records data validation indicators and student-level reports were posted to the TEA Secure Environment (TEASE) Accountability application on October 30, 2015. Reports are available only for districts that triggered one of the eight DVM-L indicators. Districts were encouraged to review and analyze these reports to ensure the leaver records data they submit reflect the requirements of leaver record reporting, including the requirements contained in the 2015-2016 PEAKS Data Standards and Appendix D. Based on this review, districts should have determined whether any new or additional procedures needed to be implemented to ensure the accurate submission of leaver record data by the fall collection resubmission date of January 21, 2016.

For the 2015-2016 year, intervention staging for DVM-L was determined by which indicators and the number of indicators that the district had anomalous data, including longitudinal data for selected indicators. Staging will be posted the week of January 11, 2016, in the Intervention, Stage, and Activity Manager (ISAM) application in TEASE. Through ISAM, a district can determine which stage of intervention has been assigned for DVM-L. All districts with anomalous data for any DVM-L indicator have been assigned an intervention stage.

Districts assigned to Stage 1 will complete the DVM-L workbook for the identified indicator and develop a DVM-L corrective action plan (DVM-L CAP) to address any leaver record coding or documentation discrepancies and/or noncompliance. Completion due date is February 4, 2016. Districts in Stage 1 will maintain the DVM-L workbook, DVM-L CAP, and supporting documentation locally. These districts will submit intervention and supporting documentation only upon request of the Texas Education Agency (TEA). No this monitoring cycle, districts will complete and submit a Superintendent Attestation Statement to the agency through ISAM by February 15, 2016. This Attestation Statement is verifying that district intervention activities are complete and ready for submission to the agency, if requested.

Districts assigned to Stage 2 or 3 will complete the DVM-L workbook for the identified indicator(s) and develop a DVM-L CAP to address any leaver record coding or documentation discrepancies and/or noncompliance. The due date for completion and submission to TEA is February 16, 2016. Further, districts assigned to Stage 3 will engage in follow-up support activities to help ensure the successful implementation of corrective actions and leaver records data submission. Specific follow-up activities will be determined after the review of the submitted DVM-L workbook(s) and DVM-L CAP.

Additionally, all districts assigned an intervention stage will need to designate a DVM-L program contact in ISAM. Step-by-step instructions for completing this task are located on the DVM-L page of the TEA website.

Data validation interventions are coordinated with performance interventions to the extent possible and tailored to data accuracy concerns. If a district staged for interventions in the DVM system also is identified for an on-site program effectiveness review through the performance-based monitoring analysis system (PBMAS), the on-site review will include a review of data quality and data reporting systems.

Resources
Information related to the DVM-L indicators is available in the 2015 Leaver Records Data Validation Manual.

Intervention documents and tools, including the Data Validation Intervention Guidance Document, for conducting the DVM-L intervention activities will be posted to the TEA website on January 9, 2016, and will be available in ISAM by the week of January 11, 2016. Districts selected for on-site data validation reviews will receive individualized correspondence from TEA detailing required intervention activities.

For questions about the 2015 Leaver Records Data Validation Manual, as well as any of the indicators, please contact Performance-Based Monitoring at (512) 463-6526 or at pbm@tea.texas.gov.

For questions about interventions, intervention resources, due dates, or submission extension requests, please contact the Program Monitoring and Interventions Division at (512) 463-5526 or by email at PMIVision@tea.texas.gov.

Education service center (ESC) contacts will also be available as resources to districts as they complete DVM-L intervention requirements.

We appreciate your support of data validation monitoring and anticipate that a data-driven, performance-based approach will assist districts in their ongoing efforts to improve student achievement and data accuracy.

Sincerely,

Michael Greenwell, Ed.D.
Director, Program Monitoring and Interventions
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## 2015 Staging for Interventions

### How Was My District Selected for Data Validation Monitoring-Leaver Intervention Activities?

Data validation monitoring for leaver records (DVM-L) staging determinations and interventions are based upon district performance on eight core indicators.

The 2015 leaver records data validation analysis for these indicators is based on PEIMS data from the 2013-2014 school year, which were submitted by districts in fall of 2014. Indicators #1 and #8 include PEIMS data submitted in the fall of 2013; additionally, Indicator #1 includes PEIMS data submitted in fall 2012. The data source for Indicators #6 and #7 is Personal Identification Database (PID) Enrollment Tracking (PET) reports for August 18, 2014, through September 18, 2015. Staging for districts identified for Indicators #2 and #6 is based on a district having anomalous data for that indicator this year and over the past nine years.

Additional information on DVM indicators is provided in the [2015 Leaver Records Data Validation Manual](#), and information on district performance on individual indicators is found in the Accountability application within the TEA Secure Environment (TEASE).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Had anomalous data for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 or more indicators OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator #2 this year and at least 2 and up to 6 of the last 9 years OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator #6 this year and 3 of the last 9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 indicators OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator #2 this year and up to one year of the last 9 years OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator #1 OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator #4, leaver code 24 OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indicator #3 OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator #4, any leaver code except 24 OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator #6 this year and up to 2 of the last 9 years OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator #8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reminder**

**Leaver Staging**

Indicators 2 and 6 include longitudinal data.
An Attestation Statement will be required of all district that have been assigned a Stage 1 in DVM-Leavers.

Signing the form states that the district has completed required intervention activities for their assigned stage of intervention and will be ready to submit those intervention activities to the agency via ISAM, if requested.

The Attestation Statement is due February 19, 2016.
## DVM – Leaver Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Indicator Workbook</th>
<th>Student Level Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Leaver data analysis</td>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Underreported students</td>
<td>Student Level Data Review &amp; Needs Assessment</td>
<td>PEIMS Edit+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Use of leaver codes by districts with no dropouts reported</td>
<td>Student Level Data Review &amp; Needs Assessment</td>
<td>DVM student list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Use of one or more leaver codes</td>
<td>Student Level Data Review &amp; Needs Assessment</td>
<td>DVM student list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Use of certain leaver reason dropout codes</td>
<td>Student Level Data Review &amp; Needs Assessment</td>
<td>DVM student list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Missing PET school start window</td>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Missing PET all year</td>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Continuing students drop-out rate</td>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td>Resource tab in accountability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAP completed for any indicator for which noncompliance is identified
1. **Create a student sample from the student level data reports** and review the supporting documentation related to the students’ leaver status to determine if the correct leaver code was originally assigned to the student and the documentation meets Appendix D specifications.

2. **The LEA must submit the supporting documentation** required by Appendix D for each student leaver record included on the SLDR.

3. **The LEA must document** and be able to demonstrate upon request its **methodology**.

4. **TEA reserves the right to request additional information.**
Instruction tab indicates the sample size required for each indicator and stage of intervention.

http://tea.texas.gov/Student_Testing_and_Accountability/Monitoring_and_Interventions/Program_Monitoring_and_Interventions/Data_Validation_Monitoring_-_Leavers_Intervention_Guidance_and_Resources/
Supporting Documentation Requirements

- LEAs must submit the required supporting documentation required by Appendix D for each student record included on the SLDR.

- Supporting documentation must be submitted via ISAM. (Stage 2 and 3) (Stage 1 if requested)

- The supporting documentation should be submitted in the same order as the names appear on the SLDR.

- Supporting documentation should be maintained by the LEA for three school years.
A *Correction Action Plan* is required if:

Discrepancies or Noncompliance is found in

- ✔ Leaver Coding
- ✔ Appropriate Documentation and/or
- ✔ Needs Assessment
Corrective Action Plan

*Considerations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root Causes</th>
<th>Consider the Following Factors (as applicable) in Developing Corrective Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root Cause</td>
<td>Consider the Following Factors (as applicable) in Developing Corrective Actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Procedures           | 1.  No written procedures.  
                          | 2.  Inconsistent implementation of procedures.  
                          | 3.  Inappropriate assignment of leaver code.  
                          | 4.  Procedures do not address PEIMS Data Standards, including Appendix D. |
| Monitoring of Procedures | 1.  Need for quality data entry checks prior to submission.  
                                         | 2.  Need for audit process of supporting documentation of leaver records. |
| Training             | 1.  Need for administrative training on PEIMS Data Standards, including Appendix D.  
                          | 2.  Need for administrative training on district procedures for leaver record reporting.  
                          | 3.  Need for data entry staff training on PEIMS Data Standards, including Appendix D.  
                          | 4.  Need for data entry staff training on district procedures for leaver record reporting. |
| Timeline             | 1.  Missed school start window. |
| Other                |                                                                                 |
Corrective Action Plan

Place cursor in column header box for additional guidance on information to include in that column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Names</th>
<th>Reason for Coding and Documentation Discrepancy</th>
<th>Root Cause</th>
<th>Corrective Actions (See tab titled 'Considerations for plan_CAP')</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Projected Completion Date</th>
<th>Resources Required and Person(s) Responsible</th>
<th>Evidence of Implementation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Select</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Select</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Select</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Select</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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