

2005 Leaver Records Data Integrity Manual

September 20, 2005

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

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

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

For information contact:

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

Leaver Records: Background

Prior to the 1997-1998 school year, districts were required to report only students who graduated or dropped out, not students who left school for other reasons. Beginning with the 1997-1998 school year, districts were required to report a **leaver** record through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for all students: students who withdrew because they graduated or dropped out and students who left school for other reasons. Since that time, the integrity of leaver records has been evaluated annually by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) through various indicators and analyses of data integrity.

Statutory requirements have also guided TEA's leaver records data integrity efforts. During the 78th Legislature Regular Session (2003), a new section of Texas Education Code (§39.055) was added to require an annual electronic audit of dropout records and a report based on the findings of the audit:

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

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

...

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

2005 Leaver Records Data Integrity Indicators

Six indicators have been developed to meet the statutory requirements described above:

1. Dropout Trend Analysis
2. Underreported Leavers
3. Unreconciled Leaver Code 80s
4. Zero Dropouts and High Use of Leaver “Intent” Codes
5. 100% Single Leaver Code Use
6. High Use of One or More Leaver Codes

Detailed information on all of these indicators is provided in the next section of this manual. Three of these indicators (High Use of Leaver Codes, Zero Dropouts and High Use of Leaver “Intent” Codes, and Dropout Trend Analysis) rely on a **district type** comparison of districts to other districts with similar characteristics. District type combines several elements, such as size, growth rates, student economic status and proximity to urban areas, in its categorization process. The nine district types are: (1) Major Urban; (2) Major Suburban; (3) Other Central City; (4) Other Central City Suburban; (5) Independent Town; (6) Non-Metro: Fast Growing; (7) Non-Metro: Stable; (8) Rural; and (9) Charter. More detailed information about each of these nine district types, including examples of districts that fall into each type, can be found in Appendix A.

The 2005 leaver data integrity analysis for the six indicators above is a two-year analysis based on the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 leaver data submitted by districts. District-level reports have been generated for each district that has been identified for further review as a result of this analysis. These reports are available via the TEA Secure Environment (TEASE). Districts not identified for further review will receive the following message if they attempt to access the report on TEASE: *“Your district was not identified in the 2005 leaver data integrity analysis, and therefore no report will be generated.”*

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

SAMPLE REPORT
 2005 Data Integrity Report
 Leaver Records

Example ISD
 Y-District Type

Region XX

2002-2003 PEIMS DATA

2003-2004 PEIMS DATA

INDICATOR

1. DROPOUT TREND ANALYSIS
 2002-2004

2002 <u>DROPOUT RATE</u>	2004 <u>DROPOUT RATE</u>	CHANGE <u>2002 TO 2004</u>
15.0	1.0	-14.0

2. UNDERREPORTED LEAVERS

UNDERREPORTED <u>COUNT</u>	UNDERREPORTED <u>RATE</u>
9	5.4

6. HIGH USE OF ONE OR MORE LEAVER CODES

<u>CODE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF CODE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF LEAVERS</u>	<u>PERCENT OF CODE</u>
16	18	184	9.8

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

DROPOUT TREND ANALYSIS: The district's decrease in dropout rate from 2002 to 2004 was more than 2 standard deviations from the mean for its district type.

UNDERREPORTED LEAVERS: In the 2003-2004 PEIMS data, 5.4% of the district's leaver reporting total was underreported (9 students), which exceeds the 5% standard. In the 2002-2003 PEIMS data, the district did not exceed the underreported leavers standard, and therefore no data are listed on the report for this indicator under the 2002-2003 column.

HIGH USE OF LEAVER CODES: In the 2003-2004 PEIMS data, the district was in the top 1% for its district type with 18 out of 184 (9.8%) student leavers coded LC16. In the 2002-2003 PEIMS data, the district was not in the top 1% for its district type for any leaver codes.

Leaver Reason Codes and Documentation Requirements

Appendix D of the 2005-2006 PEIMS Data Standards provides an expanded definition and specific guidelines on acceptable documentation for each of the leaver reason codes. This appendix can be accessed at the following web address:
<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/peims/standards/0506/appd.doc>.

Leaver Records Data Integrity Indicators

This page intentionally left blank

Leaver Records Data Integrity Indicator #1: Dropout Trend Analysis

This indicator identifies districts that had a precipitous decrease in dropout rates.

INDICATOR DESCRIPTION AND STANDARDS

A district is identified under this indicator if its change in the Grade 7-12 dropout rate is appreciably different (more than two standard deviations from the mean) from the change in the Grade 7-12 dropout rate for districts of the same type. The calculation for this indicator includes both a single-year analysis (2002 to 2003 and 2003 to 2004) and a multi-year analysis (2002 to 2004).

MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENTS	NOTES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Minimum Size Criterion: At least 5 dropouts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• District type is considered in the calculation and analysis of this indicator. (See Appendix A).• For additional information on the methodology for calculating the annual dropout rate, see the <i>Secondary School Completion and Dropouts in Texas Public Schools</i> report available at the following web address: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/research/.

Leaver Records Data Integrity Indicator #2: Underreported Leavers

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

INDICATOR DESCRIPTION AND STANDARDS

- For 2002-2003 PEIMS data, the district did not meet the standard for one or both of the following measures:
 - ◆ Count of underreported students: Must be fewer than or equal to **500**.
 - ◆ Percent of underreported students: Must be less than or equal to **5%**.
- For the 2003-2004 PEIMS data, the district did not meet the standard for one or both of the following measures:
 - ◆ Count of underreported students: Must be fewer than or equal to **100**.
 - ◆ Percent of underreported students: Must be less than or equal to **5%**.

MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENTS	NOTES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Minimum size criterion: Does not apply; all districts are evaluated under this indicator.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students who return the following year are reported on enrollment records. Students who leave during the year or do not return the following year are reported on leaver records. Grade 7-12 students for whom neither enrollment nor leaver records are received are considered “underreported.”• District type does not apply to this indicator.

Leaver Records Data Integrity Indicator #3: Unreconciled Leaver Code 80s

This indicator identifies districts with an unusually high percentage of students reported as withdrawn to enroll in another Texas public school not found in TEA enrollment, attendance, or GED files.

INDICATOR DESCRIPTION AND STANDARDS

A district is identified under this indicator if its percentage of students reported as withdrawn to enroll in another Texas public school (leaver code 80) but not found in TEA enrollment, attendance, or GED files through the agency's reconciliation process as a percentage of all students reported with leaver code 80 is in the top 1% of districts statewide.

MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENTS	NOTES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">A minimum of 10 student leavers in code 80 is necessary for evaluation under this indicator.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">District type does not apply to this indicator.

Leaver Records Data Integrity Indicator #4: Zero Dropouts and High Use of Leaver Intent Codes

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

INDICATOR DESCRIPTION AND STANDARDS

A district is identified under this indicator if it reported zero dropouts and its percentage of reported leavers with intent codes is above the 97.5th percentile of all districts of the same type.

MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENTS

- A minimum of 10 student leavers is necessary for evaluation under this indicator.

NOTES

- District type is considered in the calculation and analysis of this indicator. (See Appendix A.)
- This indicator evaluates districts' overall intent code usage.

APPLICABLE LEAVER CODES

The following leaver codes are examined for this indicator:

- LC16= intent to return to home country
- LC22= intent to enroll in other educational setting to pursue a GED or diploma
- LC24= intent to enroll in college degree program
- LC60= intent to home school
- LC80= intent to enroll in other Texas public school district
- LC81= intent to enroll in Texas private school
- LC82= intent to enroll in out of state public or private school

Leaver Records Data Integrity Indicator #5: 100% Single Leaver Code Use

This indicator identifies districts that reported all student leavers with the same leaver code.

INDICATOR DESCRIPTION AND STANDARDS

All of the district's reported student leavers were reported with the same leaver code.

MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENTS

- Minimum Size Criterion: A minimum of 10 student leavers is necessary for evaluation under this indicator.

NOTES

- LC80 is excluded from this indicator because its high use is already evaluated in Indicator #3 (Unreconciled Leaver Code 80s).
- Leaver codes for students who completed their high school program and leaver codes for students who dropped out of school are excluded from this indicator.

APPLICABLE LEAVER CODES

The following non-dropout and non-graduate leaver codes are examined for this indicator:

- LC 3= student is deceased
- LC16= intent to return to home country
- LC19= student failed exit TAAS or TAKS, but has met all other graduation requirements
- LC21= student resides in district of residence, but transfers to a neighboring district/charter
- LC22= intent to enroll in other educational setting to pursue a GED or diploma
- LC24= intent to enroll in college degree program
- LC30= student withdrew from/left school to enter a health care facility
- LC31= student completed the GED and has not returned to school

- LC60= intent to home school
- LC61= student was incarcerated in a facility outside the boundaries of the district
- LC63= graduated in a previous school year, returned to school, and left again
- LC64= completed the GED in a previous school year, returned to school, and left
- LC66= removed by Child Protective Services; no current status or enrollment
- LC72= withdrawn by court order to attend AEP; not compulsory attendance age
- LC78= expelled; failure to attend school results from adjudication
- LC81= intent to enroll in Texas private school
- LC82= intent to enroll in out of state public or private school
- LC83= administrative withdrawal

Leaver Records Data Integrity Indicator #6: High Use of One or More Leaver Codes

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

INDICATOR DESCRIPTION AND STANDARDS

The district's percentage of leavers reported with each code is compared to that of other districts of the same district type. A district is identified under this indicator if its leaver code usage of one or more leaver codes is in the top 1% of districts of the same type.

MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENTS

- Minimum Size Criterion: A minimum of 10 student leavers is necessary for identification under this indicator.

NOTES

- LC80 is excluded from this analysis because its high use is already evaluated in Indicator #3 (Official In-State Leavers).
- Leaver codes for students who completed their high school program and leaver codes for students who dropped out of school are excluded from this indicator.
- District type is considered in the calculation and analysis of this indicator. (See Appendix A.)

APPLICABLE LEAVER CODES

The following non-dropout and non-graduate leaver codes are examined for this indicator:

- LC 3= student is deceased
- LC16= intent to return to home country
- LC19= student failed exit TAAS or TAKS but has met all other graduation requirements
- LC21= student resides in district of residence, but transfers to a neighboring district/charter
- LC22= intent to enroll in other educational setting to pursue a GED or diploma
- LC24= intent to enroll in college degree program
- LC30= student withdrew from/left school to enter a health care facility

- LC31= student completed the GED and has not returned to school
- LC60= intent to home school
- LC61= student was incarcerated in a facility outside the boundaries of the district
- LC63= graduated in a previous school year, returned to school, and left again
- LC64= completed the GED in a previous school year, returned to school, and left
- LC66= removed by Child Protective Services; no current status or enrollment
- LC72= withdrawn by court order to attend AEP; not compulsory attendance age
- LC78= expelled; failure to attend school results from adjudication
- LC81= intent to enroll in Texas private school
- LC82= intent to enroll in out of state public or private school
- LC83= administrative withdrawal

QUESTIONS:

Questions about the *2005 Leaver Records Data Integrity Manual* should be addressed to:

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

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

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

Email: pbm@tea.state.tx.us

Comments on the Leaver Records Data Integrity Indicators

Comments on the 2005 Leaver Records Data Integrity Indicators are welcome and will assist the agency in its evaluation and future development efforts. Comments may be submitted to **Rachel Harrington, Division Director, Division of Performance-Based Monitoring, Texas Education Agency, 1701 North Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas 78701-1494** or sent via e-mail to pbm@tea.state.tx.us. Comments should be provided no later than December 1, 2005 in order to allow sufficient time for incorporation into the 2006 data integrity development cycle.

Appendix A

Descriptions of District Type

1. Major Urban—districts with the largest number of students in membership in counties with populations of at least 650,000, or any other district in the county that has a total student count that is at least 75 percent of the largest district's in that county. Furthermore, these districts must have a low-income percent of at least 35 percent. Low income is defined as the sum of the students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch or eligible for other public assistance, expressed as a percentage of the total number of students in the school. Example: Austin ISD 227901.
2. Major Suburban—any district in a county with a population of at least 650,000 and a total student count that is at least 15 percent of the largest district in that county, or more than 4,500 students in membership. Furthermore, districts are included in this category if they are contiguous to any major urban district and they have a student count that is at least three percent of the largest district (in their county). Examples: Goose Creek ISD (101911) and Castleberry ISD (220917).
3. Other Central City—districts with the largest student count in counties with populations of 100,000 to 650,000, or any other district in the county that has a student count that is at least 75 percent of the largest district's in that county. Examples: Brownsville ISD (031901) and McAllen ISD (108906).
4. Other Central City Suburban—any district in a county with a population of 100,000 to 650,000 and a student count that is at least 15 percent of the largest district. Furthermore, districts are included in this category if they are contiguous to any other central city districts and they satisfy both of the following conditions: a) they have a student count that is at least three percent of the largest district (in their county); and b) they have a student count that is greater than or equal to the state median of 704.5. Examples: Port Arthur ISD (123907) and Harlingen CISD (031903).
5. Independent Town—the largest districts in counties with a population of 25,000 to 100,000, or any other district in the county with a student count at least 75 percent of the largest district's. Examples: Victoria ISD (235902) and Winnsboro ISD (250907).
6. Non-Metro: Fast Growing—districts which fail to be in any of the above categories and which exhibit a five-year growth rate that is at least 20 percent and a student count that is at least 300. Examples: Somerset ISD (015909) and Harper ISD (086902).

7. Non-Metro: Stable—districts which fail to be in any of the above categories, yet have a student count greater than or equal to the state median of 704.5. Examples: Snyder ISD (208902) and Sheldon ISD (101924).
8. Rural—districts which fail all the above tests for placement into a category fall into this group. These districts either have a student count between 300 and 704.5 with a growth rate less than 20 percent, or they have a student count less than 300. Examples: Valley View ISD (049903) and Veribest ISD (226908).
9. Charter—open-enrollment charter schools operating within a facility of a nonprofit or government entity or an institution of higher education.



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