

2006 Leaver Records Data Validation Manual

Performance-Based Monitoring System

December 13, 2006
Texas Education Agency
Department of Accountability and Data Quality
Performance-Based Monitoring Division

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

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

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

For information contact:

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

Table of Contents
2006 Leaver Records Data Validation Manual

Section I: Introduction

Performance-Based Monitoring Data Validation 1
Differences Between Data Validation Indicators and Other PBM Indicators 1
Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators: Background 2
List of 2006 Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators 3
Data Sources 4
Data Validation Reports..... 4
Sample Report..... 5
Data Validation Requirements 6
Leaver Reason Codes and Documentation Requirements 6
Additional Resources 7

Section II: 2006 Data Validation Indicators

#1—Dropout Trend Analysis..... 10
#2—Underreported Students 12
#3—Unreconciled Leaver Code 80 13
#4—Zero Dropouts and High Use of Leaver Intent Codes 14
#5—100% Single Leaver Code Use 15
#6—High Use of One or More Leaver Codes 16
Description of Leaver Codes 17

Section III: Comments and Questions

Comments on the Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators..... 18

Section IV: Appendix

District Type Descriptions 19

Performance-Based Monitoring Data Validation

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

Differences Between Data Validation Indicators and Other PBM Indicators

There are key differences between the data validation indicators that are used as part of the PBM system and the performance indicators that are used in the Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS). A PBMAS performance indicator yields a **definitive** result, e.g., 100% of an LEA's graduates completed the Recommended High School Program. A data validation indicator typically **suggests** an anomaly that a local review may ultimately determine is not anomalous. For example, an LEA may report all of its leavers as intending to enroll in a private school. This single use of a leaver code for all leavers within a given year may suggest a data anomaly. However, the LEA may determine, after a local review and verification process, that the exclusive use of one particular leaver code can be validated.

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

Another difference between PBMAS performance indicators and PBM data validation indicators is standards. A PBMAS performance indicator is based on a **standard** that is made public with as much advance notice as possible and that all LEAs can achieve over time. The goal for LEAs on PBMAS performance indicators is progress toward the standard over time. A data validation indicator is typically based on an **annual review of data trends** in an attempt to identify what data may be anomalous or what trends can be observed. Standards on individual data validation indicators generally are not, and generally cannot be, made public in advance, although there are some exceptions (e.g., underreported students). The goal for LEAs on PBM data validation indicators is 100% data accuracy each year in the data that are collected and submitted by the LEA.

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

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

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators: 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 Grade 7-12 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 data analyses.

Statutory requirements have also guided TEA's leaver records data validation 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:

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

the district does not respond in a timely manner, the commissioner shall order agency staff to conduct on-site monitoring of the district's dropout records.

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

...

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

List of 2006 Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators

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

1. Dropout Trend Analysis
2. Underreported Students
3. Unreconciled Leaver Code 80
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

One of these indicators (Dropout Trend Analysis) is based 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.

Data Sources

The data source for the leaver data validation indicators is the PEIMS 203 Record. These data are part of districts' annual fall PEIMS submission. Notwithstanding the Dropout Trend Analysis indicator, the 2006 leaver data validation analysis for the indicators above is a single-year analysis based on the 2004-2005 leaver data submitted by districts in the fall of 2005.

The final PEIMS leaver data submitted by districts undergo a comprehensive recovery process by the agency that results in an "official" set of dropout and leaver data. This process is described in the following excerpt from the TEA report entitled *Secondary School Completion and Dropouts in Texas Public Schools, 2004-05*:

After TEA receives the final PEIMS data submission, an automated statewide search of other data files is conducted. The search identifies students reported to have dropped out or withdrawn who did not do so. This includes students who are found enrolled in public school somewhere else in the state, students appearing on the General Educational Development (GED) information file as having received GED certificates, students reported as having graduated, and any students who have been identified as dropouts in previous school years. Once this process is completed, TEA calculates the annual dropout rate for each campus and district with Grade 7-12 enrollment, for all students and for each student group (African American, Hispanic, White, and economically disadvantaged).

Unless otherwise noted for a particular indicator, the leaver data validation indicators are calculated using this official set of dropout and leaver data.

Data Validation Reports

District-level reports and certain student-level data¹ have been generated for each district identified for further validation on one or more of the 2006 leaver data validation indicators. These reports and student level data are available via the TEA Secure Environment (TEASE). Districts not identified for further validation will receive the following message if they attempt to access the report on TEASE: *"Your district was not identified in the 2006 leaver data validation analysis, and therefore no report will be generated."*

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

¹ Student level data are not applicable to Indicator #1. Student level data are not provided for Indicator #2 because the data (underreported students) are readily available in the PEIMS Edit+ application.

SAMPLE REPORT
CONFIDENTIAL
Texas Education Agency
2006 Data Validation Report
Leaver Records

Example ISD
Y-District Type

Region ZZ

DATA SOURCE:

INDICATOR 1 = PEIMS FALL SUBMISSION 2003, 2004, AND 2005 (203 Record)

INDICATORS 2-6 = PEIMS FALL SUBMISSION 2005 (203 Record)

INDICATOR

1. DROPOUT TREND ANALYSIS

<u>2004</u> <u>DROPOUT RATE</u>	<u>2005</u> <u>DROPOUT RATE</u>	<u>2004-2005</u> <u>CHANGE</u>
9.0	1.0	-8.0

2. UNDERREPORTED STUDENTS

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

6. HIGH USE OF ONE OR MORE LEAVER CODES

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

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 2006 Leaver Records Data Validation Manual available at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/pbm/DIManuals.html>.

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

DROPOUT TREND ANALYSIS: The district's decrease in dropout rate from 2004 to 2005 (-8.0) was appreciably different from the decrease in dropout rates for districts of the same type during that same period. ***This change may be the result of accurate reporting of dropout data by the district. Validation of accurate data is a critical part of the process that is necessary to validate and safeguard the integrity of the overall PBM system.*** (A district can trigger this indicator for a single-year dropout rate decrease and/or multi-year dropout rate decrease.)

UNDERREPORTED STUDENTS: Both the district's total number of underreported students (525) and the district's underreported rate (7.5%) exceed the state standards of 100 (count) and 2% (percent). (A district can trigger this indicator for not meeting one or both of the state standards. The standards for underreporting students are outlined in Part 1 of the 2006 *Accountability Manual*, available at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2006/manual/index.html>.)

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

Data Validation Requirements

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

Leaver Reason Codes and Documentation Requirements

Appendix D of the 2006-2007 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/0607/appd.doc>.

Additional Resources

There are several PEIMS Edit+ reports that districts may find helpful as part of a local review of leaver coding. These reports are based on data reported by districts prior to the recovery process described in the Data Source section of this manual.

- PRF8D002: School Leaver Roster
- PRF8D003: School Leaver Summary
- PRF8D004: Non-Dropout Non-Graduate Leaver Roster
- PRF6D002: Dropout Roster
- PRF0B002: Statement of Presumed Under-Reported Students

In addition, the annual report referenced earlier, *Secondary School Completion and Dropouts in Texas Public Schools*, is a comprehensive report that includes summary information about both high school completion and non-completion. The district supplement to this report (available at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/research/pdfs/dropcomp_district_supp_2004-05.pdf) contains data tables and listings of secondary school completion and dropout data at the district level. District-by-district listings of annual dropout rates and completion rates are presented, and a district listing of year-to-year reporting of students is also included.

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators

This page intentionally left blank

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicator #1: Dropout Trend Analysis

This indicator identifies districts that reported a decrease in dropout rates that was significantly higher than the reported decreases of other similar districts.

INDICATOR CALCULATION

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

$$\text{District 2005 dropout rate} = \frac{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 who dropped out of school in the 2004-2005 school year}}{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 in attendance at any time during the 2004-2005 school year}}$$

MINUS

$$\text{District 2004 dropout rate} = \frac{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 who dropped out of school in the 2003-2004 school year}}{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 in attendance at any time during the 2003-2004 school year}}$$

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

$$\text{District 2005 dropout rate} = \frac{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 who dropped out of school in the 2004-2005 school year}}{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 in attendance at any time during the 2004-2005 school year}}$$

MINUS

$$\text{District 2003 dropout rate} = \frac{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 who dropped out of school in the 2002-2003 school year}}{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 in attendance at any time during the 2002-2003 school year}}$$

MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENTS	NOTES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 10 Grade 7-12 students in attendance anytime during the particular school year <u>and</u> at least 5 Grade 7-12 students designated as official dropouts during the particular school year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A district is identified under this indicator if either its single-year or multi-year change in the Grade 7-12 dropout rates is appreciably different from the single-year or multi-year change in the Grade 7-12 dropout rate for districts of the same type. <i>This change may be the result of accurate reporting of dropout data by the district. Validation of accurate data is a critical part of the process that is necessary to validate and safeguard the integrity of the overall PBM system.</i> District type is considered in this indicator. (See Appendix 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 Validation Indicator #2: Underreported Students

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

INDICATOR CALCULATION

District count of underreported students = $\frac{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 enrolled at any time in the prior year for whom neither an enrollment nor leaver record was reported in the current year}}{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 enrolled at any time in the prior year for whom neither an enrollment nor leaver record was reported in the current year}}$

District percent of underreported students = $\frac{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 enrolled at any time in the prior year for whom neither an enrollment nor leaver record was reported in the current year}}{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 who are returning students, leavers, and underreported students}}$

MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENTS

- Minimum size requirements do not apply.

NOTES

- A district is identified under this indicator if it does not meet the standard for one or both of the following measures:
 - ◆ Count of underreported students: Must be fewer than or equal to **100**.
 - ◆ Percent of underreported students: Must be less than or equal to **2.0%**.
- District type does not apply to this indicator.

Leaver Records Data Validation Indicator #3: Unreconciled Leaver Code 80

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

INDICATOR CALCULATION

$$\text{District percent of unreconciled Leaver Code 80 students} = \frac{\text{District's official* number of students in Grades 7-12 who withdrew to enroll in another Texas public school}}{\text{District's reported number of students in Grades 7-12 who withdrew to enroll in another Texas public school}}$$

*See Data Source section of this manual for more detailed information.

MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENTS	NOTES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A minimum of 10 leavers reported by the district with leaver code 80. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A district is identified under this indicator if a high percentage of its students reported as withdrawn to enroll in another Texas public school (leaver code 80) is not found through the agency's recovery process. District type does not apply to this indicator.

Leaver Records Data Validation 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 CALCULATION

$$\text{District percent leaver intent code usage} = \frac{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 reported with Leaver Codes 16, 22, 24, 60, 80, 81, and 82}}{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 reported with any non-graduate, non-dropout Leaver Code}}$$

MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENTS

- A minimum of **10** leavers.

NOTES

- A district with zero dropouts is identified under this indicator if its percentage of leavers with intent codes is among the highest for all districts. ***This high use of leaver intent codes may be the result of accurate reporting of leaver data by the district. Validation of accurate data is a critical part of the process that is necessary to validate and safeguard the integrity of the overall PBM system.***
- District type does not apply to this indicator.

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

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

INDICATOR CALCULATION

$$100\% = \frac{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 reported with a single Leaver Code listed below}}{\text{District number of students in Grades 7-12 reported with any non-graduate, non-dropout Leaver Code}}$$

MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENTS AND LEAVER CODES	NOTES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A minimum of 10 leavers.• The percent leaver code usage is calculated for <u>each</u> of the following Leaver Codes individually: 03, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24, 30, 31, 60, 61, 63, 64, 66, 72, 78, 81, 82, 83.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A district is identified under this indicator if all of the district's leavers were reported with a single leaver code. <i>This single leaver code use may be the result of accurate reporting of leaver data by the district. Validation of accurate data is a critical part of the process that is necessary to validate and safeguard the integrity of the overall PBM system.</i>• District type does not apply to this indicator.

Leaver Records Data Validation 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 CALCULATION

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

MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENTS AND LEAVER CODES	NOTES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A minimum of 10 leavers. The percent leaver code usage is calculated for <u>each</u> of the following Leaver Codes individually: 03, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24, 30, 31, 60, 61, 63, 64, 66, 72, 78, 81, 82, and 83. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district's number of leavers reported with each code listed below is divided by the district's total number of non-graduate, non-dropout leavers, and the usage rate for each code is compared to that of other districts. A district is identified under this indicator if its usage of one or more leaver codes is among the highest for all districts. <i>This high use may be the result of accurate reporting of leaver data by the district. Validation of accurate data is a critical part of the process that is necessary to validate and safeguard the integrity of the overall PBM system.</i> District type does not apply to this indicator.

DESCRIPTION OF LEAVER CODES

- LC03 = 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
- 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
- LC83 = administrative withdrawal

QUESTIONS:

Questions about the *2006 Leaver Records Data Validation Manual* should be addressed to:

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

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

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

Email: pbm@tea.state.tx.us

Comments on the Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators

Comments on the 2006 Leaver Records Data Validation Indicators are welcome and will assist the agency in its evaluation and future development efforts. Comments may be submitted to **Rachel Harrington, Division Director, Division of Performance-Based Monitoring, Texas Education Agency, 1701 North Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas 78701-1494** or sent via e-mail to pbm@tea.state.tx.us. Comments should be provided no later than February 16, 2007, in order to allow sufficient time for consideration in the 2007 data validation development cycle.

Appendix A

Brief Descriptions of District Type

1. **Major Urban** — A district is classified as major urban if: (a) it is located in a county with a population of at least 700,000; (b) its enrollment is the largest in the county or at least 75 percent of the largest district enrollment in the county; and (c) at least 35 percent of enrolled students are economically disadvantaged. Example: Austin ISD (227901).
2. **Major Suburban** — A district is classified as major suburban if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification as major urban; (b) it is contiguous to a major urban district; and (c) its enrollment is at least 3 percent that of the contiguous major urban district or at least 4,500 students. A district also is classified as major suburban if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification as major urban; (b) it is not contiguous to a major urban district; (c) is located in the same county as a major urban district; and (d) its enrollment is at least 15 percent that of the nearest major urban district in the county or at least 4,500 students. Examples: Goose Creek ISD (101911) and Castleberry ISD (220917).
3. **Other Central City** — A district is classified as other central city if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification in either of the previous subcategories; (b) it is not contiguous to a major urban district; (c) it is located in a county with a population of between 100,000 and 699,999; and (d) its enrollment is the largest in the county or at least 75 percent of the largest district enrollment in the county. Examples: Brownsville ISD (031901) and McAllen ISD (108906).
4. **Other Central City Suburban** — A district is classified as other central city suburban if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification in any of the previous subcategories; (b) it is located in a county with a population of between 100,000 and 699,999; and (c) its enrollment is at least 15 percent of the largest district enrollment in the county. A district also is other central city suburban if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification in any of the previous subcategories; (b) it is contiguous to another central city district; (c) its enrollment is greater than 3 percent that of the contiguous other central city district; and (d) its enrollment exceeds the median district enrollment of 701 students for the state. Examples: Port Arthur ISD (123907) and Harlingen CISD (031903).
5. **Independent Town** — A district is classified as independent town if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification in any of the previous subcategories; (b) it is located in a county with a population of 25,000 to 99,999; and (c) its enrollment is the largest in the county or greater than 75 percent of the largest district enrollment in the county. Examples: Victoria ISD (235902) and Winnsboro ISD (250907).

6. Non-Metro: Fast Growing — A district is classified as non-metropolitan: fast growing if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification in any of the previous subcategories; (b) it has an enrollment of at least 300 students; and (c) its enrollment has increased by at least 20 percent over the past five years. Example: Somerset ISD (015909).
7. Non-Metro: Stable — A district is classified as non-metropolitan: stable if: (a) it does not meet the criteria for classification in any of the previous subcategories; and (b) its enrollment exceeds the median district enrollment for the state. Example: Crosby ISD (101906).
8. Rural — A district is classified as rural if it does not meet the criteria for classification in any of the previous subcategories. A rural district has either: (a) an enrollment of between 300 and the median district enrollment for the state and an enrollment growth rate over the past five years of less than 20 percent; or (b) an enrollment of less than 300 students. Example: Dew ISD (081906).
9. Charter — 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**