

---

# 2017 Discipline Data Validation Manual

---

Texas Education Agency

---

Office of Academics  
Division of Performance Reporting

---

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

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

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

For information contact:

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

# Table of Contents

---

<b>SECTION I: INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Performance-Based Monitoring Data Validation.....	3
Differences Between Discipline Data Validation Indicators and Other PBM Indicators .....	3
Discipline Data Validation Indicators: Background .....	4
List of 2017 Discipline Data Validation Indicators .....	5
Data Sources .....	5
Data Validation Reports.....	5
Sample Report.....	7
Data Validation Requirements for Districts.....	8
Additional Resources .....	8
<b>SECTION II: 2017 DISCIPLINE DATA VALIDATION INDICATORS.....</b>	<b>9</b>
Discipline Data Validation Indicator #1: Length of Out-Of-School Suspension.....	11
Discipline Data Validation Indicator #2: Unauthorized Expulsion - Students Age 10 and Older .....	12
Discipline Data Validation Indicator #3: Unauthorized Expulsion - Students under Age 10.....	13
Discipline Data Validation Indicator #4: Unauthorized DAEP Placement -Students under Age 6 .....	14
Discipline Data Validation Indicator #5: High Number of Discretionary DAEP Placements .....	15
Discipline Data Validation Indicator #6: African American (Not Hispanic/Latino) Discretionary DAEP Placements .....	16
Discipline Data Validation Indicator #7: Hispanic Discretionary DAEP Placements .....	17
<b>SECTION III: APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>19</b>
Appendix: A – Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category .....	21
Appendix: B – Applicable Disciplinary Reason Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category .....	22
Appendix: C – ESC Performance-Based Monitoring Contacts .....	23
Appendix: D – Comments and Questions.....	25
<b>SECTION IV: 2017 SUPPLEMENT ON NEW SPECIAL EDUCATION FEDERAL REGULATIONS ...</b>	<b>27</b>
Federal Regulations Pertaining to Significant Disproportionality in Discipline Placements.....	29
<b>SECTION V: 2017 SPECIAL EDUCATION DISCIPLINE INDICATORS.....</b>	<b>31</b>
SPED Discipline Indicator #1: SPED OSS and Expulsion ≤10 Days Rate (Ages 3-21) .....	33
SPED Discipline Indicator #2: SPED OSS and Expulsion >10 Days Rate (Ages 3-21) .....	35
SPED Discipline Indicator #3: SPED ISS ≤10 Days Rate (Ages 3-21).....	37
SPED Discipline Indicator #4: SPED ISS >10 Days Rate (Ages 3-21).....	39
SPED Discipline Indicator #5: SPED Total Disciplinary Removals Rate (Ages 3-21).....	41



# Section I: Introduction

---



## Performance-Based Monitoring Data Validation

The Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) system, which was developed in response to state and federal statute, is a comprehensive system designed to improve student performance and program effectiveness. The PBM system is a data-driven system that relies on data submitted by districts; therefore, the integrity of districts' data is critical. To ensure data integrity, the PBM system includes annual data validation analyses that examine districts' leaver and dropout data, student assessment data, and discipline data. Additional data analyses, including random audits, are conducted as necessary to ensure the data submitted to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) are accurate and reliable.

## Differences Between Discipline Data Validation Indicators and Other PBM Indicators

There are key differences between the discipline data validation indicators used as part of the PBM Data Validation System and the performance indicators used in the Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS). A PBMAS performance indicator yields a *definitive* result, e.g., 85% of a certain cohort graduated with a high school diploma in four years. A discipline data validation indicator typically *suggests* an anomaly that may require a local review to determine whether the anomalous data are accurate. For example, a district may report it expelled a student for three unexcused absences. This unauthorized expulsion will appear as a data anomaly. The district will need to determine, after a local review and verification process, whether the reported expulsion was a coding error or a failure to comply with discipline requirements. Depending on the indicator, the local review may also conclude the district's data are accurate and verifiable.

Another difference between PBMAS performance indicators and PBM discipline data validation indicators is the criteria used to evaluate districts. In PBMAS, performance indicators include a *range of established cut points* used to evaluate districts, while discipline data validation indicators typically require an *annual review of data* to identify what data may be anomalous or what trends can be observed over time. Evaluation criteria on individual discipline data validation indicators generally are not, and generally cannot be, made public in advance, although there are some exceptions (e.g., Indicators #5 - #7 described in Section II of this manual) where an established standard is used.

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

Differences between Discipline Data Validation Indicators and PBMAS Indicators			
Indicator Type	Result	Evaluation Criteria	District Response
Discipline Data Validation	Suggests an anomaly	Based on annual review of data to identify anomalous data and trends observed over time	Validate accuracy of data locally and, as necessary, improve local data collection and submission procedures or address program implementation concerns
PBMAS	Yields a definitive result	Based on cut points established in advance	Improve performance or program effectiveness, or if identification occurred because of inaccurate data, improve data collection and submission procedures

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

Many districts initially identified through a discipline data validation indicator will be able to confirm the accuracy of their data. This is expected and should be handled by those districts as a routine data confirmation that is documented locally and, in some cases, communicated back to the agency. Other districts identified through a discipline data validation indicator will find their anomalous data to be the result of an isolated reporting error that can be addressed through better training, improved quality control of local data collection and submission processes, or other targeted local response. For some districts identified through a discipline data validation indicator, it will be determined the anomalous data reflect a systemic issue within one data collection (e.g., discipline data in general) or a pervasive issue (i.e., across data systems). In these less typical occurrences, the district’s response will be more extensive, including more involvement by the agency and the application of sanctions as necessary and appropriate.

## Discipline Data Validation Indicators: Background

In 1995, the 74<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature enacted the Safe Schools Act, which created Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs (DAEPs) and Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Programs (JJAEPs) to serve students who had committed disciplinary offenses. To evaluate districts’ use of DAEPs and JJAEPs and to review the documentation of district-reported discipline information, TEA developed a process for collecting and evaluating discipline data. A record (425 Disciplinary Action Data—Student) was added to the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) to obtain the data necessary for these analyses<sup>1</sup>. This record collected both Disciplinary Action *Reason* Codes and Disciplinary *Action* Codes in order to capture both the student’s conduct and the district’s subsequent response.

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

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

...

<sup>1</sup> The Texas Student Data System (TSDS), a major TEA initiative, later expanded on the former PEIMS.



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

...

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

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

TEC §37.008. Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs. (m-1) The commissioner shall develop a process for evaluating a school district disciplinary alternative education program electronically. The commissioner shall also develop a system and standards for review of the evaluation or use systems already available at the agency. The system must be designed to identify districts that are at high risk of having inaccurate disciplinary alternative education program data or of failing to comply with disciplinary alternative education program requirements. The commissioner shall notify the board of trustees of a district of any objection the commissioner has to the district's disciplinary alternative education program data or of a violation of a law or rule revealed by the data, including any violation of disciplinary alternative education program requirements, or of any recommendation by the commissioner concerning the data. If the data reflect that a penal law has been violated, the commissioner shall notify the county attorney, district attorney, or criminal district attorney, as appropriate, and the attorney general. The commissioner is entitled to access to all district records the commissioner considers necessary or appropriate for the review, analysis, or approval of disciplinary alternative education program data.

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

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

## List of 2017 Discipline Data Validation Indicators

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

1. Length of Out-of-School Suspension
2. Unauthorized Expulsion-Students Age 10 and Older
3. Unauthorized Expulsion-Students under Age 10
4. Unauthorized DAEP Placement-Students under Age 6
5. High Number of Discretionary DAEP Placements
6. African American (Not Hispanic/Latino) Discretionary DAEP Placements
7. Hispanic Discretionary DAEP Placements

## Data Sources

The 2017 discipline data validation analysis for the indicators listed above is based on discipline data from the 2016-2017 school year which were submitted by districts in June 2017. (See Appendix A for a full description of the disciplinary action codes and Appendix B for a list of the disciplinary reason codes used in these indicators.)

## Data Validation Reports

District-level reports and certain student-level data<sup>2</sup> will be generated for each district identified on one or more of the PBM discipline data validation indicators. These reports and student-level data are made available via the Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE) Accountability application. Districts not identified will receive the following message if they attempt to access the report: *“A PBM Discipline Data Validation District Report is not available for your district (number: xxx) due to any of the following reasons: (a) your district did not trigger any indicators in the PBM Discipline Data Validation System; (b) your district did not meet minimum*

---

<sup>2</sup> Student-level data are not applicable to Indicators #5 - #7.

*size requirements for evaluation under certain indicators; or (c) your district did not report any discipline data for the previous school year and therefore was not evaluated in the PBM Discipline Data Validation System.”*

If a district has been identified on an indicator, relevant information such as the number of instances where specific coding was identified will be noted on each district’s report. Only the indicators a district triggers will be listed on the report. For example, in the sample report that follows, only certain indicators are listed because the sample district only triggered the specific indicators shown.

# Sample Report

CONFIDENTIAL  
Texas Education Agency  
2017 PBM Data Validation District Report  
Discipline Data

Example ISD

Region ZZ

DATA SOURCE: TSDS PEIMS SUMMER SUBMISSION 2017 (44425 Sub-Category)

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

<u>INDICATOR</u>	<u>STANDARD</u>	<u>DISTRICT RATE</u>	<u>NUMERATOR</u>	<u>DENOMINATOR</u>
5. HIGH NUMBER OF DISCRETIONARY DAEP PLACEMENTS	<3.5	6.0	359	5,982
7. HISPANIC DISCRETIONARY DAEP PLACEMENTS	<u>STANDARD</u>	<u>DISTRICT RATE</u>	<u>NUMERATOR</u>	<u>DENOMINATOR</u>
HISPANIC DAEP PLACEMENTS		12.5	160	1,277
ALL DAEP PLACEMENTS		6.0	359	5,982
DISPROPORTIONALITY RATE	2.0	2.1		

The district's discretionary DAEP placement rate for Hispanic students is 2.1 times higher than its all students' rate. This rate is calculated by dividing the Hispanic DAEP placements rate by the all students' rate. The intermediate results are not rounded.

ADDITIONAL COMPONENTS FOR ANALYSIS

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

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

This report contains confidential information and data that are not masked to protect individual student confidentiality. Unauthorized disclosure of confidential student information is illegal as provided in the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA) and implementing federal regulations found in 34 CFR, Part 99.

For detailed information on each of the indicators above, see the [2017 Discipline Data Validation Manual](http://tea.texas.gov/pbm/DVManuals.aspx) available at <http://tea.texas.gov/pbm/DVManuals.aspx>.

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

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

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

**HIGH NUMBER OF DISCRETIONARY DAEP PLACEMENTS:** The district reported 359 discretionary DAEP placements and 5,982 students in attendance, resulting in a discretionary DAEP placement rate of 6.0. That rate exceeds the standard of 3.5.

**HISPANIC DISCRETIONARY DAEP PLACEMENTS:** The district reported 160 discretionary DAEP placements of Hispanic students based on 1,277 Hispanic students in attendance, resulting in a discretionary DAEP placement rate for Hispanic students of 12.5. The rate of disproportionality is 2.1 times higher than the rate reported for all students (6.0) and exceeds the standard of 2.0. Additional data components for analysis are also presented for this indicator.

## Data Validation Requirements for Districts

The School Improvement (SI) Division will notify each district selected for a PBM discipline data validation intervention via the Intervention Stage and Activity Manager (ISAM) application located within TEASE. The SI Division will inform districts that intervention stages have been posted to ISAM by posting a “To the Administrator Addressed” letter on the TEA web page for correspondence or sending a “To the Administrator Addressed” letter via electronic mail or first-class mail. It is the district’s obligation to access the correspondence from the SI Division by (a) subscribing to the listserv for “To the Administrator Addressed” correspondence; and (b) accessing the ISAM system as directed to retrieve intervention instructions and information. Superintendents should ensure that appropriate discipline program contacts have access to TEASE and know how to sign up for “To the Administrator Addressed” updates in order to receive pertinent communications. Questions about performance-based monitoring **interventions** should be directed to the School Improvement Division at [SIdivision@tea.texas.gov](mailto:SIdivision@tea.texas.gov) or (512) 463-5226.

## Additional Resources

Performance-based monitoring contacts at each education service center are available to provide districts with technical assistance concerning the PBM discipline data validation indicators (See Appendix C). Additional resources available for districts are the annual *Texas Education Data Standards* (TEDS) (including Appendix E), which describe the TSDS PEIMS data reporting requirements and provide descriptions of data elements and the codes used to report them, as well as TSDS PEIMS reports that present student rosters listed by both Reason and Action Codes. Districts should ensure that discipline program contacts have access to TSDS PEIMS reports, which may require additional approval to access.

There are three TSDS PEIMS reports that districts may find helpful as part of a local review of discipline data. These reports are based on data reported by districts. When accessing these reports, districts should confirm the collection selected corresponds with the applicable indicator’s data source shown on the district’s PBM Discipline Data Validation Report. (The corresponding legacy PEIMS EDIT+ report is provided in parentheses.)

- PDM3-132-002 (PRF7D012): Student Disciplinary Action Detail by Reason
- PDM3-132-001 (PRF7D013): Student Disciplinary Action Roster
- PDM3-132-003 (PRF7D014): Student Disciplinary Action Summary

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

# Section II: 2017 Discipline Data Validation Indicators

---



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

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

### **Minimum Size Requirements**

- Not Applicable

### **Notes**

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

### **Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category**

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

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

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

### **Minimum Size Requirements**

- Not Applicable

### **Notes**

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

### **Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category**

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

### **Applicable Disciplinary Reason Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category**

- Codes 01, 02, 07, 21, 28, 33, 34, 41, and 56.



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

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

### Minimum Size Requirements

- Not Applicable

### Notes

- Charters are **not** included in this indicator.
- Reason Code 11 (*Brought a firearm to school—TEC §37.007(e) or unlawful carrying of a handgun under Penal Code 46.02—TEC §37.007(a) (1)*) is **not** considered in this indicator.
- A district will trigger this indicator if it reports any of the following Action Codes for a student under age 10 for any Reason Code other than Reason Code 11. For example, a district that reports expelling a nine-year old student with placement in a JJAEP as a result of a formal expulsion hearing (Action Code 02) for violation of the student code of conduct (Reason Code 21) will trigger the indicator for the unauthorized expulsion.

### Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category

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

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

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

### Minimum Size Requirements

- Not Applicable

### Notes

- Charters are included in this indicator.
- Reason Code 11 (*Brought a firearm to school—TEC §37.007(e) or unlawful carrying of a handgun under Penal Code 46.02—TEC §37.007(a) (1)*) is **not** considered in this indicator.
- A district will trigger this indicator if it reports any of the following Action Codes for a student under age six for any Reason Code other than Reason Code 11. For example, a district that reports placing a five-year old student in an on-campus or off-campus DAEP as a result of a conference, rather than a formal hearing as required for expulsion (Action Code 07) for violating the local code of conduct (Reason Code 21) will trigger the indicator for the unauthorized DAEP placement.

### Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 425 Sub-Category

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

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

This indicator identifies districts with a discretionary DAEP placement rate of 3.5 or higher for all students.

### Calculation

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

### Minimum Size Requirements:

- Numerator  $\geq$  30

### Notes

- Charters are included in this indicator.
- Only one action per incident number is counted under this indicator, and the actual length of disciplinary assignment must be greater than zero.

### Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category

- Codes 07, 08, and 10.

### Applicable Disciplinary Reason Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category

- Codes 01, 02<sup>3</sup>, 10, 21, 23, 33, 34, 41, 49, and 56.

---

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

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

This indicator identifies districts with a discretionary DAEP placement rate for African American students that is more than 2.0 times higher than the discretionary DAEP placement rate for all students.

### Calculation

1. Discretionary DAEP placement rate for African American students:

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

2. Discretionary DAEP placement rate for all students:

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

3. Disproportionality Rate:

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

### Minimum Size Requirements:

- Numerator  $\geq 30$

### Notes

- The minimum size requirements for this indicator are evaluated at the first step of the indicator's calculation.
- The calculation's intermediate results are not rounded. This multiple decimal place precision helps ensure the accuracy of the disproportionality rate.
- Charters are included in this indicator.
- An African American student for purposes of this indicator is a student who is not reported as Hispanic/Latino and is reported (with only one race) as Black or African American.
- Only one action per incident number is counted under this indicator, and the actual length of disciplinary assignment must be greater than zero.

### Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Record

- Codes 07, 08, and 10.

### Applicable Disciplinary Reason Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Record

- Codes 01, 02<sup>4</sup>, 10, 21, 23, 33, 34, 41, 49, and 56.

---

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

# Discipline Data Validation Indicator #7: Hispanic Discretionary DAEP Placements

This indicator identifies districts with a discretionary DAEP placement rate for Hispanic students that is more than 2.0 times higher than the discretionary DAEP placement rate for all students.

## Calculation

1. Discretionary DAEP placement rate for Hispanic students:

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

2. Discretionary DAEP placement rate for all students:

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

3. Disproportionality Rate:

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

## Minimum Size Requirements:

- Numerator  $\geq 30$

## Notes

- The minimum size requirements for this indicator are evaluated at the first step of the indicator's calculation.
- The calculation's intermediate results are not rounded. This multiple decimal place precision helps ensure the accuracy of the disproportionality rate.
- Charters are included in this indicator.
- A Hispanic student for purposes of this indicator is a student who is reported as Hispanic\Latino regardless of the student's reported race(s).
- Only one action per incident number is counted under this indicator, and the actual length of disciplinary assignment must be greater than zero.

## Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record

- Codes 07, 08, and 10.

## Applicable Disciplinary Reason Codes from the PEIMS 425 Record

- Codes 01, 02<sup>5</sup>, 10, 21, 23, 33, 34, 41, 49, and 56.

---

<sup>5</sup> If reported with Behavior Location Code 04 (Off campus, and further than 300 feet from the campus boundary; not while in attendance at a school-sponsored or school-related activity) or 05 (On campus of another school district, or while in attendance at a school-sponsored or school-related activity of another school district).



# Section III: Appendices

---





## Appendix: A – Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category

Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category	
Codes	Disciplinary Action
01	Expulsion (TEC §37.007) without placement in another educational setting as a result of a formal expulsion hearing [TEC §37.009(f)]
02	Expulsion (TEC §37.007) with placement in a JJAEP as a result of a formal expulsion hearing [TEC §37.009(f)]
03	Expulsion (TEC §37.007) with placement in an on-campus DAEP as a result of a formal expulsion hearing [TEC §37.009(f)]
04	Expulsion (TEC §37.007) with placement in an off-campus DAEP as a result of a formal expulsion hearing [TEC §37.009(f)]
05	Out-of-school suspension
07	Placement in an on-campus or off-campus DAEP (TEC §37.008) as a result of a conference [TEC §37.009(a)], rather than a formal hearing as required for expulsion
08	Continuation of other district's DAEP placement
09	Continuation of other district's expulsion order
10	Continuation of the district's DAEP placement from the prior school year
11	Continuation of the district's expulsion order from the prior school year
12	Continuation of the district's expulsion with placement to a JJAEP from the prior school year
14	Placement in a DAEP by court order
15	Continuation of other district's expulsion with placement to a JJAEP
25	Partial day out-of-school suspension
50	Expulsion without placement in another educational setting as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
51	Expulsion with placement to a JJAEP as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
52	Expulsion with placement to an on-campus DAEP as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
53	Expulsion with placement to an off-campus DAEP as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
54	Placement in an alternative education program established under TEC §37.008 as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
55	Continuation of other district's DAEP placement as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
56	Continuation of other district's expulsion order as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
57	Continuation of the district's DAEP placement from the prior school year as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
58	Continuation of the district's expulsion order from the prior school year as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
59	Continuation of the district's expulsion with placement to a JJAEP from the prior school year as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)
61	Continuation of other district's expulsion with placement to a JJAEP as a result of a determination by a special education hearing officer (not a hearing officer employed or appointed by the district)

## Appendix: B – Applicable Disciplinary Reason Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category

Applicable Disciplinary Reason Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category	
Codes	Disciplinary Reason
01	Permanent removal by a teacher from class – TEC §37.002(b)
02	Conduct punishable as a felony – TEC §37.006(a)(2)(A)
07	Public lewdness or indecent exposure – TEC §37.006(a)(2)(F)
10	Based on conduct occurring off campus and while the student is not in attendance at a school-sponsored or school-related activity for felony offenses not in Title 5, Penal Code – TEC §37.006(d) and TEC §37.007(b)(4)
11	Brought a firearm to school – TEC §37.007(e) or unlawful carrying of a handgun under Penal Code 46.02 – TEC §37.007(a)(1)
21	Violation of student code of conduct not included under TEC §§37.002(b), 37.006, or 37.007 (does not include student code of conduct violations covered in reason codes 33 and 34)
23	Emergency placement/expulsion – TEC §37.019
28	Assault under Penal Code §22.01(a)(1) against someone other than a school district employee or volunteer – TEC §37.006(a)(2)(B)
33	Possessed, purchased, used, or accepted a cigarette or tobacco product as defined in the Health and Safety Code, Section 3.01, Chapter 161.252
34	School-related gang violence – Action by three or more persons having a common identifying sign or symbol, or an identifiable sign or symbol, or an identifiable leadership who associate in the commission of criminal activities under Penal Code §71.01
41	Fighting/Mutual combat – Excludes all offenses under Penal Code §22.01
48	Criminally negligent homicide – TEC §37.007(a)(2)(H)
49	Engages in deadly conduct – TEC §37.007(b)(3)
56	Registered sex offender, not under court supervision – TEC §37.305

## Appendix: C – ESC Performance-Based Monitoring Contacts

ESC Performance Based Monitoring Contacts are updated by each ESC and can be found at <http://mansfield.tea.state.tx.us/tea.askted.web/Forms/Home.aspx>, using the Search RESCs function.

Full Name	Region	City	Phone	Email Address
BELINDA GORENA	1	EDINBURG	(956) 984-6173	bgorena@esc1.net
DAN BAEN	2	CORPUS CHRISTI	(361) 561-8415	dan.baen@esc2.us
NORMA TORRES-MARTINEZ	2	CORPUS CHRISTI	(361) 561-8407	norma.torres-martinez@esc2.us
LISA HERNANDEZ	3	VICTORIA	(361) 573-0731 ext:270	lhernandez@esc3.net
KENDA MATSON	3	VICTORIA	(361) 573-0731 ext:321	KMatson@esc3.net
MITZI MCAFFEE	3	VICTORIA	(361) 573-0731 ext:214	MMcafee@esc3.net
CHERYL SHAMBURGER	3	VICTORIA	(361) 573-0731 ext:297	cshamburger@esc3.net
DR LINDA HALL	4	HOUSTON	(713) 744-6399	lhall@esc4.net
JERRY KLEKOTTA	4	HOUSTON	(713) 744-6393	gklekotta@esc4.net
ANGEL LOZANO	4	HOUSTON	(713) 744-6596	angel.lozano@esc4.net
MONELLE ROUGEAU	4	HOUSTON	(713) 744-6581	monelle.rougeau@esc4.net
DANETTE THORNTON	4	HOUSTON	(713) 744-6578	danette.thornton@esc4.net
ITZIL WELCH	4	HOUSTON	(713) 744-4487	itzil.welch@esc4.net
MONICA MAHFOUZ	5	BEAUMONT	(409) 951-1702	mmahfouz@esc5.net
SANDY CAMMARATA-GARCIA	6	HUNTSVILLE	(936) 435-8235	sgarcia@esc6.net
JESSICA HASSELL	6	HUNTSVILLE	(936) 435-8355	JHASSELL@ESC6.NET
DR STEVE JOHNSON	6	HUNTSVILLE	(936) 435-8290	sjohnson@esc6.net
BETH NESMITH	6	HUNTSVILLE	(936) 435-8243	bnesmith@esc6.net
LAURA REDDEN	6	HUNTSVILLE	(936) 435-8293	lredden@esc6.net
TALLY STOUT	6	HUNTSVILLE	(936) 435-8371	TSTOUT@ESC6.NET
JAYNE TAVENNER	6	HUNTSVILLE	(936) 435-8242	jtavenner@esc6.net
TAMMY WALKER	6	HUNTSVILLE	(936) 435-8360	twalker@esc6.net
SARAH WRIGHT	6	HUNTSVILLE	(936) 435-8400	swright@esc6.net
HENRYETT LOVELY	7	KILGORE	(903) 988-6854	hlovely@esc7.net
MS SHIRLEY AGAN	8	MT PLEASANT	(903) 572-8551 ext:2769	sagan@reg8.net
MR LEONARD BELES	8	MT PLEASANT	(903) 572-8551 ext:2740	lbeles@reg8.net
MS KERRI BOWLES	8	MT PLEASANT	(903) 572-8551 ext:2720	kbowles@reg8.net
MS CAROL CARTER	8	MT PLEASANT	(903) 572-8551 ext:2647	ccarter@reg8.net
MRS DEBRA CROOMS	8	MT PLEASANT	(903) 575-2733	dcrooms@reg8.net
MS DEBBIE DREW	8	MT PLEASANT	(903) 575-2713	ddrew@reg8.net
MRS RICHELE LANGLEY	8	MT PLEASANT	(903) 575-2605	rlangley@reg8.net
MS KAREN J THOMPSON	8	MT PLEASANT	(903) 572-8551 ext:2616	karen.thompson@reg8.net
DARREN FRANCIS	9	WICHITA FALLS	(940) 322-6928 ext:302	darren.francis@esc9.net
KENNY MILLER	9	WICHITA FALLS	(940) 322-6928	kenny.miller@esc9.net
CINDY MOSES	9	WICHITA FALLS	(940) 322-6928	cindy.moses@esc9.net
MICKI WESLEY	9	WICHITA FALLS	(940) 322-6928	micki.wesley@esc9.net
KIM GILSON	10	RICHARDSON	(972) 348-1480	kim.gilson@region10.org
ANNA GRIFFITHS	10	RICHARDSON	(972) 348-1360	anna.griffiths@region10.org
MRS MYRA SCRABECK	10	RICHARDSON	(972) 348-1340	Myra.scrabeck@region10.org
KATHY DUNIVEN	11	WHITE SETTLEMENT	(817) 740-7583	kduniven@esc11.net
GRETCHEN KROOS	11	WHITE SETTLEMENT	(817) 740-7630	gkroos@esc11.net
JIM PHILLIPS	11	WHITE SETTLEMENT	(817) 740-7581	jphillips@esc11.net
CARIE DOWNES	12	WACO	(254) 297-1252	cdownes@esc12.net
CHRIS GRIFFIN	12	WACO	(254) 297-1163	cgriffin@esc12.net
ELLEN HOGAN	12	WACO	(254) 297-1195	ehogan@esc12.net
CHRISTINE HOLECEK	12	WACO	(254) 297-1284	cholecek@esc12.net
STEPHANIE KUCERA	12	WACO	(254) 297-1154	skucera@esc12.net
MICHAEL GREENWALT	13	AUSTIN	(512) 919-5117	Michael.Greenwalt@esc13.txed.net
EMILIA MORENO	14	ABILENE	(325) 675-8674	emoreno@esc14.net

Full Name	Region	City	Phone	Email Address
LISA WHITE	14	ABILENE	(325) 675-8616	lwhite@esc14.net
DAVID BEDFORD	15	SAN ANGELO	(325) 658-6571 ext:4023	david.bedford@esc15.net
LAURA STRUBE	15	SAN ANGELO	(325) 658-6571 ext:4065	laura.strube@esc15.net
SHIRLEY CLARK	16	AMARILLO	(806) 677-5130	shirley.clark@esc16.net
HEATHER BLOUNT	17	LUBBOCK	(806) 281-5817	hlount@esc17.net
CYNTHIA BAYUK-BISHOP	18	MIDLAND	(432) 561-4305	cbayuk@esc18.net
LEE LENTZ-EDWARDS	18	MIDLAND	(432) 563-2380	llentz@esc18.net
INDHIRA SALAZAR	18	MIDLAND	(432) 567-3275	isalazar@esc18.net
PATRICK SHAFFER	18	MIDLAND	(432) 561-4323	pcshaffer@ESC18.NET
JAMYE SWINFORD	18	MIDLAND	(432) 561-4350	jswinfor@esc18.net
DR MARIA LUISA NIESTAS	19	EL PASO	(915) 780-6551	mlniestas@esc19.net
REBECCA ONTIVEROS	19	EL PASO	(915) 780-5093	rontiveros@esc19.net
DAWN WHITE	20	SAN ANTONIO	(210) 370-5402	dawn.white@esc20.net

The performance-based monitoring contact information for Appendix C is provided by each education service center (ESC). If contact information is missing, call the ESC main number listed at [http://tea.texas.gov/regional\\_services/esc/](http://tea.texas.gov/regional_services/esc/) for assistance.

## Appendix: D – Comments and Questions

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS	
Questions about the <i>2017 Discipline Data Validation Indicators</i> should be addressed to:	Questions about <i>Interventions</i> , including ISAM inquiries should be addressed to:
Performance-Based Monitoring Phone: (512) 936-6426 Email: <a href="mailto:pbm@tea.texas.gov">pbm@tea.texas.gov</a>	School Improvement Phone: (512) 463-5226 Email: <a href="mailto:Sldivision@tea.texas.gov">Sldivision@tea.texas.gov</a>
Comments on the 2017 Discipline Data Validation Indicators are welcome and will assist the agency in its evaluation and future development efforts. Comments may be submitted to Performance-Based Monitoring, Texas Education Agency, 1701 North Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas 78701-1494 or sent via e-mail to <a href="mailto:pbm@tea.texas.gov">pbm@tea.texas.gov</a> . Comments should be provided no later than March 9, 2018, to allow sufficient time for consideration in the 2018 data validation development cycle.	



# **Section IV: 2017 Supplement on New Special Education Federal Regulations**

---





## Federal Regulations Pertaining to Significant Disproportionality in Discipline Placements

Since 2013, TEA has been implementing a transition plan for the Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS) special education program area in anticipation of new federal regulations under 34 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 300, which were finalized and issued on December 19, 2016. These regulations require 98 separate indicators to evaluate districts' data regarding: (a) special education representation [49 indicators]; (b) disciplinary removals [35 indicators]; and (c) educational placements [14 indicators]. These indicators will be used to assign PLs of significant disproportionality (SD) based on seven racial/ethnic groups and six disability categories, as required. To facilitate presentation and readability, these 98 indicators will be integrated as much as possible in their presentation in PBM manuals and on districts' PBMAS reports. Specifically, they will be presented as one integrated representation indicator, five integrated discipline indicators, and two integrated educational placements indicators. The federal regulations also require thresholds be set to determine which districts will be identified for SD. As with all PBMAS PL cut points, the 2017 PBMAS thresholds for these new indicators were set with advice from stakeholder groups.

Under the federal regulations, consequences for districts that exceed the established thresholds are considerably greater than the requirements that comprise intervention staging for PBMAS. Specifically, any district that exceeds the established thresholds is required to: (a) provide for the review and, if appropriate, revision of the district's policies, procedures, and practices; (b) allocate 15% of its Part B funds to be used for comprehensive coordinated early intervening services to serve children in the district, particularly, but not exclusively, children in those groups that were significantly over-identified; and (c) publicly report on the revision to its policies, procedures, and practices. States have the flexibility to stipulate that districts must exceed an established threshold for up to three consecutive years before these requirements must be implemented.

TEA has reiterated, since the inception of the PBMAS, that districts are obligated to follow federal law irrespective of their anticipated PBMAS PL assignments. The federal regulations repeat TEA's long-standing position by adding a rule of construction asserting that nothing in the federal regulations, including the potential consequences of exceeding the thresholds for SD, authorizes the development or implementation of policies, practices, or procedures that result in actions that violate federal law, including requirements related to child find and ensuring that a free appropriate public education is available to all eligible children with disabilities.

Because the PBMAS representation and educational placements indicators were already well aligned with federal requirements and had included preliminary calculations of disproportionality, the expanded federal requirements pertaining to those two components could be immediately incorporated into the 2017 PBMAS: SPED Indicator #11 (SPED Representation – Ages 3-21), SPED Indicator #7 (SPED Regular Class <40% Rate – Ages 6-21), and a new SPED Indicator #8 (SPED Separate Settings Rate – Ages 6-21). However, there was insufficient time to develop the five integrated discipline indicators for inclusion in 2017 PBMAS. Instead, the discipline indicators are previewed in the 2017 Discipline Data Validation system as described in the next section.

The preview of these discipline indicators includes several caveats and limitations. First, any PL assignments of SD (Year 2) do not reflect the application of Reasonable Progress (RP), which may enable a district that demonstrates a sufficient reduction in its risk ratio over two consecutive prior years to avoid federal sanctions. After the RP methodology has been finalized in the future, any districts with PLs of SD (Year 2) that meet RP will be provided with an updated report reflecting their new status of SD (Year 2) RP. Second, the thresholds and minimum size requirements implemented for the preview of the SD discipline indicators are the same as those implemented for the representation and placement indicators released with 2017 PBMAS, and they do not reflect any additional advice that may be solicited from stakeholder groups in the future. Additionally, the SD discipline indicator preview reports will only be available on the TEASE Accountability application in 2017. Finally, race/ethnic data pertaining to SD for a particular year will only be included for those districts that exceed the established SD threshold in that year.



# Section V: 2017 Special Education Discipline Indicators

---



# SPED Discipline Indicator #1: SPED OSS and Expulsion ≤10 Days Rate (Ages 3-21)

(New!) This indicator measures the disaggregated percent of students ages 3-21 served in special education (SPED) reported as suspended out-of-school (OSS) or expelled for ten or fewer school days.

## Calculation

$$\frac{\text{number of students ages 3-21 served in special education and reported with action codes 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 25, 50, 51, 52, or 53 for } \leq 10 \text{ days}}{\text{number of students served in special education in attendance}}$$

## Data Source

The data for this indicator are based on the number of special education students reported by the district on the TSDS PEIMS 42400, 42405, 42500, and 42505 Sub-Categories as in attendance (denominator) and reported (with ten or fewer cumulative actual days removed) on the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category with Action Code (Element E1005) 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 25, 50, 51, 52, or 53 (numerator).

## Overall Processing Criteria

- MSR:
  - Denominator ≥ 30
  - Numerator ≥ 10
- RI: No
- SA: No
- Year(s) of Data Available for Analysis: 2 (one for each year reported)
- Accountability Subset: No
- Applicable TSDS PEIMS Collections: Summer 2016 and Summer 2017

## PL Assignment

As required by federal regulations under 34 CFR Part 300, each district’s SPED OSS and expulsion rate is disaggregated by the following racial and ethnic groups: (1) Hispanic/Latino; (2) American Indian or Alaska Native; (3) Asian; (4) Black or African American; (5) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; (6) White; and (7) Two or More Races. PLs of significant disproportionality will be assigned for any racial/ethnic group if the racial/ethnic group’s risk ratio exceeds 2.5.

PL SD (Year 1) or SD (Year 2)

---

Significant Disproportionality (SD) Risk Ratio | > 2.5 - MAX

Risk Ratios:

$$\frac{\text{racial/ethnic group's OSS and expulsion rate } \leq 10 \text{ days}}{\text{other students' OSS and expulsion rate } \leq 10 \text{ days}}$$

## Notes

- For SD PLs based on 2015-2016 data, the student's age, derived from the TSDS PEIMS 40100 Sub-Category (Element E0006), must be at least 3 as of October 30, 2015 and less than 22 as of September 1, 2015. For SD PLs based on 2016-2017 data, the student's age must be at least 3 as of October 28, 2016 and less than 22 as of September 1, 2016.
- Students whose attribution code on the TSDS PEIMS 40110 Sub-Category (Element E1000) is 12 (private school) are not included in the calculation of this indicator in either the numerator or denominator.
- A student is counted as a special education student in the denominator if (a) any 42405 Sub-Category was submitted for the student; (b) Element E0940 on any 42400 Sub-Category submitted for the student contains anything but 000; (c) any 42505 Sub-Category was submitted for the student; or (d) Element E1049 on any 42500 Sub-Category submitted for the student contains anything but 000.
- The actual length of a disciplinary assignment included in this indicator must be greater than zero.
- A complete list and descriptions of all disciplinary Action Codes can be found in the TEDS available at: [http://www.texasstudentdatasystem.org/TSDS/TEDS/TEDS\\_Latest\\_Release/](http://www.texasstudentdatasystem.org/TSDS/TEDS/TEDS_Latest_Release/).
- Significant disproportionality risk ratios are based on one year of data.
- Per federal regulations (34 CFR §300.647), a significant disproportionality risk ratio is not calculated when a district does not meet the MSR for a particular racial or ethnic group. However, if a district meets the MSR for a particular racial or ethnic group but not for the comparison "other students" group, these federal regulations require a significant disproportionality risk ratio be calculated based on the alternate risk ratio, which uses the rates for "other students" in the state. If a district's significant disproportionality PL was based on the alternate risk ratio, it will be so noted on the district's report.
- The intermediate results for significant disproportionality risk ratios are not rounded. This multiple decimal place precision helps ensure the accuracy of the final risk ratio values.

## SPED Discipline Indicator #2: SPED OSS and Expulsion >10 Days Rate (Ages 3-21)

(New!) This indicator measures the disaggregated percent of students ages 3-21 served in special education (SPED) reported as suspended out-of-school (OSS) or expelled for more than 10 school days.

### Calculation

$$\frac{\text{number of students ages 3-21 served in special education and reported with action codes 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 25, 50, 51, 52, or 53 for >10 days}}{\text{number of students served in special education in attendance}}$$

### Data Source

The data for this indicator are based on the number of special education students reported by the district on the TSDS PEIMS 42400, 42405, 42500, and 42505 Sub-Categories as in attendance (denominator) and reported (with more than ten cumulative actual days removed) on the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category with Action Code (Element E1005) 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 25, 50, 51, 52, or 53 (numerator).

### Overall Processing Criteria

- MSR:
  - Denominator  $\geq 30$
  - Numerator  $\geq 10$
- RI: No
- SA: No
- Year(s) of Data Available for Analysis: 2 (one for each year reported)
- Accountability Subset: No
- Applicable TSDS PEIMS Collections: Summer 2016 and Summer 2017

### PL Assignment

As required by federal regulations under 34 CFR Part 300, each district's SPED OSS and expulsion rate is disaggregated by the following racial and ethnic groups: (1) Hispanic/Latino; (2) American Indian or Alaska Native; (3) Asian; (4) Black or African American; (5) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; (6) White; and (7) Two or More Races. PLs of significant disproportionality will be assigned for any racial/ethnic group if the racial/ethnic group's risk ratio exceeds 2.5.

PL SD (Year 1) or SD (Year 2)

---

Significant Disproportionality (SD) Risk Ratio | > 2.5 - MAX

Risk Ratios:

$$\frac{\text{racial/ethnic group's OSS and expulsion rate >10 days}}{\text{other students' OSS and expulsion rate >10 days}}$$

## Notes

- For SD PLs based on 2015-2016 data, the student's age, derived from the TSDS PEIMS 40100 Sub-Category (Element E0006), must be at least 3 as of October 30, 2015 and less than 22 as of September 1, 2015. For SD PLs based on 2016-2017 data, the student's age must be at least 3 as of October 28, 2016 and less than 22 as of September 1, 2016.
- Students whose attribution code on the TSDS PEIMS 40110 Sub-Category (Element E1000) is 12 (private school) are not included in the calculation of this indicator in either the numerator or denominator.
- A student is counted as a special education student in the denominator if (a) any 42405 Sub-Category was submitted for the student; (b) Element E0940 on any 42400 Sub-Category submitted for the student contains anything but 000; (c) any 42505 Sub-Category was submitted for the student; or (d) Element E1049 on any 42500 Sub-Category submitted for the student contains anything but 000.
- The actual length of a disciplinary assignment included in this indicator must be greater than zero.
- A complete list and descriptions of all disciplinary Action Codes can be found in the TEDS available at: [http://www.texasstudentdatasystem.org/TSDS/TEDS/TEDS\\_Latest\\_Release/](http://www.texasstudentdatasystem.org/TSDS/TEDS/TEDS_Latest_Release/).
- Significant disproportionality risk ratios are based on one year of data.
- Per federal regulations (34 CFR §300.647), a significant disproportionality risk ratio is not calculated when a district does not meet the MSR for a particular racial or ethnic group. However, if a district meets the MSR for a particular racial or ethnic group but not for the comparison "other students" group, these federal regulations require a significant disproportionality risk ratio be calculated based on the alternate risk ratio, which uses the rates for "other students" in the state. If a district's significant disproportionality PL was based on the alternate risk ratio, it will be so noted on the district's report.
- The intermediate results for significant disproportionality risk ratios are not rounded. This multiple decimal place precision helps ensure the accuracy of the final risk ratio values.



## SPED Discipline Indicator #3: SPED ISS ≤10 Days Rate (Ages 3-21)

(New!) This indicator measures the disaggregated percent of students ages 3-21 served in special education (SPED) reported with in-school suspension (ISS) for ten or fewer school days.

### Calculation

$$\frac{\text{number of students ages 3-21 served in special education and reported with action codes 06 or 26 for } \leq 10 \text{ days}}{\text{number of students served in special education in attendance}}$$

### Data Source

The data for this indicator are based on the number of special education students reported by the district on the TSDS PEIMS 42400, 42405, 42500, and 42505 Sub-Categories as in attendance (denominator) and reported (with ten or fewer cumulative actual days ISS) on the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category with Action Code (Element E1005) 06 or 26 (numerator).

### Overall Processing Criteria

- MSR:
  - Denominator  $\geq 30$
  - Numerator  $\geq 10$
- RI: No
- SA: No
- Year(s) of Data Available for Analysis: 2 (one for each year reported)
- Accountability Subset: No
- Applicable TSDS PEIMS Collections: Summer 2016 and Summer 2017

### PL Assignment

As required by federal regulations under 34 CFR Part 300, each district's SPED ISS rate is disaggregated by the following racial and ethnic groups: (1) Hispanic/Latino; (2) American Indian or Alaska Native; (3) Asian; (4) Black or African American; (5) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; (6) White; and (7) Two or More Races. PLs of significant disproportionality will be assigned for any racial/ethnic group if the racial/ethnic group's risk ratio exceeds 2.5.

PL SD (Year 1) or SD (Year 2)

---

Significant Disproportionality (SD) Risk Ratio | > 2.5 - MAX

Risk Ratios:

$$\frac{\text{racial/ethnic group's ISS rate } \leq 10 \text{ days}}{\text{other students' ISS rate } \leq 10 \text{ days}}$$

## Notes

- For SD PLs based on 2015-2016 data, the student's age, derived from the TSDS PEIMS 40100 Sub-Category (Element E0006), must be at least 3 as of October 30, 2015 and less than 22 as of September 1, 2015. For SD PLs based on 2016-2017 data, the student's age must be at least 3 as of October 28, 2016 and less than 22 as of September 1, 2016.
- Students whose attribution code on the TSDS PEIMS 40110 Sub-Category (Element E1000) is 12 (private school) are not included in the calculation of this indicator in either the numerator or denominator.
- A student is counted as a special education student in the denominator if (a) any 42405 Sub-Category was submitted for the student; (b) Element E0940 on any 42400 Sub-Category submitted for the student contains anything but 000; (c) any 42505 Sub-Category was submitted for the student; or (d) Element E1049 on any 42500 Sub-Category submitted for the student contains anything but 000.
- The actual length of a disciplinary assignment included in this indicator must be greater than zero.
- A complete list and descriptions of all disciplinary Action Codes can be found in the TEDS available at: [http://www.texasstudentdatasystem.org/TSDS/TEDS/TEDS\\_Latest\\_Release/](http://www.texasstudentdatasystem.org/TSDS/TEDS/TEDS_Latest_Release/).
- Significant disproportionality risk ratios are based on one year of data.
- Per federal regulations (34 CFR §300.647), a significant disproportionality risk ratio is not calculated when a district does not meet the MSR for a particular racial or ethnic group. However, if a district meets the MSR for a particular racial or ethnic group but not for the comparison "other students" group, these federal regulations require a significant disproportionality risk ratio be calculated based on the alternate risk ratio, which uses the rates for "other students" in the state. If a district's significant disproportionality PL was based on the alternate risk ratio, it will be so noted on the district's report.
- The intermediate results for significant disproportionality risk ratios are not rounded. This multiple decimal place precision helps ensure the accuracy of the final risk ratio values.

## SPED Discipline Indicator #4: SPED ISS >10 Days Rate (Ages 3-21)

(New!) This indicator measures the disaggregated percent of students ages 3-21 served in special education (SPED) reported with in-school suspension (ISS) for more than ten school days.

### Calculation

$$\frac{\text{number of students ages 3-21 served in special education and reported with action codes 06 or 26 for >10 days}}{\text{number of students served in special education in attendance}}$$

### Data Source

The data for this indicator are based on the number of special education students reported by the district on the TSDS PEIMS 42400, 42405, 42500, and 42505 Sub-Categories as in attendance (denominator) and reported (with more than ten cumulative actual days ISS) on the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category with Action Code (Element E1005) 06 or 26 (numerator).

### Overall Processing Criteria

- MSR:
  - Denominator  $\geq 30$
  - Numerator  $\geq 10$
- RI: No
- SA: No
- Year(s) of Data Available for Analysis: 2 (one for each year reported)
- Accountability Subset: No
- Applicable TSDS PEIMS Collections: Summer 2016 and Summer 2017

### PL Assignment

As required by federal regulations under 34 CFR Part 300, each district's SPED ISS rate is disaggregated by the following racial and ethnic groups: (1) Hispanic/Latino; (2) American Indian or Alaska Native; (3) Asian; (4) Black or African American; (5) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; (6) White; and (7) Two or More Races. PLs of significant disproportionality will be assigned for any racial/ethnic group if the racial/ethnic group's risk ratio exceeds 2.5.

$$\frac{\text{PL SD (Year 1) or SD (Year 2)}}{\text{Significant Disproportionality (SD) Risk Ratio}} > 2.5 - \text{MAX}$$

Risk Ratios:

$$\frac{\text{racial/ethnic group's ISS rate >10 days}}{\text{other students' ISS rate >10 days}}$$

## Notes

- For SD PLs based on 2015-2016 data, the student's age, derived from the TSDS PEIMS 40100 Sub-Category (Element E0006), must be at least 3 as of October 30, 2015 and less than 22 as of September 1, 2015. For SD PLs based on 2016-2017 data, the student's age must be at least 3 as of October 28, 2016 and less than 22 as of September 1, 2016.
- Students whose attribution code on the TSDS PEIMS 40110 Sub-Category (Element E1000) is 12 (private school) are not included in the calculation of this indicator in either the numerator or denominator.
- A student is counted as a special education student in the denominator if (a) any 42405 Sub-Category was submitted for the student; (b) Element E0940 on any 42400 Sub-Category submitted for the student contains anything but 000; (c) any 42505 Sub-Category was submitted for the student; or (d) Element E1049 on any 42500 Sub-Category submitted for the student contains anything but 000.
- The actual length of a disciplinary assignment included in this indicator must be greater than zero.
- A complete list and descriptions of all disciplinary Action Codes can be found in the TEDS available at: [http://www.texasstudentdatasystem.org/TSDS/TEDS/TEDS\\_Latest\\_Release/](http://www.texasstudentdatasystem.org/TSDS/TEDS/TEDS_Latest_Release/).
- Significant disproportionality risk ratios are based on one year of data.
- Per federal regulations (34 CFR §300.647), a significant disproportionality risk ratio is not calculated when a district does not meet the MSR for a particular racial or ethnic group. However, if a district meets the MSR for a particular racial or ethnic group but not for the comparison "other students" group, these federal regulations require a significant disproportionality risk ratio be calculated based on the alternate risk ratio, which uses the rates for "other students" in the state. If a district's significant disproportionality PL was based on the alternate risk ratio, it will be so noted on the district's report.
- The intermediate results for significant disproportionality risk ratios are not rounded. This multiple decimal place precision helps ensure the accuracy of the final risk ratio values.

# SPED Discipline Indicator #5: SPED Total Disciplinary Removals Rate (Ages 3-21)

(New!) This indicator measures the disaggregated percent of total disciplinary removals of students ages 3-21 served in special education (SPED).

## Calculation

$$\frac{\text{number of times students ages 3-21 served in special education were reported with action codes 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 25, 26, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, or 60}}{\text{number of students served in special education in attendance}}$$

## Data Source

The data for this indicator are based on the number of special education students reported by the district on the TSDS PEIMS 42400, 42405, 42500, and 42505 Sub-Categories as in attendance (denominator) and the number of removals reported on the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category as Action Code (Element E1005) 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 25, 26, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, or 60 (numerator).

## Overall Processing Criteria

- MSR:
  - Denominator  $\geq 30$
  - Numerator  $\geq 10$
- RI: No
- SA: No
- Year(s) of Data Available for Analysis: 2 (one for each year reported)
- Accountability Subset: No
- Applicable TSDS PEIMS Collections: Summer 2016 and Summer 2017

## PL Assignment

As required by federal regulations under 34 CFR Part 300, each district's SPED total disciplinary removals rate is disaggregated by the following racial and ethnic groups: (1) Hispanic/Latino; (2) American Indian or Alaska Native; (3) Asian; (4) Black or African American; (5) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; (6) White; and (7) Two or More Races. PLs of significant disproportionality will be assigned for any racial/ethnic group if the racial/ethnic group's risk ratio exceeds 2.5.

PL SD (Year 1) or SD (Year 2)

---

Significant Disproportionality (SD) Risk Ratio > 2.5 - MAX

Risk Ratios:

$$\frac{\text{racial/ethnic group's total disciplinary removals rate}}{\text{other students' total disciplinary removals rate}}$$

## Notes

- For SD PLs based on 2015-2016 data, the student's age, derived from the TSDS PEIMS 40100 Sub-Category (Element E0006), must be at least 3 as of October 30, 2015 and less than 22 as of September 1, 2015. For SD PLs based on 2016-2017 data, the student's age must be at least 3 as of October 28, 2016 and less than 22 as of September 1, 2016.
- Students whose attribution code on the TSDS PEIMS 40110 Sub-Category (Element E1000) is 12 (private school) are not included in the calculation of this indicator in either the numerator or denominator.
- A student is counted as a special education student in the denominator if (a) any 42405 Sub-Category was submitted for the student; (b) Element E0940 on any 42400 Sub-Category submitted for the student contains anything but 000; (c) any 42505 Sub-Category was submitted for the student; or (d) Element E1049 on any 42500 Sub-Category submitted for the student contains anything but 000.
- The actual length of a disciplinary assignment included in this indicator must be greater than zero.
- A complete list and descriptions of all disciplinary Action Codes can be found in the TEDS available at: [http://www.texasstudentdatasystem.org/TSDS/TEDS/TEDS\\_Latest\\_Release/](http://www.texasstudentdatasystem.org/TSDS/TEDS/TEDS_Latest_Release/).
- Significant disproportionality risk ratios are based on one year of data.
- Per federal regulations (34 CFR §300.647), a significant disproportionality risk ratio is not calculated when a district does not meet the MSR for a particular racial or ethnic group. However, if a district meets the MSR for a particular racial or ethnic group but not for the comparison "other students" group, these federal regulations require a significant disproportionality risk ratio be calculated based on the alternate risk ratio, which uses the rates for "other students" in the state. If a district's significant disproportionality PL was based on the alternate risk ratio, it will be so noted on the district's report.
- The intermediate results for significant disproportionality risk ratios are not rounded. This multiple decimal place precision helps ensure the accuracy of the final risk ratio values.





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