Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions
Data Validation Monitoring-Discipline

Synopsis of the Summary of Interventions

Texas Education Agency (TEA) monitoring and intervention activities have been designed to focus on a data-driven and performance-based system that will take place in a continuous improvement model. Intervention activities in this system reflect an emphasis on data integrity, data analysis, and increased student performance and improved program effectiveness. The system for TEA monitoring is referenced as the Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) system.

Determinations regarding monitoring and interventions are the result of a discipline data validation analysis implemented by the agency's Performance-Based Monitoring Division. Information related to the discipline data validation indicators calculated by the Performance-Based Monitoring Division.

The Data Validation Monitoring (DVM) system annually analyzes student leaver records submitted by districts and charter schools through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS). The analysis assesses student leaver data against performance indicators to identify data trends and anomalies, which may or may not signify data quality and/or integrity issues. Stages of intervention are assigned to districts and charter schools that trigger one or more performance indicators. Staging is based on an assessment of risk, with Stage 4 indicating the highest level of risk and Stage 1 representing a lower level of risk.

The Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions implements the DVM System to monitor the accuracy of data submitted by school districts through the Public Education Information and Management System (PEIMS) and used in the state's accountability rating and performance-based monitoring (PBM) systems.

The scope of intervention activities required for each stage of intervention include:

Stage 1 Intervention: At this level of intervention, the LEA will be required to conduct a data analysis of certain discipline data validation indicators triggered as a result of the initial data review and, if data reporting or programmatic concerns are verified, include results of the review in the CIP/CAP. The purpose of the focused data analysis (FDA) is to work with stakeholders to gather, disaggregate, and review data to determine possible causes for anomalous discipline data and address identified issues in the CIP/CAP. LEAs are required to complete a student-by-student discipline data review (SLDR template) as applicable to the indicator(s) triggering the review (note: the sample size for the SLDR varies by stage of intervention). The LEA will be required to complete all intervention activities by a specified completion date and retain all templates and materials at the LEA, subject to a request for submission to the TEA for review and verification. If selected for submission, the LEA will submit supporting documentation to verify appropriate discipline coding.

Stage 2 Intervention: At this level of intervention, the LEA will be required to conduct a data analysis of certain discipline data validation indicators triggered as a result of the initial data review and, if data reporting or programmatic concerns are verified, include results of the review in the CIP/CAP. The purpose of the FDA is to work with stakeholders to gather, disaggregate, and review data to determine possible causes for anomalous discipline data and address identified issues in the CIP/CAP. LEAs at this stage of intervention are required to complete a student-by-student discipline data review (SLDR template) as applicable to the indicator(s) triggering the review (note: the sample size for the SLDR varies by stage of intervention). Additionally, the LEA will submit supporting documentation to verify appropriate discipline coding. Documentation of all required activities will be submitted to the TEA by a specified due date.

Stage 3 Intervention: At this level of intervention, the LEA will be required to conduct a data analysis of certain discipline data validation indicators triggered as a result of the initial data review and, if data reporting or programmatic concerns are verified, include results of the review in the CIP/CAP. The purpose of the FDA is to work with stakeholders to gather, disaggregate, and review data to determine possible causes for anomalous discipline data and address identified issues in the CIP/CAP. LEAs at this stage of intervention are required to complete a student-by-student discipline data review (SLDR template) as applicable to the indicator(s) triggering

the review (note: the sample size for the SLDR varies by stage of intervention). Additionally, the LEA will submit supporting documentation to verify appropriate discipline coding. Documentation of all required activities will be submitted to the TEA by a specified due date.

Stage 4 Intervention (High Risk Determined): A targeted on-site review by the TEA will be conducted or other interventions or sanctions will be ordered to address data accuracy concerns related to documented substantial, ongoing, or imminent risks as reflected in LEA data and/or response to interventions within the PBM system. The LEA will be required to complete a focused data analysis and a student-by-student discipline data review (SLDR) as applicable to the indicator(s) triggering the review (note: the sample size for the SLDR varies by stage of intervention). If data reporting or programmatic concerns are verified, an LEA will develop a CIP/CAP in response to both the visit and any other required data review activities. This type of intervention will occur in the event the TEA identifies a high risk related to the accuracy of discipline data. Documentation of all required activities will be submitted to the TEA by a specified due date.

The LEA should use the information to begin planning for locally driven intervention activities, including establishing systems to monitor data reported to TEA.

Total # of LEAs Identified for DVM-Discipline Interventions										
	Stage 1		**Stage 2**		**Stage 3**		**Stage 4**		**Total**	
Monitoring Year	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
05-06	91	21%	260	61%	76	18%	0	0%	427	100%
06-07	99	68%	47	32%	0	0%	0	0%	146	100%
07-08*	82	61%	33	24%	17	13%	3	2%	135	100%
08-09*	111	67%	35	21%	16	10%	3	2%	165	100%
09-10*	71	33%	116	54%	16	8%	10	5%	213	100%
10-11*	40	17%	180	75%	20	8%	0	0%	240	100%
Totals do not include LEAs that were identified for Report Only indicators										