2024 Discipline Data Validation Manual

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 General Counsel
Texas Education Agency
1701 N. Congress Ave. Austin, TX 78701-1494;
Phone: (512) 463-7904
Email: copyrights@tea.texas.gov

Table of Contents

Section I: Introduction **1**

Annual Data Validation Analyses 3

Differences Between Discipline Data Validation Indicators and Other Performance Indicators 3

Discipline Data Validation Indicators: Background 4

List of 2024 Discipline Data Validation Indicators 5

Data Sources 5

Data Validation Reports 6

Sample Report 7

Data Validation Requirements for LEAs - *Updated* 8

Discipline Action Reason Codes, Action Codes and Documentation Requirements 8

Additional Resources 9

Section II: 2024 Discipline Data Validation Indicators **11**

Indicator #1: Length of Out-Of-School Suspension 13

Indicator #2: Unauthorized Expulsion - Students Age 10 and Older 14

Indicator #3: Unauthorized Expulsion - Students under Age 10 15

Indicator #4: Unauthorized DAEP Placement - Students under Age 6 16

Indicator #5: High Number of Discretionary DAEP Placements 17

Indicator #6: Black or African American (Not Hispanic/Latino) Discretionary DAEP Placements 18

Indicator #7: Hispanic Discretionary DAEP Placements 19

Section III: Appendices **21**

Appendix: A – Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Subcategory 23

Appendix: B – Applicable Disciplinary Action Reason Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Subcategory 24

Appendix: C – ESC Contacts 25

Appendix: D – Comments and Questions 27

Section I: Introduction

Annual Data Validation Analyses

The accountability and performance data reporting systems at the Texas Education Agency (TEA) rely on data submitted by Local Education Agencies (LEAs); therefore, the integrity of LEAs' data is critical. Furthermore, data can be a key component in ensuring education-related programs are being implemented with fidelity across LEAs. To ensure data integrity, annual data validation analyses and reviews are conducted to examine LEAs' leaver and dropout data, student assessment data, and discipline data. Additional data analyses, as well as 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 Performance Indicators

There are key differences between the discipline data validation indicators used as part of the Annual Data Validation System and the indicators used in performance systems such as Results Driven Accountability (RDA). A performance indicator yields a *definitive* result, e.g., 85% of a particular 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, an LEA may report it expelled a student for three unexcused absences. This unauthorized expulsion will appear as a data anomaly. The LEA 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 LEA's data are accurate and verifiable.

Another difference between performance indicators and data validation indicators is the criteria used to evaluate LEAs. In performance systems such as RDA, performance indicators include a *range of established cut points* used to evaluate LEAs, 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 LEA is also different depending on whether the LEA is identified under a performance indicator or a discipline data validation indicator. LEAs identified with a 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. LEAs 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 LEA's identification occurred because of incorrect data, improve local data collection and submission procedures.

Differences between Discipline Data Validation Indicators and Performance Indicators

Indicator Type	Result	Evaluation Criteria	LEA Response
Discipline Data Validation	Suggests an anomaly	Based on an annual review of data to identify anomalous data and trends observed over time	Validate the accuracy of data locally and, as necessary, improve local data collection and submission procedures or address program implementation concerns
Performance systems such as RDA	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 LEAs 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 accountability and performance data reporting systems and to ensure programs are being implemented with fidelity.** As such, the process LEAs engage in to either validate the accuracy of their data or determine that erroneous data were submitted is fundamental to the integrity of these systems. While all LEAs identified through a discipline data validation indicator should conduct a local review to validate the accuracy of their data, only some LEAs will be contacted by the agency for a compliance review and will be asked to share their findings and supporting documentation with the agency.

Many LEAs 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 LEAs as a routine data confirmation that is documented locally and, if issued a compliance review, communicated back to the agency. Other LEAs 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 responses. For some LEAs, it will be determined that the anomalous data reflect a systemic issue, such as program non-compliance, within one data collection (e.g., discipline data in general) or a pervasive issue (i.e., across data systems) which will require a more extensive LEA response.

Discipline Data Validation Indicators: Background

In 1995, the 74th 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 LEAs' use of DAEPs and JJAEPs and to review the documentation of LEA-reported discipline information, TEA developed a process for collecting and evaluating discipline data. The Texas Student Data System (TSDS) Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) uses Disciplinary Action Data (Student) to obtain the data necessary for these analyses. This collects both Disciplinary Action ***Reason*** Codes and Disciplinary ***Action*** Codes in order to capture both the student's conduct and the LEA's subsequent response. Currently, this record is now referenced as 44425 Discipline Action Subcategory.

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 21.006(k), 22.093(1), 22.096, 28.006, 29.001(5), 29.010(a), 33.006(h), 37.1083, 37.1084, 38.003, or 39.003, 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, or Subchapter A, Chapter 37, only as necessary to ensure:
>
> . . .
>
> (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 §39.003 gives the commissioner of education discretion to authorize a special investigation to be conducted:

> (3) in response to complaints submitted to the agency with respect to alleged violations of civil rights or other requirements imposed on the state by federal law or court order;
>
> or
>
> (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 2024 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. Black or African American (Not Hispanic/Latino) Discretionary DAEP Placements
7. Hispanic Discretionary DAEP Placements

Data Sources

The Texas Student Data System (TSDS) is a statewide system for collecting and reporting education data. TSDS is a major TEA initiative that expanded on the former Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS). As specified by TEC §48.008, LEAs are required to submit data on student demographics, academic performance, personnel, and LEA finances. These data are submitted through the TSDS PEIMS application and used by TEA annually to process discipline data validation indicators.

The 2024 discipline data validation analysis for the indicators listed above is based on discipline data from the 2023-2024 school year, which were submitted by LEAs in June 2024 and as necessary resubmitted by LEAs in July 2024 (See Appendix A for a full description of the disciplinary action codes and Appendix B for a list of the disciplinary action reason codes used in these indicators.)

Data Validation Reports

LEA-level reports and certain student-level data[1] will be generated for each LEA identified on one or more of the 2024 discipline data validation indicators. These reports and student-level data are made available via the Texas Education Agency Login (TEAL) Accountability application under the "Performance-Based Monitoring" tab. LEAs not identified will receive the following message if they attempt to access the report: *"A 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 Discipline Data Validation System; (b) your district did not meet minimum 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 Discipline Data Validation System."*

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

[1] Student-level data are not applicable to Indicators #5 - #7.

Sample Report

CONFIDENTIAL

Texas Education Agency

2024 Data Validation District Report

Discipline Data

Example ISD *Region ZZ*

Data Source: TSDS PEIMS Summer Submission 2024 (44425 Subcategory)

INDICATOR	DISTRICT COUNT
2. Unauthorized Expulsion – Students Age 10 and Older	**4**
3. Unauthorized Expulsion – Students Under Age 10	**3**

	STANDARD	DISTRICT RATE	NUMERATOR	DENOMINATOR
5. High Number of Discretionary DAEP Placements	**<3.5**	**6.0**	359	5,982
7. Hispanic Discretionary DAEP Placements				
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 placements 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 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 Hispanic 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 2024 Discipline Data Validation Manual.

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

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

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

HIGH NUMBER OF DISCRETIONARY DAEP PLACEMENTS: The LEA 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 LEA 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 LEAs - *Updated*

LEAs triggered in one or more 2024 Discipline Data Validation indicators should conduct a local review of their data and related policies and procedures to validate and document that their data are correct. LEAs should use the agency's guidance to ensure that their reporting is accurate and meets the agency's requirements and expectations. If program implementation concerns and/or incorrect data are identified, LEAs are expected to address those issues. LEAs should maintain local documentation of their data validation process. TEA also commonly works with the LEAs to bring them into compliance and/or to establish better local practices.

A select number of LEAs triggered in one or more 2024 Discipline Data Validation indicators may be issued a compliance review by the Self-Reported Data Unit (SRDU) in the Governance – Compliance and Investigations Division at TEA. Superintendents will be notified by email if their LEA is issued a compliance review. As a part of the compliance review process, TEA will request documentation and other information from LEAs to review and determine whether an LEA in compliance with data reporting expectations and related state and federal laws, rules, and regulations.

An LEA's discipline data and their actions to correct program implementation and/or data concerns will continue to be monitored by the agency. An LEA is expected to take the necessary actions to correct any program implementation or data concerns, if warranted. If an LEA is identified as having not taken the steps to remediate these concerns, TEA has the discretion to take actions and interventions under Texas Education Code Chapters 39 and 39A, as the result of a compliance review or investigation.

Discipline Action Reason Codes, Action Codes and Documentation Requirements

The *2023-2024 Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS)* provide technical resources that outline specific guidelines on acceptable documentation for each of the discipline action code and reason codes. The PEIMS Discipline Data technical resources can be accessed at PEIMS Discipline Data - Chart for Determining Mandatory and Discretionary DAEP Placements and Expulsions in addition to other discipline technical resources available.

Additional Resources

Education Service Center (ESC) Results Driven Accountability contacts are available to provide LEAs with technical assistance concerning the 2024 discipline data validation indicators (See Appendix C). In addition, the TEDS (including Technical Resources mentioned above), 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 Action Reason and Action Codes. LEAs 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 LEAs may find helpful as part of a local review of discipline data. These reports are based on data reported by LEAs. When accessing these reports, LEAs should confirm the collection selected corresponds with the applicable indicator's data source shown on the LEA's Discipline Data Validation Report.

- PDM3-132-001: Student Disciplinary Action Roster
- PDM3-132-002: Student Disciplinary Action Detail by Reason
- PDM3-132-003: Student Disciplinary Action Summary

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

Section II:
2024 Discipline Data Validation Indicators

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

This indicator identifies LEAs 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 Action 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 Subcategory

- 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 LEAs 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 Action 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 (Action Reason Code 41) will trigger this indicator for unauthorized expulsion.

Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Subcategory

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

Applicable Disciplinary Action Reason Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Subcategory

- *New!* Codes 01, 02, 07, 21, 28, 41, 56, 60, and **63**.

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

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

Minimum Size Requirements

- Not Applicable

Notes

- Charters are **not** included in this indicator.
- Action 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 Action Reason Code other than Action 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 (Action Reason Code 21) will trigger the indicator for the unauthorized expulsion.

Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Subcategory

- 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 LEAs 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.
- Action 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 Action Reason Code other than Action 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 (Action Reason Code 21) will trigger the indicator for the unauthorized DAEP placement.

Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Subcategory

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

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

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

Calculation

$$\frac{\textbf{Number of discretionary DAEP placements of all students}}{\textbf{Number of all students in attendance}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements

- Numerator ≥ 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 Subcategory

- Codes 07, 08, and 10.

Applicable Disciplinary Action Reason Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Subcategory

- Codes 01, 02[2], 10, 21, 23, 41, 49, 56, and 61.

[2] 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: Black or African American (Not Hispanic/Latino) Discretionary DAEP Placements

This indicator identifies LEAs with a discretionary DAEP placement rate for Black or 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 Black or African American students:

$$\frac{\textbf{Number of discretionary DAEP placements of Black or African American students}}{\textbf{Number of African American students in attendance}}$$

2. Discretionary DAEP placement rate for all students:

$$\frac{\textbf{Number of discretionary DAEP placements of all students}}{\textbf{Number of all students in attendance}}$$

3. Disproportionality Rate:

$$\frac{\textbf{Black or African American discretionary DAEP placement rate}}{\textbf{All students' discretionary DAEP placement rate}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements

- Numerator ≥ 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 Black or 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 Subcategory

- Codes 07, 08, and 10.

Applicable Disciplinary Action Reason Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Subcategory

- Codes 01, 02[3], 10, 21, 23, 41, 49, 56, and 61.

[3] 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 LEAs 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:

$$\frac{\textbf{Number of discretionary DAEP placements of Hispanic students}}{\textbf{Number of Hispanic students in attendance}}$$

2. Discretionary DAEP placement rate for all students:

$$\frac{\textbf{Number of discretionary DAEP placements of all students}}{\textbf{Number of all students in attendance}}$$

3. Disproportionality Rate:

$$\frac{\textbf{Hispanic discretionary DAEP placement rate}}{\textbf{All students' discretionary DAEP placement rate}}$$

Minimum Size Requirements

- Numerator ≥ 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 44425 Subcategory

- Codes 07, 08, and 10.

Applicable Disciplinary Action Reason Codes from the PEIMS 44425 Subcategory

- Codes 01, 02[4], 10, 21, 23, 41, 49, 56, and 61.

[4] 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 Subcategory

Disciplinary Action Codes can be found on the TSDS Web-Enabled Data Standards web page.

Codes	Disciplinary Action
01	Expulsion: Without placement in another educational setting
02	Expulsion: With placement in a juvenile justice alternative education program (JJAEP)
03	Expulsion: With placement in an on-campus disciplinary alternative education program (DAEP). (Do not use this code when a student has been placed in a DAEP, but not expelled)
04	Expulsion: With placement in an off-campus disciplinary alternative education program (DAEP). (Do not use this code when a student has been placed in a DAEP, but not expelled)
05	Out-Of-School Suspension
07	Placement In An On-Campus Or Off Campus DAEP
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 JJAEP From The Prior School Year
14	Placement In A DAEP By Court Order
15	Continuation Of Other District's Expulsion With Placement To JJAEP
25	Partial Day Out-Of-School Suspension
50	Expulsion: Without Placement In Another Educational Setting: As a result of a determination by 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 On-Campus Or 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)
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 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 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 Action Reason Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Subcategory

Disciplinary Action Reason Codes can be found on the TSDS Web-Enabled Data Standards web page.

Codes	Disciplinary Action 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
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)
41	Fighting/Mutual Combat – Excludes all offenses under Penal Code §22.01
49	Engages In Deadly Conduct – TEC §37.007(b)(3)
56	Student Is Required To Register As A Sex Offender Under Chapter 62 Of The Code Of Criminal Procedure And Is Not Under Court Supervision – TEC §37.305. The offense(s) for which the student is required to register as a sex offender must have occurred on or after Sept. 1, 2007
60	Harassment Against an Employee of the School District under Texas Penal Code 42.07(a)(1), (2), (3), or (7) – TEC 37.006(a)(2)(G)
61	Bullying – TEC 37.0052(b)
63	Possessed, Sold, Gave, Delivered, Or Used E-Cigarette -TEC 37.006(a)(2)(C-2)

Appendix: C – ESC Contacts

ESC Results Driven Accountability Contacts that assist with data validation can be found on the AskTED web page, using the Search RESCs function.

Full Name	Region	City	Phone	Email Address
Sanda V.Gonzalez	1	Edinburg	(956) 984-6003	sangonzalez@esc1.net
Cristina Sandoval	2	Corpus Christi	(361) 561-8454	cristina.sandoval@esc2.us
Missy Klimitchek	3	Victoria	(361) 573-0731 ext:115	mklimitchek@esc3.net
Jamie Schrade	3	Victoria	(361) 573-0731 ext:1119	jschrade@esc3.net
Mollisondra Bodungen	3	Victoria	(361) 573-0731	mbodungen@esc3.net
Angel Lozano	4	Houston	(713) 744-6596	angel.lozano@esc4.net
Danette Thornton	4	Houston	(713) 744-6578	danette.thornton@esc4.net
Robert Reeves	4	Houston	(713) 744-4410	robert.reeves@esc4.net
Nickie Miller	5	Beaumont	(409) 951-1847	nmiller@esc5.net
Sandy Cammarata-Garcia	6	Huntsville	(936) 435-8235	sgarcia@esc6.net
Beverly Beran	7	Kilgore	(903) 988-6910	bberan@esc7.net
Hannah Garrett	8	Mt Pleasant	(903) 575-2625	hgarrett@reg8.net
Holly Hawkins	9	Wichita Falls	(940) 322-6928	holly.hawkins@esc9.net
Shane Porter	9	Wichita Falls	(940) 322-6928	Shane.porter@esc9.net
Melissa Shaw	10	Richardson	(972) 348-1210	melissa.shaw@region10.org
Michael Milburn	10	Richardson	(972) 348-1632	michael.milburn@region10.org
Beth Garcia	10	Richardson	(972) 348-1526	beth.garcia@region10.org
Evan Heckmann	10	Richardson	(972) 348-1770	evan.heckmann@region10.org
Kevin Alaniz	10	Richardson	(972) 348-1592	kevin.alaniz@region10.org
Sonia Rhykerd	10	Richardson	(972) 348-1552	sonia.rhykerd@region10.org
Margo Nottingham	11	White Settlement	(817) 740-7526	mnottingham@esc11.net
Derrick Spurlock	11	White Settlement	(817) 740-7552	dspurlock@esc11.net
Stephanie Cassels	11	White Settlement	(817) 740-7569	scassels@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
Terry Arndt	12	Waco	(254) 297-1199	tarndt@esc12.net
Angela Isenberg	13	Austin	(512) 919-5328	angela.isenberg@esc13.txed.net
Lisa White	14	Abilene	(325) 675-8616	lwhite@esc14.net
Emilia Moreno	14	Abilene	(325) 675-8674	emoreno@esc14.net
David Bedford	15	San Angelo	(325) 658-6571 ext:4023	david.bedford@esc15.net
Michael Bohensky	15	San Angelo	(325) 481-4024	michael.bohensky@esc15.net
Connie Neal	15	San Angelo	(325) 481-4050	connie.neal@esc15.net
Randy Gartman	15	San Angelo	(325) 481-4035	randy.gartman@esc15.net
Melissa Anthony	15	San Angelo	(325) 481-4093	melissa.anthony@esc15.net
Mandi Palmer	16	Amarillo	(806) 677-5269	mandi.palmer@esc16.net
Anna Phillips	17	Lubbock	(806) 281-5891	aphillips@esc17.net
Jennifer De Leon	17	Lubbock	(806) 281-5889	jdeleon@esc17.net
Shannon Phillips	17	Lubbock	(806) 281-5847	sphillips@esc17.net
Angel Sindu	17	Lubbock	(806) 281-5788	asidhu@esc17.net
Monica Hernandez	18	Midland	(432) 567-3241	monica.hernandez@esc18.net
Amanda Magallan	18	Midland	(432) 563-2380	amanda.magallan@esc18.net
Desiree Caddell	18	Midland	(432) 561-4338	dcaddell@esc18.net
Maria Mata	18	Midland	(432) 567-3220	mmata@esc18.net

Full Name	Region	City	Phone	Email Address
Barbara O Amaya	19	El Paso	(915) 780-5354	bamaya@esc19.net
Yoscelina Hernandez	19	El Paso	(915) 780-5075	yhernandez2@esc19.net
Rachel A Anderson	19	El Paso	(915) 780-5078	reaanderson@esc19.net
Yesenia Frade	20	San Antonio	(210) 370-5486	yesenia.frade@esc20.net

If an ESC Results Driven Accountability contacts information is missing, please call the ESC main number listed at Education Service Centers for assistance.

Appendix: D – Comments and Questions

Questions about the *2024 Discipline Data Validation Indicators* should be addressed to:

Performance Reporting Division
Phone: (512) 463-9704
Email: Performance.Reporting@tea.texas.gov

Questions about the *2024 Discipline Data Reporting Compliance Reviews* should be addressed to:

Self-Reported Data Unit, Governance – Compliance & Investigations Division
Email: datacomplaints@tea.texas.gov
Website: Self-Reported Data Unit

Comments on the 2024 Discipline Data Validation Indicators are welcome and will assist the agency in its evaluation and future development efforts. Comments may be submitted to Performance Reporting, Texas Education Agency, 1701 North Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas 78701-1494 or sent via e-mail to Performance.Reporting@tea.texas.gov. Comments should be provided no later than March 7, 2025, to allow sufficient time for consideration in the 2025 data validation development cycle.

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