2022 Discipline Data Validation Manual

Texas Education Agency

Office of School Programs
Department of Assessment and Reporting
Division of Performance Reporting

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

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

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

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

Table of Contents

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION 1

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 2022 Discipline Data Validation Indicators 5

Data Sources 5

Data Validation Reports 6

Sample Report 7

Data Validation Requirements for Districts 8

Discipline Reason Codes, Action Codes and Documentation Requirements 8

Additional Resources 8

SECTION II: 2022 DISCIPLINE DATA VALIDATION INDICATORS 10

Discipline Data Validation Indicator #1: Length of Out-Of-School Suspension 12

Discipline Data Validation Indicator #2: Unauthorized Expulsion - Students Age 10 and Older 13

Discipline Data Validation Indicator #3: Unauthorized Expulsion - Students under Age 10 14

Discipline Data Validation Indicator #4: Unauthorized DAEP Placement - Students under Age 6 15

Discipline Data Validation Indicator #5: High Number of Discretionary DAEP Placements 16

Discipline Data Validation Indicator #6: Black or African American (Not Hispanic/Latino) Discretionary DAEP Placements 17

Discipline Data Validation Indicator #7: Hispanic Discretionary DAEP Placements 18

SECTION III: APPENDICES 20

Appendix: A – Applicable Disciplinary Action Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category 22

Appendix: B – Applicable Disciplinary Reason Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category 23

Appendix: C – ESC Contacts 24

Appendix: D – Comments and Questions 26

Section I: Introduction

Performance-Based Monitoring Data Validation

The Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) system(s), 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 local education agencies (LEAs); therefore, the integrity of LEAs' 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 such as Results Driven Accountability (RDA). A 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 performance indicators and PBM discipline data validation indicators is the criteria used to evaluate districts. In the performance-based monitoring system, 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 performance indicator or a PBM discipline data validation indicator. Districts 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. 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 Performance-Based Monitoring System RDA 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
Performance-Based Monitoring analysis system 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 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(s).** 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 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 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[1]. 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. Currently, this record is now referenced as 44425 Sub-Category.

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), 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.

[1] The Texas Student Data System (TSDS), a major TEA initiative, later expanded on the former PEIMS.

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 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 2022 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 2022 discipline data validation analysis for the indicators listed above is based on discipline data from the 2021-2022 school year which were submitted by districts in June 2022. (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[2] 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 Login (TEAL) 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 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.

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

Sample Report

CONFIDENTIAL

Texas Education Agency

2022 PBM Data Validation District Report

Discipline Data

Example ISD Region ZZ

Data Source: TSDS PEIMS Summer Submission 2022 (44425 Sub-Category)

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 detail information on each of the indicators above, see 2022 Discipline Data Validation Manual.

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 Data Reporting Compliance Unit (DRCU) will notify districts by posting a "To the Administrator Addressed" (TAA) letter on the TEA web page for correspondence that compliance reviews are available via the Intervention, Stage, and Activity Manager (ISAM) application accessed through TEAL. It is a district's obligation to access TAA correspondence by (a) subscribing to the TAA listserv at Texas Education Agency Update Subscription, and (b) accessing the ISAM application as directed to retrieve compliance review instructions and information. Superintendents should ensure appropriate district contacts have access to ISAM and sign-up for TAA correspondence in order to receive pertinent communications. Questions about compliance reviews should be directed to DRCU at DRCU@tea.texas.gov or (512) 463-9980.

Discipline Reason Codes, Action Codes and Documentation Requirements

The *2021-2022 Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS)* provides technical resources which outline specific guidelines on acceptable documentation for each of the discipline action 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

ESC Results Driven Accountability contacts at each Education Service Center (ESC) are available to provide districts with technical assistance concerning the PBM 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 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.

- PDM3-132-002: Student Disciplinary Action Detail by Reason
- PDM3-132-001: Student Disciplinary Action Roster
- PDM3-132-003: 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:
2022 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 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, 41, 56, and 60.

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 an 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 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.
- 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 44425 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 LEAs 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 ≥ 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[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 #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 Sub-Category

- Codes 07, 08, and 10.

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

- 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).

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 Sub-Category

- Codes 07, 08, and 10.

Applicable Disciplinary Reason Codes from the PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category

- Codes 01, 02[5], 10, 21, 23, 41, 49, 56, and 61.

[5] 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

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)
04	Expulsion: With placement in an off-campus disciplinary alternative education program (DAEP)
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 Reason Codes from the TSDS PEIMS 44425 Sub-Category

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

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
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	Registered Sex Offender, Not Under Court Supervision – TEC §37.305
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)

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
Tammie Garcia	1	Edinburg	(956) 984-6173	tgarcia@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
Monica Jones	3	Victoria	(361) 573-0731 ext:250	mjones@esc3.net
Kenda Matson	3	Victoria	(361) 573-0731 ext:321	kmatson@esc3.net
Angel Lozano	4	Houston	(713) 744-6596	angel.lozano@esc4.net
Danette Thornton	4	Houston	(713) 744-6578	danette.thornton@esc4.net
Monelle Rougeau	4	Houston	(713) 744-6581	monelle.rougeau@esc4.net
Monica Mahfouz	5	Beaumont	(409) 951-1702	mmahfouz@esc5.net
Ana Deter	6	Huntsville	(936) 435-8247	adeter@esc6.net
Dr Steve Johnson	6	Huntsville	(936) 435-8290	sjohnson@esc6.net
Jan Oatess	6	Huntsville	(936) 435-8207	joatess@esc6.net
Jennifer Graves	6	Huntsville	(936) 435-8216	jgraves@esc6.net
Sandy Cammarata-Garcia	6	Huntsville	(936) 435-8235	sgarcia@esc6.net
Beth Nesmith	6	Huntsville	(936) 435-8243	bnesmith@esc6.net
Beverly Beran	7	Kilgore	(903) 988-6910	bberan@esc7.net
Sara Beth Batts	8	Mt Pleasant	(903) 575-2743	sbatts@reg8.net
Stacy Elledge	8	Mt Pleasant	(903) 575-2616	selledge@reg8.net
Leonard Beles	8	Mt Pleasant	(903) 572-8551 ext:2740	lbeles@reg8.net
Heather Mcgregor	8	Mt Pleasant	(903) 572-8551 ext:2731	hmcgregor@reg8.net
Wayne Snyder	8	Mt Pleasant	(903) 572-8551 ext:2649	wsnyder@reg8.net
Kerri Bowles	8	Mt Pleasant	(903) 572-8551 ext:2720	kbowles@reg8.net
Stacie Whitaker	8	Mt Pleasant	(903) 575-2617	swhitaker@reg8.net
Sarah Jeter	8	Mt Pleasant	(903) 575-2787	sjeter@reg8.net
Cassie A Bland	8	Mt Pleasant	(903) 575-2667	cbland@reg8.net
Amy Blackwell	9	Wichita Falls	(940) 322-6928	amy.blackwell@esc9.net
Micki Wesley	9	Wichita Falls	(940) 322-6928	micki.wesley@esc9.net
Holly Hawkins	9	Wichita Falls	(940) 322-6928	holly.hawkins@esc9.net
Doug Debord	9	Wichita Falls	(940) 322-6928	doug.debord@esc9.net
Kara Fluty	9	Wichita Falls	(940) 322-6928	kara.fluty@esc9.net
Melissa Shaw	10	Richardson	(972) 348-1210	melissa.shaw@region10.org
Michael Milburn	10	Richardson	(972) 348-1632	michael.milburn@region10.org
Anna Griffiths	10	Richardson	(972) 348-1360	anna.griffiths@region10.org
Gretchen Kroos	11	White Settlement	(817) 740-7630	gkroos@esc11.net
Laura Mckean	11	White Settlement	(817) 740-7608	lmckean@esc11.net
April Whisenant	11	White Settlement	(817) 740-7555	awhisenant@esc11.net
Pamela Humphrey	11	White Settlement	(817) 740-7574	phumphrey@esc11.net
Elizabeth Schrader	11	White Settlement	(817) 740-7504	eschrader@esc11.net
Stephanie Cassels	11	White Settlement	(817) 740-7569	scassels@esc11.net

Full Name	Region	City	Phone	Email Address
Derrick Spurlock	11	White Settlement	(817) 740-7552	dspurlock@esc11.net
Carie Downes	12	Waco	(254) 297-1252	cdownes@esc12.net
Ellen Hogan	12	Waco	(254) 297-1195	ehogan@esc12.net
Chris Griffin	12	Waco	(254) 297-1163	cgriffin@esc12.net
Terry Arndt	12	Waco	(254) 297-1199	tarndt@esc12.net
Jennifer Hranitzky	13	Austin	(512) 919-5174	jennifer.hranitzky@esc13.txed.net
Lisa White	14	Abilene	(325) 675-8616	lwhite@esc14.net
Emilia Moreno	14	Abilene	(325) 675-8674	emoreno@esc14.net
Melissa Anthony	15	San Angelo	(325) 481-4093	melissa.anthony@esc15.net
Dr Michael Bohensky	15	San Angelo	(325) 481- 4024	michael.bohensky@esc15.net
David Bedford	15	San Angelo	(325) 658-6571 ext:4023	david.bedford@esc15.net
Christine Scroggs	16	Amarillo	(806) 677-5275	christine.scroggs@esc16.net
Stacie Barnett	16	Amarillo	(806) 677-5074	stacie.barnett@esc16.net
Heather Blount	17	Lubbock	(806) 281-5817	hblount@esc17.net
Lee Lentz-Edwards	18	Midland	(432) 563-2380	llentz@esc18.net
Maria Mata	18	Midland	(432) 567-3220	mmata@esc18.net
Ryan Merritt	18	Midland	(432) 563-2380	ryan.merritt@esc18.net
Autumn Sloan	18	Midland	(432) 563-2380	asloan@esc18.net
Yoscelina Hernandez	19	El Paso	(915) 780-5075	yhernandez2@esc19.net
Barbara O Amaya	19	El Paso	(915) 780-5354	bamaya@esc19.net
Kelly Joseph	20	San Antonio	(210) 370-5664	kelly.joseph@esc20.net

The ESC Results Driven Accountability contacts information for this Appendix C is provided by each ESC. If contact information is missing, call the ESC main number listed at Education Service Centers for assistance.

Appendix: D – Comments and Questions

Questions about the *2022 Discipline Data Validation Indicators* should be addressed to:

Performance-Based Monitoring
Phone: (512) 463-9704
Email: pbm@tea.texas.gov

Questions about the *2022 Data Reporting Compliance Reviews* should be addressed to:

IT Data Reporting Compliance Unit
Phone: (512) 463-9980
Email: DRCU@tea.texas.gov

Comments on the 2022 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 pbm@tea.texas.gov. Comments should be provided no later than February 3, 2023, to allow sufficient time for consideration in the 2023 data validation development cycle.

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