

# Study on the Accuracy of the Graduation Data of Students with Disabilities 2013-2014 School Year

*Office of the Independent Monitor*

This report presents the findings of a study on the accuracy of the graduation and completion data for students with disabilities (SWD) in the Los Angeles Unified School District (District) for the 2013-2014 school year. The report provides a background on past efforts to validate graduation and completion data, methodology of the study, findings and recommendations. The purpose of this report is to compare the first round of graduation data with data collected by the Office of the Independent Monitor (OIM) and compare the corrected graduation data with that collected by the OIM. The corrected data are expected to have a higher level of agreement with the OIM's data than the initial data collected by LAUSD.

## Background

The Modified Consent Decree (MCD) includes two outcomes designed to increase the rate of SWD who graduate with a diploma (Outcome 3) and/or complete high school (Outcome 4). The outcomes are intended to increase the number of SWD completing school while decreasing those who drop out. While both of these outcomes have been previously met (Outcome 3, 2007-08 and Outcome 4, 2011-12), the OIM has annually validated the graduation and completion data since the 2005-06 school year.

Previous reports have highlighted the inconsistencies between students' graduation statuses as reported in the Secondary Student Information System (SSIS), the electronic transcripts and school records used for tracking student graduation requirements. This includes pointing out the problems with the lack of edits or safeguards to ensure students' outcomes are captured accurately. For instance, the system allowed students to have conflicting leave codes in different fields of the data system in that they could be coded both a graduate or completer (L7) and/or drop out (L8). Shortcomings for capturing, maintaining and reporting these data have been well-documented. This includes issues related to the District's policy that the cumulative file transcript is a student's official record, while many schools don't update these records but maintain electronic transcripts.

These problems have persisted over 10 years with minimal progress. The Independent Monitor (IM) sent a letter to the Superintendent on April 22, 2015, noting that the problems associated with the processes for entering and maintaining graduation and completion data impede the completion of the MCD. The IM noted that the solution to these problems would require District-wide leadership, and addressing them is essential to determine if the District has systems in place to ensure substantial compliance.

During the past two months, the OIM has met with staff from the Information Technology Division (ITD) to discuss data problems that may be addressed in the My Integrated Student Information System (MiSiS) prior to the end of the 2014-2015 school year. This includes establishing edits and protocols to ensure that data codes are consistent and accurately capture student completion outcomes. The District provided the IM a status update on May 22, 2015, on its efforts to remedy these problems.

It noted, "...in order for the District to enter and maintain accurate graduation and completion data for SWD, multiple objectives must be met:

1. Policies and procedures must be clearly written, communicated and enforced across schools
2. School administrators and school staff must be adequately trained
3. Graduation and completion data must be analyzed for accuracy, corrected as needed, and monitored across schools
4. Safeguards must be built into system functionality"

These objectives are consistent with the problems identified and recommendations made by the OIM for several years. However, while the District acknowledged that these objectives were a shared responsibility across different divisions, it had not yet identified "...an ultimate owner to coordinate efforts across these divisions..." This lack of ownership has contributed to the ongoing problems with completion data.

## Methodology

To determine the District's SWD graduation rate, the OIM first established the population of all 12th-grade SWD, using data contained in Welligent and CASEMIS. A total of 5,546 SWD were identified as having been enrolled on December 1, 2013. From this original population, 83 left the District between December 2013 and June 2014, five students died and 29 transferred to an adult education program an occupational center or Alternative Education and Work Center (AEWC). After removing these 117 students, the final population of 12th-grade SWD consisted of 5,429 students (see Table 1).

Table 1. 12<sup>th</sup> Grade SWD by Educational Service Center\*

Educational Service Center	#	%
East	875	16.1%
North	1,161	21.4%
South	559	10.3%
West	332	6.1%
ISIC	1,650	30.4%
Charter Schools	576	10.6%
Central Option	182	3.3%
El Dorado Charter	90	1.7%
Missing	4	0.1%
TOTAL	5,429	100.0%

\*Based on students' school of enrollment on Dec 1, 2013.

The cohort was tracked by providing schools lists of students to maintain and update completion data. Schools are supposed to add new students who transfer in or enroll after December 1, 2013. These lists are provided by schools to central office staff who validate the data prior to submitting them to the OIM. The intent is to ensure accurate and current data.

The validation of graduation and completion data consisted of visiting the majority<sup>1</sup> of secondary schools and examining student records with an administrator or counselor. Due to the implementation of MiSiS, this year's validation study was conducted centrally. Schools were contacted only to resolve conflicts in data codes and obtain confirmation of completion status if the data did not support a student's leave code and reason. Schools were contacted and asked for completion information if a student was coded as a graduate but only had 200 credits.

While data were obtained and validated on MiSiS, the District noted that graduation and completion data were captured using the SSIS and the data were then transferred into the new system. Due to issues with MiSiS, including the accuracy of the data, graduation and completion data were delayed and provided to the OIM in March 2015 compared to late October 2014.

For 2013-14, three rounds of data were collected to determine the graduation status for SWD. Data variables were collected and entered into a database created by the OIM. The first set of data were extracted from MiSiS on December 1, 2014 and were considered the "original" dataset. This data were first validated by staff from the Division of Special Education and corrections were to be made to inaccurate student records that were found. Corrections were entered into the database, and this data set are referred as "corrected." The final round consisted of the OIM validating completion data through a review of student records, communications with school staff and cross-validation of data variables.

To calculate the SWD graduation rate for 2013-14, each student was assigned one of the following outcomes based on the information contained in MiSiS.

- Student is still enrolled or continuing at the time of the validation.
- Student graduated with a diploma and was not enrolled in 2014-15, and had a year-end code of 90 (graduated with a diploma) or 96 (graduated with CAHSEE exemption).

<sup>1</sup> Schools with enrollments of less than 20 students, special education centers and options schools were contacted and data were collected by phone, fax or email.

- Student received a certificate of completion or aged-out and had a leave reason code of 92 or 95.
- Student is a drop out or whereabouts unknown. In other words, if students did not graduate or complete, and they did not leave the District, and they were not enrolled, they were considered dropouts or unknowns.

## Findings

### *INCONSISTENCIES IN DISTRICT'S DATA*

Three data indicators provide information on a student's completion status. The first is the year-end flag which is used to identify both the leave code and reason. For example, a year-end flag of A will code the student as an L7 (completer) and 90 (diploma). However, due to a lack of edits in the data system, a year-end flag may differ from the leave code and leave reasons for each student. The system also lacks the edits to ensure that all students have a year-end flag. The discussion on the following two tables are related to the inconsistencies of data found with the original dataset.

Table 2 includes students with an end-of-year flag or a leave code of L7 or L8 and a leave date on or before June 30, 2014. There were inconsistencies in the end-of-year flag and leave code for 884 of these 3,049 (29.0%) students, with most missing year-end flags despite having left school by June 30, 2014. Some instances of incompatible codes also were observed, with students having L7 leave codes despite having year-end flags used for non-completers (E, F, G).

One of the shortcomings of the system is that it contains duplicative year-end flags (B and S) that indicate a student received a diploma with a California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) exemption and year-end flags that should not apply to SWD because of this exemption (F).

Table 2. Relationship Between Year-End Flags and Leave Codes in Original Data Submitted by LAUSD

Year-End Flag	Description (Reference Guide 6061)	L7-Student receives a diploma or Cert. of Comp	L8-Student Drops Out
A	Received a diploma	1,120	
B,S	Received diploma with CAHSEE Exemption	674	<u>2</u>
E	Has not completed course requirements and has passed CAHSEE	<u>8</u>	24
F	Has completed course requirements and has not passed CAHSEE	4	<u>1</u>
G	Has not completed course requirements and has not passed CAHSEE	<u>1</u>	35
C	Received a Certificate of Completion	254	
T	Previously received Cert. of Comp., returned to complete IEP goals	43	
	Missing end-of-year flag; leave date of 5/1/2014 – 6/30/2014	<u>872</u>	11

Table 3 includes all students with a withdrawal reason or leave code indicating that the student graduated or dropped out. A total of 196 out of 3,270 (6.0%) students had inconsistent leave codes and withdrawal reasons, and most were missing codes. Similarly, as noted above, the system contains duplicative withdrawal reasons (91 and 96) that indicate a student received a diploma with a CAHSEE exemption<sup>2</sup>, which contributes to data inconsistencies.

<sup>2</sup> The Chapman Exemption is the same as the CAHSEE Exemption, however, the Chapman Exemption should only have been used with the Classes of 2006 and 2007—the first classes for which the exemption was available.

Table 3. Relationship Between Withdrawal Reason Codes and Leave Codes in Original LAUSD Data

Withdrawal Reason	Description (Reference Guide 6061)	L1-Student returns to same school	L2-Student transfers to another LAUSD school	L7-Student receives a diploma or Cert. of Comp	L8-Student Drops Out
51-81	Codes in this range are for dropouts only	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>7</u>	121
90	Received diploma			1,681	
91	Received diploma with Chapman Exemption			29	
92	Received Cert. of Comp.			346	<u>1</u>
93	Passed CA High School Proficiency Exam (CHSPE)			1	
95	Previously received Cert. of Comp. and returned			48	<u>1</u>
96	Received diploma with CAHSEE Exemption			834	
97	Received diploma under AB216 Exemption (for foster students)			14	
Missing	There is no withdrawal reason			<u>181</u>	<u>3</u>

*DISTRIBUTION OF GRADUATION/COMPLETION INDICATORS*

Table 4 compares the number and percent of students by leave reason for the original data set, the corrected set validated by the District and the final validation by the OIM. The validation effort by the District only contained data for those students whose completion status was deemed inaccurate or changed. It did not contain data for all students, so an assumption was made that the original leave code and reason was confirmed. It is difficult to determine if those validating the data missed inconsistencies. The OIM validation collects data on all students to ensure they were reviewed and validated.

The percent of leave reasons indicating that SWD graduated with or without a CAHSEE exemption was highest in the corrected data (n= 2,677, 48.8%), followed by the original data (n=2,544 46.9%) and lowest in the OIM data (n=2,463, 45.0%).

Similarly, the percent of leave reasons indicating that SWD received a certificate of completion was the lowest in the original LAUSD data (n= 396, 7.3%) and highest in the corrected data (n= 598, 11.0%). The OIM data noted 455 students (8.3%) received a certificate, with the original data under-reporting and the corrected data over-reporting certificates issued. While there may be some differences attributed to the time variable of when the data were collected, the corrected data had much higher counts for students who received diplomas and certificates.

Table 4. Comparison of Leave Reasons in Original and Corrected LAUSD Data and OIM Data

Leave Reason	Description	Original data		Corrected data		OIM Data	
		N	% of total	N	% of total	N	% of total
90	Received diploma	1,681	31.0%	1,679	30.6%	1,578	28.8%
91, 96	Received diploma with CAHSEE Exemption	863	15.9%	998	18.2%	885	16.2%
92	Received Cert. of Comp.	347	6.4%	523	9.5%	394	7.2%
93	Passed CA High School Proficiency Exam (CHSPE)	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%
95	Previously received Cert. of Comp. and returned	49	0.9%	75	1.4%	61	1.1%
97	Received diploma under AB216 Exemption (for foster students)	14	0.3%	12	0.2%	9	0.2%
	All other students	2,474	45.6%	2,141	39.1%	2,501	45.6%

## CHANGES IN GRADUATION/COMPLETION INDICATORS

Table 5 shows the differences in leave reasons from the original data to the corrected data. The largest change from the original to the corrected data was the assignment of leave reasons to 444 students with missing leave reasons.

Another big shift from the original to the corrected data was the assignment of leave reason 96 for students originally classified as dropouts (N=28), graduates with a diploma (N=72) and graduates with a Chapman Exemption (N=15).

Table 5. Level of Agreement Between Original and Corrected LAUSD Leave Reasons

Original Leave Reason	Corrected Leave Reason											Total
	Other	Dropout (51-81)	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	Missing	
1-48	71	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	75
Dropout (51-81)	3	144	11	0	5	0	0	3	28	0	2	196
90	0	1	1,605	0	3	0	0	0	72	0	0	1,681
91	0	0	1	12	1	0	0	0	15	0	0	29
92	2	1	1	0	339	0	0	1	3	0	0	347
93	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
95	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	44	0	0	0	49
96	0	0	9	0	1	0	0	0	824	0	0	834
97	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	8	0	14
Missing	117	37	51	0	165	0	1	27	43	3	1,759	2,203
Total	195	185	1,679	12	523	0	1	75	986	12	1,761	5,429

## MISMATCHES BETWEEN DISTRICT AND OIM DATA

The rate of mismatches between the corrected data and the original and OIM demonstrate that the validation efforts did not identify all the inconsistencies of withdrawal reasons in the original data. Approximately 11 to 26% of the withdrawal reasons did not match, when comparing any two of the datasets (Table 6). There was a higher rate of agreement between the OIM and the original data (75.9%) than between the OIM and the corrected data (73.9%). Since the corrected data file did not include information for all variables to be validated, the high level of matches reflects an assumed agreement with the original data.

Table 6. Percent of Matching Withdrawal Reasons

	Match		Mismatch	
	#	%	#	%
Original and OIM data	4,120	75.9%	1,309	24.1%
Original and corrected data	4,806	88.5%	623	11.5%
Corrected and OIM data	4,014	73.9%	1,415	26.1%

## COMPARISON OF STUDENT-LEVEL OUTCOMES

Table 7 shows the 2,776 SWD identified as graduates by the OIM who were also identified as graduates by LAUSD was 90.1% in the original data and 94.7% in the corrected data. The table shows the inconsistencies in completion status reported in both datasets. Of those students originally coded as a drop out (n=183), the corrected data noted 77 students, while the OIM found all these students to have received a diploma.

Table 7. Comparison of Outcome Status for SWD Identified as Graduates by the OIM

Student outcome	Original data		Corrected data	
	N	% of total	N	% of total
Still enrolled	68	2.4%	49	1.8%
<b>Received diploma*</b>	<b>2,501</b>	<b>90.1%</b>	<b>2,628</b>	<b>94.7%</b>
Received Cert. of Comp.	24	0.9%	22	0.8%
Student dropped out/Status unknown	183	6.6%	77	2.7%
<b>TOTAL SWD GRADUATES</b>	<b>2,776</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2,776</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

The percent of SWD identified as completers by the OIM who were identified similarly by the District was 50.5% in the original data and 74.7% in the corrected data (Table 8). As was the case for SWD graduates, the level of agreement between the OIM and District data was higher in the corrected data than in the original data. Similarly, the District's validation effort did not identify all completers showing that data inconsistencies were missed.

Table 8. Comparison of Outcome Status for SWD Identified as Completers/SWD Who Aged Out by the OIM

Student outcome	Original data		Corrected data	
	N	% of total	N	% of total
Still enrolled	178	26.1%	96	14.1%
Received diploma*	6	0.9%	22	3.2%
<b>Received Cert. of Comp./Aged out</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>50.5%</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>74.7%</b>
Student dropped out/Status unknown	154	22.5%	55	8.0%
<b>TOTAL SWD COMPLETERS</b>	<b>683</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>683</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

The percent of SWD identified as continuers by the OIM who were also identified as continuers by the District was 93.3% in the original data and 92.0% in the corrected data (Table 9).

Table 9. Comparison of Outcome Status for SWD Identified as Continuers by the OIM

Student outcome	Original data		Corrected data	
	N	% of total	N	% of total
<b>Still enrolled</b>	<b>1,331</b>	<b>93.3%</b>	<b>1,304</b>	<b>92.0%</b>
Received diploma*	1	0.1%	1	0.1%
Received Cert. of Comp./Aged out	24	1.7%	48	3.4%
Student left LAUSD	0	0.0%	1	.1%
Student dropped out/Status unknown	61	4.3%	63	4.4%
<b>TOTAL SWD CONTINUERS</b>	<b>1,417</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1,417</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

The percent of SWD identified as dropouts or status unknown by the OIM who were also identified as dropouts or status unknown by the District was 63.2% in the original data and 64.0% in the corrected data (Table 10). The largest group of exceptions was for those who were reportedly enrolled, which may be attributed to differences of when the data was collected. In some instances, students may have returned but subsequently dropped out. However, due to the significant delays in obtaining the graduation data this year, it is unlikely this had an effect.

Table 10. Comparison of Outcome Status for SWD Identified as Dropouts/Status Unknown by the OIM

Student outcome	Original data		Corrected data	
	N	% of total	N	% of total
Still enrolled	155	30.8%	106	21.1%
Received diploma*	21	4.2%	31	6.1%
Received Cert. of Comp.	9	1.8%	25	5.0%
Student left LAUSD	0	0.0%	19	3.8%
<b>Student dropped out/Status unknown</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>63.2%</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>64.0%</b>
<b>TOTAL SWD DROPOUTS/STATUS UNKNOWN</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

The table below presents the results of the preceding four tables in just two tables. The first table compares the OIM determination with the original LAUSD data for each student. For example, from the table below (Table 11), the OIM determined that 1,417 SWD were still enrolled. The original dataset identified 1,331 of these as still enrolled, but identified one student as a graduate, 24 as completers and 61 as dropouts. The second table compares the OIM determination with the corrected data.

This table highlights the impact of miscoding of a student’s completion status. The original and OIM data matched for 4,495 students (82.8%). While some of these differences can be attributed to time factors, such as a student who returned but eventually dropped out, this table also highlights the impact of miscoding a student’s completion status. For example, the original data noted 183 students who dropped out but who actually received a diploma, and 154 students who dropped out and/or aged out or received a certificate of completion. Many of these cases were miscoded.

Table 11. OIM Determination Compared to Original Data by Category

Student outcome (OIM determination)	N	Original LAUSD data									
		Still enrolled		Received diploma		Completed/ Aged Out		Left LAUSD		Dropped out*	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Still enrolled	1,417	<b>1,331</b>	<b>93.9%</b>	1	0.1%	24	1.7%	0	0.0%	61	4.3%
Received diploma	2,776	68	2.4%	<b>2,501</b>	<b>90.1%</b>	24	0.9%	0	0.0%	183	6.6%
Completed/Aged out	683	178	26.1%	6	0.9%	<b>345</b>	<b>50.5%</b>	0	0.0%	154	22.5%
Left LAUSD	50	15	30.0%	2	4.0%	1	2.0%	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	32	64.0%
Dropped out*	503	155	30.8%	21	4.2%	9	1.8%	0	0.0%	<b>318</b>	<b>63.2%</b>

The corrected data were the District’s validation effort prior to submitting the data to the OIM. The corrected and OIM data matched for 4,781 students (88.1%). Many students’ data did not contain information regarding completion status, so blank fields were considered as a confirmation of the original data.

The corrected data agreed with the OIM determination for approximately 95% of the SWD identified as graduates. Of the 2,776 students identified as having received a diploma by the OIM, the District found 49 still enrolled, 22 received a certificate of completion or aged out, and 77 dropped out. While this is an improvement from the original data, the error rate is 5.3% and impacts a sizable number of students.

The rate of agreement was also high for the students in the “still enrolled” category. However, the rates of agreement were considerably lower for students who completed or aged out, left the District, or dropped out.

Table 12. OIM Determination Compared to Corrected Data by Category

Student outcome (OIM determination)	N	Corrected LAUSD data									
		Still enrolled		Received diploma		Completed/ Aged Out		Left LAUSD		Dropped out*	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Still enrolled	1,417	<b>1,304</b>	<b>92.0%</b>	1	0.1%	48	3.4%	1	0.1%	63	4.4%
Received diploma	2,776	49	1.8%	<b>2,628</b>	<b>94.7%</b>	22	0.8%	0	0.0%	77	2.8%
Completed/Aged out	683	96	14.1%	22	3.2%	<b>510</b>	<b>74.7%</b>	0	0.0%	55	8.1%
Left LAUSD	50	13	26.0%	3	6.0%	2	4.0%	<b>17</b>	<b>34.0%</b>	15	30.0%
Dropped out*	503	106	21.1%	31	6.2%	25	5.0%	19	3.8%	<b>322</b>	<b>64.0%</b>

*STUDENT OUTCOMES AND SWD GRADUATION RATE FOR OUTCOME 3*

As in previous years, the SWD graduation rate for Outcome 3 was calculated as follows:

$$SWD \text{ graduation rate} = \frac{\text{Number of SWD who graduated with a diploma}}{\text{Number of SWD who left school}}$$

The denominator for SWD graduation rates includes all SWD in the table below (Table 13) with the exception of those still enrolled and those who left LAUSD (row 1 + row 5). The official Outcome 3 graduation rate for SWD was 70.1%, which was shy of the corrected graduated rate of 70.2%. The OIM found the lowest percentage of SWD who dropped out or whose status was unknown (9.3%, vs. 13.8% and 9.8%, in the original and corrected LAUSD data)

Table 13. Comparison of Student Outcomes and Outcome 3

Description	Original data		Corrected data		OIM Data	
	N	% of total	N	% of total	N	% of total
Still enrolled	1,747	32.2%	1,568	28.9%	1,417	26.1%
Received diploma*	2,531	46.6%	2,685	49.5%	2,776	51.1%
Received Cert. of Comp./Aged out	403	7.4%	607	11.1%	683	12.6%
Left LAUSD	0	0.0%	37	.7%	50	.9%
Dropped out/Unknown	748	13.8%	532	9.8%	503	9.3%
Outcome 3 – SWD Grad. Rate	68.7%		70.2%		70.1%	

\*Includes SWD who received a CAHSEE Exemption or graduated under AB216 as a foster student, as well as SWD who passed the CHSPE or GED. For the LAUSD data, outcomes are based on whether or not student had returned to school and the leave reasons assigned to each student. For the OIM data, outcomes are based on the OIM's final determination of each student's status.

*COMPARISON OF CREDITS EARNED*

The number of credits earned was examined due to observations of higher credits at the time of the OIM validation compared to the original dataset. This analysis only includes students who graduated by June 30, 2014. Given that the data extract used for this study was obtained in December 2014, the number of credits should not be expected to change.

The percentage of SWD identified as graduates who had fewer than the 230 credits was lower in the OIM data (9.0%) than either the original data (34.9%) or the corrected data (20.1%) (Table 14). For students identified as graduates by both LAUSD and the OIM, the number of credits reported by the OIM was an average 13.9 credits (SD=17.7), higher than the number originally reported by the District. For students identified as graduates by both LAUSD and the OIM, the number of credits reported by the OIM was on average 9.3 (SD=18.9) credits higher than the number reported by the District in the corrected data.

It is unclear why students' credits would increase, and in some cases considerably so, months after they left school. The transfer of data from SSIS to MiSiS may be the cause for the double-reporting.

Table 14. Comparison of Credits Earned

NUMBER OF CREDITS EARNED	Original data		Corrected data		OIM Data	
	N	% of total	N	% of total	N	% of total
Fewer than 185	27	1.1%	24	0.9%	5	0.2%
185-199	29	1.2%	20	0.8%	101	3.8%
200-214	177	7.1%	98	3.8%	16	0.6%
215-229	634	25.4%	377	14.6%	116	4.4%
230-244	690	27.7%	936	36.3%	1,012	38.5%
245-259	412	16.5%	531	20.6%	606	23.0%
260-274	260	10.4%	303	11.7%	336	12.8%
275-289	145	5.8%	149	5.8%	191	7.3%
290-304	66	2.7%	82	3.2%	137	5.2%
More than 304	51	2.1%	60	2.3%	109	4.2%
TOTAL GRADUATES*	2,491	100.0%	2,580	100.0%	2,776	100.0%

\*Table includes the number of credits for SWD identified as graduates by each data source.

## Summary and Recommendations

Problems with the accuracy of the graduation and completion data highlight the persistent shortcomings of the processes for maintaining and reporting data. The data system continues to show a lack of safeguards within the system to ensure that students' completion statuses and transcripts are reported accurately. The inconsistencies of year-end flags to leave codes and reasons, as well as the high number of students missing codes, is evidence that the District did not address these issues despite persistent notice of such problems by the OIM. While it is unclear if these problems were associated with the transfer of data from SSIS to MiSiS, this appears to have been a contributing factor. The District's efforts to validate the data also demonstrated shortcomings. Despite these problems, the integration of the student information system shows promise in having the capacity to monitor and report students' completion and enrollment statuses.

Improvements were noted with both the accuracy and the District's efforts to validate the data. During the 2014-2015 school year, the District should continue to improve their efforts to track students and validate completion data. This should include closely monitoring the cohort of students periodically with schools, as well as updating lists of students who transfer in and out. Site administrators and/or counselors should actively review these lists and ensure that transcripts (electronic and cumulative files) and leave codes and reasons accurately reflect the students' outcome. It is highly recommended that the District streamline its validation procedures to reduce inconsistencies. Given that MiSiS provides that capacity to monitor this data centrally, this effort should be completed by a small number of trained personnel. Data should be collected on all students whether agreement with the original data variable exist or not, to ensure that all fields are reviewed and captured.

The identification of a Division and person responsible for the overall reform of these processes is critical. This person should have the authority to make and revise policies, direct staff from different departments and/or divisions, and allocate resources. District leadership should adhere to the objectives mentioned above that were presented by ITD. To ensure that these processes are not cumbersome and can be supported by MiSiS, the District must review all policies, procedures and processes that are related to the entering and maintenance of completion data and transcripts. This should include assessing the value and procedures of using year-end flags, leave codes and reasons. School personnel including counselors, administrators, clerks and other staff who enter and maintain student records must receive comprehensive training.