

A Policy Analysis: District Tardy Policies for Schools from a 2019 Texas Education Agency Campus Comparison Group

Zelmarian Ready, EdD

Associate Principal of Academics
Everman Joe C. Bean High School

Melissa Arrambide, EdD

Associate Professor
Texas A&M University-Commerce

Teresa Farler, EdD

Assistant Professor
Texas A&M University-Commerce

Mei Jiang, PhD

Assistant Professor
Texas A & M University-Commerce

Elsa Villarreal, PhD

Assistant Professor
Texas A & M University-Commerce

Abstract

The consequences and outcomes for tardiness have been controversial because of the lack of consistency, as district autonomy has created much diversity between districts and schools. The analysis involved 10 high schools among a 40-member comparison group in the Texas A-F Accountability Rating System. School districts' policy documents from the four A-rated, four B-rated, and two C-rated high schools were examined to determine consequences for tardiness in secondary schools configured as the traditional high school of Grades 9 through 12. The analysis was directed at school districts' policies to determine the commonalities, differences, and other themes that existed. The emerging themes across these schools ranged in specificity regarding school tardiness and absence policies such as, tardiness, roles and responsibilities, discipline management techniques, and violation and infractions.

Keywords: educational policy, tardy policy, absence policy, tardiness, absences

Introduction

Researchers document correlation between the loss of instructional time and academic achievement (Balfanz & Byrnes, 2012; Gottfried, 2011; London, Sanchez, & Castrechini, 2016). Researchers also find tardiness as a factor in student educational matriculation, and timeliness to school is a determinant in the success of low income, minority students (Balfanz & Byrnes, 2012). Absenteeism and tardiness result in a full or partial day without instruction (Gottfried, 2011). Students who are absent or tardy fall behind their peers and are at risk for dropout and below grade level performance (Gottfried, 2011; Tyre et al., 2011). Federal regulations require public school students in grades K-12 to achieve a 95% attendance rate, but there is little to no directive on reporting student tardiness, which has plagued the educational system for years (London et al., 2016).

School districts' leaders have developed numerous policies to combat tardiness to improve learning outcomes. The Texas Education Agency (TEA; 2019c) has state-specific attendance reporting guidelines. However, the TEA does not include tardiness in its regulations (Texas Association of School Boards, 2017). Addressing tardiness to improve learning outcomes have been controversial. School leaders in Texas have implemented tardy policies that include consequences for students such as visiting the principal's office, receiving after-school detention or in-school suspension, being locked out of classrooms, and acquiring an unexcused absence for the class period (Gills, 2013). The consequences of giving tardy students unexcused absences included increasing students' likelihoods for dropout in addition to increasing their problems of lack of engagement and lack of interest in school..

Statement of the Problem

Federal, state, and local policies regarding student tardiness are ambiguous because of inconsistent implementation. Under the most recent federal mandate, Every Student Success Act of 2015, states are expected to select at least

one indicator for measuring student performance (ESSA, 2015). Many states select the chronic absenteeism indicator as it provides early predictions of student success.

However, student tardiness is not addressed as a performance indicator. Local school districts abide by federal policies for recording chronic absenteeism. However, federal authorities do not require measurement indicators based on student tardiness.

The TEA (2019c) has reporting regulations for chronic absences and has given local agencies the authority to develop policies to minimize student tardiness. Local school boards and other district stakeholders develop policy, and then submit newly developed state officials (Texas Association of School Boards, 2017). However, local board policies on tardiness include consequences such as requiring parent conferences, receiving after-school detention or in-school suspension, visiting the principal, being locked out of classrooms, and receiving an unexcused absence for the class period (Gills, 2013). Issuing unexcused absences for tardiness increases absenteeism and decreases engagement and interest in school. Time away from the classroom also causes an increase in negative behavior (G. Johnson, 2005). Balkis, Arslan, and Duru (2016) discuss discipline and attendance as factors affecting student achievement. Thus, the consequences and outcomes for tardiness are controversial. The lack of consistency resulting from district autonomy creates much diversity between districts.

Review of the Literature

Texas Policy Related to the Development of Truancy Law

Under TEC §25.085, compulsory attendance is required for students ages 6 to 19, with exemptions for absences due to religious holidays, doctor's appointments, election clerk service, and court appearances (Texas Association of School Boards, 2017). State funding is dispersed to school districts based on their average daily attendance rather than enrollment totals. A low attendance rate results in a decrease in school funding (Baker & Corcoran, 2012). In 2015, Texas' HB 2398 decriminalized the consequences for truant students and their parents. Before passing of HB 2398, students could receive jail sentences for skipping school or accruing excessive school and classroom absences. Additional consequences for tardiness ranged from denial or suspension of a high school student's driving license as well as other disciplinary consequences from the school district (TEC, 2019). Since the Texas HB 2398, decriminalization of truancy, Texas officials attempt to resolve the root cause for the behavior through counseling, improvement plans, and the use of outside agencies.

Causes for Tardiness

School tardiness has been an ongoing concern for administrators and teachers across the country (National Center of Education Statistics, 2011). J. Moore (2011) described the dimensions of tardiness causation as student and school and personnel factors. Absenteeism and tardiness causes a lower level of student performance, requires remediation for low achievers, and reduces regular or on-level instruction time for teachers. Researchers also agree missing school causes student alienation from classmates and teachers (Finn, 1989; G. Johnson, 2005). However, there has been minimal research on the relationship between tardiness and attendance as it related to academic achievement (Evergreen & Miron, 2007). Instead, research has focused on programs and interventions for reducing tardiness and absenteeism (Roby, 2004).

Student Factors Contributing to Tardiness

In an early study of tardiness, Britt (1998) surveyed at-risk students and showed their tardiness resulted from their sleeping habits, transportation problems, family-related issues, health-related concerns, and schools' lack of cultural sensitivity. J. Moore's (2011) findings supported Britt's survey results and found tardiness is caused by sleep patterns or the lack of sleep for students regardless of their socioeconomic status. Nakpodia and Dafiaghor (2011) also contended that sleep patterns cause tardiness for high school students.

Swart (2008) introduced a different theory of stress and anxiety interfering with timeliness as a student factor. Innate anxiety hinders the punctuality of students (Swart, 2008). Conversely, students with relaxed moods tend not to be punctual because relaxation does not relate to the desire for punctuality (Swart, 2008). Swart posited that tardiness is a detriment to academic success and lifelong endeavors as it causes a reduction of time management skills as well as self-control. Morning arrivals resulting in tardies is a student factor, and a delayed start time for high school would minimize tardy occurrences (J. Moore, 2011; Woldfson & Carskadon, 2005).

Thacher and Onyper (2016) determined the relationship between tardiness and absenteeism as not significant in their longitudinal study of a 45-minute delayed start time. Data on attendance, whether excused or unexcused absences, were improved by delaying start time. In contrast, Thacher and Onyper (2016) also found schools having significant decreases in attendance categorized attendance and tardiness under one reporting category.

Consequences for Tardiness During High School

Summer and Wolfe (1977) were among the first to discover a negative correlation between “lateness” and student success on standardized test scores. However, 81.8% of school principals administer consequences for student tardiness (NCES, 2011). Tardy policies address behavior modifications punitively by including consequences, such as detention, class lockouts, Saturday school, reduction in grades, and an absence from class. In Texas, some schools in Region XI have adopted a tardy policy that considers a student absent after missing the first 10 minutes of a class period to missing more than 50% of the class period (Gottfried, 2011). Tardiness as a behavior requires the attention of educators as do managing the consequences imposed on students for tardy behavior.

Detention is usually the first consequence for tardiness. Sessions range from 10 to 30 minutes before school, during lunch, and after school. Detention time is utilized in various ways. In some cases, school officials require students to clean cafeterias, with parental approval. Other schools’ officials require students to sit quietly or study during detention. Despite criticism, administrators at a middle school in Michigan use detention as a physical fitness experience, stating the consequence is not severe (Svaluto, 2005). Consequences for tardiness must be significant; otherwise, the frequency of occurrences increases (Foreman, 2014). Isolating students from their peers using Saturday detention is optional as a corrective measure. This consequence allows the student to remain in class during instructional time and receive isolation from peers. However, the operational expenses, hiring teachers and running utilities on a weekend day, are not efficient (L. Johnson, 2004).

In-school and out-of-school suspension time means students miss large amounts of instructional time and causes students to fall behind their peers because they are unable to complete class assignments. In-school and out-of-school suspensions are inept and inadequate for adjusting behavioral changes (White, 2012).

Gottfried (2011) and Rumberger and Thomas (2000) postulated there is a need for revamping truancy policy, as policy was designed to ensure regular attendance (Nasaw, 1981). Businesses are dependent on timely employees, as tardy workers negatively affect company profits, reduce morale of other employees, and yield minimal customer service (Huebsch, 2014). Lleras (2008) stated student tardiness on the secondary school level reduced student earning potential 10 years later. Thus, school officials are compelled to prepare students for productive citizenship while addressing timeliness.

Factors to Consider When Developing Truancy Policy

Balkis et al. (2016) examined five themes instrumental in student achievement to include school climate, student surroundings, aggressive discipline, and teacher relationships. Similar factors have been identified as contributors to high attendance rates for high school students as well (Wilkins, 2008). However, the inconsistencies in the optimal implementation of these themes amplify tardiness, skipping, absenteeism, and ultimately truancy (Christenson, Reschley, & Wylie, 2012). Archambault, Janosz, Fallu, and Pagani (2009) agreed a high rate of absenteeism is a precursor of truancy. Others have contested attendance is related to internal and external factors such as the health of family members and the school environment and are categorized as excused absences and unexcused absences (Ingul et al., 2012).

Methodology

Background of the Study

The primary purpose of this qualitative policy analysis was to explore how TEA’s 2019 Campus Comparison Group of school districts, serving 1,688 to 2,588 students in Grades 9 through 12, addressed tardiness. The analysis involved categorizing the districts of a 40-member comparison group within the Texas A-F Accountability Rating System. Criteria for a comparison group included school size, grades served, economically disadvantaged percentage, mobility rate, English-language learner population, special education percentage, and early college participant percentage. The A-F accountability ratings were based on student achievement, school progress, and closing the gaps. Within the 40-member comparison group, 11 school districts had an A accountability rating, 27 had a B rating, and two had a C rating. No school district in the comparison group received a D or F rating. Policies from school districts within the comparison group having the same accountability rating were examined to determine the school districts’ consequences for tardiness. Four school districts’ policies from each accountability rating were selected, with the exception of only two school districts representing a C accountability rating. Thus, ten policies were analyzed to determine the commonalities, differences, and other themes that existed.

Research Questions

This research study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What are emerging themes within policy analysis of school tardiness and absence policies among the A-rated schools identified in the comparison group?

2. What are emerging themes within policy analysis of school tardiness and absence policies among the B-rated schools identified in the comparison group?
3. What are emerging themes within policy analysis of school tardiness and absence policies among the C-rated schools identified in the comparison group?
4. What are the commonalities in tardy policies among the A-rated, B-rated, and C-rated schools?
5. What are the differences in tardy policies among the A-rated, B-rated, and C-rated schools?

Design of the Study

Qualitative methodology bridges the gap between theory and policy analysis. This study employed the policy analysis genre to combine related data types from multiple sources into a single format in order to code the content for comparison and contrast (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014). When focusing on content, without identifying the resource or tardy policy, the researcher has the opportunity to recognize trends across the policies that represent the phenomenon of tardiness policy in secondary schools. Creswell (2013) stated policy analysis is full of context, but a thematic analysis across cases provides the researcher with assertion or interpretation of meaning. For decades, the policy analysis method has demonstrated optimal effectiveness when used with other methods in historical or cultural research (Weber, 1990).

Sample Selection

For the purpose of this study, the sample was a total of 10 policies from the 40-member comparison group which received A-F accountability ratings. Four school districts' policies from each accountability rating were selected, with the exception of only two school districts represented with a C accountability rating. Districts from the 40-member comparison group were categorized in the Texas Accountability Rating System for ranking the performance of school districts and individual schools on a grading scale of A through F. Ten policies were drawn from the 40-member comparison group of school districts and based on the 2018-2020 realignment order showing 238 Grade 9 through 12 high schools in Texas having a population of 1,688 to 2,588 students (University Interscholastic League, 2019). Four school districts' policies from each accountability rating were randomly selected in Excel, with the exception of only two school districts represented in the C accountability-rating group.

Data Collection

The researcher obtained public data from the TEA's 40-member comparison group of Grade 9 through 12 schools from their respective districts' websites. The researcher identified the following in school district policy: (a) consequences for tardiness, (b) interventions for tardiness, and (c) clauses in tardy policy directly affecting students' grades. Names of the schools and districts were anonymized by use of pseudonyms by the researcher as data were gathered and organized. Coding for the school districts' and high schools' names and locations were used to protect the identities of the selected schools. The high schools and their respective school districts were coded as High School 1 (HS1) and School District 1 (SD1), High School 2 (HS2) and School District 2 (SD2), through High School k (HS k) and School District k (SD k). The school districts' high schools' locations were referred to by general regional designations based on the Educational Service Center (ESC) of the TEA that served the specific high school. There were 20 ESCs in Texas listed as ESC1 through ESC20.

Data Analysis

The researcher used the content-analytic summary table or matrix from Miles et al. (2014) to display data obtained from the sample of eight tardy policies. The matrix display combined meaningful data from the multiple policies into a single form for an initial review. A contrast table was used to determine policies that form extremes or outliers from the matrix and to support exploration (Miles et al., 2014). Each of the code cells were examined on the matrix to find commonality or similar characteristics. When one or more cells were similar, a number to represent the emerging pattern was assigned to the cells. However, the researcher focused on the content of the policies and did not identify the districts from which the original policy came.

With the use of analysis software NVivo, the researcher explored and identified the emerging themes. Next, the researcher compared and contrasted between the emerging themes. The analysis of these themes led to insight about answering the research question. NVivo was a secondary mode for data interpretation and study development, with the researcher serving as the first mode.

Findings

Within the 40-member comparison group, 11 school districts had an A accountability rating, 27 schools had a B rating and two schools had a C rating. No school district in the comparison group received a D or F rating. Policies from school districts within the comparison group having the same accountability rating were examined to determine the school districts' consequences for tardiness. Four school districts' policies from each accountability rating was selected, with the exception of only two school districts represented with a C accountability rating.

The researcher recognized trends across the policies that represent the phenomenon of tardiness in secondary schools. Thus, 10 policies were analyzed to determine the commonalities, differences, and other themes that existed.

Results for Research Question 1

The following information delineates the research findings for Research Question 1: What are emerging themes within policy analysis of school tardiness and absence policies among the A-rated schools identified in the comparison group?

Theme 1: Definition of Tardiness at A-Rated High Schools

After examining policies of the four randomly selected A-rated schools from the comparison group, each had different definitions of tardiness. One policy provided a generic description, while others were specific on the student's time and location

Theme 2: Roles and Responsibilities at A-Rated High Schools

The theme of roles and responsibilities emerged in the policies of the A-rated high schools. One school, HS8 SD6, defined the expectations and actions of the parent, teacher, administrator, and district official but did not provide expectations for students. This observation was also evident in the school district policy of HS40 SD29 that contained no explicitly stated expectations for students. Two of the four policies emphasized expectations for student behavior. The SCOC HS14 SD1 stated, "Students are expected to attend each class everyday and to be on time." The SCOC for HS22 SD16 stated, "Students are expected to be on time."

Theme 3: Discipline Management Techniques at A-Rated High Schools

Discipline management techniques were the third focus of policy. Many techniques were common for all four district policies. None of the four A-rated school district policies used corporal punishment. However, all four districts assigned the task of trash duty around the campus because of tardiness. Detention during school was not common for three of the four districts, but all four districts used detention after school hours.

Discipline consequences for students with disabilities require procedural safeguards. However, only one school district policy addressed consequences for the disabled. Family group counseling was considered by one school district as an option for discipline consequences. Two of the four districts discussed the administrators conducting hall sweeps for tardy students. The consequence for being in the hallway after class has begun is detention for both of those school districts. Not all four policies enforced additional classroom rules. Instead, all students were expected to follow school district policy as a means of consistency. In-school suspension was used for persistent tardiness by the four districts. Only one school district policy detailed the loss of exemptions for a semester as a consequence for student tardiness. Referral for outside counseling was utilized by one school district, and one district chose to revoke district transfers for tardiness.

Theme 4: Violations and Infractions at A-Rated High Schools

The fourth theme observed was violations and infractions, which was divided into three subthemes to include the time or length of the consequence issued, the progression of the consequences for repetitive tardiness, and the number of warnings issued prior to the consequences. All four policies designated a specific period and length for the consequence, and all of the consequences were cumulative. The progression of the severity was perceptible with the most severe punishment resulting in administrators filing students' tardiness with compulsory attendance court. Two district policies granted two or three warnings prior to issuing more detention or in-school suspension. However, school HS40 SD29 responded to the first tardy.

Results for Research Question 2

The following information delineates the research findings for Research Question 2: What are emerging themes within policy analysis of school tardiness and absence policies among the B-rated schools identified in the comparison group?

Theme 1: Definition of Tardiness at B-Rated High Schools

Policies of B-rated schools were probed resulting in four identified themes of definition of tardiness, roles and responsibilities, discipline management techniques, and violations and infractions. Three of the four B-rated district policies described when students are considered tardy. Conversely, the HS23 SD17 policy did not provide guidance. Two policies use time restraints of fifteen minutes to arrive to class, while one policy mentions one minute after the bell before students are considered tardy.

Theme 2: Roles and Responsibilities at B-Rated High Schools

The roles and responsibilities of the student and the teacher were distinctive over the responsibilities of the parent, administrator, and district official. The SCOC of HS2 SD2 stated, "Teachers will send tardy students to the tardy table outside the main office for 1st period." The SCOC of HS23 SD17 stated, "A student who is tardy is required to sign in at the office." The teacher role and responsibility appeared in the HS2 SD2 policy. The student role and responsibility appeared in the HS23SD17 policy.

Theme 3: Discipline Management Techniques at B-Rated High Schools

The school district policies of B-rated schools divulged similarities in discipline management techniques. However, one school district declared preference for corporal punishment, while the other three districts opposed corporal punishment. A demit or rewards system was implemented by three of the four districts, and detention during school hours was practiced by only district. There was a mention of loss of exemptions, as well as behavior interventions, peer mediations, peer mediations, revocation of transfer, and the removal of class due to tardiness in four different school district policy.

Theme 4: Violations and Infractions at B-Rated High Schools

Violations and infractions of B-rated schools showed redundancy in all four districts' policies as it related to the progression of consequences. One school district policy detailed warning for tardiness before students received consequences, while HS2 SD2 gave two warnings before issuing tardy consequences. As for longevity of the consequences, only one policy referenced the accumulation of tardies per grading period.

Results for Research Question 3

The following information delineates the research findings for Research Question 3: What are emerging themes within policy analysis of school tardiness and absence policies among the C-rated schools identified in the comparison group?

From the 40-member comparison group of A-, B-, and C-rated schools, only two schools had an accountability rating of C. Both C-rated schools were also from the same school district. Nevertheless, four themes emerged as definition of tardiness, roles and responsibilities, discipline management techniques, and violations of techniques, were explored in the district's policy. The definition of tardiness and the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders were not discovered in the data collected. Violations and infractions were generic, and the data contained no mention of the longevity of issued consequences.

Results for Research Question 4

The following information delineates the research findings for Research Question 4: What are the commonalities in tardy policies among the A-rated, B-rated, and C-rated schools? The A-, B-, and C-rated school districts' policies have commonalities in the following discipline management techniques:

1. Assignment of school-related duties or tasks,
2. Behavior modification contracts,
3. Counseling or mediation,
4. Disciplinary alternative education,
5. Detention after school hours,
6. Loss of privileges in co-curricular activities,
7. Out of school suspension,
8. Parent and/or guardian conference,
9. Restorative discipline,
10. Seating changes within the classroom,
11. Sending the student to the office, and
12. Verbal or written correction.

There was also a commonality in the violation and infraction theme as all policies detailed a progression in consequences for repetitive tardiness. However, there were no commonalities in the roles and responsibilities and the definitions of tardiness themes.

Results for Research Question 5

The following information delineates the research findings for Research Question 5: What are the differences in tardy policies among the A-rated, B-rated, and C-rated schools? The tardy policies among the A-, B-, and C-rated high schools revealed several differences within the identified themes. All of the A-rated schools and three out of four B-rated school policies defined tardiness. The one policy from the C-rated schools did not provide a definition. The A-rated high schools' policies were descriptive and included the defining roles of the student, teacher, administrator, parent, and district official in the disciplinary consequences for tardiness.

Roles and responsibilities did not appear in the policies as prevalently among the B- and C-rated high schools, but the responsibilities of the student and teacher appeared within their policies. For the theme of violations and infractions, the A-rated high schools' policies were intentional with explicitly stating the length of the time of the consequences students would serve and the provisions for issuing warnings before issuing a consequence for tardiness. One of the A-rated schools allowed a 10-minute window before a student is tardy. Only one school district policy from the B-rated group stated the longevity of the consequences of tardiness and allowed warning before consequences. Only a statement on the progression of discipline was found in the policy of the C-rated schools.

Lastly, the discipline management consequences for the A-, B-, and C-rated high schools' policies showed differences. Table 13 shows the differences in discipline management techniques for A-, B-, and C-rated high schools. The discipline management technique in policies are presented as proportions of schools that provide the technique out of the number of schools in the rating group because of the C-rated schools as two schools and the A- and B-rated schools as four schools in each group.

Implications

This study found A-rated high schools went beyond the Texas Association of School Board's Model Student Handbook as policies included explicit definitions of student tardiness, assigned specific roles and responsibilities to stakeholders, and provided definitive timelines for consequences. Thus, the assumption of policies contributing to the academic success of A-rated schools should be considered by other underperforming schools and districts. Another notable difference between A-rated school districts' policies and other policies was the implementation of using exemptions as an incentive for timeliness. This concept is beneficial as students are motivated by not having to take semester exams, and teachers are relieved about using exemptions over other disciplinary consequences as a measure of keeping students in the classroom.

School size, as it relates to student achievement, has been debated by educators and legislators for over 20 years. Student enrollment has become more ethnically and socioeconomically diverse, and educators must respond to the individual and academic needs of the new population (Zoda et al., 2011). Freeman and Simonsen (2015) believed a smaller school environment supported truancy interventions. The high schools in this study served 1,688 to 2,588 students, which implied a smaller school setting led to reductions in incidences of tardiness. Gottfredson and DiPietro (2011) noted that larger schools have more attendance and discipline concerns. Smaller schools enable relationship building, and students who feel connected to school are less likely to skip (Demaneet & Van Houtte, 2012). Attwood and Croll (2015) believed psychosocial and antisocial behaviors affect students' attendance rates. Ingul et al. (2012) concurred truancy ensues when students avoid the adverse social situations and school-related stimuli that cause negative attitudes toward school.

School district policy has revealed many equality issues. Thus, implications for further research focused on how school characteristics affect the kinship between students' backgrounds and achievement are necessary. Students of low-socioeconomic status are less likely to complete makeup work after an absence (Chang & Romer, 2008; Hancock et al., 2017; Ready, 2010). Students of low-socioeconomic status are more unlikely to excel in socioeconomically integrated schools than schools consisting mainly of economically disadvantaged students (Montt, 2016; Rui, 2009). Thus, the creation of social and emotional learning programs have emerged. More federally-funded, evidence-based research is essential for this program's effectiveness. Supplemental federal policies which include interventions for identified students and their families are dependent on financial support. Preventative measures and policies from federal legislation can change the trajectory of the outcomes due to high school tardiness.

References

- Archambault, I., Janosz, M., Fallu, J. S., & Pagani, L. S. (2009). Student engagement and its relationship with early high school dropout. *Journal of adolescence*, 32(3), 651-670.
- Attwood, G., & Croll, P. (2015). Truancy and well-being among secondary school pupils in England. *Educational Studies*, 41(1-2), 14-28.
- Baker, B., & Corcoran, S. (2012). The stealth inequities of school funding: How state and local school finance systems perpetuate inequitable student spending. *Center for American Progress*. Retrieved from <https://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/StealthInequities.pdf>
- Balfanz, R., & Byrnes, V. (2012). The importance of being in school: A report on absenteeism in the nation's public schools. *Education Digest*, 78(2), 4-9.
- Balkis, M., Arslan, G., & Duru, E. (2016). The school absenteeism among high school students: Contributing factors. *Education Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 16(6), 1819-1831.

- Britt, T. (1998). Engaging the self in the field: testing the triangle model of responsibility. *Personality of Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(6), 696–706.
doi:10.1177/0146167299025006005
- Chang, H., & Romerro, M. (2008). *Present, engaged and accounted for: The critical importance of addressing chronic absence in the early grades*. New York, NY: National Center for Children in Poverty.
- Creswell, J. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Demant, J., & Van Houtte, M. (2012). School belonging and school misconduct: The differing role of teacher and peer attachment. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 41(4), 499–514.
- Evergreen, S., & Miron, G. (2007). *The Kalamazoo Promise as a catalyst for change in an urban school district: A theoretical framework* (Vol. 1). Working paper.
- Every Student Succeeds Act. Pub. L. 114-95 (2015).
- Ewert, S., Sykes, B., & Pettit, B. (2014). The degree of disadvantage: Incarceration and inequality in education. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 651(1), 24–43.
- Finn, J. (1989). Withdrawing from school. *Review of Educational Research*, 59(2), 117–142.
- Foreman, L. (2014). The grade: High school teacher says district should get tougher on tardiness. *The Bakersfield Californian (CA)*. Retrieved March 8 2020 from EBSCO.
- Freeman, J., & Simonsen, B. (2015). Examining the impact of policy and practice interventions on high school dropout and school completion rates: A systematic review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 85(2), 205–248.
- Gills, D. (2013). *The collaborative city: Opportunities and struggles for Blacks and Latinos in U. S. cities*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gottfredson, D., & DiPietro, S. (2011). School size, social capital, and student victimization. *Sociology and Education*, 84(1), 69–89. doi:10.1177/0038040710392718
- Gottfried, M. (2011). The detrimental effects of missing school: Evidence from urban siblings. *American Journal of Education*, 117, 147–182.
- Hancock, K., Lawrence, D., Shepherd, C., Mitrou, F., & Zubrick, S. (2017). Associations between school absence and academic achievement: Do socioeconomics matter? *British Educational Research Journal*, 43(3), 415–440.
- Huebsch, J. (2014). *Communication 2000*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Ingul, J., Klockner, C., Silverman, W., & Nordahl, H. (2012). Adolescent school absenteeism: modelling social and individual risk factors. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, 17(2), 93–100.
- Johnson, G. (2005). Student alienation, academic achievement, and WebCT use. *Educational Technology and Society*, 8, 179–189.
- Johnson, L. (2004). Down with detention! *Education Week*, 23(14), 1–4. Retrieved March 3, 202 from Academic Search Premier Database.
- Lleras, C. (2008). Race, racial concentration, and the dynamics of educational inequality across urban and suburban schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(4), 886–912.
- London, R., Sanchez, M., & Castrechini, S. (2016). The dynamics of chronic absence and student achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24,(112). doi:10.14507/epaa.24.2741
- Miles, M., Huberman, A., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Montt, G. (2016). Are socioeconomically integrated schools equally effective for advantaged and disadvantaged students? *Comparative Education Review*, 60(4), 808–832.
- Moore, J. (2011). Best practices employed by Georgia high school administrators to reduce student tardiness. Electronic Theses and Dissertations. 319. <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd/319>
- Nakpodia, E., & Dafiaghor, K. (2011). Lateness: A major problem confronting school administrators in Delta State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Science and Technology Education Research*, 2(4), 58 - 61.
- Nasaw, D. (1981). *Schooled to order: A social history of public schooling in the United States* (Vol. 626). Oxford University Press, USA.
- National Center of Education Statistics. (2011). *Average daily attendance (ADA) as a percentage of total enrollment, school day length, and school year length in public schools, by school level and state: 2007-08 and 2011-12*[Table]. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_203.90.asp
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. (2002). Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425.
- Ready, D. (2010). Socioeconomic disadvantage, school attendance, and early cognitive development: The differential effects of school exposure. *Sociology of Education*, 83(4). doi:10.1177/0038040710383520
- Roby, D. (2004). Research on school attendance and student achievement: A study of Ohio schools (Undetermined). *Educational Research Quarterly*, 28(1), 3–14.
- Rui, N. (2009). Four decades of research on the effects of detracking reform: Where do we stand? A systematic review of the evidence. *Journal of Evidence- Based Medicine*, 2(3), 164–183.

- Rumberger, R., & Thomas, S. (2000). The distribution of dropout and turnover rates among urban and suburban high schools. *Sociology of Education*, 73(1), 39-67. doi:10.2307/2673198
- Summer, A., & Wolfe, B. (1977). Do schools make a difference? *American Economics Review*, 67, 639-652.
- Svaluto, M. (2005). Detention with Heart. *Principal Leadership*, 5(5), 39-41.
- Swart, A. J. (2008). The impact of stress on student tardiness and subsequent throughput rate of engineering students: A case study. *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 24(4), 794.
- Texas Association of School Boards. (2017). *Attendance requirements*. Retrieved from <https://www.mytexaspublicschool.org/preparing-and-enrolling-your-child/attendance-requirements.aspx>
- Texas Education Agency. (2019a). House bill 3. Retrieved from https://tea.texas.gov/about_TEA/Government_Relations_and_Legal/Government_Relations/House_Bill_3
- Texas Education Agency. (2019b). 2019 Campus Comparison Group. Retrieved from <https://rptsrvr1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/account/2019/group.srch.html>
- Texas Education Agency. (2019c). *2019-2020 Student attendance accounting handbook*. Retrieved from <https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/2019-2020%20Adopted%20SAAH.pdf>
- Thacher, P., & Onyper, S. (2016, March). Why later school start times are effective. *ESchool News*, 19(1), 41.
- Tyre, A., Feuerborn, L., & Pierce, J. (2011). Schoolwide interventions to reduce chronic tardiness at middle and high school levels. *Preventing School Failures*, 55(3), 132-139.
- University Interscholastic League. (2019). *Realignment rank order*. Retrieved from https://www.uil texas.org/files/alignments/School_List_Rank_2018-20.pdf
- Weber, R. (1990). *Basic content analysis* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- White, K. (2012). Putnam schools focus on more life skills. *Charleston (WV) Gazette*. Retrieved March 3, 2020 from EBSCO.
- Wilkins, J. L. (2008). The relationship among elementary teachers' content knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and practices. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 11(2), 139-164.
- Woldfson, A., & Carskadon, M. (2005). A Survey of Factors Influencing High School Start Times. *NASSP Bulletin*, 89 (642), 47-66.
- Zoda, P., Slate, J. R., & Combs, J. P. (2011). Public school size and Hispanic student achievement in Texas: A 5-year analysis. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 10(3), 171.