



Policy Committee on Public Education Information Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, June 3, 2014

William B, Travis Building, Room **PDC7 GoToMeeting**
1701 N. Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas 78701
10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Members via GoToMeeting: Lisa Garcia, Jeff Heckathorn for Dr. Muller, Mary Ann Whiteker, David McKamie, Mary Beth Matula, Paul Clore, Brenda Padalecki, Terry Driscoll for Berhl Robertson

Members Attending: Ronny Beard

Others Attending: Melody Parrish, Terri Hanson, Amanda Callinan, Fernando Garcia, Tessie Bryant, Jessica Snyder, Howard Morrison, Jeanine Helms

Call to Order: Mary Ann Whiteker called the meeting to order at 10:05 AM.

1. March 18, 2013 PCPEI Meeting Minutes

Mary Ann Whiteker introduced the minutes from the March 18, 2013 PCPEI meeting. Paul Clore made a motion to approve the March 18, 2014 PCPEI meeting minutes as presented. Mary Beth Matula seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously and the minutes from the March 18, 2013 PCPEI meeting were approved by the committee.

2. Foundation High School Program Data Reporting Change for 2014-15

At the January 21, 2014 Information Task Force (ITF) meeting, ITF approved the addition of several new data elements to allow for the required reporting of the Foundation High School Program (FHSP).

Foundation High School Program Participation Code

- FHSP Participant Code

Foundation High School Program Endorsements

- STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) Endorsement
- Business and Industry Endorsement
- Public Services Endorsement
- Arts and Humanities Endorsement
- Multi-Disciplinary Studies Endorsement

Foundation High School Program Distinguished Level of Achievement Program

- Distinguished Level of Achievement Program

Each of these data elements were approved with PEIMS code table C088. A new code table is being proposed to replace the C088 table that was initially approved by the ITF.

The new FHSP Indicator Code code table includes an option to report that a student is pursuing the program or a component of the program. Previously, it was proposed pursuing or completed status would be determined through the PEIMS submission process. Although this works well for PEIMS, it did not support the Texas Records Exchange (TREX) system. TREX files are transmitted frequently, so the status of a student pursuing or completing any part of the FHSP needed to be built into the TREX codes and not determined by a PEIMS submission (i.e., Submission 3 indicates pursuing, Submission 1 indicates completed). Code Table C199 will allow PEIMS and TREX to use the same data elements and code table to differentiate between whether a student is pursuing or has completed the FHSP or a component of the FHSP, regardless of what submission the data is reported.

Proposed Code Table:

Code Table ID	Name	Date Issued	Date Updated
C199	FHSP-INDICATOR-CODE	7/1/2014	

Code	Translation
0	Student is not Pursuing or Participating (Submissions 1 and 3)
1	Student is Pursuing (Submission 3 Only)
2	Student has Completed (Submissions 1 and 3)

ITF Discussion

Part A. Foundation High school Program Data Reporting Change for 2014-2015 Legacy Collection, C199

Bryce Templeton reminded the ITF committee that during the January 21, 2014 ITF, the committee approved the use of code table C088 for the seven new FHSP data elements. Although the code table would have worked well in PEIMS, it did not support the TREX system. Bryce introduced a new code table, C199 – FHSP-INDICATOR-CODE that would replace the C088 on these seven FHSP data elements. Unlike C088, C199 differentiates between students who have completed and students who are pursuing.

C199 - FHSP-INDICATOR-CODE

- 1 - Student is not Pursuing or Participating (Submissions 1 and 3)
- 2 - Student is Pursuing (Submission 3 Only)
- 3 - Student has Completed (Submissions 1 and 3)

Peggy Sullivan asked why Code 2 in the C199 code table does not include “participating” as well. Bryce explained that Submission 3 is preliminary graduate data that captures intent and is not graduate data. Jessica explained that Curriculum wanted to distinguish between pursuing and completed and have this data available in the 3rd submission.

Linda Roska asked if a student could be reported as having completed in the Summer submission, referring to Edit 20335, Bryce explained that the Summer submission is for capturing intent of the student which could include the completed status of students who have just graduated from high school.

Glenn reiterated that the completed status was important to TREX and that C199 allows comparability between PEIMS and TREX codes.

ITF Recommendation

For the Legacy PEIMS system, ITF recommended that TEA replace code table C088 with the new code table C199 for the seven Foundation High School Program data elements in PEIMS Legacy.

PCPEI Discussion

David McKamie presented the minutes from the May 20th ITF meeting regarding the FHSP data reporting changes for 2014-2015.

Mary Ann Whiteker asked what impact this would have for juniors and seniors electing to graduate under the 4X4 plan. Bryce Templeton explained there would be no impact because if students are not pursuing the FHSP, then nothing has to be reported for FHSP.

Mary Ann Whiteker explained that the number of students reported as not seeking an FHSP endorsement could possibly be taken out of context. Mary Ann gave the example of the college and career readiness indicator and asked how this indicator factors in the two different graduation programs.

Bryce commented that all freshmen will enter as FHSP in 2014-15 and that more and more students will be graduates under FHSP in each successive school year. Bryce said he would have Jessica Snyder from the Curriculum department stop by to answer Mary Ann's question.

Later in the meeting, Jessica Snyder fielded Mary Ann Whiteker's questions. Jessica mentioned that for three years we will have students completing either 4X4 or FHSP. Mary Ann Whiteker wanted to make sure the college readiness indicator takes into account that different districts will have different proportions of students in the two programs, 4X4 and FHSP, and that the indicator does not favor one over the other. Mary Ann stated that the majority of students in her district would be under HB5. Jessica commented that Mary Ann's question could be answered by performance reporting and that she has noted her concern.

PCPEI Action

Motion: Paul Clore made a motion to approve the ITF recommendation to replace C088 with C199 to be used with the FHSP data elements in the legacy PEIMS system; Ronny Beard seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

**Part B. Foundation High School Program Data Reporting Change for 2014-2015
TSDS Collection, TX-GraduationProgramIndicatorType**

Fernando Garcia summarized TSDS's implementation of the changes approved in the legacy system for the Foundation High School Program data elements. The C199 code table is known as TX-GraduationProgramIndicatorType in TSDS.

Peggy Sullivan asked when the 2014-2015 TSDS data standards would be published, and Bryce stated it would be July 1st, but mentioned that the software vendors would get early notice.

Debbie Largent asked if 2013-14 seniors are affected, and Bryce explained these seniors will be reported with a Graduation Type Code of '33' for the 2013-2014 school year. Jessica Snyder clarified that students cannot graduate under the full FHSP in 2013-14, and that FHSP begins with the 2014-15 school year starting with the first time ninth graders and any 10th, 11th, or 12th grade student who "opts in" to the FHSP.

ITF Recommendation

For the TSDS PEIMS system, ITF recommended that TEA replace code table C088 with the new code table C199 for the seven Foundation High School Program data elements in TSDS.

PCPEI Discussion

None.

PCPEI Action

Motion: Paul Clore made a motion to approve the ITF recommendation to replace C088 with C199 to be used with the FHSP data elements in TSDS; Mary Beth Matula seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

3A. District and Campus Performance Indicator Data Reporting Change for 2013-14

Bryce Templeton explained that TEA is further refining exemptions as a result of the proposed TAC rule, 19 TAC 61.1023. Based on the refinement of the proposed TAC rule after public comment, Bryce stated that the TEA program area is proposing three changes.

ITF Discussion

1. For the 2013-2014 school year, the Texas Juvenile Justice Department (TJJD), county district 227-622, and its campuses, be exempted from reporting the 10 Community and Student Engagement indicators. Nancy Dunnam commented on the use of the word “residential.” Bryce clarified that TJJDs are overnight detention facilities for students who have engaged in criminal activities.
2. The requirement to eliminate all TJJD campuses (juvenile detention centers) at non-TJJD districts based on the reporting of the Student Attribution Code would not work because the Student Attribution Code is an attribute of the student and not the campus, and that students in juvenile detention centers are generally enrolled in multiple campuses during the course of a school year. Bryce then stated that PEIMS will publish an edit for the 2013-2014 school year that will list the TJJD campuses (about 85) that will be exempt from reporting the 10 indicators. The list will be provided by Shannon Housson in the Performance Reporting department and will be non-negotiable. Aaron Daitz mentioned that any AEP with 0 reported in the 400 and 500 records are also exempted.
3. For the 2014-2015 school year, the code table for the Statutory Reporting and Policy Compliance data element, C088, would be changed to a new code table dedicated to the purpose of this data element. This change request was also based on public comment, but it is too late to change the code table for the 2013-2014 school year. Bryce stated that this change would make it easier for schools to understand the response they were providing to TEA for this data element.

C200 - STATUTORY-REPORTING-AND-POLICY-COMPLIANCE-INDICATOR-CODE

- 0 - No (Not In Compliance)
- 1 - Yes (In Compliance)

ITF Recommendation

For the Legacy PEIMS system, ITF recommended that TEA replace PEIMS code table C088 on the Statutory Reporting and Policy Compliance data element with PEIMS code table C200 in PEIMS.

PCPEI Discussion

David McKamie summarized the discussion from the May 20th ITF meeting regarding the District and Campus Performance Indicator Data Reporting Change for 2013-14.

Bryce Templeton stated that there are 46 campuses listed in the edit that allows TJJD campuses to not report the ratings.

PCPEI Action

Motion: Terry Driscoll made a motion to approve the ITF recommendation to replace PEIMS code table C088 on the Statutory Reporting and Policy Compliance data element with PEIMS code table C200 in the PEIMS Legacy system; Mary Beth Matula seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

3B. District and Campus Performance Indicator Data Reporting Change for 2014-2015 TSDS Collection

Fernando Garcia stated that the requirements for the TSDS system are identical to the Legacy system, summarized the TSDS proposal, and introduced C200 (STATUTORY-REPORTING-AND-POLICY-AND-COMPLIANCE-INDICATOR-CODE).

ITF Recommendation

ITF recommended that TEA replace PEIMS code table C088 on the Statutory Reporting and Policy Compliance data element with PEIMS code table C200 in the TSDS.

PCPEI Discussion

None.

PCPEI Action

Motion: Ronny Beard made a motion to approve the ITF recommendation to replace PEIMS code table C088 on the Statutory Reporting and Policy Compliance data element with PEIMS code table C200 in the PEIMS Legacy system; Paul Clore seconded.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

4A. Public School District School Board Information Requests for 2014-2015

House Bill 628 from the 2013 regular legislative session amended TEC section 11.1512 by adding Subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) to include:

1. Districts to annually report the total number of requests submitted outside of a school board meeting by a member of the district's board of trustees for information, documents, and records.
2. Districts to annually report the cost of fulfilling the total number of requests submitted outside of a school board meeting by a member of the district's board of trustees for information, documents, and records.

The legislation requires that the districts report this information to TEA no later than September 1 of each year. The data collection for this new requirement will begin with the Summer PEIMS Collection of the 2014-2015 school year. The data collection period will be from June 1 to May 31 of each year. This data collection will occur on the 010 District Organization record for Submission 3 only.

This new data reporting requirement will be effected by adding two new data elements:

- TOTAL-NUM-SCHOOL-BOARD-REQUESTS (E1556).
- TOTAL-COST-SCHOOL-BOARD-REQUESTS (E1557).

ITF Discussion

Amanda Callinan asked permission to present the proposed 2014-15 PEIMS data collection first, then the Survey Monkey collection. Nancy Dunnam granted permission to deviate from the order on the agenda.

TEA will add two new data elements to the 010 District record as follows:

1. **TOTAL-NUM-SCHOOL-BOARD-REQUESTS (E1556)** indicates the total number of requests submitted outside of a school board meeting by a member of the district's board of trustees (school board) for information, documents, and records as specified in TEC SECTION 11.1512.

The total number will be reported in Submission 3 only and must be blank in submissions 1, 2, and 4.

The data collection period is from June 1 through May 31 of each year.

This data is not reported by Open Enrollment Charter Schools.

2. **TOTAL-COST-SCHOOL-BOARD-REQUESTS (E1557)** indicates the cost of fulfilling the total number of requests submitted outside of a school board meeting by a member of the district's board of trustees (school board) for information, documents, and records as specified in TEC SECTION 11.1512.

The total cost will be reported in Submission 3 only and must be blank in submissions 1, 2, and 4.

The data collection period is from June 1 through May 31 of each year.

This data is not reported by Open Enrollment Charter Schools.

Nancy Dunnam asked who in the school districts would be responsible for collecting and submitting the data collection and the committee agreed that the responsibility would likely fall to the Superintendent to delegate.

The committee discussed how districts would calculate cost and asked if TEA would provide guidelines. Bryce Templeton mentioned that the legislation provides no guidelines nor does it require TEA to provide guidelines to the districts. Questions arose regarding the calculation of work hours, CPU usage, programming time, etc. Nancy Dunnam asked if TEA could add a business rule to exclude CPU time and Bryce commented that we would need approval from the TEA program area. Bryce thought that the TEA program area would not support any kind of reporting standard in the absence of the same in the legislation.

Peggy Sullivan stated that the Legislation was passed last session, and that the districts should be aware of this new requirement. Amanda Callinan mentioned a new district requirement in section "d" of the same legislation that districts should also be aware of. Nancy Dunnam asked if the Data Standards could include a reference to section "d" of the legislation in case the districts are unaware of the legislation. Bryce Templeton stated that the definitions contain a reference to the reporting requirements.

Debbie Largent mentioned that some districts do not charge members of the board for data requests, and Bryce clarified that TEA is not collecting what the districts charge; TEA is collecting what it cost the districts to fulfill the requests.

Diane Borreson asked how the districts would go about documenting the data requests, and Bryce Templeton explained that the legislation does not give any guidance in this area and that each district would have to devise its own procedures for documenting the data requests.

Kim O'Leary asked if Open Enrollment Charter schools would submit a blank or a N/A, and Bryce responded that they would be submitting a blank. This reporting requirement is not applicable to charter schools.

Nancy Dunnam asked if we could provide clarification in the Special Instructions area of the code table that states that ESCs do not have to report this data. Bryce stated that the special instructions will be revised to include this change.

Nancy Dunnam expressed concern in the quality and consistency of these two data elements and proposed that these two data elements not be collected in PEIMS. She stated that the purpose of the ITF committee is to ensure that PEIMS collects quality data, and that the quality of these data

elements is questionable. Peggy Sullivan questioned the quality of the data we would be collecting, and Judi Sparks mentioned that the Performance Indicator collection provided some guidelines, unlike HB 628. Nancy commented that if the data has to be collected in PEIMS, there should be guidelines and standards in place.

Nancy Dunnam approved of the motion only if it is determined that the data has to be collected in PEIMS. Nancy requested that the minutes reflect the ITF committee recommends that the data not be collected in PEIMS. All but one committee member disagreed with the Agency's proposal to collect this data through the PEIMS system.

ITF Recommendation 4A

For the Legacy PEIMS System, ITF recommended that TEA add TOTAL-NUM-SCHOOL-BOARD-REQUESTS (E1556) and TOTAL-COST-SCHOOL-BOARD-REQUESTS (E1557) data elements to the 010 PEIMS record.

PCPEI Discussion

David McKamie summarized the ITF proceedings regarding the School Information Requests data collection requirements from TEC 11.1512. David McKamie also emphasized the fact that there are no guidelines to determine the cost calculations. David McKamie reiterated from the ITF meeting that it doesn't matter what districts charge or whether they charge, what matters is the cost to the district. One PCPEI member suggested there be an account code. Other members expressed concern about these adhoc, temporary data collections, specifically the Survey Monkey data collection for the School Board Information Requests.

Terri Hanson clarified that TEA has to collect the data, and that it's not the committee's decision whether to collect the data but where to collect the data. Terri Hanson said it's TEA's legal department's decision and that TEA 's Legal department asked for it to be in PEIMS. Ronny Beard stated that it can be confusing to collect data outside of PEIMS. The committee agreed that this data should be collected in PEIMS.

Terri Hanson suggested that PCPEI play a larger role in the future in determining what data goes into TSDS and where it goes into TSDS: TSDS PEIMS or TSDS Data Mart.

Bryce Templeton explained that sometimes legislation states the data be collected in PEIMS and for this particular collection, it does not have that requirement. Bryce Templeton also explained that data at the student level is always collected in PEIMS. The TEA Legal department requested that this information be collected through PEIMS in order to validate the data reported, and be able to display in a report back the school the information reported.

Mary Ann Whiteker suggested that the Texas Attorney General's open records costs calculations be used as a guideline since districts are already familiar with this formula. Bryce Templeton gave the example of there being no transaction, but still a cost; for example, the cost of making copies.

Jeff Heckathorn expressed concern in creating more temporary data collections and the additional burdens to the district. Jeff stated that vendors support the building of PEIMS records but not AdHoc reporting, so districts would not have any help from the vendors if we do not collect in PEIMS.

Mary Ann Whiteker stated that Survey Monkey is not taken very seriously by districts but PEIMS collections are taken more seriously.

Ronny Beard asked if we could start with the collection in PEIMS and then later move it out of PEIMS. Terri Hanson stated that it's possible but that is a lot of change management that may create too much confusion.

Bryce Templeton stated that PEIMS has controls in the system for mandatory data collections and that temporary solutions could cause districts to ignore the reporting requirement. Bryce stated that controls will be added to TSDS PEIMS system as well.

Ronny Beard stated that PEIMS, TSDS, and “other data collections” will be one in the same for 2016-2017. Terri Hanson concurred. Ronny Beard also commented that the least abrasive option is to collect the data through PEIMS.

Mary Ann Whiteker asked if TEA could help with the definition, and Bryce Templeton stated that we could ask for the TEA Legal department to draft standards for collecting costs. Bryce Templeton said he would consult with the TEA legal staff for a standard for calculating the costs associated with the School Board Information Requests.

PCPEI Action

Motion: Ronny Beard made a motion to approve the ITF recommendation that TEA add TOTAL-NUM-SCHOOL-BOARD-REQUESTS (E1556) and TOTAL-COST-SCHOOL-BOARD-REQUESTS (E1557) data elements to the PEIMS 010 District data record. Lisa Garcia seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed with one dissenter. Paul Clore voted nay because the collection did not include a definition of how to determine cost.

4B. Public School District School Board Information Requests for 2014-2015 TSDS Collection

Fernando Garcia presented the TSDS school board information request collection proposal and explained the implementation is identical to the legacy system and includes the same two data elements and the same business rules and edits.

ITF Recommendation 4B

For the TSDS PEIMS System, ITF recommended that TEA add TOTAL-NUM-SCHOOL-BOARD-REQUESTS (E1556) and TOTAL-COST-SCHOOL-BOARD-REQUESTS (E1557) data elements to the TSDS Texas Education Data Standards.

PCPEI Discussion

Mary Ann Whiteker said that we have to ensure quality data. “We have the direction from the agency to determine the cost for ourselves.”

PCPEI Action

Motion: Jeff Heckathorn made a motion to approve the ITF recommendation that TEA add TOTAL-NUM-SCHOOL-BOARD-REQUESTS (E1556) and TOTAL-COST-SCHOOL-BOARD-REQUESTS (E1557) data elements to the TSDS Texas Education Data Standards PEIMS requirements; Terry Driscoll seconded the motion; Paul Clore voted nay.

Vote: The motion passed with one dissenter. Paul Clore voted nay because the collection did not include a definition of how to determine cost.

5. Public School District School Board Information Requests for 2013-2014, Discussion Item

For the 2013-14 school year, these two data elements will be collected in Survey Monkey. For each subsequent school year, these data elements will be captured in PEIMS. This proposal is for the one-time Survey Monkey collection for the 2013-14 school year.

ITF Discussion

Amanda Callinan presented the 2013-2014 school board request data collection as an informational item. Amanda explained that for 2013-2014, the school board request totals and costs will be collected in Survey Monkey, and a link to the survey would be included in a To The Administrator Addressed letter to be released by May 31, 2014. Judi suggested the letter explain that the collection will be a PEIMS collection started in 2014-2015.

The committee discussed the collection timeline, and Amanda verified that the collection period for the Survey Monkey is nine months, and the collection period for PEIMS in the 2014-2015 school year is 12 months. David questioned whether the 2013-2014 collection timeframe could be modified to a 12-month period with a start date of June 1, 2013. Amanda stated that the legislation was effective September 1, 2013. Bryce stated that 2013-2014 would have to be an anomaly, but the PEIMS collections in the future would be for a 12-month period. Terri explained that we had to take the fiscal year, school year, and PEIMS submissions into account when determining the collection period.

ITF Recommendation

None.

PCPEI Discussion

PCPEI clarified the timeline discussion from ITF and understood that the first year collection of the data through Survey Monkey would only include nine months and starting with 2014-2015 the PEIMS collections would include 12 calendar months.

6. Early Childhood Data System (ECDS) Data Collection for 2014-2015

In order to meet the requirement for determining both the count of classes per teacher, and the student count per class. For the ECDS data collection, TEA is proposing the following changes for the 2014-2015 school year:

Add:

- New PK data element – E1558 - STUDENT-INSTRUCTION-TYPE – indicates PK student instruction type
- New PK related code table DC153 – STUDENT-INSTRUCTION-TYPE

Drop:

- Data element – E1078 - PK-PROGRAM-TYPE-CODE, and related Code Table C185-PK-PROGRAM-TYPE-CODE.

ITF Discussion

Fernando proposed the creation of a new data element and new code table which would meet the reporting requirements for counts of students in a class and the number of classes per teacher. The data element proposed is E1558, STUDENT-INSTRUCTION-TYPE, and the new code table proposed is DC153, STUDENT-INSTRUCTION-TYPE. The new code table differentiates between full day and half-day programs and whether the half-day programs are AM or PM.

Add:

- New PK data element – E1558 - STUDENT-INSTRUCTION-TYPE – indicates PK student instruction type

- New PK related code table DC153 – STUDENT-INSTRUCTION-TYPE

DC153 - STUDENT-INSTRUCTION-TYPE - StudentInstructionType

- 01 - Full Day
- 02 - Half day A.M.
- 03 - Half day P.M.

Fernando Garcia proposed that the previous data element E1078 PK-PROGRAM-TYPE-CODE and code table C185 PK-PROGRAM-TYPE be dropped since the aforementioned data element and code table would replace these.

Drop:

- Data element – E1078 - PK-PROGRAM-TYPE-CODE (only from ECDS, not the PEIMS), and related Code Table C185-PK-PROGRAM-TYPE-CODE (only from ECDS, not the PEIMS).

Nancy Dunnam commented that districts do not think in terms of “AM” and “PM”. Nancy verified with Howard Morrison that this collection has nothing to do with funding and commented that there are programs that are funded ½ day but carry out full-day instruction. Terri Hanson emphasized that this data collection is to collect instruction data and is not funding related.

There was a discussion about how districts would classify programs into the “AM” and “PM” categories since some of the software systems do not have these classifications. Brenda Padalecki commented that Northeast ISD’s software is set up with AM and PM categories. Tom Priem, Judi Sparks, and Terri Hanson concluded that many districts would have to use the Master Schedule module and create business rules that provide classification guidelines.

ITF Recommendation

For the Texas Student Data System, ITF recommended the removal of E1078 - PK-PROGRAM-TYPE-CODE and code table C185 - PK-PROGRAM-TYPE-CODE from the ECDS collection only and the addition of the new data element E1558 - STUDENT-INSTRUCTION-TYPE and its code table DC153 – STUDENT-INSTRUCTION-TYPE to the ECDS data collection.

PCPEI Discussion

David McKamie presented the minutes from the May 20th ITF meeting regarding the Early Childhood Data System (ECDS) for 2014-2015.

One PCPEI member commented that most people are used to funding and asked if there is a way to make it clear these elements are about instruction and not funding.

Terri Hanson suggested that we add the word “instruction” to the description, and Ronny Beard suggested that we make it clear in the definition of the element that it is not about funding.

Terry Driscoll asked why the distinction between AM and PM is important, and Terri Hanson explained that without these codes, the class sizes could look twice as large as they are when looking at the data.

PCPEI Action

Motion: Paul Clore made a motion to approve the ITF recommendation to remove E1078 - PK-PROGRAM-TYPE-CODE and code table C185 - PK-PROGRAM-TYPE-CODE from the ECDS collection only and then add the new data element E1558 - STUDENT-INSTRUCTION-TYPE and its code table DC153 – STUDENT-INSTRUCTION-TYPE to the ECDS data collection; Ronny Beard seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

7. Texas Student Data System Bilingual/ESL Modification for 2013-2014 and 2014-2015, Discussion Item

In reviewing the Fall Snapshot PEIMS data loads, it was discovered that E0896 PARENTAL-PERMISSION-CODE data element was only being reported for students who are in the BIL and ESL student programs. If a student was not in a BIL or ESL program but is a LEP student, the Parental Permission Codes are not being reported. In order for TSDS PEIMS to accommodate the collection of this data, the following changes are proposed:

- Add E0896 PARENTAL-PERMISSION-CODE to the StudentExtension Complex Type
- Remove E0896 PARENTAL-PERMISSION-CODE and PEIMS references from StudentESLProgramAssociationComplex Type.
- Remove E0896 PARENTAL-PERMISSION-CODE and PEIMS references fromStudenBilingualProgramAssociationExtension Complex Type.

ITF Discussion

In reviewing the Fall Snapshot PEIMS data loads, it was discovered that E0896 PARENTAL-PERMISSION-CODE data element was only being reported for students who are in the BIL and ESL student programs. If a student was not in a BIL or ESL program but is a LEP student, the Parental Permission Codes are not being reported. In order for TSDS PEIMS to accommodate the collection of this data, the following changes are proposed:

- Add E0896 PARENTAL-PERMISSION-CODE to the StudentExtension Complex Type
- Remove E0896 PARENTAL-PERMISSION-CODE and PEIMS references from StudentESLProgramAssociation Complex Type.
- Remove E0896 PARENTAL-PERMISSION-CODE and PEIMS references from StudenBilingualProgramAssociationExtension Complex Type.

ITF Recommendation

None.

PCPEI Discussion

Jeff Heckathorn asked Jeanine Helms about the edits in the document. Jeff asked if the same changes would be made to the student extension complex type as well. Bryce Templeton stated that the same level of quality checks in the PEIMS Legacy System for the bilingual/ESL program would apply to TSDS as well.

8. Texas Student Data System Economic Disadvantaged Modification for 2014-2015, Discussion Item

In reviewing the E1387 ECONOMIC-DISADVANTAGE data element, the values for this data element is either Yes or No (Boolean value) and does not provide the same detailed data as provided by E0785 ECONOMIC-DISADVANTAGE-CODE (C054) which is:

- 00 Not identified As Economically Disadvantaged
- 01 Eligible For Free Meals Under The National School Lunch And Child Nutrition Program
- 02 Eligible For Reduced-price Meals Under The National School Lunch And Child Nutrition Program
- 99 Other Economic Disadvantage, Including:a) from a family with an annual income at or below the official federal poverty line, b) eligible for TemporaryAssistance to Needy Families (TANF) or other public assistance, c) received a Pell Grant or comparable stateprogram of need-based financial assistance, d) eligible for programs assisted under Title II of the Job TrainingPartnership Act (JTPA), or e) eligible for benefits under the Food Stamp Act of 1977

The following changes are being proposed.

- Retire E1387 ECONOMIC-DISADVANTAGE data element by marking it 'NOT USED BY TEA'.
- Modify E0785 ECONOMIC-DISADVANTAGE-CODE data element to be used in the TSDS Collection

ITF Discussion

In reviewing the E1387 ECONOMIC-DISADVANTAGE data element, the values for this data element is either Yes or No (Boolean value) and does not provide the same detailed data as provided by E0785 ECONOMIC-DISADVANTAGE-CODE (C054) which is:

- 00 Not identified As Economically Disadvantaged
- 01 Eligible For Free Meals Under The National School Lunch And Child Nutrition Program
- 02 Eligible For Reduced-price Meals Under The National School Lunch And Child Nutrition Program
- 99 Other Economic Disadvantage, Including:

a) from a family with an annual income at or below the official federal poverty line, b) eligible for Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) or other public assistance, c) received a Pell Grant or comparable state program of need-based financial assistance, d) eligible for programs assisted under Title II of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), or e) eligible for benefits under the Food Stamp Act of 1977

The following changes are being proposed to the TSDS system.

- Retire E1387 ECONOMIC-DISADVANTAGE data element by marking it 'NOT USED BY TEA'.
- Modify E0785 ECONOMIC-DISADVANTAGE-CODE data element to be used in the TSDS Collection

ITF Recommendation

None.

PCPEI Discussion

David McKamie summarized the ITF discussion regarding the economically disadvantaged code table changes in TSDS.

One PCPEI member stated that not every student in every school can fill out a Free and Reduced Price Lunch application form. Bryce Templeton stated that each school is required to determine the economic disadvantaged status of each student enrolled in school. Bryce stated that depending on the school lunch program offered by the school, the economic disadvantaged determination varies. Provision 2 schools can't use Department of Agriculture forms after the initial survey, but schools can create local income survey forms based off of USDA income eligibility guidelines requirements. Bryce further explained that new students to a Provision 2 school are reported with Economic Disadvantaged codes 00 and 99 and that students still enrolled in the school are rolled forward with their codes of 01, 02, and 00s.

Jeff Heckathorn commented that Pre-Kindergarten requires 100% verification and that the school nutrition program audits a random sample.

Mary Ann Whiteker stated that Community Eligibility Program (CEP) provides no incentive for parents to fill out application forms.

Terri Hanson stated that the bottom line is that PEIMS still requires the Economic Disadvantaged reporting for each enrolled student.

Bryce Templeton explained that the school lunch applications affect the E-Rate program technology discounts and could cause schools discounts to increase or decrease. Bryce explained that the school lunch program requirements from the Department of Agriculture and the TEA requirements for reporting Economic Disadvantaged status have always been confusing for districts to reconcile and that the addition of CEP is creating additional confusion for the schools.

9. Other Business

Bryce Templeton explained that TREX publishes elements that are not in PEIMS or TSDS and gave the example of the Texas Grant Indicator code. Bryce explained that TREX elements do not currently go through the governance process.

Terri Hanson asked if we should start bringing TREX data elements to PCPEI for approval. Mary Ann Whiteker stated that that is the purpose of the committee.

Terri Hanson explained that TEA cannot see the TREx data and that TREX is information sharing between schools. Terri further explained that there are data standards for TREX. Terri stated that the current TREX change process is that we are adding elements at the request of the TEA program area responsible for students records transfer.

Mary Ann Whiteker confirmed that these additional elements to TREx are burdens to the district.

Paul Clore asked if these changes affect all districts, and Bryce Templeton confirmed that if an element is determined mandatory in TREX then it is mandatory for all districts. Jeff Heckathorn commented that not all fields are mandatory. Bryce Templeton explained that the PEIMS office determines the mandatory and optional elements in the TREx design.

Terri Hanson explained that the process is working well, but that we have not been using the governance process for the modifications to TREx.

Mary Ann Whiteker suggested the TREX be added to the next PCPEI agenda and that we start with the mandatory TREX elements.

Terri Hanson said that SEDS would prepare a formal presentation and explain what is mandatory and optional TREx data.

10. Next PCPEI Meetings

Mary Ann Whiteker called for an open forum.

Bryce Templeton said that he is planning on three meetings next year: one in November, one in February, and one in late July or early August in response to any items that are the result of the legislative session. Bryce said that he would get back with the committee about specific dates.

Adjournment: Mary Ann Whiteker adjourned the PCPEI Meeting at 11:55 a.m.