

<p>Members: Nancy Dunnam, Chair David McKamie, Vice Chair Diane Borreson Nancy Cintron Dara Fuller Adrian Garcia Keitha Ivey Debbie Largent Kim O'Leary Rochelle Kingsley Brenda Padalecki Linda Roska Nancy Smith Judi Sparks Janet Spurgin Peggy Sullivan Dennis Telas</p>	<h1 style="margin: 0;">Texas Education Agency Information Task Force (ITF) Meeting Agenda April 12, 2016</h1>		 10:00 AM to 2:00 PM William B Travis Bldg 1701 N. Congress Ave. Austin, Texas 78701 GoToMeeting Hosted from Room G-100, PDC3
<p>Members Attending via GoToMeeting:</p> <p>Alternates Attending:</p> <p>Others Attending:</p>	<p>Nancy Dunnam, David McKamie, Diane Borreson, Dara Fuller, Adrian Garcia, Nancy Cintron, Brenda Padalecki, Judi Sparks, Dennis Telas, and Linda Roska</p> <p>Pablo Martinez, Scott Lewis for Janet Spurgin, Dana Braun</p> <p><i>Melody Parrish (TEA), Terri Hanson (TEA ITS SEDS), Leanne Simons (TEA ITS SEDS), Bryce Templeton (TEA ITS SEDS), Scott Johnson (TEA ITS SEDS) John Reese (TEA ITS SEDS), Ed Linden (TEA ITS SEDS), Melissa Lemons (TEA ITS SEDS), Tami Percy (TEA)</i></p>		
<p>Call the Meeting to Order: Nancy Dunnam, ITF Chair</p>			
<p>Approval of the January 12, 2016 ITF Meeting Minutes</p> <p>Nancy Dunnam had a correction to be made on page 2, removal of verbiage 'of the'.</p> <p>Dara Fuller had a correction on page 3, under Option 3 change 'not' to 'no'.</p> <p>Dennis Telas made a motion to approve the January 12, 2016 meeting minutes.</p> <p>No objections were made</p> <p>Nancy Dunnam approved</p>		<p>Action Item</p>	
<p>2016-2017 FSHP implementation in the studentGPS® Dashboards</p> <p>Scott Johnson presented this item to the ITF committee and stated that TEA is ready to include the Foundation High School Program (FHSP) participation data, that is currently collected in submission 3, into the studentGPS® Dashboards.</p> <p>As a result of House Bill 5 being passed in the 83rd legislative session, the Texas Education Agency is required to collect participation data on students that are pursuing the Foundation High School Program (FHSP) graduation plan.</p> <p>The US Department of Education awarded the Texas Education Agency (TEA) another federal Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) grant in September 2015. The primary focus of this grant is the delivery of relevant and actionable data back to educators so they can continually improve student performance, while reducing the burden on schools to submit this data.</p>		<p>Discussion Item</p>	

<p>This grant will span over the next 4 years and will enable TEA to make more effective use of the TSDS data by extending graduation plan data to the studentGPS® Dashboards. Starting in the 2016-2017 school year, the TEA will implement the Foundation High School Program (FHSP) into the studentGPS® Dashboards based upon the data currently collected under House Bill 5 and TEC 28.025.</p> <p>This proposal will outline the student, campus and LEA level changes that would need to occur in order to fully implement the FHSP data into the studentGPS® Dashboards.</p> <p>Scott Johnson presented the details of this item to the ITF committee and provided an overview of the proposed changes to be made to the studentGPS® Dashboards that will make use of the PEIMS elements currently collected in Submission 3. Scott Johnson also provided a high level overview of the grant that was awarded to the TEA. Scott stated that the inclusion of the FHSP data will be driven off of the FHSP Participant Code with a value of 1 (participating) being the trigger that includes the student FHSP participation in the Distinguished Level of Achievement (DLA) and the Endorsements.</p> <p>Scott Johnson provided mocked up screen shots of the proposed changes to the studentGPS® Dashboards screens that will display the FHSP data collected from PEIMS. These screen shots depicted the student, campus and district level information that will be displayed on the studentGPS® Dashboards.</p> <p>Linda Roska (TEA) had a question on how the calculation of 'pursuing' and 'not pursuing' an endorsement was to be calculated. Scott Johnson said this information was to be data driven from the student level and then rolled up to the campus and district level. If the Endorsement is reported with a positive participation code, the data would be included. If a student is reported with a positive response (1 - Pursuing), then the student would be included. If a student is reported with a negative response (0 – Not Pursuing), then the student would not be included.</p> <p>Dennis Telas had a question about this data for current 11th and 12th graders and how to report for graduates in the next Fall PEIMS collection.</p> <p>Bryce Templeton (TEA) stated the 2016-2017 school year will be the 3rd year of the FHSP implementation. This will include all freshman, sophomores and juniors in high school. The 12th grade students will be fully represented in the 2017-2018 school year. The FHSP participation code E1541 will be the trigger (<i>Indicates whether a student is currently enrolled in (pursuing) the Foundation High School Program</i>).</p> <p>Scott Johnson stated that these changes should be fully implemented into the studentGPS® Dashboards in the late Fall time-frame of the 2016-2017 school year.</p>	
<p>Discussion on Sharing PEIMS Data With Other TSDS Systems</p> <p>Terri Hanson introduced this item and posed the following question to the members. There are TSDS data elements that are reported in one or more of the PEIMS submissions that need to be displayed in the studentGPS® Dashboard Application or used by the Early Childhood Data System or promoted for other TSDS collections. When other collections need to display this data, should the data come from the operational data store (ODS) or from the PEIMS Data Mart (PDM)?</p> <p>Example: <i>Foundation High School Program Participation Code (E1541) – Indicates whether a student is currently enrolled in (pursuing) the Foundation High School Program</i></p> <p>Terri Hanson presented two options to the committee.</p> <p>Option #1 ODS: If the data is promoted from the ODS to the Dashboard Data Mart (DDM) or Core Data Mart (CDM), the data would not have been validated in the PEIMS Application. Mainly, the full battery of business validations used in the PEIMS data collections would not have been applied.</p> <p>When the data is loaded into the ODS, basic validations are performed. Code values are validated, however, most of the business validations will not be applied.</p> <p>Option #2 PDM: If the data is promoted from the PDM to the DDM/CDM, the data would</p>	<p>Action Item</p>

<p>have been more extensively validated, however, the data showing in the other systems, would be dependent on the PEIMS Coordinator having promoted and validated the data.</p> <p>Nancy Dunnam voiced a concern over PEIMS data being extracted and sent often enough under Option 1.</p> <p>Nancy Dunnam voiced another concern over the data not being the same between PEIMS and the other applications that ingest PEIMS data under Option 1.</p> <p>Terri Hanson (TEA) stated that additional business edits would be included into the other data marts that ingest the PEIMS data under Option 1.</p> <p>Nancy Dunnam asked for the school district members to speak up on this issue since they are the entities most affected by this decision. Adrian Garcia stated that by using data under Option 1 it is more real time and not dependent on finalized PEIMS data.</p> <p>Adrian Garcia stated that he felt the data under Option 1 is still more useful as being real time even if these additional business edits were not performed.</p> <p>Diane Borreson stated that Option 1 data (ODS) would not be problematic as this data can be loaded nightly and would not have to wait for finalized PEIMS data.</p> <p>Dennis Telas stated that he did not see a problem with the data being collected under Option 1 (ODS).</p> <p>David McKamie stated he also prefers Option 1 (ODS) as it is the most real time data available and should reinforce correctness at the local district system level.</p> <p>Adrian Garcia made a motion for TEA to use the data from the ODS when the data is also reported to the PEIMS Data Mart for a PEIMS collection (Option 1 (ODS)).</p> <p>Dennis Telas seconded the motion and the motion was passed unanimously.</p>	
<p>PID Error Rate Suspension for 2015-2016 school year</p> <p>TEA is planning to suspend the PID error rate for the 2015-2016 school year due to Texas public schools using different PEIMS systems. The TSDS PEIMS school's PID error rate is calculated differently than the PEIMS EDIT+ school's PID error rate.</p> <p>Terri Hanson presented this item to the ITF committee. In regards to the PID Error Rate, Terri Hanson stated that the PID Error Rate is currently only used as a line item on the Texas Accountability Performance Report (TAPR). Terri Hanson said that the TEA has decided to suspend the PID Error Rate for the 2015-2016 school year and reinstated in the 2016-2017 school year, TEA would like to use a new Data Quality Rate that will be determined at a later date. Terri continued by describing that in the EDIT+ system, the PID Error Rate is calculated at the point that the PEIMS data file is approved by the school district or charter school. This is after the school has had the opportunity to clean up any data that is problematic for that particular district; thus achieving a low PID Error Rate. If any of the student data that is corrected impacts another school district, then that district is able to clean up the data prior to their acceptance of the PEIMS EDIT+ data file and achieve a low PID Error Rate as well. This practice does not result in an accurate measure of data quality and the errors between two or more schools are still floating around the UID system and are potentially not attributed to any school. The TSDS system is currently computing the PID error rate for all schools at a particular point in time, after the close of a collection.</p> <p>Nancy Dunnam stated that there is difficulty and confusion over the current PID Error reports within PEIMS due to all schools not following standard procedures for properly identifying the legal name of a student. Nancy Dunnam said a new Data Quality report with different measures would be more meaningful.</p> <p>Terri Hanson stated that a new Data Quality indicator could be created to indicate, for example, how many times a district has retired a Unique ID. This might identify the instances where a school did not follow standard procedures for determining a student's legal name. Terri stated that the ITS-SEDS Division would convene a working group within TEA to come up with recommendations to present to the ITF committee.</p>	<p>Discussion Item</p>

<p>Nancy Dunnam asked if the same guidelines needed to be followed for PID Error Rate for the upcoming PEIMS Submission 3 (Summer collection). Dennis Telas asked if there would be written guidelines to follow concerning PID Error Rate suspension for the Summer Collection.</p> <p>Terri Hanson stated that the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS) would be updated to reflect that the PID Error Rate is being suspended for the 2015-2016 school year.</p>	
<p>Other Business</p> <p>Nancy Dunnam asked if there were any other items to be discussed.</p> <p>Bryce Templeton stated the next ITF meeting would be April 26, 2016.</p> <p>Adrian Garcia had a question about any TREx changes.</p> <p>Bryce Templeton stated if there were any needed Data Standard changes to TREx to please send those to him directly.</p> <p>Dennis Telas asked who created the TAPR Report.</p> <p>Bryce Templeton stated that the Performance Reporting Division creates and publishes the TAPR report.</p> <p>Nancy Dunnam called for a motion adjourn the ITF meeting.</p> <p>Dennis Telas made the motion to adjourn the meeting.</p> <p>Dara Fuller seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned.</p>	<p>Discussion Item</p>
<p>Upcoming ITF Meetings</p> <p>April 26, 2016</p>	<p>Discussion Item</p>