



**Texas Education Agency (TEA)
Information Task Force (ITF)
Tuesday, July 09, 2019**

GoToMeeting
Wm. B. Travis Building, PDC3
1701 N. Congress Avenue
10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Call Meeting to Order

David McKamie

called the ITF meeting to order at 10 a.m.

Roll call of the ITF members attending the meeting was taken by Michele Elledge.

ITF Members Present via GoToMeeting:

Dianne Borreson, Nancy Dunnam, Dara Fuller, Adrian Garcia, Keitha Ivey, D'Lynne Johnson, Sandra Kratz (for Debbie Largent), Scott Lewis, Pablo Martinez, David McKamie, John Newcom, Brenda Padalecki, Linda Raney, John Shaffer, Nancy Smith, Peggy Sullivan, David Taylor (voting for Nancy Dunnam), Debby Wilburn, Jay Young

TEA Staff Present:

Monica Brewer (Gifted/Talented Education), Candice DeSantis (ITS-BMD), Michele Elledge (ITS-BMD), Terri Hansen (ITS-BMD), Scott Johnson (ITS-BMD), Leo Lopez (State Funding)

TEA Staff Present via GoToMeeting:

Fuat Aki (ITS), Stacy Avery (College, Career, & Military Prep), Jennifer Broussard (Research and Analysis) Jeanine Helms (ITS-BMD), David Marx (School Financial Compliance), Christine McCormick (Curriculum) Linda Roska (Research and Analysis), Leanne Simons (ITS-BDM), Nina Taylor (Research and Analysis) Carli Thomas (English Learner Support)

Approve Meeting Minutes from the April 9, 2019 ITF Meeting

Action Item

David McKamie asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the April 9, 2019 meeting.

Motion: Dara Fuller
Second: Keitha Ivey

Motion passed.

Terri expressed appreciation for everyone for attending. The majority of the proposals to be presented are related to House Bill 3 (HB 3). We usually don't make data collection changes this late, but HB 3 is in effect for the 2019-2020 school year and we need to align our data collection so that LEAs can get funding resulting from

HB 3. Please give any feedback on what we may be missing or suggestions. There is another ITF meeting next Tuesday July 16. Anything we are unable to resolve today will be addressed in next week's meeting.

1. Student Census Block Group for the 2019-2020 School Year **Action Item**

Under House Bill 3 (HB3), the Texas Education Agency (TEA) Is proposing to collect STUDENT-CENSUS-BLOCK-GROUP for all economically disadvantaged students who are not homeless and do not reside in a residential facility.

Presentation:

Terri Hanson presented the proposal which includes:

1.	Add a new data element STUDENT-CENSUS-BLOCK-GROUP (E16XX) to the StudentExtension complex type to be reported in the PEIMS Fall Submission.
1.1	Add STUDENT-CENSUS-BLOCK-GROUP reporting guidance in the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS).
2.	Add a TSDS PEIMS report to display reported STUDENT-CENSUS-BLOCK-GROUP data.
3.	Add data validation rule related to STUDENT-CENSUS-BLOCK-GROUP.

For the PEIMS Fall collection for 19-20, we propose to collect student census block group for economically disadvantaged students only. We will add some guidance and a report. The complexity will be about determining what the student census block is. Census block will not be collected for students who are economically disadvantaged and homeless because compensatory ed is calculated a different way.

Leo Lopez (State Funding) mentioned that he recently spoke with the commissioner, and for the homeless students, instead of not collecting a census block, he wants to use the campus address.

Terri explained that we have been debating which approach to take with homeless students – not collecting census block or using the census block of the campus address. We will finalize with commissioner as soon as possible (possibly by the end of the meeting) and present the results today or in the meeting next week.

Terri explained that TEA is working with a vendor to provide a resource for LEAs and charters to use to determine census block. This tool will be in production by Sept. 1. Looking into ways for LEAs to possibly use a batch process/APIs to get the census block data from this system. TEA will have training on how to use tool in mid to late August.

ITF Discussion:

David McKamie asked for clarification on the comments about determining the census block vs using the campus address.

Terri clarified that it was in regard to homeless students and which should be used.

Keitha Ivey asked for further explanation for how this tool would work. Would LEAs would provide a file with addresses to the tool, then it would provide back census block numbers that could then be loaded back into the school's software system?

Terri responded that the tool would use something such as a CSV formatted file or an excel file, that the tool would be on the TEA website, not in TSDS. LEAs would be able to load a file with Unique Id and address and the file would be return with the census block populated. .

Keitha asked if the tool would be able to handle a large file, for example, one with 20,000 records; what are the limitations on the number of students that could be processed with this method?

Terri indicated that the vendor is not concerned about the size of files; they do not foresee any issues.

Keitha asked for verification regarding the fact that census block is just being collected for students who are economically disadvantaged on the Fall snapshot date; Terri confirmed.

Keitha asked for clarification on when the census block tool would be available.

Terri indicated that the tool would be available by September 1 and that there would be training before the tool is available.

Dara Fuller asked if the tool would be presented at the 2019 Summer TSDS ESC training at the end of July.

Terri stated that if the tool is ready then we can demo it during the training.

David McKamie stated that the bill language refers to educationally disadvantaged, not economically disadvantaged students (i.e. not only students who qualify for free and reduced lunch) so educationally disadvantaged may refer to a larger population of students including economically disadvantaged code 99; correct?

Leo Lopez stated that TEC chapter 5.001 (4) defines “educationally disadvantaged” as meaning students who qualify for free or reduced lunch . There was discussion during the session about including other students, but it was decided to keep the free and reduced lunch eligibility as the gateway to be eligible to be included into compensatory education. In some cases you could have fewer students eligible for compensatory education than those getting free/reduced lunch, for example a campus designated as CEP makes students eligible for free/reduced lunch, but not all of the students at the LEA are necessarily economically disadvantaged.

David McKamie stated that due to the funding implications, it’s even more important that LEAs report this data correctly.

Leo responded indicating that TEA encourages accurate reporting.

Terri stated that economically disadvantaged is an important indicator that impacts many areas including accountability, so it continues to be an important indicator.

Keitha Ivey asked if the district uses a locally developed form income survey form if economically disadvantaged codes 01 and 02 should be used to report students who qualify for free/reduced meals or if code 99 should be reported

Terri responded that regardless of what form is used, the economic disadvantage code that reflects the student’s eligibility is the code that should be reported.

Peggy Sullivan stated that Dallas ISD is a Community Eligibility Provision district. They use a locally developed form and report economically disadvantaged code 99 where appropriate. She further stated that if the student is on the direct certification list, they are reported with economic disadvantage code 01.

David McKamie stated that for ESCs that do training, presenting the census block reporting item will provide an opportunity to revisit the importance of accurately reporting of economically disadvantage code with districts.

Terri added that this year we added a chart in TEDS to help with guidance in reporting. She encouraged everyone to let us know if they think of other ways to enhance that guidance.

Keitha – just sent Terri an email regarding a question regarding the use of the official lunch application, and what to do with PK students. She indicated that the food service department at Amarillo ISD will not allow the use of code 99.

Terri indicated that we would work to address her concerns and ensure that the chart is updated if needed.

Terri continued with the review of the proposal and indicated that the reports and data validations are based on our best understanding of business user needs, but that there may be changes in the future.

In reference to rule 40100-new1, Peggy asked if there would be a reverse rule to make sure that census block is not reported for students who are not economically disadvantaged.

Jeanine stated that a rule will be added to perform that check

Peggy stated that the following guidance under section 1.1 is not clear:

STUDENT-CENSUS-BLOCK-GROUP (E16XX) is the census block in which a student resides. This data is reported for economically disadvantaged students, but it does not need to be reported for homeless students or students residing in a residential facility.

Terri responded and said that we could update the guidance to say from “does not need to be reported” to “must not be reported”.

David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal.

ITF Action:

Motion: Peggy Sullivan

Second: Keitha Ivey

Motion passed.

Terri stated that TEA will get clarification to the ITF committee as soon as possible on whether or not census block needs to be reported for homeless students.

2. Residential Facility Attendance Reporting for the 2019-2020 School Year **Action Item**

Under HB 3, the Dropout Recovery and Residential Facility Placement Allotment was added to establish a designated amount of funding per student in average daily attendance that resides in a residential placement facility or is at a designated dropout recovery school under Section 39.0548.

Presentation:

Terri presented the proposal which includes the following:

1.	Add new data element TOTAL-ELIG-RESIDENTIAL-FACILITY-DAYS-PRESENT (E16XX) to the SpecialProgramsReportingPeriodAttendanceExtension Complex Type to be reported in the PEIMS Summer submission.
2.	Add new data element FLEX-ATTEND-TOTAL-RESIDENTIAL-FACILITY-DAYS-ELIGIBLE (E16XX) to the SpecialProgramsReportingPeriodAttendanceExtension Complex Type to be reported in the PEIMS Summer and Extended Year submissions.
3.	Added new codes to ATTENDANCE-EVENT-INDICATOR-TYPE (C188) code table.
4.	Added reporting guidance in the Texas Education Data Standards.
5.	Update existing TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
6.	Add and update data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

Terri indicated that with the Dropout Recovery and Residential Facility Placement Allotment, it will be necessary to collect eligible days present for all students that reside in residential facilities (i.e. students that receive special education services and students that do not receive special education services) in the PEIMS Summer Submission. TEA already collects average daily attendance (ADA) for students in dropout recovery programs. A new element will be added for purposes of reporting special ed or non-special ed students in residential facilities. There will also be a new data element for flex attend residential facility days.

Attendance report changes will be in line with attendance data is generally reported and data validation rules are similar to other attendance rules, such as making sure the new days present are full or half days.

ITF Discussion:

David McKamie stated that in the past, for students in residential facilities, especially special ed, there was no funding for these students, funding came from other places, . So how is this changing; is this bringing new funding?

Leo Lopez clarified that this allotment is new funding over and above any funding that LEAs may already receive for these students. Leo provided additional background stating that when the high school allotment was removed, there were several dropout facilities that were high school only, and those facilities lost funding and they were disproportionately negatively impacted. There were similar effects with residential placement facilities. This allotment is an attempt to offset those negative impacts. The only way this changes existing funding is the multiplier for mainstream is changing.

Brenda Padalecki asked if there would be additional guidance in the Student Attendance Accounting Handbook (SAAH).

Leo responded yes; we expect to have updated documentation. We are going to proceed with the publication of version one (1) of the SAAH now, and David Marx is working on a revision to include these HB 3 changes.

David McKamie asked if districts have an option on whether to report regular attendance days or flexible attendance minutes reporting.

Terri responded yes.

John Newcom asked if existing ADA codes would be used for this reporting or if there would be new codes.

Terri indicated that existing ADA codes would be used.

David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal.

ITF Action:

Motion: Adrian Garcia
Second: Pablo Martinez
Motion passed

3. Bilingual Services Reporting for the 2019-2020 School Year**Action Item**

Under HB 3, the Bilingual Education Allotment was modified to establish different funding multipliers based on the language program in which a student participates, as well as whether the student is an English Learner (EL) (also referred to as limited English proficient (LEP)). Previously, the multiplier for this allotment was the same for all language programs, and only applied to EL students.

House Bill 3 provides Bilingual Education Allotment funding for students who participate in the Bilingual Dual Language Immersion/Two-Way program regardless of their LEP/ EL status.

Presentation:

Terri Hanson presented the proposal which includes the following:

4.	Add a new data element BILINGUAL/ESL-FUNDING-CODE (E16XX) to the SpecialProgramsReportingPeriodAttendanceExtension Complex Type to be reported in the PEIMS Summer and Extended Year Submissions.
1.1	Add BILINGUAL/ESL-FUNDING-CODE (E16XX) reporting guidance in the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS).
5.	Add a new code table BILINGUAL/ESL-FUNDING-CODE (Cxxx).
6.	Add existing data element LEP-INDICATOR-CODE (E0790) to the PEIMS Extended Year Submission in the TX-StudentCharacteristics complex type within the StudentExtension complex type.
7.	Update LEP-INDICATOR-CODE (C061) code table to clarify new Bilingual Education Allotment scenarios.
8.	Update PARENTAL-PERMISSION-CODE (C093) code table to clarify new Bilingual Education Allotment scenarios.
5.1	Update PARENTAL-PERMISSION-CODE (E0896) reporting guidance in TEDS.
9.	Update BILINGUAL-PROGRAM-TYPE-CODE (E1042) reporting guidance in TEDS.
10.	Update existing TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal. Add new reports to display detailed Bilingual/ESL Attendance.
11.	Add and update data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

Terri introduced Carli Thomas from English Learner Support for any questions.

Due to the different multipliers for language program participation, it is necessary to know how many days a student is in each program, and whether or not the student is LEP/EL. The proposed changes are to structure Bilingual/ESL attendance reporting to be more like the way special ed attendance is collected. LEAs will still report the number of eligible days present in bilingual/ESL regular attendance and flexible attendance. TEA will use the bilingual/ESL funding code, the bilingual/ESL days, and the LEP indicator code to determine bilingual education allotment amount.

ITF Discussion:

Jay Young asked if it is possible for a student's LEP-INDICATOR-CODE code to change mid-way through a reporting period?

Terri indicated that technically it is a possibility, but she deferred to Carli Thomas for a response.

Carli Thomas stated that typically a student's LEP status would not change during the school year since those changes are assessed at the end of the school year. However, Carli did state that sometimes a student that is reported as English proficient may enter into a language program mid-year.

Terri explained that the way the XML is structured, if a student moves from one program to another, there would be a different code reported with the corresponding number of days related to that code in that reporting period.

Jay verified that each time a student changes programs, a new instance of complex type is reported; Terri agreed.

David McKamie asked if TEA anticipated that this change in the funding structure would result in increased bilingual/ESL funding for LEAs.

Leo Lopez responded that data from last year was analyzed for purposes of determining the funding impact of the new funding approach. TEA determined estimates based on the number of students currently in dual language programs and with more students moving from regular bilingual programs to dual language programs over time. Overall TEA expects that funding for these programs will increase.

David McKamie asked if anyone from the districts or vendors would like to comment on their SIS software and the ability to successfully accomplish this change.

Jay Young (TCC) indicated that he did not see any difficulties with implementing the change.

John Newcom (Skyward) indicated that they will accommodate this change.

Adrian asked for clarification that dual language funding will now be available for students who are non-LEP.

Terri confirmed, that yes, non-LEP students that participate in the Dual language immersion two-way program will be funded; the multiplier is 0.05.

David McKamie asked if typically only larger schools are offering dual language programs. He further asked if the smaller LEAs typically don't have these kinds of programs.

Carli stated that the program area has found that there are dual language programs at various sized school districts and charters across the state in both rural and urban areas. The demand for these programs is based on community needs and the response of the community, particularly with two-way programs. Since these programs are developed with the intention to combine English learners and English proficient students, it depends on the needs of the community.

David McKamie asked the bilingual staff at ESCs would be trained by TEA so we as trainers will know when we can present information?

Carli indicated that they have monthly meetings covering bilingual education and Title 3. She further stated that her team maintains close contact with bilingual staff in the ESCs. For 19-20, there are quite a few changes and Carli's team has provided a lot of resources to bilingual staff. They will continue to add and change the resources as the need arises. In addition, Carli will provide PEIMS coordinator training and she added that she is open to suggestions regarding additional avenues of communication with the appropriate staff at ESCs, LEAs and charters.

Carli clarified about one misconception that people have about getting a bilingual exception/ESL waiver. Some people think that the LEA does not receive funding if they have a waiver because of not having the appropriately trained teachers, but that is not true. LEAs still receive basic bilingual education allotment when they have a waiver. The alternative language program code was created to help track these LEAs. LEAs are not able to get the additional funding if they do not have the appropriate staff to run a standard program, but they still get the basic funding. Carli reiterated that if an LEA submits a waiver and submits the alternate language program code, they will still get basic bilingual education allotment funding, the LEA just isn't eligible to get additional funding.

Terri pointed out the bilingual education allotment table on page ten (10) of the proposal.

Jay Young asked if the bottom row meant that the multiplier for non-LEP (i.e. not LEP-INDICATOR-CODE 1) students who are in a bilingual dual language immersion two-way program is 0.05.

Terri confirmed and Carli added that there are two groups of non-LEP students that can be served in a bilingual dual language immersion two-way program. The first group is LEP code 0 students who have never identified as LEP participating in dual language immersion two-way program. The second group is former English learners/reclassified who are still participating in a dual language immersion two-way program.

Jay asked if this meant that even English proficient are eligible for that 0.05 funding?

Carli indicated yes; this applies to even those students who have never been identified as LEP/English learner. This incentivizes LEAs to provide these programs since they benefit both English proficient and English learner students.

Terri stated that we would list all of the codes (0, F, S, 3, 4, 5) to which the bottom row is referring to make it clearer to the reader.

David McKamie asked if more districts would implement these programs because of these changes.

Carli stated that they hope this will incentivize more LEAs to offer dual language immersion programs further stating that it is vital that LEAs implement these dual language immersion two-way programs with fidelity and intentionality. Putting these programs into place is a lengthy process and for most districts, it takes at least a year to begin a dual language program. Most start with a one-way program then ease into a two-way program. It's a mindset shift to implement a two-way program. Districts are encouraged to implement these programs carefully and Carli's group has resources (rubrics etc.) to help districts with this process.

David McKamie called for a motion to approve.

ITF Action:

Motion: Brenda Padalecki

Second: Dianne Borreson

Motion passed

4. New Tech Indicator and Expansion of Career & Technical Education for the 2019-2020 School Year Action Item

Under HB3, Section 1.030, the Career and Technology Education (CTE) Allotment was modified to include funding for campuses that are members of the [New Tech Network](#).

Additionally, HB3, Section 1.030, expands eligibility for the CTE Allotment to include students in grades seven and eight. Currently, CTE funding for students in grades seven and eight was limited to students participating in the CTE Program for the Disabled.

Presentation:

Terri Hanson presented the proposal which includes the following:

1.	Add new data element NEW-TECH-INDICATOR-CODE (E16XX) to the StudentExtension complex type to be reported in the PEIMS Fall, Summer, and Extended Year Submissions.
1.1	Add NEW-TECH-INDICATOR-CODE reporting guidance in the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS).
2.	Update existing TSDS reports to display reported NEW-TECH-INDICATOR-CODE data.
3.	Provide a resource or link with TEDS to a list of New Tech Network campuses.
4.	Add and update data validation rules to support the collection of NEW-TECH-INDICATOR-CODE.
5.	Update TEDS reporting guidance related to the reporting of CTE attendance for students in grades 7 and 8.
6.	Update and delete data validation rules to support reporting of CTE attendance for students in grades 7 and 8.

Terri introduced Stacy Avery to help answer any questions.

Terri described the new data element NEW-TECH-INDICATOR-CODE to be collected for PEIMS Fall, Summer, and Extended Year submissions on the StudentExtension complex type.

Stacy Avery explained that ECHS, P-TECH and T-STEM campus lists are managed by TEA, but New Tech Network manages the agreements with the campuses for New Tech Network. New Tech Network will be providing a list of the campuses that have an agreement with them. TEA will validate the reporting of the data elements based on the list of campuses provided by the New Tech Network.

ITF Discussion:

Terri called for questions regarding the New Tech Network indicator.

David McKamie stated that since there is new funding available to school districts, there may be campuses trying to join this throughout the school year. He asked if the New Tech Network is a specific a course or group of courses.

Stacy Avery stated that a New Tech Network school implements as specific model, it is not a course, rather it is a turnkey solution to be implemented across the campus. If a campus is interested in implementing this program, they would approach New Tech Network to implement the model. The first year is planning only, so they do not serve students in the model during the first year. After the planning year, campus enters into an implementation agreement with New Tech, and the campus pays to use this New Tech model.

David McKamie clarified stating that this program could not be implemented in a matter of days.

Stacy confirmed. She indicated that New Tech Network is a non-profit based in California. She stated that New Tech has to meet with the campus and go through one full year of planning before they can implement the program and are eligible for funding.

David McKamie asked if this mean that the only LEAs that would report this for 19-20 would be those already approved?

Stacy confirmed. She stated that there are for phases, only two of which are eligible for funding. Phase one is planning, phase two is implementation, phase three is continuation, and phase four is alumni. Only phases 2 and 3 have funding. Phase four (alumni) means there is no longer an agreement with New Tech Network, therefore there is no funding available.

Stacy continued by saying the TEA will work directly with those schools who are in phases two and three to make sure they are aware of the indicator and know how to report it. (This is about 25 campuses.)

David Taylor asked if the ESCs would some point have access to this list of campuses so that they would know if any campuses in their region have implemented the New Tech Network program.

Stacy replied that she is working with New Tech Network to get the correct CDC number and contact information for the list. The list will be posted as a separate link with TEDS under the link for P-TECH, T-STEM, ECHS campuses.

Terri confirmed.

Stacy also stated that she will provide each ESC with a list of the campuses in their region.

Terri stated that the ESC training at the end of July training would be a good time to provide this information.

Terri continued presenting the rest of the proposal which explains how students in grades 7 and 8 will be eligible for CTE funding. This change will be implemented by revising data validation rule 40110-0127 and deleting rule 42410-0003.

David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal.

ITF Action:

Motion: Jay Young
Second: Dara Fuller
Motion passed

5. Gifted & Talented Program Code for the 2019-2020 School Year - Action Item

Under HB 3 LEAs must annually certify that the LEA has established a program for gifted and talented students as required under TEC 29.124.

Presentation:

Terri Hanson presented the proposal which includes the following:

1.	Add new TX-GiftedTalentedPrograms sub-complex type to the LocalEducationAgencyExtension complex type to be reported in the PEIMS Fall Submission.
2.	Add a new data element GIFTED-TALENTED-PROGRAM-CODE (E16XX) to the sub-complex type TX-GiftedTalentedPrograms on the LocalEducationAgencyExtension complex type to be reported in the PEIMS Fall Submission.
3.	Add TX-GiftedTalentedPrograms and GIFTED-TALENTED-PROGRAM-CODE reporting guidance in TEDS.
4.	Add a new code table GIFTED-TALENTED-PROGRAM-CODE (Cxxx).
5.	Add a new TSDS PEIMS report to display the new data element.
6.	Add and update associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

Terri introduced Monica Brewer from Gifted/Talented Education for any questions.

Terri pointed out that the reporting of the new data element does not replace the student level indicator; rather, an LEA indicator is being added. A new complex type is added since an LEA can have more than one type of Gifted and Talented program and the LEA should report all programs that they offer.

ITF Discussion:

David McKamie asked if the indicator was at the campus or district level.

Terri responded that this is a district level indicator which is what the legislation specifies.

Dara Fuller asked if this indicator is for the 19-20 school year.

Terri confirmed that it is for the 19-20 school year.

David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal.

ITF Action:

Motion: Adrian Garcia

Second: Keitha Ivey

Motion passed

6. Expanded Learning Opportunities (ELO), Campus Only Reporting for the 2019-2020 School Year – Action Item

Under HB 3, the requirement for an LEA to report the number of students participating in each of the categories of expanded learning opportunities (ELOs) offered at each campus was removed.

Presentation:

Terri Hanson presented. Terri introduced Christine McCormick from Curriculum for any questions. Reporting at the Student level is being removed but reporting at the campus level is still in effect.

ITF Discussion:

Jay Young asked for verification regarding nothing has changed for the reporting of campus level Expanded Learning Opportunity code and the School ELO complex type; Christine confirmed.

Terri indicated that it was clear, based on feedback that student level reporting was going to be difficult to implement.

Christine elaborated stating that the reporting at the campus level gives TEA an opportunity to look at the campus level data and make the best use of it.

Keitha Ivey asked for clarification about what types of activities are reported at the campus level. For example, would this apply to a chess club be an ELO?

Christine stated that for determining what to report to campus expanded learning opportunities, LEAs should refer to the statute TEC Section 33.252. An expanded learning opportunity is a supplementary, voluntary, structured learning program that occurs outside of the regular school day, designed to enhance the educational program.

Christine continued that TEA is still working for more guidance that comes from the rule making process. Those rules will contain more guidance from the questions we got from the March roll out.

Keitha asked about an after-school day care, that is educationally based, but that parents pay for their children to attend? Is that something that would be reported?

Christine – Yes, if the program operates with the campus, but not if someone rents out the space to provide the service. If it is coordinated with that campus and the school day to help those students do better during the day, provide hands on activities that are coordinated with the curriculum, identified based on student needs (assessment or grades, social emotional). The parents paying for it isn't the issue, it's how the program is interacting with the students and families to serve those students.

David McKamie summed up the proposal stating student level reporting is removed, but LEAs still must report at the campus level, and we are still waiting on TEA guidance for rules on the new legislation; correct?

Christine confirmed.

David asked if the reporting could still change then based upon TEA guidance and rulemaking.

Christine stated that she didn't anticipate changes, but that TEA may provide more guidance. For now she stated that LEAs should refer to the definition of ELO in statute. She further stated that a decision has been made that TEA can't require LEAs to report UIL information because it is already gathered in another data collection.

David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal.

ITF Action:

Motion: Peggy Sullivan

Second: Dara Fuller

Motion passed

7. Leaver Reason Codes for the 2020-2021 School Year (Early Notice)**Action Item**

Under HB 3, Section 1.017, TEC section 48.009 addresses required PEIMS reporting. Included in this section is a requirement for the commissioner to adopt rules to include pregnancy as a reason a student withdraws from or otherwise no longer attends public school. Additionally, under HB 330, which modified TEC 39.053 (g-1), the commissioner is to exclude students who have suffered a condition, injury, or illness that requires substantial medical care and leaves the student unable to attend school and assigned to a medical or residential treatment facility when computing dropout rates.

Presentation:

Terri Hanson presented the proposal which includes:

1.	Add two new codes to the LEAVER-REASON-CODE (C162) code table.
2.	Add two new codes to the LEAVER-REASON-CODE (ABBREVIATED) (C162-A) code table.
3.	Update existing TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal

Terri introduced Linda Roska and Jennifer Broussard online for any questions.

This is an Early Notice item for 19-20 TEDS because LEAs must start tracking students who leave for these reasons during the 19-20 school year.

Terri noted that Leaver Reason Code 08 Pregnancy was an old code used through the 2005-2006 school year. Terri added that Linda and her team are still working on the guidance regarding the medical reasons to make sure that students who should be served are being served and that it is clear when and how to report this code.

ITF Discussion:

Regarding the medical injury code, Brenda Padalecki from Northeast ISD stated that their district has used the overnight stay/one night guideline for these scenarios. She asked in an overnight stay pertains to the determination of when this code should be reported. She also asked about scenarios in which a student is receiving intensive outpatient/day treatment that is not an overnight stay?

Linda Roska – we are still working on guidance on this, because we definitely don't want to exclude students who should be considered here.

Dara Fuller asked if either or both of these new leaver reason codes would be included to be included in the TEA dropout rate calculation or the federal dropout rate.

Linda stated that both new codes are included as dropouts in federal rate, but that the medical injury will be excluded from state dropout rate.

Keitha Ivey asked if the material Linda's group provides will also include documentation is required to support the reporting of each code. Linda confirmed that this information would be provided/

David McKamie asked for further information regarding the pregnancy code being reported for a male student. Will it be defined under what circumstances this code would be applicable for a male student?

Linda indicated that she didn't think her group would provide this detailed level of information since the legislation did not restrict the reporting leaver reason of pregnancy by gender.

Terri added that we will we work with Linda to update the TEDS Appendix for the guidance, particularly for the Medical item.

David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal.

ITF Action:

Motion: Pablo Martinez
 Second: D'Lynne Johnson
 Motion passed

8. Class Roster Supplemental Item**Action Item**

Update the collection name and add grade level from the collection of StudentSchoolAssociationExtension ENTRY-GRADE-LEVEL-TYPE.

Presentation:

Terri Hanson presented the supplemental item which includes:

1.	Update the collection name.
2.	Use complex type StudentSchoolAssociationExtension from InterchangeStudentEnrollmentExtension for the Class Roster collection.
3.	Update and add data validation rules to support the use of StudentSchoolAssociationExtension for the Class Roster collection.

Terri reminded everyone about the TAA that stated that the Class Roster collection would not have a Fall Submission for 2019-2020, just a Winter Submission. For 2020-2021 both will be collected.

ITF Discussion:

David McKamie asked if more information could be provided as to why Class Roster will not be collected in Fall.

Terri stated that we always want to ensure that TEA is using the data we are collecting. The TEA program area that will use this data would not be ready to use the data from the Class Roster Fall collection, so we postponed the collection. They will be ready for that submission in 20-21

David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal.

ITF Action:

Motion: Dianne Borreson
 Second: D'Lynne Johnson
 Motion passed.

9. Informational Items with TEDS Impact**Discussion Item**

Information related to updates to the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS) that are needed for the 2019-2020 school year as a result of some of the legislation that passed during the 86th Legislative Session. The items addressed in this document are provided to ITF as discussion only and no action is required.

Presentation:

Terri Hanson presented which includes the following:

1.	HB 1051 - Revise data element AT-RISK-INDICATOR-CODE (E0919) definition to reflect which students are considered at-risk.
	SB 1746 - Revise data element AT-RISK-INDICATOR-CODE (E0919) definition to reflect a new condition that identifies a student as at-risk.
2.	HB 165 – Revise validation rules to remove restrictions for endorsements and Distinguished Level of Achievement (DLA).
3.	HB 692 – Add data validation rule.

Terri mentioned that all of the legislation we analyzed indicates that it goes into effect September 1, 2019. We are trying to get as much of that into place, but some of the larger items will not be able to be implemented in 2019-2020.

Terri explained that the At-Risk definition is being updated in TEDS to reflect new criteria. The At-Risk indicator code does not change the TSDS PEIMS data collection, but it may change what LEAs keep track of for each student for determining at risk.

Terri described the new data validation rule to support House Bill 692 that limits the out-of-school suspension of a student who is homeless.

Terri explained the data validation rule adjustments that allow the reporting of endorsements distinguished level of achievement for graduates with graduation type code 35 “Completion of Minimum Curriculum and Credit Requirements for Graduation Applicable To Students In General Education And Participated In The Exit-Level Assessment Instrument Identified in The IEP-Foundation High School Program”

ITF Discussion:

Jay Young asked if the new at-risk criteria for the adult education program a 15th condition for at-risk?

Terri stated that this condition is very specific to only one adult charter (Excel Charter), so all students at that charter are considered at-risk

Jay said that this condition is currently only related to the Excel Center for Adult and TCC would likely change their screen to provide a 15th indicator/checkbox for students who may be in that program.

David McKamie asked for confirmation that these changes are in effect for 19-20 and why this item is a discussion item and not an action item?

Terri replied that mainly because TSDS is not changing what it is collecting, which is a Yes/No for At-Risk. She did state that this could be changed to an action item if the ITF committee wanted to vote on this item.

David asked if anyone had a problem with not voting and no one indicated so.

ITF Action:

N/A

10. RF Tracker Informational Item**Discussion Item**

Add complex type StudentProgramExtension to InterchangeStudentProgramExtension to add data element E0794 SPECIAL-ED-INDICATOR-CODE to the RF Tracker collection.

Presentation:

Terri Hanson presented which includes:

1.	Use complex type StudentProgramExtension from InterchangeStudentProgramExtension for the RF Tracker data collection, specifically for data element SPECIAL-ED-INDICATOR-CODE (E0794)
----	--

Terri explained that this is another gray area of action item vs. discussion item.

Candice clarified that we are already collecting this data in the TSDS collection, but now we are identifying it as being used by the RF Tracker collection.

ITF Discussion:

David McKamie asked to confirm his understanding that RF Tracker reporting is just pertinent to special ed students.

Terri clarified that yes, this collection is only for special ed students at a residential facility.

David asked if in the prior RF Tracker proposal, this complex type wasn't identified.

Terri responded stating that David was correct; it was not previously identified.

David McKamie called for comments or questions. There were no questions or comments.

ITF Action:

N/A

Other Business**Discussion Item**

Terri summarized that the July 19 meeting has three proposals related to funding/House Bill 3 (two for prekindergarten, one on dyslexia), and a few other small changes. We are going to do one set of meeting minutes and one report for PCPEI for these 2 July meetings. The PCPEI meeting is July 23.

Brenda Padalecki (Northeast ISD) – my discipline area is very concerned about HB 548. If we don't address that bill in the July 16 meeting, then it will be addressed in 20-21?

Terri indicated that this legislation will be dealt with for the 20-21 school year.

Brenda – what about SB 2442 regarding DAEP placement for harassment of school employee?

Terri indicated that this topic is on the agenda for July 16 for 19-20 implementation. She also stated that she would provide a list of legislation that is not being implemented until 20-21 or later. HB 3 items took priority because of the funding implications.

Jay asked if we anticipated any other changes for Fall, or if they were all covered in this meeting.

Terri said that she thinks most of the changes to be presented for 7/16 are all Summer PEIMS reporting impact, but there may be a small Fall impact.

Terri also indicated that we may not hold the August 13 meeting, and start the 20-21 items in the September meeting.

Adjournment**Discussion Item**

David McKamie asked the committee to make a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion: Dara Fuller

Second: Adrian Garcia

Meeting ended at 12.37 p.m.

