



**Texas Education Agency (TEA)
Information Task Force (ITF)
Tuesday, July 16, 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

Nancy Dunnam called the ITF meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.

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

ITF Members Present via GoToMeeting:

Dana Braun, Nancy Dunnam, Dara Fuller, Adrian Garcia, Sandra Kratz, Scott Lewis, Pablo Martinez, David McKamie, John Newcom, Brenda Padalecki, Linda Raney, John Shaffer, Nancy Smith, David Taylor, Jay Young

TEA Staff Present:

Candice DeSantis (ITS-BMD), Michele Elledge (ITS-BMD), Scott Johnson (ITS-BMD), Jacquie Porter (Early Childhood), Abby Rodriguez (Special Populations), Mary Scott (ITS-BMD), Leanne Simons (ITS-BMD)

TEA Staff Present via GoToMeeting:

Terri Hanson (ITS-BMD), Jeanine Helms (ITS-BMD), Justin Jons, Cherry Lee, David Marx, Shelly Ramos, Linda Roska (Research and Analysis), Nina Taylor (Research and Analysis), Yolanda Walker, Rhonda Williams

Terri asked for a few minutes to clarify the obligations TEA has regarding the legislation. With HB 3 and the funding changes for the 19-20 school year, we are obligated to make these changes for the 19-20 school year. We know it is important to get this info to school districts as soon as possible. We are trying to expedite the process, but please remember that as we go through these details that ITF does not share the information, as these details may change. It is important that we get the word out as soon as possible but sharing this information before it is finalized may cause issues for the districts. Terri continued by saying that by the training at the end of the month, things will be finalized, and we will provide details to districts. The next TEDS data standards will be published a few weeks after that.

1. Prekindergarten Programs Eligibility and Funding for the 2019-2020 School Year **Action Item**

From the 2019 legislative session, sections 1.013, 2.019, 2.021 and 2.023 of House Bill 3 (HB 3) made a variety of adjustments to eligibility for funding for prekindergarten programs. In particular, HB3 Section 2.019 requires Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to operate a full-day prekindergarten program for children who are at least four years of age.

Along with these adjustments, additional data reporting to TEA is required.

Additionally, Senate Bill 1679 allows a student who is eligible for prekindergarten at the age of three to automatically be eligible for enrollment in a prekindergarten class in the following school year.

Presentation:

Michele Elledge presented the proposal.

1.	Add new data element PK-FULL-DAY-WAIVER-INDICATOR-CODE (E16x1) to the SchoolExtension complex type to be collected in the PEIMS Summer Submission.
2.	Add new code to PK-FUNDING-SOURCE-CODE (C186) code table
a.	5 – Early Education Allotment
3.	Add new code to PK-SCHOOL-TYPE-CODE (C209) code table
a.	03 – Non-Public Pre-K
4.	Add new data element PK-ELIGIBLE-PREVIOUS-YEAR-INDICATOR-CODE (E16x2) to the StudentExtension complex type to be collected in the PEIMS Fall and Summer Submissions.
5.	Update reporting guidance provided in TEDS regarding PK Funding Sources
6.	Update existing TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal
7.	Add, update, and remove associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal

Michele explained that the new PK-ELIGIBLE-PREVIOUS-YEAR-INDICATOR-CODE should only be used if the student does not meet any of the other pk eligibility criteria.

ITF Discussion:

Nancy Dunnam asked if a student was eligible as a three-year-old, but not eligible as a four-year-old, then they would use this new element. Michele confirmed that this situation is when they would use PK-ELIGIBLE-PREVIOUS-YEAR-INDICATOR-CODE with a yes/1. If, for example, they were homeless when they were three, and are no longer homeless the next year at age four, they are eligible for PK funding because of being eligible at age three. Dara Fuller asked for confirmation that they would make them eligible for funding. Michele replied yes, they would be eligible for funding.

Brenda Padalecki (Northeast ISD) described a situation where their district doesn't offer a 3 year old program, a student attended another district's pk program as a three-year-old, then that student came to their district as a 4 year old. She asked for confirmation about whether this makes the student eligible in their district, and if this is when eligible previous year indicator should be used. Jacquie Porter confirmed and reiterated that if a student was in another district where they qualified and attended as a three-year-old, then they would automatically qualify to attend a 4 year old program in your district, but would only use the eligible previous year indicator if they do not qualify for PK in any other way.

Brenda stated that she assumes the records from the other district would be provided to the new district to prove that the student qualified as a three-year-old. Jacquie agreed.

Dara Fuller asked if this new eligible previous year indicator is for PK students only. Michele confirmed that this element is not mandatory and will be collected for PK students only.

Michele reviewed the tables in the proposal to clarify further. Michele introduced Jacquie Porter and Justin Jons on the phone to help address additional questions regarding this proposal.

Nancy Dunnam asked if there are any questions they should be asking and are not being asked.

Dara Fuller described a scenario of a student who qualified for PK at age three and attended, then they came at age four, and they qualified in another way for PK as a four year old (LEP, Military etc.). She asked if their eligible previous year indicator code would still be 0. Jacquie confirmed that is correct, and to only use PK eligible previous if that is the only way they qualify for PK.

Terri clarified the specifications related to HB 3 and SB 1679. Districts will still continue to report PK funding source and program type code to indicate how they are funding the other half day of a PK program. Students will continue to be reported with ADA eligibility code to indicate their eligibility for funding.

Nancy Dunnam asked if the Early Education Allotment is one way the districts can fund the program. Terri confirmed they can use that for funding the other half day. Nancy stated that the district can use their own funding, federal funding, or early education allotment. Jacquie confirmed. Nancy suggested an example would help to show the whole picture that is not that clear in the proposal.

ITF Action:

Nancy called for a motion.

Motion: Brenda Padalecki

Second: Dara Fuller

With no opposition, the motion passes as presented.

2. Prekindergarten Minutes and Instructional Programs for the 2019-2020 School Year Action Item

From the 2019 legislative session, section of 2.019 of House Bill 3 (HB3) requires 4-year-old prekindergarten programs to be full-day programs, but section of 1.013 of House Bill 3 (HB3) continues to only provide half of average daily attendance (ADA) for funding purposes.

As a result of requiring a full-day 4-year-old prekindergarten program, LEAs may choose to use the Early Education Allotment to supplement the second half of their PK day. In order to track these choices, it is necessary for the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to collect more detailed information about the prekindergarten instructional programs being offered at each campus. TEA proposes the collection additional code values for instructional program type with the calendar and reporting period data.

Presentation:

Michele Elledge presented the proposal.

1.	Update INSTRUCTIONAL-PROGRAM-TYPE (C215) code table in PEIMS to expand types of prekindergarten programs.
a.	Update code 04 – Prekindergarten Other Programs (including school districts and charter schools approved to operate after January 1, 2015) - Half-day programs for three-year old and ineligible four-year old students.
b.	Add new code 14 – Full-day Prekindergarten Program following 75,600 Operational Minutes
c.	Add new code 15 – Half-day Prekindergarten Program with Waiver following 32,400 Instructional Minutes (including school districts and charter schools approved to operate after January 1, 2015)
2.	Update guidance related to the reporting of prekindergarten programs for PEIMS.
3.	Update existing TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal
4.	Add, update, and remove associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal

Michele noted that code 14 should be used for full day PK programs instead of using code 01 because the commissioner is requiring PK programs to be tracked separately.

Brenda Padalecki (Northeast ISD) asked that, now that code 14 is available, a districts full day PK program should use code 14. The check for 32,400 minutes is no longer needed because now offer 75,600 minutes. Michele confirmed.

Nancy Dunnam asked if those PK students would be on a separate instructional track. Jacquie replied that yes, since the PK student are a different instructional program type, there should not be an issue if the PK students are on a separate track. Terri confirmed that different instructional program types use different tracks.

Jay Young asked, regarding code 14, why was it decided to use 75,600 operational minutes instead of the 4 hour (42,300 minutes) minimum for instructional minutes used by DAEPs and other programs. Jacquie responded that the decision was made to use 75,600 operational minutes because it's the same as the minutes used for the students in other grades on the same campus.

David McKamie noted that trainers will need to be careful in training when talking about operational minutes verses instructional minutes. Michele confirmed, since operational minutes are used for full day programs, but instructional minutes are used for half day programs that have a waiver. Jacquie continued by stating that operational minutes includes nap times and other activities that aren't considered instructional, but that are counted for your total minutes for the day.

Justin Jons noted that the reporting isn't much different than what it done now, where PK students are separated from K-5 on a campus with a different instructional program. The change is that there are more options to track the full day PK.

Nancy expressed concern for potential confusion regarding the change from reporting instructional minutes to operational minutes for PK students. Justin responded with clarification of the intent to report the full day PK students the same way as the other grades that report 75,600 operational minutes.

Terri also noted that the students are reported with ADA eligibility code, PK program type, and PK funding source, which also tells you if they are full day or half day.

Brenda asked if code 04 is only for half day programs for 3 year olds, or if it should also be used to report ineligible tuition-based 4 year old programs. Justin replied that code 04 can be used even if the students are going full-day, as the 32,400 minutes is a minimum and more minutes can be reported.

Dara asked if the definition for code 04 should say “half-day programs for three year olds and half day programs for ineligible four year olds”. Justin confirmed. Jacquie added that half day programs for three year olds, and half day programs for ineligible 4 year olds should use code 04. A full day program for ineligible four year old students would use code 14, because those students are there all day, regardless of the funding.

Nancy suggested starting the translation for code 04 with “Half day”

Adrian Garcia asked if code 04 is to be used for half day programs without a waiver and code 15 is to be used for half day programs with a waiver. Jacquie confirmed. A district does not need a waiver if they are serving ineligible students half day, but does need a waiver if they are serving eligible students half day. It would be more clear if the translation for code 04 added “half day” before “ineligible four-year olds”.

Nancy asked if the translation for code 04 should also specify the three year olds eligibility. Adrian continued with the suggestion that it state half day programs for 3 years olds and half day programs for ineligible students. Justin confirmed but stated that a district does not have an obligation to provide a full day program for three year olds.

Nancy suggested also adding “no waiver required” to code 04 translation.

Michele read the revised code 04 translation for confirmation as ending with “Half day programs for three-year old students and half-day ineligible three and four year old students (no waiver required)”.

Jay asked if we are moving ineligible four year old students to use code 14. Jacquie confirmed.

Jay continued to say that both eligible and ineligible 4 year old students will use code 14 when they are in a full day program, and the existing wording on code 04 doesn’t make that clear about full day four year old students. Justin suggested clarifying language for code 14 to make it more clear that full day four year olds use this code. Nancy agreed that any guidance would be helpful. Leanne suggested that code 14 translation be “Full day Prekindergarten Program (ineligible and eligible three four year olds) following 75,600 Operational Minutes”.

Jacquie stated that three year olds are only funded for a half day even if they attend the full day.

Nancy asked what instructional program should be used for a full day program for a three year old student. Justin replied that instructional program 14 should be used.

Terri explained that the reason we collect instructional program type is to tell use the instructional or operational minutes are needed for each program. In referring to the chart on page 7 of the proposal, code 04 is only for half day programs, so a full day student shouldn’t be on a track with program type 04. The new codes show the minutes associated with each program. Code 14 does not need to specify the age of the students.

Terri continued that any student attending PK full day, regardless of age, should get 75600 minutes. Individual students are coded with ADA eligibility and PK funding type to find out about their eligibility and funding.

Jacquie suggested the translation of code 14 would then read “Full day prekindergarten program for eligible or ineligible students following 75600 minutes”.

Nancy asked for confirmation that code 14 applies for three or four year olds, and that funding information would be determined from their ADA eligibility code. Jacquie confirmed.

After continued discussion of ways to provide the most clear explanation, it was decided to add three and four-year-old in brackets per recommendation from David McKamie and Adrian Garcia. The agreed upon translation for code 14 will be: “Full-day Prekindergarten Program following 75,600 Operational Minutes (eligible and ineligible three and four year olds)”

Michele continued to present the reports that would be updated, and the data validation rules.

Nancy requested a review of the rules to make sure our adjustments to the translations don’t impact the rules. Jeanine will review the rules.

Michele read through the business meanings of that data validation rules.

Adrian asked if there an edit that checks new code 15 to the PK waiver indicator. Michele replied that the program area will be confirming if a waiver exists for those not offering a full day program. Jeanine stated that a rule can also be added to do this check.

ITF Discussion:

See above

ITF Action:

Nancy called for a motion to accept the proposal with the adjustments we've described.

Motion: Dara Full moved to accept the proposal with changes to the description for codes 04 and 14.

Second: Adrian Garcia

Motion passed

3. Dyslexia and Related Disorder Services Reporting for the 2019-2020 School Year **Action Item**

Under HB 3, an allotment for services provided to students who have dyslexia or a related disorder was established. As a result, it will be necessary to provide a mechanism for LEAs to indicate a student received dyslexia/related disorder services for at least one day.

Presentation:

Michele Elledge presented the proposal.

1.	Add new TX-DyslexiaServices sub-complex type to the StudentProgramExtension complex type as mandatory in the PEIMS Summer Submission.
2.	Add new data element DYSLEXIA-SERVICES-CODE (E16XX) to the sub-complex type TX-DyslexiaServices on the StudentProgramExtension complex type to be reported in the PEIMS Summer submission.
3.	Add TX-DyslexiaServices and DYSLEXIA-SERVICES-CODE reporting guidance in TEDS.
4.	Add a new code table DYSLEXIA-SERVICES-CODE (Cxxx).
5.	Update existing TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
6.	Add data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

ITF Discussion:

Michele noted that the district can report each of the services the student received, therefore more than one service can be reported.

David McKamie asked if you can have all three codes being used in the year for a student. Michele responded yes, all three codes could be used, even though the example only shows 2 codes.

Nancy Dunnam asked if this information would be presented on the same report as the Section 504 information. They would like a PEIMS report with Section 504 data. Candice DeSantis replied that the Section 504 data was missed on a report for the Summer submission. It will be added to the student indicator report in the summer. Most likely these dyslexia services will be a brand new report so it can show all of the services provided.

David McKamie asked why this element definition includes the language of “at least one day”. It seems more common to use “at any time during the school year”. Nancy Dunnam added a concern about when a student is being served during an extended school year, would the language “at any time during the school year” have a different implication? Shelly Ramos replied that the language doesn’t impact their eligibility for the services, so we can change the definition to be like other definitions. David, Nancy, and Dara Fuller agreed that the rewording would be clearer and more consistent,

ITF Action:

Nancy called for a motion to accept proposal as presented with the change in the definition from “for at least one day during the school year” to “at any time during the school year:”

Motion: Dara Fuller - motion to approve with change to definition to “at any time during the school year”

Second: Brenda Padalecki

With no objections, the motion passes as presented.

4. Attribution Code for Students of Charter School Employees for the 2019-2020 School Year**Action Item**

Under HB 2190, TEC section 12.117 is expanded to allow an open-enrollment charter school to admit and receive attendance funding for a child of an employee of the school, regardless of whether the child resides in the geographical attendance area served by the school.

Presentation:

Michele Elledge presented the proposal.

1.	Add a new code to the STUDENT-ATTRIBUTION-CODE (C161) code table. 30 – Child of Charter School Employee
2.	Update existing TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal
3.	Update existing data validation rule to reflect the new student attribution code

ITF Discussion:

There were no questions or comments.

ITF Action:

Nancy called for a motion to approve the proposal as presented.

Motion: David McKamie

Second: Jay Young

With no objection to the proposal as presented, the motion passes.

5. Harassment Discipline Reason Code for the 2019-2020 School Year**Action Item**

Under SB 2432, TEC section 37.006(a) is expanded to allow the removal of a public school student from the classroom following engaging in conduct that contains elements of the offense of harassment under Section 42.07(a)(1), (2), (3), or (7) Penal Code, against an employee of the school district. Student harassment of an employee of the school district results in a mandatory DAEP placement.

TEA is proposing to add a disciplinary reason code for harassment against an employee of the school district to the student discipline data collection.

Presentation:

Michele Elledge presented the proposal.

1.	Add a new code to the DISCIPLINARY-ACTION-REASON-CODE (C165) code table: 60 - Harassment Against an Employee of the School District under Texas Penal Code 42.07(a)(1), (2), (3), or (7) – TEC 37.006(a)(2)(G)
2.	Update existing TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
3.	Update existing data validation rules to reflect the new disciplinary action reason code.

ITF Discussion:

There were no questions or comments.

ITF Action:

Nancy called for a motion to approve the proposal as presented.

Motion: Adrian Garcia

Second: Dara Fuller

With no objection to the proposal as presented, the motion passes.

6. Bullying Discipline Reason Code for the 2019-2020 School Year**Action Item**

Under SB 179 (85th), TEC section 37.0052 was added to all to allow a public school to expel a student from the classroom for certain bullying behaviors. The offense of bullying under Section TEC 37.0052, the expulsion of students for certain bullying behaviors, is a discretionary removal to DAEP or expulsion.

TEA is proposing to add a disciplinary reason code for bullying to the student discipline data collection.

Presentation:

Michele Elledge presented the proposal.

1.	Add a new code to the DISCIPLINARY-ACTION-REASON-CODE (C165) code table:
	61 - Bullying – TEC 37.0052(b)
2.	Update existing TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
3.	Update existing data validation rules to reflect the new disciplinary action reason code.

ITF Discussion:

Dara Fuller asked if the appendix and chart in the back of TEDS will be updated. Mary Scott stated that we are in the process of writing a discipline guide for chapter 37. In that guidebook we will be updating the chart and the rules.

David McKamie asked if the verbiage about “David’s Law” should be included, since that is what districts may be looking for. Mary Scott responded that there are many aspects of bullying, and that although they were supporters of the legislation, we can’t say for certain that this piece of legislation originated from David’s Law.

ITF Action:

Nancy called for a motion to approve the proposal as presented.

Motion: David McKamie

Second: Jay Young

With no objection to the proposal as presented, the motion passes.

7. Military Connected Student for the 2019-2020 School Year**Action Item**

In the 86th Legislative Session, SB 1557 relating to military connected students was passed. Among other things, under SB 1557, the definition of military-connected student was updated to include dependents of former members of: the United States (US) military, the Texas National Guard or a reserve force on the US military. Additionally, the definition of military-connected student also includes students who were dependents of a member of the US military, the Texas National Guard or a reserve force of the US military who was killed in the line of duty.

Presentation:

Michele Elledge presented the proposal. Michele Introduced Abby Rodriquez from the program area to address any questions.

1.	Update the definition of data element MILITARY-CONNECTED-STUDENT-CODE (E1529).
2.	Update existing codes and add new codes in the MILITARY-CONNECTED-STUDENT-CODE (C197) code table:
	Codes 1, 2, 3, 4, - Update translation
	New Code 5 - Student in grade KG – 12 is a dependent of a former member of one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the United States military - the Texas National Guard (Army, Air Guard, or State Guard) - a reserve force in the United States military
	New Code 6 - Student in grade KG – 12 was a dependent of a member of a military or reserve force in the United States military who was killed in the line of duty.
3.	Update existing TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.

ITF Discussion:

There were no questions or comments.

ITF Action:

Nancy called for a motion to approve the proposal as presented.

Motion: Adrian Garcia

Second: Dara Fuller

With no objection to the proposal as presented, the motion passes.

Other Business**Discussion Item**

Census Block Guidance was presented by Terri Hanson.

We presented this proposal last week. All economically disadvantaged students need a Census Block reported except for homeless students. This was confirmed. We also do not need census block reported for students with ADA eligibility code 0 (enrolled, not in membership). We only want census block for students in membership.

For a student in a joint custody situation, if one parent lives in the attendance zone of the school, use that address. If neither parent lives in the attendance zone, campus chooses which address to use.

We are still working on the requirements about what to report for students in residential facilities. A white paper will be created to explain more. TEDS will reflect the latest guidance.

Nancy Dunnam asked how old the census block information?

Terri replied that it is part of TEAs responsibility is to provide a tool to help districts provide an address and be given a census block. We are using the same vendor that provides the school district boundary map. They say the basis is from the 2010 census, and it is updated on a regular basis, but we don't know the frequency of the updates.

Linda Roska added that it uses American Community Survey data from 15-16, so some data is a few years old. Those data are 5 year estimates, but some of the survey questions are asked every year.

Upcoming ITF meetings:

Nancy asked if we would need a meeting before the scheduled August 13th meeting. Terri responded that we may have one other item. We will contact Nancy next week to determine if we need a meeting or can convey the information via an email.

Adjournment**Discussion Item**

Nancy Dunnam called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion: Dara Fuller

Second: Adrian Garcia

Meeting ended at 11:40 a.m.